

Statement

by the

Council of Management of the Oxford Group
in regard to the method of making
the Report on

MORAL RE-ARMAMENT

adopted by

The Social and Industrial Council
of the National Assembly
of the Church of England

THE OXFORD GROUP
4 HAYS MEWS, LONDON, W1
FEBRUARY 1955

Printed in Great Britain
By W. & J. Mackay & Co., Ltd., Chatham

Foreword

The Council of Management of the Oxford Group consider it their duty to make certain facts known concerning the method of making of the Report on Moral Re-Armament that has been published by the Social and Industrial Council of the Church Assembly.

The Oxford Group, as incorporated in the United Kingdom is, as is well known, carrying on the work of Moral Re-Armament in the United Kingdom. It is also working in close association with incorporated bodies in other countries actively carrying on the work of Moral Re-Armament and also with the large and rapidly growing number of persons in numerous places overseas who are committed to the same work. The Report of the Social and Industrial Council is, therefore, a document of a certain amount of concern to all who are so engaged, in many parts of the world.

The Council of Management thought it right that the material facts and circumstances connected with the method of making the report and the extent of consideration given to it should be made public, especially in overseas countries, as otherwise the Report may be taken to be the considered judgment of the Church of England on Moral Re-Armament formed after full, fair, impartial and informed inquiry into MRA in all its aspects and effects.

The Council of Management therefore, in the middle of December 1954, approached Sir Lynden Macassey, KBE, LL.D., one of Her Majesty's Counsel, and asked him to ascertain and to record the relevant facts and circumstances connected with the making of the Report. For that purpose they put before him all such documents and correspondence relating thereto

as were available to the Council of Management, leaving it to him to select what he considered were properly relevant. They also put him in touch with a number of persons whose first-hand evidence he thought it necessary to obtain.

The Council asked Sir Lynden Macassey in addition to make his own observations on any facts and circumstances which he thought fairly called for comment.

Sir Lynden Macassey agreed to prepare the statement desired on condition that he did it in an honorary capacity and that the statement was one confined to establishing, from what he considered to be properly admissible evidence, the facts and circumstances relating to the making of the report and the extent of investigation preliminary thereto, but to include such observations as he considered himself justified in making.

The statement prepared by Sir Lynden Macassey follows, and is now published by the Council of Management. It may seem long and detailed. That is because the Council of Management specially asked Sir Lynden Macassey to record as fully as possible the whole of the circumstances connected with the making of the Report. The Council of Management were anxious that bodies engaged in Moral Re-Armament work in other countries should be able to compare the nature of the investigation into Moral Re-Armament made by the Church of England with what they knew were the exhaustive and impartial investigations made by other Christian Churches and bodies.

On behalf of the Council of Management
of the Oxford Group

(Signed) ROLAND WILSON

1st February 1955

Statement

prepared by

SIR LYNDEN MACASSEY

for the Council of Management of the Oxford Group
in regard to the method of making by the Social and
Industrial Council of their Report on
Moral Re-Armament

ORIGIN OF THE REPORT

It is difficult, having examined the evidence, to avoid the conclusion, whatever other explanations may be offered, that the origin of the Report was initially linked up with the Oxford Group having included Sheffield among the many industrial centres in the United Kingdom in which it launched an MRA campaign in 1952. At that time Canon Wickham (the Industrial Chaplain to the Bishop of Sheffield) was engaged in doing active work in his own particular social and industrial movement in Sheffield. During the MRA campaign in Sheffield, large numbers were drawn to MRA meetings and plays, and work among the Sheffield industries was vigorously carried out by MRA workers. The Bishop of Sheffield, however, criticised MRA on more than one occasion, and Canon Wickham also expressed hostile views about it in common with other persons connected with his own social and industrial movement. It did not occur to the Oxford Group, having regard to their experience in other industrial centres that they were invading the preserves of the Bishop or Canon Wickham. The large numbers coming to the MRA meetings and plays in Sheffield was taken to indicate that MRA had its own appeal to many previously untapped sections of the Sheffield community.

THE WORKING PARTY AND THEIR PROCEDURE

In the following year, 1953, the Social and Industrial Council of which the Bishop of Sheffield was a member resolved to set up a "Working Party" to make a Report to the Council on Moral Re-Armament. The Bishop of Colchester was appointed Chairman and Canon Hudson was made Secretary of the Working Party. Presumably there are records stating what were the terms of reference to the Working Party.

The terms of reference, if any do exist, to the Working Party are not known to the Oxford Group. They have never, to the Group's knowledge, been stated. Some persons who were approached by the Working Party and asked to give evidence about MRA wrote asking what were the terms of reference and scope of the Working Party, and were given the following replies:

"The Social and Industrial Commission of the Church Assembly, of which I am a member (and was until recently chairman), has appointed a Working Party charged to produce some sort of critique and appraisal of Moral Re-Armament, with special reference to its relevance to economic and industrial problems."

The Secretary of the Working Party, Canon Hudson, in a letter to an Anglican clergyman, the Rev. Basil Hazledine, 6th July 1953. (Appendix No. 1.)

"I should find it quite impossible to define specific terms of reference for you."

A letter to the Rev. Basil Hazledine, 13th June 1953. (Appendix No. 1.)

"It is quite true that our terms of reference refer to the specific relevance of MRA to the problems of industry, but we are also concerned with a wider field."

Canon Hudson to the Mayor of Folkestone, 2nd September 1953. (Appendix No. 3.)

"The Working Party is a sub-committee of the Social and Industrial Commission of the Church Assembly, and has been appointed to produce (for the guidance of the Commission—not necessarily for publication) an evaluation and critique of the movement known as MRA."

Canon Hudson to the Mayor of Folkestone in response to a request for clarification, 12th September 1953. (Appendix No. 3.)

One may reasonably assume, if the Report was to be used "for the guidance of the Social and Industrial Council" and ultimately of the Church Assembly, that it should be a

report based on a full, fair and impartial inquiry into the whole of the facts and circumstances connected with MRA.

The Working Party, however, by-passed the Oxford Group, and made no official approach to it for information as other churches and organisations had done, in this and in other countries, although the Group is the authority in charge of the work of MRA in the United Kingdom and although the address of the Group and the headquarters of MRA are well-known and widely published. This was obviously done as a matter of policy.

EXTENT OF THE INQUIRY MADE BY THE WORKING PARTY INTO MRA

In the course of May and June 1953, the Chairman and Secretary of the Working Party, the Bishop of Colchester and Canon Hudson, made casual contacts with three persons who had taken an active interest in MRA but none of whom was, or regarded himself as being, at the centre of the work, or an authority upon it. None of them held any official position in relation to the Oxford Group and its work of Moral Re-Armament. These persons were:—

1. Alderman John Moncrieff, then Mayor of Folkestone. The Mayor happened to find himself at a civic luncheon in Folkestone on 1st April 1953, sitting next to the Bishop of Colchester. They discussed MRA, of which the Mayor says the Bishop spoke disparagingly. Some two months later the Mayor received a letter from the Bishop asking him to appear before the Working Party and give evidence about MRA. Shortly afterwards Canon Hudson also wrote to the Mayor (6th July 1953—Appendix No. 3).

2. Mr. R. C. Mowat, Lecturer in History at the Royal Naval College, Greenwich, was also approached. It appears that Canon Hudson had borrowed from Canon Demant a book by Mr. R. C. Mowat, and from it learned of his interest in MRA and subsequently wrote to him at the end of May 1953, asking him to appear before the Working Party.

3. Rev. Basil Hazledine was a young Anglican clergyman working in East London. Canon Hudson wrote to him in

early June, 1953, saying that the Working Party had been appointed to produce "some sort of critique and appraisal" of MRA, and asking him to give evidence. The reason for his selection is not known to Mr. Hazledine, and he himself cannot account for it.

LETTER FROM THE MAYOR OF FOLKESTONE

The experience which these persons had of the Working Party is summed up by Alderman Moncrieff, in a letter which he wrote to a member of the Council of Management of the Oxford Group on 19th January, 1954. (See Appendix No. 2.) In it he said:—

"I am very concerned about this Committee of the Church Assembly which is entrusted with the task of reporting on the work of Moral Re-Armament I met the Bishop of Colchester on 1st April last year at a civic luncheon in Folkestone when I was in the chair and the Bishop sat next to me as the principal guest

"A couple of months afterwards, to my great surprise, I had a letter from the Bishop asking if I would appear as a witness to a Committee of the Church Assembly which was inquiring about the work of Moral Re-Armament in industry, of which he was the Chairman. It puzzles me how that particular bishop came to be chosen as the chairman and why I, on that brief acquaintance-ship, should be asked to attend.

"I wrote to the Bishop to say that if the committee wanted to know what work Moral Re-Armament was doing in industry the best way would be for a member to go to Switzerland to the World Assembly, which was then sitting, and in a few weeks' time (in July) had a special session on the work in industry. I wrote a second time but had no reply to my letters and I later learned that no representative went.

"Canon Hudson, the convener of the committee wrote to say that 'our working party' of which the Bishop of Colchester had written would meet on the 18th of September, would I be there at 3.45 p.m. 'to tell us what you know from your own experience of the work and value of Moral Re-Armament.'

"I wrote to the Chairman on the 1st September to say, 'As you know from your visit to Folkestone when we had such a pleasant talk, I am quite happy to talk about Moral Re-Armament, but I wondered what information the committee wants and whether an approach has been made to those who are best able to give full information.' The Bishop did not reply but Canon Hudson did as I sent him a copy. The reply was very evasive. I became unhappy about what was going on and approached Moral Re-Armament headquarters to ask what was known about it. I found that no approach had been made to MRA and last week I learned that still no request had been received by responsible people in MRA for information.

"I wrote again to Canon Hudson to say I would like to know who was on the Committee and its terms of reference. His reply was so unsatisfactory that I showed it to Canon White-Thomson the Vicar of Folkestone, and said that I had learned that only two other witnesses had been called to the committee, a priest of the Anglican Church who held a minor position and a lecturer at the Royal Naval College. I decided that under those circumstances I could not attend the committee, since I did not know what use was to be made of what I said and clearly witnesses who could give a full picture of the world-wide work of MRA had not been called. I wrote to say that I felt I should not attend, since in the time available before a committee I could not give an adequate picture, but I affirmed my strong support for Moral Re-Armament and the work it was doing."

"I wrote that letter five months ago. I had no acknowledgement of my letter and I have not heard from any member of the committee since."

The Rev. Basil Hazledine also wrote expressing his reluctance to attend as he did not feel himself competent to speak authoritatively about the Group's MRA work. Mr. R. C. Mowat was abroad at the time when the Working Party met in mid-September, 1953.

It will be noted that what was to serve for the "guidance" of the Social and Industrial Council was described by the Secretary of the Working Party as "some sort of critique and

appraisal" and that the Chairman and Secretary of the Working Party were content to base it on such casual and fortuitous contacts as are described above.

Two other events occurred during the summer of 1953:

Canon Wickham, the Industrial Chaplain to the Bishop of Sheffield, looked in at the Caux Assembly in Switzerland. Those in contact with him at Caux described him as being in "a highly critical frame of mind". He departed after a visit of a few hours and could have seen nothing of the work of the conference.

Mr. R. C. Mowat subsequently invited Canon Hudson to an informal dinner at 45, Berkeley Square, with three or four friends of his who were also, like himself, supporters of MRA. Those at the dinner say that the Canon was extremely critical of everything connected with MRA and of Caux, and seemed to have prejudged the whole matter.

At the end of September 1953, the Bishop of Colchester wrote to the Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, the Rev. J. P. Thornton-Duesbery, asking him whether he could write a memorandum on the history of the Oxford Group, as the Working Party was "trying to make an objective estimate of the activities of Moral Re-Armament, especially in the industrial sphere", and complaining of "a lack of co-operativeness" in the men connected with MRA so far approached, presumably meaning Alderman Moncrieff, Mr. R. C. Mowat and Rev. Basil Hazledine. The Principal was unable to undertake the writing of a memorandum owing to pressure of work in Oxford.

Mr. R. C. Mowat, who had been abroad, was invited to lunch by the Bishop of Colchester and Canon Hudson on 11th November 1953. At this luncheon Mr. Mowat recommended the Bishop and the Canon to have a meeting with the responsible men at the centre of and carrying on the work of MRA, as he did not see how else they could obtain the first-hand information they evidently needed, or the necessary corrective to their preconceptions about MRA. In doing so Mr. Mowat was only recommending them to follow the precedent of other Churches.

AN INVITATION TO THE WORKING PARTY

Mr. Mowat communicated this to the Council of Management of the Oxford Group, who asked him on their behalf to extend a cordial invitation from the Council of Management to the Working Party to come to the headquarters of the Group, and to obtain what information they desired. Accordingly on 15th December 1953, Mr. Mowat wrote to the Bishop of Colchester and also to Canon Hudson a letter containing the following (Appendix No. 4):

“We look forward to welcoming at 45 Berkeley Square (i.e., the headquarters of the Oxford Group) yourself and any of your colleagues on the Working Committee of the Committee of the Church and Industry, whom you would like to bring with you, if you would be good enough to send me their names so that they may be invited.

“To help us bring up the right people to meet you, would you send to us the terms of reference to your Committee.

“It seems as though the best time to meet would be in the New Year¹. No doubt this will also suit you better in view of the numerous engagements of the Christmas season.

“If this is agreeable to you I will write and suggest some possible dates.”

No reply to this letter was ever received by Mr. Mowat.

LETTERS IN THE PRESS

Later, in January 1954, when the Working Party were engaged on their report a critical article on the work of MRA appeared in the *Daily Telegraph*. The correspondence in the *Daily Telegraph*, which followed, began in the industrial field, then suddenly widened out into an attack on the Christian position of the Group.

At the time, the Bishop of Colchester was the Chairman of the Working Party and Canon Wickham was a member of the Working Party. Both were charged with making, in conjunction with other members of the Working Party, what must be presumed to be an impartial report on MRA,

¹i.e., January 1954.

seeing that it was to be “for the guidance of the Social and Industrial Council” and through it for the guidance of the Church Assembly. Both of them took the surprising step, for persons in that position, of writing letters—which are reproduced below—to the *Daily Telegraph* attacking MRA. They apparently felt themselves able to reconcile that action with the discharge of their impartial duties on the Working Party to make a critique and appraisal for the guidance of the Social and Industrial Council. The letters are here reproduced and speak for themselves:

Daily Telegraph, January 13th, 1954

Oxford Group

Clichés and ‘Flamboyant Irrelevance’

“From Canon E. R. Wickham

“To the Editor of the *Daily Telegraph*

“Sir—My association with industry has brought me into contact with MRA. I have met and talked with many of its supporters and critics and studied its claims and literature in considerable detail.

“In my judgment there are a dozen serious criticisms of MRA—psychological, political, social and theological—that an intelligent man should note. But there are three to which I would especially refer.

“1. MRA is conducive to political irresponsibility. In its flamboyant writing it flings out clichés and slogans that are often quite brilliant, but are none the less question-begging. For example, ‘There’s enough in the world for everyone’s need, but not for everyone’s greed’, and ‘It’s not who is right, but what is right.’

“Excellent! But what do these mean in concrete detail in relation to the political and industrial problems of our time? MRA stops here and refuses to translate the slogans into practicalities. It gives the illusion of relevance, but is in fact a mirage.

“2. MRA makes unwarranted claims on a huge scale. We should not lightly discard the statements of such authoritative bodies as the International Confederation

of Free Trade Unions, the TUC, or the Coal Board. And in the local situations it is hard to find supporters of the claims who are not MRA adherents. I know personally of a chairman of shop stewards in a huge works who claimed that their good labour relations were the consequences of MRA. The shop stewards' committee demanded and got a recantation, and replaced the chairman.

"I have never read such arrogant claims as that of MRA—certainly 'Humility' is not one of their absolutes.

"3. MRA disavows the reason and intellect. It relies on 'guidance', testimony, choruses, theatrical demonstrations, and on a psychologically induced experience through these means. Reason, discussion, the analysis of facts, have scant place in this glittering display of fireworks. So it seemed to me when I spent a day at Caux.

"But good management and good consultation are worth many high moral plays. A sound wages structure is worth a ton of testimony. More shared responsibility is worth many books on 'inspired democracy', and a good Welfare State worth many 'new civilisations'.

"It shows confusion of mind to give a blank cheque of approval to MRA just because it has done some good to some people. Every 'ism' in the world, even no doubt, the worst, could claim this.

Sheffield

E. R. WICKHAM"

STATEMENT BY FREE CHURCH LEADERS

A group of eight senior leaders of the Free Churches then published a letter in the *Daily Telegraph* on 16th January 1954, in which they said:—

"We, members of the Free Churches, are disturbed by the recent attacks upon the Christian nature of Moral Re-Armament.

"At a time when our Christian heritage is threatened by godless materialism, when Christian movements are persecuted under dictatorships, and when in our country there is serious evidence of moral decline, we welcome a world-wide movement of the Spirit that contributes

effectively to the answer, and is reaching many outside our Churches.

“We are engaged in a world struggle between the forces of Christ and the forces of organised materialism. Dr. Frank Buchman, founder of Moral Re-Armament has said, ‘We are in a global effort to win the world to our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. The message in its entirety is the only last hope that will save the world . . . a revolution under the Cross of Christ that can transform the world.’

“For thirty years the aim of the Oxford Group has been, in Dr. Buchman’s words, ‘A Christian revolution whose concern is vital Christianity’, and this is its aim today.”

This letter was signed by:—

Rev. G. JOHNSTONE JEFFREY, M.A., D.D.

Moderator of the Church of Scotland, 1952-3.

Rev. M. E. AUBREY, C.H., B.A., LL.D.

General Secretary of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, 1925-51.

Rev. W. E. SANGSTER, M.A., PH.D.

President of the Methodist Conference, 1951-2.

Rev. E. BENSON PERKINS, M.A.

Vice-Moderator (now Moderator) of the Free Church Federal Council.

Rev. T. CARLYLE MURPHY, B.D., O.B.E.

President of the Congregational Union of Scotland.

Rev. S. W. HUGHES, D.D.

Secretary Emeritus of the Free Church Federal Council.

EBENEZER CUNNINGHAM, M.A.

The Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales.

Rev. F. TOWNLEY LORD, B.A., D.D., D.LITT.

The President of the World Baptist Alliance.

This immediately drew forth the letter, published in the *Telegraph*, on 19th January, from none other than the Chairman of the Working Party, the Bishop of Colchester.

Daily Telegraph, January 19th, 1954

Moral Re-Armament

“From the Bishop of Colchester

“To the Editor of the *Daily Telegraph*

“Sir—For certain purposes I am having to attempt research into the Moral Re-Armament movement. I know enough already to fear that the letter of the Free Church leaders may be somewhat seriously misleading.

“Whatever may be Dr. Buchman’s ultimate objective, Moral Re-Armament is now functioning, in India for example, without the name of Christ being mentioned.¹ Even so I can imagine the Free Church leaders desisting from condemnation.

“But they go so much further and declare Moral Re-Armament to be a ‘world-wide movement of the Holy Spirit’ that one wonders whether they are fully aware of the degree of responsibility (theological and otherwise) implied in their utterances.

Yours faithfully,

DUDLEY COLCHESTER”

Colchester

At this point, the correspondence in the *Daily Telegraph* was closed down and no letters correcting the Bishop’s mis-statements were ever published in that paper, although a number are known to have been sent to the Editor of the *Daily Telegraph*.

¹This statement is contradicted categorically by the Metropolitan of India who unlike the Bishop of Colchester had direct personal knowledge of the facts. His statement is also given in *Appendix No. 7*.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

On 14th January 1954, following Canon Wickham's letter, the Mayor of Folkestone wrote to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury (*Appendix No. 6*). On 22nd January, following the Bishop of Colchester's letter in the *Telegraph*, the Mayor wrote again to His Grace (*Appendix No. 6*). He said:—

“I wrote you on the 14th January expressing my concern that a member of a sub-committee of the Social and Industrial Commission of the Church Assembly which was considering a report on the work of Moral Re-Armament should publicly prejudge the issue in a national newspaper. Since then the Chairman himself (i.e., the Bishop of Colchester) has written a critical letter to the *Telegraph*.

“I knew that the Bishop of Colchester was an opponent of Dr. Buchman's since he told me so at a civic luncheon in Folkestone on 1st April 1953, but now everyone knows.

“I feel it would be very desirable for the Church to know more of the work of Moral Re-Armament and I hope that those at the centre of the work will be asked to give full information, but in the meantime I feel that it would be very unfortunate if any kind of report from a ‘Working Party’, some of whose members are clearly in opposition, should reach the popular press.”

To this His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury replied on 26th January 1954 (*Appendix No. 6*):—

“You will have got my reply to your earlier letter. In answer to your second letter, may I just underline that no kind of report from this working party will reach the Press or be made public at all.¹

It is an internal affair of the Social and Industrial Council. Like you I hope that some of those able to speak officially for MRA will consent to meet the working party.”

It was obviously not known to His Grace the Archbishop that none of those who were alone able to speak officially for MRA had ever, up to this time, been invited by the Working

¹The Social and Industrial Council are disregarding this and are publishing their Report.

Party to do so. The Working Party had never approached them.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE SOCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL AND Mr. R. C. MOWAT

Mr. R. C. Mowat then received a letter dated 26th January 1954 (*Appendix No. 5*), from the Secretary to the Church Assembly and to the Social and Industrial Council, Mr. J. A. Guillum Scott. In this letter, the Secretary wrote that the Bishop of Colchester had told him he had sent a reply to Mr. Mowat's invitation of 15th December 1953, to a meeting between members of the Working Party and the Oxford Group, about MRA, but perhaps it had got lost in the Christmas mail. The Bishop said he had accepted the invitation and that he had arranged to attend a meeting on the 27th January (the next day after Mr. Guillum Scott's letter was written) and the Bishop was anxious to know whether his letter had ever reached Mr. Mowat.

As Mr. Mowat had never received any reply from the Bishop or from the Secretary to the Working Party, Canon Hudson, to whom he had also sent a copy of his letter, he replied to the Secretary of the Church Assembly in a letter of 27th January 1954 (*Appendix No. 5*) in which he said:—

“I have received your letter of the 26th January addressed to me at the Royal Naval Hospital, Greenwich (my proper address is the Royal Naval College), and I think it may be of assistance to you if I recapitulate what is the present position.”

Mr. Mowat then outlined the main points of his own contact with the Bishop of Colchester and Canon Hudson, and referred to his letter of invitation of 15th December. He continued:

“No reply was received to my letter of the 15th December, and as it was not returned to me I assume it was delivered to his Lordship and also the copy delivered that was sent to Canon Hudson. As it occurred to me after receiving your letter of the 26th January that the Bishop had, as you have done, addressed a letter to me at the

Royal Naval Hospital, Greenwich, I made careful inquiries at the Seamen's Hospital, Greenwich (there is no Royal Naval Hospital) but found that no letter to me had been received at that address. I also made inquiries of the appropriate department of the Admiralty, but there was no record of any such letter.

“During a discussion that has taken place in the columns of the *Daily Telegraph* in regard to Moral Re-Armament, it has been observed with very great surprise that two of the members of the Working Party, namely the Bishop of Colchester and Canon Wickham, were not prepared to await the results of an impartial inquiry into the work of Moral Re-Armament, which those responsible for Moral Re-Armament would have welcomed, but anticipated it by sending to the *Daily Telegraph*, which published them, letters launching an attack upon Moral Re-Armament and the whole basis of its work.

“I cannot of course anticipate whether the central body of Moral Re-Armament would think now of appearing before a Committee or a working party which comprises members who have apparently abandoned all attempt at an impartial inquiry into Moral Re-Armament, and have adopted a procedure which is completely incompatible with exercising a judicial judgment, and in no way calculated to provide the Social and Industrial Council or the Assembly itself with reliable evidence about MRA, but I hardly think it likely. That is, however, entirely a matter for the central body of Moral Re-Armament, and their decision could only be ascertained by your writing to them officially to ask whether, notwithstanding the publication of those letters, they would still be prepared to appear before the working party. I understand that no communication of any kind has been received by the central body of Moral Re-Armament from either yourself or any Secretary to or member of the Working Party.”

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE SOCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL AND THE OXFORD GROUP

On the 29th January 1954, the Secretary of the Church Assembly did write a letter to the Secretary of the Oxford Group (*Appendix No. 8*). *This it should be specially noted was the first letter received by the Group from or on behalf of the Social and Industrial Council or the Working Party since this inquiry into MRA was set in motion.*

This letter asked whether the Group would be prepared to send representatives of MRA for "a friendly and informal consultation" with the Social and Industrial Council on the afternoon of Thursday, 20th May.

To this letter the Council of Management of the Oxford Group replied on 17th February 1954 (*Appendix No. 8*), saying they would welcome a meeting with the Social and Industrial Council on a mutually convenient date, with the object of giving the Council such information as the Group could give about itself and its work, including its work of Moral Re-Armament. In order to enable the Group to provide the information, the Council of Management said that it would be necessary for the Secretary of the Church Assembly to send to the Group in good time before the meeting the questions on which the Social and Industrial Council wanted information. That was regarded by the Council of Management as essential to enable the Group to see what information it would be necessary to have prepared and to enable it to obtain, from overseas if necessary, any relevant facts and documents, and also to enable the Group to determine what persons it would have to take to the meeting to give the first-hand information.

Further, in view of the fact that important members of the Working Party of the Social and Industrial Council regarded themselves as free, before or after any meeting with the Group, to write letters to the public press condemnatory of the Oxford Group and its work of Moral Re-Armament (as the Chairman and a member of the Working Party had done), the Council of Management of the Group were advised that, in the circumstances, it was desirable to

have an accurate and reliable record taken of any discussion between representatives of the Group and the Social and Industrial Council. Such a record would be available to the Group and to the Council, in case of any subsequent controversy as to what the Group had said, or what had been said to or about the Group. This was internationally important to the Group in view of its associated bodies in many countries of the world, who would all be concerned in any report on MRA made by the Social and Industrial Council.

The Council of Management, however, received a letter, dated 22nd February 1954, from the Secretary of the Church Assembly (*Appendix No. 8*) saying that if the Oxford Group felt that discussions with the Council had to be "invested with so much formality", it would be better to defer any meeting for the time being.

To this the Council of Management replied by letter, dated 3rd March 1954, in which they said that they regretted that their letter of 17th February should be considered as forming any ground for postponing a meeting between representatives of the Group and of the Social and Industrial Council, but that they had no choice but to accept the postponement decided on by the Social and Industrial Council. In the letter the Council of Management reiterated that they were always ready and willing to give the Social and Industrial Council all the information possible about the Group and about MRA.

They also stated that a booklet entitled *The Oxford Group and its Work of Moral Re-Armament* was almost completed giving information about the Group and its work of Moral Re-Armament, and that they would be glad to send copies, when the book came out, to the Social and Industrial Council.¹

On 7th April 1954, the Council of Management of the

¹By letter dated 12th March 1954, the Secretary of the Church Assembly asked that twenty-four copies of the booklet should be sent to him. These were delivered to him on 27th March 1954, immediately on publication of the booklet.

Oxford Group again wrote to the Secretary of the Church Assembly, saying that if any further information was desired by the Social and Industrial Council, they would be glad to have particulars. The Council of Management reaffirmed that they were, as they always had been, ready to supply the Social and Industrial Council, as far as practicable, with full information.

The Council of Management received a letter, dated 12th April 1954, from the Secretary of the Church Assembly merely saying that the Social and Industrial Council felt it would be better to leave over the question of a meeting between themselves and representatives of the Oxford Group for the time being, but that they hoped an "informal" meeting might still be possible at a later date. This letter of 12th April 1954 was the last communication which the Council of Management of the Oxford Group received from the Social and Industrial Council.

On 28th October 1954, a member of the Social and Industrial Council called at the headquarters of the Oxford Group to inform the Council of Management of the Group that the Working Party had now made its report, and that the Social and Industrial Council were proceeding to print and publish it, with a view to laying it before the Church Assembly and debating it there.

Observations

by

SIR LYNDEN MACASSEY

The first duty assigned to me was to find and record, on what was available as reliable evidence, the facts and circumstances relevant to the method of making of the Report on MRA by the Social and Industrial Council. That is what I have endeavoured to do, in the foregoing part of this statement. The second part of my duty was to make such observations as in my opinion any facts or circumstances merited.

I now proceed to submit certain observations.

THE WORKING PARTY'S METHOD OF SELECTING EVIDENCE The purpose of the Report, according to the statement of the Secretary to the Working Party (Canon Hudson), was "to produce for the guidance of the Social and Industrial Council . . . an evaluation and critique of the movement known as MRA" (see letter of 12th September 1953 from Canon Hudson to the Mayor of Folkestone, *Appendix No. 3*). By an earlier letter of 6th July 1953, to the Rev. Basil Hazledine, Canon Hudson gave a still looser description of the intention of the Report which was to be "some sort of critique and appraisal of Moral Re-Armament with special reference to its relevance to economic and industrial problems".

PERFUNCTORY PROCEDURE

If the Report was to be no more than "some sort of critique and appraisal of MRA", to use the accommodating and elastic expression of Canon Hudson (and he as Secretary to the Working Party ought to know what the intention

was), almost anything ought to satisfy that requirement. The Report could obviously be used as a medium for recording individual views about MRA and individual objections to and prejudices against it. No obligation on the Working Party would be implied to make any kind of investigation into how MRA was operating in various countries, and the effect it was having on personal, national and international life. The perfunctory character of the procedure adopted by the Working Party to obtain casual and vague opinions about MRA, plainly shows that they did not regard the report as being more than "some sort of critique or appraisal of MRA etc.," calling for no real investigation of it.

But in his letter to the Mayor of Folkestone of 12th September 1953, Canon Hudson added an important and significant qualification to his earlier description of the purpose of the report. It was to be, he said, "for the guidance of the Social and Industrial Council". That imposed quite squarely on the Working Party an obligation to conduct such an investigation into MRA as would present a well-balanced, impartial, informative description of MRA and its effects that would provide guidance, not precluding any member of the Working Party or the Social and Industrial Council from having his own opinions or prejudices separately recorded. No such investigation was made.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE WORKING PARTY

It was an important and responsible duty committed to the Working Party—the giving through the Social and Industrial Council to the Church of England and, ultimately, to the Anglican Church throughout the world, what would be taken to be the Church of England's considered conclusion on the world-wide movement of MRA, now actively operating in 118 different countries.

That responsibility cannot be lightly brushed aside by it being said that the report is only a domestic report of the Social and Industrial Council and not of the Church Assembly. If that fine distinction ever came to exist it would soon disappear.

A PARALLEL CASE

An illustration of how easily that could happen is ready to hand. The Secretariat of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (the ICFTU) prepared the draft of a highly critical report on MRA which slipped, or was slipped, into circulation and was hailed with great satisfaction and given great publicity by Communists and Communist agencies throughout the world as the considered conclusion of the ICFTU on MRA. Canon Wickham in his letter to the *Daily Telegraph* of 13th January 1954 refers to this report as the authoritative voice of the ICFTU. He did not know the facts.

The actual facts are that the report, although described as the official report of the ICFTU on MRA, had never been submitted to or discussed or voted on by the Congress of the ICFTU which alone, by its constitution, can give an official decision or vote on behalf of the ICFTU or speak in its name. Yet in many countries the Secretariat's report was described as the official view of the ICFTU on MRA. The true facts were stated in a letter published in *The Times* on 13th October 1953.

Exactly the same thing may occur in the case of a Report by the Social and Industrial Council. It may well be elevated to the status of a statement on MRA by the Church of England after a full and impartial inquiry.

THE WORKING PARTY'S METHODS COMPARED WITH THOSE OF OTHER BODIES

Bearing in mind the important purpose of the report as stated by the Secretary to the Working Party, it is difficult to imagine any more casual and haphazard way in which the evidence on MRA could have been gathered by the Working Party. There was no attempt to collect evidence which would portray the basis and the methods of MRA, particularly its results, so as to give a fair and full and unprejudiced account.

The investigation into MRA by the Working Party—if

what the Working Party did could possibly be called an investigation—stands out in sharp contrast with the searching observations and inquiries into MRA carried out by other Christian Churches and bodies. There is first-hand evidence on what they have done, but of course no information as to what views they had formed. What matters is the nature of the investigation they made before forming a judgment upon or making any report upon MRA, and in the fact that their investigations are still continuing.

First of all, they accepted what has been consistently claimed by the Council of Management of the Oxford Group, and by the parallel bodies in other countries carrying on the work of MRA, that MRA has to be viewed and judged in its full sweep and widest operation, and not merely by taking particular limited parts of the work in different places, and individual views or prejudices about them, as sufficiently indicative of the whole.

Secondly, they accepted what has been affirmed by many independent observers, that the best if not the only place in Europe to study MRA from every angle, and in fullest operation and activity, is at and during the Annual Assemblies at Caux, which from May to October each year meet in Switzerland in the Mountain House centre provided by the Swiss 'la Fondation pour le Réarmement Moral'.

Thirdly, they formed and acted on the view that MRA could not be judged on a short or casual visit to Caux (certainly not one of a few of hours duration!) but only on prolonged and intensive observation. Proceeding on this obviously sound view, they spent long periods at Caux as observers—sometimes for months, and not in one year only but during several successive years. In all cases other than the Social and Industrial Council of the Church Assembly of the Church of England, an open and candid approach was made either to the Oxford Group in London, or to la Fondation pour le Réarmement Moral in Switzerland, saying it was desired to go to Caux to observe and study MRA. The observers usually were priests or ministers of their respective churches going with the approval of their eccle-

siastical superiors. In some cases the observers stayed in Caux for as much as three months in a year. In some cases they repeated visits of similar duration for several years running. In one important case a body of clerical observers, after a lengthy visit to Caux, were convened by a high dignitary of their church to discuss with him the views they had formed of MRA. In another case a certain high ecclesiastical dignitary is in the habit of sending young clergymen to Caux to get experience there as an aid to their pastoral work. All such visitors to Caux had been and are in the habit of approaching and obtaining information on many matters from the MRA authorities direct, and work in complete amity and concord with them.

**THE LETTERS TO
THE PRESS OF
THE CHAIRMAN
AND A MEMBER
OF THE WORKING
PARTY**

The action of the Chairman and of a member, of the Working Party, in writing to the *Daily Telegraph* the letters quoted earlier, calls for the strongest criticism. One was an executive, and both were members, of the Working Party charged at the time with preparing what must be assumed to have been intended to be a fair and impartial report for "the guidance of the Social and Industrial Council". For them, while holding those positions of detachment, to step down from them and, while engaged in preparing their report, to write partisan letters to the public press condemnatory of what they had to inquire into, was quite contrary to all accepted principles applying to the conduct of any occupant of the positions they held. If they entertained personal opinions and prejudices as strongly as appeared, and wanted to ventilate them in the press before the Working Party of which they were members made their report, their duty was first of all to resign their respective positions on the Working Party. It would be difficult if not impossible to imagine a parallel action, even in the case of any unimportant "fact-finding" committee, and certainly not in the case of any committee or tribunal which was engaged in forming a judgment on an important controversy that was

intended to serve for the guidance of a great body of people like the Church of England. As the action of the Chairman and of the member of the Working Party in so writing to the Press met with no reproof or reprobation from the Working Party or the Social and Industrial Council, it is to be assumed that both bodies accepted what was so irregularly done as a legitimate method of attempting to influence opinion in the Church of England to a particular view in advance of the publication of their Report.

THE ALLEGED REFUSAL OF THE OXFORD GROUP TO MEET THE WORKING PARTY It has been asserted by members of the Working Party that the Oxford Group raised difficulties about meeting the Working Party and the Social and Industrial Council to discuss and give evidence about MRA. That, if true, would be to the discredit of the Oxford Group; but it is not true and quite contrary to the facts.

As will be seen from the letters included in *Appendix No. 8*, an invitation, dated 29th January 1954, came from the Secretary to the Church Assembly to the Secretary of the Oxford Group asking that representatives of MRA should meet the Social and Industrial Council for "a friendly and informal consultation" regarding MRA, "with particular reference to work in the industrial field". By letter of 17th February 1954—also in *Appendix No. 8*—the Acting Secretary of the Oxford Group replied that the Group would welcome such a meeting if they could be supplied with a list of the exact matters on which the Social and Industrial Council wanted information, so that they could get the information ready—surely a reasonable request—and also that they would be allowed to bring to the meeting a reliable and competent shorthand writer to take a verbatim note of the discussion as a reliable account of the proceedings. In view of what had been charged against MRA in the public press by the Chairman and also by a prominent member of the Working Party, that was a perfectly fair and reasonable request. It may be assumed that, in accordance with

customary practice, the Social and Industrial Council would have for their own records their own shorthand writer recording the discussion. This is what is described by Canon Hudson in a letter of 7th January 1955, as "a refusal to allow us to obtain information straight from the horse's mouth, so to speak, except upon ridiculous and impossible terms". The intemperance of the language is sufficiently answered when set against the true facts as stated above.

The Secretary to the Social and Industrial Council replied by letter dated 22nd February 1954, saying that what was intended by the Council to be no more than an "informal" discussion was being invested by the Oxford Group with so much formality that the intended meeting had better be postponed. The meeting did not take place.

"FORMAL" AND "INFORMAL"

It is to be noted that the meeting which was to be regarded by the Oxford Group as "informal" was all the time intended to be made as "formal" as could be by the Social and Industrial Council. They were intending to use for the purposes of their published report what the Oxford Group said at the meeting about MRA—a report which was to be printed and issued and debated in the Church Assembly. The meeting could not be more formal, however described, and one of very great importance to the Oxford Group. As will be seen from subsequent letters in *Appendix No. 8*, the Oxford Group repeated their readiness to meet the Social and Industrial Council on the two conditions of being informed of the matters on which the Council needed information and of being allowed to take a shorthand note of the discussion. It is impossible to believe that the Social and Industrial Council could really have cancelled the meeting because of the insistence of the Group on those two conditions. Certain opponents of MRA on the Social and Industrial Council obviously welcomed any grounds that could be devised for saying the Oxford Group would not meet the Council.

26th January 1955

LYNDEN MACASSEY

Appendix

The principal relevant letters

1. Letters from the Secretary of the Working Party to the Rev. Basil Hazledine.
2. Letter from the Mayor of Folkestone to the Council of Management of the Oxford Group.
3. Correspondence between the Mayor of Folkestone and the Chairman and Secretary of the Working Party.
4. Letter to the Chairman of the Working Party from Mr. R. C. Mowat.
5. Correspondence between the Secretary of the Church Assembly and Mr. R. C. Mowat.
6. Correspondence between the Mayor of Folkestone and His Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury.
7. Statement by the Most Reverend the Metropolitan of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon.
8. Correspondence between the Secretary to the Church Assembly and the Oxford Group.

N.B.—There are in addition to these letters a large number of other letters.

APPENDIX NO. I

Letters from the Secretary of the Working Party, the Rev. Canon Hudson, to the Rev. Basil Hazledine.

Hillingdon,
St. Albans.
6th June 1953.

Dear Mr. Hazledine,

The Social and Industrial Commission of the Church Assembly, of which I am a member (and was until recently chairman), has appointed a working party charged to produce some sort of critique and appraisal of Moral Re-Armament, with special reference to its relevance to economic and industrial problems.

The Chairman of the working party is the Bishop of Colchester. He has appointed September 18 for the first meeting, and suggests that one or two people who are, or have been, committed adherents of MRA might be willing to come along on the afternoon of that day and speak to us about it out of their own experience. The Bishop tells me that you are one of the people who could give us valuable assistance in this way, and I write now, as convener of the working party, to ask whether you would be willing to do this—say 2.15 on Friday 18 September, in one of the committee rooms of the Church House. We should be very grateful.

Yours sincerely,

CYRIL E. HUDSON

Hillingdon,
St. Albans.
13th June 1953.

Dear Mr. Hazledine,

Thank you for your letter.¹ I am grateful to you for your promise to come and help us on the afternoon of 18th September. The proceedings will be quite informal, of course, and I should find it quite impossible to define

¹ There is no copy of this letter, as it was written by hand and no copy was kept by the Rev. Basil Hazledine.

Appendix 1

specific terms of reference for you: I imagine that the Chairman is likely to ask you to tell us shortly the case for MRA as you see it, and in terms of your own experience—after which you will be bombarded with questions!

It would be very kind of you to let me have the names of one or two people who could speak from their own knowledge of the work of MRA in docks and mines—though I am not quite sure that we shall want them (anyhow on 18th September), and I cannot, until I have consulted the Chairman, promise to invite them!

Yours sincerely,

CYRIL E. HUDSON

APPENDIX NO. 2

Appendix 2

Letter from the Mayor of Folkestone to a Member of the Council of Management of the Oxford Group.

Town Hall,
Folkestone,
19th January 1954.

I am very concerned about this Committee of the Church Assembly which is entrusted with the task of reporting on the work of Moral Re-Armament. Clearly it is not going about the job in an open and proper way. Of the ten members of the Committee several are well known as opponents of the work of Moral Re-Armament. Last week one wrote an abusive letter to the *Telegraph* and today even the Chairman of the Committee has rushed a damaging letter to the *Telegraph*, while the whole matter is still before the Committee.

I met the Bishop of Colchester on the 1st April last year at a civic luncheon in Folkestone, when I was in the chair and the Bishop sat next to me as the principal guest.

He talked about Moral Re-Armament right through the lunch and we continued the conversation with Canon White-Thomson, our vicar, after lunch. He seemed very friendly and after tea my wife walked with him to the

station where she gave him a Moral Re-Armament book "to read in the train".

A couple of months afterwards, to my great surprise, I had a letter from the Bishop asking if I would appear as a witness to a Committee of the Church Assembly which was inquiring about the work of Moral Re-Armament in industry, of which he was the Chairman. It puzzles me how that particular bishop came to be chosen as the Chairman and why I, on that brief acquaintanceship, should be asked to attend.

I wrote to the Bishop to say that if the committee wanted to know what work Moral Re-Armament was doing in industry the best way would be for a member to go to Switzerland to the World Assembly, which was then sitting, and in a few week's time (in July) had a special session on the work in industry. I enclosed a folder about this and said that many prominent leaders among both employers and workers of different countries would be at these meetings and assured him that a member of the committee would be welcome. I wrote a second time but had no reply to my letters and I later learned that no representative went.

Canon Hudson, the convener of the committee wrote to say that "our working party" of which the Bishop of Colchester had written would meet on the 18th of September, would I be there at 3.45 p.m. "to tell us what you know from your own experience of the work and value of Moral Re-Armament."

I wrote to the Chairman on the 1st September to say "As you know from your visit to Folkestone when we had such a pleasant talk, I am quite happy to talk about Moral Re-Armament, but I wondered what information the committee wants and whether an approach has been made to those who are best able to give full information." The Bishop did not reply but Canon Hudson did as I sent him a copy. The reply was very evasive. I became unhappy about what was going on and approached Moral Re-Armament headquarters to ask what was known about it. I found that no approach had been made to MRA and last week I learned that still no request had been received by responsible people in MRA for information.

I wrote again to Canon Hudson to say I would like to

know who was on the Committee and its terms of reference. His reply was so unsatisfactory that I showed it to Canon White-Thomson, the vicar of Folkestone, and said that I had learned that only two other witnesses had been called to the committee, a priest of the Anglican Church who held a minor position and a lecturer at the Royal Naval College. I decided that under those circumstances I could not attend the committee, since I did not know what use was to be made of what I said and clearly witnesses who could give a full picture of the world-wide work of MRA had not been called. I wrote to say that I felt I should not attend, since in the time available before a committee I could not give an adequate picture, but I affirmed my strong support for Moral Re-Armament and the work it was doing. I added that previous to being associated with MRA I had not attended a church for years but at the age of just over forty I asked to be made a member of the Baptist Church, which my family had attended in my boyhood, and was baptised. I later became the secretary of the Folkestone and Hythe Free Church Council, a position which I still hold.

I wrote that letter five months ago. I had no acknowledgement of my letter and I have not heard from any member of the committee since.

Of course MRA has been attacked before as all sections of the Christian Church have been opposed when they have been most active. The most notable recent example was the report from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, a report from a small committee which was not brought before the full meeting or ever voted on, but that report was printed in leading newspapers all over the world. It followed the attacks on the Moscow Radio and followed closely the pattern of those attacks. Surely the Anglican Church will not allow this little committee, whose chairman has today shown his opposition in a letter to the *Telegraph*, to produce an adverse report about MRA which would equally be quoted by newspapers particularly in Eastern countries and used by anti-religious forces.

At a time when there is such need for all Christians to unite and direct their attention to the obvious tasks which confront them, it does seem utterly wrong that vital spiritual work should be undermined by a section of the Church itself.

Appendix 2

I do hope that the Anglican Church as a whole can be shown the danger before the damage is done.

I want to let you know that if there is anything I can do to make known the Christian work and teaching of MRA I will be happy to do it, particularly in view of my concern about this committee of the Church Assembly.

With good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

JOHN MONCRIEFF

APPENDIX NO. 3

Appendix 3

Correspondence between the Mayor of Folkestone and the Chairman (the Bishop of Colchester) and the Secretary (the Rev. Canon Hudson) of the Working Party.

Derby House,
Colchester.

26.6.53

My dear friend,¹

I am so grateful. It is to be on Friday, September 18 in the afternoon. You will be notified of exact time and place later.

All good wishes to you both,

Yours sincerely,

DUDLEY COLCHESTER

Hillingdon,
St. Albans.

6 July, 1953

Dear Mr. Mayor,

I hear from the Bishop of Colchester that you will be willing to help our working party by coming to the Church House, Dean's Yard, on the afternoon of 18 September to tell us what you know from your own experience of the work

¹Mr. John Moncrieff, the Mayor of Folkestone.

The Bishop had written a short time previously to the Mayor, inviting him to appear before the Working Party and the Mayor had replied saying that he would do his best to help.

Appendix 3

and value of MRA: this is very good of you, and we are greatly obliged. The porter at the lodge will tell you in which room the meeting is being held (I do not yet know myself). I think it would be most convenient to us if you could turn up at about 3.45 p.m.

Yours sincerely,

CYRIL E. HUDSON

His Worship
The Mayor of Folkestone

Mayor's Parlour,
Folkestone.
31st August, 1953

Canon C. E. Hudson,
Hillingdon,
St. Albans.

Dear Canon Hudson,

I am quite pleased to come to the committee at Church House on the 18th September to tell of my experience of Moral Re-Armament but I would like to know more about what is to take place. The Bishop of Colchester only said in his letter that it was to do with industry. I have no knowledge of industry in the normal sense. There are many with Moral Re-Armament who have had considerable experience of meeting leaders of industry and also workers and trade union officials, no doubt you will ask the Secretary of Moral Re-Armament to send along one or two who are experts on this subject.

It would be helpful if I knew who are the members of the committee and what people you are calling to meet the members. Perhaps you will let me know this then I will see better where I fit in.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN MONCRIEFF

Mayor

Mayor's Parlour,
Folkestone.

1st September 1953

My dear Bishop,

I was thinking about your invitation to meet the committee on Moral Re-Armament. As you know from your visit to Folkestone when we had such a pleasant talk, I am quite happy to talk about Moral Re-Armament, but I wondered what information the committee wants and whether an approach has been made to those who are best able to give full information, so I wrote yesterday to Canon Hudson, as the enclosed copy.

I hope that I have made it very clear that I want to help and I would certainly like to do anything I can to see that the committee has all the information it needs. I enjoyed meeting you in Folkestone and look forward to meeting you again.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN MONCRIEFF
Mayor

Hillingdon,
St. Albans,
2nd September, 1953

Dear Mr. Mayor,

Many thanks for your letter.

I am very glad to hear that we shall see you on the afternoon of September 18. I do not think I can give you any precise details of our procedure. I imagine what is likely to happen is that the chairman (the Bishop of Colchester) may ask you to tell us shortly what from your own experience you have found to be particular and specific achievements of MRA, and no doubt others round the table will ask you to amplify or explain some of the things you say. It is quite true that our terms of reference refer to the specific relevance of MRA to the problems of industry, but we are also concerned with a wider field, and we have already asked one or two people to tell us about the influence of MRA in industry.

Yours sincerely,

CYRIL E. HUDSON

Appendix 3

Mayor's Parlour,
Folkestone.
10th September 1953

Canon Hudson,
Hillingdon,
St. Albans,
Herts

Dear Canon Hudson,

I was disappointed that in your letter of the 2nd you answered only a part of my letter. You did not say who are the members of the committee and you did not answer my questions "what people are you calling to meet the members?"

You say "we are also concerned with a wider field" but it is not clear to me whether this is in connection with industry or the wider field of Moral Re-Armament.

In view of the uncertainty that is now in my mind, I feel I must ask what is the purpose of the committee and who appointed it? I think you will agree that it would be helpful to me if I knew these things, and also what use is to be made of the information obtained from the interview and whether it, or any findings of the committee, are to be published.

I am sorry to add to the questions but I would like to be helpful to the committee and I think you will understand that I cannot be unless I have an answer to these questions.

Perhaps you did not know that the Bishop only wrote me a very brief note and that I know nothing about the committee. I would appreciate some information from you.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN MONCRIEFF
Mayor

Hillingdon,
St. Albans,
12th September 1953

Dear Mr. Mayor,

The working party is a sub-committee of the Social and Industrial Commission of the Church Assembly, and has been appointed to produce (for the guidance of the Com-

mission—not necessarily for publication) an evaluation and critique of the Movement known as MRA. The members of the working party are the Bishop of Colchester, Bishop Allen, Canon Wickham, Rev. Michael Gedge, Rev. D. Nineham, Mr. Gerald Steel, Mr. D. S. Tennant, Mr. J. O. Blair-Cunynghame, Miss Upton and myself.

Besides yourself, the Rev. B. W. Hazledine and a representative from the headquarters of MRA are coming on the afternoon of 18 September to tell us about the Movement.

I hoped it was clear from the last sentence of my letter to you on 2 September that the “wider field” refers to MRA and not to industry.

Yours sincerely,

CYRIL E. HUDSON

Mayor's Parlour,
Folkestone,

16th September 1953

Canon Hudson,
Hillingdon,
St. Albans

Dear Canon Hudson,

I thank you sincerely for your letter received today which answers my questions fully. I have now given careful thought to the question of what help I can give to the committee.

I feel that I am not qualified to be one of three people who are to attempt to give an adequate picture of the influence of Moral Re-Armament. I do not see how three people in a brief interview could tell of the effect of the sale of hundreds of thousands of Moral Re-Armament books published in many languages or the showing of the plays in Germany, Italy and other countries and the effect which teams of workers are having in the principal cities of this country. I feel that a proper picture can only be seen by some members of the committee visiting the World Assembly at Caux, or at least hearing a deputation drawn from a number of countries and then seeing Moral Re-Armament at work.

Appendix 3

I feel I could not in a brief interview before the committee add to what is available to you. I could tell of my own conversion due to Moral Re-Armament and the fact that although I had not been to a church for many years, at the age of 40 I was baptised and became a member of the Baptist Church. I could produce letters to tell of my work since then for the Free Churches and of my public witness to my Christian faith, but the news being given daily in news sheets from the World Assembly quote from speeches of men and women who are nationally known in their countries right across the world and who speak of new conviction. I am happy to witness to the entire Christian character of Moral Re-Armament which I have known for a dozen years and have seen at the World Assembly in U.S.A. as well as in Switzerland. The foreword, written by a former President of the Norwegian Parliament, to the book of collected speeches by Dr. Buchman, refers to the meetings being "Part of the strategy of an all embracing plan to conquer the world for Christ." From my experience Moral Re-Armament is succeeding in that plan in a way which few people in this country understand.

I do not feel that as one of three in an interview I could add anything of value to what you already have in the published speeches, so I regret that I must decline the invitation to meet the committee on this occasion. Should your committee decide to investigate in another manner, I would be pleased to take some small part that would be suitable for me.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN MONCRIEFF

P.S. I wrote to the Bishop of Colchester a month or so ago suggesting that the best way for the committee to learn about Moral Re-Armament's work in industry would be for a member to visit the Industrial Conference part of the World Assembly in Switzerland. I enclosed a printed card which told about it.

APPENDIX NO. 4

Letter from Mr. R. C. Mowat to the Bishop of Colchester.

Royal Naval College,
Greenwich,
S.E.10

15th December, 1953

Dear Bishop,

We look forward to welcoming at 45 Berkeley Square yourself and any of your colleagues on the Working Committee of the Committee of the Church and Industry, whom you would like to bring with you, if you would be good enough to send me their names so that they may be invited.

To help us bring up the right people to meet you, would you send to us the terms of reference to your Committee.

It seems as though the best time to meet would be in the New Year. No doubt this will also suit you better in view of the numerous engagements of the Christmas season.

If this is agreeable to you I will write and suggest some possible dates.

Sir Lynden Macassey, who has had long and wide experience in industry and of trade unions and who knows intimately the whole policy and work of Moral Re-Armament, has promised to act as chairman of the meeting.

With all good wishes for Christmas,

Yours sincerely,

ROBIN MOWAT

APPENDIX NO. 5

Correspondence between the Secretary of the Church Assembly and Mr. R. C. Mowat.

Church Assembly,
Church House,
Dean's Yard,
Westminster, S.W.1.
26th January 1954

Dear Sir,

The Bishop of Colchester who, as I think you know, is Chairman of the sub-committee on Moral Re-Armament which has been set up by the Social and Industrial Council of the Church Assembly, has been in touch with me, as Secretary of the Council, concerning a suggested meeting with you.

His Lordship tells me that he wrote to you on the 19th December last, offering the 27th January as a possible date when he and Canon Hudson might come to Berkeley Square to meet you and other representatives of M.R.A., but that so far he has received no reply to that letter. He wonders whether this may be due to some failure in the Christmas post, but fears perhaps some misunderstanding has arisen.

In the circumstances, I am anxious to know whether, in fact, the Bishop's letter reached you safely, and am writing to you on his behalf in order to enable me, if you could very kindly reply in time, to inform the Council at its meeting on Thursday of this week, whether arrangements could be made at a later convenient date, for a meeting with some representatives of MRA. At the same time I am concerned lest any misunderstanding may have arisen either regarding the arrangements for the proposed meeting, or in connection with the work of this sub-committee, and I shall be very glad to hear from you so that the position may be clarified.

Yours faithfully,

J. A. GULLUM SCOTT

Robin Mowat, Esq.,
The Royal Naval Hospital,
Greenwich

Royal Naval College,
Greenwich, S.E.10.
27th January 1954

The Secretary,
Social and Industrial Council
of the Church Assembly,
(J. A. Guillum Scott, Esq.),
Church House,
Dean's Yard,
Westminster, S.W.1.

Dear Sir,

I have received your letter of the 26th January addressed to me at the Royal Naval Hospital, Greenwich (my proper address is the Royal Naval College), and I think it may be of assistance to you if I recapitulate what is the present position.

At the end of May, 1953, I received a letter from Canon Hudson, as a result of his borrowing my book, *Climax of History*, from Canon Demant. He asked me to appear in September before the Working Party of the Social and Industrial Committee of the Church Assembly to discuss MRA. I was unable to accept, but invited Canon Hudson to meet a few friends associated with MRA at a dinner at 45 Berkeley Square in June which he did. Later Canon Hudson invited me to have lunch with him and the Bishop of Colchester at his Club (the United Universities) on the 11th November, which I accepted. Realising then my own inadequacy to present a rounded picture of Moral Re-Armament, I suggested that the Bishop and the Canon might come one evening to 45 Berkeley Square, where a fuller presentation of Moral Re-Armament could be made.

On the 15th December last I accordingly wrote a letter to the Bishop of Colchester and sent a copy of it to Canon Hudson, and for your information, in case you may not have seen it, I append a copy. I felt that if there was to be any worthwhile discussion with the Working Party, it was desirable it should be completely and accurately informative and impartial, and for that reason it was suggested in my letter that Sir Lynden Macassey, Q.C., who had been Director of shipyard labour, and also President of several of the national wages tribunals, and also an arbitrator in

industrial disputes, and who also has had experience and wide knowledge of the activities of the Oxford Group and of MRA, should preside at the meeting. Also, in order to have a record of the discussion available, not merely for the members of the Working Party, but also which was far more important, for the information of the Social and Industrial Council of the Church Assembly, it was decided to have a verbatim note of the proceedings taken by a shorthand writer of the Supreme Court.

In my letter to the Bishop of the 15th December I also asked him to be good enough to send the terms of reference of the Working Party, which in the letter was called "The Working Committee". This was considered essential by Sir Lynden Macassey if the discussion was to be directed to the points referred to in the terms of reference. It was assumed, of course, that as a matter of ordinary organisation there were some terms of reference.

No reply was received to my letter of the 15th December, and as it was not returned to me I assume it was delivered to his Lordship, and also the copy delivered that was sent to Canon Hudson. As it occurred to me after receiving your letter of the 26th January that the Bishop had, as you have done, addressed a letter to me at the Royal Naval Hospital, Greenwich, I made careful inquiries at the Seamen's Hospital, Greenwich (there is no Royal Naval Hospital), but found that no letter to me had been received at that address. I also made inquiries of the appropriate department of the Admiralty, but there was no record of any such letter.

During a discussion that has taken place in the columns of the *Daily Telegraph* in regard to Moral Re-Armament, it has been observed with very great surprise that two of the Members of the Working Party, namely the Bishop of Colchester and Canon Wickham, were not prepared to await the results of an impartial inquiry into the work of Moral Re-Armament, which those responsible for Moral Re-Armament would have welcomed, but anticipated it by sending to the *Daily Telegraph* which published them, letters launching an attack upon Moral Re-Armament and the whole basis of its work.

I cannot of course anticipate whether the central body of

Moral Re-Armament would think now of appearing before a Committee or a working party which comprises members who have apparently abandoned all attempt at an impartial inquiry into Moral Re-Armament, and have adopted a procedure which is completely incompatible with exercising a judicial judgment, and in no way calculated to provide the Social and Industrial Council or the Assembly itself with reliable evidence about MRA, but I hardly think it likely. That is, however, entirely a matter for the central body of Moral Re-Armament, and their decision could only be ascertained by your writing to them officially to ask whether, notwithstanding the publication of those letters, they would still be prepared to appear before the working party. I understand that no communication of any kind has been received by the central body of Moral Re-Armament from either yourself or any Secretary to or member of the Working Party.

Yours faithfully,

R. C. MOWAT

Church Assembly,
Church House,
Dean's Yard,
Westminster, S.W.1

27th January 1954

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter of today's date. I very much regret that my letter to you was incorrectly addressed, due entirely to the fact that I did not look sufficiently critically at the address which was given me. I hasten to send you this note of apology, but you will not, of course, expect me to answer your letter until after my Council has met tomorrow.

Yours faithfully,

J. A. GUILLUM SCOTT

R. C. Mowat, Esq.
Royal Naval College,
Greenwich, S.E.10.

Appendix 5

Royal Naval College,
Greenwich,
London, S.E.10
28th January 1954.

Dear Mr. Scott,

Thank you very much for your note of yesterday which I much appreciated. In view of the importance of the issues involved, I very much hope that you will read your letter of 26th January together with my reply of yesterday, at today's meeting of the Social and Industrial Council of the Church Assembly.

Yours sincerely,

R. C. MOWAT.

J. A. Guillum Scott, Esq.,
Church Assembly,
Church House,
Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.1.

APPENDIX NO. 6

Appendix 6

Correspondence between Alderman John Moncrieff, Mayor of Folkestone and His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Town Hall,
Folkestone.
14th January, 1954

My dear Archbishop,

A letter, see next page,¹ appeared yesterday in the *Daily Telegraph* which gives me the gravest misgivings and I feel I must bring the matter to your attention.

Some months ago I received an invitation from the Bishop of Colchester to testify before a Working Party of which he was the chairman. The Working Party is a sub-committee of the Social and Industrial Commission of the Church Assembly appointed to produce "An evaluation and critique of the movement known as MRA." I wrote to Canon Hudson, the convener of the Working Party, to ascertain the terms of reference of his committee and to discover what sort of information its members would be likely to require of me. The answers I received were so unsatisfactory that I decided it would not be wise for me to appear before the committee.

¹The Mayor enclosed a copy of Canon Wickham's letter to the *Daily Telegraph*.

I discussed the matter with Canon White-Thomson and told him of my decision.

In the course of the correspondence I was told the names of the members of the Bishop of Colchester's Working Party. I was therefore profoundly disturbed to see that one of the Committee, Canon E. R. Wickham, has written a highly critical letter in yesterday's issue of the *Daily Telegraph* (13th January 1954).

It appears to me utterly improper that while a matter which to many of us is of the greatest importance is *sub judice* in a committee of the Church Assembly, a member of that committee should publicly prejudge the issue in a national newspaper. I can only hope that his lack of impartiality is not shared by other members of the committee.

I would very much value some personal word from you of counsel and reassurance.

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN MONCRIEFF

Mayor

Town Hall,
Folkestone.

22nd January 1954

My dear Archbishop,

I wrote you on the 14th January expressing my concern that a member of a sub-committee of the Social and Industrial Commission of the Church Assembly which was considering a report on the work of Moral Re-Armament should publicly prejudge the issue in a national newspaper. Since then the Chairman himself has written a critical letter to the *Telegraph*.

I knew that the Bishop of Colchester was an opponent of Dr. Buchman's since he told me so at a civic luncheon in Folkestone on 1st April 1953, but now everyone knows.

I feel it would be very desirable for the Church to know more of the work of Moral Re-Armament and I hope that those at the centre of the work will be asked to give full information, but in the meantime I feel that it would be very unfortunate if any kind of report from a "Working Party", some of whose members are clearly in opposition, should reach the popular press.

Appendix 6

You will be interested I am sure to see the enclosed article in today's *Truth* written by a member of the Anglican Church.

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN MONCRIEFF

Lambeth Palace,
S.E.1.

26th January 1954

My dear Mr. Mayor,

You will have got my reply to your earlier letter. In answer to your second letter, may I just underline that no kind of report from this working party will reach the Press or be made public at all. It is an internal affair of the social and industrial commission. Like you I hope that some of those able to speak officially for MRA will consent to meet the working party.

Yours sincerely,

GEOFFREY CANTUAR

His Worship the Mayor of Folkestone,
Town Hall,
Folkestone.

APPENDIX NO. 7

Appendix 7

*A statement by the Metropolitan of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, the Most Rev. Arabindo Nath Mukerjee, 10th March, 1954.*¹

It would appear from letters appearing in the *Daily Telegraph* that some people in England are somewhat confused regarding the basis of Moral Re-Armament's work out here in India. Perhaps they do not write from personal experience either of the work of this movement or of the task of preaching the Kingdom of God in Eastern countries today.

I feel impelled to write because my great predecessor in this office, the late Dr. Foss Westcott, frequently and publicly testified that his close association with MRA meant a deeper experience of Christ's power in his own life and a greater effectiveness in passing on that experience to others.

¹Reprinted from *The Oxford Group and its Work of Moral Re-Armament* (1954).

At this stage of the development of the work of MRA in India, most of those who are giving their whole time to this work, at the sacrifice of salaried jobs and the other normal securities of life, come still from the Western nations, which are professedly Christian. I know at first hand the work of these people and I am convinced that a personal experience of the living Christ and dedication to His service and to the guidance of the Holy Spirit are the inspiration and impetus of their work.

One of the books which is selling widely here is the collected speeches of Dr. Frank Buchman. Anyone who will take the trouble to look through this book can see that the transformation of this world through the power of Christ is the consistent theme of Dr. Buchman's message.

The people of Asian nations have often been critical of the representatives in Asia of Western nations for giving lip-service to the name of Christ while not practising out here the absolute moral standards laid down by Him. Dr. Buchman's visit last year with a team of 200, and the continuing work of MRA since then, have demonstrated these great truths in a way that has transformed some people of extreme Right and Left and roused ordinary citizens from apathy to responsibility.

For my part I welcome MRA as one of the effective instruments of God in the task of saving this world from the disruption and destruction that threaten it.

In conclusion I should add that I am not, have not ever been, and do not intend to be a member of the MRA; but that is no reason why proper appreciation should not be given ungrudgingly to an organisation that is doing a wonderful piece of Christian work among the people of our Land.

ARABINDO CALCUTTA,

Metropolitan

APPENDIX NO. 8

Correspondence between the Secretary of the Church Assembly and the Oxford Group.

Church Assembly,
Church House,
Dean's Yard,
Westminster, S.W.1.

29th January 1954

Dear Sir,

The Social and Industrial Council of the Church Assembly, of which I am Secretary, decided at its meeting yesterday that it would very much like to devote its next meeting, to be held in the afternoon of Thursday, the 20th May, to a friendly and informal consultation with representatives of M.R.A., with particular reference to work in the industrial field.

I was therefore instructed to invite you to nominate two or three representatives who could attend this meeting, and to express the hope that they would be willing to answer some of the questions which are in the minds of those members of the Church of England who are themselves working in the industrial field.

If your Council can accept this invitation, I will, of course, let you have full particulars as to the time and place of the meeting.

Yours faithfully,

J. A. GUILLUM SCOTT

The Secretary,
Moral Re-Armament,
45 Berkeley Square,
W.1.

4 Hay's Mews,
London, W.1.
2nd February 1954

The Secretary,
Social and Industrial Council of the
Church Assembly,
(J. A. Guillum Scott, Esq.)
Church House,
Dean's Yard,
Westminster, S.W.1.

Dear Sir,

I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 29th January, 1954, addressed to me.

I will put this before the next meeting of the Council of Management of The Oxford Group and Moral Re-Armament for their consideration in the light of what has happened.

Yours faithfully,

D. C. GRIMSHAW
Acting Secretary

Oxford Group,
4 Hay's Mews,
London, W.1.
17th February 1954

The Secretary,
Social and Industrial Council of
the Church Assembly,
(J. A. Guillum Scott, Esq.)
Church House, Dean's Yard,
Westminster, S.W.1.

Dear Sir,

The Council of Management of the Oxford Group desire to thank you for your letter of the 29th January, and on behalf of the Group to say in reply that it will welcome an opportunity of attending a meeting with the Social and Industrial Council, on a mutually convenient date, with the object of giving the Council such information as the Group

can give about itself and its work, including its work of MRA. In order to enable the Group to do so, it will be necessary for you to send to the Group in good time before the meeting a list of the exact questions on which the Social and Industrial Council would like to have information. This is essential to enable the Group to decide what information it can give and to obtain, if need be from overseas, the facts and documents which are relevant to the questions, and also to enable the Group to determine what persons it will have to take to the meeting to give first-hand information to the Council.

To avoid any misunderstanding arising at the meeting, the Group will regard the meeting as intended to be an amicable occasion, confined to the purpose of enabling the Group to give to the Council in regard to the questions such information as the Group is able to give, or, having regard to the interests of its world-wide associates, entitled to give. The Group could not regard the meeting being used as an occasion for directing criticisms against the Group and its work, which the Group would be expected then and there to meet. It is fully recognised that the Council, collectively or its members individually, are entitled to form their own opinions and criticisms on and about the Group and its work and its methods of working, and the Group would not presume to suggest any limit on their freedom to do so. The Group, however, entertains the hope that the accurate factual information which the Group will be able to give, or to assist the Council to ascertain for themselves, will dissipate many misconceptions arising from imperfect, inaccurate or hearsay information or misrepresentations, and that any differences which in the end are found to remain are no more than the differences of opinion which prevail *inter se* between different sections of the Christian Church.

The Group would require permission of the Council to bring to the meeting a reliable and competent shorthand writer and it would undertake to provide the Council with a transcript of his verbatim notes. It has been found by the Group in the past that such notes have proved most valuable as forming in the background a source of reference for any later discussions that may arise, and an available corrective of misleading reports and rumours put into circulation, as

has often happened by opponents to the Group, and disseminated from certain foreign Communist countries.

Also, in view of the fact that in certain Church and trade union circles in the North of England a rumour has been put into circulation that a negative report on the work of the Group is about to be published by some committee of the Anglican Church, the Group regards it as most important to safeguard in every possible way the fair and just nature of any procedure before the Social and Industrial Council.

Yours faithfully,

D. C. GRIMSHAW

Acting Secretary, The Oxford Group

Church Assembly,
Church House,
Dean's Yard,
Westminster, S.W.1.
22nd February 1954

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter of 17th February, from which I am sorry to see that what was intended to be no more than an informal discussion has been invested with so much formality in the minds of your Council. If your Council feels that discussions can at present take place on no other basis, it would perhaps be better to defer any meeting for the time being, with the hope that it may be possible to arrange a meeting at a later date.

I would add that so far as the Social and Industrial Council is concerned, the rumours to which you refer have no foundation whatsoever.

Yours faithfully,

J. A. GUILLUM SCOTT

The Acting Secretary,
The Oxford Group,
Four Hay's Mews,
Berkeley Square,
London, W.1.

Oxford Group,
4 Hay's Mews,
London, W.1.
3rd March 1954

The Secretary,
Social and Industrial Council
of the Church Assembly,
Church House,
Dean's Yard,
Westminster, S.W.1.

Dear Sir,

The Council of Management of the Oxford Group desire me to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of your letter of the 22nd February and to say that they regret that their letter of 17th February should be considered as forming a ground for postponing a meeting between representatives of the Group and of the Social and Industrial Council, but naturally have no choice but to accept your decision.

All that their letter asked as preliminaries to the meeting taking place was that the date and the agenda for the meeting should be agreed, which the Council of Management are disposed to regard as an ordinary and necessary preliminary to any meeting, and that for the reasons mentioned in their letter of 17th February they should be furnished with a list of the matters on which the Social and Industrial Council wanted information, assuming in so asking that the Council had already some definite matters in mind.

With a view to trying to assist the Social and Industrial Council, the Council of Management will send to you for distribution to the Social and Industrial Council, copies of a small booklet which gives in summary form very full information about the Oxford Group, its origin, its development, its finance, its fundamental principles and basic methods of work and its international expansion, along with numerous endorsements of the Christian character of its activities from leaders of Christian churches in many countries.

The Council of Management reaffirm that they were always ready and willing to give the Social and Industrial Council all the information possible, but that they were not

willing to a meeting between the Social and Industrial Council and representatives of the Group, who would probably have been drawn from a number of different countries, being extended into a debate on the general principles of the Group.

Yours faithfully,

D. C. GRIMSHAW

Acting Secretary, The Oxford Group

Church Assembly,

Church House,

Dean's Yard,

Westminster, S.W.1

12th March 1954

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter of the 3rd March.

Your letter of the 17th February forms a ground for postponing a meeting between representatives of the Group and the Social and Industrial Council only in so far as it seemed to indicate that your Council was unwilling to accept the invitation extended in my letter of the 29th January to send representatives to meet the Social and Industrial Council, in the afternoon of Thursday, the 20th May, for a friendly and informal consultation. That is the only invitation which I have, at the moment, any authority to extend, and if, as I gather, your Council is unwilling to meet mine on this basis, it will be necessary to postpone any meeting until I can obtain further instructions.

Thank you for your offer to send to me, for the information of my Council, copies of the booklet to which you refer. I should be grateful if you could let me have 24 copies.

Yours faithfully,

J. A. GUILLUM SCOTT

The Acting Secretary,
The Oxford Group,
4 Hays Mews,
Berkeley Square,
London, W.1.

Oxford Group,
4 Hay's Mews,
London, W.1.
27th March 1954

The Secretary,
Social and Industrial Council
of the Church Assembly,
Church House,
Dean's Yard,
Westminster, S.W.1.

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter of the 12th March.

I now have pleasure in sending you twenty-four copies of the booklet to which I referred, for the confidential information of the members of your Council.

Yours faithfully,

D. C. GRIMSHAW
Acting Secretary

Oxford Group,
4 Hay's Mews,
London, W.1.
7th April 1954

The Secretary,
Social and Industrial Council of
the Church Assembly,
Church House,
Dean's Yard,
Westminster, S.W.1.

Dear Sir,

In further answer to your letter of March 12th, the Council of Management of the Oxford Group presume that members of the Social and Industrial Council will by now have received copies of the book, *The Oxford Group and its Work of Moral Re-Armament*, 24 copies of which, the number you suggested, were delivered to you on March 27th. It is hoped that members of your Council will take an early opportunity of reading this book.

As this book contains authentic and attested particulars of the origin, growth and principles of the work of the Oxford Group, it is hoped that the questions, so far undisclosed, which your Council had in mind to put to representatives of the Group have been satisfactorily answered. However, should there still be questions regarding which information is desired by your Council, would you please supply particulars of them. The Council of Management of the Oxford Group are, as they always have been, ready to supply the Social and Industrial Council as far as is practicable with information in answer to their questions, and if you will supply the nature of any questions that your Council still have in mind, the Oxford Group will do their best to answer them.

Yours faithfully,

D. C. GRIMSHAW

Acting Secretary, The Oxford Group

Church Assembly,

Church House,

Dean's Yard,

Westminster, S.W.1.

12th April 1954

Dear Sir,

My Council, at its meeting on Tuesday last, gave careful consideration to the correspondence which has passed between us. They thought that no useful purpose could be served, at this stage, by a discussion on so formal a basis as you proposed in your letter of 17th February 1954.

In the circumstances they feel it would be better to leave over the question of a meeting between themselves and representatives of your Council, for the time being, but they hope that an informal meeting may still be possible at a later date.

Yours faithfully,

J. A. GUILLUM SCOTT

The Acting Secretary,

The Oxford Group,

4 Hays Mews,

Berkeley Square,

London, W.1.

Note: As this statement goes to press, I have received the following letter from the Secretary of the Oxford Group to the Secretary of the Social and Industrial Council. It was written after the Report of the Social and Industrial Council had been issued to the press.

4 Hays Mews,
London, W.1.
28th January 1955.

Dear Sir,

Press inquiries at our office indicate that the report of the Sub-Committee on Moral Re-Armament is to be published this weekend.

It is a surprise to us that the report has been issued to the press before a copy was handed to us. Word has reached us of three persons who have been shown the report by members of the Social and Industrial Council who are issuing it. In two cases this leakage took place at least two weeks ago.

We should be grateful if you would provide the bearer of this letter with six copies of the report or inform him when and where they can be obtained. I have asked him to pay whatever the cost of the documents may be.

Faithfully yours,

ROLAND W. WILSON,
*Secretary of the Council of Management,
The Oxford Group*

J. A. Guillum Scott, Esq.,
Secretary, Social and Industrial Council
of the Church Assembly,
Church House,
Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.1.