

(E)
Pam 1

THE CHURCHES AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

"LEST WE FORGET."

*"If I justify myself, mine own mouth shall
condemn me."—JOB, IX, 20.*

Alfred Marks, ed.

LONDON :

"NEW AGE" OFFICE, 1 & 2 TOOK'S COURT, E.C.

1905.

MAR

PRICE TWOPENCE.

E/1
7/6

THE CHURCHES AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

“LEST WE FORGET.”

If I justify myself, mine own mouth shall condemn me.—
Job, ix, 20.

It is desirable to say something in explanation of the origin of this collection. In the correspondence columns of the “Times” the question had been raised whether it is right to discuss political questions in Non-conformist chapels. In the “Times” of July 26, 1905, appeared a letter from the Rev. Silvester Horne, containing this passage: “At the time of the Boer war the pulpits of the Established Church rang with enthusiastic panegyrics on that appalling and disastrous policy.” In reply to this statement, Mr. Horsfall, of Swanscoe Park, near Macclesfield, wrote, in a letter printed in the “Times” of August 8: “Now what are the facts? I am probably in touch with more clergymen of the Church of England than is Mr. Horne, and I do not know a single clergyman who uttered ‘enthusiastic panegyrics’ on the war, or on the course of political action which preceded the war, and I do not believe that Mr. Horne can give us the name of a single clergyman who uttered any panegyrics of the kind.”

This statement, preceded by the question: “What are the facts?” shows an ignorance or forgetfulness simply astonishing. Mr. Horsfall is believed to be a prominent churchman. If he could entertain this belief, a similar delusion is probably widespread. In fact, Mr. Horsfall’s contention was supported by the “Church Times” (Sept. 29). It was evidently a matter of public interest that the attitude of the clergy on the subject should be recalled. Accordingly, in the “New Age,” four articles were published (Septem-

ber 21, 28, October 5, 12) under the heading "Thou Canst Not Say I Did It," quoting passages from sermons, books, addresses, etc., of clergymen of the Established Church. And not only of these. In the "Times" of September 29 Dr. John Hunter, of Glasgow, intervened in the discussion on "Christianity and Politics." He admitted that if sermons, prayers, and speeches of Nonconformists could be unearthed they would be found to contain panegyrics quite as enthusiastic as those uttered by clergymen of the Established Church. Dr. Hunter, indeed, expressed the view that, "It is a pity to recall what is best forgotten"—a view which, for reasons to be shown, cannot be admitted—"but," he continued, "but let us hear both sides if we are to hear one side." The demand is obviously fair. Accordingly, in the articles above-mentioned, all religious denominations were treated equally.

In answer to numerous requests, proving the deep interest taken in the question, it was determined to reprint the articles. The matter has been recast, and many passages have been added. Acknowledgments of assistance rendered are due to several correspondents of the "New Age." In particular, the assistance and co-operation of Mr. J. S. Trotter are gratefully acknowledged.

It must be understood that the present collection gives merely samples of the clerical utterances of the time. For one thing, ministers of religion in South Africa are not represented here. It suffices to recall the fact that Mr. Chamberlain placed them in the very front rank of his supporters: "Who has influenced her Majesty's Government? . . . In the first rank I put the ministers of religion in South Africa. . . . These gentlemen, whose profession inclined them to peace, to whatever denomination they belong, and whether they are British or American—all their organisations, and almost without exception all their ministers, are heartily on our side" (at Birmingham, May 11, 1900). The statement was warranted.

It was said above that it is not possible to admit Dr. Hunter's view that the attitude of the Churches on the question is "best forgotten." Of the men whose utterances are here recorded, many openly claim to be divinely commissioned to reveal the ways of God to man. Those whose pretensions are humbler, at least

claim to speak with a certain authority as elected by their fellows to the duty of teaching, of exhorting to righteousness, of warning to avoid evil. All are professed followers of the Prince of Peace. It is therefore of the greatest importance to remember how these teachers bore themselves in a great national crisis. In 1853, John Bright said: "They will say, Were there no churches in 1853? Were there no chapels? Were there no ministers of the Gospel of Peace? What were these men doing all the time?" John Bright complained in 1853 of the inaction of the clergy. Had he lived till to-day he would have complained, not that the clergy were inactive, but that in support of an infamous war by far the greater number threw themselves with zeal on the side of its makers. Not only was there no condemnation of the barbarous methods of conducting the war, but glowing eulogies were published of the Concentration Camps in which perished fifteen thousand children and some thousands of women.

Some of those who panegyrised the war and the methods of the war are unrepentant; they still glory in their shame. Others, it would seem, are terrified by the wrecking alike of England and South Africa, by the crowds of unemployed in the one, the hordes of Chinese slaves in the other. They hope that we may forget. They figure on Peace Societies: they preach sermons in praise of Peace. Some even go so far as to denounce the war they once eulogised. It is for us to remember. Ten, twenty, thirty years hence an occasion may arise in which we or our children will have to choose between Peace or War. Then let us remember the attitude of the churches; how, instead of preaching peace, they exhausted their oratory in inflaming the passions of the people. Let us remember the lessons of the past and be warned by them.

ALFRED MARKS

November, 1905.

The Established Church.

Within the limits of this island alone on every Sabbath 20,000—yes, far more than 20,000—temples are thrown open in which devout men and women assemble that they may worship Him who is the Prince of Peace. Is this a reality? Or is your Christianity a romance?—JOHN BRIGHT.

In the form of prayer recommended by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the justice of the war was assumed :—

Let Thy protecting care be over those who have now gone forth to fight the battles of their country for the deliverance of the oppressed and for the maintenance of justice and equity between man and man.

Note the words “ justice and equity between man and man.” They became, as we shall see, the catch-words of the panegyrists of the war.

Our troops had shown already what Englishmen were like. They had upheld the honour of England as no armies had ever surpassed them in doing.—Archbishop of Canterbury, Jan. 7, 1900. (“ Times,” Jan. 8, 1900.)

Neither need we doubt the justice of our cause, nor the beneficial results which our victory would bring, even to the very people with whom we are now at war.—Archbishop of York. (“ Times,” February 19, 1900.)

After a reference to the Boer proclamations of “ Days of thanksgiving and humiliation ” :—

As yet there have been no such days in England. It may be that our heavenly Father is only waiting to be gracious. . . . If without hypocrisy we had long ago taken a similar course, it might have fared better with us than it has done.—Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop of York, October, 1901.

Of the greatness of our mission in South Africa, one need have no doubt, and if the English race was to fulfil its destiny that it must be able to throw back its shoulders and breathe the air of freedom was surely an incontrovertible proposition. . . . One thing stood out clearly and nobly—the patience, the Christian patience, with which our Government had been of late striving after peace when the blundering Boers had done so much to provoke them. . . . It seemed as if not a stone were left unturned under which the key to an honourable peace might lie.—Bishop of Bath and Wells, at Diocesan Conference. (“ Times,” October 6, 1899.)

“ The patience, the Christian patience,” with which Mr. Chamberlain strove after peace! “ If I had read these Blue-books,” said the eminent Tory lawyer, Sir

Edward Clarke, "not knowing the persons concerned in the matter, I confess that I should have been forced to the conclusion that the correspondence was conducted not with a view to peace." (October 19, 1899.)

The Bishop of Chester took part in the presentation of the South African medal to the two Cheshire companies of Imperial volunteers, September 7, 1901.

The glorification by this prelate of the Concentration Camps, in which more than 15,000 children perished, is mentioned under "The Massacre of the Innocents."

A corrupt and tyrannous oligarchy that had for long been secretly preparing for war with money wrung from the Uitlanders can no longer be permitted to treat our fellow-countrymen with cruel injustice, in spite of all that patient diplomacy in the present could achieve, or former treaties could secure; and in the sacred names of justice, liberty, and humanity England had been compelled, though with much reluctance, to submit the questions in dispute to the stern arbitrament of war. . . . And at whatever cost in blood and treasure England would now see that justice was done. There would be no faltering, no hesitation, no drawing back.—Bishop of Chichester, at Diocesan Conference, November 7, 1899. ("Times," November 8, 1899.)

He believed from the bottom of his heart that the war was not only an inevitable war, but a just war and a righteous war. It was a war of light against darkness, a war of liberty against injustice: the only means, it seemed, whereby true peace and real liberty and perfect justice might be secured in that country for the future.—Bishop of Chichester, December 10, 1899.

In his view the war in South Africa was distinctly a war of defence against aggression, a war of resistance to injustice and cruelty, not for conquest and dominion. It had been forced upon us, all unwilling to undertake it, by the mad ambitions of a small but tyrannous oligarchy, which had induced a mistaken people to fight. . . . A war which had for long been preparing against us in silence and treachery with the avowed object of sweeping every British subject from South Africa. . . . He was personally deeply persuaded of the paramount necessity and the entire justice of the war.—Bishop of Chichester. ("Times," January 9, 1900.)

As we shall hear more of this "avowed object," we will here quote the words of Dr. G. M. Theal, the historiographer of the Cape Government for over forty years, a man who has a complete knowledge of South Africa. In an interview published in the "Manchester Guardian" he said: "I say to you on my word of honour that I am as sure as I am sitting here that

the design to oust the English from South Africa and set up a great Dutch Republic, no more entered the minds of men like Kruger, Steyn, Reitz, and Joubert than it has occurred to Premier Laurier to oust the United States from the American Continent, and make of all North America a great Canadian Dominion."

But what power the war has brought! The British soldier has risen greatly in the estimation, not only of England, but of the world. . . . It has knit together England and her many sons in a bond of love and common interest which shall never be divided. It has shown that she possesses great and unexpected reserves. . . . It has bound up classes and obliterated distinctions here at home. . . . Knees have bent before God in an attitude to which they have long been strange.—Bishop of Chichester, October 1, 1901.

Preaching to the 3rd Essex Volunteers on January 11, 1900, the Bishop of Colchester said:—

We were knitted together as one man with one purpose, because we believed it was God's cause, and not only the cause of the Queen.

When we had obtained the blessing of stable peace in regions now desolated by war, we should be able to show in what spirit we resisted at all costs the attack on our supremacy, by striving to bring to all who would be under our dominion—Englishman, Boer, or Kaffir—the ennobling privileges of the true freedom which was born of truth.—Bishop of Durham. ("Times," November 16, 1900.)

The Bishop of Durham addressed a message to the Company of Durham Artillery which was going to South Africa. The message was read on parade. The Bishop said:—

A great crisis had revealed the Empire to itself. They felt from one end of the world to the other as they had never felt before, that they were one people charged with a great mission, and united by a history which was our inspiration to noble deeds. All minor differences of class and opinion were lost in the universal desire to fill Imperial obligations according to their opportunities, and to preserve unimpaired for the next generation the inheritance which they themselves had received. ("Times," March 24, 1900.)

From "The Obligations of Empire," by the Bishop of Durham, published in 1900:—

It is not only our paramount authority in South Africa which is at stake, but as involved in that our dominion in India, and our fitness to inspire and guide the life of Greater Britain. We have to show that we are still worthy to hold, both by might and by counsel, the Empire which has been

entrusted to us, to protect those who rightly look to us for help, and to bear patiently the thankless burden of the white man, and train uncivilised races to a nobler life.

He looked upon the present war as waged by an English army as a great effort and a distressing necessity for righteousness and peace.—Bishop of Durham, at a presentation of war medals, November 23, 1901.

The war in South Africa had shown at least this much already—that the manhood of our country had not been destroyed by the luxury which had long prevailed amongst us, that all classes, rich or poor, were ready to unite for the defence of the Empire. . . . It had knit together the hearts of Englishmen throughout the world.—Bishop of Ely, at Ely Diocesan Conference, June, 1901.

We are at war with men with whom we would fain be at peace. . . . Her Majesty's Government believe the war to be necessary in the cause of justice and equity, and the nation believes it.—Bishop of Lichfield, at Diocesan Conference, November 2, 1899. ("Times," November 3, 1899.)

Even if we were brought to a condition of wanting real help, it might be a means of joining the Colonies one to another, and with the mother country. . . . In plainer words, it would make a more united Empire than it had yet been. God in His ways might be working that, and he hoped and trusted it would prepare the way for the missionaries to spread the Gospel all round about in Africa.—Bishop of Lincoln. ("Times," January 9, 1900.)

Did St. Augustine need to have the way cleared for him by the legions of Rome?

In Africa the sad realities of war had been experienced even when freed by Christian influence from barbaric atrocity and redeemed by the heroic and Christian conduct of individual men.—Bishop of Lincoln. ("Times," October 10, 1900.)

The Bishop of Lincoln, preaching in Spalding Parish Church to a crowded congregation, said that it seemed according to all human probability that peace could not be very far off. It seemed as though the hand of God had been with them and given them the victory. . . . They might hope that there would be some great cathedral church built at Cape Town to represent the great things which God had done for the English nation. There ought to be some visible object, witnessing the acknowledgment of England that what had been done was not in their own strength, but under the hand of God. ("Times," May 7, 1901.)

“Not in their own strength.” But their own strength was very considerably taxed before the 50,000 farmers were subjugated. We sent out 448,876 officers and men, not including 50,000 armed natives and hordes of Bechuanas hired to burn and devastate. The Colonies, called on to come and save their old mother, sent their corner boys and larrikins in response. And who can say how many millions were squandered, to the enrichment of contractors and the impoverishment of the country?

The Swiss Branch of the Evangelical Alliance issued what the “Times” calls a “pro-Boer appeal to ‘the Christians of Great Britain’.” In reply to that appeal the Bishop of Liverpool addressed a letter to the Branch, printed in the “Record” of August 23, 1901:

We did not seek the war. It was forced upon us by men who, whatever may have been their pretext, really aimed, as is now beyond doubt, at the overthrow of British power in South Africa, and the setting up of a South African Republic.

We have not conducted the war unrighteously and cruelly. . . . The exigencies of war will always require the burning of farms, and even of villages, which are used by the enemy to harass the opposing army, and to harbour combatants and ammunition. Terrible as the farm-burning has been, it was only ordered when absolutely necessary by a British general whose character for humanity and godliness is beyond dispute.

The Boer women and children were crowded into camps because they could not be kept alive in any other way. . . . No doubt they have suffered hardships, but so have our own soldiers and civilians. No doubt the death-rate in the concentration camps has been lamentably high, especially among children, but so has it been in our own camps amongst strong and seasoned men. . . .

The great mass of Evangelical Christians in Great Britain of all shades of political opinion, support, and will continue to support, the policy of their Government, because it involves the integrity of the British Empire, the complete civilisation of South Africa, and the evangelisation of the native races.

The Bishop of Liverpool, writing a month later:—

I see no reason whatever to modify any of the statements which I have made in reply to the Swiss pastors. I do not think that the Proclamation of Lord Kitchener [calling on the Boers to surrender by September 15] is contrary to the usages of civilised warfare; nor do I see how it is possible for Great Britain to accept arbitration in South Africa. (“Times,” September 25, 1901.)

On this letter Field-Marshal Sir Neville Chamberlain wrote, on August 26, 1901: "What must have been the distress and dismay of the simple Swiss Protestant ministers to discover that a prelate of the Church of England could view as unavoidable the horrors that had already devastated, and are still devastating, the two Boer States? Never before has anything approaching to such wholesale and reckless destruction or abduction of families been enacted by a British army" ("Manchester Guardian"). Notwithstanding, the Bishop saw "no reason whatever" to modify any of his statements.

We may just observe, parenthetically, that the Council of the British Organisation of the Evangelical Alliance "would refer to the recent letter of the Bishop of Liverpool as, in the main, giving utterance to their own views in the matter." ("Times," September 30, 1901.)

The Bishop of London, preaching to C.I.V.'s, January 19, 1900:—

You go for your fathers who begat you, whose work you cannot refuse to carry on. You go for your children, who are to come after you that you may hand down to them England's honour untarnished during the brief period in which it was committed to your trust.

It was not now worth asking why or how the war had come about. The only thing before them was to do their country's duty in the hour of their country's need.—Bishop of London. ("Times," June 25, 1900.)

It is difficult to say whether the following gem was meant to be taken seriously. The second sentence seems to sparkle with a delicate irony:—

No nation, however rich, can even financially go on spending so many millions a month in war without suffering at last; and of the drain on our resources money was the least. It is true, and we must never forget it, that we have received in this war priceless lessons; we have received a unique experience of warfare under most difficult conditions.—Bishop of London's Thanksgiving Sermon, at St. Paul's, June 8, 1902.

The cause for which they were to fight was a righteous one. . . . The righteousness of the cause should determine them so to behave in the face of the enemy that not one jewel should be torn from the forehead of our beloved

Queen.—The Bishop of Marlborough. (Address to the C.I.V.'s, January 31, 1900.)

The cloud of almost inevitable war was now hanging over the nation. They had striven and prayed for peace, it seemed, in vain. The admirable patience of the Government had stretched forbearance almost beyond the bounds of national self-respect. Now it appeared that only one thing, war was rapidly approaching, and that soon from thousands of British and colonial homes there would go forth the flower of the nation's youth to fight their battle and win for their fellow-countrymen in the Transvaal the rights and liberties of equal citizenship.—Bishop of Peterborough, at the Peterborough Diocesan Conference. ("Times," October 5, 1899.)

We believe that every great race had a mission to fulfil in the world, and England had the lessons of Magna Charta and of religious toleration to give, and freedom and equal rights wherever the English flag floated, to every man, no matter to what race he belonged.—Bishop of Ripon. ("Times," January 15, 1900.)

On January 2, 1901, the Bishop of Rochester took a leading part in welcoming the return from South Africa of Lord Cranborne.

We feel the moral strain. We hate the position of a big power treading down a little one. The rôle of putting down independence is as unwelcome to us as it is uncongenial to our traditions. We are not reconciled to it, even though independence has in this case associated itself with Krugerism, corruption, unsleeping and bitter animosity, and enormous military outlay: or though we know that we are fighting for the prevalence of a higher civilisation over the lower.—Bishop of Rochester, September 17, 1901, in a letter to the Editor of "Die Christliche Welt," of Marburg.

The immense preponderance of reasonable responsible opinion had steadily recognised that, once begun, the war must be persisted with steadily to a decisive issue.—Bishop of Rochester, at a Diocesan Conference, November 6, 1901.

It must, however, be remembered to the credit of the Bishop of Rochester that on one occasion he was distinctly in advance of his clergy. Alarmed by the frightful mortality in the Concentration Camps, he wrote to Mr. Brodrick, and at the Diocesan Conference in November, 1901, approved a resolution referring to "the terrible result of military measures." And this is how he was met: The Rev. W. H. Longsdon thought that in view of the mortality statistics in some parts of Lon-

don, it was unnecessary to criticise the Concentration Camps in South Africa.

Canon Pollock said he could have wished that the resolution had embodied an expression of the feeling that it rested very much more with the Boers than with us to terminate the present state of things. (Hear, hear.) ("Times," November 8, 1901.)

It is a war which, in my opinion, has been forced upon us; we would gladly have remained at peace. . . . We do right to ask God to bless our cause, believing it to be a just and righteous cause.—Bishop of St. Albans, at Diocesan Conference, October 25, 1899. ("Times," October 27, 1899.)

England holds too great responsibilities in South Africa to abdicate her position, on which rest not only the present engagements under which alone Englishmen can live there, but the whole future conditions of South African united civilisation. War to overthrow that position has been preparing only too many years, and the grievances under which our countrymen have been more and more oppressively and contemptuously refused the equal rights which were the essence of the convention under which the Republic exists, have meant the war so long preparing. We may have waited too long; we have certainly not been hasty.—Bishop of Southwell, at Diocesan Conference at Nottingham. ("Times," October 25, 1899.)

Pray for a righteous issue—yes; but not as in doubt if we are assured of our cause, nor in pretence, but pray sincerely for blessing and success in what we feel righteous.—Bishop of Southwell. ("Times," January 9, 1900.)

The glorious thought about it was that we thereby helped on the will of God. Just as by sowing and reaping we obtained His gift of bread, just as by study and reading we acquired His gift of knowledge, so by praying and fighting we showed that our prayers were in earnest, and that we believed we were spreading His gracious gift of good government throughout the world. . . . The supremacy of the Boers meant the inferiority of every other race; our supremacy had been used, and would be used, to secure equality for the white races and justice to the black races.—Bishop of Stepney at St. Paul's, February 11, 1900.

Dr. Gott, Bishop of Truro, in his Twentieth Century Address, said:—

God has added to this Empire a diamond-field, a land whose harvest is pure gold, or whose rich mines were of ruby, rocks of opal: these sounded like phrases, but our colonists

knew they were facts. (Quoted in the "Herald of Peace," November 1, 1901.)

He had heard it said within the last few days that the spirit stalking abroad in England was an un-Christian spirit of pride, anger, and revenge. To his eyes it seemed quite otherwise. . . . Who that had had large opportunity of observing the really prevalent tone and temper, but had marvelled—almost awe-struck—at the deepened sense of the greatness and beauty of life's true issues?—Bishop of Winchester, February 11, 1900.

Preaching at Blackburn on December 25, 1901, Bishop Thornton [Assistant Bishop to the Bishop of Manchester] said :—

He had been requested to speak on the wickedness of the war, and their duty to stop it. The wickedness of continuing the war he freely admitted, and in the cry to stop it he heartily joined, but that appeal must be addressed to a certain old man in Holland. What were the Boers now fighting for? It could not be for the restoration of the so-called Republics—that was impossible—nor for liberty, because free self-government was already assured. Their only motive—one most potent with men and wild beasts—was hate. Hate it was that kept these motley commandos in the field, shedding the blood of our best and noblest. If the Boers wished for peace they could have it, but if they contemptuously refused generous terms there was only one way to peace, and that a hideous one—suppression. ("Times," December 26, 1901.)

"Suppression" cannot here refer to the overthrow of the Boer Governments; they were already overthrown, and to restore them was "impossible." "Suppression" meant extermination. One hundred and twenty-three years before this time a protest of 31 British peers declared that "Those objects of war that cannot be compassed by fair and honourable hostility, ought not to be compassed at all; an end that has no means but such as are unlawful is an unlawful end." Some of the awful facts about the Concentration Camps were known through the publication of a Blue-book; among other facts, that the death rate in the Camps was so high that school benches had to be used for making coffins. And with such facts before him a Christian Bishop could talk of "suppression"!

Two Colonial Bishops bring up the rear :—

As a nation we entered upon the undertaking with a sense of responsibility resting on us, not in any spirit of aggression.

We had been taught, and he believed rightly, that the interests of South Africa demanded the action. The British nation had its faults, but it had its virtues also, and it was a matter for thankfulness that wherever the British flag was flying there was liberty, security to life and property, and administration of justice.—Bishop Tugwell, November 1, 1899.

May I be permitted through your valuable columns to sound the bugle, and call the people once again to prayer?

We cannot forget Septuagesima Sunday of last year, which was set apart for prayer at the beginning of the present war in South Africa, and how it was immediately followed by the relief of Kimberley, the defeat and capture of Cronje and his army, the relief of Ladysmith, and the capture and occupation of Bloemfontein.

Can it be that we have ceased to pray, seeing that we are not yet able to bring the war to an end?

We have faith in the justice of our cause; then let us to the Lord our God, Who waiteth to be gracious, yet will be inquired of, as in the days of old, to do it for us.—Bishop of Sierra Leone, in "Times," September 24, 1901.

We come now to clergymen below the episcopal rank.

Dean Farrar, preaching at Canterbury Cathedral on November 5, 1899, said that:—

Just as every good and great man was sure to be at all times the butt of slander and of malice, so England, who in her relations with all classes of men, desired only to be just and generous, stood to-day amid the jealousy of the nations and the hubbub of lies. We had need for righteous determination and for ardent watchfulness. The Dean went on to consider the questions: Is war justifiable? and Is the present war just and right? To both questions he answered an unhesitating "Yes." ("Times," November 6, 1899.)

It is easy for those who hold that war is anti-Christian to draw frightful pictures of the miseries which all war must necessarily involve. . . . They ask whether the Saviour of the world permits His followers, under any circumstances, to shoot each other down by tens of thousands, by way of "relieving the oppressed and maintaining the cause of justice and equity between man and man?" . . . There are whole books of the Old Testament which ring with the clash of conflict. . . . Nor is it otherwise in the New Testament. . . . Our Lord never forbade war, from which he sometimes took His metaphors. He said: "When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace."—Dean Farrar, in the "North American Review," September, 1900.

We were fighting for truth and justice, not for revenge, and when the end of the war came there would be no thought of vengeance or punishment. The vanquished would be asked to consent to live as Englishmen, free as they are, under the same laws, the same Queen, enjoying the same rights—one nation, one people.—Dean of Gloucester. (“Times,” January 9, 1900.)

The following is a quotation from a sermon preached on the text, “For my sword shall be bathed in heaven,” Isaiah xxxiv, 5 :—

He called the struggle righteous, for it was to right the wrong done by a people who had deliberately set themselves to play the part of tyrants, who had opposed all real Christian projects, whose one aim was to advance the selfish, narrow ends of a few, and whose rule was not only oppressive and unjust to the Englishmen who dwelt among them, but also to the untutored natives of the land. England in her great world-work needed neither land nor gold; wealth she gave rather than received. Free herself, she wished freedom to be the heritage of every people upon earth. . . . Then, was not the preacher justified—amply justified—when, in invoking the blessing of the Most High upon the arms of England in this war, he dared to use the magnificent imagery of the Hebrew prophet, and to speak of the sword of England as being “bathed in Heaven” ?—Dean of Gloucester, in Gloucester Cathedral, February 11, 1900.

This war being, as we believe, for a righteous cause.—Archdeacon of Ripon. (“Times,” December 27, 1899.)

On November 5, 1899, the Archdeacon of London preached at St. Paul’s from the text,

“Ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars; see that ye be not troubled, for all these things must come to pass.” It was disappointing for the British nation to find itself at war so soon after the Peace Conference; but it was quite possible even for the most peace-loving people to be placed in circumstances where war was inevitable. . . . It was not the duty of a preacher to investigate the causes of such things, but to draw lessons from existing facts. It might be laid down that the British have no desire for either war or conquest; the sufferings of the one, and the responsibilities of the other had from time to time been forced upon them.—(“Times,” November 6, 1899.)

The war had brought out many lessons, and had shown the bitterness and hatred with which, most unhappily, our nation was now regarded by all but one of the greater nations of the Continent. The combined effect of all these things had been to enhance the sense of national Imperial unity beyond all

that went before it, and the result had been seen in the return of the Government which had carried the war through—although the country had not been slow to find fault with it—by an immense and increased majority and by a markedly large number of votes.—Canon Mason, at Westminster Abbey, October 14, 1900.

Which was the "one of the greater nations of the Continent"? Turkey? We know that the Sultan was honoured by an autograph letter from the Queen, and that the fleet illuminated at Constantinople on his birthday.

We knew how the present war had been forced on this country: how the British Government had striven almost beyond the bounds of prudence to stave off the appeal to the sword. We knew to-day, if we ever doubted it, that war was inevitable. This, if any, was a war waged in the eternal interests of justice and truth, for the promotion of the welfare of thousands, including the welfare of those now unhappily pitted against us. . . . There could be no more solemn moment than when a nation unsheathed its sword and struck a blow at the tyrant, the oppressor, and the murderer, hurling with all the power of Empire its armed hosts against the enemy, and cried, with the confidence bred of seriousness, and the bravery that came of the consciousness of a good cause, "God defend the right!" He unhesitatingly said that war had its blessings as well as its horrors.—Canon Newbolt, before the Lord Mayor, December 6, 1899.

We all know the horrors of war, or, at least, we can imagine them; they are striking and obvious. But I venture to say, even on the lowest ground, they are out-balanced by the horrors of voluptuous peace. . . . We . . . must let the beauty of war, its heroism, and its wonderful virtues, balance the pain and horror.—Canon Newbolt, "Endurance: a Message from the War," a Sermon preached in St. Paul's, December 17, 1899. ("Church Times," December 22, 1899.)

One is forced to ask whether the beauty of war and its wonderful virtues would have been so obvious to Canon Newbolt if his house had been burnt over his head, he himself sent to a distant land as a prisoner of war, while those dearest to him were sent to rot in a Concentration Camp?

Is not the present check to our arms making manifest high works of God, giving scope, as it does, for a wonderful exhibition of patriotism, of national strength, of brotherhood between class and class, of liberality, of self-sacrifice, of sympathy, such as would not otherwise have been elicited?—Canon Argles. ("Times," December 25, 1899.)

The Boer is a cunning, deceitful, treacherous foe. . . .

When the devil and his angels fought as rebels against God, and prevailed not, because Michael, the archangel, and the heavenly hosts fought with the prevailing power of God, and cast out these evil hosts, they found a place where they could carry on what we may almost compare to the guerilla warfare in South Africa. They came to earth to carry on that incessant system of ambushes and surprises, the cunning and deceit of which are accompaniments of this very poor class of warfare now going on in South Africa—you can hardly dignify it with the name of true and straightforward fighting. It is just that which constitutes danger to us all. Our foes are not straightforward: they do not show themselves in their true colours: they are always lying in wait, in ambush unseen, and we fancy their power is not what it is.—Canon Bartram, Vicar of St. Mary's, Dover. ("Dover Standard," March 18, 1901.)

As to the negotiations which preceded the war:—

It seemed to him that if ever a war was legitimate and just, then this war was both. We went into the war with heavy hearts: we clutched with almost irrational eagerness at every chance of making peace.

These words were spoken by Canon Henson in a sermon preached at St. Margaret's, Westminster, on June 8, 1902, long after Sir Edward Clarke's cross-examination of Mr. Chamberlain in the House of Commons. (October 19, 1899.)

In this war, now happily ended, there was raised, as men everywhere now confess, at least outside the coterie of unteachable political partnership, the gravest possible issue. The Imperial mission of Great Britain was endangered. . . . To my thinking, this Imperial mission represents a Divine vocation.—Canon Henson, June 8, 1902. ("Christian World Pulpit.")

Canon Knox Little published early in July, 1899, a book, "Sketches and Studies in South Africa," dedicated to Cecil Rhodes, company-monger, chiefly responsible for the Chartered Company, the most colossal swindle of the nineteenth century. The tone of this book may be inferred from the following extract from a review in the "Daily Telegraph," a shining organ of the new Imperialism:—"Canon Knox Little has the lowest opinion of the Boers and all their ways. Indeed, if he were not well known as a serious student of politics, as well as a distinguished Churchman, the uninformed who read his book would almost be driven to

the opinion that it is the work of a violent partisan." It will suffice to quote one sentence of this book :—

There is something saddening in the notion that English statesmen should waste the courtesies of diplomacy on the Transvaal Government.

From the same oracle :—

I fear the thing [a day of humiliation and prayer] would not be real, and, therefore, would be powerless towards God; and towards man it would give the impression that we are ashamed of one of the most righteous wars—as most of us believe—ever waged.—Canon Knox Little, in "Times," December 22, 1899.

We must have a high moral principle that right is right, and wrong is wrong: that a great empire has great responsibilities, and that that empire, in fulfilling its responsibilities, may be dragged or driven, in spite of its desire, as we have been dragged and driven by our enemies into this war. When an empire is so dragged or driven it must stand by its colours, manly and true, serious and in earnest. They must have no lowering of the moral tone, no sentiment masquerading as principle, no cant masquerading as religion, but they must fight for what is right and true, and carry the flag of freedom wherever the great Empire of which God had made them part, extended her bounds.—Canon Knox Little, at Kidderminster, December 1, 1901.

Canon Knox Little's eulogy of the Concentration Camps will be found under the head "The Massacre of the Innocents."

We fought that we might defend and preserve the high interests which the God of nations and of Christendom had committed to the keeping of our country.—Rev. Dr. Llewellyn Davies, September 26, 1900.

Towards the end of 1900, Dr. Powell, Vicar of St. Paul's, Maidstone, gave an address on the war. * In this he said: "Our position was very much like that which Joshua took up, 'As Captain of the host of the Lord am I now come'." A Union Jack, "which had waved over more than one bloody fight," was exhibited, whilst another was "spread about the altar."

† He thought it a splendid thing that we had embarked in a cause of national righteousness. . . . They believed their country had been fighting for the restoration of liberty, justice and equity to their fellow-countrymen, unfairly oppressed, and that they had, by God's help, overcome a sordid, ignoble, and wicked conspiracy.—Rev. Forbes E. Winslow, Rector of St. Leonard's-on-Sea, on the surrender of Pretoria.

We have nothing to add, but to strike the new note of

optimism. All is for the best in the best of all possible worlds. We feel ourselves to be like Israel coming out of Egypt—Jehovah has triumphed, his people are free. The Boer oligarchy has been broken down. A base conspiracy against the liberties of mankind and the equality of races has been swept away. Like the Mormons of Utah, these Boers have been overtaken at last, and by the aid of a great army and at vast cost their anti-social settlements have been broken up. Kruger and his gang of unscrupulous dacoits have been laid by the heel, and the last cry, "Give me back my gold," has been raised as the "Bundesrath" steamed out of Delagoa Bay, carrying off to the Netherlands thirty-six chests of loot.—From an article entitled "Optimism," in the "Church Gazette," June 16, 1900, by the Rev. J. B. Heard, M.A., Hulsean Lecturer.

"Not the yellowest editor on earth has come near the abysmal conception of the Rev. E. J. Houghton, rector of St. Stephen's, Bristol. In the course of an Accession Day sermon this worthy sketched his idea of a war memorial, for which he asked the alms of his hearers: It would take, he said, the form of the Crucified Christ, surrounded by the nimbus and the Union Jack, while at the foot, in the place of the familiar figures of St. John and Mary, would be those of St. Stephen and St. George, a soldier and a blue-jacket."—"Morning Leader," June 26, 1900.

"A strawberry tea and sale of work, in aid of the fund for putting new gates to St. Paul's Church, Chatham, was held in the vicarage grounds on Wednesday afternoon and evening. Cocoanut shies and other amusements, such as Kruger and his pill, were in full swing."—"Chatham and Rochester Observer," July 7, 1900.

A column of the "Kent and Sussex Courier" of November 3, 1899, contains a chorus of the local clergy. The Rev. D. Stather Hunt, vicar of Holy Trinity, wrote deploring the horrors of war:—

Thank God, the present war is not of our seeking: nay, we may go further and say that our Government seems to have done its utmost to prevent the outbreak. Unfortunately the ignorant arrogance of a people who have not hesitated to express their intention of driving the British into the sea has been too much for those who were endeavouring to bring about an honourable and settled peace by means of diplomacy. It has been patent to many for years past that the Boers were bent on bringing about such an issue.

The Rev. Dr. Townsend, vicar of St. Mark's, wrote :

The Government have known for long enough (what we are only grasping slowly and almost incredulously) that a vast conspiracy has been spreading through Cape Colony and Natal among the Dutch residents in our territory: a conspiracy hatched and helped on by the Transvaal and Orange Free State to drive the English out and to establish a great Dutch South Africa. It is no wonder, therefore, that the whole nation has sprung to its feet to resist this wrong, and that a thrill of patriotic feeling has been felt over the great Empire to its farthest extremities.

The Rev. C. Storey, vicar of Christ Church, wrote :—

Forbearance and patience on the part of our Government seem to have been mistaken by the Boers for weakness and vacillation, so their tone towards us became more and more insolent, culminating in an ultimatum, to which its authors must have known there was but one answer. . . . We admire the cool courage and the skill of those in command, and the splendid heroism of the rank and file, who face the foe without flinching, and storm and carry their positions with a ringing British cheer.

Another dignitary thus wrote :—

It is rumoured that we are to have a day of humiliation. Had we not better wait till we are humiliated? We fight for justice and equity between man and man. And are we sorry for that? There never was more self-sacrifice shown in our land than now, and should this make us ashamed before God or man?—Prebendary Harry Jones, in "Times," December 18, 1899.

Here, once more, is the archiepiscopal tag, "justice and equity between man and man," which did service in so many declamations. Gatacre, Methuen, Buller, and the flower of the British army had been routed by Boer farmers, but the Prebendary was still waiting to be humiliated.

A few more mementos :—

That in the present case it is on our side a righteous war, into which we entered unwillingly, does not affect the question. We believe that it is a righteous war, and that we shall be ultimately successful. We shall do our very utmost to succeed. The present attitude of the nation is a guarantee for that.—Rev. E. A. Eardley-Wilmot, in "Times," December 23, 1899.

One cannot read the Old Testament without seeing very plainly that under the providence of God war as well as

famine and pestilence have been instruments in God's hands, and used by Him, even commanded by Him, to accomplish His divine purposes.

It is not difficult to see how completely the Boer influence in South Africa has always been an obstruction to the spread of Christ's church. The motto of Boer Christianity has never been "Preach the Gospel to every creature," but rather "Keep the Gospel to yourselves."—"The Kingdom and the Empire," Ten Sermons for the present times, Preached in a Village Church. Richard Orme Assheton, 1902.

We close our list of "panegyrics" to be credited to the Established Church with quotations from two Army Chaplains:—

If Great Britain is not ready to draw the sword, and give the signal to her marksmen to sight their rifles for justice, liberty, and freedom, only because the crotchety conscience of some little Englander who would dwarf our dominions everywhere calls a halt, then the half-breeds will get first blood, and their hangmen will find halters for every tree. . . . We must strike for life and honour such a blow as shall make all Boerdom reel. Oom Paul will swim through seas of blood, Psalm-singing with every stomach stroke, and not the least bit off colour all the while. Whilst we are politically procrastinating, he is prayerfully preparing, and whilst some of our Radicals are calling on the hucksters of the party to curse our cause and bless our enemies, he is in pious prostration before the Lord of Hosts. Meanwhile his myrmidons can all do murder at a pinch, and to ravish they are not ashamed.—Rev. A. Robins, Military Chaplain of Windsor, in "Daily Telegraph," September 6, 1899.

It is something to find that in its obituary notice of this follower of the Prince of Peace—he died before the end of the year—the "Guardian" spoke of his "ultra militant and scarcely clerical sentiments in regard to Mr. Kruger." "Scarcely clerical" was an admission.

In South Africa Jesus Christ had had a chance with these men [soldiers]. The Church must make it possible for the soldier to have in peace the virtues he had in war.—The Chaplain-General, October 3, 1901.

The "Guardian" newspaper may be supposed to reflect fairly clerical opinion. On December 1, 1899, it had a leading article on "The Blessing of War." It wrote: "That [war] in which we are now unhappily engaged is one that was entered on as righteously as it is being conducted bravely. We are fighting both for our religion and our existence. . . . We have had it forced on us by the inexorable law of self-preservation. . . ."

It is very singular that this should not be recognised by those anæmic people among us—few as they are, they are all too many—who seem to base their every action on the simple axiom that whatever is British is wrong. . . . Our Lord Himself declared that He came not to send peace but a sword.”

Other Denominations.

We turn now to pronouncements of the non-established clergy. In the circumstances, and not alone on the ground of its antiquity, we give the first place to the Synagogue.

On December 5, 1899, the Rev. Francis Cohen, preaching at the Aldgate Synagogue, said :—

It was felt by British Jews to be a privilege and an honour to fight for the British flag, for, in addition to their natural devotion to the land of their birth, the spirit of the Anglo-Saxon seemed to them more to draw its nourishment from Biblical principles than was the case with any other modern stock.

The reference to the British flag reminds us that Mr. Rhodes, himself of Jewish origin, regarded the British flag as the most valuable commercial asset of the British Empire. The worthy rabbi was, no doubt, quite right in his testimony to the “Biblical principles” of the Anglo-Saxon, by which we are, of course, to understand the principles of the Old Testament. Others than the Boers have felt the weight of these “Biblical principles.” “The conversion of the papists in Ireland,” said Sir John Clotworthy, “was only to be effected by the Bible in one hand and the sword in the other.” The precept was so well observed that, as is said by Prendergast in his “Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland,” “truly they had no bloodier instrument than the Bible in all their arsenal of war.”

The Chief Rabbi had before this directed a prayer to be offered in the Synagogues of the United Hebrew congregations of the British Empire during the continuance of the war :—

Unto Thee, O Lord, we give thanks, for already hath Thy right hand helped our troops. . . . Gird them with victory, so that the war be speedily ended. (“Times,” October 26, 1899.)

Cardinal Vaughan, the head of the English Catholics,

seems to have had his doubts as to Mr. Chamberlain's good faith in negotiating, for on October 1, 1899, he uttered this solemn warning :—

An unjust or an unnecessary war would be a great national crime, deserving of Divine chastisement, because it would be an offence against God and mankind.

But if he had his doubts they were soon dispelled, for he thus spoke of the war in a circular letter issued in December, 1899 :—

Whatever doubt was entertained as to the lawfulness of enforcing the British demands by recourse to the sword, there can be no doubt now that we have been forced into war, and that justice is on our side. It has been clearly ascertained that Boer leaders in both Republics had long since determined to strike for the establishment of a Boer supremacy throughout South Africa; that military preparations on a large scale had been secretly carried out for that purpose.

It is needless to repeat that the Cardinal's assumptions had no foundation in fact.

Dr. Bilsborrow, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Salford, was asked to sign a requisition to the Mayor of Manchester to summon a meeting of the citizens on the subject of the Concentration Camps. He refused :—

Whilst I am in perfect harmony with the kindly sentiments of those who wish to call a public meeting, I do not conceive it to be either advantageous or necessary as a means of lessening the mortality, whilst it is not unlikely to embarrass the Cabinet, and possibly tend to inflame still more political passions. ("Times," November 11, 1901.)

There was too much sugary jargon and talk of peace. It was said that war was hell. He had his doubts about that. There were worse things than war. God, in the scheme of this great universe, had included the earthquake, the pestilence, and the storm, and how did they know that He was not the Lord of Hosts, and the God of Battles?—The Protestant Archbishop of Armagh, at the Diocesan Synod, October 24, 1899.

The Archbishop had probably already worked out this idea in verse. For in the "Times" of October 31 appeared a poem by him in eighteen stanzas. In one of these he seemed to find some affinity between the British Tommy and Thomas à Kempis. We can give only the first, second, and eighteenth stanzas :—

They say that "war is hell," "the great accursed,"

The sin impossible to be forgiven—

Yet I can look beyond it at its worst,

And still find peace in heaven.

And as I note how nobly natures form

Under the war's red rain, I deem it true
That he who made the earthquake and the storm
Perchance makes battles, too!

Thus, as the heaven's many coloured flames

At sunset are but dust in rich disguise,
The ascending earthquake dust of battle frames
God's pictures in the skies.

In an article in the "North American Review," September, 1900, Dean Farrar quoted with entire approval these "words of a most venerable and excellent prelate."

The Bible hardly seems to see any evil in war at all. . . . Nor is the New Testament far behind in this respect. The Lord Jesus never says a word against war. John the Baptist gives advice to soldiers, but never condemns their profession. St. Paul revels in military phrases. The history of the world is full of wars, then must war be congenial to the mind of God in His evolution of Humanity. What does God care for death? What does God care for pain? Many good people go into hysterics about the horrors of war. . . . But all such talk is artificial.—Canon Carmichael, of the Protestant Church of Ireland. ("The Christian," January 11, 1900.)

There is already a very widespread and an ever-growing conviction that the bloody business which has occupied us through the year will prove a great national blessing. The verdict of history . . . will be this, that heavy though the price, the result will be worth it all.—Rev. Dr. Macgregor, one of her Majesty's chaplains for Scotland, in the "Weekly Scotsman," December 15, 1900.

We suppose that this is the gentleman who, on October 7 of the present year, took a subordinate part in a ceremony conducted in St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh, by General Sir Ian Hamilton. If so, the Rev. Dr. Macgregor is not one who would cry, "Thou Canst Not Say I Did It." We cannot find space for General Sir Ian Hamilton's preponderant part in the service. Dr. Macgregor's is thus told. The memorial is to the officers and men of a regiment who fell in South Africa :

"I now solemnly dedicate this memorial to the glory and service of our great God, and to the memory of those brave men, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The buglers then sounded the reveille, after which Dr. Macgregor delivered an address. He said: Among all the monuments in this cathedral, there was not one more

sacred or more well-deserved than the memorial which had been erected to their brave comrades whose names were recorded on the memorial. The South African War was the result of long-continued provocation, and the Boer ultimatum of transcendent insolence, and the nation and Empire resolved as one man to restore what should never have been given away—the absolute authority over the Transvaal—if it cost them their last sixpence and their last man. Britain never entered on a more righteous war than that, nor one which owing to the vastness and ruggedness of territory, and the immense distance from their shores, was more arduous and difficult. There is not another nation in the world that could have faced it with success.

The hymn, “The Son of God goes forth to war,” was then sung, after which the benediction was pronounced by Dr. Macgregor, and closed with “God Save the King.” (Edinburgh “Evening News,” October 7, 1905.)

The Rev. Dr. Scott, of St. George’s, Edinburgh, and other leading members [of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale of the Church of Scotland] strongly expressed themselves as to the righteousness of the British part in the war. War, said Dr. Scott, had been forced upon the British by those who had long been premeditating it, and long preparing for it, and who had rushed at the first opportunity. (“Times,” November 8, 1899.)

God, because he is a righteous God, can never bless unrighteousness, and had ours been an unrighteous cause no prayers could have availed to turn away His displeasure from us.—Dr. Norman McLeod, Thanksgiving Sermon, June, 1902.

The “Free Churches.”

We come now to the Protestant Nonconformists, constituting the “Free Churches.” Dr. Horton, as will be seen later, claimed that “the proportion of pro-Boers among Free Churchmen is less than among members of the Established Church.” We incline to think that this was merely a vainglorious boast. In the worst times there was a remnant of Nonconformists strongly opposed to the war. This opposition, though ineffectual, sometimes made itself known. Here is an instance:—

The London Baptist Association decided by 85 votes

against 36 that a resolution expressing sorrow at the prolongation of the war in South Africa, and the loss of precious lives, and containing an appeal to the Government to offer such terms of settlement to the enemy as would be inducive to bring this lamentable struggle to a close, was "too controversial" to be discussed on the platform of the Association. (Letter from a correspondent, "Daily News," September, 1901.)

Be that as it may, whether the "Free Churches" could or could not boast of a smaller proportion of "proBoers" than the Established Church, they undoubtedly had their energumens, chief among them the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes. Mr. Hughes, who claimed that Jesus Christ was the founder of Methodism, occupied a position almost unassailable. He was regarded as the head of Wesleyan Methodism; was a popular preacher, and controlled a weekly newspaper, "The Methodist Times." He claimed to be in possession of supernatural gifts, and as there was no repudiation of the claim, which must have made generations of buried Nonconformists turn in their graves, we must assume that it was admitted. With all these things in favour of his war-campaign, Mr. Hughes was probably right in asserting that 75 per cent. of the Wesleyan Methodists favoured the war. "Wesleyan Methodism," he declared, "is an Imperial body, even to an extent that Wesleyan Methodists themselves do not recognise." This Imperialism was shown by the fact that Mr. Chamberlain was actually invited to lunch at the celebration of the 100th anniversary of Wesley's death. The luncheon was to be preceded by a four hours' continuous prayer-meeting, and a sermon by Dr. Watson (Ian MacLaren). Owing to the strenuous opposition, headed by Dr. Lunn, Mr. Chamberlain was compelled to give up the engagement. Mr. Hughes was probably the most potent ally of Chamberlain and Milner, themselves the tools of the motley crew of Johannesburg mine-owners. A short extract from Mr. Hughes's paper will suffice:

We absolutely decline to put on sackcloth in relation to this present war, hateful as its inevitable incidents are to us. We rather desire to be clothed with garments of praise, and to thank God from the bottom of our hearts that, after all, Old England and her colonies are not so eaten up with the love of gold, or so enervated by luxury as to be afraid of sacrificing everything, even life itself, in the defence of freedom, justice, and humanity.

Mr. Hughes's passionate advocacy of the war led him into strange depths. He declared that President Kruger had for fifteen years been preparing for war. He declared that "it is now in evidence that immense sums—in fact, all that the so-called Republic could afford—had been spent in preparing for an attack on the British Empire." He refused to publish disproof of his statements, having no "evidence" behind them. He also refused to publish letters in vindication of John Bright written by the daughter of that statesman.

There was a strange scene at St. James's Hall, on Peace Sunday, December 24, 1900, when, challenging some of Mr. Hughes's statements, a lady wayed a Bible, crying, "It's not in the Bible!" and "A Voice" told him to be honest and go to the front!

After all this it reads like a bad joke to find that at the Methodist Conference of 1901, a subject for discussion was "The Influence of Methodism in the Promotion of International Peace"!

Other "Free Churchmen," if they could not keep up with the stride of Mr. Hughes, followed as best they could. On February 4, 1900, the Rev. W. J. Dawson preached at Highbury on "Patriotism as the Duty of the Hour." "The British Weekly," a Nonconformist organ, gave this account of the sermon:—

"As Mr. Dawson proceeded with his address, it was obvious that the audience could with difficulty restrain their emotions. In referring to those who had gone to the war, some from that very congregation, he would say,

Glory be to God that such sons are still born of English mothers! Glory be to God that there are still those found amid the over-ripeness of a luxurious civilisation who are willing and eager to die for their country!

This outburst was instantly followed by a denunciation of those who in the present crisis, with Europe eager for our downfall, raised the cry: "Stop the war!" Such persons were either imbeciles or traitors; imbeciles if they thought it could be stopped, and traitors if they thought it ought to be stopped. At this point the whole audience broke out into loud applause. There were some hostile cries, but the agreement of the audience with the preacher was overwhelming."

From the printed address we add the following :—

The war must go on as long as there is a single man in the British Empire capable of bearing arms. It must go on because it is a war for progress, liberty, and good government in South Africa, for human rights and human equality; nor will its object be achieved till all men from the Zambesi to Cape Town enjoy the rights of free citizenship.

A correspondent of the "New Age" (November 9) has given some quotations from an article on "The Folly of War," by Mr. Dawson, printed in the "Western Weekly Mercury" in August, 1904 :—

The fact of the matter is that war is the worst of all human follies. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it can be avoided without the least cost of honour. The man who provokes a war is at once the biggest of all fools and the greatest of all criminals. Pride and ignorance are the chief causes of war.

We have heard some such tardy condemnations of war spoken of as "recantations," on the strength of which we are asked to forget former eulogies of the Boer war.

Dr. Parker, of the City Temple, one of the leading lights of Nonconformity, thus spoke when the tremendous issue of peace or war was apparently trembling in the balance—apparently, though, as we now know, the Government had already determined upon the subjugation of the two Republics, and was only waiting till the country was "ready." Speaking at Bath, on October 11, 1899, Dr. Parker said :—

The members of the Government were inside the question, they knew more than those outside could possibly know, and they were as patriotic as others were, whether they were Liberals or Tories. He, therefore, left the final decision to the Government, and, whatever it might be, he would heartily and reverently throw in his lot with theirs. There was no man there to speak a word in favour of war; there was no man there who was not a lover of peace. The Lord was a man of war. . . . They should leave the issue with the Sovereign of the Universe.

This is how he expressed himself in his "Thanksgiving Sermon," preached at the City Temple in June, 1902 :—

He believed with all his heart that this country was by one act of the Transvaal positively driven into war. England was not accustomed to have an ultimatum thrown in her face. She answered such an ultimatum with a great challenge of patriotism and fire. . . . There was one man for whom he would not make things too easy, and that was Mr. Kruger.

Some loose tongues might call him the most snivelling old hypocrite on the face of the whole earth, but as a Christian minister he was bound not to say such things. As an honest man, however, he was bound to agree with it. Paul Kruger paid one of the handsomest tributes to the British army ever paid to that great body. We owe it to Paul Kruger to say that he got on the back of a veld pony, with two millions sterling behind him, and left his wife in charge of the British! Isn't that a tribute to pay to the arms, the courage, the chivalry of this country?

At Union Church (or Chapel), Brighton, the Rev. R. J. Campbell was qualifying for the future occupancy of the pulpit of the City Temple. On December 17, 1899, he said:—

I am amongst the minority who do not approve and never have approved of the motive for this war. We owe it in the first place to the Jameson Raid. . . . A great deal of cant has been talked about the Divine mission when we have wanted to take such and such land. Let us away with that for ever.

But in the following March he went to South Africa, from which he returned an enthusiastic advocate of the war. He lectured upon it. A correspondent of the "New Age" (March 21, 1901) thus described the lecture on what proved to be a memorable occasion:—

A large sheet was fitted up in front of the pulpit, and various limelight pictures were thrown upon it from time to time as the lecture proceeded. Photos of armoured trains, 4.7 guns, lyddite shells, and other engines of destruction met with a good deal of applause, but when the photo of our hero-god, Lord Roberts, was shown, the applause was almost frantic. As it died away, someone asked, "May we now see a picture of Christ, as I consider that would be only proper in this House of Prayer?"

The cry of "pro-Boer" was immediately raised, and Mr. Bull, of Enfield, who had been so ill-advised as to mention the name of Christ, was ejected with great violence from this Christian temple. He himself thus explained his indiscretion: I had protested against their Christian church being turned into a recruiting-room by speech and illustrations glorifying the slaughter of our fellow creatures for empire, lust, gold mines, and revenge.

Mr. Campbell, whose conversion to Jingoism was

rapid, seems to adhere to his new faith, for he thus spoke on November 1, 1903 :—

We have heard a great deal of late about the horrors of the war in which we were recently engaged. It is all a question of imagination. The horrors of war—and war is always hell—are nothing to the devastations of peace.

The passage occurs, appropriately enough, in a sermon on “Some Signs of the Times.” It is indeed a portentous sign of the times that these words should have been spoken in one of the leading pulpits of Non-conformity.

The Rev. Bernard Snell, of the Brixton Independent Chapel, preached in 1899 and 1900 on the subject of the war five sermons, afterwards printed in a small volume. Their air of restraint made these sermons more dangerous than the coarse inflammatory appeals of less skilful advocates.

Great Britain has undertaken stern and arduous work, involving honour and justice. There are those who speak of cupidity, revenge, and arrogance, as the springs of this war. For myself I am content to say that I believe England to be making a great effort in what she deems to be a righteous cause. . . . The Government exhausted the patience of our people in trying every resource of a peaceful termination to negotiations, and at last moved with grave reluctance. . . . There is no nation on earth so instinctively opposed to war, no nation that has given so many hostages to peace. We stand to win nothing by war, we stand to lose much. War is horrible, but it was not we that plunged into it. The Jameson Raid was [not a crime, but] a deplorable mistake. War was thrust suddenly upon us. I know nothing more shameful than to speak of it as “Mr. Chamberlain’s war”: I know no speech in my time that has been so cruel and wicked as that. The contest was not of our making: it was precipitated by the imprudent dreaming of our opponents that they might drive us from the land. We had no lust of conquest. Our Premier declared: “We seek no territory; we seek no gold-fields.” [Mr. Snell forgot that Lord Salisbury, attacked on account of having so spoken, was quickly driven to eat his words.] But what can we say to the following?: “Nothing could be more deplorable, more pitiable, than that England, whose pride it has ever been to befriend small nationalities, should feel laid upon her the odious business of crushing these two Southern Republics. It seemed as if the Anglo-Saxons were the victims of Fate, for here were the Americans driven to prevent the self-government of the Philippines, and at the same time engaged in devastating Cuba.”

Yes, on the part of the United States, "Hell-roaring Jake" was taking up "the white man's burden"!

The series of sermons concludes with a benediction of the peacemakers, of whom, possibly—for self-deception has no limits—Mr. Snell deemed himself one.

Dr. Horton, of Hampstead, was, we believe, at this time a Vice-President of a Peace Society. On October 7, 1900, he preached a sermon on the lessons of the war. After eulogising the actions of some of our soldiers in the field, deeds "which glorify our human nature," he continued:—

And while there are these deeds of courage and devotion upon the field, we have had also in the person of our Commander-in-Chief a certain subject for devout gratitude as a nation. There has shone from him a gentle and chivalrous radiance which will rank him in the noble line of Nelson and of Wellington.

Then, after a long quotation from Wordsworth's "Happy Warrior," he continued:—

We have to be profoundly thankful that that ideal description by a poet at the beginning of the century should be again realised in the character of the man whom circumstances placed at the head of military operations in South Africa. . . . We have at least this profound subject of congratulation and joy, that there came in the hour of need the Happy Warrior, the man who was no brute soldier, but a gentle and tender Christian spirit. ("Christian World Pulpit," October 10, 1900.)

It must be assumed that when this was spoken Dr. Horton was unacquainted with what is known as the "Infamous Circular Memorandum" sanctioned by Lord Roberts for, to put it quite plainly, the supply of native women to soldiers' brothels. ("The Queen's Daughters in India," 1899, p. 17.)

It must also be assumed that Dr. Horton was ignorant of the manner in which Lord Roberts had carried on war in Afghanistan in 1879 (Mr. Frederic Harrison in "Fortnightly Review," December, 1879, March, 1880). But assumptions must end here. It is impossible to suppose that Dr. Horton was ignorant of the course of events in South Africa. We were, indeed, at this time far from knowing all that was then being done by the Commander-in-Chief, the subject of this extravagant eulogy by the Vice-President of a Peace Society. But we knew something from his own Proclamations:—

"June 16, 1900.—The principal residents of the town

and districts will be held, jointly and severally, responsible for the amount of damage [to railways, telegraphs, etc.] done in their district. As a further precautionary measure, the Director of Military Railways has been authorised to order that one or more of the residents, who will be selected by him from each district, shall from time to time personally accompany the trains while travelling through their district. The houses and farms in the vicinity of the place where the damage is done will be destroyed, and the residents in the neighbourhood dealt with under Martial Law."

"September 1, 1900.—All persons are hereby warned to acquaint her Majesty's forces of the presence of the enemy upon, or in the neighbourhood of, their farms, and if they fail to do so they will be regarded as aiding and abetting the enemy, and will be liable to be treated as rebels."

Dr. Horton is perhaps now aware that the methods of warfare employed by his "Happy Warrior" were unreservedly condemned by no less an authority than Field-Marshal Sir Neville Chamberlain (Letters to the "Manchester Guardian," reprinted in the South Africa Conciliation Committee's leaflet, No. 82).

At the National Free Church Council, held in March, 1900, the Rev. C. H. Kelly, "the genial and masterful President," contrived to burke all discussion of the war, or, as the "British Weekly" said, "broke the neck of a very menacing difficulty." On this incident the Rev. Dr. Clifford commented in these terms:—"It is a somewhat pathetic spectacle that a gathering of the wisest, sanest, and saintliest men in the kingdom should be unable to give, in a grave crisis of the nation's history, any word of advice" ("British Weekly," March 22, 1900).

But the question could not be burked for ever.

At the Free Church Conference in July, 1901, there was what may be described as a fight for the soul of Nonconformity on the question of the war. At this date the facts about farm burning were well known. The wife of the Military Governor of Pretoria had published an appeal on behalf of "the little children who are living in open tents, without fires, and possessing only the scantiest of clothes." All this and much more was known. From a sermon preached on January 6, 1901,

it is clear that Dr. Horton knew that farms had been burnt and that women and children had been driven from their homes. Let him tell us the result of the struggle at the Conference. The following is from his letter quoted in the "Daily Chronicle" of October 26, 1901:—

I hope you will be able to convey to the Congregationalists in South Africa the truth that our Free Church Conference in July represented the defeat of the pro-Boer section among us. Our manifesto started from the point that nothing should be done till the enemy surrender. The proportion of pro-Boers among Free Churchmen is less than among members of the Established Church. . . . I cannot bear that our brethren at the Cape should feel that we are out of sympathy with them on this matter.

If the metaphor can be allowed in speaking of a minister, we may say, in Lord Salisbury's words, that Dr. Horton has since discovered that he "put his money on the wrong horse." Early this year he preached a most edifying sermon on the text, "Nation shall not lift up the sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." But, in this case, what opening will there be for the "gentle and chivalrous radiance" of a future Commander-in-Chief, of a future "Happy Warrior"?

Dr. John Watson (Ian Maclaren) was widely known both as preacher and writer. Here are three passages from sermons or addresses delivered by him:—

The question before us is simply this: Whether, with the Ammonites and the Syrians, and all the rest of them that fear and hate us, united against us in battle array, we ought to negotiate for peace on such terms as the King of Ammon and the King of Zobah may be pleased to give us, or to fight the matter out to the bitter end. . . . For my own part. . . . I see no other way for it, but that we must continue this war till our arms have triumphed and we have planted our flag in the capitals of the allies, and that to accomplish this end we must put forth our whole resources, both of men and of treasure. ("British Weekly," February 22, 1900.)

Here, again, in this jargon about Ammonites, Syrians, and the King of Zobah, we find the "Biblical principles" endearing the "Anglo-Saxon" to the chosen people.

There are many of us who were afraid—and we had some reason—that the lure of gold, so dangerous a snare for every people, had something to do with the beginning of the war, and against that some of us lifted our voices. . . . It is not for gold that England is fighting to-day! No! When

England rises in a body, and such intriguers or speculators disappear: and England rose, and England fights to-day for that which has been dear to her, from the Commonwealth downwards—for liberty, for righteousness, for equal rights between man and man, for lasting peace in a fair province of God's world, and for the ancient, unstained glory of the English nation.—March 2, 1900. ("Christian World Pulpit.")

Do not let us forget the ignoble spectacle of that obstinate, greedy old man, who, having ruined his country, fled from its capital, carrying with him every piece of gold on which he could lay his hands. . . . I suppose there has not been any Government in modern days, outside barbarism, so utterly and hopelessly dense as that which, to the good of the land, we have swept away at Pretoria. . . . Do not let us cant in speaking as if we were the holiest people on earth, and do not let us cant in speaking of our opponents as if they were an upright, modest, well-governed, and well-ordered people.—June 10, 1900. ("British Weekly.")

"It is not for gold that England is fighting to-day!" So spoke Dr. Watson in 1900. Had he forgotten this sermon when he spoke at the Free Church Congress at Newcastle? We ask, because we have before us a report of a meeting of the Congress, at which the new yellow slavery—an outcome of the war, one of the objects of the war—was denounced by him:—

"The late war was largely brought about by the lust for gold, and by the conduct of the international criminals who ought to be in penal servitude—"

"He could proceed no further for the clamorous applause.

"A delegate shouted, 'Why did you not say this three years ago?'

"'I did,' cried Mr. Watson indignantly, 'from my own pulpit,' and then he ended his former sentence—'but instead of penal servitude are sitting in Parliament'."

Was it God's will for us to be confined to these little islands, to be among the dependent and conquered peoples? I feel sure it was not. (And his audience corroborated by applauding vociferously.) I altogether repudiate the suggestion. What some regard as Godlessly gained I regard as God-given. While as a nation we have sins to confess, I cannot believe that we ought to have refrained from winning and holding an Empire. I believe it is for the world's welfare that we should rule. . . . And it is because I believe that the British ideal for South Africa is nobler than the Boer, and more for the advantage of the world at large, that while I deeply de-

plore the war now being waged, I can and do pray for the speedy success of the British arms.—Rev. Alfred Rowland. (“Christian World,” March 1, 1900.)

At Gracehill Wesleyan Church, in December, 1899, the Rev. George Adcock gave a list of thirty-nine wars in which England had been engaged since 1838, and now, he said :

We have the second Transvaal war which is being waged on behalf of our oppressed countrymen, and which we pray and believe will eventually tend to the fuller and firmer establishment of Christ's kingdom. (“Folkestone Herald,” Dec. 9, 1899.)

At a thanksgiving service for the relief of Ladysmith at Princes Street Church, Norwich, the Rev. Dr. Barrett said that the war meant on the one hand the supremacy of righteousness, liberty, and equality between nations; or, on the other, the domination of a corrupt military oligarchy. (“Christian World,” March 8, 1900.)

President Kruger has been blamed for many things. In the following passage we find him—often abused as an ignorant, unlettered peasant—told that he ruined his country through not being acquainted with the results of modern Biblical criticism! Poor man!

Had that misguided man, President Kruger, made himself intelligently acquainted with the results of modern criticism of the Old and New Testaments, he would not have allowed the incidents related in the Hexateuch to bulk so largely before his eyes as to hide from him the teaching, so much better and nobler, of the four Gospels. He would not then ignorantly and superstitiously have pursued a course which has brought nothing but devastation, misery, and death in its train.—Dr. Scott, Principal of the Congregational Union, 1902.

Here are a few miscellaneous jottings :—

The other day a Wesleyan minister wrote this sort of thing : “The Boers, by their present desperate policy, have for the time put themselves outside the pale of civilisation and of all the international regulations to which civilised governments have agreed with the view to mitigate the horrors of war.” Do you realise what that is? When a minister of the Gospel tells you that these men, because they have withstood us, have put themselves outside the pale of civilisation, I think I am justified in saying that there has been an explosion of barbarism.—Mr. John Morley, at Brechin, June 5, 1901.

Who now dare preach the cowardly doctrine of the forgiveness of enemies?

A clergyman in the North of England, quoted by Dr. Spence Watson. ("Herald of Peace," October, 1901.)

Replies to a suggestion made in February, 1901, for a Peace Sunday.

A rector, N.B., writes:—

Preacher: The "Maxim."

Time: Now and on, until Britain's enemies are EXTERMINATED.

Literature required: A record of all exterminated—their numbers.

A clergyman from Bath:—

Peace with the enemies of God, and of the Israel of God? NEVER.—("Herald of Peace," March, 1902.)

The Massacre of the Innocents.

Let us also learn to detest the horrible cruelty of the Spaniards in all executions of warlike stratagems, lest the dishonour of such beastly deeds might bedim the honour wherewith English soldiers have always been endowed in their victories.—"The Spoil of Antwerp," 1576.

She said: Let me not see the death of the child. And she sat over against him, and lift up her voice and wept.—Genesis, xxi, 16.

It were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones.—Gospel of St. Luke, xvii, 2.

In the years 1896 to 1898 the country had rung with denunciations of the Spanish General, Weyler, who had invented Concentration Camps as a method of warfare. For instance, the "Spectator" of April 23, 1898, had these words: "General Weyler issued an order more terrible than any given since the days when Louis XIV ordered the wasting of the Palatinate." The measure was admirably characterised by President McKinley, in his Message to Congress, in April, 1898: "The policy of devastation and concentration" was stigmatised as "a new and inhuman phase happily unprecedented in the modern history of civilised Christian peoples. . . . The fields were laid waste, dwellings unroofed and de-

stroyed, and, in short, everything that could desolate the land and render it unfit for human habitation or support." "Reconcentration, adopted avowedly as a war measure to cut off the resources of the insurgents, worked its predestined result. It was extermination. The only peace it could beget was that of the wilderness and the grave." Who that listened to British denunciations of Weyler's atrocious measure could have believed that within a very short time England would herself adopt the invention? So it was, however. In the words of Lord Milner "the formation of Concentration Camps was adopted on purely military grounds as a means of hastening the end of the war." President McKinley spoke of the "predestined result." In the case of the Camps established by Lord Roberts the result was not only predestined. The result of General Weyler's new methods of warfare was ascertained. It was before the British Government, the British Generals, and the people of Great Britain.

The Government made futile attempts to blind us to the character of these Camps. "These are voluntary camps formed for protection. Those who come can go," said Mr. Brodrick on February 25, 1901. Later he declared that "the great majority of the women and children now concentrated [mark the word] in camps had gone in on their own desire." "It was absolutely untrue that there had been wholesale devastation in the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies" (February 26, 1901). "It is not a fact that the death-rate among the women and children was abnormally high" (April 25, 1901). In the first Returns the Camps were called "Camps of Relief" or "Refugee Camps," but their parentage could not be disowned, they finally became known, even officially, by a name giving a new and horrible significance to the word "Concentration": to the end of English history they will be known as "Concentration Camps."

In time, after infinite lying on the part of the Ministry, we learnt the facts. Thirty thousand homesteads were burnt: even churches, school-houses, and libraries did not escape: British and Canadians "burnt a tract six miles wide through fertile valleys, turning out the women and children to sit and cry beside the ruins of their once beautiful farmsteads": the whole country was pillaged, plundered, and devastated: live stock

killed, one column alone destroyed 60,000 sheep : agricultural implements were destroyed : crops trodden into the ground : irrigation dams broken down. Lord Milner admitted that " the destruction of agricultural capital is now pretty well complete " (November 15, 1901. Cd. 903 of 1902, p. 135). Later, " We began working with the country absolutely denuded of everything " (April 4, 1903. Cd. 1551, p. 4).

In the Concentration Camps, imitated from those of the execrated Spanish General, prisoners were fed at the rate of four pence, three pence, two pence, three half-pence a day : in one case the cost of the ration fell to one-third of a penny a day. The children died like flies : 15,000 perished miserably. At least 15,000 : the Returns published by the Government are incomplete, but they admit so much.

Where are the protests of the Churches against these infamies? When the horrors of the Camps were known ; when from the figures published by the Government we learnt that over 5,000 children had perished in them ; months after the dreadful facts had impelled the Government to send out a Commission of ladies to inspect the Camps—after all this Canon Knox Little dared to write, on October 29, 1901 : " Among the unexampled efforts of kindness and leniency made throughout this war for the benefit of the enemy, none have surpassed the formation of the Concentration Camps " (" Times," October 31). A few days later, on November 10, the Bishop of Chester referred in a sermon to the life and work of Alfred the Great. After eulogising his chivalry towards the wife and children of a foe, the Bishop said, " we might humbly, though gratefully, think our nation was walking worthily of our great King, when in South Africa we were doing all that in us lay to minister care and comfort and health, through overwhelming disadvantages, to the women and children of our opponents, the Boers " (" Times," November 11). Somewhat earlier (see " Times," August 23 and September 25), the Bishop of Liverpool, as we have seen, defended the burning of farms and villages, the formation of Concentration Camps, and the Proclamation of Lord Kitchener requiring the Boers to surrender by a given day. The " Morning Leader " of October 22, 1901, gave the result of an appeal to 8,000 clergymen of all denominations living in London,

and within a radius of about 80 miles. This was done by means of a post-card summarising "the official statistics about the mortality among the children in the Concentration Camps. The post-card contained no expression of opinion, but concluded with a suggestion that it might be the duty of the Churches to intervene to save the remaining children from extermination, and a question as to whether the subject might not be worth a pulpit reference." A certain number, not stated, replied to the card. Of the replies received this summary was given:—"Roughly, 55 per cent. of our correspondents are abusive, 14 per cent. argue with more or less courtesy against our view of the facts, exactly the same number agree with us, and undertake to speak to their congregations; the rest are interrogative and uncertain. One reverend gentleman regrets his inability to assault us, and another would like to 'lynch' us and 'wreck our office'."

Have any of those who uttered panegyrics of the war expressed contrition now that they certainly know what they were supporting? If any such have been published, we have failed to find them.

A long time ago, Herod, in pursuit of his political aims, slew certain children. The voice of lamentation and weeping heard in Rama has sounded through the ages. Herod slew but a score of children at the most, but from his day to ours his name has been a mark for the execration of mankind. Christian Churches have set apart the 28th of December as a day devoted to the memory of these Innocents. A service is always held on that day in Westminster Abbey. In December, 1900, some of the terrible facts of our war upon women and children were known. On Innocents' Day Dean Bradley preached a sermon in the Abbey. Here was a great opportunity. He said: "They felt sure that the souls of these infants were very dear in the sight of their Father in Heaven." But the infants he had in mind were not the victims of our lust of territory and gold, but the poor score or so slain by Herod. The celebration of Innocents' Day will soon come round again. Beforehand, we invite the preacher on the occasion, whosoever he may be, to deal faithfully with us; to leave aside Herod, crushed as he is beneath countless anathemas, and to address himself to the facts of our own time. Let him tell us with all the eloquence he can

command how their Father in Heaven regards our slaughter of 15,000 Innocents.

For sooner or later we have got to take to heart consideration of the crimes committed in that hideous time. The day will come when we shall tire of presenting freedoms and erecting statues to the Generals who then blotted for ever the good name of England. The country will turn with gratitude to those men who in the senate or in the pulpit dared to speak for justice and the honour of the land. In the pulpit not a few were found who did what they could to save England's honour. Their task was difficult indeed. They were often told that they represented "a contemptible minority of a minority." They were "anæmic, hysterical, effeminate." A brave soul who then stood firm to his principles might hear unmoved the crash of brick-bats through his windows: he might remain calm under vulgar and brutal insults, even when hurled at him from the bench by Mr. Justice Grantham. But it was hard to witness the defection of a congregation, to endure the disruption of old ties, the severance of old friendships.

Here is a typical case on which we stumbled in looking for the report of an address:—

"During the service yesterday morning at Brunswick Wesleyan Church, Whitby, the minister, the Rev. T. Hitchon, announced that a form of petition to the Government, urging a peaceful settlement of the Transvaal question, on the ground that there was no reason for going to war, and also urging the Government to submit the whole of the matters in dispute to arbitration on the lines suggested by The Hague Peace Conference, was awaiting the signatures of the congregation in the vestry. Immediately the reverend gentlemen had finished speaking, a wealthy member of the congregation, Mr. Harrison Baxter, a managing steamship owner, rose, and in a voice which could be heard all over the building, shouted: 'You had better put it in the fire!' At the close of the service some prominent members of the church gathered together in the vestry, and expressed great indignation that such a petition should have been submitted to them. . . . The draft of the petition—which had been signed by only five persons—somehow or other altogether disappeared in the excitement."—"Times," October 9, 1899.

He did but ask for "a peaceful settlement"; he did

but ask that difficulties should be solved by arbitration instead of by the sword, and "somehow or other the petition altogether disappeared." What does the loud-voiced "steamship owner," what do the "prominent members of the Church" think of the matter to-day? What do the like of them all over England now think?

And the five whose humble petition was so rudely thrust aside? Little as they knew it, they were that day pleading for the lives of 15,000 Innocents. They, too, might ask, humbly, wonderingly, as in the most touching and beautiful of all parables: "Lord, when saw we Thee an hungered, and fed Thee? Or when saw we Thee sick or in prison and came unto Thee?" To them also would the answer be given: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

164/374

The distress now existing as the result of the war is appalling.

The Rev. A. Winter, at Hartebeestfontein, Transvaal, writes: "The damage to church property alone amounts to more than £6,000. The village resembles a city of the dead. The inhabitants have simply nothing to eat. To satisfy their hunger, people eat roots, onions, and berries. — The children catch little birds for food, and on the sallow, emaciated faces, hunger is plainly inscribed."

During the war many thousands of children became orphans. Subscriptions can be sent to Rev. A. P. Kriel, Langlaagte, Johannesburg, who has an Orphanage. Georgiana M. Solomon, Hon. President, South African Women's Federation, c/o Editor of "South African News," Cape Town, makes an earnest appeal for help. "Numerous widows in the country districts, once amply provided for, are without the necessaries of life." "Some had not clothing to cover them."

"I had the honour to visit in their homes some of the heroic women who spanned their own bodies into the ploughs, in yokes of nine women to draw each plough." There exists no household treasure, no comfort is to be seen. "Yet the ancient virtue of hospitality is still to the fore among these noble people." "Said an old Boer of the upper class with a smile: 'That we only need six feet of our own veld after all when the call comes to enter upon our inheritance'." "It was pitiful to witness the unsupplied needs of invalids, little children, and babes, for whom there is no milk. I could make this letter unreadable by describing what I know." The people are miles and miles away from a railway, and absolutely nothing is done for them by the Government. We stole or destroyed everything.

The New Age.

**A Democratic Review of
Politics, Religion and Literature.**

ADVOCATES

ECONOMIC REFORM: Taxation of Land Values;
Public Ownership of Public Services.

SOCIAL REFORM: All Educational Institutions
supported by public money to be controlled
by authorities popularly elected for that pur-
pose; Suppression of the Liquor Traffic.

POLITICAL REFORM: Adult Suffrage and Pay-
ment of Members of Parliament and Official
Election Expenses.

FOREIGN POLICY REFORM: International Rela-
tions governed by the Commandment—
"That ye love one another."

All earnest Political and Social Reformers
should support

THE NEW AGE.

Every Thursday. One Penny.

1 & 2, Took's Court, Funnival Street, London, E.C.