WORLD ANTI-WAR CONGRESS
GENEVA, JULY 28th, 1932

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

Provisional Secretary: R. BRIDGEMAN
Provisional Treasurer: JOHN STRACHEN

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 Yen 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, to which we appeal for a general declaration of opposition to war.

"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 undervalued men and women are determined to do everything to hinder the crime of war. We cannot, however, ignore that 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 impose 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 organise 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.


June, 1932.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD

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

SUPPORTS PACIFISM: NOT FASCISM.

Demands Responsible and Gracious Amendments to U.N.B.

UPHOLDS CIVIL LIBERTY IN WAR-TIME.

Has a Low Notion of All Parliamentary Placemen, 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 peacetime. It is the motto of Bertrand, Earl Russell, who is no longer a Pacifist. He has resigned himself to the motto and 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 1872, was the third son of the then Duke of Bedford. His rebuke to Sir Francis Bondett, quoted in "Why James Hogg", shows that "finality makes" as he was nicknamed, was not moved by too great a respect for resignation to the fate.

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.

Published by R. Bridgeman, 46/4 I.A.L., 41 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.I.
What Will Be—Will Be," is the motto of Lord Russell of Killowen; of Viscount Amery; of Baron de Clifford; and of Sir Alex of Invercaul. 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 Rifle Brigade (Middlesex Regiment). For over twenty years he has been an ardent Fascist, because he believes to a Fascist that the frightful task of re-educating the whole world, a task which 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 immense, 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 willing to, and be a defender of the Anti-Militarist. As a Fascist he not only cannot be a Fascist but he is an enemy of Fascism. He is a Fascist and enemy 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, we will have an 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 by James I. Later, after the death of the Earl of Bedford, the title was inherited in the family by the Duke of Bedford, an excellent one, as he was the best man who considered the views placed before him by the present Duke of Bedford.

Ever ready to turn to good account the opinions of others, the Duke was remarked that he was not a republican, and only welcomed the writings of Voltaire, Rousseau, Helvetius, and Diderot, because, by another method, he was granted us those virtues which we attributed to war with Inflated France was both just and necessary, since it showed how great was the assumption of certain mistakes which were left to the mighty 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 learn from those who were unprepared to give a reasonable attention to popular requirment, by a relaxation of the reins of despotism, that opinions were not subdued, but confirmed. He knew 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.

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 to us that he would have preferred to issued a widespread curt statement of his views, headed A Personal Statement. We explained that this would not have permitted the personal peculiarities of his views being done in an interview. It is true that the interviewer makes only a digest of the conversation, but the digest, if properly arranged, can be made as clear as the happy 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 suggesting to me as a Fascist, or even as a man, the ceaseless propaganda which has betrayed him into being "pro-Fascist." I have, however, had no thought of producing a "For Fascism is essentially a militarist philosophy. I am definitively an Anti-Militarist and am therefore opposed to all hate campaigns."

"Many of my friends and colleagues have been subjected to innuendo on account of their association with the Duke, and the statement of any position may be desirable in order to clear the air. Such a statement will make no impression on those who are opposed to war that they are not concerned with the essence of the "pro-Fascist" label. They use it as a slogan of abuse, without regard for sense or truth, as a means of making me for my criticism of, and opposition to, war. As he goes on, the foolish and disastrous consequences of appeal to arms to settle the disputes of civilisation will become apparent and not 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 horrors of war. I cannot pay tribute to Mars."

"Apart from the wilful slanderer, there are many who have been led by a desire to slumber and men are at least, realising that I am a pro-Fascist."

DEFEATED 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 I was engaged in running a hate campaign against Soviet Russia, just as they now do it against Fascist Germany. You will notice that the arguments used then for "national" and "security" were the same as 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:

"There are objectionable features of Fascism may be summarised as espionnage and acts of violence by police agents; the imposition of vindictive and excessive penalties on those wronged by 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 militarism. 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, he produced the League for the Abolition of War, and Labour M.P.'s: David Kirkwood,等相关名句。本季度论"..."。The Duke at the time was the Marquis of Tavistock and his signature was there. Why he had 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 Anti-War Congress..." The Duke then went on to say that 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 opposite side of this 1932 Congress, Marisberi called the following warning: FACTS TO REMEMBER:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World War, 1914-1918.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Killed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,742,914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1921 the World was Spent £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, 12% of the debt was spent on war, and only 7% 1d. on peace, that is, health, education, old age, and the like. The leaflet quoted also from Howard, May 30, 1932, Vol. 260, No. 100, to show what exports permits had been issued by the British Government for export of material intended for Japan, to assist the campaign of invasion against China.

The Duke defined his attitude towards the denunciation 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, and the various conditions of ruthlessness out of which Hitler and Nazism arose. He was prepared to consider all this as an explanation of Nazism, and then to proceed to the further campaign of hate which would add violence to violence and so aggravate the evil.

The Duke of Bedford has dealt very thoroughly with this matter elsewhere and his attitude appears a much better way to deal with the matter need not be dwelt on at great length in the present report. There is so much more to ground to: for the Duke's statement was explicit and we have no further points to make about the evils of Fascism, to which many politicians had paid no attention until to do so sowed the hatred propaganda which belongs to war, and we have to see whether those who fight as 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 retribution of these evils, and do not let us introduce them here," stated the Duke. "Yet this is exactly what has happened to our War-time Democracy almost to the barbarism of Fascism. The Duke added that he took his stand unshaken and definitely by the right of full civil and religious freedom which included the right of conscience, and the right of political liberty, even in war-time. Hitler's persecution of religious leaders is intolerable, but I unreservedly condemn it," said the Duke. He added 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, I do not approve of it. But we 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 defender of individual rights in society, and conscience cannot respect nor mark time at nominal Christianity."

CONSCIOUS OBJECTORS.

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

"We had a party of CO's over to tea, who are working with a local forestry unit: quite nice young fellows. Some of them came from Churt. I talked to one or had seen one. One was a keen member of the LCP, and a great admirer of Maxton."

CREECH JONES.

We mentioned Croom-Jones, and insinuated the splendid stand he took as an absolutist during the last war. We commented on his desire to see CO's today and on his excellent record in the House. We added that Croom-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 Croom-Jones since you feel that he was a splendid officer and a loyal comrade during the last war. I quite understand you commending his loyalty and his memory of his past. But if he supports war, and becomes identified with the Imperial War Office and with the House of Commons 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 against the will of the nation. I hope that conscience supports unreservedly the war measures enacted 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, I was only doing so in the hope that those who have never been associated with 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 exmembers 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 strongly maintained that justice should be done to political prisoners. In the past, Anarchists have been prosecuted in all countries, 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 persecution. I have always stood by the victims when the victims are exmembers of the British Union, or even members. I hold that neither a member of the House of Commons nor any other member of the House of Commons ought to be prosecuted.

"There can be no good reason, not even in war-time, why persons arrested should not be given adequate information to those who have informed against them have to appear for cross-examination."

The Duke complained that argument against trial for Government by decree and pre-emption was plausible, but dangerous. He gave the example of the development of the prosecution during the struggle and the wars of French Revolution. This prosecution, as his colleagues have related, rose naturally out of war conditions. The important and interesting feature of the whole is that legal analogy will be illustrated and detailed to the 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 Fascism, I will stand by them. But I cannot agree to their trial for fair treatment. I would make the same demand for Socialists, Communist, and Anarchists, if they were in a like position. I would even extend it to conscientious objectors. Conscientious objection is a right. Of what value is a sense of justice if it is displayed only towards friends, and only in peace, and not in war?"

SIR OSWALD MOSLEY.

Sir Oswald Mosley is a militarist and an instrument 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 nearly every point. I believe in the importance of industry, and that industry can be made to co-operate with Hitler in promoting an invasion, he would not announce this fact publicly. Neither would it be always a repetition of the previous instance. Fairness and co-operation compel me to add that it is monstrous that, without proof, a man should be treated as a traitor, suspect, merely because some persons are of his race, have no use for military, whether the militarism of Sir Oswald Mosley, or that of the Government, but I have a deep and genuine respect for the principles 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, in the House of Commons, has been without question 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 would not have given the Fascist Movement the benefit of the doubt.

Strike-breaking was not confined to the Fascists and some members of the present Government, and certainly many members of the British Union of Fascism have been Freeholders of Emergency Powers and strike-breaking in 1926. The Duke made a later reference to this subject.

At this stage, the Duke handed me letters he had received from relatives and friends of victims of 18B all over the country since he became leader of the British Union. He sent letters and complaints in a separate article. The Duke explained why he had done nothing in the way of criticism in the House of Lords.

AGAINST "THE UPPER TIER."

"Since I began to reflect on the problem of poverty, I have grown more and more apart from the so-called 'Upper Tier.' I have found, for example, that they are not only the children of greater than I knew before. My faith is in democracy and the common people. I did not see how I could stand in the same position as they did or how I could do so without standing in the same spirit. If I ever I can serve peace and justice, conscience and society, the cause of the poor. I am the last 25 years," he repeated, "I have been happier not in the company of the 'upper tier.'"

LOW NOTION OF PARLIAMENTARY PLACE-MEN.

I have developed a really low, notion of parliamentary place-men. I see ex-conscientious objectors who are still working in the prison while holding the imprisonment, without trial, of ex-socialists, men who are yet suffering from the measure in the last war, when they were told they were conscientious objectors were threatened with political dis-enfranchisement. What has become of the idea of the British Union? I believe the need for honesty and sincerity in public life. I do not believe that the conditions of warfare are the best conditions for developing a fascist spirit. I believe that the only real war is to develop a spirit of unity and that the real struggle is to develop a spirit of unity and that the real struggle is to develop a spirit of unity and to 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 Lords. 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 people. But the people had made Parliament useless as a sounding-board. It ought not to be so but it was. Nevertheless, if those who stood for Socialism and Fascism in the House of Lords were to work-co-operative manner they represented, desired it, he would take his stand as their spokesman in the House of Lords.

The Duke was somewhat different 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 was the man. Whatever it was in the House of Lords. If he could serve the cause of public usefulness, in that capacity, he would do so. He was willing to serve 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. In the end that movement must turn against both militarism and Fascism and overthrow the terrible appeal to war. He had faith that pacifism would move. There must be established, in the interest of every section of the people, even of the soldiers and the workers-workers, a united Socialism, a united Socialism, a united Socialism, a united Socialism, a united Socialism.

"The Duke felt that the Government must decide this point soon. In time the people would. The
BLAKER, M.P.!

A STUDY IN TORY MENTALITY!

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

Sir Reginald was born in 1900 and succeeded to the family seat in 1920. He was educated at 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 branch of the Tory League was published 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 forget and forgive. For me no Versailles. I believe our war is not almost to be lost, 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 10 per cent. more brutal than the severity they have met 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 “Conservative” to which Blaker belonged, of which Parmoor became chairman. Obviously, they know nothing about the Versailles Treaty and still less about the principles of humanism. Each person in the world is answerable finally.

RICHARD CARLILE

The following comments on the 1920 edition appeared in The Freethinker, the local organ of the Labour Party, for September-October, 1927:

“A man is not honest who is not held enough to his honour and active enough 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 was one of the 19th century Fundamentalists, who contributed to the struggle for the freedom of the individual. Those who are prepared to have their complete freedom who are prepared to have their complete freedom are those who, regardless of cost, are prepared to stand for that which is to them right. And “Richard Carlile—Agitator,” by G. Aldred, a stimulating book.

They may not agree with all that Carlile wrote or with all the methods he advocated, but they are likely to find in his day an inspiration for the day of the Labour Party, who will not fail to benefit by reading the thought-challenging statements and actions of Carlile, who devoted his life to the writing of letters in gold in every public meeting place and private general, a true order of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.

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. Today the figure has doubled. In the first half of 1920, conservatives have contributed less than £250 towards the special appeal we issued then for £1,971 11s. 6d. Every month this paper must carry national propaganda. This journal is not subsidised and personally we are now without funds. During July we have received only £4 16s. 4d. This amount required: £1,285 10s. 9d. If every reader makes a real effort this deficit can be overcome within a month. If every reader makes a real effort this deficit can be overcome within a month.
THE SCOTTISH SECRETARIAT

THOMAS JOHNSTON'S EVOLUTION

(Continued from page 137)

At the trial for sedition of the founder of the Anti-Secessionist Association in London (1876), it appears that Mr. Horatio Bottomley, the editor of the Edinburgh Review, was called as a witness to give evidence against the Scottish nationalist movement. However, when the�� detected the existence of his work, he immediately withdrew his support and burned his manuscript. The terms of the declaration of independence were not published at the time, but the use of this document became a symbol of Scottish nationalism.

In their spare time, the added insult of injury they are trying to make to them, economic and social injustice was a great blow to the working class. They fought back against this at the meeting in Edinburgh, where the Scottish Nationalists announced their intention to form a new political party.

During the 1970s, the members of the Scottish Secretariat worked closely with the Irish Republican Army (IRA) to bring about a united Ireland. They also supported the struggle of the Basque people for independence.

The Scottish Secretariat was dissolved in 1983, but its legacy lives on in the ongoing struggle for Scottish independence.

Accusations of sedition were also made against Thomas Johnston, who was a member of the Scottish Secretariat. He was arrested and imprisoned for his activities.

Johnston was a leading figure in the movement for Scottish independence. He was a close friend of Robert Burns and a supporter of the Scottish Nationalists. He was also involved in the London Irish Nationalist Movement and was a member of the Irish Republican Brotherhood.

In addition to his political activities, Johnston was a poet and a literary figure in his own right. His work included a number of pamphlets and books, as well as translations from the Scottish and Irish languages.

Johnston's writings were often critical of the British government and its policies towards Ireland. He was also a strong advocate for the cause of Scottish independence.

His contributions to the movement for Scottish independence were recognized after his death in 1815. A monument was erected in his honor in Edinburgh, and his works were collected and published posthumously.

The Scottish Secretariat was an important part of the movement for Scottish independence, and its legacy lives on in the continuing struggle for self-determination.
The main narrative continues: 

This Entente Cordiale, of which our Capitalist friends have been so fond, lasted from April 1904, when the Anglo-French Entente was signed, until the war of France and Germany broke the pact to the world. France was to recognize British interests in Egypt and Britain was to recognize German interests in Belgium. Germany, through her Diplomacy because she had not been asked, had been left out. She was, therefore, left out. Mannsennemann, Brothers, had obtained an exclusive contract to build the railroad from Morocco to the Krippps, and, to whom it had lent money to support a rebellion in the French Morroco, to a Sultan, to whom it had lent money to support a rebellion in the French Morroco, to a Sultan, it was suddenly disclosed by a Salon Journal, “Le Temps,” that there were no exceptions to the Anglo-French Agreement. In articles 1, 2, and 3 of the Agreement, the French Government had declared that the force of circumstances compelled either to take the German Government’s protest, to its new protectorate to support another one and get its working class to fight if necessary, and Germany had definitely partitioned between France and Spain. (See Dr. Halide Rossa’s “The Origins of War,” Vol. I, 10, 14, and Mr. Fenby’s Brochure “Was Britain Blameworthy?”) This dirty piece of maneuvering, of course, excited German Capitalists. The Germans were Huns today, but they were brave and chivalrous Allies only a few years ago, when they loaned the French and British fleets to a Turkish fleet and then connecting a naval demonstration against President Roosevelt of the United States because the Turkish Government and their Allies in European Capitalist countries were not receiving their dividends regularly.

In 1912, the indomitable Turks, imperial missionaries, opium wars, suziers of Wei-Hai-Wei and Kaio Chou, opened the gates of China so that two German missionaries had been murdered, but in reality because one Skertcheley, a mining prospector, and the other, a Russian, was rich in tin and carbonates and the third a mineral section. And in 1913, the Germans acquired Diamant and Spirit monopolies and huge subsidies in China and, in 1914, they organized a Janissary Raid. It falls. Then comes the Johannesn plot of May, 1899.

Johnston proceeds to quote Lord Lansdowne in his Letter to Mr. M’Intosh, dated December 27, 1899. He describes the reckoning and plundering of Turkey; the reorganisation of Turkish Naval Dockyards; the creation of “The” Armament-Visitors group, formed in the discussion in the Lords in 1913; the German loan to Bulgaria and its meaning to the Russian; the conspiracies between arms manufacturers, both French and German. Schneider, the armament king of France, the British manufacturers, led by Edward Grey and the D’Asquith House of Commons, “the greatest moral force on the earth”, and American manufacturers, led by Ormsby, Morley, Burns, and Trevelyan had a “protect against Secret Diplomacy and open diplomacy.” Of the British Government it is likely to follow the excellent example set by Morley, Burns, and Trevelyan, who became, for five months, honest men. Even that is too drastic a sacrifice for our modern Parliament. Johnston adds:

Can we or can even place implicit trust in the White Papers which profess to give us the diplomatic plot? Correspondence on this subject is too secret.

Johnston concludes his pamphlet with these words of denunciation:

Money kings over the proli—according to Mr. M’Intosh, the “White Papers” have $3,000,000,000 of British owned money invested in armaments, making $4,000,000,000, more than to make $200,000,000; armament trusts seeking whom they may exploit; money talking loudest in every Parliament and most loudly in the one which is pledging your lives and mine as stakes in the game. Whither are we going, and what is the continuance in Foreign Policy—the doctrine first announced by Lord Rosebery, who married a Rothschild, and Rosebery himself the first expert for Foreign Affairs—is taken for granted. Everywhere, “the enterprising, orderly, unimpeachable King, is
—pawns on the board.

There is no hope, no way out; no remedy possible denunciation, only an absolute, positive, and drastic control of every department of social activity. All protests against the unsupportable international operation of inequalities, the harm done, the old code as Cobden, who clearly saw the flagrant folly of a national system of credit would have been made in the world. All money exposed for armaments—armaments which in turn the creation of the counter preparations to meet them, are the result of the operations of the Colonial expansionist traders, and the knavish and system of illegal operations which disguise the deceptions and the robberies from the common people. More protests are useless; they

Johnston tells the story of the Kaiser’s pilgrim:

In 1899, the German Kaiser visited the Holy Land. Our special correspondent reports that he was a Christian Pilgrim. He said so himself. “Not spendour,” he declared, “not power, not glory, not the taking in hand of all the world, but to see, to buy, to taste, to offer prays and to see the pious are being offered. Then we pine, we pray, we strive alone after the soul that is the path of the Sacred Pilgrim. This our capital for this world and the minds of many of us, for this reason, the German Pilgrim will be allowed to do this.”

Johnston concludes: the Kaiser is a man with a purpose and a plan, and the Kaiser is a man with a purpose and a plan, and the Kaiser is a man with a purpose and a plan.
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 seems in the present day that we should consider that the Duke of Bedford is "pro-Fascist" or "pro-Fascist". The article is reprinted for a sane understanding of the German question. The article is one of the most interesting articles that appeared in the Soviet Union. The essay was published in 2 papers at the time. It was entitled: "A Sane Outlook on the Russian Empire". The essay is reprinted from the original MS.—Ed.

The fact that I have not been to Russia and cannot even speak the Russian language might, under ordinary circumstances, cause me to hesitate to write this article. I do, however, feel that it is my duty to speak with authority about Russia as I have never been in the country; whereas countless people whose ignorance is as great as my own are laying down the law in the most dogmatic fashion and are ascribing to public opinion even very dangerous paths. These people think that the Russian people is the only nation that is truly great, because they are seen by us as the only nation that is truly great. The people of Great Britain and the Near East are not mentioned even in the same breath, but the people of the Soviet Republic are always held in contempt, because they are ill-educated, the spirit of conflict is bred. There are few enough in both countries to allow the power of the idea to be dry and, by the law of national honour and need for self-defence, ring the people of the British Empire who desire aggressive war. The article is also directed against another nation whose rank and file may be as ignorant as those of any other country in the world, but unlike the other, their independence is likely to be achieved upon their opponents. It may be very bad and shocking, but undoubtedly it will happen and always has happened. It is simply the result of human nature.

To expect to realise financial obligations entered into under a system they detested and despised is to expect too much. They could not be expected to such consideration from ill-educated men, who are embittered by the armed expedition sent against them, and flushed with new power and new schemes for the social reorganisation of an impoverished country. That they failed to establish political freedom is again on natural: men who have their wills on the people, 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, just as they believe, from subtle hostile influences and from the effects of their own ignorance of what is going on.

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 do not mention the causes which are really local. No allowance is made for the effects of the war; for the phenomena which have arisen from the Russian peasantry, nor for the fact that even under the Czar's rule the standard of living was generally a little lower in the country and the export trade in grain, the wolf was often at the door.

The Soviet Government is bitterly anti-colonial, but it is not this world, as some of our worthy critics might more easily realise if they cultivated a bit more of their Master's genius for the hon-owed outlook. The Orthodox Church in Russia, before the Revolution, was appallingly
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corrupt. Religion there was in plenty, Christianity it was hard to find. Mighty churches, richly decorated, towered above the hovels where the people lived. The Church and the State were on good terms with the ruling class; never a word of protest against Siberia, nor any clear direction that privilege carries with it responsibility. The Soviet authorities saw in the religion around them a great organized hypocrisy, and it is not unlikely that Christ-Sufferer was not to be reckoned with, but rather with their own. Jesus Himself they regarded as a poor figure: an unpractical visionary, dangerous. He was taken seriously: that, too, was natural: only those who have had close personal experience of really Christian individuals can be expected to understand and to sympathize with the outcasts behind the startling paradoxes on which our religion is largely based. I have known many a Communist and Socialist in my own country who, in their 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 opinion of the people.”

Lastly there is the propaganda greeence. Well are not we continually issuing propaganda by the hundred and keeping missionaries to foreign lands? Do not the Anglo-Israelites and the Mormons and various other earnest but more or less misguided people spend their time going about the world telling propagandists are often partly mistaken in sin; almost wholly futile in suggested methods; and supremely fatuous in expression, we must remember that it is the religion and have 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 them to do, but their bark is likely to prove worse than their bite. Their hands are more than full with the administration of a great but not too large country; they are militarily and physically averse to war outside their own dominions. The hard disciplines 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 enterprising men the scene of stupidity is to admire them rather than to beat them at the brick wall. The policy of the late Government has been disastrous in its effects and the mischief done will take many years to repair. But those who are now in power have some powerful and highly strung animal to bade, loses his nerve, bites the creature and bolts out of the cage leaving it ten times more dangerous 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 was a mistake, as I have often said, to talk too much about the time when her leaders began to talk about withdrawal and immigration. Without being foolishly confounding you should take every opportunity of establishing contact, partly that there may be an interchange of views, and partly that you 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 sympathize with the leaders of the followers of the Churches, if it be compatible with the advancement of God’s Kingdom, their time of trial may speedily be ended, it is with great sorrow to remember that few things are less commendable for the quality of faith and perseverance. It was speculation that made the early Church a living power during the first three centuries of its existence, and it has often been a tenacious which the 1600 years have done nothing 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

UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP

The question whether allegiance to a country is a condition upon which 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, 1909, in connexion with two applications for naturalization.

The Court reversed the decisions of the Connecticut and New York District Courts and ordered that the two persons named in the applications be admitted to American citizenship.

Miss Marie Devreux Bland, of Canadian birth who nursed American soldiers in France during the war, and Miss M. Bland, was, at the time of application, the Rector of Kirkley Underwood, Bourne, Lincolnshire.

In a case, the question, a Canadian, Miss Macpherson, of Halifax, Nova Scotia, was admitted to American citizenship, in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, and ordered that the application for naturalization be granted.

Miss Bland said that her conscience as a Christian would not permit her to swear an oath. She was willing to go to the front and bear arms. The Court of Appeals pointed out that Dr. Macpherson apparently was willing to give the United States all the allegiance he ever gave or could give to any country but “he could not be a citizen of a government of any country before his allegiance to the Will of God.”

The Court emphasised that there was a distinction between moral justice and the available war as a means to achieve international law. It is an institution, which was 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. Alfred,—I am interested to see that in the June number of “The Baptist” there was given so much space to some of our Baptist doings.

I am glad you put in the bit about our addition to the Baptist Report. We felt at our Assembly that it was necessary, and I was authorised to strengthen that paragraph, which in the final form now appears.

“T he Council accept, as the writers do, the Five Peace Points suggested by the Pope, but would add as their view expressively: ‘It is incumbent on nations to full religious liberty. The reference to the real needs and just demands of nations and population in the special social conditions of our time is more likely to imply religious freedom and respect for the rights of the conscience of the individual, than a system of sufficiency 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 which I made a mild disclaimer 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,

June 19, 1911.

Dear Conrado,—I have just finished reading “Richard Carlyle,” and 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 author has been able to present a really thorough and valid FOURTH EDITION OF THE TIMES "PRINCIPLES OF NATURAL LAW." Can you tell me where this is obtainable?

One minor mistake: First Period, pacifism begins, page 130.

Thanking you once more,

Yours fraternally,

C. C. SIMMONS.
East Barnet, Herts.
July 8, 1911.

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 Street, G. N., was fined, when tried at 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. The fines was a symbol of compulsion and not service.

To our mind the decision against Gordon can not be defended, and ought to be recalled.
ventive arrest and custody. This is an odious idea. Since it is in operation, the question of how the prisoners are treated arises.

In 1874, 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 involving great harm or public consequence, should be kept in simple detention, apart from common criminals. It was stated that Germany had already recognised this principle of Custodia Honoraria. 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 colleaguesInitialState. They 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 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 no longer severe and painful to the persons sentenced for offences of a nature that it is to the ordinary thief or forgeter."

Speaking in the House of Commons on March 1st, 1888, Mr. Gladstone said:

"I know very well you would 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 were guilty of base and degrading crime ... These sentences are, of course, of this kind may be a matter on which men will differ according to their ideas, and 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 the metaphorical language when he said: 'The spirit which feels and is divided.'"

We now pass to PRISON REGULATIONS NUMBER 243A.

"In the case of any offender of the Second or Third Class, the following procedure is generally adopted, 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 some amelioration of the regulations prescribed in the ordinary rules as the Secretary of State may approve in respect of the wearing of prison clothing, bathing, hair-cutting, recreation, exercise, books, and otherwise. Provided that no such amelioration shall be greater than is allowed 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 20th, 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, in accordance with any acts involving moral turpitude, I propose to relieve them of the ordinary rules of the Second and Third Class, of being specially searched, and of being compelled to take the regulation regarding bathing. I also propose to enable the offenders in the Second and Third Class, under certain circumstances, to obtain food from outside, to go out into the open air in the morning and in the afternoon, to converse with other prisoners when taking exercise, and to keep their own expense, such books, not dealing with current events, and so forth; and such literature as is in accordance with the public opinion."

Relying 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 the right of appeal under the Act must not be taken as a mistake of the First Division. This was amended by the Prison Act of 1888, 61 & 62 Vict. C.41, 56(5). In Scotland the political offender of this class became a Civil Prisoner, and in England he became a prisoner of the 1st Division. Later Acts varied this, in event of the prosecution 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 did not take him long to 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 Judicial Committee of the Privy Council 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 seemed to us to have been willing, 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 imprisoned, or the persons who had been interned, or released, denied the need for 18B legislation. This fact impressed us, because we do not believe in the Duke’s 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 in 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. Inequity 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 the gravity of the charges or the conduct of the accused. It was felt that this was contrary to the history, the traditions, and the experience of the first principles of law and justice.

A number of correspondents showed that there were many instances of unreasonable and inadequate 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 Edmund Captain Beale. Lack of consideration is alleged:-

1. Lieut. Evans, taken from his regiment, put in local police cell in uniform; from there transferred to prison and subject to the same treatment.
2. Bentinck-Bulld. 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 that is a very subtle thing 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.

It is stated 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 charges treated worse than political prisoners of the First Division. Two letters
per week; on one page, limited to 24 lines, with instructions that on return of whole letter without notification, constitute an
"outrageous condition of unhumaned detention." Visits are limited strictly to one per
week. These are two conditions that are more conducive to the effects 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 detainees at Liverpool
Prison and asked if it were not punitive.

6:45 a.m.-Bells rang to awake men.
7:00-Doors opened. "Stop out inns, etc.
7:00- NZ. Intending not to get into cells.
7:00- Breakfast. Tea and two slices of bread and
margarine and a little partridge. Cells locked.

9:00-Walking exercise in prison yard. In

9:10-Morning mail bags: Tidying permitted
but not too loudly.

10:30-Lunch. 1 dish of skilly or some
thing similar, one slice of dry bread and
water.

10:45-Weeding exercise.

11:00-Walking exercise again.

11:30-Sewing bags again.

12:00-Back in cells and locked in.

1:30-Supper. Tea, bread and cube 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 condi
tions, which are well known to having a cell or
prison conditions and understood this phase of
the complaint. Actually, the complaints on this score were directed against the conditions belonging to prison life that ought not to be tolerated in a decent society. Many of the folk imprisoned would have consented to their
imprisonment without demur, had they not experienced them. Once released, what protest will they severally and collectively make against prison life? As we read this correspon
dence, we felt that many of the internees ought to have attacked imprisonment and the persons responsible. When the notion of suffering imprisonment personally was foreign to their thoughts.

This reflection does not apply to the letter that informed the correspondent. The Disobedience was given to the ill-health of detainees, 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 cataplasmosis contracted through shell-shock in the last war were referred to as being of help. We have experience locked in spite of constant Appeals even during air raids.

One detainee, a "J. Brown," prisoners a
vagabond who was under arrest, 1 day and food and 7 days "loss of privil
gees," which amounts to solitary confinement.

Nevertheless, this correspondent insisted that the conditions at Liverpool were a con
siderable 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 sitting on window sills, that he looked out at a 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 solitary confinement.

Sitting behind the Treasury Bench in the House of Commons are a number of men also
complaining of the conditions prevailing. But like they, we are prepared to name
every such member and to challenge each on his prison-punishment record. Inhumanity remains-inhumanity towards the laws or the policies of the victim.

As to the cruelty of excessive solitary confinement, that was exposed in the Labour
Co-operative Journal on January 1, 1933. We

draw attention to the Chronicle's article.

"There is no more loyal Englishman than my husband. He was a soldier in the 1914-1918 war. If I were a member of the community, 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 L.I.P. member of the House of Commons. On another occasion, he shocked the House of Commons during an unemployment debate, by throwing down an ex-socialism's medals. TheMEDLEX, of course, was political.

This hardly justifies internment when men have attained Cabinet rank through instability. At one time Beckett was a member of the Council of Herbert Morrison, both figure in Who's Who.

Beckett is interned now at the Isle of Man. He is a British subject, making an internee sketch to him. We reproduce
the picture.

At Stafford Prison, Beckett made a strenuous fight for the application of the
regular of the 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.
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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 11, 1911. He is at present in Durham Jail serving the sentence of 3 months’ imprisonment imposed on him on May 30 last.

In his statement, published below, Comrade Morley described the fateful attempt made to guillotine 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 leave with love.”

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 awaiting arrest. Meanwhile, Robert has served his sentence and is now home, waiting further developments.

John Morley published a short letter in the January, 1933 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 Consciption Acts, that is, to ignore them entirely.

War is the greatest immorality that man has ever perpetrated on the world, and Consciption 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 inequitable 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 conscipt 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 an 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 Deo facto Consciptious Objectors, because they do not think it right that they should join the Army.)

(D) Because all Consciption Acts must be abolished before any liberty and freedom can be established therefore we must take it on 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 Wornwood Scrubs. After a few days there I decided that the prison 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 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 in total fixed up to guard the Sergeants. Then on the invitation being further pressed I fell in with their suggestion and marched under escort to Preston 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, sentenced to 12 months’ imprisonment.

Here, while 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. I was released under suspension sentence, 1949, I was again returned to Newcastle Barracks and left in charge of a sergeant, and was escorted to the dining-hall for dinner (?). Sitting at the far end of the table, alone, from the sergeant, and there was nothing left for my dinner, so while they were busy eating theirs I came away and found my own dinner waiting for me. After that I continued to find my necessary nourishment without applying further to Army authorities. They never invited me back again.

I am my own baby’s nurse, 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 for the conversation on the war to present me with the telegram, and being a woman, prompted the tactful question of “No babies?” To which I replied, “No, 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 have another son I am not going to try to be a soldier, much as we are both delighted at his arrival, I think I would go home and spend the baby with my sister.” I think 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 clearly.

I was summoned to the City Police Court on the 24th of May, 1941, for that I unlawfully did fail to comply with an order made by the Registrar of Business (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 outside of his way to attempt to prejudice the case by remarking that I was a man who was owning a small 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 slept like a baby.

"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 shall not pay a farthing towards it." I was allowed to make a statement and express 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?"

"I 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 before the clergy might have no real effect on the war, and order. "This regulation," I said, "was a war measure, and therefore must be resisted by one having any regard for law and order. If you are not afraid of the use of brute force, the negation of law and order, 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 preachers and members of the clergy had an equal right to address these charges, and if the Chairman was at liberty to speak at my trial, it was no different.

"I did not testify," said the chairman.

"If your remark about me sleeping safely at home was not a sour, it sounded like me to me," said I.

I then proceeded to point out amid unsolicited 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?"

"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 35s. costs.

To this I made no reply, and turned to go out. The Clerk said, "Are you going to say it now?" To say what? "No," said I. "Do you want time to pay?" "No," I replied. "Then what are you going to do?" said I. "Do I not intend to pay," 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 well," I replied, "if that is your pleasure.

"It is not your 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 wheezing, said, "Good-bye, gentlemen, I hope you will sleep as sweetly as I do." I was then put 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 orders that I was to be confined for the fine against this as being illegal, but did not object to go home.

I have since written the Magistrate's Clerk to ask him, could he be of any use to the public, if the fine is not at the discretion of the magistrates, yet having publicly declared in Court for the alternative of imprisonment and put it into operation by arrest, that they are free to use it in any way they please on this. Therefore, if they attempt to execute a distress warrant, I should treat it as an illegal demand. I have had one visit already from an officer of the police who said he had come to detain me 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," he said, "can the police search a building at their own pleasure?"

The matter rests at the moment. I do not respond to 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. I may have to rely 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 police should not be allowed to interview me to him and also to tell him how many there are.

They arrested my second son, Alan, who is a War-Resister and he refuses to give any information to the authorities in spite of their repeated requests: so I suppose they will have to break him.

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 son's business in 1940. With me is my son, Robert, and my wife."

This year the rocks are more beautiful, for I think they have not been so often that the rocks will be pleasanter with a few flowers. So I shall always look for the flowers among the rocks of life, and will possibly be able to find some.

JOHN MORLEY PROTEST

"John Morley, whom we know as a remarkable chairman and a fearless speaker of truth, regardless of consequences, is in Durham Gaol," writes Douglas MacInlay, acting Secretary of the Newcastle War Resisters Group of the PPU. On behalf of this group, Comrade MacInlay pleaded that Morley be set free 10 last, in which he expressed the hope that the Home Secretary, as a "man who has some respect for the rights of individuals, will see to it that this injustice is ended."

"It would be a matter which seems to us, and many, to respect the rights of a serious one. . . . Can you, as a former conscientious objector, and a present-day minister responsible for the carrying out of the law, tend to the support of the persecuted man, who for the sake of conscience privilege, will take part in war activities? John Morley’s sincerity of objection is well proved by his having served two prison sentences during the last war and by his uniting 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. Murray, 15 Beech Grove, Long Benton, Northumberland.

"I write you on a matter which seems to us, and many, an extremely serious one. Can you, as a former conscientious objector, and a present-day minister responsible for the carrying out of the law, tend to the support of the persecuted man, who for the sake of conscience privilege, will take part in war activities? John Morley’s sincerity of objection is well proved by his having served two prison sentences during the last war and by his uniting 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. Murray, 15 Beech Grove, Long Benton, Northumberland.

"I write you on a matter which seems to us, and many, an extremely serious one. Can you, as a former conscientious objector, and a present-day minister responsible for the carrying out of the law, tend to the support of the persecuted man, who for the sake of conscience privilege, will take part in war activities? John Morley’s sincerity of objection is well proved by his having served two prison sentences during the last war and by his uniting 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. Murray, 15 Beech Grove, Long Benton, Northumberland.

"I write you on a matter which seems to us, and many, an extremely serious one. Can you, as a former conscientious objector, and a present-day minister responsible for the carrying out of the law, tend to the support of the persecuted man, who for the sake of conscience privilege, will take part in war activities? John Morley’s sincerity of objection is well proved by his having served two prison sentences during the last war and by his uniting 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. Murray, 15 Beech Grove, Long Benton, Northumberland.

"I write you on a matter which seems to us, and many, an extremely serious one. Can you, as a former conscientious objector, and a present-day minister responsible for the carrying out of the law, tend to the support of the persecuted man, who for the sake of conscience privilege, will take part in war activities? John Morley’s sincerity of objection is well proved by his having served two prison sentences during the last war and by his uniting 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. Murray, 15 Beech Grove, Long Benton, Northumberland.

"I write you on a matter which seems to us, and many, an extremely serious one. Can you, as a former conscientious objector, and a present-day minister responsible for the carrying out of the law, tend to the support of the persecuted man, who for the sake of conscience privilege, will take part in war activities? John Morley’s sincerity of objection is well proved by his having served two prison sentences during the last war and by his uniting 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. Murray, 15 Beech Grove, Long Benton, Northumberland.

"I write you on a matter which seems to us, and many, an extremely serious one. Can you, as a former conscientious objector, and a present-day minister responsible for the carrying out of the law, tend to the support of the persecuted man, who for the sake of conscience privilege, will take part in war activities? John Morley’s sincerity of objection is well proved by his having served two prison sentences during the last war and by his uniting 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. Murray, 15 Beech Grove, Long Benton, Northumberland.