

1931/13.1.74

My dear Mr. Woolf,

Many thanks for your letter - I wrote to Sir Bernard to day - and I placed the case against the person who libelled me in the hands of a celebrated conservative lawyer of London. I am sure I. R. & I. way made a wit's paw, by "Sir little" or that crafty statesman and historian Gingham. The very names themselves suggest the work in life of these fellows! - I am very liberal in my abstract view, but I confess that one sometimes meets at clubs, most insufferable "snobs", and the tone of "Freemason", supported by a certain clique (y very injurious to the reputation of the craft - Mr. Parker and two others are the only sensible correspondents is he - "Lupus" writes like a gentleman - but the majority are wretched illiberal underlings, who abuse each other with puerilities, which they mistake for wisdom and research. Of course this opinion of mine, is not against the craft, but against some of those whom it cannot avoid harbouring.

Masonry would be much better if there
were some discipline - but that is
impossible - It is neutral ground,
where, as in Swendenborg's vision
of another world, good and base
spirits commingle for a while!
It was very fortunate the attack
made against me; or rather against
Sir B. Burke, in Nov. by a Mr.
James Crossley, an relative to James
Crossley of this town (the F.S.A.), because
I have had the opportunity to
correct the blunders of Sir B.
now in his perusal and at the
same time to defend him - I have
had proofs of the article, though
it will be inserted in Saturday's No. of
There will be also in the Free-
masons' Magazine the concluding
part of my article - I intend
to publish it as a separate pamphlet
in green style for article
in question everywhere with

The following suspicion -
The Imperial Libel Commission Order
of 1891 - A review of modern
impunity - and a sketch of its
"history" - Is such a title
"reasonable"? - Even if it is
not, it is not, because it
is not by law, from which I
shall have a better opportunity
than degrading myself to some
shopkeeper's or the reader's
The newspapers are, my identity
revive, myself -
I. H. H. letter is not libel, I am
easily deceived, for it contains the
essential elements of libel, viz -
intentional malice, without
malice, and a desire to degrade
either in the world's estimation
and so damage his credit which is
as much a loss as any other -
If it is no libel, how
can Lord Selton be suffering

damage - his wife being innocent
clearly damage intended to a
reputation of the same as any
other - But of course you know best
I leave you to remain with
sincerest regard and esteem

My dear Mr. Wood
Yours faithfully & fervently
A. H. Dromarkis

28 July 1874
Bank House
New Number 12