

Homefield Torquay - Nov. 14 - 1913.

D.V.P. Yours? No, there is nothing to answer or acknowledge. The following is the verbatim report of the last conference at 1 pm today.

After 2 hrs labour in the drive, carrying dirt about & repairing damage done by flood (the Corporation, after several complaints, said the pipe was choked, & dug a hole and put in a new piece of pipe; quite unnecessary. I think, as it could have been poked clear with a proper tool), O.H. wants his dinner & goes down to fetch it. —

O.H. Ready? M.W. Very nearly - O.H. That piece of steak is very thin. You know I like it thick, to keep it juicy. M.W. That's the last piece. The charwoman wouldn't have it. She had tripe instead. O.H. (dismayed). It was a week ago! Och, well; but you better not call her a woman. They are all ladies now. You should say the washlady, or the charlady. M.W. That reminds me when I was at Antwerp I was quite surprised to hear them say that the washlady had come with the clothes. O.H.

Very well, you can have important it is. They are all ladies, & won't be called women - why, even the nurses call themselves ladies. The nurse-lady, you must say. Ha, ha! M.W. The nurse that was here was no lady [contemptuously]. O.H. Well, you are coming round now! She said she was a lady, & you said she was a lady, & you couldn't put her to do housework because she was a lady. ~~if~~ you were

afraid of her. M.W. And so would you have been if she had attacked you.

O.H. Oh no, I didn't. I ~~would~~ have thrown things at her. No, I couldn't do that. Immovable. Well, I ~~would~~ have called her WOMAN, & ordered her to go, WOMAN.

M.W. She ~~would~~ have killed me, and she ~~would~~ have killed you too if she had

attacked you. O.H. And yet you tried to get me to consent to come up and

massage me. Three times! M.W. Och, but that was before I got to know her.

O.H. And you had to come to me for help to get rid of her. What I wonder at most is how those silly people at T. St got taken in by her. So simple minded! Any person with knowledge of people's character could see through her at once. People who tell you they are ladies, & talk about their important connections, and how they ~~want~~ attend the best families, etc., condemn themselves at once.

M.W. O, they don't understand her a bit at T. St.

[Dinner ends]. In afternoon, signs of ptomaine poisoning, & nature's revolt against the same!]

From which you will see that M.W. has revolted against the T. St corporation who expect her mind so. But there is a good lot of vinegar left. I am evaporating it by steadily adding to the Kitchen range -

It makes the kitchen the most comfortable room in the house, from 10 am to midnight. But it is troublesome to manage to keep going so as to warm the house as well, which is what I want particularly, & M.W. thinks it. But by perseverance in good example, & its comfortable results, I hope to get her to do it regularly. The radiator is just outside her bedroom, so she can have it warm without the gas fire, unless it is cold weather. Coal is cheaper than gas, by far. In front I shall go down at midnight and stoke. Then warm air comes up to my "apartments", so I hope to save  $\frac{1}{2}$  on every ton of coal burnt up in the kitchen!

But she is like the people of Gotham, who tried to drown eels in a pond, & did other silly things. I have to be continually circumventing her tricks. She shuts the door next the radiator, & opens the window wide! And then complains that the room is damp. Of course, it is practically out of doors, then I shut the window and open the door, understanding that if you can. Lots of things like that. No use explaining things to her by the reason why. It only makes her wiser & come out. But by persistently doing the right thing patiently, she becomes more tractable.

What an awful lot of rot there has been in the papers about the Father of Wiles, as a friend of yours calls him. There isn't a single one that tells the real truth about him, not even S.P.T. in Nature, & he knows something of the wily man's impudence and greediness. The ABCs given of the discovery of wireless by the wily man are mostly all wrong. Firstly, he didn't discover it. Secondly, it wasn't wireless telegraphy at all, save by misuse of language. As for the KR Law, they don't mention that. He stole it first. I set a trap for him, & he fell in, as I expected. No one else could have been so silly as to be caught by what I said. I had the pleasure for years in pointing out the absurdity of this KR law, as interpreted by him, & showing him up as a fool as well as a cheat <sup>the of course I never said he took it</sup>, & sharing his up as a fool as well as a cheat <sup>and they say nothing about</sup>, his views on telephony, & my exposure of him and his determined opposition to my theory, & ridicule of my "loaded system", which, when done by Pupin in America, he (and Kempf also) declared had nothing to do with me! That was the real man - greedy, and perfectly unscrupulous. An impudent imposter in short.

Why should I have set a trap for him? Because I knew he was a thief already, in the matter of the Wiles discovery. A.W.H. was very sore about it. He had made the excepts, under my scientific advice (save the first lot), & wanted <sup>which he initiated, not P.</sup>

3.

to write a paper about them, and P. would let him. I babbled him instead, and went to the B.A. and read a paper <sup>himself</sup> & got great K.-S., so less a man than Sir W.T. describing it as of great importance & interest. That was why. Not very long after, a year or so, A.W.H. got permission to write a paper on his Telephone Exchange. I was joint author, & it was a very heavy piece of work. I put <sup>in</sup> my Appendices my Telephones Theory, etc, in great opposition to P.'s views, but I took care not to send them in along with ~~the~~ the main paper, knowing that P. would scratch if he could, & reject the paper. But there was some 20 pages or so of mine in the main paper, & P. ordered it all to be left out. There was nothing personal to him in it though. I protested. P. was not the Council, and had no right to interfere. The paper did go to the Council. But it never did, & P. later had the audacity to say that there was never any paper at all. At the time, he said that he declined to pass the paper in his capacity of electrician, scientific man, & member of council. That claim to be a scientific man was the starting point of the eminent scientist. ~~The~~ I was much hampered by my brother's coming in, & submission to P. It was a great mistake, & he paid for it later. He ~~cd~~ have appealed to the Secretary. As for the KR law of Peacock, which he sent to the R.S. Proceedings, it came about just this way. My brother's circuits were a mixture of underground copper & iron suspended wires, & he asked me how to calculate so as to compare different lengths. I explained there ~~cd~~ not be any simple rule. Thomson's law of the squares didn't apply. But as the wires were mostly of high resistance, I gave him this rough rule. Add together all the resistances, say R. Add together all the capacities, say S. The product RS would represent the "Retardation" to first approx.; to take place of W.T. in  $c k l^2$ . But I was careful to point out limitations, & that it would not apply at all to copper wires of low resistance & little capacity. A.W.H. sent this to P., & he got two things, the "KR law", and that copper wire was a panacea for retardation. I sent paper to R.S. in which the "KR Law" was made universal. He also went in for copper wire. Now in the rejected paper referred to ~~as~~ somewhat I repeated my remarks. So P.

The wily man knew all along that I was the authority on the subject, & so felt quite sure that he would be right in sticking up for the KR law, and also for the merits of copper, although he didn't know the real reason! He attributed it to the absence of self-induction (?) That was a trap of his own making. <sup>Paper at the B.A. again. & then</sup> He tried to teach him that it was caused by self induction itself, in a special article, which was refused by several journals, (one of wh. sent it to P. himself.) At the same time the Edu left off printing my regular articles, <sup>disliking him any more.</sup> Kemp's Journal not merely refused my criticism of P., but actually published a very rude attack upon me, to keep <sup>on</sup> attacking me for years after (<sup>15 or 20</sup>, perhaps more, but I never said it now). I sent it to S.T.E., but the Sec. (a relation of P's) wouldn't take it. I asked the Ed. of the Edu plainly whether there was anything objectionable in style in the paper - why did he refuse it? But he said No, there were "other considerations". Either they believed in P., and that I was cracked, or else they were afraid of him.

Now altho heaps of details have been omitted, <sup>you can easily guess</sup> in his bounding career that it was a matter of self-interest and pride with P. that he should ridicule any theory, & try to bolster up his KR law, & deny that there was any paper, and oppose the "Loading" of lines. For he knew that I knew he was a humbug & a thief! And that I would expose him if he gave me a chance. I have heard that he took refuge in slander, but I mustn't say who told me. Not even Sir W.T.'s support of my views on self-ind. would change his attitude. The rest of his life was spent in boasting to newspaper men & others about what he had done. He turned agt Lord Kelvin for supporting me. I once saw a letter he had written in wh. he denied all credit to W.T. for the Atl. cable affair! <sup>He said</sup> W.T. only did one thing, & that was a failure. It was Faraday, & one or two others, who did everything worth mentioning. When W.T. saw that letter he said "I do really believe that Preece is influencing the Editors adversely to Mariside". I had said so to others, but as usual, won't believe. He did his utmost to crush me, stopping every avenue of publication, calumniating & slandering me, and scarcely

everybody seemed to be in league with him, passively at any rate. But at last it ended, when he was disengaged, & the P.O. took up loading coils with immediate success.

Even Lord R. was set against me, as I saw in a report of his sayings about me at the Roy. Inst. <sup>If always</sup> He exaggerated so, and had such absurd animosity against H., and the Post Office, & Cartierian <sup>anglophiles</sup>. If not the word that was the general sense of it, and showed that he had been betrayed by me in the "Post Office" affair. I didn't understand it, or believe any complaints were justified. Conservation was account for the rest.

He must have been a very clever man though, to be able to impose upon people so. At the Socy of Authors, when he was their guest, they sang a song in his honour "All hail to the Father of Warren, etc." I don't remember the exact words. Even my brother A. W. H. was for P. at one time, in spite of his strong ground of Complaints. I ~~suggested~~ P. had done ~~or~~ would do a certain thing, but he was indignant. "Why, P. is a gentleman!" he replied. I was right, though. Perhaps I have a special faculty for the discovery of Rogues. I have to pay for it in finding myself entirely unbelieved, at first; & no thanks at any time! For such is the nature of things. He who imposes evil which others cannot see is considered to be the offender! Always was so, I expect.

<sup>or went</sup> Nothing has come from Burton's intercession with Lodge & Raleigh, which was somehow drifted into. Though I never meant it at first. I don't know any details, but can only conclude that to get the R.S. to reverse its decision is considered too absurd to consider. At any rate it is ~~too~~ premature. Things are as you was.

In some former letter I told you about my fight with the Inc. tax people, & how I had beaten them, & that I consider their ways very dishonest, & that lots of people were taken in. Well, just now are some letters in the D.T. about it. One says <sup>he has been</sup> he has been done out of £500, through the demand that he sh<sup>d</sup> pay <sup>tax</sup> on the interest on back loans, and another that he rec'd consulting letters from the Commissioners. & didn't get any return of the tax paid. Well, I went further than that!

I w<sup>n</sup>t pay the tax at all. It is iniquitous to charge it. It is a tax on the Bank's income, <sup>make the borrower</sup> not on the borrower. The bank always pays it. And the Inc. tax people pay it as well. I was twice over served with notice of distress, as you very likely don't remember. I shd like some persistent & persevering M.P. to move for a return for the last 10 years of all the money paid as tax on borrowed money from banks, & how much was returned eventually. The difference w<sup>d</sup> be millions I shd say. There w<sup>d</sup> be all sorts of obstacles put in the way. If the inform<sup>n</sup> was off, there w<sup>d</sup> come a further question, What steps are the Govt going to take to return the twice paid tax? What has the Govt done with the money under what law are they entitled to charge two people for one & the same tax, & keep the money till it is forced out of them (only within 3 years even then). Neither is the bank entitled to charge the borrower the tax on the portion of the bank's income derived from the borrower. I don't know any bank does that, but it seems to be implied in one of the letters - If the bank lends £5000 on security, at 5%, it charges every six months £25 to the customer, or £50 a year; that is part of the bank's income, & pay the tax on the £50 to the Govt.

I believe the origin of the tax to the borrower was merely a check upon the bank<sup>or lender</sup> <sup>letter</sup> "we will get the money somehow". And then the Inc. tax people found it was very profitable. But the most aggravating thing about the Inc. tax is the impudent intrusion into people's private affairs. As Gladstone said, It makes a nation of liars. It does indeed. It used to be a war tax. Gladstone promised to abolish it in time of peace. He didn't. It has become permanent, & bigger & bigger. It seems fair in theory, & especially so if the rich pay a larger percentage than the poor, by graduation; but the fundamental inequality remains, or is made worse.

Gladstone's finance was very good on the whole. He abolished a very large number of small taxes. But one improvement he made was a curse. Grocer's license to sell wine & spirits! The result has been to produce an enormous amount of secret drinking by ladies who w<sup>d</sup> never have dared to go to a pub. The grocers encourage it. It is so profitable. And a further result has been that women who w<sup>d</sup> have been ashamed to be seen in a pub before, are not so now. That comes of lowering the standard

7.

An argument agt. raising the duties on alcoholic liquors used by some temperance reforming people is that it is making money out of vice - Engaging in the traffic.

It seems to me a very unsound argument. People shd be made to pay heavily for their darling sins. That is the best discouragement they can have, & it brings some good out of the evil of the drink traffic. The abolition of the drink taxes wd cause enormous evils. Drunkards in every street all over the place, neglect of work, lower wages, as penitent as churches, general degeneration of the race. To rob a poor man of his beer is the proper way to reduce the horrible waste of money on beer amongst the working classes. John Burns knows the working classes intimately, & is not afraid to tell in their faults, drink, betting, etc.

How ~~less~~ <sup>less</sup> ends some of the mischief caused by the Due-tax? Do it by instalments. Raise the limit from 160 to 200 first, & put the loss of revenue on the drink. Also raise the rich man tax. Then after a few years, do the trick again! And so on, until the due-tax is derived solely from the minority of rich people, those who cant enter heaven on account of the wealth. Then the great majority wd have to be a "nation of liars" in Gladstone's sense.

A further improvement is suggested. A tax on church & chapel goers, to be collected at the door by the Officials. For to go to church is a confession of wickedness & therefore of liability to the tax. No good people need go the church. Dont you see? And then consider the result. People wd leave off going to church, & would tend to become good. It wd take time, of course. Needs repute first boniment. Yr

ale, Oliver Hearside.

The Sugar tax shd ~~be~~ <sup>go</sup>. Sugar is a most valuable food, especially for the children of the poor. Chancellor of the Exchequer always excede themselves unscrupulously in saying they dont know how to raise the money lost by abolishing the tax on sugar. Thats rubbish. They can always get money when they want it.