



The
 BRITISH LIBRARY
of POLITICAL *and*
 ECONOMIC
 SCIENCE

Rerum Cognoscere Causas

BRITISH LIBRARY
 OF POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SCIENCE
 (London School of Economics)

HEADING

TITLE & VOL. NO.

EDITION

CLASS MARK

DATE OF PUBLICATION

Jx
1901

BOOK NUMBER

STAFF
Date issued

RESEARCH STUDENTS
Date due for return

--	--	--	--

S.1125

The

CHRISTIAN PACIFIST

THREEPENCE

3 JAN 1944

THE CURRENT OF AFFAIRS

Destruction of Hope

The increasing terror of air raids on German cities can give no satisfaction to those sincere Christians who believe it to be their duty to support the war-effort. As an American correspondent who accompanied one of the raids on Berlin said in a broadcast talk, "This is an unpleasant kind of warfare!" Victory gained in this way can hardly be pleasant either and the threat of still more damaging attacks to come is a threat to our own peace as well as to that of Germany. It is not only the homes and lives and livelihoods of the common people that are being destroyed in the unimaginable horrors of concentrated bombing. Hopes of restored relations in the future between the now belligerent nations, of unembittered co-operation between the best elements in all lands after the war are also being brought down to dust and ashes. Whatever the German people have witnessed and suffered at the hands of Nazi government, can they ever forget that they have suffered even more from the liberating forces which have surpassed their own rulers in ability to inflict devastation. Long after the humiliation and sorrow of

military defeat has been forgotten, the terror of these ghastly nights of aerial bombardment will be burnt into the memory of the coming generation.

Transferred Anxiety?

It is not surprising that there have been protests against this kind of warfare. Even such a conservative and patriotic Christian leader as the Bishop of Gloucester has denounced the recent raids as "barbaric", thereby provoking the abuse of the popular Liberal press. The outcries about juvenile courts and the release of Sir Oswald Mosley were perhaps anxiety transfers on the part of a public whose conscience is more uneasy than it knows. The outraged protests against the suspension of an order under Regulation 18B, on the part of those who a couple of years ago were rightly and vigorously attacking that infamous disregard of civil liberty, is itself a significant commentary on the course of the war. The reiterated argument in defence of the aerial warfare (somewhat too loudly uttered of late to be convincing) is that it tends to shorten the war. Indeed this is the single hope that leaps in the heart as the sickening accounts of human

misery are read. Will this bring the war to an end? If the world could be spared even a few weeks of that vast anguish of captivity, death, exile and pain which, according to the defenders of civilian bombing, every day of the war brings, then could not even this kind of fighting be justified? That is the cruelly deceptive temptation that comes to those whose better feelings are so outraged by a prolonged and worsening war that they would consent to anything, however terrible, to finish it quickly.

Does it Shorten?

To this plea of shortening the war two answers must be plainly made. In the first place these atrocities are not shortening the war, which is now in its fifth year, and which authoritative statements predict is going to last for some time to come in Europe and then indefinitely in the Far East. It may be that the only way in which the Allied Nations can overcome German resistance is to make an indirect assault on German armies by attacking the civil populations behind them in blockade and aerial bombing. But if that is the only possible way of winning the war, it is not a short way. It is a long and roundabout way, as well as a rather unsavoury way. It seems a little ridiculous solemnly to protest that the lives of soldiers on the battle field are to be spared by taking the lives of civilians at home, or that hardship to armies is to be averted by hardship to women and children.

War Prolonged into Peace

The cry of "Shorten the war" is like that of the mad surgeon who amputates one limb of his patient after another in the plea that he is saving life. But he is not saving life. If he does not soon desist there will be no life left to save. It is very doubtful whether, in the absence of military victory, the bombing of cities will ever bring hostilities to an end. Military authorities who write for the news-

papers declare that bombing will never end war. But even if bombing became so terrible that it did, can anyone suppose that the excessive misery thus inflicted would bring anything that could be called peace, except in the sense of desolation. The war will not necessarily end with the armistice. An exhausted or stunned nation may stop fighting, but whether it stops to make peace, or stops to rest for another war, waged perhaps with other weapons, depends on the means by which a cessation of hostilities has been obtained. Every home-devastating raid on German cities pours into a new generation of German youth the bitterest of motives for revenge. So far from shortening the war, the effect of these unrestrained acts of violence must be to prolong it even into the peace, and to ensure the existence in the post-war world of all the poisonous ingredients of wars to come.

Is Any Weapon Justified?

But supposing that the bombing of German cities *could* shorten the war, does that consideration justify so horrible a kind of warfare? If it does, is not the use of any weapon, no matter how cruel, equally justified by the same argument? Where are we to stop? Can we in honour descend to any depths of inhumanity so long as it can be claimed that it will shorten the war? Is the use of poison gas or disease germs to be so justified? Much as we all want to shorten the war, we cannot agree that the least mischievous of wars is the shortest. Every day of war is a disaster for the future of humanity. But we shall gain nothing by limiting the number of days only to pack into them more war. Just as a concentrated, short raid may be more destructive than one which continues all night, so a shortened war is not necessarily one which proves easier for the world to bear.

Preparation for Peace

The main energies of the pacifist

Christian movement must now be directed to creating the possibilities of a righteous and therefore lasting peace. Our first and chief object is not so much to persuade governments but to make a clear witness before the nation in loyalty to our Lord.

The following letter has been addressed by the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups to the Officers of the Denominational Fellowships:—

"At least as much preparation is required for peace as for war. While the end of the war is possibly still a long way off, people's minds are everywhere turned, with new hope, to peace. They are weary and distressed at destruction and carnage and long for a new world; and much thought is being given to the problem of bringing the fighting to an end and preventing its renewal, to the principles on which a just and durable peace can be established, and to the concrete political and economic arrangements that a new world involves.

There is, however, danger that wrong principles, those of Vansittartism, for example, or those of a new joint, or even competitive, imperialism of the United Nations, may in the event of military victory gain the ascendant. "Unconditional surrender" thrusts "peace by negotiation" and the idea of a general co-operation of those who have been enemies into the background. No common effort at real reconstruction in political terms will be possible unless a new psychological and spiritual basis for local and international relationships can be laid. The need of the time is for the practical and effective Christianity by which, in its services to the bodies, minds and spirits of men, the Church of Jesus Christ asserts its own values and shows itself most true to His example. It is to this task and responsibility, therefore, that the earnest thought of Christians of all denominations and

nationalities ought to be turned afresh.

We are convinced that the Christian pacifist minority can give new stimulus to the faith of their Churches, reminding them of the power for good that God has placed in the hearts of men. If in the Moscow Conference and in the Commissions to direct the affairs of Europe for the time being the political shape of the peace of the world is being determined, this is the moment for the Christian Churches, confident in the supremacy of spiritual values and forces and in the strength of God, to take the initiative and to speak both to peoples and to governments. Ought not the Churches to call for righteousness and generosity, mercy and forgiveness, as well as for freedom and security?

The Council of Christian Pacifist Groups hopes that the denominational peace fellowships will give urgent consideration to this whole matter and to the best ways of bringing it before both the leadership and the membership of their own Churches. What is wanted, at any rate in the first instance, is not propaganda but exploratory and constructive thinking by Christian minds in the atmosphere of prayer. Then if divisions and misunderstandings, which during the last war made the Churches ineffective, can now be put away, Christian influence will be exerted with power for the construction of a right relation between the nations."

Contributors and correspondents are requested to address their communications to The Editor, 17 Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1, and to enclose return postage if a reply is required. Signed articles appearing in these pages must not be understood to express editorial opinion or necessarily to represent the policy of the publishers.

THE F.O.R. BASIS

WILLIAM ROBINSON

The following article is the substance of the charge delivered by Dr. William Robinson, Principal of Overdale College, Selby Oak, to the Rev. Samuel Mason, on the occasion of his induction at Hope Street Church, Liverpool, to the North-West Secretariat of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

In charging you with all diligence to fulfil the task to which you are now called, I may be permitted to remind you that it was in December, 1914, in the midst of a great and terrible war, that some 130 people met at Cambridge, drawn together by a common purpose and resolve, inspired by a common loyalty to Jesus Christ as Lord and Master. They knew themselves to be called of Christ to protest against war, and to declare that as Christians they could take no part in it. They were inspired by neither political motives (of the baser sort) nor by partisan desires, but simply by a will to be loyal to the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. They were *Christian Pacifists*. They saw clearly two things: (1) that Christian Pacifism meant, not merely the absolute repudiation of war, but "the positive acceptance of a costly way of fellowship", and (2) that Christian Pacifism could never be the simple matter of the application of a few well chosen ethical principles, received in the abstract, to the difficult business of living in a concrete and complex structure of life. They were far-seeing and deep thinking people, and we can only conclude that in doing what they did they were guided and informed by another spirit than that of their own mind and will.

It was given to these 130 people to produce "The Basis", which has ever since remained the guiding light of the F.O.R. The 130 has grown to many thousands in many lands. The witness has gone forth to the ends of the earth. It has stood the test of persecution and

martyrdom. It has never wavered from the fundamental basis laid down by that 130, whom we cannot but regard as having been inspired to produce a statement so complete and so satisfying in its whole range. Let me remind you what this Basis is. See how deep, how wide, how embracing is this statement which they produced.

I

That Love, as revealed and interpreted in the life and death of Jesus Christ, involves more than we have yet seen, that it is the only power by which evil can be overcome, and the only sufficient basis of human society.

No one can read the Bible honestly, from Genesis to Revelation, without being conscious of the fact that the whole book is struggling to bring this truth to birth. Here is no juggling with proof-texts, but insight and penetration into the total meaning of the Word of God, spoken, acted, and finally made flesh in the Man, Jesus Christ. The conviction which you hold is not based on the contingencies and relativities of history, nor is it a piece of idealism unrelated to the concrete necessities of the historical situation; it is based on the disclosure *in history* of the way in which God Himself has chosen to bring order out of chaos—a wisdom indeed which is foolishness to the wise of this world and a stumbling-block to the obturate, but "to them that are called, the power of God and the wisdom of God, because the wisdom of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God stronger than men."

II

That, in order to establish a world-order based on Love, it is incumbent upon those who believe in this principle to accept it fully, both for themselves and in their relation to others, and to take the risks involved in doing so in a world which does not as yet accept it.

Here is a plain unemotional statement pointing to the way which lies in front of all who accept this Basis. It steers between the Scylla of those who so misinterpret the following of Christ as to make of it a comfortable and secure way, paved with good intentions and strewn with easy compromises; and the Charybdis of those who are inspired with the morbidity of the martyr-complex and who, when no actual martyrdom is forthcoming, never cease to play the martyr. It recognises that in a world marred by sin we cannot take this way without suffering and agony, not only for ourselves, but for those we hold dear, and indeed for all mankind. But, in its stern austerity, its matter-of-factness, it forbids the adoption of a martyr-complex and the deliberate creation of martyr situations, which is a grave danger of all who tread this heroic path.

III

That, therefore, as Christians, we are forbidden to wage war, and that our loyalty to our country, to humanity, to the Church Universal, and to Jesus Christ our Lord and Master, calls us instead to a life-service for the enthronement of Love in personal, social, commercial and national life,

It is as *Christians*, not as some special brand of Christians, that we are forbidden to wage war. Here we make no self-righteous judgment on our fellow-Christians who do not see the matter as we do, but we do claim that we ourselves must follow the light which has come to us. Here we stand and we can do no other.

Note also the range of loyalties that are involved. There is first no disavowal of loyalty to one's own country. We are not bidden to deny those rich and lovely things which are our heritage, to become that horrible thing which has no roots and no loves. But we are bidden to see what this loyalty means in relation to a graded series of still higher loyalties—loyalty to humanity, to the Catholic Church which knows neither Jew nor Greek, and to Jesus Christ who demands our supreme loyalty. The enthronement of Love in our own lives is to cover the whole field of personal, social, commercial and national life. Pacifism has to do not with war only—it is a way of life, of the whole of life. And, most important, it is first of all to be manifested in our own personal relationships. How easy it is to have a creed, to contend for it, even to fight for it, and to deny every item of it in our personal relationships! Need I remind you that there are Pacifists who are more like roaring lions in their attitude to others? How ill they serve our cause! It is the mark of the Christian Pacifist to be temperate in all things, to be no brawler, not contentious, but gentle in all things, loving all men, envious of none, possessing himself in that serenity which comes to those who know a peace which passeth all understanding.

This does not mean that we are called to the unreality of pious and sickly sentimentality, which avoids every difficult situation by ignoring it or by capitulating; to a ministry of toleration which knows no conviction. On the contrary, we are called to a ministry which is rooted in that deep conviction, which is so deep and real that it needs no weapons of anger and noisy dispute, but possesses itself in the strength of quietness and peace, and declares itself in action as well as words. Every action of your life, small or

great, must be shot through and through with the spirit of Love.

IV

That the Power, Wisdom and Love of God stretch far beyond the limits of our present experience, and that He is ever waiting to break forth into human life in new and larger ways.

I cannot say how glad I am that this fourth statement appears in our Basis. It is perhaps the most comprehensive of all the statements. Herein is the whole doctrine of grace as contained in the Bible, and it is stated, too, as the Bible states it, in apocalyptic terms, and therefore in terms of *hope*. The Christian doctrine of hope is one of the most neglected of all doctrines, and never was it so eclipsed as in our own day.

The world is full of dark and doleful prophets—prophets indeed who have done well to remind us of the reality of sin and the foolishness of any sentimental attitude towards it, but who have neglected almost completely to observe that the whole Gospel of the grace of God is set to deny the foolish saying that “the leopard cannot change his spots nor the lion his skin.” That is precisely what does happen when men come under the power of the living Christ. Observe that the Lord Jesus never lost His faith *in man*, not even when He was in that terrible agony which led Him to cry, “My God! my God! Why hast thou forsaken me?” In that very hour He said to the penitent thief, “This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise.” And did He not in almost the same breath pray for His enemies, “Father forgive them, they know not what they do?” He shared in our weakness so completely as to know and experience the agony of despair. But He followed the Psalm He began to quote right through to the very end, and finally cried with a loud voice, not “It is finished”, as the Greek hath it, but “He hath done it”, a triumphant shout of victory.

It will be yours, in His strength, to maintain hope in the greatest hour of darkness, never to lose faith in your fellowmen, as you maintain faith in God, whose resources are never broken by the pitiable disloyalties of faithless men and women, and “who is ever waiting to break forth into human life in new and larger ways.”

V

That since God manifests Himself in the world through men and women, we offer ourselves to Him for His redemptive purpose, to be used by Him in whatever way He may reveal to us.

Here is the completion of the doctrine of grace. Here is “the mystery which aforesaid was partly hid”, but which was made plain in Christ Jesus. It is a double mystery. First, the mystery of God’s holy and righteous Love, that He wills to rule the world by “powerless power”. God was never so great as when He stooped so low. Then the mystery, which, if it had not been manifested, would be the greatest conceit and the greatest blasphemy, that in His mercy He wills to call sinful men and women to be His agents in the work of His redemption. We say it so easily, repeat it in glib phrases, that we hardly realise the magnitude of this humbling condescension of God. Nevertheless, we must proclaim this also to be the truth in Christ Jesus.

But this, which was meant to be the most humbling of all His mercies, can so easily be debased into a ground for conceit and idle boasting. We must never forget that what we make is an *offering* of ourselves *in Him*, not an exaltation of ourselves in conceit and pride of spirit. It is not of ourselves, but of Him who giveth all things. It is in His strength and His alone that we can dare to take this way, and dare to pursue it, even though, as for Him, it leads right up to the Cross.

TAKE YOUR CHOICE: An Argument

ETHEL COMBER

ENQUIRER: I have been reading Canon Grensted’s article “Invocation to Anarchy”, and I am very much impressed by it; but it still leaves me undecided on some points. I agree with him that our place is with our fellow-Christians, and that no isolated personal perfection is possible, or would have much connection with Christianity if it were. It would be simpler if the Church and the State were one; but does not the Church sometimes have to stand *over against* the State? Then comes the difficulty for the person who is both Christian and citizen. I’m thoroughly fogged; so I will ask you first, Mr. Anarchist, how you feel about it.

MR. A.: I am glad you start with that expression, the Church as “over against” the state, for that is where I start too. We who are Christians are committed to the task of establishing the Kingdom of God here on earth; and that can only be done by living *in* the Kingdom here and now, in the midst of a world organised after a different fashion. That is the basis of our refusal of war—it is a method contradictory to God’s method of love, and therefore we will not take part in it. But surely all government is under the same condemnation, for all government is in the long run based upon force: force gives it its “sanctions”. As Reinhold Niebuhr said in his broadcast some time ago, “All human organisations are held together by power as well as by rational consent; and the basis of all power is physical force.” I have not seen the script, but I think I am quoting correctly. In His dealings with mankind, God does not use the method of force at all. If we want to go wrong, He allows us to do so, and allows us to suffer the consequences. More than

that, He allows innocent people to suffer the consequences of our wrongdoing. He never enforces obedience to His laws. Surely a truly Christian community would do the same: it would use every effort to persuade a man to obey the laws, and to make it as easy as possible for him to do so; but if he still refused, the community would “carry” him, accepting the suffering caused by his failure to obey the regulations for health, education, or whatever it might be. If it is right for us as pacifists not to follow the way of the world in regard to war, but to live here and now according to the laws of the Kingdom of God (as we believe all Christians should be doing), we ought surely to do so in regard to the use of compulsion in every direction; for the only way that the Kingdom of God can come is by Christians living according to its laws. God cannot wish us, as citizens, to employ a method which He forbids to us as Christians. The argument of “What would happen if...” should not affect us in this, any more than in the question of war; in the end, God’s way must be the most effective, as well as the most righteous. If we were consistent in this, it would at least put an end to the taunt of non-pacifists that we follow the way of Christ in regard to war, but not in regard to anything else.

ENQUIRER: You certainly sound most convincing: now what has Mr. Betterway to say?

MR. B.: Mr. A. has already said a good deal of what I think; but he stops at the negative side. We must indeed as Christians stand outside the secular government, which is of necessity based on physical force; but we should have a government of our own. We can’t just be in-

dividualists. The Church should set up its own system of government, with its own schools, hospitals, and social services of all kinds; Christians living on the fruits of their own labours, and sharing their combined incomes. They would be gathered in separate communities, living their own self-contained lives and acting as an example to the world outside. By demonstration in this way, far more than by any preaching or merely standing outside, the world could see what a Christian social order might be.

ENQUIRER: But if among one of those communities there arose someone who would not conform to the order of the community as a whole, and if your community is not to invoke the sanction of force, what would you do?

Mr. B.: We should, of course, use every effort to persuade him; but if in the end he insisted on continuing his bad practices, we should be obliged to realise that he did not belong to our community, and he would be expelled. After all, that is the way recommended in St. Matthew's Gospel: "If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be as a heathen man".

ENQUIRER: Yes. I see. It seems to me a little like leaving the unconverted to do the dirty work. If the Church can't look after the sinners, whose business is it? That is, after all, what her Master came into the world to do. But what have you to say, Mr. Co-operator?

Mr. C.: I support entirely what you have just said. The Church is in the world for the sake of the world: Christians everywhere should be missionary-hearted, seeking the lost, healing the sick; all the things that Christ did in His human Body are the task of His Body the Church. The moment we Christians turn our eyes from the world and regard only our own life of perfection, we stand in danger of the sin of phari-

saim. Always our motive must be "For their sakes . . .", and our prayer, "God, be merciful to me, a sinner." Why should the whole care of the community, and particularly of its weaker members, be laid upon those without the faith? We have the right, indeed the duty, of refusing any task which is repugnant to our conscience; but to refuse to become a Medical Officer of Health (for instance) because it might in certain circumstances involve the use of compulsion—still more, to say that Christians, or even Christian pacifists, as a whole should do so—that seems to me completely unreal. Is it better or worse for the community that there should be Christian teachers in the state schools, Christian probation officers, public assistance officers, and members of Parliament? To withdraw from participation in government because it rests upon power is to give up all hope of reforming it from within. I believe it is largely the result of our refusal to admit that in an imperfect world there must always be a tension between the Church and the community as a whole. We try to ignore this tension, and to save ourselves the pain of it, by cutting loose from the organised community, and forming little communities of like-minded folk. Of course power is dangerous: all good things are! Was there ever a more dangerous power than the creative power of sex? Yet I have not heard the argument advanced that all pacifists should be celibate! In my opinion, we ought to be in secular government up to our necks, striving with all our might to make it more nearly what it ought to be. The reason why this is not a fully Christian country is that we who are Christians don't put our backs into the job of making it one. But what is your own opinion now, Mr. Enquirer?

ENQUIRER: Well, I don't know. All I can see is, I must lend a helping hand where I find someone who needs

it. I must be off now, because I'm on night duty at the Mental Hospital. Nice folk they are, some of the patients. They are there under

compulsion, of course; but it doesn't seem to hurt my conscience to work there, so I suppose I'm with Mr. Co-operator after all!

The prolongation of the war with its increasing brutality and terror is a heavy burden on the Christian conscience, pacifist and non-pacifist alike. As those who have seen the only way of loyalty to Christ in refusal to participate in war, what ought we to do? What can we do? In the two short articles that follow two different answers are given. The first is written by a Biochemist at the Burden Neurological Institute at Stapleton, Bristol; the second by a well known local preacher and leading pacifist in Leicester.

THE FIFTH YEAR

CÆCILIA E. M. PUGH

Pacifism is at present a dead issue. We are in the fifth year of war. Everyone has long ago decided the extent to which he can or cannot participate. The rush of young people into pacifist groups which took place during the first year has died out as they have become settled into their war-time pacifist occupations. The rank-and-file pacifist rightly or wrongly feels that the pressing of pacifist influence in the political field is rather a matter for prominent pacifists on behalf of the rank and file, than for himself. In many Branches there is a slump in group activity.

The moment is opportune for us in the Fellowship of Reconciliation to realise that we are not primarily a Christian pacifist organisation, but a fellowship founded in broad principles of allegiance to Christ in every sphere of life. Let us re-read the Basis, to bring ourselves back into the wider outlook: "As Christians, we are forbidden to wage war", is but a very small aspect of our testimony. We have allowed it to usurp too prominent a place. We have indeed become known as the Christian Pacifist organisation. This is a deplorable straying from the path rightly mapped out for us. We are failing to give the pioneering lead

in other directions which I believe God Himself requires of us at this juncture.

Take the Basis paragraph by paragraph. 1. "Love . . . is the only sufficient basis of human society." 2. "In order to establish a world-order based on Love, it is incumbent upon those who believe in this principle to accept it fully, both for themselves and in their relation to others, and to take the risks involved in doing so in a world which does not as yet accept it." 3. . . . "forbidden to wage war . . . (called) instead to a life-service for the enthronement of Love in personal, social, commercial and national life." 4. . . . "He is ever waiting to break forth into human life in new and larger ways." 5. . . . "we offer ourselves."

It is no distortion of the Basis to maintain that the main preoccupation of the F.O.R. should be with social relations and only incidentally with pacifism. The opportunity and the call present themselves now. The need of the day is for leadership both in word and example in the building of a new social structure based on Love in place of the rotten social order which has crumbled under the impact of war. Unless we take up this challenge throughout the movement, we have little to offer our fellowmen relevant to the present situation.

A LIFE SERVICE

W. R. BURWELL

There are some who tell us that "the F.O.R. stands to-day precisely where it stood at its inception in 1914". If that is true it implies that we have no life within us or we should have shown signs of growth other than in numbers. We are called to "life service for the enthronement of love in all human relationships". If we stand where we stood in 1914 we stand to fall. It is not our basis of conviction that has failed, it is our technique of propagating it. *That* has failed. We cannot hope to achieve in 1944 what our fathers failed to achieve in 1915 if we are using their methods.

Their method consisted of holding branch meetings, organising conferences, issuing a magazine, pamphlets and books, and working through the churches. We need a bigger scheme to which all this will be merely subsidiary.

Two suggestions are before us. One is to try and stop this war now; the other is to draw up a blue print for a sub-Christian peace that will appeal to a non-Christian world when the war is over. The latter is the one to which we are committed. Of the former we are told not to interfere with what does not concern us. We have a solution to this and all problems, but not now. Having failed in peace to prevent war we can now do nothing to stop it. "Stand aside, don't interfere; let it run its normal course and then, when it is all over, we can show them how to avoid the next". Of no other problem do we reason thus.

Do we realise how disastrously our old method has failed and to what extent it has been responsible for this war? We cannot risk again the 1915 technique. God is calling us to one of the most stupendous tasks ever attempted in human

history. "A life service for the enthronement of love in all human relationships". Think of the last gladiatorial fight in the Colosseum when Telemachus stood between the battle and cried "Stop! stop! you were meant for something better than this". Is not our ministry to point men to a higher way? A life service for the enthronement of love is not a pious hope or a lofty thought but a dominating course of action engaging every moment of our future lives. Nothing less can compensate our age for our refusal to fight; there is no other moral equivalent for military service.

We must not underrate the enormity of the task, or wrongly assess the strength of those that are against us. Nor must we forget the infinite resources of God's Holy Spirit that are at our service. The times of ignorance God overlooked; but now calleth *all men* everywhere to change their ways. With whose voice will God call to-day? Are we brave enough to lead mankind forward to the Kingdom of God on earth?

"CHRISTIANS AND JEWS"

The first number of an "Occasional Review", which has just appeared, contains important articles and items of news with regard to the development of the Council's work. Copies, which are sent free of charge to Associate Members of the Council, are available to all others interested at a cost of 6d. per copy (post free 7d.), and may be obtained on application to the Organising Secretary, Council of Christians and Jews, 21, Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1.

The Review also contains a stimulating article by Dr. James Parkes on two recent additions to the literature on the Jewish question: "The Great Hatred", by Maurice Samuel, and "Justice for My People" by Ernst Frankenstein.

If you are not a regular
reader of the

Christian Pacifist

See notice on back cover.

THE INVOCATION OF ANARCHY

So much interest has been aroused by the C.P. News-Letter in our November issue that we are printing this month part of the correspondence received together with Professor Grensted's reply. We apologise to correspondents whose letters we have not been able to print and to those whose letters are printed only in part. We have now exhausted, not, we trust, the interest of our readers in this topic, but the space which can be spared for it meantime. We hope to return to the consideration of a Pacifist Church in a later issue.

To the general reader, untrained in philosophy, Professor Grensted's article says too much for ease of mind, but too little for practical guidance in action. One is left in a state of mental and moral paralysis!

To the ceaseless tension we all can witness; that "separation will not do" most of us have come to realise; but the writer does not seem sufficiently to allow for the fact that men and women of Service age are faced with a plain either-or by the State and society of their day.

He says: "For a majority of men it is not a matter of State pressure but of conscience itself that they should join the fellowship of military service. . . . Let our place be simply and happily with . . . our fellow citizens in the world."

But, the pacifist of Service age cannot close his or her eyes to the fact that "the fellowship of military service" is now a euphemism for the indiscriminate bombing of cities, the indiscriminate starving and slaughter of friends and enemies alike. And, since this is so, the most ardent patriot in Britain and U.S.A. has no difficulty in paying tribute to the German "C.O." who will have no part in it!

If—as Prof. Grensted seems to imply—conscience is little more than a subconscious reaction to the "instincts of the herd" and that to break step with the herd is "anarchy", then it follows that pacifism (and all nonconformity) is

devoid of moral and social validity. *Vox populi, vox Dei?*

The conscience of those who follow the crowd is certainly a more sociable attribute than that inconvenient taskmaster that commands one to affront society and would appear to have a different origin. Not so long since it was the "correct thing" to own slaves, burn witches, fight duels and beat one's wife, anarchists in the meantime have, as we now put it, "raised the social conscience". "It was said of old time . . . but"!

Will Professor Grensted tell us whether, in his view:

1. The primitive Church was right or wrong to refuse military service (even when the Hun was at the gate) and to refuse those conventional pinches of incense that were the current mark of social solidarity?
2. What are the young men and women of pacifist conviction *to do* in present circumstances?

R. P. NORTHCOTT.

36, Grove Avenue, N.10.

Professor Grensted indicts the "sentimental" pacifist who speedily accepts "current militarism". Yet he claims that even the uncompromising pacifist towards Conscription should sink his difference of conscience with the current religious bodies. He claims further that the "pacifist cannot have a special

world of his own, or a special Church." We agree that we cannot have the former, but fortunately or unfortunately we can have the latter—unfortunately, because a Church can function to the limited extent that all Churches function, in a world whose pattern has scarcely any relevance to Christianity. If a National Church were realising its moral principles through the machinery of a State, then a new Church would be anarchical. But unhappily a new Church is just a schism and not anarchy, and the ordered State will go on oblivious to the religious movement towards heresy.

The Professor cites the convenient example of the French Revolution as an instance of high motivated anarchy ending in disaster. Were the Reformation and Renaissance also tragedies? Every non-conformist Church must come under condemnation, for all were separatist movements.

Jesus has no State to be loyal to, and He paid no loyalty, as such, to the Jewish Church. If Jesus had said with the Professor, "Let our place be simply and happily with our fellows in the Church and in the world", there would have been no Christianity. Jesus could fit in neither to the Jewish nor Roman systems—and demanded there must be new bottles for new wine. Jesus broke fellowship with the Jewish Leaders, and prayed for a small schism of a score or so of marked-off men and women, that "they might be one." This unity, or at least harmony, is essential to sincere worship and fellowship. We can work and worship with those who hold different opinions, but not with those whose principles are a negation of our own.

FRANK P. HANCOCK.

If "anarchy" means here a conception of society without government and not the more conventional "chaos"; and since anarchist prin-

ciples demand a much higher sense of social responsibility than any statist conception does, how can the position of those who "appeal to anarchy" depend upon a "conception of human nature as having its completeness within itself and not in its setting of social relationships?"

Moreover, if those sincere pacifists of the "second group" whose "philosophically untenable and practically dangerous" position in "denying to the State that authority over conscience which belongs to God alone—based as it is upon one of the fundamental truths of Christianity" can be said to "appeal to anarchy", how do pacifists of the "fourth group" avoid doing so, however deep their pacifism is set in the Christian Gospel, "and in the loyalties, far deeper than logical consistency which the Gospel involves"?

These are real difficulties to me, and I cannot see how our Christian Pacifism can be "firmly set—in the life of the State", if "State" means as I see it to mean, a society controlled by political and economic power vested in a government whose appeal is to violence.

A. W. PARDEY.

231, Hospital Bridge Road,
Whitton, Middlesex.

The following is Professor Grensted's reply. It is not, of course, his last word on the subject, nor is it ours. It is intended to deal particularly with the important points raised in the letters.

I am grateful to those who have written to criticise or to ask explanations of my article in the November issue, and, I need hardly add, to those who have written to say that it expressed for them something that they had wanted to put into words. The Editor has let me see the selection of these letters which he is able to print. May I add these few lines in comment.

The title was not my own. The

word "anarchy" came from a regional secretary of the F.O.R., who found that many pacifists were toying with the word and puzzled by the idea. I wholly agree with Mr. Pardey that it needs careful defining. For our purpose it is sufficient to regard it as meaning the repudiation, right or wrong, of some part of a settled system of law and order. The real problem, as he says, is to discover the full meaning of what is meant by "State" and "Church", and the relation between them. In actual life the words mean much more than Mr. Pardey allows. The State, any actual State, is a whole subtle and living fellowship. Political and economic power vested in a government which appeals to violence is, even in such States as Germany or Russia only a very small part of what we mean by the State. The endless decencies and loyalties and goodwill, the common service of the air-raid shelter, the good fellowship of Home Guards and a cup-tie and a seaside holiday, the undying spirit of a people, are the things that constitute the life of the State. Of that life the Church is wholly a part, and is in spirit and principle, though not yet in fact, the whole. The organised Churches are the outward expression of a unity as yet not realised. They must needs exist, in some such separate sense, until it is.

But the Churches should not have their being as expressing some special opinion or interpretation. As soon as they do that they become sectarian in the wrong sense. They divide Christ and become gatherings of Christians who, with whatever good intentions, proclaim a partial interpretation instead of a whole and Catholic loyalty.

Loyalty to Church and State, in this broad sense, is absolutely necessary to a healthy life, on either side. It is only because this loyalty is so strong that the testimony of the idealist, the revolutionary, is so

compelling upon his conscience and so costly. The suggestion of a pacifist Church is not only a contradiction in terms but actual escapism. It would mean leaving that fellowship within which, however imperfectly, the witness to the living Christ is maintained, and avoiding the costly tension whereby that witness is continually being purged.

May I say in passing that Mr. Hancock is simply wrong on comparing the Renaissance or the Reformation to such a revolution. The Renaissance was not a revolution at all and the Reformation was a movement within the Church, which only gradually took shape, by no desire of the Reformers, in external and national divisions. Some of what we now call the Free Churches were, of course, very largely sectarian in origin. Most of them have long ceased to be that in intention, and despite all difficulties of externals in organisation Christendom is rapidly moving once more to a common loyalty and a common witness.

But, in answer to both Mr. Hancock and to Mr. Northcott (for whose letter I am especially grateful), I have not said and do not say that the Christian pacifist "should sink his difference of conscience with the current religious bodies". He must feel that difference until it hurts and bear his testimony, if the call comes, with unflinching and uncompromising heroism. And even so he will draw his happiness, since joy is the mark of the Christian life, from Christ Himself and from that very fellowship, Christ's broken and living Body, within which the tension has become, humanly speaking, unbearable.

May I add a note on one or two other points in the letters?

In answer to Mr. Northcott, I hold that the primitive Church was almost wholly pacifist for some three centuries, but the "conventional pinches of incense" were actually refused not on pacifist grounds but as idolatry.

And by the time "the Hun was at the gate" the Empire was nominally Christian and Christian pacifism had in fact largely ceased.

Mr. Hancock's account of Jesus is almost wholly imaginative. He was never disloyal to the Jewish Church, either to the Synagogue worship, which He shared "as His custom was", to the great festivals, in which He joined, or even to its leaders. They betrayed Him, but He came not to destroy but to fulfil. And His few sayings about the State are all on the side of loyal acceptance. Even Pilate's authority is not denied.

Finally, I should like to put in a plea for a distinction between what "the Church teaches" and what may be inferred, by pacifists and others, from what individual Christian leaders say. It is simply untrue and unfair to say that because some Christians believe that this terrible use of force can be consecrated they "advocate" the unrestricted dropping of "block busters". I do not believe that any responsible Christian leader has ever advocated any such thing. And if my conscience, like Mr. Hancock's, is deeply stirred about these things, I can only add that, even as I write, I find that same concern vividly expressed in a leading article in the Church of England Newspaper, in a letter and note in the *Catholic Herald*, and in an article by the Bishop of Gloucester, all written within the last few days. We pacifists have no monopoly of conscience.

L. W. GRENSTED.

The following letter, though not part of the same correspondence, has a bearing on one aspect of the subject. The reference is to the letter quoted in "The Christian Pacifist" for November, 1943, from Mr. Wallace Hancock, Mr. Frank Hancock's brother.

A Pacifist Church

The letter by Mr. Wallace Hancock in the November issue of *The Christian Pacifist* is very timely. . . .

It would seem that there can be little unity between the Christian who can approve, however reluctantly, such sub-Christian conduct, and the Christian who repudiates *all* war for any end however good and desirable.

With such a deep division in faith and practice, there is perhaps need to take note of the apostolic injunction to be "not unequally yoked together".

Would it not be more helpful to both parties to separate and unite with those whose fundamental convictions they share, so that each might worship in perfect unity, without restraint or compromise?

It will possibly be urged that such secession would be unfortunate as weakening the collective witness and power of the Church.

On the other hand might not the formation of small groups of worshipping Christian pacifists, scattered throughout the country, be a powerful witness to the vitality of Christianity in these pagan days?

GEO. E. HARTLEY.

Shirley, Smith Avenue,
Old Colwyn, N. Wales.

In future issues we hope to publish articles by such well known writers as Gerald Bailey, Vera Brittain, the Rev. Henry Carter, George Ll. M. Davies, Stephen Hobhouse, Muriel Lester, Professor G. H. C. Macgregor, Professor Charles E. Raven, Dr. Salter, the Rev. R. W. Sorensen, M.P., Dr. Alex Wood, and others, as well as our regular contributors. Correspondence relating to these Newsletters is welcomed although in our present much reduced space it is not always possible to publish it.

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Canada

The Chairman of the recently re-formed Canadian F.O.R. reports that a part-time Executive Secretary, Mr. Albert Watson, has now been appointed. At a meeting of representatives of the F.O.R. and the Christian Pacifist Fellowship it was agreed to publish jointly a national pacifist magazine with the title "Reconciliation". The magazine will probably appear bi-monthly.

U.S.A.

Letters received from Willi Solzbacher show that he has quickly established himself in new and active life in his new country. He is working for a Catholic news organisation, with the name "Center of Information Pro Deo", and it appears that a number of different nationalities are represented among his fellow-workers there. During the summer he gave lecture courses to two international service seminars; and he reports a considerable programme of lectures before him during the winter.

Europe

A report of last summer from F. Siegmund-Schultze, in Zurich, gives some news of the situation in various Continental countries. He writes that friends in the Baltic countries find it impossible to maintain contact with other F.O.R. groups. In Finland war conditions prevent the holding of meetings, but the Chairman of the group is in communication with the individual members. The University re-opened last winter. In Denmark, the paper *Fredsvarden* still appears, and occasional meetings are held. Of Germany, F. Siegmund-Schultze says that there is increased understanding in church circles of the radical peace attitude, and appreciation of the F.O.R. is growing again.

Other friends send the news that in France Henri and Philippe and

their families are well. Henri's children were able to spend several months in Switzerland and to build up their health a little there.

Siegmund-Schultze says that the discontinuance of American aid in Southern France has put tasks before the continental centre of the I.F.O.R. which occupy them increasingly. One of the refugee homes in Le Chambon is maintained by funds collected by the F.O.R. in Switzerland, but more money is urgently needed.

Elisabeth Monastier in Switzerland writes of a quite serious illness from blood-poisoning, in which it was feared she would have to lose a finger. She says: "All through these days of danger and suspense I had felt perfectly quiet in God's hands, well knowing that one can serve as well maimed as whole; but now this eventuality is removed I feel very thankful, and look back to this hospital time as upon a time of grace and blessing." Of the gathering called together by F. Siegmund-Schultze in the summer to consider post-war reconstruction, she says: "In spite of lack of common spiritual ground from the start, we grew into one closely-bound family. . . . This study week has forged all sorts of links."

Scotland

From one point of view, news about Scotland belongs elsewhere than in "International News": but it seems appropriate to mention here the lecture-tour, lasting nearly a month, which Muriel Lester gave during October and November up and down the country, speaking among other subjects on "Thinking Asiatically", "Living with the Chinese", "Personalities behind the Indian Scene". Muriel Lester spoke to groups of various sorts, not only F.O.R., in Alloa, Dundee, Glasgow, Ayr, Greenock, Edinburgh

and Perth; and ended up by taking part in the Religion and Life Week at Greenock. She wrote of this last engagement: "It seems a poor state of affairs that I'm the only woman": but looking through the

REPORT OF THE PRIME MINISTER'S COMMITTEE OF ENQUIRY INTO DETENTION BARRACKS, 1943

A COMMENT BY WITNESS No. 36.

Following the trial of two Warrant Officers for the manslaughter of Rifleman Clayton at Fort Darland Detention Barracks which profoundly shocked the public, "a considerable section of the Press was for a time filled with articles, letters and comments, many of which suggested that this was not an isolated occurrence but that brutality and so-called Gestapo methods were the rule and not the exception at military places of detention throughout the country." The Prime Minister appointed a committee with the Hon. Mr. Justice Oliver, M.C., as chairman, "to enquire into and report on the treatment of men under sentence in Naval and Military Prisons and Detention Barracks in the United Kingdom and whether it is in accordance with modern standards and satisfies war-time requirements."

The Committee, after an investigation extending over five weeks, report that "they are satisfied that at present at any rate and for some time past no brutality of the sort indicated is being or has been practised. They are less satisfied about the conditions prevailing in the early days of the war. The Committee are not saying that the system and its administration are, in their opinion, perfect. . . . There are a number of matters which they think could and should be remedied, . . . but . . . calculated brutality does not in their opinion exist. . . .

programme, and seeing among the list of speakers the names of George Macleod, Henry Carter, Donald Soper, and Alexander Miller beside that of Muriel Lester, we feel not dissatisfied.

"Treatment of persons sentenced to imprisonment and detention is in the main the same, the only difference being that some of the places of detention are in their environment more unpleasant than others." The best prisoners "are men who have transgressed more or less accidentally or because of other pressure. The worst of them are men who show by their conduct that they are quite determined not to serve in any event." The latter are called "recidivists" as they keep returning to prison. The Committee consider it reasonable that "in the case of all but the recidivists the object of these places should be rehabilitation." "In the case of the recidivist it is probably hopeless to try to convert him to better ways." Mr. Churchill, when Home Secretary, spoke of "the treasure that is in the heart of every man", but the Committee do not appear to acknowledge this grain of Christian truth. They said, however, "The strictest justice must be meted out to all in detention. Nothing in the nature of ill-treatment or injustice is to be tolerated. The discipline must be firm but humane."

"The Committee . . . emphasise that they are not in a position to find that specific allegations of brutality are true. Before this could be done the persons accused would have to be heard in their defence . . . as physical brutality . . . is not only a gross breach of discipline but also a criminal offence, the Committee could not hold any such offences proved without doing the gravest in-

justice to persons who would in law, before being convicted, be entitled to trial by jury or court-martial."

The following is the evidence of two witnesses "who were apparently telling the truth and whose statements bore investigation":—

"No. 37 was a c.o. in detention from March—October, 1940, for refusing to obey orders. . . . He was forcibly undressed (as he refused to undress himself), during the process of which he was repeatedly struck in the stomach, and when he fell was lifted up by his hair and struck again until his clothes were off. Later in the day his arm was twisted. He also said that he saw the injured condition of the witness . . . No. 36 after the latter had arrived. . . ."

"No. 36 was a c.o. who was sent to detention in June, 1940. He said that when he arrived, because he refused to pick up his rifle and equipment he was struck and his head was violently and repeatedly knocked against the wall and that as he still refused to obey, he was assaulted and punched about the face and body by a number of the Staff and actually kicked in the eye. . . . The Committee has by enquiry found support, other than No. 37, for the fact that he made the allegations at once and that his head and face bore marks of violence."

"(NOTE.—The demeanour of the above two witnesses very favourably impressed the Committee.)"

The following extract might well have the title TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

"No less than five c.o.s . . . said that they had never experienced nor seen any violence towards prisoners on the part of the staff anywhere. . . . The force of this testimony is threefold. In the first place, these were all men of good character, education and intelligence. In the second place, it is in the nature of things that a conscientious objector is fearless about expressing his opinions, and therefore would not hesitate to make a complaint. Finally, it would be difficult to imagine a type of man more calculated to arouse the fury of a brutal N.C.O. than a conscientious objector who refuses to obey orders and sometimes even to dress. . . ." This statement would seem to prove the point that c.o.s should not be kept in the hands of the military authorities as the Committee admit "a few bullies will almost inevitably be found."

The main complaints related to shouting, "chasing" and bad

language, with regard to which "the Committee feel sure that a certain amount of this does go on". The need for better sanitary arrangements is stressed. Recommendations included—more and better trained staffs with more commissioned officers, as bullying is not known to take place in the presence of officers (probably because they have more to lose if found guilty of irregularities, but no doubt also because they are better educated and of a higher intellect); diet tins to be rendered and kept bright (more "spit and polish" for unfortunate prisoner rather than initial outlay on a suitable, serviceable article). Surprise was expressed by the Committee that in spite of the comparative harshness of Naval Detention Quarters there has been no public outcry against them, but, in view of the rigours, it was recommended that men should be sent to civil prisons after not more than 6 months in N.D.Q. Facilities for general education and training should be extended.

The Committee make the following statement: "The onus on Medical Officers would be lightened if days spent comfortably in hospital did not count towards the completion of the sentence." This practice if followed would provide medical officers with the powers of 18b resulting in indefinite detention.

An examination of complaints which were made, but which were considered unreliable, reveals the great need for the services of trained psychologists who will be prepared to acknowledge that a man's greatest usefulness may lie outside the robot-like military regime.

The Committee emphasise as strongly as possible the importance of good welfare work in the units from which the men come as the principal means of saving men from getting into the trouble which leads to detention.

THEY SAY

By SEAWARD BEDDOW

Atrocity Stories

"In the desert we knew the Germans as correct soldiers and punctilious in the treatment of prisoners, especially the wounded. . . . There have been many frightful atrocities. . . . But at least 50 per cent. of the stories are examples not so much of German cruelty but of the fortune of war."

—Alan Moorehead (from Italy) in the "Daily Express".

The Best Christian Prayer

"The most Christian prayer I have heard about in this war came from the great Chinese Generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek. After a horrible air raid by the Japanese he prayed that he might not be filled with hatred for the enemy; he prayed for Japanese Christians and the poor workers who were being exploited to make war possible; he prayed for the bombed; he prayed for the men who did the bombing."

—"Humanist" in "John Bull."

Peace Scare on the Stock Market

"The stock markets provided a two-way reaction to the news from Moscow. A few prices went up, but rather more went down. . . . The main Moscow reaction may be summarised in a phrase heard in the market—"increased danger of peace". Business was discouraged. . . . All war shares, such as iron and steel shares, tended to fall."

—"City News" in "Daily News".

Spirit of Fear

"The bitter fact is that the ruling groups in both England and America have fought the war out of fear rather than out of belief—fear for their survival rather than a basic hatred of Fascism and belief in democracy's possibilities. And as the war has been fought out of fear, so the peace is being built in a spirit of fear—fear of the revolutionary possibilities of European democracy."

—"New Republic" (U.S.A.)

BOOK REVIEWS

LESSONS OF MY LIFE. Lord Vansittart. (Hutchinson. 9/6.)

Lord Vansittart, after a lifetime in the Civil Service, first obtruded himself on public notice by a vigorous (and we think vicious) pamphlet, *Black Record*. In this he set forth the thesis that Germany had been the butcher-bird in Europe. This thesis was embellished by a carefully selected (but not equally carefully checked) series of historical illustrations. He makes great play with his facts, but it has been pointed out that, whereas in *Black Record* Lord Vansittart refers to the massacre after the siege of Magdeburg as an example of the cruelty and bestiality of the German people, in actual fact the army that took Magdeburg and massacred the inhabitants was commanded by Tilly, a Walloon, and that his soldiers were a mixed lot of Walloons, Poles and Croats with some Southern German Catholics thrown in, and the garrison that was slaughtered consisted of Protestant Prussians. As to his claim to trace German brutality for the Germans of Tacitus, we need probably only record Prof. E. H. Carr's acid comment: "The recourse to the Germans of Tacitus need not . . . be taken seriously. . . . This argument may be suitably left to Benito Mussolini, who appears to have invented it and to writers whose scholarship is of the same calibre! Not unnaturally he was accused of preaching a race hatred based on a racial theory that was the inversion of Nazism. This accusation, reinforced by quotations from his pamphlet, Lord Vansittart has described as unjust and the book we are reviewing is at once an apologia and a renewed attack. Intellectually Vansittartism is not a serious question. Politically it is a dangerous red-herring. Deliberately or not it has the effect of distracting attention from the causes of war in the economic sphere. It is of some use that it should help to prevent a too superficial view of the problem of Germany in Europe and it should help to correct certain misconceptions about the history of the period between the two wars; but when we have said that, we have said all that can be said for it. In its different way, this book is as alarming as Sir Neville Henderson's *Failure of a Mission*. It confirms our suspicion that the professional diplomats had no understanding of the age in which they were living. Lord Vansittart writes at the top of his voice, but his case is not strengthened by an abundance of cheap verbal witticisms such as "it is not Faustian but fustian", and "full of sound and Fuhrer". Hardly a page is free from wisecracks of this calibre. Lord Van-

sittart's sense of proportion is as much at fault as his history and his humour. Mr. Lionel Fielden reminds us that "Vansittart's *Black Record* must be balanced by the fact that, in the last brief century and a half, Britain has made war upon America, France, Italy, Russia, Turkey, South Africa, Japan and Germany, and in the same period she has also been the ally of each of them. In each case, friend or foe as circumstances happened to direct, the propaganda machine has been at work to engender the required hatred or the required fulsome praise. We are now at it again, and there is no earthly reason to suppose that our present momentary loves and hatreds will survive longer than previous war emotions." In spite of Lord Vansittart's denials, we must confess that he seems in this book to justify most of what his opponents have said about his teaching. All that they have done is to make deductions from the evidence he alleges.

G. LL. P.

THE CHURCH FACES THE FUTURE. The Report presented to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. (S.C.M. 1s. 3d.)

When a great Church sets itself to discover the Will of God in the midst of a world crisis and then prepares to put its own house in order that it may shape its own life accordingly, the results are likely to be of value for all Christian people. This is certainly true of the Commission appointed by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in the first year of the war. Under the able Convenership of Dr. John Baillie a report was presented to the Assembly in 1942—published as *God's Will in our Time*,—which stirred the Assembly to its depths and has challenged the thinking of other branches of the Church. The basis of the Church's task was examined and in the light of conclusions arrived at certain directions were indicated in which the methods of the Church should be overhauled. The value of the present booklet lies partly in the fact that the Commission in its later deliberations had before it the returns from Presbyteries in which are to be seen the reactions of the Church in different parts of Scotland to the suggestions previously made regarding the re-shaping of the Church's organisation, e.g., in the case of preparation for the Ministry, the place of Preaching in Public Worship, and so on. We would not suggest, however, that for this reason the pamphlet is of merely domestic interest for the Church of Scotland. It goes deep into the doctrine of the Church—The Church of Christ, its True Nature and its Universal Mission. The last two chapters, carrying further the lines of investigation indicated in *God's Will in our Time*, represent careful study of the

Church's attitude in this "Crisis in Modern Education" with which we are faced, and then the part the Church should play in the future Reconstruction of the International Order. It is not expected that everybody will agree with everything stated in this pamphlet, but it is to be warmly welcomed as a careful and relatively thorough examination of the Church's job, presented in terms that the ordinary person will find readable. We commend it most highly to the Churches at large.

R. E. F.

A MECHANISTIC OR A HUMAN SOCIETY? Wilfred Wellock. 1/-.

The pacifist movement owes Mr. Wilfred Wellock a debt for past services in keeping political and economic factors before it. His recent developments are however not so happy. This pamphlet is a moving protest against a materialistic conception of progress and civilisation that has resulted in a degradation and disintegration of personality. His answer however is pure mediævalism and runs away from the problems set us by a mass industrial age. We dare to suggest that this disappointing failure is the direct result of an inadequate grasp of the theological principles that are the foundation of a Christian doctrine of society.

G. U. P.

ORANGE TERROR. By "Ultach". (Reprinted from "The Capuchin Annual" 1943. Dublin.)

That the partition of Ireland is as innately absurd as it is irritating is a fact so self-evident to the impartial observer that Miss Dorothy Crisp (of the *Sunday Dispatch*) was constrained to make mock of it in a recent article. (Her deduction from the fact need not concern us here.)

That there is persecution in Ulster is a fact that can be verified from disinterested sources (e.g., The National Council for Civil Liberties (London)).

That the flag of religious bigotry is well to the fore is so obvious as to distract the eye from the more sinister influences which give direction to the partisans.

No student of Irish history, however, no reader of Richard Hayward's delightful volume *In Praise of Ulster*, can fail to be convinced that the disease of the "Six Counties" owes little to any genuine religious antipathy.

If this pamphlet, which is a simple, factual account of conditions in the Six Counties of Northern Ireland (with comments by 20 prominent people in various walks of life) does something to stimulate his healthy curiosity, it will have achieved its purpose. For the crux of the matter is simply this, that *Partition is entirely a British problem, which can be solved only at Westminster*.

A. R. DUNNE.

THE JUDGMENT OF THE NATIONS. By Christopher Dawson. (Sheed and Ward).

If books were listed in order of merit, as motoring hotels used to be in the palmy days of peace, this would have at least three stars, in spite of its very moderate length (154 pp.). In the first half, the author deals with the disintegration of Western Civilisation, and in the second, with the restoration of a Christian order; and he opens up new vistas of thought on almost every page. E. C.

THE CHRISTIAN'S DILEMMA. By The Rev. G. H. C. MacGregor, D.D., D.Litt. (Friends Peace Committee. 4d.)

"Does God ever place him (The Christian) in such a situation that he is compelled to commit what he knows to be sin, but honestly believes to be a lesser sin in order that he may escape committing a greater sin still?" In this pamphlet (which is a reprint of the C.P. News Letter in our issue of September last) Professor MacGregor discusses this problem with particular reference to the bombing of civilians and what should be the attitude of Christians in regard to it. . . . "The principle that we cannot cast out devils by the prince of devils, the faith that there is only one Christian way of overcoming evil, is not a mere appendage to the Gospel. . . . It is the core of the whole Gospel as proclaimed, and as lived by Jesus Christ Himself."

PEACE AND EDUCATION. By Dr. Maria Montessori.

Dr. Montessori gives us much to think about. It is astounding, she says, that no research study has been done on the universally dreaded phenomenon of war. We have nothing but sentimental meetings, resolutions and appeals (or have pacifists at last taken their job seriously?). Our ancestors ascribed the plague to malevolent persons, so we war; but the plague only flourished because of the physically unhealthy environment, so we the shall find war flourishes because of

psychologically unhealthy environment in which our children reach—immaturity. Scoldings together with unjust and unreasonable demands for obedience prepare the child for slavery. Praise of the successful competitor prepares the child "not to conquer truth and possess it, nor to love others and join with them in striving for a better life," but for war. If we could but reverence the personality of the child, Dr. Montessori appears to say, our society would give birth to the New Man to whom wars would be unthinkable. H. P.

THE POLITICS OF PEACE. By Bill Grindlay, Donald Port, Ronald H. Smith and Howard Whitten. Foreword by Vera Brittain. (A Peace Commentary Publication. 23 pp. 6d.)

We recommend this pamphlet as a strenuous endeavour to give pacifism a political philosophy. It is not a consistent whole, however, and does not carry through the good start made by the first contributor. Two quotations will show his standpoint: "If we must choose between the Fascism of British capitalists and the Socialism of British Communists, then the outlook is dark indeed. And yet that is the choice, plainly and inescapably: are the instruments of production to be privately or publicly owned? Pacifism does not offer a third possibility. The call to love your neighbour is irrelevant in this context, and at this level: and proponents of Community beg the question. The real political division to-day is between Socialist and non-Socialist."

G. U. P.

CAMPAIGN TOWARDS A CHRISTIAN PEACE. Introductory Statements, No. 1, Cultural. By Dr. E. L. Allen; and No. 2, Political. By Carl Heath.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL TREATMENT OF DELINQUENCY. By Dr. Henry Wilson. 9 pp. 2d. (Penal Reform Committee of the Society of Friends.)

FOUR YEARS OF WAR. By Grace M. Beaton. 32 pp. 6d. (W.R.I.)

CONCERNING THE FELLOWSHIP

LESLIE ARTINGSTALL

The New Year sees the real commencement of our Campaign "Towards a Christian Peace". This has turned out to be very much in line with other Societies' plans towards that desirable end, and, of course, we want to co-operate with all. We think that there is one particular method which, if adopted, and resolutely carried through, will

make all the difference in the world between a successful spreading of our views and failure or relative failure. The method is that known as the "cell" method. It is to be expected that all readers of our magazine will know what this is, but in case there should be some who have not come across it perhaps I may explain it in this way:—

Here is a Branch meeting held after the various Campaign documents have been considered in order to discuss and plan the further work of a Branch and the ways to be tried for spreading the idea. The Chairman of the meeting asks for volunteers to hold meetings in their own houses. To these meetings the said volunteers will invite their own personal friends—not pacifist friends. Each meeting thus arranged will be addressed by a speaker who has prepared himself or herself upon the details of the Campaign, and the speaker will be provided by the Branch Secretary. The whole basis of our Campaign will be placed before such meetings in as interesting a fashion as possible.

If nothing further happens, six or eight or more people will have been freshly approached. It is more than likely, however, that two further things will happen: firstly, the little meeting of non-pacifist friends will be ready to have another meeting or a whole series of meetings to explore these Christian views; and secondly, with the aid of careful suggestion at the appropriate moment, some one person or other within that little cell will be ready in his turn to have a meeting at his house and invite his friends. And so on and so on, until first and foremost we have permeated the Christian Churches to which we severally belong, but, of course, not confining this method to the Churches. Here, imagination fails because it seems to me there is just no limit to the possibilities of such a method if resolutely pursued.

All our Branch secretaries have been asked to consider, discuss and adopt such a method, and we put it up to you to be resolute in carrying it out.

THE BAPTIST PACIFIST FELLOWSHIP

It would scarcely be an exaggeration to say that the Baptist Pacifist Fellowship owes its existence, under God, to the

vision and the initiative of one man, Rev. W. H. Haden. In 1929 he sent a letter to all the Ministers of the Baptist Denomination, urging them to consider the Covenant which had been adopted by our friends of the Congregational Churches. Out of 400 replies received, more than 300 were in favour of a "Peace" Movement rather than of a definitely Pacifist organisation. Accordingly in 1932 a "Baptist Ministers' Peace Movement" came into existence as the result of a decision taken in our Pastoral Session; but it soon became apparent that little could be expected from a body comprising men holding conflicting views on almost every vital issue. The outcome was that two years later (1934) the "Peace Movement" ceased to exist, and a Pacifist Fellowship was brought into being, on the basis of the Covenant—"We, Baptist Ministers, covenant together to renounce war in all its forms, and to do all in our power, God helping us, to make the teaching of Jesus Christ effective in all human relations." Eighty Ministers represented the nucleus of the new Fellowship. The first President was Thomas Phillips, with Haden serving as Hon. Treasurer and Secretary. In the following year the Fellowship ceased to be exclusively ministerial, its membership being thrown open to all members of Baptist Churches. The story of the succeeding years has been one of steady growth in influence and in numbers, and today the B.P.F. has a membership of nearly 2,000.

With the expansion of the Movement Haden found that the duties devolving upon him were becoming increasingly burdensome. In order to provide much-needed relief, two new appointments were made (in 1937), Eric Wilkins becoming Treasurer and Glyn Phelps Assistant Secretary. In the following year Haden resigned his position as Secretary, owing to his expressed conviction that the time had come for him to "make way for a younger man". Phelps took over the secretarial duties, and the Fellowship expressed its gratitude to Haden by electing him its Chairman for the ensuing year (1939). Phelps rendered devoted service until the Spring of 1943, when he resigned his office on becoming an agent of the Christian Auxiliary Movement.

A tribute to the work done by Haden and Phelps was implicit in the decision that the duties of the Secretariat should henceforth be divided, Sydney Wing becoming Membership Secretary and the writer of these notes Hon. General Secretary. Meantime (1940) the B.P.F. had come to be very closely affiliated with the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the arrangement has proved of real value to the two bodies concerned.

PAX

Chairman: Dr. Cecil Gill.
Hon. Sec.: Stormont Murray, Green End,
Radnage, High Wycombe, Bucks.

If any special message is needed for the New Year it is perhaps the hope that the Holy Father's calls for prayer, penance and work for Peace will certainly not fall on deaf ears where Pax members are concerned, and it is to be hoped that, more and more, Catholics and others will recognise the high vocation of work for Peace. Warmongering has its nurseries, its toys, games, schools, colleges, examinations and commerce, and even offers itself as a career, or a money-making end in itself. Pacifism has few, if none, of these things to offer, but all the ardent study in Peace Societies is bound to bear noble and visible fruit one day. A good resolution for Pax in this New Year would be "Something concrete for the Pope's Peace, from each one of us, this year".

Pax is a Peace Society grounding its objection to modern war on the basis of Roman Catholic theology, although membership is open to all who can accept the Pax statement.

Pax Bulletin is issued monthly. For subscription rates and all other enquiries please address the Hon. Sec. Pax (as above).
T. G. W.

METHODIST PEACE FELLOWSHIP

Headquarters Office (first floor), Kingsway Hall, London, W.C.2.

The recent meeting of the Executive reported the addition of 33 new members. Four of these had been received by "Vigil". The remainder at special Covenant Services at Norwich (10), Reading (10), Bletchley (2), Rochdale (7). One ministerial and seven lay members had resigned. Six more from whom no communications had been received for a long time, were removed to the Associate List. Rev. D. J. Dando and Mrs. E. Adams (Derby) had died. The net increase was 17.

It has been resolved to send out the occasional letter issued from Headquarters direct to every individual member in future, beginning with the December letter. If you have not received this letter, please write. In this way it is hoped to keep in direct contact with even the most isolated members several times each year. Additional equipment has been necessary in the office for this purpose, but our co-Treasurer, Rev. Percy Ineson, was able to report the receipt of £42 in special donations in response to his appeals for help to meet the extra cost involved.

Birmingham Area Committee. The M.P.F. in Birmingham has been represented since the outbreak of war by a centralised committee which has watched

the interests of the Fellowship, arranged meetings, held services, and managed local funds. Rev. Cyril Newman is the present chairman, and Mr. G. V. Channing, 35, Rowan Road, Sutton Coalfield, the secretary. Mr. Channing would be pleased to hear from any members of M.P.F. in the Birmingham area who have not yet been in touch with the Committee, or from any Methodist pacifists who would like to join the Branch.

LESLIE KEEBLE.

NATIONAL PEACE COUNCIL

The National Peace Council (144, Southampton Row, London, W.C.1) is continuing its successful series of Lunch-hour addresses on "The Conditions of Peace" which are held on Fridays in the Kingsway Hall, London. The Rev. Leslie Weatherhead is to be the speaker in the first meeting of the new series to be held on January 14th, and lecturers in succeeding weeks will include Professor John Macmurray, Canon Charles E. Raven, G. D. H. Cole, Dr. Edward Thompson, Professor Denis Saurat, Olaf Stapledon and Dr. Franz Hildebrandt. Admission is free but tickets are available for reserved seats at 9d. per lecture or 5s. 0d. for the whole series.

ANGLICAN PACIFIST FELLOWSHIP

1, Adelaide Street, Charing Cross, W.C.

A new group, the Central London Group, has been formed. Its initial programme will be the study of existing trends of public opinion both within and without the Church, so that members of the A.P.F. will be better able to present the pacifist case to both intellectuals and the man in the street, and will have a sounder knowledge of the economic conditions necessary for harmony between nations. The first speaker will be the Rev. W. G. Peck, on "Christian Sociology", at 3 p.m. at St. Anne's Church House, Dean Street, Soho, on January 15th. It is hoped to have these Group Meetings every third Saturday at 3 p.m. All further details and programmes from the Secretary, Mr. James Ellis, The Hungerford Club, Hungerford Lane, Charing Cross.

Margaret Ibbotson has left the A.P.F. Office to take up Secretarial work in the Almoner's Department at the Princess Beatrice Hospital. She hopes later to train as a hospital almoner. The thanks of the Fellowship cannot adequately be expressed for her four years of devoted service at Headquarters, and we shall miss her greatly. The whole membership will wish her happiness and success in her new work. She is on three of the A.P.F. Committees, so it will not be a real goodbye. We shall always feel that she is part of the A.P.F.

Classified Advertisements

RATE: 1½d. a word. Minimum 2/-. Church Notices; 6 lines or less 3/6.
Notices of Branch Meetings 1d. per word. Discount: 5% for 6 insertions
10% for 12 insertions.

WYE VALLEY and FOREST OF DEAN—Guest House, own parkland and 150 acres. Very tranquil and mild district. Grand walking centre. From £3. Lindors Settlement, St. Briavels, Glos.

The Briars, Crich, Matlock (Ambergate Station, L.M.S.). Vegetarian Guest House. Rest and comfort amid beautiful scenery. Alt. 600 ft. Arthur and Catherine Ludlow. Tel.: Ambergate 44.

MEETINGS.

A FELLOWSHIP MEETING for communion with God and each other is being held at 165, Gray's Inn Road, W.C.1, on the last Friday in each month, from 5.30—6.15 p.m. The next meeting is on 28th January, and the leader will be Eric Hayman.

"WHICH ROAD TO PEACE?"
Speakers: Rev. R. H. Le Messurier and Rev. Leslie Artingstall. Hampstead Friends' Meeting House, Saturday, January 29th, at 3 p.m.

SITUATIONS VACANT

STAFF REQUIRED at country hostels for refugee children: Nurses, Nursery and Domestic Helpers, Handymen, etc. Opportunity social service and preparation post war relief work. International Commission, 67, Brook Street, London, W.1.

OPPORTUNITIES for men with progressive convictions and vocation for land work, to gain all round experience over two year period. One vacancy for married couple if wife able to cater for three other men. Must be socially adaptable. Write for particulars. Community Farming Society, The Laurels, Holton Beckering, Wragby, Lincs.

MISCELLANEOUS

"THE VOICE WITHIN". The Organ of The Friends of God. Contents include: The Foundation Stone—The Kingdom Within—Evolution—Life—The Only Way—The Spiritual Law of Attraction. Obtainable from Brynhyfryd, Beaumaris, Anglesey. 2/6 post free.

MISCELLANEOUS—continued.

"THE CHRISTIAN'S DILEMMA", by Professor G. H. C. Macgregor, printed in the *Christian Pacifist* for October, 1943. Has been reprinted by the Friends' Peace Committee as a 4d. pamphlet. Obtainable from the Committee at Friends House, Euston Road, N.W.1.

LOVE RULES THE WORLD

THE FRIENDS OF GOD. Will all who are sincerely seeking to LIVE the Life Within write to the Secretary, The University of the Spirit, Brynhyfryd, Beaumaris, Anglesey. There is accommodation for Students.

SHERWOOD SCHOOL, EPSOM, a progressive co-educational community; boarding and day; 3—18. Margaret Barclay, B.A., Harold Pratt, B.A.

See the new PEACE NEWS

Edited by John Middleton Murry

The New Year brings a number of improvements in Peace News, which will continue to give (for 2d. weekly) a valuable news service and and to provide a forum for every variety of pacifist thought

New Year Trial Offer

New readers can give it a three months' trial for 2/-—post free at less than the weekly price!

Send a P.O. now to Dept. B1,
Peace News, 3, Blackstock Rd., N.4.

SAVE TO CONSTRUCT

3% TAX FREE

Thrift may be practised easily and simply by systematic investment in the withdrawable shares issued by the St. Pancras Building Society, the yield on which is three per cent. per annum free of income tax.

Write for our "Guide for Investors"
(2d. post free)

Managing Director: E. W. BALES

St. Pancras Building Society
St. Pancras House, Parkway, N.W.1.

IF YOU ARE NOT A
REGULAR READER

OF THE

CHRISTIAN PACIFIST

WHY NOT BECOME ONE

BY SENDING

3/8

TO COVER THE COST UNTIL
DECEMBER, 1944,

TO

THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION,
17, Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1.

Fellowship of Reconciliation

LONDON UNION

New Year Party

SATURDAY, JAN. 22ND, 1944,

3 to 7.30 p.m.

At THE METHODIST CHURCH,
HINDE ST., MANCHESTER SQ., W.1
(Behind Selfridge's).

DENIS HAYES, LL.B., will speak on
"COMPULSION; its meaning and
implications".

A CONCERT

by THE INTERNATIONAL CHOIR,
conducted by DAVID JENKIN.

AN ENTERTAINMENT

arranged by DICK WILLIAMS.

TICKETS for the whole time 1/-,
for Afternoon Concert only 6d. To be
obtained from 165, Grays Inn Road,
W.C.

F.o.R.

Campaign Literature

Introductory Statements:

1. "Cultural," by E. L. Allen, M.A. (6d.)
2. "Political," by Carl Heath. (6d.)

Racial Problems:

- "Black and White in South Africa,"
by John Mellor, B.A. (4d.)
- "Christianity and Race Relations,"
by Harold A. Moody, M.D., B.S. (4d.)

*Essays on Social and Economic
Reconstruction:*

- "Economics and the Christian," by
the Rev. Leslie Artingstall, B.A. (4d.)
- "Social Control and Personal Free-
dom," by Leyton Richards. (4d.)
- "Social Policy Report." (6d.)
- Youth Service A.B.C.* (6d.)

Peace Posters. (4d.)

THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
17, Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1