

New Series. No. 7. Vol. 1

JULY 1939

*The*  
**CHRISTIAN  
PACIFIST**

1125  
BRITISH LIBRARY  
1 JUL 1939  
OF POLITICAL AND  
ECONOMIC SCIENCE

A  
*new series of*  
**Reconciliation**

THE FOOT OF THE CROSS

*George Lansbury*

HIDDEN FROM THE WISE

*Eric Hayman*

FROM WAR TO PACIFISM

*Vera Brittain*

CHINA'S CHALLENGE TO PACIFISM

*P. C. Hsu*

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GANDHI

*Stephen Hobhouse*

DR. LINDSAY'S BURGE LECTURE

*E. L. Allen*

PAX BULLETIN

*Eric Gill*

*Gerald Vann*

Published by the  
**FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION**  
17 RED LION SQUARE  
LONDON, W.C.1

Threepence



**“PUBLIC OPINION”**

presents in a handy form each week a complete summary of the best current thought and activity of the world, and for the man and woman anxious to know everything worth while it is an essential.

A few Reasons why you will like  
“Public Opinion”

BECAUSE it is a News-paper Room, a Weekly Library of New Books, and always a cheerful and well-informed companion. It gives a rapid survey of the events of the week, and covers a remarkably wide area of interests.

BECAUSE it is interested in Social Problems, in Religion, in Politics, in Science, in Travel, in Literature, in all Arts and Crafts, and in everything that interests intelligent people.

BECAUSE it gives opinion on world matters in a compact form; to sum up, because it is a weekly review of what people think, say and do, and the new books they are reading.

BECAUSE it informs, stimulates and saves time in a unique way, and is interesting from the first to the last page.

**WHY NOT TRY IT FOR YOURSELF ?**

All you have to do is to send a post card with your name and address to the Manager, “Public Opinion,” 163A, Strand, W.C.2, and you will receive a FREE copy of the current issue.

Read the  
Socialist Case against  
**WAR**  
Every Week in  
**“FORWARD”**

EVERY FRIDAY—TWO PENCE  
Send a postcard for free specimen copy to: “Forward”  
Office, 26, Civic Street, Port Dundas, Glasgow

The New  
**PEACE YEAR BOOK**  
is now ready!

Full details of the peace movement at home and abroad—Facts and figures concerning the world’s armaments—The Trade and Profit in Arms—Peace books and pamphlets, etc.  
**ONE SHILLING (postage 2d.)**

Copies of the 1938 and 1939 editions available at the special rate of

**TWO SHILLINGS (postage 6d.)**  
**NATIONAL PEACE COUNCIL**  
39, VICTORIA STREET - - LONDON, S.W.1

**Order “THE CHRISTIAN PACIFIST” Now!**

and help to increase the circulation to 10,000 copies each month

The purpose of “THE CHRISTIAN PACIFIST” is to develop a constructive policy expressive of Christian principles, and to keep peace workers in Church, Colleges and the various Christian Pacifist Fellowships in touch with each other.

To the Editor,  
“THE CHRISTIAN PACIFIST,”  
17, Red Lion Square, W.C.1.

Please send me “THE CHRISTIAN PACIFIST,” August to December inclusive.  
I enclose 1/6 to cover cost.

Name.....

Address.....

N.B. — The cost of the magazine for one year is 3/6 post free, the annual payment becoming due in January.

The  
**CHRISTIAN  
PACIFIST**

JULY, 1939

*The Christian Pacifist* is the organ of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and of the Christian Pacifist Crusade (Congregational), the Methodist Peace Fellowship, the Unitarian and Free Christian Peace Fellowship, the Baptist Pacifist Fellowship, the (English) Presbyterian Peace Fellowship, the Church of Scotland Peace Society, the Scottish Congregational Ministers, Peace Society, and the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. The aim of the paper is to become a vehicle of the positive message of Christian pacifism. Its policy is guided by the following sponsors, those starred forming an Editorial Committee: \*Canon C. E. Raven (Chairman), \*the Rev. Leslie Artingstall, the Rev. W. Harold Beales, the Rev. James Binns, the Rev. Henry Carter, the Rev. A. C. Craig, Miss Ruth Fry, \*the Rev. C. Paul Gliddon, Dr. A. Herbert Gray, \*Mr. Eric Hayman, Mr. Carl Heath, \*the Rev. Leslie Keeble, \*the Rev. Lewis Maclachlan, Mr. Hubert W. Peet, Mr. F. E. Pollard, Dr. James Reid, the Rev. Leyton Richards, the Rev. Sidney Spencer, the Rev. J. W. Stevenson.

**THE CURRENT OF AFFAIRS**

**Empires Clash at Tientsin**

The Tientsin incident is a sign of the clash of rival imperialisms which could not for long have been avoided without a great deal more tact than Japan has recently been exercising. In attempting to set up a “new order” in China Japan is probably just as sincere as imperialism usually is. If in helping ourselves we can help others, it is so easy to feel that we are acting disinterestedly. The burglar who before leaving the house administers first aid to the unfortunate householder whom he has been compelled to put out of action, doubtless feels a thrill of philanthropy. So Japan setting up her “new order,” swells with a pride not unknown in this country. China, we can say with all respect, does need a new order and was well on the way under her national government to get it. Japan might have proved a very helpful neighbour but for the national arrogance which believes that she could manage China’s affairs better than China can herself.

**As One Burglar to Another**

In attempting to take over control of China, Japan was bound sooner or later to clash with the other Powers which had taken to themselves “interests” in that country. Of these the interests of Britain are by far the largest, and

although fortunately foreign behaviour in China has much improved in the last few decades, Japan is hardly to be expected to put up with all that the much more long-suffering Chinese have tolerated for the best part of a century. On the other hand, it is not likely that Britain will be disposed to make concessions to an aggressive Japan which she might reasonably and very properly have made to rightful Chinese government. That British, and to a lesser degree, American and French interests are an obstacle to Japan’s policy is obvious. While the Japanese feel that they are really conferring a benefit on China, and no doubt they do just as sincerely if not as reasonably as British people believe that they have been the benefactors of India and Africa, it must perplex them to find the great colonising Powers refusing to co-operate with them. It remains to be seen to what lengths Japanese militarism will go in challenging the rival imperialists.

**Defending Chinese Currency**

We are confronted here with a really difficult situation, to make light of which will help towards a solution just as little as to fall back on threats of naval force. The minatory tone which has crept into the comments of even



responsible newspapers is to be regretted. The settlement of disputes is never facilitated by that means. It is not quite fair to say that we are concerned in Tientsin solely with the defence of selfish imperialist interests. A case can be made out for our support of a cause which belongs to China as well as ourselves. The Japanese motive in blockading Tientsin is to gain control of currency in North China. Their object is to compel foreigners to stop trading in the China dollar and to use instead the dollar notes of the Federal Reserve Bank which the Japanese Puppet Government has set up in Peiping. The foreign banks in Tientsin have hitherto stood out against the new dollar and in so doing are helping to save Chinese currency and to defeat Japan's policy of economic conquest.

#### Why Fight Now?

It is, however, one thing to hold out against a blockade in defence of what they believe to be right, as the British community in Tientsin has gallantly done, and quite another to resort to fighting. As long as it is regarded as ignoble to suffer injuries and only dignified to inflict them, the position of the British and French people must appear intolerable. It must be realised that true dignity can never be maintained by returning blow for blow, any more than by returning insult for insult. A close study of the situation will show that recourse to war could not help anyone unless perhaps it might provide the Japanese with an excuse which they are likely soon to need for the failure of their adventure in China. Since we have during the last few years allowed with great tolerance very much larger Chinese interests to suffer, to fight for Chinese interests only now when our own are involved would scarcely convince China, or anyone whom we might ask to help us, such as America, of the heroism of our motives.

#### Madness of War Talk

It is so easy to speak of "resistance" or "operations" or "force" or to use some other of the many euphemisms for war as though to put the machinery of war into motion were as simple as calling in the police. Such language ignores the fact that war is so clumsy and brutal and destructive in its methods that its effects are entirely uncalculable. Not only is it quite unlikely to achieve the object with which it begins, but it is certain to bring down upon

the heads of all who are involved in it many entirely unforeseen and far-reaching consequences of evil. Start a war in Tientsin to save Chinese trade and it will end in no one having any trade at all. War can do immeasurable evil; it can never do any good that would not be better done without it. It can leave a legacy of dispeace for generations to come; it can never settle any problem. To talk as though it might be wise or right to send hundreds of thousands of young men to kill and be killed in China to uphold imperialist pride or capitalist interest is sheer irresponsibility. Pacifism in its defence of ideals does sometimes look just a little mad. In this situation that privilege belongs entirely to our opponents.

#### Conscription of Clergy

The measure for the conscription of clergy in war time passed by the Church Assembly last month is unfortunate for two reasons. It adds to the poisonous atmosphere of expectancy of war and it confers on Church dignitaries powers "admittedly wide and exceptional" of constraint which is not that of love. If compulsion is ever rightly used by the State it certainly should have no place in the Church. Archdeacon Hartill's amendment that "the Assembly welcomes the action of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in conjunction with the Pope and other Christian leaders, in summoning Christian people to special prayer for peace; and mindful of our Lord's precept that they who pray for blessings should believe that they have received them, declines to proceed with a measure which rests on the assumption that God will not give His people the blessing of peace," met with no better reply from Dr. Temple than that to threaten war was to avert it. This is to treat war as though it were a wholesome kind of punishment or some sort of surgical operation for which we prepare while sincerely praying that it may not be necessary. It ignores the fact that war is no such salutary discipline but, as Canon Fletcher argued in seconding the amendment, "a great outburst of immorality which it is the Church's job to prevent, not to deal with after it has happened."

#### Demand for World Conference

Admiral Horthy's speech on June 14th was another important and significant expression of the desire for a World Peace Conference. "There are no problems," he is reported to

have said, "which cannot be solved in a peaceful way. The nations must sit round the conference table and discuss peaceably and with good will every question which bears the germ of possible conflict . . . In my opinion it would be the happiest solution if . . . the Pope would propose to the Great Powers a conference to settle all present disagreements." A letter in *The Times* signed by Mr. George Lansbury, the Rev. Henry Carter, and Mr. Percy Bartlett makes this comment: "This speech, which shows that Admiral Horthy is just as concerned now for the calling of a peace conference as he was when he received us in Budapest at the beginning of September last, is also encouraging, because it suggests that the efforts of the Vatican in the same direction are being maintained. But from our own knowledge we can affirm that the statesmen of other countries in Europe are convinced that nothing of this kind is likely to happen without the help of a British initiative."

#### Who Shall Dominate?

Further correspondence in *The Times*, mainly arising out of Sir Norman Angell's sensible letter on June 19th, gives hope that some more thoughtful solution of world problems will be sought than the insane conversion of all the world's produce into armaments. The much-advocated mixture of firmness and fairness naïvely assumes that what *we* think fair ought to be accepted by all nations, and that a conference of the Powers will be fairer if we first put ourselves in a position to compel acceptance of our views. Is our horror of domination really a jealousy lest anyone should dominate but ourselves?

#### Conscription

The number of men of 19-20 years of age who registered as conscientious objectors is not so large as was in some quarters expected, amounting to rather less than two per cent. of the total. There must, however, be added those who did not register at all and who therefore remain an unknown though probably a large number. But if the proportion of C.O.s all over the country is not large in some particular communities, it is noteworthy. In the University of Cambridge, for instance, out of 800 men eligible for conscription, 140 registered as conscientious objectors. All the theological students of the Baptist Church in England, with the exception of those of one college, are conscientious

objectors, and in several other theological colleges there is also a 100 per cent. objection on religious grounds. Does this mean that in communities in which men are encouraged to think for themselves and in which they are freed from the usual economic pressures, resistance to military training tends to grow? To help and support the conscientious objectors, 171 Advisory Councils have been set up all over the country. We must wait and see how the Act will be administered and with what fairness and intelligence the Tribunals will work, but it would be a mistake to take up too suspicious an attitude in advance.

#### Liberty and Authority

More than anything else at the moment the Christian pacifist movement needs a clear doctrine of the State in its relation to the Church and the individual Christian and citizen. There is a real danger of making a god out of what is merely a committee of the community. In his Merttens Lecture on *Liberty and Authority in the Modern World*, the Rev. Henry Carter makes a timely contribution to the study of this subject. Admirably concise as Mr. Carter's style is, the lecture is far too brief to deal adequately with the issues involved, but it opens up the question in terse and stimulating argument. For Mr. Carter there is not merely a profound question; there is an assured answer. "Authority and liberty meet in the Christian message," implicit in which are "four immense objectives" (a) The federation of all nations to work co-operatively for the good of all; (b) the ending of worklessness, economic poverty and meagre educational opportunity; (c) the recognition and honouring of "liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely, according to conscience"; (d) the wholehearted rejection of war. This spirited little book calls for unswerving loyalty to Christ, whose authority—not imposed save by the constraint of love—is supreme over that of every other and cannot be identified with that of secular authorities. We commend this pocketful of truth to everyone who desires to think out clearly the relations of individual, Church and State.

#### The "Pax" Bulletin

We heartily welcome to the hospitality of our pages this month another "denominational bulletin," this time contributed by the largely though not exclusively Roman Catholic society called "Pax." While these bulletins each make a special appeal to one section of our readers,



all are of such general interest and of such value both in introducing one part of the Christian pacifist movement to another and as witnessing to our unity in Christ, that we propose to continue them through the year, incorporating

one in each issue excepting that for August and the special Armistice number in November. The appearance of articles in the bulletins or in any other part of this journal does not necessarily imply editorial agreement.

## THE FOOT OF THE CROSS

GEORGE LANSBURY

*A Speech on the occasion of the Annual Meeting of the Christian Pacifist Crusade (Congregational) held at Memorial Hall, May 9th, 1939.*

WE are here, as the Chairman has told you, to talk about peace, and to talk about peace in a very broad and big sort of way.

In the House of Commons the other night a man as good, and perhaps in some ways infinitely better than I, putting the case against conscientious objectors, and especially those who objected on religious grounds, quoted Scripture, and pointed out that for one statement on one side you could always find another on the other. Whatever truth, or untruth, there may be in that statement, this cold, simple fact stares us in the face: that in the crisis of His life, at the moment when it would have been justifiable to have used force, Jesus just accepted the situation and went to the Cross, and in the final minutes of His life, we are told, He just said: "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do."

So I want to start there because I meet good Christians and I know there is a sort of—not sneer exactly—but a sort of feeling amongst our opponents—Christian opponents especially—that people like ourselves are sort of self-righteous prigs who think we are better than other people. God forbid that any of us should. I know perfectly well that I am not, because whatever else I don't know, I do know myself, and therefore I never feel that it is right to begin to sit in judgment on anyone, and those who are here who take the opposite view and defend war, as the Archbishop of York defended it on Sunday night, and as other ministers defend it under certain conditions of a righteous war—a war to defend something—all I want to say on that is that history proves that wars come about because mankind has refused to take the Christian religion seriously.

I believe myself and I'd like to stress on the minds of the leaders of people, and all the rest of us, that we are living in a very remarkable, marvellous age; that this is once more a tremendous opportunity for the religion of Jesus Christ to express itself in the life of nations all over the world. And the Church, it seems to me—and I say the Church in the broadest sense, and that is what Congregationalists should want me to say—I should like to see to-day the leaders of Christendom, whoever they are, wherever they are, shaking off for themselves in this supreme moment in history the shackles of sectarianism, and coming together and saying to the world: God has given us this tremendous power and at present the children of God don't know how to use it; the genius of man is being used to destroy civilisation and all we hold good. That is not God's will—that mankind should over and over again destroy itself, as it has done in the past.

Well, I do not know whether I am making clear what I want to make clear; it is that on the Christian Churches—and by Churches I mean the individual men and women who make up the congregations of professed Christianity—on these men and women, I think, depends the peace of the world, the future of civilisation.

I want to say to every one of you that I think there is no power in the world can give you courage, can give you consolation, can give you inspiration, except the Gospel and the inspiration of that which we call the spirit of religion, which comes from casting ourselves at the foot of the Cross, and asking for courage to do the right.

## FROM WAR TO PACIFISM

VERA BRITAIN

I AM often asked when I first became a pacifist. It is always difficult to recall the exact moment of "conversion" to a faith or point of view, even though that conversion may transform the past with the illuminating power of revelation, and put the whole future into a different perspective.

But I do remember the period at which I ceased to take the Great War for granted as an "act of God," and my service in it as my unquestionable duty to the British Government.

In August, 1917, I should normally have just completed my third year at Oxford. Actually, I was in a camp at Etaples, nursing German prisoners after two years of war service. My only brother had recently been sent from Somme to Ypres, where his regiment was taking part in the opening campaign of the long agony now known to historians as the Battle of Passchendaele.

One day, when I had just finished the gruesome and complicated dressing of a desperately wounded prisoner, a disturbing thought struck me. Wasn't it somehow odd that I, in Etaples, should be trying to save the life of a man whom my brother up at Ypres had perhaps done his best to kill? And didn't that argue the existence of some fundamental absurdity in the whole tragic situation?

My misgivings were increased by the tolerant, friendly attitude towards the prisoners of our wounded Tommies, who dropped in of an evening with packets of cigarettes from the canteen, and seemed to feel no trace of arm-chair hatred which had been so rampant at home. I had never been much impressed by the propagandist articles which described "the Huns" and "the Bosches" as devils incarnate and ourselves as angels of light. But I now began to think on definite pacifist lines—though I did not then recognise them as such. By the time that I went on night duty in a British hut at the same camp four months later, I had definitely ceased to regard the war as an instrument of God or even of human justice.

In this hut we had sent down to us, almost as soon as they left the field, the first mustard gas cases from the Battle of Cambrai. There were about a dozen of them. I cannot remember how many survived, but the proportion was not

high. Their plight made me write, in a letter home, my first angry protest against war-time hypocrisy.

"I wish those people who write so glibly about this being a Holy War . . . could see a case—to say nothing of ten cases—of mustard gas in its early stages . . . The only thing one can say is that such severe cases don't last long; either they die soon or else improve—usually the former; they certainly never reach England in the state we have them here, and yet people persist in saying that God made the war, when there are such inventions of the devil about . . ."

### Making the World Safe for Militarism

To-day, we who lost our friends and lovers between 1914 and 1919 are faced with the bitter fact that all the suffering and service of those nightmare years failed completely in their purpose. Far from smashing German militarism and making the world safe for democracy, their long-range consequence has been to smash German democracy and make the world safe for militarism. The war to end war has resulted in a greater fear of war than the world has ever known. The attempt to smash militarism by force has led to more of it—and not in Germany and Italy alone—than at any period of history. The Europe that was to be made safe for democracy has only 150 million people living under democratic governments, and 350 millions under different forms of despotism.

If we are indeed to be faced with another emergency, our only hope of releasing mankind from perpetual cycles of devastating war will lie in avoiding the emotional ferocity which produced the Treaty of Versailles. In this form of reconciliation the service of pacifists to prisoners can play an important part. I know of no better lesson in the fundamental similarity of human nature, and the urgency of curing its fatal tendency to periodic self-destruction. But it is not the only form of service. There are many other kinds, which can be carried out not only during a war, but in order to maintain the friendly relationship of peoples in time of peace.

Pacifists divide into two main varieties. The first is the uncompromising type whose protest against war takes the form of complete non-co-operation with the State and a resolute



endurance of its consequences. These are the martyrs of the movement, who testify by their own sufferings in prisons and concentration camps to the fact that neither force nor violence can break the resolute human spirit.

But a large number of pacifists are not of this order. Judging by letters that reach me from anxious correspondents, the writers do not feel that they could serve under a government in wartime, or do anything to further, even indirectly, the purposes of war. Many have taken a pledge not to do so. But at the same time they have a sense of obligation to the community of which they are part, and feel unwilling to remain completely passive while the world is in turmoil. Among them are highly intelligent persons with vigorous bodies and trained minds, who would suffer intensely and even be driven to the verge of madness by prolonged inactivity during a period of tension. How, they demand, can they serve society without lending themselves to the purposes of militarism?

#### Our Almost Enforced Service

It is, of course, difficult even for the most uncompromising pacifist to withdraw completely from all connection with war when the conduct of a war is the leading purpose of the world in which he lives. Every income-tax payer contributes not only to armaments, but to the salaries of Cabinet Ministers and other Government servants who are deliberately using those armaments to destroy their fellow-men. The prisoner who eats his ration in gaol is consuming food which has been guarded for him by patrol-boats and anti-aircraft guns. The mother who accepts a gas-mask for her child—and there are, I imagine, few mothers who would condemn their children to a greater risk of death for the sake of opinions which when adult they may not share—is co-operating with the clumsy, lethargic and inefficient apparatus of A.R.P. And even if she goes to the length of refusing the gas-mask, she still co-operates by paying rates and taxes to the local authority which is responsible for the shelters and trenches that now deface the green parks of many great cities. Conscientious pacifists can cause themselves much purposeless suffering by these painful inquisitions. All that a pacifist can undertake—but it is a very great deal—is to refuse to kill, injure or otherwise cause suffering to another human creature, and untiringly to order his life by the rule of love though others may be captured by hate.

There are two main forms of national service which pacifists, both in and out of war, can undertake. The first method—an obligation upon both active and non-co-operative pacifists—is that of acting as perpetual evangelists for peace and conciliation. In war-time, and even during a period of tension, this is harder than it sounds. It involves finding out and telling the truth—which Lord Ponsonby has called “the first casualty in war-time”—at a moment when every device of propaganda is being employed to conceal or distort it. It means that the truth-teller and conciliator will be vilified, called by opprobrious names and suffer the deliberate misrepresentation of his motives and actions by those who are caught up in the war machine. This form of service is probably the most valuable which can be undertaken by writers, preachers, speakers and other exceptionally articulate pacifists. Inevitably, for the duration of war or tension, they will have to face loss of reputation, of income, and even of their means of livelihood—a price paid during the Great War by many courageous writers, such as Bertrand Russell and Laurence Housman.

The second form of service, which can be undertaken by any intelligent and able-bodied person, is that of relief and reconstruction work under such unofficial organisations as those of the Society of Friends. During the Great War this relief work—carried out in a spirit of love and co-operation which was directly opposed to the destructive hatreds and intolerance of war—took those who performed it into devastated areas of France, Belgium, Poland and Russia where no other civilians were allowed to penetrate. The relief of pestilence and famine, the organisation of hospitals, the distribution of food and clothing, the comforting of prisoners, both at home and abroad, the rebuilding of ruined cities and villages, all came within the scope of this active pacifism. Much of the work involved risks of death or disease which disposed for ever of the allegation that pacifists have an abnormal preference for living safely.

A full and useful account of the pacifists' reconstruction work in the last war has been drawn up for the Council of Christian Pacifists by Miss Ruth Fry, under the title of *Pacifists and the Call for National Service*. This pamphlet rightly emphasises that relief work of the type described need not be confined to a period of general war. Quite apart from national battlefields such as those of Spain and China, there are at all times and in every country “Depressed Areas” where pacifists could find ample scope

for reconstruction, and lonely individuals who would receive a new lease of life from inclusion within a pacifist fellowship. A scheme once submitted by an Italian to the League of Nations for “the relief of peoples overtaken by disaster” also suggests the service which could be rendered by a “flying squad” of pacifist relief workers, who would be prepared to go at any time to any part of the world where earthquakes, floods or epidemics had caused damage beyond the scope of repair by national resources. Hardship, grief and confusion are not confined to the war-time. The community is always with us, and the pacifist is its servant.

#### Had We But Known

One final and specialised type of national pacifist service could, it is true, operate only during or immediately after war. This is the task of seeking out ways for shortening the conflict, hastening negotiations, and laying the foundations of a just and lasting peace. During the Great War, leading peace-lovers from many countries—not all absolute pacifists, but all agreed that fighting should cease—met in neutral cities, made proposals for peace by negotiation, and discussed the bases of post-war agreements. The little that was good in the Treaty of Versailles came out of their advice, and the worst evils from disregarding it. Had

their counsel been heeded in 1916, the two bitterest years of war would have been eliminated and the world would never have had to confront the recent months of terror—consequences of a crushing defeat and a Peace dictated by cumulative animosity in which the early ideals of war were lost.

The war-time negotiators failed because they received insufficient support from their own countries, and least of all, perhaps, in England. It therefore seems clear that the success of such preliminary peace-making depends less upon the leaders who initiate it, than upon the strength of the movements behind those leaders. This in its turn results from the influence which the rank and file of pacifists can exert upon their friends and neighbours.

At all times the pacifist's task is to act as a leaven of peace and gentleness throughout his society. But in time of war and crisis he becomes not less, but more important. So long as war can still be prevented—and this is right up to the moment that the bombs begin to fall—it is the pacifist who will prevent it by determined sanity and the refusal to be swept off his feet. And if war comes, it is again the pacifist whose level-headedness, power over others, and ability to keep in touch with both sides, can alone guarantee the next generation against another Versailles.

## PIERRE MARTIN

By HENRI ROSER.

[Translated]

As a student in Paris, Pierre Martin heard of the Service Civil Volontaire International and, with the haste of one long interested in practical work for peace, and a conscience resolutely opposed to war, he went at once to Oaken Gates. He returned so convinced that he immediately abandoned his thesis on statistics and began to prepare another concerning the Service Civil.

Then came the time for his military service. Quietly but firmly he refused. He was condemned to 18 months' imprisonment, which he spent partly in Metz, partly at Briey, most of the time in the cells. Freed at the beginning of March, 1939, he went to spend a few days with his parents. His state of health left much to be desired; certainly his imprisonment had been the cause of the trouble from which he was

suffering. He was in urgent need of rest. Unfortunately, at the end of four days he was taken in charge by the gendarmerie and conducted to an artillery regiment at Metz. Again he declared he could not accept military service. Then a subaltern thought he could break his resistance by shutting him up in a dungeon and covering even the hatch of this dungeon with some kind of covering. Fortunately, protest reached the Colonel of the regiment, who had him transferred to the infirmary. Two days later, sentence having been passed, he was transferred to the district prison, where he was again sent to the infirmary. It was there I saw him, extremely weak; so much so that, after twenty minutes' interview, he fainted and had to be carried to his bed by two men. As soon as he was advised of the circumstances his



lawyer, our friend Andre Philip, obtained from the Minister of War permission for an administrative enquiry to be made into the treatment from which Pierre Martin had suffered; he was then transferred immediately to hospital and came before a Medical Committee.

On May 25th, Pierre Martin was actually discharged by a Medical Committee—that is to say, exempted from military service. However, the previous sentence remains and he will probably have to come before a Military Tribunal and suffer some punishment. In this particular case, the Minister of War gave the lawyer to understand that the time of his punishment would be spent in the infirmary. But Andre Philip is trying to obtain a provisional liberation before the proceedings and will try, after the sentence, if there is one, to obtain his discharge before it is put into effect.

The case of Pierre Martin will therefore soon be settled. But the question raised by his conscientious objection remains. How can I put it better than by quoting the conversation I had with the Colonel charged to uphold the accusation of the Council of War, to whom I went for permission to communicate with Pierre Martin: "Pierre Martin must understand,"

said the Colonel, "that confronted by the immense peril which the Hitlerian régime represents for the human spirit, his attitude becomes impossible."

[H.R.] "No doubt, Colonel, but the attitude of Martin is not commanded by the events of the day. It relates to the eternal struggle between truth and error, love and hate, and the living Spirit of God against violence."

[Colonel] "I am a Christian myself, Sir, but I think at the present time we cannot wait for conscientious scruples. Everything must be subordinated to the welfare of the nation."

Scruples—inacceptable scruples—the refusal to kill the brother for whom Christ died, and to believe that the only way of defending that which must be defended is by the impiety of war? In truth, to subordinate all to what is called the welfare of the nation, and may well be instead its perdition, is to abandon oneself entirely to one form of totalitarianism on the pretext of protection from the other. If only Christians could see this and were able to offer a resistance other than military—a true resistance; that they do not is the tragedy!

By cases such as that of Pierre Martin is God questioning us on this matter.

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GANDHI

STEPHEN HOBHOUSE

### PART II.

#### God in the Thought of Gandhi

To Gandhi God appears as quite definitely ethical and personal (as well as super-personal) in the sense in which He is so to the Christian mystic. I find no disagreement here. Nor does his Hindu belief in re-birth and re-incarnation appear to affect his practical teaching in any way to which the Christian need object. And I find no trace in Gandhi's writings of any attribution to God as a *person* of the emotion of wrath or the function of punishment. It is Mammon, human pride and selfishness, which brings its own punishment and destruction. "God," says Gandhi, "is Love." "He is Tolerance incarnate." "He is the greatest Democrat the world knows." In his interpretation of *karma* as the unravelling of the results of sin, Gandhi seems to come very near to the doctrine of the *impersonal*, self-acting "wrath" of God, as held by Boehme and Law and some modern thinkers, as it probably also was by the Apostle Paul.

Moreover the progressive redemption of evil men is made inevitable by Gandhi's mystical belief in the ideal and therefore the real oneness of humanity with God. "We have but one soul . . . I cannot therefore detach myself from the wickedest soul . . . I must involve in my own experiment [i.e. the *satyagraha* movement] the whole of my kind."\*

On the other hand it is not surprising that Western Christians like myself find in the Mahatma's complete programme, e.g. in his ascetic views of marriage and in some important points connected with the purified Hindu nationalism which he calls *swadeshi*, some things that are irrelevant and alien or that even deny the spirit of the essentially Christian as well as Hindu ideal of *ahimsa-satyagraha*.

\* Gandhi's words at the time of his fast at Delhi in 1924. See *Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas*, p. 306, by C. F. Andrews, to whose three volumes every European at least who writes on this subject owes an incalculable debt.

Nevertheless it seems clear to an increasing number of us, including significantly many Anglo-Saxon missionaries of the Christian Church in India, that (in the words of one of these) "*Satyagraha* as advocated and practised by Gandhi and his true followers is *the* central teaching of Christianity—the Cross as an eternal principle for the conquering of wrong [by love] and the transforming of the evil will into a good will by suffering self-chosen and patiently endured."\*

#### The Jesus India Understands

Orthodox Christians have to reckon with the truly remarkable fact that it is not a member of Christ's Catholic or visible Church but a *sanatani* (conservative) Hindu (consider similarly Tolstoy's detached position) who seems to have penetrated deepest into the eternal significance for human society of the message of the Cross, of the atoning and life-imparting death of their Lord; and that it is he who has been given the power to inspire thousands with a devotion to this message, without compromise with the ever insistent demands of Mammon, of Caesar, and of Mars. One may indeed feel sure that, were it not for the restrictions of the Mahatma's very natural loyalty to his Hindu heritage, he would appeal far more constantly than he does not only to the teaching of Jesus but to his supreme example and to his inspiring, indwelling Spirit as the source of *satyagraha* to-day.

When I ask myself what are the most likely forms of impact of the *satyagraha* spirit and movement on the course of human history, I imagine the probabilities somewhat as follows. The violent policies and intentions of the "totalitarian" States are evil indeed, but to the religious mind the two most threatening features in the world situation should surely be these—on the one hand, the unwillingness of the great Western democracies (so-called), who lead mankind in many respects in the things of the spirit, to divide with other nations in the most equitable way possible their vastly disproportionate share in the control of the earth's habitable surface and resources; and, on the other hand, the vociferously declared readiness of the same nations to use up all their available energy and wealth in the most devastating and horrible methods of warfare imaginable, in order to keep their hungry neighbours away from the share that they

\* John S. Hoyland in *The Cross Moves East*, 1931.

claim. This desperate competition for material wealth and domination, coupled with the vastly increased capacity of the human brain for utilising both the forces of nature and the organisation of individuals in order to dominate or to destroy, seems likely to result in the whole habitable earth falling before very long under the sway of a number of loosely allied dictatorships, whether autocracies or oligarchies, of varying degrees of cruel and materialistic principles and practice. Attempts made by the remaining more or less democratic States to oppose these dictatorships by force of arms, as well as uprisings of revolutionary violence within the dictator states, will merely intensify the general poverty and oppression, the régime of greed and fear; for amid the horrors of modern war the democracies will either be destroyed as such by their more efficient and unscrupulous adversaries or will naturally fall, by the necessities of military organization, into the hands of dictatorial governments of their own.

#### An Atheistic Pax Romana

Thereafter will be established on a world-wide scale another "pax Romana," atheistic and ruthless in many respects. Yet, just as the Roman rule tended to become more beneficent and impartial after armed resistance to it had been stamped out, so the rule of the world dictatorships, while remaining autocratic and materialistic, will tend towards the régime of a less severe and even paternal despotism.

Nevertheless there will be a widespread and ever growing refusal on the part of tens of thousands of men and women to become the slaves or tools of despotism; and a Christian Church or Churches, purified by poverty and suffering, alongside of purified Buddhist, Hindu, Islamic, and other religious societies, tending ever to draw into a closer intercommunion, will lead a life of intermittent persecution and toleration. (As a Christian I am bound to believe in the eventual world-supremacy of some form of the faith of Christ, but such a consummation may well be delayed for centuries.) The means of defence of these non-conforming associations, against governmental tyranny and against outbursts of mob-violence, will assuredly become more and more exclusively a disciplined, purified, and extended *ahimsa-satyagraha*, the vigorous child of Mahatma Gandhi's experiments in our own time. To him therefore, with his forerunner



Tolstoy, men will look back as to the opener of a new epoch. For some time indeed the world-dictators, having no external enemies, and with a diabolically ingenious technique for educating public opinion and the rising generation in particular, may appear permanently invincible. But the divine spirit in man cannot thus be entombed for long; and the power of the ruling class will steadily be sapped from within. In the first place, evil has an inevitable and progressive tendency to destroy itself, the more so if left undisturbed by any misguided, impatient violence on the part of men of goodwill. So internal feuds and civil warfare will break out between rival factions of the ruling oligarchies. And in this warfare, owing to the spread of the *satyagraha* spirit of non-co-operation, the combatants will find, as years go by, ever fewer tools and supporters among the populations of the globe. In time there will be millions of men and women ready to suffer the utmost rather than allow themselves to be conscripted as the unwilling instruments of violence, injustice, and greed.

#### The Meek Shall Inherit the Earth

In the second place, there is sure ground for hoping that the subtle influence of goodwill, radiating through the communities of *satyagrahis*, will gradually permeate the rulers themselves and their supporters. This influence will not be just that of humanitarian sentiment, but will be of those who are constantly inspired by faith in a God of love, incarnated in Christ or it may be in Buddha or Krishna, as Lord and as Leader. It will indeed be *satya*, Divine Truth and the Spirit of Love, the Kingdom of Heaven among us and in us. In this way the rulers too will progressively become gentler and wiser, and, being impressed by the usefulness of the *satyagrahis* to the State, they will allow them a greater measure of freedom of action and of self-government. In the economic sphere this freedom will enable the religious societies to become self-supporting and to escape from the demoralizing dominance of machinery, such machines only being tolerated as are proved not to interfere with the most perfect development of man and the welfare and beauty of the animal and lower creation. There will be an ever-increasing stream of conversions to the *satyagrahi* communities, until at last the vast majority in one after another of the great empires, into which the world has been divided, become sufficiently convinced of the worth of

*satyagraha* to adopt it as the ruling principle of the State, leaving only small bodies of irreconcilables and semi-lunatics who will grow tired in time of indulging in sensual pleasures and in lives of domination in the face of a society which meets them with unwearied patience and refusal to be provoked into retaliation. Then shall be fulfilled that which was spoken by the Prophet, "Blessed are the meek [*i.e.* the gentle or non-violent], for they shall inherit the earth"—the kingdom of earth as well as the kingdom of Heaven.

Here imagination fails. This is an ideal picture—too pessimistic at short range, you may say, and too optimistic at long range. Nevertheless it is useful fearlessly to face both the worst and the best. It may be indeed that Providence will allow the intervention of some overwhelming catastrophe, in which the surviving generation of mankind will be irretrievably involved. If not, and if we are destined to attain some day even on this earth to the reign of justice and peace, there will assuredly be very many setbacks on the way. The mills of God grind slowly, and unredeemed human nature is terribly obstinate. But, if and when God's kingdom does come on earth, let none fear that with the removal of war and of conflict, external at least, between man and man (and, Gandhi would add, between man and the animal creation), life will become a wilderness of wearisome monotony and commonplace. We may trust the richness and creativeness of Reality that there will always be room for endless adventures of the spirit, for exploration into countless new mysteries and secrets of the divine creation, for the conquest of its many realms by the same human spirit of loving activity and sacrifice that is now at work conspicuously, though as yet in an undeveloped and experimental stage, amid the aspiring masses of India.

#### Heil, Gandhi!

The years to come are likely to be full of suffering and darkness, yet they will be full also of light and joy. The writer of this essay thankfully acknowledges how his eyes were opened nearly forty years ago by the stirring words of Leo Tolstoy, so that he made hesitating experiments in voluntary poverty and in war-resistance which eventually gave him some long experience of a prison cell. He wishes indeed that his efforts since that time had been more consistent and sustained. He is notwithstanding glad to pay his tribute here to the

Indian prophet on whom the great Russian's mantle has fallen to-day.

An aged man's but a paltry thing,  
A tattered coat upon a stick, unless  
Soul clap its hands and sing, and louder sing  
For every tatter in its mortal dress.

So wrote (without stress, I think, on the epithet "paltry") a great poet of the spiritual who has but recently left us. And just as the aged Yeats could truly say "my muse is still young," so the message of *soul-force* that comes to us from the lips of Mohandas Gandhi's toil-worn and aged body is young, triumphantly young, younger even than it was forty-five years ago, when he was making his first brave "experiments with truth." For has he not in

the course of years been growing by slow degrees more incorporate with the eternal youth of the Godhead, with the strength of the Divine humility, with the Divine life that dies to give men more abundant life? It may be that, as Christians or as social philosophers, we can discern limitations upon the clearness of his vision; nevertheless Gandhi is the great soul, the *mahatma* of our day, the youthful prophet of a redeemed humanity, a regenerated society, of a world yet to be born, a world already, if we also will but do our part, in its birth-throes; and we, who stand beneath the shadow of Jesus Christ, reverently salute him and all true *satyagrahis* as members of the same company, as fellow-citizens of the eternal City of God, the City of our dreams to be.

## THE UNION OF PRAYER FOR PEACE

GERALD VANN

THE Union of Prayer for Peace was founded at the beginning of 1937. Three main ideas lay behind it: the need of an intensive and universal crusade of prayer if Christendom was not to collapse completely; the need of uniting the different nations together in the unity of prayer; the need of uniting the prayer of many individuals in the sacrifice of the Mass. It was thus hoped that something very simple could be asked, and yet very powerful: a promise simply to say a prayer, no matter what, every day for peace; and to this was added the request that names should be sent to the secretary of the Union so that they might be put down in a register to be placed on the altar once every month for the offering of Mass for peace by the whole membership of the Union. From the first the aim was to secure members from every country; and eventually, to establish a national centre of the Union in every country, having its own register of names, and its own monthly Mass. To-day, the members number some 20,000, and are drawn from countries as far apart as Denmark and China, Ireland and the U.S.A., Holland and the Phillipine Islands. National centres have been established in some half dozen countries. The Union has always relied on "poor means": it has no membership

fees and therefore no established funds, and in consequence it has always been indebted, for its propagation, to the generous work of individuals. A year or so ago it was possible to have a little leaflet printed, briefly describing the Union and its aims; and through the zeal of many helpers this leaflet has been widely diffused, and now has its counterpart in other countries as well. There is still an enormous amount of work to be done; still need for many helpers to spread the leaflet abroad.\* That 20,000 of many nationalities should be joining together every day in prayer, every month at Mass, for peace, is good; but it is far from sufficient. We need more and more help.

The object for which the Union prays is the establishment of the peace of Christ: a peace founded upon justice and charity. Prayer is not a substitute for work, for action; but it is one of the conditions of successful action. The days grow more and more critical; but there is still room for hope if we Christians, realising our duties, make the effort which is demanded of us, and put our trust wholeheartedly in the strength and mercy and love of Christ.

\* Copies of the leaflet may be obtained from me, at Laxton, Kettering, Northants. These are sent free, in any quantity, though I am grateful for stamps.



## THE FELLOWSHIP OF PRAYER

*Behold God is my salvation: I will trust and not be afraid.*

Although the nations nurse their wrath, and the people imagine a vain thing

*In God have I put my trust: I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

Because He has promised that He will guide the meek in judgment and teach them His way

*In God have I put my trust: I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

Being persuaded that neither death nor life, nor any unseen force, nor government nor circumstance, nor anything that could occur, nor time nor space, nor anything in all creation shall be able to separate us from the love of God

*In God have I put my trust: I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

Knowing that all things work together for good to those that love God, to those whose vocation is in His purpose

*In God have I put my trust: I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

Believing that we ought to obey God rather than men; daring to act contrary to the decrees of Caesar, knowing that there is another King, one Jesus

*In God have I put my trust: I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

Because Jesus said, Be not afraid of them that kill the body and after that have no more that they can do

*In God have I put my trust: I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

Knowing that all things are ours, whether the world or life or death, or things present or things to come; and we are Christ's and Christ is God's

*In God have I put my trust: I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

Counting it all joy when we fall into diverse trials, knowing that the trying of our faith worketh patience

*In God have I put my trust: I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

Looking unto Jesus the Pioneer and Master of our faith; Who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God

*In God have I put my trust: I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

Inasmuch as this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endures grief, suffering wrongfully

*In God have I put my trust: I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

Though Christ should bring not peace but a sword, and a man's foes be they of his own household

*In God have I put my trust: I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than worldly treasure; enduring as seeing Him Who is invisible

*In God have I put my trust: I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

Having learned that he that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty

*In God have I put my trust: I will not be afraid what man can do unto me.*

## "PAX"

"PAX" is an association of those who maintain that spiritual activity and personal integrity are the first means towards the removal of the causes of war and that all men of good will have the duty to work actively for peace and justice; and that, meanwhile, individuals have the right to abstain, on ground of conscience, from any sort of warlike activity."

So runs the opening declaration of the first leaflet explaining its principles and objects issued by "Pax."

The association was formed in the Autumn of 1936. For some years past the conscience of many Catholics throughout the world had been rendered profoundly uneasy by the whole question of modern warfare; this uneasiness was intensified by certain happenings in the Near East and finally became articulate in this country as a result of an article in the "Catholic Herald" in the early spring of 1936.

The article in question suggested that more parents should interest their sons in the army as a career. This caused a flood of letters pointing out that though self-defence was a human right, and at times a duty, the causes, the nature, and the results of modern warfare had become such that a Christian *could* be justified in refusing to take part in it.

The result of the correspondence was the formation of "Pax." In long and large committee meetings the whole subject was thoroughly thrashed out, and after about six months of close consideration the statement of principles and aims was issued, the officials elected and at a public meeting in September "Pax" was launched. The first of our London monthly meetings was held at the "Devereux" in the Strand, appropriately enough with the sound of children singing Christmas carols in the street outside, and they have been held there with more or less regularity ever since. At first the movement was received with some hostility, especially by the press. This was due to misunderstanding of our principles, and the correspondence which followed largely cleared the matter up.

On Armistice Day of that year Eric Gill spoke with members of other pacifist groups at Kingsway Hall and was received with tremendous applause. During the following year, through the "Catholic Worker" of New York, "Pax" was inaugurated in America, and is now much

larger than its parent organisation. In the meantime the "Catholic Worker" of England became interested and gave us a very welcome page of publicity, which resulted in a good increase of membership.

At the close of 1936 the first three of a series of "Pax Pamphlets" were published. The winter also saw the first number of our bulletin, which has appeared regularly every two or three months since. That Christmas, also, we made contacts with a group of young Flemish Catholics, who base their refusal to take part in war on the teaching of Thomas Aquinas and the papal encyclicals, and embody their views in a statement almost word for word identical with the "Pax" leaflet. This group has been in existence some ten or eleven years.

Besides our monthly meetings our more prominent members have spoken at public meetings in various parts of the country. Last summer, a suggested notice about keeping churches open during air raids, administering the sacraments, and praying for friend and foe alike was sent to every parish priest in the country, and we received many sympathetic letters in return. Crisis came for "Pax," too, with the Munich crisis, when a simple statement of principle was drawn up for use by members who might be affected, and a panel of people of standing, both clerical and lay, who would stand by them in case of need. Since then we devoted our energies to the issuing of another three "Pax Pamphlets," one of which, by E. I. Watkin, dealt with the moral objections to conscription.

New members steadily come in, and few resign, but our chief hope is that the time may come when the realisation of the utter unjustifiability of modern war may be so general among Christians that another way of settling international differences will have been found by the nations, and, the need for "Pax" being over, the organisation will cease to exist.

The basis of PAX is as under:—

1. The use of force for the vindication of an undoubted right is in some cases and under certain conditions allowable to men both individually and collectively.
2. But under present conditions warfare involves moral and physical evils so great as to exceed any possible legitimate gain to either side; therefore such warfare is morally unjustifiable.
3. Those who are convinced of the truth of this have the right and duty to abstain from participation in any warlike activity.



## Summary of objects:—

To unite those who accept these principles; to give support to those whose fidelity involves them in conflict with authority; to spread the traditional Catholic teaching on the nature and limits of patriotism and the just use of force; and to promote understanding and friendship between peoples and seek to remove the causes of war.

The chairman of the general committee is Mr. Eric Gill, and the hon. secretary, Mr. J. R. Burfoot; communications may be sent to 17, Red Lion Passage, W.C.1.

[A note on the Union of Prayer for Peace is included in this supplement; but we would emphasise that the Union, of which Father Gerald Vann, O.P., is director, has no connection with PAX and is intended solely to promote prayer for peace and the celebration of the Mass for this intention; while it has the support of all members of PAX it will be apparent that its sphere is purely a spiritual one, implying no acceptance of the principles of PAX by its members.]

## WAR AND ECONOMICS

ERIC GILL

IT is commonly said that though Europe has never been nearer to universal war than it is to-day, there has never been a time when the various nations and peoples have had less desire to fight one another. This is obviously a demented situation. All the nations are armed to the utmost with all the latest diabolical inventions of pious chemists and mechanics and none of the peoples comprising these nations has the least desire to use them. On the contrary they not only hope that they will never be needed, but they persuade themselves that the existence of such armaments makes their use unnecessary. They say: You have a sword and I have none, therefore I expect you to kill me. But if I get myself a sword, too, then neither of us will be tempted to use them! We are not here concerned with the fallacies involved in such an argument; we are concerned with the puzzle: Why if no one wants war are all peoples preparing for it? Why, when the boasted results of our industrialisation (i.e., the mechanisation of production) are that food, clothing, shelter and amusement can now be supplied in adequate quantity to all the peoples of the globe, why are we preparing to squander all those benefits in a world-wide conflagration and destruction?

Doubtless there are many possible answers to these questions, and some are more immediately appropriate than others. I wish to put before the readers of *The Christian Pacifist* one set of considerations which, if not actually answering the questions, may help to a juster judgment of the matter.

If we survey the history of men and nations, we shall see that from the beginning human

conflicts have been for the most part economic. We may leave out of account the emotions of hate and racial animosity which have so much coloured these conflicts; for in general it is true to say that those emotions have rather been fanned into flame as stimulants than that they were the causes of the conflicts themselves. From the earliest and most barbarous times, what has first of all moved men to fighting has been need of or desire for material goods. The less favoured tribes have raided the more prosperous. The motive which inspires the robber is the same motive as that which inspires the tribe or the nation which goes to war. And in a general view of human history, a view detached from any consideration of Christian revelation or the teaching of Jesus as to love of our fellowmen and of our enemies in particular, we can see that such a motive, however deplorable from a Christian point of view, is not only inevitable, but, apart from Christianity, honourable. My wife and children have less of this world's goods than yours. What shall restrain me, what human motive can restrain me, from seeking how I may reverse the situation? And if my family is starving and unclothed, why should I not seize your cattle and your clothes and finery?

## This Business of Defence

And having thus started out with war-making you will set up all the business of defence. And if your defence proves stronger than my attack, then "unto him that hath shall be given," and you will take away from me even that little which I have. And so it becomes difficult to know which aspect of war is more "glorious"—that of the raider or that of the defender. And thus from small raids and inter-tribal quarrels sprang up the whole history of war and, in their twofold aspect of defenders of the wives and children (and, by extension, of their country) and enlargers of the family and national fortunes, robbers came to be heroes, and to be employed as professional soldiers, the trade of arms came to be regarded as an honourable profession, and the life of the soldier as the highest patriotism. But it all began with robbery—that is, taking what somebody else has got and adding it to your own possessions. All through the many thousands of years of our history, this business of war has gone on and, as being the means of increasing a nation's greatness, it has been honoured and glorified. And then came God among men!

## One in Christ

And though He is the author of the whole creation and therefore of men and the nature of man and of the world and all those circumstances which seem to drive man ever more desperately to prey upon his fellows, He set out to teach a doctrine apparently quite contrary to the nature of His own creation. He said, "Blessed are the peacemakers," "Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you," and "How hard is it for a rich man to enter heaven." But how can a man sustain his life unless he fight for it? How support his family and nation unless he be solicitous for their material wellbeing? Thus Christianity seems to be a contradiction of nature . . . The resolution of this difficulty is not our immediate concern. We may observe only in passing that in the two thousand years of the Christian era, with varying success and failure, successes and failures due as much to themselves as to the pagan world around, it has been the constant effort of Christians to oppose the materialist spirit of the animal man by the spiritual nature of man redeemed—"for you are all one in Christ Jesus."

## The Unsuccessful Doctrine of Christ

I say that the doctrine of Christ has met with varying success, and it is clear that, to-day, it meets with no success at all. This is the more strange inasmuch as there has never been a period in which man's material achievements have been more stupendous, in his own eyes, and there has never been one in which what we call "the social services" have received more attention. Every kind of amelioration of the lot of the poor has been made—in housing, clothing, and amusement and in the feeding of mind and body. The poor have benefited by every advance made in the application of science to industry. Why then wars? Why, if man has indeed conquered nature and has no longer any need to fear the privations which drove his ancestors to raiding and warring, why has he not ceased to raid and make war?

There seems to be but one clear answer. It is this: All the ameliorations of man's lot which industrialism and "the application of science to industry" have brought have not in fact been their object. It is, in the slang of to-day, just one great racket. It is, in the language of its exponents, simply *enlightened self-interest*. It is not *practical Christianity*, it is not a product of the love of God. It is not charity, it is not even love of one's fellow man. It is, in fact, nothing

more than a refinement on the methods of primitive robbers. The robbers are still there. In the heart of every man of business there is precisely the same motive as inspired the Picts and Scots to raid the farmers of Northumberland. The conquest of nature has not been undertaken from any motive of charity but solely with the primitive robber's eye on his material advancement.

Hence our mystification. Hence the confusion of a world which, though seeming to have no need of war, is yet continually on the brink of it. There is still the raider in our hearts and our brave defenders are still simply the defenders of spoils.

ROMAN CATHOLIC  
WAR RESISTERS

THERE are to-day radical Catholic war-resisters, and they are such precisely because they are Roman Catholics: they have to the best of their ability applied the ordinary moral principles of their religion to war as we know it—and have rejected it. They therefore in general avoid the label "pacifist" as unnecessary (he who repudiates the misuse of human sexuality is not dubbed, and does not call himself, a "puritan") and as suggesting some special moral philosophy.

For sixteen hundred years there has been an all but unanimous belief among Christians that in certain circumstances and under certain conditions it is lawful to resort to a particular form of organised force, called warfare, to vindicate a right that has certainly been infringed. That is the belief of most Christians to-day, and that is the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church.

## All War Evil

But she also firmly recognises that *all* war is an evil. This involves the distinction between evil and sin. If I arbitrarily attack my neighbour and deprive him of a limb, that loss is an evil and my infliction of it is a sin; if a surgeon cuts off a man's leg to save his life, that loss is an evil but the infliction of it is not a sin—on the contrary. (I use this as an illustration, not as an analogy between surgery and war.)

In what circumstances, then, is the evil of war not a sin, but a just (i.e., justifiable) war, as it is called?

## Conditions for Just War

Roman Catholic theologians lay down that the following conditions must *all* be fulfilled:



It must be a strict right that has undoubtedly been infringed, and of proportionate importance to the means invoked (war) to vindicate it.

There must be reasonable hope that the injured nation will be successful in enforcing its right.

The war must be entered into simply with the intention of righting the wrong suffered.

There is usually added:

War must not be resorted to unless all other means of settlement have been tried and have failed.

Furthermore, war is subject to all the general rules governing human activity, notably:

It must be waged by legitimate methods, that is, those in consonance with our nature as rational beings and children of God.

All these conditions must be fulfilled—a just cause alone is not sufficient. If only one is certainly lacking, then the war is unjustifiable, and in that case Catholics are obliged by the Church to refuse to take any direct part in or to support it.

To a small but increasing number of Roman Catholics it appears inconceivable that any war should occur in Europe to-day in which one side would fulfil all the conditions required for justifiableness.

#### The Crucial Question

In particular, there is the question of means. Modern war cannot be carried on for a week without an intensive campaign of hate and blood-lust against the enemy. Moreover, both sides would deliberately direct attacks against the lives and property of innocent non-combatants among their opponents. (We have the authority of, e.g., Lord Baldwin and *The Times* newspaper for knowing that Great Britain would do this like anybody else.)

Obviously, Christians may not co-operate in these sinful proceedings.

Moreover, there is general agreement (even among such diverse characters as Earl Baldwin, Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. Eden) that the evils of all kinds—moral, spiritual, physical—resulting from large-scale war in present conditions must enormously exceed any possible legitimate gains by either side. As the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Cincinnati put it, in calling for an organisation of conscientious non-combatants in his diocese, "War to-day never attains its ends." Then on this count, too, it is unjustifiable and, in the circumstances, monstrously wicked.

#### "We Will Not Fight"

Even were there not these and other similar objections to war as we know it, there are some Catholics who say, "We will not fight—not because we are frightened or because war is wrong or horrible, but because the good which mankind needs and which we desire is not obtainable by that means." The human race was redeemed by One Man who refused by force to resist an unjust aggression.

This is the briefest possible, and an utterly inadequate outline of what lies behind radical war-resistance among Roman Catholics. They have as little, less, success in commending their convictions to their fellows as have Anglicans and Protestants with like convictions, and—on the whole—for much the same reasons. But there has lately been an encouraging increase of such convictions among the lower clergy, and there are others in responsible positions who find the arguments adduced "disturbingly cogent."

We commend ourselves and our efforts to the prayers of our brothers and sisters in Christ, as we remember them before God, without the enlightenment and strength of Whose Holy Spirit all we do is no more than the crackling of thorns under a pot.

D.D.A.

## PAX PAMPHLETS

1. And who wants Peace? By Eric Gill
2. War and the Christian Conscience.  
By Nicholas Berdyaev
3. Morality and Politics.  
By Don Luigi Sturzo
4. The Crime of Conscriptio.  
By E. I. Watkin
5. Bombs, Babies and Beatitudes.  
By Donald Attwater
6. Common Sense, Christianity and War.  
By Gerald Vann, O.P.

### 6d. EACH

"Render great service to the cause of Peace."  
—*London Quarterly Review*.

"Will play their part in bringing about the Christian Revolution which alone can save the world."  
—*Church Standard*.

"Cogent arguments by outstanding Christian thinkers."  
—*Blackfriars*.

**JAMES CLARKE & CO.**  
PUBLISHERS, LONDON

## ANGLICAN PACIFISTS

A report of the meeting organised in Kingsway Hall on Wednesday, June 14th, by the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship.

THE Chairman, Lord Tavistock, made reference to the "unseen war memorial" which he feared was being set up in our midst—a memorial which, if it were established, would show that those who died and suffered between 1914-1918, in a war they were assured was a war to end war, had made their sacrifice in vain. He referred to the sub-Christian attitude of many in the Church of England, and felt that those gathered together that night had a duty in three directions: to give the Conscientious Objectors all the advice and help they could; to create among all young men such a spirit of resistance to war and such enlightenment as to its nature that the Government's latest measure would become at an early date a dead letter; and, thirdly, to bring about radical reform that will cut the ground from under all appeals for war service.

The Rev. C. G. Holland said that he had been begged, for the sake of unity, not to preach pacifist sermons. He said no one realised more than himself the need for unity in the Body of Christ—but such unity must not be purchased at the cost of all for which Christ stood.

Members of congregations who are now most bitter and hostile to pacifism are, in fact, putting up a defence mechanism in their minds—fighting an unconscious conviction that pacifists are right. The more bitter they become the nearer they are to being converted.

The Rev. "Don" Robins said that the Christian nation must follow the example of Christ and claim the right to love, with the very real danger that it may be crucified in consequence. He felt that there was some danger amongst pacifists in saying pacifism is "an easy way out"; it is not; but the nation that took this way of Christ might live as the greatest moral force in the world—might leave the biggest permanent mark for good that any nation had ever known. It might die, but it would be a creative death with the possibility of a creative life. He would sooner see England make this common act of sacrifice that will save the world than see her sons die like beasts for no other reason than that we are too near to being beasts.

There was no worse atrocity in the history of the human race than the blockade during

and after, the last war. Germany has seen famine three times in the last thirty years—not merely hunger, but famine. People dropping dead in the streets. In a single maternity hospital in Germany during the war 98 out of 100 children born died because there was nothing with which to feed them. We had read in the papers that the blockade was having its effect; and we were pleased. Why were we pleased? Because women were losing their children?

The truth of this moment in the world's history was that we are passing out of the Nation State into the World State. The only practical policy in the whole world is a fearless application of the principle of the Brotherhood of Man under the Fatherhood of God. This is God's will for mankind; he can either obey or perish.

The Rev. Kenneth Rawlings said it is not the C.O. who is on trial to-day—it is the Church of England; the defendant at the Supreme Tribunal is the Church which condones massacre and which even dares to bless it in the name of the God of Love and the Prince of Peace. It is a sad thought that in the world to-day the men who will not kill their fellow-men are looked upon as mad.

There was the argument that "war may be the lesser of two evils." No Christian can be put in this dilemma at all; there is never a time when a Christian is called by his Master to do evil; there may be a time when he is called upon to suffer it, as did his Lord. This is always the Christian alternative to evil; for on the Cross Christ conquered evil and revealed for ever to His Church the only way to victory.

Thus our challenge to the Church of England is this: not to be kind to Conscientious Objectors, but to declare that the CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR IS RIGHT and that the private conscience is, in the last resort, supreme.

Miss Mary Gamble said that, everywhere she went, at meetings all over the country, men and women were in no doubt whatever that the Church of Christ, to be loyal to her Master, must repudiate war. Our Church leaders, however, are now saying, "War brings out the very best"—"Let us mass might on the side of right": where is the right? Are we so sure that we are right? Was the Treaty of Versailles



indicative of right? She herself was brought up in a church atmosphere; she attended an Anglo-Catholic School and had since worked a good deal in church organisations, but she had become aware of the fact that between her own view in regard to the teaching of the Church and that of the official leaders of the Church there was a difference as wide as that between Heaven and Hell. She felt that the Church leaders were so anxious to preserve the Church that, in the process of preservation, they forgot the very reason for the Church. The Church represents a society of Christian people which is in the world in order to redeem it; just as any individual Christian must be willing to lose his or her life in order to save it, so surely the Church must be ready and prepared, if necessary, to lose her life in order to save the world. Her Calvary might mean the resurrection of the spirit of Christ throughout the whole world. The Church would never redeem the world unless she is willing and ready to be the great universal liberator of the spirit of love, at whatever cost.

George Lansbury, M.P., said he held rather heterodox views about most things, and perhaps especially about the causes of the unrest in the world to-day and the people to blame for this state of affairs, and he felt somehow that the only thing for each of us to do really was to look in the looking-glass and blame the person we saw reflected there! He remembered the Archbishop of Canterbury, when Bishop of Stepney, calling some of them together in Amen Court for a discussion, in the course of which he said: "I could never give my conscience into the guardianship of someone else. Conscience and your own thought are in the end the decisive factors of what you believe and do and become." Mr. Lansbury added: "If he were on the platform here now he would, I think, say much the same thing."

He mentioned that during the week's debate on the Conscription Bill scarcely a derogatory word was spoken about the Conscientious Objectors. There was almost complete acquiescence to the statement of Mr. Neville Chamberlain; with the great bulk of the members there was the feeling that these young men were entitled not only to decent treatment but to respect. Mr. Lansbury said that fundamentally it was not possible to get rid of the danger of conscription and the horrors of war until the causes of war had been dealt with, and ended by saying that, protest against conscription as one may, the one and only way to conquer it

is to substitute for competitive strife the principle of co-operative love and brotherhood.

The Rev. B. C. Hopson, Vicar of Cockfosters, Barnet, said that during the last war he was an Army Chaplain; each morning he had to give the Eucharist to those right in the front line. So near were they to the enemy trenches that they could even hear the lorries coming up with supplies. In those enemy trenches were others, like himself, administering the Holy Communion to "enemy" men in their own lines. Soon after these men would hurl themselves upon each other in a frenzy of hatred and fear. And he asked himself: Is it for this that I have administered the Body and Blood of Christ—that they should be strengthened to kill each other? And is it for this that those other ministers have given the same Communion to their communicants? He said he realised then that one of two things must happen: either war must go—or the Holy Communion has got to go.

Canon Morris appealed for co-operation in the establishment of local Advisory Bureaus, where Conscientious Objectors could obtain advice, friendship and fellowship, and mentioned that 171 such Advisory Bureaus had been established already throughout the country. He would ask Conscientious Objectors to remember that the Tribunals were not established for the purpose of trying their pacifism, but to find out if they held their views in sincerity.

One other thing he found; everywhere there seemed to be springing up appeals for prayer. He felt that there was danger of such appeals to prayer being used in the way of avoiding the challenge, and as a means of escape. Prayer, it should be remembered, is not an easy way of getting what we want—but a difficult way of becoming what God wants us to be. He felt that some of these prayers, in effect, might almost be interpreted thus: "Give us armaments in our time, O Lord, because there is none other that fighteth for Thee, but only us, O God." We must remember that it is not peace at any price but love at all costs that is our aim.

We were ineffective because we had forgotten the ancient counsel: "If thou hast a gift to lay upon the altar and there rememberest aught against thy brother, first be reconciled to thy brother and then come and offer thy gift."

The meeting closed with an act of confession and repentance.

## THINGS HIDDEN FROM THE WISE

ERIC HAYMAN

IT has been observed that pacifists rejoice in the company of their kind. Our conferences are attended by convinced pacifists, to listen gladly to a familiar case presented by speakers likewise convinced. We discuss earnestly in branch meetings, but at few of such discussions is pacifist conviction in a negligible minority, as in fact it is in the world as a whole.

With the recent growth of the pacifist movement, however, our principles are being critically examined by those who cannot share them. It is common experience to meet in daily life thoughtful men and women who long to share them, but cannot in intellectual honesty join with us. Two recent examples of this criticism\* may afford opportunity to listen patiently and seriously to our non-pacifist critics. The first of these is a University sermon preached in 1938 by the late Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford University: the other is a new work by Kenneth Ingram, a well-known "left-wing" publicist. To the latter we shall need to give special attention, as it is the first serious book of its kind.

### A Regius Professor of Divinity

The two writings show little similarity in the treatment of a common subject. Canon Goudge felt led to oppose pacifism, and to state his opposition from so prominent a pulpit, "because he is a Christian." So good a scholar does not waste much time in the usual New Testament exegesis. There is one footnote on the "Two Swords" passage which shows how far one can be driven, but we are spared the scourge of small cords, and the other seasoned attempts to enlist our Lord among the opponents of pacifism. The writer considers, however, that Jesus carried on His ministry, and established the Christian Church, only by virtue of the efficiency of the Roman garrisons in the East. It is implied rather than stated that He was grateful. In the main, the criticism is serious, but not very dangerous. There are also too many instances of academic ignorance. His real case rests on a false dualism between things spiritual

and temporal, though he artlessly charges pacifism with a Marcionite heresy. He assumes, also, a dual standard in the individual and corporate life. Since it is "right" for the State, the individual is exonerated from moral responsibility. For Dr. Goudge, again, as for almost all Christians who cannot see the inevitability of pacifism in their faith, the end becomes the justification of the means. "Cannot pacifism see that, while the special evils of war cease when the war is over, the overwhelming of . . . a higher people by a lower lasts on century after century." With respect to the memory of a great scholar, it is strange that a Christian theologian can be entrapped so easily. This precise argument, and the evident danger that His mission would be wasted, and truth be overwhelmed by falsehood, would have caused Jesus to turn His back upon Jerusalem, and to reject the will of His Father.

The issue is faced far more effectively by the publicist than by the theologian. We speak of the broader issue, for Mr. Ingram's very sincere book really centres round a concrete political proposal for the defeat of war in the present situation. He does not claim the proposal as original thinking, and it is, in fact, largely indebted to much recent thought in the pacifist forum. But he claims with justice to be the first to bring the whole into a single scheme. To this scheme we shall return, for he first examines sympathetically the several claims of pacifism, and of Christian pacifism, to make his political alternative to war unnecessary by themselves ensuring the defeat of war.

### Ingram, Huxley and Heard

Mr. Ingram first analyses closely the call for a new pacifist technique which Aldous Huxley and Gerald Heard have each put forward. He discusses, for example, Huxley's contention that the war method inevitably degrades its users, so that the finest ends become distorted by its means. This, to him, implies "that human beings are powerless to resist inclinations—that they must always respond to a particular set of conditions in the same way." This implication may be unfair to Huxley, but Ingram is right in calling it a determinist psychology. Where he is wrong, we think, is in forgetting the effect

\* *The case against pacifism.* The late Rev. Canon H. L. Goudge. Mowbray, 1938. 16 pp.

*The defeat of war—Can pacifism achieve it?* Kenneth Ingram. Allen & Unwin, 1939. 131 pp.



upon the will of the deliberate choice of the lower of two means, when the higher has been seen. This tends to create a virtual bondage which can almost determine the course of the future of that will.

Again, Ingram reveals his own dominant interest when he rejects Gerald Heard's psychological analysis of the causes of war (in which St. James and George Fox at least preceded Heard), and demands objective, material, and in fact economic causes as alone relevant. A wise doctor does not ignore all symptoms save those of his special pre-occupation. But this interest leads Ingram, as Dr. Goudge was led from vastly different interests, into the facile heresy of the pragmatist, which earned St. Thomas à Becket's rebuke to his priests:—

"You argue by results, as this world does,  
To settle if an act be good or bad,  
You defer to the fact . . ."

For Dr. Goudge, the desired result is the stability of existing things, especially a type of culture and religion with which the Anglican Church is associated. For Mr. Ingram it is—openly and frankly—the Socialist State. The present writer may be in a small minority in feeling that the zeal of some among us for Mr. Ingram's ideals will ultimately drive them from their pacifist faith.

Leaving the views of Huxley and Heard, but with his preoccupation firmly in view, Ingram regards the Christian pacifist case as "an entirely distinct field of thought." This is not from any dogmatic angle, since while Ingram thinks and writes as a convinced Christian, he is also a modernist of wide sympathies, and is fully prepared to find religious fellowship outside the Church. (Incidentally, an informed Anglican publicist should surely be aware of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, which he limits to "a few priests" as lambs among the wolf-packs of Non-conformity.)

#### Pacifist Fundamentalists

He assumes, curiously and quite wrongly, that the Christian pacifist case rests upon the "single issue—whether Christ insisted on absolute pacifism or not." This form of the statement might be accepted, but his own use of it classes us with fundamentalist literalism. The mistake does not affect his argument, for he accepts our whole contention on these lines, giving special praise and considerable space to Canon Raven's recent "War and the Christian."

He deals at least as faithfully as does Canon Raven with the Archbishop of York, and concludes in a fine passage (pp. 56 and 57) that the whole teaching and life of Jesus are unquestionable and final justification of our view.

But, at the point when the Christian pacifist speaker resumes his seat, Ingram stands up and begins in earnest. In a very well-argued passage (pp. 58-62) he raises the old issue of the temporal and the eternal. We agree with him that the teaching of Christ is not a text-book or a code of law. We hesitate when he continues, "It is not enough to know what line of action is right—we must also be able to judge the right moment for carrying it into operation. A policy which is essentially good may become a crime if it is launched too soon." And our hesitation becomes denial when he concludes, "The fact that Christ insisted on the evil and futility of violence, and substituted for it the law of love, does not in the least prove that it is the duty of the Christian to apply this maxim absolutely at the present moment."

#### The Offence of God

This line of argument rests on two grave misconceptions. The first and greater is that it overlooks the person of Christ and takes possession of an abstracted teaching. Christ is open to the charge Mr. Ingram brings against us—not in His "policy" (if the absurdity may be excused) but in His person. Ingram agrees that Christian pacifism is a total theology. This theology—and the whole Christian faith—asserts that Jesus is the Word of God made flesh. His coming declares Eternity in the very midst of actual Time. Because of the act of God in the Incarnation, Mr. Ingram would be compelled by his own argument to say that God Himself had done the very thing condemned in pacifist faith. We are Christians first, and therefore (*pace* Dr. Goudge) pacifists. From the standpoint of this central faith in the Incarnate Word of God we are bound to admit the evidence also of the Gospels, wherein Jesus speaks and acts as one who is called to live the life of Eternity in all the limits of temporal humanity. For that reason, with His supreme insight into our weakness, He enjoins the same incredible absolutism upon his very human disciples, and upon the weakest member of His Body, the Church.

The command, "Be ye perfect" is not a vague idealism which may be postponed to await Mr. Ingram's political judgment of its appropriateness. It is a stern reminder that the Will of

God must be realised daily in and through the limits of Time. The life of the humble and time-ridden human creature must be in increasing measure an incarnation of the Eternal. And because of the calling of the Church to be His Body, we dare to assert that not merely the individual, but also human society in all its relationships must so embody the life of God. The choice of time and place may be left with Him who saw and loved His world, and for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven and was made Man . . .

Ingram demands the *prior* changing of the whole system of relationships, as though to make a world safe for pacifism. Dr. Lindsay, more acutely, has said:—"Most of us are everyday people going about our everyday business, and I hold it unreal to think we can leave all that much as it is, and on this one point alone adopt the absolute method and behaviour of the Saviour of the world." It would appear that in the new strength of the Christian pacifist movement, and in the heightened tension of the world, we have failed to commend to our critics, if not to our friends, the conviction that Christianity demands a new order of relationships in which the defeat of war is almost an incidental.

#### An Amazing Admission

There lies the gravamen of both criticisms. Let Ingram summarise them:—"It is not the issue whether pacifism is right or wrong. Pacifism is unquestionably right. War belongs to a primitive order: it is bestial and futile. Man cannot be released so as to enter a wider and more fruitful sphere of activities until he has loosed himself from the chains of war. But to do this he has much to achieve. Pacifism as a policy for the present is wrong, in so far as it does not belong to the immediate situation. The first essential is to change the situation."

Because we have failed him, Mr. Ingram turns to an alternative political solution. One suspects that, though the horror of war has oppressed him deeply, he finds a deeper wrong in the structure of political society. He seeks an order of living which Christian pacifism cannot help him to attain. He realises, further, that men may not want to live in his brave new world (would that all pacifist propagandists did the same), but he is too experienced to seek ways of compelling them to do so. He advocates with careful detail a two-part programme. The first part largely accepts and even develops what we call the "Lansbury programme." He recognises

that no preparation for a new world conference can succeed while the inviting powers are tainted with imperialism. He has not, however, seen his way to propose a unilateral offer of renunciation. His conference is hedged with conditions which the Axis would certainly suspect. In his revised "League of Nations" he seems personally to hope for sanctions, and therefore puts them on his agenda, but as it were, among the Other Business, for which no chairman has great hopes. But the pacifist must not be ungracious. Ingram states and faces these and other objections. He is under no illusion as to the integrity of the Axis powers.

He believes that the initial invitation to such a conference would be accepted. For an experienced publicist, he is rather sanguine as to the spreading of the facts in Germany and Italy, and as to the Dictators' regard for their own public opinion. But he is convinced of the early breakdown of negotiations. The Dictators' demands will be too high, and their patience too short.

#### A League Swept and Garnished

He turns, therefore, to elaborate the second part of his proposals for a still newer League, to be called the Peace Front. The organisation is carefully envisaged, but the first cause seems to be absent. When "certain nations" have met together, and agreed to set up a legal Council, these self-appointed arbiters will sit in judgment upon the claims of other powers. The grounds of judgment, after stringent mutual guarantees, are interesting. Not only do the "founder-nations" decide on the moral integrity of the applicant (Poland falls at this fence) but also on the possibility of effective defence of territory. By this test Denmark, and perhaps some Balkan States, are ruled out. The colonial possessions of all members of the Front are to be placed under the corporate mandate of the Front. This appears ill-judged, and we prefer the more informed analysis of the late Christian Lange in his Merttens Lecture of 1938, when he concluded:—"Peace is a necessity—imperialism is not."

These proposals envisage a League swept and garnished, and *within itself* relatively free of offence, because theoretically defenceless. How often, alas, do our political theories fall foul of human nature. But in the attitude of the Front towards the Axis, Ingram has only the sorry tale of collective security to repeat. There is an overwhelming allotted strength, against which



the aggressor may batter in vain. There will be no vindictive Treaties or punishment of the defeated Axis—only an intensified rearmament after each world war, and “we hope that eventually you will learn your lesson.”

#### The Kingdom That Suffers Violence

This conclusion is futile, and yet we would encourage the careful reading of a book so sincere and moderate. Ingram's concern for his task is far from that of a professional writer. But let us learn, and beg him to learn, that his quest for results on a short-time scale is intrinsically doomed to vitiate Christian thinking. To establish the goal of the Socialist State, of the classless society, of financial reform, or even of the abolition of war will only distort our vision. We write this with John Woolman's inspiration fully in mind. Such steps as manifestly advance our chosen cause will be taken *for that reason*, and by that reason they will ultimately be justified, until we have lost

sight of the pacifist faith. Our faith calls us to share in a victory already accomplished, to realise in human relationships a Kingdom already established, eternal, unchanging. If pacifism be called, as we are warned in these books, to an attitude of life which is so disarmed in body and spirit that it invites aggression, then sooner or later the hatred of the aggressor must be broken by the love of God. Till that time we declare that ultimately there is no other way, and we do well to act upon our faith.

Meanwhile, we do *not* ask that men should be compelled to take this course. We serve the world more deeply in our love than in any impatience. Violent men—even sincere publicists among them—will seek to take God's Kingdom by violence, or by impatience. Each succeeding phase finds the corporate witness and corporate action of the Christian pacifist fellowship unchanged. “I am come not to do my own will, but the will of Him that sent me.”

## CHINA'S CHALLENGE TO PACIFISM

P. C. Hsu

FOR the last twenty-four months China has been carrying on a heroic struggle against invasion. As a Chinese Christian pacifist, let me try to set forth the nature of the tremendous challenge that has come from this situation.

An average educated Chinese, speaking of the present situation, would say:

Because China has resisted invasion, she is today politically more united than ever, and her morale has been excellent. Now, supposing she had not resisted, what would have happened? The nation would have been overrun by invading armies just the same. In addition to bombing and killing, looting, raping and wanton destruction, the invaders would flood the nation with drugs, prostitution and the worst forms of gambling, which they have already done in occupied areas. Maybe fewer people would have lost their lives had China not resisted. But this must be offset by the complete shattering of the national morale, which in turn would lead to complete subjugation and enslavement of the nation.

As it is, China is not only hopeful about the ultimate outcome of the war, she also likes to feel that she has been sacrificing and fighting for international justice and peace in general,

and for the liberation of the Japanese nation in particular, because the latter have been “under the thumb” of their military party, who deny to them every freedom. When China wins the war, it would also mean the liberation of the Japanese people. Then the two free nations of China and Japan, one freed from invasion and the other freed from oppression, will be in a position to join hands in establishing peace in the Far East, which, in turn, would be a great step in advance toward world peace.

Let us proceed to examine the cultural and philosophical basis of this statement.

#### An Ancient Teacher of Pacifism

First, there is the whole question concerning the justification of resistance or national defence. As far as I am aware, Laotzu is the only Chinese sage who taught “returning evil with kindness.” This teaching applied to international relations would be akin to Christian pacifism. Historically, however, it is the Confucian teaching of “returning evil with justice” which has been accepted in China. We shall discuss a little later this Confucian conception of justice. Moti taught the doctrine of universal love and non-aggression, but at the same time he not only taught defence, he actually invented

weapons for national defence and made a successful demonstration which averted an imminent war of invasion. From this study, it is easy to see that the idea of non-resistance in face of foreign invasion has never been accepted nor even taught in China.

Secondly, if a nation as well as an individual is to return evil with justice, then it is highly important to find out the exact meaning of the word. Now, according to Confucianism, justice does not mean the Mosaic idea of an eye for an eye, for that would be returning evil with evil. In the present conflict, it means China would not do the same thing to Japan, even if she were capable of doing it. The Confucian conception of justice would mean, in the first place the making of a clear distinction between the actual wrongdoer and those who were compelled to acquiesce. In this case it means clearly distinguishing between the military party of Japan and the Japanese people. Then it means that, after having thus singled out the evil-doer, we must put a restraint upon the evil-doer. Confucius said: “He is a coward who, after having seen a righteous course of action, does not do it.” Lastly, it means that, as soon as evil is restrained, we should no longer cherish ill-will. Philosopher Chang, of the Sung

Dynasty, said: “The anger of the sage is entirely objective. He becomes angry because there is something in the objective situation to justify his anger. His anger stops as soon as the objective situation is changed.” Confucius also said: “Do not shift anger to another person.” When applied to the present conflict, it means China must resist, because resistance is a way of restraining the evil-doer. This, however, does not mean that she would not listen to other forms of restraint if such were available. Lastly, it means that China would stand ready to forgive even the evildoer when he has been successfully restrained, and also to co-operate with the Japanese people in working toward world peace.

#### Bringing Forth the Fruits

Now, the challenge that comes from such a philosophy is quite self-evident. The challenge becomes keenest when we remember that in the entire history of the West, no single nation has ever practised the Christian doctrine of “loving one's enemy,” and the further fact that in China one does not find the sort of national hatred toward Japan that one found in the West during the last war.

(To be continued)

## INTERNATIONAL NEWS

The International F.o.R. Summer School for Peace Workers, held for ten days at Whitsuntide on the island of Fano, off the North Coast of Denmark, was a very happy occasion.

It was a disappointment that Professor Raven was compelled by his new duties as Master of Christ's College, Cambridge, to cancel at the last moment. We were sorry, too, to miss Dr. Ording, of Norway. But others, in particular Dr. F. Siegmund-Schultze and Dr. G. H. C. Macgregor, readily gave even larger contributions than they had first promised, so that the school enjoyed a very full programme.

Dr. Siegmund-Schultze took as his subject the problem of Justice and Love. First illustrating it concretely from the problem of minorities, he went on to discuss the terminology of the subject in German, English, Greek and Latin. He referred particularly to the meanings of the words “Kraft,” “Gewalt,” “Exousia,” “Macht” and analysed the term

“Gerechtigkeit.” He argued that the application of Macht in practice was Gewalt and that Gewalt was wrong if it was brutal, if it interfered with freedom and if it dominated from above.

Dr. Macgregor, who is Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Glasgow, started from the point that the Christian ethic was rooted in Christian Theology, which fact drove us to seek the view of God that Jesus taught. But Christians, as a matter of fact, held different views on war. The difference depended partly on the attitude taken to the Old Testament and its relation to the New, and partly on the dogmatic position held, especially since the Reformation. He discussed the views both of the early Fathers and of Luther and Calvin. Turning to the New Testament, Dr. Macgregor discussed Apocalyptic. He urged that, though the Kingdom of God was, in some sense, still future, Jesus felt that in His own person the power (exousia) of the Kingdom had broken



through into the present age. With regard to the injunction, "Resist not evil," Dr. Macgregor enunciated four principles—the duty of loving all men, God's fatherly love for all without respect of persons, the absolute value of personality, and the overcoming of evil by good. He expounded the last principle at length, taking the cases both of the "brother" and the "enemy." The logic of the passage demanded the translation, "I say unto you that you requite not evil with evil." This was a "fulfilment" of the restrictive law which permitted not more than an eye for an eye, by bringing out the underlying spirit. Jesus never belittled the stark reality of sin, but His distinctive way of overcoming it was by redeeming the evil will. In war there was no redemptive element.

Dr. P. C. Hsu, of China, delivered three lectures on the Chinese Challenge to Christian Pacifism. He gave the School some insight

## DR. LINDSAY'S BURGE LECTURE

PACIFISM AS A PRINCIPLE AND PACIFISM AS A DOGMA: A. D. Lindsay. S.C.M. Press. 6d.

In his Burge Memorial Lecture the Master of Balliol has asked for controversy, and I do not doubt that he will get it. He has, however, one considerable advantage on his side at the outset; he has made so many points in the course of his 47 pages that it would require a whole issue of *The Christian Pacifist* to deal adequately with them, and modesty forbids me to ask for that. Dr. Lindsay has given us a clear if unconvincing statement of that militant idealism of the Left which is perhaps more opposed to our point of view than the somewhat hesitating imperialism of the Right. He is sure that "if we really cared for world peace, we should have to be prepared to risk war on its behalf." Perhaps someone who has benefited by Dr. Lindsay's translation of the *Republic* will show us what an uncomfortable half-hour the author of that paradox would have had had he enunciated it in the presence of Socrates!

Dr. Lindsay tries to be fair to his opponents, and only in two places does he allow his indignation to get the better of his information. Thus, to say that "the war of 1914-18 might have settled at least that it did not pay to make aggressive war if only our post-war doctrinaire pacifism had not intimidated dictators that in future it would pay," is to say the least, fantastically unfair. Then Dr. Lindsay likens the pacifists

into the teaching of Lao-Tze, Confucius and others of the classical Chinese scholars, and explained the Confucian concept of Justice, which stood for restraint without bitterness. He pointed out, however, that non-resistance in the face of invasion had never been taught in China.

Muriel Lester spoke of her experiences in the Far East, under the title "Thinking Asiatically."

Henri Roser, who also took responsibility for five of the devotional periods with which each day was opened, spoke on the translation of faith into practice. Several of those present gave accounts of the situation in their own countries, one of these talks dealing with the problem of the Schleswig frontier, and several of the evening sessions were devoted to the work of the Christian Pacifist Movement and the part of the International Fellowship in it.

in this country to the advocates of prohibition in the United States, and speaks more than once as though they are planning a mild sort of *coup d'état* such "as will force their countrymen who do not share their views to submit helplessly to injustice"! One might as well aver that the Opposition candidate at the Oxford by-election last year was trying to drive the country into war against its will. He was seeking to persuade his fellow-countrymen to adopt and act on a certain set of opinions: why should not the pacifist have this right also? The sound analogy in this case is not that of prohibition but that of the abolition of slavery, brought about, in Prof. Trevelyan's words, by "the conversion of England."

### The Realists of the Unreal

Lord Ponsonby has pointed out elsewhere that Dr. Lindsay's pacifism turns out, on examination, to be as doctrinaire as anyone's. He speaks of abstractions, such as "society," "law," and "war," and is driven in the end to admit that these are very different from the realities with which we have to deal. In the actual world of to-day, society turns out to be anarchy and the law is—or was—a League of Nations which half the Powers do not recognise.

There are two points which perhaps merit closer attention. Dr. Lindsay is convinced that the methods which keep peace between the

nations will be those which have been found to keep peace within the nation. What are those methods? The truncheons of the police, he answers, and in the last resort the bayonets of the military. "We get along in normal times with the use of comparatively little force at home, because everyone knows that if more force is needed it will be used, and because in the past when more force was needed it was used." Dr. Lindsay has taken over without examination the conventional view on the function of coercion in society: can we accept it?

### More Justice, not More Force

Death was not so long ago the penalty in this country for any one of over two hundred offences; are person and property less secure because we have abandoned that form of coercion for all ordinary crimes? I suspect that, in point of internal order, Britain is far superior to India; yet I do not doubt that the authorities in the latter country would be more ready than in the former to call out the military. Surely we are more secure because our social order is on the whole more just. I suggest that apart from two special cases—(a) unavoidable differences of opinion between persons of equally good intentions, and (b) the existence of anti-

social individuals who need treatment—a society has to use coercion only in so far as it is unjust to some of its members. The function of force—and Dr. Lindsay knows his Marx too well not to have faced this—is quite often not to back the law but to maintain injustice. The inference from this is clear: in the nation and between the nations, what we need is more justice and not more force.

Then there is the theological question of law and grace. For Dr. Lindsay, law represents a level of morality which grace must surpass but may not challenge. I answer: Is not the message of Jesus that moral standards are maintained in the end much better by forgiving the sinner than by sitting in judgment on him and defending against him the cause of the righteous? When Paul argues from the faith of Abraham that the promise came first and the law could not annul it, does he not mean that grace is God's way at all times, while law is the second-best with which God does what He can, but which must never be pleaded against His original intention? Dr. Lindsay offers us only the hoary paradox *Si vis pacem, para bellum*: Christ stands for the paradox of the Cross, that evil can only be destroyed by those who have given up all thought of defending themselves against its assaults.

E. L. ALLEN.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### GROUP ASSISTANCE FOR REFUGEES

The plight of refugees seeking sanctuary in this country from oppression and misery, sometimes from imprisonment, torture, and even death, and unable to find that sanctuary because of a lack of financial guarantee, has deeply moved many of our people.

Yet very often those so moved have been unable to give practical expression to their sympathy because the financial responsibility involved in a guarantee has been beyond the means of the would-be helper.

The Refugee Guarantee Appeal Committee, which is recognised by the Co-ordinating Committee for Refugees, and at whose preliminary conference on April 27th the signatories of this letter were present, has as its object the encouragement of schemes whereby groups of people in clubs, church congregations, or similar bodies, may, through individual, small, and regular subscriptions, support one or more refugees. The members of the Committee believe that even those who can spare no more

than a few coppers weekly can, in this way, become a valuable source of assistance.

Any who feel that a group to which they belong could offer aid of this kind are invited to write to Mr. D. J. Finney, Secretary of the above Committee, at the Bruce Hotel, 37, Coram Street, W.C.1, who will be glad to give information regarding types of cases and methods of group assistance. Speakers are available to address meetings of interested people in the neighbourhood of London and to give any necessary advice or help.

The letter was signed by:

Sir NORMAN ANGELL, King's Bench Walk, E.C.4.

Mrs. D. F. BUXTON, Erskine Hill, N.W.11.

Canon F. A. COCKIN, Amen Court, E.C.4.

Miss ROSE MACAULAY, Luxborough House, W.1.

MAURICE ROWNTREE, Esq., Endsleigh Street, W.C.1.

Dr. MAUDE ROYDEN, Nestlewood, Sevenoaks.



**BUTTER FOR BERLIN**

We have demonstrated our sympathies with the Czechs, the Jews, the Spaniards and others—usually after disaster has befallen them. We helped, very tangibly, Germans and Austrians after the last war.

We have sent messages of goodwill to the German people. We have agitated for a Peace Conference *before* the next war rather than after. If war should ensue and the result were the same as the last time, we should be sending relief to the Germans again. Why not *before* the war instead of afterwards? Why not send a symbolic gift to Germany now? It might set in motion a wave of goodwill that would turn the tide of European thought.

I want a ton of butter sent to the hospitals of Berlin in the name of the Christian Pacifists of this country. George Lansbury has been as our Ambassador. Let us follow up with a gift.

It would raise a storm of protest in some quarters here. But this would give us an opportunity to express our pacifism in terms of Christianity.

I am ready to pay for one hundredweight of butter if the F.o.R. will make up the ton.

Yours sincerely, FRANK R. HANCOCK.

Graig View, Cwmyoy,  
Abergavenny, Mon.

[We think this is a good idea. But it must be a real gift with no suggestion of charity, which

would be deeply resented. The gift perhaps would be more acceptable if it were not associated with pacifists.—Ed.]

**REFUSAL TO PAY RATES**

I have refused to pay the A.R.P. rate for a year and was summoned before the magistrate on Monday. Feeling I must still refuse, my goods are now to be distrained upon. I know many pacifists support A.R.P., but I feel so strongly that A.R.P. are entirely against the way of life which those calling themselves Christian should try to lead that I cannot pay to assist them. I know we cannot be logical in this complex social system, and we all draw the line in different places; my line has just got ruled at supporting A.R.P.

BEATRICE C. M. BROWN.

165, Gray's Inn Road, W.C.1.

**The Proposed Pacifist Public School**

The letter published under this heading in our June issue has the additional support of:—

HENRY BETT,  
J. IVORY CRIPPS,  
A. HERBERT GRAY,  
LAURENCE HOUSMAN,  
LEYTON RICHARDS.

**CONCERNING THE FELLOWSHIP****Appeal for Some Czechoslovakian Children from Ten to Fifteen Years Old**

Frau Elsa Tutschova, the widow of our late Secretary in Czechoslovakia, is making an appeal for hospitality and schooling under Home Office conditions for some children, boys and girls, of whom she has particulars through our F.o.R. friends in Czechoslovakia. She would be grateful to hear from members or friends of the F.o.R. who could help by taking a child. Please address all letters to Frau Tutschova, 17, Red Lion Square; a stamp for a reply would be appreciated.

**Conscription**

Ever since the Military Training Bill was announced the Fellowship has naturally felt that an urgent matter is to assist all its members who are immediately affected, and to assure them that the whole Fellowship is behind them

in thought and prayer in the stand they are taking.

Following a statement on the subject of Conscription issued by the Chairman, many letters came in, and up to the time of writing we have on our C.O. Register 260 names. (Quite a number of these are not actually Fellowship members.) We have from the outset kept in close touch with these twenty-year-olds, and shall, of course, continue to do so.

Apart from various letters which have been addressed to the C.O.s, we have sent to all of them copies of two leaflets issued by The National Joint Advisory Bureau—one being a short description of the Military Training Act, and the other, entitled "Before the Tribunal," giving information in regard to the regulations, together with some advice to applicants. On the New Testament side, a pamphlet, "Does the New Testament Sanction War?" written by

Professor George H. C. Macgregor, of Glasgow University, has been circulated.

We are concerned to ensure adequate support before the Tribunal, and are endeavouring to do so by communicating with the Minister, or other personal friend, of every conscientious objector in touch with us.

**HOSPITALITY FOR CHILDREN**

The work of the Children's Hospitality Committee (London Union of the F.o.R.) is to introduce into private homes guests who may not have had the background of security, comfort and education desirable for every child, or who may specially need personal sympathy and help. There may be some immediate problem to solve, the illness or death of a parent—some loss of tone owing to deterioration in family standard through unemployment, or even the simple human need of the town child for country air and conditions.

A child is never sent away until it has been certified clean and free from infectious disease and in every way fit to become a guest. In like fairness to the child, the host is asked for references to ensure that the home is a proper one for a child to enter. The length of a stay offered is

usually a fortnight, and often the invitation is extended and gratefully accepted. Many examples of happy results can be given; a hostess with one child said that her little visitor, who came from a large family, had transformed her own child from a "naughty little monkey" into one with an entirely fresh outlook, and the visitor had returned with interests previously unimagined. This work is a practical way of helping towards ultimate fellowship—national and international; most of it is done voluntarily. Will those who can and would like to help write to London Union of the F.o.R., 165, Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1.

**THE LONDON UNION OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION.****OUTER WEST LONDON COUNCIL.**

We are arranging an International Garden Party, to be held on Thursday, July 6th, commencing at 6.30 p.m., at Heston Cottage, Heston, Middlesex, the home of our friends, Mr. and Mrs. Blake.

The speakers who will give short talks at intervals throughout the evening will be Mr. P. H. Liang from China, Mr. Kan Kan Boadu from West Africa, Mrs. Elsa Tutsch from Czechoslovakia, and Miss Mary Campbell, who has been engaged in refugee work for the Society of Friends here and in Vienna. Tickets will be one shilling each, including refreshments.

DOROTHY E. SOAR.

39, The Park, Ealing, W.5.

Of course you are joining

**'The Pathfinder' Houseparties**

this year! These have become so popular that early bookings are advised

**EASTBOURNE**

August 5th-September 2nd at Winceby House School. Cost £2 5s. per week.

**BODELWYDDAN CASTLE, N. WALES**

August 5th-September 2nd. Cost £2 10s. per week.

**CHATEAU D'OEX, SWITZERLAND**

July 29th-August 12th and August 19th-September 2nd. Cost £9 9s. for two weeks, including 3rd Class return fare from London.

Prospectus from

**'THE PATHFINDER,' 9, Tufton Street, LONDON, S.W.1**



## PEACE WORK IN THE CHURCHES

### METHODIST PEACE FELLOWSHIP.

Hon. Sec.: Rev. LESLIE KEEBLE.

The annual general meeting of the Fellowship will be held at Great George Street Congregational Church (near the Methodist Conference Hall), Liverpool, on Friday, 21st July, at 7 p.m.

Rev. Henry Carter will preside. The meeting will be of unusual importance. In addition to the appointment of officers and other regular business, the question of a Forward Movement Propaganda Fund will be discussed. During the evening a member of the Executive will introduce a conversation on "The M.P.F. and the Military Training Act." At the close of the meeting it is hoped to hold a shortened "Covenant" Service for re-dedication and to provide an opportunity for new members to take the Covenant and join the Fellowship. Light refreshments will be served.

In view of the need of fellowship and consultation in promoting our increasingly important work, it is hoped that all M.P.F. members, lay and ministerial, as well as all who reside in or near Liverpool, will do their utmost to be present.

**Additions to Membership.** Large increases in membership have been reported at the two recent Executive meetings. On May 25th, 138 new lay members from 23 centres, and 7 ministerial members were announced. The largest additions were from Cambridge (10), East Ham (28) and Luton (35). Under the leadership of the Rev. C. L. Brewer, the Luton Circuit membership has been divided into a number of groups, each with its own secretary. On June 13th, there were 28 lay members reported from 10 centres, 8 ministers, and 35 students from Handsworth College. The last figure refers to a remarkable service held at Handsworth College by the Rev. Henry Carter when, after careful thought and preparation, 39 out of the 47 resident Theological students took the Covenant of the Fellowship. The ministers who have recently joined are the Revs. J. A. Clayton, H. P. Browell, G. J. Gage, F. W. Loy, H. S. Millward, W. Whittle, A. J. Wigley, J. Heaven, J. H. Collins, E. A. Barber, W. I. Morgan, W. Bradshaw, N. Upright, W. Savage, and Pastor C. E. Bellerby.

In two months 166 lay, 15 ministerial, and 35 student members have been added to the Fellowship.

**Rev. Henry Carter's Merttens Lecture.** The 1939 Merttens Lecture was delivered by the Rev. Henry Carter in May at Friends' House on the subject: "Liberty and Authority in the Modern World." It contains a valuable review of the various aspects of this vital problem, and shows that the Christian ideal and ethic alone can solve the relationship of these two necessary elements in the organised life of man. We commend it heartily to our readers. The lecture is printed in an attractive form at the price of sixpence only. Copies can be ordered from the Temperance Department, 1 Central Buildings, S.W.1.

**The Military Training Bill.** A letter of advice was sent out prior to Registration Day to all members of M.P.F. We thank those who have written expressing appreciation. We have reason to know that the ministers in the M.P.F., as well as the older lay members, have been guiding and helping the young men who have taken their stand as conscientious objectors. We urge them to continue to assist these young men in facing the Tribunals and in any other way possible during the coming weeks.

**The Rev. J. H. Clay writes:** "We duly held our Covenant Service in the Methodist Church, Amesbury, Wilts., at which seven friends took the Covenant. The local F.o.R. joined us, and the Vicar of a Salisbury parish helped in the Sacramental Service."

### BAPTIST PACIFIST FELLOWSHIP.

Hon. Secretary: The Rev. G. LLOYD PHELPS, B.D.

The Milton Hall, 244 Deansgate, Manchester, 3.

The London Union held its annual meeting on May 12th and unanimously passed the following resolution:—

"We desire to place on record our unqualified opposition to the Military Training Bill, now before the House of Commons, on the following grounds:

*First*, we believe that war is contrary to the will of Christ, and, therefore, compulsory military training is to be condemned;

*Secondly*, we hold that it is intolerable that men should be trained for the slaughter of their fellows;

*Thirdly*, we believe that by it, control over individual thought and action is placed in the hands of the Government, which is entirely contrary to the value set upon human personality by Jesus Christ."

There has been an influx of over one hundred members this month and our membership is now over 1,200. We welcome the formation of the church group at King's Langley. This brings the number of our groups up to 26. We invite our ministerial members once more to see what they can do to form live pacifist cells in their own churches.

A number of our young men have had to face the implications of their pacifism over the Military Training Act and have had their names provisionally recorded in the Conscientious Objectors' register. We wish to assure them of the reality of our fellowship with them as they face the tribunals this month. The secretary will be glad to be at the disposal of any young man who needs help and company at the tribunal and many of our ministers has volunteered to help in this way.

### THE CONGREGATIONAL PACIFIST CRUSADE.

A new venture was attempted during the May meetings in the form of a public meeting at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London, E.C. on Tuesday, 9th May. The Chairman was the Rev. Leyton Richards, M.A., and there were two speakers: The Rt. Hon. George Lansbury, M.P., and the Rev. Henry Carter, C.B.E. The meeting was attended by 750 people, in spite of the fact that it followed long Union sessions.

The Chairman said that one of the most difficult things we had to grapple with in this whole issue of peace and war is a matter of words. He stressed the need to get behind phrases to the reality which they hide and of reaching the decision that we must renounce war absolutely and meet aggression with justice and goodwill. This, he said, was the way of Christ—He met evil with its opposite; He met it with His own death, and *not* the death of the evil man. "To stand for the way of Christ is always to stand on the winning side."

The Rev. Henry Carter, at the close of a brilliant address, said there were before us two alternatives: Force or Fellowship. He appealed to the audience to measure up to this issue, and to those who felt called to follow the way of fellowship, he said: "You will not be a spectator, you will be a servant, somebody who brings to this tremendous task vision, toil, thought, energy. There is one universal Father, and, therefore, all men everywhere are in His name to be one brotherhood."

George Lansbury, a summary of whose speech will be found in this issue, also addressed the meeting.

On Thursday, 11th May, the Annual Business Meeting and Breakfast of the Crusade was held at Whitefields, Tottenham Court Road, at 8 a.m., 80 members being present. The Chairman was the Rev. Leyton Richards, M.A., and the speaker the Rev. C. Paul Gliddon.

## KENT COLLEGE CANTERBURY

HEADMASTER: H. J. PRICKETT, M.A.  
(Trinity Hall, Cambridge)

A boarding school for boys aged 7-19. (Separate Junior House for boys aged 7-12) in which the education is on progressive lines. There are opportunities for boys to share in the government of the school and for many kinds of creative activity. International contacts are encouraged. Owing to exceptional circumstances it is possible to give a high standard of equipment and catering at a very moderate fee. The school has a remarkable health record. The co-operation of parents is welcomed.

Fee: £75 per annum

INFORMATION AND PROSPECTUS FROM  
THE BURSAR



## 4% FREE OF INCOME TAX

is the excellent yield from the £10 Shares issued by St. Pancras Building Society. Withdrawals can be effected easily, at any time, in full. The Shares cannot depreciate in value.

Write for the Society's "Guide for Investors"  
Managing Director, E. W. Bales.

ST. PANCRAS BUILDING  
SOCIETY  
ST. PANCRAS HOUSE, PARKWAY,  
REGENT'S PARK, N.W.1.

## CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

RATE: 1½d. per word. Minimum 2/-. Church Notices: 6 lines or less 3/6.

Discount: 5% for 6 insertions. 10% for 12 insertions.

### HOLIDAYS

WENSLEY HALL, NEAR MATLOCK. A.A. Appointed. Small sunny Guest House. Good walking or motoring centre. Excursions arranged when desired. Suitable for Conferences. Telephone, Darley Dale 116. Eric and Muriel Bowser.

SIMPLY FURNISHED HUTS and quiet camping site, in private ground. Beautiful scenery. Sea 1¼ miles. Water and sanitation. Mrs. K. M. Ghosh, Trelaske House, Looe, Cornwall.

### HOLIDAYS

FREDSHJEM Holiday Language Centre on the frontier between Denmark and Germany. Pacifist family are willing to receive paying guests. Glorious scenery, bathing and rowing, and opportunity for studying German, French, Italian, Danish and Swedish. Lodging and board and language tuition, 6½ Danish Kroner per day. For further details write to W.R.I., 11, Abbey Road, Enfield, or direct to Dr. Arnold Kalisch, Fredshjem, Roenshovod pr. Rinkenæs, Denmark.

### DEVON AND CORNWALL

The Ideal Holiday Centres

FAIRFIELD GUEST HOUSE, DAWLISH, S. Devon, beautifully situated in own grounds of 8 acres. CORISANDE GUEST HOUSE, Pentire, Newquay, N Cornwall, close to sea, sands and cliffs. Both comfortable, well recommended and terms moderate. Illustrated brochure No. 9, free from Douglas Bishop, Fairfield Guest House, Dawlish, S. Devon. (Tel. 151.)

### SITUATIONS WANTED

PHARMACEUTICAL Chemist (London University degree), Christian pacifist, seeks post where knowledge useful. Age 25, retail, wholesale, some hospital experience. Write Box C.56, F.o.R. 17, Red Lion Square, W.C.1.

GERMAN lessons for beginners, conversations by Viennese pacifist, University student, living in Balham, S.W.12. Write Box No. C.54, F.o.R., 17 Red Lion Square, W.C.1.

### CHURCH NOTICES

ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL. Every Wednesday at 7.45 a.m. there is held in the Crypt the Celebration of the Holy Communion for Pacifists, first planned by Dick Sheppard.

### MEETINGS

FELLOWSHIP of Reconciliation. A Fellowship Hour for communion with God and each other is being held at 17, Red Lion Square, W.C.1., from 6 p.m. to 7 p.m., on the third Monday in each month. The next hour is on July 17th when the leader will be The Rev. W. T. Elmslie.

### SITUATION VACANT

EXCEPTIONAL opportunity offered lady to run Food Reform within high-class store. Advertiser, 1 Westbury Road, Bristol.

### WANTED

WANTED—room for group meeting W.C.2. Last Tuesday in month 6.30 p.m. (20 members approx.) Write Miss Hamp, 22, Downsway, Sanderstead.



LEIC  
6REA  
PAI  
30J

////// iv

# *One Hundred Per Cent. of Theological Students*

in some of the Training Colleges

## HAVE NOW BECOME PACIFISTS

This means that the complete Conversion of the Christian Church to the Pacifist Witness is now practical politics. How this might be fully accomplished will be considered at the F.o.R.

## SUMMER CONFERENCE AT BANGOR

*From Friday, August 4th to Friday, August 11th*

---

Speakers will include Leslie Artingstall, Alan Balding, Percy Bartlett, Canon Fletcher, Lewis Maclachlan and Charles Raven.

---

The programme will gladly be sent on application to F.o.R., 17 Red Lion Square, W.C.1. It will show the arrangements whereby none should be prevented from attending the Conference on the grounds of expense.



*Spend a useful week, planned to give adequate leisure-time, amidst some of the loveliest country in Great Britain*

UII  
PAI  
30J

//////