

**THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION 1914-1945**

THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION 1914-1945

By

GIJSBERT GERRIT JACOB DEN BOGGENDE

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1986)  
(History)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY  
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Fellowship of Reconciliation 1914-1945

AUTHOR: Gijsbert Gerrit Jacob den Boggende

SUPERVISOR: Dr. R. E. Rempel

NUMBER OF PAGES: xi, 646

## **ABSTRACT**

The present study is an attempt to describe and explain the institutional history and intellectual discussions of the Fellowship of Reconciliation in Britain during the period 1914-1945. Since its inception on December 31, 1914, the FOR has commonly been described by historians and other authors as an interdenominational Christian pacifist organization. Yet, the establishment and maintenance of peace was not the ultimate aim of the founding members. What they envisioned was the establishment of the Kingdom of God. Peace, they argued, would be an indubitable consequence of the Kingdom. However, FOR members often did not agree with one another about the method by which the Kingdom could be inaugurated. During the period discussed in this thesis, the FOR gradually narrowed its focus. From striving to achieve the Kingdom of God, which encompassed all aspects of life, the Fellowship shifted its attention to what are generally regarded as matters pertaining primarily to pacifism. By the advent of World War II, however, the wider perception of the FOR's mission had been reasserted by many members.

This pendular movement is described in the four parts of the thesis. Part I looks at the matrix out of which the FOR grew, the gestation period, the nature of the envisaged Kingdom, the growth and the activities of the Fellowship until the end of World War I. Part II, covering the period 1919-1929, surveys the FOR's internal struggles, the



changing theological climate and the Fellowship's attempts, however unsuccessful, at creating a new society. During the 1930s, described in Part III, the FOR was largely a single issue interdenominational Christian pacifist organization, providing the churches and other pacifist organizations with a vast amount of literature on pacifism. During the second world war, discussed in Part IV, the FOR entered a new phase which yet invites comparison to 1914. The publications and activities, especially those of the second half of the war, readily recall the original FOR vision.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The ideas expressed in this thesis began to take shape while doing research at Swarthmore College Peace Collection in the fall of 1983. The help of the SCPC library staff made it much easier to take the first uncertain steps towards the completion of this thesis. Further thanks are due to the staffs in London of Friends House Library, the British Library of Political and Economic Science, Lambeth Palace Library, and the British Library; the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth, and the Bodleian Library, Oxford. The relatives of the late Dr. Cecil John Cadoux permitted me to use extracts from his papers. Furthermore, Rev. Hamish Walker, FOR general secretary, Chris Gwyntopher, secretary of the London Union, and Rev. Sydney Hinkes, honorary secretary of the APF, gave in their own special ways encouragement. Drs. Cassels and Beame made many useful suggestions concerning style and organization; the former even read the entire manuscript twice. That the thesis is still lengthy is not their fault. Finally, I wish to thank my supervisor, Dr. Rempel, who, in spite of health problems, was still able to guide me in his usual kind way.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFOR	American Fellowship of Reconciliation
APF	Anglican Pacifist Fellowship
BFI	British Federation of Industry
BP	Bell Papers
BPF	Baptist Pacifist Fellowship
CBCO	Central Board for Conscientious Objectors
CCPG	Council of Christian Pacifist Groups
CJC	C. J. Cadoux
C.O.	conscientious objector
COPEC	Conference on Politics, Economics & Citizenship
CPC	Christian Pacifist Crusade
CPFLU	Christian Pacifist Forestry and Land Units
DORA	Defence of the Realm Act
EO	Embassies of Reconciliation
FAU	Friends' Ambulance Unit
FFMA	Friends Foreign Mission Association
FOR	Fellowship of Reconciliation
GD	George Davies
HTH	Henry T. Hodgkin
IFOR	International Fellowship of Reconciliation
ILP	Independent Labour Party
JAB	Joint Advisory Board
JAC	Joint Advisory Committee
LL	George Lansbury
LNU	League of Nations Union
MPF	Methodist Peace Fellowship
MTCI	Movement Towards a Christian International
NCC	Non-Combatant Corps
NCF	No Conscription Fellowship
NCCL	National Council for Civil Liberties
NFCC	National Free Church Council
NMWM	No More War Movement
NPC	National Peace Council
PPU	Peace Pledge Union
PSU	Pacifist Service Unit/Corps
RAMC	Royal Army Medical Corps
RR	Richard Roberts
SCM	Student Christian Movement
SCPC	Swarthmore College Peace Collection
SFCF	Swanwich Free Church Fellowship

SOR	Reginald William Sorensen
SQS	Socialist Quaker Society
SVMU	Student Volunteer Missionary Union
TUC	Trades Union Congress
UDC	Union of Democratic Control
WEA	Workers Educational Association
WILPF	Women's International League for Peace of Freedom
WRI	War Resisters International
YMCA	Young Man's Christian Association

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	1
ENDNOTES	12
 <b>PART I</b>	
THE FOR AND WORLD WAR I	13
 CHAPTER 1	
THE EDWARDIAN PROLOGUE	15
ENDNOTES	23
 CHAPTER 2	
THE ANTECEDENTS OF THE FOR	26
ENDNOTES	45
 CHAPTER 3	
A VISION IN THE MAKING: AUGUST-DECEMBER 1914	52
ENDNOTES	81
 CHAPTER 4	
A VISION: THE KINGDOM OF GOD	92
The Kingdom of God: Atonement and Personality	95
The Kingdom of God: War and Peace	104
The Kingdom of God: The Church	109
The Kingdom of God: The State	116
The Kingdom of God: The Socio-Economic System	125
ENDNOTES	133
 CHAPTER 5	
RESTRICTED ACTIVITY 1915-1918 I.	149
The FOR and the Churches	153
Popular Suspicion and the Government's Opposition to the FOR	159
The Growth of the FOR in 1915	167
Office Changes and Summary for 1915	175
ENDNOTES	178

## CHAPTER 6

RESTRICTED ACTIVITY 1915-1918 II.	188
Conscientious Objection	188
The Function and Future of the FOR	198
The Activities	201
Office "Changes" and Summary	211
ENDNOTES	216

## PART II

THE 1920'S: THE DECADE OF GRADUAL CHANGE	226
--	-----

## CHAPTER 7

THE FOR IN THE 1920'S	228
ENDNOTES	246

## CHAPTER 8

THE FOR AND RECONSTRUCTION: THE RELIGIOUS THEOLOGICAL ASPECTS	253
ENDNOTES	272

## CHAPTER 9

THE FOR'S VISION IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD: THE INTERNATIONAL SPHERE	277
The IFOR	277
The League of Nations	282
Ireland	288
China and India	294
ENDNOTES	300

## CHAPTER 10

THE FOR AND RECONSTRUCTION: SOCIO-ECONOMIC-POLITICAL ASPECTS	309
Of C.O.s and Children's Relief	311
Education	313
Political Reconstruction: Practice and Theory	319
Of Socialism, a Social Program and the 1926 General Strike	323
Three Experiments	332
ENDNOTES	341

### **PART III**

THE 1930S: THE DECADE OF PACIFISM AND GROWTH	353
--	-----

#### **CHAPTER 11**

THE "CHRIST AND PEACE" CAMPAIGN AND DISARMAMENT, 1929-1934	356
--	-----

The "Christ and Peace" Campaign	356
Disarmament	367
ENDNOTES	382

#### **CHAPTER 12**

CONTINUITY AND SHIFTS UP TO 1935	392
----------------------------------	-----

The FOR and the Economic Dilemma	396
The FOR and the U.S.S.R.	402
The FOR and Ecumenism	406
ENDNOTES	412

#### **CHAPTER 13**

A PERIOD OF RAPID GROWTH 1935 - 1939	418
--------------------------------------	-----

The Christian Pacifist Party	424
1935: Temple and the FOR	428
The Embassies of Reconciliation	433
ENDNOTES	446

#### **CHAPTER 14**

THE THEOLOGICAL-PHILOSOPHICAL SHIFT	455
-------------------------------------	-----

Four Examples	457
War and Pacifism	464
1. The Historical Approach	467
2. The Biblical Approach	468
3. The Theological Approach	470
4. The Evolutionary Approach	478
5. The Utilitarian Approach	480
6. The Causitive Approach	482
ENDNOTES	487

### **PART IV**

WORLD WAR I REVISITED	500
-----------------------	-----

CHAPTER 15	
WORLD WAR TWO: THE FOR'S GROWTH AND ACTIVITIES	503
Conscription and C.O.s	510
Four Relief Activities	515
ENDNOTES	521
CHAPTER 16	
THEOLOGICAL DEBATES AND CONTRIBUTIONS	528
Reinhold Niebuhr and the FOR	529
Cadoux Re-examines Pacifism	534
Other Contributions	542
ENDNOTES	547
CHAPTER 17	
THE FOR'S PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGNS	554
The Literature Sub-Committee and External Propaganda	554
ENDNOTES	583
EPILOGUE	591
ENDNOTES	597
CONCLUSIONS	598
ENDNOTES	604
APPENDIX I - "The Basis"	605
APPENDIX II - Papers for Wartime	606
APPENDIX III - The Christian Revolution Series	606
APPENDIX IV - FOR New Series Pamphlets	607
APPENDIX V - Significant Church and FOR Conferences	608
BIBLIOGRAPHY	609



## **PREFACE**

No one has expressly examined the origins, bases and developments of the Fellowship of Reconciliation for the period 1914-1945. This neglect is all the more remarkable since the FOR became the largest British Christian inter-denominational organization concerned with pacifism. Admittedly, such scholars as Peter Brock, Martin Ceadel and David Martin have incorporated the FOR in their general treatment of pacifism.<sup>1</sup> However, their emphasis has fallen on the institutional approach. Without questioning the validity and value of such an approach, it is an incomplete method for a full understanding of the FOR. The current interpretation is that the FOR was and is exclusively a pacifist organization. This thesis attempts to show that the FOR was much more than simply a pacifist organization. At the heart of the FOR's concern was the Kingdom of God. This concept implied that all aspects of life needed to be scrutinized in order to see how these aspects contributed to or distracted from the inauguration of this Kingdom. FOR literature, therefore, abounds with discussions on the role and place of the state, on education, on rehabilitation of young offenders, on the abolition of capital punishment, on justice, on labour relationships, on property, not to mention biblical and theological arguments about pacifism. Brock, Ceadel and Martin ignored this notion of the Kingdom of God on earth. They defined pacifism only in

relationship to war. Such a narrow interpretation of pacifism is inadequate for the FOR, since it misses the key to a full understanding of the Fellowship. Pacifism, as understood by most FOR members, was an integral part of a holistic world and life view, not an addendum. Even so, FOR members differed among themselves about various aspects of the Kingdom of God or about the way it could or would be implemented. Some thought that they themselves could usher in the Kingdom, while others saw the coming of the Kingdom as a gift from God. There was only general agreement about the notion that war was a serious obstacle in the attainment of God's Kingdom. The thesis attempts to show the rich variety of views both of the leaders and of the rank and file. This variety not only helps to explain the pendular nature of their history and the strength and weakness of the FOR, but also demonstrates the tension between the Fellowship and the individual. The different roads FOR members travelled account for the developments of the Fellowship. Positions taken during the first world war were later refined or even abandoned. Biblical and theological presuppositions were constantly being challenged. A number of interesting activities received only limited support. The FOR's world and life view made it impossible for the Fellowship to be a single issue organization. Although pacifism was a key element, it was secondary to the achievement of the Kingdom of God. Pacifism was a consequence of a particular understanding of the Kingdom. Pacifism in this context was the antithesis of passivism. Rather, it denoted a whole way of life with significant consequences for every sphere of life. The divergence of views and the fluctuating

movement of the FOR are reflected in the four parts in which this thesis is divided. Part I describes what may be called the FOR's full-orbed pacifism during the first world war. In the 1920's, as Part II shows, the FOR attempted to reconstruct society in accordance with the biblical ideas developed during the conflict. Organizational turmoil and financial difficulties seriously hampered the few attempts which were undertaken. These problems contributed to the changing nature of the FOR. Gradually the FOR shifted its focus, as Part III illustrates, to pacifism alone. A key role in this transformation was played by the Christ and Peace Campaign of 1929-1931. Although the earlier world and life view was never forgotten, it was the new image which entered the secondary literature and was held valid for the FOR since its inception. Actually, as Part IV suggests, the earlier view resurfaced during the second world war. In spite of the many differences between the FOR of World War I and of World War II, the final period can be viewed with some justice as World War I revisited.

Modern scholarship has ignored this pendular movement and has treated the FOR as essentially a pacifist, monolithic and quietist organization whose theory remained constant. Instead of engaging in a running debate with the secondary sources in the body of the thesis, it seems more useful to point out here some specific methodological problems with two representative books by Ceadel and Martin. In spite of its significant contribution to the historiography of pacifism, Ceadel's Pacifism in Britain 1914-1945: The Defining of a Faith

contained two general weaknesses. In the first place, Ceadel concentrated on the institutional approach, the inadequacy of which has been suggested above. The book's second weakness, comparable to that of other historians of pacifism, is what may be called a chronic problem of nomenclature. Ceadel suggested the usage of "pacifist" and "pacificist", terms he borrowed from A. J. P. Taylor's The Trouble Makers.<sup>2</sup> But such a division is too simplistic and too static to do justice to the great variety of views within and the dynamic development of the FOR. First of all, many in the FOR used both terms in the early period indiscriminately.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, most people have pacifist tendencies and they would basically all fall in the pacificist category, thus, arguably, making the term meaningless. A small group could possibly be classified as warmongers or lovers of fighting, while another small group could fit the pacifist category. Yet within this pacifist category there existed a great variety of views, as the history of the FOR attests. Some FOR members refused all state directions related to warfare, other members accepted alternative work unrelated to war activities, while still others volunteered their services in such organizations as the Friends Ambulance Unit (FAU) and Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA). In the 1930s the situation became even more complex with the influx of Anglicans who adhered to a just war theory. According to Ceadel's nomenclature these should be classified as pacificists, yet in practice they were pacifist because they thought that the criteria of a just war could never be fulfilled in a modern war. Essentially canon Charles Raven, FOR chairman between

1933 and 1945, belonged in this category, for he could still justify some type of war between a civilized nation and some barbarous, raiding border tribes. Perhaps Henry Hodgkin, the first FOR chairman, tended to think in that direction when he was in China in the 1920's. This particular nomenclature is too simplified to do justice to the great differences hidden behind and the subtleties within the word pacifism. Ceadel himself seems to have realized its inadequacy, for he introduced another pair of words, which embodied "a distinction vital to the analysis of pacifism: that between its inspiration or basis; and its orientation or attitude towards society and the problem of war prevention." Ceadel distinguished three types of inspiration, namely, the religious, the political and the humanitarian, as well as three types of orientation, namely, the sectarian, the collaborative and the non-violent.<sup>4</sup> As will become apparent in this thesis, the FOR members' inward disposition determined the variety of their outward action. Yet, as also will become apparent, the types Ceadel suggested were often inextricably bound together in the FOR, rather than representing the separate types of Ceadel's treatment. Within the FOR it was often a question of emphasis, not of strict delineation. This mixture of types within one organization helps to explain the divergence of opinion, the tensions and the changing nature of the Fellowship. In regard to Ceadel's orientation typology more will be said in the discussion of Martin's book.

In Pacifism David A. Martin approached pacifism sociologically, using Ernst Troeltsch and Max Weber to arrive at his

basic categories. As he stated in his introduction, "Clearly pacifism belongs to sectarian rather than ecclesiastical religion, and must be associated with religions which reject the world in some degree."<sup>5</sup>

Theologically the distinction between church and sect is not so clear as Martin suggested. The Greek word αἵρεσις(hairesis) occurs nine times in the New Testament. It could be translated by heresy or sect. The evidence suggests that groups of people formed factions within the larger body. Such factionalism is clearly manifested in Paul's letters to the Corinthian church. These groups emphasized one particular aspect often at the cost of other parts of doctrine. Usually the item emphasized was ignored or downplayed by the rest of the church. When these factions left the church they impoverished the whole church, because something of the corrective nature to the entire body was lost. Often these factions felt themselves to be the real church, for they did not drop the rest of the doctrines but downgraded them to make place for what was regarded as the major issue or issues. Theologically it is, therefore, not necessarily wrong to have sects within the church. Put differently, the sect has always something of the nature of the church, and the church has always something of the nature of the sect.

Scripture nowhere and the churches never have declared pacifism a heresy. As C. J. Cadoux, FOR chairman between 1927 and 1933, has shown, pacifism was the accepted doctrine of the early church.<sup>6</sup> So historically Martin is wrong to associate pacifism only with sectarianism, even if one momentarily accepts his own terminology.

The second point which Martin made was that pacifism belonged to religions which rejected "the world in some degree". Martin's terminology is here very confusing. By its very nature a religion rejects something of what is available in the world. If Martin means by the "world" the physical environment, then the FOR members are no different from, for example, Anglicans or Calvinists. It should be stated unequivocally that the FOR did not reject the physical environment. Only if "world" means methods and ideologies contrary to Scripture would Martin be able to apply his statement to the FOR. But then he would have to apply "world" to the whole church, because the church is always in the world but not of it (see John 17). Martin's starting point is therefore totally at variance with the FOR and confuses rather than helps understand the basic nature of the Fellowship.

Having said all this, the question still needs to be answered: "Did the FOR overemphasize one aspect of theology at the cost of others?" In order to answer this question use is made of an article by the American theologian H. Richard Niebuhr. In "The Doctrine of the Trinity and the Unity of the Church" Niebuhr argued that certain groups focussed exclusively on one of the persons of the Trinity.<sup>7</sup> Although Niebuhr separated the groups too sharply, it seems fair to say, for example, that Calvinists emphasized the Father, "the first cause and grand designer"; that modernists generally proclaimed a Jesus-centered ethics; and that Pentecostals stressed the work of the Holy Spirit. Broadly speaking, the FOR's emphasis on the "imitatio Christi" could

make the Fellowship "Second Person Unitarians". The many references to St. Francis in FOR literature should, therefore, be no surprise. It would be wrong, however, to suggest that FOR members were exclusively "Jesus people". For example, many FOR prayers were not "dear Jesus" prayers but were directed to the Father, although often in a vague, somewhat abstract way. The FOR's interest in the problem of justice easily parallels the Presbyterian's emphasis on the Law. Many FOR members did not derive their pacifism exclusively from Jesus, which may help explain the pull to one of the other Persons of the Trinity. The Inner Light of the Quakers predisposed them to the Third Person. One of the earliest books by Raven was The Creator Spirit (1927). There were frequent references in FOR literature to μετάνοια , (metanoia), the renewal of the mind. These examples should suffice to indicate that it would be too facile a solution to categorize the FOR as overemphasizing the Second Person in the Trinity. Perhaps Rev. George MacLeod's 1964 Alex Wood Memorial Lecture "The New Humanity Now" showed best the attempt to find a proper balance between the Three Persons of the Trinity. Borrowing from the Russian Christian existentialist N.A. Berdyaev (1874-1948), MacLeod saw the Age of the Spirit (today) as the first mark of the new humanity. But in order to be "respectful to both its parents" MacLeod called for a return to the Age of the Father (the first three centuries) and to the Age of the Son (the period of Christendom).<sup>8</sup>

From this short discussion it is evident that in the general theological outline the FOR differed little from other theologies. The



emphasis was on Jesus but not at the cost of ignoring the other two Persons of the Trinity. The point is important because pacifism according to the FOR was not a separate entity within theology but was an integral part of it. In Raven's words, there was no pacifist theology, only Christian theology. To treat the FOR therefore as a purely pacifist organization, that is, as a single-issue organization, is to miss the mark completely.

If the approaches and definitions of Ceadel and Martin do not do full justice to the FOR, does this thesis then provide another approach? The methodology followed in this thesis is founded on two premises. Firstly, the FOR had to function in a society in which Christianity became increasingly marginalized. The Fellowship, meanwhile, attempted to make Christianity more relevant. Like the late Victorian Nonconformists and Anglicans, the FOR interacted with innumerable aspects of society. In addition to functioning within the general context of British history, the FOR, as a Christian organization which normally couched its message in religious terminology, should specifically be related to religious developments. Secondly, statements by FOR members have been used to interpret and criticize statements of other members. In this way the enormous complexity and development of the FOR are best exemplified. It is a method which, by revealing diversity, avoids treating the Fellowship as the monolithic organization portrayed in the existing secondary literature. It requires some subtlety to appreciate the sometimes minor differences in one area in

order to understand the major differences in another sphere. These differences, however, were not sufficient to break apart the organization. Rather, they constituted what may be called a harmonious tension. In addition, this approach helps the thesis to divide naturally into the four parts described above. Strict chronological divisions have frequently an enforced character, tending to diminish the significance of continuity. Nevertheless, a chronological division is used here because new influences and thoughts in particular periods contributed to a changing nature of the FOR. Furthermore, chronology allows for an examination of the roots of the Fellowship which reached down to the "Nonconformist conscience", Christian socialism and nineteenth century pacifism. Within the four parts attention to the chronological development has been adhered to as much as possible. Theological discussions, however, have a tendency to deal with abstractions. The discussions in the FOR were generally concerned with principles rather than with concrete events. The FOR had concluded that war was incompatible with the words and actions of Jesus. To use just war theory terminology, the FOR focussed on the jus ad bellum. The events and justice in war (jus in bello) were less important because particular events did not prove or disprove the principle that war was morally wrong. Consequently, commentary on those particular events was limited or even absent. FOR discussions, therefore, seem frequently to occur in something approaching isolation. Yet it is apparent that FOR authors assumed that their readers were familiar with the main controversies and problems at any given time. Where relevant this

thesis has provided essential background against which some of the FOR thoughts and actions can be placed. Because the FOR dealt with so many different issues this background material has been kept to a necessary brevity in order to explain the FOR ideas as well as to keep the thesis to manageable proportions.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Peter Brock, Twentieth-Century Pacifism, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1970. Martin Ceadel, Pacifism in Britain 1914-1945: The Defining of a Faith, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980. David Martin, Pacifism, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965.

<sup>2</sup>Ceadel, Pacifism, p. 3. A. J. P. Taylor, The Trouble Makers, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1957, p. 51. See also Martin, Pacifism, p. 73.

<sup>3</sup>Some used the terms even long after the war.

<sup>4</sup>Ceadel, Pacifism, pp. 11-17.

<sup>5</sup>Martin, Pacifism, p. IX. FOR Ceadel's critique of Martin see Ceadel, Pacifism, pp. 25-26.

<sup>6</sup>C. J. Cadoux, The Early Christian Attitude to War, London: Headley, 1919; George Allen & Unwin, 1940.

<sup>7</sup>H. Richard Niebuhr, "The Doctrine of the Trinity and the Unity of the Church," Theology Today, 1946, pp.371-384.

<sup>8</sup>George MacLeod, The New Humanity Now, London: F.O.R. 1964, esp. pp.24-29.

## **PART I**

### **THE FOR AND WORLD WAR I**

On December 31, 1914, a group of Christian men and women adopted a five point program which became the basis for a new organization, the Fellowship of Reconciliation. This program, later called "The Basis", incorporated ideas which had been discussed before and during the war at other conferences and written about in a number of books. To appreciate fully the FOR's emergence, a survey of the FOR's matrix is essential. This matrix is described in the first three chapters of this thesis. Chapter 1 briefly analyzes the weaknesses of the dominant pre-war peace organizations and the growth of armaments and the clamour for conscription during the Edwardian period. Chapter 2 takes a close look at some organizations and ideas which influenced the leaders of the FOR and "The Basis". Chapter 3 deals with ideas discussed at meetings and conferences held between the outbreak of war and the end of 1914. These deliberations culminated in a conference held at Cambridge on December 28-31. In Cambridge the conferees rejected the idea that the new organization should be purely a pacifist organization. Instead, they adopted what may be called a world and life view which incorporated pacifism. Most of the FOR's literature and the books written by FOR leaders dealt with this world and life view. From the vast amount of literature it is clear that the FOR leaders held to the concept that

theory and practice were indivisible and that thought preceded action. FOR leaders tried to construct a theory which they regarded as radically Christian. They envisaged bringing about the Kingdom of God on earth. This vision, which the early FOR leaders regarded as the heart of the new organization, is described in chapter 4. During the war the FOR tried to implement this vision but was essentially thwarted. The actions which were undertaken to build God's Kingdom and the restrictions which hampered their implementation have been described in chapters 5 and 6. At the same time, these chapters foreshadow the many difficulties the FOR would encounter in the post-war era. Some of the material in these two chapters has appeared in the secondary literature, but it has never been placed in its proper context.

## CHAPTER 1

### THE EDWARDIAN PROLOGUE

On August 14, 1905, a then civil servant Cecil John Cadoux, later FOR chairman between 1927 and 1933 and one of the FOR's leading theologians, wrote a letter to his minister brother Arthur in South Africa.<sup>1</sup> The lengthy letter was a belated reply to Arthur's challenge that war, seen from a social evolutionary perspective, was a good thing "because it fosters and encourages altruism in the citizens, whereas a state of peace is advantageous to selfishness." Cadoux' counterargument was basically that the infliction of suffering was wrong and that a Christian should work towards the alleviation of suffering. Furthermore, he rejected the idea that "Christ counselled [sic] nonresistance only in religious, or at most in purely personal + private concerns." Rather, Christ's own work as carpenter had "consecrated the humblest human toil into work for his Kingdom." Thus the law of nonresistance was applicable in all spheres of life, "including even so-called secular duties" such as defending others. Here in summary fashion was Cadoux' - and the FOR's - notion that pacifism was not a negative 'being against war' but a positive force for the good of mankind in all spheres of life. Cadoux' broad understanding of pacifism stands at the heart of this thesis. Arthur's searching questions had forced him to examine the pacifist ideas he had espoused since early in 1900, as a reaction against Britain's involvement in the Boer War. The shallowness of these

early ideas becomes apparent in the opening paragraph of his letter of August 14, a shallowness which was representative of much of pre-1914 pacifism:

At last I feel myself in a position to answer your letter of the 1st Jany containing some arguments in justification of war. On reading it I found myself quite taken off my feet + out of my depth, + it is only after many months of thinking + waiting that I feel myself once more approaching firm ground.

Cadoux needed more than half a year to rethink his pacifist ideas. The challenge of his brother's letter gave Cadoux an advantage which many other pacifists of this pre-1914 period lacked. The lack of profound intellectual challenges in this particular area of thought helps to explain why so many pacifists gave up their simplistic pacifism when war broke out in August 1914. The vast majority who regarded themselves as pacifists had never thought through the implications of their pacifist position. They did not even perceive the growing militarism in Britain - discussed below - as an intellectual challenge. As Peter Brock has shown, they thought that they could solve the problems of war and peace through such conventional political devices as arbitration, international congresses or the codification of international law.<sup>2</sup> They asserted the need for peace, but they never constructed a coherent theory of peace, that is, they never articulated convincingly the prerequisites in domestic and foreign policy through which nations could avoid war. When war broke out these pacifists did not have the leisurely time of more than half a year to re-examine their ideas. Instead, many of these peacelovers, including a significant number of Friends, gave up their pacifism and became militant defenders of



Belgium. A few sentences from Bertrand Russell's Autobiography help illustrate the point. After having discovered, to his amazement, that "the average men and women were delighted at the prospect of war", Russell turned to some specific examples :

The first days of the War were to me utterly amazing. My best friends, such as the Whiteheads, were savagely warlike. Men like J. L. Hammond, who had been writing for years against participation in a European War, were swept off their feet by Belgium.<sup>3</sup>

This apparently sudden transformation raises two important questions: "What kind of pacifism was espoused?" and "How was it possible that the behaviour of so many peace advocates changed so quickly?". In order to answer these questions it is necessary to discuss briefly some of Britain's pre-1914 peace societies.

The oldest peace organization was the Peace Society, founded in 1816 in London. It was dedicated to the "Promotion of Permanent and Universal Peace" and, according to Peter Brock, the Society "soon became a rallying point for Quaker pacifists and for pacifists in other denominations."<sup>4</sup> By the turn of the century peacelovers could choose from many peace organizations, ranging from the League of Liberals Against Aggression and Militarism to the Independent Labour Party (ILP) and from the Society of Friends to the Church of England Peace League.<sup>5</sup> However, the Peace Society remained the largest group. Its South London branch asked Cadoux in July 1908 for some money "believing [him] to be in sympathy with our efforts to establish more friendly and peaceful relations between the various nations of the world."<sup>6</sup> The beliefs and assumptions held by the Peace Society could probably best be defined as

Christian - humanitarian.<sup>7</sup> Keith Robbins, a historian of the British peace movement, has described the Peace Society as having lost much of its vigour by the Edwardian period. It was resentful of the newer societies and the newer trends.<sup>8</sup> This resentment interfered with the Peace Society members' ability to re-evaluate the basic assumptions as Cadoux had done. Their intellectually rigid and negative attitude helps to explain not only why the Peace Society was unprepared for the August 1914 events, but also clarified why the FOR members felt unable to join the Peace Society once the war had begun.

In contrast to the Peace Society, the prominent Church of England Peace League was specifically denominational and Christian. In 1913 the League's president was Edward Lee Hicks, bishop of Lincoln, while four other bishops were vice-presidents.<sup>9</sup> The League could best be described as favouring and promoting peace rather than being against war. This attitude became apparent in "An Appeal to the Diocesan Bishops of the Church of England" of 1913. The appeal was a protest against the advocates of compulsory military service. The signatories argued that Britain, because of its insular position, did not need to fear "those fresh additions to the armies of our great continental neighbours." However, they did not "dispute that a State might be justified in summoning to arms its whole manhood."<sup>10</sup> In case of war pacifists could not expect support from the League.

The most important pacifist group during the Edwardian period was the Society of Friends. During the nineteenth century opposition to war had faded as a key issue among the membership. As a result of this

weakening stance nearly one-third of the Friends of military age joined the army during the war. Nevertheless, Thomas Kennedy was right when he stated that many in the Society of Friends took a vigorous antimilitarist stance in the Edwardian period as a consequence of the Boer war. The new vigour was perhaps best epitomized by Edward Grubb, described by Kennedy as "theologian, teacher, social reformer and editor of the British Friend from 1902 to 1913".<sup>11</sup> In The True Way of Life of 1909, Grubb delivered a scathing attack on the Germanophobic journalist J. St. Loe Strachey's defence of the National Service League in A New Way of Life.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, the Society showed signs of reinterpretation of pacifist theory. Noteworthy is the very small Socialist Quaker Society's attempt to integrate pacifism and socialism.<sup>13</sup> William E. Wilson, a leading theologian, endeavoured to convey a profounder theological peace testimony to and by the Society of Friends in Christ and War of 1914.<sup>14</sup> However, these efforts were insufficient to make much impact against the growing influence of the 'peace through strength' movement.<sup>15</sup> Hence, although there were a large number of peace societies Cadoux could have joined before 1914, most, if not all, of those Societies had failed to work out a comprehensive theological basis. Essentially, they held the same shallow view as Cadoux before he was confronted, in 1905, by his brother Arthur's searching questions about pacifism.

From 1910 on Norman Angell's 'neo-pacifism' provided non-Christian pacifists, and many Christian pacifists as well, with a utilitarian - evolutionist theory. Keith Robbins asserts: "Many

intelligent young men, indifferent to religion but dedicated to peace, wanted a new approach to the entire problem. Norman Angell met it."<sup>16</sup> Between 1910 and 1913 his book The Great Illusion sold about two million copies,<sup>17</sup> an indication that many people were concerned about and interested in a purely utilitarian - evolutionist argument against war. The popularity of the book, perhaps because it was "so well tuned to the pitch of Edwardian 'progressive' thought",<sup>18</sup> may have contributed to the impression of so many peace advocates that 'we are all pacifists now'.<sup>19</sup> However, 'Angellism' was as shallow as the pacifism of the peace societies described above.<sup>20</sup> It was founded on the mistaken notion that capitalists, victors and vanquished alike, did not and, indeed, could not profit from war. Thus 'Angellism' did not foresee that capitalism could easily adapt itself, allowing in the first place the belligerents to fight a long war, and secondly, permitting some to benefit economically from the struggle. The events of 1914 showed that Angell's mono-causal understanding of war was inadequate. This inadequacy caused a major intellectual and emotional crisis for many pacifists. No wonder that, with their theory shattered, such pacifists were swept off their feet.

The shallowness of pre-war pacifism alone does not explain adequately the rapid collapse of the anti-war forces in August 1914. Already allusion has been made to the rise of militaristic values during the Edwardian period. Another incident in Cadoux' life could be regarded as representative of the pervasiveness of the militarism which so significantly contributed to the nearly total collapse of pacifism in

1914. In 1903 Cadoux became lieutenant in the 76th London Company of the Boys' Brigade. The objective of the brigade was "the advancement of Christ's Kingdom among Boys, and the promotion of habits of obedience, reverence, discipline, self-respect, and all that tends towards a true Christian manliness."<sup>21</sup> During the next five years lieutenant Cadoux had strong disagreements with the commanding officer captain Peacock - disagreements which climaxed in 1910 when the captain took the boys "to witness the Military Tournament."<sup>22</sup> As far as Cadoux was concerned, Peacock had no right to indoctrinate the boys in a militaristic ethic. Yet, the tournament was not so different from the annual demonstration of London companies of the Boys' Brigade. In 1909 the 76th won The Daily Telegraph trophy for which the boys had to perform military drills. The influential conservative Daily Telegraph approvingly reported on the annual demonstration and on the duke of Argyll's militaristic speech. The duke, who was chairman, expressed the hope that churches and schoolmasters would work more in this way with the boys, for "the best antidote against a bullying class of armed men" was to train the entire nation in military values so that "our Navy and Army should represent the whole nation afloat and ashore."<sup>23</sup>

The captain's action and the duke's speech may be regarded as representative of an important stream of thinking and action in Edwardian Britain. This stream was best exemplified by the National Service League founded in 1902. It was this stream which Denis Hayes discussed in the first chapter of his book Conscription Conflict, a chapter called "Wanted: Conscription for All".<sup>24</sup> The embodiment of this

increasingly fashionable pre-war attitude was Lord Roberts, the national hero of the Boer War. But Roberts and others like him certainly did not fully capture public and parliamentary opinion before the war.

Liberals, the Labour Party and especially ILP members and many trade unionists objected strongly to a conscript army. Such a policy was looked upon as Prussianism at its most pernicious. In the more general words of Hayes, "Peace-time conscription did not come because the people would not have it."<sup>25</sup> However, the ideas of Lord Roberts and the National Service League, as well as the values of many para-military organizations, such as the Boys' Brigade, had permeated much of society. Thus Zara Steiner concluded correctly that "though the pacifist case was reaching a larger number of citizens in the years immediately preceding the war, it was an uphill fight against this far more diffused vision."<sup>26</sup> When war came there were so many volunteers that the recruiting agencies were unable to cope with the flood of aspiring soldiers and sailors. Denis Hayes in Conscription Conflict, Thomas Kennedy in The Hound of Conscience, and Zara Steiner in Britain and the Origins of the First World War have persuasively demonstrated the influence of militarist groups. It is against this background of the collapse of shallow and often confused pacifist views and of emerging and permeating militarism of Edwardian Society that the antecedents and birth of the FOR become intelligible.

## ENDNOTES CHAPTER 1

<sup>1</sup>C. J. Cadoux, Bodleian Library, Oxford, Box 2, 14-8-1905. Hereafter cited as CJC. Between 1902 and 1908 Cadoux worked as Assistant Victualling Store Officer at the Admiralty. A draft letter dated 11-9-1908 stated that he felt his position to be inconsistent with his principles (Box 3). He then pursued his studies at the University of London and in 1911 at Mansfield College, Oxford. The letter from Arthur does not appear to have survived. The letter shows clearly that Cadoux was not converted to pacifism around 1911 as Ceadel suggested in Pacifism, p. 36. Arthur Cadoux was an FOR member for most of the war but during 1918 he seems to have given up his pacifism.

<sup>2</sup>Brock, Twentieth, p. 8.

<sup>3</sup>Bertrand Russell, The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell, Vol. 2, 1914-1944, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968, p. 16.

<sup>4</sup>Peter Brock, Pacifism in Europe to 1914, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972, pp. 376, 378. See also Michael Howard, War and the Liberal Conscience, London: Temple Smith, 1978, p. 40.

<sup>5</sup>See Keith Robbins, The Abolition of War The 'Peace Movement' in Britain 1914-1919, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1976, ch. 1.

<sup>6</sup>CJC Box 3, 27-7-1908. Cadoux sent ten shillings.

<sup>7</sup>For the Peace Society, see Robbins, Abolition, pp. 12-15.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid. See also Thomas C. Kennedy, The Hound of Conscience, Fayetteville: The University of Arkansas Press, 1981, pp. 19-20. In return, absolute pacifists tended to mistrust the non-absolutist peace organizations. According to H. Runham Brown, "the members of a Peace Society tend naturally to support a war." Cutting Ice, Middlesex: W.R.I., 1930, p. 12.

<sup>9</sup>Swarthmore College Peace Collection (hereafter cited as SCPC), CDG-B, Box 70, no. 1378. The four were the bishops of Hereford (John Percival), Oxford (Charles Gore), Southwark (Hubert Murray Burge), and Northern and Central Europe. Other vice-presidents - there were twenty - included W. Temple, G. Lansbury and W. H. Dickinson.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

<sup>11</sup>Kennedy, Hound, p. 20. For the Quakers in general see Kennedy's "The Quaker Renaissance and the Origins of the Modern British Peace Movement, 1895-1920," Albion, Vol. 16 no. 3, Fall 1984, pp. 243-272. See also Margaret E. Hirst, The Quakers in Peace-and War, London: Swarthmore Press, 1923; new edition New York: Garland, 1972., ch. 18.

<sup>12</sup>Edward Grubb, The True Way of Life, London: Headley Brothers, 1909. The first edition came out in October 1909, the second, unchanged, shortly afterwards. The third edition was totally revised in the war and should not be used to interpret the pre-war period. For a brief discussion of Grubb's book see Kennedy, Hound, pp. 20-21. For Grubb's theological views see his Authority and the Light Within, London: James Clarke, 1908.

<sup>13</sup>For a further discussion of the SQS see chapter 1. The somewhat larger liberal Friends Social Union was another example of this new vigour.

<sup>14</sup>William E. Wilson, Christ and War, London: James Clarke, 1913; 1914. The book came out in December 1913 and was revised in 1914. Wilson's views are discussed in various places in this thesis.

<sup>15</sup>The 'peace through strength' movement could perhaps be dubbed the Nobel philosophy of peace.

<sup>16</sup>Robbins, Abolition, p. 15. 'Neo-pacifism' meant usually 'Angellism'. For an example of 'Neo-pacifism' see Henry Noel Brailsford, The War of Steel and Gold, London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914. New York: Garland, 1971.

<sup>17</sup>Howard Weinroth, "Norman Angell and the Great Illusion: an Episode in pre-1914 Pacifism," The Historical Journal, Vol. 17 no. 3, 1974, p. 551. Robbins, Abolition, p. 15, gives the number of copies sold as one million. For Angell's pre-1914 influence see Philip Dale Supina's dissertation "Norman Angell and the years of illusion 1908-14," Ball State University, 1969.

<sup>18</sup>Kennedy, Hound, p. 21.

<sup>19</sup>For an instance of this sentiment see Richard Roberts, The Renaissance of Faith, London: Cassells, 1912, part II.

<sup>20</sup>Jo Vellacott in Bertrand Russell and the Pacifists in the First World War, Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1980, p. 5, stated about Russell that he thought that "war was so irrational as to be literally unthinkable." Consequently, he thought it unnecessary to formulate his ideas clearly before August 1914. In Why Men Fight, of 1917, Russell acknowledged that awareness of self-interest, Angell's basic motive, was inadequate. For the changing nature of capitalism see Bob Goudzwaard,



Capitalism & Progress, Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1979, esp. ch. 9.

<sup>21</sup>CJC Box 2; 4-1-1903. For a survey of British youth movements between 1883 and 1940 see John Springhall, Youth, Empire and Society, London: Croom Helm, 1977.

<sup>22</sup>CJC Box 4; letters dated 26-6-1910 and 27-7-1910. As Springhall has mentioned, between 1909 and 1911 R. B. Haldane, the secretary of state for war, attempted "to incorporate the Boys' Brigade into a national cadet force to be administered by the Territorials." (Youth, p. 29). William Smith, the founding father and secretary of the Boys' Brigade, resisted the attempt. The brigade remained primarily a religious organization. Cadoux may have emphasized the religious nature but he could hardly have ignored the military character of the Boys' Brigade.

<sup>23</sup>The Daily Telegraph, 7-5-1909, p. 13.

<sup>24</sup>Denis Hayes, Conscription Conflict, New York: Garland, 1973 (1949).

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid*, p. 146.

<sup>26</sup>Zara S. Steiner, Britain and the Origins of the First World War, London: Macmillan, 1977, p. 157. For the collapse of the parliamentary opposition to armament see Howard Weinroth, "Left-Wing Opposition to Naval Armaments in Britain Before 1914," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 6, no. 4, 1971, pp. 93-120.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE ANTECEDENTS OF THE FOR

At 7:15 on December 28, 1914, a group of between 120 and 130 people<sup>1</sup> came together at Trinity College, Cambridge, to discuss the implications of the war on their personal and corporate life. Most, if not all, conferees were members of the organizations discussed below. Many of those present assumed immediately or later on important roles in the FOR. The group had some general characteristics. Most of the conferees were born in the 1870's or early 1880s, and by 1914 their careers had often only begun. They grew up in predominantly middle class homes. Many became professionals, especially clergymen, who carried on the Victorian middle class sense of social responsibility. Their social concern became evident in some of the organizations discussed below. Most embraced a theologically optimistic view of man. Many of the conferees will be mentioned later, but here a few leading figures will be introduced. These tiny biographical vignettes are indicative of the general characteristics outlined above and yet provide evidence of the varied background of the FOR members. The two leading figures were Richard Roberts (1874-1945) and Henry Hodgkin (1877-1933). Roberts, a Welshman, was a leading London Presbyterian minister in Crouch Hill. He became the first FOR general secretary, resigning this post in order to become a minister in New York. Later on, he became a

leading minister in the United Church of Canada. Hodgkin, the first FOR chairman, was a "weighty" Friend involved in countless committees. During the 1920s he was a medical missionary in China. If these two men could be regarded as organizers, William Orchard (1877-1955) and Maude Royden (1876-1956) could be viewed as preachers. Orchard, a London Congregationalist who in the 1930s became a Roman Catholic, was one of the most popular preachers in England. Royden, a leading feminist, started her own congregation after the war when it was apparent that the Church of England was unwilling to accommodate her talents. Among the several theologians present, the Congregationalist C. H. Dodd (1884-1973) achieved most fame later on as an Oxford and Manchester New Testament scholar. William Wilson (1880-1955) was a leading Quaker theologian, while Cecil John Cadoux (1883-1947) became a Congregational scholar in Oxford. William Fearon Halliday (1874-1932) was a Presbyterian minister whose interest in psychology led to his appointment to the central staff of Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, in 1921. The FOR's second general secretary, Leyton Richards (1879-1948), who, while in Melbourne in 1912, had opposed compulsory military training, became the leading Congregationalist minister in Birmingham. Finally, the Quaker Marian Ellis (1878-1952), later Lady Parmoor, and Lilian Stevenson (1871-1960) were both members of wealthy families.

By the time the group met in Cambridge it had become obvious that the war would last much longer than originally anticipated. On the last day of that year they agreed to form an organization called the Fellowship of Reconciliation. At this meeting a five point program

called "The Basis" was adopted.<sup>2</sup> The third point specifically condemned war as unacceptable for Christians. It is noteworthy that war was the only ethical problem carefully spelled out, while a much wider scope of social involvement was hinted at in only general terms. Not surprisingly, therefore, the problem of war played a crucial role in the further history of the Fellowship. Yet, to consider the FOR as a single issue organization, that is, as a purely pacifist group, is to ignore the other four points of "The Basis". That the FOR was not just another pacifist group such as those described in chapter 1 becomes clear from a few representative statements made during the war.

Shortly before the FOR came into being, Richard Roberts, the chairman of the Cambridge Conference, declared that "Pacifism + non-resistance are byproducts of some central things to which we have to testify."<sup>3</sup> Edith J. Wilson, who could not attend the Cambridge Conference, clarified Roberts' vague generalization of "some central things" when she wrote on Jan. 2, 1915, that what was needed was "no new organization merely for peace propaganda but reorganization of personal lives.... We want to do something for the Kingdom of God comparable to what men are doing for the British Empire."<sup>4</sup> An undated draft of not later than 1916 stated that "the organization is thus much more than a Peace Society" and that "it proclaims war against all that debases human life, that reduces man to machines."<sup>5</sup> The theologian William E. Wilson elaborated on the draft when, on June 1, 1918, he wrote that the FOR "must be something very much more than a Peace Society, even than a Christian Peace Society. It must stand for the Ideals of Jesus Christ

in every department of life." <sup>6</sup> These quotations clearly indicate that the FOR attempted to proclaim a world and life view, that is, a model of and for life, containing an implicit eschatology. In other words, pacifism for FOR members was an integral part of an all-encompassing worldview. <sup>7</sup> It was this world view which led to topics seemingly unrelated to pacifism. And it was often these topics which filled the journals and were discussed at conferences. These concerns have been ignored in the secondary literature.

The basis of the FOR's world and life view was not novel. Christians throughout the ages would have had no objections to the words of article 1 of "The Basis" that "the only sufficient basis for human life ... [is] Love, as revealed and interpreted in the life and death of Jesus Christ." What was novel was the fusion of the problem of war with theological, social, political and economic areas of concern. Before the war, those who founded the FOR had, in fact, discussed these areas of concern in four closely related, partly overlapping groups: the Socialist Quaker Society (SQS), the Student Christian Movement (SCM), the Swanwick Free Church Fellowship (SFCF), and the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches (World Alliance). These four groups provided the FOR with prospective members, ideas, methodologies and connections. In order to understand the formation and further growth of the FOR, it is necessary to review briefly these four groups.

On April 2, 1898, seven people started the Socialist Quaker Society, using as immediate guide "the Light which lighteth every man

that cometh into the world" and suggesting that the Universal Brotherhood could not be realized in a meaningful sense under the present competitive system of industry.<sup>8</sup> Basically, the SQS dealt with three concerns, namely, the meaning of socialism, the Quakers' responsibility towards socialism as a solution of the problems of the day, and their unique position for the spread of socialism. The conservative Quaker leadership was hostile to the aims of the SQS. Indeed, after an initial growth to about 175 members by 1902, the Society declined steadily till 1908 when threatening world events turned the attention of many Friends again to the SQS.<sup>9</sup> Since its inception members propagated the SQS views through speaking and writing, with emphasis on "being" and "doing", and encouraging individual action by collective sympathy and advice.<sup>10</sup> After 1908 the SQS organized conferences and study groups and started in 1912 to publish a quarterly, The Ploughshare, with William Loftus Hare as editor. In 1913 it also allied itself with the ILP pacifists. The SQS's methodology closely resembles that of the early FOR. The SQS also contained other basic ingredients of the FOR. The Society constituted a group of socially concerned Christians, notably Corder Catchpool and Alfred and Ada Salter,<sup>11</sup> who looked to socialism as the most appropriate solution - perhaps as a panacea - for society's problems. They perceived war as a disastrous hindrance to any plans for implementing their collectivist solution. In a letter of 1911 to non-member Friends, the SQS stated, somewhat simplistically, that "modern war must be recognized as an adjunct to the nation's business and is entered upon solely in the

interest of the Capitalist class", while socialist principles tended to diminish world-struggle.<sup>12</sup> The Ploughshare no. 1 proclaimed that war was the fruit of the terrible strain that the modern system of industry imposed upon the forces of civilization and religion.<sup>13</sup> But fortunately, the SQS contended, "into the ancient struggle of man against man ... came the light of Christianity."<sup>14</sup> According to the SQS, socialism and Christianity were complementary.<sup>15</sup> How closely the two were connected was suggested by Lewis H. Wedmore in a paper on "Some Economic Aspects of the Kingdom of God" in which he interpreted in an economic sense such parables as the "Labourers in the Vineyard".<sup>16</sup> Capitalism was the "Great Mistake". Hence "economic liberation from the evils of the profit motive and wavery mean[s] wings for the soul."<sup>17</sup> According to a Memorandum, signed by Mary E. Thorne, Clerk of the SQS in 1914, the task of the Friends, and not merely the SQS, was to create "an economic system as shall help liberate the spirit of man from his present thralldom."<sup>18</sup>

This socio-economic Christian perspective is also seen in the second group deserving attention, the SCM. Inaugurated in Cambridge as the Student Volunteer Missionary Union (SVMU) six years before the SQS in 1892, the movement, according to its biographer Tissington Tatlow, had no social perspective until 1900. In this the SCM was not alone, for the churches had not adequately grappled with industrial questions either. Their social campaigns had generally been restricted to crusades against such 'social evils' as sexual immorality, intemperance and gambling. However, there was one exception within the SCM: Richard

Roberts had addressed students in Wales on social problems before the turn of the century.<sup>19</sup> The change came in 1900. At an SCM world conference at Versailles at which Henry T. Hodgkin was present, Dutch representatives asked what the relationship was between Christianity and society. As a result the SCM turned its attention to the "Social Questions" during the winter of 1900-1901 and a series of seven papers appeared of which Tatlow's "Outline Studies in Social Problems" was the first one. These were to be used in Bible and Social Study groups. Increasingly, the social aspects became more prominent in the SCM and several conferences on the theme followed. A Matlock Conference in 1909 formulated the problem succinctly: "We are the problem." The problem was not just the slums, for everyone was implicated since "we profit to some extent by the system which produces, or at least allows, this wretchedness." Deliverance from the problem was an inner and outward matter, with the emphasis on the former, for "the Kingdom of God, if it is to exist at all, must be within us."<sup>20</sup>

The SCM contributed more to the FOR than an awakening awareness of the social conditions. It worked with Bible Study groups and later with Social Study groups, organizational structures which played an important role on the local level of the FOR, especially during the crucial first few years. Hodgkin, who was chairman during the early years of this century, was instrumental in the formation of a prayer group, which was "a potent factor in causing a deepening of the corporate prayer life of the S.V.M.U. committee."<sup>21</sup> Furthermore, the aim of the SCM was "to urge upon students the necessity of learning the



will of Christ, and following it in every department of life"<sup>22</sup> through policies which the FOR later incorporated into its own program:

1. To draw attention to the grave conditions of modern life, and to the duty of the disciples of Jesus Christ in the face of these conditions.
2. To emphasize the Christian function of home, business and professional life, and to claim men and women for the service of Christ therein.
3. To direct thought to the discovery of these forms of social life which are the fit expression of the Spirit of Christ.
4. To recover the hope of the redemption of society.<sup>23</sup>

Unlike the SQS, the SCM was ecumenical. Many of the later FOR leaders were involved in the SCM. Hodgkin and Roberts, the founders of the FOR, as well as Cadoux, Royden and Stevenson, have already been mentioned.<sup>24</sup> Malcolm Spencer (1877-1950) was largely responsible for the SCM social policy and he was a regular contributor to the FOR journals.<sup>25</sup> His book The Hope of the Redemption of Society was required reading for those attending a September 1914 conference at Llandudno, a conference which set the stage for the Cambridge Conference.<sup>26</sup> Others were either local secretaries or missionaries. Kees Boeke (1884-1966) was a Dutch engineer and educator married to Beatrice Cadbury. In 1919, in his house in the Netherlands, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation was organized.<sup>27</sup> John R. Coates (1879-1956) and A. Herbert Gray (1868-1956) became Presbyterian ministers. Hugh Martin (1890-1964) was a Baptist minister who gave up his pacifism in 1939. Charles E. Raven (1885-1964) botanist, theologian, and at various times dean of Ely and vice-chancellor of Cambridge University, became FOR chairman in 1933. The list includes the political theorist Roger H. Soltau (1888-1953), the physicist Alex Wood (1879-1950), the eccentric

Marquis of Tavistock, later Duke of Bedford (1888-1953), and the Quaker philosopher-theologian H. G. Wood (1879-1953). Lucy Gardner (1863-1944), a vigorous Friend, was something like an 'associate member'.<sup>28</sup> The SCM thus provided a network of contact for later FOR members. Moreover, the SCM exerted considerable influence on Christian students. Later on, the FOR tried to make use of this potential source and one FOR Committee member, McEwan Lawson, a Congregationalist minister, was specifically elected as SCM representative. Yet, the SCM was not a pacifist organization. When some theology professors accused the SCM during the war of harbouring pacifists, Tatlow attempted to dismiss this charge by pointing out that most staff members were clergymen. It was hardly an adequate denial since the FOR was, by and large, also led by clergymen. More important in countering the accusations was Tatlow's 1916 "Memorandum" which pointed out that the pacifist movement hardly existed in the SCM.<sup>29</sup> Perhaps five percent of the members were pacifist.<sup>30</sup> Indeed, little thought had been given to the relationship between Christianity and war in spite of an incident during the Boer War when the Dutch declined to attend the London conference of 1900.<sup>31</sup> As with many other social and peace groups the outbreak of war took the SCM by surprise.<sup>32</sup> Obviously, the FOR did not borrow its pacifist ideas from the SCM. But Lilian Stevenson frequently mentioned the SCM's organization and conferences, especially in relation to the need of the 'lay-mind' and the freedom to think together.<sup>33</sup> In letters to Henry Hodgkin shortly before the Cambridge Conference she also referred to the Swanwick Free Church Fellowship, the third group providing ideas and a

network of personnel for the FOR.<sup>34</sup>

The SFCF was started by a group of about a dozen men the week before Easter of 1911 at Mansfield College, Oxford.<sup>35</sup> These men had "been drawn together by the common desire to understand the real state of mind of the young people of our Free Churches, and the search for the springs of a new and more vigorous life."<sup>36</sup> The founders were "all very gravely disturbed in [their] minds about [their] various churches."<sup>37</sup> Their uneasiness about their churches' complacency was reflected in the preamble of the 'Covenant' of the Fellowship which spoke of "the challenge of the whole world to the Christian Church in our day, in the light of which we have to come to realise the distractions and feebleness of our state."<sup>38</sup> According to a 'Private Invitation to a Conference', they desired "to cultivate a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church", which would ultimately lead to a reunion of Christendom, or at least an appreciation of the "oneness and immediacy of our missionary and social problems."<sup>39</sup> Their intention was not "the formation of any new movement within the Church, but the strengthening of the hands of those who direct the existing work."<sup>40</sup> Cadoux regarded the SFCF as a leaven, a term which would frequently appear in FOR literature.<sup>41</sup> The proposed methodology would be that of "corporate prayer and thought", both in the area of ecumenism and "the social life of all the nations", while the members would "gladly take upon [themselves] all the loyalties implied in the discipleship of Jesus Christ at whatever cost." These ideas were incorporated in the Collegium which was founded to "assist the solution

of the social problem and revive the sense of the power of God in Christ."<sup>42</sup> Lucy Gardner, the Collegium's Warden, was the FOR's initial secretary and the Collegium became the first FOR office.

The similarities with the SQS and SCM are most noticeable in their mutual social interest as both an intellectual and ethical challenge. Similarities were somewhat less marked in matters of ecumenism and methodology. Nevertheless, the Swanwick Conference of September 11-16, 1911, anticipates organizationally later FOR conferences:

The programme of the Conference falls into two parts. The first two days will be devoted to a diagnosis of the situation, and the last two will be given to a consideration of constructive suggestions.... In the evening of each day ... a devotional hour will be held.... On Saturday morning the Conference will close with a Communion Service.<sup>43</sup>

Moreover, the SFCF provided another overlapping but also different network of people later involved in the FOR. Richard Roberts, the chairman, was the initial driving force, while Malcolm Spencer was a tireless secretary. Among other founding members were Henry Carter, a Methodist leader, the Quakers G. E. Darlaston and J. S. Hoyland, and Herbert Morgan, a Welsh clergyman. Later members included Cadoux, Coates, Gray, Hodgkin and Orchard as well as A. D. Belden, a leading London Congregationalist, the Quaker mystic Stephen Hobhouse, who had renounced his wealth, Nathaniel Micklem, an influential Congregationalist minister who became principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, and Gilbert Porteous, a Presbyterian minister who played a prominent role in the FOR in the 1920s.<sup>44</sup>

The fourth group to be discussed, the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, provided several other key elements to the FOR. It was international, ecumenical and pacifist. The history of the movement goes back to a meeting held on May 6, 1907, in Exeter Hall, London. Representatives of various denominations decided to present memorials, to be collected from various countries, to the Second the Hague Conference held in 1907.<sup>45</sup> The memorials were the only contributions of the churches to this remarkable if ultimately unsuccessful conference.<sup>46</sup> The memorials were signs of a renewed peace interest for "an active movement was set on foot to interest the Churches in the question of peace."<sup>47</sup> The first step was to organize closer relations between English and German churches. Thus in 1908 "one hundred and thirty representatives of the German Churches visited England as guests of representative men of the English Churches."<sup>48</sup> In 1909 the English visited Germany. The result of the exchange was a new organization, the Associated Councils of Churches in the British and German Empires 'for Fostering Friendly Relations between Two Peoples, with about 12000 members in Great Britain and about 4000 in Germany.<sup>49</sup> Soon the need was felt for wider cooperation and provisional committees were set up to organize a conference for Protestants at Constance on August 2-4, 1914, and for Catholics at Liège on August 10, 1914. Owing to the German invasion of Belgium on August 3 the Liège conference never materialized. At Constance, however, about ninety delegates, including Henry Hodgkin, were able to meet briefly on August 2.<sup>50</sup> They passed four prepared resolutions before hurrying home. The

first two resolutions suggested ironically that the churches should be concerned about "the maintenance of peace and the promotion of good feeling among all the races of the world." Churches should use "their influence with the peoples, parliaments, and governments" so that people "may reach that universal goodwill which Christianity has taught mankind."<sup>51</sup> Although the Preamble and "The Basis" of the FOR contain different words, the tenor is remarkably similar. Moreover, the first resolution starts with the "work of conciliation," a key word in FOR literature. It may even have contributed to the name of the Fellowship.

The third resolution called for a central bureau to coordinate the work connected with the Alliance. In 1919 the FOR was able to establish its own version of an international bureau. The final resolution appointed a committee to bring forward recommendations for further actions. The committee consisted of, among others, J. Allen Baker, M.P., later present at the Cambridge Conference, W. H. Dickinson, the Liberal "suffragist" M.P. and later chairman of the League of Nations Society, and Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze, a founding member of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation. Dickinson became the secretary of the British section. In a letter dated September 5, 1914, he asked Hodgkin to become a member of this group.<sup>52</sup> Hodgkin immediately became treasurer.<sup>53</sup> The committee continued its work in spite of the war and twenty-seven members even met at Berne on August 25-27, 1915. At that time Hodgkin and Siegmund-Schultze renewed their friendship.<sup>54</sup>

The four strands discussed above developed separately, although

the ideas, the methodology and the personnel often overlapped. The war acted like a catalyst, fusing the various elements together in the FOR. How the fusion came about is the story of the period August-December 1914, the subject of the next chapter. What actually made the fusion possible was theology, and it is, therefore, necessary to review briefly the theological matrix out of which the FOR grew.

The theology discussed here draws only upon some leaders, keeping in mind the warning of the historian of religion T. A. Langford that there is "always a distance between these leaders and the majority of the churchmen."<sup>55</sup> In 1889 a group of concerned liberal Anglo-Catholics published a series of essays called Lux Mundi, edited by Charles Gore, later bishop of Oxford.<sup>56</sup> The essayists defended an incarnational theology and accepted the new methods of biblical criticism. They regarded much of Genesis as folklore and poetry and viewed the history of Israel in an evolutionist way, thus trying to reconcile science and religion.<sup>57</sup> The group had, according to Alec R. Vidler, "a decisive and enduring influence"<sup>58</sup> as can be witnessed in the works of archbishop William Temple and canon Charles Raven. However, they hardly applied the new methods of biblical criticism to the New Testament which they maintained to be historically accurate. The change in N.T. studies came after 1897 with the publication of W. Wrede's pioneering work Concerning the Task and Method of So-Called New Testament Theology.<sup>59</sup> A further challenge came in 1906 with A. Schweitzer's The Quest of the Historical Jesus. He denied the possibility of a "psychological presentation of the development of the

mind and thought of Jesus."<sup>60</sup> Although it took some time before these German ideas entered Great Britain, they set the stage for R. J. Campbell's The New Theology (1907) and Foundations: a Statement of Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought (1912), edited by B. H. Streeter.<sup>61</sup> Later Streeter developed the two-document theory of the 19th century (Mark and Q) into a four-document theory and both theories were used by FOR members. Bishop Gore, then at Birmingham, attacked Campbell's book so thoroughly that the Congregationalist recanted and became an Anglican. Campbell's book belongs to the broad stream of Christian Socialism, on the American continent better known as the Social Gospel movement.<sup>62</sup> In British historiography little attention has been given to the movement during the Edwardian period. There is no doubt that Campbell influenced several leading FOR members, most noticeably his close associate William Orchard, who has been described by E. L. Allen "as unbalanced as he was brilliant."<sup>63</sup> According to Roy H. Campbell, a historian of the Social Gospel, no clear definition can be given to the term.<sup>64</sup> What, then, were the ideas espoused by R. J. Campbell? First of all, Campbell took up Lux Mundi's notion of immanentism and stressed it to the exclusion of God's transcendence.<sup>65</sup> Immanentism, with its focus on earthly matters, was strongly though not exclusively emphasized by many early FOR members. This focus is theologically represented in the incarnation and psychologically in the personality of Jesus. Less than a decade later W. Fearon Halliday, an FOR theologian, started to develop what may be called a theology of personality.<sup>66</sup>



Secondly, Campbell used the old theological terminology and the articles of faith but "shed the husk".<sup>67</sup> Consequently, he rejected such orthodox ideas as salvation, redemption and atonement, and redefined forgiveness, expiation, reconciliation, ransom, justification, propitiation, satisfaction and sanctification.<sup>68</sup> For example, he stated, "Show me a Christlike life and I will show you a part of the Atonement of Christ."<sup>69</sup> Atonement in an orthodox sense was impossible because the fall was an archaic notion which had nothing to do with Christianity.<sup>70</sup> Like Campbell, many FOR members modified orthodox doctrines. But whereas Campbell, like many Anglicans, used as basis the doctrine of incarnation, FOR members used a moral influence view of atonement. Thirdly, Campbell declared so-called orthodoxy demonstrably false to the religion of Jesus.<sup>71</sup> In order to save the religion of Jesus it was necessary to hitch the "waggon of socialism" to the "star of religious faith".<sup>72</sup> For Campbell the New Theology was the religious articulation of the social movement; it was a spiritual socialism and a religion of science.<sup>73</sup> He wanted competition to be replaced by collectivism which he equated with the Kingdom of God.<sup>74</sup> This Kingdom could be brought about because the problem of evil was soluble.<sup>75</sup> However, this Kingdom would be a purely earthly affair.<sup>76</sup> According to Campbell, the Church existed for the establishment of the Kingdom of God: that is for the new social order. He saw no other use for the Church. From such logic it was only a small step to suggest that the Church was not even necessary to attain the Kingdom. Over against this depreciation of the doctrine of the Church, especially among

Nonconformists, P. T. Forsyth, a leading Congregationalist theologian, posited that the "Church is a divine creation and not a voluntary society,... not a means to the Kingdom, it is the Kingdom in the making, it is the Kingdom coming-to-be in a particular place and time."<sup>77</sup> These two opposing views surfaced frequently in the early literature of the FOR, some of whose members saw the FOR as "their church", a voluntary society drawn together by mutual attraction of common impulses.<sup>78</sup>

Campbell's Kingdom of God was the result of an evolutionary process and progress rather than the result of divine irruption which connoted too much transcendence. The Christian's duty was to bring about that Kingdom, stressing the moral aspects of religion.<sup>79</sup> From FOR literature it is evident that the Kingdom of God, the nature of the social order and the quality of individual and national moral character were key issues. The understanding of and the connections between these key issues depended, however, on the views held about immanence and transcendence. For Orchard, the Kingdom of God meant a regenerated social order, in which wealth, as suggested by the prophets and the gospels, were justly divided.<sup>80</sup> This modernist theological view had repercussions for the political view. Orchard, like so many FOR members, moved from liberalism to socialism.<sup>81</sup>

Campbell's new eschatology incorporated a new anthropology, perhaps best reflected in Orchard's thesis for his D.D., Modern Theories of Sin (1909). Orchard admitted that in orthodoxy the doctrine of sin held the determinative position in theology, regulating one's sense of the need of salvation and one's conception of

reconciliation and redemption. The doctrine, in other words, regulated soteriology and anthropology.<sup>82</sup> However, Orchard doubted whether such influence should be given to this doctrine. Rather than the Fall of Genesis 3 one needed to start from human experience.<sup>83</sup> He described the relation between sin and salvation as follows:

It is certainly possible to maintain that, even if man is not personally guilty for his sin, he is still in need of salvation; but in that case salvation would only need to be illumination of deeper knowledge, or the infusion of superior strength.<sup>84</sup>

Here is no need for Christ's vicarious suffering, only a sense of sin which is "valuable in the degree in which it leads to moral progress."<sup>85</sup> Rather, the idea of Christ's vicarious atonement clashed with (Orchard's) moral law.<sup>86</sup> To Richard Roberts' question "Jesus or Christ?" Orchard answered, in effect, that the historic man Jesus was the moral example for the world's problems, a guide to the new social order.<sup>87</sup> Modernists like Orchard regarded man as essentially good. This optimistic view of man was shattered when the war broke out. Only gradually were FOR theologians able to develop a more profound understanding of evil. Although Campbell had provided many of the ingredients for the FOR's world and life view, some key doctrines remained to be worked out during the war. Some, like Cadoux and Raven, continued to adhere to a modernist viewpoint. Others, like Orchard, moved completely away from their liberal position.

In this survey not much attention has been given to Anglican theology, except Lux Mundi, essentially because so few early FOR leaders-members were Anglican.<sup>88</sup> It was Free Church theology which

really provided the matrix out of which the FOR grew. Undoubtedly this handicapped the FOR in attracting Anglicans, for as Jeffrey Cox has suggested, there was still a stigma attached by many middle and upper class Britons to Dissent.<sup>89</sup> A further handicap was that from the 1890's on there had been a significant decline of church attendance, especially among the suburban middle class.<sup>90</sup> In spite of these setbacks, liberal theologians were very optimistic. Richard Roberts wrote in 1912 that "there never was a time when the prospects of abolishing war were so bright."<sup>91</sup> For many people, certainly for Roberts, the war came as a shattering shock.<sup>92</sup>

## ENDNOTES CHAPTER 2

<sup>1</sup>For further discussion on this number see ch. 3.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix I. See also Vera Brittain, The Rebel Passion, Nyack: Fellowship Publications, 1964, p. 35.

<sup>3</sup>From notes of the Dec. 4, 1914, conference, in Box 1 file 16 of Henry T. Hodgkin's papers temp. MSS 355, located at Friends' House Library, London. Hereafter cited as HTH.

<sup>4</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16.

<sup>5</sup>HTH Box 1 file 19, p. 4.

<sup>6</sup>HTH Box 1 file 14, underlining in the original letter.

<sup>7</sup>As will be shown in parts II and III this holistic approach was not fully adhered to in practice later on, in spite of Charles Raven's theoretical work.

<sup>8</sup>Minutes SQS, Friends' House Library. See also Peter d'A. Jones, The Christian Socialist Revival 1877-1914, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968, pp. 367-389.

<sup>9</sup>The Balkan crisis of 1908 and the clamor for dreadnoughts to remain ahead of rapidly growing German naval power are just two of these threats.

<sup>10</sup>Minutes SQS 2-4-1898 and 2-6-1898.

<sup>11</sup>Minutes SQS. They became member on 27-9-1910 and 10-6-1913 respectively.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid. This came as a reaction to Yearly Meeting, p. 6. The idea that war was an adjunct to the nation's business is similar to statements by Carl von Clausewitz in his book On War (editor and translator Michael Howard and Peter Paret, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976 [1832], esp. pp. 87, 605). World War I indicates that war was not always an adjunct. Nevertheless, the SQS and the FOR do not seem to have grasped this different function of war.

<sup>13</sup>The Ploughshare no. 1, Nov. 1912, p. 11.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., no. 3, May 1913, p. 25.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., no. 1, Nov. 1912, p. 5.

<sup>16</sup>Minutes SQS, 27-5-1911. The Kingdom of God concept played a crucial role in the theology of the FOR. Two tracts published by the SQS had similar themes as Wedmore, namely Mary O'Brien, The Oneness of Religious and Secular Life, 1898, tract 1, and A. T. Priestman, Socialism an Essentially Christian Movement, 1901, tract 2.

<sup>17</sup>The Ploughshare, no. 4, Aug. 1913, p. 50 and no. 3, May 1913, p. 27.

<sup>18</sup>The Memorandum was published in a booklet containing the addresses delivered at the Llandudno Conference of Sept. 25-30, 1914, Friends and the War, London: Headley Brothers, 1914, p. 125.

<sup>19</sup>Tissington Tatlow, The Story of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland, London: S. C. M. Press, 1933, pp. 338, 163. See also Ruth Rouse, The World's Student Christian Federation, London: S.C.M. Press, 1948, esp. ch. 12 "The Rise of Social Consciousness". Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill, ed., A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517-1948, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954, ch. 7. D. W. Bebbington, The Nonconformist Conscience, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982, ch. 3.

<sup>20</sup>Tatlow, SCM, pp. 339-350.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 230; see also p. 225 and HTH Box 1 file 19. Hodgkin joined in 1898. See the letter to his parents dated 30-4-1898, HTH Box 3 file 38. When he was FOR chairman he stressed again the importance of prayer. The place of prayer in the FOR can be judged from a series on "Is Prayer Reasonable?" by W. Fearon Halliday in The Venturer, Vol. 1 nos. 4-9, Jan. - June, 1916. According to Halliday, the world could not go on without prayer, Vol. 1 no. 4, p. 122.

<sup>22</sup>Compare W. E. Wilson's statement quoted on page 28 (footnote 6).

<sup>23</sup>Tatlow, SCM, p. 353.

<sup>24</sup>See CJC Box 7, April 1913.

<sup>25</sup>He was also the secretary of the Swanwick Free Church Fellowship. McEwan Lawson, an SCM member elected to the first FOR executive, wrote his biography God's Back-Room Boy, London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.

<sup>26</sup>For the Llandudno Conference see next chapter.

<sup>27</sup>See Wyatt T. Rawson, Kees Boeke, Purmerend: J. Muusses, 1956, p. 3.

<sup>28</sup>Tatlow, SCM p. 525. Some other members were C. F. Andrews, Edwyn Bevan, D. S. Cairns, Donald Grant, J. Morgan Jones, Alan G. Knott, Frank Lenwood, John H. Lewis, J. H. Oldham, William Temple.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 586.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 588 - see also p. 512. It was perhaps this 5% which the FOR had in mind when McEwan Lawson was elected to the first executive specifically as an SCM representative.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., pp. 186-187.

<sup>32</sup>Tatlow went as far as saying that none in the SCM knew even anything about peace societies [p. 506].

<sup>33</sup>HTH Box 1 file 19, see especially letters dated 12-1-1919; 17-1-1919; 6-2-1919.

<sup>34</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16, letters between Dec. 4 and Dec. 28 (undated).

<sup>35</sup>United Church Archives, Richard Roberts Papers, Box 7, The Story of the Covenant, p. 19, private publication. Hereafter cited as RR.

<sup>36</sup>CJC Box 5, "Private Invitation to a Conference", 30-4-1911, p. 1.

<sup>37</sup>RR Box 7, The Story of the Covenant.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., p. 18. According to Nathaniel Micklem, he wrote the Covenant. See his autobiography The Box and the Puppets (1883-1953), London: Geoffrey Bles, 1957, p. 51. Probably Malcolm Spencer helped in drawing up the Covenant. See Lawson, God's, pp. 24-26.

<sup>39</sup>CJC Box 5, "Private Invitation", p. 1.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., 5-10-1912. In FOR literature, leaven has always a positive meaning. In Scripture, however, leaven can have the meaning of disintegration and corruption. See e.g. Lev.2:11; 1 Cor.5:7-8.

<sup>42</sup>RR Box 7, The Story of the Covenant, p. 18 and S.F.C.F., 1911, p. 82.

<sup>43</sup>CJC Box 5. "Private Invitation", pp. 2-3.

<sup>44</sup>Hodgkin became a member in 1913, the others mentioned joined nearly all in 1911.

<sup>45</sup>SCPC; CDG-B, Box 117, Handbook of the World Alliance, 1919, pp. 10-13. See also Brittain, Rebel, pp. 26-30; and Rouse and Neill, History, chs. 8, 11.

<sup>46</sup>See Barbara W. Tuchman, The Proud Tower, New York: Macmillan, 1962, 1966 pp. 324-338; Joseph H. Choate, The Two Hague Conferences, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1913.

<sup>47</sup>SCPC; CDG-B, Box 117, Handbook, p. 10.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 11. See also Bebbington, Nonconformist, p. 125, and Charles Edward Bailey, "Gott mit uns: Germany's Protestant Theologians in the First World War," Ph.D. thesis University of Virginia, 1978, pp. 27, 164-167.

<sup>49</sup>These numbers may have contributed to the optimistic feeling that the churches were now all pacifist. This interpretation, as has been suggested in the prologue was quite inadequate if not unsubstantiated. For a brief review of this organization see Robbins, Abolition, pp. 17-19.

<sup>50</sup>There were supposed to be 153 delegates. The threat of war made it impossible for many to travel. See also ch. 3.

<sup>51</sup>SCPC; CDG-B, Box 117, Handbook, p. 13.

<sup>52</sup>HTH Box 1 file 8.

<sup>53</sup>He resigned when he left for China in 1920. His position was filled by Stafford Cripps.

<sup>54</sup>SCPC; CDG-B, Box 117, Handbook, p. 16. See also Rouse and Neill, History, pp. 512-514. Brittain, Rebel, p. 30 states that the two could not meet during the war years.

<sup>55</sup>Thomas A. Langford, In Search of Foundations-English Theology 1900-1920, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969, p. 29.

<sup>56</sup>For the importance of Lux Mundi see for example S. C. Carpenter, Church and People, 1789-1889, London: S.P.C.K., 1933, ch. 17. Although not very critical, Carpenter has given a clear exposition of the tenets of Lux Mundi. Also Arthur Michael Ramsey, From Gore to Temple, London: Longmans, 1960. Charles Gore (1853-1932) was principal of Pusey House at the time of Lux Mundi. His social concerns influenced many Anglicans. J. D. Douglas has described Gore, who became bishop of Oxford in 1911, as "the most versatile, and probably the most influential, churchman of his generation." (The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974, p. 424).



<sup>57</sup>The liberal thinker L. T. Hobhouse was in Oxford when Charles Gore was at Pusey House. In spite of their many differences both men used an evolutionist framework for their theories and ethics. For Hobhouse see Stefan Collini, Liberalism and Sociology: L. T. Hobhouse and Political Argument in England 1880-1914, Cambridge: University Press, 1979. According to canon F. W. Dillistone, Charles Raven had a passion to reconcile modern science and Christian theology. See Charles Raven, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1975, p. 15.

<sup>58</sup>Alec R. Vidler, The Church in an Age of Revolution, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974, p. 195.

<sup>59</sup>For a discussion of Wrede's importance see Gerhard F. Hasel, New Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1978, pp. 43-50. According to Wrede, the gospel of Mark was not historically reliable because it did not portray the Jesus of history but the divine Christ of the apostolic church. Liberal theology up to Wrede had recognized a historical Jesus who was a liberal ethical prophet of love, brotherhood and righteousness. For a critique on Wrede see George Eldon Ladd, The New Testament and Criticism, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1974, pp. 157-158.

<sup>60</sup>Stephen Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1961, London: Oxford University Press, 1964, 1975, pp. 194-195. See also C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

<sup>61</sup>For a discussion on Foundations, see Vidler, Church, pp. 196-197. For Streeter, see Neill, Interpretation, pp. 122-127.

<sup>62</sup>The term "social gospel" was rarely used by FOR members although Rauschenbusch's books were frequently recommended to FOR members. Rauschenbusch himself was a member of the American FOR.

<sup>63</sup>G. Stephens Spinks, E. L. Allen and James Parker, Religion in Britain Since 1900, London: Andrew Dakers, 1952, p. 61. Probably through Edward Grubb, Campbell influenced the Quakers. See Grubb, Authority esp. after p. 87.

<sup>64</sup>Douglas, New, p. 911.

<sup>65</sup>R. J. Campbell, The New Theology, New York: Macmillan, 1907, 1912, p. 22. See also p. 92: "Jesus was God, but so are we."

<sup>66</sup>*Ibid.*, ch. 6, esp. p. 92. See also this thesis ch. 4.

<sup>67</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 73.,

<sup>68</sup>*Ibid.*, ch. 8, esp. p. 110.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., p. 165. This does not differ much from such FOR theologians like William E. Wilson.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., pp. 53-64.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., p. 14. Compare Karl Barth, Raven's theological foe, who in 1915 stated that "a real Christian must become a socialist (if he is to be earnest about the reformation of Christianity!)" in Eberhard Busch, Karl Barth, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976, p. 83.

<sup>74</sup>Campbell New, p. 249. For a detailed discussion of the various meanings of "collectivism" see Collini, Liberalism, ch. 1.

<sup>75</sup>Campbell, New, p. 43.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 234.

<sup>77</sup>Langford, Search; pp. 172-3. Peter Taylor Forsyth (1848-1921) had studied in Germany with A. Ritschl. In 1901 he became principal of Hackney College, London. He strongly opposed Campbell's New Theology as is evident from his most important book The Person and Place of Jesus Christ (1909).

<sup>78</sup>For a discussion on this problem see W. Fearon Halliday, Reconciliation and Reality, London: Headley, 1919, p. 40. Halliday himself did not see the FOR as "his church". The problem surfaced again during World War II.

<sup>79</sup>Campbell's secularized Kingdom of God brought about by evolution finds a parallel in such non-Christian thinkers as L. T. Hobhouse.

<sup>80</sup>W. E. Orchard, From Faith to Faith, New York: Harper, 1933, pp. 80-81.

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., pp. 81-83. In general, this political shift has been described by Ross McKibbin in The Evolution of the British Labour Party 1910-1924, London: Oxford University Press, 1974.

<sup>82</sup>W. E. Orchard, Modern Theories of Sin, London: James Clarke, 1909, p. 1.

<sup>83</sup>This experiential approach played a crucial role in the theology of personality which was popular among early FOR members (see ch. 4).

<sup>84</sup>Orchard, Modern, p. 5.

<sup>85</sup>Ibid., p. 119.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid., ch. 4, esp. p. 142.

<sup>87</sup>Quoted by Langford, Search, p. 51. Robert's article appeared in the Hibbert Journal of 1909. B. C. Plowright in "The Misgivings of a Modernist," The Congregational Quarterly, Vol. 9 no. 3. July 1931, p. 289, described the impact of liberal theology:

Like a clear sea-breeze blowing away the death-like stillness and stupor of a breathless, sultry summer day, modernism came then with a swift sense of invigoration, which sent new currents of thought and emotion tingling throughout one's religious life. Almost literally, "all things were made new" for us in those great days. The new thought about Christ and God, and the new understanding of the heart and essential nature of God and of the meaning of life, ran like wine through the veins. How high we pitched our hopes! How sure we were then that we had laid hold of the infallible remedy which could not fail to arrest declining church attendances and the like!

<sup>88</sup>There were some important exceptions such as W. C. Roberts, Mary E. Phillips or Bernard Walke. Usually they were Anglo-Catholic. The exception to this rule is provided by George Lansbury.

<sup>89</sup>Jeffrey Cox, The English Churches in a Secular Society, New York: Oxford University Press, 1982, ch. 5.

<sup>90</sup>Ibid., ch. 1. esp. p. 47. See also Alan D. Gilbert, Religion and Society in Industrial England, London: Longman, 1976, esp. ch. 2. Hugh McLeod, Class and Religion in the Late Victorian City, London: Croom Helm, 1974. pp. 289-290.

<sup>91</sup>Roberts, Renascence, p. 62.

<sup>92</sup>Busch, Barth, p. 81, wrote about Karl Barth that the outbreak of war "shook him and disturbed him to the depths of his being." He quoted him as saying, "A whole world of exegesis, ethics, dogmatics and preaching, which had hitherto held to be essentially trustworthy, was shaken to the foundations, and with it, all the other writings of the German theologians."

## CHAPTER 3

### A VISION IN THE MAKING: AUGUST-DECEMBER 1914

While much of Britain tried to enjoy the August Bank holiday, Germany invaded Belgium, an action which precipitated the British declaration of war. The decision took the majority in Britain by surprise, in spite of the war predictions in "invasion literature" and much of the press. Those who were taken aback had thought that war with Germany was "most unlikely" because the nations involved were "far too civilized".<sup>1</sup> Certainly the two key figures in the formation of the FOR were taken off guard. Richard Roberts had interrupted his holidays in Aldburgh to attend a Presbyterian Church conference in Swanwick. Henry Hodgkin was in Constance, Switzerland, for the World Alliance Conference. Orchard, who was probably less surprised than many others,<sup>2</sup> lamented the unpreparedness of pacifists in general: "The forces for peace were not ready for mobilization... [and] the opposition [to war] consisted of vague desire and was composed of unrelated units."<sup>3</sup> Pacifists in general received little or no support from existing peace organizations and Christian pacifists none from the major churches. Christian pacifists apparently expected that the churches would protest against the war.<sup>4</sup> The churches' silence and shortly afterwards their active support for the war<sup>5</sup> added to the confusion of Christian pacifists. This confusion is perhaps best exemplified by Roberts. Even

towards the end of 1915 he still felt "in the fog".<sup>6</sup> How much more confused must he have been when he returned from the Swanwick conference to London. In 1943 he recalled the events:

I felt it my duty to be in my own pulpit on the first Sunday of the war.

I cannot recall the sermon that I hastily prepared for that Sunday; I know only that it was a potpourri of my own conflicting emotions. But that sermon was never delivered, for just before rising to deliver it, I made a discovery.<sup>7</sup>

He discovered that some young Germans were not in church as usual:

I stood petrified for some minutes; then I found words to say to my people that my duty was to report what I had discovered, and ask them to consider as Christians the appalling circumstance that lads of that congregation, who had worshipped God together in that Church, might, under the orders of their superiors, be called to murder each other. What more I said that morning, I cannot recall. But I knew when I left the church that morning that as a minister of Christ I could take no part in a war.<sup>8</sup>

The Hornsey Journal of that week reported that Roberts called for an end to that "stupid" paradox that if you wish for peace you must prepare for war. Furthermore, the journal reported him as saying that the war was God's visitation on Christendom's denial of Him. The war was only the end of an age, not the end of civilization. He thought that the greed of materialists had received a blow from which they would never recover. Unlike most other ministers in the area, Roberts did not pray for the empire's success. But, if the newspaper report is accurate, Roberts was confused enough to say that since the British were at war they "must see it through".<sup>9</sup> After the service he phoned a number of sympathetic friends, mainly from the four groups discussed, inviting them to his empty home for a meeting.<sup>10</sup> He described that

event:

We were a very bewildered company. Since the Boer War at the turn of the century, we had no occasion to consider the Christian attitude to war. Henry Hodgkin had promised to come, and I remember how anxiously we awaited him. Surely he would bring, out of the long testimony of the Society of Friends against war, some clear word that might resolve our bewilderment. But so far as our course of action was concerned Henry was as puzzled as we were.<sup>11</sup>

Those present could only agree on two points: namely, that war was unchristian and that they should meet again. In the meetings which followed essentially two options were discussed: they could refuse to join in the war effort or they could reluctantly "accept war as the best possible method under certain circumstances."<sup>12</sup> In order to clarify their thoughts they decided at the second meeting to publish a series of position papers, called Papers for War Time with William Temple, the prominent young Anglican rector of St. James, Piccadilly, as editor.<sup>13</sup> It was he who wrote the first tract, entitled Christianity and War, published on November 2, 1914. By that time two groups had gradually emerged: those tolerating the war and those espousing pacifism. The split between these two groups came about in November. The turmoil it caused for the pacifists is best described in its chronological setting after the Llandudno Conference, a conference which enabled the pacifists to break with the "Papers for War Time" group.

If Roberts and the group discussed above represent one stream contributing, be it ever so imperfectly, to the formation of the FOR, Henry Hodgkin and the Friends represent a second and more important stream. Part of FOR mythology is the "handshake-farewell" scene between Henry Hodgkin and Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze at Cologne. Writing in

The Friend about the fiftieth anniversary of the FOR, Claude Coltman described the parting as "the vital spark to a movement already smouldering in several Christian circles."<sup>14</sup> Although some important documents have been destroyed, the events surrounding the parting can be reasonably reconstructed.<sup>15</sup>

In spite of the threats of war about ninety Christian leaders from all over the world gathered briefly in Constance on August 2 to discuss "the influence of religion for promoting International amity and avoidance of war."<sup>16</sup> The conferees had to leave Constance quickly if they wanted to catch the last train to get them safely through and out of Germany.<sup>17</sup> Among those who were on this train were the young Lutheran pastor, organizer and Constance conference chairman Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze, Henry Hodgkin and his wife Joy, World Alliance chairman Allen Baker, and Willoughby H. Dickinson, the secretary of the British section of the World Alliance. In the secondary literature there is confusion about the travel arrangements, the Cologne farewell and two letters. It has been thought that Hodgkin and Siegmund-Schultze travelled together in the same compartment; that the farewell contributed to the formation of the FOR, and that Hodgkin gave Siegmund-Schultze a letter in Cologne. The existing evidence does not support these suggestions. During the trainride Hodgkin was able to write a lengthy diary-form letter to his father. This letter is silent about the young Lutheran. In 1958 Joy Hodgkin, who had finished Henry's letter, denied to Percy Bartlett, FOR general secretary between 1924 and 1936, that the two men had travelled together in a luggage van. In 1959

Siegmund-Schultze corroborated her statement when he wrote to Bartlett that he "went along the corridor from the luggage van to talk to H.T.H."<sup>18</sup> Although Hodgkin's letter is silent about the "handshake-farewell" at Cologne, Siegmund-Schultze affirmed to Nevin Sayre, chairman of the International Fellowship, in 1959 that he had said to Hodgkin in Cologne that the war would make no difference in their friendship and work.<sup>19</sup> There is, however, no evidence that this Cologne incident had any bearing on the formation of the FOR. In Cologne, Baker and Dickinson gave Siegmund-Schultze a letter for Bethmann-Hollweg, the German chancellor. Hodgkin may have known about this letter, but he was certainly not involved in its composition. He wrote his own letter to Siegmund-Schultze, sometimes confused with the Baker-Dickinson letter, on August 4 in Allen Baker's garden. Professor Benjamin Battin of Swarthmore College<sup>20</sup> took this letter to Berlin where Siegmund-Schultze probably translated, revised and circulated copies among church leaders and friends of peace. This letter and these copies do not seem to have survived.<sup>21</sup> Siegmund-Schultze and Bartlett thought for some time that this letter was the same as the "Message to Men and Women of Goodwill", published on August 7, 1914, by Friends Meeting for Suffering and in The Friend of August 14. Hodgkin was indeed largely responsible for the "Message", as he admitted to Roberts, but the "Message" and the letter were not identical, although the contents apparently were similar.<sup>22</sup> If so, the letter reaffirmed the friendship between the two men which the war indeed could not break. It was this friendship which contributed to the formation of the International Fellowship in 1919 in Bilthoven. The



"Message", and thus probably the letter, contained a number of ideas which would recur in FOR literature, though it lacked the much more comprehensive view of the FOR.

The "Message" may be regarded as the beginning of the second strand in the formation of the FOR. Hence, a few statements should be highlighted. The document acknowledged that England "entered into war under a grave sense of duty to a smaller State." However, this new situation stunned so many that they were "scarcely... able to discern the path of duty" because it denied the brotherhood of humanity. No course of action could be offered,<sup>23</sup> only certain principles could be considered. The first principle deserves to be quoted in full because it anticipates much of the FOR literature:

1. The conditions which have made this catastrophe possible must be regarded by us as essentially unchristian. This war spells the bankruptcy of much that we too lightly call Christian. No nation, no Church, no individual can be wholly exonerated. We have all participated to some extent in these conditions. We have been content, or too little discontented with them. If we apportion blame, let us not fail first to blame ourselves, and to seek the forgiveness of Almighty God.

The other principles may be summarized as follows:

2. Never was there greater need for men of faith.
3. There was a need to continue to show love to all men.
4. Members needed to start thinking about the post-war situation.
5. War should not be carried on in a vindictive spirit.
6. No day should be closed without a prayer that God would lead his family into a better way.

A total of 475,000 copies were printed in England and 50,000 for Friends in the U.S.A.<sup>24</sup>

The next important milestone leading to the formation of the FOR

was the Quaker organized Llandudno Conference. The conference had been planned months before the war erupted. As early as April 1914 The Friend announced that the conference would be held from September 21 through 30.<sup>25</sup> The conveners hoped that such speakers as John Mott, Richard Roberts, D. S. Cairns, H. G. Wood and W. C. Braithwaite would raise the life of the Society of Friends "to a higher level of efficiency and power."<sup>26</sup> Due to the war the conveners decided to shorten the conference; not all speakers were able to attend, and the focus shifted. The original question, though not concentrated on at the conference, would become a common FOR theme:

Is His Gospel a satisfactory message of life and hope to India and China, as well as to England and America, to the toiler and the outcast as well as to the comfortable middle classes, to 'seekers' of all kinds, practical, intellectual, or mystical?<sup>27</sup>

Although the delegates narrowed their attention to "the great challenge to Christianity involved in the outbreak of war between professedly Christian nations, and on the vastest scale the world has ever known,"<sup>28</sup> the initial theme was not forgotten. The SQS, for example, submitted a memorandum to the conference urging the conferees not to forget the connection between war and socio-economic problems: "War... is ... a ghastly struggle for the advantages to be reaped from [the] exploitation ... of workers or subject races."<sup>29</sup> A similar note was sounded in a memorandum of September 7, the first day of the battle of the Marne, by five young Free Churchmen and future FOR members - G.H.C. Angus, M.S. Lawson, N. Micklem, W. Paton, R. D. Rees. A part of this memorandum was read at the conference. The authors stated that the Church's duty is

constantly to protest against

all cases of social evil, of which war is but one....(E)ven if for the moment the right is wholly on the British side, this war is no solution to the problem, [because] the Passion and Cross of Jesus Christ seem to us the utter repudiation of the method of violence... [Therefore] Christian men should feel themselves forbidden to take part in war; [for] the only legitimate and practical way of the Church is the way of love.<sup>30</sup>

Their statement about the relationship between church and state contained nothing new, yet it clashed with any philosophy of the absolute supremacy of the state: "Christians are members of the nation, but before all things they are members of the Church - that is, a fellowship, whose ideals and boundaries transcend nationality ... to be a society in the world and yet not of the world."<sup>31</sup> These memoranda show that the problem of war was in the process of becoming fused with theological, social, political and economic issues. In speeches and discussions the conferees tried to clarify and to assert the relations between the various areas. For example, chairman Henry Hodgkin in his Sunday address (September 27) stated that pacifists "proclaim to the world a truer ideal of nationalism,... a truer internationalism, ... a truer doctrine of the Church of Christ."<sup>32</sup> These "truer" ideals were founded

firstly on our belief in human brotherhood, the Fatherhood of God, and the reverence ... due from one another ... to another ... who has within him the seed of Divine Life. ... Secondly on freedom of conscience, which ... [is] essential to spiritual development, but which is contravened as soon as men, under the military system, are compelled to do things which, as private individuals they would know to be gross violations of the moral law. ... Thirdly, upon the belief that the supreme forces that are given to men are mental and spiritual. ... Above all, we base our protest upon the fundamental truth that love is the supreme force

in the universe.<sup>33</sup>

Hodgkin drew the implication that these four principles were fundamental to the whole of a Christian's life as well as to the social system.<sup>34</sup> These principles and implications became common themes in FOR literature.

The similarity between the ideas expressed at the Llandudno Conference and the tenets of the FOR went even further. The conferees who discussed 'War and the Social Order' drew the conclusion--"with a haste and possibly a rashness most unusual in the Society of Friends"<sup>35</sup>--that they "must treat the problem of war as a whole, and that peace must be the basis of all social order and progress." They admitted that it was wrong to continue the mistaken tendency of the past "to isolate the problem [of war] from other social problems", because "the seeds of war lie within every one of us."<sup>36</sup> As the editor of The Ploughshare, William Loftus Hare argued, the Society as a whole had never yet protested against all war.<sup>37</sup> In other words, the Society of Friends had treated pacifism as an addendum to rather than an integral part of their philosophy-theology. At Llandudno Quaker conferees came to realize the insufficiency of their old approach. Hence the conference organizers decided that further meetings were necessary, a decision which ultimately led to Cambridge.

At the conference were also some non-Quakers, among them Richard Roberts, one of the initially invited speakers. His two speeches whose "epigrammatic style captured attention throughout,"<sup>38</sup> enabled him to clarify some of his own thoughts as well of his audience. Roberts still

acknowledged that "England, as England, could do nothing else than act in the way in which she has done", but in doing so broke the heart of Christ.<sup>39</sup> The war, according to Roberts, showed that civilization was based on force and not on real Christian ideals. That the Church was blamed for allowing the war to break out was in itself a "recognition that Christianity ought to have prevented the war."<sup>40</sup> But to the question: "Has Christianity failed?", Roberts answered that it had "never yet been really tried."<sup>41</sup> Rather, the Church, nations and individuals had always performed on a "sub-Christian platform".<sup>42</sup> What was needed was "something of the Catholic spirit" infused into the individualism of Protestantism.<sup>43</sup> Here was an allusion to the idea of fellowship. The notion is important because fellowship could overcome divisions in the body of Christ. It became a key idea in the FOR.

Perhaps Roberts' most remarkable statement dealt with people's failure to recognize the fact of sin: "We need the core of the doctrine of Original Sin back in its right place."<sup>44</sup> It was not only a reaction against his own and others' liberal theological past,<sup>45</sup> but was also an expression of a different understanding of the idea of progress, for "we modern Christians have bowed down ... in a quite superstitious way ... before the little tin god of Progress."<sup>46</sup> Roberts struggled with what became a central theme in FOR literature: what was the Kingdom of God like and how did the fulness of that Kingdom come about? At Llandudno Roberts realized that a shallow view of sin produced an inaccurate view of God and consequently of God's Kingdom. He rejected the common liberal evolutionary ethical teleology that Christianity was a "kind of

stimulus to this cosmic climb."<sup>47</sup> Although he still accepted the liberal idea that he could help establish the Kingdom of God, his understanding of it added a transcendent dimension to it. As he said in his speech on "The Meaning of the Cross": "The true fulness of the meaning of the cross... is the convergence of two great movements - of God to man and of man to God; God, in the Person of Jesus Christ, offering to God the gift of perfect obedience." In His offer Jesus swept away the barrier between God and man, providing thus the moral dynamic with which one could consecrate oneself to His service.<sup>48</sup> Here, Roberts gave the justification for the name Fellowship of Reconciliation three months before the organization with that name was established.

The Quaker philosopher-theologian H. G. Wood termed the conference a success. Though the conferees "met in much perplexity ... [they] ended in an atmosphere of dedication", for they were able to renew and deepen the loyalty to their general peace testimony. Yet, he realized that they had failed to "arrive at any judgment on the situation which we could offer for the guidance of the Society or the public." Furthermore, the conferees did not learn "what alternative course could have been taken by our nation, which would have been either honourable or Christian."<sup>49</sup> The only practical step taken was to arrange meetings of Friends to disseminate the results of the conference,<sup>50</sup> a method frequently used later by the FOR.

Nevertheless, Wood's assessment of the conference was not complete. Both Friends and non-Friends were able to clarify their thoughts. They were challenged by the question "What are you ready to

sacrifice to diminish suffering and prepare for a better future?"<sup>51</sup> Hodgkin answered the question in a "Letter from the Conference", positing that Friends' "testimony against all war must not be merely passive. We must be ready to sacrifice our comfort."<sup>52</sup> As "The Basis" of the FOR indicates this question and the answer to it played a prominent role at Cambridge.

In addition to the intellectual challenge and the need for individual and collective clarification on these critical issues, the Llandudno Conference contained two procedural decisions crucial to the formation of the FOR. First and foremost, the Llandudno committee decided to continue its meetings.<sup>53</sup> Secondly, the committee decided to invite non-Quakers who agreed with the Llandudno interpretation on war.<sup>54</sup> They did so because they wanted "to make their voice heard collectively in a wider circle."<sup>55</sup> As a letter of Leyton Richards indicates, Friends had tried to reach a wider audience before the Llandudno Conference: "Here in Manchester, the Friends have been - + are still - holding fortnightly meetings on aspects of "Xtianity + War": Some of us are associated with them in this + it is good to be able to report attendance up to 1000."<sup>56</sup> In contrast to the open Manchester Quaker meetings, the Llandudno committee was selective in its choice of non-Friends. The invitations came at an opportune time. Some pacifist non-Friends suffered from a profound feeling of isolation. Richards' letter, for example, began with the words, "Thank you for writing to me. We need mutual encouragement in these days."<sup>57</sup> Others, like Orchard and Roberts, had become increasingly frustrated with the views expressed by

the majority of the "Papers for War Time" group. The invitation offered the opportunity to break with one ecumenical group and join another.

It is against the background of the invitation that the story of the "Papers for War Time" group can be resumed. As has already been mentioned, at the second meeting of the group it was decided to publish short position papers. On November 2 the first two papers were published, namely Temple's Christianity and War and Roberts' Are We Worth Fighting For?. Temple's paper contained an explanatory note introducing the series. The note not only set the tone for Temple's paper, but also reflected Liberal government policy and popular sentiment: "Great Britain is engaged in a war from which, as we believe, there was offered to our nation no honourable way of escape."<sup>58</sup> Temple was even more explicit in the actual article. He argued that England was right to declare war on August 4 because it defended a just cause. He went so far as to say that "this war, far from representing the bankruptcy of Christianity, really represents a great advance in its conquest of the world",<sup>59</sup> because "we have at least found out ... that all war is contrary to the mind and spirit of Christ. That is a real gain."<sup>60</sup> Temple argued that pacifists were necessary since "the nation could ill do without them", yet "it was not possible for England on the 4th of August, nor for any Englishman then or now, to act in full accord with the mind of Christ."<sup>61</sup> Temple could hardly have given a better definition of interim ethics.

While Temple's essay was a clear exposition, Roberts' paper was, uncharacteristically, poorly written. In spite of the contorted style it



is clear, however, that Roberts, like so many secular pacifists, still accepted a dualism between individual and state. Using an Angellian approach, he argued that in the light of the costs the individual should answer the question "Are We Worth Fighting For?" with a resounding no. For the nation the answer was different, for "the greatness and the unity of a people depend upon their willingness to subordinate their personal rights to the interests of the whole" as long as this subordination did not interfere with the rights of conscience.<sup>62</sup> This dualism was in essence not so different from Temple's interim ethics. But whereas Temple gave primacy to the government to decide political right and wrong, Roberts came to realize that the values which held the empire together were moral principles. Thus he could say that it was "the vocation of Britain to proclaim and practise the faith that in the supremacy of moral ideas lies the promise of the liberty and the peace of the world."<sup>63</sup> Furthermore, he began to realize that Temple's interim ethics led ultimately to an absolute sovereignty of the State, and this he implicitly rejected, for "there is that which is greater than England, nobler than the empire. It is the Kingdom of God. Into this Kingdom the nations of the world are to pour their glory."<sup>64</sup>

Two other tracts should be mentioned here because their contents help to explain why some future FOR members stayed as long with the "Papers for War Time" group as they did. A. Herbert Gray, who did not become an FOR member until around 1928, made some scathing attacks on the British war effort in The War Spirit in Our National Life, published on November 30: "What a world gone mad it is! ... It is the foulest

business the world has ever seen. ... We must have missed the way in which the real world can be constrained to work to good ends."<sup>65</sup>

According to him, the war contained within it the very negation of civilization. Furthermore, both Germany and England were guilty because both had displayed the same militant spirit in social, commercial and industrial life.<sup>66</sup>

Gray's ideas constituted one reason why Roberts, Hodgkin and Orchard continued to attend the group meetings. These ideas gave them hope that more could be accomplished. Orchard's essay The Real War, published on December 14, placed the problem of war on a different level than Roberts' or Gray's. Orchard posited that the real war was "a war against pernicious ideas" which had infected both the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance. To prevent evil ideas from becoming dominant, Christians had "to muster against them all the force of right ideas." The real war was, therefore, a fight within.<sup>67</sup> He rejected the new slogan popularized by H. G. Wells in August 1914, that this war would end all war.<sup>68</sup> Orchard predicted with prophetic insight that "all the nations at war are committed to the policy of fighting to a finish", using methods which appealed to the doctrine of might is right. He rejected those methods because "the worship of force cannot be destroyed by force, nor Satan cast out Satan."<sup>69</sup> Orchard regarded the war as a fight for an empire, dismissing such a fight as an outdated idea; instead, "there must ... be a world-wide Empire of Christian Faith and Brotherhood."<sup>70</sup>

In spite of their attacks on war, the papers of Gray, Roberts and Orchard were not outright calls for pacifism, unlike the essay submitted by Hodgkin. In a letter to Temple, dated November 17, Hodgkin expressed his disappointment that his paper "The Church's Opportunity" had been rejected by Temple. Since Hodgkin wrote as a founding member of the group, his paper should have been published in order to reach a wider circle than the Friends. Some members objected to a Friend writing about the Church. Several objected to Hodgkin's presentation of the pacifist idea of force. Probably the decisive reason for the rejection was that some members had begun to support the war. According to Hodgkin, they now viewed the war as a "holy war".<sup>71</sup> Probably he overstated his case, but the term reflected the new general tendency in the group quite well. For example, the "Basis of Publication" of the second series of Papers for War Time starts with the words : "Great Britain was in August morally bound to declare war and is no less bound to carry the war to a decisive issue." The words of A. G. Hogg could have been spoken by any member of Asquith's cabinet: "It appears to me to be the duty of the individual Christian ... to fling himself earnestly into the national effort."<sup>72</sup> It was this emerging militarism in the "Papers for War Time" group, undoubtedly influenced by the developing trench warfare on the battlefield, together with the rejection of Hodgkin's essay, that contributed to the withdrawal of the pacifists from the group.<sup>73</sup> The disillusion with the group is perhaps best exemplified by Roberts. In addition, his correspondence with Hodgkin allows one to suggest an approximate date for the break. On

November 13 the Hornsey Journal noted that the problem of war blocked everything else in Roberts' thought.<sup>74</sup> In addition, the attitude of the group left him very depressed. In a letter to Hodgkin, dated November 11, he confided that only a few members sided with him,<sup>75</sup> while the others supported the idea that "war is wrong, but this war is right." In contrast to this interim ethics, Roberts maintained the absoluteness of Christianity. Like a biblical prophet he called out: "Come ye out from among them and be ye separate." Only through separation could a "frontal attack" against "nominal" views come about: "Somebody must wade right into this whole business--in a whole-hogging way--or we'll just go round in a vicious circle for another generation."<sup>76</sup> However, the letter does not state that he had withdrawn. On November 30 Hodgkin wrote to his father that Roberts had psychologically calmed down and that he had "come more and more to our position."<sup>77</sup> Roberts, in an undated letter to Hodgkin, stated that he had come to realize that the difference with the pro-war members was one of presuppositions. Arguments against war alone, therefore, could not settle the difference. Something far more radical than propaganda against war was necessary. Roberts made here some crucial observations. In the first place, what was needed were "foundations for a deliberate and forthright propaganda of the Kingdom of God outside the ordinary ecclesiastical channels." For that purpose a central institution could be formed, around which a good many activities could be arranged. Here, for the first time, the FOR's *raison d'être* is stated. Secondly, Roberts propounded the methodology the FOR was to use during its first year of existence: the

usage of a caravan or crusaders like Quaker Tramps, and preaching on village greens and city street corners. Thirdly, he thought it necessary to move from personal to social and international reconciliation.<sup>78</sup> Roberts' undated letter must have been written shortly before November 30. The ideas he expressed in this letter show a clear break with the "Papers for War Time" group, unlike the November 19 letter. The separation may, therefore, be dated between November 19 and the end of the month. Whatever the limitation of the group, the meetings and papers helped to clarify the issues and thoughts, especially on the problem of interim versus absolutist ethics.<sup>79</sup> For Roberts and those of like mind the "Papers for War Time" group turned out to be a dead end.

Roberts' separation from the group was eased by the knowledge that the Llandudno Conference committee had called another meeting, to be held on December 4 at the Collegium, 92, St. George's Square S. W. 1. This pacifist gathering hoped to "find in spiritual fellowship a common message adequate to the present situation."<sup>80</sup> Those who had been invited to this Pimlico conference had received a memorandum defining the message to be discussed as well as a note containing three plans of action. The memorandum, which was probably read and interpreted by Hodgkin at the meeting,<sup>81</sup> contained the essence of the FOR "Basis". The message was defined in the following summarized points:

1. In relation to individual duty:  
All war is wrong for the Christian.  
 The claim of Christ is absolute.  
 Loyalty to Him comes before loyalty to nation.
2. In relation to our national situation:  
 We cannot identify our cause with that of the Kingdom

of God, nor that there was no other course but war or dishonour, nor accept the doctrine of fighting to a finish.

3. In relation to the future:  
We believe that the greatest forces in the world are moral and spiritual which should be given a fair trial. This could mean for the nation that it would become a "suffering servant" for the sake of humanity.
4. In relation to the Kingdom of God:  
Our testimony in regard to war is only part of our testimony to the reign of righteousness. To exorcise the spirit of war involves a reconstruction of the whole fabric of society.

The memorandum concluded that it was the duty of all involved to proclaim these truths always, so that "by this means... the Kingdom of God will be set up on earth."<sup>82</sup>

From the surviving minutes of the conference it can be gathered that several of those present felt the memorandum to be too political.<sup>83</sup> The differences of opinion expressed here would continue unabated after the FOR had come into formal existence. J. R. Coates argued that people could not usher in the Kingdom. Maude Royden told that she had no interest in seeking martyrdom.<sup>84</sup> Basil Yeaxlee and Mary Phillips called for a "peace army".<sup>85</sup> Roberts was only interested in foundational statements, for

pacifism + non-resistance are byproducts of some central things to which we have to testify. We are in the world for the business of reconciliation; being reconciled first to God + changed to preach reconciliation among men divided as they are by all kinds of jealousies - antipathies.<sup>86</sup>

It was this message, according to Roberts, which as an imitation of the ways of Christ, ought to be brought first of all to the common people.

How much of the memorandum was officially adopted is not clear from the surviving notes,<sup>87</sup> but most of the ideas were discussed again

at Cambridge and in later FOR literature. The conference did adopt one plan outlined in the letter of invitation. This was essentially the blueprint for the organization of the Cambridge Conference, calling for

the holding of a school of study and prayer during the Christmas vacation at which all who are prepared to take part in the campaign to follow should come together in order to discuss the lines of their message, how to meet the arguments which will be brought forward, and the message of approach to others. An important feature should be ample time spent in prayer and waiting upon God.<sup>88</sup>

The Pimlico meeting appointed a committee to organize a conference along the lines of this plan. The planning group consisted of Hodgkin, Roberts, and Royden, who in turn invited Lucy Gardner, McEwan Lawson, J. St. G. Heath (1882-1918), the Warden of Toynbee Hall, and Fearon Halliday to join them.<sup>89</sup> The conference date was set to run from Monday evening December 28 until Thursday morning December 31. The planning committee was asked to find conference space within a fifty mile radius of London. Moreover, the conference gave the new committee a mandate "to work out the implications of our position and bring to the larger group some concrete proposals as to the basis of membership and as to the lines of propaganda",<sup>90</sup> something the Collegium conference had failed to achieve.<sup>91</sup>

No minutes of the steering committee seem to have survived, but there is a circular letter from Hodgkin, dated December 9, summarizing the results of the Pimlico conference and inviting the sympathizers to a new conference at an as yet unknown location.<sup>92</sup> Nothing is known of a meeting held on December 16 except that the Quaker Roderic K. Clark (1884-1937) was asked to join the steering committee.<sup>93</sup> Ebenezer

Cunningham recalled in 1964 how the conference came to be held in

Cambridge:

One day ... I was met by Rendal Wyatt ... who told me that there was a group of people desirous of meeting in Cambridge to think further concerning the questions raised for the Christian by the war .... [He asked] 'Could I do anything to find a convenient room in which to meet?' I was then a young Fellow of St. John's College, but I ventured to write to the Vice-Chancellor to ask if we could have the use of a room .... I was glad to receive a reply saying that we could meet in the Arts Theatre.<sup>94</sup>

At Cambridge the steering committee was able to present a draft of their position, called "The Order of Reconciliation".<sup>95</sup> Why the word "order" was used is not completely clear, but one suggestion may be made. In an undated letter Lilian Stevenson called for "Militant Pacificists", a "new grouping of peace-advocates out to form something like the Franciscan tertiary Order--i.e. relating to all of life."<sup>96</sup> Although the word "order" disappeared from the final name of the FOR,<sup>97</sup> the notion remained alive for a long time. As late as 1944 Eric Hayman, in a chapter called " ... Militant Here in Earth", described orders as specialist groups with a special vocation.<sup>98</sup> He went on to point out that "much of the greatest service and the most notable sanctity has been found within such Orders," and that they had "proved constantly the seed-bed of Christian life."<sup>99</sup> He approvingly quoted Percy Bartlett's book Quakers and the Christian Church which compared Quakers and Orders:

Yet in spite of all the wide differences between Quakers and the regular monastic Orders, Quakers are already an Order in the sense that as a community within the larger community of the Christian Church we hold the general Christian positions, but hold some of them, for example the peace testimony, in a more intense form, and under something like a vocation to its maintenance.<sup>100</sup>



One suggestion contained in the draft called for such vocational peacemakers: "The enrolment and training of a definite corps of men and women... who feel called to devote themselves entirely to proclaiming and working out these ideals."<sup>101</sup> Moreover, there existed an "Order of the Kingdom" group of which Malcolm Spencer was secretary.<sup>102</sup> Whenever there were significant difficulties in the FOR, as in 1919 and 1929, reference was made to "Orders". At least one segment in the FOR regarded the movement as an order. The influence of this segment is noticeable in the Preamble to "The Basis", which called on people "who are prepared to devote some time and energy towards making an effective witness" to the ideals of Fellowship. To some extent the history of the FOR could be compared to a spectrum with strong polarities, one extreme viewing the FOR as an order, and the other regarding the FOR as a political pressure group.<sup>103</sup>

On Monday evening December 28 a group of between 120 and 130 conferees listened to chairman Roberts' opening speech.<sup>104</sup> As an introduction to the discussion of the draft he stated that

it was not "pacifism" that we wanted, still less "neutrality", but Peace conceived as a positive force - Peace conceived as Love.... We should realize that love could not involve hate, nor love of our own country hatred of another. We should take the way of self-sacrifice as Christ took it.<sup>105</sup>

Horace Alexander recalled seventy years later that

the man who made the conference for me was Richard Roberts. I recall almost nothing in detail. But it was Richard Roberts who helped me see that the world was making great demands of us. Richard Roberts got right into me, and helped me to find a sure foundation of life.<sup>112</sup>

Maude Royden spoke about "The Absoluteness of the Claim of Christ" on Tuesday morning. She may not have sought martyrdom under DORA, the Defence of the Realm Act, but she realized that for pacifists there was a profound clash between church and state. Later on Tuesday Hodgkin dealt with the necessity for love in national and international relations. J. St. G. Heath, Warden of Toynbee Hall, spoke on the relationship between war and other social problems on Wednesday morning.<sup>107</sup> The rest of the day dealt with organizational work, including a discussion on the draft. Unfortunately, no minutes of this discussion have survived. The draft consisted of a Preamble, a five point agreement later known as "The Basis", a set of four general principles of propaganda, and examples of the methods to be followed.<sup>108</sup> Probably "The Basis" was discussed first and slightly altered.<sup>109</sup> Article 1 of "The Basis" stressed that love as revealed in the life and death of Jesus Christ was the only sufficient basis of human society. Article 2 stated that this love had personal and national consequences. Only after this declaration was war mentioned. Article 3 makes it abundantly clear that the waging of war was forbidden as a consequence of the proclamation found in the two previous articles. Furthermore, the condemnation of war was tied to a service in all areas of life, so that, according to article 4, the new Kingdom could come about. Finally, article 5 proclaimed that God uses human beings for His redemptive purpose.

From "The Basis" it is already clear that the conferees saw the problem of war and peace as a more complex issue than any of the

existing peace societies. This is further borne out by the Preamble. Its wording was changed considerably but the general ideas remained unchanged. These included the ecumenicity of the Fellowship and the condemnation of the various denominations for their confused statements on war and for their failure to interpret the mind of Christ properly. Thus the churches endangered the future of the Kingdom of God.<sup>110</sup> Moreover, the conferees felt themselves to be a remnant, for they were "but a few out of many".<sup>111</sup> The most obvious change, however, was in the name. Roberts, who apparently suggested the word reconciliation, gave in 1943 two reasons for the choice. Firstly, the word peace could get the new organization mixed up with the Peace Society.<sup>112</sup> Roberts did not explain why the conferees wanted to avoid the confusion, but good reasons could easily have been marshalled. In the first place, the Peace Society was not a pacifist organization. Secondly, in the Constitution of the larger Peace Society there was nothing of a solid Christian basis. Thirdly, its objective was "to diffuse information tending to show that War is inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity and the true interests of mankind."<sup>113</sup> As the FOR conferees had come to realize such an objective was inadequate. Fourthly, J. A. Pease, the president of the Peace Society, was and remained during the war a member of the cabinet, thus compromising the witness and effectiveness of the Society.<sup>114</sup> In other words, the Peace Society, and others like it, offered little for which the Cambridge conferees were searching. The second reason Roberts gave in 1943 for the title was that reconciliation was an activity, "the art and practice of turning enemies into friends",

rather than a passivity, the absence of war, "a state of rest, a lull between wars." Moreover, reconciliation was at the heart of Christian ethics. Using 2 Cor. 5: 17-19, Roberts argued that reconciliation was "a universal principle, to be practiced on every plane and in every department of life."<sup>115</sup> Actually 2 Cor. 5: 17-19 gives a somewhat different contents to this ministry of reconciliation, for it is namely God who in Christ was "reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Although Roberts' immediate exegesis was not precise, the consequence of man's reconciliation with God is that he is also reconciled with his fellow man.<sup>116</sup> Thus reconciliation must be regarded as the key idea to the understanding of the FOR.

Unlike the Preamble, the four general principles of propaganda were only slightly modified at the conference, although the fourth one became part of the Preamble. This principle helps to explain why the FOR shied away from the confrontational tactics later espoused by numerous conscientious objectors. The members desired to "proclaim their conviction in a spirit of humility, honour and love, to exercise forbearance in argument, and to guard against the danger of controversial methods." In spite of the FOR's premise that practice followed theory, knowledge of the principle was no guarantee that the members always practised what they preached. Captain Peacock's accusation of Cadoux could apply to many other FOR members: "Is it any use pleading for peace and goodwill from one so warlike as yourself?".<sup>117</sup>

The other three principles emphasized the positive aspect of the message for all of life, asking the members to "work out personally and on their own lines what is involved in their membership." The principles were silent about the function of the committee and head office. Perhaps here, more than anywhere else, one can find the weakness and strength of the Fellowship as an organization. It was really up to the members to devise means to proclaim the message. No one was forced into a stereotyped program. Thus there was great scope for individual creativity. The members, as it were, had to work out their own salvation (Phil. 2:12). The corporate structure, meanwhile, remained vague and the members' methods were not necessarily accepted by the head office. There was and remained an unresolved disharmonious tension between the individual and the Fellowship as a body. Consequently, in order to understand the FOR it is necessary to look at a corporate structure as well at individuals.<sup>118</sup>

The final section of the draft dealt with examples of methods. Most examples had been discussed at the Pimlico conference. The methods which the Cambridge conferees approved were those of various types of meetings, both private and public, the publication of literature, the formation of a "peace army", and the exhortation to prayer, described as the "supreme method". It may be noted that these methods allowed for cooperation with other organizations. In this way the FOR was separate yet ecumenical. Furthermore, the conferees tried to approve only those methods which were in harmony with the message. Means and ends had to be of the same kind.<sup>119</sup> Here the FOR significantly differed from

Christians who tolerated or supported war, since for them ends and means could be of a different kind. Finally, there is no reference at all to political tactics. It seems, therefore, that the conferees wanted to see the FOR more as an order than as a political pressure group.

Confrontational methods were deemed to be inappropriate means. This point helps to explain why, for example, the FOR felt often uneasy about participation in marches or strikes.

However much the conferees had talked, Lucy Gardner, the newly appointed honorary secretary, remarked shortly afterwards that many implications of their position had not been faced. Above all, the question on the loyalty to the nation had not received an adequate answer. She thought that perhaps greater simplicity was needed, preferring therefore smaller group meetings of sympathizers to be saturated with the thought of love.<sup>120</sup> Her view may be regarded as the reflective side of the FOR as contrasted to the active side. The word 'contrasted' is used here on purpose, for many members took their stand on a particular side, apparently not recognizing that they thus perpetuated a non-biblical dualism.<sup>121</sup>

Gardner's somewhat negative remarks must be balanced by the report which J. W. Graham and Gulielmo Crosfield gave to Meeting for Sufferings. The Friend of January 8, 1915, stated that "the two and a-half days' Conference had been a great inspiration and encouragement." According to The Friend the conference was "a revelation of how many, outside our borders, were fully prepared to adopt Friends' attitude with respect to war." Probably about half of those present were non-

Friends.<sup>122</sup> Because of the great similarity between the two organizations, many Friends did not find it necessary to join the FOR, especially since their own organization offered many opportunities to work for peace.<sup>123</sup> But there were differences, in ecumenicity, in theology, in ecclesiology, as well as in linking war between nations with socio-economic concerns. Perhaps this "socialistic" aspect held back many, not just Quakers, from joining the FOR.<sup>124</sup>

Finally, the Conference appointed a committee to help in carrying forward the work of the Fellowship. It consisted of C. Franklin Angus, Roderic K. Clark, Marian Ellis, Lucy Gardner (honorary secretary), W. Fearon Halliday, J. St. G. Heath, Henry T. Hodgkin (chairman), McEwan Lawson, W. E. Orchard, the Anglican Mary E. Phillips, Richard Roberts, A. Maude Royden, Lilian Stevenson. It may be noted that the conferees had made a deliberate attempt to elect women to the committee, thus indicating the important role women were expected to play in the FOR.<sup>125</sup> Although no Roman Catholics were represented,<sup>126</sup> all major Protestant bodies were - a deliberate policy which continued for many years. When the committee started to work it was January 1915, five months after the start of the war and a month and a half after the Union of Democratic Control and the No Conscription Fellowship had held their initial constitutional meetings, both on November 17, 1914.<sup>127</sup> What is remarkable is the almost total absence of references to these two organizations. The FOR members could not have been ignorant of the UDC and NCF. For example, Leyton Richards was a founding member of the NCF.

The considerable differences in bases and goals between these two organizations and the FOR may explain this near total omission. Furthermore, the absence of references to the UDC or NCF as well as to important political and military events in the correspondence among the various FOR members leaves the impression that the FOR members were working in something approaching isolation and on an intellectually abstract level. This charge is not without substance. Even FOR members admitted this at various times. The rest of the history of the FOR should prove how accurate this allegation is.



### ENDNOTES CHAPTER 3

<sup>1</sup>See such different authors as Tatlow, SCM, p. 506; Gilbert Murray, The League of Nations Movement: Some Reflections of the Early Days, London: David Davies Memorial Institute of International Studies, 1955, p. 3; H. G. Wells, Mr. Britling Sees It Through, New York: Macmillan, 1916, p. 77; Richard Aldington, Death of a Hero, Garden City: Garden City Publishing Co., 1979 (1929), p. 148-149. Basil Thomson, My Experiences at Scotland Yard, Garden City: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1923, p. 37; In spite of his surprise Thomson also noted that "there were, in fact, no illusions at the War Office." (p. 37).

<sup>2</sup>Orchard, Faith, p. 120. Another FOR member, J. Morgan Jones, wrote in Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 9, Sept, 1927, p. 163, that he saw war coming three years before it actually started. During the war Jones was more involved in the NCF.

<sup>3</sup>William E. Orchard, Outlook for Religion, London: Cassell, 1917, p. 98.

<sup>4</sup>Orchard, Outlook, pp. 98-99.

<sup>5</sup>See chapter 5.

<sup>6</sup>Richard Roberts, The Faith For The New Age, FOR pamphlet, n.d., p. 5.

<sup>7</sup>Fellowship Vol. 9 no. 1, Jan. 1943, p. 3. Reprinted in Christian Pacifist, May 1943, pp. 93-96. The first War Sunday was August 9. The church was in Crouch Hill.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Hornsey Journal, 14-8-1914, p. 2. In Latin the paradox reads "si vis pacem, para bellum".

<sup>10</sup>Roberts had actually been on holidays in Aldburgh and the rest of the family stayed there. No list of those attending this meeting survives, but at least the following were present: G. K. A. Bell, E. Bevan, G. Darlaston, P. Dearmer, H. T. Hodgkin, W. E. Orchard, M. Spencer, possibly W. Temple. Bevan worked later for the Department of Information and wrote German War Aims New York: Harper, 1918.

<sup>11</sup>Fellowship, Vol. 9 no. 1, Jan. 1943, p.3. Roberts had been opposed to the Boer War which he regarded as unjust, but he was not a

pacifist at that time. See RR file 28. Perhaps Hodgkin's letter of August 26 to Roberts referred to this meeting. "We all owe you a debt of gratitude for bringing us together the other day." RR File 38. It is possible, however, that the statement referred to the second meeting. Compare Lansbury to C. P. Trevelyan, Oct 2, 1914: "I haven't anything to propose" in A. J. A. Morris, C.P. Trevelyan 1870-1958, Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1977, p. 120.

<sup>12</sup>The Friend, (Philadelphia) Vol. 89 no. 21, Nov. 18, 1915, p. 243. The latter position could be regarded as interim ethics. References to it are found throughout this thesis but especially in connection with Niebuhr in the 1930's and 1940's. Hodgkin hoped that the group would "get into touch with Ramsay MacDonald + other Labour leaders." Hodgkin to Roberts, RR file 38, 11-8-1914.

<sup>13</sup>They also appealed to the archbishop of Canterbury to call a Lambeth Conference on war. The appeal led to nothing. See H. G. Wood, Henry T. Hodgkin, London: S.C.M. Press, 1937, p. 150 and RR file 38 letter Hodgkin 26-8-1914, p. 2. The archbishop's reluctance is also discussed in Robbins, Abolition, p. 57, in connection with a public discussion on a negotiated peace.

<sup>14</sup>The Friend, Vol. 122 no. 21, May 22, 1964, pp. 631-633. See also Brittain, Rebel, p. 30; John Ferguson, The Enthronement of Love, London: F.O.R., 1950, p. 98, and The Politics of Love, Cambridge: James Clarke, 1977, p. 45; E. P. Blamires, War Tests the Church, London: F.O.R., 1958, p. 38.

<sup>15</sup>Siegmund-Schultze's archives, recently relocated in Berlin, have nothing relevant before 1915.

<sup>16</sup>SCPC; CDG-B, Box 117.

<sup>17</sup>HTH Box file 15. Letter to his father, started on Aug. 2, 1914 and finished by his wife Joy on Aug 6. Edgar W. Orr in Christian Pacifism (Ashington: C. W. Daniels, 1958, p. 109) quotes Emil Ludwig's Kaiser William II to indicate that the emperor was "avowedly opposed to war". For a negative view of the emperor, see Fritz Fischer, Germany's Aims in the First World War, New York: W. W. Norton. 1967.

<sup>18</sup>SCPC; Nevin Sayre Papers, Percy Bartlett to Nevin Sayre, 19-10-1959.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Roberts in a letter to Hodgkin (HTH Box file 16, 19-11-1914) called Battin, rather uncomplimentary, an "unimaginative American ASS." Battin worked for a year for the World Alliance.

<sup>21</sup>Siegmund-Schultze was courtmartialed several times. The military apparently destroyed his papers. SCPC; Nevin Sayre Papers, Percy Bartlett to Sayre, 19-10-1959. Bartlett does not give a date for the courtmartial.

<sup>22</sup>Hodgkin wrote to Roberts (RR file 38, 11-8-1914): "I must plead guilty to being largely responsible for it." The members of the committee which published the message were: Hodgkin (clerk), Arnold S. Rowntree, T. Edmund Harvey, E. Richard Cross, J. Allen Baker, B. Seebohm Rowntree, Joan M. Fry, Anna L. Littleboy, Isaac Sharp, Arthur Dann. For a copy of the message see London Yearly Meeting 1915: Aug 7, 1914, Sept 1914, Apr. 1915 - the latter contains notes for the German edition.

<sup>23</sup>Compare the meeting called by Roberts.

<sup>24</sup>For newspapers which printed the message and for reactions to it see especially London Yearly Meeting, 1915, Sept. 1914. Roberts felt that the manifesto helped, see RR file 38, letter Hodgkin 11-8-1914. The role of the U.S.A. for the pacifists in England has been discussed by e.g. Vellacott, Russell, in connection with Russell, and Laurence W. Martin, Peace Without Victory (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958) in connection with the British Liberals and Woodrow Wilson.

<sup>25</sup>The Friend, Vol. 54 no. 16, April 17, 1914, pp. 263-264.

<sup>26</sup>Friends and the War, p. 8. The initial conveners were the Woodbrooke Extension Committee, Friends' Foreign Mission Association, Friends Home Committee and Young Friends' Sub-Committee. Later the SQS "welcomed the call to the Society of Friends to a Conference to be held at Llandudno, and very much desires to unite with other Friends in seeking wisdom and guidance at the Source where these are to be found." Friends and the War, p. 124.

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 8. For the July memorandum containing the topics see pp. 111-123.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 98. When the conference convened the first Battle of the Marne had already been fought.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 124. The SQS was concerned about the objective causes of war.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 137, 136, 135, 137.

<sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 136. The statement is obviously based on the gospel of John chs. 15-17.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.* pp. 13-14.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., pp. 11-12. Compare The Friend, Vol. 54 no. 41., Oct. 9, 1914, p. 738 and no. 40, Oct. 2, 1914, p. 727.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>35</sup>The Friend, Vol. 54 no. 41, Oct. 9, 1914, p. 738.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., pp. 738-739.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., Vol. 54 no. 40, p. 727. See also no. 41, p. 740.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., no. 40, p. 726.

<sup>39</sup>Friends and the War, p. 32.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 34.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid. The quotation is usually attributed to G. K. Chesterton. Roberts' view contrasts with a more prevalent view expressed in the title of G. J. Heering's book The Fall of Christianity (Dutch 1928 De Zondeval van het Christendom, English 1930).

<sup>42</sup>Friends and the War, p. 35.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., p. 36. Roberts did not make clear what he meant exactly with "something of the Catholic spirit." It could mean spirituality as well as community. These two were not mutually exclusive for Roberts. Probably he meant both with the emphasis on community.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>45</sup>See ch. 2, especially Campbell and Orchard.

<sup>46</sup>Friends and the War, p. 36.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid.

<sup>49</sup>The Friend, Vol. 54 no. 42, Oct. 16, 1914, p. 757. Wood in Hodgkin, p. 149, wrote:

The value of the conference lay not so much in its findings, which were vague and provisional, but in the resolve to stand by those who could not conscientiously fight and in the eager desire to pass from a negative testimony against war to something positive and constructive.

<sup>50</sup>The Friend, see for example, Vol. 54 no. 41, p. 747 and no. 46, Nov. 13, p. 829.

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.*, Vol. 54 no. 41, p. 740.

<sup>52</sup>Friends and the War, p. 138.

<sup>53</sup>RR Box 2 file 38, Letter from Hodgkin, 26-8-1914. Perhaps this fulfilled Hodgkin's hope that "Llandudno may lead us all on a few steps."

<sup>54</sup>It is not clear when the decision was taken but it must have been before November 6. There was a mix-up who would write letters of invitation. Hodgkin wrote several such letters until he read the minutes of the November 6 meeting--which do not seem to have survived--which made it clear that Lucy Gardner had been asked to write the letters. Hodgkin expressed the hope not to be blamed for the mix-up. HTH Box 1 file 16, 16-11-1914.

<sup>55</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16, 14-11-1916.

<sup>56</sup>RR Box 2 file 38, 25-IX-1914.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>58</sup>William Temple, Christianity and War, London: Humphrey Milford/Oxford University Press, 1914, p. 2. The first dozen papers, each 16 pages long, were published before the end of 1914. Another 24 followed in 1915. Temple's statement was precisely what pacifists denied.

<sup>59</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 3. Both Hodgkin, in 'Message of Goodwill', Aug. 7, 1914, p. 2., no. 1, and Roberts, at Llandudno, had interpreted the war as the bankruptcy of Christianity.

<sup>60</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 4. See also no. 5, J. H. Oldham's The Decisive Hour Is It Lost?, pp. 7 and 13.

<sup>61</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 11 and 13. See also no. 15, A. G. Hogg's Christianity and Force, p. 12. In Temple's archives, Vol. 101, there are a few paper clippings lauding the essay. How representative Temple's interim ethics was is difficult to gauge. The many references to, for example, Jesus driving the merchants out of the temple with a whip (John 2:14-17) suggest that many clergymen saw no discrepancy between war and the mind of Christ.

<sup>62</sup>Richard Roberts, Are We Worth Fighting For? p. 7.

<sup>63</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., The opposite conclusion is drawn in no. 9. written by X, The Witness of the Church in the Present Crisis.

<sup>65</sup>A. Herbert Gray, The War Spirit in Our National Life, pp. 3, 5. Gray's "conversion" occurred around 1928.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., pp. 6-8.

<sup>67</sup>William E. Orchard, The Real War, p. 8.

<sup>68</sup>H. G. Wells, The War That Will End War, New York: Duffield, 1914, written towards the end of August 1914.

<sup>69</sup>Orchard, The Real War, p. 8. This statement recurs numerous times in FOR literature. His prophecy was correct in so far as none of the belligerents issued any war aims until some years of conflict had elapsed and then only under American pressure.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>71</sup>HTH Box 1 file 14, 17-11-1914. The essay was published in 1915 for the FOR by Headley.

<sup>72</sup>Hogg, Christianity, no. 15, p. 12.

<sup>73</sup>Remarkably enough, Hodgkin remained a member of the group even after Roberts and Orchard had withdrawn. It is impossible to determine how much longer he attended the meetings but probably not beyond December 1914. Roberts in a letter dated November 19, hinted at a possible reason. He thought Hodgkin "to have staked more on the group." (HTH Box 1 file 16). Probably Hodgkin saw the group as a means to reach a wider audience. When the FOR came into existence the group became superfluous. Hodgkin's archives contains an undated paper with names of the members divided into four groups. No reason for the division is given but it is clear that a letter had been circulated. Its contents may have dealt with the emerging split between pacifists' and non-pacifists. The list reveals another network for the FOR:

1. those desiring to continue: Miss Barton, Rev. H. Bissiker, A. Black, Dr. Cairns, Miss Fairfield, Rev. A. H. Gray, Archdeacon Gresford Jones, Mrs Mackenzie, Basil Matthews, Rev. N. Micklem, W. Paton, W. Reason, Miss R. Rouse, M. Spencer, Miss L. Stevenson, H. G. Wood; 2. assumed: Miss M. C. Gollock, Hodgkin, Rev. F. Lenwood, T. R. W. Hunt, MacLennan, J. H. Oldham, Rev. W. Temple, Rev. B. Yeaxlee; 3. no reply: C. F. Angus, Rev. H. N. Bate, C. T. Bateman, S. R. Bevan, Rev. P. Dearmer, Miss L. Gardner, T. R. Glover, S. S. Hayward, Heath, Rev. R. Jones, Rev. W. R. Maltby, W. H. Moberly, Rev. W. E. Orchard, R. Roberts, Arnold Rowntree, Mrs. Streatfield, Rev. B. H. Streeter, A. C. Turner. 4. unable to continue: Miss Livingstone, Rev. H. Anson, Rev. W. B. Selbie. (those underlined attended the Cambridge Conference or were FOR members in 1915.).

<sup>74</sup>Hornsey Journal, 13-11-1914.

<sup>75</sup>Roberts to Hodgkin, HTH Box 1 file 16, 19-11-1914. Roberts thought that Orchard, Halliday, Fraser, Henry Lloyd Wilson, Lady Barlow, Lenwood, McEwan Lawson and possibly Temple were on his side. Probably he misinterpreted Temple's position.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid.

<sup>77</sup>HTH Box 4 file 41, 30-11-1914.

<sup>78</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16. Most likely Roberts' letter was written before Nov. 30.

<sup>79</sup>Compare for example Rev. James Hope Moulton's letter to Hodgkin (HTH Box 5 file 49, 4-12-1914):  
Your line is, of course, that of sheer Christianity, and if real Christians were even in a majority in this country it would, I think, beyond doubt be the line we should take. But it is so difficult and so exalted that nothing but the very quintessence of religion could strengthen men to take it.

<sup>80</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16, letter 14-11-1914. The meeting started on Friday at 5:30. Joyce Avrech Berkman in "Pacifism in England: 1914-1939," Ph. D. thesis Yale University, 1967, pp. 54-55, has a short account of the founding of the FOR, containing several mistakes.

<sup>81</sup>It is not clear if this memorandum was identical with the one read by Hodgkin. Since the message of the memorandum was in point form Hodgkin may have elaborated on it.

<sup>82</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16, 4-12-1914.

<sup>83</sup>The minutes mention Joan Fry, Edward Grubb, F. Halliday, Seebohm Rowntree, Miss Gittins, Howard Houlder, Lawson, W. Reason, J. R. Coates, Orchard. Their objections were not always stated or were inadequately written down.

<sup>84</sup>Here is perhaps an early indication why she gave up her pacifism in 1940.

<sup>85</sup>Henry Brinton in his book The Peace Army (London: Williams & Norgate, 1932) totally ignored the fact that the concept of a peace army was well-known in the FOR.

<sup>86</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16 - emphasis added. The secretary of these notes is unknown.

<sup>87</sup>It is possible that the conference produced a one page 'Declaration of Peace' covering much the same material as the memorandum. A copy of it is among Hodgkin's papers. It is undated and its precise purpose is not clear. HTH Box 1 file 16 - possibly dated 4-12-1914.

<sup>88</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16, 4-11-1914. This statement is comparable to those of the SFCF and SCM. The second plan called for a series of meetings throughout the whole country. The third plan envisioned the enrolment of pacifists.

<sup>89</sup>Lawson was specifically invited as an SCM member.

<sup>90</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16, 9-12-1914.

<sup>91</sup>Hodgkin's papers contain a list of names of possible Collegium conferees (Box 1 file 16). The list was compiled before the conference and gives eighty-seven names. However, not all could attend; seven out of twenty-eight of the Llandudno committee could not be present; twenty-eight others hoped to attend; seventeen thought they might be present, and fourteen expressed sympathy but were unable to attend.

<sup>92</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16, 9-12-1914.

<sup>93</sup>The meeting was held, with some of the Llandudno committee, just before a Meeting for Suffering. (HTH Box 1 file 16, 16-12-1914 and 23-12-1914).

<sup>94</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 41 no. 1, Jan. 1964, p. 6. Roberts called it Trinity College. Wood, Hodgkin, p. 153, suggests that Trinity Hall was obtained through the kind offices of Walter G. Bell. See also Reconciliation, Vol. 31 no. 10, Oct. 1954, p. 186, for another recollection of Cunningham.

<sup>95</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16.

<sup>96</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16. The letter must be dated between Dec. 4 and Dec. 28, and possibly after Dec. 17.

<sup>97</sup>There are no minutes of the Cambridge Conference to explain the reason why it disappeared.

<sup>98</sup>Eric Hayman, Worship & The Common Life, Cambridge: University Press, 1944, p. 146.

<sup>99</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 147.

<sup>100</sup>*Ibid.* Percy W. Bartlett, Quakers and the Christian Church, London: Friends' Book Centre, 1942, p. 45.



<sup>101</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16, draft p. 3.

<sup>102</sup>HTH Box 1 file 19. Letter by Lilian Stevenson, dated Jan. 8, 1918. More than likely the date should be 1919.

<sup>103</sup>If representative names have to be attached to the two groups they should be, e.g. George Davies and Leyton Richards for the "order" and Walter Ayles and Cecil Wilson for the "political pressure group".

<sup>104</sup>There exists an incomplete late list of those who attended the conference. The list gives 108 names but does not include any of the executive and their spouses. 120 seems to be closer than the usually quoted 130. Wood, Hodgkin, p. 153, stated that Hodgkin presided but this is definitely wrong. Hodgkin in his report to a meeting of Friends made it clear that Roberts presided over the Cambridge Conference. (The Friend, Vol. 55 no. 3, Jan. 15, 1915, p. 46.).

<sup>105</sup>The Friend, Vol. 55 no. 3, Jan 15, 1915, p. 46.

<sup>106</sup>Apr. 10, 1984 in a letter to author. Alexander stated that he did not become an FOR member although his name appeared in the list of 1915. He wrote several articles for the FOR.

<sup>107</sup>The Friend, Vol. 55 no. 3, pp. 46-47.

<sup>108</sup>The draft was presented on Monday evening by Roberts. It was probably due to an extended discussion of the draft that Royden's speech was postponed from Monday to Tuesday.

<sup>109</sup>In the SCPC is a sheet which has a corrected "Basis" and name but the rest differs considerably from the final product. The sheet has hand written alterations. On top the same hand has written "Altered and agreed to. Original Statement." The words "agreed to" do not seem to be correct.

<sup>110</sup>The draft stated "the authentic Word of God" instead of the "mind of Christ." The former may have been regarded as too problematic for strong proponents of Higher Criticism.

<sup>111</sup>The idea of a remnant was a recurring theme in FOR literature, most notably in Rufus M. Jones' book The Remnant, published in the "Christian Revolution Series" sponsored by the FOR (London: Swarthmore Press, 1920). The remnant idea clashed with the idea of the FOR being a leaven. No one seems to have been aware of the contradiction. This contradiction is a good example of the theological confusion or variety in the FOR.

<sup>112</sup>Fellowship, Vol. IX no. 1, Jan. 1943, p. 5.

<sup>113</sup>W. Evans Darby, The Claim of "The New Pacificism" London: Peace Society, 1913, p. 2. The paper was read on Oct. 14, 1912. (SCPC; CDG-B, Peace Society Box 2).

<sup>114</sup>See Robbins, Abolition, p. 31. Pease resigned, however, from the Peace Society.

<sup>115</sup>Fellowship, Vol. IX no. 1, Jan. 1943, p. 5. Interestingly enough, Grubb in Authority, p. 114, had already stated, "In the New Testament, Atonement is Reconciliation--the reconciliation of man to God."

<sup>116</sup>See for example Matt. 5:24. The Greek word used here is διαλλάττω (diallattōmai), meaning to be changed throughout. It is closely related to the words Paul used, καταλλάσσω (katalassō) and καταλλαγή (Katallagē), meaning to change thoroughly or a thorough change. See also Jesus' summary of the law, Matt. 22:37-39. For a critique of Roberts' exegesis see C. Clare Oke, "The Purpose of Reconciliation," Reconciliation (Toronto), Vol. 1 no. 1, Oct. 1943, p. 7. Oke's critique is inadequate since he ignores the consequence of man's reconciliation with God. Ferguson in Politics, p. 48, acknowledged the misinterpretation but drew the conclusion Oke failed to make.

<sup>117</sup>CJC Box 4, 27-7-1910. Peacock had difficulties with "the ultra fastidiousness of (Cadoux's) conscience." For the clash between Peacock and Cadoux see chapter 1.

<sup>118</sup>There is no direct evidence that the unresolved tension was due to Quaker influence, but the organizational similarities between the Friends and the FOR are close enough to suspect strong Quaker influence here.

<sup>119</sup>Although the words "means" and "ends" did not appear in the draft nor in the final statement, there can be no doubt that the conferees had in mind that they had to be of the same kind. The FOR anticipated Aldous Huxley's Ends and Means (New York: Harper, 1937) by more than two decades.

<sup>120</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16. The memorandum is undated.

<sup>121</sup>Many FOR theologians, standing in the liberal tradition, differentiated between Jesus' words and His actions. One group in the FOR could therefore be regarded as the "thinkers", while another group could be characterized as the "activists". The theological issue is further discussed in ch. 4.

<sup>122</sup>The Friend, Vol. 55 no. 2, Jan. 8, 1915, p. 30. The Labour Leader of 7-1-1915, p. 2, has a note on the Cambridge Conference. During the first half of 1915 the Labour Leader carried frequently FOR

notes; after that they became more sporadic.

<sup>123</sup>The Friends had, e.g., a special Sub-Committee of the Peace Committee to think out the methods of work, an Emergency Committee on internment camps, a General Relief Committee, an Employment and Hospitality committee and a War Victims' Relief Committee.

<sup>124</sup>Lord Soper, the present FOR president, expressed in a private interview with the author in April 1984, the thought that this "socialism" was the main reason. The view taken in this thesis is that the reason for not joining was much more complex.

<sup>125</sup>For the role of women in the peace movement, see e.g. Gertrude Bussey and Margaret Tims, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1965; Roger Chickering, Imperial Germany and a World Without War, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975, p. 166.

<sup>126</sup>The official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church in regards to war is based on a just war theory. Donald Attwater in A Cell of Good Living, a biography of Eric Gill (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1969, p. 179) mentions Stanley Morison and Francis Meynell who were C.O.s in World War I and were regarded by their co-religionists as an "astonishing aberration".

<sup>127</sup>The most recent history of the UDC is Marvin Swartz, The Union of Democratic Control in British Politics During the First World War, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971. See also Helena M. Swanwick, Builders of Peace, London: Swarthmore Press, 1924; New York: Garland, 1973. For the NCF see Kennedy, Hound.

## CHAPTER 4

### A VISION: THE KINGDOM OF GOD

"I found that all kinds of diverse opinions contributed to the anti-war attitude, and a really Christian pacifist philosophy was still in need of formulation."<sup>1</sup> William Orchard's lament was echoed in May 1916 by the FOR Literature Committee, which concluded that "the mind of the Fellowship was not sufficiently matured to produce literature of much value."<sup>2</sup> In spite of the FOR's immaturity, the Fellowship attempted to formulate a world and life view which incorporated various ideas propounded by the SQS, SCM, SFCF and World Alliance. It is this world and life view which provides the key to the understanding of the FOR and which distinguished it from the UDC which largely adhered to chairman's E.D. Morel's and Angell's utilitarian view of internationalism, and from the NCF which as an organization hardly went beyond the humanitarian slogan of the sanctity of life. This world and life view was shared by many Friends, largely because such leading FOR members as Hodgkin and Wilson were also leading Friends. The FOR's world and life view could be regarded as a vision of an ideal world. FOR literature spoke of this vision as the Kingdom of God. The FOR's vision was thus eschatological, though the word eschatology is rarely mentioned in FOR literature. Immanentists objected to the word because it was often associated with speculations about the end of the

world. They also avoided the term "the Kingdom of Heaven", because "heaven" had frequently the connotation of "not on earth" and it was precisely the point of the FOR's authors that they wanted to establish God's Kingdom on earth.<sup>3</sup> Their aim was to make "the Kingdoms of this world the Kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ."<sup>4</sup>

Although there was agreement about the aim, FOR members did not always agree with each other on the nature and establishment of God's Kingdom. For Muriel Lester and many others like her, the Kingdom was a social affair with its advent hindered by war. For George Davies the coming of the Kingdom was something mystical and sacramental, much closer to what Corder Catchpool wrote in On Two Fronts: "I look upon the WHOLE of life as a sacrament of service, demanding loyalty to the highest ideal. For me, this idea is the life of Jesus Christ."<sup>5</sup>

Already at the Collegium meeting of December 4, 1914, J.R. Coates had protested against the evolutionist view of the Kingdom, stating that man could not inaugurate the Kingdom.<sup>6</sup> Orchard, in his 1914 Advent Sermons, took a middle position, proclaiming that the Kingdom was "not to be God's work alone, nor man's work alone." Nor would the Kingdom come by coercion-war or display. Paradoxically he saw the war both as a postponement of the Kingdom to an "imperceptible future" and as "the indispensable prelude to a further coming of the Kingdom of God."<sup>7</sup> Yet not too long afterwards, in "The Kingdom of God is Within You", he acknowledged that the Kingdom was actually and potentially already present among people, "ready to break forth when there is faith to receive it."<sup>8</sup> The Kingdom was not something of the future but of

today. C. H. Dodd invented the term "realized eschatology" for this present Kingdom.<sup>9</sup> These different views on the nature and establishment of the Kingdom help to explain why some members became more involved in the socio-politico-economic reconstruction, while others used much of their energy to reform the churches. These views sparked the frequent debates, both during and after the war, on the nature and function of the FOR. These differences, however, were not strong enough to break the consensus which can be found in the FOR's conception of the atonement and the personality of Christ. This conception was largely immanentistic and inextricably bound up with the problems of war and peace. If true peace were to be established the churches had to proclaim a proper understanding of Jesus. According to the FOR, the churches had failed to proclaim the proper view of Jesus. The FOR saw itself as an organization whose main task was to call the churches back to their roots. This challenge meant that the FOR had to show what the original teachings were and how to exegete critical biblical passages. The conversion of the churches, however, was only a means to bring about true peace. True peace for the FOR meant infinitely more than the absence of war. God's Kingdom had specific consequences for the place and role of the state and for socio-economic relations. Hence, during the war the FOR tried to work out a blueprint for the new society. It was this blueprint which set the stage for the activities both during and after the war. The FOR believed it was essential that before particular activities began, the members should have incorporated the vision. Stated differently, theory preceded action. Without a correct

theory there could be no correct action and thus the Kingdom could not come.

While the members agreed with the general outline of the FOR's vision, there were numerous variations in the details which had major consequences for the way the Kingdom was to be inaugurated. Not everyone agreed with the heavy emphasis on immanentalism. There were members who left their church because they saw the church as a lost cause. Some members had a negative view towards the state. Some of the major differences need to be discussed, because, firstly, they show that the FOR was not monolithic. Secondly, they explain why the FOR spent so much time on religious-theological debates. Thirdly, they provide the background against which one needs to understand the developments after World War I. In spite of these various differences and whatever the imperfections of the vision, the theory about the Kingdom stands at the heart of the FOR. In order to understand the nature of the Fellowship it is, therefore, imperative to understand how the FOR viewed the Kingdom.

#### The Kingdom of God: Atonement and Personality

For the FOR, God's Kingdom was connected to all aspects of life. Roberts expressed the indivisible oneness of common life and religion through a short, Puritan-like statement: "The storekeeper's merchandise is sacramental life, congealed life. His store should be a temple."<sup>10</sup> Hence, he could state in his last sermon at Crouch Hill in May 1915: "Jesus Christ asks from us everything, or nothing, he demands the first place in our life, or no place at all. The moral law is one and the

same in social life, in business, in politics, in international relations."<sup>11</sup> Peace, one of the aspects of life, was therefore "not a military thing, not a diplomatic attainment, and not a political state, but a religious experience."<sup>12</sup> War, peace's opposite, was thus an expression of irreligion, a divorce from Christ.<sup>13</sup> The view of the Kingdom, the New Commonwealth, the new and full life was therefore determined by the answer to the ancient question: "What do you think about the Christ?" (Mt. 22:42).<sup>14</sup>

FOR theologians usually thought about Jesus as a man of action whose greatest moral achievement was the Cross.<sup>15</sup> The Cross stood at the center of the Fellowship because at the Cross reconciliation was achieved, a "transaction of infinite costliness".<sup>16</sup> God through Christ brought about reconciliation with man. Such reconciliation, according to Roberts, was "a great social action" providing "at once a social vision and a way of life."<sup>17</sup> To Hodgkin the cross was not only a revelation of God's love but "the method chosen by our Father to show how evil is evil, and how good is good, and, therefore, to strike a fatal blow at evil."<sup>18</sup> Only by following God's method could evil be cast out and the Kingdom of God be secured. Thus the aim of the pacifist movement was one of purification:<sup>19</sup> "If the F.O.R. were such a body, even its mere handful of members would mightily avail to bring in the Kingdom of God, to bring nearer peace among men and nations, to vindicate truth and right by the method of Christ."<sup>20</sup>

In essence, Roberts and Hodgkin spoke about two aspects of Christ: namely, His atonement and His personality. It was the Quaker



William Wilson who developed a theology of the atonement which was accepted by many FOR members.<sup>21</sup> Although his major book was not published until 1929, the main points of the work appeared in his 1914 publication Atonement and Non-Resistance. W.F. Halliday developed a theology of personality, first sketched out in "Personality and War" (1915) and more fully in the post-war "Christian Revolution Series" Reconciliation and Reality. The direction of Halliday's thinking becomes very clear in the title of his 1929 book Psychology and Religious Experience. The psychological aspect started to emerge during the war,<sup>22</sup> but its fuller development had to wait to the post-war period.

In order to understand Wilson's and Halliday's views of the Atonement something of the history of this doctrine needs to be sketched. According to Wilson, the various theories of the Atonement agreed on four points: 1. Atonement is God's work; 2. It is accomplished through Christ's death; 3. It is appropriated by faith; 4. As a consequence of these criteria there is a union of the reconciled with Christ.<sup>23</sup> Implicit in the four points is the conception that God and man are not "at-one" owing to man's disobedience-opposition to God. Christ somehow overcame man's opposition. The disagreement centers on how this was accomplished.

Crucial to earlier theories of atonement, such as Anselm's or the Reformers', was the understanding of the words "ransom" and "propitiation". Both words had been taken literally and seen as a process or a transaction. Instead, Wilson argued, they should be

understood metaphorically, to express result.<sup>24</sup> In the older theories current human laws, such as Roman or feudal law, were used as standards to which God, as it were, had to conform. Rather, God forgave men freely. The death of Jesus was caused because he testified to the principle of non-resistance.<sup>25</sup> Here is Wilson's contribution to the doctrine: he incorporated the historical Jesus in the nineteenth century "Moral Influence View of the Atonement". The death of the historical Jesus was both a condemnation of man's sin - "sin itself killed Him" - and the supreme proof of the depth of Christ's love.<sup>26</sup> In Christ's call to take up one's cross one should be willing to suffer, thus showing one's love.<sup>27</sup> The way of Christ's death showed the way of salvation. Followers, and thus imitators, of Christ should show this way of sacrificial love in their own lives and to non-believers. Opposition to war was thus not based, as for example the Christadelphians argued, on an Old Testament statement like "You shall not kill", nor founded, as many Quakers thought, upon the New Testament Sermon on the Mount, but anchored in love as exemplified in Jesus.<sup>28</sup> Pacifism, therefore, was not a negative opposition to war, but an outgoing love to one's neighbour, or as Wilson later called it, "Spiritual Activism".<sup>29</sup> Only this active, Christ-like conduct could remove what stood in the way of Christ's Kingdom.<sup>30</sup> One obstacle which stood in the way was war, which, as Hodgkin wrote in 1913, was a disaster to the missionary cause and deflected attention from the great causes associated with the betterment of the human race.<sup>31</sup> The only way to remove this obstacle was through a Christ-like love, overcoming evil,

willing to suffer and if necessary to be killed.

This emphasis on morality is a recurring theme in FOR as well as in Quaker literature. In a pamphlet published in 1915 describing the work of local groups, it was stated that

the central principle of the Fellowship is the application of the Christian ethic to all human relationships, the promulgation of "the will to love" as the only and sufficient basis of a wholesome social life and of a stable world-order. ...We find the ground of our advocacy of it in the fact that the will to love is the characteristic energy of God Himself, and is, therefore, the ground of our own redemption.<sup>33</sup>

This "new attitude" could only be observed in relationships. Therefore, the FOR called people to live the Sermon on the Mount in their daily lives because this would "constitute nothing less than the Kingdom of God on earth." The inevitable fruit of the new relationships developed in the Kingdom, and given by the Spirit, would be pacifism.<sup>34</sup> Thus pacifism was not regarded as an end in itself, but as a gift, a gift in the service of the Kingdom, a gift given after first seeking the Kingdom of God.<sup>35</sup> Here, perhaps, one can find the most profound difference with non-Christian theories of pacifism. When the FOR came into open conflict with the government over the Military Service Act of January 1916, the editor of the FOR News Sheet made it clear that not pacifism nor concern about their souls was what mattered:

What happens to us matters little to us; what happens to the Kingdom of God matters everything. ...The progress of the Kingdom of God is bound up with the witness that we are being called to make to-day, and to be true to our consciences is the only way to be true to God's Kingdom in the world. With the furtherance of the divine order in the world is connected all that we believe to be for the true welfare of our nation and of the world. The Kingdom of God can only come by the method of God, and of that method, as

we see it in Christ, war is the utter denial. We refuse to participate in war, whether voluntarily or under compulsion, because our submission to Jesus Christ and our salvation through Him commit us to an endeavour to bring in His Kingdom in His way.<sup>36</sup>

Wilson's theory of the atonement was based on a limited part of Scripture. He largely confined himself to the evidence of the Synoptic Gospels, because here the Father's character was demonstrated in the "one great and certain instance of Divine interposition in the history of the world", in Jesus, and He "did not use violence or coercion, but appealed to love and persuasion."<sup>37</sup> Christ's methods of reconciliation were valid for all Christians because in Christ men were reconciled to the Father, and in the Fatherhood of God all men became brothers. This, according to most FOR members, differed considerably from the views expressed in the Old Testament. Generally speaking, FOR members had a negative view of much of the O.T., thus differing from many other Christians. According to Hodgkin, the difference between the Old and New Testament was "that in the former the moral order is vindicated by punishment of evil, in the latter by accepting the full consequences of evil. The cross is not simply a revelation of the love of God. It demonstrates the ultimate moral order."<sup>38</sup> FOR assistant general secretary George Davies stated the difference in one of his "Letters from Prison" published in the FOR's monthly The Venturer:

Between Moses' God, who punishes with death a man who gathers sticks on the Sabbath,...and Christ's Father...who is merciful to the ungrateful and the evil - there is an absolute, fundamental, vital, difference in idea, of which the outcome in practice and conduct is either the wild beast show or the Kingship of God as expressed in the Sermon on the Mount.<sup>39</sup>

In another "Letter from Prison" he described the God of Moses as a "jealous, angry, punishing, changeable God, strangely partial to Jews", as a God "who punished men and who countenanced and even commanded men to punish and penalise one another, in order that righteousness might be maintained on earth."<sup>40</sup> J.D. Maynard wrote in November 1915 that the O.T. met "the human problem from the standpoint of a military situation strikingly similar to our own."<sup>41</sup> Indeed, much of the defence of the war was based on the interpretation of the O.T., because much Reformation theology held to an ethical continuity between the two testaments. Since the N.T. states little about war as such and the O.T. is full of it, the latter was taken as guideline, even though that could mean "some considerable postponement of the Christian ideal."<sup>42</sup> For most FOR members, as for most Quakers, there was a distinct break between the O.T. and the N.T., and for some even only a few sections of the latter were of any use.<sup>43</sup> According to Rev. F.W. Armstrong, the O.T. was not normative for conduct on equal terms with the N.T. since an ethical development had taken place.<sup>44</sup> As the statements of Hodgkin and Davies suggest, there was a strong Marcionite tendency among FOR members.<sup>45</sup> This negative view of the O.T. left the FOR vulnerable to attacks from other Christians, who could argue that the FOR's understanding of the atonement was inadequate and hence its view of the Kingdom.

Halliday was essentially concerned with the psychological aspect of the atonement. During the war he began to develop his theory of Personality, tentatively developed in an essay called "Personality and

War" in Christ and Peace (1915), edited by Joan M. Fry,<sup>46</sup> and another one, "The Goal of Christianity", in Hugh Martin's The Ministry of Reconciliation (1916). Halliday asserted that the soul was the only thing of absolute worth in the world, giving value to the world.<sup>47</sup> This idea constituted the heart of religion and morality, for the soul related man to God and to his fellowman. Therefore Halliday could say that the soul's meaning was "never found in its mere individuality, but in itself as social, as a member of a universal society, having what is disinterested and universal at heart."

As he elaborated in his second essay, personality was "in its nature universal and social", and that in Jesus the world had "a perfect example of free personality." Hence, Christianity could never truly be understood unless it was "bound up with infinite value of personality." As Hodgkin wrote, the Christian message was rooted in the highest conception of the worth of the human personality.<sup>48</sup> To be in Christ meant to accept the new ideal of manhood.<sup>49</sup> In Orchard's words, Christ was "essential...to the full completion of personality", yet as soon as one knew Christ one saw the ethical disparity between oneself and one's ideals and "discover[ed] how absolutely dependent upon the ethical idea" one was.<sup>50</sup> Elsewhere, Orchard stated that the essentiality of Christ's personality to the Kingdom of God was not arbitrary nor due to personal dogmatic claims, but that it was in the nature of man's humanity.<sup>51</sup> In other words, man's real humanity was exemplified in Christ. To be a real person was thus to be Christ-like and reconciled to God and man.<sup>52</sup> This relational understanding of the atonement had crucial implications

for the FOR's views of society. The existing society denied the worth of the individual, treating men not as free beings but as machines. Yet, FOR members argued, society was held together by respect for personality,<sup>53</sup> an argument similar to the NCF's credo. Personality - Roberts preferred the word individuality - had little in common with individualism which is selfish. Rather, the Christ-like person was willing to be servant, trying to modify the environment so that others could develop their personality. This high regard for personality frequently turned into the idea that human life was sacred. Wilson used the Pauline idea that the body was God's chosen temple, the most sacred thing on earth.<sup>54</sup> Lansbury used the idea in a wider sense: "When pacifists like me say that human life is sacred, they don't mean that their individual life is sacred, but the life of the human race in the aggregate."<sup>55</sup> What these variations of the idea of Personality had in common was the significance they attached to the social relationships and to the notion that war destroyed relationships. Yet, war did not have the final word.

History, according to Robson, was the "journey towards Personality" and "Personality is the kingdom I am to win". In order to win this kingdom a new spiritual order was envisaged, requiring "the complete transformation of life by the elimination of all that hinders it."<sup>56</sup> The question here is how FOR members thought about this new commonwealth. A clue was given by Orchard: "In every exercise of thought we are implicitly assuming that personality is the ultimate reality, and personal adjustments and personal relationships the real

clue to existence."<sup>57</sup> Thus Halliday called one of his essays "Personality and War" and Roberts one of his books Personality and Nationality. FOR theologians claimed that the ideas of personality and atonement were inextricably bound up with the problems of war and peace, the church, the state (including nationality, nationalism and patriotism), the economic system, or as it was frequently called, society.

### The Kingdom of God: War and Peace

In the introduction to Christ and Peace, Hodgkin wrote that pacifists shared the blame which rested upon the Church for having failed to think about the issue of war before the outbreak of war.<sup>58</sup> As a generalization Hodgkin's statement has the weakness that exceptions could be found. For instance, C.J. Cadoux had written in 1905 to his brother in South Africa that it was "every Christian's bounden duty...to put an end, wherever + whenever he can, to suffering + hardship + misery of his fellow creatures." As far as he was concerned the waging of war stood condemned as a sin.<sup>59</sup> And in 1912 Leyton Richards, then in Australia, had stated that pacifism was more than merely an objection to war. Yet, perhaps Lansbury proved the truth of Hodgkin's generalization when he said in 1915: "All my life I have been more or less a pacifist, but never an out and out pacifist until now."<sup>60</sup> It should, therefore, be no surprise that many of the ideas on war and peace were undeveloped or later found to be unacceptable.

Indeed, initially several leading FOR members such as Roberts and Orchard were confused. They saw war not just as a catastrophe, but



as an ushering in of the Kingdom. Orchard's article in the first The Venturer has the telling title "The Kingdom of God is at Hand".<sup>61</sup> He interpreted the war as a judgment of God on all, as well as a sign of the Last Judgment.<sup>62</sup> Moreover, he confidently expected a religious revival, seeing such hopeful signs as the seriousness of people, the call for prayer meetings and intercessions, and the mystic experiences of the new recruits.<sup>63</sup> Yet he could say at the same time that the Kingdom of God did not come by coercion or display, and so he condemned military service which was devoted to the destruction of human life.<sup>64</sup> Even so, he thought such service "better than the life which unthinkingly or contentedly battens on the life of others and suffers no twinge of conscience."<sup>65</sup> Orchard's position is not very far from Roberts' argument that since Britain was not a Christian nation, the country had done the right thing and could have done nothing else than act in the way in which she had done.<sup>66</sup>

By 1915 some of the confusion had dissipated. Significantly, the FOR endeavoured to understand those who accepted or supported war. The first FOR pamphlet, "To Christ's Disciples Everywhere", probably published in January, was therefore not an outright condemnation of FOR opponents, but an attempt to convince them with forbearance of their weakness. The pamphlet did not deny that there was a good deal of religion in the war, but it denied that this was Christianity.<sup>67</sup> This claim led on the one hand to toleration and, on the other, to a condemnation of the false ideas of Christianity. Probably Cadoux dealt

most adequately with the idea of toleration.<sup>68</sup> In a January 1917 issue of The Venturer he pointed out that many people honestly and conscientiously weighed various principles and came to the best conclusions of which they were, humanly speaking, capable at that moment. This did not mean that the best conclusions were the best absolutely but the best relatively. Therefore, the C.O. should not condemn the honest soldier, but rather try to persuade him to change his mind, for even the most thoroughgoing Christian ethic - that of the Christian pacifist - was not the best absolutely. Thus, according to Cadoux,

We can yet gladly recognise that God has a place in the service of the world for the sub-christian and non-christian way of doing things; that God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, had a work for the unenlightened and conservative to do, provided only that the workers be honest; that the good of the world is really being served by those who differ sharply from us on this question of war.

Not the soldier--the human being--was condemned, but the system--sin. These ideas of tolerance, shared at least by the FOR leadership, were substantially incorporated in his book Christian Pacifism Re-examined, published in 1940, which FOR members gave a mixed reception.<sup>69</sup> The FOR's idea of toleration was the relational aspect of the doctrine of atonement put into practice.

Toleration did not mean acquiescence in wrong ideas. After the introduction of "To Christ's Disciples Everywhere", the FOR's first pamphlet, contained also a condemnation:

We have not followed Him whose name we profess. ...We have denied our Lord; we have betrayed Him; we have crucified

Him again. ...We, in our wisdom, have chosen other methods for the establishment of truth and goodness in the world. Our choice is seen today to be fraught with infinite pain and disaster to mankind.<sup>70</sup>

The fatal flaw in the choice, as the second FOR pamphlet pointed out, was found in "our fatal facility for compromise with the evil in the world." To break this tendency the pamphlet called for penitence so that people could see what war really was.<sup>71</sup> This war deluded people into thinking that it was, in H.G. Wells' words, the war to end all wars.<sup>72</sup> War was the negation of Christianity, in which "Caesar has been clothed in the seamless robe of Christ."<sup>73</sup> War was a return to barbarity, stripping away the veneer of civilization, dethroning reason and making religion sheer hypocrisy.<sup>74</sup> War was the subordination of truth to military necessity.<sup>75</sup> War, as the American Civil War general Sherman commented, was hell.<sup>76</sup> His statement showed how far war was removed from the Kingdom of God.

Any one of these views was sufficient to oppose war, yet an editorial by Rorke in The Venturer of October 1917 reflected probably the sentiment of a considerable number of FOR members: "For the Christian disciple the central and all-sufficient objection to war is and must remain the gruesome fact that it involves as its essential feature the willful and deliberate act of putting one's fellow-man to death."<sup>77</sup> There were, however, many other FOR members who held a more profound view. Fred Pope, editor of The Venturer after Rorke in 1918, wrote that pacifists were actually the greatest fighters, fighting against "the principalities and powers that lord it over the minds and wills of men"; but it was fighting to save, not to kill.<sup>78</sup> According to

Wilson, the pacifist's work was not to abolish war, though it prostituted noble virtues to base purposes and was a passionate expression of greed, strife, ruthlessness and hatred, but to remove the causes of war and establish a free community.<sup>79</sup> John Darbyshire wrote that it was becoming clear that THE conflict was not between physical but spiritual powers. Therefore, only the force of love could repel the love of force,<sup>80</sup> or again in Wilson's words: "The Christian way of conquering evil [was]...to endeavour, by means of sympathy and example, to cooperate with evil-doers for their good, and to do that without limit, and in the face of all disencouragements, because Christ died."<sup>81</sup> Actually, in an editorial in The Venturer of January 1916, Roberts had already stated that the taking of life was only one aspect and that the more important message of Christianity was that of redemption.<sup>82</sup> In essence, Rorke's editorial emphasized the sacredness of life, while the others saw war within a much broader framework. For the latter it was not just a matter of stopping war but being involved in reconciliation, a corollary to the fact that God in Christ had reconciled Himself to mankind.<sup>83</sup>

Stopping war seemed to imply that peace was an end in itself, rather than, as Carl Heath suggested, a condition for growth of freedom.<sup>84</sup> To crush Prussianism, as so many British had set out to do, would not constitute peace. Peace had to "be prepared for with infinite self-sacrifice and vigilance",<sup>85</sup> while in the attempt to crush Prussianism, Britain had become infected with that disease.<sup>86</sup> Peace could not be enforced, and those who spoke of a league of nations using

a police force—as the US League to Enforce Peace, the Bryce Group and many in the UDC did--were only deluding themselves.<sup>87</sup> Rather, peace would only come with the arrival of a full democracy which allowed individual human freedom, equality of opportunity within and without the state, and accepted the sanctity of life.<sup>88</sup> A return to pre-war days was thus undesirable: it would not bring peace nor would it bring God's Kingdom any nearer.<sup>89</sup> Peace was not the absence of war or even of struggle,<sup>90</sup> but a harmonious relational development. Yet, what that really meant was not spelled out because the implications of the whole ministry of reconciliation were not yet clear,<sup>91</sup> or in the words of "The Basis": "That Love, as revealed and interpreted in the life and death of Jesus Christ, involves more than we have yet seen." It was clear to the FOR that war was an obstacle to the Kingdom. To overcome that obstacle, many FOR members believed, the churches had to give a lead so that true peace would come about. They saw the churches as the channels to achieve the Kingdom.

### **The Kingdom of God: The Church**

During the war the FOR spent much of its energy on attempting to reform the churches. In general, FOR members agreed that the churches had failed, for instead of making war unthinkable, the churches were filled with exhausted conventional Christianity which by endorsing war had committed apostasy from their first principles.<sup>92</sup> The least the churches could have done when war was declared, was to have mobilized Christians and taken the field, "resolved that before the armies [came]

to grips it [should have been] across the dead bodies of all Christian people", an action comparable to that of Telemachus and the gladiatorial fights.<sup>93</sup> Orchard's call for a peace army came perhaps closest to reality two decades later with Maude Royden, Herbert Gray and Dick Sheppard as leaders. Instead, almost all churches on either side of the conflict defended their own political leaders, and it seemed better to split the churches than split the nations. Against such churches pacifists revolted and called them back to their tasks, namely, to advance the knowledge of God, to give a sense of world-service, to be united in witness, and to be a living fellowship, that is, to be and to advance the Kingdom of God.<sup>94</sup> The FOR employed two approaches to call the churches back to their first love and principles, namely, history and exegesis.

In the historical approach scholars, such as Wilson and Cadoux, tried to establish that up to the fourth century pacifism had been the norm in Christianity. They blamed Constantine for the change of the norm, but they also showed that the churches had never been without some pacifist testimonies, although these were "voices in the wilderness". For Wilson the culmination of pacifist protest was found in the early Quakers, and a certain hagiography developed of pacifist "saints", ranging from Ezra via Francis of Assisi to Fox.<sup>95</sup> Undoubtedly, C.J. Cadoux' The Early Christian Attitude to War, though not published until 1919, was the most important book in this context. Cadoux had been working on this idea since October 26, 1915, when he received permission from London University to write his D.D. thesis on the "History of

Christian Attitude to Pagan Society and State".<sup>96</sup> Cadoux realized that this early history could not give a direct or final answer to the ethical question "Should Christians take part in war?", but it could give a valuable confirmation to the pacifist's faith. As far as he could see, the early history indicated that participation was widely shunned as being inconsistent with the Christian norms.<sup>97</sup> Moreover, as Cadoux pointed out, the teaching of the later churches had included the abstention of the clergy from war which would suggest that the church stood really for peace.<sup>98</sup> Although Wilson's and Cadoux' findings have not been modified significantly, non-pacifist Christians have not accepted the idea that in this instance the early church was normative.

The second approach FOR members employed to change the churches was exegesis. Throughout the war non-pacifists used texts to show that the Bible supported war. Although the FOR did not base its views on specific texts, it was nevertheless imperative to show that the texts opponents used did not support war. Most of these texts were taken from the O.T. Since the FOR regarded Jesus as the "pleroma" (fulness) of the Godhead<sup>99</sup> and the fulfilment of the prophecies, it did not regard the O.T. as being on the same level for determining man's conduct as the N.T. The O.T. was only regarded as a prelude to the N.T.<sup>100</sup> Usually FOR theologians used the results of modern critical biblical scholarship to show that slowly and gradually the O.T. writers moved away from the acceptance of war to regarding war and violence as being no part of the Messianic order. The late dating of the so-called Mosaic books or the separation of Deutero-Isaiah from Isaiah fitted very well in this

progressive, evolutionary scheme. This scheme made it possible to accept some O.T. texts or pericopes. On the whole, the approach to the O.T. was rather unsatisfactory. Much of the Higher Criticism was received uncritically. And instead of looking for principles, FOR theologians were all too often satisfied with texts. They really had no coherent view of the O.T., certainly a weakness in the attempt to turn the churches around.<sup>101</sup>

Several N.T. texts were quoted against pacifism as well. Often these texts were taken out of context or suffered from the so-called argument of silence. There were no scholarly difficulties in showing the invalidity of the usage of these texts. They reflected much more the sad state of religious knowledge and understanding. There were, however, two texts which caused difficulties for pacifists: Luke 22:36 and John 2:15. The former has Jesus say: "And let him who has no sword sell his mantle and buy one." The latter deals with the "Cleansing of the Temple" for which Jesus used a whip or cords, or scourge, to drive the money changers and animals out of the temple. Luke's statement was usually explained with the help of Moffatt's translation. When the disciples told Jesus they had two swords, Jesus answered, "Enough! Enough!" (Lk. 22:38). FOR theologians argued that Jesus' remark was ironical and that the disciples still did not understand His way. His answer was, therefore, something like "Enough of this nonsense".<sup>102</sup> Modern scholarship seems to have accepted this interpretation.<sup>103</sup>

The "Cleansing of the Temple" posed more problems. Although Roberts thought the scourge a "puny point", his solution was hardly



satisfactory: "Probably He [Jesus] only threatened its use; perhaps He only wished to indicate, as did Van [sic] Tromp - by use of a broom - that He would cleanse the temple."<sup>104</sup> Some suggested that the scourge was only used on animals.<sup>105</sup> Most preferred, in nearly typical FOR fashion, a moral solution:

Even had Jesus attempted to use it [the scourge] against the money-changers themselves, of what use would such a weapon have been against a crowd of angry men? It is perfectly clear that they were overawed simply by the moral and spiritual force of the personality of Jesus, and could do nothing but obey.<sup>106</sup>

Such exegesis undermined the whole idea of the opponents that such a text supported war. Even though N.T. scholars today remain divided over the precise translation of this text, they have, generally speaking, agreed with FOR theologians on the exegesis of gospel "war" texts. Unfortunately for the FOR, the average Christian continued to adhere to an inadequate reading of Scripture, making it difficult for the FOR to use the churches as channels for its vision.

While the FOR had mixed success in the exegesis of texts, it had little success convincing church leaders about two principles, namely, that pure Christianity in its pacifist form was possible for the present and that pacifism provided protection for the weak. Most influential British theologians, such as P.T. Forsyth and W. Temple, adhered to interim ethics. In 1916 Orchard regarded interim ethics as apostasy,<sup>107</sup> while Roberts thought that Forsyth did not understand pacifism, for it was impossible to get acceptable ethical results through unethical means.<sup>108</sup> Perhaps it was not so much apostasy or misunderstanding as well a weak faith in the power of God. The question by professor D.S.

Cairns of Aberdeen to Hodgkin elucidates the point: "Do you really think that the Christian Church just now, as a whole, has the right to expect much of God, with its heart so unpurged and foul, its spirit so unrepentant and unbelieving?"<sup>109</sup> Cairns' anemic view of the power of God was based on the weakness of man and projected back on God. But God was not the image of man, but man the image of God, and therefore Hodgkin could respond that the FOR expected "with confidence far, far more from God than any of us has any right to expect today."<sup>110</sup> Cairns' interim ethics was a counsel of despair; the FOR's proclamation a message of hope. Those who adopted the idea of interim ethics thought, nevertheless, that war and Christianity were incompatible.<sup>111</sup> They perceived the idea of no war as an ideal which would be achieved in some undetermined future; the FOR in contrast accepted the idea of no war as a possible present reality. The former let the State decide in a rather autonomous way; the latter placed the State under the sovereignty of Jesus.

Cairns, in the same letter to Hodgkin, also commented on the defence of the weak: "Would the Love of Jesus have prevented him from defending the little child that He held in His arms from torture and death?"<sup>112</sup> Hodgkin answered that Jesus would have defended the child, but not in the way Cairns expected:

I am perfectly confident that He would have been far stronger in His defence of that child in using the method which He did, as far as I can see, consistently use throughout His life than if He had resorted to the method to which you or I would naturally turn.<sup>113</sup>

War, with the Fall of man, had become a part of man's natural being, but

in Christ a new method had been revealed and in Christ, those who believed, had become new creatures, followers of the Way. Being grafted into Christ, the Christian could only follow Christ's method. Yet, Hodgkin's answer contained an ambiguity, for what was meant by Jesus defending the child in "every way" open to Him? Cairns in his letter stated that Halliday thought that it was right "to wing a murderous burglar, but apparently wrong to kill him, right, therefore, to shoot him in the leg, but wrong to shoot him in the trunk."<sup>114</sup> But not every FOR member thought this distinction acceptable. Cairns was right when he indicated that the FOR had no precise policy on this point, only members with individual solutions. This dilemma was apparent in the answers of some C.O.s to this particular problem. One of the questions usually asked by the members of the tribunal was one related to the defence of the weak and some C.O.s were driven to answer that they would not defend anyone in any fashion.<sup>115</sup> Perhaps the FOR leadership was partly responsible for such unsatisfactory answers. When the executive met with A. Herbert Gray in March 1915, Roberts stated that it was dangerous to make exceptional cases into general principles.<sup>116</sup> The defence of the weak individual was separated from the method of war, but his point was never clearly stated in FOR literature. Consequently, many FOR members had to find a solution for themselves and these solutions were not always auspicious.<sup>117</sup> The FOR was right to separate in theory the problem of defence of the weak individual from the method of war, but since the majority of people connected the two issues, much more attention should have been given to the problem. Here the

leadership failed to understand popular feelings, and C.O.s who were unwilling to defend the weak contributed to an image which was a mockery of pacifism. A proper exposition was all the more urgent since God had made Himself known as a defender of the weak, the fatherless, the widows.<sup>118</sup> Many church people went, therefore, to war to defend such a weak nation as Belgium. It was probably true, however, as Cadoux pointed out, that Britain waged war for national interests and not to defend the weak.<sup>119</sup> But such an argument was inadequate to turn the churches around and start with their mission. If the churches had failed, as the FOR alleged, then the FOR failed to achieve one of its major objectives, to convince the churches that the method of Jesus, as interpreted by pacifists, was the only way.

### The Kingdom of God: The State

Already in 1914, Hodgkin, in The Church's Opportunity, argued that the Church was "set in the nation to witness to the supra-national as against the exclusively national spirit."<sup>120</sup> Instead of "my country right or wrong" or "Deutschland über Alles", the Church broke the narrow confines of nationalism.<sup>121</sup> Although the inter/supra-nationalism of the Church did not threaten a nation's existence - rather, it could provide a foundation for reconciliation - it raised questions about the function of the state, the role of nationalism and patriotism. This questioning of the function of the state was part of a much broader stream. According to A.W. Wright, the immediate pre-war years saw a general and varied challenge to the existing form of the state.<sup>122</sup> Such challenges

ranged from Fabian collectivism to Tolstoyan anarchism, from guild socialism to syndicalism. During and after the war Harold Laski mounted a strong attack against the "fiction" of state sovereignty.<sup>123</sup> The war and the government's conduct made it clear to many Christians that there was a serious conflict between the activities and ideas of the government and the tenets of Christianity.

Basically Christians held one of three positions. There were those who thought that the state fought a righteous and just war. They did not really feel the conflict. Those who advocated the theory of interim ethics realized that the conflict existed, but they postponed the solution in favour of the state. A Leeds magistrate acknowledged a conflict of interest when he had 20,000 copies of the Sermon on the Mount in leaflet form destroyed as seditious literature.<sup>124</sup> The effect of these two positions was a temporary suspension of Christianity, confining it "to other things than the essence of war."<sup>125</sup> The third position involved a conflict between the obligations of the individual over against those of the state, or in Cadoux' words, the conflict was a choice between King George and Jesus of Nazareth.<sup>126</sup> The first obligation for a Christian, as Mt. 10:37 indicated, was to follow Jesus. It was to no avail to sacrifice everything for the national and political good if in the process one lost one's soul.<sup>127</sup> The state's demands were placed below those of Jesus; consequently the FOR rejected the absolutist and sacrosanct view of the state and denied by implication the limits of freedom of conscience set by the state.<sup>128</sup> In The Venturer Roberts rejected Forsyth's idea that "the state is an

ethical institute of God as much as the family is" as too absolutistic, for "at best the State embodies but an ethical average, normally even less than that."<sup>129</sup> Instead of sovereignty endowed with mystical attributes like omniscience, the state, according to Cadoux, was in essence simply a special form of "my neighbour".<sup>130</sup> Man was not made for the state, but the state for man, with as chief end "the ordering of common life so that men shall have the space to grow to the full stature of their possibilities." Authority over man's will as exercised during the war was, therefore, contrary to the proper function and right of the state.<sup>131</sup> Such authority was a wrong form of relating the individual to the community as a whole and hampered the coming of the "New Humanity".<sup>132</sup> As Cadoux stated, "There is no more reason for subordinating conscience to the State than for subordinating it to the views of our next-door neighbour."<sup>133</sup>

Rejecting an absolutist view of the state did not mean espousal of an anarchic, Tolstoyan view. Although many FOR members had been influenced by Tolstoy,<sup>134</sup> they did not accept his views on the state. Cadoux was fairly representative when he posited that

we must be willing to accord a certain relative approval to that whole system of coercion and penalty - insofar as it may be regarded as representing the best system that the nation at large can at present adopt, and as not below the average morality of the time: and I maintain that it is no inconsistency with this relative approval to insist that a Christian's true duty is not to participate in that system.<sup>135</sup>

Cadoux' position did not mean, as some fallaciously thought, no cooperation at all.<sup>136</sup> Such a view was based on the erroneous idea that since people differed on one item they could not cooperate on others,

and on the mistaken idea that the (modern) state rested on force.<sup>137</sup> Through cooperation it was hoped to Christianize the state, so that in the end "the kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ."<sup>138</sup>

Cadoux could have added Roberts' statement that the state as a political entity was not equivalent to the whole of society.<sup>139</sup> Roberts regarded the state as "the voice of the majority", while asserting that a majority could be wrong.<sup>140</sup> Loyalty was due to the whole family of man because Jesus had made His followers citizens of the world.<sup>141</sup> Consequently, the war was a civil war, a "war within the family", a "consummation of all the anti-social tempers and activities within States which determine their collective policies." By going beyond its proper role the state came into conflict with the conscience of individuals.<sup>142</sup> As Cadoux wrote, it was "simply the old question whether one is to obey God or man."<sup>143</sup> Over against the seemingly absolute claims made by the state, the FOR claimed the absoluteness of the conscience. The claim of either side clashed head-on in the position of the C.O. The FOR, by limiting the claims of the state, gave wider scope to individual liberty. The Fellowship feared that liberty - "the most priceless thing you have" - was being destroyed by the Military Service Acts of January and May 1916. Not that liberty was an end in itself; it was a means to achieve full moral personality.<sup>144</sup> The latter, as has been suggested above, was a reflection of Jesus, the moral personality in its purest form. A summary of these views was published in October 1917 in a "Manifesto on Political Action" which set

the limits, type and character of a government acceptable to the FOR:

"Human government can only express the mind of God as it is based on and proceeds by the free consent of the peoples. True democracy rests on a deep reverence for human personality as the dwelling-place of the Spirit of God."<sup>145</sup>

Closely related to the discussion about the nature of the state, liberty and conscience, were the problems of nationalism and patriotism. During the war pacifists were accused of being anti-nationalistic and anti-patriotic, that is, they were regarded as unworthy corporate citizens. This accusation the FOR rejected. In general, FOR members put limits to the terms because, as Royden stated, they could not "sacrifice the Christian ideal even to a national necessity."<sup>146</sup>

Although some members regarded nationalism as a perversion which led to division and strife,<sup>147</sup> others thought that pacifists were the true nationalists because they had respect for others and were "anxious to outstrip all others in service for the Kingdom."<sup>148</sup> It is only because the term nationalism remained rather undefined that these two positions seem to be at variance.<sup>149</sup> Both groups really objected to the elements of exclusiveness, the clear consciousness of distinction from others felt by a people themselves.<sup>150</sup> Against this exclusiveness the FOR held up the Christian conception of international brotherhood.<sup>151</sup> Like Lord Acton, the Fellowship thought that the healthiest form of nationalism incorporated a large number of different groups.<sup>152</sup> Interestingly enough, this conception led some momentarily, like Roberts, for a time to a sympathy for imperialism. They regarded the British empire as a



model or symbol or promise of a future harmony. Roberts became later more critical of the empire, but he kept the notion of a commonwealth of diversity because international goodwill was a prerequisite for a true and continuous national development.<sup>153</sup> Most members never had this sympathy. When Corder Catchpool used the familiar nineteenth century term "Little Englanders" in a letter to his mother, he reasonably summed up the general FOR position on the empire.<sup>154</sup> Perhaps the FOR's position could be characterized as nationalism with an international flavour and with service as purpose. This characterization is corroborated by the FOR's understanding of patriotism. According to Orchard, true patriotism was a "concern for your country's welfare", "a love of your neighbours", and a divinely inspired "love of an invisible ideal". This Christian patriotism was, however, being replaced by a "fear of some other country's progress" and a "hatred of your enemies".<sup>155</sup> The militantly socialist Quaker A. Barratt Brown saw true patriotism as being true to Christ and thus, by reduction, true to the nation and to humanity. The true patriot felt a duty to call attention to the nation's faults, thus becoming a moral critic.<sup>156</sup> However, the reality was different. As Father Nicolas, a Serbian Orthodox priest, pointed out, patriotism had come to mean the adoption of the views of the government without the necessary self-criticism.<sup>157</sup> It was this type of patriotism which had been denounced by Dr. Johnson when he said that patriotism was "the last refuge of the scoundrel", and by Tolstoy when he spoke of "that gross imposture" which was "the cause of a great part of the ills from which mankind is suffering."<sup>158</sup> S.E. Keeble

objected that such critics "mixed up love of country with war and arms, and associated patriotism solely with militarism, political partisanship, and caste predominance." If this were indeed patriotism, it would not be permissible for a Christian, "but an enlightened Christian practises an enlightened position - one illumined by the principles of his Master, and compatible with love to all other nations." Keeble used an illuminating illustration to help understand this enlightened patriotism:

A preferential love of one's native land and one's own people is as psychologically inevitable as the preference for one's own wife over all other women, or for one's own children. It in no way necessitates lack of love, still less hatred for other countries and people, any more than love for one's own wife necessitates indifference or dislike to all other women, or love of one's own children requires hatred of all other children.<sup>159</sup>

Such a Christian patriotism was quite removed from Stephen Decatur's toast in 1816 "My country, right or wrong".<sup>160</sup> Although the terms nationalism and patriotism were not always demarcated, the FOR's idea of patriotism is reasonably clear. The FOR called the state to account, limiting its range of activities, for the patriotism of Christ was a refusal to "conform to the pagan patriotism of violent rebellion and force."<sup>161</sup>

There were two other problems related to the state, security and justice. Surprisingly little was written about them, even though the FOR held that the state's interpretation of them prevented the ushering in of the Kingdom. Security and disarmament were usually discussed as a single issue. Royden's booklet The Great Adventure contained a call for disarmament. She thought that the nations involved in war all saw

themselves as acting in self-defence. At various times they had felt themselves to be threatened and at those times the "defence" budget was raised. They gave the lie to the old Latin proverb that if one wanted to have peace one needed to prepare for war; the nations prepared for war and got it. Instead of the security the nations wished for, there was no security on land and sea - and later in the air. In counselling disarmament, Royden realized that it would not necessarily have prevented war, but such a risk was a real adventure. At the same time, a nation ready to die for peace was not dishonoured but rather showed the essence of redemption, as exemplified in the Crucifixion.<sup>162</sup>

Royden's disarmament call undercut the whole idea of the power of the state. Roberts defined the state as "the organisation of a group for the safeguarding of its interests."<sup>163</sup> Armaments were developed as a means to safeguard these interests. Roberts could find no historical evidence for the success of the method, and therefore he thought that it was a

reasonable presumption that those societies which have sought security by the method of trusting and dealing fairly with their neighbours and have discarded the use of armaments, have found a better and more effectual security. ... [Conversely,] material and outward defences, however strong and well organised, do not secure the life of human societies, but rather put them in jeopardy every hour.<sup>164</sup>

Going one step further, Roberts suggested that a passion for security became a passion for power, or in other words, armaments were "not a means of insurance, but a means of aggression."<sup>165</sup> But these cravings for security and power were "twin illusions", false trusts with which the Christian should not be mixed up.<sup>166</sup> Royden's and Roberts' ideas,

however inadequately worked out, were indeed revolutionary—though as the UDC's position indicated, hardly unique-- and provided a basis for a new humanity.

To bring about the new humanity it would be necessary to provide a different system of justice. Although Quakers had a long history of involvement in reforming the penal system and many FOR conscientious objectors experienced the prison system in all its harshness, not much was written about justice in an abstract sense. Even when the problem of justice was touched upon, it was put within a legal frame, often contrasting the O.T. with the N.T.<sup>167</sup> C.H. Dodd placed the O.T. "lex talionis" over against Jesus' notion that mercy modified justice. Justice, according to Dodd, was an entire system of relations springing out of love. Justice could not be equated with rights -- an accusation levelled at Asquith -- nor could it be Aristotle's mechanical idea of distributive and corrective justice.<sup>168</sup> Justice was to be a positive force and consequently the forms of punishment should also be positive. Therefore William Wilson rejected the theories of retributive and deterrent punishment in favour of one which was reformatory. Both Dodd and Wilson understood Rom. 5:8 to be the key to the Christian idea of justice, for men were reconciled to God through Christ while they were still sinners. Romans 5 indicated, therefore, that the punishment of evil doers was not necessary for the well-being of the world at large. Even assuming that a nation waging an unjust war was comparable to a criminal - something the FOR strenuously denied - it did not follow that the nation needed to be punished.<sup>169</sup> In practical terms, prime-minister

Lloyd George's drive to the final victory and the punitive clauses in the Versailles Treaty were seen by the FOR—and many others—as misguided ideas of justice, devoid of any form of reformation and totally lacking in love. They thus prevented the coming of the Kingdom.

### The Kingdom of God: The Socio-Economic System

According to the FOR, its principles were applicable to "every department of life". Hence, much was written about the socio-economic system. Yet, in 1916 the FOR declared that its "work in the world [had] hardly more than begun," even acknowledging "ignorance of what our principles involve for the complex social relationships of the modern world."<sup>170</sup> In spite of these disclaimers, FOR members held strong views about private property, capitalism and competition.<sup>171</sup> Societal evils were exposed in typical FOR fashion. As Hodgkin made clear, "Discords are the results of sin - therefore the point of attack is the sin and not the actual discord."<sup>172</sup> Ultimately, the FOR's aim was to convert those involved in the sins. The conversion process was again typically FOR: one needed to identify with both sides of a quarrel so that a "settlement by conversion instead of settlement by compromise" could be achieved. Conversion would cut at the root of the conflict and thus help to bring about a new order, while compromise contained elements of defeat and thus of a new conflict. In order to achieve conversion a true mediator was necessary. Only in this way true peace could be achieved.<sup>173</sup>

Essentially, the FOR identified one great sin: materialism.<sup>173</sup> It was the source from which militarism sprang; it twisted one's correct perception of God and neighbour.<sup>175</sup> Discussions about materialism can be divided conveniently into two subsections, namely, wealth-private property, and commerce-competition. According to General Committee member Mary E. Phillips, a Christian's concern was not with wealth but with "well-th", meaning the sharing of the wealth of the earth God gave to mankind. This "well-th" implied that "the rich need[ed] to learn how to live efficiently on less, and the poor how to live wisely on more."<sup>176</sup> Alfred Salter, Bermondsey doctor and later Labour MP, regarded any act of exploitation as unbrotherly, and he could not think of a Christian society "wherein some members draw rent, interest or profits from the forced labour of someone else." Although he called for the adoption of some form of socialism, he did not condemn the rich as such. Rather, he called the rich back to such London boroughs as Bermondsey, Poplar or Hoxton, because the move of the wealthy to the suburbs had seriously undermined the economic viability of these boroughs and had sharpened class-distinctions.<sup>177</sup> According to Rorke, an editor of The Venturer, the seeking and trusting of money were the central spiritual dangers. These materialistic concerns separated Christianity from modern civilization.<sup>178</sup> Thus Hilda Strickland called for the uprooting of materialism, not in order to replace capitalism with communism but with the Christian idea that private property was given to the people as a trust.<sup>179</sup> The revolutionary, rather than evolutionary, changes the FOR members called for could only be brought

about by the Holy Spirit:

Our thoughts of the possible development of human society are too largely conditioned by ideas of organic evolution. One of the chief needs of the time is the recovery of such faith in God as to lead us to plan on the assumption that He may at any time lift the world onto an altogether higher plane of desire and achievement.<sup>180</sup>

The statement is a clear indication that the FOR distanced itself from the evolutionist idea of progress as found in immanentist theology. But the "higher plane" did not mean a purely spiritual existence. This is apparent from the use of the notion of stewardship which implied at least two things, namely, that Christian principles were applicable to daily life and that property had a service function for the whole international community. These ideas placed the FOR in the stream of moral economic theory, propounded by such widely diverging economists as Alfred Marshall and R.H. Tawney.<sup>181</sup>

The application of Christian principles meant, negatively, a condemnation of the spirit of acquisition which manifested itself in such diverse ways as imperialism, poor labour conditions or competition.<sup>182</sup> Mary Phillips, for example, pointed out that in 1914 there were 159,000 industrial casualties due to neglect of safety conditions, defective apparatus, disease, poisonous fumes and long working hours.<sup>183</sup> She did not condemn machines, nor did she advocate a return to hand-made goods: "Machinery has come to stay and must be tended, but one man, one woman, or one child need not tend it for twelve hours a day, and become practically inferior to the machine itself."<sup>184</sup> The industrial labourer was abused so that others could profit. Such a system, contrary to the teaching of Jesus, led the FOR to believe that

it could not be modified but had to be abolished.<sup>185</sup>

Positively, the FOR called for "cooperation in commerce and industry in place of competition." That meant no protective trade barriers, no arbitrary task distinctions between men and women, the reconciliation between the various classes, the recognition of each human being as an individual personality, and the production of commodities for use and not for profit.<sup>186</sup> William Wilson realized that these ideas needed a better understanding of commerce and competition than most FOR members had. He accepted the idea that commerce was necessary for life, but rejected the idea that it was a competition similar to war. War's essence was struggle, "prostituting noble virtues to base purposes" in which the passions of greed, strife, ruthlessness, and hatred had free play. In contrast, the purpose of commerce was beneficial.<sup>187</sup> What commerce needed was reform, not abolition. Competition, on the other hand, had to be eliminated because of its anti-Christian and social Darwinist nature. Wilson viewed competition as tending to suppress individuality and originality, and as pitting the strong against the weak.<sup>188</sup> Wilson's alternative was more a theological statement than a practical solution: "The secret of a reformation of society lies in the relation of the individual to God. The whole duty of man is to enter into true relations with God, and live his life under Divine Guidance."<sup>189</sup> Orchard essentially agreed with Wilson when he wrote that "the theory that internecine competition is essential to human existence would seem to be almost a denial of Providence." Instead of offering a solution, he merely indicated that there were two



opposing streams of thought about how to attain the new Christian order. The first stream held that all people needed first to be converted to the Christian faith. The result would "automatically" usher in the new social order. In the meantime, however, the adherents of this view stuck to the present order. The second stream called for a social awakening. The group's terminology, however, was laced with selfishness, hatred and an advocacy of class war. The group seemed to be willing to use revolution.<sup>190</sup> Between these two extremes one could find most FOR members. However, they never offered a practical way to achieve their end. The closest solution for the whole of society was the advocacy of guild socialism or a moderate form of state socialism which, the members hoped, would remove the evils of the competitive system.<sup>191</sup> Generally, the proposals or the expositions on how to solve society's problems were by and large products of individual thinking. Together, the various proposals helped the FOR to formulate its ideas. Yet, as T.S. Attlee, an older brother of the later Labour prime minister, said at the 1916 Swanwick Summer Conference, the FOR members were part of the problem they tried to solve. The members believed that they were working "for the good of [their] fellows as a body, and not only for [their] individual selves", but they were, nevertheless, "interested parties, not impartial arbitrators." Attlee illustrated his point with a personal example which was equally valid for the predominantly well-to-do FOR members:

The vice of the Capitalistic system is this: that master and men never meet. I am master of dozens of men in South America, because I hold shares in a railway there:

but I know nothing of the conditions under which they work, nothing of their aspirations and their grievances; and they know not even my name, nothing about me - except that I draw a percentage of what they earn.

That is the damnable thing about the system: it seems to shut the door on Reconciliation. ...Reconciliation means Revolution.<sup>192</sup>

A year later the reviewer of the social reconstruction session of the 1917 Swanwick Summer Conference found it necessary to remark that "one of the interesting features of this session was the number of those present who affirmed that they had been brought up in working-class homes."<sup>193</sup> Some of the well-to-do, like General Committee member Muriel Lester, imitated Francis of Assisi in order to identify with the poor.<sup>194</sup> Others, like Barrow Cadbury, the Birmingham Quaker JP, were very generous with their wealth. These individual solutions again show the difficulty at arriving at a common solution. In other words, criticism of the system required self-examination and an individual solution. FOR leaders hoped that the members would be like Jesus, who, in Richards' words, "was what he taught."<sup>195</sup> Through discussions, the publication of pamphlets and conferences, the FOR tried to help its members, but ultimately the individual members themselves had to decide what they thought was the solution. For instance, the 1917 FOR Manifesto to the Labour Movement was silent about the topic of strikes because there were some fundamental disagreements within the FOR ranks. While Rev. Reginald Sorensen, a later Labour MP, supported strikes, Rev. E.E. LeBas of Bradford could not accept them as being Christian because they were forms of coercion.<sup>196</sup> The problem of strikes would surface again in the next decade in the face of serious labour unrest. The

division remained, although most leaders tended to agree with Rev. LeBas' view.<sup>197</sup>

The inability of the FOR to come up with practical solutions to overcome the sins of society was one of the reasons for the decline of the Fellowship in the next decade.<sup>198</sup> To say as Hodgkin did that he held "the conviction that the principle of love, as interpreted to us in the life and death of Jesus Christ, ought to be and can be applied as the sufficient basis for human society"<sup>199</sup> was not adequate for those who wanted to know what that meant in terms of application. Similarly, Roberts in The Red Cap on the Cross stated that the central problem of the social order was "how to respect man's clear right to achieve individuality without leaving the door open to the disruptive waywardness of mere individualism."<sup>200</sup> But his emotional appeals at the end of book, such as "To the people--Your day at last has come. ...You are about to take the affairs of the world into your hands. ...You are going to recast the existing order",<sup>201</sup> still begged the question of how to solve the problem. While the FOR presented the basis for a new society and exposed contemporary sins, it indicated only the general solution. Nevertheless, the comprehensive vision of the FOR set the Fellowship apart from other pacifist organizations. Simultaneously the vision incorporated both practical and theoretical ideas espoused by the UDC, NCF and Friends. The vision was not formulated in isolation nor constructed on an intellectually abstract level. The vision was, to slightly paraphrase a biblical phrase, for the world yet not of the world. In other words, the nature of the vision was both unifying and

divisive. During the war the strength of the FOR was found in its comprehensive, unifying vision. Its nature determined the FOR's methodology. It explains why the FOR did not become a political pressure group while nevertheless the FOR expected its members to become politically involved. The FOR's understanding of the Kingdom made the FOR decide to become involved in a variety of activities ranging from the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents to attempts to start a school, from the support of and caring for C.O.s to industrial peace through industrial parliaments. The next two chapters could be regarded as the attempts of FOR members to live out the vision.

#### CHAPTER 4 ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Orchard, Faith, p. 122. Cf. FOR 456; 2/1; 9-10-1916: the FOR "has not found itself, and until it does nothing can happen."

<sup>2</sup>FOR 456; 4/1; 22-5-1916.

<sup>3</sup>There were some exceptions to the use of the word 'heaven'. See for example Muriel Lester, It Occurred to Me, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1937, p. 95; London: S.C.M., 1938, p. 70. The importance of the notion of the Kingdom of God was still very evident in E. L. Allen's book, The Purpose of Jesus, London: F.O.R., 1951.

<sup>4</sup>FOR 456; 5/6; 30-4-1917. See Rev. 11:15.

<sup>5</sup>T. Corder Catchpool, On Two Fronts; London: Headley, 1918; New York: Garland, 1972, p. 131, May 12, 1917. GD 477 and 478. Davies thought of living for another person, bearing personal rejection or misunderstanding for God's sake.

<sup>6</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16.

<sup>7</sup>W. E. Orchard, Advent Sermons, London: James Clarke, 1914, pp. 184, 197, 241, Preface.

<sup>8</sup>Joan Mary Fry, ed., Christ and Peace, London: Headley, 1915, p. 63. Orchard still saw war as an indispensable prelude to the coming of the Kingdom.

<sup>9</sup>Dodd, Parables. See also Neill, Interpretation, p. 255. Dodd's term meant a rejection of Schweitzer's "consistent" or "thoroughgoing" eschatology.

<sup>10</sup>Richard Roberts, The Untried Door, London: S.C.M. 1921, p. 75. See also News Sheet, 2-4-1915, p. 2, and Hayman, Worship, ch. 1. For the Puritan comparison, see R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism, Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1962, ed., p. 199. See also Bebbington, Nonconformist, p. 12, who saw as one of the characteristic attitudes of the Nonconformist of the period 1870-1914 the denial of the distinction between the sacred and the secular.

<sup>11</sup>RR Box 1, file 29-32, Biography, p. 57. Cf. GD 2305 (to his mother 1915): "Either Christ's gospel was impractical and therefore useless to men in the time of crisis, or else it was the one thing necessary and + only power by which we could conquer the world + death."

<sup>12</sup>News Sheet, 30-4-1916, p. 9. Italics in original. This statement clearly differentiates the FOR from the UDC and NCF.

<sup>13</sup>News Sheet, 30-5-1916, p. 6.

<sup>14</sup>N.I.V. translation. Cf. News sheet, 2-7-1915, no. 9, p. 4, reporting a sermon by Rev. P. Green on this text.

<sup>15</sup>Richard Roberts, The High Road to Christ, London: Cassells, 1912, pp. 78, 89. Cf. Christ and Ourselves, London: S.C.M. 1915, p. 21.

<sup>16</sup>Richard Roberts, The Red Cap on the Cross, London: Headley, 1918, p. 104.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 89. See also pp. 106, 121. See Gal. 3: 28, Col. 3:11.

<sup>18</sup>News Sheet, 25-10-1916, p. 13.

<sup>19</sup>HTH, Box 1 file 14 "Love and Fine Thinking" and J.D.M. Rorke in The Venturer, Feb. 1917, pp. 131-132. Cf. J.R. Coates, The Gospel of the Cross, London: Macmillan, 1918, p. 109. The article's title may come from H.G. Wells' book The New Machiavelli, see Samuel Hynes, The Edwardian Turn of Mind, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968, p. 123.

<sup>20</sup>News Sheet, 25-10-1916, p. 15.

<sup>21</sup>See R. Dunkerley, The Proclamation, Heanor: Walter Barker, 1918, p. 5. Edward Grubb only touched upon the atonement but with the early Quakers rejected the idea that the atonement was a mere transaction. The atonement was not external to a person but brought about a change in personality, (Authority, p. 113). After the war the moral theory was propounded in the following books: J. R. Coates, The Christ of Revolution (1920); G. B. Robson, The Kingship of God (1920); N. Micklem, The Galilean (1920); C. J. Cadoux, The Guidance of Jesus for Today (1920); E. Grubb, The Meaning of the Cross (1921); A. T. Cadoux, Essays in Christian Thinking (1922); N. L. Robinson, Christian Justice (1922); C. J. Cadoux, The Message About the Cross (1924); A. T. Cadoux, The Gospel that Jesus Preached (1925). For a similar view in the U.S.A., see W. Rauschenbusch, A Theory for the Social Gospel (1918).

<sup>22</sup>See for example George B. Robson, The Way to Personality, London: Headley, 1917 (actually finished by Christmas 1915). Re-issued as no. 5 in the Christian Revolution Series. See also Richard Roberts, Personality and Nationality London: Headley, n.d. [Nov. 1914]. In psychology James Ward in England and Wilhelm Stern in Germany had looked at personality, but the topic was relatively new. FOR theologians were in the forefront to connect the concept of personality with religion.

According to Jack F. Padgett, the idea of personality was central to William Temple's philosophy-theology. The Christian Philosophy of William Temple, The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1974.

<sup>23</sup>William E. Wilson, Atonement and Non-Resistance, London: Swarthmore Press, 1923 (1914), pp. 11-12. It was published serially in The Friend in August 1914. Chapter 6 was added at the suggestion of Hodgkin, making the book a pacifist tract.

<sup>24</sup>Wilson, Atonement, ch. 3.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., ch. 4. Previous moral atonement theories gave the impression that Christ died only to make a moral appeal. Wilson added a historical view of Christ's death to these theories.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., ch. 5. p. 37.

<sup>27</sup>Remarkably enough, Wilson has a substitutionary theory of his own when writing on page 39: "in our work for the salvation of men we shall suffer for them as Christ suffered." Cf. Coates, Gospel, p. 69. Coates quotes Hebr. 13:22 for a positive meaning for human suffering. (see also ch. 6, esp. pp. 113, 116.).

<sup>28</sup>Plymouth Brethren or Jehovah's Witnesses based their pacifism on the Decalogue. Many Quakers based their pacifism on the Sermon on the Mount.

<sup>29</sup>William E. Wilson, The Foundations of Peace, London: Headley, 1918, p. 22 and ch. 2. Cf. Eric Hayman, The Challenge of the Kingdom, London: Headley, 1918 (also Friends' Quarterly Examiner, Vol. 52, Jan. 1918, pp. 49-65), p. 5: non-resistance is a "vital, positive, burning force" which brooks no moral laziness. On July 8, 1915 Russell commented that "Pacifists are really no good. What is wrong with mere opposition to war is that it is negative." Quoted by Vellacott, Russell p. 23. Wilson's atonement theory has a weakness in common with the theories he rejected: it is strongly individualistic. Societal redemption is only a consequence of individual redemption. Wilson's theory lacked the harmonious balance between the individual and society. It was this harmony the FOR was striving after. John Ferguson, who was essentially silent about atonement in The Politics of Love, tried to correct this weakness when he spoke of "corporate personality" (p. 71), a term which has socio-politico-economic consequences.

<sup>30</sup>Cf. Wilson, Christ, p. 103. It is this understanding of activism which militates against Ceadel's usage of quietism for the FOR.

<sup>31</sup>HTH Box 1 file 8, article in Peacemaker (July ?) 1913, p. 151. It may be noted that Hodgkin was secretary of Friends' Foreign Mission Association.

<sup>32</sup>Here is the FOR's solution to Robbins' "abolition of war".

<sup>33</sup>News Sheet, 21-5-1915, insert. Cf. Coates Gospel, p. 59: "Divine Love gives a new meaning to morality."

<sup>34</sup>News Sheet, 3-9-1915, pp. 4-5; see also 2-7-1915, p. 1, where Hodgkin stated that the Summer Campaign was "to bring men to realize the Kingdom of God on earth."

<sup>35</sup>Cf. News Sheet, 18-6-1915, Mary Phillips.

<sup>36</sup>News Sheet, 15-1-1916, p. 2. Compare progress and men's involvement with Wilson's "The Hope of a Spiritual Revolution," The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 2, Nov. 1915, p. 61: "The Kingdom of God, which is a Kingdom of men, must come through men." Dunkerley, Proclamation, p. 6. "It all depends upon us. It can only happen if we will have it."

<sup>37</sup>Wilson in The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 2, Nov. 1915, p. 60.

<sup>38</sup>News Sheet, 25-10-1916, p. 13.

<sup>39</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 3 no. 10, July 1918, p. 243. One of these letters caused the prosecution of Rorke, the editor the The Venturer, described on p. 212.

<sup>40</sup>Davies, Essays, Letter III, pp. 45, 44.

<sup>41</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 2, Nov. 1915, p. 49.

<sup>42</sup>P. T. Forsyth, Christian Ethic of War, quoted by Hayman, Challenge, p. 9 and Orchard, Advent, p. 241. Forsyth's fairly representative reasoning easily led to the idea that the war was a "battle for Christ", a crusade. See George M. Ll. Davies, Essays Towards Peace, London: Sheppard Press, 1946, ch. 2; Hugh Martin, ed., The Ministry of Reconciliation, London: Headley, 1916, p. 14. Forsyth's argument is an example of interim ethics, strongly rejected by the FOR.

<sup>43</sup>The break between the two testaments is also evident in Mennonite theology.

<sup>44</sup>F. W. Armstrong in Martin, ed., Ministry, p. 14.

<sup>45</sup>Marcion (second century) argued that there was a total discontinuity between the O.T. and N.T. The god of the O.T. was a 'demiurge' who had created the material world, but he was not the Father of Jesus. For his views he was excommunicated in 144. In 1935 Temple accused pacifists of being Marcionites.

<sup>46</sup>The essay was also printed as an independent issue in New York (Association Press, 1916).



<sup>47</sup>What exactly is meant by soul is not very clear. With one possible exception (Rev. 6:9) the Hebrew word nephesh (נֶפֶשׁ) and the Greek psyche (ψυχή) do not seem to denote a separate entity. Rather, the two words seem to have as primary meaning 'possessing life'.

<sup>48</sup>In Martin, ed., Ministry, p. 120.

<sup>49</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 2, Nov. 1915, p. 55.

<sup>50</sup>Orchard, The Necessity of Christ, London: J.M. Dent, 1916, pp. 113-101.

<sup>51</sup>In Christ and Peace, p. 69.

<sup>52</sup>cf. "What is a Christian?," The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 2, Nov. 1915, p. 57. See also Robson, Way pp. 50 and 134.

<sup>53</sup>Roberts, Personality, pp. 46, 58, 62.

<sup>54</sup>Wilson, Foundations, pp. 14, 42.

<sup>55</sup>George Lansbury papers, British Library of Political and Economic Science, London, Coll. LL Vol. 7, no. 213. Hereafter cited as LL. However, in a letter to D. S. Cairns, Hodgkin was not so sure about the Tolstoyan idea of the sanctity of life. (HTH Box 2 file 25; 23-3-1916, p. 4). See also Richard Roberts, The Gospel at Corinth, New York: Macmillan, 1924, pp. 148-149.

<sup>56</sup>Robson, Way pp. 18, 25, 55, 57. See also Halliday in Martin's Ministry, p. 136.

<sup>57</sup>Orchard, Necessity, p. 37.

<sup>58</sup>Fry, ed., Christ, p. 12. Orchard in Advent p. 242, stated that war showed that the Church had been surprised: "We are absolutely without guidance."

<sup>59</sup>CJC Box 2, 14-8-1905. See also the prologue of this thesis.

<sup>60</sup>LL Vol. 7, no 213. Orchard wrote in Outlook, p.78 that "the forces of peace were not ready for mobilisation."

<sup>61</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 1, Oct 1915, p. 20ff.

<sup>62</sup>Cf. Advent, pp. 245, 267.

<sup>63</sup>Orchard, Outlook, pp. 12-16.

<sup>64</sup>Orchard, Advent, pp. 197, 263.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., p. 263. See also Maude Royden's The Great Adventure, London: Headley, n.d. [1915], pp. 3-4, "dishonour is worse than the worst of wars." Stevenson wrote in Amor Vincit Omnia, London: S.C.M., 1914, p. 5: "Instinctively we feel that even war is better than 'self-regarding Pacificism'."

<sup>66</sup>Richard Roberts' address at Llandudno. He thought that the lifestyle of the people was decidedly sub-Christian. See Friends, pp. 32-33.

<sup>67</sup>See also The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 3, Dec. 1915, pp. 65-69.

<sup>68</sup>"The Implications of Mutual Tolerance," The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 4, Jan. 1917, p. 118. See also The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 3, Dec. 1915, p. 66.

<sup>69</sup>Swomley in his introduction to the 1972 Garland edition misinterpreted Cadoux by ignoring the 1917 material. Cadoux' ideas on toleration antedate those of Raven by two decades.

<sup>70</sup>SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2, file 1, 1915.

<sup>71</sup>SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2, file 1, 1915, "A Call to Penitence."

<sup>72</sup>Wells, The War That Will End War.

<sup>73</sup>Roberts in The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 4, Jan 1917, p. 99. See also Hodgkin's How to Check the Spirit of Militarism, p. 1.

<sup>74</sup>Orchard, Outlook, pp. 4 and 156. See also The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 5, Feb. 1916, p. 153, where Gwynn Jones argues that "war is based on the supposition that reason has failed." Roberts, in The Venturer, Vol 1 no. 12, Sept, 1916, p. 355, felt that sound reason was lost in the rush.

<sup>75</sup>Roberts, Faith, p. 8. See also Arthur Ponsonby, Falsehood in War Time, London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1928.

<sup>76</sup>Quoted by Wilson in Christ, p. 106.

<sup>77</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 3 no. 1, Oct. 1917, p. 1. See also H. W. Horwill, The Cost to Humanity, FOR pamphlet 1915 (SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2, file 1).

<sup>78</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 4 no. 1, Oct. 1918, p. 278. The problem of 'principalities and powers', important to the understanding of the place and role of government, was not discussed by FOR theologians. The discussion on the problem seems to have started in 1953 when Hendrik Berkhof wrote Christ and the Powers. For the literature of this issue

see Richard J. Mouw, Politics and the Biblical Drama, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976, ch. 5. He does not mention G. H. C. Macgregor's "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought," New Testament Studies, Vol. 1, 1954, pp. 17-28.

<sup>79</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 6, March 1917, pp. 178-179.

<sup>80</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 8, May 1916, pp. 240-241.

<sup>81</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 8, May 1916, p. 228.

<sup>82</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 4, Jan. 1916, p. 101. Orchard in The Venturer of Feb. 1916, p. 144, stated that he was not one of those who saw war as the ONE evil in the world.

<sup>83</sup>See for example Roberts in Fry's Christ, p. 26.

<sup>84</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 6, March 1917, p. 173.

<sup>85</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 10, July 1916, p. 301.

<sup>86</sup>See for example Roberts in The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 4, Jan. 1916, p. 99.

<sup>87</sup>See for example Wilson in The Venturer, Vol. 3 no. 1, Oct. 1917, pp. 16-19, or Carl Heath in Pacifism in Time of War, London: Headley, n.d. [1914/5], p. 69. Swartz, U.D.C.; for the Bryce Group see Robbins, Abolition.

<sup>88</sup>Heath, Pacifism, pp. 24-25, 76.

<sup>89</sup>Martin in Ministry, p. 10. See also Roberts in Fry's Christ, p. 30, where he argues that simple pacifism is bankrupt and that it is impossible to superimpose peace on the existing international system.

<sup>90</sup>See for example Doncaster in The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 4, Jan. 1917, p. 115.

<sup>91</sup>Martin in Ministry, p. 10. The FOR rarely gave detailed blueprints how to arrive at the desired ends. The absence of detailed plans should be regarded as a weakness in methodology.

<sup>92</sup>See for example Roberts in The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 4, Jan. 1916, pp. 97-101 and Fry's Christ, p. 22.

<sup>93</sup>Orchard, Advent, p. 251. The monk Telemachus or Almachus was killed when he tried to separate the gladiators, c. 400. Perhaps due to his action emperor Honorius abolished such fights. His feast day is January 1.

<sup>94</sup>Hodgkin in Ministry, pp. 123-130. In 1958 Blamires, War, p. 98, quoted J. H. Oldham approvingly: "If something radical is to happen to society, something radical must happen to the Church."

<sup>95</sup>Ezra is mentioned in Rose Waugh Hobhouse's The Records of Senelder (London: C. W. Daniels), published in 1940 but written in 1898. The manuscript circulated privately in the 1930's and may have influenced some FOR authors. Francis of Assisi was very popular among FOR members, see for example News Sheet, 15-1-1916, p. 6; Lansbury, Royden, Father Andrew used him as example. Davies wrote a lengthy essay on the saint. (GD 299). References to Fox were not so frequent and usually by Quakers.

<sup>96</sup>CJC Box 8, 26-10-1915.

<sup>97</sup>See Cadoux' essay in H. Martin's Ministry esp. pp. 34 and 38. Cadoux' research remained the major source of information on the early church's attitude towards war for the FOR. Even in the 1950's his work was basic to chapter 3 in John Ferguson's book The Enthronement of Love or chapters 5 and 6 in Edgar W. Orr's Christian Pacifism. Alan Kreider in his short paper "Rediscovering Our Heritage" in Jim Wallis, ed., Waging Peace, (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1982) lists six ways modern Christians can be helped by the example of the early church (pp. 124-125).

<sup>98</sup>Cadoux in Martin's Ministry, p. 44. Cadoux does not seem to have connected this abstention with the Lutheran - Calvinistic idea of the priesthood of all believers.

<sup>99</sup>Col. 2:9; for πλήρωμα (pleroma) also Col. 1:19, Eph. 1:23, John 1:16.

<sup>100</sup>See e.g. F. W. Armstrong in Martin's Ministry, pp. 14-15.

<sup>101</sup>For a critical evaluation of O.T. scholarship see R. K. Harrison, Introduction to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1969), part One; see also Parts 8-14 for the individual O.T. books. The weakness of the FOR theologians becomes very evident if their work is compared with some modern theologians who combined Higher Criticism with a thematic approach. See for example Peter C. Craigie, The Problem of War in the Old Testament, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1978; Vernard Eller, War and Peace, Scottdale: Herald Press, 1981; Millard C. Lind, Yahweh is a Warrior, Scottdale: Herald Press, 1980.

<sup>102</sup>See for example News Sheet, 15-2-1916, pp. 7-8 or The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 1, Oct. 1916, p. 19.

<sup>103</sup>For example Leon Morris, The Gospel According to St. Luke, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1974, p. 310: "Enough of this kind of talk!" Ferguson, in Politics, p. 31, thought this text "the most difficult passage in the New Testament to reconcile with the general tenor of Jesus' teaching of non-violent love."

<sup>104</sup>News Sheet, 24-9-1915, p. 7.

<sup>105</sup>For example News Sheet, 15-2-1916, p. 8. Both the R.V. and the N.I.V. translations accept this possibility, which is rejected by the A.V., R.S.V., N.A.S.B., J.B., as well as French, Dutch and German translations. The scourge is not mentioned in the Synoptics: Mt. 21: 12-13, Lk. 19: 45-46; Mk. 11: 15-17.

<sup>106</sup>News Sheet, 15-2-1916, p. 8. This argument is backed up by the question of the Jewish leaders by what authority Jesus did it (John 2:18). Strangely enough this verse was not used by the FOR. See also Hodgkin's letter to D. S. Cairns, HTH Box 2 file 25, 23-3-1916, p. 6, and William E. Orchard, The True Patriotism and Other Sermons, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1918, ch. 8.

<sup>107</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 5, Feb. 1916, p. 146.

<sup>108</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 9, June 1916, pp. 258-259. See also Vol. 2 no. 1, Oct. 1916, p. 24, for a review of Forsyth's book, The Christian Ethic of War, and Vol. 2 no. 3, Dec. 1916, p. 80, Vol. 2 no. 4, Jan. 1917, p. 98. Roberts anticipated Huxley's Ends and Means by some two decades.

<sup>109</sup>HTH Box 2 file 25, 23-3-1916. For more on the discussion see Wood, Hodgkin, pp. 159-163. Cairns had given an address at the Llandudno Conference. Hodgkin and Cairns were members of a committee which inquired into the state of religion in the army. In 1919 Cairns published the committee's findings in The Army and Religion (London: Macmillan).

<sup>110</sup>HTH Box 2 file 25, 23-3-1916. Cf. the FOR's "The Basis".

<sup>111</sup>See C. J. Cadoux, "The Cross and the Bayonet," Friends' Quarterly Examiner, Vol. 52, 1918 (Nov.) pp. 376-399.

<sup>112</sup>HTH Box 2 file 25, 23-3-1916.

<sup>113</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>114</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>115</sup>Cf. John Rae, Conscience & Politics, London: Oxford University Press, 1970, ch. 6 ii.

<sup>116</sup>FOR 456; 1/1; 23-3-1915.

<sup>117</sup>The questions asked by the members of the tribunals were often rather pharisaic, for the questions were often used to trap a C.O., the members tried to discredit the C.O. rather than ascertain the truth. C. D. Broad in "Conscience and Conscientious Action" (in Joel Feinberg ed., Moral Concepts, London: Oxford University Press, 1969, pp. 74-79) drew the conclusion that "the Tribunals have been given a task which is, from the nature of the case, incapable of being satisfactorily performed. This, so far as it goes, is a strong ground against allowing exemption from military service on grounds of conscience and against setting up Tribunals at all." (p. 79).

<sup>118</sup>See for example Ex. 22:22; Deut. 10:18; 14:29 or Lk. 20-47. See also Royden's The Great Adventure, p. 4.

<sup>119</sup>CJC Box 8, 22-1-1915. Asquith wrote to the king on July 29, 1914 that the defence of Belgium by England was "rather one of policy than legal obligation." (Stephen Koss, Asquith, London: Allen Lane, 1976, p. 156, or Roy Jenkins, Asquith, London: Collins, 1964, p. 325). The slogan to defend the weak, however sincere it may have been, hid conveniently the ends Cadoux discerned.

<sup>120</sup>Henry T. Hodgkin, The Church's Opportunity in the Present Crisis, London: Headley, 1915, p. 9.

<sup>121</sup>Ibid., pp. 10-11.

<sup>122</sup>A. W. Wright, G. D. H. Cole and Socialist Democracy, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979, ch. 3, esp. pp. 32-33.

<sup>123</sup>Ibid., p. 33; Harold J. Laski, The Foundations of Sovereignty, New York: Harcourt & Brace, 1921.

<sup>124</sup>Leyton Richards, The Christian's Alternative to War, p. 89 (1929); p. 59 (1935/1972). Richards also quotes the Labour Leader of Jan. 14, 1915, as saying that the censor struck out biblical quotations. Also RR Box 2 file 37, 11-7-1917, letter by Willard L. Sperry (?).

<sup>125</sup>CJC Box 8, 22-1-1915. Cf. W. Fearon Halliday's Personality and War, London: F.O.R., 1916, p. 9 or Fry's Christ.

<sup>126</sup>CJC Box 8, 22-1-1915.

<sup>127</sup>Cf. Roberts, Faith, p. 5.

<sup>128</sup>Ibid., pp. 17-18.

<sup>129</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 11, Aug. 1916, pp. 321-323; cf. The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 1, Oct. 1916, p. 4. It is not clear if FOR

theologians rejected the idea that the state ("powers and principalities") existed in principle before the Fall. Mennonites posit usually that the state-government is a consequence of the Fall. The FOR, however, had generally a much more positive view of the state. The members seem to have accepted that the government was a God-given institution. They rightly rejected the idea that God always approved governmental decisions.

<sup>130</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 8, May 1917, p. 225.

<sup>131</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 9, June 1917, p. 260.

<sup>132</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 1, Oct. 1916, pp. 4-5.

<sup>133</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 8, May 1917, p. 227. On p. 228 he quotes Mill to further his argument.

<sup>134</sup>For example, see Orchard, Outlook, p. 153, Lester Occurred, 1937, p. 12, 1938, p. 10; FOR 456; 5/4; 29-10-1915, or HTH Box 2 file 25, 23-3-1916 (Letter to Cairns).

<sup>135</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 8, May 1917, p. 229. The FOR discussion force and coercion must probably be seen in the context of war and Tolstoyan anarchistic views.

<sup>136</sup>Canon Rashdall, for example, had argued that pacifists were unfit for social life, a view rejected by Roberts in "The Criticism of Conscience," The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 10, July 1916, p. 289.

<sup>137</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 8, May 1917, pp. 230-231, where Cadoux quotes Hodgkin.

<sup>138</sup>Ibid., p. 232. The implication is that England was not a Christian state. See, e.g., The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 10, July 1916, p. 292. The FOR's position resembles H. Richard Niebuhr's description of "Christ the Transformer of Culture", ch. 6 of his Christ and Culture (New York : Harper & Row, 1951). See Ferguson, Politics, p. 51, "in being transformed ourselves we are to transform the world."

<sup>139</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 10, July 1916, pp. 289ff.

<sup>140</sup>As far as Roberts and the FOR were concerned, the majority was wrong in going to war.

<sup>141</sup>Cf. Stanley Mellor "The Spirit of Christian Internationalism," The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 10, July 1916, pp. 307-310. He quotes The Round Table: "Humanity is one. It is one great family of which the different races and nations are members." (p. 309).

<sup>142</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 10, July 1916, pp. 290-292. The notion of war as civil war was popularized by Dick Sheppard.

<sup>143</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 8, May 1917, p. 227.

<sup>144</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 5, Feb. 1916, pp. 129-133.

<sup>145</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 3 no. 1, Oct. 1917, pp. 30-32. See further chapter 6.

<sup>146</sup>Royden, Great, p. 15.

<sup>147</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 3 no. 2, Nov. 1918, pp. 293-294; Roberts in Martin's Ministry, p. 57.

<sup>148</sup>Orchard, True, p. 140.

<sup>149</sup>But see for an attempt at a definition Orchard, True, p. 135.

<sup>150</sup>Ibid.

<sup>151</sup>The Fellowship of Reconciliation, (Fellowship Service - Individual and Group), pp. 3-4 SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2.

<sup>152</sup>Roberts in Martin's Ministry, p. 55; The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 1, Oct. 1915, p. 28; Roberts, Personality, p. 71. It is not clear if there is a direct link here with the ideas of Lord Acton. For his ideas see Gertrud Himmelfarb, Lord Acton, 1952.

<sup>153</sup>Roberts, Personality, esp. pp. 71-73, 104.

<sup>154</sup>T. Corder Catchpool, Letters of a Prisoner, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1941, letter 4-2-1918; p. 46.

<sup>155</sup>Orchard, True, pp. 130-135. See also The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 8, May 1917, p. 228 point 2, and Vol. 1 no. 1, Oct. 1915, pp. 18-19. M.L., probably Muriel Lester, called the two types true and false patriotism. As criterion she used a consistency with one's loyalty to God.

<sup>156</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 6, March 1916, pp. 186-188. Brown preferred the term "New Patriotism".

<sup>157</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 11, Aug. 1917, pp. 322-323. Father Nicolas gave a sermon on the topic at St. Margaret's, Westminster. Rorke asked him to have the sermon printed in The Venturer.

<sup>158</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 3 no. 2, Nov. 1918, pp. 300-301 and Davies, Essays ("Patriotism"), p. 22.



<sup>159</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 3 no. 2, Nov. 1918, p. 301.

<sup>160</sup>Keeble pointed out that the words, "may she always be in the right!", had been forgotten. Decatur's actual statement seems to have been: "Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right; but our country right or wrong." See A. S. Mackenzie, Life of Stephen Decatur, Boston: C. C. Little and J. Brown, 1846, ch. 14, footnote 163.

<sup>161</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 4 no. 2, Nov. 1918, p. 302. See also Vol. 2 no. 2, Nov. 1916, p. 56.

<sup>162</sup>Royden, Great, esp. pp. 6-9. See also The Venturer, Vol 3 no. 6, March 1918, p. 156. The Latin proverb is "si vis pacem, para bellum." Most FOR members seem to have been convinced that disarmament, even onesided, would have prevented war. Royden at least allows that this may not have been so. The notion of a 'martyr-nation' is a recurring FOR theme. Orchard in his unpublished manuscript "War and the Will of God" (1941 ? Oxford : Bodleian), pp. 104-105 questioned this notion.

<sup>163</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 3, Dec. 1916, p. 66.

<sup>164</sup>Ibid.

<sup>165</sup>Ibid.

<sup>166</sup>Roberts acknowledged that the Church suffered from the same illusions.

<sup>167</sup>Cf. Davies, Essays, p. 46, The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 2, Nov. 1916, p. 49.

<sup>168</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 8, May 1916, pp. 248-249.

<sup>169</sup>Wilson Foundations, ch. 4; The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 2, Nov. 1916, pp. 45-48 and Vol. 2 no. 3, Dec. 1916, pp. 88-90.

<sup>170</sup>News Sheet, 25-8-1916, p. 4 and 1-11-1917, pp. 4-5. FOR "Manifesto to the Labour Movement": behind the present war there was "another, less apparent but more permanent - the war that goes on within each nation in its industrial life."

<sup>171</sup>Fellowship of Reconciliation (Fellowship Service - Individual and Group), pp. 2-4. SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2.

<sup>172</sup>SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2 "A Constructive Policy"; the letter is undated and unsigned but was probably written in 1915 by Hodgkin.

<sup>173</sup>Ibid., and J. St. G. Heath, The FOR and the Social Order, four page pamphlet, n.d. (1916?) SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2. The FOR was to be a reconciler not an arbitrator. Heath's pamphlet may have been the result of his work at the Ministry of Labour where he started to work in 1916. Liberation movements (and liberation theology) seem to identify with the oppressed but the FOR tried to identify with both the rich and poor like Christ did. Yet, the question needs to be raised if the FOR really could fulfil a mediatorial role. For instance, most FOR leaders were socialists. Would they be able to identify themselves properly with capitalists or would mediation only be a means to convert capitalists to socialism? For a strong condemnation of capitalism, see Henry Evans' letter to the London Union, 19-10-1918: "Capitalism, that enemy of mankind which must be exposed +destroyed." See also T.S. Attlee's speech at the 1916 Swanwick Summer Conference (News Sheet, insert 25-8-1916.).

<sup>174</sup>Roberts Renascence, p. 47.

<sup>175</sup>Hodgkin, Church's, p. 6.

<sup>176</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 12, Sept. 1916, pp. 369-370.

<sup>177</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 9, June 1916, pp. 277-280.

<sup>178</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 1, Oct. 1916, p. 21. Rorke's observation reflected more an ideal Christianity than the actual situation. See also G. Lansbury's article and pamphlet Why I joined the F.O.R. [1915], p. 2.

<sup>179</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 5, Feb. 1917, pp. 150-151. See also News Sheet, 25-11-1916, p. 8. See also the familiar hymn "We Give Thee But Thine Own."

<sup>180</sup>"Manifesto on Political Action," published in The Venturer, Vol. 3 no. 1, Oct. 1917, pp. 30-32. Here quoted from an earlier draft. SCPC; DG 13, Box 1/2; 29-6-1917.

<sup>181</sup>Marshall stressed a moralized capitalism, Tawney a moralized socialism. For Marshall see Reba N. Soffer, Ethics and Society in England The Revolution in the Social Sciences 1870-1914, Berkeley: University of California Press 1978, part II. For Tawney, see Ross Terrill, R. H. Tawney and His Times, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

<sup>182</sup>See, e.g., Lansbury, Why, p. 2; "The Manifesto to Labour", News Sheet, 1-11-1917, pp. 4-5; Orchard, Outlook, pp. 240ff. The FOR's ideas predates R.H. Tawney's 1920 book The Acquisitive Society, New York: Harcourt, Brace. It is not clear who influenced who.

<sup>183</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 6, March 1916, p. 182.

- <sup>184</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 12, Sept 1916, p. 370.
- <sup>185</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 3 no. 5, Feb. 1918, pp. 125-126;  
News Sheet, 1-11-1917, pp. 4-5.
- <sup>186</sup>Ibid., News Sheet, 25-11-1916, p. 8.
- <sup>187</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 6, March 1917, pp. 177-179.
- <sup>188</sup>Ibid. See also J. St. G. Heath in Fry's Christ, p. 76: "Much of modern competition is a kind of warfare with hypocrisy thrown in." See also p. 77. Wilson's ideas were not new, they resemble Cobden's.
- <sup>189</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 7, April 1917, pp. 204-207. This essay, with the previous one, is found in Wilson's Foundations, ch. 5.
- <sup>190</sup>Orchard in Martin's Ministry, pp. 108-115; Outlook, p. 51. The thoughts of the first group he thought "a trifle vague." In News Sheet, 1-9-1917, p. 3, the TUC was described as "neither selfish nor irreligious." The second group contains many characteristics of the Social Gospel, but Orchard tied the group closer to Labour. Mouw in Politics, p. 49, called conservative Evangelicals to task because it was not enough to insist that "changed hearts will change society." He also called liberal theologians to task (p. 45) for viewing socialism as a means of redemption.
- <sup>191</sup>News Sheet, 25-11-1916, p. 8.
- <sup>192</sup>News Sheet, insert 25-8-1916.
- <sup>193</sup>News Sheet, 1-9-1917, p. 4.
- <sup>194</sup>Her lifestyle helped her in the 1930's to make friends with Gandhi.
- <sup>195</sup>London Union, Minutes, 17-8-1917. See also Hayman, Challenge, p. 7.
- <sup>196</sup>News Sheet, 24-9-1915, pp. 1-2, 15-12-1915, p. 15; 15-2-1916, pp. 12-13. For the Manifesto see 1-11-1917, pp. 4-5; also The Venturer, Vol. 3 no. 5, Feb. 1918, pp. 127-8 giving the answers by MacDonald and Snowden.
- <sup>197</sup>The FOR's views on strikes may help to understand the FOR's attitude to Gandhi: although very sympathetic towards him, the FOR leaders regarded his method as one of coercion.
- <sup>198</sup>See for example, Stanley B. James, The Adventures of a Spiritual Tramp, London: Longmans & Green, 1925, p. 114. He regarded

the FOR as having an "unadventurous policy", against which Theodora Wilson Wilson rebelled. In describing her James used another word which seems characteristic of the FOR: "discretion". James himself described that as a "dubious quality".

<sup>199</sup>Hodgkin in Fry's Christ, pp. 45-46.

<sup>200</sup>Roberts, Red, p. 55.

<sup>201</sup>Ibid., pp. 123-124.

## CHAPTER 5

### RESTRICTED ACTIVITY 1915-1918 I.

The new vision, though not yet clearly articulated in January 1915, called for an immediate reconstruction of society. Hence, the FOR became involved in a variety of activities. These actions were hampered in several ways. The first part of this chapter looks at the reasons for the constraints on FOR activities throughout the war. These restrictions arose, partly from the very character of the FOR, partly from the unhelpful attitude of the churches, and the hostility of both the government and the people during the war. The second part of this chapter deals with the measure of success the FOR did in fact experience in 1915. This year stands somewhat apart from the period 1916-1918 because the FOR's direction and methods had not been clearly defined. Gradually, however, specific issues became apparent. In many respects the year 1915 set the pattern for the following war years.

#### The Character of the FOR

There can be no doubt that the immediate concern of the FOR was to speak out against a war for which both the military and the pacifists were ill-prepared. First the outbreak and then the length and the atrocities of the war convinced the FOR "that the whole structure of society needed refashioning on a different basis."<sup>1</sup> As the Cambridge conferee and Labour politician George Lansbury recognized, the

reconstruction the Fellowship envisaged was not socialist and its method not political.<sup>2</sup> Stanley B. James, who exchanged a position at the militantly anti-government NCF office for one at the FOR, has given a very flattering description of the method and character of the Fellowship in his 1925 autobiography The Adventures of a Spiritual

Tramp:

The difference of atmosphere made itself felt at once. Coming into the company of these quiet-minded folk out of the feverish passions of a war-mad world, and to sense their consciousness of moral responsibility after the reckless adventuresomeness of the body I had just left was like coming into port after a storm at sea. The lofty idealism of these uplifters was a tonic antidote to the grossness let loose by war conditions. ... The way in which differences of opinion were settled in Committee without recourse to vote-taking and the decisions of majorities. The almost miraculous manner in which a certain course would be decided on after prayerful silence, the absence of personal bitterness and intrigues, and the clearness with which the principle that "love conquers all things" was enunciated, all went to confirm this impression.<sup>3</sup>

Stanley James's impression of the calm of the FOR proceedings is confirmed by Mary Phillips who attended the often day-long early FOR meetings at the Collegium.<sup>4</sup> She thought that at least the committee meetings soothed her nerves.<sup>5</sup> The first annual report issued in 1916 may suggest why. Instead of "busy energetic people, full of ideas and accustomed to put their ideas into action as quickly as possible", the committee "sat still for a day or a week." The members did not want to render their service in their own strength, but "were convinced that God was waiting 'to break forth into human life in new and larger ways'."<sup>6</sup> As the Quaker historian John Graham rightly discerned, the FOR worked by prayer, was interested in the propagation of a right spirit, eschewed

political action and was not in "any immediate hurry to count up results."<sup>7</sup> The result of this quietist, or better mystical, approach was that "the outer history of the Fellowship, so far [1916], may seem a very meagre one - so little accomplished."<sup>8</sup> George Lansbury in his autobiography My Life echoed similar sentiments: "We were rather nebulous in our conclusions and did not, as an organized body, do very much against the war."<sup>9</sup>

However, there was another reason within the FOR which contributed to the limited success of the activities. The "lofty idealism of these uplifters" was not always equal to the praxis. George Davies, who started working for the FOR early in 1915, was aware that it was not easy to be reconciled:

Some of us forget (I did often) that the F.O.R. stood primarily for a common aspiration - a will and a way to reconcile. We forgot that to stand for counsels of perfection did not necessarily mean that we ourselves were walking the road to that perfection, that it was easier to argue for the faith than to live it, that there was as much need for the life of reconciliation within the Fellowship as without it, and even more need of it within our own wayward hearts themselves.<sup>10</sup>

From correspondence between Hodgkin and Roberts<sup>11</sup> it is clear that the 'esprit de corps' was not always what it was supposed to be. Hence Stanley James immediately modified his initial description with the critical observation that the atmosphere was

apt to degenerate into Pharisaism. The fact that we were separated from others by the profession of a higher moral standard did not make for humility. All unconsciously there crept upon us the feeling of a superior caste, free from the taint of the common humanity surging around us. ... It was not long before it became evident that it was largely a temperamental unity that had brought us together. Peace, I found, was achieved not by securing some firm

basis of unalterable dogmatic truth and submitting to an authoritative discipline, but by shelving matters likely to disturb the harmony. On the question of militarism we were agreed, but any application of our principles outside this was adroitly evaded.<sup>12</sup>

Furthermore, the majority consensus was sometimes used coercively, a problem George Davies recognized as belying the very basis of fellowship in freedom.<sup>13</sup> Hodgkin was partly responsible for that, at least according to Davies. In a letter dated December 13, 1920, he compared some of Hodgkin's methods of debate to the "guillotine", and the man himself to a "Prussian".<sup>14</sup> Hodgkin's somewhat dictatorial manner may have been due to two circumstances: first, that many looked to him for guidance, and, second, that his involvement in the innumerable committees left him little time to spare.<sup>15</sup> The FOR, starting on January 13, added one more weekly meeting to his already busy schedule. Often he attended the meetings of the several sub-committees as well. In short, the FOR proclaimed a message of perfection through imperfect men and women, who agreed about opposing war but not necessarily about anything else,<sup>16</sup> not even about the methods and activities to be used in the pursuit of peace. Few activities, therefore, were supported by all members. Moreover, the FOR's Christian ideals held little appeal in an increasingly secularized Britain. In other words, the potential from which the FOR could draw support was relatively small. That the FOR grew from the approximately 120 to 130 gathered at Cambridge to about 8000 at the end of war suggests that the message and method did work. And, as will be shown later, the outer history was not so meagre after all.



### The FOR and the Churches

According to the FOR, the churches were supposed to provide the foundation on which society rested. If the FOR wanted to reconstruct society successfully, the churches had to be won over to the FOR's vision. Hence, the Fellowship spent much of its energy in attempting to influence the churches. Here the question needs to be raised, "What was the attitude of the churches to the war?" The existing historiography does not provide a unified answer as a representative example shows. In 1966 R. B. Lloyd, in The Church of England 1900-1965, drew attention to the devotion of the chaplains and the wise episcopal leadership. He thought that the undeniably negative post-war press of the church had created an unfair image of the church in war-time.<sup>17</sup> However, in 1974 Albert Marrin, in his important study The Last Crusade, disagreed with Lloyd. He could find no evidence in newspapers or periodicals that the Church of England opposed war.<sup>18</sup> There was some opposition to bishop Winnington-Ingram's notion of "Holy War",<sup>19</sup> and to Lord Halifax's "crusade", but generally almost all of the Anglican clergy agreed that, based on article thirty-seven of the "Thirty-Nine Articles", England had an obligation to go to war.<sup>20</sup> Writing four years later, Alan Wilkinson generally agreed with Marrin, though he noted that as the war dragged on Anglican criticism against it mounted.<sup>21</sup> Furthermore, Marrin's and Wilkinson's observations appear to be valid for most other churches.<sup>21</sup>

Although the official pronouncements of the churches tended to be reluctantly supportive of the war, many individual clergymen were less reluctant. In spite of R. B. Lloyd's efforts, he has been unable to undermine seriously the contention by the anti-clericalist George

Bedborough that generally the clergy gave solid support to the war efforts of the government. His collection of statements, though not always presented fairly, shows how difficult it was for the FOR to influence the church. For example, bishop Browne of Bristol is quoted as saying that "it is not only folly to limit the output of power, it is sin." Rev. A. C. Bucknell suggested that "we Christians are very fortunate in possessing a special hand-book, God's Guide to the War, the Holy Bible, containing most valuable information, which teaches us how to meet the war and what it involves." Apparently not all of the Bible was a good guide for Mr. Berry thought that at least one section, the Sermon on the Mount, was "ideal for the moral sluggard."<sup>22</sup> Broadly speaking, the press welcomed ministerial pro-war efforts and statements. Thus, the Hornsey Journal thought it laudatory that the War Office was making full use of the clergy, remarking that the churches had "risen to yet greater heights of self-sacrificing devotion in its service to the nation."<sup>23</sup> Even if some clergy had empathy for pacifism, they may not have dared to speak up. Muriel Lester in It Occurred to Me (1937) tells of a parson who could not include Germans in his prayer because he thought it too dangerous. Against Lester's objection the pastor "replied that the crowd might tear us limb from limb."<sup>24</sup> Indeed, congregations could make life miserable for pacifist clergymen. In non-Anglican churches pacifist ministers could be dismissed or pressured to resign.<sup>25</sup> For instance, Nathaniel Micklem was first asked to remain silent about his pacifism. When he refused the request he was forced to leave his ministry in Manchester in 1916.<sup>26</sup> Leyton Richards, who also

was asked to remain silent on pacifism, resigned from Bowdon Downs because "to me war and the situations incidental to it, are such a flagrant challenge to my whole conception of Christianity that silence on my part in regard to these things would be infidelity to One whom I call Lord and Master."<sup>27</sup> Richard Roberts admitted that his pacifist views caused deep division in his congregation. Since he felt he had no right to impose his views, he decided to leave.<sup>28</sup> In this particular case, the need of the FOR and that of Roberts coincided and the parson became general secretary. According to Orchard, who preached many pacifist sermons throughout the war at King's Weigh House, "It was a rare thing, in those early days of the war, to find anyone, especially in the heart of London, daring to denounce from the pulpit all war in general, and that one in particular."<sup>29</sup> To Ed Beck, a friend of Cadoux, Orchard admitted that "he had got into trouble about it and more to follow."<sup>30</sup> There can be no doubt that the churches, individual clergymen and congregations alike, were generally not very receptive to the FOR's message. No wonder, therefore, that for pacifists such as archdeacon W. C. Roberts, the churches had failed in their prophetic function.<sup>31</sup> G. Norman Robbins, president of the Warley Institutional Church, even regarded non-pacifist churches as heretical and sectarian because their teaching on war was not in accord with Christ's.<sup>32</sup> Robbins saw the FOR as a means to draw the churches back to their original teachings. Perhaps Robbins stated his view more bluntly than most other FOR authors, but in essence they agreed with him.

The negative if not openly hostile attitude to pacifists did not

prevent the FOR from attempting to change the disposition of the churches. To achieve its aim the Fellowship used several approaches. In the first place, the FOR called upon its members to be a leaven.<sup>33</sup> Hence it should be no surprise that there are numerous references to the parable of the leaven in FOR literature.<sup>34</sup> This particular parable fit the quietist-mystical approach of the FOR very well. However, Jesus used different analogies in his parables. Some of these parables, like the Sower, portrayed a much more active involvement. Yet, the parable of the Sower is absent in FOR literature. To formulate a methodology using only one parable at the exclusion of others can hardly be regarded as satisfactory.<sup>35</sup> In the second place, FOR leaders spoke at church meetings. For example, Hodgkin presented the FOR position clearly before the National Free Church Council at Manchester on March 9, 1915.<sup>36</sup> He posited that Jesus had surrendered his right to defend himself and that it was his "firm belief that unless a moral and spiritual revolution (took) place, we too, (should) be bitterly disappointed."<sup>37</sup> In the third place, the Fellowship invited prominent clergymen for discussions, among them William Temple and A. Herbert Gray in March 1915. With the former the General Council discussed "the interpretation of secular history in relation to the Kingdom of God" and the idea of personality as the center of ethical action.<sup>38</sup> The Council thought the meeting useful though no agreement was achieved. The minutes on the meeting with Gray noted that the differences were "very real". Although Gray accepted the idea that all wars were the result of sin, he also thought "that the sin of one party may force a war on

another, and that that other may have no course but to fight." The problem for him was what England in the concrete situation of 1914 should have done to protect the lives of innocent people.<sup>39</sup>

And finally, the FOR and its members published numerous books, articles and pamphlets. Indeed, much of the FOR's energy was spent in attempting to educate the churches. For instance, in October 1915 the FOR began to publish The Venturer, a journal meant to reach a wide Christian reading public.<sup>40</sup> In the same year FOR leaders wrote Christ and Peace, edited by Joan M. Fry, and in 1916 The Ministry of Reconciliation, edited by Hugh Martin. Frequently Christian pacifists thought, rather naively, that if the pacifist message was stated clearly, the readers-listeners would automatically be converted.

How successful were these approaches? Since successful has relativistic connotations, it seems worthwhile to listen first to Cadoux' warning as to why expectations should not be too high:

I believe there are many Xns who in all sincerity are + for a long t. will be unable to see that war + Xty are inconsistent. ... We must labour to remove diffces by comparison, examin~~n~~ + discussion. ... We must resist temtn to condemn those who differ-my nbr. enjoys the same r't. as I do to decide for himself. We must learn to tolerate gladly convictions that differ from our own ... + we must readily admit that until these convictions are changed, the man who honestly holds them, is justified in God's sight in acting accg to them. ... And so I gladly accord honour + revce to every Xn soldier. ... Now we mustnt expect too much of argumve method.<sup>41</sup>

Cadoux was much more tolerant of non-pacifist Christians than many other FOR members. And whether or not the leaven approach would be successful depended on tolerance and a willingness to suffer. As a controversy in

1916 indicates, not everyone wanted to be a leaven. A remarkable number of rank and file members sent letters to News Sheet, the FOR's periodical, about the FOR's aim to work in and through the churches.<sup>42</sup> Miss Mary Watson advocated "Overthrow", but as Lilian Weston rightly pointed out, that would be in contradiction to the name and spirit of the Fellowship.<sup>43</sup> While C. F. Titford wanted to stop the 'leave the Church' tendency, E. W. Cox argued that pacifists could "only work usefully and harmoniously when there is a bond of sympathy among their workers. In the churches there is no sympathy with the pacifists." Several who agreed with Cox had left their churches.<sup>44</sup> In contrast, W. J. Platt saw hope because many students of the Didsbury Wesleyan College, Manchester, were pacifists. Since the college's closure, these students had been put in charge of churches.<sup>45</sup> From these few examples it is obvious that the membership was divided over being a leaven. In contrast, the FOR leadership seems to have been much more united on this issue.<sup>46</sup> Their view should be no surprise. Many FOR leaders were clergymen, who allotted a central place to the Church in their theology. Their views, as the debate in the News Sheets shows, were not always shared by the membership. Although the leadership's expectations were probably too high, the pacifists who remained in their churches had some measure of success.

While the leaven approach was less effective than the leadership hoped, the second approach—speaking to a gathering of church leaders—did not bring the desired results. In 1933 Leyton Richards, in a memoriam to Hodgkin, recalled the effect of the FOR chairman's speech to

the National Free Church Council: "I recollect how his persistence and patience gradually won an angry assembly to silence though not to assent."<sup>47</sup> Nor was the third approach, discussions with prominent clergymen, entirely satisfactory. While Temple would call pacifism a heresy two decades later, Gray accepted pacifism towards the end of the 1920's. Finally, the fourth approach, publications, often strengthened the already converted rather than changed the minds of the unconverted. Again, the immediate success was limited. To summarize then, the methods the FOR employed failed to achieve the FOR's main objective. In other words, the lack of support from or, worse, the hostility of the churches seriously hampered the activities the FOR undertook.

### **Popular Suspicion and the Government's Opposition to the FOR**

Like the ILP, NCF and UDC, the FOR was viewed with great suspicion by the government and the vast majority of people. Although some secondary sources, notably Kennedy, Swartz and Vellacott,<sup>48</sup> have given attention to these hostile attitudes, very little has been written about the suspicion specifically directed at the FOR. The general distrust may be exemplified by an article in the Morning Post of June 21, 1915, called "Traitors in the Camp".<sup>49</sup> This ultra Tory paper castigated the ILP for running a systematic anti-war campaign. The article also made hostile remarks about a pamphlet based on religious grounds. Such a pamphlet would not have emanated from the ILP. On the other hand, by June 15 the FOR had published several pamphlets. Since many FOR members were also ILP members, the Morning Post's confusion is

understandable. Even without being specifically mentioned, the FOR stood condemned. The Morning Post continued by stating that a person had witnessed a meeting in London where soldiers were compared with "professional murderers". The paper claimed that "indoor and outdoor meetings are being organised all over the country, at which this sort of poisonous nonsense is being talked, and so far the Government seems to have taken no step to prevent it." Rather, the government should use DORA and "enforce the law and put an immediate stop to this puling, peace-mongering, and treasonable anti-war campaign of traitors in the national camp." Those 'unpatriotic agitators' should be willing to "relinquish their most cherished privileges, even personal liberty, for their country's sake."<sup>50</sup> The paper clearly equated anti-war activity with pro-German sympathy and support.

There need be no doubt that the FOR published pamphlets and organized meetings which objected to the war. But the Morning Post editorial raised two questions whose answers would, at least partly, determine the government's attitude to the FOR. Firstly, "Was the FOR a militant pacifist organization?" Secondly, "Was the FOR pro-German or supported by Germany?" An answer to the first question can be found in the events surrounding the Caravan Campaign and their aftermath.

In the News Sheet of March 15, 1915, there was an announcement of a van campaign-peace pilgrimage which was soon to be undertaken. It set out after the Swanwick Summer Conference of July 5-12.<sup>51</sup> The nine women and eight men, including Maude Royden, Reginald Sorensen, Claud Coltman and John Lewis, attempted open-air propaganda in the Midlands.<sup>52</sup>



Although they preached the gospel,<sup>53</sup> the listeners regarded them as pro-German,<sup>54</sup> and at Hinckley, Leicestershire, on July 30, the caravan was looted and destroyed, and some members were injured.<sup>55</sup> Coltman wrote shortly afterwards to Cadoux that "the affair ... was far more serious than the Press suggests. ... For 90 minutes we were at the absolute mercy of a mob quite beside itself with rage and hatred."<sup>56</sup> There is not enough evidence to suggest that the affair was a full-scale riot. Nevertheless, the FOR was implicated in what may have been the first large scale violent action in Britain against pacifists. Although the method of the campaign was regarded as "most clumsy" and an intolerable burden on the organization,<sup>57</sup> Coltman thought that the FOR's "'pacifism' had both a vital test and a supreme vindication." They had at least lived the Christian fellowship. Five of them had gone a step further and "spent a whole day in the town and have set powerful reconciling influences at work."<sup>58</sup>

In spite of the group's opportunity to start the process of reconciliation, the caravan campaign was a disaster. The failure contributed to a reappraisal of some FOR ideas. The hostile attitude of the public made it clear that a simple exposition of pacifism did not automatically convert the people. This failure in turn led to other reappraisals. Firstly, the FOR immediately reassessed its methods. Secondly, the members had to reevaluate their understanding of human nature. Furthermore, the disaster probably reinforced the 'leaven approach' favoured by the leadership. Finally, from a government perspective the caravan campaign provided evidence that the FOR

consisted of troublemakers, disturbers of the peace. Thereafter during the war the FOR tried to erase this image, and consequently, the disaster contributed indirectly to the non-confrontational image of the FOR. The incident also helps to explain why the FOR, unlike the NCF, did not become a political pressure group. Yet, the disaster did not mean that caravan campaigns were abandoned. Coltman, undeterred by the violence, wanted to be involved in another campaign. As he wrote to Cadoux, he hoped that the van incident would not discourage Cadoux from working for a new campaign.<sup>59</sup> The new campaign would include the encouragement of the fainthearted, the organization of conferences on the practical applications of FOR principles, open-air-speaking, interviewing possible converts and addressing Adult Schools. Instead of restricting the campaign to caravaners, the corporate FOR body, living out the Sermon on the Mount, should be involved.<sup>60</sup> It was the "quiet visit" approach which C. H. Dodd preferred.<sup>61</sup> The caravan campaign had one interesting side effect. Theodora Wilson Wilson used the Midlands events in her successful novel The Last Weapon. The FOR Literature Committee recommended the book for publication because it was written "with the specific purpose of setting out the Fellowship point of view, in regard to war."<sup>62</sup> It was one of the few occasions that the FOR used the arts to proclaim its message.

If the FOR was probably the first pacifist organization to become involved, be it against its will, in violence, what then about the Morning Post's second accusation? As has been seen, the caravan

campaigners were accused by listeners of being pro-German. The FOR had indeed contacts with Germany, especially but not exclusively with Siegmund-Schultze, the editor of the peace journal Die Eiche. The News Sheet of May 21, 1915, quoted the Völker Friede of April as saying about the 'Order of Reconciliation' : "May their efforts be crowned with success!"<sup>63</sup> Such words in a suspicious world could easily be misconstrued. Moreover, at the outbreak of war the German Evangelical leaders wrote a letter to their English counterparts justifying the German position. The British replied with a letter signed by the leaders of the Church of England and National Free Church Council. This letter provoked an even stronger defence by the German church leaders. At this juncture the English signatories felt it useless to continue the correspondence. The FOR tried to keep this German channel open and asked Orchard to write a letter - but he got no reply.<sup>64</sup> Furthermore, the FOR used Henrietta M. Thomas from Baltimore to convey oral messages to German peace lovers.<sup>65</sup> The Dutchman Kees Boeke, the later Birmingham branch FOR secretary, offered in late May - early June 1915 to go to Germany to further explore the possibility of reconciliation. He spent six weeks in central Europe, visiting pacifists.<sup>66</sup> There were no immediate results but it seems more than likely that the contacts he made helped in the forming of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR) in 1919. These contacts with Germany did not mean that the FOR was pro-German. Nevertheless, activities like the Caravan Campaign and these contacts could, and did, make the government suspicious, especially in the light of the various spy scares,<sup>67</sup> the

newspapers clamoring for the implementation of the relevant DORA clauses, and the jingoes ready to riot.

Perhaps after 1915 the degree of suspicion towards the FOR was less than towards the NCF, but in 1915 there was possibly little differentiation in government and public mind. Even though the FOR condemned the sinking on 7 May 1915 of the Lusitania<sup>68</sup> and thus showed itself once again not to be pro-German, the taint remained. Consequently, the police continually harassed the FOR and its members, a treatment shared by other pacifists. Basil Thomson, head of the Criminal Investigation Department of Scotland Yard, writing shortly after the war, indicated why the harassment continued unabated and even intensified: "Pacifism, anti-Conscription, and Revolution were ... inseparably mixed", and the same individuals were in these three groups, whose real object was to ruin the country.<sup>69</sup> On October 17, 1917, Thomson handed in a

report on the activities of pacifist revolutionary societies for the War Cabinet, who are not disposed to take doses of soothing syrup in these matters. Being persuaded that German money is supporting these societies, they want to be assured that the police are doing something. I feel certain that there is no German money, their expenditure being covered by the subscriptions they received from cranks.<sup>70</sup>

At least Thomson exonerated the FOR from being supported by Germany. He could have added that the FOR's income derived from gifts of members, especially Friends, and from some dividends. But the harassment of pacifists continued unabated. During the autumn there were police raids on the offices of several anti-war organizations. The FOR office was raided on November 14, 1917. Everything in the office was taken to the

police station and it took a while before the FOR got all its material back.<sup>71</sup> Ostensibly the raid was conducted on yet another charge that the FOR was supported by German money. As the News Sheet reported, "particular inquiries were made with regard to documents relating to our finances."<sup>72</sup> However, the raid may actually have been a consequence of some events which took place during the early summer. As Stephen White has written, the March Russian Revolution was warmly welcomed by nearly all sections of British opinion, though for different reasons.<sup>73</sup> The heady enthusiasm was evident during the Leeds Convention of June 3, 1917. The Convention had two important results, one of which may have led to the later raid. According to White, Lloyd George's cabinet decided on June 5 that the "time had come to undertake an active campaign to counteract the pacifist movement, which at present had the field to itself."<sup>74</sup> The second result was to hold regional conferences. One of them was planned for London on July 28. The meeting, held at the Brotherhood Church on Southgate Road, Hackney, was disturbed by violence. Henry Hodgkin, Edith Ellis and Henry Harris were threatened and manhandled by a large crowd, though they did not suffer any serious injuries nor real damage. Hodgkin's papers were destroyed and, as Hodgkin wrote to his father, he feared for his life but did not put up a fight.<sup>75</sup> Again FOR leaders were, unwillingly, involved in violence. For a government bent on destroying the pacifist movement incitement to violence served to justify the continual harassment.

One incidence of harassment had unexpected consequences. It involved the Dutchman Kees Boeke, the Birmingham branch FOR secretary.

Each Saturday afternoon he spoke in front of a big munitions factory. The police warned him that he was not allowed to give his message out of doors, but he disregarded the warning. In January 1918 he went to South Wales where on January 28 he was given a 20s. fine or 10 days for "causing an obstruction" ten days before. He was also recommended for deportation. Since he thought his conviction unjust he appealed to the Quarter Sessions. He refused to pay the fine and was consequently arrested on January 30 and taken to Swansea jail. Because he had enough money with him, the police took that to pay the fine and released him. When he returned to Birmingham there awaited him three summonses, relating to an alleged offence committed at an open air meeting on December 23. He appeared before the Police Court on February 22, charged under DORA "for unlawfully making statements likely to prejudice the administration and discipline of His Majesty's Forces, and intended to interfere with their success."<sup>76</sup> He was fined £50 or 41 days' imprisonment and again recommended for deportation.<sup>77</sup> Ironically, on December 17, 1917, the FOR General Committee had passed a resolution protesting against regulation 27<sup>c</sup> under which Boeke had been condemned, because the regulation limited expression of religious and political conviction. The resolution had been sent to members of Parliament, the press and church leaders.<sup>78</sup> Boeke's new appeal, like the FOR's protest, was ignored and he was hurriedly deported. His deportation turned out a blessing in disguise because it prepared the way for the 1919 conference at Boeke's house in Bilthoven which started the International Fellowship

of Reconciliation.<sup>79</sup>

There is no evidence to suggest that the government knew anything about the FOR's revolutionary world and life view. To the government and the general population the FOR was just another pacifist organization which they regarded as injurious to the successful pursuit of the war. Throughout the war the FOR and its members were subjected to harassment which handicapped the implementation of their activities. Still, the harassment was never so severe that the FOR could not operate.

#### The Growth of the FOR in 1915

When Hodgkin introduced the first News Sheet on March 1, 1915, there was not much to report "Since Cambridge".<sup>80</sup> The conference had been reviewed by several papers<sup>81</sup> and the resultant interest led to an increase in membership to about 280. The names and addresses appeared as information. In subsequent issues new names were added and at the end of the year a separate list with names and addresses was published. It was an excellent way for pacifists to see who lived nearby. A member might have thought that he or she was the only pacifist in the area and discover this was not so. For example, a Methodist wrote to the News Sheet that he had found one other pacifist in the neighbourhood, a Roman Catholic, "but labels didn't really matter much."<sup>82</sup> The listing of names made the formation of study circles and branches much easier, and probably accelerated membership growth. It is possible that the slow initial growth had been deliberate. Some leading members, such as

James Fraser, were not interested in a big organization and wanted to keep the FOR "homely".<sup>83</sup> However, by the time of the Summer Conference at Swanwick of July 5-12, 1915, the membership had grown to nearly 2000. With the much more rapid growth new concerns emerged. The potentially most divisive issue concerned relations with the denominational peace societies. At the General Committee meeting of April 22, 1915, Rev. H. Chalmers suggested a separate Baptist section of the FOR. Shortly afterwards Hodgkin announced in News Sheet that the FOR leaders had been thinking about denominational groups. He warned, however, against the breaking up into cliques. He promised a discussion about the topic at the Swanwick Summer Conference.<sup>84</sup> There the suggestion was rejected. Twenty years later the problem was to surface again at which time several denominational peace groups were formed. In 1915 ecumenicity was stronger.

The first News Sheet merely hinted at the new connections and activities which had led to the growth. From a listing of late January meetings it is evident that most meetings were held at a Friends' Meeting House. The initial core was probably Quaker, but at a Mansfield meeting there were "more non-Friends than Members of the Society."<sup>85</sup> Unfortunately, the FOR did not keep statistics indicating the religious affiliation of its members. From such incidental statements pertaining both to the Mansfield meeting and to the composition of the leadership it is only possible to draw the most general conclusions. The largest group seems to have consisted of Congregationalists, followed by Quakers and Methodists. Baptists and Presbyterians were fewer still. There



were very few Anglicans. In its membership statistics the FOR used the term sympathizers. These were probably people who could not completely subscribe to "The Basis", such as non-Christians or Christadelphians, but were otherwise willing to cooperate with the FOR or derive benefits from the Fellowship.

The FOR also attempted to make political connections. For instance, Theodora Wilson Wilson spoke to the Women's Liberal Association. Marian Ellis, later Lady Parmoor, was asked by the General Committee to represent the FOR unofficially at the ILP.<sup>86</sup> Noteworthy here is the role of women. The women's activities were not confined to Britain. The first News Sheet carried a tantalizingly brief note about five women who at the end of February had gone to Amsterdam. At a private meeting the women planned a large conference. This important conference was held in the Hague on April 28, 1915, and inaugurated the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.<sup>87</sup>

Actually there were many more activities "Since Cambridge" than Hodgkin mentioned. These activities showed the broad scope of the FOR concerns. Hugh Martin had been asked to prepare outlines on "Christ and Peace".<sup>88</sup> Mr. Dyson, the travelling secretary of the SCM, had been supplied with FOR literature for his theological colleges tour.<sup>89</sup> The General Committee had been able to compile a list of speakers willing to help at some of the planned local meetings.<sup>90</sup> On March 3 a meeting with Indian students was held, the first sign of the FOR's long-lasting interest in the Indian problem. Perhaps even more indicative of the broad scope and activity of the FOR was the formation of eight sub-

committees to deal with publications, international work, social implications, approach to churches, relations with other movements, press, children and study circles. The variety of committees is another indication that the FOR was not a single issue pacifist organization.<sup>91</sup> Furthermore, they suggest that the FOR tried to avoid isolation.

Not every sub-committee functioned properly, while others were initially very active. Harold Bligh showed something of the activity on the Cambridge local level when he wrote to Cadoux on February 5, 1915, "We meet every Wednesday + are forming a 'press-gang' to teach the newspapers one or two details of Christianity."<sup>92</sup> Yet, the 'press-gang' remained largely a local phenomenon. Much more impressive was the achievement of the publications committee. Most of the early pamphlets were published by Headley Brothers, a Quaker company which traditionally had published pacifist literature. It published Hodgkin's address to the National Free Church Council How to Check the Spirit of Militarism, and The Church's Opportunity in the Present Crisis, the rejected essay for Papers for War Time. In March the company reprinted Herbert W. Horwill's The Cost of Humanity from the Atlantic Monthly,<sup>93</sup> a significant American magazine with an editorial policy dedicated to keeping the U.S.A. out of the war. Around the same time Headley published Maude Royden's The Great Adventure: The Way to Peace. Short pamphlets included A Call to Penitence and J. St. G. Heath's The Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Social Order. In October it started to publish The Venturer, "an endeavour to commend and to justify the whole Fellowship position to the reading Christian public."<sup>94</sup>

Richard Roberts, the editor, thought that The Venturer's business was to recall and restore the adventurous quality of Christian living.<sup>95</sup> The sharp pen of Roberts inhibited the policy that the monthly should be educational rather than propagandistic and should avoid extreme positions.<sup>96</sup>

Closely related to the publications was the work of the Children's Sub-Committee, later the Education Committee. The committee looked for suitable books which "should illustrate the whole new standard of values for which the F.O.R. stands." These books did not have to deal with the ideas of war and peace. Lilian Stevenson compiled and published a bibliography of such books in A Child's Bookshelf.<sup>97</sup> This kind of project never emanated from the NCF or UDC. Furthermore, the committee published leaflets for working class mothers so that they could educate their children properly. And it suggested peace work through such organizations as the Boy Scouts and Life Saving Brigades.<sup>98</sup> Subsequently, the committee was involved with the rehabilitation of young criminal offenders. But more will be said about that later.

While the Literature and Children's Committees were quite active, the Social Service Committee did not get started until late in 1915. Dr. S. Mellor of the Liverpool League of Emancipation complained that the FOR had done little in the social area.<sup>99</sup> However, the FOR had initiated a discussion on social matters at the Swanwick Summer Conference. After reaffirming that love was a force and the touchstone of all virtues rather than a sentiment, the conferees discussed the FOR's social responsibilities.<sup>100</sup> The central question seems to have

been what to do with surplus wealth. The most acceptable suggestion was to start with a simplification of one's personal life.<sup>101</sup> This first step showed that the emphasis of the discussion was on the individual rather than on the society as a whole. Clearly, the FOR had not learned to balance the two sides adequately.<sup>102</sup>

Since its inception the FOR had been interested in international relationships. One of the FOR's antecedents was international, namely the World Alliance. The war hampered such contacts but was not able to sever them totally. As has been shown, the FOR tried to maintain ties with Germany. The FOR International Committee had correspondents in the Netherlands, France, Denmark and Sweden.<sup>103</sup> In the committee Carl Heath argued for an International Press Bureau to get pacifist news from abroad. On the other hand, the restrictions imposed by war were clearly evident in the government's refusal to give Marian Ellis a passport which she needed to visit Scandinavia. The government obviously discriminated. Russell was refused a passport to go to the U.S.A., while Norman Angell, Lowes Dickinson and Henry Hodgkin were allowed to visit that country. The deciding factor for a passport seems to have been the degree of opposition to war involvement and the perceived importance of the British opponent of war in the official mind.

Perhaps the most noticeable success was Hodgkin's visit to the U.S.A. in October-November 1915. In an April 1915 letter to Dr. William Hull of Swarthmore College,<sup>104</sup> Hodgkin explained not only the ideas behind the FOR but also elaborated upon the aspect of international brotherhood. In his explanation Hodgkin made an important statement on

methodology which had a general application:

We felt that, as a general rule, work in different countries should be established through personal visits, so that we might ensure, as far as possible, that close personal touch and mutual understanding which are peculiarly necessary in a movement of this kind.<sup>105</sup>

In October Hodgkin could establish this personal contact, and after many discussions and speeches a group of Americans decided to start a Fellowship of their own, independent of and yet intimately associated with the British group. A memorandum for the seminal Garden City Conference<sup>106</sup> put the ideals, the methods and dangers more succinctly than any other document. The document is fundamentally a summary of Cambridge and the experience of 1915. Of the seven points listed in the memorandum four are an exposition in shorthand of the FOR's situation at the time. As such they deserve to be listed:

2. What are the Fellowship of Reconciliation ideals?
  - (a) Positive and constructive, not negative and critical.
  - (b) Peace position part of larger ideal.
  - (c) Essentially spiritual (not political).
  - (d) A Christian basis, interdenominational, apocalyptic.
  - (e) Catholic potentially.
  - (f) Willingness to pay the price.
3. What has led to formation of Fellowship of Reconciliation in England?
  - (a) A deep conviction.
  - (b) The knowledge of widespread need.
  - (c) To prepare during war for the problems arising after the war.
  - (d) Need of a spiritual awakening.
4. Methods adopted:
  - (a) Group study and prayer.
  - (b) Campaign.
  - (c) Literature.
  - (d) Personal life etc.
5. Dangers to be avoided:

- (a) Too early expression.
- (b) A "paper membership".
- (c) Becoming a political organization.
- (d) Breach with fellow-Christians (too critical).
- (e) Over-organization.<sup>107</sup>
- (f) Too middle-class.

Although this list is not exhaustive, it provides a perspective on the history of the FOR to this day, a perspective so sorely missed in, say, Ceadel's book. It was this perspective which Hodgkin had in mind when, on his way back on board the S. S. Noordam, he wrote a letter to the members of this newly founded FOR group, encouraging them with the power of love: "We shall meet with rebuffs and misunderstandings and indifference. There is a power that can snatch victory out of defeat, 'Amor vincit omnia'." <sup>108</sup>

Was the founding of the AFOR the FOR's answer to the UDC's "International Council" or the Fabians' "International Government"? FOR literature for 1915 is of no help in answering this question since it contained no discussion on a "League of Nations". Only later did the FOR become involved in the discussion about such a league (See Chapter 9). Here it should suffice to note that internationalism was inherent in the FOR's basis. Hence, FOR members could appreciate the attempts to form a league. The fundamental question for the FOR was what the philosophical foundation of such a league would be. The AFOR was the result of organic growth, as the IFOR later on would be. The League of Nations, though in many aspects attractive to the FOR, had essentially a different nature.

### Office Changes and Summary for 1915

The most noticeable change had to do with the location of the office. The headquarters at the Collegium were found to be relatively inaccessible.<sup>109</sup> This difficulty led to two changes. The FOR moved to a new and more central location and hired a new secretary since Lucy Gardner stayed at the Collegium. On March 23, 1915, Richard Roberts was appointed as the first full-time general secretary, although he did not start until July 1.<sup>110</sup> It was George Davies, the newly appointed assistant to Roberts, who found a new location. Later, in 1947, he recalled the difficulties of obtaining accommodation. After several weeks of searching and many refusals,

Accidentally, or perhaps providentially, I had wandered into Red Lion Square in my quest, and, as I read this memorial to artists and poets [Burne Jones, Rossetti, and William Morris], I noticed a card above the door which announced that offices were to let.<sup>111</sup>

For more than a quarter century 17 Red Lion Square would house the offices of the FOR.

At the end of September the General Committee accepted Lucy Gardner's resignation and ratified the appointments of Maude Royden as travelling secretary and of George Davies as assistant general secretary.<sup>112</sup> To his mother Davies wrote that no salary had been discussed and that he expected that "the work will be largely organisation, educating of local groups, preparation of literature and of a monthly Journal."<sup>113</sup> For a short time Lewis Maclachlan, in 1936 to become the editor of Reconciliation, worked at the office until he started to work for the Friends in the Netherlands. Rev. Sorensen did

not stay long either, for in 1916 he leased 17 acres of land to start a cooperative with some other pacifists.<sup>114</sup> Finally, George Lansbury was asked to join the General Committee but he declined,<sup>115</sup> while the Baptist minister Hugh Martin (1890-1964) and Theodora Wilson Wilson accepted.<sup>116</sup>

Through the various activities described above the FOR gained exposure to the public. In addition, the increasing possibility of the introduction of conscription made many Christian pacifists search for an organization which could support them. As a result, by the end of 1915 the membership had grown to about 4000. Moreover, the organization had become truly international. A good number of pamphlets and leaflets had been published, the News Sheet bound the members together, and The Venturer provided a forum of FOR ideas. Regularly, new branches and study circles were added, and the expanding staff had found new premises. There were thus many reasons to be optimistic, and for many the FOR was a ray of hope. Yet, there were nagging problems. Many pacifists started to lose their jobs. The vast majority of the population and the government were suspicious if not downright hostile. The churches remained adamant in their support of the government's war policy. The financial situation of the FOR was, and essentially always remained, precarious. The latter need not be a surprise, for membership meant only the agreement with and the signing of "The Basis". There were no membership dues and the FOR income derived from voluntary donations and some dividends. Although budgets were usually met, the limited amount of money frequently hampered the activities of the



FOR.<sup>117</sup>

The year 1915 set in many ways the pattern for the following war years which perhaps could be called "themes and variations". The most dominant themes in those later years were concern for conscientious objectors and the debate about the future and function of the FOR. The variations included change of personnel, harassment, the Riverside Village experiment, agitation for prison reform, education and propaganda. Inherent in this whole pattern of activity was the danger that too few people were involved in too many activities. Consequently, not all the necessary resources could be marshalled when required. As will be seen in the next chapter, most members were involved in the "themes", while only relatively few participated in the "variations".

## ENDNOTES CHAPTER 5

<sup>1</sup>Lilian Stevenson, Towards a Christian International, Vienna: I.F.O.R., 1929, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup>Lansbury, Why, p. 4; see also News Sheet 3-9-1915, pp. 8-9. According to Wood, Hodgkin, p. 147, Hodgkin refused to associate the advocacy of peace with political criticism.

<sup>3</sup>James, Adventures, pp. 106-107. A revised version of the book appeared in 1945 under the title Becoming a Man. For similar ideas see Hayes, Conscription, p. 277.

<sup>4</sup>No minutes were kept for these early meetings.

<sup>5</sup>Wood, Hodgkin, p. 157.

<sup>6</sup>FOR 456; 7/1; First Annual Report, 1916, p. 4.

<sup>7</sup>John W. Graham, Conscription and Conscience, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1922; New York: Garland 1971, p. 205. He nearly equates the FOR with Quakerism.

<sup>8</sup>FOR 456; 7/1; First Annual Report, 1916, p. 4.

<sup>9</sup>George Lansbury, My Life, London: Constable, 1928, p. 211. Emphasis added.

<sup>10</sup>George M. Ll. Davies, Pilgrimage of Peace, London: F.O.R., 1950, pp. 24-25.

<sup>11</sup>RR Box 2 File 38, April 4, 1917. In Roberts' unpublished biography, by his daughter, Orchard even speaks about a "deep rift" (p. 88).

<sup>12</sup>James, Adventures, pp. 107-108. James' views may be biased because he was in search for a "firm basis of unalterable truth and submitting to an authoritative discipline" which he said he found later on in the Roman Catholic Church. His pilgrimage was similar to that of Orchard's.

<sup>13</sup>Davies, Pilgrimage, p. 24.

<sup>14</sup>RR Box 2 file 41. Davies acknowledged that although Hodgkin still dominated in 1920 he had considerably mellowed. See also

Reconciliation, Vol. 24. no. 10, Oct. 1947, p. 168, where Hodgkin is described as a "dominating personality".

<sup>15</sup>See for example Richards' obituary of Hodgkin in Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 5, May 1933, p. 85.

<sup>16</sup>Wood, Hodgkin, 154.

<sup>17</sup>Roger Bradshaigh Lloyd, The Church of England 1900-1965, London: S.C.M., 1966, esp. pp. 210-220.

<sup>18</sup>Albert Marrin, The Last Crusade, Durham: Duke University Press, 1974, p. 81.

<sup>19</sup>In the Hornsey Journal of Sept. 9, 1914, p. 9, some clergy are quoted to speak about a "hallowed war". See Bailey, "Gott mit uns", p. 146.

<sup>20</sup>Marrin, Crusade, pp. 139, 142, 132. The obligation was based on three issues: 1. Code of honour; 2. England had to protect Europe against outlawry; 3. to uphold God's Word as embodied in various treaties.

<sup>21</sup>Alan Wilkinson, The Church of England and the First World War, London: S.P.C.K., 1978, p. 69. See also C. E. Montague, Disenchantment, New York: Brentano's, 1922, ch. 9. K. W. Clements, "Baptists and the Outbreak of the First World War," The Baptist Quarterly, Vol. 26 no. 2, Apr. 1975, pp. 74-92. Sir James Marchant, Dr. John Clifford, C.H., London: Cassell, 1924, p. 230. Robert Moore, Pitmen, Preachers & Politics, London: Cambridge University Press, 1974, pp. 197-202. On p. 197 Moore writes that "the certainty of the crusade [for the Methodists] was perhaps a little clearer at the beginning of the war than at the end." Compare R. Tudur Jones, Congregationalism in England, 1662-1962, London: Independent Press, 1962, p. 356. The Assembly of 1915 stated that there was no other course open consonant with the national righteousness except the government's.

<sup>22</sup>George Bedborough, Arms and the Clergy (1914-1918), London: Pioneer Press, 1934, pp. 41 and 21. The statements are taken out of context. Orchard, for example, is made to support the war. A. D. Belden's case is not so clear, because at the beginning of the war he was not a pacifist. Barnes, echoes very similar sentiments as Bedborough's. See John Barnes, Ahead of His Age, London: Collins, 1979.

<sup>23</sup>Hornsey Journal, 16-10-1914. For a similar attitude by German theologians, see Bailey, "Gott mit uns".

<sup>24</sup>Lester, Occurred, 1937, p. 69; 1938, p. 51.

<sup>25</sup>This was only the case in Nonconformist Churches. While Anglicans could not be dismissed on account of their pacifism they could be--and often still are--ignored for promotion.

<sup>26</sup>Micklem, Box p. 59.

<sup>27</sup>Edith Ryley Richards, Private View of a Public Man, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1950, p. 67.

<sup>28</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16, undated letter. See also the Hornsey Journal for May 21 and 28, 1915, p. 7. Stanley James was forced to resign in 1916 (Adventures, p. 94). Kees Boeke was also forced to resign in 1916. He was a teacher at a preparatory school. See Rawson, Boeke, p. 14. Bernard Walke in Twenty Years at St. Hilary, London: Methuen, 1935, p. 158, wrote that he "experienced a sense of loneliness, of being apart and different from the men and women around us." John Barnes, later bishop of Birmingham, and Bertrand Russell were pressured to leave Cambridge. For Barnes, see the biography by his son John Barnes, Ahead, pp. 61-64. For Russell, see Vellacott, Russell, ch. 7.

<sup>29</sup>Orchard, Faith, p. 120. In the House of Commons questions were asked about these pacifist sermons (p. 121).

<sup>30</sup>CJC Box 8, letter by Beck 1-2-1915. Beck and his wife are listed in "names and addresses" of FOR members, published in Dec. 1915, p. 3. (SCPC; CDG-B, Box 1).

<sup>31</sup>For a biography on W.C. Roberts, see Susan Miles, Portrait of a Parson, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1955, (p. 40). When Roberts was at Bow in 1902 he was able to get Lansbury back to the Church of England. Miles suggests that Lansbury joined the FOR due to Roberts, but no evidence is cited. Both were at the Cambridge Conference and this does not corroborate Miles' point.

<sup>32</sup>G. Norman Robbins, Is the Christian Church Necessary?, London: Williams and Norgate, 1931, p. 192. Usually pacifism was regarded as heretical and sectarian. For a further discussion on this issue, see ch. 13 of this thesis. Robbins was an early FOR member. He is mentioned in the December 1915 list, p. 24. He was president of the Warley Institutional Church since 1906.

<sup>33</sup>C. J. Cadoux' books Attitude and The Early Church and the World (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1925) are essentially attempts to show that the early Church was pacifist. Hence the frequent appeals to the early Church.

<sup>34</sup>Mt. 13:83, Lk. 13:21; cf. 1 Cor. 5:6 and Gal. 5:9. It is not clear how much Fabian influence there was in using the term, but Fabian literature was frequently recommended in connection with social

problems. Barnes (Ahead, p. 287) mentioned the leaven of Modernism, which he regarded not as a creed but as an attitude of mind.

<sup>35</sup>It should be noted that the parable of the leaven was only one of the ingredients which made up the FOR's methodology. The FOR members do not seem to have asked if the parables could even be used in the formulation of a methodology.

<sup>36</sup>Late in the nineteenth century Nonconformists began to cooperate more closely. In 1892, the first Free Church Congress convened in Manchester, while in 1896 the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches or National Free Church Council was organized. The NFCC organized opposition to the 1902 Education Act. See Bebbington, Nonconformist, chs. 4 and 7.

<sup>37</sup>News Sheet, 16-4-1915. His speech was published as a pamphlet How to Check the Spirit of Militarism, p. 4.

<sup>38</sup>FOR 456; 1/1; 19-3-1915 Minute Book. For the idea of personality see ch. 4. It may be kept in mind that Papers for War Time were still being published.

<sup>39</sup>FOR 456; 1/1; 23-3-1915 and HTH Box 1 file 16, letter by Gray 23-2-1915.

<sup>40</sup>News Sheet, 24-9-1915, p. 8.

<sup>41</sup>CJC Box 8, 22-1-1915. The quote given here is in many ways a summary of Cadoux' book Christian Pacifism Re-examined. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1940) which caused several of his friends some discomfort. His pacifist concern for the Christian soldier antedates Raven's similar concern by some two decades.

<sup>42</sup>The 1916 Swanwick Summer Conference Memorandum mentioned this as the first aim.

<sup>43</sup>New Sheet 15-2-1916, pp. 10-11. Lilian Weston thought that the FOR should "try to act as leaven in the churches as well as in the world." cf. 25-9-1916, p. 6. R.R. Punchard who thought that it "was the mission of the F.O.R. to Christianise the Church."

<sup>44</sup>Titford went actually further: he called for a "back to the Church" tendency. News Sheet, 25-8-1916, p. 7. For Cox, see News Sheet, 25-9-1916, p. 6. K. J. Middleton and four other members of the Letchworth Branch had left their churches, News Sheet, 25-11-16, p. 7. The debate shows the Nonconformists' theological weakness on the place of the Church alluded to in ch. 2.

<sup>45</sup>News Sheet, 25-11-1916, p. 7.

<sup>46</sup>See for example FOR 456; 1/2:16-10-1916; 13-11-1916; 12-3-1917; 16/17-4-1917.

<sup>47</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 5, May 1933, p. 85, emphasis added.

<sup>48</sup>Kennedy, Hound; Swartz, U.D.C.; Vellacott, Russell.

<sup>49</sup>Earlier in the year the paper had tried to establish an Anti-German League. See News Sheet, 16-4-1915, p. 4.

<sup>50</sup>Morning Post, 21-6-1915, editorial p. 6. The article was probably a reaction to two letters to the editor of 19-6-1915, p. 6. in which W. N. Ever estimated that 200 anti-war meetings per week were being organized "under the auspices of various anti-war and pro-German societies", and in which W. Faulkner objected to Dr. Salter's speech (and article) "Christ in Khaki". For Salter's biography see Fenner Brockway, The Life of Alfred Salter Bermondsey Story, London: George Allen & Unwin 1949. For Salter's speech see p. 59f.

<sup>51</sup>See News Sheet, 4-6-1915; p. 8. The campaign was thus not a reaction to the National Registration Act of July 15, 1915.

<sup>52</sup>Sorensen had been a missionary with the Unitarian Van Mission in the summer of 1913, preaching on the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man. See Reginald William Sorensen, House of Lords Records, Historical Collection 102 (hereafter cited as SOR) file 159. John Lewis should not be confused with his namesake, and onetime FOR member, who later on wrote The Case Against Pacifism.

<sup>53</sup>Probably Royden did most of the preaching. Sorensen regarded her as the leader. See SOR file 230, unpublished autobiography.

<sup>54</sup>Coltman wrote to Cadoux that "The people were firmly convinced we were Germans or German spies, at least financed by Germany." CJC Box 8; 11-8-1915.

<sup>55</sup>Mr. William Cook, the owner of the van, claimed £300 damages. FOR 456; 5/1; 13-12-1915. Wood, Hodgkin, pp. 164-165, confused both date and place. Compare with HTH Box 4 file 41, letter 27-7-1915, and RR file 38, letter 9-8-1917.

<sup>56</sup>CJC Box 8, letter 11-8-1915. See Kennedy, Hound, for similar experience in the NCF.

<sup>57</sup>See HTH Box 1 file 16, and News Sheet of 13-8-1915 and 3-9-1915.

<sup>58</sup>CJC Box 8, letter 11-8-1915.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid. Cadoux was with the Friends Ambulance Unit (FAU) when the campaign started to be organized. He was in France for about three months. The disturbance had apparently frightened C. H. Dodd who had been "in paroxysms of terror because the Caravan was coming!" CJC Box 8, letter John Lewis 11-8-1915. Dodd was at Warwick and Lewis hoped that Cadoux would do campaign work there. Cadoux, however, wanted to work only in Oxford. F.W. Dillistone, Dodd's biographer, is completely silent on the incident. As far as pacifism is concerned the book is of very little use (F.W. Dillistone, C.H. Dodd, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1977).

<sup>60</sup>See HTH Box 1 file 16. At a Business Committee meeting of April 8, 1915, it was remarked that the branches relied on a central initiative. Instead, they should work out their own lines.

<sup>61</sup>CJC Box 8, letters John Lewis 11-8-1915 and 14-8-1915. See also HTH Box 1 file 16, News Sheet, 3-9-1915, pp. 4-5. John Lewis was the campaign secretary. Dodd was a founding FOR member.

<sup>62</sup>Theodora Wilson Wilson, The Last Weapon, London: C.W. Daniels, 1916. FOR 456; 4/1; 8-12-1915. The end of the book is the reverse of Shaw's Major Barbara. The Last Weapon became the first part of a trilogy, but The Weapon Unsheathed and The Wrestlers were not as well written and not so successful. Wilson lived in Bloomsbury and R. H. Tawney was a neighbour in Mecklenburgh Square.

<sup>63</sup>News Sheet, 21-5-1915, p. 5. Die Eiche was a quarterly, founded in 1913, for "the fostering of better relations between Great Britain and Germany." See Chickering, Imperial, p. 62, for the Völker Friede.

<sup>64</sup>See Orchard, Faith, p. 125. Orchard gave no dates. His own letter was probably written early 1915. The German church leaders included Harnack and Eucken, both frequently quoted by Roberts. For the various German "Appeals" see Bailey, "Gott mit uns", pp. 52-55, 75-84.

<sup>65</sup>News Sheet, 15-3-1915. As an American citizen she could visit Germany. FOR archival material does not say who was sent and News Sheet used the term "a living epistle". In the The Christian Pacifist of April 1940, p. 106, Stephen Hobhouse identified her. She was a Quaker founding member of the FOR. She died in 1919.

<sup>66</sup>FOR 456; 1/1; 10-6-1915. Rawson, Boeke, p. 13. He started on June 23. Deported to the Netherlands in 1918.

<sup>67</sup>See e.g. Basil Thomson, Experiences and The Scene Changes, Garden City: Doubleday & Doran, 1937.

<sup>68</sup>News Sheet, 21-5-1915.

<sup>69</sup>Thomson, Experiences, p. 302.

<sup>70</sup>Thomson, Scene, p. 392. For the FOR's finances see FOR 456; 5/1. (Business Committee 13-12-1915 till 26-9-1918), especially 11-9-1916.

<sup>71</sup>456; 5/1; 11-12-1917. Richards was asked to write because they still had not received anything back. See Swartz, U.D.C., pp. 184-187.

<sup>72</sup>News Sheet, Jan. 1918, p. 2. See also The New Crusader, 25-1-1918, p. 1, which contains "An Open Letter to the P.M." by Theodora Wilson Wilson whose home had been raided. Vellacott has pointed out that Russell was frequently harassed.

<sup>73</sup>Stephen White, "Soviets in Britain: the Leeds Conference of 1917," International Review of Social History, Vol. 19 no. 2, 1974, p. 166.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 185. For Russell's view on the Convention, see Vellacott, Russell, pp. 160-169.

<sup>75</sup>HTH Box 4 file 41, letter 29-7-1917 and RR Box 2 file 39; 9-8-1917. Wood, Hodgkin, p. 164, has 1915. Although the story is otherwise correct, the context is wrong, even though Wood correctly stated that "the meeting was called to inaugurate the London section of the Workers and Soldiers Council." See also Russell, Autobiography, pp.31-32.

<sup>76</sup>The New Crusader, 1-3-1918, p. 8. Boeke's arrest parallels that of Russell.

<sup>77</sup>For an account of the trial see The New Crusader, 8-3-1918, pp. 7-8.

<sup>78</sup>News Sheet, Jan. 1918, p. 1, giving as date Dec. 18. The minutes, however, give Dec. 17. FOR 456; 1/2; 17-12-1917.

<sup>79</sup>For information about the trial see The New Crusader issues for Feb. and March 1918. He had hoped to stay his deportation order (FOR 456; 1/2; 18-3-1918), but his appeal was apparently disregarded.

<sup>80</sup>The early numbers of News Sheet have no pagination.

<sup>81</sup>See. e.g. The Labour Leader, Jan. 7, 1915 and The Friend, Jan. 8.

<sup>82</sup>News Sheet, 2-7-1915, p. 9.



<sup>83</sup>HTH Box 1 file 16, Fraser 2-1-1915. Initially the NCF also experienced a slow growth. According to Kennedy, Hound, pp. 54-55, the NCF grew more rapidly after the passage of the National Registration Act (July 15, 1915). Even before the passage of the act the FOR had started to grow more rapidly.

<sup>84</sup>FOR 456; 1/1; 22-4-1915. Chalmers was not a member of the committee. News Sheet, 7-5-1915.

<sup>85</sup>News Sheet, March 1, 1915.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid.; FOR 456; 1/1; 21-1-1915. For the ILP see Robert E. Dowse, Left in the Centre, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1966.

<sup>87</sup>Of the five Theodora Wilson Wilson was an FOR member, Kathleen Courtney, Leaf, Macmillan and Marshall were not. The outcome of the conference was the WILPF. Its history has been described by Bussey and Tims, W.I.L.P.F..

<sup>88</sup>Published with Joan M. Fry as editor, Christ and Peace, London: Headley, 1915.

<sup>89</sup>The FOR preferred to look for theological students to work through.

<sup>90</sup>These speakers included J.R. Coates, John Oman, John Skinner, Edward Grubb, John W. Graham, Nathaniel Micklem, Herbert Morgan, N. Brayshaw, Joan Fry, J.D.M. Rorke, W.E. Wilson, and W. Littleboy. For a planned local meeting and group see for example Claud Coltman's letter to Cadoux, Box 8, 14-6-1915, "a combined 'city & Varsity' has been formed" at Oxford. Coltman was at Mansfield College at this time.

<sup>91</sup>FOR 456; 1/1; Jan-March 1915.

<sup>92</sup>CJC Box 8; 5-2-15.

<sup>93</sup>Horwill later analyzed "foreign affairs" for The Venturer.

<sup>94</sup>News Sheet, 24-9-1915, p. 8. For the choice of the name see Roberts, Fellowship, Vol. IX no. 1, Jan. 1943, pp. 4-5. It came from F.W.H. Myers' poem "St. Paul". The name was first announced in News Sheet, 21-5-1915, p. 6.

<sup>95</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 1, Oct. 1915, p. 8.

<sup>96</sup>Compare for example CJC Box 8, note of Jan. 1, 1915: "people have got to be offended sometimes."

<sup>97</sup>Lilian Stevenson, A Child's Bookshelf, London: S.C.M., 1917. In 1922 the book went through a fifth edition. FOR 456; 5/4; 29-10-1915.

<sup>98</sup>FOR 456; 5/4; 29-10-1915. In the Prologue these youth organizations have been described as para-military. Some FOR members had experienced these groups differently.

<sup>99</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 14-12-1915.

<sup>100</sup>News Sheet, 23-7-1915.

<sup>101</sup>It is not clear how much the members were influenced by the ideas of J. A. Hobson. The report in News Sheet is too scanty to be certain, but members of the FOR were familiar with his ideas.

<sup>102</sup>The dominance of the individual was perhaps most clearly stated by Hodgkin: "We stand for individual guidance and responsibility. No central committee or organization can express our life." News Sheet, 21-5-1915.

<sup>103</sup>FOR 456; 5/5; 4-11-1915 - 11-1-1916. The first minutes of the committee date from November, but it is evident that earlier meetings had been held.

<sup>104</sup>Hodgkin knew Hull from a visit to Swarthmore. Possibly this letter was related to a planned earlier visit of Hodgkin and Royden, a visit which fell through because the General Committee thought Hodgkin's presence in England more important. Hull was the author of The Two Hague Conferences and their Contributions to International Law (1912), reprinted by Garland in 1972.

<sup>105</sup>SCPC; CDG-B; Box 2.

<sup>106</sup>For the conference see Frederick Lynch, "The Fellowship of Reconciliation," The Christian Work, Nov. 27, 1915, reprinted in The Observer. Of the hundred present forty signed up.

<sup>107</sup>SCPC; CDG-B; Box 2. There is no date on the document. For a discussion of a general policy see FOR 456; 5/4; 29-10-1915.

<sup>108</sup>SCPC; CDG-B; Box 2; 19-11-1915: For the further development of the AFOR see Betty Lynn Barton's Ph.D. thesis "The Fellowship of Reconciliation: Pacifism, Labor and Social Welfare, 1915-1960". Florida State University, 1974. She does not seem to have been aware of the documents mentioned here.

<sup>109</sup>See News Sheet, 21-5-1915, p. 6.

<sup>110</sup>Lucy Gardner was Honorary-Secretary and not full-time. She resigned her position at the end of September. The reasons for her resignation are nowhere stated in FOR 456; 1/1 and 1/2; 23-3-1915 and 27-9-1915. Probably it was due to her own work and the distance from the Collegium to Red Lion Square.

<sup>111</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 24 no. 10, Oct. 1947, p. 168. In 1943 Roberts suggested that he and Hodgkin found the office. (Fellowship Vol. IX no.1, 1943, p. 4), but there need to be no doubt that Davies found the house. The plaque is still there.

<sup>112</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 27-9-1915. Royden's appointment had already been announced in the News Sheet of May 21, 1915.

<sup>113</sup>GD Letter 2311. For Roberts very favourable reaction to Davies, a fellow Welshman, see Fellowship, Vol. XI no. 1, 1943, p. 4. The Journal was The Venturer.

<sup>114</sup>SOR file 230, autobiography, pp. 116-117. Sorensen's co-operative seems to have been the first one of a series in which FOR members become involved. For Maclachlan and Sorensen see First Annual Report FOR, 1916.

<sup>115</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 19-10-1915. The reason for Lansbury's decision is unknown.

<sup>116</sup>First Annual Report FOR, 1916. C.F. Angus had resigned early in the year. He apparently went to India. He had been replaced by James Fraser.

<sup>117</sup>See for example News Sheet, 15-11-1915, p. 3.

## CHAPTER 6

### RESTRICTED ACTIVITY 1915-1918 II

In spite of formidable opposition the FOR continued to be involved in numerous activities throughout the war. Apart from the formulation of its vision, the FOR worked on two major "themes" for the remainder of the war. The first was the growing crisis, from early 1916 on, of conscientious objection, a development which tended to unify the Fellowship. The second theme dealt with the function and future of the FOR, a topic which tended to divide the Fellowship. These two "themes" are discussed in the first part of this chapter. They are followed by the "variations", which should be considered as the FOR's reconstruction program during the war. Special attention is given to education, help for juvenile delinquents at Riverside Village, industrial reconciliation as suggested by Malcolm Sparkes' Industrial Parliaments, and political action. These "variations", which continued for some time after the war, were the practical proofs that the FOR was not a single issue pacifist organization. Little has appeared in the secondary literature on these "variations", and the little that has appeared has not been placed in the context of the FOR. Finally, the chapter concludes with office changes.

#### Conscientious Objection

In spite of the growing influence of the National Service

League before 1914, there was never any chance of conscription before the war. Then the influx of volunteers at the outbreak of war was more than enough for the immediate needs. When the war lasted longer than anticipated and the carnage started to take its toll, the call for conscription became more insistent. Moreover, a rational system of keeping skilled men at home had to be devised. According to Rae, Asquith refused to act upon the conscription demands "until he was satisfied that there was overwhelming popular support for its adoption."<sup>1</sup> He could have added that Asquith was unwilling to break up his coalition government announced on May 27, 1915. Powerful Unionists, notably their leaders Andrew Bonar Law and Lord Curzon, who were brought into the cabinet, all favoured conscription. It was possibly in reaction to this new cabinet that J. St. G. Heath in the June 1915 News Sheet discussed for the first time in FOR literature the issue of conscription. Heath contrasted state coercion to ensure national service and the voluntary dedication in the service of humanity.<sup>2</sup> In July Coltman stated that as yet the FOR had no official policy on conscription, but it was clear enough that there was a serious problem in the relationship between the state and the individual.<sup>3</sup> The FOR's official policy--like the government's--was gradually worked out and whatever the FOR leaders may have said to the contrary, the objection to conscription was as much a political as a philosophical-theological issue.

If the formation of the May 1915 coalition government was the first step towards conscription, the national register of July 15 was

the second step.<sup>4</sup> The register was introduced in order to ascertain the exact number of men available for military service. The measure did not satisfy Asquith's mainly Unionists pro-conscription cabinet members. Asquith put these members off balance when he asked the earl of Derby, an ardent conscriptionist, to become the director-general of recruiting for a new voluntary recruiting drive. The scheme was launched in October and ended in mid-December. Although the door-to-door canvass, using the register, was reasonably successful, the scheme's final tally did not really matter since the cabinet had already decided on conscription.<sup>5</sup>

On January 5, 1916, Asquith introduced the military service bill in parliament. His skillful political tactics had ensured that there was both popular and parliamentary support, and only Simon resigned from the cabinet. In addition, he won over organized labour by promising no industrial conscription. The bill had a smooth passage and became law on January 27; it came into operation on February 10. The Act deemed unmarried men between eighteen and forty-one "to have been duly enlisted in His Majesty's regular forces ... for the period of the war." However, the Act contained a number of exemptions, the most important one for the purposes of this thesis being the exemption based on conscientious objection. Local tribunals would decide on the validity of the application for exemption. The decision of the local tribunal could be appealed, first to the Appeal and then to the Central Tribunal.<sup>6</sup> Later on two changes extended the initial Act. On May 25, 1916, married men were included and on April 18, 1918, the upper age

limit was raised to fifty-one. Neither change influenced the nature of the exemptions. The type of exemption was either conditional or unconditional. The tribunals were reluctant to grant the latter. Conditional exemption could take on different forms. Some C.O.s objected to killing but not to other military duties. These C.O.s could be placed in the non-combatant corps (NCC), formed on March 10 by the Army Committee. Others were willing to accept alternative service. This service meant "work of national importance", such as agricultural work, Red Cross work, education, or shipbuilding. Into this category fell the work of the Friends' Ambulance Unit (FAU), which actually was a voluntary civilian Quaker organization working on the battlefields.<sup>7</sup> What constituted acceptable alternative work was decided by the Committee on Work of National Importance, established on March 28 and chaired by the assistant secretary at the Board of Trade, T.H.W. Pelham. While the Pelham Committee decided on the type of acceptable work, the Home Office Scheme under the Labour MP William Brace, under secretary of state, attempted not entirely successfully to organize this acceptable alternative work of national importance under civil control.<sup>8</sup>

The issue of conscription, which brought pacifists in direct, sharp conflict with the government, has been discussed extensively, notably by John W. Graham in Conscription and Conscience in 1922, Denis Hayes in Conscription Conflict in 1949, and Thomas Kennedy in The Hound of Conscience as recently as 1981.<sup>9</sup> The following discussion is, therefore, limited to the role of the FOR and the involvement of some representative members. As has been indicated, the FOR initially

had no official view on conscription. However, when the military service bill was introduced the FOR leadership left no doubt about its position. Two days after the introduction of the bill, on January 7, 1916, the FOR sent a letter to Asquith because the leaders felt that Asquith misunderstood the position of the C.O.<sup>10</sup> The letter specifically reaffirmed the FOR's stand based on a religious conviction and suggested as well that this position, unlike that of some other pacifist organizations, did "not involve any judgment on the political situation which led to our war...and that this communication [was] devoid of any political intention."<sup>11</sup> In spite of the disclaimer, some, like Halliday, still felt that the letter drew the FOR dangerously into political action, thus losing its distinctive religious standpoint. There was some substance to Halliday's objection, but any opposition to the bill meant some kind of political involvement. A much more definite stand was taken a week later in News Sheet, a stand which brought the FOR into open conflict with the government: "We refuse to participate in war, whether voluntarily or under compulsion, because our submission to Jesus Christ and our salvation through Him commit us to an endeavour to bring in His Kingdom in His way."<sup>12</sup> The refusal had indeed serious consequences. It meant that members had to be ready to pay the price. In addition, the Fellowship had to become a source of inspiration to those who had to stand trial. The FOR's position was now clear and firm. The later changes to the Act had no impact on the FOR's position; they only increased the work of those not conscripted.

The act and the refusal had an unanticipated effect, for January



1916 recorded the largest growth of membership up to that date.<sup>13</sup> Several joined who had no religious basis but expected help as C.O.s.<sup>14</sup> This help came in various ways. The FOR sent a letter to its members of military age affected by the Military Service Act, explaining the contents of the Act and the procedures to obtain exemption.<sup>15</sup> The FOR also established a special committee, called the Conscription Committee, which remained in existence till 1919.<sup>16</sup> The committee worked closely together with the Joint Advisory Committee, made up out of the FOR, the NCF and Friends Service Committee and established in early 1916. There was an important division of work in the JAC: The National Council Against Conscription (soon to become the National Council for Civil Liberties or NCCL) dealt with legal matters before the arrest of the C.O., while the NCF dealt with the C.O.s after their arrest.<sup>17</sup> This division of labour seemed to make the Conscription Committee superfluous. However, on July 21, 1916 the committee suggested seven areas as its special concern:

1. To preserve records of C.O.s and keep in touch with C.O.s;
2. To assist the branches affected;
3. To give information to the branches and to give advice to individuals;
4. To consider lines of action;
5. To safeguard the interests of the men and their dependents;
6. To keep in touch with other bodies concerned with C.O.s;
7. To consider and advise the General Committee as to the larger question(s) raised by the Acts.<sup>18</sup>

For example, the committee tried to obtain names of employers who were willing to employ C.O.s— none too easy a task. In addition, an emergency fund was established to help maintain some FOR conscientious objectors and their families. Hence, News Sheet carried frequent calls

for clothing.<sup>19</sup> It was probably this type of help which made the JAC decide to ask the FOR towards the end of the war to concentrate on hospitality and convalescent work. These tasks involved trying to organize holidays, light work and training in open-air work for recently released C.O.s. Many needed medical help. These were usually sent to Fairby Grange, a country house bought by Dr. Salter of Bermondsey for that purpose.<sup>20</sup> Those who had no money were provided with some pocket money and given food when sick. In order to do this work the FOR received 6656 for the period late 1918 until mid-1919, usually donated in small amounts.<sup>21</sup>

Despite the fact that this convalescence work grew into a large enterprise,<sup>22</sup> the committee's work became steadily less. In 1916 it held weekly meetings. In 1917 the members did not even meet monthly and between September 10, 1917, and April 26, 1918, there were no meetings at all. Probably much of the work in this "quieter period" was done by Stanley James who came from the NCF in order to work for the FOR on April 30, 1917. His salary was secured by special donations so that he could work as conscription secretary.<sup>23</sup> This decline in meetings seems to suggest that the conscription conflict was most serious in 1916 and that much of the work with the C.O.s was not done by the FOR as an organization. However, as individuals FOR members remained very much involved. Hodgkin and Orchard functioned, for example, as chaplains.<sup>24</sup> Others, such as Walter Ayles and George Davies, became C.O.s.<sup>25</sup>

Although both Ayles and Davies were imprisoned, they actually represented two different types of C.O. Within the FOR there were still

other C.O types. The diverse positions do not seem to have clashed strongly in the FOR. Obviously there were disagreements, but nothing comparable to what happened in the NCF.<sup>26</sup> The FOR was willing to help every type of C.O. Probably there were five main groups represented in the FOR. The first group consisted of those who had obtained a temporary exemption. For example, the bank Davies worked for wanted him to stay another year during which he could train his replacement. The second group was comprised of those who were permanently exempted. Sorensen could have used his clerical status to obtain his exemption but instead based his request on a confession of faith:

I believe that Jesus is my absolute authority in life and therefore believing that His love can and will conquer and bring the Kingdom of God to earth, I cannot slay my fellow men in war or assist voluntarily in activities substantially necessary to the carrying on of war.<sup>27</sup>

Others who used a similar confession were only exempted from combative duty.<sup>28</sup> The third group was made up of a few members who joined the Royal Army Medical Corps (RAMC). Members came to have second thoughts about the RAMC. In the words of Harold Bligh, who worked in the sanitary section: "Im [sic] beginning to think that the Pacifist should avoid any sort of work wh. assists in the working of the whole military machine."<sup>29</sup> Probably few, if any, joined the NCC because it was part of the army and not a healing ministry. The fourth group consisted of those who joined the Friends' Ambulance Unit (FAU). Cadoux joined the FAU for three months in the spring of 1915. Davies tried to join, but his request was disallowed by the tribunals.<sup>30</sup> The fifth group was made up of those, like Ayles, who refused all cooperation with the

government, and of those, like Davies, who were willing to serve the country in a healing ministry but were not allowed to do so by the tribunals.<sup>31</sup> Usually those in this group have been designated as absolutists. Yet, such a nomenclature is somewhat misleading. Ayles and Davies represented two different mentalities. The importance of the distinction in mentality becomes apparent from the following incident in 1917.

In June of that year the FOR Conscription Committee communicated with Russell, then acting NCF chairman, about the slackness of the men in some settlements.<sup>32</sup> Indeed, in the Denton Camp the non-religious section of the C.O.s was hostile to the FOR conscientious objectors who, in turn, complained about the materialistic views of the others.<sup>33</sup> In general, FOR members were willing to work and, if necessary, to suffer. Whatever the circumstances, they tried to "preserve peace of mind". Two anonymous FOR members 'clearly' reflect this general spirit among FOR conscientious objectors. One wrote: "Jail is a happy home to many, and everything done (that can be done under law) to help men be better." The other stated: "Thanks to His guidance and presence, my days in prison and guardroom cell have been ones of joy. I have converted prison into a monastery, a home whereby I can meditate upon Him."<sup>34</sup> These two examples reflect what FOR leaders were aiming at. It was not to be an Absolutist or Alternative Service Guild member, "not this specific form of witness or that, but each man's absolute fidelity to the Will of Christ as he conceives it."<sup>35</sup> Such a mentality ruled out obstructive methods. This is apparent from a letter Roberts wrote to

Fenner Brockway, the NCF honorary secretary, on September 19, 1916, which also gives insight into the thought of the FOR:

We are out, I take it, immediately for two things: first, to bear a witness against war and militarism; and second, to secure the defeat and repeal of the Military Service Act. What I wish to point out is that this is a case in which it is not merely bad policy to try, but is impossible, to kill two birds with one stone. For the first purpose, we have to adopt a method forced upon us by the provisions of the Military Service Act; for the second, we are compelled to accept a method consistent with democratic professions. My fear is that the attitude of the [NCF] National Committee in its emphatic (and practically exclusive) endorsement of the Absolutist position is looking to the defeat of the Military Service Act by process of obstruction which seems to me to be a practical denial of the democratic principle.<sup>36</sup>

For Roberts, central to the democratic process was the pursuit and preservation of the idea of liberty. Thus the alternativist had just as much liberty to follow the dictates of conscience as the absolutist. The Military Service Act denied, according to Roberts, this liberty which he had thought to be unassailable because it was "so deeply inlaid in the national consciousness."<sup>37</sup> The act, implemented to help deliver Europe from Prussianism, delivered England precisely to Prussianism and thus the act undercut the whole basis of English democracy.<sup>38</sup> Moreover, this liberty, now apparently lost, had often been gained by "C.O.s of the past", a reference to Britain's long Nonconformist heritage.<sup>39</sup> Therefore, the present C.O.s were in the vanguard of the fight for conscientious freedom.<sup>40</sup> In other words, conscientious objection was not just a religious principle, it was a political (democratic) principle as well, and, as the words of Roberts indicate, the two were inseparably linked.<sup>41</sup>

Although there were thus various types of C.O.s, there was a general agreement that they all needed help and support. The whole problem brought the Fellowship closer together and brought in many new members. When asked what the FOR was doing, the leaders could always direct the attention to the help extended to the C.O.s.

### The Function and Future of the FOR

While the problem of conscientious objection tended to unify the FOR, the problem of the function of the Fellowship contained seeds of division. Broadly speaking, there were two major views on the FOR's functions: the view of the quietists-mysticists and the view of the activists. The debate between the two views centered on the question what the FOR was or should be doing. Presbyterian General Committee member James Fraser obviously represented the mystical view when he stated that the Fellowship was mainly a "hidden" thing.<sup>42</sup> The emphasis, in this view, fell on the role of the individual rather than on the corporate body. For people like Fraser, the task of the FOR was primarily and chiefly spiritual, namely, to achieve a victory in souls. Other aspects were regarded as secondary.<sup>43</sup> Significantly, when Hodgkin wrote about the future of the FOR in October 1916 he began by saying that the FOR "had been called into existence in order to emphasise the central truths." He felt, however, that there was a tendency to get away from these truths, perhaps "because we are too much taken up with their application." Hodgkin did not deny the need of implementation because without it the truths would often remain obscure. In addition, it conditioned further revelation. Nevertheless, this application was

"first and largely a matter of individual conscience." Hodgkin's mystical view of the task is evident from his words that "the F.O.R. and every single member [should be] a luminous point at which the light of God's presence as the God of love shines in and illuminates the darkness and twilight of our common life."<sup>44</sup> A month after Hodgkin's article, News Sheet published Eric A. Beavon's poem which reflected and summarized well the mystical view:

What Has the FOR Done?

What have we done? the unperceiving ask us;  
 What finished? What begun?  
 Searching the Light themselves, they rightly task us  
 With questions on THINGS DONE.  
 So cried Saint John from prison, when our Saviour,  
 As Man, lived on this earth:  
 He, by no words, but gentle, sweet behaviour  
 Proclaimed this doings' worth!  
 Thus, with our individual lives made holy,  
 By quiet intercourse  
 With the Omnipotent--we may, in lowly  
 Untroubled faith, endorse  
 Christ's all impartial Love; and say, "We, brothers,  
 Have learnt: Love is the One  
 Virtue, without which none of all the others  
 Can live! This have we done".<sup>45</sup>

The more activist-oriented members, such as Theodora Wilson Wilson, felt dissatisfaction with what they interpreted as the inaction of the General Committee.<sup>46</sup> In spite of their pressure, the Swanwick Summer Conference in 1916, reaffirmed the quietist-mystical dominance. This is evident from the words in "Methods of Work" of the constitution:

The chief method is a life lived in obedience to Christ, expressing itself in prayer and in every activity and relationship of life. Members should also seek to use such opportunities for furthering the objects as are open to them individually, and should co-operate in meetings, use of literature, study circles, and in any other methods

which they be led to adopt.<sup>47</sup>

It is clear that "being" took precedence over "doing", but this should not be construed as "quietistic" in the sense of withdrawal as Ceadel suggests. While the FOR's methodology could be considered as quietist, or better even as mystical, the activities, which must be regarded as necessary consequences of "being", could not be described as quietist. For example, a memorandum on the future of the FOR published in August 1916 referred to the need for socio-economic experimentation, and a new type of citizenship and civil order, that is, a new order of life.<sup>48</sup> Furthermore, the memorandum claimed that the FOR's principles had an "application to every department of life, and that in consequence its work in the world [had] hardly more than begun."<sup>49</sup> According to FOR activists, the leadership was too slow in working out the implications. Their accusation was not completely fair. For a relatively small organization the FOR was involved in a remarkable number of activities. Yet, as FOR leaders recognized—not unlike those of the NCF and Quakers—it was impossible to satisfy both views, and they tried hard to avoid a break up of the Fellowship by not moving dramatically in one particular direction.<sup>50</sup> Nevertheless, the pressure by the activists may have contributed to the publication of the memorandum and to several new enterprises. But the question "What is the FOR doing?" remained, and the future of the FOR was not really decided until after the war when the question was raised whether or not the FOR should continue.



### The Activities

The FOR was involved in many activities which were limited in scope and duration, such as sending out 40,000 circulars to clergy<sup>51</sup> or trying to set an international day of prayer for peace.<sup>52</sup> There were, however, activities which were broader in scope and longer in duration, mainly in the educational area. The justification for the Fellowship's interest in both formal and informal education can be found in the FOR's presupposition that action followed thought. Education, therefore, was crucial to the establishment of the new society the FOR envisaged. Hence, the FOR kept on publishing. For example, in 1916 Hugh Martin with the cooperation of several other members edited The Ministry of Reconciliation, a study circle text book, used for some time at Woodbrooke, a Quaker study and retreat center.<sup>53</sup> Teachers' conferences were held to deal with such problems as force, discipline, punishment, citizenship, and the teaching of Biblical Studies and History.<sup>54</sup> A group of history teachers put out a series of pamphlets which were advertised in educational papers.<sup>55</sup> In order to further this educational work Margaret Glaisyer, a Quaker teacher herself, started to work at FOR headquarters.<sup>56</sup> The growing concern among the membership about militarism in the schools brought about several schemes for an FOR school. Such a school would combine FOR principles with progressive educational ideas such as those of Montessori.<sup>57</sup> An attempt was made to start such a school in September 1918, but inadequate finances made it impossible to get the scheme going.<sup>58</sup> It was not until the 1920's that such a school came into existence, but then in Gland, Switzerland.

Perhaps here is a case where it was not a question of "What is the FOR doing?" but rather, "What are the members willing to pay to implement their ideas?"

Probably the most ambitious FOR scheme put into practice was Riverside Village, a social experiment with delinquent boys and girls.<sup>59</sup> Although the Children's Act of 1908 provided for a Children's Court and section 108 for other methods than punishing delinquents with prison and whipping, very little actually had been done to improve the lot of juvenile delinquents. In 1917 W. Clarke Hall, a magistrate of the Old Street Police Court, London, who encouraged the Riverside Village experiment, knew of only three worthwhile experiments. Yet the social upheaval brought about by the war had significantly contributed to the increase of juvenile delinquency. Riverside Village was thus an exploration into relatively new territory.<sup>60</sup> In February 1916 the General Committee discussed and decided to support a delinquents' colony. A Commune Committee was appointed, consisting of Maclachlan, secretary, Royden, Gardner, H.A. Mess and F.R. Hoare who became the Warden of Riverside Village.<sup>61</sup> In the March issue of The Venturer a protest was lodged against a gang of boys who had been birched. The article suggested that there were better ways of correcting boys whose fathers were in the army. A proposal was made for an experimental colony for which Barrow Cadbury had already promised £ 500.<sup>62</sup> The announcement was appropriately followed by Russell Hoare's article on "The Redemption of the Boy and the Girl", which discussed restraint versus redemption. In the meantime, the committee looked for a suitable

site, Gardner even offering her cottage as a temporary site.<sup>63</sup> After a few months the FOR bought thirty-eight acres, for £3100, from John Thurman, the Quaker owner of Sysonby House near Melton Mowbray.<sup>64</sup> The colony started on June 6, 1916, with Hoare as warden, assisted by Mrs. Robert Forman and George Davies. The last literally and figuratively did much of the spade work. Shortly after the start he wrote:

We have already eight young criminals who are allowed to run wild exactly as they like in every way. There is no discipline or punishment of any kind. They steal + fight + quarrel + damage things recklessly. We have no method except persistent kindness + patience + good will.<sup>65</sup>

The children were medically examined and Cyril Burt of the Advisory Board offered to examine them psychologically.<sup>66</sup> The young criminals came to Riverside under the Probation Act, generously interpreted by W. Clarke Hall of the Old Street Police Court.<sup>67</sup> Although Dr. Helen Webb of the Advisory Board reported receipts of £2160.10 as of June 26, 1916, and further donations and loans of £360 and £460, there were soon financial difficulties. These were compounded by "serious developments" at the Village itself--complaints to the local police about the conduct of the children, and problems of finding suitable staff.<sup>68</sup> Early in 1917 a Home Office assessment of Riverside was made and the report was not favourable. It complained about the want of industrial training, untidiness, lack of religious training and a need of greater freshness in staff.<sup>69</sup> The overworked staff needed a rest, and when Hoare got sick the FOR decided to close the Village for three months during the summer. When the Home Office refused officially to approve Riverside the decision was made to close it for the time

being. Various arrangements with employers were made to provide for the children. The Annual Report of 1918 described the result as follows:

"The committee felt that although individually the children had been helped and some of them greatly benefited by the freedom and love bestowed upon them, yet as a community the ideal sought for had not been attained."<sup>70</sup>

The reopening of Riverside ran into several problems, and it was not until the end of September 1918 that Riverside resumed, with a certain Douglas Bishop as warden.<sup>71</sup> The primary focus now, however, was on communal living and on Riverside as a small Co-operative Industrial Society. As the minutes of the committee indicate, there was far less interest in the new set-up; many members had resigned and meetings were held irregularly. This was a reflection of FOR mood in the post-war period and the remainder of the FOR association with Riverside Village is therefore better left to that period.

Another attempt to implement the new order advocated by the FOR was Sparkes' Industrial Parliaments. According to the Quaker FOR member Malcolm Sparkes (1882-1933), the Industrial Parliament was really a child of Llandudno and Cambridge.<sup>72</sup> However, there was another source for Sparkes' ideas, namely Guild Socialism, propagated first by A. J. Penty in The Restoration of the Gild System (1906), and later and with more influence by A. R. Orage, the editor of The New Age, S.G. Hobson and G.D.H. Cole.<sup>73</sup> In April 1915 the National Guild League was started and its members included such diverse people as Tawney, Lansbury and Russell.<sup>74</sup> But while guild socialists wanted to abolish the existing

capitalistic industrial system completely,<sup>75</sup> Sparkes wanted cooperation and reconciliation.<sup>76</sup> Sparkes' initial ideas, scarcely mentioned in the existing secondary literature, appeared in The Venturer of December 1916 under the title "National Industrial Parliaments".<sup>77</sup> He called his FOR inspired proposal the first step towards an industrial order founded on the principles of the Kingdom of God. The step was necessary if contracts were not to fail, especially since coercion had proved to be a failure. His Industrial Parliament idea was based on cooperation rather than the adversarial idea advocated and historically developed by the unions: "Industrial peace...must arise as the natural accompaniment of complete confidence, real justice, constructive good-will." The parliaments would appoint committees of investigation "with power to co-opt experts and leaders of progressive thought", concentrating on the regulation of wages, unemployment, disabled soldiers, technical education and other general beneficial plans. The reports of the committees would form the basis upon which the Industrial Parliament would take action. The chairman, chosen by mutual consent, would have only an advisory capacity, thus preventing the parliament from becoming a Court of Arbitration. Sparkes hoped for two basic results. First, the compulsory code would include general agreements which would be enforceable by law throughout the whole of the industry. Instead of laws imposed from outside, these laws would come from within. There would be no opposition because all had agreed to have these laws. Second, the voluntary code comprised proposals agreed on in principle but not yet feasible to enforce. These could be discussed fully on

their merits, without ulterior motives. The consequences, according to Sparkes, would be far-reaching for the whole tone "would gradually accustom public opinion to the thinking out of problems in terms of humanity as well as in terms of material advantage."<sup>78</sup>

In 1917 the proposal attracted the attention of J. H. Whitley, the Liberal MP for Halifax, and it became the basis for the Whitley Report, issued by the Garton Foundation.<sup>79</sup> However, Sparkes, like G. D. H. Cole, Beatrice Webb and many militant Labourites, was not very enthusiastic about the Report, calling it "the hull of the ship without her engines."<sup>80</sup> The Whitley Councils, projected by the government as the basis for industrial reconstruction after the war, were seen as devices to secure "Industrial Peace" and not as instruments for a scientific industrial revolution. They should have been used as a clearing house for ideas, a kind of "Permanent Royal Commission".<sup>81</sup> Sparkes' ideas were for a "new and better industrial order", while the Report called for a "permanent improvement in relations", or as Sparkes said, "One is Revolution—the other Lubrication."<sup>82</sup> Over against the Whitley Councils, Sparkes, with G.D.H. Cole,<sup>83</sup> organized the Building Trades Parliament, "a Labour scheme--presented to the employers by a group of big Trade Unions."<sup>84</sup> Sparkes saw his new scheme as a bridge between classes. Not until 1920 did the Builders' Parliament discuss his National Guild Scheme, "a system of democratic control organized for the public service."<sup>85</sup> The scheme was accepted, voluntarily, but in 1923 Sparkes wrote to George Davies that he and H. Barham had been dismissed from the National Building Guild by S.G. Hobson because he,

Sparkes, had prepared a big scheme of reorganization necessitated by the alleged wrecking work of Hobson. He had started all over again with Guild Housing Ltd., trying to implement FOR principles.<sup>86</sup> Sparkes experienced how difficult it was to bring about the "new order". For the FOR, Sparkes' scheme was an alternative to Capitalism, State Socialism, Syndicalism, and Guild Socialism. The scheme was more than a reconciliation between labour and management. It provided for a third party to be involved, namely the community/consumers. In other words, reconciliation was a triangular affair. This idea continued to play a role in the FOR during the 1920s. (see chapter 10).

While Riverside Village, a corporate FOR experiment, and the Industrial Parliaments, an FOR inspired experiment, were practical attempts to establish the "new order", the Political Action Group endeavoured to provide a theoretical basis for political action. The Group was formed late in 1916, probably at a conference held at Jordans, S. E. Bucks.<sup>87</sup> The Group's origins are unclear, but at least one strand can be traced. In January-February 1916 some FOR members visited Ireland to get first hand-knowledge of and try to bring reconciliation among the various factions.<sup>88</sup> The visit once more raised the question how much the FOR could be directly involved in political action. The question was apparently discussed at the Swanwick Summer Conference, but the results were negligible. A memorandum admitted that the FOR did "not yet see sufficiently far ahead to indicate any suitable line of approach to political action." Some individual members, however, were making "tentative inquiries".<sup>89</sup> These inquiries led to the formation of

the Group. At Jordans the members discussed the nature of the "New Commonwealth". Using a biblical phrase, they proclaimed that their political aim was to make "the Kingdoms of this world the Kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ."<sup>90</sup> Perhaps the March Revolution in Russia prodded the group into greater action, for on June 29, 1917, Hodgkin wrote to Gilbert Beaver, a prominent AFOR member, that a memorandum had been prepared which he hoped would lead to some definite activities.<sup>91</sup> Yet, he still thought it possible to proclaim a totally new order without political activity. The Group's proposals were

of a very far-reaching, if not revolutionary, character...bringing into the minds of people the idea of such changes as would be needed to bring about a society in accordance with the mind of Christ. This...seems a very large programme, and almost more than the F.O.R ought to think of: but yet we feel that there is an urgent need for men and women to face these questions from the fundamentally Christian standpoint.<sup>92</sup>

As the Preamble of the "Manifesto on Political Action" stated, the changes were necessary "to be delivered from the nightmare of social injustice, merciless commercial competition and international war."<sup>93</sup> The envisaged new order, expressed in five principles, encompassed all of life. The proposed new order aspired to bring about the Brotherhood of Man, man's mind in harmony with the will of God, and an awareness of and tolerance for different viewpoints for human development. The third and fourth principles could be regarded as the summary of the FOR's views on the state and government:

3. Human government can only express the mind of God as it is based on and proceeds by the free consent of the peoples.
4. True democracy rests on a deep reverence for human personality as the dwelling-place of the Spirit of God.



The two principles indicated the limits, the type and the character of a government acceptable to the FOR. Two points should be made here. The principles do not suggest that the government had to be Christian.<sup>94</sup> Rather, they provide a standard against which the actions of the government could be measured. Furthermore, the principles are silent about the legitimacy of participation in government activities. Perhaps two not necessarily mutually exclusive reasons could be adduced for this silence. Since several FOR members were politically involved, the silence could be intended to imply that political involvement was legitimate. Possibly the silence was an attempt to satisfy the more quietist FOR members. The rest of the Manifesto hints at this ambiguity. One section of the document contained a discussion on coercion and force. The FOR disavowed the coercion of minorities by majorities, preferring, in Quaker fashion, "a continuous effort to arrive at a common ground of action." Limited use of force was accepted, but only on the condition that it was used redemptively and educationally, not destructively. Destructive force destroyed the sense of reverence for the human personality. Individuals or governments using this type of force were thought to regard men as machines or mere units. Such destructive force was not only used in military systems but also in some social systems. Such systems were unacceptable to the FOR. On the basis of this view of force and coercion it would seem to be that participation in politics would at least be regarded as problematic.<sup>95</sup>

The conclusions drawn in the memorandum were not unlike those favoured by such diverse anti-war organizations as the UDC and ILP. The memorandum advocated open diplomacy, free trade, international parliaments, arbitration, disarmament, cooperation between capital, management, labour and consumer, limitations of individual incomes, education for all and of the whole person, and the abolition of capital punishment. Although the memorandum was produced by leading FOR members, it did not necessarily represent official FOR policy. The memorandum was more like a discussion paper. For that reason it was published in The Venturer of October 1917. For a few months the New Commonwealth Group explained their ideas in a supplement in the journal, but when The Venturer experienced paper shortage that supplement was dropped.<sup>96</sup> At the same time the group seems to have been disbanded for the last minutes date from February 11, 1918.

The way the Group worked was probably fairly representative of the FOR as an organization. A letter to Cadoux provides the necessary information. Hodgkin invited Cadoux to join because the Group "should value your help very much in this effort." Furthermore, he hoped that Cadoux would write, or rather type, a paper which would then be sent to all members of the Group. After discussing the paper the resulting suggestions could then be used to finalize the essay.<sup>97</sup> Moreover, Cadoux was invited to a retreat at Jordans to think out the further implications of the FOR's message. Little is known about the deliberations of the conference, but those who were present could be regarded as the FOR's elite. With such exceptions as George Lansbury

and Gerard Collier most of this elite group were clergymen and theologians. What becomes clear from the letter is that the Political Group largely confined its actions to discussions among a select few.<sup>98</sup> In other words, political activity was very limited.

### Office "Changes" and Summary

When Roberts had been appointed as general secretary he had committed himself to a one year experiment. To John Skinner he wrote on May 8, 1916, that he "must get back to preaching as early as possible."<sup>99</sup> When in March 1916 he went as emissary of the FOR to the U.S.A. he found another opportunity to preach. Brooklyn Church invited him to become its minister. In his report to the General Committee on May 15, 1916, Roberts mentioned his call to the U.S.A., but it was not until July 18, 1916, that he announced that he had accepted and that his official connection with the FOR would be terminated on January 3, 1917.<sup>100</sup> The FOR not only lost its general secretary but also its editor of The Venturer. Perhaps George Davies could have filled both posts, and apparently he was asked, but he declined.<sup>101</sup> Instead, Leyton Richards became general secretary. But as he confessed to Cadoux, he had "no literary talent" and was "therefore devoting [his] energies to other things."<sup>102</sup> Thus another person had to found to be editor and the choice fell on Rev. J.M.D. Rorke. The choice was not a happy one. Hodgkin admitted later to Roberts that since he had left The Venturer had never reached the same level.<sup>103</sup> Richards' appointment had been made possible by his resignation from Bowdon Downs Church in the Spring of 1916.<sup>104</sup> He was asked to work for the FOR for

a few months. Before he started this work he preached for a few months at Brooklyn Church, for like Roberts he longed to go back to preaching.<sup>105</sup> In December News Sheet finally announced Richards' appointment and Roberts' resignation, the former coming from and the latter going to the U.S.A.<sup>106</sup> According to the General Committee minutes, Richards was to be general secretary till August 1917, but his resignation was not announced till May 13, 1918.<sup>107</sup> He had found another congregation, Pembroke Chapel, Liverpool, with many pacifist members. He started there in April.<sup>108</sup>

At the same time Rorke resigned as editor, but the circumstances were less happy. In May 1917 the decision was made to put the FOR's name unobtrusively on The Venturer.<sup>109</sup> Later in the year the FOR proposed to publish the journal themselves, but the proposal fell through. Instead, it was reduced in size to cut losses.<sup>110</sup> It was during this difficult period that Davies wrote about his experience as C.O. in an article called "Letter from Guard Room," The Venturer, March 1918. The government thought apparently that this was seditious material. Rorke, as the editor, and Headley Brothers, as the publishers, had to appear before the court. Both were found guilty and fined.<sup>111</sup> The strain, the uncertainty about the journal, and possibly the dissatisfaction of some FOR leaders with his editorial skills, made Rorke decide to resign.<sup>112</sup> With the resignation of Richards and Rorke the FOR was again without a general secretary and an editor. It took quite some time to find successors. It was not until September that the FOR was able to secure the services of Rev. Oliver Dryer, who

resigned from his church on October 13.<sup>113</sup> During this lengthy interim period Richards retained his office but without salary.<sup>114</sup> A successor for Rorke was found in Rev. Fred Pope who started his work on October 1, 1918.<sup>115</sup> The new appointees essentially started their work in a new situation.

What emerges from all this "doing" described in chapters 5 and 6 is that pacifism for the FOR had nothing to do with passivism. The leadership tried to grapple very carefully with a large number of issues: the church, the state, capitalism, society, personal relations, theology. Frequently the members were asked to contribute to the discussions on these issues, but opinions were often quite contradictory. Experts were used at conferences but they could not always translate their ideas into easily understood language. This was especially true of theology. The complexity of the problems easily made for an elite, which in turn probably contributed to a certain lukewarmness and weariness among the members.<sup>116</sup> Chairman Chalmers of the London Union called the attitude "slackness".<sup>117</sup> There were other factors contributing to this slackness. Many members were isolated, especially in Scotland, and for them it was difficult to do something together. Furthermore, the branches relied usually heavily on an active secretary. With the departure of the secretary branch life would frequently be seriously disrupted. For example, Leeds lost its "energetic Secretary, Miss B.B. Rogers, in November, ... and the organizing of our work in Leeds was delayed in consequence."<sup>118</sup> Moreover, some branches grew so large that members did not get to know

each other well enough.<sup>119</sup>

Internal limitations became evident in quite a different direction as well. Late 1916 Cyril Wood and his wife Winifred, chairman and secretary of the London Union, shocked many FOR members when they resigned. They felt that the FOR was too Christian for them. Increasingly, they had been "finding the Christian standpoint more and more impossible." They agreed with a general Christian ethic but could work no longer with people whose thought was "so essentially Christian as the members of the F.O.R."<sup>120</sup> Their resignation raised the question whether or not non-Christians could be FOR members. Furthermore, their resignation seemed to be a case in which reconciliation had not worked. As a consequence the General Council considered at its spring meeting the terms of membership. The Council reaffirmed that the FOR's unity was found in the person of Jesus Christ, but also reiterated that "The Basis" was not a dogma excluding those unable "to make a precise creedal profession."<sup>121</sup> Yet, it was precisely this exclusively Christian basis which set the FOR apart from such groups as the NCF or the UDC.

One final internal weakness needs to be mentioned. At the 1916 Swanwick Summer Conference T.S. Attlee, brother of Clement, gave a speech on "The Attitude of the FOR to Social and Industrial Problems". One of his arguments was that FOR members themselves were part of the problem:

We don't love our neighbours: we exploit them.  
We were at war long before the Great War began. I say "we" advisedly, for we in the FOR are predominantly well-to-do;

we belong to the classes which seem to profit, materially, by the existing systems: we are part of that system. We are interested parties, not impartial arbitrators.<sup>122</sup>

The rest of the speech contained a strong attack on capitalism. When the speech was printed in News Sheet it was introduced by a significant disclaimer: "That we print the document is not to be understood as meaning that it represents the view of the Fellowship upon the subject. As yet, the mind of the Fellowship upon this subject is not formed." As the debate in the next decades would suggest, the FOR continued to have problems in making up its mind. Perhaps at this time there was even more agreement than later on, at least among the leaders who were usually Labourites.<sup>123</sup>

The limitations of FOR activities were thus not only the result of external forces but of internal forces as well. There were financial limitations; there were philosophical-theological differences; there were geographical-organizational problems; there was slackness. Nevertheless, these limitations did not prevent the FOR from extending help to C.O.s, from experimenting in social reconstruction, and from engaging in serious philosophical-theological thinking. At the end of the war more than 7,000 members and nearly 900 sympathizers seemed to be agreed that the positive aspects outweighed the limitations. The FOR seemed to be well-poised to participate in post-war reconstruction.

## CHAPTER 6 ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Rae, Conscience, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>News Sheet, 4-6-1915. Hayes has discussed Heath's article in his book Conscription, p. 277. It is also possible that Heath had the "national register" in mind, but a bill was only introduced after News Sheet appeared.

<sup>3</sup>News Sheet, 2-7-1915.

<sup>4</sup>According to Rae, Conscience, p. 14, the opposition to the bill was negligible.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 15-21. For the drafting of the military service bill see Ch. 4. See also Kennedy, Hound, pp. 38-40, 75-76. The scheme depended on the percentage of the single men who attested not on the total number.

<sup>6</sup>5 & 6 Geo. 5. Ch. 104, Military Service Act, 1916. See Rae, Conscience, Ch. 3 for the passage through parliament and for a discussion on the provisions.

<sup>7</sup>For the FAU, see Geoffrey Winthrop Young, A Story of the Work of the Friend's Ambulance Unit, Oct. 1914-Feb. 1915; private publication. Michael Barratt Brown, The Evolution of the Friends' Ambulance Unit (1914 and 1939), pamphlet, July 1943, reprinted from Friends' Quarterly Examiner, April and July 1943. Perhaps the most interesting case here is Corder Catchpool. For his expression in the FAU see his On Two Fronts. See also the biography by William R. Hughes, Indomitable Friend. Corder Catchpool 1883-1952, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1956; Housmans, 1964). The FAU itself was a contentious issue among the Friends.

<sup>8</sup>For the Pelham Committee, see Rae, Conscience, pp. 125-128, 195-200; for the Home Office Scheme, see Rae, Conscience, ch. 8.

<sup>9</sup>Others which may be mentioned are W.J. Chamberlain, Fighting for Peace, London: N.M.W.M., 1928; New York: Garland, 1971; Rae, Conscience; Robbins, Abolition; David Boulton, Objection Overruled, London: Macgibbon & Kee, 1967; Stephen Hobhouse, Forty Years and an Epilogue, London: James Clarke, 1951.

<sup>10</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 7-1-1916. A copy of the letter was sent to all M.P.s. For the letter see News Sheet, 15-1-1916, p. 3 and Hayes,



Conscription, p. 278.

<sup>11</sup>News Sheet, 15-1-1916, p. 3. The FOR rejected a "combined" letter with other pacifist organizations, because such a letter would not sufficiently indicate the full nature of the FOR objection. The leaders tried to make clear that they had no part in a political opposition to the bill. FOR 456; 1/2; 7-1-1916.

<sup>12</sup>News Sheet, 15-1-1916, p. 2.

<sup>13</sup>Around 500 new members joined. News Sheet, 15-2-1916, p. 1.

<sup>14</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 14-3-1916.

<sup>15</sup>The letter was published in News Sheet, 15-2-1916, pp. 8-10. A similar letter was sent on 13-6-1916 after the inclusion of married men. See RR Box 2 file 58. See also Vellacott, Russell, pp. 286-287.

<sup>16</sup>The initial members were Isaac Goss, chairman, Hodgkin, Roberts, Davies, Sorensen, Ellis, Grubb, Phillips, Gardner, Richards, Mellor, L.J. Farmer and L.J. Morgan. Later members included S. James, T. Attlee, W. Backhouse, Harris, and Tothill. At least two of these members represented the FOR on the JAC. Furthermore, several members were involved in the NCF. For other help see Robbins, Abolition, p. 85.

<sup>17</sup>FOR 456; 5/3; 8-5-1916. See Boulton, Objection, p. 119, and Robbins, Abolition, p. 75, for NCAC/NCCL.

<sup>18</sup>FOR 456; 5/3; 21-7-1916.

<sup>19</sup>FOR 456; 5/3; 1-9-1916. The committee was apparently able to help C.O.s Walker and Hughes who were badly treated at Chatham. The precise nature is not clear from the minutes. FOR 456; 5/3; 30-5-1916.

<sup>20</sup>FOR 456; 5/3; 10-5-1918; 1-7-1918; 28-1-19; see also FOR 456; 1/2; 16-9-1918.

<sup>21</sup>For example, £1650 was received from 330 persons. FOR 456; 5/3; 28-1-1919; 27-6-1919.

<sup>22</sup>Early in 1919 Isaac Goss had six men working for him for six weeks, sorting out the stock of clothes.

<sup>23</sup>FOR 456; 5/1; 27-3-1917.

<sup>24</sup>Hodgkin had been accepted as a minister by the Darlington Monthly Meeting on Sept. 12, 1901. (HTH Box 3 file 39). Orchard, Faith, p. 122, states that he was chaplain at Wormwood Scrubbs.

<sup>25</sup>Ayles became later on FOR chairman, but he was not a member of the General Committee until the very end of 1919. He is mentioned in the 1915 list. During the war he seems to have been involved mainly with the NCF.

<sup>26</sup>See Kennedy, Hound, ch. 10; Vellacott, Russell, ch. 6.

<sup>27</sup>SOR file 160, March 3, 1916. In spite of his absolute exemption he had to appear before the West Ham Petty Session on July 18, 1917, for a re-assessment of his position. At that time he claimed exemption on grounds of being in holy orders.

<sup>28</sup>See for example, George M.Ll. Davies, National Library of Wales, Manuscripts and Papers (hereafter cited as GD) 480a.

<sup>29</sup>CJC Box 8; 3-2-1916.

<sup>30</sup>The tribunals were described in News Sheet, 15-3-1916, p. 2, as "unsatisfactory in the extreme".

<sup>31</sup>GD 480a. The Home Office Scheme was designed as a system of alternative service for those C.O.s who refused to accept the tribunal's decision. See Rae, Conscience, chs. 7 and 8. The scheme itself was a failure.

<sup>32</sup>FOR 456; 5/3; 10-1-1917. Compare Ed Beck to Cadoux (Box 9, 25-4-1917): he works with three other C.O.s, but they are slackers and a trouble to the foreman. See also Vellacott, Russell, Ch. 12. "Trouble at the Dartmoor Home Office Camp".

<sup>33</sup>FOR 456; 5/3; 19-6-1917.

<sup>34</sup>News Sheet, 25-12-1916, p. 5. See also 25-10-1916, p. 3; Catchpool's On Two Fronts and Letters of a Prisoner; S.B. James, The Men Who Dared (London: C.W. Daniel, n.d., [1917]); RR file 58, 12-9-1916, for the conditions at Dyce in connection with the death of W.L. Roberts. Sparkes in Pioneers of Good Will (p. 4, SCPC; AFOR) called prison a "spiritual university".

<sup>35</sup>News Sheet, 1-5-1917, p. 10.

<sup>36</sup>RR file 39, 19 -9 -1916. For the division of opinion on absolutists and alternativists in the NCF, see Vellacott, Russell, Ch. 6. By September 1916 the NCF, though not necessarily Brockway, had moved away from an exclusive absolutist position.

<sup>37</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 5, Feb. 1916, p. 129. Similarly, Sidney Webb spoke of "established expectation" in "Conscience and the 'Conscientious Objector'," The North American Review, Vol. 205, March 1917, p. 418.

<sup>38</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 5, Feb. 1916, p. 129. Roberts' argument is an example of a type frequently found in FOR literature, expressed in two common phrases: "You cannot cast out Satan with Satan" and "You cannot overcome evil with evil".

<sup>39</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 6, March 1916, p. 161.

<sup>40</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 9, June 1916, p. 257.

<sup>41</sup>Cf. the memorandum for the Garden City Conference points 2c and 5c (pp. 173-174).

<sup>42</sup>News Sheet, 2-4-1915. He admitted that peace doing was more difficult than peace hearing.

<sup>43</sup>See for example News Sheet, 2-7-1915, p. 8, a letter by E.H.S.

<sup>44</sup>News Sheet, 25-10-1916, p. 15. Perhaps M. Phillips' phrase "first to BE before to DO" is the best summary of this position (News Sheet, 30-5-1916, p. 6). For the emphasis on the individual's role see the recommendations of the Social Service Committee in News Sheet, 15-2-1916, p. 7.

<sup>45</sup>News Sheet, 25-11-1916, p. 3.

<sup>46</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 18-4-1916. According to Roberts this group emphasized immediate peace agitation. See FOR 456; 1/2; 11-12-1916.

<sup>47</sup>News Sheet, 25-7-1916, p. 4.

<sup>48</sup>Reconstruction was an essential feature of the FOR's "Basis". Similar ideas of reconstruction have been described by Paul Barton Johnson in Land Fit For Heroes (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), significantly subtitled, "The Planning of British Reconstruction 1916-1919".

<sup>49</sup>News Sheet, 25-8-1916, pp. 4-7.

<sup>50</sup>See for example FOR 456; 1/2; 11-12-1916. An incident with the London Union illustrates clearly the opposing views. The London Union united with various anti-war organizations in a definite peace propaganda. The General Council did not approve of this activity because it was not a function of the FOR. See FOR 456; 2/1; 30-3-1917. For a further discussion on the future of the FOR see FOR 456; 2/1; 9-10-1916. The attempt to balance the demands of both groups by the FOR leadership is somewhat paralleled by the NCF leadership which tried to find a balance between the views of the absolutists and the alternativists. See Kennedy, Hound, Ch. 8.

<sup>51</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 13-11-1916.

<sup>52</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 14-3-1916; 4/2; 17-1-1916 and 17-4-1916; and 5/5; 12-6-1916. Cf. FOR 456; 5/5; 8-3-1916: "The Church had laid stress on the mystic idea of sacrifice, and that this was a holy war, and had lost sight of the real meaning of prayer." Ironically, this suggested date coincided with the Republican uprising in Dublin. See Calton Younger, Ireland's Civil War, London: Fontana Collins, 1968; 1970. Archbishop Davidson did not favour Easter Day (FOR 456; 5/1; 10-4-1916).

<sup>53</sup>Martin, ed., Ministry. William Wilson taught at Woodbrooke, and during the Second World War Richards was its Warden. See Richards, Private, p. 97 and Ch. 15.

<sup>54</sup>FOR 456; 5/4; 7-10-1916. Cf. News Sheet, 25-10-1916 and 25-11-1916, p. 3: the FOR was in touch with 125 teachers; and 1-5-1917, p. 11.

<sup>55</sup>FOR 456; 5/4; 21-2-1917 and 14-6-1917. The series consisted of 1. St. Francis of Assisi; 2. The Story of the Poor and Poor Law; 3. Pilgrim Fathers; 4. Merchants and Craft Gilds; 5. Monks; 6. Village Life in the 14th Century.

<sup>56</sup>She started on April 4, 1917 and remained for a decade.

<sup>57</sup>See insert News Sheet, 1-11-1917 for the Aim and Curriculum of the school.

<sup>58</sup>See The Venturer, April 1918, pp. 176-179, July 1918, p. 239.

<sup>59</sup>In the memorandum on the future of the FOR the scheme was placed in the category of social experimentation. (News Sheet, 25-8-1916, p. 6).

<sup>60</sup>W. Clarke Hall, The State and the Child, New York: Frederick A. Stokes, 1917. The experiments he mentioned (Ch. 6) were Homer Lane's Little Commonwealth, Dorsetshire, a Women's Colony, Berkshire, and the Caldecott Community. One experiment was not mentioned by name but there is little doubt that Hall described Riverside Village. For the increase of war juvenile delinquency see Arthur Marwick, The Deluge, New York: W.W. Norton, 1965; 1970, pp. 118-119. For the pre-war increase see John R. Gillis, "The Evolution of Juvenile Delinquency in England 1890-1914," Past & Present, 67, May 1975, pp. 96-126.

<sup>61</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 16-2-1916. Later on an Advisory Board was appointed. See FOR 456; 1/2; 13-4-1916 for the names.

<sup>62</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 6, March 1917, p. 169. For Cadbury's generosity see Percy W. Bartlett, Barrow Cadbury, London: Bannisdale Press, 1960. Cadbury was an FOR member since 1915. He was for many

years treasurer of the IFOR and the financier of Embassies of Reconciliation.

<sup>63</sup>FOR 456; 5/2; 12-4-1916.

<sup>64</sup>FOR 456; 5/2; 3-5-1916. The FOR had an option to buy other sections of land later. The whole estate did not come into the FOR's possession until 6-4-1919. (FOR 456; 3/1; 6-4-1919).

<sup>65</sup>GD letter 2368, n.d., probably to his mother. A fairly similar description is given by Cyril Burt, The Young Delinquent, New York: D. Appleton, 1925, p. 88.

<sup>66</sup>FOR 456; 5/2; 1-6-1916.

<sup>67</sup>See Davies, Essays, chapter "Non-violence in Practice", 1916, p. 28ff, who gives the name as Sir Edward Clarke Hall. Section 108 of the Children's Act stated that police authorities had the duty to provide places of detention. According to Hall, in England the wrong-doer had to be punished. He pointed to the U.S.A. where the emphasis was on care of and protection for the child. See Hall, State, especially pp. 35-46. Of the experiments Hall reviewed, Riverside Village, not mentioned by name, was apparently the most advanced. See pp. 165-170 for his praise and probably very justified critique.

<sup>68</sup>FOR 456; 5/2; 10-7-1916 and 3-10-1916.

<sup>69</sup>FOR 456; 5/2; 14-3-1917. Charles Russell had later on a somewhat more favourable report. (FOR 456; 1/2; 16 and 17-4-1917).

<sup>70</sup>SCPC; CDG-B, Box 1. According to Hall, State, p. 167, the extreme position "that it is only the good that each individual can discover that has any real and lasting effect" was "a vital fallacy". Riverside Village could perhaps be regarded as an experiment based on the liberal theological view of the nature of man.

<sup>71</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 4 no. 2, Nov. 1918, p. 302.

<sup>72</sup>For his statement see HTH Box 2 file 25, 27-12-1918. Sparkes was arrested as C.O. in Jan. 1917 and not released until Feb. 1919. He had been present at both conferences.

<sup>73</sup>See for example S.G. Hobson, Guild Principle in War and Peace, London: G. Bell, 1917, with an introduction by A.R. Orage; S.G. Hobson, National Guilds, London: G. Bell, 1919; Maurice B. Reckitt, As It Happened, London, J.M. Dent, 1941; G.D.H. Cole, Guild Socialism Re-stated, London; Leonard Parsons, 1920.

<sup>74</sup>S.T. Glass, The Responsible Society, London: Longmans, 1966, p. 39.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., p. 50. Glass essentially overlooked Sparkes' contribution.

<sup>76</sup>It is not clear how much Sparkes borrowed from Robert Owen. Even before he published his ideas Sparkes had been able "to establish some means for promoting permanent right relations" in one London industry. This endeavour was used by the FOR as example of its methods. News Sheet, 25-8-1916, p. 6.

<sup>77</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 3, Dec. 1916, pp. 76-80. As assistant managing director of H.H. Cleaver, architectural woodworkers in London, Sparkes had some experience as a negotiator on the employer's side. Sparkes' proposals were discussed at a conference between FOR leaders and some SCM members (FOR 456; 1/2; 11-12-1916). In 1927 Sparkes published Modern Industry (London: S.C.M.) which looked at the success and failure of his guild socialism. For similar ideas see Bertrand Russell's Roads to Freedom, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1918.

<sup>78</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 1 no. 3, Dec. 1916. The core of the argument is found on pp. 78-79. The quotes are taken from these pages.

<sup>79</sup>News Sheet, Apr. 1920, p. 2. There had been an "industrial council" in 1911 but it never worked. Johnson in his book Land does not mention Sparkes at all. For the history of the Whitley Report see pp. 48-54, 156-165 and 377-382. See also James Wilson Stitt, "Whitley Councils: Their Conception and Adoption During W.W.I," Ph.D. thesis University of South Carolina, 1976. Stitt refers briefly to Sparkes (called Sparks, pp. 108-109), acknowledging that Whitley was impressed by Sparkes' proposals. Stitt only alludes to but does not explain the differences between the Whitley Report and Sparkes' ideas.

<sup>80</sup>HTH Box 2 file 25, letter Sparkes 27-12-1918. The letter lists five differences. The English government asked the imprisoned Sparkes to help with reconstruction (FOR 456; 5/7; 11-12-1916). The proposal also attracted attention from Washington's Bureau of Industrial Research.

<sup>81</sup>See Sparkes, Modern, Ch. 6, esp. p. 53; R.K. Webb, Modern England, New York: Harper & Row, 1980, pp. 496, 512; G.D.H. Cole, "Industrial Councils," Encyclopedia Britannica, 1967, Vol. 12, p. 198.

<sup>82</sup>News Sheet, Apr. 1920, p. 2.

<sup>83</sup>Wright, Cole.

<sup>84</sup>News Sheet, Apr. 1920, p. 2. Glass in Responsible, p. 50, suggested that Guild Socialists were hostile to industrial parliaments, "regarding them as tricks to seduce the worker and bind him to the capitalistic system." The statement needs modification.

<sup>85</sup>News Sheet, Apr. 1920, p. 3.

<sup>86</sup>GD 1745, Letter Sparkes 28-5-1923.

<sup>87</sup>For the minutes of this group see FOR 456; 5/6; Apr. 30, 1917-Feb. 11, 1918. The Press Committee was apparently its ancestor, but the switch to politics is nowhere explained in the minutes. Even the start of the group is unclear.

<sup>88</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 14-2-1916. For an earlier visit see News Sheet, 1-3-1915, p. 3. Others went again in 1917 (FOR 456; 1/2; 14-5-1917).

<sup>89</sup>For the Memorandum see News Sheet, 25-8-1916, point 8. Compare also point 7 which called for an involvement in and a knowledge of international affairs. The mandate for the inquiry was found in point 5 of the Aims: to work out the implications of the FOR's principles into a political philosophy.

<sup>90</sup>FOR 456; 5/6; 30-4-1917. The Group consisted at this time at least of: Hodgkin, Mary Phillips, Carl Heath, Marian Ellis, Leyton Richards, Gerard Collier, Hugh Martin, Wilson Harris and Seaward Beddow.

<sup>91</sup>Although objecting to the violence accompanying the Russian Revolution, the FOR seems in general to have welcomed the overthrow of the Tsarist regime. The FOR's reaction was fairly representative of liberal thinking.

<sup>92</sup>SCPC; DG 13, Box 1/2; 29-6-1917. Hodgkin used the term revolutionary which does not appear in the Preamble of the Memorandum itself. Perhaps the Russian Revolution had something to do with the terms, but it became quite popular in FOR literature, culminating in the "Christian Revolution Series".

<sup>93</sup>The Manifesto was published in The Venturer of Oct. 1917, pp. 30-32. The following is a summary of the Manifesto.

<sup>94</sup>Carl Heath in The Venturer, Nov. 1917, pp. 55-60, raised the question "How far can a state act upon a Christian basis while many of its citizens do not accept the Christian ethic?" The question was also discussed with Group see FOR 456; 5/6; 2-10-1917.

<sup>95</sup>It may be remembered that J.A. Pease, the president of the Peace Society, remained in the cabinet and thus, according the FOR, had compromised the pacifist position.

<sup>96</sup>FOR 456; 5/6; letter from Rorke, the editor, 11-2-1918. The manifesto had been introduced by Carl Heath, who may have been the most active in the group.

<sup>97</sup>CJC Box 9, 3-10-1917.

<sup>98</sup>The conference was held from Dec. 31, 1917 to Jan. 3, 1918. The agenda placed the discussion of a political program and philosophy within the framework of the future of the FOR. Hodgkin mentioned in his letter that the following had been invited: G.B. Robson, C.H. Dodd, G. Lansbury, G. Collier, Hewlett Johnson, the later red dean of Canterbury, J.D.M. Rorke, G. Unwin, W. Wilson, C. Heath, M. Ellis, L. Stevenson, B.D. Taylor, A.T. Cadoux (Cecil John's older brother), W.F. Halliday, J. Darbyshire, M. Royden, S. Mellor, W.E. Orchard and L. Richards. B.D. Taylor does not seem to be mentioned elsewhere.

<sup>99</sup>RR Box 2 file 39, 8-5-1916. John Skinner was a theologian who seems to have influenced many FOR members.

<sup>100</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 14-3-1916; 15-5-1916; 18-7-1916.

<sup>101</sup>There is a copy of a letter from Roberts to Davies (RR Box 2 file 39, 2-4-1917) which suggests this. The original is not in Davies' archives.

<sup>102</sup>CJC Box 9, 16-1-1917.

<sup>103</sup>RR Box 2 file 41, 8-2-1919.

<sup>104</sup>He was essentially forced to resign. Interestingly enough he resigned from the NCF at around the same time on a disagreement of some points of general policy. See Richards, Private, p. 63.

<sup>105</sup>Ibid., p. 70.

<sup>106</sup>News Sheet, 25-12-1916. See also News Sheet, 1-3-1917, p. 8 for a note on the annual meeting of the Manchester Branch, held at Jan. 20, 1917, at which Richards "was warmly welcomed back from America." He was back just before Christmas for he was present at the Business Committee meeting of Dec. 19, 1916.

<sup>107</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 14-5-1916 and 13-5-1918.

<sup>108</sup>Richards, Private, p. 72.

<sup>109</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 14-5-1917.

<sup>110</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 17-12-1917. Perhaps half of the FOR members subscribed to The Venturer.

<sup>111</sup>The Venturer, June 1918, pp. 231-234. Cf. an incident with Mr. Iveson who was prosecuted for printing FOR literature without imprint (FOR 456; 5/1; 5-3-1918). The FOR had more difficulties with printing for in March it was discovered that Botolph Press did not



conform to Trade Union rules. The FOR decided to find another printer. FOR 456; 1/2; 18-3-1918.

<sup>112</sup>The resignation was discussed on the same day as Richards'. FOR 456; 1/2; 13-5-1918.

<sup>113</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 16-9-1918. Rev. Herbert Morgan had declined. HTH Box 1 file 8, 5-6-1918.

<sup>114</sup>FOR 456; 5/1; 14-5-1918.

<sup>115</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 16-9-1918.

<sup>116</sup>News Sheet, 25-10-1916.

<sup>117</sup>Minutes of the London Union, 2-6-1917.

<sup>118</sup>News Sheet, 15-1-1916, p. 9. Leeds was fortunate that John Darbyshire came over from Bolton to help the branch.

<sup>119</sup>London Union, started on June 14, 1916, had about 20% of the FOR members, spread over several branches.

<sup>120</sup>News Sheet, 25-11-1916, p. 9.

<sup>121</sup>News Sheet, 1-5-1917, p. 8; FOR 456; 2/1; 30-3-1917. See also News Sheet, 25-12-1916, pp. 7-8 for Jessie Brodie's reaction to the resignation.

<sup>122</sup>News Sheet, insert 25-8-1916. Cf. News Sheet, 25-8-1916, p. 12, for a complaint about some of the wealthier FOR members who ignored the poorer ones: there was "too much caste" in the FOR.

<sup>123</sup>Most FOR leaders seem initially to have been liberals. For a discussion of the trend of Liberals to switch to Labour see Ross McKibbin, Evolution; Swartz, U.D.C.; and C.A. Cline, Recruits to Labour, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1963. Cline mentions the UDC, NCF, LNS Bryce Group and 1917 Club as Liberal-Labour groups contributing to the switch. There seems to be no reason why she should not have included the FOR.

## PART II

### THE 1920'S: THE DECADE OF GRADUAL CHANGE

Historians of pacifism have given relatively little attention to the 1920's. In fact, for the FOR the 1920's were a paradoxical if not confusing period in which some significant changes took place. During the war the FOR and its members had developed a vision for a new society. In spite of serious restrictions some attempts to implement the vision had been made. With the end of the war many of the constraints began to disappear. The government discussed and adopted plans for reconstruction. In such a new atmosphere the way for the FOR's reconstruction plans seemed to be favourable. The FOR, as if to leave no doubt about its vision, published a series of seventeen books, called "The Christian Revolution Series" (1918-1923). One could thus expect a significant FOR effort to make its blueprint a reality. Yet, the FOR's attempts at reconstruction, in the event, were limited. The following four chapters discuss the FOR's efforts and the reasons for its limitations. What should become clear is that after some initial successes, mainly but not exclusively in the international sphere, the momentum ground to a halt. The reasons for the loss of momentum were of two different kinds. The first can be regarded as organizational-administrative. During the 1920's there were serious personnel problems. Staff members were often confused about their functions. The early, strong leaders relinquished their positions. Hodgkin, for

example, left for China. The leadership was divided about the function of the FOR. Gradually, the activists, such as Walter Ayles, lost out against those who preferred the FOR to be an order. The organizational-administrative troubles, it will be argued in chapter 7, constituted the most important reason for the FOR's limited reconstruction success. This internal weakness was reinforced later in the decade by a shift in theology. The emphasis on the immanence of God, so central to the social gospel, was challenged by the Swiss theologian Karl Barth (1886 - 1968) who stressed the transcendence of God. For many FOR members this meant that not they themselves but only God could usher in the Kingdom. The stronger emphasis on transcendence weakened the social gospel's imperative to redeem society. In addition, the theological publications show more clearly than any other evidence the nearly imperceptible shift in the FOR towards a single issue pacifist organization (chapter 8). By the end of the decade the FOR had become a significantly different organization from that of World War I. The membership had shrunk dramatically, the focus was in the process of being shifted from the Kingdom of God to pacifism, and the desire to be an order had led to an even greater emphasis on working through the churches. These changes were reflected in the FOR's attempts at reconstruction. During the first few years of the decade the FOR was still involved in many activities, but thereafter the involvement was spasmodic. At the same time, these international and domestic activities, discussed in chapters 9 and 10 respectively, provide some modifications to the negative picture drawn in chapter 7.

## CHAPTER 7

### THE FOR IN THE 1920'S

In 1924 Henry Hodgkin reminisced in a letter to the new general secretary Percy Bartlett about the beginning of the FOR, writing that "there was not a shadow of a doubt about the mission in December 1914."<sup>1</sup> But after the armistice many members questioned if the FOR still had a mission. Already by the end of 1918, however, the leadership decided that the FOR's task had hardly begun, a decision which was quite different from that of the NCF which wound up its affairs in November 1919. Nevertheless, throughout the 1920's the issue whether or not to continue was persistently debated. Despite such uncertainty, it is clear that with the decision to persevere an extensive program for the next decade was envisaged. This program could be summarized under three general headings: international affairs, reconstruction and the church. As will be seen in this chapter, uncertainty about the FOR's function and organizational-administrative difficulties during the 1920's seriously hampered the implementation of the program. To some extent the program shared in the vicissitudes of the general post-war reconstruction of which it was a part. The initial euphoria, so noticeable in the Coupon Election of December 1918, soon wore off. While Lloyd George turned his attention to international affairs, as Ramsay MacDonald did later in 1924, Britain was seething with labour

unrest. Labour unions and party alike tried, often in vain, to hold on to or even extend the gains made during the war. In contrast, business leaders and the conservative element in society in general, exemplified by the important Conservative leader Stanley Baldwin, looked nostalgically back to the Edwardian era. The British Federation of Industry in particular tried to break the power of the unions. Hence, the reconsolidation of the British right in the 1920s, the economic depression from 1920 onwards, the frequent international unrest, the clashes between the various social groups, and the theological gropings for a new direction aggravated the FOR's difficulty in implementing its plans of reconciliation.

With the coming of peace the FOR leaders thought it necessary to call a conference. The gathering was held late in December 1918 at King's Weigh House, London. For various reasons this conference turned out to be of great significance for the FOR's future. Firstly, the conferees agreed that the FOR still had a task, since the deep economic and psychological causes behind the origins of the war had not been eradicated and the nations were not reconciled.<sup>2</sup> As general secretary Oliver Dryer emphasized once again, the FOR stood for more positive and fundamental ideas than mere opposition to war. Secondly, the conferees reaffirmed that the FOR was "fundamentally a Christian Society, and only secondarily and, as it were, incidentally, pacifist."<sup>3</sup> But thirdly, the approximately two hundred conferees reached no agreement as to how these more positive ideas could be expressed in a definite socio-economic program. Although a nine-point program was adopted, the discussion

about the nature of the program was apparently very sharp, resulting in a tense atmosphere. Orchard, who was quite disturbed by the proceedings, characterized the division as one between two basic groups, namely, Quakers who stood for "do nothing" and Catholics who were "firebrands".<sup>4</sup> The usage of the words Quakers and Catholics may have been too indiscriminate and unfair, but the rift was real enough. This division, however, was not the only cause for disappointment. The leadership in an attempt to secure unanimity of opinion like a Quaker Yearly Meeting, showed indecision. According to one member, this unanimity would be impossible to secure because various energies needed outlets in activities which meant different things to different people. Moreover, the silent majority could be, and apparently was, overridden by the insistent individual.<sup>5</sup> Her confidence in the FOR was waning and the lack of leadership no doubt contributed to her disillusionment.

It was probably during this heated discussion that the proposal was made, possibly by Leyton Richards, to dissolve the organization. The proposal was overwhelmingly rejected. Yet shortly after the conference even Hodgkin wondered if it was worthwhile to carry on. He felt that the General Committee had been "too much afraid of giving a definite lead along certain lines." The FOR needed strong leadership for otherwise disintegration would rapidly proceed.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, indecisive leadership and the continued deep division contributed to the decline in membership over the next few years and led to renewed proposals for dissolution. The decline was already noticeable in 1919, for shortly before the General Committee meeting of June 1919 the FOR made a small

survey to find out why members were resigning. The answers varied considerably, ranging from theological and political objections to lack of time.<sup>7</sup> In July, at the Swanwick Summer Conference, Richards tabled a motion to dissolve the country wide organization and retain only a small committee nucleus, to be elected annually by subscribers of the FOR Fund. Such a committee would publish pamphlets and books, maintain formal links with overseas movements and play the role of watchdog. Richards gave various reasons for his proposal. He thought that the churches were becoming more tolerant. There were difficulties in maintaining regular meetings, especially since there was a perception among many members of a reduced sense of the need for and relevance of the FOR. Finally, Richards mentioned financial difficulties.<sup>8</sup> Although Richards' reasons were substantially valid, the motion was defeated. Instead, the suggestions to re-enrol the members and to give substantial liberty to the sub-committees were adopted. In the discussion the message that the FOR was "more than a mere pacifist society" became very evident.<sup>9</sup> For reasons which are unclear, the idea of re-enrolment was shortly afterwards abandoned.<sup>10</sup> As far as the sub-committees were concerned, these either stopped meeting shortly after the war or struggled on for a few more years.<sup>11</sup>

In the autumn of 1919 the General Committee acknowledged that no attempts were being made to re-vivify dead branches.<sup>12</sup> The membership statistics showed for the first time a decline, from 7089 to 7057, although the number of sympathizers nearly made up for this loss, increasing from 880 to 909. While on paper the membership remained

fairly stable during much of the next decade - there was even a slight increase in 1920 - the reality was different. The numbers included those whose interest had lapsed. In 1921 fifteen hundred lapsed members were circularized to find out if they were still in sympathy.<sup>13</sup> The significance of this number may be illustrated by two examples of early leading FOR members. The prominent Quaker Joan Fry resigned because she doubted the present need of the FOR. Maude Royden became a sympathizer because she could not fully agree with the FOR's outlook and methods.<sup>14</sup> In 1922 it was reported that the Fellowship had lost touch with about two thousand members.<sup>15</sup>

Even more telling was the decline in branches. From a war-time high of 187 the number dwindled to 110 in 1922 with only thirty active and nine doubtful. The average attendance at the meetings was ten.<sup>16</sup> Horace Fuller was probably correct in November 1919 when he wrote to Cadoux that the London Union was the "real thing at the moment - in fact it IS the F.O.R. as far as I can see."<sup>17</sup> When in 1924 Mabel Tothill resigned as secretary of the Bristol branch for health reasons, the branch was soon dead.<sup>18</sup> The July 1924 issue of Reconciliation announced that the Scottish branch was practically dead. The October issue gave a membership of 8500 but admitted that headquarters was only in touch with about 4000.<sup>19</sup>

In 1921 FOR staff member Tom Foley gave five reasons for the decline of the FOR. His reasons would have been just as valid for 1919 or for 1924 or later:

1. The FOR was seen as merely a Christian pacifist organization;



2. Progressive Movements have drawn off vital members;
3. International work must inevitably be directed from Headquarters;
4. The members lack personal touch with one another;
5. The FOR is looked upon as a closed Fellowship.<sup>20</sup>

In her book Kill or Cure? (1937) Muriel Lester later gave another insight into the FOR's decline in the years after the Great War when she wrote

The F.o.R. was the non-violent society through which a good many of us had been working; but now there arose the need for a more popular movement, membership of which would not carry with it such serious implications as to religion, philosophy, education, etc. A few members of the Fellowship got together therefore in a Bloomsbury sittingroom and founded the "No More War Movement".<sup>21</sup>

The No More War Movement (NMWM) was actually started in early 1921 as an anti-war organization. The new group consisted mainly of socialists, many of whom, like Will Chamberlain and Fenner Brockway, came from the defunct NCF. However, several prominent FOR members worked for the NMWM-churches committee, notably James Binns (secretary), W. Ayles, T. Foley and Lucy Cox. There were other organizations, such as the League of Nations Union (1918), the Congregational Crusade Against War (1926), and the Society of Friends which competed with the FOR for members or duplicated FOR work in administration and outreach to the churches.

In this uncertain situation the question once again arose as to just what the function of the FOR was supposed to be. In 1922 the FOR dealt extensively with this question. The discussion centered essentially on three options. Some argued for the FOR as a "spiritual home" with the imperative need for close cooperation with others to pass on the vision; others envisioned the FOR as an Order without organized

groups of its own and working through the Churches, Labour or the Auxiliary Movement; still different members wanted the FOR to widen its basis in order to include non-pacifists. Gerard Collier, a General Committee member since 1916, was asked to draw up a new, re-interpreted form of "The Basis".<sup>22</sup> Those advocating options two and three actually questioned if pacifism could really be made the test for FOR membership. Even Richards, who had been able to start an order-like group in Bowdon Downs Church<sup>23</sup> and who was probably the strongest proponent of an order, had to admit that the FOR had a distinctive function to perform, namely, the implementation of the social consequences of Christ's teaching. He preferred the relegation of "The Basis" and pacifism to an introductory statement and an emphasis on the exploration of the meaning of Christ.<sup>24</sup> However, with the death of Collier in 1923 nothing came of the re-interpretation.

The question of the FOR's function emerged again at the Cambridge Conference in 1924. Reconciliation reported that

all the energies of the Fellowship, re-awakened, better organised, concentrated, ought to be directed to two main objects: one the spread of the spirit and message of Christian pacifism through and by the Churches as the very essence of the gospel, and the other the development of the international side of the work.<sup>25</sup>

It was clear what the FOR wanted to do, but the members were confused as to how their missions could be accomplished: "We have got known to the world, not as a people who are thinking widely on the real way of living in the spirit of Jesus Christ but as a people who are out against all war."<sup>26</sup> Richards emphasized again that the FOR's function was one of propaganda, with the head office concentrating solely upon publication.

Then the direction would be something like the early The Venturer under Roberts "when it had a bite and a snap about it."<sup>27</sup>

The recurring question of dissolution or re-organization did not provide for much optimism. This was reflected in the steady decline in membership, an issue which deserves close scrutiny. The first step to stop the decline came in 1919. Dryer invited Roberts, back in Britain from his Brooklyn ministry, to speak to small groups on the FOR's understanding of the political method and the economic system. Roberts accepted the invitation, but he rejected the suggestion to become the first FOR Servant, whose task was to preach the gospel of reconciliation. Shortly afterwards he accepted a call to the American Presbyterian Church in Montreal.<sup>28</sup> Instead of Roberts, the FOR in 1920 appointed George Davies, Gilbert and Bessie Porteous, and Oliver Dryer as Servants, who were a combination of Bernard Walke's "Preaching Friars" and an FOR order.<sup>29</sup> In 1921 Tom Foley was appointed a Servant Secretary for social and industrial affairs shortly after Dryer had agreed to be the part-time IFOR general secretary.<sup>30</sup> The Servants organized campaigns, or missions as they were called later, which lasted a week or more in a particular area. During that time they would speak to ministers, Adult Schools, Brotherhoods, Quakers, in churches and to open air gatherings on such topics as Ireland's political troubles, the need for a Christian social revolution or various local problems.<sup>31</sup> In 1920 they helped the Liverpool branch which contemplated going out of business.<sup>32</sup> In 1923 they were especially busy in Yorkshire,<sup>33</sup> Somerset and Dorset as well as with boosting the 'Cornish Scheme'.<sup>34</sup> Frank

Fincham, who was involved in the Pontypridd mission, wrote: "One becomes increasingly conscious of the value of this branch of F.O.R. work."<sup>35</sup> Obviously not all hopes had been given up on branch life, although most fresh impulses had to come from headquarters.<sup>36</sup> Yet not all branches relied on the head office. The Manchester branch, for example, was reformed under Leslie Artingstall, a later general secretary, and Ada Samuel.<sup>37</sup> This branch was particularly involved with young people.<sup>38</sup> The fresh outburst of enthusiasm in 1925 may have been due to COPEC, the "Conference on Politics, Economics and Citizenship", held in the spring of 1924 in Birmingham.<sup>39</sup> The conference heightened the social awareness in the churches and declared that all war was contrary to the teaching and spirit of Jesus.<sup>40</sup> Yet COPEC did not produce new additions to the FOR membership. Rather, COPEC created a new enthusiasm among FOR members, evidenced in the number of subscribers to Reconciliation. In February 1925 there were 2400 out of 7400 members and 1100 sympathizers, but by September there were nearly 3500.<sup>41</sup> In March 1927 the decision was finally taken to start weeding out the membership list. A circular was sent out; 2000 "members" failed to respond and subsequently their names were deleted.<sup>42</sup> From the 7478 members of August 1927 there were only 3328 members and 343 sympathizers left at the end of July 1928, and only a half dozen branches.<sup>43</sup> These numbers gave a much more realistic picture for the whole decade. They not only put a different perspective on the number of subscribers to Reconciliation, but they also help understand why the dissolution question continued to be debated.

The year 1929 was probably the nadir of the FOR's existence; yet, as will be shown in chapter 11, the year was also the start of the resurgence of the FOR. The renewal brought the FOR much closer to being an order. As has been seen, Richards was the main proponent of such a structure. Even Lilian Stevenson, who did not agree with Richards, was willing to experiment for a few years with the FOR as an order, despite the fact that such a reorientation would upset the constitution.<sup>44</sup>

Twice Hodgkin, both times on holiday from China, tried to help to stop the decline or the change in direction. The first time was in 1926 when he invited a select group for "sharing and study", similar to the important Jordans conference which resulted in the publication of the seventeen volumes of the "Christian Revolution Series" (1918-1923). The group's composition was indeed very similar to that of the conference: Cadoux, Wilson, Halliday, Micklem, Stevenson, Royden, Gardner, Robson, Dryer, Morgan, Coates, Dodd, Armstrong, Carter, Richards and Davies.<sup>45</sup> No new series was produced, but the meeting may have contributed to the FOR's reconciliation attempts at the time of the General Strike (see ch. 10). The second attempt Hodgkin made came at the end of 1929 with a small gathering at Selly Oak, Birmingham. Since 1926 the general attitude had become much more negative. For example, Halliday wrote to Davies in February of 1929: "My own feeling is that it would be better if it [FOR] shut down, as it seems to have become an institution of a formal kind." According to him, the FOR did nothing vital at the time, although he agreed to attend the Selly Oak conference.<sup>46</sup> Perhaps two things made him somewhat more optimistic. In the first place, Hodgkin

did not return to China and spent most of 1929 in England. He even chaired a General Committee meeting in April when Cadoux was absent.<sup>47</sup> Secondly, the Christ and Peace Campaign discussed in chapter 11 had started in the autumn.

During his long stay Hodgkin had time to ask FOR leaders to put their thoughts concerning the FOR's future on paper. Their letters formed the basis for the Selly Oak discussions. There were as many opinions as there were letters, showing that even the "Left Wing of the Fellowship" was not unified.<sup>48</sup> Cadoux thought that it was time "for a fuller investigation into the whole problem of practical ethics."<sup>49</sup> Glaisyer suggested something like an international Society of Friends organized on similar lines.<sup>50</sup> Davies also picked up the Quaker thread. He thought that Quaker "ambassadors" who "state and illustrate their concerns" were a step in the right direction.<sup>51</sup> Already Joseph W. Sault had suggested something similar in 1924, recommending Lansbury. It was indeed Lansbury who became a roving ambassador in 1936, but not exactly in connection with the problems Sault had stated.<sup>52</sup> However, even in 1929 Davies could not see how the FOR could implement the idea, for there was "neither adequate personal MISSIONARY PERSONNEL nor the kind of MANAGEMENT THAT ELICITS OR CO-ORDINATES MISSIONARY WORK OR THOUGHT AMONG MEMBERSHIP."<sup>53</sup> In contrast, Lilian Stevenson thought that there should be an inner core of about five hundred people "pledged to put the claims of the F.O.R. first in some real way in terms of service, study, time, giving and intercession." Such a core could help a general secretary, who now was too much on his own.<sup>54</sup> Furthermore, such a core

could help overcome the "meddling" and "amateurish" approach to social work and thinking by well-meaning but inept members. The criticism may have been correct, but the social aspect was "an essential part" of the FOR's work "so long as we do not think we are likely to get the whole answer."<sup>55</sup>

Hodgkin summarized the Selly Oak results aboard the s.s. Aquitania to the U.S.A. In a lengthy letter to Bartlett he acknowledged that the FOR still had a special task but recognized quite a number of weaknesses. His eight "needs", summarized below are both an acute analysis of the FOR in the 1920's and a master plan for the 1930's:

1. The FOR needed a clearer definition of the exact aims for the post-war world.
2. The FOR needed a greater degree of unity of purpose so that the members could experience spiritual fellowship.<sup>56</sup>
3. The FOR needed an organization commensurate with its activities. This could possibly mean decentralization.
4. The FOR should renew services to isolated members. In the early days such services may have been the FOR's greatest contribution.
5. The FOR should stimulate the Christ and Peace Campaign even more.
6. The FOR should initiate more appointments to commissions like Tavistock's to the Commission on Property.<sup>57</sup>
7. The FOR needed a new Quarterly implementing a "fearless application of Christian principles to the world of life" with J. R. Coates as editor.
8. The FOR should display a greater enthusiasm for the work of the IFOR.<sup>58</sup>

There is scant evidence that these suggestions were implemented, but three comments may shed further light on his analysis and proposals. In chapter 11 it will be seen that there was external opposition to the FOR's involvement in the Christ and Peace Campaign. Secondly, in the autumn of 1929 Porteous resigned as editor of Reconciliation, suggesting that it should be an organ of a wider campaign among the churches.<sup>59</sup>

Porteous' and Hodgkin's suggestions were not much at variance. Porteous' proposal was more tied to the Christ and Peace Campaign, while Hodgkin had more the "Christian Revolution Series" in mind. However, both were concerned with reaching church members. Ultimately Reconciliation remained and in the mid-thirties denominational peace societies distributed the magazine to their members. Thirdly, the IFOR was often regarded as quite a different body, even more so when Dryer resigned and the offices were moved to Vienna to be closer to the reconciliation work in central Europe.<sup>60</sup> There was a latent antagonism between members of the FOR and IFOR.<sup>61</sup>

So far in this chapter the pattern of decline in membership has been linked to the uncertainty about the function and the recurring calls for a dissolution of the FOR. There was, however, still another interacting, and probably secondary, factor, namely, the change in the FOR's personnel. The various changes may help understand why the FOR's attempts at reconstruction were not as successful as they might have been. Furthermore, the changes were at times indicators of disunity, decline and indecisiveness. Finally, the attitudes by and towards the personnel explain something of the loyalty to the ideas and ideals of the FOR.

Just before the war ended there was a re-organization in the FOR. The decision was made to elect an Executive Committee which would meet monthly and report to the bimonthly General Committee.<sup>62</sup> The first meeting of the new committee was held on November 19, 1918, with Richards as chairman.<sup>63</sup> With a few exceptions the chairman served for



only one year. Up to 1925 S. Beddow, I. Goss, J. Fraser, and F. Pope served in turn. Pope was willing to serve another year on the condition that a vice-chairman was appointed. Goss accepted the new position and a year later he became chairman. He stayed till late 1929 when the relative newcomer J. Binns, a Congregationalist minister, was appointed.<sup>64</sup> The chairman of the Executive Committee was, however, not the chairman of the FOR. Up to his departure for Shanghai in October 1920, Hodgkin remained chairman,<sup>65</sup> when he was replaced by Arthur S. Rashleigh, a Cornish minister.<sup>66</sup> Although Rashleigh was present at Cambridge and soon involved in FOR committees, he must be regarded as the least known of the chairmen. Even committee minutes rarely mentioned him, and after he was replaced by Walter Ayles in 1923 he disappeared from the FOR scene. Under his leadership—or lack of it—the FOR started to experience serious difficulties. There were clashes between staff and leading committee members. For example, Dryer asked Fraser in 1920 to become chairman of the Council because Ayles "wouldn't do", but Ayles was nevertheless elected.<sup>67</sup> In 1922 Davies wrote to Hodgkin that the FOR needed him back very badly.<sup>68</sup> Earlier in that year Dryer confided to Hodgkin that he was not happy about his combined FOR-IFOR position because much work was left undone; there had been and were clashes with Ayles and Paul Gliddon, a General Committee member between 1918 and 1921.<sup>69</sup> Dryer clearly indicated that there was a problem of leadership.<sup>70</sup> In 1923 Foley complained to Davies that Dryer used his influence unfairly. His argument was corroborated by Stevenson and Goss who wrote that Dryer viewed himself as the master and distrusted his

colleagues' decisions. The result was an atmosphere of fear in the office.<sup>71</sup> During this difficult period Porteous decided to return to the ministry and remain only as a part-time Servant. Essentially this meant that he stayed on as editor of News Sheet.<sup>72</sup> Shortly before Porteous left, a curious FOR election incident took place. Two clergymen had been proposed as chairman and vice-chairman. There were some strong objections to this and it was decided that one should be a layman. The outcome was that Ayles was elected chairman and Richards vice-chairman.<sup>73</sup>

It is against this background that Dryer's acceptance to become full-time IFOR general secretary can best be understood.<sup>74</sup> As Stevenson wrote, Dryer was willing to take the burden of the IFOR without the backing of the FOR.<sup>75</sup> His decision meant a search for an FOR general secretary. The search turned out to be difficult. The new secretary had to be a good administrator, an inspiration to the staff and an innovative leader. Many candidates were considered but rejected; others who were thought capable declined, Hodgkin including. Somewhat in desperation the FOR finally appointed a "smaller man", Percy Bartlett, as interim secretary till September 1925. Then, without much further search, Bartlett was appointed as general secretary.<sup>76</sup> The lengthy search weakened even further the effectiveness of the FOR.

The search for a new secretary meant that much attention was given to the internal FOR affairs. Hence there were attempts to reorganize the office. A number of people, including staff members, made suggestions about the reorganization. Serious disagreements became

evident, further hampering the work of the FOR. For example, Cadoux thought that Foley was not suitable as assistant secretary. Goss complained about Glaisyer's lack of efficiency, while Glaisyer herself saw her role as "mothering". Ayles and Goss preferred immediate changes, while Dryer and Glaisyer favoured gradual changes.<sup>77</sup> The friction in the office not only showed that the FOR's teaching was very hard to put into practice, but also helps to explain why the FOR was ineffective in much of its reconstruction work. Furthermore, several staff members resigned, which probably contributed to the FOR's inadequate preparation for the well-known events leading up to the General Strike of 1926. Before 1924 was over Foley resigned as Servant.<sup>78</sup> Watkins continued as full-time financial secretary till July 1924 and part-time till January 1925 because the FOR could financially not sustain the present staff.<sup>79</sup> Nevertheless, at the end of 1924 Ayles was appointed Servant, provided that money could be found.<sup>80</sup> Indeed some private money was forthcoming and Ayles combined his FOR work for some time with that of the IFOR, ILP, and NMWM.<sup>81</sup> At almost the same time he resigned as chairman, apparently due to a minor as yet unknown incident.<sup>82</sup>

Ayles was replaced as chairman by Davies. Bartlett had hoped that Richards would be chairman, asking Cadoux to sound him out. When the result was negative Bartlett suggested that Cadoux stand.<sup>83</sup> However, Cadoux' answer had not been received at the time of the Summer Conference at which he could not be present. With many new General Committee members and Davies chairing the Council the majority felt that

Davies was the person who could reconcile the various parties.<sup>84</sup> The reason Davies accepted is worth noting because it has bearing on his resignation:

He felt that he would only be of use if the General Committee were a group meeting for prayer and corporate thought on the deeper side of the work and message of the Fellowship, the detailed business being entrusted more fully to the Executive.<sup>85</sup>

It was the 'group way' which made him accept the chairmanship, and when he resigned in 1927 he wrote Bartlett that the 'group way' and the 'group mind' had been absent. Davies felt a sense of being pushed or watched, "a sense of strain & estrangement of which one is so conscious in the Fellowship in these days." He felt that he was wasting his time on secondary issues. The Executive he compared to a Board of Directors which was given to a "careful and suspicious limitation of spheres."<sup>86</sup> To Cadoux, Davies simply wrote that for several reasons he could not accept the chairmanship for 1928, asking him at the same time to stand for the nomination. Davies felt that Cadoux had the necessary qualifications: "a clarity of mind & a continuity of experience & warm sympathy for the Fellowship's work that no one else on the Committee has, besides [a] gift for business & expression."<sup>87</sup> Cadoux accepted the challenge and during his tenure several important changes in the life of the FOR took place.<sup>88</sup>

Davies' letter to Bartlett mentioned two important internal weaknesses. He reproached himself for not spending more time with staff members. Thus he was unable to provide the necessary spiritual unity. The second weakness was Bartlett. In one revealing sentence Davies

sketched the general secretary's share: "Your very efficiency in the externals, your busyness--with as little time for tiresome persons--and your 'justification by works' may tend to alienate the very persons who form the Committee you are so zealous to serve."<sup>89</sup> Davies' words sum up much of the FOR's internal disharmony for the 1920's. Together with the financially unstable situation, the decline in membership and the division on the function of the FOR one is left with a seemingly negative picture. Admittedly, such a conclusion is too one-sided and misleading. As the next chapters make clear, it needs to be modified. However, the modifications do not invalidate the idea that internal difficulties seriously hampered the implementation of the FOR's reconstruction program and made the desire that the FOR would become an order increasingly stronger.

## CHAPTER 7 - ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>HTH Box 1 file 21, 6-12-1924. For the 1920s, see Johnson, Land; Keith Middlemas, Politics in Industrial Society, London: André Deutsch, 1979; Maurice Cowling, The Impact of Labour 1920-1924, Cambridge: University Press. 1971.

<sup>2</sup>News Sheet, Feb. 1919, p. 1. The conference was held Dec. 30 - Jan. 2. In a different way and for different purposes John Maynard Keynes in The Economic Consequence of the Peace, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920) showed that there was substance to the FOR's analysis.

<sup>3</sup>News Sheet, Feb. 1919, p. 1.

<sup>4</sup>RR Box 2 file 41, 10-2-1919. See also News Sheet, Feb. 1919, p. 1: "On almost everything on which men could differ, we differed, and our differences were bluntly and forcibly expressed," and p. 3 "Not peaceable albeit pacifists. Only the bitter restraint of our one dogma kept us from rending one another."

<sup>5</sup>HTH Box 1 file 14; 5-1-1919, letter Bertha M. Skeat.

<sup>6</sup>HTH Box 1 file 19; 24-2-1919, a letter to Dryer.

<sup>7</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 2-6-1919. The committee listed seven reasons: 1. no longer in sympathy; 2. wish more definite political action; 3. hold views akin to Plymouth Brethern; 4. theosophist; 5. no reason given; 6. already in similar organizations; 7. lack of time to attend meetings.

<sup>8</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 8-7-1919; GD. 485-51, p. 2.

<sup>9</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 8-7-1919. For the re-enrolment the subscription to "The Basis" was suggested.

<sup>10</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 10-11-1919.

<sup>11</sup>The Propaganda, Political and Business Sub-Committees left no minutes after 1918; the Literature and Conscription Committees did not meet after 1919, the Social Service and International Committees continued till 1921, the Commune Committee met till 1922 and the Education Committee struggled on till 1924.

<sup>12</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 10-11-1919.

<sup>13</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 13-7-1920. The News Sheet of July 1920, p. 3, gives 7116 members and 950 sympathizers. FOR 456; 1/3; 25-7-1921.

<sup>14</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 25-7-1921 and 7-11-1921. Royden actually wished to resign. In the minutes of 2-3-1922 it is stated that she thought the FOR to be too exclusive in methods and urging too strongly a purely pacifist position. She may have started to change her views as early as 1917.

<sup>15</sup>Half of this number was due to change of address.

<sup>16</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 2-3-1922.

<sup>17</sup>CJC Box 10; 12-11-1919.

<sup>18</sup>FOR 456; 2/2; 8-9-1924; Gilbert Porteous wrote Hodgkin that the FOR had difficulties finding secretaries (HTH Box 1 file 21; 12-3-1925).

<sup>19</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 7, p. 120 and no. 10, p. 177. The Scottish branch had never been large and strong.

<sup>20</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 7-11-1921. See also News Sheet, Apr. 1921, p. 1 and Jan. 1922, p. 2; and GD 485-50, Lilian Stevenson, p. 1.

<sup>21</sup>Muriel Lester, Kill or Cure?, Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1937, p. 87. For a different account of the start of the NMWM see Ceadel, Pacifism, p. 72. From the declaration of membership it is apparent that the NMWM was a single issue organization: "War is a crime against humanity." The headquarters were at Doughty Street, London. Probably the NMWM rather than the LNU drew off most FOR members.

<sup>22</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 21 and 22-12-1922, Appendix I.

<sup>23</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 17-9-1923.

<sup>24</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 21 and 22-12-1922, Appendix V.

<sup>25</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 2, Feb. 1925, p.23.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p.26.

<sup>27</sup>According to Richards, no publication had the "bite and snap" since Roberts left. He thought that Reconciliation was an example of how it should not be run; its matter and contents were "stodgy and unattractive in the extreme." GD 485-12; 15-2-1927.

<sup>28</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 10-2-1919. FOR 456, 1/2; 10-2-1919; CJC Box 10; 17-9-1919. RR Box 2 file 41, 10-2-1919, letter by Orchard. Roberts accepted Orchard's invitation to preach at King's Weigh House. Although

Roberts remained in Canada--he became a minister of the Sherbourne United Church, Toronto in 1927--his books were still regularly reviewed in Reconciliation. For his influence in Canada see Thomas Paul Socknat, "'Witness Against War': Pacifism in Canada, 1900-1945," Ph.D., McMaster University; 1981, esp. pp. 199-202, 254, 261, 266, 277, 291-292.

<sup>29</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 13-9-1920; News Sheet, Oct. 1920, p. 7.

<sup>30</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 25-7-1921 and 5-9-1921; 2/1; 3-3-1922.

<sup>31</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 25 and 26-6-1923, Appendix IV.

<sup>32</sup>HTH Box 2 file 20, 23-12-1920, letter by Dryer. In 1927 there was a mission to unemployed dockworkers in which Raven was involved Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 11, Nov. 1927, p. 201.

<sup>33</sup>CJC Box 12; 18-5-1923, letter by Coltman. Probably Frank Hancock was caravanning here around this time--see GD 1150.

<sup>34</sup>For the 'Cornish Scheme' see ch. 10.

<sup>35</sup>News Sheet, June 1923, p. 4. See also April 1923, pp. 1-2 and FOR 456; 1/3; 26-3-1923. Some mission work was done outside Britain. Richards went to Norway in the spring of 1921 and Davies visited Scandinavia early 1923. News Sheet, May 1921 and March 1923.

<sup>36</sup>CJC Box 11; 21-4-1922, letter by Foley.

<sup>37</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no 12, Dec. 24, p. 220; CJC Box 13; 22-11-1925 or 21-1-1925 for the Bury branch and Box 16; 29-7-1927 for the Ilkey branch.

<sup>38</sup>The branch held a special youth conference in 1926. Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 3, March 1927, p. 46.

<sup>39</sup>See e.g. HTH Box 1 file 24; 12-3-1925, letter by Porteous. For COPEC see W. Reason, ed., The Proceedings of C.O.P.E.C., London: Longmans, Green, 1924.

<sup>40</sup>Ceadel, Pacifism, p. 67, regards the statement that "all war is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ" as a pacifist declaration. Ceadel should have taken some other statements to prove his point. See next chapter.

<sup>41</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 2, Feb. 1925, p. 37 and no. 9, Sept. 1925, p. 168.

<sup>42</sup>FOR 456; 2/2; 3-8-1927.

<sup>43</sup>FOR 456; 1/5; 30-7-1928 and 2/2; 31-7-1928. It has been as



high as 7657, but by April 1929 it had been reduced even further to 2974 members and 311 sympathizers. (FOR 456; 1/5; 15-4-1929).

<sup>44</sup>GD 485-42; 25-5-1927. This is a copy of a letter Stevenson sent to Richards.

<sup>45</sup>CJC Box 14; 18-1-1926.

<sup>46</sup>GD 1147; 10-2-1929. He did not stay for the whole conference. For those present, see GD 1180.

<sup>47</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 5, May 1929, p. 92.

<sup>48</sup>The term is Davies'; see GD 485-37.

<sup>49</sup>GD 485-50.

<sup>50</sup>She used two other descriptions as connoting essentially the same idea: a world-wide Christian religious Order and a Christian Endeavour Society. She thought that the FOR was already primarily an Order (GD 485-36 and 50).

<sup>51</sup>GD 485-50, p. 11. To a large extent the Servants of the FOR had fulfilled that role, but only Gilbert Porteous still remained and he left early 1930 to be a full-time Presbyterian minister at Nottingham. Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 1, Jan. 1930, p. 10.

<sup>52</sup>Sault had written to Davies that the "Back to the Land policy [was] the solution of the slum, health and education problems." GD 1723; 3-3-1924.

<sup>53</sup>GD 485-50, p. 12. Capitals in original.

<sup>54</sup>Although Stevenson did not say so, the core could only come from the well-to-do like herself. GD 485-50, p. 5; FOR 456; 1/5; 20-2-1928 and 21-1-1929. Glaisyer thought similarly about the position of the general secretary.

<sup>55</sup>GD 485-50, p. 1.

<sup>56</sup>According to Davies, the Selly Oak gathering was a "happy experience of friendliness and unity." GD 485-37.

<sup>57</sup>Compare Glaisyer GD 485-50.

<sup>58</sup>GD 485-38, pp. 1-7; 4-2-1930. Point 8 was a special concern of Lilian Stevenson, see GD 485-50, p. 5. The eight points are not direct quotations, although the wording is largely Hodgkin's.

<sup>59</sup>FOR 456; 3/3; 16-10-1929.

<sup>60</sup>Perhaps resigned is not the correct word for Dryer's leaving. The official reason was health, and indeed in 1926 he had been on a leave of absence for several months due to ill health (FOR 456; 3/2; 14-10-1926). However, the unofficial reason was probably quite different. Early in 1928 (perhaps late 1927) Dryer made statements on sexuality which were contrary to the ideas of the FOR. The leaders felt that his disclosures "better be confined to a small circle in the hope that they may never be publicly known." Since the FOR held to a Christian standard of sexual purity it was felt that Dryer should be dismissed. Possibly Dryer was involved in extra-marital affairs. Furthermore, the latent antagonism between the IFOR and the FOR made Dryer's position even more difficult. Although there were strong pressures for immediated dismissal, there were several members who put the person before principle and tried to counsel him. He requested, and was granted by Council, a year leave of absence with a possibility to return. A few days later, however, he decided to resign after all. A more exact reason of resignation may well have been spiritual health. Much of this information comes from a special file in Cadoux' papers, CJC Box 17; 15-1-1928. Goss and Bartlett were most strident; both were more concerned about the principle than about the person. Halliday spoke about "brothels" at FOR conferences. Stevenson wrote about "sin and wrong doing" and "personal moral tragedy."

<sup>61</sup>The reasons are not clear but likely there were personality clashes and differences of opinion as to the philosophic direction of the IFOR.

<sup>62</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 4-11-1918.

<sup>63</sup>FOR 456; 3/1; 19-11-1918.

<sup>64</sup>FOR 456; 3/1; 20-1-1920 and 8-2-1921 and 23-5-1922; 3/2; 3-11-1924, and 8-12-1925 and 14-10-1926; 3/3; 20-11-1929.

<sup>65</sup>News Sheet, Oct. 1920, p. 1, for his farewell.

<sup>66</sup>FOR 456; 2/1; 20-11-1920.

<sup>67</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 13-9-1920 and HTH Box 2 file 20, 23-12-1920, letter by Dryer. Up to 1921 the Council met twice a year but then the Autumn Council was discontinued. FOR 456; 2/1; 1-8-1921.

<sup>68</sup>HTH Box 1 file 18, 20-6-1922. The comment is all the more interesting since Davies had described Hodgkin in not so flattering terms in a letter to Roberts, RR Box 2 file 41; 13-12-1920. Davies used such words as "Hodgkin's guiltine" and "The Prussian has melted."

<sup>69</sup>Gliddon played later a prominent role in the APF. In late 1921 he was replaced by Percy Bartlett.

<sup>70</sup>HTH Box 5 file 53; 16-3-1922; file 54; 9-1-1922. FOR 456; 1/3; 7-11-1921. Bartlett started working on Russian relief (FOR 456; 3/1; 27-11-1922).

<sup>71</sup>CJC Box 12; 28-4-1924; GD 1003; 1099; 1755. Goss had a low opinion about Dryer as secretary which may have played a role in Dryer's resignation in 1928.

<sup>72</sup>In July 1919 Laurence Hogg became editor, replacing A. Knott. (FOR 456; 1/3; 8-9-1919). When Hogg left for India, Porteous replaced him in April 1921.

<sup>73</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 25-6-1923; News Sheet, Sept. 1923, p. 14.

<sup>74</sup>Per March 1924.

<sup>75</sup>GD 1756. Ayles and Goss opposed Dryer as FOR secretary but not as IFOR secretary.

<sup>76</sup>According to Goss, the new secretary had to be a good administrator because presently there was a lack of control and loyalty in the office (GD 1756). Since Porteous was not an administrator he was rejected by the search committee consisting of Ayles, Cadoux, Dryer, Fraser, Goss, Richards and Stevenson. The committee members considered Davies but felt that this work would inhibit his prophetic spirit (GD 1756; CJC Box 12; 28-4-1924). Goss thought that if Davies were to become general secretary, the FOR needed a good office secretary which he thought Margaret Glaisyer was not. Foley and Sorensen were dismissed as too one-sided. At the first committee meeting S. Mellor, S. Beddow, and H. Morgan were regarded as the best possible candidates with C. Coltman, F. Finchman, H. A. Mess, P. W. Bartlett, C. H. Watkins and R. J. Barker as the smaller men. (GD 1756). The top three candidates declined: Mellor had financial objections; Beddow could not leave Leicester; Morgan did not answer (CJC Box 12; 20-12-1923). A. W. Bonsey, recommended by Richards, was interviewed on Jan. 24, 1924. In February Dryer was asked to invite Hodgkin to become secretary on his return from China. The suggestion to ask Hodgkin may have come from Stevenson (see CJC Box 12; 6-2-1924). The first communication gave some reason for optimism, but in July Reconciliation (Vol. 1 no. 7, p. 117) told the members that Hodgkin, after careful deliberation, had declined (see also Wood, Hodgkin, p. 209). Davies, who was supposed to act as interim secretary, was unable to do so due to illness (CJC Box 12; minute of Sub-committee, 15-4-1924; also 12-4-1924 and 14-5-1924 and Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 7, July 1924, p. 117). Ayles opposed Davies on grounds of incompatibility (CJC Box 12; 3-5-1924).

<sup>77</sup>It is clear that the staff was uncertain about the division of labour. Foley therefore asked for a clearer definition and function of the staff's work. Dr. Watkins thought it best to carry on without staff changes. Muriel Lester urged using Sorensen. In the whole process

Glaisyer felt she was being squeezed out. She preferred to develop right personal relationships, while Goss thought in terms of office efficiency (CJC Box 12; 15-4-1924 and 23-4-1924). Glaisyer stayed till 1928 as assistant to the general secretary. She resigned her position to start work with delinquents (Reconciliation, Vol. 5 no. 12, Dec. 1928, p. 237; FOR 456; 1/5; 30-7-1928). Goss was probably correct in thinking that she was not so efficient, for in 1927 there were frictions between her and Bartlett which related to office efficiency. (GD 485-35 and 36). Already in 1924 Stevenson had confided to Cadoux that Glaisyer probably was not so efficient. But she had other good qualities to be assistant (CJC Box 12; 26-1-1924; also 17-4-1924 for a long letter by Glaisyer and 28-4-1924 for one by Goss). From the existing correspondence it is clear that Cadoux functioned as a mediator between Glaisyer and Goss who seemed to have missed each other's point.

<sup>78</sup>FOR 456; 3/2; 3-11-1924; Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 1, Jan. 1925, p. 11. He resigned per Dec. 31, 1924.

<sup>79</sup>FOR 456; 3/1; 31-7-1923 and CJC Box 12; 15-4-1924. The declining membership interest was very noticeable in the financial areas, especially since a large number of Friends had withdrawn their support (FOR 456; 3/1; 30-4-1920).

<sup>80</sup>The FOR was already £300 short. CJC Box 12; 3-12-1924.

<sup>81</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 2, Feb. 1925; p. 37.

<sup>82</sup>For this period there are no General Committee meeting minutes and other minutes make no mention of the incident. Dryer wrote Cadoux (CJC Box 13; 6-1-1925): "on top of a little incident at Committee." He did not say what the incident was, or what the deciding motive was.

<sup>83</sup>CJC Box 15; 30-6-1926 and 27-8-1926.

<sup>84</sup>HTH Box 1 file 21; 12-3-1925, letter by Porteous. He thought that Davies appealed to all sections.

<sup>85</sup>FOR 456; 2/2; 30-9-1926.

<sup>86</sup>Apparently many leading and influential members felt like resigning. Davies suggested that Skinner, Oman and Halliday "were only hanging on by the skin of their teeth." GD 485-35; 11-8-1927.

<sup>87</sup>CJC Box 16, 9-7-1927.

<sup>88</sup>FOR 456; 1/5; 24-10-1927. With this event the minutes of the General Committee start again. For the events of Cadoux' tenure see especially ch. 11.

<sup>89</sup>GD 485-35; 11-8-1927.

## CHAPTER 8

### THE FOR AND RECONSTRUCTION: THE RELIGIOUS THEOLOGICAL ASPECTS

On January 2, 1919, the stormy conference at King's Weigh House adjourned. The conferees took with them the outline for an extensive program for the next decade. The program mentioned three ways of religious reconstruction, namely, prayer, ecumenicity and the reinterpretation of Jesus to the present.<sup>1</sup> For the FOR, true reconstruction could only come about with a change in the basic nature of society. To achieve this change, first the churches needed to be changed. Hence, the FOR directed much of its attention to the churches. This primary task set the FOR apart from other attempts at reconstruction. With such an ambitious program, how much was achieved and how did the religious reconstruction attempt reflect the changing nature of the FOR?

The FOR's "metanoia", the revolution of the mind, started with prayer. Meetings started with prayer and the office staff regularly met for prayer. The News Sheet carried a column called "The House of Prayer", while a leaflet called "Intercession Paper" was published quarterly in the early part of the decade.<sup>2</sup> The intercessions themselves give some insight into the reconstruction work of the FOR. There were, for example, prayer requests for the Cornish Scheme and Fairby Grange, for the Hospitality Committee and the Howard League for

Penal Reform, for the work of the IFOR and the miners in the Rhondda Valleys, for the London open air work which needed more speakers and the Servants of the FOR who travelled much of the country. Theologically speaking, there were no new insights, only the content of the prayers was new.<sup>3</sup> Although these new prayers set the tone and direction of the FOR's reconstruction work, there is no evidence that they directly influenced the churches. Significantly, the publication of the intercession leaflets seem to have been confined to the early period of the 1920s.

The second way to achieve a religious reconstruction, according to the King's Weigh House program, was through ecumenicity. Point 3 of "the Basis" spoke about the "Church Universal", but what did that mean in the 1920s? Internationally, the FOR/IFOR indeed became a small link in the chain which led ultimately to the World Council of Churches.<sup>4</sup> Nationally, there was more division than at first glance was apparent. Cadoux' article "The Crux of the Problem of Christian Re-Union", published in The Venturer of August 1920, may be used to indicate the division. According to Cadoux, the Church was the sum total of all who made public profession of faith in Christ and who desired fellowship with their fellow-believers.<sup>5</sup> This sociological definition of the Church was based on his prior question "Who is my fellow-Christian?". If agreement was reached on this question, one would have a true definition of the Church and a proper start to reunion.<sup>6</sup> Cadoux' definition made the Church essentially a voluntary society, something more orthodox theologians have always denied. Cadoux' solution was,

therefore, not acceptable to all. Moreover, Cadoux saw no possibility of union with the Roman Catholic Church which he felt entirely lacked freedom.<sup>7</sup> For most FOR members the keyword was cooperation rather than reunion. Even though many members were involved in COPEC, SCM and the Auxiliary Movement, there can be little doubt that the heavy emphasis which the founding members put on this topic disappeared.<sup>8</sup> From being an integral part of the FOR message, ecumenicalism became much more an incidental aspect.

The third approach to reconstruct the Church and thus society, was through a reinterpretation of Jesus to the present. The most daring literary venture came with the publication of the "Christian Revolution Series" by the Headley/Swarthmore Press. Although the series had no official connection with the FOR, the attempt was made to reflect the FOR message. The series opened with Hodgkin's Lay Religion in 1918 and closed in 1923 with his The Christian Revolution, the seventeenth volume.<sup>9</sup> When the series was first advertised ten books were included. However, Lansbury's These Things Shall Be never appeared in the series, though printed in 1920 by Swarthmore Press. Probably Micklem, the series editor, thought that the book was not on a high enough intellectual level. With the exception of Robson's The Way to Personality all volumes were new. The leaflet announcing the series stated that "these books are written under the persuasion that only a religious solution is adequate to the world's need." It is this series which provided the framework for the FOR's reconstruction. The range of the series was wide because religion claimed "every sphere of life as

her own."<sup>10</sup> Thus the authors covered such disparate areas as New Testament studies, theology, early Christian pacifism, justice, biology, the state and architecture. The series' unity was not found in pacifism but in religion. The series was thus not just a means of educating the public, but a challenge to the Church, a reinterpretation of faith, and a grappling, from a religious perspective, with the socio-economic problems. In short, the series expounded the Kingdom of God, the real framework of "reconstruction".

Within the series there were two books which used the historical approach to show that pacifism was the norm for the early Christians and that a segment of the Church had never ignored this teaching. The books were essentially a call to the Church to return to its early principle. But these pioneering volumes showed in different ways the limitations of this approach. The more important volume was Cadoux' The Early Christian Attitude to War, which appeared in 1919. In it, as well in his 1925 book The Early Church and the World, he tried to establish why the early Christians were initially pacifists. Crucial in Cadoux' argument was the observation that many early Christians were Jews, slaves and women who were not eligible for military service. That explained, according to Cadoux, why the New Testament or the Early Fathers said so little about war or pacifism. Jesus himself gave no explicit teaching on the subject of war. There was only cumulative evidence culled from the Sermon on the Mount, the temptation stories, the disapproval of gentile authority (Mk. 10:42 - 45), the attitude to the function of judging, and some incidental utterances.<sup>11</sup> During the



war numerous clergymen had argued that various statements and actions of Jesus legitimized warfare for Christians. Cadoux reviewed the texts and concluded that within a proper context these texts did not approve war at all.<sup>12</sup> The same methodology he used for the rest of the N.T.<sup>13</sup> Early Christian Fathers made unfavourable criticisms on the soldiers' character. Not until A.D. 174 could he find some evidence of Christians participating in the army.<sup>14</sup> For Cadoux, as for most pacifists, the Church reversed its position after the Edict of Milan of 313 when it made a compact with governmental powers.<sup>15</sup>

Perhaps the best part of the book was the discussion on the forms of early Christian acceptance of war. Christian non-pacifists have used the same or similar arguments to justify the Christian's participation in war. Cadoux' observations have thus a much more general application. Early Christians used war as an analogy to the Christian life. The apostle Paul frequently used military terms and phrases to illustrate the religious life. Early Christians were familiar with the wars in the O.T., with apocalyptic wars, with the Jewish War of 67 - 71, and with war as an instrument of divine justice. However, for these early Christians warfare was a spiritual struggle, not a violent activity. Later on the analogy became an actuality.<sup>16</sup> The change in exegesis, still noticeable today, was a gradual process which led the Church, misguidedly, to abandon its earlier vigorous principles.<sup>17</sup> The book's conclusions could, therefore, be interpreted as showing a way to the desired change of the Church. In the first place, Cadoux noted a dualism among the early Christians: whatever was

in Scripture was not necessarily practised by them. For example, the Hebrew wars were used as analogy but were kept separate from the principles of daily life. As a consequence, Cadoux advocated a differentiation in what was sanctioned for Christians and non-Christian. In turn, this idea helped him to find relative approval for the state,<sup>18</sup> but he failed to realize that the differentiation created a moral dualism among people. Secondly, Cadoux insisted on accepting the gentleness of Jesus and non-resistance in the literal sense, while rejecting much that others accepted as literal.<sup>19</sup> Cadoux provided no careful defence why these aspects should be taken literally and not the others. It was a weakness, if not a logical inconsistency, from which not only Cadoux but many other FOR members suffered.<sup>20</sup> Such a weakness was certainly not conducive to drawing the churches back to their early principle.

The second volume was Rufus M. Jones' The Remnant, published in 1920. Theologically, the remnant has the connotation of the elect, those who have been divinely preserved while the rest has gone astray. At the same time the remnant is a sign of hope because the small group contains the seed of ultimate victory. Against this theological background Jones' book must be placed. Jones started his survey, surprisingly enough, with Plato's idea of remnant in order to formulate his hope for a better future world. He saw the remnant as having a true vision, with clear insight in the underlying principles of life and action, and a venturing faith.<sup>21</sup> Jones' definition was essentially humanistic and far removed from a revolutionary Christian understanding,

even though he later stated that the remnant stood for a spiritual, ethical religion.<sup>22</sup> Interestingly enough, he did not regard all remnants as good. According to Jones, history held the answer, that is, hindsight settled if a remnant was good or not. A rather shaky basis to prove that pacifism is right!

From Plato, Jones moved to Isaiah, attempting to show that revelation was progressive and marked by advancing stages.<sup>23</sup> At the heart of Is. 3:16 - 26 was a moral horror of war and this notion was to be spread by the remnant until war was completely eliminated. His next stage was the N.T., arguing that the Church became the true Israel.<sup>24</sup> It is not clear how Jones' progressive idea can be reconciled with Cadoux' argument that the early Church was initially pacifist but then failed to abide by its principles. Jones simply ignored this problem. Hardly convincing to the mainline churches, Jones traced his remnant in the fringe groups, from the Montanists to the Quakers.<sup>25</sup> In reviewing the various groups, Jones never showed a progressive revelation marked by advancing stages. Rather, his review showed that the small flame of pacifism was never snuffed out. More importantly, the remnant idea contains the suggestion of smallness and Jones never bothered to show how the remnant would become majority. Again, this would hardly be convincing to mainline churches. Finally, Jones, like Wilson before, stopped with the Quakers as if they were the culmination point. However, the FOR was non-denominational and its pacifism was integrated into a holistic world and life view. Jones' book put pacifism, and the FOR, in a historical context and lineage but failed to show why the

Church should return to its first love. In other words, the historical approach was hardly convincing to the magisterial churches to return to the pre-Constantinian positions.

After the "Christian Revolution Series", leading FOR members published relatively few books during the remainder of the decade. Little was written about the vision. More and more pamphlets and articles dealt with pacifism. When at the end of the decade Leyton Richards published The Christian's Alternative to War,<sup>26</sup> the FOR closed a phase which at the same time ushered in a new one. Much that was written about pacifism was repetitive, but gradually some new elements began to appear while some earlier emphases diminished. The new understandings were both a correction to some earlier FOR weaknesses and a reaction to Karl Barth's stress on the transcendence of God. In Britain, Barth's books were generally only indirectly known through reviews and debates in the religious press. His influence on Free Church theology, including the FOR's, came only in the second half of the decade. In addition, the new ideas were a challenge to leading non-pacifist theologians to produce a more accurate exegesis. Such a new exegesis, the FOR hoped, would encourage the churches to take a firm stand against war. As will be suggested in this chapter, there was a measure of success in this approach.

Probably the most prolific FOR author during the 1920s was Cadoux, a representative of the evangelical-modernist school. In his pamphlet An Appeal to the People of the Christian Church (1919) he called all Christians to think about the question of war afresh.

According to Cadoux, the core truth in Jesus was the "reconciliation of man to God, the conquest of sin in the life of the individual man...by the revelation to him...of God as a holy and loving Father. ...The primary aim of the Christian life...[was] to create Christlike persons."<sup>27</sup> The Christian method had to be consistent with that aim, and this meant overcoming evil with good. In contrast, war's primary aim was not "to win the wrong doer into the way of right, but at all cost to prevent him doing wrong."<sup>28</sup> Hence, the FOR condemned the Franco-Belgian invasion of the Ruhr in January 1923 as not commensurate with Christian ideals.<sup>29</sup>

Hayman and Wilson went a step further than Cadoux when in 1924, at a time when prime minister Ramsay MacDonald was working at constructive appeasement,<sup>30</sup> they wrote on "The Pacifism of God". Hayman wrote that the basis of pacifism was the perfect life of Jesus, "the express image of the Godhead in bodily form, the complete expression of Divinity."<sup>31</sup> By using the life of Jesus, Hayman made pacifism a divine principle of action instead of merely a theory. And action drew pacifists into the realm of ethics. Hayman saw the pacifism of God as a result of recent Christian thinking with the corollary that the division between the moral standards of God and man had gone because in Christ man was called to be perfect.<sup>32</sup> Just as God acted mercifully, so should man. The strong emphasis on the atonement, so prevalent during the war, has been modified significantly.

Wilson focused his attention on the problem of evil, especially on the spiritual consequences. It could be thought that evil actions

had bad spiritual results on the evil-doer. These results could then be interpreted as a sign of divine punishment. Wilson rejected this interpretation without denying that God intervened in human history. He saw the results as a consequence of the action. Sin itself destroyed mankind.<sup>33</sup> In this way Wilson reformulated the idea of the wrath of God: God allowed sin to work itself out. War was, therefore, not a sign of divine punishment, as so many Christians held, but a result of man's evil actions.

Already in An Appeal Cadoux had dealt with God's wrath, and one point is relevant here. For the sake of argument Cadoux assumed momentarily that God coerced and punished. Then he asked if from this assumption the conclusion could be drawn that human beings should imitate God in the use of violence. Cadoux argued that, since God was not man's brother but Father, He had prerogatives man did not have, one of them being divine chastisement.<sup>34</sup> Hence the conclusion was incorrect, and the argument from God's wrath turned out to be irrelevant. Essentially Cadoux pointed out that Christian non-pacifists had misused an analogy. This was also the case with the homily of the "disciplining of children". Just as a father disciplined a naughty child, so could one nation punish an "iniquitous foreign power". Cadoux did not challenge some moderate corporal punishment. However, he thought the analogy invalid because children were on a different footing from fellow adults. Moreover, parental discipline aimed at the good of the child and not at destruction.<sup>35</sup> Ultimately, Cadoux, Hayman and Wilson challenged the Church to be committed to more accurate exegesis. Although none of the

major churches accepted the FOR's position on pacifism, they have since the early 1920s repeatedly stated that war was contrary to the spirit and teaching of Christ.

While the churches moved closer to the FOR on pacifism, many in the FOR moved closer to a more traditional view of transcendence. Before the war, theologians had often thought about God in an impersonal way and had overemphasized the relationship between man and the universe.<sup>36</sup> The latter had been a basic concept in immanent theology. Many FOR members still used this view. For example, Lansbury still spoke of the "'Immanence' we call God",<sup>37</sup> and E. E. Unwin spoke of a spiritual environment as God.<sup>38</sup> This basic view came now under attack, for, according to Roberts, the "logic of immanentism ends in the moral paralysis of Pantheism."<sup>39</sup> This did not mean, however, a rejection of immanentism.

How successful were these various FOR reinterpretations of Jesus for the present? There is some evidence that the churches were more receptive to the FOR's message. Two events should be mentioned here, namely COPEC in 1924 and the "Christ and Peace Campaign" of 1929 - 1931. The latter will be discussed in chapter 11. COPEC, the Conference on Politics, Economics and Citizenship, was the churches' response to the problems of society. The discussions ranged from the home to international relations, from leisure to crime. In other words, COPEC applied Christianity to the whole of life.<sup>40</sup> The conference, held in Birmingham on April 5 - 12, 1924, had Lucy Gardner and Charles Raven as secretaries, William Temple as president and Hugh Martin as chairman.

COPEC asked the FOR for five representatives in addition to Dryer and Davies.<sup>41</sup> Ayles, Dodd, Richards, Walke and Porteous were the official FOR delegates. Other FOR members, such as Cadoux, Micklem, Fraser, Morgan, Wilson, Yeaxlee, Phillips, Belden and the Marquis of Tavistock, and future FOR members, such as Carter and Gray, attended COPEC as delegates from other organizations.<sup>42</sup> Section VII dealt with the topic "Christianity and War". Both pacifists and non-pacifists condemned war as contrary to Christian ethics. The point of debate was really whether pacifism could be applied immediately. Although the debate remained inconclusive - the non-pacifists favoured a "just war" position<sup>43</sup> - the recommendations were far removed from the position the churches had held during the war. This suggests that the FOR's message had some measure of effect: all war was contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus. Furthermore, the churches were called upon to use their influence against war-provoking policies; to refuse to support war which had not been submitted to arbitration;<sup>44</sup> and to hold these principles in time of war and when war was imminent.<sup>45</sup> Although COPEC's final conclusions fell short of the FOR's expectations, they were a clear indication that the churches were moving away from their pre-war positions. The socio-economic interest shown by the churches, and shortly afterwards exemplified in the reconciliation attempts during the "coal crisis" of 1925 - 1926, allowed the FOR later to concentrate more and more on pacifism in a narrower sense.

The Nine Point Program of the King's Weigh House Conference asked for a reinterpretation of Jesus fitting the time. What has been



shown, however, is not one interpretation but a variety of interpretations. Clearly, the FOR was not a theologically homogeneous group in the 1920s. These differences had their influence on methodology and FOR statements. All agreed that pacifism was a biblical truth, but not all arrived at that truth in the same way or derived the same consequence from it. To mention one minor divergence, Cadoux became a vegetarian, while Corder Catchpool gave up his vegetarianism. There was general agreement that only through "metanoia", the revolution of the mind, the Kingdom of God could come. Yet, on the one hand the "immanentists" thought that they could usher in the Kingdom, which undoubtedly led to a more activist position. On the other hand, the "transcendentalists" saw the Kingdom more as a gift which led to a more mystic and possibly to a less politically activist position. The differences caused tensions among the FOR members and made it difficult for sympathizers to understand the message (one needed a good theological grasp) and for opponents not to confuse one approach with another. The differences undoubtedly contributed to the decline in FOR membership. But they also helped the FOR to be better prepared for the 1930s. The fact that the FOR survived, even though sometimes precariously, suggests that the positive aspects outweighed the negative ones. There was indeed unity in diversity.

Roberts saw the shifting emphasis more as a correction so that the transcendence of God could be accepted. Unlike the evolutionist theologians, including later on Raven, Roberts posited that Jesus in the Incarnation came down from on high, not up from the ranks. Moreover, he

thought that creation implied a transcendent God.<sup>46</sup> Like the apostle Paul, Roberts combined immanence and transcendence, but unlike Paul he felt it as a dualism.<sup>47</sup> The mention of Paul is intriguing. In 1924 Roberts wrote, "I have less and less patience, the more I live with Paul, with the idea that he threw a smoke screen over the lucid simplicity of Jesus."<sup>48</sup> Paul, according to Roberts, described an ultra-human quality in Jesus, a "supermanhood of a spiritual sort." In Jesus, manhood was joined to the deity and in Him God was starting a new race.<sup>49</sup> Moreover, Roberts saw this new man in the Gospel of John. It is not clear how familiar Roberts was with the actual work of Karl Barth, but he at least followed the new trend set by the Swiss theologian. The rediscovery of Paul, of transcendence and of the mysticism of John represented a break with the earlier FOR theology. Roberts could be regarded as a representative of the "mystical school" in the FOR which included among others Davies, Walke, Orchard and later MacLeod.<sup>50</sup>

The renewed stress on the transcendence of God had some consequences for the idea of the Kingdom of God. Instead of a steadily improving, reforming world brought about by man, the Kingdom was a revolution which Jesus brought into this world by giving "the world a new principle of life, a new scale of values, a new standard of judgement. He was not aiming at making a better world but a different kind of world."<sup>51</sup> The Kingdom, the "City of God", was a gift with consequences: it was to be "a Beloved Community" in which Roberts envisaged "men and women living together, doing great things together--

the great things of the Spirit."<sup>52</sup> The renewed stress on transcendence possibly contributed to the frequent calls for the FOR to become an order. What is certain is that the idea of transcendence became stronger during the second half of the decade, at a time when the FOR experienced its most serious decline and crisis.<sup>53</sup> These problems coincided with religious difficulties elsewhere. The Anglicans were involved in the Prayer Book debate.<sup>54</sup> Liberal protestants, such as early FOR members Russell Hoare and Stanley James, turned to Roman Catholicism where they hoped to find certainty and absolute ideas.<sup>55</sup> Congregationalists were troubled by sharply differing views on immanence and transcendence.<sup>56</sup> Politically the scene may have been relatively quiet under Baldwin, but the religious scene was in ferment. And the FOR was part of this ferment. More than during the war the religious issues now separated FOR members. For example, while Micklem and others gradually moved towards a more orthodox position, Cadoux stuck tenaciously to his liberal Evangelicalism. In such an atmosphere it was difficult to educate the churches. One could not expect much from those who had only recently started to grapple with the issues so powerfully enunciated by Karl Barth. Nor could one expect much from those who reiterated their older positions.

Yet, it should not be forgotten that for much of the decade the older position was dominant in the FOR. Representative of this position was again Cadoux. A summary of his views can therefore be used as representative of much of the FOR during the 1920s. The cross, according to Cadoux, convinced man of the Being and Goodness of God, of

sin and the consequent suffering of God, and induced man to repentance, pardon and moral vigour.<sup>57</sup> If there was no moral response, Jesus' death was of no benefit.<sup>58</sup> If there was a moral response, man showed the redemptive power of human self-sacrifice and goodness. For Cadoux, the uniqueness of Jesus was found in being the first and best, the pioneer, but his redeeming acts were no different in kind from those of his disciples.<sup>59</sup> In other words, Jesus was and is foremost an ethical figure: He accepted death because He believed that Love involved non-resistance.<sup>60</sup> The cross and non-resistance were therefore inseparable and essential to a full Christian ethic.<sup>61</sup> They were an expression of Jesus' submission to the will of God, and man, imitating Christ, would be willing to accept the will of God as the norm for human life.<sup>62</sup> Jesus, according to Cadoux, multiplied himself in the persons of his disciples and his disciples were to do similarly.<sup>63</sup>

Unfortunately, since Constantine, credal, political and liturgical rather than moral interests had become dominant, thus creating a confusion in ethics.<sup>64</sup> If the Kingdom of God, which was "definitely ethical in its character and demands",<sup>65</sup> was ever to be established, the Christian's task was to help and induce others to know and love God as Father and match the Kingdom's principles with the world's needs.<sup>66</sup>

Yet, Cadoux was not very clear on how these principles could be established. He rejected the Bible as the ultimate standard of faith and morals. Instead, he posited that the Bible contained Divine truth, for much of the Bible reflected human error, and much non-biblical literature contained divinely inspired and helpful passages.<sup>67</sup> The

danger of this position is that one can pick and choose whatever one likes. Cadoux chose love, gentleness, peace, generosity, truthfulness, humble service, prudence and a refusal to worry about wealth.<sup>68</sup> Cadoux' position on inspiration and authority opened the door to opponents of pacifism to posit other principles. Thus while firmly anchoring pacifism in the person and work of Jesus, Cadoux weakened his position through theologically unresolved problems. Ultimately, Cadoux did not base his arguments on Jesus but on the adequacy of reason, for "reason must decide".<sup>69</sup> Many FOR members never abandoned this rationalistic approach. As will be seen in part III, this approach was at the heart of Raven's understanding of pacifism.

While Cadoux' views changed little, Fearon Halliday, whose theological contributions have been discussed in chapter 4, attempted to incorporate new psychological ideas into his understanding of reconciliation. His theory is sometimes known as "Personalism", the thought that the significance of the Saviour was in what he was in his own soul and in the power to reconcile man to God.<sup>70</sup> According to Halliday, the atonement theory had only validity if it touched the individual. Thus there was a need to understand the nature of personality, both of God and man, for God was "not apprehended primarily in nature but in Personality",<sup>71</sup> and man's personality would only be evident in self-realization.<sup>72</sup> Sin was a psychological obstacle in the attainment of self-realization with Jesus as the perfect example showing how to overcome this psychological barrier through reconciling man's with God's personality.<sup>73</sup> This reconciliation ushered in the reign of

God in the individual and "without that, the Kingdom of God in the community could not exist."<sup>74</sup> This reconciliation made religion and life of one piece, for "religion must affect life by altering character and transforming and renewing thereby the social relationships that depend upon it."<sup>75</sup> It was the task of the Christian to proclaim this message of reconciliation.<sup>76</sup> Although Halliday still used the atonement theory, his understanding of the Kingdom, and thus of pacifism, had shifted to the psychological plane. His views influenced many in and outside the FOR, both in the 1920s and in the 1930s. He wrote his book Psychology and Religious Experience especially for ministers to function better as ministers. He was professor at Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, dealing especially with pastoral problems. When C. H. Dodd had some difficulties he consulted Halliday, who, according to Dodd's biographer Dillistone, "helped him to use psychological insights in interpreting the Bible and in applying the Gospel message to the pastoral needs of men and women today."<sup>77</sup> It was already noticeable in Dodd's contribution to the "Christian Revolution Series", The Meaning of Paul for To-day, which made use of Halliday's interpretation of atonement.<sup>78</sup>

The New Psychology Halliday made use of was essentially psychoanalysis, although Micklem quite readily accepted telepathy.<sup>79</sup> There was some criticism of Freud and Jung, but these criticisms concerned more the details than the center. That there was not more criticism may be due to the fact that however negative Freud's view of religion was, it could be reconciled with an immanentist theology. One example

should suffice. In his sublimation theory, Freud derived the higher, the spiritual aspect of man, from the lower aspects. Halliday wrote in 1929 that "the secret of life lay not in the response, but in the sublimation, that is to say in the spiritualization of the instinctive."<sup>80</sup> The moment transcendence was admitted, the Freudian theory became inadmissible, yet there is no evidence that FOR members thought the Freudian theory incompatible with their statements of faith. It needs to be wondered how much of the acceptance of Freudian ideas was an adoption of fashionable currents of thoughts, a recurring phenomenon in FOR circles. As Roberts once said:

There was poverty in the world; the socialist came to me and said, This is the way to get rid of poverty; it looked plausible; and I became a Socialist...; there was war in the world; and I became a kind of pacifist; and so it went on.<sup>81</sup>

## CHAPTER 8 - ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>News Sheet, Feb. 1919, p. 3. C - General - Religious.  
7 - Reinterpretation of Jesus to our age.  
8 - Attempt at solution of the problem of a common Christian worship and the unity of the Church.  
9 - Exploration of the power of Prayer in Fellowship.  
See also GD 485-51, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup>The publication of the leaflets started in Jan. 1921.

<sup>3</sup>These prayers are very comparable to those compiled by Lewis Maclachlan in 1951 for group and private worship, Fellowship Prayers (London: F.O.R.).

<sup>4</sup>See Rouse and Neill, ed., History, ch. 11.

<sup>5</sup>The Venturer, New Series Vol. 1 no. 11, Aug. 1920, p. 11.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>7</sup>Cadoux was strongly opposed to Roman Catholicism, as is apparent in his Catholicism and Christianity (1928), Roman Catholicism and Freedom (1936) and Philip of Spain and the Netherlands (1947).

<sup>8</sup>Hodgkin remained honorary secretary of the World Alliance until his departure for China. Probably his leaving contributed to the weakening of ecumenicalism within the FOR.

<sup>9</sup>See Appendix III.

<sup>10</sup>Henry T. Hodgkin, Lay Religion, London: Headley, 1918, p. 209.

<sup>11</sup>Cadoux, Attitude, pp. 20 - 31; Church, Ch. 4. William Wilson had already made use of the historical approach during the war; see p. 110.

<sup>12</sup>Cadoux, Attitude, pp. 31 - 46.

<sup>13</sup>Cadoux, Church, part II, esp. Ch. 5; Attitude, part II.

<sup>14</sup>Cadoux, Attitude, pp. 87, 97. J.F. Bethune-Baker, who reviewed the book in The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 22, April 1921, pp. 294 - 296, disagreed with Cadoux but gave no solid evidence.



<sup>15</sup>Cadoux, Attitude, p. 146. But Roberts argued that life must have degenerated before compromise was possible, Untried, p. 69. Actually, the edict gave Christians the freedom to worship.

<sup>16</sup>Cadoux, Attitude, part III; Church, part II Ch. 5.

<sup>17</sup>Cadoux, Attitude, pp. 257, 263. Yet Cadoux admitted that the Church had omitted to take a decided line from the beginning (p. 251), due to immature thought (p. 253). Christian non-pacifists could easily argue that their thoughts were an expression of maturity.

<sup>18</sup>Cadoux, Attitude, p. 253. The dualism Cadoux espoused here was definitely not acceptable to many other FOR members. It opened the way for a different ethics for a group (state) and for individuals, an idea the FOR strenuously rejected.

<sup>19</sup>For example, he rejected miracles, the Virgin Birth and the physical resurrection. In The Christian Crusade, London: J.M. Dent, 1924, p. 84, he rejected the Bible as the ultimate standard of faith and morals.

<sup>20</sup>The argument is not really between literal versus figurative, but one of coherent, consistent exegesis. See for example Calvin Seerveld, Rainbows for the Fallen World, Toronto: Toronto Tuppence Press, 1980, Ch. 3.

<sup>21</sup>Jones, Remnant, p. 10.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>23</sup>Jones could have benefitted from John Lewis' slightly later remark that the Church had "never learnt to use the O.T. rightly, and in consequence it has been a source of weakness." The Old Testament in the Twentieth Century, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1923, p. 152.

<sup>24</sup>See for example, 1 P. 2:9-10, and the Pentecost story, Acts 2.

<sup>25</sup>He included Donatists, the "religious" and spiritual Franciscans, the Waldensians, the Beghards and Beguines, the Anabaptists and spiritual reformers.

<sup>26</sup>Leyton Richards, The Christian Alternative to War, London: S.C.M., 1929. Later incorporated in Realistic Pacifism.

<sup>27</sup>C.J. Cadoux, An Appeal to the People of the Christian Church, London: F.O.R., 1919. The quotes come from the American edition, New York: A.F.O.R., p. 3.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., pp. 4 - 5.

<sup>29</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 4, April 1924, p. 55.

<sup>30</sup>David Marquand, Ramsay MacDonald, London: Jonathan Cape, 1977, Ch. 15. Alan Cassels, "Repairing the Entente Cordiale and the New Diplomacy," The Historical Journal, Vol. 23 no. 1, 1980, pp. 133-153.

<sup>31</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 7, July 1924, p. 106.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid.

<sup>33</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 11, Nov. 1924, pp. 191 - 193. See also N. Micklem, The Open Light, London: Headley, 1919, Ch. 3 ("Christian Revolution Series" No. 4).

<sup>34</sup>Cadoux, Appeal, pp. 5 - 7. Probably Cadoux argued here against a commonly used argument of World War I.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 7. It may be noted that other FOR members rejected corporal punishment, holding very similar views to, for example, Russell.

<sup>36</sup>Roberts, Red, pp. 73 - 75.

<sup>37</sup>Lansbury, These, p. 23.

<sup>38</sup>E.E. Unwin, 'As a Man Thinketh...', London: George Allen & Unwin, 1919, Ch. 2.

<sup>39</sup>Richard Roberts, The New Man and the Divine Society, New York: Macmillan, 1926, p. 10.

<sup>40</sup>Reason, C.O.P.E.C., p. 171.

<sup>41</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 17 - 9 - 1923.

<sup>42</sup>There were about 1300 delegates. See review Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 5, May 1924. FOR 456; 3/1; 31 - 7 - 1923, makes mention that the March 1923 issue of News Sheet had been sent to all delegates.

<sup>43</sup>The proceedings give no evidence that anyone held to a crusade or preventive war position. This position had been fairly common during World War I. The position gives scant attention to biblical ethics, contrary to the "just war" position.

<sup>44</sup>This ambiguous point clearly reveals the influence of the LNU.

<sup>45</sup>It should be noted that these were recommendations, not binding resolutions. For the recommendations see Reason, C.O.P.E.C., pp. 287 - 288.

<sup>46</sup>Roberts, New, pp. 10 - 12.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., pp. 14 - 16.

<sup>48</sup>Roberts, Gospel, p. 12.

<sup>49</sup>Roberts, New, pp. 78 - 81. Jesus is type and promise of the new manhood. (p. 95). Using Phil. 3:20, Christians are said to be a "colony of heaven" (p. 99). Cf. Basil A. Yeaxlee, Towards a Full-Grown Man, London: The Brotherhood Movement, 1926, p. 8: Jesus is the one full-grown man in history.

<sup>50</sup>Roberts had read Theological Germanica, see Untried, p. 12.

<sup>51</sup>RR Box 5, 1929 "Lord's Prayer" VI.

<sup>52</sup>The Venturer, April 1921, p. 332. Roberts used the phrase "City of God" without reference to Augustine, but it seems likely that he recently had read Augustine's book.

<sup>53</sup>Ceadel, Pacifism, pp. 207-209, posits that Barth's influence came a decade later.

<sup>54</sup>See e.g. Barnes, Ahead, p. 151, and Robert Graves and Alan Hodge, The Long Weekend, New York: W. W. Norton, 1963 (1940), p. 207.

<sup>55</sup>See e.g. Jones, Congregationalism, p. 368f. and Graves and Hodge, Long, p. 127.

<sup>56</sup>Jones, Congregationalism, chs. 7 and 8.

<sup>57</sup>C. J. Cadoux, The Message About the Cross, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1924, pp. 28, 36-38. It is not clear how much Cadoux was a patripassianist.

<sup>58</sup>Cadoux does not seem to have much use for the objective side of the cross.

<sup>59</sup>Cadoux, Message, Chs. 4 and 5.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., p. 75.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., pp. 81 - 83.

<sup>62</sup>Cadoux, Crusade, Ch. 3.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., p. 27. Cadoux used the phrase "multiplied multipliers".

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., Ch. 4.

<sup>65</sup>Cadoux, Church, p. 10.

<sup>66</sup>Cadoux, Crusade, Ch. 5.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., p. 84.

<sup>68</sup>Cadoux, Church, pp. 13, 27 - 29.

<sup>69</sup>Micklem, Open, p. 17.

<sup>70</sup>Micklem, Box, p. 64. John W. Grant, Free Churchmanship in England 1870-1940, London: Independence Press, n.d., pp. 248 - 250. Berdyaev stated that personalism stood between individualism and collectivism. (GD 36). How much the "personalists" were influenced by such psychologists like the German W. Stern (1871 - 1938) or the American W. James (1842 - 1910) is not clear. They were probably familiar with James.

<sup>71</sup>Halliday, Reconciliation, p. 157.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 114.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., p. 130, Chs. 10 and 11.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 183.

<sup>75</sup>W. Fearon Halliday, Psychology and Religious Experience, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1929, p. 37.

<sup>76</sup>Halliday, Reconciliation, Ch. 17.

<sup>77</sup>Dillistone, Dodd, p. 81. Dodd had more reason to thank Halliday. As a "marriage broker" he introduced Dodd to Phyllis Terry who became his wife. (p. 91f).

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., p. 89.

<sup>79</sup>Micklem, Open, p. 44. For Orchard, see Graves and Hodge, Long, p. 103.

<sup>80</sup>Halliday, Psychology, p. 73. For a critique on Freud see David E. Stannard, Shrinking History, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

<sup>81</sup>RR Box 5, 1929 "Lord's Prayer".

## CHAPTER 9

### THE FOR'S VISION IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD: THE INTERNATIONAL SPHERE

#### The IFOR

The FOR's international involvement was anchored in "The Basis". Point two advocated the establishment of a world order and point three spoke of loyalty to all humanity. In the autumn of 1915 the FOR established an International Committee while Hodgkin visited the U.S.A. Indeed, Hodgkin's activities resulted in an independent American Fellowship. By October 1916 the FOR had 111 members in 22 countries.<sup>1</sup> In June 1917 the Committee heard that the Friends had sent out a "Message" to many Christians, suggesting an international conference. The FOR decided to cooperate, although such a conference, however, did not materialize until 1925 in Stockholm.<sup>2</sup> Several International Committee members had widespread contacts, thus providing the FOR with a ready network.<sup>3</sup> The 1918 Annual Report left no doubt about the objectives of the Committee:

1. Preparation for definite propaganda in other countries;
2. Study of international problems;
3. The international Christian Conference.<sup>4</sup>

The FOR's international involvement was thus not a post-war phenomenon, but an integral aspect of the FOR's existence. The coming of peace only provided a more extensive scope for involvement. Thus when Hodgkin informed the Executive on May 12, 1919, that he had

conferred in the Netherlands with Kees Boeke, the deported Birmingham branch secretary, and agreed to hold a conference in Bilthoven, it was the fulfilment of an old dream.<sup>5</sup> Less than a month later the General Committee was told that the conference had been postponed from August to early October so that some members of the World Alliance could attend both conferences.<sup>6</sup> On July 7 fourteen FOR members were appointed delegates, including Dryer, Hodgkin, Richards and Stevenson.<sup>7</sup> In the Netherlands the conference was prepared by a group called "Broederschap in Christus" (Brotherhood in Christ), whose members came from in and outside the churches.<sup>8</sup> Undoubtedly Kees Boeke and his wife Beatrice were the driving force. At the Bilthoven conference fifty men and women from ten countries were present, including Siegmund-Schultze and Pierre Ceresole, a Swiss who became joint secretary with Boeke.<sup>9</sup> Ceresole had been invited by Leonard Ragaz whose invitation "was a beam of light, a breath of moral fresh air." Ceresole could freely mix with Protestants, Catholics, Orthodox Church members, Quakers and free-thinkers. In the words of Ceresole's biographer,

They were people after his own heart; free, attentive to the Spirit, hostile to mere chatter, aware that words begin to be effective when they are translated into actions. Like him they believed, 'We communicate truly by actions. Actions unite; words separate.'<sup>10</sup>

Because he was a very active person, Ceresole was invited to be the first international secretary of the new organization, the "Movement Towards a Christian International" (MTCI).<sup>11</sup> Officially the MTCI was a federation, but for the first few years it was essentially "an association of individuals".<sup>12</sup> The conference accepted the FOR's "The

Basis", and published its own message, called "The Way". The message contained a confession of guilt for the recent tragedy of war, but a key word was 'revolution', a word which, in spite of its violent connotations, was at that time very popular in FOR writings: "Revolution through reconciliation. Jesus is the real revolutionary because He is the real reconciler. If we take His way, we too will be reconcilers and revolutionaries. The path lies open to every man who loves and dares."<sup>13</sup> Some conferees started this new type of revolution by touring the Netherlands for a week, holding several meetings in western Dutch cities. Oliver Dryer visited Germany instead, being able to observe the devastating effects of the until July 12, 1919, continued Allied blockade. In April 1920, Dryer and Ceresole went to the U.S.A. "to acquaint the American F.O.R. with the new developments of our international work and to secure their cooperation." Hodgkin meanwhile visited Scandinavia.<sup>14</sup> One instance of the new development may be mentioned here. Through its Council for International Service, the MTCI agreed to cooperate with the new Quaker Embassies, "linking centres of conscious, purposeful, international life."<sup>15</sup> For example, Beatrice Hoysted worked in Vienna on relief and a "save the children" campaign, while Corder Catchpool was "ambassador" in Berlin.<sup>16</sup>

During the first week of August 1920 the MTCI held another conference in Bilthoven.<sup>17</sup> It was attended by fifty-six people from seventeen countries,<sup>18</sup> who dealt with very diverse subjects, such as the movement's relation to the state and to property, foundational religious truths, and practical service. Dryer's report contained a number of

illuminating sentences:

No attempt was made to state a political philosophy or work out the further political implications of our Christian pacifist position, but the futility of coercion to produce a true order was clearly seen and some glimpses were caught of the City of God, built of Living Stones, rising in the midst of the present system. The discussions on property were of course inconclusive to those who looked for a clear delimiting of private possession and a critical examination of communism.<sup>19</sup>

In spite of this apparent indecision the conferees thought that capitalism was unacceptable. Instead, they advocated "the socializing of the chief means of production." Through this economic change they expected a new order of society "in which there will be no difference of class, but only men and women who work for the common good."<sup>20</sup>

Furthermore, the conference passed a resolution condemning racism,<sup>21</sup> sent letters to the Lambeth Conference, the World Conference on Faith and Order and the Conference of the World Alliance.<sup>22</sup> Perhaps most important of all, Ceresole's suggestion for international work through volunteers was accepted. Shortly afterwards Ceresole met Hubert Parris, an English Quaker who had been working in France on aid projects. The two launched the International Civilian Service, taking on as first task the rebuilding of Esnes, near Verdun.<sup>23</sup> It was the start of a long list of such projects.<sup>24</sup>

Soon, however, the organization started to experience troubles. Boeke moved towards an anarchistic position. He wished no statements of principles, no membership, no closed committee.<sup>25</sup> His views caused most members of the Brotherhood to leave.<sup>26</sup> Boeke felt that he had no right to his wealth. Initially he used his shares for workers,<sup>27</sup> but in 1922



he set up a trust, completely surrendering all his privileges of wealth.<sup>28</sup> He thought that a select few dominated the MTCI which he regarded as undemocratic. In addition, Boeke had no use for "diplomacy",<sup>29</sup> and could not acknowledge the state in any way.<sup>30</sup> Many MTCI members felt that these ideas made Boeke unsuitable as secretary and early in 1921 he was replaced by Lilian Stevenson.<sup>31</sup> The appointment was for only half a year. Not being able to find a full-time secretary, the MTCI decided to accept Dryer as the new secretary, sharing him with the FOR.<sup>32</sup> With his appointment, the secretariat moved from Bilthoven to London. In 1923 the name of the Movement was changed to International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR). The move and change indicated the close relationship between the two bodies, in spite of some antagonism. The FOR was by far the larger and financially the most supportive of the IFOR.<sup>33</sup> News Sheet and later Reconciliation regularly gave attention to IFOR activities. Moreover, many FOR members were heavily involved in IFOR work. But the closeness should not obscure the fact that the FOR and IFOR were two separate organizations with different functions. Sometimes the differences were ignored and this contributed to mutual friction. Within the scope of this thesis it is impossible to deal with the IFOR, and therefore the organization is mentioned only incidentally. The independence of each organization should not be interpreted as if the FOR had, for example, little interest in Ceresole's social work or in foreign affairs simply because in the actual FOR literature there is relatively little about Ceresole or international events. The division of spheres allowed the FOR to

concentrate more on purely British affairs. Only indirectly, via the IFOR, was the FOR involved in foreign affairs. The close connection between the two organizations prevented the FOR from developing an exclusively insular look, but on the other hand helps to explain why the FOR said relatively little about many international affairs which disturbed or contributed to international peace.<sup>34</sup> However, there were a few international aspects which were of more than passing interest to FOR members, namely the League of Nations, Ireland, and China and India. The rest of the chapter deals with these three topics.

### The League of Nations

In an address delivered at the annual meeting of the National Free Church Council, held in Manchester on March 9, 1915, Henry Hodgkin seemed to allude to the so called Bryce Proposals when he said that "we are to have, it is suggested, a confederated States of Europe and an International Police Force."<sup>35</sup> As Martin Dubin observed in 1970, the Bryce Proposals were "the source of key concepts and language" of the League of Nations' Covenant.<sup>36</sup> In 1915 Hodgkin did not brush aside the proposals, but warned that they could lead to the "Parade Ground" rather than the "Promised Land".<sup>37</sup> Hodgkin set the FOR's critical tone for the debate on a league of nations. However, it was only around the time of the appearance of Leonard Woolf's influential book International Government (1916) that the FOR started to participate more fully in the wide-spread debate.<sup>38</sup> In May 1916 the FOR's International Committee discussed the problem of collective security. The question then posed was: "Do we want a league of nations, or of what sort? Could it be the

non-resistant?". In order to answer the question the committee proposed a 'Scheme of Study' in training for international work. The scheme suggested research in four areas which presented potential difficulties, namely, the spiritual, organizational, international and political spheres.<sup>39</sup> The results of this study became the probable basis for a more elaborate scheme published in the July News Sheet. It was hoped that the scheme could be used as a private study, or for a series of lectures, or could serve at Woodbrooke, the Quaker study settlement, whose warden was the philosopher-theologian H. G. Wood. The outline provided a long list of textbooks related to the four areas of concern. It is sufficient to mention only a few to indicate that many FOR members got their ideas on war, politics, economics, democracy and psychology from leading social critics: Norman Angell, The Great Illusion; C. Delisle Burns, Morality of Nations and Political Ideals; G. Lowes Dickinson, The European Anarchy and After the War; J. A. Hobson, Imperialism and Towards International Government; L. T. Hobhouse, Democracy and Reaction; G. Robson, The Way to Personality; Graham Wallas, The Great Society. The scheme specifically called for study of racial problems, international courts, postponement of a declaration of war, armaments and sanctions.<sup>40</sup> Thus when the League's Covenant was accepted, FOR members were reasonably well-informed about the issues.

Basic to the whole discussion was the kind of peace various segments of society advocated. The FOR held that peace could only come through a change of heart so that people would be willing to cooperate.<sup>41</sup> The FOR discerned such a change in Woodrow Wilson's peace

proposal - issued and refined between May 1916 and January 1917-which, the FOR hoped, would lead to an honourable, negotiated peace.<sup>42</sup> In November 1916 The Venturer castigated Lloyd George, then secretary of state for war, for trying to prevent such a peace through the advocacy on September 28 of that year of a "knock out blow".<sup>43</sup> According to Carl Heath, the task of the internationalist was to reestablish a proper level of mutual confidence with a free and united humanity.<sup>44</sup> Such ideas excluded a "knock out blow" policy and favoured the inclusion of the defeated in a future league. Cooperation and confidence made annexations and indemnities unacceptable and ultimatums impossible.<sup>45</sup> One member argued that it was impossible for a country to remain isolated, for in isolation a country's integrity could not be preserved. The war had at least shown how interconnected the nations were. If more war were to be avoided, people and governments had to understand and have confidence in each other.<sup>46</sup> Such confidence would make it impossible to return to the 'status quo ante bellum', for such a return would not only not solve the problems which led to war, but would rather hamper the Kingdom of God.<sup>47</sup> To achieve peace and create a workable league William Wilson called for unilateral disarmament.<sup>48</sup> Thus the debate on a league of nations helped shape several FOR ideas before the actual League came into existence. As will be seen shortly, many of these ideas were similar to and probably borrowed from the UDC. These ideas were further tested and refined in the postwar period. In order to understand the FOR's ambivalent position vis-a-vis the League of Nations it is necessary to say something about the FOR's reaction to the

peace treaty and about the League's Covenant which was "at the same time the law of its action and the very source of its existence."<sup>49</sup>

Like many other pacifists and non-pacifists, FOR members were appalled by 'Versailles'. Fred Pope, the editor of The Venturer, saw the treaty as the absolute negation of the New Testament rule of life because it had accepted the "doctrine that state necessity knows no law." Pope, anticipating the thesis of Keynes in The Economic Consequences of the Peace, thought that the demands were harsh and crushing, opening the way for future wars.<sup>50</sup> John Darbyshire thought that the peace terms were a death sentence for the Central Powers and for liberalism.<sup>51</sup> Roberts stated that the treaty had left them "with pretty much the kind of world that [they] were familiar with before the war." With so many faults, according to the FOR, the treaty was seen as a major obstacle to the ushering in of the Kingdom of God.

Whereas the FOR condemned the treaty, the League's Covenant was received with mixed reactions. The preamble of the Covenant, adopted on April 28, 1919, indicated the nature of the League. The signatories agreed "to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war."<sup>52</sup> These obligations were spelled out more fully in a series of articles only a few of which are relevant to the present discussion. Article 8 point 1 called for "the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations." Articles 12 through 15 suggested ways of settlement for territorial disputes,

through arbitration, by the Permanent Court of International Justice, a tribunal, the Council or the whole Assembly. Perhaps article 23, even more than the preamble, showed what the League really was, namely a means to facilitate international relations.<sup>53</sup>

Generally, the FOR, like the UDC, lauded the proposals for conciliation and arbitration, the call for disarmament and the attempt at postponement of the declaration of war. Thus Rev. John Lewis could say in 1923 that many felt the League "a piece of solid constructive work for peace and yet brotherhood."<sup>54</sup> But was the League the brotherhood the FOR was looking for? Hodgkin posed the question as follows: "We see before us World Brotherhood based on trust, or World Downfall as the outcome of fear. Which is it to be?"<sup>55</sup> The Covenant answered Hodgkin's rhetorically expressed aspiration in two ways. In the first place, it did not address the problems of racial discrimination and of religious liberty. In the second place, the Covenant still accepted warfare. According to Article 12, disputants could go to war three months after the award of the arbitrators. In case of war, according to articles 16 and 17, the other League members were obligated to take (collective) sanctions, which ranged from the breaking of economic ties to the use of military force.<sup>56</sup> Thus the League's Covenant was at variance with the FOR's "The Basis".

The debate among FOR members during the subsequent years centered on the question whether or not the constructive aspects outweighed the unacceptable ones. The climax of the FOR debate came in 1923, triggered by the Franco-Belgian invasion of the Ruhr in January.

In August 1923 News Sheet published two opposing views, not about the invasion, but about the methods and purpose of the League. Fred Pope, who in 1919 had denounced the peace treaty, saw the League as a great ideal with the "possibility of the perfect fulfillment." He realized that the League's basis was not pacifist, but neither was the Church as an institution. Although unity was based on a negative criterion, "a common hatred of war", the League's positive aspects — the beginning of a realization of a great ideal — warranted his support.<sup>57</sup> Hence, he also gave his unqualified support for the League of Nations Union (LNU). Pope's opponent was John Lewis. According to Lewis, the "effective governing principles" were wrong and would remain "so long as the wrong men are the really controlling factors." Like ILP members, he complained that the League was a government for governments rather than for the people. He denounced the League as "a piece of unconscious camouflage behind which all the old international rivalries can flourish unchecked." Instead of the commencing realization of the ideal as Pope held, Lewis perceived the League as a "sham substitute for the real thing", because it shirked the issues.<sup>58</sup> Lewis' harsh words were actually much more a condemnation of the nations controlling the League--Britain and France--than the League itself, for their remorseless pursuit of national interests led to the League's ineffectiveness. In spite of their opposing views, Pope and Lewis had probably more in common than they thought. Both attacked the idea of the absolute sovereignty of states, an idea which, as has been seen in chapter 4, had been attacked by the FOR since its inception. In spite

of this debate, many issues were not thoroughly discussed and researched within the FOR until the very end of the 1920's when the disarmament issue became more prominent. In the meantime, the FOR was officially cautiously in favour of the League even though many individual members had serious reservations about several articles. This ambiguous position was reciprocated by the LNU. As Donald S. Birn has pointed out in The League of Nations Union 1918-1945 (1981), the LNU encouraged pacifists to join, while at the same time distancing itself from pure pacifist organizations and activities.<sup>59</sup> It was only in the mid-1930's that the FOR's ambiguity disappeared when it became apparent that the League of Nations was unable to prevent wars and that the LNU favoured rearmament. But already in 1929 it was evident that the relationship between the FOR and the LNU was strained by the very nature of their differing philosophies and strategies. In that year the FOR organized the "Christ and Peace" Campaign against which the LNU raised several objections.

### Ireland

This section deals with a small FOR contribution to the solution of the 'Irish Problem'. Ireland was generally regarded as a "home" problem. Thus the FOR gave close attention to the events in Ireland. The first evidence of the FOR's interest comes from a single sentence in the first News Sheet: "Early in January [1915], Bertram Pickard and Harold Wilson went on a visitation to Ireland."<sup>60</sup> Since both men were present at Cambridge it seems reasonable to assume that their visit was



the result of the conference. Unfortunately, nothing more is known about this first contact. Perhaps the visit was an attempt to ascertain the feelings of the various Irish factions about the postponement of the Home Rule Act. More than a year later Jonty Hanaghan, a General Committee member from Liverpool, visited the island in the wake of the Easter rising of April 24, 1916, in Dublin.<sup>61</sup> The execution of the leaders of the insurrection, Eamon de Valera excepted, aroused indignation and united the various southern nationalist factions. This set the stage for the 1918 election in which Sinn Fein captured seventy-three out of a hundred and five seats. Instead of meeting in Westminster the Sinn Feiners created the Dail Eireann and declared a republic. In order to restore control in the new "republic" Lloyd George's government used the auxiliary police and the "Black-and Tans", a special force, against the Irish Republican Army, the military arm of Sinn Fein. Both sides in the conflict committed numerous atrocities. Into this confused political and vicious military situation the FOR tried to bring reconciliation. The Fellowship's involvement gives some insight into its methodology: there was prayer, writing and individual action.

In April 1920 Hodgkin wrote a letter to the General Committee, stating that the FOR's task concerning Ireland was "to awaken the conscience, stir out of apathy, appeal to the instincts of goodwill." He made a number of suggestions to bring about the awakening, admitting at the same time that he himself could not be the organizer he called for.<sup>62</sup> The Committee called an emergency meeting for which an appeal

was drafted. The Committee members regarded the draft as too long, redrafted it and then decided not to publish the appeal because they thought there were so many similar ones! The original draft gives, however, a good insight into the FOR's position. The appeal suggested that England had no right to Ireland; rather, Ireland had the right of self-determination. Furthermore, the House of Commons was "the most unsuitable body in the world...in the passing of the Irish Home Rule Bill, to arrive at the correct solution of the problem." Therefore, the draft advocated the calling of an Irish convention with other nations as assessors.<sup>63</sup> Instead of this rather one-sided condemnatory appeal, the FOR published the leaflet "Save Ireland" which called upon all parties involved to forsake the way of violence. In addition, the English were urged to pledge themselves in advance to recognize the Representative Irish Assembly (Dail Eireann) and withdraw their troops to give that parliament a fair chance.<sup>64</sup> The key to the FOR's reasoning can be found in the idea of trust. Trust would open the way to reconciliation. Trust could overcome the fears of Protestant Ulster for the Roman Catholic South. Without trust and goodwill, which "must be expressed in actual terms of our political life",<sup>65</sup> the FOR could only see warfare between the various antagonists.

In July 1920 a group of Christian pacifists came together at Cooldara in conference and prayer over Ireland.<sup>66</sup> The group appealed to the churches to take the initiative in calling a conference dealing with Irish independence. The appeal coincided with the King's similar appeal at the Lambeth Conference and Lloyd George's at Pwllheli.<sup>67</sup> In spite of

the appeal of the political leaders to the churches to take the lead in the solution of the Irish problem, the churches were not willing to do so. It was in this atmosphere of unwillingness and distrust that George Davies attempted to bring reconciliation. Using some connections made in prison as a C.O., and probably with the help of the later Sinn Fein minister for foreign affairs Desmond Fitzgerald, Davies approached the acting head of the "Irish Republic", the moderate Sinn Feiner Arthur Griffith.<sup>68</sup> This first attempt to build bridges failed because Griffith was unwilling to renounce Sinn Fein.<sup>69</sup>

Early in June 1921 Davies got a second opportunity. By this time the situation was even more confused than in 1920. The Government of Ireland Act of December 1920 provided for elections which were held in May 1921. The result of the elections was a divided island: Ulster got its own parliament, while the south elected a new Dail without accepting the partition. According to Younger, "the North had a parliament they did not really want. ...And in the South members had been elected ostensibly for a parliament which never met."<sup>70</sup> Around the time of the elections a Quaker lady, possibly Edith Ellis,<sup>71</sup> spoke with de Valera, urging him to give up violence. However, de Valera thought it "unfair to ask the weaker side to take the first step to this higher plane."<sup>72</sup> She begged Davies, a relative of the wealthy Lloyd George supporter and his onetime parliamentary secretary David Davies, to convey de Valera's attitude to Lloyd George. A few days later Davies met the prime minister at a Calvinistic Methodist Assembly at Portmadoc and appealed to him publicly. Lloyd George, however, evaded the issue

by pointing out that the church was not a place for partisan politics.<sup>73</sup> Since Davies agreed with that point he wrote to Ernest Evans, a friend who stayed with Lloyd George at the latter's country home, Criccieth, and asked him if he could arrange a meeting. The prime minister expressed an interest but could not meet because he had to leave for London immediately. Soon afterwards Davies had to be in Westminster for a conference convened by Quakers. The conference delegated Davies and a Quaker to go to 10 Downing Street. They were not received by the prime minister and a discouraged Davies wrote a note in Welsh to state the facts.<sup>74</sup> Recollecting the event, Davies later wrote: "To my amazement, on the Monday morning the newspapers announced that the longed-for invitation had been dispatched to De Valera on the evening of the very day on which we had called at Downing Street."<sup>75</sup> Davies did not claim that the invitation was the result of his note. Although the coincidence is striking, it should not be forgotten that on June 22 the king had visited Ireland. Davies' note may or may not have influenced Lloyd George, but at least it seems to have opened the way for further mediation. On July 2, 1921, "a friend in high places" urged Davies to go to Dublin: "If you or your friends have any power in Dublin, now is the moment to use it. De V. is invited unconditionally and can raise and discuss any topic he likes."<sup>76</sup> Davies arrived Sunday morning, July 3, in Dublin, meeting Quaker FOR member James Douglas, later Deputy Speaker of the Dail Eireann, who told him that the invitation was suspected to be a ruse. Via Erskine Childers, the Anglo-Irish aristocrat who was executed by the Free State government in 1922,<sup>77</sup>

Davies met de Valera, albeit with difficulty. The Sinn Fein leader expressed his own suspicion but apparently Davies was able to allay the suspicion, and open the way for possible negotiations.<sup>78</sup>

A month later Cecil Wilson, who had been to a "little gathering", gave Davies letters for Lloyd George and de Valera. Davies was supposed to go to Dublin at the invitation of Childers<sup>79</sup>, but from the correspondence it is clear that not he but Gerard Collier, now working with Walke in Cornwall, gave the letter to Childers.<sup>80</sup> The mediation helped to bring the two leaders face to face, a policy which the FOR advocated and later pursued in the Embassies of Reconciliation.<sup>81</sup> The negotiations between the two leaders and later their plenipotentiaries resulted in a peace agreement on December 6, 1921.<sup>82</sup> The agreement was, however, not the end of violence. Therefore the FOR sent its Servants Porteous and Foley to the troubled island "to help forward the cause of friendship" between Protestants and Roman Catholics. In Belfast they met leaders of the Irish Christian Fellowship, including James Douglas, interviewed the Roman Catholic bishop of Belfast, the Presbyterian leaders, the Anglican bishop and the Lord Mayor, suggesting that they think out, not to fight out, the solution. In Dublin they were apparently unable to meet any leading figures.<sup>83</sup>

Davies remained interested in Ireland. He corresponded with the Fitzgeralds, Mrs. Childers and "A.E." (G. W. Russell), the pacifist editor of the Irish Statesman. In October 1924 he spoke in the Commons, to which he had been elected in the December 1923 election, on the Irish

Free State (Confirmation of Agreement) Bill, emphasizing the spirit rather than the letter and recalling the events of July 1921. One sentence above all characterized the FOR's thinking: "The politics of time seemed to be beginning to accord with the politics of eternity." Davies' concern was not with geography but with human beings and the treatment of minorities.<sup>84</sup> To use the title of one of his booklets, Davies was concerned with "the politics of grace", that is, the way of Christ, the only way which made cooperation between nations possible.<sup>85</sup>

### China and India

The reason why Hodgkin could not be involved with Ireland was his departure for China. On October 8, 1920, he and his wife Joy sailed for Shanghai. For most of the decade they remained in China. Through them the FOR was kept up to date about the tensions between China and Japan as well as about internal Chinese conflicts. Nevertheless, the FOR did not give much attention to these tensions, except in 1927.<sup>86</sup> In March of that year Nationalist troops entered Nanking, looting homes of foreigners and killing a number of whites.<sup>87</sup> British and U.S. gunboats on the Yangtze prevented further atrocities. The incident revealed a weakness among some FOR members' understanding of pacifism.<sup>88</sup> Gilbert Porteous, for example, thought that "the use of force, up to and including war, with a right motive, must have some right and good effect, for right motive can never be lost." However, in the long run such force produced evil results.<sup>89</sup> The political scientist and 1928 General Committee member Roger Soltau disagreed with Porteous, upholding the earlier FOR notion that violence was always wrong.<sup>90</sup> How much the

incident contributed to resignations is unclear, but at least Rev. A. Guthrie, an early FOR member, resigned because he thought that from a political point of view the use of troops seemed to be justified.<sup>91</sup> Although the Chinese problem disappeared fairly soon from the pages of Reconciliation, the incident may have contributed to the FOR's internal dissension and even to Davies' resignation as chairman.

In contrast to China, India remained a continuous issue in FOR circles. The reasons for that were basically twofold: India raised directly the problem of imperialism and Gandhi was greatly admired by many FOR members. In general, the FOR was strongly opposed to imperialism in any form. Hence, it favored independence for colonies as soon as possible. However, it was really Gandhi who brought India into sharp focus.

Several Indians had been FOR members during the war. Real interest in Gandhi's ideas, however, did not start until after the second Bilthoven Conference of 1920, at which J. E. C. Ganguly, a Quaker secretary of the YMCA, and E. Ariam Williams, SCM secretary, were present. Undoubtedly, the conferees heard about the Rowlatt Acts of 1919, which empowered the authorities to imprison without trial allegedly seditious persons, and about the Amritsar massacre of April 1919.<sup>92</sup> The two events provided the fuel for Gandhi's movement. Nevertheless, the first article on the 'Gandhi Movement' did not appear until July 1922 when News Sheet borrowed an article on non-cooperation from Young India.<sup>93</sup> The next month Bessie Porteous reviewed Gandhi's ideas, neither supporting nor condemning his views.<sup>94</sup> The second issue

of Reconciliation, February 1924, was entirely devoted to 'India'. The non-committal exposition of Bessie Porteous gave way to a much more appreciative attitude. H. S. L. Polak, who in 1949 edited a book on Mahatma Gandhi, ended his analysis of Gandhi's non-violent non-cooperation with these words:

His sanctity of life, his ascetic habits, his simplicity, his love of Truth, his sacrifice of health, material wealth, and liberty in the service of the poor, have made him the hero-saint of India, assured to him the title of Mahatma--the Great Soul--and vested him with the halo of martyrdom.<sup>95</sup>

Polak thought that Gandhi, like so many FOR members, had been deeply influenced by the Sermon on the Mount, and the writings of Tolstoy and Thoreau.<sup>96</sup> Polak discussed four key elements in Gandhi's ideas: 1. Satyagraha or Truth-force, a weapon of the strong which excludes violence; 2. Passive resistance, a weapon of the weak which does not necessarily exclude violence; 3. Civil disobedience, a breach of any statutory and unmoral law; 4. Non-cooperation, a withdrawal of cooperation from a corrupt state. Essentially Gandhi combined these four aspects, as did many FOR members.<sup>97</sup>

However, some crucial critical remarks were made. J. W. Shome saw non-cooperation as essentially nationalistic and in India as anti-British.<sup>98</sup> C. H. Watkins pointed out that nationalism was too narrow for the internationalism espoused by the FOR, for it was "blind partiality inverted." According to him, cooperation was the normal channel of the Christian. Although Watkins admired Gandhi, who believed in love and hated violence, he realized that in Gandhi's view not all



violence was made impossible by love.<sup>99</sup> Finally, J. O. Dobson interpreted Gandhi's non-violent coercion as a continuation of the strike and an extension of the boycott to non-economic relations.<sup>100</sup>

The discussion in Reconciliation was limited and the FOR, therefore, decided to devote the 1925 Summer Conference to the topic "East-West". Several Indian speakers were invited. A certain N. M. Joshi read a paper on industrial development in India and Tarini P. Sinha, an Indian journalist of the Guardian, presented a paper on India's culture.<sup>101</sup> In December 1925 Shoran S. Singha, an Indian Christian, wrote an article on "Gandhi and the Gospels". According to Singha, nearly every group in India claimed Gandhi. Although Christians did not claim Gandhi, he had brought a new awakening to Indian Christians. Gandhi, who remained a Hindu, reinterpreted the traditions of the Bhagavad-Gita and the Upanishads and applied them to the sphere of social action. Nevertheless, when he put vicarious suffering into practice, he used Jesus' passive resistance as his model.<sup>102</sup>

Not only did Gandhi invigorate Indian Christians, he inspired many pacifists, including FOR members. C. F. Andrews (1871-1940), author of Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas (1929), became his close associate. Andrews influenced the India Conciliation Group, which in turn provided Lansbury with the information he wanted for his work in the House of Commons.<sup>103</sup> Muriel Lester read Gandhi's weekly Young India in 1919 and felt an immediate empathy. According to her, Gandhi stood for the same things as the FOR during World War I. She thought that "non-violence and Christian pacifism had much to learn from each other."<sup>104</sup> In 1927,

at the suggestion of professor N. N. Gangulee, son-in-law of Rabindranath Tagore, she visited India to observe Gandhi and the country at close quarters.<sup>105</sup> While there she invited Gandhi to come to England. It was not until 1931, however, that Gandhi came to Great Britain, and that was at the invitation of the government to attend the second Round Table Conference.<sup>106</sup> While in London, he stayed at Lester's Kingsley Hall.<sup>107</sup> The FOR had long called for such a government-sponsored conference.<sup>108</sup> The call became even more urgent in 1930 after an IFOR conference at Arley when the conferees sent a message to a jailed Gandhi, attempting reconciliation and understanding.<sup>109</sup> But while the AFOR gave "definite support" to Gandhi, the English did not unreservedly agree with the Indian's ideas and methods. As an editorial of the August issue of Reconciliation pointed out, Gandhi's tactics were not pacifist in the Christian sense; they were highly provocative and challenged opponents to resort to violence.<sup>110</sup> Gandhi used his tactics to obtain swaraj, self-government, and thus they were a form of coercion. Gandhi, as Richards later shrewdly pointed out, tried to redress wrong-doing, while Jesus sought to redeem the wrong-doer.<sup>111</sup> The Quaker F. E. Pollard wrote that Gandhi's tactics implied "a deepening of the gulf and the refusal to build a bridge."<sup>112</sup> Clearly, the ideals of the FOR and those of Gandhi were not as close as the IFOR conference message or Lester supposed. Gandhi's satyagraha was truth-power in politics, but it was not a politics of grace. Although India and Gandhi remained regular topics in FOR literature in the 1930's, they were relegated to a secondary plane by events closer to home.<sup>113</sup>

The FOR contribution to 'foreign affairs' may perhaps best be summarized in the words 'cooperation' and 'better understanding'. During the war the FOR had encouraged its members to study German and learn about customs in other countries, so that after the war they could contribute properly to the building up of a new world. The IFOR, the cautious appreciation of the League, Davies' reconciliation attempts in Ireland, and the interest in India and Gandhi were all steps towards the shaping of a new earth, the Kingdom of God. Moreover, in this survey of 'foreign affairs' something of the pendular movement in the FOR can also be observed. The IFOR and Irish reconciliation were achievements of the early part of the decade. FOR members began to leave the organization for the LNU, a process which was not reversed until the mid-1930s. In particular, Gandhian ideas were a specific challenge to pacifism, thus reinforcing the gradual transformation of the FOR towards becoming a single issue pacifist organization.

## CHAPTER 9 - ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>FOR 456; 5/5; 25-10-1916. The number included India: 22, South-Africa: 12, New Zealand and China: 10, Canada and France: 9.

<sup>2</sup>FOR 456; 5/5; 11-6-1917. See also Rouse and Neill, History, p. 523. Nathan Soderblom, archbishop of Uppsala, primate of Sweden, and recipient of the 1930 Nobel Peace Prize, eagerly supported the idea, but otherwise there was not much ecclesiastical support. See Douglas, ed., Dictionary pp. 914 and 932; FOR Annual Report, 1918, p. 7. SCPC; CDG-B, Box 1. For some significant ecumenical conferences, see Appendix V.

<sup>3</sup>For example, J. Allen Baker, who had helped inaugurate the Constance Conference of 1914, had many contacts with members of the World Alliance; Joseph G. Alexander represented England on the Central Bureau of the International Peace Movement at Berne; Kees Boeke, after his expulsion from England, continued his work in the Netherlands. This FOR committee seemed to have had more Quakers on it than any other committee.

<sup>4</sup>SCPC; CDG-B, Box 1, Annual Report, 1918, p. 6.

<sup>5</sup>Hodgkin had been on holidays in the Netherlands. The conference was to be held in Boeke's house "Boschhuis". FOR 456; 3/1; 12-5-1919; Rawson, Boeke, p. 21. It is doubtful that the conference was a reaction to the League of Nations whose Covenant was signed April 28.

<sup>6</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 2-6-1919. The World Alliance Conference was held at Oud-Wassenaar, Sept. 30 - Oct. 3. See Rouse and Neill, History, p. 365.

<sup>7</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 8-7-1919. Other delegates were Lady Parmoor, Joan Fry, Carl Heath and William Paton of the International Committee as well as T. S. Attlee, Walter Ayles, Gerard Collier, Muriel Lester, Wilfrid Wellock and Theodora Wilson Wilson. News Sheet of Nov. 1919 mentioned only Attlee, Collier, Dryer, Hodgkin, Richards and Stevenson. Stevenson, Towards, p. 7, also mentioned Wellock. There is no clear evidence that all delegates attended.

<sup>8</sup>Among them were Rev. T. B. Th. Hugenholtz, Nannie Grondhout and Rob Limbourg who played an important role in the IFOR. Vera Brittain did not mention the latter two in her book, although Grondhout was the IFOR's first treasurer. According to Hugenholtz, it was "an isolated group of individuals" who made up the Brotherhood. SCPC; CDG-B, Boxes 153, 155. The Dutch Brotherhood was founded on a Christian revolutionary communism. FOR 456; 1/3; 10-11-1919.

<sup>9</sup>For the names of other conferees see Stevenson, Towards, p. 7. Brittain's book is essentially here a summary of Stevenson's. For the countries present see FOR 456; 1/3; 10-11-1919: France, Denmark, Germany, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, U.S.A., Finland.

<sup>10</sup>Daniel Anet, Pierre Ceresole. Passionate Peacemaker, tr. Marjorie Taylor, Delhi: Macmillan of India, 1974 (1969), pp. 57-58. Certainly Lilian Stevenson was a person after his own heart: he fell in love with her, but she never accepted his marriage proposal. Ragaz was quite influential at this time. See for example James D. Smart (tr.), Revolutionary Theology in the Making: Barth-Thurneysen Correspondence, 1914-1925, Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964, pp. 16, 31, 91, 130.

<sup>11</sup>In FOR circles Ceresole is better known for his work with the IFOR's social service branch, the International Civilian Service. For his involvement in the ICS, see Anet, Pierre.

<sup>12</sup>News Sheet, Dec. 1920, p. 4.

<sup>13</sup>Stevenson, Towards, p. 8.

<sup>14</sup>News Sheet, March 1920, p. 4; Wood, Hodgkin, p. 178.

<sup>15</sup>News Sheet, Feb. 1920, p. 2.

<sup>16</sup>News Sheet, March 1920, p. 4; May 1920, p. 1; Hughes, Indomitable, chs. 4 and 5. For children's relief see next chapter; Brittain, Rebel, pp. 48, 139; John Ormerod Greenwood, Quaker Encounters. Volume 1, Friends and Relief, York: William Sessions, 1975.

<sup>17</sup>The date was chosen so that delegates could attend the Geneva conferences of "Work and Life" and of "Faith and Order".

<sup>18</sup>News Sheet, Aug. 1920, p. 4, gives a list of people and countries. Brittain, Rebel, listed 60 people from 16 countries. Probably the Irish delegate was not counted separately (compare News Sheet, Aug: 1920, p. 1). There probably could have been more delegates if the Dutch government had not caused passport troubles. See News Sheet, June 1920.

<sup>19</sup>News Sheet, Aug. 1920, p. 2.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 3. The 'Message of the Conference' used the term "private capitalism". Undoubtedly the term should be contrasted with "state capitalism". Both were common terms in guild socialist literature. See e.g. Hobson, National, pp. 21, 31. The Message seems overly optimistic about human goodness.

<sup>21</sup>Part of the resolution reads: "Men must learn to treat one another simply as human beings and not as of a supposedly superior or inferior race, and to express this fundamental fact in political, economic and social life." Stevenson, Towards p. 18. Unlike the AFOR, the FOR did not concern itself much with racism until nearly two decades later.

<sup>22</sup>The World Alliance Conference is usually called "Work and Life".

<sup>23</sup>Anet, Pierre, pp. 61-63, ch. 6.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., chs 7-10; Stevenson, Towards, ch. 7.

<sup>25</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 25-7-1921.

<sup>26</sup>Several started somewhat later "Kerk en Vrede" (Oct. 8, 1924), of which Hugenholtz, Buskes and Heering were the leading figures.

<sup>27</sup>RR Box 2 file 41, 13-12-1920, letter by Davies.

<sup>28</sup>Rawson, Boeke, p. 29.

<sup>29</sup>HTH Box 5 file 57; 8-2-1921, letter by Boeke.

<sup>30</sup>HTH Box 5 file 53; 16-3-1922, letter by Dryer. Boeke refused to pay taxes with the result that he was several times imprisoned, like Ceresole. However, there was an important difference between the two. Boeke was Tolstoyan and paid no taxes at all; Ceresole refused only to pay a military tax.

<sup>31</sup>HTH Box 2 file 20; 17-2-1921, letter by Dryer. Shortly afterwards Boeke started PACO which later became WRI. The NMWM became the WRI's English branch.

<sup>32</sup>For Dryer's unhappiness about the combination see pp. 242.

<sup>33</sup>On paper the FOR had about 7500 members; next was the AFOR with about 1500 (News Sheet, Dec. 1920, p. 4).

<sup>34</sup>Both Stevenson's and Brittain's books are essentially about the IFOR, the latter mainly about the leading figures.

<sup>35</sup>Hodgkin, How, p. 4. See also News Sheet, 16-4-1915, p. 4.

<sup>36</sup>Martin David Dubin, "Toward the Concept of Collective Security: The Bryce Group's "Proposals for the Avoidance of War," 1914-1917," International Organization, XXIV/2, Spring 1970, pp. 288-318. See also Keith G. Robbins, "Lord Bryce and the First World War," The Historical Journal, X, 2, 1967, pp., 255-278; Robbins, Abolition, ch. 3.

<sup>37</sup>Hodgkin, How, p. 4.

<sup>38</sup>Leonard S. Woolf, International Government, New York: Brentano's, 1916; reprint ed., New York: Garland, 1971. For the roots of the League of Nations, see Sylvester John Hemleben, Plans for World Peace through Six Centuries, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943, (reprint ed. : New York: Garland, 1972); F. H. Hinsley, Power and the Pursuit of Peace, Cambridge: University Press, 1963; Martin, Peace; The League's early biographer was F. P. Walters, who had been Deputy Secretary-General: A History of the League of Nations, 2. vols., London: Oxford University Press, 1952. For the LNU, see Donald S. Birn, The League of Nations Union 1918-1945, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981. For the widespread debate, see Robbins, Abolition, ch. 5.

<sup>39</sup>FOR 456; 5/5; 10-5-1916.

<sup>40</sup>News Sheet, 25-7-1916, pp. 12-14.

<sup>41</sup>E.g. The Venturer, Vol. 3 no. 11, Aug. 1918, p. 249.

<sup>42</sup>For Wilson's plan and influence, see Martin, Peace. Wilson's peace move came after his re-election was secured and after the German peace note of Dec. 12, 1916.

<sup>43</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 2, Nov. 1916, "Monthly Notes".

<sup>44</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 6, March 1917, pp. 172-173.

<sup>45</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 2 no. 10, July 1917, p. 298.

<sup>46</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 3 no. 11, Aug. 1918, pp. 249-250. For Roberts' views see The Venturer, Vol. 5 no. 1, Oct. 1919, pp. 3-5.

<sup>47</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 4 no. 3, Dec. 1918, pp. 314-315.

<sup>48</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 3 no. 6, March 1918, p. 156.

<sup>49</sup>Walters, History, p. 40. See also Ruth B. Henig, ed., The League of Nations, Edingburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1973.

<sup>50</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 4 no. 7, Apr. 1919, pp. 361-362 and Vol. 4 no. 9, June 1919, p. 389. For Keynes, see Economic.

<sup>51</sup>The Venturer, Vol. 4 no. 10, July 1919, p. 408.

<sup>52</sup>Walters, History, p. 43.

<sup>53</sup>The Covenant is printed in Walters, History, ch. 5. Article 8 point 5 conceded that private manufacture was "open to grave

objections." Article 10 accepted territorial integrity.

<sup>54</sup>News Sheet, Aug. 1923, p. 8. See also W. G. Wilkins, Christianity and Brotherhood, London: John G. Pike, 1923. Wilkins regarded the League as one among many brotherhoods. The history of Brotherhood he saw as a struggle of God and people for 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity' (especially pp. 5, 121, 123).

<sup>55</sup>The quote is from "Every man's Opportunity", a leaflet issued by Society of Friends. There is a hand written copy in Hodgkin's files which suggests that the Message was written by Hodgkin, probably late 1918 or early 1919.

<sup>56</sup>The three months delay was a strong point because it provided a cooling off period. The Covenant did not include a provision for an international force although this topic had been debated.

<sup>57</sup>News Sheet, Aug. 1923, p. 8. For the early LNU development see K. Robbins, Abolition and Birn, LNU, ch. 1. The LNU was the result of the merger of the League of Free Nations Association (1918) and the League of Nations Society (1915) in October 1918.

<sup>58</sup>News Sheet, Aug. 1923, pp. 8-9. Lewis did not concern himself much with the LNU. See also Henig, League, ch. 2, esp. pp. 47-58.

<sup>59</sup>See e.g. Henry Hodgkin, The Christian Revolution, London: Swarthmore Press, 1923, ch. 10, esp p. 248; and RR Box 2 file 41, 14-2-1919. The FOR published several pamphlets related to various League issues, including "To end War seek International Justice" and "In a Crisis What Should One Do?" Both are isolated but come from the early 1920's. Birn, LNU, p. 26.

<sup>60</sup>The name Ireland has been used following FOR usage denoting the whole island. News Sheet, March 1, 1915, p. 3.

<sup>61</sup>Hanaghan continued to concentrate on Ireland, see FOR 456; 5/1; 3-7-1917. For a full account of Irish question see Younger, Ireland's. See also Thomas M. Coffey, Agony at Easter, Baltimore: Penguin, 1969.

<sup>62</sup>FOR 456; 3/1; 7-5-1920. His 8 suggestions were: 1. place an ad in all papers; 2. organize meetings everywhere; 3. form local committees; 4. prepare literature; 5. appoint a temporary first rate organizer; 6. appoint a special London committee to supervise his work; 7. write to all members to ask for backing of the scheme; 8. form a group of speakers to present the FOR message.

<sup>63</sup>FOR 456; 3/1; 7-5-1920.

<sup>64</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 13-7-1920. GD 481h for the leaflet.



<sup>65</sup>News Sheet, July 1920, p. 5.

<sup>66</sup>The conference was held on July 5-8, 1920 (GD 480; 30-6-1920) at Lilian Stevenson's home. The conferees were invited by Dryer. Probably Hodgkin was the driving force behind the meeting.

<sup>67</sup>GD 481h, pamphlet "The Irish Crisis", GD 169, pp. 18-19, GD 481, 30-6-1920. The group circulated the religious press with the same appeal.

<sup>68</sup>Much of Davies' correspondence was with Mrs. Fitzgerald.

<sup>69</sup>In a letter to Roberts, Davies expressed his sadness about this lost opportunity. RR Box 2 file 41, 13-12-19120. Griffith's acceptance of the British terms, presented at the London conference of autumn 1921, suggests his willingness of a peaceful solution. De Valera, the president of the Dail, was in the U.S.A. between June 1919 and December 1920.

<sup>70</sup>Calton Younger, A State of Disunion, London: Frederick Muller, 1972, p. 249. Collins, de Valera and Griffith were elected in Ulster, a clear indication that Sinn Fein objected to the partition.

<sup>71</sup>She is only referred to as a daughter of a member of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's government. She had been aiding the Irish White Cross. GD 169, p. 20. In August 1932 "a Miss Ellis" met de Valera about a "truce" proposal. See Younger, State, p. 296.

<sup>72</sup>GD 169, p. 20.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid. In 1932 David Davies (1880-1944) was created Baron Davies of Llandinam.

<sup>74</sup>See Walke, Twenty, p. 181, for a slightly different account of the Downing Street meeting. He was undoubtedly wrong in some of the details.

<sup>75</sup>GD 169, p. 24. GD 169 is dated 1924. See e.g. The Times, 27-6-1921, p. 10.

<sup>76</sup>GD 169, p. 24.

<sup>77</sup>Childers was a strong influence on de Valera and was hated by Griffith.

<sup>78</sup>GD 169, pp. 25-30. See also Davies, Essays, p. 79.

<sup>79</sup>The invitation was apparently for Aug. 16, the day the Dail Eireann came together after the truce.

<sup>80</sup>GD 481; 5-8-1921; 6-8-1921; 7-8-1921; 19-8-1921.

<sup>81</sup>The Chinese and Japanese Christians pursued the same course; see Stevenson, Towards, p. 22.

<sup>82</sup>Ratified by the House of Commons on Dec. 16, 1921 and the Dail on Jan. 15, 1922.

<sup>83</sup>GD 481c, 7-7-1922; FOR 456; 2/2; 4-9-1922. The violence at this time was largely due to civil war. Yet Porteous and Foley seem to have spoken mainly to religious rather than political leaders.

<sup>84</sup>Davies, Essays, pp. 75-83.

<sup>85</sup>The Politics of Grace was delivered to the London Union as a series of lectures. This series then appeared in Reconciliation, Vol. 2 nos. 8-10, Aug-Oct, 1925. Compare News Sheet, Aug. 1920, p. 5 and Sept. 1920, p. 3.

<sup>86</sup>For a more elaborate review see Stevenson, Towards, pp. 22, 67-69. The IFOR gave frequently attention to the tensions.

<sup>87</sup>Up to this time Nationalists and Communists made up the Kuomintang. In 1927 the two groups split.

<sup>88</sup>During 1927 the FOR organized a series of lectures by Chinese speakers in various churches and advocated sending a protest postcard to China. The latter idea completely misfired and annoyed Hodgkin considerably, probably because it jeopardized his position and his organization. FOR 456; 3/2; 10-3-1927 and 12-5-1927; Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 3, March 1927, p. 47, and Vol. 4 no. 4, April 1927, and no. 6, June 1927, p. 105.

<sup>89</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 6, June 1927, pp. 103-104.

<sup>90</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 7, July 1927, p. 123. Soltau thought that they should have evacuated. Hodgkin apparently agreed with the actions of the gunboats.

<sup>91</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 6, June 1927, p. 104. Guthrie had been a missionary in China.

<sup>92</sup>See Joan V. Bondurant, Conquest of Violence, Berkeley: University of Berkeley Press, 1965, ch. 3.

<sup>93</sup>News Sheet, July 1922, pp. 6-7. See also FOR 456; 1/3; 2-3-1922, which contains the first mention of a desire to obtain accurate information regarding Gandhi's personal standpoint.

<sup>94</sup>News Sheet, Aug. 1922, p. 1.

<sup>95</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 2, Feb. 1924, p. 23.

<sup>96</sup>GD 258. Davies talked with Gandhi in 1931 and thought that Gandhi was influenced by the passive non-resistance policy of British nonconformists against the 1902 Education Act, and by the 1906 racial laws of South Africa.

<sup>97</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 2, Feb. 1924, pp. 22-23. Cf. Bondurant, Conquest, chs. 1 and 2.

<sup>98</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 2, Feb. 1924, pp. 23-24.

<sup>99</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 2, Feb. 1924, pp. 26-27.

<sup>100</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 2, Feb. 1924, p. 29.

<sup>101</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 10, Oct. 1925 and no. 11, Nov. 1925. The April issue contained another article by Sinha on Gandhi. At the conference some attention was given to China.

<sup>102</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 12, Dec. 1925, pp. 221-223. It is somewhat ironic that Gandhi practised the idea of vicarious suffering, a notion that Wilson had rejected in his atonement theory.

<sup>103</sup>Carl Heath was president of the group and Agatha Harrison was secretary. See Irene Harrison, Agatha Harrison, London: George Allen & Unwin, p. 156, p. 52. LL Vols. 23, 24, esp. 23 p. 297.

<sup>104</sup>Muriel Lester, It So Happened, New York: Harper, 1947, p. 51. Lester was much less critical than many other FOR members, especially theologically. Gandhi did not start Young India until Oct. 1919. Whether Lester read the weekly in 1919 is therefore open to question.

<sup>105</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 3, March 1927, pp. 49-52; Lester, Occurred, ch. 14.

<sup>106</sup>The first conference of 1930 was boycotted by Congress leaders because Gandhi was jailed for his initiation of a campaign of civil disobedience about salt tax. The conferences were attempts to produce a constitution for India.

<sup>107</sup>See Lester's Occurred, ch. 18 and Entertaining Gandhi, London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1932.

<sup>108</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 8, Aug. 1930, a special issue on India.

<sup>109</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 10, Oct. 1931, p. 195; FOR 456; 2/2; 5-9-1930.

<sup>110</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 8, Aug. 1930, p. 142; cf. p. 149 "meant to stimulate antagonism."

<sup>111</sup>Leyton Richards, Christian Pacifism After Two World Wars, London: Independent Press, 1948, pp. 36-39. See also Frank Hancock's statement in Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 10, Oct. 1930, p. 197, that Gandhi's pacifism was not redemptive.

<sup>112</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 8, Aug. 1930, p. 149.

<sup>113</sup>Lester, e.g., went again to India in 1934.

## CHAPTER 10

### THE FOR AND RECONSTRUCTION: SOCIO-ECONOMIC-POLITICAL ASPECTS

The key to the FOR's reconstruction involvement can be found in part B of the program adopted at the stormy King's Weigh House conference of 1919. Its first point reads, "Determination of the methods of applying the principles of Jesus to modern economic and political conditions." An important observation needs to be emphasized again when discussing the FOR and reconstruction. Since its inception the FOR had called for a "Christian Revolution", which certainly did not imply creating "a land for heroes", but rather envisioned a new world order, the Kingdom of God. After some years of writing about this Kingdom and after some practical experiments, it could be expected that the FOR would be more affirmative about the methods to be employed. The tentative nature of the key sentence probably reflected the heated debate of the conference. The FOR's reconstruction program should, therefore, be viewed in two ways. In light of the vision, one could expect the FOR to be involved in numerous activities. Yet, as becomes apparent, the activities were limited, largely confined to the early part of the decade and supported by a relatively small number of members. In other words, there was a clash between expectation and realization. In spite of their peculiar basis, the FOR's practical activities were not significantly different from the much larger,

fundamentally practical schemes of reconstruction. In order to show the similarities and dissimilarities between the FOR and the general stream of reconstruction a number of important FOR activities will be discussed. Some of these activities had already started during the war, notably care for C.O.s, Riverside Village and education renewal. Other activities, especially the Cornish Scheme (1918-1923) and later the help extended to miners during and after the 1926 General Strike, were direct responses to serious socio-economic hardships. The various activities were frequently accompanied by theoretical discussions. From these it becomes apparent that the FOR during the 1920's was part of the mainstream of the developing British Left and that FOR theorists were particularly close to the Christian socialist R.H. Tawney. However, as Wallace Hancock, an outspoken London Quaker, made clear at the end of the decade, not every one in the FOR accepted socialism, thus showing again that the FOR was not monolithic. Furthermore, Hancock's statement came at a time that the FOR had become much more a single-issue organization. Although the activities themselves do not indicate this transition, their absence late in the decade was indicative of and probably contributed to the transition. From the many activities it becomes apparent that the FOR actually employed two methods to achieve reconstruction. These two, charity and education, are discussed first, followed by an examination of the application of the principles of Jesus to political issues and to the socio-economic problems. Finally, three experiments will be discussed.

### Of C.O.s and Children's Relief

For a short time after the war the FOR was still involved with C.O.s. Although C.O.s were still being sentenced to prison terms of up to two years in April 1919, most were being released, either on grounds of ill-health or under the so-called "cat and mouse" act.<sup>1</sup> The JAC had assigned the FOR the task of taking care of the released C.O.s. The Fellowship was reasonably well-prepared for its task. Rehabilitation had been a key concern at Riverside Village. Halliday and Robson, among others, had thought about psychological issues. The caring nature of FOR members was further underlined by the very good response to the frequent requests in News Sheet for clothes and other necessities. Nevertheless, the rehabilitative care for the C.O.s was of relatively short duration. By mid-1919 the whole issue had been pushed into the background. Without tasks, the Conscription Committee became superfluous and it did not meet anymore after June 27, 1919.<sup>2</sup> Even the NCF decided to disband officially at a concluding convention held at the end of November 1919.<sup>3</sup> With the end of the rehabilitation of the C.O.s, the topic of conscription disappeared from the pages of News Sheet. Even correspondence about the C.O.'s loss of voting rights for a five year period ceased.

The FOR's involvement in caring for the C.O.s was carried over to caring for children. Lilian Stevenson has already written about the FOR's involvement in children's relief.<sup>4</sup> Here, therefore, only a few highlights. In 1919 the FOR urged the members to confine themselves "to the consumption of the necessities of life only, until countries which

have suffered from starvation and disease have been provided with such necessities."<sup>5</sup> This call could be regarded as the informal start of the FOR involvement in famine relief, a relief necessitated by the continued allied blockade. Formally the FOR took up famine work through its Children's Hospitality Committee early in 1920.<sup>6</sup> Initially the new committee worked together with the Central Famine Areas Children's Hospitality Committee. When this committee broke down due to poor organization the FOR committee took complete responsibility and continued to do so until the end of 1922.<sup>7</sup> The first group of 550 children came from Vienna in May 1920. After medical examinations and a period of quarantine these children were placed in private homes.<sup>8</sup> A few months later a group from Budapest arrived and in October another group from Vienna came.<sup>9</sup> In May 1921 News Sheet reported that 1420 children were in England but most were to leave by September.<sup>10</sup> In order to prevent a relapse into poor health "after care" was provided.<sup>11</sup> Later on the after care changed from relief in kind to help in other economic ways.<sup>12</sup>

The help to Central European children gave way by 1921 to an attempt to help Russian children starving in the aftermath of the civil war.<sup>13</sup> The News Sheet of December 1921 advocated the same treatment as that accorded to the Austrian children. Various countries and transport agencies were willing to cooperate. The FOR General Committee was notified that everything was organized and that cheap fares had been secured.<sup>14</sup> However, at the last moment the Lloyd George government vetoed the whole idea.<sup>15</sup> The FOR's involvement in relief had in the



first place been for reasons of compassion, but the compassion incorporated an attempt to break through the barriers of fear and hatred so that reconciliation between the nations could take place. The FOR interpreted the government's veto as a clear sign that foreign affairs were still conducted by fear and hatred and that a pervasive war mentality still existed. It is no wonder, therefore, that many FOR members doubted that true reconstruction could come through the Lloyd George, Tory dominated government. In spite of this significantly disturbing condition the caring program was otherwise fairly successful. It should be noted, however, that this success was in the field of traditional charity, not in what is usually understood as reconstruction. The FOR's understanding of social peacemaking was that it entailed

the divine business of drawing men together into unity of spirit and purpose - teaching them to live the love way, and forming in the very warp and woof of human society the spirit of altruism and loyalty to the higher interests of the group.<sup>16</sup>

### **Education**

Charity was not the only method of peacemaking. Education, both formal and informal, received as always much attention as a way to "create a new heart". As Davies argued in The Politics of Grace (1925), what happened at home and school had critical bearings on politics.<sup>17</sup> He praised recent attempts to change the educational system. With the Left-wing publisher Victor Gollancz he agreed that the "most crying need of the age" was to revolutionize the public schools which were "a bulwark of the reactionary forces of class selfishness and narrow

patriotism."<sup>18</sup> Davies might easily have quoted others. For example, Tawney, the dominant figure in the Workers Educational Association (WEA), thought that education was "the process by which we break down the barriers of our individual isolation, and become partners in a kingdom of ideas which we share with our fellows."<sup>19</sup> While Tawney emphasized the fellowship aspect in education, Russell stressed the individual. Yet both, like Davies, were concerned about the contents, pedagogy and didactics of education.<sup>20</sup> New educational ideas were put into practice by H.T. Lane in "The Little Commonwealth", Dorset. His experiment pre-dated and influenced the FOR's Riverside Village experiment.<sup>21</sup> The FOR's involvement in education was part of this diverse stream of educational ideas. Concurrently, there was another stream which dealt essentially with administrative changes, as can be observed in the 1902 Balfour Act, the 1918 Fisher Act and the 1944 Butler Act. This stream, much discussed in the historiography of education,<sup>22</sup> said little about the contents of education and had, therefore, little impact on the FOR discussions on education.

During the war FOR teachers had held conferences on how to implement FOR ideals into the schools. They had published history booklets which incorporated these ideals.<sup>23</sup> In 1917, possibly as a result of discussions at the Swanwick Summer Conference, the FOR drew up a scheme for a school. There were two practical emergencies which stimulated the FOR to look into the possibility of starting a school:

1. The need for increased facilities for parents to send their children to schools free from the pressure of military training and ideals.

2. The difficulty experienced by many pacifist teachers in working in or even obtaining positions in many schools.<sup>24</sup>

The aim of the scheme was that each child should grow into Christ's likeness through, firstly, the encouragement of the quest of truth and beauty;<sup>25</sup> secondly, the opportunities for the achievement of self-discipline; and, finally, the exposition of the possibilities of fellowship and service. Furthermore, the scheme eschewed any demarcation between the sacred and secular, with all knowledge "esteemed for its life value and its social worth."

Some features of the scheme made the school part of the modern educational stream<sup>26</sup> and revealed at the same time something of the FOR in general.<sup>27</sup> The site was to be close to or in a village, preferably a farm, similar to Riverside Village. The number of students was to be limited but coeducational. They were to share fully in village life, while local craftsmen would help in the school. The curriculum gave ample space to practical manual work, observation of nature, and self-expression through music, poetry, drawing and physical exercises. Academic subjects emphasized relationships and rigorous thought. For example, geography gave opportunity "for a sympathetic understanding of people in other lands", while history stressed "the social story of the common people... international in scope, and including religious history to a larger extent than usual." An extensive library was regarded as essential.<sup>28</sup>

The scheme was an attempt at educating the whole human being, or, as Davies called it, "education for life" which stressed a

cooperative commonwealth instead of the selfish competition which was standard in British schools.<sup>29</sup> Davies certainly had no use for exams, which he regarded as detrimental to mind and character.<sup>30</sup> To him, a school was a centre of reconciliation and integration.<sup>31</sup> However, high fees made the scheme also elitist and protective, thus undercutting much of the reconstruction it aspired to achieve. For two reasons the initial scheme never got off the ground, despite the large amounts of time and energy the FOR spent on it. There were difficulties raising the necessary capital and there were Quaker schools which could incorporate FOR ideas.

After the war, the two practical emergencies which brought about the initial scheme largely disappeared, but the attempts to influence the schools and start an FOR school continued. In 1919 Mr. Westlake of Woodcraft Chivalry School suggested a merger of his school with the FOR school scheme. Mr. Westlake's school was based on the ideals of freedom and self-development. Although these ideals were part of the FOR scheme, its real basis was the FOR's vision. The FOR Council was, therefore, strongly against the merger.<sup>32</sup> In mid-1920 the FOR decided to hold a teachers' conference at Guildford between December 30, 1920 and January 3, 1921.<sup>33</sup> The theme of the conference was "Revolution in Education". Topics on the agenda included psychoanalysis, esperanto, militarism in schools, and Montessori methods compared to FOR principles.<sup>34</sup> The conference was well-attended, yet there was no follow-up! After December 15, 1920, the Education Committee apparently ceased save for one incident.<sup>35</sup> On October 28, 1924, some members came

together who chose a committee to organize a conference for January 8 - 12, 1925 on "Education the Pathway to Peace".<sup>36</sup> Although no FOR school ultimately materialized in Britain, the ideas, the history booklets and the frequently well-attended teachers' conferences influenced the various Quaker schools. Possibly they exerted greater influence through such people as Basil Yeaxlee, who in the 1920s was editor of the Sunday School Chronicle, principal at Westhill, chairman of the Council of Christian Education, and author of Towards a Full-Grown Man (1926).

Internationally there were a few successes. Dr. Elizabeth Rotten (1882-1964), an early IFOR member, was a leading educationist in Germany. Kees Boeke started a school in Bilthoven, appropriately called "De Werkplaats" (The Working Place).<sup>37</sup> The most important experiment, from the FOR's viewpoint, was that of Emma Thomas. She was able to start an international school at Gland, near Geneva, under the name of "Fellowship School". The News Sheet of May 1923 invited FOR members to cooperate with this experiment which had started as a private adventure on the basis of the FOR scheme.<sup>38</sup> The staff was British with the exception of Pierre Ceresole who felt the school's atmosphere as the "spirit of Bilthoven".<sup>39</sup> It seems likely that the start of the school renewed the discussions in England in 1924, even though the effect was only temporary.<sup>40</sup>

However important formal schooling may have been regarded, it was only a part of the FOR's education program. It was not only necessary to educate youngsters, but also to inform the "public". This was largely done through publications. News Sheet was used to inform

the FOR members. After the war it appeared monthly, carrying short articles, decisions of committees, reviews of conferences, notices, branch news and prayers. The Venturer had been started in October 1915 to enlighten the general public about the FOR position in all spheres of life. Late in 1917 there were proposals to publish the journal by the FOR, but the plans did not go through.<sup>41</sup> The discussions started again in early 1919, but by the middle of the year Headley/Swarthmore had definitely taken it over.<sup>42</sup> In October 1919 a new series started, promising more on arts and literature. No FOR news was included and the contents was not necessarily Christian nor pacifist. During the first two years there were still many articles by FOR members. Roberts, for example, opened the new series and Hodgkin started the second issue. Cadoux, Wilson and Orchard were other early and regular contributors. However, gradually the non-pacifist and non-Christian articles became more prominent.

For a while the FOR had a column in the pacifist weekly The Crusader whose editor was ex-FOR staff member Stanley James. The situation was, however, unsatisfactory, and in 1924 a new periodical was published, Reconciliation. It absorbed News Sheet and the initial ideas of The Venturer. Although many FOR members did not subscribe to Reconciliation, as they had not done to The Venturer, the views expressed in the new journal could be regarded as representative of the members. There is little evidence that the journals reached much beyond the Christian pacifist circle. Probably the "Christian Revolution Series", already discussed, had a wider audience. It is difficult to

assess the influence of the various educational approaches but it seems reasonable to say that the influence was limited.

### **Political Reconstruction: Practice and Theory**

In the December 1923 election called by the Conservative prime minister Stanley Baldwin thirteen members of the FOR stood for Parliament, although only Davies ran exclusively on a pacifist platform. Nine were elected.<sup>43</sup> Before the balloting News Sheet carried several articles analyzing election issues, framing questions to be asked to candidates and showing a Christian pacifist's duty to the election.<sup>44</sup> But could pacifists really participate in the political process? A.T. Cadoux in his book Jesus and Civil Government argued that pacifists who condemned coercion made civil government impossible.<sup>45</sup> The practical side of the argument was that C.O.s had had their franchise rights revoked for five years. The question of political involvement was thus both abstract and practical for the FOR. The question can probably best be answered by focusing on the FOR's understanding of the state.

If the Kingdom of God, or to use Dodd's terminology the Divine Commonwealth, were ever to be realized, religion and politics had to converge.<sup>46</sup> The political ideal had to become more religious and the religious ideal more political. This transformation would lead to a political democracy and a democratic religion.<sup>47</sup> Yet, neither should be confused or identified with the Kingdom itself. In order to establish a just political democracy it was imperative to study the life and teaching of Jesus.<sup>48</sup> Many Christians objected that Jesus' messiahship was non-political. The third temptation (Mt. 4:8 - 10) rejected a

militant messianism and the way of the world.<sup>49</sup> But that in itself was a political statement, and S. Dickey in The Constructive Revolution of Jesus (1923), volume 16 in the "Christian Revolution Series", rightly pointed out that various parties had clashed with Jesus.<sup>50</sup> In those clashes Jesus showed that not might but right and service were the proper ways. Since Jesus was the model for Christian pacifists and since the FOR did not accept an ethical dualism between personal behaviour and the actions of the state, Jesus gave a new basis for society and state.<sup>51</sup> Jesus left people free to choose for or against Him. That kind of liberty was at the heart of democracy. In the words of the 1920 Social Program, "We cannot assent to be governed except by those persons and principles with which we sympathise."<sup>52</sup> Yet, democracy of itself did not guarantee freedom. It was only a "necessary but inadequate organ of life", for people could find themselves "under the heels of a bureaucracy" which was "more monstrous" than Hobbes' Leviathan.<sup>53</sup> No acts of parliament could make any one good; they could only modify the environment<sup>54</sup> which, hopefully, would then be more conducive to achieve the good. The argument rejected both the Tolstoyan anarchistic view of the state and the Webbs' promotion of state socialism. The former would in all likelihood bring about chaos, while the latter form could all too easily lead to tyranny. Like Tawney, the FOR espoused a mixture of guild and Christian socialism which perhaps may be called a "socialism of concern".<sup>55</sup>

With such skepticism towards democracy in its most ideal form one should not be surprised to find that FOR members were skeptical



towards the democratic state as it existed. Hodgkin thought that people had "a quite exaggerated sense of the importance of the State in human society."<sup>56</sup> J. Scott Duckers asked in Reconciliation whether

Christianity was compatible with politics.<sup>57</sup> Gilbert T. Sadler answered the question negatively as the title of his book indicated:

Our Enemy the State. He called for the adoption of Tolstoy's suggestion

to boycott the state because it embodied a pagan system of life and was based on force.<sup>58</sup> Orchard argued that trust in force had pernicious,

dehumanizing and demoralizing effects.<sup>59</sup> Roberts posited that the state had grown out of military necessity.<sup>60</sup> But unlike Sadler, the FOR

writers could find some relative justification for a pagan state. C.J.

Cadoux interpreted Rom. 13:1 - 7 as spoken about pagan, not Christian, magistrates, implying a sub-Christian role for the state.<sup>61</sup> Up to a

certain extent the Christian could accommodate him or herself to that situation, through, for example, service to people. The Christian could not compromise the higher principles set out by Christ.<sup>62</sup> Obedience to

the state was, therefore, acceptable if no un-Christian conduct was involved.<sup>63</sup> In such a scheme there could be no absolute state. The

state was only provisional and a transitory stage in the development of the human society. It would evolve into something else, but a condition of further evolution was the elimination of war.<sup>64</sup> Reactionary-minded

people stood in the way of this evolutionary process. The task of education was to liberate the individual from this "herd mind", so that

the "state itself will have less importance and be superseded in its present primacy by the industrial and commercial organizations."<sup>65</sup>

While Roberts emphasized the supersession of the state, others, like Davies, stressed a different basis. For Davies it was fear which stood in the way of the state's evolution. Only love could break through this barrier. Essentially Davies made "true psychology--the science of the soul--... the foundation of a true politics--the science of the State."<sup>66</sup> Only charity, not justice, could be the basis of the state.<sup>67</sup> Such a basis would make coercion impossible. And as already has been seen, charity was at the core of the FOR's reconstruction. However, as Micklem, Morgan or Hodgkin pointed out, not all forms of coercion or force were wrong.<sup>68</sup> They hoped, nevertheless, that ultimately political life would be based wholly on consent. Hodgkin made an important contribution to the debate on the limits of coercion. He suggested that coercion could be used when the coerced consented. This coercion should, however, be redemptive and never injurious. Furthermore, the coercion could only be used by an impartial party and even then the party should be subject to public criticism. Finally, the aim of all coercive measures should be to do away with the need for coercion.<sup>69</sup> Hodgkin's guidelines were essentially a summary and a refinement of statements made during the war. But while during the war the emphasis usually fell on the negative aspects of coercion, now coercion became a servant of love and was made compatible with FOR non-resistance. Coercion was, however, not an essential element in the make-up of the state. Thus pacifists who participated in the political process did not need to compromise the higher principles set by Jesus. Rather, their participation contributed to the reconstruction of

politics and, they hoped, of the socio-economic situation.

### Of Socialism, a Social Program and the 1926 General Strike

What did the King's Weigh House program mean by aspiring to apply "the principles of Jesus to modern economic conditions"? In 1919 Kees Boeke made that at least partly clear in a letter published in the June issue of The Venturer:

We take our stand against all violence, not only in the hands of those attempting to bring about a new order of society, but also of those who wish to maintain the present disorder of society who thus threaten to let loose civil war. We cry out to all "lay down your arms!". We strive through love and through love alone to revolutionize society.<sup>70</sup>

Boeke's statement was as much directed against socialists who propagated "direct action" as against conservatives who advocated a return to the Edwardian "golden age" and whose presence in the Lloyd George coalition seriously hampered reconstruction. But with the socialists he called for a radically new society. Boeke's, and with him the FOR's, view was that the gospel was "completely subversive of the present social order." According to The Venturer, the new order, the Kingdom of God, needed a totally different basis, which could "be gained when all men everywhere respond to God's giving to them, by giving themselves to Him and one another. The Christian social ideas is then a society founded upon giving rather than upon getting."<sup>71</sup> Certainly during the first few years after the war many FOR members were still optimistic enough<sup>72</sup> to think that the Kingdom of God would soon be reality. Its coming was contingent upon human effort. Therefore, according to Hodgkin, human

society would only progressively be transformed to embody God's will.<sup>73</sup> For Hodgkin, the key to the new social order was the Sermon on the Mount, which, if put into practice, would undermine what Tawney called the "acquisitive society".<sup>74</sup> The present society suffered from ill-distribution of wealth, exploitation--the exploited suffered and the exploiters degenerated--ultranationalism, militarism and materialism.<sup>75</sup> From these woes society had to be freed, yet Hodgkin realized that changes had to be carefully implemented so that the changes did not bring about starvation.<sup>76</sup> The Fatherhood of God, the unique value of the spirit of man, the love to others, and the kingship of service<sup>77</sup> meant getting rid of the wage system so that the absolute worth of each individual was recognized.<sup>78</sup> The changes would correct industry which had failed to become a real human partnership and service.<sup>79</sup> If these changes were to be brought about peaceably, it was imperative that Christians should give the lead,<sup>80</sup> and give up the materialism which robbed life of all its higher value.<sup>81</sup>

However, social peace making was not always easy. Dryer noticed that there was a good measure of agreement on general statements and methods among FOR members, "but divergence occurs when we try to apply these general principles to the transition state where the individual finds himself involved as a citizen of a non-Christian state."<sup>82</sup> Yet, there was initially broad enough agreement to develop the King's Weigh House outline into the 1920 Social Program. The program was the FOR's response to the recent massive rise in unemployment. It proclaimed a social revolution through liberty, equality and fraternity.<sup>83</sup> Yet,

these key words had "no permanent validity apart from a consciousness of God." The economic suggestions the program made were therefore contributions on the way to achieve God's Kingdom. The program listed five guidelines:

1. Ownership... is not absolute.
2. The community should own the land and such industries as produce and distribute the things essential to life.
3. The community should regulate the conditions of employment...
4. It is the privilege and duty of every individual... to serve the community and develop his own personality.
5. An industry should... be in the control of the workers engaged therein.<sup>84</sup>

Such a program could be interpreted as a denial of industrialization<sup>85</sup>, or a romantic return to the land movement<sup>86</sup>, or a call to return to crafts and small shopkeepers.<sup>87</sup> But this was not the intention. Like the Labour Party's 1918 new constitution and program, it was a definite attack on a system: capitalism. The program was an attempt to strike a balance between the community and the individual, not an attack against a particular class.<sup>88</sup>

The program formed the basis for speeches, discussions and conferences.<sup>89</sup> It helped to establish close links with the Labour movement, but it would be wrong to identify the program with that of socialism or with communism, the latter being perceived as "an absurdity in any climate colder, or civilisation more advanced, than that of the South Sea Islands."<sup>90</sup> Significantly, the program did not condemn private property or even wealth. Rather, it aspired to achieve a more equitable distribution of wealth, and, like Christ, warned against economic irresponsibility with its concomitant use of people as tools

for profit.<sup>91</sup> Although the program did not use L. T. Hobhouse's terminology of "property for use" and "property for power", the terms would be very applicable.<sup>92</sup> The program condemned the latter and accepted the former, keeping in mind that all property was held in stewardship. By making private property acceptable, the FOR shied away from asceticism.<sup>93</sup> As Martin pointed out, wealth was a danger, not a sin.<sup>94</sup> However, great wealth, like poverty, was intolerable because it led to the starvation of the soul. Thus a more equitable distribution was also a theological requirement.

Such a program was also a challenge to the churches,<sup>95</sup> for "as long as there is industrial unrest and economic strife religious fellowship will be impossible."<sup>96</sup> Orchard hoped that the churches would side with Labour.<sup>97</sup> In many ways COPEC was the churches' positive response to the social scene. Although there is no evidence that COPEC borrowed directly from the Fellowship's Social Program, there were close resemblances between the resolutions on "Industry and Property" and the program. In COPEC the churches proclaimed their concern not just for the individual but for the organization of society, a concern which had been at the heart of the FOR's message. After COPEC many FOR members came to view the churches, rather than the FOR, as their channel to achieve social justice. This helps to explain why the FOR in the 1930's could focus its attention much more on pacifism in the narrower sense.

It was one thing to preach the destruction of the existing social order, as Liverpoolian Unitarian Stanley Mellor did,<sup>98</sup> but quite another to see that change happen peacefully. Mellor accepted that

there would be disturbance and sacrifice but not that the changes had to be accompanied by violence.<sup>99</sup> Even those who supported strikes, like Lansbury, rejected violence. But did strikes fit in with the Christian method? As a certain R. McKinley wrote:

One is nearly always in sympathy with the striker and yet one is always critical about identifying one's self with the strike method. ...However sympathetic one may have been with the miners in the last strike [1921] the element of violence which was used to anyone who tried to keep the machinery going was obviously unchristian.<sup>100</sup>

What McKinley essentially condemned was coercion used negatively because it was incompatible with the conception of power as given by Jesus.<sup>101</sup> Those who rejected strikes were in a much less favourable position to identify with the miners than those who accepted them. The FOR's disunity on strikes was not a new phenomenon. The question of what position to adopt on strikes had been discussed in 1916 and again in the New Series of The Venturer of 1919.<sup>102</sup> The disunity undoubtedly hampered the FOR's mediation attempt in the coal dispute of 1925-1926. However, disunity did not prevent all activities. The FOR attitude in 1925-1926 was molded during and after the strikes of 1919-1921 when the Fellowship had shown its concern for the plight of the unemployed. The economic crisis which began with the collapse of the post-war boom late in 1919 had led to unprecedented numbers losing their jobs. The FOR had apparently no immediate solution to this crisis, for rather naively the Fellowship, through their News Sheet, asked the unemployed to state their needs. The few respondents stated the obvious: work. Resorting to a more traditional form of assistance, the Fellowship provided some financial support. Traditional charity rather than genuine

reconstruction was all the FOR could achieve.<sup>103</sup>

The limited achievements of the early 1920s did not prevent the FOR from making another attempt at reconstruction during the 1925-1926 coal crisis. In the spring of 1925 the miners threatened to strike when the mine owners demanded lower wages and longer work hours. Baldwin was temporarily able to prevent both the implementation of the demands and the threatened strike. During this troubled period the FOR took two initiatives. First, the FOR sent 24,000 clergymen a letter calling for a united influence to support the principle of arbitration. This initiative had apparently no direct result since there was no united effort.<sup>104</sup> The second initiative came during the 1925 Kiplin Summer Conference (July 31-August 6). The FOR's Council held a special session to consider the explosive industrial situation. But no decisive action was taken. Only a committee on wages was appointed to enunciate the principles the FOR thought would lead to a solution in the coal dispute.<sup>105</sup> Shortly afterwards the committee prepared a statement which was sent to prime minister Baldwin, the Miners' Federation and the Mining Association.<sup>106</sup> The statement indicated that victory for either the Federation or the Association, the two direct adversaries, was undesirable since that would cause further strife.<sup>107</sup> It recommended that the coal industry "should be organised to secure a maximum of efficient service." At least the owners could agree on this point. The statement also called for an enquiry "with references to the service rendered to the community." Here is an instance of Malcolm Sparkes' idea of the community as an interested third party. Furthermore, the



statement assumed that the enquiry would concede that the miners had a right to "decent living conditions" which should not be modified by shareholders.<sup>108</sup> An enquiry was indeed held in the form of a Royal Commission in October 1925 under Sir Herbert Samuel, who had been home secretary in 1916.<sup>109</sup> His report appeared in March 1926. For the FOR the crucial point of the statement was undoubtedly the attempt to involve a third party: the community. It was this key point which was ignored by the parties involved and by the Samuel Report. According to Davies, the statement was ignored, because a war mentality prevailed which produced a dictatorship of fighting men on either side.<sup>110</sup> Baldwin, who recognized the dangers of the harsh demands of the owners, started to take part in the negotiations on April 22, 1926,<sup>111</sup> but to no avail. When Baldwin abruptly and unilaterally broke off the negotiations on May 3 the TUC proclaimed a general strike and the government a state of emergency. Unfortunately, no FOR archival material exists to indicate what the FOR actually did during the strike.<sup>112</sup> What is known is that the Fellowship could not support the strike because it was an attempt to coerce the community. As an organization the FOR probably did little. However, individual members were active in visiting leaders of all sides to convince them to resume negotiations.<sup>113</sup>

After the strike, on May 28, 1926, the FOR sent a message to the membership, reviewing the events of early May. It contrasted the "marvellously pacific demonstration" of the strikers with the government's "reliance on, and even provocative display of, military

force."<sup>114</sup> The message expressed gratitude to the churches which had called for a resumption of the negotiations.<sup>115</sup> Significantly, the message spoke of the conflict as war, which may explain why so many FOR members tried to help during and after the strike. The message was accompanied by a number of suggestions and questions. The questionnaire could be regarded as the 1920 Social Program applied to the coal-dispute and put into question form. At the same time the questions resembled the "Kiplin" Statement of 1925. For example, question 1 asked, "Has the community as a whole... any right to express an opinion on the coal dispute?", while question 3 asked, "Do you accept the principle... that wages adequate to a standard of life should be a first charge on industry?".<sup>116</sup> The questions and suggestions tried to come to grips with the effects of the strike on the community as well as being fair to and understanding of the two contending sides. In other words, the key to reconciliation was a three-sided approach. But as in 1925 no one of the disputants seemed to be interested in this approach in the spring and summer of 1926. Hence, archbishop Davidson's reconciliation attempt, the "British Charter for Mines", signed among others by G.K. Chesterton, Orchard and Royden, and Davies' "Christian Policy for Mining Peace" fell on deaf ears.<sup>117</sup> Perhaps the failure of the General Strike indicated more profoundly than any other event in the 1920s the difficulties of reconciliation in the face of the growing power of the British right and the taming of both the Labour Party and the trade unions.<sup>118</sup>

The FOR was not content to send out a message and a questionnaire and with some involvement in mediation. It also established a special fund which included food and clothing for the miners who held on after the General Strike had ended.<sup>119</sup> This aftercare probably stimulated a series of related activities, mainly in the form of missions. One such mission, among the unemployed Liverpool dockworkers in 1927, had a special consequence. For about two weeks missionaries visited, among others, churches, young people's groups, communists and businessmen. They asked canon Charles Raven, as yet not a pacifist, to give a lecture on evolution. About six years later Raven would become the chairman of the FOR.<sup>120</sup>

The "miners' Versailles",<sup>121</sup> had another consequence: it stimulated an even stronger FOR demand for public ownership - "democratic control" - and for a change in the social system.<sup>122</sup> The issue of public ownership continued to be debated, finally culminating in the 1929 Bangor Summer Conference on "Christianity and Property". The verdict of the conference was that Christianity and capitalism were irreconcilable. Capitalism caused the workers to lose their humanity. Moreover, it bred false egotism and had a false idea of efficiency. Hence the conference called for a structural and mental change.<sup>123</sup> The 1929 IFOR conference at Lyon reinforced these conclusions.<sup>124</sup> These conclusions led to Wallace Hancock's complaint that the FOR was rapidly moving left. However, the 1929 Bangor conclusions were essentially no different from the 1920 Social Program. It is possible to go even one step further. The revolutionary terminology of the "Christian

Revolution Series" had largely disappeared. Two months before Hancock's complaint Reconciliation published J.E. Francis' article "Christian Capitalism", a title quite unthinkable for the FOR in the early 1920's.<sup>125</sup> A month after Hancock, the economist J.R. Bellerby wrote that Jesus gave no direct guidance on the use of property, so that the conclusions drawn from Christ's principles could differ.<sup>126</sup> And differ the FOR members did. The events surrounding the General Strike made it abundantly clear that reconciliation and reconstruction were extremely difficult to attain. As the FOR had said frequently before, a new society could only be achieved if people had a change of heart. Probably the results of the General Strike contributed to the FOR becoming more of an order: the involvement of the churches in the strike offered hope that in the churches the "metanoia" could be attained. Ironically, during the General Strike the various power groups ignored the proffered help of the churches.

### Three Experiments

A discussion of the FOR's attempts at reconstruction would not be complete without some attention to three social experiments: the second Riverside Village, Fairby Reformatory school and the "Cornish Scheme". All three were endeavours to create an atmosphere of social peace through different types of communal living. All three were short-lived, but while the first two could be regarded as continuations of earlier experiments, the third one was new.

Late in 1917 the first Riverside closed because of illness of some administrators and disagreements among the leaders. Yet the

purchase of the rest of the property was completed so that at a later date the experiment could continue. Instead of the original reclamation of young offenders, the second experiment was to be a small "Cooperative Industrial Society" which finally got underway early 1919. In order to become a settler one had to have the support of two-thirds of the other settlers as well as that of the management. Moreover, there was a trial period of three months. The settlers were expected to work forty-four hours a week with two hours daily for sectional duties at which time some young delinquents were associated with them.<sup>127</sup> The scheme, however, did not work well because of dampness, unfavourable produce prices, costly repairs, disagreements and wages. Early in 1921 the suggestion was made to sell Riverside because it needed £ 3000 to carry on.<sup>128</sup> Later in the year it was sold for £ 6645 - and even at that price not all the loans could be repaid.<sup>129</sup> Although the Riverside Committee changed its name to become the Fairby Grange Committee, Riverside kept going for a few more years, though without young offenders. There remained the usual disagreements among the settlers, but the biggest handicap undoubtedly was that the settlers were not farmers by background. The result was that Riverside kept on losing money, and in 1925 share and loan holders decided to discontinue the experiment.<sup>130</sup>

One incident deserves special mention because it indicates that theory and practice in the FOR did not necessarily coincide. There was an attempt to use hired labour at the current rate for the district because it was thought to be cheaper than settlers' labour. In this way

management and shareholders hoped to recover some of the loss. In a letter to Davies, one of the settlers, E.G. Collison, wrote that the current rate was quite inadequate and "hence resolves itself into a proposal to retrieve our broken fortunes by means of sweated labour."<sup>131</sup> If Collison was correct, and there is no reason to think he was not, the FOR did not always put its own 1920 Social Program into practice in its own experiments.

Dr. Salter enabled the FOR to start with the second experiment. In 1918 he purchased Fairby Grange, Hartley, Kent, as a convalescent home for C.O.s.<sup>132</sup> When the work with C.O.s was finished, the FOR acquired the home rent free for delinquent girls.<sup>133</sup> Initially there was a clash with the Hospitality Committee which wanted to use the home for English children who otherwise could not enjoy a holiday.<sup>134</sup> After the disagreement had been resolved, a small reformatory for about twenty girls was set up. Grace Costin was appointed warden and the Home Office gave approval of the project. Again judge Clarke Hall, the magistrate of Old Street Juvenile Police Court, was a moving force behind the experiment. The FOR did not take the experiment lightly as can be seen from the composition of the Committee. Members included Margery Fry and Cecil Leeson, honorary secretary and secretary respectively of the Howard League for Penal Reform, Seaward Beddow, chairman of the Committee, Oliver Dryer, FOR general secretary, Margaret Glaisyer, chairman of the FOR Executive Committee, and Arthur Rashleigh, FOR chairman.

The school aimed at giving the girls some training in horticulture. A notice from the Inspecting Education Officer indicated that the school was working satisfactorily.<sup>135</sup> Yet shortly afterwards the school had to close, to the regret of Dr. Norris of the Home Office who thought that the school was sound.<sup>136</sup> There were essentially two reasons for the closure. Firstly, not enough grants were forthcoming so that the experiment became too expensive. Secondly, not enough girls were in residence due to the decrease in female juvenile delinquency and the increasing use of the probation system.<sup>137</sup> And so after nine months Fairby Grange also closed. Clearly, reconstruction needed money and this was not available.

The third experiment, the "Cornish Scheme", can conveniently be divided into two distinct episodes, unified in Bernard Walke, the Anglo-Catholic rector of St. Hilary, Cornwall. The first scheme was called the "Brethren of the Common Table" and the second "Servants of the Church". The "Brethren" started in 1918 as a very mixed group which "had not learnt even to tolerate each other."<sup>138</sup> There were great differences in social status and wealth but around the communion table they freely discussed the Christian's relation to property. At the table they shared their spiritual as well as their material wealth, stating their financial position, possessions, expectations and obligations: "Those who had a surplus laid it on the table. ... Those who needed extra took it."<sup>139</sup> As Walke said at the 1920 Swanwick Summer Conference, "One cannot share in spiritual things unless one shares the others also. One cannot be dependent on God till one is dependent on

men, through whom God's gifts are mediated."<sup>140</sup> As in St. Francis' "Prayer", it was in giving that one received.<sup>141</sup> It was, however, not necessary to take a vow of poverty in order to become a member of the "Divine Brotherhood". The members were responsible for seeing that none of their members was wanting in the means of living suitable to their requirements.<sup>142</sup> It was hoped that the members would extend their help beyond the Brotherhood and thus bring peace in all spheres of life. The Brotherhood, according to Walke, was a form of Christian Communism which in its sacramental approach to life erased the distinction between the sacred and profane.<sup>143</sup>

Walke was able to inspire some London East Enders who formed a separate chapter,<sup>144</sup> while W.C. Roberts tried to establish a Brotherhood at St. George's, Bloomsbury. While still in Crick, in the Midlands, Roberts had failed to have clergy share their income. The Bloomsbury initiative did not work either, as Susan Miles, Roberts' biographer wrote: "But the meals shared in the Rectory kitchen and the informal discussions as to the obligations of Christians living within a capitalistic society no doubt strengthened the community spirit in the congregation."<sup>145</sup> None of the chapters survived for long, but Hodgkin saw the Brethren as "an attempt to carry out within the circle of the Christian family Christ's ideal for a true social order, without making any attempt to regulate life for others."<sup>146</sup>

Walke did not restrict himself to the Brotherhood. After reading J.M. Keynes' book The Economic Consequences of the Peace (1920)<sup>147</sup> Walke became even more convinced of the need of a new social



order. He therefore called for "Preaching Friars" to be channels for such a new order. The preachers, like Christ's disciples, should go in pairs, who, it was hoped, would be offered the necessary hospitality.<sup>148</sup> The appeal could be made to the Church or to the Labour Party<sup>149</sup> or to anyone outside any organization, depending on the individual sense of vocation.<sup>150</sup> Probably Walke preferred the Church. In a letter to Davies he wrote: "The problem for me is not so much how can we, the FOR, influence the world but how can we help the Church to discover the implications of the Creed + Sacraments."<sup>151</sup>

In his new endeavour, the second episode, Walke got help from and was stimulated by Gerard Collier who, in 1919, came to live in the neighbourhood.<sup>152</sup> It was probably Arthur Jenkins, a Quaker, who drew attention to the problem in the tin mining industry in Cornwall,<sup>153</sup> when, in autumn 1919, Walke and Collier visited him in Redruth. The two visitors were so struck by the bad situation--the tin mines had been closed for about eight months--that they felt something needed to be done. Thus the concept of "Preaching Friars" became the "Servants of the Church". Jenkins started with opening Friends' Meeting house to unemployed miners for worship, discussion and refreshment. Russell Hoare, a close friend of Walke, decided to go to St. Just before Christmas, and T.S. Attlee and Frank Fincham, a Congregational minister, followed. At a New Year's retreat at St. Hilary those present felt that the Church needed to take the lead. They got the cooperation of Herbert Rider, the chairman of the Wesleyans, and Guy Warman, the bishop of Truro,<sup>154</sup> Rhys Harris, the secretary of the Congregational Union, J.R.

Green, Baptist minister, E.C. Lark, a United Methodist minister, and W. Bryant, a Primitive Methodist minister. The cooperation of so many denominations was a step towards Church unity, one of the ideals of Walke. The result of the retreat and the cooperation was the Industrial Council of the Church in Cornwall, which acquired a deserted mine near Scorrier. Before doing so there was a dedication service with about fifty miners at Redruth on June 6, 1922. The participants used a ring "as a symbol of the marriage of men to industry under the blessing of the Church." They also made a vow: "I promise before God and you my brothers while I belong to this Communion to work for the glory of God, the love of Jesus and for my fellow-men."<sup>155</sup> An engineer made favourable recommendations but the necessary capital for the development of the mine was not forthcoming. Those who had guaranteed to raise the required sum withdrew their support when they heard that the government was preparing a road-making scheme to relieve unemployment. They now perceived the Cornish Scheme as an inopportune rival scheme.<sup>156</sup> The scheme collapsed completely when Gerard Collier died on April 27, 1923, a great blow to Walke.<sup>157</sup>

Why did these socio-economic schemes, and FOR reconstruction in general, fail? The prime reason was undoubtedly lack of money. Even during the war there were many members who made no financial contributions. When the war was over even more members, especially Quakers, withheld their donations because they had other opportunities for service.<sup>158</sup> Furthermore, only a relatively small group was actively involved in the experiments and the members often had to work without

previous experience and models. The few available models usually lacked the FOR's framework, which in itself showed a lack of clarity in details. The experiments showed great freedom but a lack of discipline. Moreover, in the case of Walke's attempt there may have been a certain fear on the part of the wider FOR membership. It was one thing to express sympathy for the ideals of the Russian Revolution in March 1917 but quite another to start Christian Communism. In addition, the Anglo-Catholic stress on sacramentalism may have made others very hesitant. Some early FOR leaders, notably Orchard, Stanley James and Russell Hoare, had started their pilgrimage to the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>159</sup> As several strongly worded articles in Reconciliation against Roman Catholicism indicate, there was less tolerance than one might have expected.<sup>160</sup> Stated more broadly, differences of opinion were detrimental to the socio-economic experiments. Such differences could be of major proportion. For example, although most FOR members supported some form of socialism, others, like Cadoux and Hancock, advocated only a modification of capitalism. From the debate following a burglary of FOR headquarters in 1926 it is evident that there were differences about the practical and theoretical understanding of justice.<sup>161</sup> In other words, the FOR's framework was not as clearly thought out as might have been expected. A further reason for the failure must be found in the FOR's methods. Traditional charity was completely inadequate to deal with the problem of housing or massive unemployment. Education meant often talking and writing rather than action. Reconstruction for the FOR usually meant only "metanoia".

Thought preceded action, but activities frequently followed only spasmodically. Furthermore, the activities were part of a Christian organization, while according to Alan D. Gilbert,<sup>162</sup> much of society was moving away from Christianity. Finally, several energetic members gave their energy to the IFOR, thus draining the FOR of the needed leadership.

However, from the activities some other conclusions can be drawn. In the first place, most of the caring, education, and experiments took place during the early part of the decade. Little was done towards the end of the 1920s. This pattern fits in with the organizational turmoil and the changing religious understanding. Secondly, the churches became more involved in the social sphere. Their involvement could be interpreted as showing that the FOR's message and methods were beginning to work. Thus the churches became even more than before the conduit for the FOR. Finally, however flawed the activities were, they showed that FOR in the 1920s was not a purely pacifist organization, even though it was gradually becoming one. It is clear from Lilian Stevenson's booklet Towards a Christian International, published in 1929 probably to commemorate the FOR's fifteen years existence, that at least the leadership still adhered to the initial world and life view.

## CHAPTER 10 - ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>News Sheet, Apr. 1919, p. 15. Normally the two year terms were commuted to 112 days.

<sup>2</sup>FOR 456; 5/3; 27-6-1919. For the work of rehabilitation, the money and goods received see FOR; 5/3 minutes after 10-5-1918.

<sup>3</sup>The No-Conscription Fellowship - A Souvenir, p. 87. A few committees continued and these contributed later to the formation of the NMWM.

<sup>4</sup>Stevenson, Towards, ch. 4, "Child Reconcilers".

<sup>5</sup>CJC Box 10; 15-1-1919.

<sup>6</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 13-2-1920. The Committee was registered as a War Charity. News Sheet, Nov/Dec. 1922, p. 12.

<sup>7</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 20-12-1920; 3/1; 27-11-1922. The committee ceased on 20-11-1922.

<sup>8</sup>The first sentence of an undated leaflet called "War's Aftermath" described the plight of these Viennese children: "Starvation was written on every child. They were not children so much as the shadows of children." SCPC; CDG-B.

<sup>9</sup>The August News Sheet, 1920, p. 3, described the Budapest children as very ill clad and that the children's bones literally stuck out sharp.

<sup>10</sup>News Sheet, May 1921, p. 2.

<sup>11</sup>About 950 families received relief in kind.

<sup>12</sup>Stevenson, Towards, pp. 14-15. Lester, Kill, p. 76ff.

<sup>13</sup>Percy Bartlett started working for the FOR on Russian Relief, earning £7 per week. FOR 456; 3/1; 27-11-1922. The work was done in cooperation with Friends.

<sup>14</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 7-11-1921. Much of the work for Russian refugees was done by Fridtjof Nansen, the League of Nations first high commissioner for refugees.

<sup>15</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 2-3-1922. According to the minutes, the Home Office gave as reason for the refusal: "safeguards to health were considered insufficient." A flimsier excuse would hardly be possible.

<sup>16</sup>The Venturer, March 1921, p. 262. Jones quoted by Sparkes.

<sup>17</sup>George Davies, The Politics of Grace, London: F.O.R. 1925, pp. 22-23.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 29. Lord Robert Cecil, LNU Chairman, had written to the press that internationalism should be taught at school. According to Birn (LNU, pp. 135, 138-140) the LNU was much involved in education. FOR 456; 2/1; 20-11-1920. Gollancz was not an FOR member, but he promoted many peace causes. In the late 1930s he was publisher of the Left Book Club. For the history of this club see John Lewis, The Left Book Club, London: Victor Gollancz, 1970.

<sup>19</sup>Quoted by Terrill, Tawney, p. 136.

<sup>20</sup>For Russell, see Russell, Why, ch. 5; Education and the Good Life, New York: Avon, 1926; reprinted as Education of Character, 1961. Joe Park, Bertrand Russell on Education, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1963. David Bruce Harley, "A Critical Exposition of Russell's Solution to the Mind-Body Problem," McMaster, M.A., 1975.

<sup>21</sup>See Hall, State, pp. 145-165 or S. J. Curtis and M.E.A. Boulwood, A Short History of Educational Ideas, London: University Tutorial Press, 1953 (1961) pp. 512-519. Homer Tyrrell Lane (1876-1925) started "The Little Commonwealth" in 1912 in Dorset. The experiment lasted till 1918.

<sup>22</sup>For a full discussion of the Fisher Act and its antecedents, see Geoffrey Edgar Sherington, "World War One and National Educational Policy in England," Ph.D. thesis McMaster, 1975, esp. ch. 5.

<sup>23</sup>FOR 456; 5/4; 14-6-1917.

<sup>24</sup>News Sheet, 1-11-1917, insert.

<sup>25</sup>Truth and beauty were common terms in liberal theology.

<sup>26</sup>See the books mentioned in footnotes 20-22 and W.A.C. Stewart, The Educational Innovators, Vol. 2: Progressive Schools 1881-1967, London: Macmillan, 1968. This volume is incorporated in Progressives and Radicals in English Education 1750-1970, London: Macmillan, 1972. Also W. A. C. Stewart, Quakers and Education. As seen in their schools in England, London: Epworth Press, 1953.

<sup>27</sup>Cf. FOR 456; 5/4; 13-12-1918.

<sup>28</sup>News Sheet, 1-11-1917, insert.

<sup>29</sup>GD 132, 133. For Russell's negative views on competition see Russell, Education, ch. 3.

<sup>30</sup>GD 482f.

<sup>31</sup>GD 28. For Russell's views on integration see Why, ch. 8. esp. p. 250.

<sup>32</sup>FOR 456; 5/4; 16-4-1919. The Order of Woodcraft Chivalry had been started in 1916 by the natural scientist Ernest Westlake. The Order, a breakaway from the Scouts, combined naturalism and socialism. See Springhill, Youth, ch. 7, for its origins, development and philosophy.

<sup>33</sup>The date was later changed but no minutes exist to indicate the precise date.

<sup>34</sup>News Sheet, Jan. 1921; FOR 456; 5/4; 14-6-1920 and 19-7-1920. For militarism, see FOR 456; 5/4; draft letter between pp. 51-52. Esperanto was quite popular among FOR members.

<sup>35</sup>There are no minutes after Dec. 15, 1920.

<sup>36</sup>FOR 456; 5/4; 28-10-1924.

<sup>37</sup>For the importance of Boeke see Rawson, Boeke. Ironically, later some royal children attended the school.

<sup>38</sup>News Sheet, May 1923, pp. 8-9. FOR members raised the financial support necessary to rent the estate at Gland.

<sup>39</sup>Anet, Pierre, p. 68. FOR literature or minutes are silent about how long the school lasted.

<sup>40</sup>The very first issue of Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 1, Jan. 1924, was devoted to education.

<sup>41</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 12-11-1917.

<sup>42</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 2-6-1919 and 8-7-1919.

<sup>43</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 1, Jan. 1924, 1, p. 13. Those elected were W. H. Ayles, G. Davies, F. Pethick-Lawrence, Campbell Stephen, W. R. Raynes, G. Lansbury, John Scurr, Cecil Wilson, H. Dunnico. The four who lost were Dr. A. Salter, C. R. Buxton, R. W. Sorensen, Mrs. R. Simpson.

<sup>44</sup>News Sheet, July 1923, pp. 1-4; Dec. 1923, pp. 2-4, 12-13.  
Cf. Reason, C.O.P.E.C., section IX.

<sup>45</sup>A. T. Cadoux, Jesus and Civil government, New York: George H. Doran, 1923. For reviews see Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 3, March 1924, pp. 36-46 by Richards, Wilson and Dryer. For a change of A. T. Cadoux' pacifist views see CJC Box 9; 22-10-1918. Cadoux treated pacifists as if they were by definition Tolstoyans.

<sup>46</sup>Hodgkin, Lay, p. 32.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 33.

<sup>48</sup>According to the FOR, the primacy here was religion. In contrast, Temple virtually asserted political virtues higher. See Micklem and Morgan, Christ, p. 193.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 209.

<sup>50</sup>Dickey, Constructive, ch. 1; see also ch. 4.

<sup>51</sup>See e.g. C. J. Cadoux, "The Way of Jesus," Reconciliation, Vol. 5 no. 11, Nov. 1928, which was incorporated in his "The Politics of Jesus," Congregational Quarterly, Vol. 14 no. 1, Jan. 1936, pp. 58-67.

<sup>52</sup>News Sheet, Jan. 1920, p. 5.

<sup>53</sup>Roberts, Red, pp. 64-67. See also Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 9, Sept. 1929, p. 170.

<sup>54</sup>Norman L. Robinson, Christian Justice, London: Swarthmore Press, 1922, pp. 194-195.

<sup>55</sup>It may be noted that the future FOR chairman Charles Raven wrote his Christian Socialism in 1920.

<sup>56</sup>Hodgkin, Christian, p. 101.

<sup>57</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 4, Apr. 1924, p. 57. This whole issue deals with the "state".

<sup>58</sup>Gilbert T. Sadler, Our Enemy the State, London: C. W. Daniel, 1922, ch. 1.

<sup>59</sup>W. E. Orchard, Christianity and World-Problems, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1925, p. 103.

<sup>60</sup>Roberts, New, p. 45.



<sup>61</sup>For a similar Mennonite view see Guy Franklin Hershberger, War, Peace, and Non resistance, Scottdale: Herald Press, 1944. Cadoux' interpretation of Romans seems questionable.

<sup>62</sup>Cadoux, Appeal, pp. 13-14.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., pp. 14-16, see also his Church, p. 107 and Micklem and Morgan, Christ, p. 219, and Reason, C.O.P.E.C., section IX.

<sup>64</sup>Roberts, New, pp. 45-47, 51, 164.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., pp. 52-55, 174-175; Roberts, Unfinished, ch. 9. For the further role of education see Davies, Politics, pp. 15-30.

<sup>66</sup>Davies, Politics, pp. 2, 9.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., p. 4. Davies quotes here Aquinas. Temple stressed justice.

<sup>68</sup>Micklem and Morgan, Christ, pp. 225, 241; Hodgkin, Christian, pp. 110-112.

<sup>69</sup>Hodgkin, Christian, pp. 111-112. Hodgkin gave a list of eight propositions.

<sup>70</sup>The Venturer, June 1919, p. 398. For reconstruction in general see Johnson, Land.

<sup>71</sup>The Venturer, March 1920, pp. 210-212.

<sup>72</sup>The optimism had various sources. There was initially the hope that a just treaty would be concluded. There were practical and theoretical attempts at reconstruction. There was a growing interest in the churches about the socio-economic situation. "Semi-nationalization" of, e.g. the mines during the war gave rise to the expectation that this was the start of a totally new beginning. Liberal theology held on to an optimistic view of history. There was the expectation that the capitalism was breaking down, a view also held by Tawney (see Terrill, Tawney, p. 250).

<sup>73</sup>Hodgkin, Christian, pp. 52-60. Hodgkin conveyed here a traditional Quaker approach. On p. 224 he contradicts himself saying that the world is not yet ready for changes.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., Ch. 3. See also Robinson, Christian, Ch. 9 (3). Hodgkin probably borrowed many of his economic ideas from R. H. Tawney, The Acquisitive Society, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1920.

<sup>75</sup>Hodgkin, Christian, pp. 24-32.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 218.

<sup>77</sup>Samuel Dickey, The Constructive Revolution of Jesus, London: Swarthmore Press, 1923, pp. 130-144. Both Dickey and Hodgkin borrowed from Rauschenbusch.

<sup>78</sup>Hodgkin, Christian, pp. 220-223.

<sup>79</sup>Robinson, Justice, p. 234.

<sup>80</sup>G. Lansbury, These Things Shall Be, London: Swarthmore Press, 1920, p. 28.

<sup>81</sup>See e.g. Nathaniel Micklem and Herbert Morgan, Christ and Caesar, London: Swarthmore Press, 1921, pp. 66-67, 78. In the 1930s Nicholas Berdyaev expressed very similar thoughts in such books as Christianity and Class War, The Bourgeois Mind, and The Fate of Man in the Modern World.

<sup>82</sup>CJC Box 10; 17-7-1919.

<sup>83</sup>As Terrill pointed out, Tawney's views could be arranged under the same headings. Tawney, like the FOR, preferred to speak about fellowship rather than fraternity.

<sup>84</sup>News Sheet, Jan. 1920, p. 4. See also GD 485-47, and News Sheet, Aug. 1922, p. 5. Ayles mentions the 1922 Edinburgh Labour Party Conference and the resolutions passed there were similar to the FOR's.

<sup>85</sup>See W. E. Orchard, No More War and Other Sermons, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1922, ch. 9, "The Labour Basis of Christianity". Not industry but the system was condemned.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid., p. 139. Orchard called for a return to simpler conditions and argued that agriculture was the only true basis for the economy. Yet he did not advocate a return to the land. Sorensen in 1917 and Riverside Village were FOR examples of a return to the land movement.

<sup>87</sup>T. S. Attlee, Man and His Buildings, London: Swarthmore Press, 1920, ch. 7, shows a great sympathy for crafts and small shopkeepers.

<sup>88</sup>The program was thus not Marxist. As Berdyaev has stated, (Christianity and Class War, p. 14), Marx reduced the manifold conflicts of various social groups to a single class war.

<sup>89</sup>See News Sheet, Nov.-Dec. 1922, p. 15, April 1923, p. 8, and CJC Box 12; 23-2-1923.

<sup>90</sup>News Sheet, July 1923, p. 6.

<sup>91</sup>News Sheet, July 1923, pp. 4-5 (Pethick-Lawrence) and H. C. Carter, Human Relations in the Light of Christ, Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1924, chs. 1 and 2.

<sup>92</sup>See L. T. Hobhouse, "The Historical Evolution of Property, in Fact and in Idea," in Property Its Duties and Rights, New York: Macmillan, 1922, ch. 1 esp. p. 23. See also H. Martin, Christ and Money, London: S.C.M., 1926, ch. 3. Richards thought that Russell first made the distinction (GD 485-47). Hobhouse's terminology was used in the 1916 Quaker Report "Whence Come Wars?", London: Headley, 1916, p. 15.

<sup>93</sup>FOR 456; 5/7; p. 4. St. Francis was more an ideal than a reality for FOR members although the Lesters gave up their wealth.

<sup>94</sup>Martin, Christ, p. 34.

<sup>95</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 3, March 1924, p. 49. "Church Program for Unemployment."

<sup>96</sup>Orchard, No More, p. 130.

<sup>97</sup>CJC Box 11; 22-4-1921. Stanley A. Mellor, Jesus Christ & Social Change, London: Swarthmore, 1920, p. 53: The Church must declare itself on the side of social revolution, "nothing less than that".

<sup>98</sup>Mellor, Jesus, pp. 48, 90.

<sup>99</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 51.

<sup>100</sup>News Sheet, July 1923, p. 3.

<sup>101</sup>See e.g., Davies, Essays, p. 65.

<sup>102</sup>The Venturer, Oct. 1919, p. 11; Nov. 1919, pp. 52-53. Gilbert Thomas addressed an open letter against Lansbury's 'Direct Action.' William Mellor, Direct Action, London: Leonard Parsons, 1920, p. 15, defined Direct Action as "the use of some form of economic power for the securing of ends desired by those who possess that power." Mellor declared open war on the capitalist system. He saw no place for pacifists.

<sup>103</sup>In early June 1922, shortly after the request had appeared in News Sheet, only eight had responded. See FOR 456; 3/1; 12-6-1922. The disunity is still clearly shown in Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 6, June 1925, pp. 126-127.

<sup>104</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 8, Aug. 1925, p. 157. See G. A. Phillips, The General Strike, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1976, for a comprehensive survey of the coal dispute. See also Noreen Branson, Britain in the Nineteen Twenties, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1976, esp. chs. 11, 12.

<sup>105</sup>FOR 456; 2/2; 5-8-1925.

<sup>106</sup>The exact date is not mentioned. The Statement was published in Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 10, Oct. 1925, p. 197.

<sup>107</sup>The Prince of Wales was reported saying, "It would not be satisfactory that one side should be forced to give way on account of the suffering of its dependent." Reconciliation, Vol. 3 no. 6, June 1926, p. 91.

<sup>108</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 10, Oct. 1925, p. 197.

<sup>109</sup>Herbert Samuel (1870-1963) was the first member of the Jewish community to hold a cabinet rank (1909). He held several cabinet posts before going to Palestine as Britain's first high commissioner. He was a skilled mediator and a leading liberal.

<sup>110</sup>GD 93/94, p. 27, 1927. Cf. Phillips, General, ch. 4 title "Prospects to War and Peace, 1925-6". The owners demanded lower wages which was accepted by the Samuel Commission but rejected by the miners.

<sup>111</sup>Phillips, General, p. 107.

<sup>112</sup>There are no General Committee minutes for 1924-1927.

<sup>113</sup>There is a resemblance here with Davies' mediation in the Irish Question and the Embassies of Reconciliation after 1936. For the members' involvement see Reconciliation, Vol. 3 no. 6, June 1926, p. 103.

<sup>114</sup>SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2; cf. FOR 456; 3/2.

<sup>115</sup>The Archbishop of Canterbury was willing to mediate but Baldwin rejected his offer. For Archbishop Randall Davidson's role in the strike, see G. K. A. Bell, Randall Davidson, London: Oxford University Press, 1935, vol. 2, ch. 80. For the churches' sympathetic attitude towards the strikers, see John Oliver, The Church and Social Order, London: A. R. Mowbray, 1968, p. 93.

<sup>116</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 3 no. 6, June 1926, pp. 90-91.

<sup>117</sup>For the Charter, see Reconciliation, Vol. 3 no. 10, Oct. 1926, p. 180. The charter made 4 points: 1. a living wage for the miners, 2. nationalization of the mines, 3. a reorganization of the

industry by cooperation of consumers, workers and experts, 4. provide municipal distributing agencies. For Davies, see Reconciliation, Vol. 3 no. 9, Sept. 1926, p. 165. Davies suggested 1. arbitration 2. decentralization, and 3. liberty for local groups to get their own local problem into the right relationship. A two-sided rather than a three-sided approach was again in evidence in the miners' strike of 1934-1935.

<sup>118</sup>See Alan Bullock, The Life and Times of Ernest Bevin, Vol. I, London: Heineman, 1960, esp. ch. 14. Middlemas, Politics.

<sup>119</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 3 no. 6, June 1926, p. 103; no. 7, July 1926, p. 112. FOR 456; 3/2; 10-2-1927: 512. 18.5 in relief was collected, which was mainly spent in Wales. See also FOR 456; 3/2; 19-1-1928.

<sup>120</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 11, Nov. 1927, p. 201; Vol. 5 no. 12, Dec. 1927, p. 218; FOR 456; 3/2; 19-1-1928. Raven worked at that time in Liverpool. A few weeks after the Liverpool mission Davies met him at a Quaker Settlement at Trealaw, Rhondda. It seems likely that Raven wanted to get to know the miners' problems first hand. GD 732; 25-1-1928.

<sup>121</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 1, Jan, 1927, p. 3.

<sup>122</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 5, May 1927 (whole issue); no. 7, July 1927, pp. 124, 129; no. 9, Sept. 1927, pp. 162-171; no. 10, Oct. 1927, pp. 185-187.

<sup>123</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 9, Sept. 1929, pp. 162-163.

<sup>124</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 10, Oct. 1929, pp. 179-180.

<sup>125</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 8, Aug. 1929, p. 144.

<sup>126</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 11, Nov, 1929, p. 206. Bellerby was a Cambridge economist who had taken the chair of economics at Liverpool. See also Ceadel, Pacifism, p. 135.

<sup>127</sup>FOR 456; 5/2; 17-3-1919.

<sup>128</sup>FOR 456; 5/2; 18-2-1921. See also FOR 456; 1/3; 7-2-1921. The most serious handicap seems to have been the agricultural depression. (GD 655).

<sup>129</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 7-11-1921. For example, Edith Ellis and E. Backhouse were not paid back.

<sup>130</sup>The cattle suffered from foot and mouth disease. GD 655.

<sup>131</sup>GD 684.

<sup>132</sup>FOR 456; 1/2; 16-9-1918, News Sheet, May 1919.

<sup>133</sup>Some of the girls would come from Riverside Village.

<sup>134</sup>FOR 456; 1/3; 7-11-1921.

<sup>135</sup>FOR 456; 5/2; 12-5-1922.

<sup>136</sup>FOR 456; 5/2; 7-7-1922. The school closed Sept. 9, 1922.

<sup>137</sup>FOR 456; 2/2; 4-9-1922.

<sup>138</sup>Walke, Twenty, p. 147; cf. FOR 456; 1/2; 4-11-1918.

<sup>139</sup>Lester, Occurred, pp. 66-67. Hodgkin, Christian, p. 205. Possibly there was an influence of The Epistle of Barnabas, included in J. B. Lightfoot's The Apostolic Fathers, published in 1891. (reprinted: Grand Rapids: Bakers Book House, 1956).

<sup>140</sup>News Sheet, Sept. 1920, p. 3.

<sup>141</sup>Hodgkin, Christian, p. 297.

<sup>142</sup>Ibid., p. 298.

<sup>143</sup>News Sheet, Sept. 1920, p. 3. Hodgkin Christian, pp. 200-204; Lester, Occurred, pp. 192-193, appendix 2.

<sup>144</sup>Lester, Occurred, pp. 90-91. Little is known about the chapter. It is not clear how much Walke, or his followers, were influenced by, for example, Toynbee Hall.

<sup>145</sup>Miles, Portrait, p. 61. Susan Miles was the pseudonym for Mrs. Ursula Roberts.

<sup>146</sup>Hodgkin, Christian, p. 205.

<sup>147</sup>The form and the extent of Keynes' influence are not clear. Very likely Walke was struck by the data Keynes used to show the harshness and potential destructiveness of the peace treaty.

<sup>148</sup>FOR 456; 2/1; 13-2-1920: The preachers should be united in purpose with those who sent them.

<sup>149</sup>During the war the FOR had a liaison with the ILP. Most leaders were socialist. These two reasons alone could explain an appeal to the Labour Party. However, there may have been other reasons. The newly constituted Labour Party (1918) began to replace the badly split Liberals as a viable alternative to the Conservative Party. Walke and

the FOR hardly could expect the Conservative party to be in favour of the changes envisioned. In fact, the so-called "Geddes axe" seriously restricted reconstruction attempts.

<sup>150</sup>News Sheet, March 1920, p. 5. S. B. James had called for Preaching Friars in News Sheet, March 1919. See also FOR 456; 1/3; 13-7-1920: "Comrades of the Cross" who brought a message of pacifism, Catholicism, sacramentalism and socialism.

<sup>151</sup>GD 1832, no date. Cf. FOR 456; 1/3; 6-6-1921, where there is an emphasis on Church unity and the FOR.

<sup>152</sup>Walke, Twenty, p. 169. Walke thought that the coming of Collier was one of the two events which was of greatest significance to him in 1919. The other was the coming of Austrian children.

<sup>153</sup>Walke, Twenty, p. 180. Orchard visited St. Hilary on New Year 1921 and said that if a revolution came, secular organization would collapse and that the ecclesiastical organization could have to feed the people. For this "chance saying" see News Sheet, Dec. 1922, p. 13.

<sup>154</sup>Both had cooperated a year before.

<sup>155</sup>Walke, Twenty, pp. 206-213, News Sheet, Nov-Dec 1922, pp. 13-14; FOR 456; 2/2; 4-9-1922.

<sup>156</sup>Walke, Twenty, p. 212. It is not clear which government was meant. Lloyd George resigned on 19 October and was replaced by Bonar Law. FOR Council minutes (FOR 456; 2/2) of Sept. 4, 1922, mention the Redruth service but not the financial problems. Walke gave no dates, but it is clear that the engineer's report came after the Council Meeting, probably shortly afterwards. After the report came in Walke wrote: "After days of waiting I received a communication from the Bishop." This suggests that the information came before the fall of the Lloyd George government.

<sup>157</sup>Walke, Twenty, p. 214.

<sup>158</sup>For example, there was the Auxiliary Movement. Originally it was a fellowship for the SCM. Its aim was very similar to the FOR's (see GD 485). Quakers had heavily supported the UDC and NCF as well.

<sup>159</sup>Cf. Jones, Congregationalism, pp. 368ff. James and Hoare preceded Orchard.

<sup>160</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 1 no. 9, Sept. 1924, pp. 145-147; no 11, Nov. 1924, pp. 183-185, 189-191; 195-199. See also Cadoux who wrote three books against Roman Catholicism: Catholicism and Christianity (1928), Roman Catholicism and Freedom (1936) and Philip of Spain and the Netherlands (1947). The move towards "Rome" is reminiscent of the

Oxford Movement eighty years earlier.

<sup>161</sup>In January 1926 the FOR headquarters were burglarized. Foley disagreed with the FOR's refusal to put matters into police hands. While the editor of Reconciliation thought that the burglars could not be dealt with in a pacifist way when in the hands of the police, Foley argued that one could not reform criminals unless they were apprehended. Furthermore, the poor penal system was an insufficient reason not to cooperate with police. No cooperation meant abetting criminals. Reconciliation, Vol. 3 no. 2, Feb. 1926, p. 39. For the reactions to the view of Foley and the editor, see Reconciliation, Vol. 3 no. 3, March 1926, p. 58 and no. 7, July 1926, p. 127.

<sup>162</sup>Gilbert, Making, ch. 4.



### PART III

#### THE 1930S: THE DECADE OF PACIFISM AND GROWTH

The year 1929 must be regarded as one of the key dates in the history of the FOR. The year was both the nadir of the Fellowship as an organization and the beginning of a renewal. As has been suggested in part II, the organizational turmoils were major contributing factors in the failure both to implement much of the vision and to halt the decline in membership. Although in the early 1930s there were still organizational and leadership problems, there was no turmoil. Its absence, however, did not mean a renewed attempt to implement the vision. Rather, the FOR became much more a pacifist organization. Already in the 1920s there were signs of a changing direction, but the real change did not come until 1929. In that year the "Christ and Peace" Campaign began, a campaign specifically directed at the churches to convince them that Christ and peace were inextricably bound together. This campaign set the tone for the decade. The emphasis on pacifism was reinforced through the attention given to various conferences on disarmament held during the early part of the decade. These two issues are discussed in chapter 11. Some aspects of the original vision, however, remained a part of the FOR. Yet even these aspects indicate the shift in the FOR's direction towards a single issue pacifist organization. The continuity and shift are most pronounced in the FOR's

attitude to the economic crisis. When in October 1929 the New York stock market crashed, the FOR, like Ramsay MacDonald's second minority Labour government, was totally unprepared for the crisis. Not until 1931 did the FOR give some attention to the hardships of millions of unemployed and underemployed and even then attention was limited. The continuity and shift are also traced in the FOR's attitude to the U.S.S.R. and ecumenism, described in chapter 12. It was not until 1935 that the FOR started to grow once more significantly. Many of the new members were also members of denominational peace organizations which became associated with or part of the FOR. This influx combined with the new organizational arrangement made the FOR give even more attention to the churches. Although many in the churches had listened sympathetically to pacifism since 1924, the year of COPEC, and had cooperated in the "Christ and Peace" Campaign, a new attitude became noticeable in 1935 when William Temple, now archbishop of York, made a strong attack against pacifism. Temple's attack reinforced the tendency in the FOR to write more on pacifism. Frequently in these writings something of the earlier FOR vision became apparent, especially in the economic sphere. The connection between pacifism and the economy is exemplified in the Embassies of Reconciliation whose main ambassador was the ex-Labour leader George Lansbury. These different developments are discussed in chapter 13. During the decade FOR authors produced numerous books, articles and pamphlets. However, there was nothing comparable to the "Christian Revolution Series" of 1918-1923. The absence of this kind of writing is in itself a sign of the shift taking place in the FOR.

Moreover, there were different approaches to the problem of war and pacifism. Three were specifically directed to the churches, two showed the incorporation of philosophical ideas which were not necessarily Christian, and one dealt with the causes of war. Contemporary opponents, and authorities writing later, ignored this variety of approaches and hence misunderstood what different FOR authors tried to say. This volumous writing is discussed in chapter 14.

## CHAPTER 11

### THE "CHRIST AND PEACE" CAMPAIGN AND DISARMAMENT, 1929-1934

#### The "Christ and Peace" Campaign

Since its inception the FOR had attempted to work in and through the churches to convey its message. The task had been very difficult, especially in the Church of England whose bishops, as Charles Raven admitted in 1931, had often during the war turned themselves into recruiting officers.<sup>1</sup> Even in 1925 Rev. George Humphreys, a Congregationalist, reported to Cadoux that he had been banned by the Anglican Community, "never to enter their Church no more [sic]" because of his pacifism.<sup>2</sup> Yet this hostile, rigid mentality was slowly changing, both in the churches and in the nation. The first really encouraging sign was COPEC, 1924, even though there was deep division on the section "Christianity and War".<sup>3</sup> In the same year John Barnes, who had been a pacifist since 1914, was elevated to bishop of Birmingham.<sup>4</sup> On May 3, 1925 the bishop of Kensington gave a radio broadcast on the topic "The Way of Peace", in which he called Christians to have the mind of Christ and to let His love be the ruling principle.<sup>5</sup> However, probably many Anglicans were more concerned about the Prayer Book Controversy which preoccupied the church through much of the decade.<sup>6</sup> It is perhaps, therefore, no surprise that H.R.L. (Dick) Sheppard - England's most beloved clergyman of the interwar period - called his

book The Impatience of a Parson (1927), a book which Herbert Gray characterized as a call to the church to be Church.<sup>7</sup> The book was also Sheppard's confession of pacifism.<sup>8</sup> Gray, a prominent Presbyterian minister, had himself only recently become a pacifist: "I found myself for years unable to take a thoroughgoing attitude on this question of Christianity and war, because I wanted, before committing myself, to see clearly what would happen if any nation refused to fight."<sup>9</sup> But he had turned from walking by sight to walking by faith. Gray's conversion, Sheppard's popular book, and the Congregational Christian Pacifist Crusade (1926)<sup>10</sup> all helped set the stage for the "Christ and Peace" Campaign.

On February 20, 1928, the FOR General Committee discussed anew the problem of Church and Peace. Three suggestions were made: namely, the holding of ministers' conferences, the mobilization of peace opinion in the churches, and a discussion on the Christian alternatives to war. The FOR's function would be that of an order.<sup>11</sup> The November 1928 issue of Reconciliation put the program under four headings: 1. Thought and Witness; 2. International Church Loyalty; 3. Missions of Peace; 4. Doctrine.<sup>12</sup> It is probable that the Reconciliation program was the result of the February meeting. But there were two other possible sources. There was a U.S. pioneer example.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, the WILPF's propaganda campaign for the peace proposals of the U.S. secretary of state F.B. Kellogg had suggested to the FOR that their members should attempt to influence the churches and the National Council for the Prevention of War.<sup>14</sup> It is also unclear precisely who originated the

actual plans for the "Christ and Peace" Campaign. But certainly Percy Bartlett, the FOR's general secretary, was the actual driving force behind the campaign.

In February 1929 Bartlett wrote to Cadoux that he wanted Gray and Sheppard to run a campaign on a full-time basis for a year or two. The campaign did not have to be exclusively pacifist but at least the whole gospel of reconciliation needed to be proclaimed.<sup>15</sup> In July Reconciliation announced that the plans for the winter campaign among the churches were progressing and that Gray and Sheppard had agreed to cooperate.<sup>16</sup> During the summer meetings were held at A.D. Belden's Whitefield's Tabernacle. Support was obtained from the influential Peace Committee of the Society of Friends and the Fellowship of the Kingdom.<sup>17</sup> However, in September Sheppard was ill with recurring asthma in France and unable to continue his work. His position was taken over, at least partly, by bishop George Bell of Chichester, one of the most outspoken and controversial Anglican leaders of the mid-20th century.<sup>18</sup>

The official start of the campaign took place on October 22, 1929. On that day the bishop of Kensington led an intercession service at St. Martin-in-the-Fields. Those present, about a thousand, walked in procession to Central Hall, Westminster, where another two thousand people were assembled.<sup>19</sup> Bishop Bell chaired the meeting at Central Hall. The audience listened first to messages from church leaders in the U.S.A., France, Germany and Sweden. Surprisingly, the French peace movement which sent a message was mainly Roman Catholic, while the Campaign was unable to get the support of that church in Britain. The

audience also heard two short messages from Dick Sheppard and Margaret Bondfield, the Labour M.P. and first woman cabinet minister, both of whom could not be present due to ill health. The rest of the public meeting was taken up by speeches from, among others, bishop Bell, long-time FOR member Mrs. Pethick-Lawrence, FOR General Committee member the marquis of Tavistock and Richards.

The speeches were short and not very profound. Nevertheless, a few points deserve attention. Both Dr. Bell and Mrs. Pethick-Lawrence used Erich Maria Remarque's All Quiet on the Western Front (1928) as an illustration of the senselessness of war. Bell also stated that war as an institution of settling international disputes was incompatible with the mind and method of Christ. Hence, it was imperative for the churches to make as clear a declaration against war as they had done earlier against duelling and slavery. Furthermore, repudiation of war was not enough: "The movement on which we are engaged involves the enforcement of the alternative to war, the method of arbitration." This sentiment was repeated by Richards who, however, went further when he called for unconditional disarmament, daring his audience--and indirectly the Great Powers--to take the first step. Tavistock stated that the Christian should bear resemblance to Christ in character; any church which approved under certain circumstances war should not be called the Church of Christ.<sup>20</sup>

From this summary it is apparent that the broad scope of the FOR was absent. Instead of being an integral aspect of a world and life view, pacifism was now treated in a much more restricted sense. The

"Christ and Peace" Campaign was the first major step on the road of the FOR becoming a one-issue organization. Admittedly, the other aspects were never forgotten but were gradually de-emphasized.<sup>21</sup> Since "The Resolution", prepared by Richards and adopted at the opening meeting of the Campaign, is a good example of this new trend, it is quoted here in full:

This representative meeting of Christian people affirms its conviction that the way of War and the way of Christ are unalterably opposed; it therefore welcomes the increasing emphasis upon world-peace in the League of Nations, the Kellogg Pact, and other political instruments; and urges upon the Churches of this and other lands that they should give sustained prayer and thought to the issues of world-peace, and that henceforward they should refuse in the name of Christ to sanction recourse to War as a means for the settlement of disputes, or allow themselves to be used as agencies of its support.

Furthermore, this meeting commends to all Christian people in this country the movement here inaugurated for associating the Christian name with an unqualified repudiation of War.<sup>22</sup>

The October 22 meeting also passed a resolution to form a council to conduct a limited campaign of meetings of Christian people of all denominations, and to call a convention in eighteen months time. The limitations were the condition set by the British Council of the World Alliance to ensure its support.<sup>23</sup> The new campaign council consisted of bishop Bell, chairman, Dick Sheppard and A. Herbert Gray, vice-chairmen, Joseph Stephenson Rowntree, honorary-treasurer, and Percy Bartlett, honorary secretary. The new executive committee included four founding FOR members, namely W.C. Roberts, H. Martin, J. Fraser and Lady Parmoor, as well as J. Binns, the new chairman of the FOR Executive Committee.<sup>24</sup>

By all accounts the Central Hall meeting was a success, even



financially.<sup>25</sup> Early in the new year Bartlett wrote to John Nevin Sayre, a leading AFOR and IFOR member, "Our Christ and Peace Campaign seems to be the best contribution that we can offer at the present time, and it is going pretty well."<sup>26</sup> But by then there were already financial and organizational problems. Moreover, there were complaints that the Campaign was too closely associated with the FOR. Guy Rogers, bishop of Chelmsford, wrote Bartlett that the World Alliance was "timid about the Headquarters being the office of the FOR."<sup>27</sup> The World Alliance was not very certain about the Campaign, for it was "nervous lest the campaign should be identified with extreme and cantankerous pacifism."<sup>28</sup> However, when Bell wrote to H. W. Fox, the secretary of the World Alliance, that the "principles on which the Campaign [was] being developed [were] not pacifist", the World Alliance passed a resolution welcoming and recommending the Campaign.<sup>29</sup> There were even more difficulties with the LNU. That organization wrote that it feared that any connection with the FOR would weaken its appeal and hence the cause of peace. Undoubtedly the LNU meant the appeal of collective security, even though the resolution of October 22 did not mention this. The vague terminology in the correspondence could not hide, however, a deep rivalry and resentment. As Birn recently has pointed out, LNU propaganda was well received in the churches.<sup>30</sup> Hence, the LNU probably regarded the "Christ and Peace" Campaign as an encroachment on its territory. Bartlett defended the FOR to Bell, stating that the scheme originated with the FOR. But he agreed that no FOR paper or imprint would be used.<sup>31</sup> He feared, for his part, that the LNU and the World

Alliance would annex the campaign and render it innocuous.<sup>32</sup> In mid-December the LNU also decided to support the Campaign, with the proviso that the Council members should have done their utmost to promote the LNU, that no notepaper of the FOR or signed by FOR officers should be used, and that the Campaign should not be presented as an alternative for the LNU or World Alliance.<sup>33</sup> At the first Council meeting, held on December 17, 1929, Basil Yeaxlee also mentioned that some members of the Council of Christian Education were afraid of the FOR's involvement.<sup>34</sup> The fears, directed against the FOR's pacifism, theology and dominant political leftism, mixed with a fair dose of jealousy, made the Campaign less a success than the leading figures hoped. In addition, the separation between the FOR and the Campaign brought the FOR much less immediate increase in numbers and influence than might have been expected, in spite of the fact that Bartlett concentrated much of his attention on the Campaign. At the same time, Bartlett's involvement contributed significantly to the new direction of the FOR.

The London Union organized several follow-up meetings, starting on December 4.<sup>35</sup> Bartlett and others tried to connect these meetings with the Five Power Naval Conference held in London early in 1930 (see next section).<sup>36</sup> A special Prayer Service was held on January 19, 1930, and Intercession Services on March 1 in City Temple and Westminster Abbey with a procession from one to the other. Archbishop Lang of Canterbury who had been asked to participate declined, because he felt he could not identify himself officially with a particular demonstration.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, the dean of Westminster was very

uncooperative; he was unwilling to pray for disarmament, omitted other prayers and changed the hymns.

In spite of these disappointments the meetings and services in the London area were generally successful, but little was done in the rest of the country.<sup>38</sup> Bell got many invitations to preach in the provinces and to extend the Campaign but he declined most of them due to other obligations. His example showed that the Campaign lacked dynamic leadership.<sup>39</sup> Money to the amount of £500, however, was provided by the Quaker Rowntree Fund. This assistance made it possible to appoint Rev. C.J. Wigan as provincial organizer.<sup>40</sup> The first large meeting outside London was held in Liverpool on April 1, 1930, with Bell and Gray and 2500 other people present.<sup>41</sup> The success in Liverpool was blunted by failure in Manchester on May 20. It had been very difficult to get Anglican speakers for the provinces and Manchester was no exception. Finally, the bishop of Salisbury, St. Clair Donaldson, accepted the invitation. His speech, however, was definitely not pacifist, and clashed with Gray's. As Eric Philip, the Manchester secretary, wrote, "Everyone was very discontented with the Cathedral meeting."<sup>42</sup> The ambiguous nature of the Campaign was reflected in the press. Most of the public meetings were reported in local press, but the religious press gave scant attention!<sup>43</sup>

Much of the summer and fall of 1930 was taken up by the meetings in the provinces and the Lambeth Conference. Ceadel, who has usefully drawn attention to the "Christ and Peace" Campaign, called the declaration on war adopted at the Conference as the "one conspicuous

achievement" of the Campaign.<sup>44</sup> However, there was no official link between the Conference and the Campaign. Admittedly, resolution 25 stated that "war, as a method of settling international disputes, is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ", a statement resembling the Resolution adopted on October 22, 1929, at Central Hall. Nevertheless, the reports spoke about the right of nations to defend themselves, an idea congenial to the LNU but not to the FOR.<sup>45</sup> The resolutions for which Bell and others had worked had been "somewhat submerged by other subjects there considered."<sup>46</sup> From the FOR point of view, the results of the Lambeth Conference were both encouraging, for the Church spoke out against war, and disappointing, for the Church was rather ambiguous in its resolutions.<sup>47</sup>

Organizationaly the Lambeth Conference had nothing to do with the "Christ and Peace" Campaign, unlike the final meeting at Oxford. During much of the autumn and winter of 1930 there had been attempts to organize a larger meeting at Manchester, similar to the opening meeting. These attempts foundered largely owing to insufficient Anglican support.<sup>48</sup> Instead, a much smaller meeting of some eighty invited people was held at Somerville College, Oxford, on April 15-18, 1931.<sup>49</sup> Although the conference opened with a public meeting, it was an elitist, somewhat motley gathering, including Gerald Bailey, Bartlett, Bell, Brinton, Lord Robert Cecil, Coltman, Lord Dickinson, Dodd, Fraser, Gray, Hartill, Heering, Martin, canon Morris, Oldham, Raven, Royden, Siegmund-Schultze, Spencer, Stevenson, Tavistock, Toynbee and Sir Francis Younghusband.<sup>50</sup>

The conferees discussed four closely related topics under the headings: 1. Armaments; 2. Revision: Reparation and War Debts; 3. Minorities; 4. Economic nationalism. Bishop Bell in his Chairman's Address warned against the "temper of nationalism and imperialism." He called the Church to state unequivocally that the system of war was inherently anti-Christian because war was devilish. The Church's task was "to show that in the Christian principle of fellowship and sharing, in the Christian doctrine of forgiveness lay far greater forces for human happiness and for international security than in the world's method of coercion."<sup>51</sup> Furthermore, Bell called on the Church to give a lead to the politicians who would be involved in 1932 in the ongoing Disarmament Conference (see next section). That would mean, according to the Leiden theologian G. J. Heering, that the Church needed to regain its original independence so that it freely could tell the state to stop war preparations.<sup>52</sup> According to Royden, what was necessary was an "intensive school of peacemakers", Christ-like people who acted out rather than proclaimed their message. Royden's speech could be regarded as a proclamation of the peace army which she, together with Sheppard and Gray, attempted to form soon afterwards.<sup>53</sup> After three days of discussion and devotional meetings the conference accepted a message which stated that the way of war and the way of Christ were unalterably opposed and that the cure of the ills of the world was the way of the Cross. The message asked the churches to urge their members not to serve in war and "to make peace secure in our time."<sup>54</sup> The message was sent to all presidents, moderators and secretaries of the Free Churches.

Furthermore, the conferees invited the churches to appoint committees to deal beforehand with the Disarmament Conference.

The emphasis on disarmament and the consequent call to the churches actually extended the "Christ and Peace" Campaign. Officially the Campaign ended with thirty-five meetings attended by about 25,000 people,<sup>55</sup> but the unofficial work continued with intercessions, letters to M.P.s and the education of church members on disarmament. Nevertheless, Dr. Garvie was afraid that this unofficial work related to the disarmament resolution would trespass on World Alliance ground.<sup>56</sup> The "Christ and Peace" Campaign had deliberately shied away from the question of defence because many Christians were not agreed on the Christian's duty in this regard.<sup>57</sup> But this did not mean that "disarmament" was the preserve of the World Alliance. Thus, in spite of the World Alliance's objection the new work went ahead. Several denominations appointed committees<sup>58</sup> which jointly met on November 15, 1931, in close cooperation with the LNU and the World Alliance.<sup>59</sup> According to bishop Bell, the chairman of the new "Arms and the Churches Committee", disarmament was a moral question,<sup>60</sup> an idea the FOR had been proclaiming for years. Although the FOR was not party to the conference, its members were there as delegates of other organizations. Moreover, because of a visit to India, Bartlett, the driving force behind the "Christ and Peace" Campaign, had little connection with the new group. Nevertheless, the FOR heartily welcomed the December message of the Joint Disarmament Committee because it reflected the FOR sentiment:

Disarmament is an indispensable step to world peace....We believe that it is within the power of the Christian Church, with its resources in God, to bring about disarmament. We believe that to hold war inevitable and disarmament impracticable is to deny our faith in Jesus Christ. ...We urge the Churches not to refuse participation in this cause on the ground that it is political or technical. The question is a moral one. The abolition of war is a religious duty.<sup>61</sup>

The December message showed the close connection between the "Christ and Peace" Campaign and "Disarmament". However, the two areas of concern had quite different immediate purposes. The "Christ and Peace" Campaign's function was to create a sympathetic climate for the pacifist message in the churches. The function of the disarmament conferences, according to the FOR, was to bring about the abolition of armaments or at least the curtailment of any arms race. Moreover, the two concerns had different origins. The "Christ and Peace" Campaign was the result of an organic process within the FOR; the disarmament issue was essentially a reaction to external events. The growing concern among the FOR members about armaments reinforced the shift towards a more narrowly conceived pacifism within the FOR.

### **Disarmament**

In order to understand the FOR's growing concern about armaments it is necessary to review briefly some events of the 1920s. Foreign affairs was essentially the domain of the IFOR. The International Fellowship kept British members informed through an insert in News Sheet and Reconciliation. However, starting in 1925 foreign affairs received more FOR attention.<sup>62</sup> There were probably several, possibly even contradictory, reasons for this attention. During the early part of

1925 IFOR general secretary Oliver Dryer visited various European countries. On his return he wrote in Reconciliation that there was an urgent need to Christianize Europe in order to make peace.<sup>63</sup> In September Walter Ayles wrote in Reconciliation that he felt the drift towards war was getting stronger.<sup>64</sup> This conviction may have been due to the bellicose language of Mussolini whose fascism was analyzed in the 1925 December issue of Reconciliation.<sup>65</sup> FOR members were urged to watch the international situation. The periodical had made its own contribution in November to this call for vigilance by publishing an article by Camillo Morocutti on "South Eastern Europe", a survey of dictators.<sup>66</sup> On the other hand, the Pact of Locarno (1925)<sup>67</sup> and the League of Nations' newly appointed commission to prepare the way for a disarmament conference gave reason for optimism: general disarmament seemed at last politically feasible. The key to success hinged upon the implementation of the disarmament clauses of the Treaty of Versailles in a manner which was acceptable to all parties. The Treaty of Versailles had imposed arms restrictions on Germany with the intention that this could lead to a general disarmament. On one of the preparatory Disarmament Commission meetings, open to non-League members, the Russian delegation read a declaration proposing total disarmament (November 29, 1927).<sup>68</sup> The other delegates and the press did not question the proposal but its sincerity which was doubted. The FOR was disturbed by the rejection because such action seemed to imply that the other countries were not really interested in disarmament. The Fellowship thought that through distrust a valuable opportunity was lost.<sup>69</sup>



In the January 1928 issue of Reconciliation, which discussed the Russian proposal, there appeared also an FOR appeal to scientists for joint action against the prostitution of their work by its use for the destruction of man.<sup>70</sup> The appeal was the first, though feeble, step by the FOR in its grappling with the scientific contributions to war.<sup>71</sup> The non-Christian poet and pacifist Max Plowman, in 1936, went so far as to state that men were not really threatened by fellow-men, but by the destructive machinery of scientific invention: "War has now become the exhibition of the destructive power of science."<sup>72</sup> In his Musings and Memoirs of 1931 Charles Raven put a similar thought in a somewhat more emotional vein: "War is not a conflict between opposing armies, but of flesh and blood against the tyranny of blind and impersonal events, of life against the inanimate, of man against brute metal and high explosives."<sup>73</sup> This statement was his early way of saying that scientists shared in the blame of war, an idea which, as an acknowledged scientist, pained him greatly. The FOR's attempt to draw scientists away from war industry could be regarded as a disarmament contribution which failed.

More successful than the Russian disarmament declaration was the Kellogg Pact. At least the major powers signed this document on July 24, 1929.<sup>74</sup> The FOR, which saw the Pact as a step towards disarmament, urged world leaders to sign the document without reservations. Although many hailed the Pact as a renunciation of war,<sup>75</sup> the FOR recognized that the signatories retained the right to use military force under certain circumstances, such as self-defence, protection of other national

interests, enforcement of "sanctions", suppression of rebellion and measures against unrecognized governments. An FOR pamphlet which listed these loopholes ended significantly with the words "The peoples must demand complete and unqualified renunciation of the war method."<sup>76</sup>

These various developments set the stage for the FOR's attitude to the disarmament conferences of the early 1930s. There was hope that politically something could be accomplished; there was skepticism about the willingness of world leaders to disarm. It was the hope which made the FOR decide to give more attention to more "purely pacifist" objectives.

Early in 1930 the Five Power Naval Conference was held in London. The conference, it was hoped, would build on the achievements of earlier naval disarmament conferences, notably those in Washington (1922) and Geneva (1927). The London conferees reached a general agreement on conditions of submarine warfare and on a five year moratorium of capital ship construction.<sup>77</sup> There was, however, disagreement on the ratio of battleship tonnage with the result that France and Italy refused to sign.<sup>78</sup> The achievements differed significantly from what the FOR hoped for, as is clear from a message to Labour's first lord of the admiralty, A. Alexander. The FOR called for a "real reduction" instead of a "mere limitation" of naval armaments, a dramatic reduction of cruiser strength and a complete abolition of the battleship.<sup>79</sup> There was some satisfaction, however, when king George V, who opened the conference, called for limitation. The editor of Reconciliation thought the king's remarks to be a step in the right

direction.<sup>80</sup>

Between the Five Power Naval Conference and the 1932 disarmament conference four issues surfaced which set the tone for the conference and gave colour to the pacifism of the 1930s. These issues were the FOR's attitude to the League of Nations, a renewed proposal for a peace army, arms production, and the use of psychology in the FOR's message. As has been seen in chapter 9, the FOR always had ambivalent feelings about the League of Nations. This ambivalence was reinforced by IFOR general secretary Donald Grant's information about the preparations for the disarmament conference in Geneva. Perhaps Davies best exemplified this ambiguity. The first sentence of his 1932 essay "Political Pacifism" reflected optimism: "Peace is now policy." Yet in nearly the same breath he wondered about the understanding of some recent recruits to pacifism, and for their benefit he quoted a 1923 statement by the then recently deposed prime minister Lloyd George not to put one's trust exclusively in the League of Nations' machinery.<sup>81</sup> One such recent convert, Charles Raven, thought that the most important work of the League was

not its political task in limiting armaments and adjusting disputes, but its attempts to get down to the causes of disagreement, to devise plans for international co-operation, to promote general standards of labour and prevent exploitation and unfair competition.<sup>82</sup>

Other FOR members were even less convinced of the function or success of the League's machinery. They held to the old ILP contention, which was repeated by George Davies and the Quaker Ruth Fry (1878-1962), that the League was really a government for governments, not for the people.<sup>83</sup>

In this atmosphere of hope and skepticism the 1914 idea of a peace army was revived. According to John A. Hall, the pacifist should not only show mental and moral courage but physical courage as well. Pacifism was an activity, a matter of doing. Hall's call for a peace army in 1929 never explained how such an army could get into no-man's land and stand between the two fighting armies.<sup>84</sup> In April 1931 Maude Royden repeated the call at the Oxford Conference of the "Christ and Peace" Campaign.<sup>85</sup> Nearly a year later, in February 1932, Royden, Gray and Sheppard discussed the topic at Sevenoaks. Now the idea was more specifically related to Japan's invasion of Manchuria in September 1931. The result was a letter to the London press on February 25, 1932.<sup>86</sup> Gray explained in Reconciliation that the Peace Army was destined for the Far East, but if necessary could be used anywhere if the League of Nations saw fit.<sup>87</sup> Sir Eric Drummond, the secretary general, replied that such matters could only be brought before the League by member nations. Sir John Simon, Britain's chief delegate at Geneva, expressed sympathy for the proposal, but nothing came of it in spite of the help of Frank Crozier, the Black and Tan brigadier turned pacifist, and the 800 offers of cooperation.<sup>88</sup> The imitation of Telemachus' heroic act between the fighting gladiators was regarded as too naive for nations indoctrinated by the power of armed might.

LNU staff member Henry Brinton's book The Peace Army (1932) fleshed out many of Gray's ideas but the basic weakness remained.<sup>89</sup> According to Brinton, the Peace Army was of purely psychological value. It was assumed that soldiers would not dare to destroy defenceless

people.<sup>90</sup> The Peace Army was ultimately an appeal to human goodness in an environment of evil. As Brinton said, the change which had to take place was spiritual.<sup>91</sup> No one in the FOR would disagree with this, but was it reasonable to expect a dramatic, sudden change? Many FOR members had come to realize that change required a long period of time. No wonder, therefore, that the FOR was sympathetic towards the idea but otherwise not very supportive.<sup>92</sup> Whatever the flaws of the idea, it had two important side effects. Firstly, the plan made it clear that pacifism, properly understood, was a positive activity. Secondly, it kept the problem of disarmament in the limelight.

The third issue, arms production, needs to be put in the context of the Report of the Temporary Commission on Armaments, a 1921 publication of the League of Nations. The Report was the result of a Sub-Committee investigation into the private manufacture of munitions. The Report, sounding like an old Edwardian Radical cry, implicated the firms involved on six counts:

1. They have been active in fomenting war-scares...
2. They have attempted to bribe government officials...
3. They have disseminated false reports concerning military programs...
4. They have influenced public opinion through the control of the news media...
5. They have organised international armament rings...
6. They have organised international armament trusts...<sup>93</sup>

The six charges became the basis for Fenner Brockway's ten charges in his book, The Bloody Traffic, the UDC's The Secret International and Beverley Nichol's Cry Havoc!.<sup>94</sup> Superficially, the material published by the FOR - IFOR looked very similar, and hence the FOR could easily be accused of adhering to the so called merchants of death thesis. In the March 1931

IFOR Bulletin it was reported that in 1930 the governments of the world had spent 800 million on armaments.<sup>95</sup> In May the Bulletin gave a few examples of flourishing armament industries in Western Europe, notably Vickers - Armstrong.<sup>96</sup> Essentially, however, the FOR tried to make two points with this information, namely, that armaments were an unacceptable drainage on the treasury and that they provided a false sense of security.<sup>97</sup> The problem of economic waste elicited not much comment in the FOR at this time. A few articles dealt with a related question, namely, whether or not the root cause of war was want.<sup>98</sup> Later in the decade much more was written about the economic aspect, especially in connection with the Embassies of Reconciliation. More was written about security. The FOR held that a Christian's security was not bound up with that of the state, but was found in Christ. Dependence on armament was therefore wrong, according to Bartlett, who went as far as saying that Christianity involved defencelessness.<sup>99</sup> As he said in a July 1931 leaflet:

The Christian will be unable to change the heart of the aggressor, the conqueror, the man of coercion, until he has discovered a way of leaving behind the protection of the State and of civilisation and of walking straight out into No Man's Land - defenceless.<sup>100</sup>

General Committee member P.J. Spooner in another July 1931 pamphlet argued that the fear of attack was the chief obstacle to arms reduction. Spooner understood, correctly, that reduction was tied to the idea that the nation's primary duty was to defend its sovereignty and the "homes". On that basis only proportional disarmament was possible.<sup>101</sup> However, such an approach was the result of a mistaken idea of security. The

security argument rested on something like a chain reaction: one country armed itself in self-defence which produced fear in another country which therefore started counter-armament. The only way to break through this chain, according to Spooner, was to place one's full trust in Christ and accept His way as the only true defence. He dared the government to initiate a new attitude and take "the risk of reliance upon the moral conscience and the enlightened spirit of men."<sup>102</sup>

Spooner's appeal was in vain though the world experienced crises which threatened "security". The economic depression deepened in 1931. The League of Nations' existence was threatened by the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in September 1931 and by the general failure of government leaders to give decisive leadership. In connection with Manchuria, the FOR Executive Committee sent, belatedly, a resolution to Ramsay MacDonald, the prime minister and Sir John Simon, the secretary of state for foreign affairs, expressing approval of the actions taken so far by the government and urging further negotiations. In case Japan and/or China refused to negotiate the British government should press for an arms embargo and stop all loans and supplies of war materials.<sup>103</sup> It is worth noting that the FOR restricted sanctions to armaments; economic sanctions or war under the guise of a police force were anathema.

In December 1931 the FOR drafted a statement relating to the various crises. The FOR called upon the leaders to seek "a radical solution to the questions of treaty revision, reparations and debts, and economic nationalism." So far not only politicians but pacifists had failed to seek such a solution: "It is insufficient to denounce war;

Christian idealism must set its hand to construct a five years plan of industry, and indeed of life, to show what life and work might mean."<sup>104</sup> Concerning the five years plan<sup>105</sup> the FOR could only provide basic philosophical guidelines: there was no attempt to work out a plan in more detail. The FOR's economic remedy was the suggestion that Britain support Russia's total disarmament proposal and act upon it.<sup>106</sup> But there was no proof that disarmament would provide more work. The FOR laid a foundation but expected others to erect the superstructure.

The absence of more concrete plans was mainly due to the nature of the FOR. The renewed emphasis was on the Fellowship as an Order and on propaganda. As Cadoux said, pacifists could not make a nation disarm and neither could one nation make the world disarm. To achieve disarmament there had "to be persuasion, and ever more and more persuasion." If such persuasion was to be successful, the FOR had to adopt its "appeal to the psychological condition of [its] audience."<sup>107</sup> Frequently this appeal was rather emotional, tending in the direction of "What would happen to you if another war broke out?"<sup>108</sup> Such an appeal usually contained two components, as is evidenced from G. Norman Robbins' book, Security By Disarmament. Robbins, an FOR member since 1915, tried first to explain the reasons for people's insecurity, mentioning, among others, physical and spiritual deterioration, natural catastrophes, oppression and poor economic conditions.<sup>109</sup> Robbins' underlying assumption seems to be that if a person knew the reasons for his fear, he would be able to overcome his fear and thus would not need the so-called protection of arms. Secondly, Robbins, using, among others,



Remarque's All Quiet on the Western Front and Ponsonby's Falsehood in Wartime, tried to show that war created a psychological-moral wreckage, which in turn gave rise to insecurity. In other words, Robbins and the FOR tried to show how people were caught in a vicious circle. Robbins' suggestion to break through this circle simply consisted of total disarmament. Only after this had been achieved could one deal with the League of Nations, arbitration or a change in the competitive economic system.<sup>110</sup>

Robbins' suggestion was definitely not a detailed alternative plan to armaments. The FOR was not alone in its lack of detailed plans. For example, the well-known contributors to Challenge to Death (1934) defended collective security in various ways but offered no concrete plans.<sup>111</sup> Charles Roden Buxton's main contention in his book The Alternative to War was to draw attention to the possibilities of peaceful change in international relationships rather than the organization of security.<sup>112</sup> What the books and pamphlets had in common was a desire to change the status quo and peoples' attitudes without, however, a program explaining how this transformation could be accomplished. And many of the books started from a wrong assumption. As Norman Angell pointed out in 1933, peace workers should recognize the fact that the world was not ready for individual and national non-resistance. Peace workers underestimated their opponents' moral sincerity and overestimated their intellectual grasp of the elementary problems of human society.<sup>113</sup>

From this short discussion on the psychological approach and the

lack of detailed plans it is necessary to raise a question: "Could pacifists really expect their government to perform better at the Disarmament Conference?". Assuming momentarily that total disarmament was possible, it could not be accomplished instantly. The dismantling of the military would be extremely complex. Yet the FOR and other pacifists had not shown the government how the problem could be tackled. In other words, pacifists may have provided moral support to the government but little else. And the government needed more than moral support in the face of the surging Nazi party in Germany and the Japanese invasion in Manchuria.

The Disarmament Conference opened on February 2, 1932, presided over by Arthur Henderson, the leader of the decimated Labour Party.<sup>114</sup> From its inception there was little agreement among the representatives of the fifty-nine states. Through Donald Grant, the IFOR general secretary, who worked in Geneva as a member of the Total Disarmament Group,<sup>115</sup> the FOR was kept up to date on the development of the conference. FOR members were soon disillusioned with the proceedings. In a letter to Sir John Simon the FOR complained that the discussions of the technical advisers had gone far to destroy his resolution for qualitative disarmaments. The letter asked him to take a new lead.<sup>116</sup> Sir John's new proposals made on November 17, 1932, disappointed the FOR greatly. Reconciliation described them as "effective mischiefmaking, bad... judiciously mixed with good", deferring hope again and making one's heart sick.<sup>117</sup> The disappointment was deepened by the events in Germany. In April 1933, less than three months after Hitler had become

chancellor, Reconciliation spoke of shadows which seemed darker than at any time since 1919. The magazine spoke of the dreadful spectre of Nazi Germany and suggested putting moral pressure on the country in order to stop the savagery against communists, socialists, pacifists and Jews.<sup>118</sup> In November the editor showed keen insight and put the lie to later accusations that pacifists underestimated Hitler:

It may be that the mentality that can fire the Reichstag to provide an excuse and an occasion for seizing power would not hesitate to set Europe alight if power seemed ever so slightly to be slipping from its grasp and if any such device could even temporarily rally to it popular support. And people of that sort are certainly dangerous to the peace and well-being of Europe. Moreover, they are not, at first sight, of a kind to respond to peaceful persuasion.<sup>119</sup>

Such an indictment did not mean that the course of disarmament had to be abandoned: "Let us ignore the noise and get on with the work. Let us go about to make better and still more genuine use of the League of Nations, even if the German representatives are absent."<sup>120</sup>

As one example indicates, the "noise" was not ignored. On October 19, 1933, George Lansbury, who had succeeded Henderson as Labour leader, gave a radio broadcast on disarmament and castigated the futility of the national government. His simple talk brought many letters from Labour and non-Labour listeners alike, thanking him for his clear and sincere message. As one letter writer wrote:

Thousands of Christian Men and Women are wondering "Where are we drifting". Yet what you say stands out clearly, and the simple fact is that till we entertain a more Christian feeling towards one another, and get back to the Lord Jesus, things will be no better.<sup>121</sup>

The "noise" could not be ignored for Hitler had withdrawn, on October

14, 1933, from the Disarmament Conference, thus destroying any hopes of disarmament.<sup>122</sup> Although the conference reconvened in May 1934, the emphasis now switched from disarmament to the problem of rearmament. To check the new arms race an agreement on an armament convention was necessary, which, its proponents argued, was possible if Britain promised to join in a collective war of defence against aggression. The suggestion, supported by the LNU, posed a dilemma for FOR members, as Lewis Maclachlan realized: "Is it better to promise to make war if necessary, knowing that it will then not likely be necessary, than in the name of pacifism make a repudiation of war which is very likely to make war inevitable?"<sup>123</sup> Not only was the proposal without proof and not only were the assumptions behind it questionable, but the suggestion was essentially ethical, calling on Satan to cast out Satan. That kind of ethics had long been rejected by the FOR. Maclachlan, arguing against the proposal,<sup>124</sup> concluded his argument with a statement which had not so much to do with armaments as with the philosophy of the FOR and is therefore quoted in full:

But even if it were true that peace could be secured by a promise to make war the ends of true pacifist would not be gained thereby. We are not out for peace at any price. The price may be too great. If peace can only be secured at the cost of our ideals and convictions then even peace must be sacrificed. But a peace so secured would be no peace in the sense in which we seek it. A peace founded on the threat of war—even if the threat is unlikely to be carried out—is only war in disguise. If in the last resort civilisation is to be based on violence, it is a civilisation which renounces the essential principles of peace.<sup>125</sup>

The final collapse of the Disarmament Conference in 1934 signalled the

end of one phase of pacifism in the 1930s. Much FOR energy had been spent on the issue of disarmament. Consequently, other areas received less attention with the result that the FOR became largely a single-issue organization. The shift, however significant and observable in other areas still to be discussed, was never complete. The next chapters survey what remained of the former broad interests in the light of the shift.

## CHAPTER 11 - ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Charles E. Raven, Musings and Memoirs, London: Martin Hopkinson, 1931, p. 165.

<sup>2</sup>CJC Box 13; 12-3-1925.

<sup>3</sup>See p 326. See also Oliver, Church, pp. 69-70.

<sup>4</sup>See Barnes, Ahead, pp. 59, 151.

<sup>5</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 6, June 1925, p. 102. See 1 Cor. 2:16, cf. Eph. 4: 23-24.

<sup>6</sup>See Barnes, Ahead, p. 151. The proposed revisions were accepted in the House of Lords in 1927 and 1928 but rejected in the House of Commons.

<sup>7</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 11, Nov. 1927, p. 199. H.R.L. Sheppard, The Impatience of a Parson, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1927. Sheppard's emotional, evolutionary and utilitarian pacifism has not been carefully analyzed by his biographers. See R. Ellis Roberts, H.R.L. Sheppard, London: John Murray, 1942; Carolyn Scott, Dick Sheppard, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1977. See also Laurence Housman, What Can We Believe? London: Jonathan Cape, 1939.

<sup>8</sup>Housman, What, p. 298.

<sup>9</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 5 no. 4, Apr. 1928, pp. 70-71. Ceadel, Pacifism p. 68, suggested that Gray became pacifist after the "Christ and Peace" Campaign. For Gray's earlier views see pp. 50 and 80.

<sup>10</sup>See for a further discussion ch. 12 pp. 406-408.

<sup>11</sup>FOR 456; 1/5; 20-2-1928.

<sup>12</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 5 no. 11, Nov. 1928, p. 199.

<sup>13</sup>Lambeth Palace, Bell Papers, Vol. 1 Christ and Peace Campaign, p. 13. Hereafter cited as BP. Bartlett wrote Georges Hoog, 5-11-1929, that they were "copying the pioneer ex" of the U.S.A.

<sup>14</sup>FOR 456; 3/2; 19-4-1928. F. B. Kellogg (1856-1937) was U.S. secretary of state between 1925 and 1929. Kellogg, together with Aristide Briand, the French minister of foreign affairs, initiated

proposals which called upon future signatories to renounce and outlaw war as an instrument of national policy and conversely settle disputes peacefully. The treaty was proclaimed on July 24, 1929. The pens used for that purpose were inscribed with the words "Si vis pacem, para pacem."

<sup>15</sup>CJC Box 18; 5-2-1929. Ceadel, Pacifism, p. 68, blamed the campaign, withouth grasping its purpose for "its failure to make clear the all-important distinction between condemning war and preaching pacifism."

<sup>16</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 7, July 1929, p. 130.

<sup>17</sup>FOR 456; 3/3; 10-7-1929.

<sup>18</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 10, Oct. 1929, p. 191. In July 1929 Sheppard had replaced Bell as dean of Canterbury.

<sup>19</sup>The day was organized by W. C. Roberts, G. F. Saywell, J. A. Wallace, and W. G. Downie. P. Gliddon was in charge of the procession.

<sup>20</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 11, Nov. 1929, pp. 200-203. Canon Patrick McCormick and Rev. A. E. Cornibeer also spoke.

<sup>21</sup>The de-emphasizing went so far that Wallace Hancock in 1955 astonished many FOR members, including the editor of Reconciliation, when he stated that the FOR was "not primarily a pacifist organisation, but an organisation committed to explore the way of love in 'personal, social and national life'." Reconciliation, Vol. 32 no. 11, Nov. 1955, p. 207 and Vol. 33 no. 1, Jan. 1956, p. 1.

<sup>22</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 11, Nov. 1929, p. 199.

<sup>23</sup>BP Vol. I, p. 17, 8-11-1929.

<sup>24</sup>FOR 456; 6/1; 17-12-1929. Other members were Gray, canon L. S. Hunter, P. Ineson, G. F. Saywell, J. R. Ackroyd, W. M. Barwell, F. C. Bryan, G. Ayre, W. Long, C. Hall and A. Reeve, all clergy. See also BP Vol. 1 p. 32. A total of 116 people were invited to attend a Dec. 17 meeting at St. Martin-in-the-Fields. At this meeting the new council and committee were formed. Among those who attended or were invited were: Raven, Orchard, Richards, Dodd, Belden, Yeaxlee, H. C. Carter, Constance Coltman, Haden, H. Carter, S. E. Keeble, Pope, Oman, H. H. Farmer, J. R. Coates, H. E. Wood, Alex Wood, Tavistock, Hodgkin, Royden, Mary Phillips and Ruth Fry.

<sup>25</sup>FOR 456; 3/3; 20-11-1929. The balance was 129.

<sup>26</sup>SCPC; DG 117 (Sayre Papers); 30-1-1930. See also 5-11-1929.

<sup>27</sup>BP Vol. 1, p. 28, 23-11-1929.

<sup>28</sup>BP Vol. 1, p. 31; 26-11-1929; see also p. 21; 14-11-1929. The statement indicates that the World Alliance had moved away from its 1914 position.

<sup>29</sup>BP Vol. 1, p. 61; 9-12-1929, and p. 65; 11-12-1929.

<sup>30</sup>BP Vol. 1, p. 30; 25-11-1929. Birn, LNU, PP. 135-138.

<sup>31</sup>BP Vol. 1, p. 31; 26-11-1929.

<sup>32</sup>BP Vol. 1, p. 32; 25-11-1929. See also pp. 337-339 on the Oxford Conference of 1931 which could become an "appanage of the LNU."

<sup>33</sup>BP Vol. 1, p. 73; 13-12-1929.

<sup>34</sup>BP Vol. 1, pp. 90-91.

<sup>35</sup>The LNU objected to the meetings, fearing that "an application of [the FOR's spiritual] principles... would weaken rather than increase support for the League of Nations." BP Vol. 1, p. 51; 3-12-1929.

<sup>36</sup>BP Vol. 1, p. 107; 26-1-1930. Frank Lenwood, a liberal Congregationalist, suggested a night procession in front of Parliament while the conference was in progress.

<sup>37</sup>BP, Vol. 1, p. 132; 20-2-1930. Because Lang refused, Temple did not want to participate either (p. 134).

<sup>38</sup>This is a clear example that the events in London stood in isolation from the rest of the country.

<sup>39</sup>There were essentially two reasons why Bell declined the invitations. He still had to familiarize himself with his bishopric. He had become bishop of Chichester only in 1929. Perhaps more time consuming was his secretaryship of the Lambeth Conference.

<sup>40</sup>BP Vol. 1, p. 169; FOR 456; 6/7; 11-4-1930. His appointment was initially only temporary.

<sup>41</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 5, May 1930, p. 88.

<sup>42</sup>BP Vol. 1, pp. 192-196; 28-5-1930.

<sup>43</sup>FOR 456; 6/1; 11-4-1930.

<sup>44</sup>Ceadel, Pacifism, p. 68.



<sup>45</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 8 no. 11, Nov 1930, pp. 205-209.  
(Inexplicably, the volume number changed here). Birn, LNU, p. 136, is undoubtedly correct to draw attention to the LNU's influence on the Lambeth Conference.

<sup>46</sup>BP Vol. 1, p. 230; 3-11-1930.

<sup>47</sup>Theologically there was not much difference between the COPEC statement of 1924 and the Lambeth Conference resolution of 1930. The difference needs to be found in the organizations. COPEC's statements had no official standing in any denomination. The Lambeth resolution was an official pronouncement of the largest English church.

<sup>48</sup>FOR 456; 6/1; 8-11-1930.

<sup>49</sup>About two hundred people had been invited.

<sup>50</sup>FOR 456; 3/3; 6-5-1931; Annual Report, 1931/32, p. 4. (SCPC; CDG-B, Box 1). Bailey (1903-1972) had become NPC secretary in 1930. Lord Robert Cecil (1864-1958) had been president of the LNU since 1923. He was the principal promoter of the "Peace Ballot" of 1934. Sir Francis Younghusband (1863-1942) had been a British soldier and explorer of the Indian subcontinent. He had been president of the Royal Geographical Society since 1919. The World Congress of Faith (1936) was his brainchild. Others who were present included the bishop of Carlisle, Dr. John William Graham, Pat McCormick of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke and A.E. Zimmern, professor of International Relations at Oxford and LNU Executive member.

<sup>51</sup>FOR 456; 3/3; 6-5-1931.

<sup>52</sup>Gray stated similarly that loyalty to Christ came before loyalty to the state.

<sup>53</sup>See also pp. 371-373.

<sup>54</sup>FOR 456; 6/1; 6-5-1931 and 3/3; 6-5-1931; Annual Report, 1931/32, p. 4. (SCPC; CDG-B, Box 1), IFOR Bulletin, June 1931, p. 7.

<sup>55</sup>The total count for 34 meetings was 24750 but at one meeting no count was taken. The official end was in compliance with the promise to the World Alliance.

<sup>56</sup>BP Vol. II, p. 3; 8-5-1931.

<sup>57</sup>BP Vol. II, p. 13; 13-5-1931.

<sup>58</sup>Those who did were: Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Anglicans, Friends, Baptists and Methodists.

<sup>59</sup>There is no reason to think that the conference was an immediate reaction to Japan's invasion of Manchuria on Sept. 18, but the invasion made the conference all the more urgent.

<sup>60</sup>BP Vol. II, pp. 87ff.

<sup>61</sup>Annual Report, 1931/32, p. 5. SCPC; CDG-B, Box 1.

<sup>62</sup>See Walters, History, for some pre-1925 events related to disarmament, especially pp. 216-217 for the optimism on disarmament in 1922; p. 231 for the period Oct. 1922-Sept. 1923 which was disastrous to the moral and material recovery in Europe; and p. 273 for the 1924 Protocol of Geneva which dealt with arbitration, collective security and disarmament. The protocol was rejected by England (p. 283). George Aitken commented on the protocol in Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 2, Feb. 1925, p. 28. He was willing to acquiesce in its adoption in spite of its many demerits. See also Vol. 2 no. 1, Jan. 1925, pp. 1-3.

<sup>63</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 4, Apr. 1925, p. 62 and no. 6, June 1925, p. 101.

<sup>64</sup>See Walter Ayles' "Foreign Policy - Peace or War!," Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 9, Sept. 1925, p. 167.

<sup>65</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 2 no. 12, Dec. 1925, p. 229. The article was prepared by the IFOR.

<sup>66</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 3 no. 11, Nov. 1926, p. 191ff.

<sup>67</sup>The treaties were initialled at Locarno on Oct. 16 and signed in London on Dec. 1, 1925. The Pact consisted of a series of agreements between western European countries guaranteeing peace and accepting arbitration in disputes. One result of the Pact was that Germany joined the League of Nations in Sept. 1926.

<sup>68</sup>For the full proposal see The Peace of the World, London: U.D.C. (1928?) pp. 6-7. A Friends' Peace Committee leaflet of Feb. 1928 gives as date Nov. 30, 1927. The U.S.S.R. did not become a League member until 1934.

<sup>69</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 5 no. 1, Jan. 1928, p. 5; Friends' Peace Committee leaflet of Feb. 1928.

<sup>70</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 5 no. 1, Jan. 1928, p. 11.

<sup>71</sup>For another early example see "Chemistry and Future War," Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 9, Sept. 1929, p. 159, which looks at poison gas. Alfred Nobel had called dynamite "security powder", an expression of hope that dynamite would be the material which would make war

"eternally impossible". Scientists with similar outlook would hardly be persuaded by the FOR's appeal.

<sup>72</sup>Max Plowman, The Faith Called Pacifism, London: J. M. Dent, 1936, pp. 21-22.

<sup>73</sup>Raven, Musings, p. 170.

<sup>74</sup>Cf. The Peace of the World, U.D.C. pamphlet, pp. 14-15, 18-22.

<sup>75</sup>See e.g. Walters, History, p. 384. The nations "condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another."

<sup>76</sup>FOR pamphlet "Get Rid of War" n.d. but pre-July 24, 1929. Italics in original. SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2. See also Reconciliation, Vol. 5 no. 6, June 1928, p. 107, where Bartlett points out difficulties with the Pact which cannot be ignored as some pacifists tended to do. Also Vol. 6 no. 1, Jan. 1929, p. 9. Cf. Barthelemy de Ligt, Conquest of Violence, New York: E. P. Dutton, 1938; Garland ed., 1972, p. 223: "with the Briand-Kellogg Pact we entered the realms of pure talk, or if you prefer, the most misleading idealism."

<sup>77</sup>The Five Powers were: Britain, France, Italy, Japan and the U.S.A.

<sup>78</sup>The London conference thus failed to modify adequately the Washington Treaty of 1922.

<sup>79</sup>SCPC; DG. 117, Bartlett to Sayre, 31-1-1930; Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 1, Jan. 1930, p. 9; Vol. 7 no. 2, Feb. 1930, p. 31. In 1926 George Lansbury, Rennie Smith and James Barr had spoken on a motion in the House of Commons (March 11), to "Abolish the Navy!". The speeches were published by the NMWM (undated pamphlet). The UDC's Manifesto was more specific than the FOR's but less drastic. See the UDC's year report for 1930-1931 (SCPC).

<sup>80</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 2, Feb. 1930, p. 21.

<sup>81</sup>Davies, Essays, pp. 104-105. A.J.P. Taylor, English History, 1914-1945, New York: Oxford University Press, 1965; 1970, p. 298, posited 1931 as the watershed in English History between World War I and II. Peace was regarded as a natural rule.

<sup>82</sup>Charles E. Raven, The Church's Task in the World, Cambridge: University Press, 1930, p. 65; see also p. 70.

<sup>83</sup>Davies, Essays, P. 105; Ruth Fry, Jupiter's Moons, pamphlet, p. 5. See Birn, LNU, p. 12, for the views of the left. The letter to

Drummond was the same as the one sent to the papers. He answered on 1-3-1932.

<sup>84</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 4, Apr. 1929, p. 67.

<sup>85</sup>This is at least a half year earlier than Ceadel, Pacifism, p. 94, suggested. He seems to infer that the call was the result of the Japanese invasion in Manchuria in Sept. 1931. Royden had made a reference to a peace army in the Illustrated Sunday Herald of March 18, 1917, p. 7! The idea had already been mentioned on Dec. 4, 1914. See p. 70. See also FOR 456; 1/1; 10-6-1915.

<sup>86</sup>See e.g. Roberts, Sheppard, pp. 216-217. Gray in Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 4, Apr. 1932, p. 74, gives Feb. 26 as date. See also Ceadel, Pacifism, p. 95.

<sup>87</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 4, Apr. 1932, pp. 74-75; FOR 456; 1/5; 7-3-1932; Guildhouse, March 1932, pp. 68-69 for the letter and the related sermon of 28-2-1932. At Royden's Guildhouse there was a LNU group, but no FOR.

<sup>88</sup>For further history see Ceadel, Pacifism, pp. 95-101; also SCPC; CDG-B, Box 106. Frank Percy Crozier (1879-1937) had attained the rank of brigadier-general and had seen action in South-Africa, Ireland and Russia. After his resignation in 1921 he started to speak for the LNU. Later he became a friend and collaborator of Dick Sheppard.

<sup>89</sup>The book was actually written before the appeal of Gray-Royden-Sheppard was launched; see Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 8, Aug. 1932, p. 160. For a short discussion of Brinton's book, see Ceadel, Pacifism, pp. 100-101.

<sup>90</sup>Brinton was not too certain about air warfare, for dropping bombs involved less personal involvement than ground combat. In other words, in impersonal combat the scheme may not work. Thus the question needs to be raised if the scheme could work in modern warfare.

<sup>91</sup>Brinton, Peace, pp. 74-83. Brinton seems to have had a very optimistic view of human goodness.

<sup>92</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 4, Apr. 1932, p. 68.

<sup>93</sup>Report of the Temporary Commission on Armaments, p. 11. The Report can be found in International Trade in Armaments, ed. Richard Dean Burns, New York: Garland, 1972. The volume includes A. Fenner Brockway's The Bloody Traffic (London: Victor Gollancz, 1933) and The Secret International, (London: U.D.C., 1934). Burns, p. 8, argues that the Report was not an indictment. The Report itself used the phrase "grave objections".

<sup>94</sup>Ibid., and Beverley Nichols, Cry Havoc!, Toronto: Doubleday, Doran & Grundy, 1933.

<sup>95</sup>IFOR Bulletin, March 1931, p. 4. The information is taken from "Concord", Jan. 1931. According to Ayles, Bulletin, May 1931, p. 2, the amount was the same as for the whole English budget.

<sup>96</sup>IFOR Bulletin, May 1931, p. 1.

<sup>97</sup>Ibid., pp. 1-2.

<sup>98</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 5 May 1929, pp. 83-85.

<sup>99</sup>SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2, file 3, leaflet Disarmament The Christian Demand, July 1931, p. 3.

<sup>100</sup>SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2, file 3, leaflet A Call to No Man's Land, July 1931, p. 3. The precise context of this pamphlet is ambiguous. The opening sentence reads: "A sense of the moral as well as of the political urgency of the peace and war issue might tip the balance at this critical moment." Is this a reference to the deepening economic crisis or to the government crisis or to the international scene?

<sup>101</sup>This was the formula used at the Five Naval Power Conference.

<sup>102</sup>P. J. Spooner, Facing the Disarmament Issue, July 1931, SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2, file 3. For a similar non-Christian appeal see Arthur Ponsonby, Disarmament A Discussion. London: Hogarth Press, 1932.

<sup>103</sup>FOR 456; 3/4; 4-2-1932. The approval probably referred to the Lytton Inquiry Commission. China had appealed to articles 15 and 16 of the League's Covenant, but the League was unwilling to consider sanctions. On the basis of article 10 (territorial integrity) the League appointed the Inquiry Commission. Before the Commission arrived in China, the Japanese had occupied more territory in the north-east. When a year later the Commission reported Japan withdrew from the League (1933). The FOR Executive adopted at the same meeting a resolution adopted the day before by the NPC.

<sup>104</sup>FOR 456; 3/3; 22-12-1931. The statement is an echo of Davies' "Pacifism is not enough," Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 5, May 1927, pp. 90-91.

<sup>105</sup>The idea was undoubtedly based on the U.S.S.R. example. Planning started to become a popular term in FOR parlance.

<sup>106</sup>Litvinov at the Disarmament Conference reiterated essentially the 1927 proposal. According to Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 4, Apr. 1932, p. 79, the proposal met with total silence.

<sup>107</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 1, Jan 1932, p. 2.

<sup>108</sup>The famous Oxford 'King and Country' debate of 1933 is a good non-FOR example. C.E.M. Joad, who defended the notion "that this House will in no circumstances fight for its King and Country", was reported by The Isis, the Oxford student weekly paper, as having said that "he wished everyone to know what would happen to them within the first half-hour of the next war. A single bomb from an aeroplane could poison every living thing within an area of three-quarters of a square mile." (The Isis, 15-2-1933, p. 7).

<sup>109</sup>G. Norman Robbins, Security By Disarmament, London: Williams and Norgate, 1932, ch. 1.

<sup>110</sup>Ibid., ch. 8.

<sup>111</sup>Storm Jameson, ed., Challenge to Death, London: Constable, 1934. The contributors included Vera Brittain and her husband George Catlin, Philip Noel Baker, and Julian Huxley.

<sup>112</sup>Charles Roden Buxton, The Alternative to War, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1936, p. 16.

<sup>113</sup>Norman Angell, "Weak Points of Pacifist Propaganda", chapter 3 in C. P. Gooch, ed. In Pursuit of Peace, London: Methuen, 1933. FOR authors frequently overestimated the intellectual grasp of their readers.

<sup>114</sup>Cf. John F. Naylor, Labour's International Policy, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969. Philip John Noel-Baker, The First World Disarmament Conference: 1932-1933 and why it failed, New York: Pergamum Press, 1979.

<sup>115</sup>This Group included WILPF and Friends; see Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 6, June 1932, p. 116.

<sup>116</sup>FOR 456; 1/5; 13-6-1932. For the various proposals see Peace Year Book, 1933 Part II, pp. 61-115.

<sup>117</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 3, March 1933, pp. 41-43. The proposals were made during the second session of the conference, which was initially not attended by Germany and the U.S.S.R. Both had rejected the limited agreement of July 1932. Germany did participate later on.

<sup>118</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 4, Apr. 1933, pp. 62, 70.

<sup>119</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 11, Nov. 1933, p. 202. The Reichstag fire took place on the night of Feb. 27, 1933. The Dutch

communist Marinus van der Lubbe was accused of setting the fire. The FOR saw through the sham.

<sup>120</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 11, Nov. 1933, p. 202.

<sup>121</sup>LL Vol. 13 no. 28, T. G. Wilkinson, 19-10-1933.

<sup>122</sup>In 1934, Hitler broke with the League of Nations as well.

<sup>123</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 6, June 1934, p. 144. The proposal was undoubtedly due to the publication of the German military estimates in March 1934.

<sup>124</sup>The proposal was based on the idea that the choice was limited to two options. The FOR argued that the way of Christ was a third option so that a choice between two evils did not have to be made.

<sup>125</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 6, June 1934, p. 147. This statement helps explain why the FOR had serious reservations about Chamberlain's actions in 1938.

## CHAPTER 12

### CONTINUITY AND SHIFTS UP TO 1935

In the previous chapter it has been suggested that the FOR narrowed its focus considerably. Through the "Christ and Peace" Campaign the FOR started to function more as an order; through the disarmament conferences it came to concentrate on a narrower pacifism. Consequently, less attention was given to other national affairs which helped shape the nature of developments in British society as a whole. This limited attention was unfortunate for the FOR, since it clearly had to operate within the following national and international contexts. In June 1929 MacDonald formed his second minority cabinet. In October the New York stock market collapsed, spelling disaster for other western nations as well. But even before this shockwave reached Britain the government was experiencing difficulties. David Marquand has stated: "The Government had no chart to steer by. It swung about from one emergency to the next...it had assembled a miscellaneous hodge-podge of proposals."<sup>1</sup> The government did not dare or even know how to implement a full socialist program, yet it was committed to the eventual abolition of capitalism. During the election campaign Labour had rejected the Liberal Party's largely Keynesian economic platform.<sup>2</sup> In spite of consultations with Tawney, Cole, Hobson and Keynes the government was unable to find a constructive answer to the slump.<sup>3</sup> Instead, the number



of unemployed rose to nearly three million in January 1932, double the number for January 1930. When in the summer of 1931 the foreign exchange crisis was added to the government's woes, MacDonald and Snowden, the chancellor of the exchequer, felt forced to demand cuts in unemployment benefits.<sup>4</sup> The majority of the ministers, led by Henderson, refused the cuts. In the ensuing crisis the Labour Party split. MacDonald with a few other Labourites joined with Liberals and Conservatives in forming a National Government (August 1931). This new coalition swept the October 1931 elections, decimating the Labour Party now led by Henderson. Although MacDonald remained prime minister till June 1935, the real power in the cabinet was Stanley Baldwin, the Conservative lord president of the council.<sup>5</sup> In June 1935 the two men exchanged their positions. However, although the 1931 National government made cuts in unemployment pay, raised taxes, balanced the budget and abandoned the gold standard, unemployment remained a serious problem. The attention given to the "Christ and Peace" Campaign and disarmament took so much of the FOR's members' time that these national domestic problems were relegated to a secondary plane. The restricted attention to these problems stands in stark contrast to the FOR's earlier history. Apart from the reasons mentioned above, it will be demonstrated that this was also due to the FOR's organizational and leadership problems.

In January 1933 Cadoux asked again the question "Should the Fellowship survive?"<sup>6</sup> In 1919 the counsels had been divided, but Cadoux thought that on the whole the decision to continue was the right one.

Surveying the FOR's record since 1919, he concluded that there had been no large accession of new members; the contrary was the case. Moreover, Cadoux pointed out, the problems of industrial injustice and economic perplexity had not been significantly alleviated much less solved. The FOR had not produced a fully pacifist apologetics. Many members had left because they thought the FOR too socialistic or not socialistic enough, or not practical or not Christian enough. Cadoux' thumbnail sketch is not only illuminating for the 1920s but also helps to explain the complexity of the FOR. What FOR members had left undone was a good enough reason to continue, for the FOR was the only body in Britain that was Christian, completely undenominational, unanimously and thoroughly pacifist.<sup>7</sup> Hence, in 1929 the FOR rejected a merger with the NMWM whose constituency was made up of many past and present FOR members. Yet, the FOR, together with other pacifist organizations, constituted no more than a "remnant".<sup>8</sup> Even the "95%" pacifist "Christ and Peace" Campaign hardly contributed to the growth of the FOR. When the Campaign started there were about 3000 FOR members and 300 sympathizers. A year later the membership had grown to 3115 and 317 respectively.<sup>9</sup> In August 1931 Reconciliation remarked that the sentiment of peace had ceased to be abhorrent and was beginning to become universally popular.<sup>10</sup> Cadoux believed, just before the opening of the Disarmament Conference of 1932, that there were more pacifists than ever.<sup>11</sup> Yet, the growth of the FOR was steady rather than spectacular. By June 1935 the membership had grown to 3693 members and 427 sympathizers.<sup>12</sup> The pace quickened in 1935 after Sheppard started a new movement, called from 1936 on the Peace

Pledge Union (PPU).

The steady growth could not hide the fact that the FOR experienced some disorganization.<sup>13</sup> General secretary Percy Bartlett's time and energy were largely taken up by the "Christ and Peace" Campaign and the Disarmament Conferences. Porteous was not replaced as a Servant until January 1931 by Sidney Berry who could not continue with the work due to lack of money. In his short tenure he complained about the lack of local leadership and about members who lived in the same neighbourhood without knowing each other. Because of this disorganization many members were inclined to work for such organizations as the LNU or NMWM.<sup>14</sup> Not only was there a lack of local FOR leadership, but there was also a leadership vacuum at the top. Cadoux was in poor health and could act only as nominal chairman, while James Binns, the vice-chairman, acted as chairman.<sup>15</sup> The search for a new chairman led to canon Charles Raven, who, however, was on record that "he was not 100% pacifist."<sup>16</sup> The statement made several members doubt if Raven was the right man for the FOR. Binns thereupon visited Raven in Ely on June 23, 1933, for a lengthy and searching talk. He came away feeling "the very great positive advantages of having a man like Raven as our chairman."<sup>17</sup> The visit resulted, indeed, in Raven becoming chairman. A letter Binns wrote to Bartlett on the visit contained, however, a remark which illuminated the problem of leadership:

As to the "100%" point, he quite frankly said that he was seeking, and that he "would not let us down" (those, I think, were his actual words). I said that of course we all realised that there was a margin, more or less wide, of uncertainty in

all ethical problems of the "war" kind; and that it was precisely because we wanted, spiritually, intellectually and practically to go adventuring...<sup>18</sup>

The organizational difficulties partly help to explain the FOR's haphazard approach to the economic crisis. Yet, more was involved. As has been argued in the previous chapter, there was an increasing emphasis on a narrower pacifism. This trend was reemphasized in a number of issues which showed both continuity with the past and a shift away from the original vision. FOR reaction to three issues are taken here to exemplify this trend: the economic dilemma, the U.S.S.R. and ecumenism.

#### The FOR and the Economic Dilemma

In 1919 the King's Weigh House Conference program had suggested that the FOR involve itself significantly in economic problems. In 1934 Cecil H. Wilson reviewed how much had been done since the adoption in 1914 of "The Basis" up to the 1929 Bangor Conference. He then concluded: "Although in recent years it may appear that less attention has been given to the social than to the military aspects of war, it would be a complete mistake to suppose that there has been indifference or apathy in regard to the former."<sup>19</sup> Certainly between 1929 and 1934 very little was written by FOR members on this societal topic. At the Bangor Conference the issue of property had been discussed. A Commission on Property had been formed whose report became the basis for the 1930 Summer Conference. The IFOR at its 1929 Lyon Conference agreed that the existing economic system was incompatible with Jesus' teaching, that the class war was a fact and should be abolished, and that society

was organized in the interests of a privileged class.<sup>20</sup> In essence, the conference members, like Tawney, questioned the acquisitive method of property.

There were reactions to these conclusions. Wallace Hancock's reaction has already been mentioned in chapter 10. In Reconciliation of November 1929 the Cambridge-Liverpool economist J.R. Bellerby noted that Christ gave no direct guidance on the matter of property and that twentieth century problems were then unknown. According to Bellerby the conclusions drawn from Christ's principles could therefore differ.<sup>21</sup> FOR founding member Eric Hayman took up Bellerby's conclusion and tested it against the attitude to wealth in the early Church. Jesus, according to Hayman, was not concerned with economics but with life. He did not advocate asceticism, socialism, capitalism or communism. As far as the latter was concerned, Acts 4 and 5 dealt with the common ownership of a loving family, not communism.<sup>22</sup> Gray touched the heart of the matter - and probably some raw nerves as well - when he pleaded for a policy of surrendering of personal wealth and privileges in order to get rid of the tyranny of property and thus clear the way to social peace: "A noble peace can only be built upon justice, and as long as injustice remains embedded in our national life it is equally undesirable and impossible that we should have social peace."<sup>23</sup> Gray was not objecting to property as such but to its idolatrous and ideological use. Undoubtedly he could agree with the general consensus at the Christian Social Council--the continuation of COPEC--that the taking of interest in itself was not wrong but that the wrongness came in the use of interest.<sup>24</sup>

What is remarkable about the discussion leading up to the 1930 Summer Conference is the paucity of references to the existing economic situation. In the "Current Affairs" of Reconciliation one may find a paragraph or two about unemployment but no more. This may have been due to two factors. Firstly, the unemployment during the 1920s was never below one million. Thus unemployment for many Britons was a normal phenomenon. Secondly, the impact of the economic crisis hit England less severely and somewhat later than some other nations.<sup>25</sup> Nevertheless, these two factors are inadequate explanations when 1931 is taken into consideration. In that year unemployment approached the three million. Moreover, in contrast to the 1920s unemployment became increasingly a long-term experience for tens of thousands. In June 1931, at a conference in Edinburgh, about 400 protestants looked at the implications of Christian discipleship, especially as they related to the financial-economic field.<sup>26</sup> A few articles appeared as a result of the conference. For instance, J. W. Graham, echoing Cobden's nineteenth century solutions, called for the abolition of tariffs, because tariffs were acts of unfriendliness, contained seeds of war and blocked trade.<sup>27</sup> The discussions did not lead to action. The only exception, Pierre Ceresole's Civilian Service, was actually not FOR but IFOR organized. During the summer the group worked at Bryn Mawr, Wales, mending roads, repairing houses and completing a swimming pool.<sup>28</sup> Only towards the end of 1932 did the General Committee speak with great concern about the unemployed. As a result of this belated interest a group was formed to look into the situation.<sup>29</sup> The only satisfactory explanation for the

relative absence of the economic area in FOR literature and activity can be found in the FOR's shifting emphasis towards a narrower definition of pacifism.

Although the somewhat haphazard reaction of the FOR to the economic situation compared unfavourably with Roberts' comments in The Venturer or the activities in the 1920s, there are a few aspects which deserve closer scrutiny. It has been argued here that FOR members were reluctant to work out the details of whatever plans they had. As has been seen, the FOR proposed a solution to the economic distress but no plans to implement it. According to Harold Clough, the Fellowship was not alone, for orthodox economists had no real plans to solve the economic chaos either. They had failed to see that the "real problem [was] the production of more money and credit so as to allow production to expand without causing a fall in price level."<sup>30</sup> Clough himself did not follow up his argument with detailed proof.<sup>31</sup> One interesting exception may be noted. In 1933 Mary Phillips published a long pamphlet called The Responsibility of the Christian Investor. In it she gave practical advice, looking at, among others, cooperatives, essential services and government services.<sup>32</sup> Her advice showed her social and moral concern, evidenced by the questions she suggested investors should ask themselves: "Is the investment useful to the community or harmful?" or "What effect does it have on the employed?".

Although Phillips' pamphlet was an exception, her social and moral concern provides a clue to the surprising absence of detailed plans. The FOR was always more interested in the principles and

assumptions governing life, and believed that through various ways of propaganda the right principles could be established.<sup>33</sup> Thus F. R. Hoare, the first Riverside Village warden, could write: "If we learn the moral laws of human society and really apply them, we shall find that by that alone we shall have taken a great step forward out of our present disorders, towards our distinctively Christian goal."<sup>34</sup> For Hoare and the FOR it was a heresy to dissociate economics from ethics. Hoare went further, for he regarded the moral law as the only sound economic law, "re-establishing the primacy of the spiritual over the material which it is the mission of the Church to assert."<sup>35</sup> According to the Rev. B.C. Plowright, true economic laws did not contradict the spirit of Christ:

The Christian cannot accept the position that the mandate of Christianity does not run in this territory of life, and since he believes that the spirit of Christ is the completest expression we have yet had of the abiding spiritual structure of life, he cannot believe that true economic laws can ever present a final contradiction to it. There is no finality about economic laws as conventionally understood, and therefore there can be no sanctity attaching to them. Economic determinism is a myth: our statements of economic laws will vary with the fundamental conception we hold of the relation of a man to his fellows.<sup>36</sup>

For this enlightened Congregationalist the economic situation of 1932 was fluid, giving the Christian an opportunity to mould it closer to what it should be. He suggested a "planned economy", a new terminology in FOR parlance but not new in concept. The planning of production, finance and consumption was to be done for the sake of the community.<sup>37</sup> The Scottish clergyman J.W. Stevenson in an article called "A Suggested Confession of Our Faith in Time of Economic Breakdown" held that

the will of the people ought also to be identified with the



trades and industries which produce and distribute the necessities of life, with the finance which regulates these industries, and with the land on which crops are raised and houses built. ...[Hence,] the financial resources of each might be entrusted to a common fund, from which each would accept what is needful for himself or his family...the common capital to be invested in productive schemes of social welfare.<sup>38</sup>

Stevenson's "Confession" had a Marxist flavour, yet his framework differed. He reasoned, like the early FOR leaders, from the perspective of the Kingdom of God. But while the early leaders thought that they could somehow usher in the Kingdom, Stevenson stated now that "the Kingdom of Heaven is not triumphantly created on earth as a product of our religious energy." The Church was not called upon "to bring in the Kingdom of Right-Living amongst the nations. That belongs entirely to God." This did not imply a "do-nothing" approach. Rather, as God's children Christians should be working for the coming of the Kingdom in all places. That implied responsible stewardship in both personal and corporate affairs.<sup>39</sup> Like the early FOR leaders, Stevenson could thus write that at the heart of the church's mission should be a re-formation of society.<sup>40</sup> His "Confession" quoted in part above, showed how the re-formation could take place. Norman Robinson added a crucial aspect to Stevenson's argument. He pointed out that this new social order was basic to international peace which could otherwise not be fruitfully worked for.<sup>41</sup> Robinson's connection produced a more integrated theology. Without such a connection there was a compartmentalization which made it possible to treat peace apart from economics. And that, as has been suggested, had become more characteristic of the FOR since 1929.

### The FOR and the U.S.S.R.

So far in this thesis scant attention has been given to the FOR's attitude to the U.S.S.R. and to communism. Although the violence of the Russian revolution had always been condemned, the revolutionaries were often lauded as visionaries.<sup>42</sup> When Lansbury returned from a visit with the Labour Party delegation to the U.S.S.R. in 1920 he had much praise for the country and his attitude could be regarded as reasonably representative of the FOR for the early part of the decade.<sup>43</sup> The Russian disarmament suggestions were enthusiastically received. The idea of planning almost certainly derived from the Russian model. Nevertheless, a more critical tone gradually started to appear in FOR literature. Therefore, some attention is first given to the development of the critique, followed by possible reasons why the FOR became more critical at a time when many British intellectuals increasingly turned to Moscow.

The first serious FOR critique came in 1928 when Roger Soltau reviewed Harold Laski's book Communism. Soltau concluded that communism was a religion of violence with dogmas as rigid as those of any church, and that while its ideal was spiritual its weapons were definitely not.<sup>44</sup> Shortly after the review the FOR started a discussion on property. In the debate it became clear that property as such was not condemned but the manner of acquisition and disposal of property. The participants in the debate also saw no reason to assume that "collectivism" would cure the ills of capitalism.<sup>45</sup> The next serious

critique came in 1930 when the FOR Executive Committee expressed concern about the persecution of religion in the U.S.S.R., without specifically including the massacre of kulaks in their concern. In order to ascertain the facts the committee arranged a private meeting with the Russian ambassador and other leaders.<sup>46</sup> When in 1932 Hodgkin published Seeing Ourselves through Russia, it was criticized in Reconciliation by L.A. Fenn as deficient in its criticism of Bolshevik philosophy.<sup>47</sup> Even stronger criticism came with the 1933 Summer Conference at Saffron Walden. Cadoux, the departing chairman, argued that it was a serious misjudgment to speak approvingly of the Soviet system. The Quaker philosopher-theologian H.G. Wood thought that an enthusiasm for the U.S.S.R. experiment was just as shortsighted as praise for the fall of the Bastille. Bolshevism, according to Wood, denied the worth of common humanity and was a philosophy of hate: immoral, irreligious and reactionary.<sup>48</sup>

Not all were as strong in their condemnation as Cadoux and Wood. The editor of Reconciliation credulously wrote that here was

a people who have repudiated Christianity and who have brought into being within a few years a social order which in many respects is a far better practical expression of the principles of the New Testament than centuries of unhindered Christian teaching have produced in our own country.<sup>49</sup>

J.W. Stevenson lauded the communists' enthronement of philosophy and their capacity to see "man in movement and in relation to the whole of society." For the capitalistic West, the U.S.S.R. "came upon us, like Babylon, as the loving scourge of God."<sup>50</sup> Dr. J.F. Hecker's speech at the Conference was a complete apologia for Russia.<sup>51</sup> Russell Hoare,

now a Roman Catholic, objected to Hecker's antithesis between capitalism and communism, because they were both "heads of one monster, the materialistic conception of life." Raven, in his inaugural address, was more sympathetic than Hoare: "Pure communism must be the ideal of the Christian as well as the Socialist." However, he admitted that Marxism was coercive and that it, "like Apocalyptic, was a call to the weak things of the earth and a promise of a good time coming."<sup>52</sup> Raven could be regarded as standing midway the two extreme positions.

At the Summer Conference the Leiden theologian G. J. Heering introduced a new comparison. From a Christian's point of view, he posited, the communist ideal was clearer and more justified than that of the fascists.<sup>53</sup> However, a decade later Hayman wrote that the praxis of both was essentially no different for "in their degradation of human personality, in their blasphemy and their overweening pride the movements of Fascism and Communism are identical. They both deny God for the same reasons, and enthrone man in his stead for the same reasons."<sup>54</sup> The comparison between the two systems is interesting in the light of a remark in the November 1933 issue of Reconciliation which noted that the fear of Bolshevism tended to evaporate now that Hitlerism was seen to be a greater menace.<sup>55</sup> It is, therefore, somewhat ironical that the FOR became more critical of communism just as the fear of Bolshevism started to decline with the rise of the Popular Front movement.

It is not clear why there was a shift in attitude but some suggestions may be made. The understanding of property was

changing. The events described in Acts chapters 4 and 5 came to be seen not as early forms of communism but as a "common ownership of a loving family."<sup>56</sup> Secondly, there were misgivings about the degree of religious freedom in the U.S.S.R.<sup>57</sup> Thirdly, there were the upheavals in the AFOR when several prominent leaders, notably A.J. Muste, turned Marxist.<sup>58</sup> Although Hewlett Johnson, later called the red dean of Canterbury, and John Lewis, the author of the 1940 publication The Case Against Pacifism, were early FOR members, there is no evidence that the FOR went through a struggle similar to the AFOR. The AFOR conflict may have contributed to a more jaundiced attitude to communism among FOR members.<sup>59</sup> Finally, the name of N. Berdyaev started to appear in FOR literature. Berdyaev had been a Marxist but was expelled from the U.S.S.R. in 1922 when he turned to Christianity. Since 1924 he had been living in Paris, and it is possible that through the French FOR his ideas became known to the English members. In the early thirties his books started to appear in English. The books contained a strong critique of the bourgeois mind, contemporary society and Marxist theories.<sup>60</sup> When the Embassies of Reconciliation was established in 1936 he became a member of the board. Wood's criticism could have been arrived at independently, but Hayman acknowledged his debt to Berdyaev,<sup>61</sup> and it is likely that Wood was indebted to him as well. Cumulatively, the FOR's response to the four suggestions contributed to a shift in attitude and understanding, characteristic of the organization in the early 1930s.

### The FOR and Ecumenism

Since its inception the FOR had attempted to unify Christian pacifists in a single organization. That objective had not been achieved. As an organization for individuals, the FOR had rejected from its early days the idea of becoming something like a central board for various denominational pacifist groups. Hence there was no formal organizational link between the FOR and, for example, the Friends Peace Committee. However, during the 1930s this policy was changed. In this section two different denominational groups are discussed to exemplify this change as well as the different nature of the association. The first group, the Congregational Crusade, had started in 1926, while the Anglican Fellowship came into existence a decade later.

During World War I there had been a few small denominational pacifist groups.<sup>62</sup> These groups disappeared shortly after 1918. However, in 1926 a group of Congregational ministers came together in Leicester and formed the Congregational Ministers Crusade Against War, later named the Christian Pacifist Crusade.<sup>63</sup> As their "Leicester Covenant" made clear, the Crusade was a single issue organization. The name was slightly misleading, because the "movement was one of quiet and peaceful penetration", working only within the Congregational Union.<sup>64</sup> Like the other denominational pacifist groups, the Crusaders hoped that their pacifist witness within their own denomination would be more effective than through an interdenominational body like the FOR. Initially the growth was slow and only after the "Christ and Peace" Campaign did the pace accelerate.<sup>65</sup> With the increase there came a need

for a secretary who could give more attention to the organization and to fundraising. As J.R. Ackroyd wrote in 1939, "The best way out of these difficulties of growth seemed to the Committee to be a definite amalgamation with the F.O.R., with an interchange of membership, and the adoption by the F.O.R. of the costs of conducting the Crusade."<sup>66</sup>

The development of the Crusade was fairly representative of other denominational pacifist groups. In September 1933 the FOR accepted the idea that it would act as a coordinating body for the various Christian peace societies.<sup>67</sup> The first step in the new direction came from A.D. Belden, one of the founding members of the Christian Pacifist Crusade and pastor at Whitefield's Tabernacle. In April 1933 he invited the FOR to a May meeting to organize a British Christian Pacifist Council of Action.<sup>68</sup> The result was the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups (CCPG), uniting the FOR with the Christian Pacifist Crusade, the Methodist Peace Fellowship, the Unitarian and Free Christian Peace Fellowship, and the Society of Friends.

The second step in the new direction came through the use of Reconciliation. At the end of 1933 the decision was taken that the magazine was to be the organ of the Christian peace groups with specifically a Christian pacifist message to the churches. A new editorial board advised Percy Bartlett who had already been editor for about a year. The FOR, however, remained the publisher of Reconciliation.<sup>69</sup> Within a few months the circulation jumped from about 1600 to nearly 2500.<sup>70</sup>

The third stage began in mid-1934, when the Christian Pacifist Crusade became a part of the FOR, thus creating a fellowship within a fellowship.<sup>71</sup> Initially this meant that pacifist Congregationalists were members of both organizations.<sup>72</sup> When in mid-1935, however, the CPC indicated that it wanted to join the FOR as an organization, there were some difficulties. Until now the FOR had been strictly an organization for individuals.<sup>73</sup> If the CPC were accepted there would be no reason why the other denominational societies should not be accepted as well. Indeed, the CPC was incorporated into the FOR, and soon after the Baptist, Methodist and Unitarian groups applied and were accepted. Usually the process started with an FOR person working as secretary of the denominational group. For example, Fred Pope, upon his retirement as minister, worked for the MPF, and Glyn Lloyd Phelps worked for the BPF.<sup>74</sup>

However, there were exceptions. The Church of Scotland Peace Society made it clear in 1937 that it wanted to remain separate from the FOR. It was not until 1940, when Maclachlan was FOR secretary for Scotland, that there was a request for closer union.<sup>75</sup> Probably the most notable exception was the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. There had been attempts around 1935 to form a fellowship but it was not until 1937, when Dick Sheppard called a meeting of about one hundred priests, that pacifist Anglicans became organized.<sup>76</sup> The official inauguration was on June 11, 1937, at King's Weigh House, at a meeting called by Paul Gliddon and canon Morris. Initially R.H. Le Messurier, an ex-Canadian, was secretary, but due to ill health he was replaced by Gliddon, the FOR



secretary for South England.<sup>77</sup> In a year's time the APF had grown from 60 to 764 and a year later the membership had doubled again. In February 1938 no newsletter was published because of the leaders' involvement in drawing up a scheme for affiliation with the FOR. The working arrangement consisted of three points. First, the FOR would take on the entire office routine work with the financial burden born by the FOR but with help of donations from the APF. Second, each APF member would automatically become an FOR member. Third, each Church of England FOR member would be asked to become an APF member. However, the APF Executive Committee decided to postpone affiliation because some felt that the APF's distinctiveness was not sufficiently guaranteed. In January 1940 another proposal of affiliation was made. It differed from the first one in that the members of one group would not automatically become members of the other. This time the proposal was accepted. But whereas the CPC had become amalgamated with the FOR, the APF became affiliated.<sup>78</sup> Whatever the nature of the cooperation with the FOR, these were specifically pacifist groups, single-issue denominational organizations. They could concentrate on this single issue because their denomination usually had internal organizations which dealt with other social issues. One example was Henry Carter and his role in the Methodist Social Service.<sup>79</sup> The close association with these specifically pacifist groups reinforced the shift in the FOR to a more exclusively pacifist emphasis. Although the new organizational format probably prevented a more serious administrative duplication, it contributed to an ecumenical fragmentation.

Such separateness also became quite apparent in a different though related direction, namely the drive for a Pacifist Church. The idea was not new for it had been discussed and rejected by the early FOR leaders. Belden started to advocate the idea in 1930 because he felt that Christian pacifism was being diluted with sub-Christian elements.<sup>80</sup> He had been heavily involved in the launching of the CPC in 1926 and in the formation of the CCPG in 1933, which were later regarded as the first two stages towards a Pacifist Church.<sup>81</sup> Actually, Belden's idea for such a church came in between the two stages, for in the October 1930 issue of Reconciliation, in an article called "A Pacifist Church", he wondered if it was not time to separate from churches which did not want to "excommunicate" war.<sup>82</sup> Ironically, Gray in the July 1930 issue had stated that the idea of union was "in the air" and that although everyone felt some doubt of one kind or another, there was something which united all Christians.<sup>83</sup> As letters to the editor indicated, pacifism was an inadequate reason for dissociation. Christianity was bigger than pacifism and pacifists needed to be the leaven in the churches.<sup>84</sup> Two years later Belden "answered" the charges. He pointed out that there were profound theological differences between pacifist and non-pacifist Christians in the various conceptions of God, of human nature, and of atonement.<sup>85</sup> Belden's answer was actually an exposition of these conceptions and not a call to separation. No letters to the editor followed, only another article by B.H. Reed who suggested that God was the supreme pacifist.<sup>86</sup> Belden did not jettison the idea of a Pacifist Church, but the third stage took place during the war where it

will be discussed in its own context.

In summary, the three issues reviewed in this chapter confirmed and reinforced the trend in the FOR which became apparent during the "Christ and Peace" Campaign. Compared to 1915 the FOR of 1935 had assumed a different character. Theoretically the Fellowship adhered to its original vision, but in practice the FOR often acted like a single-issue organization. For many FOR members pacifism was not so much a way of life anymore, but rather an issue related to war. In the next chapter the development of this trend will be followed up to the outbreak of World War II.

## CHAPTER 12 - ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Marquand, MacDonald, p. 520. See also Chapter 23 "Looking for a policy".

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 484 - 487. The Liberal program "We Can Conquer Unemployment" contained a series of public-works projects. MacDonald, Snowden and other important cabinet ministers did not favour or understand such schemes. Their inaction as well as Mosley's poor political judgment help to explain why Mosley's program was rejected as well. (pp. 534 - 542). It should not be forgotten that such programs maintained capitalism. Keynes thought that capitalism needed to be overhauled and be made more efficient (see his The End of Laissez-Faire, London: Hogarth Press, 1926, pp. 52 - 53). Instead of its destruction, Keynes advocated technical adjustments to correct capitalism's faulty operation.

<sup>3</sup>Marquand, MacDonald, p. 523. For the best debate concerning the Labour government's attempts to find a solution to the depression see Robert Skidelsky, Politicians and the Slump: The Labour Government of 1929-31 (1967) and Ross McKibbin, "The Economic Policy of the Second Labour Government," Past and Present, Vol. 68, 1975, pp. 95-123.

<sup>4</sup>The crisis started with Germany's request to suspend certain reparation payments. See Marquand, MacDonald, ch. 25 "Crisis".

<sup>5</sup>Marquand, MacDonald, p. 679, rejects the idea that MacDonald was a helpless prisoner of the Conservative Party.

<sup>6</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 1, 1933, pp. 1 - 2.

<sup>7</sup>See e.g. the list for the election to the General Committee in 1933: there were 4 Congregationalists, 8 Methodists, 8 Quakers, 3 Presbyterians, 3 Anglicans, 1 Church of Scotland, 1 Unitarian and 3 without denomination given. The 1935 list gives one interesting change: 3 Congregationalists, 8 Methodists, 10 Quakers, 4 Presbyterians, 11 Anglicans, 2 Church of Scotland, 1 Unitarian and 2 without denomination given.

<sup>8</sup>Clarence Pickett wrote in July 1934 that, compared to "a great surge of recoil from war and an honest search for the ways of peace" right after the war, pacifists were still a remnant. Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 7, July 1934, p. 179.

<sup>9</sup>FOR 456; 2/2; 5 - 9 - 1930.

- <sup>10</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 9 no. 8, Aug. 1931, p. 389.
- <sup>11</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 1, Jan. 1932, p. 1.
- <sup>12</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 3 - 6 - 1935.
- <sup>13</sup>Perhaps the growth exposed the internal weaknesses more clearly.
- <sup>14</sup>FOR 456; 1/5; 15 - 6 - 1931.
- <sup>15</sup>FOR 456; 1/5; 26 - 9 - 1932; CJC Box 21; 2 - 9 - 1932. Cadoux had serious eye problems.
- <sup>16</sup>CJC Box 23; 29 - 6 - 1933.
- <sup>17</sup>CJC Box 23; 10 - 7 - 1933.
- <sup>18</sup>CJC Box 23; 26 - 6 - 1933.
- <sup>19</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 7, July 1934, p. 179.
- <sup>20</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 10, Oct. 1929, pp. 179 - 180.
- <sup>21</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 11, Nov. 1929, p. 206.
- <sup>22</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 3, March 1930, p. 41; Vol. 7 no. 4, April 1930, p. 65. See also Vol. 7 no. 9, Sept. 1930, p. 161.
- <sup>23</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 2, Feb. 1929, p. 27.
- <sup>24</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 6, June 1930, pp. 105 - 106.
- <sup>25</sup>See John Stevenson and Chris Cooke, The Slump, London: Jonathan Cape, 1977.
- <sup>26</sup>See e.g. J.W. Stevenson, Christ and the Economic Crisis, London: Williams and Norgate, 1932, Ch. 7.
- <sup>27</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 9 no. 7, July 1931, pp. 374 - 375. Graham stressed the moral aspect. See also G.H.C. Macgregor who thought it necessary to review "all exclusive or preferential trade pacts, such as the Ottawa Agreements, which render the Empire a closed economic system." A Christian Peace Settlement pamphlet by Church of Scotland Peace Society, n.d. (post 1939), p. 4.
- <sup>28</sup>FOR 456; 3/3; 18 - 3 - 1931; Anet, Pierre, pp. 105 - 107. The group worked from June 3 till Aug. 26. Initially the Trade Unions did not look favourably upon the idea.
- <sup>29</sup>FOR 456; 1/5; 5 - 12 - 1932.

<sup>30</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 7, July 1932, pp. 127 - 128.

There is no direct evidence that Clough knew Keynes. There may be some indirect evidence, though. In 1928 Davies tried to write a pamphlet on reparations. In GD 483 there is some correspondence from Sir George Paish, William Beveridge and Keynes on this pamphlet. Since Davies was a very influential member, Keynes' ideas may have entered the FOR through him.

<sup>31</sup>Even the Marquis of Tavistock, a strong believer on Social Credit and a voluminous author on this topic, did not always work out the details.

<sup>32</sup>Mary E. Phillips, The Responsibility of the Christian Investor, London: Christian Social Council, 1933, pp. 6 - 25. Another example of a more detailed plan is Leslie Artingstall's series "Towards a Christian Economic," Reconciliation starting June 1938 and later worked into a book, Towards a Christian Economic, London: F.O.R. 1941.

<sup>33</sup>The assumption is that once the mind has accepted and incorporated the principles a person will ACT on them. In practice the assumption does not always hold.

<sup>34</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 7, July 1933, p. 126.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid. It should be noted, however, that natural ethics contain much that is distinctively un-Christian.

<sup>36</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 9, Sept. 1932, p. 162.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 163.

<sup>38</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 7, July 1933, pp. 128 - 129. The article consists of 12 points. Points 9 and 10 show the strength and weaknesses of communism. For the influence of Henry George see Reconciliation, Vol. 16 no. 6, June 1938, pp. 176 - 177.

<sup>39</sup>Stevenson, Christ, pp. 12, 14, 17, Ch. 3.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 50. It should be noted that such a re-formed society was not equal to the Kingdom of God.

<sup>41</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 9 no. 9, Sept. 1931, p. 411.

<sup>42</sup>See e.g. The Venturer, March 1918, pp. 147, 150; April 1918, p. 172. For a more critical view see Salter in The Labour Leader, March 7, 1918, quoted by Robbins, Abolition, p. 163.

<sup>43</sup>George Lansbury, What I Saw in Russia, New York: Boni and Liveright, 1920; Life, Ch. 11.

<sup>44</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 4 no. 8, Aug. 1927, p. 143. B.C. Plowright, Christ or Caesar?, Westminster: Livingstone Press, 1934, p. 6: "Communism does conceive itself as a gospel...for mankind."

<sup>45</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 3, March 1930, p. 42 and no. 4, April 1930, p. 65.

<sup>46</sup>FOR 456; 3/3; 17 - 3 - 1930.

<sup>47</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 8, Aug. 1932, pp. 143 - 144. Henry T. Hodgkin, Seeing Ourselves Through Russia, New York: Ray Long & Richard R. Smith, 1932. The book was the result of a course-discussion at Pendle Hill.

<sup>48</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 8, Aug. 1933, pp. 143 - 145, 153. See also Plowright, Christ, p. 23, H.G. Wood, The Truth and Error of Communism, London: S.C.M., 1933.

<sup>49</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 9, Sept. 1933, p. 162. MacLachlan was editor at this time.

<sup>50</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 173; FOR 456; 2/2; 1 - 8/8 - 1933.

<sup>51</sup>Hecker was not an FOR member. He had been expelled from his church in New York. He had been invited to the conference to obtain a wide range of views.

<sup>52</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 9, Sept, 1933, p. 174; FOR 456; 2/2; 1 - 8/8 - 1933.

<sup>53</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 10, Oct. 1933, p. 186.

<sup>54</sup>Hayman, Worship, p. 23.

<sup>55</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 11, Nov. 1933, p. 210.

<sup>56</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 4, April 1930, p. 65.

<sup>57</sup>For the increasing persecution see Kenneth Scott Latourette, Christianity in a Revolutionary Age, Vol. IV: The Twentieth Century in Europe, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1961, ch. 19, esp. pp. 495 - 497.

<sup>58</sup>See Barton, F.O.R.

<sup>59</sup>The AFOR upheaval needs to be kept in mind in assessing Reinhold Niebuhr's later writing. He was chairman of the AFOR but resigned in 1933, turning strongly against pacifism.

<sup>60</sup>See e.g. Christianity and Class War (1932), The Bourgeois Mind

(1934) and The Fate of Man in the Modern World (1935). Nikolai Aleksandrovich Berdyaev (1874 - 1948) was a "Christian existentialist".

<sup>61</sup>Hayman, Worship, p. 11.

<sup>62</sup>In this account the Quakers have been ignored since they remained separate.

<sup>63</sup>For the name change see Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 6, June 1933, p. 118.

<sup>64</sup>See J.R. Ackroyd, "How it Began," The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 5, May 1939, pp. 125 - 126. The group met at Seaward Beddow's Wycliffe Church. As Ackroyd wrote, "From the beginning, Leyton Richards was our leader and public advocate."

<sup>65</sup>During the "Christ and Peace" Campaign there was no appreciable increase in membership in apparently any - Christian - pacifist organization. For the faster rate of growth see FOR 456; 1/5; 18 - 9 - 1933.

<sup>66</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 5, May 1939, p. 125.

<sup>67</sup>FOR 456; 1/5; 18 - 9 - 1933.

<sup>68</sup>FOR 456; 3/4; 21 - 4 - 1933. According to the Peace Year Book of 1938 the CCPG was founded in 1934. FOR 456; 2/2; 31 - 7 - 1934. In the discussion the CCPG was seen as a consequence of the "Christ and Peace" Campaign. There is no direct evidence for this suggestion. Later the following groups also joined: Presbyterian Peace Fellowship, Baptist Pacifist Fellowship, Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, Church of Scotland Peace Society, Society of Catholic Friends and the Scottish Congregational Ministers' Peace Society.

<sup>69</sup>FOR 456; 1/5; 11 - 12 - 1933. Bartlett had replaced Maclachlan in 1932. The new board consisted of nearly all clergymen. Raven was its chairman.

<sup>70</sup>FOR 456; 1/5; 12 - 3 - 1934. The growth was even more dramatic because in Jan. 1933 it was observed that subscriptions for the previous three years had declined. Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 1, Jan. 1933, p. 20.

<sup>71</sup>FOR 456; 3/4; 10 - 5 - 1934.

<sup>72</sup>Reconciliation was paid for through the membership fee of the CPC, contrary to FOR practice.

<sup>73</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 3 - 6 - 1935; Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 8, Aug. 1935, pp. 200 - 201.



<sup>74</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 3, March 1934, p. 82.

<sup>75</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 13 - 12 - 1937 and 24 - 6 - 1940.

<sup>76</sup>There was a Society of Catholic Friends (C. of E.) which had been in existence for some time. The Society had notes in Reconciliation but did not do much until the APF came into existence. See Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 5, May 1937, p. 121 and APF, April 1938.

<sup>77</sup>APF, April 1939. The APF papers are presently in the possession of Rev. Sidney Hinkes, Oxford, the present secretary. Morris was a central figure in the PPU.

<sup>78</sup>The APF had a specific problem in Article 37 of the Thirty-Nine Articles. For a discussion of this Article see Percy Hartill's pamphlet Article XXXVII and War, SCPC; CDG - B, Box 64 No. 1339.

<sup>79</sup>See E.C. Urwin, Henry Carter, C.B.E., London: The Epworth Press, 1955, esp. Chs. 3 and 4.

<sup>80</sup>Alex Dimond, Ernest B. Storr and Albert D. Belden, Three Views of Pacifism, London: Epworth Press, 1937, p. 40.

<sup>81</sup>SCPC; CDG - B, Box 99 no. 2. Movement for a Pacifist Church of Christ.

<sup>82</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 10, Oct. 1930, p. 190.

<sup>83</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 7, July 1930, p. 124.

<sup>84</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 9 no. 1, Jan. 1931, p. 248.

<sup>85</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 11, Nov. 1932, pp. 205 - 206.

<sup>86</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 1, Jan. 1933, p. 6.

## CHAPTER 13

### A PERIOD OF RAPID GROWTH 1935 - 1939

In the second half of the decade, domestic political concerns took second place to the development of Neville Chamberlain's active involvement in the foreign policy of appeasement and its concomitant of accelerated rearmament. The National government remained in power although Baldwin replaced a tired MacDonald in June 1935. Two years later, on May 28, 1937, the chancellor of the exchequer, Neville Chamberlain, became prime minister upon Baldwin's resignation. By this time the slump had become less intense, and domestic questions seemed relatively less urgent. The relative calm in England contrasted starkly with the turmoil elsewhere. On October 3, 1935, Italy invaded Ethiopia, while Hitler's armies occupied the Rhineland on March 7, 1936. In July the Spanish civil war broke out. Such military "solutions" to difficult political problems totally undermined the credibility of the League of Nations. This militarism also contributed to the birth of the Embassies of Reconciliation (EoR), an organization which plays a prominent role in this chapter. The military "solutions" had a significant impact on British opinion. According to R.K. Webb, "The year 1936 saw a definite stiffening in British public opinion, a willingness to believe that war must come eventually."<sup>1</sup> On the whole Webb's blunt verdict is correct. For example, Bevin unceremoniously forced Lansbury to resign his Labour

leadership in 1935 because he disagreed with the latter's pacifist policy. Britain started to re-arm itself, though hesitantly. It was in the face of the "military solution" that Chamberlain's appeasement policy took shape.<sup>2</sup> The League of Nations had failed the test of countering the "military solutions". The aggressors had formed an "axis". Britain was behind in rearmament. If war was to come eventually, Chamberlain, as Newman demonstrates, needed more time to be ready militarily. Buying time to prepare for war has been a common *ex post facto* justification of the complex phenomenon of appeasement. But whatever the myriad and deeper motivations of appeasement may have been, the British government felt it necessary to convince the public, various antiwar movements, and such Conservative critics as Churchill, that it was doing everything possible. The tense situation was aggravated by Hitler's invasion of Austria on March 12, 1938. A half year later Chamberlain went to Munich where he accepted Hitler's demands over Czechoslovakia. The agreement Chamberlain reached was a Pyrrhic victory for his appeasement policy: on March 15, 1939 Hitler took over the rest of Czechoslovakia. Shortly afterwards Britain made a guarantee to Poland in defence of its borders.

Webb's verdict is also supported by, paradoxically, the growth of the pacifist movement. While the majority of people reluctantly admitted that rearmament was necessary because of the increasingly hostile international climate, a small minority chose pacifism as the solution to the international animosities. Of this minority most people became members of the PPU. Their influence as a pressure group was,

however, evanescent. Far fewer people decided to become members of the FOR with its holistic world and life view. The growth of the pacifist movement was thus largely the result of tense international affairs. This does not mean a denial of the influence of Dick Sheppard on the growth of pacifism. It was only after Sheppard had started his peace movement in late 1934 that the FOR's real growth became apparent. The unexpectedly wide response to his letter of October 16, 1934, became the basis first for the Sheppard Peace Movement, inaugurated in June 1935, and later for the Peace Pledge Union, founded in May 1936. The enthusiasm of the new movement had two consequences for the FOR. Early in 1936 Sheppard decided to use Reconciliation for his organization. As a result 8000 instead of 5000 copies were printed.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, by the fall of 1936 the membership had grown to 4405 members and 495 sympathizers, an increase of more than 300 in three months.<sup>4</sup>

With such rapid growth it was imperative that Bartlett, who had resigned as general secretary to take up his task with the EoR, should be replaced quickly. Rev. Jack W. Stevenson was asked but he declined. At an emergency meeting, held on November 25, 1936, the decision was taken to appoint the Congregational minister Leslie Artingstall for a period of not longer than seven years.<sup>5</sup> The new general secretary was faced with two organizational problems. He was well-qualified to deal with the first question, that of reorganizing the FOR. According to Doris Nicholls, later a co-general secretary with Hampden Horne, if Artingstall had not organized the FOR "as he did, it would never have become the force that it did by 1938."<sup>6</sup> The second problem concerned

the PPU: What should be the relationship between the two organizations?

The first problem was the less complicated. Early in January 1937 the office was reorganized and 16 Red Lion Square was added to number 17.<sup>7</sup> At the Summer Conference it was announced that there were 5192 members. By the end of 1937 this had grown to 6033. The number of branches tripled in two years to 120.<sup>8</sup> In order to handle this growth the country was divided in regions to which regional secretaries were appointed. Although the boundaries of the regions changed in the course of time, the basic structure remained until after the war. The renewed organizational vigour helped to increase the membership to 9813 and 852 sympathizers when the war broke out.<sup>9</sup> Yet this reorganization does not fully explain the growth. In their different ways the enthusiasm aroused by Dick Sheppard, Chamberlain's appeasement policy, the fear for another war, the Embassies of Reconciliation, and the peace statements by the churches - most notably at Oxford 1937 - contributed to the FOR's growth. But it was probably the FOR's understanding of pacifism which contributed most to its growth. Some of the more significant contributions are explored in this and the next chapter.

The second problem, the relationship to the PPU, remained ambiguous.<sup>10</sup> Several leading FOR members, notably Lansbury, Raven, Soper and Wood, were asked by Sheppard to become sponsors, which soon became a largely honorific function of the new organization. Canon Morris, Dr. Salter, Henry Carter, MacLeod, Belden, Gill and Davies were also to become involved. The two organizations not only shared important members, but often sponsored local meetings as well.<sup>11</sup> In some cases the

local groups fused. Not all members, however, liked the united meeting. Dorothy Gill told Cadoux, with whom she regularly corresponded, that she was against such meetings, although the local FOR secretary did not see much difference between the two groups.<sup>12</sup>

The difference was not always easy to detect. The PPU seemed to go far beyond its simple pledge: "I renounce War and will never support or sanction another". For example, Raven and Davies wrote articles for the PPU weekly, Peace News, and their pamphlets, containing a full-fledged FOR world and life view, were published by the PPU. Yet, there were fundamental differences, clearly noticeable in comparing the "Pledge" with "The Basis". As the Jordans Conference of 1942 later summed it up:

There was a difference in the basis, aims and methods of the two bodies. The basis of the F.O.R. was entirely religious. ...The special task of the F.O.R. was to convert the Christian Church to the recognition that pacifism was inherent in its Gospel. The purpose of the P.P.U. was to convert the man in the street to recognise the essential disaster of the war method and to recognise the fundamental causes of war.<sup>13</sup>

The two different appeals were in practice a reality, but the FOR's "Basis" made no distinction between the "man in the pew" and the "man in the street", for that would be an unacceptable form of dualism.<sup>14</sup> The overlapping in members, publications, and speakers often blurred the differences between the FOR and PPU, but they were nevertheless real, as real though often not as obvious as the difference in numbers of members. For while the PPU by 1939 had more than 100,000 members, many of whom had little or no relationship with Christianity, the FOR had less than 10,000, most of whom were committed Christians.<sup>15</sup>

The growth and changes described above, indicative of the changing focus of the FOR, were also reflected in Reconciliation. Since the cooperation of denominational peace societies, the number of printed copies of Reconciliation had grown steadily. In order to reach an even wider audience the magazine was sold for some time through the services of W.H. Smith and Sons. However, this turned out to be less financially attractive than anticipated.<sup>16</sup> Management looked for advertisements and exchange of space with other periodicals, changed the cover somewhat, and ordered a special Armistice November 1938 issue of 10,000 copies, double the number for January 1937.<sup>17</sup> In January 1939 the magazine appeared with a new title: The Christian Pacifist. The title was chosen by the FOR Executive Committee in spite of some objections that it would not attract non-pacifists.<sup>18</sup> The title change was indicative of the changed emphasis in the FOR. The new name also covered the contents more accurately. For example, the June 1939 issue confined itself to such articles as those by Davies, "Growing in Pacifism", Hobhouse, "The Significance of Gandhi", Macpherson, "The Peace Movement in the Scottish Churches" and Joyce Pollard, "Peacemaking in Palestine". The CCPG gave advice on compulsory military service, while Morris, Raven and Wood invited inquiries about the wisdom of starting a pacifist public school.<sup>19</sup> The contents, confined to pacifism, stands in contrast to an all-encompassing statement made by the Social Policy Committee which published a special report in March 1937, calling the members back to the early days of the FOR and The Venturer:

Nothing less than a whole way of life can be denoted as the true sphere of activity of our Fellowship. This is

explicitly stated in the basis of the Fellowship drawn up by those who came together through the urgency of the peace and war question in 1914.<sup>20</sup>

But the Committee's message fell on deaf ears. Hence, the issues discussed in the rest of this chapter have more in common with the contents of The Christian Pacifist of June 1939 than with the statement by the Social Policy Committee of March 1937.

### The Christian Pacifist Party

In the archives of George Davies is a short treatise by the ex-Quaker and guild socialist Maurice B. Reckitt on a Christian Political Party. Such parties were common on the continent. Usually these were Roman Catholic, although in the Netherlands there were protestant parties as well. In 1924 Davies thought that Britain, unlike continental countries, was not ready for such a party although he was sympathetic to the idea. He suggested that M.P.s should enrol themselves as a Christian group and get outside help from, for instance, Christian sociologists. A few pacifist M.P.s, elected with Davies in the 1923 election, had formed an informal parliamentary group, but no Christian Political or Pacifist Party developed.<sup>21</sup>

In March 1935, more than half a year before a general election occurred, the issue resurfaced. Mrs. W.C. Roberts, whose husband had done much work in the early FOR days, asked the General Committee about the formation of a national movement on a non-party, non-sectarian, Christian basis for peace work within the existing parliamentary system. She seems to have had in mind support for candidates associated with or close to pacifism. The Committee declined to take the initiative



because it regarded the request as a task for individual members and not for the FOR as an organization.<sup>22</sup>

In mid-1937 the idea became an actuality when Rev. H. Ingli James, the chairman of the BPF, founded the Christian Pacifist Party. The aim of the new party was "to serve the Kingdom of God by seeking to promote the material and spiritual well-being of mankind, and to establish world-peace."<sup>23</sup> The members were asked to pledge a renunciation of war, to propagate Christ's principles and to live simply.<sup>24</sup> In common with Lansbury's aspiration and, indeed that of the Labour Party, its policy called for an immediate summoning of an international conference, which would deal with the control of "backward lands" and help to bring about freer international trade.<sup>25</sup> War, according to James, was a political phenomenon and could only be ended by political processes.<sup>26</sup> Since the Labour Party, after the forced resignation of Lansbury in 1935, was committed to a rearmament policy, many Christian pacifists felt that they could not vote for the party anymore. It may be noted that Lansbury's book Why Pacifists Should be Socialists appeared in 1937 as well. The book and the new party were more closely linked than is apparent on the surface: both addressed the same people and the same tendency.

James' position meant that one's religious ideas had political consequences.<sup>27</sup> To separate religion and politics was therefore an unacceptable dualism - bad both for society and the individual, because such dualism destroyed a person's spiritual integrity.<sup>28</sup> The Christian Pacifist Party, like the Pacifist Church, was an attempt to overcome the

sometimes exaggerated individualism of pacifists, exemplified in the FOR's answer to Mrs. Roberts. Although James' theoretical position was logical enough, the practical side involved serious obstacles, most prominent among them the nature of the electoral system. Essentially the system was geared to a two-party contest, not to an arrangement based on proportional representation. The bias against a new party was thus enormous as the communists and Mosley's fascists discovered in the 1930s. This nearly insurmountable practical obstacle helps to explain the FOR's mixed reaction to the new party. As the editor of Reconciliation wrote: "Not all Christian pacifists will approve of the formation of a pacifist party, though all will sympathise with the motives."<sup>29</sup> Raven did not think the party "desirable or attainable."<sup>30</sup> Artingstall suggested what was needed was a program towards a Christian economic policy rather than a political party.<sup>31</sup> Others agreed in essence with James but wanted the name and the program changed. Frank Hancock correctly pointed out that a Christian Pacifist Party would appeal only to a small number of people. Moreover, pacifism was a single issue while a viable political party needed a much more comprehensive program.<sup>32</sup>

G. Norman Robbins accepted such a program in his 1937 pamphlet Suggestions for a Christian Party. In changing the name Robbins could appeal to a much larger group. But even a Christian party would only appeal to a small and declining number of professing Christians. Yet Robbins was no less a pacifist than James. One of his program points called for the abolition of "all weapons of killing" and for the

transformation of the army and navy into organizations "to assist the misfortunes of our own and other people."<sup>33</sup> The purpose of the party, according to Robbins, was

- (a) To unite individual Christians, Christian Societies and Churches, into a compact body of militant activity for the complete reorganization of society on a Christian basis.
- (b) To relate a political action, social reconstruction and economic arrangement, to the definite moral and spiritual truths exemplified in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ.<sup>34</sup>

In general, Robbins described the purpose as if it were lifted out of the "Christian Revolution Series", a terminology which appealed to the Hancocks but which was unfamiliar to the many new FOR members. The program included such varied items as the reduction of the hours of labour, limitation of all interests and dividends, raising of the "incomes of all people below the average income", opposition to betting and gambling, reduction and limitation of the use of alcohol, preservation of the Sunday rest, and workers' control of industry. The entire, neatly outlined program was a mixture of moral conservatism and socio-economic progressivism. The mixture was equally true for the FOR.

Like the Pacifist Church, the Christian Pacifist Party was not successful. The theory which gave rise to the party was a logical consequence of the FOR's rejection of the separation of religion and politics. The party was an attempt to come to grips with a new political situation, for it reflected the uneasiness of many FOR members with the Labour Party's view on rearmament, particularly from 1937 on when Labour endorsed defence estimates. In spite of its practical

failure, the emergence of the party signified the changing emphasis in the FOR.

### 1935: Temple and the FOR

Long before the collapse of the Disarmament Conference in 1934 the FOR had become disillusioned with its results (see Chapter 10). The disillusion did not mean disinterest. For example, when the Baldwin government in a white paper on collective security of March 1936 called for the increase of armaments, even arguing that such an increase helped fight unemployment, the FOR immediately and strongly rejected the argument in a Manifesto.<sup>35</sup> The FOR's concern about rearmament expressed itself, however, in three different though closely related ways: through theology (discussed in the next chapter), in the Embassies of Reconciliation (discussed in the next section), and in a reaction, to be discussed here, to Temple's broadcast address of September 1, 1935.

On August 19, 1935, The Times published a letter by Lansbury in which he called upon the Baldwin government to urge the League of Nations to summon a new world conference. The letter appealed to the archbishops of Britain to give leadership. The background for this call and appeal was the quickly deteriorating relationship between Italy and Ethiopia.<sup>36</sup> According to Lansbury, the political crisis could be solved by a more equitable distribution of resources world wide. The letter had at least three results. On September 1 William Temple, the archbishop of York, gave his radio address on the crisis.<sup>37</sup> On September 13, 1935, a large meeting was held at Central Hall, Westminster, discussing the Italo-Ethiopian crisis with speeches by Raven, Carter,

Lansbury, Sheppard and Lady Parmoor.<sup>38</sup> Lansbury himself started in 1936 his Embassies in his quest for the world conference.

Temple's speech was certainly not the lead Lansbury had hoped for. The first part of the speech was really no different from the statements on war made by COPEC or the Lambeth Conference. The second part, which proposed the acceptance of League military sanctions against Italy, caused objections in FOR ranks. Reconciliation examined four points made by Temple.<sup>39</sup> These deserve special attention for two reasons. In the first place, the archbishop, though not primate, was the leading figure in the Church of England and his views could sway many church members. Secondly, the arguments adduced against Temple give insight into FOR thinking.

The first point scrutinized was Temple's suggestion that since Christians enjoyed the fruits even of a sub-Christian world they could not refuse duty as ordinary citizens. Few, if any, FOR members would want to quarrel with the notion of a sub-Christian world. Early FOR authors had gone out of their way to prove that society acted on sub- or anti-Christian principles. The disagreement was with Temple's conclusion. The task of the Christian, according to Reconciliation, was not to identify him or herself with the acts of the state, but "to transform the whole of the social order into a community based on goodwill and service." The second point Temple made was that man could not love on order.<sup>40</sup> Reconciliation rightly pointed out that the archbishop had ignored Jesus' command to love, even to love one's enemies. Rather than being unable to love on order, the Christian is

unable to stop loving. The third point dealt with the law. According to Temple, the reign of law was prior to the reign of love and law was based on the sanction of force. Consequently, the Christian had to be prepared to use force. The FOR disagreed with Temple's interpretation of the evolutionary process rather than with his biblical scholarship. Instead of starting, for instance, with Paul's epistle to the Romans,<sup>41</sup> the FOR proposed another evolution theory: "a process in which life moves forward in response to a new factor", the new factor being love.<sup>42</sup> Jesus, who introduced this new factor, accepted the aim of the law, but substituted love for coercion. It was this new factor which could cause conflict between the Christian's conscience and the state's demand. The Christian should, however, never be in doubt where his prior allegiance lay, for he had only one Master. Temple, according to Ruth Fry, had apparently succumbed to the idea that prior loyalty was due to the state. Therefore he could, fourthly, support military sanctions, if necessary.<sup>43</sup> From a practical view, Reconciliation argued, sanctions would result in countersanctions, creating a war-psychology and leading actually to war. As Maclachlan wrote, "Military sanctions can hardly fail to be provocative of hostility", for it would be difficult to limit military operations. The attempt to prevent war by fighting was, "therefore not only morally wrong but stupid".<sup>44</sup>

It could be argued that by rejecting military sanctions pacifists let aggressors have their way. Temple seems to have believed this view to be the case and assumed that pacifists were passivists. That assumption had been rejected by the early FOR leaders with whom

Temple had had close connections. But while the early leaders had suggested that goodness could and would overcome evil and aggression, Maclachlan did not think that goodness had much chance if there was the threat of force in the background. But this did not mean, as Temple's broadcast implied, that one needed to resort to interim ethics.<sup>45</sup> Negatively pacifism meant at least not selling weapons or giving financial aid. Positively it meant the application of the redemptive principle.<sup>46</sup>

Temple fastened his ideas on the "do-nothing" interpretation and in a letter to The Times of October 29, 1935, he called pacifism a heresy even though he admitted that the Church had never declared it to be a heresy and even though he did not want to call individuals heretics. He associated pacifism with three ancient heresies: Marcionism, Manichaeism and Pelagianism. He concluded his letter with the assertion that the law of love was not applicable to nations.<sup>47</sup> Scripturally and theologically this last remark was very questionable. It accepted the dualism the FOR had fought against for two decades. His accusation that pacifism was related to Marcionism had some semblance of truth to it.<sup>48</sup> Raven and many other FOR members had, indeed, often very little use for the Old Testament. They, however, did not go as far as Marcion, though they had very strong Marcionite tendencies.<sup>49</sup> Yet, as especially the Mennonite Hershberger has shown, a rejection of much of the O.T. was not necessarily an inherent feature of Christian pacifism.<sup>50</sup>

Temple's reference to Manichaeism showed that he understood neither Manichaeism nor pacifism.<sup>51</sup> Dualism, so essential to Manichaeism, was strongly rejected by the FOR. Temple's charge of Pelagianism would be applicable to much of English theology--indeed to English liberal thought in general.<sup>52</sup> His own ideas on the social aspects of theology stood condemned by his own reasoning. Although Christian pacifists called others to live a life of love, they did not say that man was capable by the action of his own will of living by love only.<sup>53</sup> Generally the FOR theologians adhered to the idea of free will, but usually admitted a somewhat mystical infusion of Christ to direct the will. Temple's unsound and misguided attack was demolished by Raven whose divinity studies had focused on early Christian doctrines.<sup>54</sup> Moreover, as Raven correctly pointed out, Temple's argument was not based on principles but on a judgment of values. As will be seen later, Reinhold Niebuhr used the same argument as Temple in his 1939 booklet Why the Christian Church is Not Pacifist. FOR reactions were then even stronger.

In the dispute with Temple the disagreements overshadowed the agreements. In his radio broadcast Temple gratefully acknowledged Lansbury's call. He stressed the importance of justice - the disagreement was on how this could be achieved - and that led him to a call for a strengthening of the League of Nations. Many FOR members agreed with this call. Rev. Henry Carter, for example, in his speech to the National Peace Congress of 1936, stated that a world organization such as the League, was essential to the healthful activities of men.



Because the League was so essential it needed to be saved in spite of its recent failures. Those failures were due to the fact that the League's premises were founded on fear and armed force, and that the organization was a child of a "false" peace. The failures needed to be balanced by achievements in and contributions to peace, health, justice, industrial betterment, native peoples and general social progress. Carter's idea to strengthen the League was to call for a new world conference which would make changes in the League's covenant, method and economic cooperation.<sup>55</sup> Carter's ideas show that at least some of the FOR had not given up on the League. Furthermore, his views were similar to Lansbury's and through the EoR they attempted to bring about this new world conference.

### The Embassies of Reconciliation

In an account of the year 1935 the FOR stated that "the deterioration in the position of international affairs, crisis succeeding crisis, has made the testing of a series of so-called practical proposals a matter of some urgency and importance to the peace movement."<sup>56</sup> One such proposal was that of Lansbury and Carter. In order to implement the proposal the Embassies of Reconciliation (EoR) was created in 1936. There were antecedents for the EoR. Elizabeth Isichei in her book Victorian Quakers mentioned embassies to foreign rulers, but she commented rather slightly on them.<sup>57</sup> Isichei missed the theological point, clearly stated in the pamphlet The Spiritual Purpose of the C.I.S. of 1926-7: "The conception of the Quaker Embassy... was an embassy of the City of God to every great city of

Man."<sup>58</sup> In addition, she overlooked the biblical precedent of the king as the dispenser of justice.<sup>59</sup> In 1918 the Quakers renewed the idea of embassies and set up a Council for International Service (CIS), "with a view of co-ordinating the whole of the foreign activities and seeking for a fuller expression of the Quaker mystical conception of religion in international life."<sup>60</sup> The driving force behind the idea was Carl Heath. His ideas appealed to Corder Catchpool who finally in 1930 made his way to Berlin as a Quaker Ambassador.<sup>61</sup> In 1934 Friends Service Council published a pamphlet called Quaker Embassies, tracing these more recent developments.<sup>62</sup> The EoR needs, then, to be placed in the context of the growing world crisis, of recent Quaker Embassy developments, and of the biblical-theological understanding.

On September 13, 1935, Lansbury spoke at the Central Hall meeting where Henry Carter compared him to Joseph, the dreamer whose dreams were disliked by his brothers.<sup>63</sup> Lansbury himself spoke about the hopes he had entertained after the war that the League of Nations might bring about disarmament and peace. Now he questioned if people were willing to "pay the price."<sup>64</sup> Three weeks later some other hopes and dreams were shattered. At the instigation of Bevin, the annual Labour Party conference voted in principle overwhelmingly in favour of the use of sanctions, undoubtedly influenced by the events in Ethiopia. Lansbury thereupon resigned the leadership. Socialism could not be won by force, according to Lansbury, because the "One whose life I revere and who, I believe, is the greatest Figure in history, has put it on record: 'Those who take the sword shall perish by the sword'."<sup>65</sup> The

result was that Lansbury had more time but much less power and influence to pursue his pacifist activities. A month later at an Armistice Day rally, attended by about 5500 people, he argued that civilization stood at the cross roads of survival.<sup>66</sup>

Lansbury took one way and in April 1936 he went to the U.S.A. to speak for the National Emergency Peace Campaign.<sup>67</sup> There he spoke again about the price. In time of war people were willing to pay and suffer in order to destroy the enemy, yet when hostilities had ended no such efforts were made to organize the world for service and peace. Such willingness, Lansbury said in a press interview, could only come about by "creating a will to peace among the peoples of the world. Nations must, like individuals, give up the idea that they can live alone, that some can prosper while others are denied prosperity."<sup>68</sup> In the various speeches he made for the Campaign, he referred to his proposed conference which would outlaw discrimination in trade and financial arrangements, especially in relation to colonies. Colonies should be converted to mandates in order to break monopolistic imperial trade.<sup>69</sup> If one wanted peace, then one had to get rid of what he passionately believed to be the folly and futility of imperialism. Lansbury's idea would promote equality of rights of all people, which implied that all nations should be equally represented at the reconstituted League of Nations. He hoped that his ideas would help remove the causes of war and thus win collective security.<sup>70</sup> The Campaign should be regarded as a prelude to the Embassies.

In July 1936 the IFOR held a conference at Cambridge which produced what came to be called the Embassies of Reconciliation.<sup>71</sup> The Executive Board was formed by the American J. Nevin Sayre, chairman of the IFOR, Raven, Carter, Siegmund-Schultze, H. Runham Brown, Barrow Cadbury and Bartlett who acted as secretary-director.<sup>72</sup> Sponsors included Berdyaev, Ceresole, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Ruth Fry, Rufus Jones, Lester, Richards and Roberts.<sup>73</sup> Bartlett convinced Lansbury, on his return from the Campaign, to become the peace ambassador of the new group and to visit on its behalf several heads of governments. The narrative of Lansbury's visits need not be told here because Lansbury has done so in his book My Pilgrimage for Peace. However, several salient points should be further analyzed.

In August 1936 Lansbury visited the French socialist premier Léon Blum and in September the economist and premier Paul van Zeeland of Belgium. He canvassed their opinion about the convening of an international conference to deal with the relationship between economics and rearmament. According to Lansbury, both men were favourably disposed to the idea. Although Lansbury himself did not make the claim, it is possible that the visits helped prepare the way for an Anglo-French request to Van Zeeland to inquire into international trade obstacles.<sup>74</sup> Meanwhile, the visit to Brussels had an unintended outcome. As the first year review of the EoR stated, the visits were part of the witness to reform the League of Nations.<sup>75</sup> When Lansbury was in Brussels to meet Van Zeeland, there was a world conference for all peace societies. At the conference Lansbury represented the FOR and

Sheppard the PPU. Both opposed "collective security" and since the point was ruled as inadmissible for the discussion at the sessions they withdrew. As Reconciliation stated, the conference was biased too much towards the LNU.<sup>76</sup> The conference showed clearly that the FOR differed from the LNU in its understanding of the role and nature of the League of Nations and in its approach to peace. The sharp divergence did not bode well for the EoR's quest to reform the League.

In the autumn of 1936 the Peace Army asked if the FOR could help to bring about a truce and offer mediation in the Spanish Civil War.<sup>77</sup> The General Committee, however, "did not see any light on taking action", and referred the letter to the IFOR and the EoR because it was "primarily their concern."<sup>78</sup> The Committee's reply showed unmistakably the division of tasks and the independence of the organizations.<sup>79</sup> In the case of the EoR that was physically noticeable because the offices were at 16 Victoria Street, not at 17 Red Lion Square. The letter, however, did not go unheeded. Carter and Bartlett visited Barcelona, Valencia and Madrid at the invitation of the Republican government. While they were unable to visit territory held by Franco or meet with Roman Catholic leaders, they did interview the Duke of Alba, Franco's representative in London. However, unwillingness of the combatants prevented reconciliation.<sup>80</sup>

More spectacular than the visit to Spain were the visits to Hitler and Mussolini, meant to convince these leaders of the need for an economic world conference through which war could be avoided. In April 1937 Lansbury, accompanied by Bartlett and Catchpool, went to visit the

Führer. Catchpool translated - and amended - Lansbury's memorandum for Hitler.<sup>81</sup> The two hour interview and the released text made a favourable impression in and outside Germany, at least according to the press. The Rheinland Westfälische Zeitung of Essen wrote:

George Lansbury...has had the courage to go to the Leader. He has not allowed himself to become befogged by the atrocity stories of marxist and pacifist papers about Hitler Germany. Lansbury is certainly in the current sense a marxist and a socialist, but he is also a man of such goodwill that his socialism and his pacifism reach far beyond the horizon of the mass of those who hide their irresponsibility under marxism and pacifism.<sup>82</sup>

The New York Times headlined: "Hitler Backs Idea for World Parley on Trade and Arms". The catch was that Roosevelt, or some other world leader, would have to call an international conference. But Roosevelt, whom Lansbury had met during the Peace Campaign, thought the situation premature for such action.<sup>83</sup> Similarly, the Northern Whig and Belfast Post gave as headline: "Germany Ready for New World Peace Conference", and as sub-headline: "Results Widely Acclaimed: Führer Waiting for a Lead".<sup>84</sup> But the lead was not forthcoming, and the acclaim in the press was not followed by the action Lansbury called for.

The British government's cool reception and Roosevelt's reluctance probably contributed to less attention being given to the visit to Mussolini and Ciano, Italy's foreign minister, in July. The message was the same and the Italians gave the impression that they were anxious to avoid war. The impression was important because it encouraged the EoR to continue. In addition, Mussolini expressed himself in principle in favour of a world economic conference.<sup>85</sup> Lansbury, with Carter and Bartlett, went in December to Prague and

Vienna. In Prague Lansbury presented president Edvard Benes with his views. At the end of the visit a communiqué was issued which included the observation that the soon-to-be published Van Zeeland report ought to receive careful attention. The observation of the communiqué was not an isolated incidence, for as Maurice Cowling in The Impact of Hitler has pointed out, Geoffrey Dawson of The Times had recently taken up Van Zeeland's plan for economic cooperation.<sup>86</sup> In Vienna, after a visit to chancellor Schuschnigg, Lansbury gave an address to a very large and representative meeting of the Kulturbund on December 17, 1937, which could be regarded as a summary of his quest and of his pacifist position. While early FOR leaders had often seen pacifism as something of a panacea, Lansbury made no such claim in 1937. His opening words are, therefore, worth quoting:

We pacifists possess no more courage, no more virtue than other people; neither are we cowards - as many prisons in the world testify at this moment. We make no claim to be able to cure the ills of the world by the use of smooth words, excusing evil, or by any means other than those associated with the two words, "common sense". Religion is applied common sense.<sup>87</sup>

Yet, it would not be totally unfair to see Lansbury's quest as the search for a panacea. His solution to the ills of the world was rather simple and well-summarized in his slogan, "Peace follows mutual economic cooperation".<sup>88</sup>

Lansbury's dream seemed to come a step closer to reality with the publication of Van Zeeland's report on January 26, 1938. The Report had two quite different effects in Britain. The press and the government soon ignored the Report, and, it may be added, so has the

standard secondary literature.<sup>89</sup> In contrast, the FOR had a high regard for the Report. For instance, EoR ambassador Henry Carter described it as "a peacemaker's effort, a genuine attempt to restore not only communications but also close relations between countries that have fallen further and further apart."<sup>90</sup> The Report essentially rejected autarky. It advocated the reduction and in some cases the abolition of duties, and the removal of indirect protection. Suggestions were made to ease the problem of financial exchange and thus promote international cooperation. Finally, Van Zeeland recommended a pact of International Economic Collaboration, the aim of which would be "to raise the standard of living by improving the general well-being." The leading powers were invited to take the first steps.<sup>91</sup> The Report was very much what Lansbury had been asking for.<sup>92</sup> During 1938 the Report became the basis of several of FOR publications. Bartlett wrote a pamphlet, The Economic Approach to Peace, summarizing the Report and predicting that dictators, dreaming of autarky, would find it unacceptable.<sup>93</sup> It stimulated Artingstall to write a series "Towards a Christian Economic" for Reconciliation.<sup>94</sup> The first article showed how much more FOR thinking had changed since 1914. The article started with a look at the advantages of the capitalist system. Although Artingstall adduced arguments against the system and found it ultimately unacceptable, that does not alter the fact that he did not denounce it outright as Hodgkin or Roberts had done earlier.<sup>95</sup> Although the international conference on economics and disarmaments was not convened, the 1936 visits seemed to have some measure of success. At least they encouraged the EoR to continue.



While the EoR could point to 1936 and 1937 as reasonably successful years, 1938 saw Lansbury's quest falter and collapse. At the time of the Austrian invasion in March 1938, Lansbury, to no avail, telegraphed Hitler reminding him of his conversation of the year before and appealing to him to restore Austrian independence.<sup>96</sup> Eden's resignation on February 20, 1938, made it unlikely that Britain would take the first steps towards a world conference. His resignation was both a reaction to Chamberlain's missed opportunity to call such a conference after the prime minister had received an inquiry from Roosevelt and was also the result of his disagreement with Chamberlain's Italian policy.<sup>97</sup> The Van Zeeland Report was effectively shelved. Whatever hope there still may have been for Lansbury's call for a world conference was killed by September 1938.

Lansbury anticipated that Hitler would say something about the relationship between Germany and Czechoslovakia at the Nazi party congress at Nürnberg. He therefore sent him a telegram on September 9, three days before Hitler's closing address to the congress. Lansbury reminded Hitler that for the last eighteen months he had travelled the world to find a statesman willing to give a new lead. Lansbury urged Hitler to use his Monday speech to

call European statesmen to the Council chamber. Throw out a new challenge. Bid them join you in giving up reliance upon armaments, violence and war, and together join in a mighty effort to build international relationships, on the basis of co-operation, common sense and truth.<sup>98</sup>

Instead of accepting a conference, Hitler denounced Benes' policy. Actually it was Chamberlain who shortly after took steps to secure

peace, meeting Hitler on September 15, 1938, at Berchtesgaden. However, Chamberlain's initiative differed significantly from Lansbury's quest. The latter called for an economic world conference at which economic policies could be formulated which would result in world peace. Chamberlain, responding to an immediate threat of war, attempted to secure peace through dramatic face-to-face diplomacy without encumbering himself with economic considerations.

Hitler's demands diminished the prospect of peace, and John Nevin Sayre, the AFOR chairman and co-treasurer of EoR, whose brother Francis was an assistant secretary of state, decided on September 20 to send a message to Roosevelt. He reminded him of Lansbury's visit in 1936 and urged him to call a conference:

[Would] it not be infinitely better to hold it now while there is still some sanity left in the world rather than wait until after civilization is again crucified in war and then, in a time of war passions, meet for a peace conference which will in such an atmosphere probably repeat all the tragic mistakes in Versailles?<sup>99</sup>

Roosevelt reacted after Chamberlain had met Hitler again on September 22. His appeal did not go far enough as the "heartening telegram" of September 26 of Lansbury to the president indicated: "Warm thanks for your splendid appeal. Beg you consider following up by asking European Statesmen to meet you round Conference table."<sup>100</sup> On the same day Lansbury sent a telegram to Benes, asking him to be willing to accept further sacrifices: "To accept the German terms now may be the greatest, strongest act possible to statesmanship, releasing new spiritual forces."<sup>101</sup> While Lansbury stated that he and his friends could not share this sacrifice with Benes, Muriel Lester in a telegram on

September 27 to the new Foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax, asked, "Must not we as well as Czechoslovakia make sacrifices for peace? This may be the moral lead for which the world is waiting."<sup>102</sup> But there was no such British moral lead, for the Czechs were forced under extreme duress to submit to Hitler's demands. Such an exercise in pressure and threat was contrary to the FOR's understanding of diplomacy. Hitler ignored yet another of Lansbury's telegrams. Instead of a world conference, Hitler, Mussolini, Chamberlain and Daladier decided on September 29 in Munich the fate of Czechoslovakia. On September 30 Benes received a telegram signed by Lansbury, Carter and Bartlett which read: "Unbounded thanks for courageous sacrifices for world peace and deepest sympathy. Sincerely trust great nations will give you all necessary practical help through days of economic reconstruction."<sup>103</sup>

As The Christian Pacifist indicated, not all FOR members could give such "unbounded thanks". They pointed out that force had not been used redemptively but had rather been employed for the maintenance of the balance of power. Furthermore, they were disturbed that a small nation had been coerced to give up territory, while the great powers had been unwilling to alienate any territory under their jurisdiction. Not surprisingly, therefore, the editor of The Christian Pacifist observed in the January 1939 issue that there was an undercurrent of unease about Chamberlain's appeasement policy. The editor thought it necessary to state that the policy deserved hearty support. However, the support was for the original policy, not for the one twisted by its opponents.<sup>104</sup> In other words, the FOR was thankful for the momentary avoidance of war

but not with the way this had been achieved. Superficially, the FOR's objection to the way may not appear so significant. Yet it was crucial because the FOR held that means and ends had to be in harmony. Thus the FOR's understanding of appeasement was fundamentally different from Chamberlain's. Hence Chamberlain could claim that he had achieved peace for his time, a claim rejected by the FOR.

With the telegram to Benes Lansbury's quest came to a halt for all practical purposes, even though the EoR continued till 1967.<sup>105</sup> The initial EoR budget had been for three years. The £1500 for each year came through "one generous gift...promised for the whole period."<sup>106</sup> With more money forthcoming other ambassadors were supported. When Lansbury died on May 7, 1940, Europe was at war and his missions seemed to have failed. An obituary in the New York Post stated that "George Lansbury believed every word of what he said and wrote. He was the typical pacifist, honest, idealistic but far removed from the realities of the world."<sup>107</sup> On the other hand, John Nevin Sayre claimed at a Haverford Conference in 1939 that Lansbury's visit to Hitler opened the way for the visit of Chamberlain.<sup>108</sup> There is no proof for Sayre's claim, but if Lansbury was out of touch with reality, then a "realist" like Chamberlain was just as far removed - if not further.<sup>109</sup> According to Lansbury, war was imminent if no economic changes took place; Chamberlain, upon his return from Munich, stated that there was "peace for our time."

In this chapter much attention has been given to international affairs on which much FOR energy was spent, although these were more

properly the domain of the IFOR. These international matters were largely responsible for the change of emphasis in the FOR from an all-encompassing world and life view towards a single-issue organization. The shift in emphasis can also be observed in the FOR's literature, the subject of the next chapter.

## CHAPTER 13 - ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Webb, Modern, p. 545.

<sup>2</sup>Simon Newman, March 1939: The British Guarantee to Poland, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976. Newman did not deal with the general perception of appeasement. For early biographical defences of Chamberlain, see Keith Feiling, The Life of Neville Chamberlain, London: Macmillan, 1946;; Iain MacLeod, Neville Chamberlain, London: Frederick Muller, 1961. Later treatments of value include Maurice Cowling, The Impact of Hitler, London: Cambridge University Press, 1975; Robert Paul Shay, British Rearmament in the Thirties: Politics and Profits, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977; G. C. Peden, British Rearmament and the Treasury 1932-1939, Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1979.

<sup>3</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 14 no. 4, April 1936, p. 88. It was not until July 1936 that Peace News became the PPU's official organ. For its FOR origin see Morrison, I Renounce War, London: Sheppard Press, 1962, pp. 20-21.

<sup>4</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 21 - 9 - 1936. In June the figures were 4071 and 471.

<sup>5</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 25 - 11 - 1936. Leslie Artingsstall (1885 - 1952) was a Congregational minister who worked for the London Missionary Society from 1919 till his FOR appointment.

<sup>6</sup>McMaster, Vera Brittain Papers, A24, Box 1, folder 3b; 1 - 11 - 1961.

<sup>7</sup>FOR 456; 3/6; 21 - 1 - 1937. Hayman, who was an architect, was responsible for the reconstruction.

<sup>8</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 15 - 3 - 1937; CJC Box 28; 17 - 1 - 1938. (Artingsstall) and Jan. 1938 (Goss). In 1935 there were 40 branches, in 1936: 80; 1937: 120.

<sup>9</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 25 - 9 - 1939. This was an increase of nearly 2500 in one year. The numbers do not always coincide with those reported on other dates. But the general trend is never in doubt.

<sup>10</sup>For the history of the PPU see Morrison, Renounce; Ceadel, Pacifism; Aldous Huxley, An Encyclopedia of Pacifism, London: Chatto & Windus, 1937, p. 89ff; Yvonne Aleksandra Bennett, "Testament of a

Minority in Wartime: the Peace Pledge Union and Vera Brittain, 1939 - 1945," McMaster University Ph.D. thesis, 1984.

<sup>11</sup>CJC Box 28; 13 - 5 - 1938 (London Union); Fox 29; 17 - 2 - 1939.

<sup>12</sup>CJC Box 29; 22 - 10 - 1939.

<sup>13</sup>PPU Minutes, Executive Committee, Oct. 6, 1942, p. 85.

<sup>14</sup>The distinction is essentially between the sacred and secular. It seems very questionable if Hodgkin or Roberts would have allowed this statement to stand.

<sup>15</sup>PPU Minutes, Executive Committee, 6 - 7 - 1939, give 127644 as members. In contrast, FOR 456; 1/6; 25 - 9 - 1939, gave only 9813.

<sup>16</sup>FOR 456; 3/6; 5 - 4 - 1937, and 4/3; 18 - 2 - 1937.

<sup>17</sup>FOR 456; 3/6; 17 - 11 - 1938 and 4/3; 20-6-1938. Actually 15,000 copies were sold. Although long planned before "Munich", the issue was very timely. Several articles dealt with Czechoslovakia where the IFOR had a small organization, led by Premysl Pitter. In Jan. 1937, 4746 copies were sold. FOR 456; 4/3; 21-1-1937.

<sup>18</sup>FOR 456; 4/3; 20 - 10 - 1938. The title remained until Jan. 1947 when it became again Reconciliation.

<sup>19</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 6, June 1939.

<sup>20</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 15 - 3 - 1937. C.H. Wilson, in a letter to the editor, Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 8, Aug. 1935, p. 220, remarked that the other issues were being ignored. Clearly, Wilsor had recognized the shift in focus.

<sup>21</sup>GD 570. Reckitt's undated treatise was possibly written around 1924. A similar group was founded in 1936, called the Parliamentary Pacifist Group. See Ceadel, Pacifism, p. 275; and Berkman, "Pacifism", pp. 261-263.

<sup>22</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 11 - 3 - 1935. Mrs. Roberts became much involved in the APF. It is not clear why the issue re-surfaced at this time. The proposal may have been nothing more than a sign of a growing pacifist sentiment.

<sup>23</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 9, Sept. 1937, p. 227. No exact date of the formation is given. The Peace Year Book is silent about it.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid. The Hancock brothers were members but FOR archival material does not contain a membership list.

<sup>25</sup>See later in this chapter on the EoR. See also Bullock, Bevin, Vol. 1, 1960, p. 563.

<sup>26</sup>See e.g. FOR 456; 1/6; 21 - 6 - 1938. James' argument contradicted the FOR's call for "metanoia", a change of mind, as a prerequisite to the prevention of war.

<sup>27</sup>For a similar idea see Reginald Sorensen's "Politics and the Churches," The Labour Candidate, March 1933, p. 2.

<sup>28</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 16 no. 2, Feb. 1938, p. 42.

<sup>29</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 9, Sept. 1937, p. 227.

<sup>30</sup>See Robert F. Rizzo, "Christian Vision and Pacifism: A Study of Charles Earle Raven with a Comparison to Reinhold Niebuhr," Ph.D. thesis; the Catholic University of America, 1971, p. 183, Rizzo quoted Raven's "Is there a Christian Politics?," Hibbert Journal, 49, July 1951, p. 352.

<sup>31</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 16 no. 6, June 1938, p. 175.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 171.

<sup>33</sup>G. Norman Robbins, Suggestions for a Christian Party, Birmingham: Cornish Brothers, 1937, p. 6, point m of "General and Far Reaching Programme".

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>35</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 14 no. 4, Apr. 1936, p. 105. See Shay, British, pp. 83-84, for the mixed reception of the White Paper.

<sup>36</sup>In Dec. 1934 their troops had clashed at Walwal. Ethiopia subsequently appealed to the League of Nations which appointed a commission of arbitration. This commission concluded on Sept. 3, 1935 that neither country was to blame. Both Lansbury's letter and Temple's broadcast pre-dated the conclusion. Lansbury's letter is reprinted in his My Pilgrimage for Peace, New York: Henry Holt, 1938; Garland, 1972, pp. 8-10.

<sup>37</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 10, Oct. 1935, p. 276, gives as date Sept. 7. For the speech, "The Christian and the World Situation", see the publication by The New Commonwealth, London: Constable, Series A no. 7, March 1937. Temple himself gives as date Sept. 1. The president of the British Section of The New Commonwealth was Winston Churchill.

<sup>38</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 13, no. 10, Oct. 1935, p. 263.



<sup>39</sup>Ibid., pp. 276-279. The reply was produced by a committee of the CCPG. Also published as a separate pamphlet. See also A. Ruth Fry's pamphlet A Pacifist Replies to the Archbishop of York, Oct. 1935.

<sup>40</sup>See Fry, Pacifist, p. 4.

<sup>41</sup>Especially Romans 4-6.

<sup>42</sup>In the Hamilton Spectator of 9-2-1985, p. E5, Dr. Ian G. Weeks is quoted as saying that "in the Western world ... the idea of love has found its greatest acceptance, ... Love is not typical of other cultures and civilizations." Although Reconciliation did not mention the word ἀγάπη, it was this kind of love which the committee had in mind.

<sup>43</sup>See Fry, Pacifist, p. 4. As will be seen later, Reinhold Niebuhr held to a similar position on the priority to the state.

<sup>44</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 11, Nov. 1935, pp. 299-301.

<sup>45</sup>Temple assumed that the Christian's conscience was not yet actively sensitive enough.

<sup>46</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 11, Nov 1935, p. 300. Maclachlan's negative point implied a devastating blow to the armament industry.

<sup>47</sup>The Times, "Pacifism and 'Heresy'" - An Explanation by Dr. Temple." 29-10-1935, p. 19. The letter was also published as a York Diocesan Leaflet.

<sup>48</sup>Marcion was excommunicated c. 144. He posited a total discontinuity between the O.T. and N.T., between Israel and the Church, between the God of the O.T. and the Father of Jesus. The God of O.T. was a demiurge. His ideas of the material world were close to gnosticism.

<sup>49</sup>Peter Craigie in a footnote in his book The Problem of War in the Old Testament p. 34, footnote 4, has stated that Raven, though an unorthodox theologian, "was in no sense a Marcionite." Craigie seems to have ignored how Raven viewed God's actions in the O.T.

<sup>50</sup>Hershberger, War.

<sup>51</sup>Mani (216-276/7) was an aristocratic Parthian. He posited that Light and Dark, God and Matter were eternal. The two principles were antithetical. The creation of Adam was an attempt to imprison Light. Hence, Mani condemned reproduction. Jesus was an example of the suffering of imprisoned Light in matter. Salvation was based on right knowledge. Mani's scheme borrowed heavily from Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Judaism and Christianity. Augustine was a Manichaean 'auditor'

for a decade. After his conversion to Christianity, Augustine wrote against Manichaeism.

<sup>52</sup>Pelagius was a British contemporary of Augustine. His key tenet was the freedom of the human will. He denied any original sin inherited from Adam. Adam was merely an ill example, easily followed by the rest of mankind. However, man had the power not to sin. This power was imparted by baptism on the basis of Christ's work. Raven in a foreword to John Ferguson's The Enthronement of Love, wrote that it was "immensely refreshing to be challenged bluntly by one who is not afraid to say a word for Pelagius."

<sup>53</sup>This was Temple's interpretation of Pelagius and pacifism.

<sup>54</sup>Raven, in 1923, wrote a thesis on Apollinarianism. See Dillistone, Raven, pp. 49, 56. The 1971 edition of Encyclopedia Britannica still used the book in the bibliography. Raven's article against Temple appeared in Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 12, Dec. 1935, p. 320.

<sup>55</sup>The Congress took place in Leeds, June 26-29, 1936. SCPC; CDG-B, Box 99, Henry Carter, The Pacifist and the League of Nations, London: Epworth Press, 1936.

<sup>56</sup>The Christian Pacifist Message, London: F.O.R. [1936] p. 9.

<sup>57</sup>Elizabeth Isichei, Victorian Quakers, London: Oxford University Press, 1970, p. 192. Isichei referred to the visit to Nicholas I during the Crimean War.

<sup>58</sup>SCPC. The Spiritual Purpose of the C.I.S., Supplementary Report Series, no. 1. [1926-7], p. 3.

<sup>59</sup>2 Sam. 15.

<sup>60</sup>Quaker Embassies, London: Friends Service Council, 1934, p. 5.

<sup>61</sup>See Hughes, Indomitable, p. 48 and ch. 5.

<sup>62</sup>Quaker Embassies. Richards at an Executive Committee meeting drew attention to Ambassadorial services. FOR 456; 3/5; 15-11-1934.

<sup>63</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 10, Oct. 1935, p. 266. It may be recalled that the meeting was called after the League of Nations commission brought out its report on the Dec. 1934 incident between Italy and Ethiopia.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 269.

<sup>65</sup>R. Postgate, The Life of George Lansbury, London: Longmans & Green, 1951, p. 302. Officially Lansbury resigned, but "forced out" describes the event better. David Martin in the Introduction to the 1972 Garland edition of Lansbury's Pilgrimage stated that the resignation was a clash between Lansbury's irrationalism and the realist trade union position (p. 11) The statement can hardly be more ironic because Lansbury always maintained that pacifists were the realists. See e.g., ch. 3, p. 47 of the book.

<sup>66</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 12, Dec. 1935, p. 323. See also The Christian Pacifist Message, p. 6.

<sup>67</sup>Dr. Salter toured other sections of the U.S.A. Lansbury was supposed to speak in Toronto. After a series of intrigues he declined at the last moment. See LL Vol. 16. The invitation came from Kirby Page. The campaign slogan was "Keep America Out of War." See Lansbury, Pilgrimage, ch 3, p. 44.

<sup>68</sup>Public Ledger, Philadelphia, 24-4-1936, clipping SCPC; CDG-B, Box 71.

<sup>69</sup>"The Way to Peace", in The Forum, Apr. 22/23, 1936, pp. 120-123, clipping, SCPC; CDG-B, Box 71.

<sup>70</sup>LL Vol. 16, pp. 72-79, Radio broadcast 21-4-1936.

<sup>71</sup>The conference was not held while Lansbury was in the U.S.A. as Lansbury wrote in Pilgrimage, p. 19.

<sup>72</sup>Bartlett resigned as general secretary of the FOR on 30-9-1936.

<sup>73</sup>Dr. Salter was not included as Ceadel, Pacifism, p. 275, suggested.

<sup>74</sup>The request was made on April 3, 1937; The Times, 6-4-1937, p. 14.

<sup>75</sup>Embassies of Reconciliation, A Report, 1936 - 7, London: E.o.R., p. 3.

<sup>76</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 14 no. 10, Oct. 1936, p. 272; FOR 456; 3/5; 21-9-1936.

<sup>77</sup>In mid-July, 1936, general Franco started a revolt in Spanish Morocco against the Popular Front government in Madrid. The revolt became the beginning of the Spanish Civil War which ended in 1939 with the defeat of the republicans. The Peace Army by this time was led by Royden, Joyce Pollard and Gwen Paine. Few people were practically involved in Peace Army work.

<sup>78</sup>FOR 456; 3/5; 9-10-1936.

<sup>79</sup>The organizations were "independent but cooperative". There was no permanent organization or membership for the EoR; See Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 3, March 1937, p. 72 and Fellowship, Nov. 1936, p. 4.

<sup>80</sup>Embassies of Reconciliation, A Report, 1936 - 7, pp. 7 - 8. They went as part of a small unofficial group of churchmen. No date is given in the report. The visit took place early 1937, See Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 3, March 1937, p. 71.

<sup>81</sup>Hughes, Indomitable, p. 143. For a more extensive evaluation of the two visits, see David Lukowitz, "George Lansbury's Peace Missions to Hitler and Mussolini in 1937," Canadian Journal of History, Vol. 25 no. 1, Apr. 1980, pp. 67-82.

<sup>82</sup>Rheinland Westfalische Zeitung, 21-4-1937, translation in SCPC; CDG - B, Box 71.

<sup>83</sup>New York Times, 20-4-1937, clipping in SCPC; CDG - B, Box 71.

<sup>84</sup>Northern Whig and Belfast Post, 20-4-1937, clipping in SCPC; CDG - B, Box 71. See also Lansbury's Pilgrimage, Ch. 6.

<sup>85</sup>Lansbury, Pilgrimage, Ch. 7; Embassies of Reconciliation, A Report, 1936 - 7, p. 7. The key here is "impression". Mussolini and Ciano may or may not have been anxious to avoid war. Lukowitz, "George Lansbury", p. 79.

<sup>86</sup>Lansbury, Pilgrimage, Ch. 8, esp. p. 183. Brittain, Rebel, p. 53. Cowling, The Impact of Hitler, p. 132; The Times, Oct. 28, 1937, p. 15.

<sup>87</sup>Lansbury, Peace Through Economic Cooperation, London: E.o.R., 1937, p. 3. The address became Ch. 14 of My Pilgrimage for Peace. For Schnuschnigg's promise to treat political prisoners better see Lansbury, Pilgrimage, Ch. 10; Hughes, Indomitable, p. 148; Embassies of Reconciliation, A Report, 1937 - 8, p. 9.

<sup>88</sup>LL Vol. 16, pp. 170 - 178.

<sup>89</sup>Report presented by Monsieur Van Zeeland to the Government of the United Kingdom and France on the Possibility of Obtaining a General Reduction of the Obstacles to International Trade. London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, Jan. 26, 1938. Cmd. 5648. For the Times favourable review see The Times, 28-1-1938, pp. 14, 15, 21, 28; 29-1-1938, pp. 9 and 12. According to The Times of June 3, p. 13, and June 16, p. 8, the report was "gathering dust".

<sup>90</sup>Henry Carter, Battlefield or Council Table?, EoR pamphlet, 1938, p. 2.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid., p. 5; Report, pp. 48-49. During the 1930s many countries had raised tariff barriers. Germany could be regarded as the prime example of autarky. Oppressive regimes often have a need to support autarky since it reduces the liability to external pressures.

<sup>92</sup>Lansbury, Pilgrimage, p. 81.

<sup>93</sup>Percy W. Bartlett, The Economic Approach to Peace, E.o.R., n.d. [1938?]; George Lansbury, This Way to Peace, London: Rich and Corvan, n.d. [1940?], p. 30. See also letter to Times, 31-1-1938, SCPC, Sayre Papers - EoR. It should be kept in mind that Blum and Baldwin were replaced by Daladier and Chamberlain. The latter was committed to protectionism. Thus Chamberlain's views contrasted strongly with Van Zeeland's recommendations. The conflicting views would explain why the Report was shelved.

<sup>94</sup>The series started in the March 1938 issue. They formed the basis of his book of the same name published in 1941.

<sup>95</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 16 no. 3, March 1938, pp. 71 - 75. Artington suggested two critiques of capitalism: economic and ethical. Waste was ethically unacceptable. Since unemployment was unrelievable under the capitalist system, capitalism was guilty of wasting human energy.

<sup>96</sup>Embassies of Reconciliation, A Report, 1937 - 8, p. 9.

<sup>97</sup>Eden was vacationing when the inquiries came in January. Chamberlain wanted to wait with such a conference until after consultations with Italy had been completed. See Earl of Avon, The Memoirs of Anthony Eden. Facing the Dictators, Houghton: Riverside Press, 1962, p. 636: "I determined that if the Cabinet Committee would not support Roosevelt's scheme, I must resign." According to David Carlton in Anthony Eden (London: Allen Lane, 1981, p. 128), Eden resigned because he was unwilling to treat with Mussolini. Possibly poor health may have contributed to the resignation.

<sup>98</sup>SCPC; CDG - B, Box 71; 9-9-1938. Embassies of Reconciliation, A Report, 1937 - 8, p. 14, gives 26-9-1938 as date, but this is definitely wrong.

<sup>99</sup>SCPC; CDG - B, Box 71; 20-9-1938.

<sup>100</sup>Embassies of Reconciliation, A Report, 1937 - 8, p. 14. The "heartening telegram" was a comment made by the U.S.A. ambassador in London.

<sup>101</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>102</sup>SCPC; CDG - B, Box 71, 27-9-1938; LL Vol. 16; 27-9-1938.

<sup>103</sup>Embassies of Reconciliation, A Report, 1937 - 8, p. 15.

<sup>104</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 1, Jan. 1939, p. 1. See Reconciliation, Vol. 16 no. 11, Nov. 1938 for some reactions; as well Bartlett, Cadbury, p. 103; and Brittain, Rebel, p. 54, for the confusion.

<sup>105</sup>In 1939 Lansbury still wrote Horthy, the regent of Hungary, and queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, while he met king Leopold of Belgium. LL Vol. 17. For Muriel Lester's visits to China, Japan, India, the U.S.A. and South America, see her It So Happened.

<sup>106</sup>Embassies of Reconciliation, A Report, 1936 - 7, p. 9. The gift probably came from Barrow Cadbury, see EoR minutes of 17-7-1957 on Cadbury's death.

<sup>107</sup>E.L. Meyer of the New York Post quoting Ludwig Lore. Clipping, SCPC; CDG - B, Box 71, n.d.

<sup>108</sup>SCPC; EoR - Sayre Papers; Embassies of Reconciliation, Report, 1939. There is no other evidence to support Sayre's claim. Perhaps the proof in this case is less important than the perception. The perception could create a myth that the methods of the EoR (and thus pacifism) worked. See also Lukowitz, "George Lansbury".

<sup>109</sup>P. M. Kennedy, "Idealists versus Realists: British Views of Germany, 1864-1939," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Fifth Series, Vol. 25, 1975, pp. 137-156.

## CHAPTER 14

### THE THEOLOGICAL-PHILOSOPHICAL SHIFT

After 1929 the FOR became more and more an order, with its message largely directed to church members. One could have expected, therefore, careful expositions of the Fellowship's vision in FOR literature. Yet, this was not the case. Admittedly, the vision was not forgotten, but articles and books about justice or the state were not common. Such a limitation in topics represented a shift. But within this restriction there was another shift. Themes which used to receive much attention, such as atonement and fellowship, also received limited treatment. This "internal" shift, also noticeable in the numerous works on pacifism, reflected to some extent a new theological climate. As has been seen, early FOR members generally stressed the divine immanence. In the 1920s there came a reaction against this emphasis, largely through the writings of the Swiss theologian Karl Barth (1886-1968). During the war Barth, then a pastor at Safenwil, had come to regard the liberal theology of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man as inadequate. His dissatisfaction came powerfully to expression in his Romerbrief of 1918, the start of his "theology of crisis" or as it later became known the "dialectic theology".<sup>1</sup> Barth did not reject the validity of the historical-critical method of his predecessors, but relegated it to a minor position. Instead, Barth emphasized the

transcendence of God, the divine side of the God-man relationship, and rejected the idea that man's effort could obtain righteousness. Barth's influence was soon noticeable in English theology.<sup>2</sup> The result for the FOR was another theological conflict. The most vocal critic of the new emphasis on transcendence was Raven who saw it as a threat to scientific theology. While Cadoux, who maintained his modernist position, could be regarded as representative of one segment of early FOR members, Raven could be viewed as representing the new Anglican influx. However, many older and newer members, under the influence of the new theological direction, now started to question many presuppositions held previously. To some extent, therefore, this chapter can be regarded as a critique of several views delineated in chapters 4 and 8.

The conflicting views may have contributed to the relative absence of the FOR's world and life view in their publications. But instead of concentrating on these differences, the Fellowship concentrated on a topic agreed upon by all members: pacifism. Although the churches in the 1930s were much more sympathetic towards pacifism--founding FOR member James Fraser was even elected moderator of the Presbyterian Church--they had not accepted pacifism as a basic Christian tenet. FOR publications had essentially two functions, namely, to provide new FOR members with a proper basis of and defence for their pacifism, and to convince the churches that they ought actively to preach pacifism. Because FOR members travelled on different roads to their pacifism, they also used different explanations and approaches. Some approaches had serious shortcomings. Opponents who pointed out



these weaknesses frequently thought that they had undermined if not defeated the pacifist argument. They did not seem to realize that the defeat of one approach did not necessarily invalidate another. In the six approaches discussed here the theological-philosophical shifts as well as their strengths and weaknesses will become apparent. Although specific events were rarely mentioned in this literature, except as illustrations, William Temple's speech of 1935, the preparations for the 1937 Oxford conference of churches and the threatening external events from the middle of the decade onwards contributed to the brief explosion of pacifist writings.

#### Four Examples

In 1929 William Wilson finally published his book on atonement, The Problem of the Cross.<sup>3</sup> It was a greatly expanded version of what had appeared earlier in The Venturer and The Friend (discussed in Chapter 4). Ironically, in the same year another book was published with a different understanding of the atonement: The Atonement in History and in Life, edited by canon L.W. Grensted. While Wilson had rejected Anselm's theory, Grensted's volume was the "result of the dissatisfaction of the tossing away of the Anselmian view which had become popularized in the Evangelical movement and was the main theme of Mission preaching."<sup>4</sup> Against Wilson's subjective theory of atonement, that is, the effect on man of what Christ did, Grensted and his fellow authors reviewed the history of the doctrine from an objective theory, that is, the atonement was seen as arising from the inner necessity of God's Being.<sup>5</sup> In 1931 bishop Gustav Aulen's book on the atonement

appeared in English as Christus Victor.<sup>6</sup> C.T.H. Walker commented on this book in Reconciliation in 1935 when he reviewed Anselm's theory of atonement. In his conclusion he combined Aulen and Grensted against Wilson: "We must go back from the Enlightenment to the more massive and realistic outlook of S. Anselm, to the dynamic and triumphant enthusiasm of the Early Fathers."<sup>7</sup> Belden seemed to accept a vicarious aspect, to which Wilson had objected, when he commented on the atonement that "Evangelical believers profess that on the Cross Christ bore the sins of the world."<sup>8</sup> Wilson, who in his Preface expressed thanks to Cadoux, H.G. Wood, Coates, Grubb and Stephen Hobhouse, could be regarded as a representative of the earlier leaders whose views on the atonement were now being questioned.<sup>9</sup>

The idea of fellowship, like atonement, was a topic discussed throughout the decade.<sup>10</sup> It was often treated in a summary fashion and little substantial emerged. Yet some statements deserve attention because they reflected the heart and the changes in the FOR. Fellowship was both a practical and a theoretical issue. In practice it was not always easy to have fellowship. FOR members came from different walks of life and had come to pacifism along different lines. Hence, their reactions to tensions were different as well. That in itself would cause varieties of pacifism.<sup>11</sup> The difficulty of fellowship was compounded by the fact that, according to Davies, recent converts to pacifism had too shallow an understanding of peace.<sup>12</sup> Yet it was precisely in this situation that there was a need of solidarity and ecumenism.<sup>13</sup> Divisions and difficulties were not allowed to deter

others from joining. Fellowship was, therefore, crucial to the FOR and its growth. But what was the foundation for fellowship? Norman Robinson, whose Christian Justice had appeared in the "Christian Revolution Series", tied the idea of fellowship to economics when he argued that a fellowship was determined by how one looked at or dealt with money. Often a fellowship was poisoned by class distinctions.<sup>14</sup> Socio-economic aspects influenced fellowship, but "The Basis" made clear that the essence of the fellowship was not determined by them. As Leslie Stubbings in "Concerning Community" suggested, fellowship was not a pattern, program, plan or institution but a living spirit.<sup>15</sup> Such a living spirit was possible everywhere, not just in the newly emerging communities, such as the Cotswold Bruderhof, which were usually back-to-the-land movements.<sup>16</sup> Such a living spirit, he claimed, would also overcome class barriers and hostile emotions. These obstacles would make only a limited fellowship possible. Yet, limitations were the key to Preston Lambley's "Fellowship of Disagreement", for in transcending them the only real possible fellowship was found: "The fact is that the only true unifying principle in religion is this very principle of disruption. ...It is by loyalty to the truth that men are divided, but through such division comes a deeper unity."<sup>17</sup> The FOR had always acted on this principle, though it had never been clearly formulated. It was this principle which allowed so many Christian pacifists to stay within their church or work for the state and reject the Tolstoyan conclusion of anarchic pacifism. It was a principle of harmonious tension of individual and community:

When we stand out by ourselves we declare ourselves separate from others, we recognise the right of all true men so to stand out according to their own guidance. And so having once stood apart we draw near again not in uniformity, but in respect for each other's principles, not in any attempt to soften down what we believe, or to try to get our neighbours to compromise with conscience so that they may be more agreeable to us, but frankly recognising differences entering into that deepest of all fellowships, the fellowship of those who are true to the light they have.<sup>18</sup>

Everything which broke or denied this fellowship came under the scrutiny of the FOR.<sup>19</sup> As will be seen later in this chapter, war was the worst denial of this principle and received therefore most attention.

The third example of change, love and justice, was closely tied to the notions of fellowship and atonement as well to the concept of the state. Again, while early FOR authors made frequent references to love and justice, the FOR writers of the 1930s made relatively few comments about them. This change is somewhat surprising, especially for the period after Temple's 1935 speech.<sup>20</sup> Temple, like most non-pacifists, put justice before love, "first law, then grace".<sup>21</sup> But at least the two concepts were retained, in contrast to totalitarianism which eradicated both. H. C. L. Heywood, a Cambridge Anglican clergyman, gave unwittingly an explanation why there were so few references when he wrote that "justice is a notoriously difficult notion to analyse."<sup>22</sup> However difficult to analyze, Heywood, like Temple, suggested that justice was inextricably bound up with property. Temple built his just war theory on it, essentially assuming that the existing order, with some modifications, was worth defending. Heywood on the other hand did not believe that the status quo was worth preserving.<sup>23</sup> Therefore, FOR

members were called upon to work for the removal of economic burdens and other injustices as well for a Christianization of the social order, a task no different from what COPEC in 1924 had proposed.<sup>24</sup> Temple himself had been a major proponent of the ideas of COPEC, which would suggest that a basic assumption in his 1935 argument was wrong. E.W. Philip in "Stern Love" did not mention Temple but he showed where the flaw in the archbishop's argument lay. According to Philip,

the love and the righteousness of God are one and the same. ...To separate righteousness from love is to be left with the hard righteousness of the Pharisee...[and] is not the righteousness of Jesus and therefore not the righteousness of God. ...To separate love from righteousness is to make love a mere sentiment, blind to moral values. ...[Jesus' love was] concerned not with comfort but with character, and it is a righteousness not of legal justice, concerned to fit the punishment to the crime, but redemptive.<sup>25</sup>

Redemptive righteousness could be regarded as a virtue, while legal justice could be seen as a duty. Of the latter, C. T. H. Walker wrote that it "preserves and constitutes equilibrium. It obviates and abolishes evil. But it never does any positive good to anyone, though it may preserve good already created and existent."<sup>26</sup> Temple attributed a much more positive role to this type of justice than Walker, while many earlier FOR leaders were still less positive about this type than Walker. The shift relative to both love and justice was one of direction rather than understanding.

The final short example is a discussion about the Christian pacifist's view of and relationship to the state and its use of force. In the pamphlet A Christian Peace Settlement G. H. C. Macgregor, one of the most prominent FOR theologians during the 1930s and 1940s, wrote a

suggestion for intercession which was no different from the FOR's answers to Temple's 1935 speech: "Inasmuch as the Christian is called to serve not the State but in the State to serve Christ, let us seek in all our public as in private life to obey Him, knowing that our steadfast loyalty to Him is our highest loyalty to the nation."<sup>27</sup> From this representative statement it is clear that the FOR continued to maintain its earlier view on the state, still hoping that it would become "the organ of goodwill in all life, industrial, civic, national, and international."<sup>28</sup> The FOR saw this hope thwarted by the state's misuse of force. Few, if any FOR members still held to the notion that all force was wrong, although many people assumed that pacifism meant a repudiation of all force.<sup>29</sup> Rather, the members now distinguished between excess and moderation.<sup>30</sup> Under all circumstances force could only be used redemptively and in a form that could be controlled.<sup>31</sup> As Leyton Richards pointed out in his book The Christian's Alternative to War, physical force was in and of itself non-moral and could be used for or against God.<sup>32</sup> According to the FOR, sanctions and war used force non-redemptively and stood therefore condemned.<sup>33</sup> There was, however, some confusion in FOR circles about police force. The FOR accepted the notion that the police force could use some force. The question in the 1930s was whether or not an international police force under the aegis of the League was acceptable. The answer was best stated by Richards, who regarded such a police force as a euphemism for an army whose aim was the negation of the police ideal:

The aim of military force is not to bring the enemy before an impartial court of justice, but by and of itself it acts

as prosecution, judge, jury, jailor, and executioner in one; while in the process it seeks to inflict upon the enemy people the maximum of injury, harm, and destruction, alike to property and to life.<sup>34</sup>

The editor of Reconciliation admitted in 1930 that the distinction was not always so easy to define,<sup>35</sup> but Richards' differentiation between the police and army was essentially maintained by the FOR. This distinction helps to explain why the FOR was against the League of Nations' use of a "so-called police force" and by implication against collective security.

There were, however, FOR members who were willing to grant greater power to the state. With the growing influx of Anglicans in the later 1930s, Article thirty-seven of the Thirty-Nine Articles started to play a greater role. R.H. Le Messurier wrote in Reconciliation that "every priest of the Church of England--and indeed of the Roman Communion as well--is committed in theory to the doctrine of a just war."<sup>36</sup> However, as a 1939 PAX leaflet stated, "The conditions laid down by theologians for a justifiable war are no longer possible of fulfilment all together."<sup>37</sup> The implication of the pamphlet was that at some unspecified time in the past a just war was possible. With the new developments in military technology not all the conditions for a just war could be fulfilled and thus no longer could there be a just war. In essence, this meant for many Anglicans that not all wars were condemned, something very few early FOR members would have been willing to concede. This background also helps to explain Raven's lecture series and book title Is War Obsolete?<sup>38</sup> and accounts for much of the unease felt by other FOR members when Raven was appointed as chairman.

Allowing the state some measure of coercion - "in order that it may prevent the coercion of one citizen or group of citizens by another"<sup>39</sup> - the FOR did not imply that now the state was somehow sacrosanct or "endowed with any supermoral authority which gives it a right to ride roughshod over the meanest of its citizens."<sup>40</sup> Not only did the FOR question anything remotely suggestive of the divine right of the state,<sup>41</sup> but, through its understanding of pacifism, it was constrained to question the status quo. As the editor of Reconciliation wrote in 1933: "The Christian knows that while God delights in an ordered world His purpose is not to keep order but to achieve fellowship."<sup>42</sup> The FOR's ideal of fellowship, however, was quite different from what the state tried to maintain through law and order, and so the FOR was inherently at odds with the state.<sup>43</sup>

### War and Pacifism

The different views on the state and force were equally noticeable in the understanding of war and pacifism.<sup>44</sup> An incident in 1934 may illustrate the point. In January Raven wrote an article for Reconciliation, titled "On Refusing War", in which he argued that a peace pledge was inadequate and unsatisfactory as a test of membership in the Fellowship.<sup>45</sup> In the February issue Cadoux objected to this view as negating the FOR's past witness. In his objection Cadoux made essentially the same point as Raven, yet without realizing it:

The sub-Christian policy of coercion by force of arms is justifiable (and therefore in a measure useful) relatively to the ethical vision and ideals of the general public, but not to that of the Christian Church, nor to that of the individual Christian pacifist, nor to that of the F.O.R.<sup>46</sup>



Yet, Cadoux did not think that Raven made this point. As the editor stated in a note appended to Cadoux' letter, Raven's article bore "careful reading". Raven's subtle-and sometimes overly subtle-reasoning had led Cadoux astray and in the March issue Raven expressed regret for the misunderstanding and Cadoux apologized for the misinterpretation.<sup>47</sup> If two leading pacifist theologians misunderstood each other, it could be no surprise that the general public misunderstood pacifism or that there were indeed different ways of understanding pacifism.

In spite of the regret and apology there were differences which could not be harmonized and yet these different views found room in the FOR.<sup>48</sup> There were those, for example, who saw or felt themselves as a remnant or a loyal minority, while others never bothered with these concepts which had played such important roles in the early FOR history.<sup>49</sup> APF members were asked to sign a declaration which merely repudiated modern war, while the FOR's "The Basis" categorically forbade all war.<sup>50</sup> There were those, like one A. Mackendrick, who believed that "the Natural Order, if not interfered with by unjust laws, special privileges or monopolies, will run smoothly; that it will give free play to the friendliness that is inherent in our common human nature."<sup>51</sup> Others had a much more negative view of human nature. For example, Ruth Fry, in a May 1939 pamphlet, stated unambiguously that it was "untrue...to say that we are all peace-loving people."<sup>52</sup>

Reconciliation carried many divergent views which did not necessarily coincide with the FOR's original ideas. The growing membership needed to hear the pacifist message as if for the first time.

This led to much repetition and to Hayman's article "Pacifism is not Enough" in which he expressed the hope to "rediscover for this generation of members the extraordinary depth and insight of the foundation statement."<sup>53</sup> The article was undoubtedly intended to correct inadequate interpretations. In 1938, the same year Hayman's article appeared, Artingstall asked Cadoux if he could be at a Crusade meeting at Whitefield's where Belden was to speak. Artingstall did not fully trust Belden on the topic and thought that Cadoux could steer the meeting in the right direction.<sup>54</sup> A month after Artingstall's letter Dorothy Gill wrote to Cadoux about an FOR meeting at Bradford with Rev. G.L. Phelps, the FOR's northern regional secretary. She commented on Phelps' pacifism that it "seemed merely to mean 'no more war' - a vastly different thing from the FOR ideal, it seems to me."<sup>55</sup> Gill, like other early FOR members, still adhered to the FOR's early vision, but many newer members did not. These differences meant different approaches to convert the churches and strengthen the converted. For convenience, these approaches may be arranged under six general headings:

1. historical, 2. biblical, 3. theological, 4. evolutionary,
5. utilitarian, 6. causative. The first approach called the churches back to their origin, while the second one showed the biblical basis for this origin. These two cleared the ground for the theological approach, which can be regarded as constituting the heart of the FOR in the 1930s. For some members evolution and/or utility were inextricably bound up with theology, while others saw them as quite separate approaches. The causative approach was largely an independent approach to the problem of

war.

# 1. The Historical Approach

The historical approach received scant attention in FOR literature. The members generally agreed that Cadoux had argued adequately that the early church had been pacifist. In 1928 G.J. Heering published his book De Zondeval van het Christendom, which in 1930 appeared in English as The Fall of Christianity. The book was greatly admired by leading FOR members,<sup>56</sup> and reaffirmed, as the title suggested, Cadoux' position that THE fall of the church occurred when it endorsed the war policy of Constantine.<sup>57</sup> A.F.C. Beales reinforced the idea, not only in his popular book The History of Peace, but also in an article he wrote for Reconciliation in which he stated his idea of the value of the historical argument. He thought that it explained the development of theories and ideals, and related them to the political evolution which they thought to influence. The historical approach could help determine which theories could most likely be realized. Beales, even more than Cadoux or Heering, combined the historical approach with evolutionary thinking. As far as he was concerned, war had outlived its usefulness.<sup>58</sup>

No dissenting voice to the findings of the historical approach was heard until 1938 when R.H. Le Messurier, the APF secretary, applied to it the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The Church has always accepted the notion that the Spirit guided the Church. From this Le Messurier concluded that it was not a

sufficiently sound argument to say that the Church of God was pacifist for three centuries and ever since then it has

gone astray on the point, for the Catholic priest cannot accept the premise implied in this statement that God the Holy Spirit has been guiding His Church wrongly for sixteen hundred years.<sup>59</sup>

Le Messurier's charge was not answered even though his argument included a just war theory. Le Messurier was an Anglo-Catholic priest, and his views were apparently fairly representative of the APF.<sup>60</sup> They were quite contrary to those held by earlier FOR members and are indicative of the change within the Fellowship.

## 2. The Biblical Approach

The British mandate in Palestine, established after World War I, created a favourable climate for systematic archaeological excavations. In neighbouring Lebanon C.F.A. Schaeffer discovered a wealth of literature at Ras Shamra/Ugarit in 1928. The new archaeological material stimulated a renewed interest in Old Testament studies in the 1930s. Yet, in FOR literature there is little evidence of the new insights gained. The FOR's understanding of the O.T., often already negative, was now becoming outdated as well, as is apparent in W. Robinson's Christianity is Pacifism.<sup>61</sup> Like Hodgkin and Davies before him, Robinson wondered if the God of the O.T. was the God of the N.T. Like them, he concluded that O.T. morality was not the morality of the Christian.<sup>62</sup> Hence, Christians could not use the wars of the O.T. in an argument justifying war. The FOR's unsatisfactory Old Testament scholarship left the Fellowship wide open to attacks from opponents.

More attention was given to the New Testament, notably by Raven, Macgregor and Dodd. Form criticism, pioneered by Rudolf Bultmann in

1921, can easily be detected in Raven's books.<sup>63</sup> Nevertheless, most FOR members still did not venture much beyond the synoptic gospels although the gospel of John and Paul's epistles started to receive some attention. The most significant book dealing with exegesis was Macgregor's The New Testament Basis of Pacifism, a book published in 1936, revised in 1953 and popular in Britain and the U.S.A. till the 1970's. Chapter 2, the critical portion, opened with the words, "Both sides to the present controversy must plead guilty to the unfortunate practice of quoting isolated texts, often wrested from their context."<sup>64</sup> Macgregor then discussed a dozen texts which were most often quoted against pacifism.<sup>65</sup> Rejecting a literal interpretation of several texts - rightly so in connection with texts from parables - Macgregor on the whole was able to show that these texts were poorly exegeted by proponents of war. Although his own exegesis was not always convincing, it has generally been vindicated by subsequent scholarship.<sup>66</sup> However, one aspect emerged clearly: Macgregor made a distinction between war and carrying a weapon in self-defence, something no previous FOR member had done. As he wrote in the conclusion of his discussion on Luke 22:36-38, "We cannot cite Jesus as definitely discountenancing the recognized habit of carrying arms in self-defence."<sup>67</sup> Since the FOR rejected a dualism between the actions of an individual and of a nation, such an admission could be quite damaging to the pacifist cause.<sup>68</sup> However, Macgregor was not so much concerned with one text as well with the whole spirit of Jesus' teaching and within that context the Lucan passage proves nothing in favour of the "war exegetes". What the admission does

prove is that the biblical basis for pacifism as far as texts were concerned was not as strong as had been assumed.<sup>69</sup> The admission only reinforced the FOR's contention that pacifism was not based on proof texts but on principles.<sup>70</sup>

### 3. The Theological Approach

While the historical and biblical exegetical approaches received scant attention, the theological books and articles on pacifism, representing the heart of the FOR in the 1930s, abounded. Probably the most familiar are Richards' Realistic Pacifism (1935), Raven's Is War Obsolete? (1935) and War and the Christian (1938) and Macgregor's The New Testament Basis of Pacifism (1936). Raven's books have been adequately dealt with in R.F. Rizzo's 1971 unpublished Ph.D. thesis "Christian Vision and Pacifism: A Study of Charles Earle Raven with a Comparison to Reinhold Niebuhr" and need not be discussed here to the extent they might otherwise deserve.<sup>71</sup> The popularity of Richards', Raven's and Macgregor's books, the rapidly increasing subscription to Reconciliation and The Christian Pacifist, and the debate on war at the 1937 Oxford Conference (the follow-up of Stockholm 1925 and a link in the formation of the World Council of Churches, 1948) indicate that the theological aspect of pacifism was reaching a wide audience. Essentially FOR members supplied Britain with the theological treatises favouring pacifism. Frequently they published articles in Peace News, the widely-read PPU organ which often was filled with commentary on current events. In order to understand fully the FOR in the 1930s it is imperative to know its message.

The FOR's position was succinctly summed up by Macgregor's statement that "for the Christian war is primarily a moral problem, and every moral problem is ultimately theological."<sup>72</sup> As already has been suggested, the FOR's theology and the ethics of the New Testament were inextricably bound up together.<sup>73</sup> For most Christian pacifists the core of the N.T. consisted of the gospels.<sup>74</sup> Some limited the core even further to the Sermon on the Mount, about which all agreed that it was not just an ideal for the future, as Temple and Niebuhr argued, but a call to put the ideals into practice in the present.<sup>75</sup> But these limitations on the N.T. called into question its reliability. Modernists like Cadoux and Raven rejected the N.T.--not to mention the creeds--as infallible.<sup>76</sup> Rizzo rightly questioned how Raven - and others like him - could be "so certain of the values and principles of the Gospel as the basis of his pacifist position, since our understanding of Jesus is mediated to us through the interpretation of the first-century Christians."<sup>77</sup> The liberal theologian's answer was extra-biblical. Rizzo was only partially correct when he argued that Raven compensated through his religious experience.<sup>78</sup> Modernists compensated through a humanist faith in reason. Reason was the highest appeal court, and the criterion of acceptance or rejection of passages in the N.T. was whether they were reasonable or not. In other words, Christian pacifism was not just defended on biblical-theological grounds, but incorporated much non-biblical material. Thus it should be no surprise that when Raven reviewed Bertrand Russell's book Which Way to Peace?--a book Russell later repudiated--he expressed great

admiration for it. The London Union, in contrast, decided not to stock Russell's book because it was non-Christian.<sup>79</sup>

What the limitations to the gospels made clear was that the Christian pacifists' focus was primarily on Jesus.<sup>80</sup> While the early FOR authors had frequently emphasized Jesus' actions at the cost of his teaching, thus creating an unacceptable dualism, the theologians of the 1930s had generally speaking a much more balanced view on Jesus' actions and teachings.<sup>81</sup> Yet, Jesus was perceived in different ways. One such view was Raven's immanentist-evolutionist view. For Raven in Jesus "the eternal is incarnate, and God and Man are one: yet He is not an intruder from another region but the perfect expression of that which is also revealed in varying degrees by the universe and by mankind."<sup>82</sup> But Jesus was more than a perfect example:

There is that in Jesus which would horrify the Pacifist and the humanitarian: He is the lover of men and their physician: but at need and for love's sake He will use the knife. ...This apparent dilemma is responsible for a twofold misunderstanding by those who would either eliminate all its violence from the life of Jesus and make Him the perfect example of non-resistance, or would regard this element in Him as an occasional outburst of anger, or,...moral indignation, inconsistent with His true character but human, natural and lovable.<sup>83</sup>

If there is one statement which set Raven apart from the early FOR writings and from many in the 1930s it is this one. Yet, he was not alone, for as has been seen Macgregor did not absolve Jesus from all possible violence either. At the same time that Jesus' example was normative and Christian ethics should be consistent with the records of Him, Raven posited that Christ's example could not be slavishly followed because circumstances differed.<sup>84</sup> In addition, absolute truth was



beyond the grasp of human beings<sup>85</sup> and this called Jesus' normative example into question. If Raven was not a relativist he had certainly strong relativistic tendencies.<sup>86</sup>

While Barth and his followers posited that personal and national conduct were two different, separate spheres, FOR members made Jesus normative for both spheres.<sup>87</sup> Cadoux in "The Politics of Jesus" argued that Jesus began his mission with an expectation of the impending approach of the Kingdom on earth, calling for a nation-wide repentance. Therefore Jesus told Israel to turn away from desiring vengeance against Rome and the surrounding pagan nations, and instead submit to Rome and trust in deeds of love and truth. Jesus' Messiahship was not based on military might but on pacifism, thus showing that the "way of war...was inherently evil."<sup>88</sup> Raven essentially concurred with this view, although he thought Cadoux too extreme in stating that "Pacifism is the essence of Christianity: to abandon it was an apostasy."<sup>89</sup> Cadoux' argument involved a rejection of the dichotomy between the sacred and the secular, a distinction which would have been quite meaningless to Jesus.<sup>90</sup> Cadoux' "deeds of love and truth" were thus not restricted to personal relationships but included national as well as international conduct. At the same time, the requirement of such deeds was a rejection of the popular notion that pacifism meant passivism: "For the Christian Pacifist the negative prohibition, which he conceives to rest upon war, has its source in the positive imperative of the Christian ethic."<sup>91</sup> The ultimate source was Jesus who expounded "an ethic of the Brotherhood of Man founded on a theology of the Fatherhood of God."<sup>92</sup>

This notion was not new but more than before the conclusion was drawn that all war was, therefore, civil war, class war included.<sup>93</sup> War, according to Dodd, contradicted the characteristics of the Kingdom, such as unity, agape, the method of freedom, the worth of the individual, the Fatherhood of God.<sup>94</sup> To wage war, as the state claimed was its right or duty, meant going against the Kingdom of God, and a suspension of Jesus' teachings. War was not just a case of unbelief, deluding people into thinking that war could be eradicated by going into "this" war,<sup>95</sup> but the supreme challenge to the churches<sup>96</sup> and a contradiction to the Christian's confession that doing God's will should come first.<sup>97</sup> This constituted the dilemma "Christ or Caesar".

Richards recognized that this dilemma was not always so clear cut. Aggression was often disguised under allegedly noble motives, making it difficult for an individual to decide one way or another. This confusion easily led to the idea that a person had only a choice of evils from which there was no escape. In the case of war it meant that going to war was evil, but not going to war would bring about evil as well. The defenders of war argued that not going to war was a worse evil than going to war. Richards rightly pointed out that this theory was without proof. Going further he argued that the theory implied that God asked people to do evil. This Richards could not accept because it went against God's character. Hence he proposed that the choice was not between two evils, but that God provided always a way out, namely the way of Jesus, which for Richards obviously meant the way of pacifism.<sup>98</sup> Richards' view became the FOR's axiom,<sup>99</sup> but when in 1940 ex-FOR member

John Lewis published his book The Case Against Pacifism he totally ignored this point, a notoriously common occurrence among the opponents of pacifism.

Richards' argument led to two other points. Since the dilemma was not as clear cut as had been suggested in the earliest FOR writings, there was more sympathy for those who decided that war was the lesser of two evils.<sup>100</sup> Cadoux had already made this point in 1917, though from a slightly different angle, and elaborated upon it in his 1940 book Christian Pacifism Re-examined. Probably the strongest statement came from Raven. Undoubtedly influenced by his experiences as a chaplain, he went so far as to say in Is War Obsolete? that war, "so hideous 'a second best'", could be accepted "if it were demonstrable that every possibility had been tried and found futile."<sup>101</sup> To which Heering, reviewing Raven's book for Reconciliation, retorted: "War is not justifiable at all! From the highest point of view, from the point of view of Christ there is no alternative for us. No choice! For war is sin...against God!"<sup>102</sup> Raven sounded indeed as if he was not a full hundred percent pacifist.

The second point, closely associated with the first, was the place of conscience. As before, the idea of conscience was not clearly defined. Only its working was refined. Earlier FOR writings had emphasized the absoluteness of conscience; it was the authority to which C.O.s appealed. That idea did not disappear. Macgregor wrote that the Christian pacifist "only affirms that there are certain State activities which the Christian conscience can never endorse."<sup>103</sup> However, the

emphasis shifted from the more static approach to a more dynamic understanding. As Richards wrote, "Jesus Christ became a fact of conscience" and this had historical consequences:

A new standard of moral judgment and a new sense of sin came into the world with Him, and things which men had previously accepted without question began to be suspect. ...Iniquities are therefore being challenged as our modern civilisation is brought under the scrutiny of a Christian judgment.<sup>104</sup>

Such a dynamic understanding of the conscience suited Raven's evolutionary approach or what could be called his theory of the gradual working out of the gospel.<sup>105</sup> When Raven thought Cadoux too extreme<sup>106</sup> he was afraid that Cadoux' words suggested that Christ came to give a code of ethics.<sup>107</sup> Raven rejected the idea of a code in favour of the idea that each period had a dominant issue challenging the conscience. Such an issue once had been slavery, an extremely frequent example in FOR literature. Now it was thought to be war.<sup>108</sup>

Although writing about alternatives to war could help create a more favourable psychological attitude towards pacifism, it could not overcome war. At the heart of the FOR writing remained the idea that only love could overcome this evil. "All that is needed to save the world", said Lansbury in 1938, "is the application of His doctrine of Love to the affairs of our every day life."<sup>109</sup> But could war not bring about good things as well, or put differently, could evil produce good? Early FOR members had strongly denied this possibility. Lansbury continued to hold this view as is apparent from the central theme of his book This Way to Peace, published in 1940 shortly before his death: "War

never has, never can, never will, settle anything."<sup>110</sup> Canon Percy Hartill's argument was, however, more representative of the FOR and of pacifism in general in the 1930s. He did not deny that God sometimes produced good out of evil, but that did not prove anything about the legitimacy of war.<sup>111</sup> War remained an evil, even for most opponents of pacifism. Various pronouncements of the various denominations drew the same conclusion.<sup>112</sup> The problem for Christian pacifists was not to identify the source of Love or the way to overcome evil, but to put that love into practice. As Gray wrote in Love: The One Solution, (1938): "Love can only do its work when it is believed in and trusted."<sup>113</sup> Gray's statement is the test for every Christian, not just the pacifist. It is not enough to know about love or being able to construct a coherent theological scheme. As Ruth Fry wrote in one of her numerous 1938 pamphlets:

I doubt whether a belief in pacifism is exactly the result of reasonable arguments. I believe it is more truly an awakening to a spiritual truth, an inner conviction which, when it is reached is incontrovertible, and must illumine our whole life, for it is not an isolated fact, but the key to a philosophy, and a religion.<sup>114</sup>

As the Cambridge Congregationalist H.C. Carter formulated this truth, "Peace is something that is in the life of God." That peace was given to man as a gift by Christ, as John 14:27 states, "My peace I give unto you." As St. Francis had already stated in his "Prayer", man became a channel of God's peace.<sup>115</sup> This being so, means and ends had to be of the same kind. Undoubtedly Aldous Huxley popularized the idea of harmony between ideal and method in Ends and Means, (1937) but the FOR had propounded this theory for more than two decades before Huxley's

book appeared.<sup>116</sup> The terms had gained popularity since Richards wrote in 1929 that "unless means and end are in moral harmony the one inevitably stultifies the other."<sup>117</sup> Without the harmony the Kingdom of God on earth could not be established.

#### 4. The Evolutionary Approach

As has been seen, the evolutionary approach connected at various points with theology. Heering's comments in connection with Raven's Is War Obsolete? throws an interesting light on the difference between the continental and the English approach to pacifism:

I don't think the evolutionary point of view, which Dr. Raven takes, is very relevant. It is a typical characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon mind, due to its harmonizing tendencies. On the Continent this point of view has been in general abandoned. Since the beginning of this century we have felt the need of distinguishing more sharply between the realm of nature and the realm of the spirit.<sup>118</sup>

Heering may have thought that the evolutionary approach was not relevant, but for Raven it was essential. As an acknowledged scientist, Raven tried to show that religion and science were not at odds, as was often assumed.<sup>119</sup> The book was, therefore, not called "Is War Sin?", as Heering preferred, but "Is War Obsolete?". Since it was Raven's first book on pacifism, it showed exactly where his priorities were. Rizzo correctly suggested, therefore, that the basis of Raven's pacifism was twofold:

A religious and theological foundation which derives from an understanding of Jesus and the New Testament, and a philosophical foundation which is formed from an interpretation of evidence assembled from a study of evolution, history and the behavioral sciences.<sup>120</sup>

How radically new this position was, as Rizzo seemed to suggest, is far more questionable. Roberts, Cadoux, Richards, to mention a few, had used the historical approach; Halliday and Grensted were deeply involved in psychology; all FOR writers had a religious-theological foundation. Where Raven differed was on biological evolution, not even on the use of evolution.<sup>121</sup> As R.C. Dentan has pointed out, one of the characteristics of the post-war period was the loss of faith in evolutionary naturalism.<sup>122</sup> Raven used thus a largely discarded theory. It was on this point that Heering really objected. Raven argued that "history of every species is the history of incessant and precarious war."<sup>123</sup> Heering questioned the usage of the word war: "Where in nature do we see mutual and wholesale slaughter within the same species?". Heering interpreted this as a possible parallel to man's situation and this he rejected:

But when man misuses his intellect in this struggle for life—or rather for death—he is much more dangerous and demonic than the tiger and the ape. Animals are not demonic at all. It is the human realm that is the realm of Satan—and the realm of Christ.<sup>124</sup>

Raven probably did not mean it as a possible parallel, for he thought war as unnatural, a reversion to the environment man had long outgrown, a relapse into the childhood of race.<sup>125</sup> At the deepest level the disagreement between Heering and Raven was on the view of who man is and that involved the view of creation and the view of God. It is not clear if Raven's immanent view of God influenced his evolutionary theory or the other way around,<sup>126</sup> but the two were too closely intertwined to separate.<sup>127</sup> Heering's objection was thus not just

against one part of Raven's basis of pacifism but ultimately involved questioning the whole basis.<sup>128</sup>

Special attention has been given to Heering's objections because they illumine the problems contained in the most coherent FOR theory of the 1930s. For Raven, evolution was an integral part of his philosophical world view; for most other FOR members evolution was an additional source to be used against non-pacifists. The difference is important because the latter could drop the subject at will without loss to their central argument. Raven could at the utmost modify some of his statements - which he did in War and the Christian - but could not drop the subject without undermining the rest of his position. The point is even more significant, because opponents of pacifism, such as John Lewis, never realized the difference and treated Christian pacifists as if they all thought similarly and built their arguments on the same basis. The argument of this thesis is that FOR pacifists were not a monolithic body but represented a plethora of views. Admittedly, other Christian pacifist groups were not monolithic either, but the variety and depth in the FOR appear to have been greater.

##### 5. The Utilitarian Approach

Norman Angell's The Great Illusion of 1910 is probably the best-known and earliest extended statement advocating utilitarian pacifism. Although Angell received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1933 he was not a pacifist, as is clear from his 1910 statement that as long as Germany was aggressive England must arm.<sup>129</sup> He wrote against war because war disrupted economic growth and social stability. Early FOR authors had



frequently referred to his book. Although in the 1930s he was rarely mentioned, his utilitarian approach had not been forgotten.<sup>130</sup> Like the evolutionary approach, it was another means to convince non-pacifists. Much of this point has already been discussed in other contexts. War stood in the way of the society envisaged by the FOR. War disrupted all of life and not only the soldier but everyone was involved.<sup>131</sup> Many FOR authors warned that a next war would be worse than the Great War and would usually focus on the effects of gas attacks.<sup>132</sup>

The utilitarian approach was frequently connected with an evolutionary theory, especially among those who held to a just war theory. Its proponents argued that past wars were so restricted that they did comparatively little damage. With the use of modern technology it would be impossible to fulfil all the claims of a just war.<sup>133</sup> Total war, therefore, became too disruptive for the whole of society.<sup>134</sup> This view could be associated with the Anglo-Catholics in the FOR, but the view was also held by Raven. However, the FOR differed on one point with Angell. When Porteous answered his own question as to why war must be ruled out, he remarked that war above all "excludes the possibility of the moral appeal."<sup>135</sup> In other words, according to the Christian pacifist war made the proclamation of the gospel impossible,<sup>136</sup> and if not impossible its consequence was a "permanent moral deformity."<sup>137</sup> Perhaps Heywood reflected the utilitarian approach best when he commented upon a statement by the Spanish-American philosopher George Santayana (1863-1952):

"War wastes a nation's wealth, kills its flowers, narrows

its sympathies, condemns it to be governed by adventurers, and leaves the puny, deformed and unmanly to breed the next generation". Multiply that as many times as you like, and you have a picture of the consequences of the next orgy of impersonal killing for which we are so feverishly preparing our contribution now.<sup>138</sup>

Heywood drew the inference that the utilitarian approach could only be a means: "All this is indisputable. But although it shows that to engage in war is man's supremest folly, it does not show that war is wrong."<sup>139</sup>

## 6. The Causative Approach

In 1923 Kirby Page published a special edition for wide distribution of his book War Its Causes, Consequences and Cure. In the back a short history and "The Basis" of the FOR were printed, together with the addresses of the AFOR and IFOR.<sup>140</sup> Obviously the causative approach did not specifically belong to the 1930s. What specifically engaged those expounding the causative approach in the 1930s were two issues. There was first of all the debate between those, like Richards, who attacked nationalism, and those, like Lansbury, who saw capitalism as the primary cause of war. Secondly, there was the attention given to the psychological influence.

Richards, like such secular intellectuals as Russell, Woolf and Lowes Dickinson, reacted against a nationalism which had dominated much of Nonconformity—and more of Anglicanism—since the end of the previous century. Richards, and with him the FOR, stood squarely in the stream of liberal internationalism, harking back to Cobden and Mill. In a chapter called "The Enemy of the World", Richards identified nationalism as the "dominant factor which in the modern world governs the issues of

war and peace."<sup>141</sup> He agreed with Edward Shillito that nationalism was "man's other religion."<sup>142</sup> This is the key to Richards' argument. As has been argued in this thesis, FOR members clung to the biblical notion that man is a religious being. Religion decided thought and action, and this was valid for this new religion as well.<sup>143</sup> Richards did not deny that there were other factors which contributed to crises leading to war, "but underlying or superimposed upon every such factor there is always to be found that complex of emotion and loyalty and tradition which we know as the spirit of nationalism."<sup>144</sup> It was nationalism which ultimately proclaimed "national 'sovereignty' as the final warrant of state action."<sup>145</sup>

In contrast, Lansbury held that the main contributing factor to war was capitalism, a system based on competition and the conquest of markets. If peace were ever to be established, it would be necessary to get rid of such economic warfare.<sup>146</sup> Lansbury followed essentially the materialistic notion that man is an economic being.<sup>147</sup> Yet, he was certainly not consistent, for in This Way to Peace Lansbury stated that moral-religious changes had to occur first before economic changes would be possible.<sup>148</sup> It would not be unfair to say that Lansbury did not have a very consistent and coherent world and life view: there was little logical connection between his understanding of religion and economics. By and large the two were two separate entities.

It was here that Lansbury and Richards differed. The latter thought it too simplistic to regard war and peace solely in terms of political economy,<sup>149</sup> for "unless nationalistic passion be superimposed

upon economic strife, the latter does not of itself issue in war."<sup>150</sup> This nationalistic passion used as its creed "My country right or wrong."<sup>151</sup> Instead of advocating the destruction of capitalism and the institution of a socialistic order as Lansbury proposed, Richards suggested that the Christian's effective contribution to peace could be made "by throwing the whole weight of his citizenship on the side of internationalism."<sup>152</sup> Richards' suggestion was much more in line with the FOR's thought and actions than Lansbury's.

The second aspect of the causative approach characterizing the 1930s was psychology. As L.S. Hearnshaw has pointed out, before the Great War the study of psychology in Britain was lamentable.<sup>153</sup> After the war it was especially psycho-analysis which drew attention.<sup>154</sup> The journalist Gerald Heard (1889-1972), who later became a Buddhist, was probably the FOR's staunchest defender of psycho-analysis, for he regarded Freudianism as the most complete school of psychology.<sup>155</sup> Halliday and Grensted were sympathetic towards psycho-analysis but not as uncritical as Heard.<sup>156</sup> Perhaps the best known book on "pacifism in the light of psycho-analysis" which appeared during this decade was War, Sadism and Pacifism, by the Freudian psychiatrist Dr. Edward Glover.<sup>157</sup> C.E.M. Joad wrote critically of the book that Glover saw reason as a mere instrument of passion and desire, an idea totally at variance with the FOR.<sup>158</sup>

The importance of psychology was recognized by Cadoux and the following statement helps to explain why more attention was given to this aspect:

Our immediate objective is to secure a verdict in favour of world-peace; and the attainment of that objective will be impossible without an adaptation of our appeal to the psychological condition of our audience. This condition is one that will give a hearing to a broad appeal along immediately telling lines....<sup>159</sup>

According to Richards, "the military-security thesis ignores psychological and political facts," implying that pacifists could not ignore such facts.<sup>160</sup> Ruth Fry, perhaps the most prolific Quaker pamphleteer, published in 1935 a pamphlet called Fear: The Dictator and in 1939 her pamphlet Blue Funk opened with the sentence: "Perhaps the most striking fact about the world to-day is that it is full of FEAR, paralyzed with it, ill with it."<sup>161</sup> As Percy Hartill, professor of Philosophy of the Christian Religion at Oxford and author of The Psychology of Religion, recognized, many people who were sympathetic to pacifism were held back by fear.<sup>162</sup> Fear disrupted international as well as personal relationships and this psychological factor was therefore an important contributor to war.

To break through this disruptive force George Davies agreed with "the psychology of the evangelical appeal and of conversion", that it insisted "on seeking first a relationship of grace."<sup>163</sup> Hodgkin, using Luke 5:1-11, pointed to Jesus' words "Fear not" as the beginning for a new life.<sup>164</sup> D. Glen Morgan called for an "investigation into the underlying psychic causes of war."<sup>165</sup> Morgan, more than any other FOR author, recognized that love needed investigation as well, because "the very power within us assumed to be the urge towards peace and fellowship is also a most powerful urge towards strife, hatred and war."<sup>166</sup>

Although Richard B. Gregg's book The Power of Non Violence (1934) falls outside the scope of this thesis, it must not go unmentioned because it was recommended to FOR members.<sup>167</sup> Undoubtedly, the book was much more popular among PPU than FOR members, because the basis of Gregg's book was humanistic rather than Christian. Although the book was published before Morgan's article appeared, it was indeed an investigation Morgan called for.<sup>168</sup> Gregg's book together with the works mentioned here were attempts to come to grips with both the psychological aspects of human life in general and with the psychological atmosphere of the period.<sup>169</sup> The attention to psychology itself reflected a shift in the FOR's understanding. The theological-philosophical shift manifested itself in a deepening, broadening and refining, and even rejecting, of earlier held theories, as well as in the near complete silence about so many early theories which made for a full-orbed world and life view. The writings thus confirm that the FOR's character had changed significantly. The preeminence of the Kingdom of God of the early period had given way to pacifism. The pendular movement had reached its extreme.

## CHAPTER 14 - ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>For the development of the first Römerbrief see Busch, Barth, pp. 92 - 109. Barth's revised edition of 1922 made even a greater impact. See Busch, Barth, pp. 117 - 125. (English translation 1933 by E.C. Hoskyns). H.D. McDonald has described the Dialectical Theology as: concerned...with the judgement of God, not in a particular concrete situation, but with the Divine "No" to all human efforts, and especially to the religious search for righteousness. Yet the "No" is not God's only and final word, for it is the very occasion for His "Yes".

H.D. McDonald, "Dialectical Theology", in Douglas, Dictionary, p. 296.

<sup>2</sup>A perusal through the Congregational Quarterly for the 1920s and 1930s gives already a good indication of Barth's influence. In 1930 he visited Great Britain at which time he said to his audience that they were all Pelagians. In 1937 he delivered the Giffen Lectures. See also Hasel, New Testament, pp. 53 - 54. According to Jack F. Padgett, The Christian Philosophy of William Temple, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974, p. 12, few Anglicans were influenced.

<sup>3</sup>In 1925 the London University Press had rejected the manuscript, see CJC Box 13; 31-1-1925.

<sup>4</sup>Grensted, ed., Atonement, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 6. The transcendence of God is a key element in the book.

<sup>6</sup>In the 1950s the IFOR journal carried this title.

<sup>7</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 6, June 1935, p. 161; see also Vol. 14 no. 8, Aug. 1936, pp. 200 - 202.

<sup>8</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 11, Nov. 1932, p. 206. Raven in The Quest of Religion, London: S.C.M., 1928, p. 79, wrote that Jesus was the sacrament of God, but from Chs. 10 and 11 it is clear that Raven differed fundamentally from Belden and agreed largely with Wilson.

<sup>9</sup>William E. Wilson, The Problem of the Cross, London: James Clarke, 1929, p. 7. S.D. Morris and L. MacLachlan essentially still agreed with Wilson, see Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 9, Sept. 1934, pp. 233 - 234 and Vol. 14 no. 1, Jan. 1936, pp. 4 - 5.

<sup>10</sup>For the topic's popularity in the 1920s see Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 3, March 1930, p. 58. Davies stated that the popularity of

the word and idea was a post-war phenomenon. This view, however, is questionable.

<sup>11</sup>This variety of pacifism is very well understood by John Yoder in his Nevertheless, Scottdale: Herald Press, 1971. Both Martin and Ceadel either missed or ignored this variety.

<sup>12</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 2, Feb. 1932, p. 34.

<sup>13</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 8, Aug. 1939, pp. 212 - 213. For the division of the churches see Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 9, Sept. 1934, pp. 239 - 240.

<sup>14</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 9 no. 9, Sept. 1931, p. 41.

<sup>15</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 2, Feb. 1939, p. 35.

<sup>16</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 14 no. 3, March 1936, p. 62; Vol. 16 no. 3, March 1938, pp. 79 - 80; GD 85, which contains The Cotswold Bruderhof. A Christian Community, Swindon: The Cotswold Bruderhof, 1938.

<sup>17</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 17 no. 6, June 1930, p. 117.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid. See also John Lewis, A Faith to Live By, London: Williams & Norgate, 1931, Ch. 7, and Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 9, Sept. 1929, pp. 166 - 167.

<sup>19</sup>See Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 8, Aug. 1933, p. 142, and C.E. Raven and Eleanor Raven, The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ, Cambridge: University Press, 1933 (1959), p. 104. Other terms often used were brotherhood and neighbourship.

<sup>20</sup>It should be noted, however, that three short articles on this topic appeared in Reconciliation between August and November 1936.

<sup>21</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 2, Feb. 1939, p. 46. See also Mauleverer's "Kingdom of Love" and "Kingdom of Law" in Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 7, June 1937, p. 186.

<sup>22</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 7, July 1937, p. 173.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Henry Carter, ed., For Christ and Humanity, London: Epworth Press, 1935, especially Ch. 4.

<sup>25</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 14 no. 11, Nov. 1936, pp. 284 - 285. See also Vol. 14 no. 8, Aug. 1936, p. 202, where Jesus is portrayed as Judge and Saviour at the same time. In 1929 Roberts in The Christian God, New



York: Macmillan, p. 137, wrote that in God love and justice were one. See also A. Herbert Gray, Love: The One Solution, London: Rich and Cowan, 1938, p. 119.

<sup>26</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 14 no. 8, Aug. 1936, p. 201.

<sup>27</sup>G.H.C. Macgregor, A Christian Peace Settlement, Church of Scotland Peace Society, n.d. [post - 1939], p. 7. See also Henry Carter, Liberty and Authority in the Modern World, London: Mervens Lecture Committee, 1939, p. 60.

<sup>28</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 10, Oct. 1935, p. 278.

<sup>29</sup>H.H. Farmer, The Christian and War, pamphlet, n.d. [1935?], p. 4.

<sup>30</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 1, Jan. 1932, p. 2. See also Vol. 16 no. 7, July 1938, p. 209; and Vol. 16 no. 11, Nov. 1938, p. 358.

<sup>31</sup>Farmer, Christian, p. 5.

<sup>32</sup>Richards, Alternative, (1929), p. 25; in Realistic Pacifism, p. 3.

<sup>33</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 11, Nov. 1935, pp. 299 - 301; Vol. 14 no. 11, Nov. 1936, pp. 299 - 302, especially p. 300. Frequently the FOR wrote something on the topic in its Armistice Day number. Particular events, such as Italy's invasion of Ethiopia, were examples - illustrations of a more abstract principle.

<sup>34</sup>Richards, Alternative, 1929, pp. 38 - 39; see also Ch. 7, pp. 113ff; 1935, p. 18, Ch. 6, pp. 80ff, Ch. 16; Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 11, Nov. 1935, p. 300; Vol. 15 no. 6, June 1937, p. 160; Vol. 6 no. 10, Oct. 1929, p. 184; Vol. 9 no. 10, Oct. 1931, p. 432.

<sup>35</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 8 no. 8, Aug. 1930, p. 142.

<sup>36</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 16 no. 8, Aug. 1938, p. 235. The name given with the article is R.M. Messurier. It has been assumed here that this should be R.H. Le Messurier, the secretary of the APF.

<sup>37</sup>Hubert Grant Scarfe, ed., A Catholic Approach to the Problem of War, Green End: PAX, n.d. [1944], p. 2.

<sup>38</sup>The Halley Stewart Lectures were given in 1934 and in 1935 the book was published by George Allen & Unwin.

<sup>39</sup>Richards, Realistic Pacifism, p. 144.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid.

<sup>41</sup>See e.g. the debate between Richards and Malcolm Spencer in Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 1, Jan. 1929, pp. 4 - 8.

<sup>42</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 11 no. 5, May 1933, p. 84. He continued the statement with: "and to that end coercive measures can never be the means."

<sup>43</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 14 no. 3, March 1936, p. 64: the real Christian would NOT fit easily in contemporary society. Lewis, Faith, Ch. 5, p. 47: Jesus quarrelled with church and state. Plowright, Christ, pp. 17 - 18: the absolute state is challenged by the Christian conception of the Kingdom of God.

<sup>44</sup>In this section pacifism is used in a narrower sense.

<sup>45</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 1, Jan. 1934, p. 5. Ten months later Sheppard used such a pledge which led to the formation of the PPU of which Raven was a sponsor!

<sup>46</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 2, Feb. 1934, p. 43.

<sup>47</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 3, March 1934, p. 66. As an aside it may be noted that in the extensive correspondence of Cadoux there are no letters by Raven.

<sup>48</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 8, Aug. 1939, p. 212: "We attained to pacifism along different lines."

<sup>49</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 7, July 1934, p. 179; no. 8, Aug. 1934, p. 205; no. 9, Sept. 1934, pp. 233 - 235; J.W. Stevenson, A Disarmed Church in an Armed World, London: F.O.R., 1935, Chs. 1 and 7.

<sup>50</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 4, Apr. 1939, p. 97.

<sup>51</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 16 no. 2, Feb. 1938, p. 54. See also Hughes quoting Catchpool: "Der Mensch ist doch gut", Indomitable, p. 112 and Lansbury, Pilgrimage, pp. 5 and 33. Mackendrick seemed to ignore that the natural order had been interfered with for centuries.

<sup>52</sup>A. Ruth Fry, Jupiter's Moons, pamphlet, May 1939, p. 3. N. Micklem's comment on natural religion is illuminating: "essentially it is not the Christian faith and is scarcely a pale reflection of it." What is the Faith?, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1937, p. 81.

<sup>53</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 16 no. 3, March 1938, p. 76. See also Vol. 10 no. 3, March 1932, p. 74.

<sup>54</sup>CJC Box 28, 28-9-1938.

<sup>55</sup>CJC Box 28, 23-10-1938. Gill was a regular correspondent of Cadoux. In the late 1950s Phelps was editor of Reconciliation.

<sup>56</sup>For Cadoux' and Richards' reactions see CJC Box 20; 20-1-1931; for Hodgkin's, HTH Box 2, file 18.

<sup>57</sup>Gerrit Jan Heering, The Fall of Christianity, tr. J.W. Thompson, New York: Garland, 1972. (1928, 1930), especially pp. 33ff. See also Gray, Love, p. 16: "The Christian Church became fatally involved with the State."

<sup>58</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 9 no. 8, Aug. 1931, p. 393. A.C.F. Beales, The History of Peace, New York: The Dial Press, 1931; Garland, 1971.

<sup>59</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 16 no. 8, Aug. 1938, p. 234. Catholic meant here Anglo-Catholic, but Le Messurier's argument would equally count for the Roman Catholic priest.

<sup>60</sup>See also Percy Hartill's views in A.M.D. Ashley's Joyful Servant, Abingdon: Abbey Press, 1968, p. 85.

<sup>61</sup>W. Robinson, Christianity is Pacifism, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1933. See also Heering: Fall, Ch. 1.

<sup>62</sup>Robinson, Christianity, Ch. 1, esp. pp. 26 and 34. See also Raven and Raven, Life, p. 85. Robinson's explanation was not so much exegesis as eisegesis.

<sup>63</sup>See e.g. Raven and Raven, Life. Raven used essentially B. H. Streeter's four source theory.

<sup>64</sup>G.H.C. Macgregor, The New Testament Basis of Pacifism, London: F.O.R. 1936, (1935) p. 16. See also Richards, Alternative, pp. 22 - 23, 43 - 44. "What would Jesus Do?", and Reconciliation, Vol. 7 no. 5, May 1930, pp. 84 - 85.

<sup>65</sup>See also Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 12, Dec. 1934, pp. 312 - 313, and Macgregor's pamphlet Does the N.T. Sanction War? with about 70 texts.

<sup>66</sup>Essentially Macgregor dealt here with the question "How should one use the N.T.?" See also his The Christian Pacifist and the New Testament, especially p. 18. Strangely enough, the same question was not asked for the O.T. As will be seen in chapter 16, Niebuhr concurred with Macgregor's exegesis.

<sup>67</sup>Macgregor, New Testament, p. 29. (1953 ed., p. 24).

<sup>68</sup>For the notion of dualism see Rizzo, "Christian", p. 194.

<sup>69</sup>Macgregor, New Testament, preface, p. 7.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., p. 9 (b). 1953 ed: p. 11. In an appendix Macgregor included about 70 "proof texts" favouring pacifism.

<sup>71</sup>If there is a weakness in the thesis it is the lack of historical development in Raven's thought. The weakness is partly remedied in Ch. 5. The thesis provides a much better understanding of Raven's pacifism than Dillistone's biography.

<sup>72</sup>Macgregor, New Testament, p. 7.

<sup>73</sup>Stevenson, Disarmed, p. 13.

<sup>74</sup>Generally the gospel of John received little attention. The key question for Macgregor's book is "What...does Jesus Himself teach?" (p. 7).

<sup>75</sup>The Sermon on the Mount and War, London: F.O.R. 1938, reprint 1939. SCPC. The leaflet is an example of the FOR's rejection of interim ethics. Lansbury and Lester were essentially "Sermon on the Mount Pacifists".

<sup>76</sup>See, e.g., Raven's Truth and Tradition, London: Ernest Benn, 1938, p. 26, and War and the Christian, London: S.C.M., 1938; New York: Garland, 1978, p. 52.

<sup>77</sup>Rizzo, "Christian", pp. 171 - 172.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., pp. 172ff. See Raven's A Wanderer's Way, London: Martin Hopkinson, 1928; Musings; Christ and Modern Education, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928, p. 201; The Quest of Religion, London: S.C.M., 1928, Ch. 1. See also Richards, Realistic Pacifism, p. viii: the convictions are not only based on theory but upon experience as well.

<sup>79</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 14 no. 12, Dec. 1936, p. 336. Raven found Russell's book the most convincing and ruthlessly logical statement of the case for pacifism. For the London Union's decision, Minutes 21-6-1937. The differences were another example of the FOR's diversity.

<sup>80</sup>A good case can be made that Christian theology should start with Christ. Many FOR members went beyond this start.

<sup>81</sup>For example, Raven and Raven, Life, p. 102; Macgregor, New Testament, p. 47. (1953; p. 37): "Jesus was what He taught."

<sup>82</sup>Charles E. Raven, Jesus and the Gospel of Love, New York:

Henry Holt, 1931, p. 264.

<sup>83</sup>Ibid., pp. 273 - 274.

<sup>84</sup>Raven, Obsolete?, pp. 28 - 29. See also his "We Will Not Fight", in Let us Honour Peace, London: Cobden-Sanderson, 1937, p. 44.

<sup>85</sup>Raven, Obsolete?, p. 86.

<sup>86</sup>Rizzo, "Christian", p. 183, approached this problem from Raven's theory of knowledge and experience.

<sup>87</sup>Barth followed Luther's "Law-Gospel" dichotomy. At this point Temple could agree with Barth.

<sup>88</sup>C.J. Cadoux, "The Politics of Jesus," The Congregational Quarterly, Vol. 14 no. 1, Jan. 1936, pp. 58 - 67.

<sup>89</sup>Raven, Obsolete?, p. 106.

<sup>90</sup>Macgregor, New Testament, p. 53. For his agreement with Cadoux, see Ch. 4 where he quotes Cadoux repeatedly.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid., p. 9 (1953: p. 11).

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., p. 36 (1953: p. 29).

<sup>93</sup>Raven, War, p. 145; Ronald Duncan, The Complete Pacifist, London: Boriswood, 1937, p. 13.

<sup>94</sup>C.H. Dodd, "The Theology of Christian Pacifism," The Basis of Christian Pacifism, London: C.C.P.G. 1940, pp. 9 - 12.

<sup>95</sup>Stevenson, Disarmed, p. 24. The argument was against the idea expressed in e.g. Wells' The War That Will End War.

<sup>96</sup>Stevenson, Disarmed, p. 23. See also Raven, Musings, p. 171: war is "an intensified and concentrated sample of the whole cosmic process."

<sup>97</sup>Raven, War, p. 87.

<sup>98</sup>Richards, Alternative, Ch. 2 and Realistic Pacifism, Ch. 1. Macgregor in "The Christian's Dilemma," The Christian Pacifist, New Series, no. 21, Sept. 1943, pp. 173 - 177, (reprinted as a pamphlet by Friends Peace Committee) stated that Richards' answer was the typical pacifist answer best put. W.M. Watt, Can Christians be Pacifist?, London: S.C.M., 1937, p. 119, rejected Richards' notion.

<sup>99</sup>See Raven, War, Ch. 7.

<sup>100</sup>For example Percy Hartill, Christians in War-Time, Lichfield: A.C. Lomax's Successors, 1940, point 7: each person needs to follow one's own conscience and respect that of others.

<sup>101</sup>Raven, Obsolete?, p. 157.

<sup>102</sup>Reconciliation, Vol 13 no. 3, March 1935, p. 66.

<sup>103</sup>Macgregor, New Testament, p. 134. (1953: p. 94).

<sup>104</sup>Richards, Alternative, pp. 55 - 56 (1936: pp. 34 - 35); see also p. 47 (1936: p. 26): to hold the conscience in contempt is to regard it as of secondary account. If it does not count in war, why in peace?! For a more recent debate on the place of conscience see C.D. Broad, "Conscience and Conscientious Action" and A. Campbell Garnet, "Conscience and Conscientiousness" in Feinberg, ed., Moral, Chs. 6 and 7. For a much earlier discussion, see Sydney Webb, "Conscience and the 'Conscientious Objector'," The North American Review, Vol. 205, March 1917, pp. 403-420.

<sup>105</sup>See Rizzo, "Christian", pp. 53ff.

<sup>106</sup>See p. 437.

<sup>107</sup>Raven, Obsolete?, p. 106. Raven's fear was not without ground - see Reconciliation, Vol. 14 no. 4, Apr. 1936, p. 104.

<sup>108</sup>For example, Richards, Alternative, p. 56 (1936: p. 35).

<sup>109</sup>Lansbury, Pilgrimage, p. 34. See also Raven, Church's, p. 42: "If God is love and love the true nature of reality, then love must be the motive not only in the Church, but in politics, in industry, in the daily dealings of us all."

<sup>110</sup>Lansbury, Way, p. 12.

<sup>111</sup>Percy Hartill, Pacifism and Christian Common Sense, London: A.R. Mowbray, 1938, p. 13.

<sup>112</sup>See e.g. Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 6, June 1937, pp. 160 - 161; no. 7 July 1937, p. 172; no. 9, Sept. 1937, pp. 234 - 235; The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 2, Feb. 1939, p. 41. See also the Lambeth Conference of 1930 and the Oxford Conference of 1937.

<sup>113</sup>Gray, Love, p. 200.

<sup>114</sup>A. Ruth Fry, Quite Impossible, pamphlet. March 1938, pp. 3 - 4. Address given at Christ Church, London, on Feb. 17, 1938.

<sup>115</sup>H.C. Carter, "The Spirit of the Peacemaker," Christianity and War, London: Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1929, Ch. 6, pp. 63 - 64.

<sup>116</sup>Aldoux Huxley, Ends and Means, New York: Harper, 1937; Greenwood Press, 1969.

<sup>117</sup>Richards, Alternative, p. 51. (1936: p. 30). See also Davies in Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 9, Sept. 1929, p. 167, and Vol. 12 no. 6, June 1934, p. 146.

<sup>118</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 3, March 1935, p. 65. Heering used an evolutionary idea in the title of his article "War Morally Obsolete". While Raven may have been guilty of constructing a "natural theology", Heering was guilty of creating a dualism between the realms of nature and the spirit, a dualism which at least goes back to Aquinas' "natural theology".

<sup>119</sup>See Dillistone, Raven, especially Ch. 10. Raven wrote several books on science.

<sup>120</sup>Rizzo, "Christian", p. 32.

<sup>121</sup>See e.g. canon Morris in Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 9, Sept. 1934, p. 234.

<sup>122</sup>R.C. Denton, Preface to O.T. Theology (1963), quoted by Hasel, New Testament, p. 53.

<sup>123</sup>Raven, Obsolete?, p. 128. See in general Ch. 5.

<sup>124</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 3, March 1935, p. 66. Heering seems to downplay Rom. 8:19-23.

<sup>125</sup>Raven, Obsolete?, p. 143.

<sup>126</sup>Raven's scientific studies and his early doubts would suggest the latter.

<sup>127</sup>Rizzo, "Christian", pp. 56ff, suggested that Raven used the interpretation of evolution to counter the non-pacifist contention that war had a function in the evolutionary process. This seems to be a too artificial separation from the theological approach.

<sup>128</sup>It is doubtful if Heering realized the full consequences of his objection.

<sup>129</sup>Angell, Illusion, p. 297. Angell's views have been mentioned briefly in the Prologue.

<sup>130</sup>See e.g. Richards, Alternative, p. 45 (1936: p. 24) and part II of Realistic Pacifism, "The Christian Contribution", p. 115.

<sup>131</sup>See e.g. Richards, Alternative, Chs. 4 and 5. Baldwin was quoted by Reconciliation, Vol. 12 no. 11, Nov. 1934, p. 305, as saying that a next war would be total war.

<sup>132</sup>Tavistock in Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 11, Nov. 1929, p. 203: "It will mean the destruction, or at any rate the almost permanent crippling, of the civilisation to which we belong."

<sup>133</sup>Not all just war theorists use the same criteria. See e.g. Walter Klaassen, The Just War: a summary, Dundas: Peace Research Institute, 1978. (Peace Research Reviews, Vol. 7, no. 6).

<sup>134</sup>See Cadoux in Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 1, Jan. 1932, pp. 2 - 3.

<sup>135</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 5 no. 11, Nov. 1928, p. 217; see also Vol. 15 no. 7, July 1937, p. 174.

<sup>136</sup>See 1 Tim. 2:2.

<sup>137</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 7, July 1937, p. 174.

<sup>138</sup>Ibid. See also Raven, War, p. 51 and its review in Reconciliation, Vol. 16 no. 6, June 1938, p. 174.

<sup>139</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 7, July 1937, p. 174. See also Richards, Alternative, p. 124 (1936: p. 88): Christian morality is neither pragmatic nor utilitarian.

<sup>140</sup>Kirby Page, War Its Causes, Consequences and Cure, New York: G.H. Doran, 1923. Page listed as causes: economic imperialism, militarism, alliances, secret diplomacy, fear, immediate causes.

<sup>141</sup>Richards, Realistic Pacifism, p. 128. On p. 129 Richards admitted that in previous centuries the dominant factor could and was different. In many ways the debate would be valid for non-Christian pacifists as well.

<sup>142</sup>Ibid., p. 129. Edward Shillito, Nationalism: Man's Other Religion, London: S.C.M., 1933.

<sup>143</sup>According to Langdon Gilkey, "any global understanding of history...foundational for political and theoretical life alike, has a religious or a theological dimension or component." Langdon Gilkey, "Scripture, History and the Quest for Meaning", in C.T. McIntire and Ronald A. Wells, ed., History and Historical Understanding, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1984, p. 7.



<sup>144</sup>Richards, Realistic Pacifism, p. 129. See also Plowright, Christ, p. 4.

<sup>145</sup>Richards, Realistic Pacifism, p. 147. Nationalism should not be confused with nationality which Richards defined as "the sense of belonging together in an organized political community." See also Plowright, Christ, pp. 12, 16 - 18; and Reconciliation, Vol. 14 no. 1, Jan. 1936, pp. 16 - 17.

<sup>146</sup>Lansbury, Why, Introduction, pp. 12, 15, 20; Way, p. 52.

<sup>147</sup>See also Plowman, Faith, p. 32: rightminded socialists and genuine Marxists cannot be pacifists.

<sup>148</sup>Lansbury, Way, pp. 77, 82. The book's title is an answer to Russell's Which Way to Peace? J.M. Winter in Socialism and the Challenge of War (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974, p. 5) made a distinction between socialism as a theory of society and as a theory of action. Lansbury could be compared to Keir Hardie in his disinterest in abstract theories. Although Lansbury would fit the "theory of action" it may be better to regard his "theory" as a "theory of concern".

<sup>149</sup>Richards, Realistic Pacifism, p. 159.

<sup>150</sup>Ibid., p. 151. See also Nichols, Cry, Ch. 14.

<sup>151</sup>Richards, Realistic Pacifism, p. 189. H.M. Swanwick, The Roots of Peace, London: Jonathan Cape, 1938, Ch. 1. The quote is a variant of Stephen Decatur's 1816 toast.

<sup>152</sup>Richards, Realistic Pacifism, p. 192.

<sup>153</sup>L.S. Hearnshaw, A Short History of British Psychology 1840-1940, New York: Barnes & Noble, 1964, p. 120. See also Hynes, Edwardian, pp. 138ff. The somewhat negative attitude towards psychology can still be observed in R.G. Collingwood's The Idea of History, published in 1946 but conceived a decade earlier.

<sup>154</sup>Hearnshaw, Short, pp. 167, 292.

<sup>155</sup>See e.g. Gerald Heard, Social Substance of Religion, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1931, p. 26. The subtitle is revealing as well: "An Essay on the Evolution of Religion." See also Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 4, Apr. 1937, p. 97. There is no evidence to suggest that Heard played any role of importance in the FOR. His views can hardly be regarded as biblical. Heard does not seem to have realized that Freudianism and Christianity are incompatible. For Heard's role in the 1930s, see Ceadel, Pacifism, esp. pp. 186-187, 219, 224.

<sup>156</sup>L.W. Grensted, Psychology and God, London: Longmans & Green, 1931, p. 23: the danger of Freudianism is its mechanistic conception of the mind. See also Halliday, Psychology, 1929, and Personal Freedom Through Personal Faith, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1934, p. 38.

<sup>157</sup>Edward Glover, War, Sadism and Pacifism, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1933. The book was said to be an attempt to catalogue and classify the instinctual phenomena of war. (p. 16) Glover never bothered to give proof that man has instincts. For a short review of Glover's book, see Berkman, "Pacifism", pp. 182-184.

<sup>158</sup>C.E.M. Joad, "Pacifism: Its Personal and Social Implications", in Gooch, ed., Pursuit, Ch. 4. See also Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 6, June 1935, pp. 149 - 150: Glover is too nebulous and speculative.

<sup>159</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 10 no. 1, Jan. 1932, p. 2. See also R.E. Fenn's review of Richards' book in Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 2, Feb. 1935, p. 37: "The Christian's contribution to world peace turns in the last analysis upon his ability to win public opinion to his side." Also FOR 456; 1/6; 3-6-1935.

<sup>160</sup>Richards, Realistic Pacifism, p. 173.

<sup>161</sup>The 1935 pamphlet was her Armistice address of Nov. 11. Blue Funk, Feb. 1939, p. 1. See also p. 3: "The nations of Europe literally buy panic of each other."

<sup>162</sup>Hartill, Pacifism, p. 40.

<sup>163</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 6 no. 9, Sept. 1929, p. 167.

<sup>164</sup>Henry T. Hodgkin, Jesus Among Men, London: S.C.M. Press, 1930, p. 85. See also Ruth Fry, Blue Funk, p. 6.

<sup>165</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 6, June 1935, p. 150; see also Vol. 15 no. 7, July 1937, p. 175: war is wrong because it lives on fear, hatred and mistrust.

<sup>166</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 13 no. 6, June 1935, p. 150. Also Vol. 16 no. 8, Aug. 1938, p. 229. MacLachlan: there can be no claim that love always averts violence. Also Vol. 13 no. 5, May 1935, p. 122: "Everybody is ready to be good when everybody else is good."

<sup>167</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 7, July 1937, p. 155: "Non-resistance is not the whole nor the vital part of pacifism, but positive, active love." See also FOR 456; 3/5; 9-10-1936.

<sup>168</sup>How much a chapter title like "Moral Jiu-Jitsu" (Ch. 2) would be in line with FOR theology is quite another matter. There is no evidence that Morgan knew Gregg's book.

<sup>169</sup>There were few FOR members who saw the fundamental causes of war as psychological. Norman Richard, "Psychological Causes of War", Reconciliation, Vol. 14 no. 3, March 1936, p. 67, did not think that there was a single cause but rather a chain of processes.

## **PART IV**

### **WORLD WAR I REVISITED**

Since the end of the 1920s the FOR had been in dialogue with representatives of Britain's Jewish Community. Through this contact members were informed about the anti-semitic events in Germany. This knowledge had two consequences. In the first place, FOR members were under no delusion about the ruthless nature of Third Reich. This perception, together with the series of major international crises in 1938-39, resulted in few FOR members being taken aback when war actually broke out in 1939 — in marked contrast to their startled attitudes in 1914. The preparedness did not mean, however, that the FOR regarded war as inevitable. The concept of inevitability, in a deterministic sense, was viewed as militating against God's freedom and could, therefore, never be accepted. That war could be averted was precisely the premise of Lansbury's pilgrimage for peace. Preparedness meant that FOR members expected a new world conflict and that they were willing to stand up for their convictions, knowing that the atrocities perpetrated against German Jews and pacifists, could be their lot as well if Britain were conquered. Indeed, when the war broke out only a few FOR members resigned. Instead, the membership grew. The pattern of growth during the war is discussed in chapter 15.

In the second place, from 1938 on the FOR attempted to help Jewish refugees. During the apogee of the FOR's pacifism the FOR as it were reached back to its past, to the post-World War I experience of caring for continental children. The assistance to the refugees was a sign that the pendulum was swinging back to the broader scope of the early FOR. There were other activities which in many ways resembled the FOR of World War I, most notably that of opposing conscription and supporting C.O.s. These activities are discussed in the second part of chapter 15. The new involvement in the various activities did not mean that the educational-propaganda side of the FOR was ignored. Actually, the war contributed to new examinations and reaffirmations of pacifism. The first reappraisal came in response to Reinhold Niebuhr's highly publicized attack on pacifism, Why the Christian Church is not Pacifist (1939). The second assessment came through Cadoux' controversial book Christian Pacifism Re-examined of 1940. The third contribution came mainly from Anglican members. These contributions, discussed in chapter 16, indicate both the continuity with and the departure from the ideas of Cambridge 1914.

World War II had still another influence. It raised for the Fellowship the whole question of what kind of society could be created after the war. This is discussed in chapter 17 through two campaigns. The first campaign, conducted during the first few war years, was meant to reach non-members. This external campaign can be regarded as a transition stage between the FOR of the 1930s and the FOR during the later war years. The second campaign, called the "Campaign Towards a

Christian Peace", was initially aimed at FOR members. Only towards the end of the war did this internal campaign become external. Much in this second campaign resembled the early FOR. There were again publications about economic, cultural and political aspects--topics which had scarcely been written about in the previous decade. As a result, the FOR of 1945 resembled more closely the FOR of 1918 than the FOR of much of the interwar period.

## CHAPTER 15

### WORLD WAR TWO: THE FOR'S GROWTH AND ACTIVITIES

#### The FOR's Growth

The pattern of growth can be divided into three phases, which coincided with particular events in the war. In the first period, the time of the phoney war, the rate of growth was higher than before the outbreak of war. In the second period, spring 1940 till late 1942, the growth rate slowed down considerably. In the final phase the increase in membership was slowed. At the outbreak of war in September 1939 the FOR had 9813 members and 852 sympathizers.<sup>1</sup> In October 1939 the MPF announced that only one member had resigned in September, while 165 lay people and 13 ministers had joined.<sup>2</sup> The MPF statistics were quite representative of the FOR as a whole. In November 1939 The Christian Pacifist announced that in the last three months there had been an increase of more than a thousand new members, bringing the total to over 11,000 members and 300 branches.<sup>3</sup> At the March 1940 meeting of the General Committee the membership had reached 11,916 and 957 sympathizers.<sup>4</sup> Although the committee gave no reasons for the influx, it seems likely that many new members were C.O.s who needed assistance.

The growth is all the more remarkable in the light of a declaration of September 1939 signed by Cosmo Lang, Archibald Main and Robert Bond, the three major church leaders:<sup>5</sup>

At all costs, for the sake of the world's peace and order, the policy proclaimed by the German Führer must be resisted and overcome. It is based on force. It must be met by counterforce. What this means must be hateful to any Christian man, but there is no other way - would God there were.<sup>6</sup>

Those who appealed to non-resistance were accused of encouraging Hitler. Whatever strictures the churches had proclaimed against war during the 1930s became, as it were, null and void. But this collapse of the churches did not draw the FOR along. According to Charles Chatfield, the Fellowship did not collapse because it was sustained by different values.<sup>7</sup>

These essentially religious values could, however, not prevent some leading members to feel depressed by the outbreak of war. For instance, the veteran socialist pacifist Fenner Brockway wrote of his colleague Alfred Salter that the coming of war had shattered him;<sup>8</sup> Charles Raven wrote relatively little during the war.<sup>9</sup> Some early and prominent FOR members even decided to support the war. Fred and Emmeline Pethick-Lawrence thought Hitler and Mussolini "outside the range of reconciliation."<sup>10</sup> Hugh Martin justified his switch in a pamphlet called The Christian as Soldier (November 1939), although his actual break with pacifism had taken place before the war started. In reconsidering his position he was influenced by Reinhold Niebuhr,<sup>11</sup> and he found it heartening that "not a few of my friends had gone through the same process."<sup>12</sup> One who went "through the same process" was Maude Royden. Although she resigned from the PPU in October,<sup>13</sup> she did not renounce her pacifism, as is evident from an article she wrote for the January 1940 Jubilee number of The Christian Pacifist. She admitted,



however, that the coming of war had been a shattering blow to her.<sup>14</sup> Royden's renunciation probably came shortly after the end of the phoney war in April 1940, for in the July issue of The Guildhouse Fellowship she admitted that she had changed her mind in believing that "there was nothing in the world worse than war." She was now convinced that "NAZI-ISM IS WORSE THAN WAR."<sup>15</sup>

With the defeat of Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium and especially France, and the beginning of the battle of Britain, many other pacifists gave up their pacifism. Yet again, few FOR members joined Royden. Only one member of the General Committee, John Prickett, resigned from the FOR.<sup>16</sup> But in contrast to September 1939 the FOR did not experience a significant influx. Although by September 1940 there were 12,470 members, the rate of growth had slowed down significantly.<sup>17</sup> If the statistics can be relied upon, the FOR continued to grow at a steady but slow pace till the end of 1942. For instance, early in January 1942, the General Committee heard that there were 13,417 members and 1026 sympathizers.<sup>18</sup> At the next meeting, however, the number was considerably downgraded to 11,961 members and 744 sympathizers due to a revision of the lists.<sup>19</sup> Yet, a year later the number had grown again to 12,669 and 754.<sup>20</sup>

The third phase in the FOR's growth coincided with El Alamein and Stalingrad, the first significant allied victories. Branches started to collapse and more members decided to resign. In 1944 the ten regions were reduced to eight. The London Union, which totalled about one fifth of the FOR membership, experienced difficulties in meeting.

It gave two reasons for falling attendance, namely, the destructive effects of the renewed German bombing and the extra responsibilities in church affairs and youth work.<sup>21</sup> However, the FOR's internal "Towards a Christian Peace" Campaign (discussed in Ch. 17) may have generated a new enthusiasm. The campaign, dealing with post-war reconstruction of society, probably was responsible for the growing number of non-Christians in the FOR, which caused Ethel Comber, a regional secretary, some concern.<sup>22</sup> But the Fellowship did not grow much. In September 1944 the membership was reported to be 12,875 members and 821 sympathizers.<sup>23</sup> Six months later this had become 12,925 and 815 respectively.<sup>24</sup> In June 1945 there was a slight drop to 12,902 but in September the number had grown again to 12,978 and 840.<sup>25</sup> Compared to 1918 this was an increase in membership of more than 60% while the population growth in Britain was about 23% and active religious participation declined. Yet in spite of the approximately 32% increase in membership during the war, the FOR constituted only a minuscule 1/40% of the total population.

There is some evidence which calls into question the slow but steady growth described above. The Silver Jubilee issue of The Christian Pacifist in January 1940 had a run of 25,000 copies, far above the normal edition. Six months later 10,000 copies of the magazine were sold, slightly less than in the previous months. The decline continued, for since May 1941, 9,500 copies were printed, and only about 8,000 in 1942. By the end of the war about 7,750 copies were sold.<sup>26</sup> Although the change of format and quality, the difficulty of distribution or even

the destruction of some issues due to bombing could account for some of the decline, the major reason was probably a lessening of interest. In other words, the discrepancy between the numbers of subscribers to The Christian Pacifist and those enrolled on the FOR lists may be explained by paper membership.

There are some statistics which give some insight into the organizational aspects of the FOR comparable to and different from 1914-1918. Near the end of the war the Fellowship published a report for 1944-1945, tabulating the membership in denominations. Out of the nearly 13,000 members there were about 4,500 whose denominational membership could not be ascertained. The others were designated as follows: 2309 Congregationalists, 2067 Methodists, 1586 Anglicans, 1385 Baptists, 603 Society of Friends, and 400 Presbyterians.<sup>27</sup> The numerical success of the FOR can perhaps best be seen in the increased membership of Methodists, Anglicans and Baptists. From a practical point of view, the work through the MPF, APF and BPF had been successful.

Some of the 4,500 members whose denominational membership could not be ascertained were probably members of the Pacifist Church. As has been seen in Chapter 12, Belden had argued in favour of a Pacifist Church during the early part of the 1930s. In 1942, when the fate of the Allies hung in the balance, Belden took up the issue again in his book Pax Christi. The plan was not for a new church but was rather an attempt to use the sheer influence of all Christians to abolish war. Belden called for collective action because he regarded personal

pacifism as inadequate.<sup>28</sup> Yet others saw the book as a call for a new church. The Pax Christi plan actually failed but it indeed gave the impetus for a new church.<sup>29</sup> The church was not very successful either. The brothers Wallace and Frank Hancock were probably the driving force.<sup>30</sup> A somewhat exaggerated passage in News Letter of Movement for a Pacifist Church of Christ by Frank Hancock gives some insight into the type of member who joined the new church. The quotation is also, by implication, revealing about a segment of FOR membership:

In some ways we are all sorry that a new Church should be necessary. We are sorry that the present Churches have forfeited the respect of so many. Personally, I am sorry that Christian pacifists have not found their way into the Society of Friends, with its silent worship, its freedom from dogmas, its long witness against war, and its fine record of Service. But the Society of Friends is almost static as regards membership.

When I remember the hundreds, if not thousands, of Christian pacifists who must have resigned their Church membership, I am amazed that so few have joined Friends. But there it is. Many, if not most Christian pacifists today must be without attachment to any Church, just as so many of the best of the C.O.s in the last war have never since entered a Place of Worship. Hence, the basic need of our Movement.<sup>31</sup>

Although the members of the Pacifist Church represented only a small segment of the FOR, Hancock's statement gives some insight into the difficulties Christian pacifists faced and into the probable ecclesiastical background of many of the 4,500.

Financially the FOR always worked on the margin of solvency. For example, the budget for 1942-43 allowed for a 993 deficit, although at year's end it was only 307.<sup>32</sup> However, in spite of increased

voluntary giving the deficit rose to 786 18s 6d in 1945. This deficit, as new treasurer Eric F. Wilkins pointed out, could be met from the general reserves.<sup>33</sup> Wilkins' statement needs some further explanation. In the first place, some of the income was derived from dividends. Even during World War I the FOR had drawn dividends and at various times there had been questions as to whether or not investments should be used to cover deficits. However, the investments had been used as a security for employees as well as collateral. At the end of the war the investments earned £123.<sup>34</sup> Secondly, the FOR derived income from legacies. The most important legacy the FOR received came from the estate of Elsie Ghosh, a regional secretary who died 7 January 1941. She left the Fellowship about £6000. This sum was not paid until 1943 because the will was contested in a High Court action.<sup>35</sup> The money was used to obtain a Fellowship House, which had been a dream for a quarter century. The FOR got a seventeen year lease on 38 Gordon Square from the Duke of Bedford. It was not until March 1944 that the move was made from 17 Red Lion Square to the new quarters. The delay was due to extensive repairs for which permission of the Ministry of Works was required.<sup>36</sup> In the 1944-45 Report the move was described as follows:

It is of course very much more convenient and we are very much happier than in the old cramped place in Red Lion Square. We anticipated that it would be somewhat costly, but it now transpires from the year's working that it has proved more economical than we had dared to hope and is only about 100 higher in general costs, allowing for the greater rent and rates and also for the letting of certain floors, than the old premises.<sup>37</sup>

The deficit described by Wilkins was thus far less serious than it appeared to be at first sight. There can be no doubt, however, that the

limited financial resources hampered the work of the FOR.

### Conscription and C.O.s

In December 1937 the Chamberlain government accepted the policy of limited military liability on land. This meant abandoning the idea of a small professional expeditionary force similar to the BEF of 1914. Moreover, the needs of the army were made subservient to those of the airforce and, to a lesser extent, the navy. The new policy was not an abandonment of rearmament but a rearrangement of priorities, imposed by a combination of financial constraints and political and skilled manpower considerations.<sup>38</sup> Nevertheless, Chamberlain hoped to contain, according to Simon Newman, "German expansion within the limits of British power."<sup>39</sup> Initially the government thought that this policy could be achieved without war. However, the limited liability policy was severely undermined by Hitler's invasion of Austria in March and the Czechoslovakian crisis of the autumn of 1938. When the crises were followed by the German invasion of a reduced Czechoslovakia in March 1939, the Chamberlain government, in accordance with its policy of German containment, decided to guarantee Poland's territorial integrity. It was at the time of the first Czechoslovakian crisis that the issue of conscription was debated in Parliament, but it was not until early 1939, with Hitler's blatant disregard of the Munich agreement, that conscription became "the leading issue in the debate on British defence policy." The issue culminated in April when, for the first time in peace time, the government legislated conscription. According to Peter

Dennis, the new policy was "a political gesture to French and allied opinion, and to public and parliamentary opinion in Britain."<sup>40</sup>

In June The Christian Pacifist carried the advice of the CCPG concerning the new policy. It counselled conscripts to register even though opposing compulsory military service.<sup>41</sup> Leyton Richards' words, condemning conscription, could have been written nearly twenty-five years earlier:

For us, the Lordship of Christ covers the whole of life; and the State therefore exceeds its legitimate functions under God, not only when it invades the realm of Christian worship, but no less when it presumes to dictate the limits of Christian living and a Christian reaction to men and things in the world at large.<sup>42</sup>

The FOR, together with the London Friends' Local Conscription Committee, published a pamphlet "The London Tribunal Questions the C.O.". Such pamphlets were necessary for already in June the FOR counted about 250 C.O.s among its members.<sup>43</sup> In order to help the C.O.s a Joint Advisory Board (JAB) was created, similar to the JAC of World War I. The counselling which the FOR provided for absolutists and alternativists alike helps to explain why the Fellowship grew so fast just before and after the outbreak of war.

What is surprising is that the few published yearly reports said nothing about C.O.s. During the first few years of the war The Christian Pacifist usually carried a monthly survey about C.O.s but this diminished in later years. The FOR did not even have a C.O. Committee similar to that in World War I. Yet, in 1944 there were 1813 Fellowship C.O.s out of a total of about 60,000 C.O.s.<sup>44</sup> In September 1943 the Executive was notified that Phyllis Waterhouse, who had worked with

C.O.s since the beginning of the war, was "now largely relieved of that owing to its being greatly reduced in quantity."<sup>45</sup> There were basically two reasons why far more C.O.s received far less attention in FOR literature than those in World War I. First, much of the work with C.O.s was done by the JAB, since December 1939 called the Central Board for Conscientious Objectors (CBCO). Second, the treatment of C.O.s, because of a greater tolerance by government and general public alike, was much better.

Since the JAB did most of the work, the C.O. issue falls largely outside the scope of this thesis. Moreover, Denis Hayes in Challenge of Conscience and Rachel Barker in Conscience, Government and War have dealt at some length with the topic.<sup>46</sup> However, the issue touched upon three points deserving further scrutiny, namely the victimization of C.O.s, the C.O.s' involvement in several experiments and activities, and the complexity of the FOR. Between September 1939 and April 1940, the time of the phoney war, neither the government nor the populace harassed pacifists very much. With Hitler's invasion of north and west Europe that attitude changed, and pacifists were increasingly victimized and again accused of cowardice and possibly treason.<sup>47</sup> Perhaps the most notorious case of victimization was the one by the BBC which banned everyone connected with pacifism. Leading pacifists such as Soper, MacLeod and Raven were banned from all broadcasts, not just those of a religious nature. Raven, for example, was not allowed to continue his regular talks on ornithology! The Glasgow Orpheus Choir was banned because of its pacifist conductor, Sir Hugh Robertson. As Hugh Redwood



in News Chronicle stated, the "B.B.C. is assumed to have acted as the instrument of the State."<sup>48</sup> The broadcasting ban was lifted in 1941 for musicians but not for the preachers, which, as The Christian Pacifist generously noted, was at least some form of tolerance.

The accusation of cowardice never ceased during the war, even though the FOR countered with evidence from non-pacifist sources. Two of these pieces of evidence should be noted. In late 1941 the Westminster Medical Officer of Health invited the FOR via Bernard Nicholls to initiate a scheme of emergency service in the event of an outbreak of a serious epidemic such as typhus.<sup>49</sup> The result was a Health Service Committee for London which organized the necessary groups.<sup>50</sup> The second piece of evidence came from Kenneth Mellanby's Human Guinea Pigs. In January 1941 Mellanby started his experiments by inflicting scabies on volunteers who were all pacifists. Although Mellanby was not a pacifist, he totally rejected the idea that pacifists were cowards.<sup>51</sup> He described pacifists as normal people with "perhaps rather more virtues and rather less [sic] vices than the average members of the population", but they were neither "saints", nor "sissies". Most of them, he believed, were above the average intelligence, completely trustworthy and loyal.<sup>52</sup> Mellanby distinguished two groups of pacifists: Christian and non-Christian. The latter he thought on the whole the more aggressive type, while the majority of both groups were "left wing".<sup>53</sup> One of the guinea pigs, Richard Wodeman, was sentenced to three months imprisonment because he refused a military medical examination.<sup>54</sup> His stand clearly established that not fear but a

principle was involved.<sup>55</sup>

Principle was also the key when it came to the issue of military and possibly industrial registration. Generally the FOR favoured registration but not all members agreed on this point. Norman E. Forward listed several reasons why some refused to register, thus indicating the complexity of the issue. They refused to register because they opposed the Armed Forces Act; they thought that acceptance made conscription easy; they protested that conscience could not be judged and thereby refused to accept the tribunals' decisions; and they saw the whole matter as a question of aggression versus morality.<sup>56</sup> Although generally the members of the tribunals were less antagonistic towards C.O.s than during World War I, many of the tribunals, as Richards pointed out, gave no unconditional exemptions. Their reasons, he avowed, were based on moral fallacies which were not warranted by the Military Training Bill of April and the National Service (Armed Forces) Act of September 1939.<sup>57</sup> Ultimately the decision to register or not was regarded as a matter of conscience. Yet, as Raymond Winch argued, pacifists had operated without a clear definition of conscience. To correct this deficiency he suggested that Roman Catholic moral theology had such a definition: "a judgement or dictate of the practical reason, based on the common principles of morality, indicating the good or evil of an action about to be performed."<sup>58</sup> A PAX leaflet defined conscience as "the judgment of reason concerning the lawfulness or unlawfulness of an act to be or already performed or omitted."<sup>59</sup> Remarkably enough, the whole idea of the sufficiency of conscience was now also questioned.

Phelps stated that "conscience alone can never be the final judge", for the conscience was not necessarily the voice of God as had frequently been assumed. Rather, Phelps argued, "the mind of Christ is our final authority."<sup>60</sup> The divergence was not pursued but it may explain why Paul Gliddon wrote "An Open Letter" to C.O.s complaining that many did not witness properly and that they left a "blurred impression" on the general population.<sup>61</sup> The disagreement on such a basic point helps to explain why FOR members differed in tactics and tribunals differed in judgments. It should be no surprise, therefore, that of the seven FOR staff who had to register, three did not do so.<sup>62</sup> Yet, there seems to have been no friction in the Fellowship about the different tactics.

#### Four Relief Activities

Many C.O.s were involved in all kinds of organizations and four of their activities are briefly discussed. Two characteristics should be noted. In comparison to World War I the range of activities was much more limited. In addition, the activities were not necessarily FOR inspired or organized, although the FOR became (or was) ultimately responsible for them. Since 1928, when the FOR was invited to send a representative to a conference of Christians and Jews,<sup>63</sup> the FOR had maintained contact with Jewish leaders. The EoR, mainly through Henry Carter, studied both the national and international problems experienced by Jews.<sup>64</sup> In order to heighten the British awareness of the evils of anti-semitism, a day of intercession was held on Sunday, July 17, 1938.<sup>65</sup> A week later, at the Matlock Summer Conference of July 23-29,

1938, the Children's Hospitality Committee reemerged in order to try to get Jews out of Germany. Although the London Union Executive Committee minutes indicate that much attention was given to this problem no committee minutes seem to have survived.<sup>66</sup> The committee came into existence at a time when, according to one historian of the refugees of the Third Reich, A.J. Sherman, there was "a massive flight characterized by widespread panic, the virtual expulsion of refugees stripped of almost all their property, and the hasty tightening of immigration regulations by countries all over the world."<sup>67</sup> Unfortunately, the absence of FOR archival material prevents making a proper assessment of the FOR's contribution. With the outbreak of war the Hospitality Committee turned its attention elsewhere. The London section organized summer holidays for children, as they had done twenty years before. Towards the end of the war this "work was severely curtailed by the flying bomb raids."<sup>68</sup> On the whole, participation in this work was limited.

Like the Hospitality Committee, the Pacifist Service Corps or Unit (PSU) was centered mainly in London. Originally the PSU had started in 1939 as the Pacifist First Aid Corps, indicative of the intended work.<sup>69</sup> Each individual unit consisted of about ten people who were available day and night anywhere for emergency work.<sup>70</sup> Later during the war some members undertook social and club work for boys and girls.<sup>71</sup> As the London Union Annual Report for 1944 stated, it was "particularly encouraging to note the gradual change in attitude of some of the boys and girls towards the church."<sup>72</sup> In Liverpool the unit

helped deserted children and the poor, cleaned houses and drains, tried rehabilitation and sought rehousing where necessary.<sup>73</sup>

The third activity, the Hungerford Club, was again London based. FOR staff member Bernard Nicholls started the Club as an APF activity, helping hobos at Charing Cross Station who were unwanted in other shelters. The London Union accepted the responsibility for the catering and some C.O.s helped in the organization.<sup>74</sup> Doris Nicholls, a general secretary after the war, who thought the Club very successful, reminisced in 1974 about this "adventure of friendship": "One of the sad things that happened when peace came was that the economic factor in dealing with the country's misfits had to be re-introduced and opportunities for creating permanent centres like the Hungerford were lost."<sup>75</sup> The largest activity for C.O.s was the Christian Pacifist Forestry and Land Units. In 1952 Lewis Maclachlan published a book describing the history of the CPFLU,<sup>76</sup> so that there is no need to give an extensive description. The CPFLU was the brainchild of MPF leader Rev. Henry Carter who saw it as "an expression of our service for pacifism, of a certain group within the pacifist movement."<sup>77</sup> Maclachlan saw the movement as "a part of that world-wide conflict between liberty and tyranny, between dictatorship and democracy, between brutality and humanity, between organised force and the meekness and gentleness of Christ."<sup>78</sup> Carter's concern was really more practical. He wanted to help members of the MPF in war time and contacted Ernest Brown, the minister of Labour and National Service, on September 18, 1939, asking what could be done. The answer was not unfriendly. Ten

days later Carter wrote again but the ministry's reply was that there was no intention to embark on training schemes to fit C.O.s for landwork or anything else. Yet many C.O.s were told by their tribunals to find agricultural work. When Walter Smith, the head of the Timber Control Department of the Forestry Ministry, met Carter on October 26, 1939, he suggested that there could be work in remote areas for physically fit men who were willing to work fairly hard in open air conditions. On January 2, 1940, the first unit started at Lockenden, Kent, on a totally voluntary, self-supporting basis. At that stage the FOR became involved.

At a meeting on January 23, 1940, composed of various denominations, the possibility of an ad hoc committee taking charge of the formation of the forestry and land units was discussed.<sup>79</sup> Such a committee was formed on February 16, 1940.<sup>80</sup> It was agreed that non-Christian C.O.s could participate in the plan. The difficulty was that many farmers did not want to cooperate until in 1941 the government ordered them not to discriminate. Meanwhile, their discrimination contributed to some C.O.s being imprisoned because they could not be accommodated. The total number employed during the war was 1392, but by the time that the CPFLU became a Limited Company on April 15, 1944, there was already a decrease in units and membership. The decline is another sign of the decreased rate of influx of new C.O.s and of pacifists in general. After the war the units started to close down and the supervision was given to the general secretary of the FOR.

Not all work, however, was done in forestry and on the land.

There was, as well, work in civil defence, coal mining and mental hospitals. Maclachlan was certainly correct when he saw the CPFLU as primarily a religious movement which was influenced by the community movement and influenced it in return.<sup>81</sup> If there was still a need of proof that pacifism was not passivism but a constructive approach to peace, the CPFLU and the other services discussed here could be used as such a proof. As the "Standard of the Movement" stated:

We volunteered to give ourselves to constructive, useful work for our fellows in ways of peace. We have learned that peacemaking is a hard task, demanding sympathy and unselfish service in all our dealings.... This determination to serve conscientiously the way and work of peace, as followers of Christ and servants of our neighbours, is our standard.<sup>82</sup>

These various activities were aptly described by an anonymous correspondent who wrote to Leslie Tarlton, the London Union secretary: "The groups thus seem to act as a powerhouse, a centre from which the members radiate."<sup>83</sup>

Not all members were so convinced that the FOR was doing what it could. One at least wrote:

Don't you think that the F.o.R. ought to come out into the open and fearlessly expound the true way of overcoming evil and establishing God's Kingdom on earth, and like its brother organization the Peace Pledge Union, hold open air meetings in Hyde Park and elsewhere? Pacifism that is afraid to go out into the highways and byways with its message, is worthless, and is like hiding your candle under a bushel: you will never be able to influence public opinion that way.<sup>84</sup>

Carl Heath, discussing whether compromise in itself was evil or not, stated that what was really essential was witness.<sup>85</sup> According to Rev. Paul Gliddon, the FOR had missed the opportunities to witness,

especially during the phoney war: "Most certainly the impromptu pacifist societies of the last war gave a far better account of themselves than the fully-prepared movement of to-day, organized to the point of disorganisation." He continued that to proclaim the pacifist method only was not sufficient. In order to be effective it was necessary to know the "language" of the opponents. Pacifists had failed because they had given blueprints for the experts but not working models for the masses.<sup>86</sup> Although Gliddon's scathing attack needs some modification in the light of the various activities discussed above, active propaganda consisted of the maintenance and strengthening of fellowship in personal examples rather than in direct propaganda.<sup>87</sup> FOR headquarters seemed to fear the confrontational approach possible in open air meetings. But Donald Soper seemed to enjoy such an approach at Tower Hill and Hyde Park.<sup>88</sup> The FOR preferred the quieter personal witness and literature.<sup>89</sup> This approach is apparent in the reestablishment of the Literature Sub-Committee and the "Towards a Christian Peace" Campaign which are the subject of Chapter 17. Apart from the campaigns there was some incidental literature, mainly theological and frequently polemical. It is this material which is the subject of the next chapter.



## CHAPTER 15 - ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 25-9-1939.

<sup>2</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 10, Oct. 1939, p. 268. Russell resigned from the PPU over the invasion of Poland. As suggested, very few FOR members resigned over Poland.

<sup>3</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 11, Nov. 1939, pp. 303 - 304.

<sup>4</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 1-3-1940. It should be noted that the numbers do not always coincide from one meeting to another.

<sup>5</sup>Lang was Archbishop of Canterbury and thus primate of the Church of England; Main was the moderator of the Church of Scotland; Bond was the moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches.

<sup>6</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 10, Oct. 1939, p. 275.

<sup>7</sup>Charles Chatfield, For Peace and Justice, Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1971, p. 329.

<sup>8</sup>Brockway, Salter, p. 219.

<sup>9</sup>Much of what Raven wrote during the war was related to science.

<sup>10</sup>Vera Brittain, Pethick-Lawrence, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1963, pp. 109 - 110, 115.

<sup>11</sup>For Niebuhr see Ch. 16.

<sup>12</sup>Hugh Martin, The Christian as Soldier, London: S.C.M., 1939, p. 5 and p. 23. For the rejection of his position see The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 2 no. 2, Feb. 1940, pp. 55 - 56.

<sup>13</sup>PPU minutes 5-10-1939; see also the Sunday Dispatch of March 10, 1940. For her joining the PPU see Ceadel, Pacifism, p. 277; for resignation, p. 294.

<sup>14</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 2 no. 1, Jan. 1940, p. 39. The shattering blow was not peculiar to Royden. Many pacifist leaders suffered similarly yet did not give up pacifism.

<sup>15</sup>The Guildhouse Fellowship, Vol. 4 no. 7, July 1940, p. 2. See also the Daily Herald, 17-6-1940.

<sup>16</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 16-9-1940.

<sup>17</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 16-9-1940.

<sup>18</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 6-1-1942.

<sup>19</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 23-3-1942. The revision of the lists was an administrative exercise and had little, if anything, to do with recent resignations.

<sup>20</sup>Report, 1943, p. 1.

<sup>21</sup>Annual Report, 1944 - 1945, p. 5. See also Report 1939 - 1943, p. 3, which mentioned black-out conditions.

<sup>22</sup>FOR 456; 1/7; 3-1-1945.

<sup>23</sup>FOR 456; 1/7; 26-9-1944.

<sup>24</sup>FOR 456; 1/7; 20-3-1945. But see Annual Report, 1944 - 1945, p. 5, which gives 12907 and 793.

<sup>25</sup>FOR 456; 1/7; 19-6-1945 and FOR 456; 1/7; 25-9-1945. A total of 840 members resigned between Sept. 1939 and June 1945. See IFOR quarterly newsletter no. 47. (GD 485).

<sup>26</sup>FOR 456; 3/6; 20-7-1939; 20-5-1940; 17-4-1941; 19-3-1942; 15-11-1945. See also FOR 456; 4/3; and FOR 456 3/6; 17-12-1942.

<sup>27</sup>Annual Report, 1944-1945. It would be wrong to conclude that these 4,500 were non-Christian, see below.

<sup>28</sup>Albert D. Belden, PAX Christi, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1942, especially Ch. 7. The idea was that 5000 would sign at the same time. This idea went against the FOR's approach that the individual should take the first step.

<sup>29</sup>The Christian Pacifist, NS, no. 29, May 1944, p. 331. The inaugural meeting was held on April 29 led by Patrick Figgis at Friends House. Probably the church attracted a few hundred people.

<sup>30</sup>In 1943 they published the pamphlet The Case for a Pacifist Church. From various articles and letters it would appear that the brothers were somewhat recalcitrant.

<sup>31</sup>Frank Hancock, News Letter of Movement for a Pacifist Church of Christ, April 1945, p. 1. The new church did not require a new

member to break with his denomination. For Belden's influence in Canada see Socknat, "Witness", pp. 535 - 537.

<sup>32</sup>Report, 1942 - 1943, p. 3.

<sup>33</sup>Annual Report, 1944 - 1945, p. 6. Harper Bond had died in 1940 and Isaac Goss in 1943.

<sup>34</sup>Annual Report, 1944 - 1945, p. 6. For World War I see FOR 456; 5/1. The strong FOR statements against capitalism, especially on "unearned" income, turned out to be in practice far less militant.

<sup>35</sup>Report, 1942 - 1943, p. 3.

<sup>36</sup>FOR 456; 3/6; 16-9-1943. The total cost of the repairs came to £2500. The Ministry had not been very cooperative. The official change of address was March 20, 1944.

<sup>37</sup>Annual Report, 1944 - 1945, p. 3. Due to the death of the Duke in a tragic accident the lease was called in several years earlier and the FOR had to vacate the premises.

<sup>38</sup>Shay, British, p. 170; Peden, British, ch. 4; R. A. C. Parker, "British Rearmament 1936-9: Treasury, Trade Unions and Skilled Labour," English Historical Review, Vol. 96, Apr. 1981, pp. 306-344.

<sup>39</sup>Newman, March 1939, p. 3. According to Newman, the government chose this third option rather than concessions or an anti-German coalition as previous historians had argued. According to Newman (p. 5), the guarantee to Poland was the culmination rather than a revolution in British foreign policy. For a different view see Peter Dennis, Decision by Default, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972, pp. 108 - 114.

<sup>40</sup>Dennis, Decision, p. 2, Ch. 11. According to Hayes in Conscription, pp. 379 - 382, conscription came about due to pressure of conservative backbenchers.

<sup>41</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 6, June 1939, p. 143.

<sup>42</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 9, Sept. 1939, p. 230.

<sup>43</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 19-6-1939.

<sup>44</sup>FOR 456; 3/6; year report 1943 - 1944. There were 56 C.O.s in military service, 72 in prison, 120 had been given unconditional exemptions and 494 conditional exemptions.

<sup>45</sup>FOR 456; 3/6; 16-9-1943.

<sup>46</sup>Hayes, Challenge of Conscience, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1949; New York: Garland, 1972; Rachel Barker, Conscience, Government and War, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.

<sup>47</sup>For a change in this attitude see Bennett, "Testament", pp. 177 - 182.

<sup>48</sup>News Chronicle, 4-1-1941, p. 5. For a more extensive review of this episode, see Bennett, "Testament", pp. 194-208.

<sup>49</sup>London Union Minutes, 12-12-1941. The outbreak of an epidemic was quite feasible since bombing had caused extensive damage.

<sup>50</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 16-9-1941; and 3/6; 18-21-1941. See also the Report 1939 - 1943, p. 6; SCPC; CDG-B, Box 1.

<sup>51</sup>Kenneth Mellanby, Human Guinea Pigs, London: Victor Gollancz, 1945, p. 82.

<sup>52</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>53</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 83, 88. In a private interview with the author in May 1984, Fenner Brockway, who was chairman of the CBCO, guessed that 95% of the C.O.s were so on religious grounds and only 5% on political grounds.

<sup>54</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 61.

<sup>55</sup>On principle, Robert Foster, an FOR staff member, refused to register for the Civil Defence Duties (Part-Time) Order. He was sentenced to 14 days at Croydon Police Court. FOR 456; 3/6; 22-1-1942. The FOR allowed him half his salary.

<sup>56</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 2 no. 5, May 1940, p. 136.

<sup>57</sup>The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 4, Apr. 1942, pp. 65 - 68. In general, Richards had a high regard for the tribunals. For the difference between the tribunals of the two wars see especially Barker, Conscience, Ch. 2. For the Bill and Act, see Barker, Conscience, ch. 1; Hayes, Challenge, Ch. 1; Dennis, Decision, Ch. 11. The Bill passed the House of Commons on May 18, 1939.

<sup>58</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 2 no. 6, June 1940, p. 148.

<sup>59</sup>Scarfe, Catholic, p. 30.

<sup>60</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 3 no. 6, June 1941, pp. 105 - 106.

<sup>61</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 3 no. 3, March 1941, p. 49.

<sup>62</sup>FOR 456; 3/6; 11-9-1941 and 18-12-1941. For female C.O. regulations see The Christian Pacifist, NS, no. 4, Apr. 1942, p. 63.

<sup>63</sup>FOR 456; 3/2; 19-1-1928.

<sup>64</sup>Embassies of Reconciliation Report, 1936-1937, p. 8.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., 1937-1938, p. 9.

<sup>66</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 19-9-1938; London Union Executive Committee Minutes, see e.g. 17-1-1939. The scanty evidence suggests that the London Union did most of the work.

<sup>67</sup>A.J. Sherman, Island Refuge, London: Paul Elek, 1973, p. 17. Sherman discerns five stages: 1) Jan. 1933 - Sept. 1935: few refugees who still could take some property along. 2) Oct. 1935 - March 1938: increasing repression under the Nuremberg Laws. 3) March 1938 - Nov. 1938: incorporation of Austria. 4) Nov. 1938 - March 1939: Kristallnacht and chaotic migration. 5) March 1939 - Sept. 1939: Gestapo pushes refugees over the Reich frontiers. Probably in May 1938 a Coordinating Committee for Refugees was formed of which, among others, the TUC and Society of Friends were constituents. For Friends' help see e.g. Hughes, Indomitable, chs. 8 and 9. The FOR's help came thus during stage three.

<sup>68</sup>London Union Report, 1944 - 1945, p. 7.

<sup>69</sup>FOR 456; 3/6; 12-1-1939.

<sup>70</sup>See The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 2 no. 12, Dec. 1940, p. 281. In June 1940 the Pacifist Service Bureau organized the units, using the PPU's address. Secretary was Stephen Morris. The FOR unit at Eltham consisted mostly of C.O.s. See The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 8, Aug. 1942, p. 160 and the PSU's first annual report.

<sup>71</sup>See second and third annual PSU reports.

<sup>72</sup>London Union Annual Report, 1944, p. 8. See also the FOR's Annual Report 1944 - 1945, p. 14 and Report 1939 - 1943, p. 6.

<sup>73</sup>The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 22, Oct. 1943, p. 191. See also third annual PSU report and the report for 1944 - 1945. For a more extensive discussion of the PSU see Bennett, "Testament", pp. 279 - 283.

<sup>74</sup>FOR Report, 1939 - 1943, p. 6; London Union Report, 1944 - 1945, pp. 7 - 8; The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 3 no. 4, Apr. 1941, p. 69 and NS no. 24, Dec. 1943, p. 242, for Nicholls resignation. Britten,

Pears and Tippet gave a concert on June 21, 1944 at Friends House for the Hungerford Club. (The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 28 Apr. 1944, p. 324).

<sup>75</sup>Reconciliation Quarterly, Dec. 1974, p. 26.

<sup>76</sup>Lewis Maclachlan, C.P.F.L.U., London: F.O.R. 1952. For the Canadian counterpart see Socknat, "'Witness'," pp. 460, 464, 472ff.

<sup>77</sup>FOR 456; 6/2; 23-1-1940.

<sup>78</sup>Maclachlan, C.P.F.L.U., p. 9.

<sup>79</sup>Present were H. Carter, L. Keeble, E.C. Urwin, P.W. Applegate, G. Tomlinson, F. Mitchell (all MPF), L. Artingstall, (FOR - Congregationalist), E. Philip (Presbyterian), H. Goodrich (Anglican), S.J. Thomas (Friend), E.H. Bales (Baptist), E. St. J. Catchpool (Youth Hostel Association).

<sup>80</sup>According to Maclachlan, C.P.F.L.U., pp. 24-25, the Society of Friends did not participate in the formation because "it would or could involve co-operation with the Government to facilitate the working of Conscription".

<sup>81</sup>Maclachlan, C.P.F.L.U., pp. 46, 75; FOR 456; 6/2. Maclachlan was the organizer in Scotland (FOR 456; 6/2; 15-3-1940) and George Davies in Wales (The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 2 no. 7, July 1940, p. 177).

<sup>82</sup>Maclachlan, C.P.F.L.U., p. 81.

<sup>83</sup>London Union Archives. The letter was probably written by Marcelle Sugden, possibly in 1944.

<sup>84</sup>London Union Archives, Norman B. Troy, 4-4-1944, probably to Tarlton. See also Wallace Hancock's letter to Tarlton, 28-1-1944, which suggests that the FOR is not leading, only following.

<sup>85</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 3 no. 1, Jan. 1941, p. 10. He argued that compromise was not evil in itself.

<sup>86</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 2 no. 11, Nov. 1940, p. 263.

<sup>87</sup>See e.g. London Union Archives, Report East London (South) Groups by B. Brinch (?) to Tarlton, n.d. but probably 1944 - 1945.

<sup>88</sup>For Soper see Christ and Tower Hill, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1934; Question Time on Tower Hill, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935; Christianity and Its Critics, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1937. See also the biographies by Douglas Thompson,

Donald Soper, Nutfield: Denholm House Press, 1971; William Purcell, Portrait of Soper, London: Mowbrays, 1972; and George Gill Hunter, "Evangelistic Rhetoric in Secular Britain: The Theory and Speaking of Donald Soper and Bryan Green," Evanston: North Western University, Ph.D. thesis, 1972.

<sup>89</sup>Ceadel, Pacifism, p. 65. His assessment would better fit for World War II.

## CHAPTER 16

### THEOLOGICAL DEBATES AND CONTRIBUTIONS

The focus in this chapter is on the FOR's critique of Reinhold Niebuhr's views on pacifism, on Cadoux' book Christian Pacifism Re-examined, and on the theological contributions made mainly by a group of Anglicans. Despite such concentration some theological material is not discussed until Chapter 17 where it appears more appropriately within the context of the FOR's internal and external campaigns. What should perhaps be stressed again is that so much time and space was devoted to theology. Not that the fall of France in June 1940, the battle of Britain in July-September 1940, or much later area bombing went unnoticed. These events were in themselves important and brought immense suffering. But the episodes and atrocities were regarded by pacifists as merely the logical or natural consequences of war. The FOR did, therefore, not so much protest against particular atrocities as against the war in principle, a stance which was also taken by many Quakers and PPU people. Hence, it was imperative for the Christian pacifist to have the right basis and the proper understanding of Scripture. Without the right foundation the Christian's pacifism would crumble. The pressure from government and neighbours to "conform" could only be withstood by a solid faith and a sure vision. FOR theologians contributed to the building up of such a faith and the construction of



such a vision. Moreover, individual FOR members often cooperated with other organizations in practical activities. It is against this background that the rest of this and the next chapter need to be placed in order to understand the contribution of the FOR to the pacifist movement.

### Reinhold Niebuhr and the FOR

In the spring of 1933 Reinhold Niebuhr, the chairman of the AFOR, brought fraternal greetings to the FOR.<sup>1</sup> Even before he had become chairman in 1931 he had already published a critique on pacifism. With his changing theological direction came an increasing advocacy of coercion. There were several other leading AFOR members who had strongly opposed capitalism and were willing to use violence for its overthrow. The issue came to a head after Niebuhr returned from his European visit. Niebuhr, who strongly opposed both capitalism and fascism, sided with those who argued that some forms of violence might well be essential to suppress fascism and at the very least transform capitalism. At a December 1933 conference a majority of the AFOR rejected the use of violence and a number of members, including Niebuhr, left the Fellowship.<sup>2</sup> His books Moral Man and Immoral Society (1932) and An Interpretation of Christian Ethics (1935) aroused some FOR comments before the outbreak of war.<sup>3</sup> FOR members rejected his idea that individuals acted differently as group members and that therefore personal and national morality had to be dissimilar. Like Temple, Niebuhr emphasized justice at the cost of love.<sup>4</sup> Raven commented that it was not true that groups always fell "below that which the

individuals composing them can achieve."<sup>5</sup> Raven directed his polemic mainly against Barth whose theology he thoroughly disliked. As Rizzo wrote, Raven gave "the impression that Niebuhr shares the general outlook of Barthian theology."<sup>6</sup> In other words, Niebuhr shared in the strong denunciations meted out to Barth.<sup>7</sup> However, the strong reaction against Niebuhr did not come until after his booklet of 1939, Why the Christian Church is not Pacifist. As George R. Edwards has written: "Niebuhr was resolved to expose the untenability of the claims of pacifism and thus to secure support in the church for America's active engagement in the war against Germany."<sup>8</sup> Niebuhr argued that Jesus' "impossible perfection" was not directly relevant to the political situation. He did not deny that Jesus' ethic was one of non-resistance.<sup>9</sup> On this issue he agreed with the exegesis of pacifists and disagreed with those who tried to find support for war in Jesus' words and actions. But for Niebuhr the ideal was reserved for the Kingdom of God so that in the interim not Love's perfection but justice was the point of reference for the relations between nations. Violent coercion could therefore not be ruled out as a means to secure justice.<sup>10</sup> Niebuhr also accused pacifists of being parasites who benefited from a society based on coercion yet "arbitrarily introduce the uncompromising ethic of the Gospel into one particular issue."<sup>11</sup>

G.G. Cameron reacted against these charges in The Christian Pacifist of August 1940. In October G. H. C. Macgregor, professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism at Glasgow University, started a six-part series against Niebuhr's views called "The Relevance of an

Impossible Ideal", later published in pamphlet form.<sup>12</sup> In 1942 B.S. Moss reexamined the arguments presented, criticizing both Niebuhr and Macgregor.<sup>13</sup> In one of the first FOR pamphlets after the war W. Robinson, principal of Overdale College, Selly Oak, continued the critique against Niebuhr in Evil Confronted, while E.L Allen's guide to the thought of Niebuhr Christianity and Society appeared in 1950.<sup>14</sup> Obviously the debate was an ongoing process.

Macgregor's pamphlet was the most important. The pamphlet's popularity was such that it was still being sold long after the war on both sides of the Atlantic. Macgregor admitted some areas of agreement with Niebuhr, such as non-resistant love, love as the ultimate ethical norm, the "peril of compromising with the Absolute" and the selfishness in war.<sup>15</sup> Macgregor arranged Niebuhr's indictment of pacifism under three headings: namely, the false optimism of Christian pacifists, the fallacy of non-resistance, and the isolation of a single issue. Although the American "Basis" differed from the British one and while the issues in the two countries were different (the AFOR, for example, was very much involved in the struggle against segregation), Niebuhr either never understood the Fellowship's policy or he deliberately misled his audience on the third point. Even if the AFOR had been a single-issue organization - which it was not - the FOR certainly was not.

The first point was really theological, the question being, "What is the extent of forgiveness?". Macgregor accused Niebuhr of having "apparently no doctrine at all of the Holy Spirit--at any rate in

the New Testament sense."<sup>16</sup> Macgregor, and with him the FOR, could be regarded as starting with Paul's words to the Corinthians, "If any man be in Christ there is a new creation" (2 Cor. 5:17).<sup>17</sup> This starting point could easily lead to an optimistic view of man and, as this thesis has illustrated, the early FOR leaders were very optimistic about the possibility of ushering in the Kingdom of God. Their optimism arose at the outset because many of them had a very superficial understanding of the nature of sin.<sup>18</sup> According to Allen, Niebuhr put the fact of sin in the center of the picture of man, especially in collective life.<sup>19</sup> However, by the 1930s many FOR members had a much more orthodox view on the nature of sin, although there were such notable exceptions as Raven or Cadoux. Muriel Lester, one of those early optimists, was representative of the changing understanding when she wrote in 1937:

Our grandfathers thought sin as personal. For the last thirty years we have regarded it as social, a thing for which we were only partly responsible. We became glibly impersonal about it. We have now rediscovered it as the prime cause of our miseries.<sup>20</sup>

While Niebuhr, like Barth, stressed the depravity of mankind and the fact that "God is wholly other", Macgregor directed attention to the hope and joy expressed in the New Testament, aspects quite lacking in Niebuhr's booklet.

Niebuhr's second point divorced Jesus' words and actions from the political situation. He argued that Jesus' non-resistance was irrelevant to politics. Non-resistance had only eschatological value.<sup>21</sup> As has been seen, Cadoux in his early works had already argued that Jesus' politics were no mere incident to His ministry. Niebuhr

completely ignored Cadoux' arguments. In addition, Niebuhr seemed to imply that Christian pacifists rejected all force. This charge was possibly true for 1914 but certainly not for the 1930s. According to Rizzo, Niebuhr failed to confront directly Raven's pacifism which, like the FOR's, was "a kind which admits a need for limited coercion or force under certain circumstances."<sup>22</sup> What Niebuhr's charge amounted to was that moral judgments and actions were relative. Raven had little problem with this charge because he incorporated an evolutionist view in his theory.<sup>23</sup> Macgregor's reaction to the charge was that Niebuhr made an excuse to avoid the relevance of Jesus' demands in all spheres of life, or if relevant, only in the sacred sphere.<sup>24</sup> Although Macgregor only devoted one paragraph to the sacred-secular argument, the rejection of this dualism should be regarded as a key element in the understanding of the FOR.<sup>25</sup>

One minor though interesting point in the debate deserves attention. Robinson speculated on what might have happened if a single major nation had taken the way of non-resistance, a notion popular since the FOR's inception. Robinson pointed out that even the old non-pacifist liberal theologian Dean Inge (1860 - 1954) had stated that the notion of the martyr-nation could not be contemptuously dismissed.<sup>26</sup> In an unpublished manuscript of probably 1941, William Orchard questioned this martyr-nation notion: "How can we expect a nation to do what is not even enjoined upon the individual Christian to do?"<sup>27</sup> There is indeed no biblical injunction that a Christian should seek to be a martyr. Since the FOR rejected moral dualism between individual and nation, its

members had really no right to ask martyrdom for a nation. Yet, no one seemed to object - Orchard's view remained unpublished - and this aspect may be regarded as one of these issues not properly thought through and against which Niebuhr - rightly - objected.

### Cadoux Re-examines Pacifism

After his resignation as chairman in 1933 Cadoux was seldom involved in organizational FOR affairs, although he was still regularly invited to speak.<sup>28</sup> General secretary Artingstall's remark in a letter of March 29, 1941, "If I may assume that you are still in sympathy with the objects of the Fellowship",<sup>29</sup> gives reason to think that there was a good deal less contact than before. The Cadoux archives for the war period contain relatively few letters from FOR members. Tom Foley asked him in January 1942 to sign a petition for the abolition of night bombing.<sup>30</sup> Bartlett expressed hopes that Cadoux could bring Orchard back into closer contact.<sup>31</sup> Horace Fuller wrote that he and Wilfrid Bligh were called again for the Tribunal on the same day as twenty-six years before!<sup>32</sup> But there is basically nothing from Cadoux for this period about the FOR as an organization.

Although Cadoux was probably slightly out of touch with FOR headquarters, he had not abandoned pacifism. This was clear from his book Christian Pacifism Re-examined of 1940, a major publication containing the FOR's message. He reaffirmed his position in A Pilgrim's Further Progress, published in 1943. However, he had come to realize more clearly "the complexity and difficulty attending a direct

application of His [Jesus'] teachings to that and other modern society problems." He acknowledged that he was somewhat bewildered and that he found it "very difficult to be pacifist in these days."<sup>33</sup> As he stated elsewhere, possibly in reaction to the German successes in the Balkans and North Africa in the spring of 1941, pacifists now more than ever were thrown on the defensive. He suggested therefore that pacifists should "for the present form something resembling a religious 'order' consisting of men and women with a special vocation."<sup>34</sup> He did not think that the state, under the present circumstances, could be pacifist. Logistically Cadoux was at least realistic: there were not enough pacifists.

Cadoux may have been slightly out of touch with FOR headquarters and somewhat bewildered, but Christian Pacifism Re-examined was an examination as well as a re-affirmation of earlier held positions; the book was both a culmination of past thinking and a projection ahead. Interestingly enough, this key book appeared at the same time as ex-FOR John Lewis' prominent The Case Against Pacifism.<sup>35</sup> The Christian Pacifist, like many other journals, reviewed the two books in the same issue.<sup>36</sup> Lewis accused pacifists of being unrealistic in national and international affairs, an accusation Cadoux partly accepted:

Failure to allow accurately for the relativity of ethical conduct to personal conviction is the reason why some pacifists are prone to write as if full Christian pacifism were already well within the reach of their country at large, and were therefore ethically practicable for its government, and accordingly to press for its immediate inclusion in the country's international policy. Critics of pacifism ought to realize that such pleas form no

essential part of the pacifist case.<sup>37</sup>

As The Christian Pacifist review pointed out, Cadoux further discredited several already anachronistic "impressive platitudes of pacifist speech", such as "that coercion is always wrong, that war settles nothing, that the end never justifies the means, that no good has been achieved or evil averted by war."<sup>38</sup> Leading FOR authors had discarded these ideas years ago. Marzani in the introduction to the Garland edition of Lewis' book stated that Lewis demolished old pacifist arguments.<sup>39</sup> As far as the FOR was concerned, it would be more correct to say that Lewis was tilting against windmills.

Lewis' weakness is nowhere clearer than in his discussion of biblical texts. Although Lewis never concluded, like general William Dobbie, that God was "a man of war",<sup>40</sup> by taking verses out of context his treatment was, in fact, very similar. His unscholarly analysis of the texts shows that he totally ignored the interpretation given by pacifist theologians such as Macgregor.<sup>41</sup> Lewis' insistence that Christian pacifists treated the Sermon on the Mount as a rigid code of precepts<sup>42</sup> may have been true for some FOR pacifists, but the FOR had never based itself on one or more texts. Lewis nowhere discussed the theological underpinnings of the FOR, although he recognized that absolute-religious pacifism was based upon fundamental principles.<sup>43</sup> As a critique of the FOR's position the book has thus little value.<sup>44</sup> The self-criticism of Cadoux gave a better insight as to why the FOR had abandoned some positions.

Swomley in his introduction to the Garland edition of Christian



Pacifism Re-examined suggested, firstly, that Cadoux separated his ethical from the political analysis, and, secondly, that the book became a matter of controversy.<sup>45</sup> But were Swomley's observations correct? Cadoux hardly could be expected to know the outcome of the war, let alone the post-war situation. Swomley ignored the fact that the debate of "League of Nations" versus "world federalism", regarded as the largest post-war problem, had specific FOR connotation. For the FOR, the punitive character of the Versailles Treaty and the League's faulty constitution contributed significantly to the rise of Hitler and thus to the outbreak of a new war. One of the points Cadoux mentioned in his preface as "crucial" was that "war inevitably tends to lead on to further war, and to worse war."<sup>46</sup> The inevitability could be eliminated if the peace to be concluded would have a proper basis. World federalism, Cadoux claimed, would be the right direction since it would mean at least a partial surrender of national sovereignty, approaching the commonwealth or brotherhood of people.<sup>47</sup> Cadoux certainly did not separate theology from politics.<sup>48</sup>

Neither did Cadoux really separate ethics from politics. He realized that, given the present circumstances, the political scope for pacifists was limited. Political involvement could mean compromise with another "crucial" point, namely love's way of overcoming evil: "The Christian ethic definitely inculcates on its adherents the policy of overcoming evil with good, and of making the sacrifices incidental to any temporary failure in so doing."<sup>49</sup> As is apparent from The Historic Mission of Jesus, Cadoux held on to his often proclaimed notion of "The

Political Significance of the Kingdom."<sup>50</sup> Swomley's accusation appears therefore to be without foundation.

Even if Swomley had been correct, the separation would have caused only a mild controversy.<sup>51</sup> Cadoux himself suggested another area of controversy. Cadoux, like Raven, expressed great sympathy for those who, after careful thought, had decided to go to war. His position was not new. In fact, it dated back to the middle of the first world war.<sup>52</sup> He reiterated his position here more forcefully, devoting a chapter to ethical relativity.<sup>53</sup> In his conclusion he recognized that "some at least of my pacifist friends may feel that I have virtually sold the pass by my theory of relative justification."<sup>54</sup> This view enabled him to argue that Britain was relatively more justified than Germany in going to war. But this relative justification did not mean that Cadoux justified war. It was his way of grappling with the problem of evil combined with a sympathy for an honestly held opinion. That he did not justify war as such is clear from his third "crucial" point: "the activities of fighting men cannot be harmonized with any standard of conduct reasonably describable as Christian."<sup>55</sup> This point was really the heart of the book, for Cadoux was concerned only with "war and pacifism as they constitute a problem in Christian ethics."<sup>56</sup>

Although Cadoux recognized that his book was not the definitive word on Christian pacifism,<sup>57</sup> it was really the only one of its kind published during the war. Hence a few statements are highlighted even though some may now sound familiar. For some time FOR writers had accepted that some form and degree of force was acceptable. However,

Cadoux seems to be the first one who replaced the word force by pressure, hoping thereby to avoid the physical aspect often associated with force. The real problem for Cadoux here was whether or not some types of pressure valid for individuals would also be valid for a corporate body. Since he could not accept an "untenable moral dualism", he attempted to show a limited validity for both. War, because its very nature was violent, fell outside the valid limits.<sup>58</sup> Many theologians, however, had accepted a dualism between the actions of the individual and the state. For example, in 1916 P.T. Forsyth had written that the object of war was "not to kill but to bind the strong superman", intending to separate the individual's actions from the state's intention.<sup>59</sup> Cadoux rightly regarded Forsyth's attempt as an abstraction devoid of reality. Cadoux also pointed out that war did not settle the problem of right and wrong: the most powerful side was not necessarily right. But in contrast to Lansbury who held that war settled nothing, Cadoux pointed to history to show that war settled many things.<sup>60</sup> To mention only one item, war had frequently settled territorial boundaries. In his discussion on war, he also mentioned the international police force, usually in FOR circles regarded as a misleading idea. Although he ultimately rejected such force, he thought that much of the argument in favour was plausible, cogent and on some crucial points sound.<sup>61</sup> As he said in his conclusion, he tried to do justice to both sides.<sup>62</sup> He certainly tried on the topic of the international police force.

Perhaps the most controversial sentence in the book was that

"neither the philosophical nor the theological approach enables us to reach really final answers to our basic questions."<sup>63</sup> He then continued to posit some presuppositions and his relativist theory becomes clear in the words preceding the presuppositions: "those of my readers who cannot agree with these presuppositions will, I fear, be unable to concur in the argument I build on them."<sup>64</sup> These words are the key not only to Cadoux' defence of pacifism but to every defence of pacifism, for in accepting the premises Christian pacifism can be made into a coherent system and lifestyle. For those who do not accept Christ as the focal point of life, the presuppositions are quite meaningless. For Christians, Cadoux' three premises may seem reasonable:

- (1) The Christian answer to the question as to whether it is ever justifiable to take part in war, whatever that answer may turn out to be, is the right and valid answer...
- (2) There is a certain general way of life recognizable as the Christian way...
- (3) There exists for the Christian a Divinely - authoritative Law, which it is his bounden duty to learn, to apply his own case, and to obey.<sup>65</sup>

Cadoux interpreted this Law as the Will of God which could be known and learned. To arrive at its correct understanding Cadoux suggested five relative tests which together were a far cry from the nearly autonomous appeal to conscience as found in early FOR literature. The first test was the "general sense of the Christian community." Cadoux suggested that the individual look how the Christian community of past and present dealt with a particular problem. The second test was the "utterance of the Christian heart" with which one had to be careful because the conscience could not always give an immediate or constant answer to a choice. The third test, the "character and teaching of Jesus", implied

a thorough study of the synoptic gospels. The fourth test was theologically even more encompassing than the third for one had to formulate the "Christian doctrine of the character of God." The final test, to which Cadoux devoted a whole chapter, showed the author's relativist position in emphasizing "the nature of the results, or the test of expediency."<sup>66</sup>

These tests are an indication of the complexity of a Christian pacifist's basis. This complexity was reflected in Cadoux' lengthy definition of the position of a pacifist:

As a responsible member of society and as one committed to a particular way of life, the Christian rightly desires to move or influence others in particular ways, both for their own sake and for the sake of yet others whom they may affect for good or ill: in exerting this pressure upon them, he naturally requires to know what methods he ought to adopt, and what he ought to avoid: being required by the greatest pertinent commandment in the Law to love his neighbour as himself, and therefore to refrain from anything which injures or damages that neighbour's personality, he will confine himself to those methods of pressure which are either wholly non-coercive or are coercive in a strictly non-injurious way, forgoing altogether such injurious methods of coercion as torture, mutilation, or homicide: that is to say, he will refrain from war.<sup>67</sup>

The definition deserves a few comments. Although influenced by Tolstoy,<sup>68</sup> like so many pacifists, Cadoux rejected the anarchistic position or the accusation of non-pacifists that pacifists placed themselves outside the pale of organized society.<sup>69</sup> The pacifist was actually more responsible because though the state lost a soldier it gained a reconciler. Pacifism was not merely a theory but a way of life; indeed, pacifism was an integral part of a holistic life. The pacifist was not passive but actively concerned about and with others.

In an interesting use of words Cadoux said that he would not "undertake to defend a Christian pacifism which was purely quietistic and negative",<sup>70</sup> a statement which militates against Ceadel's interpretation that the FOR was "quietist". Finally, a holistic lifestyle required methods commensurate with it. Whatever the faults and shortcomings of the book, Cadoux' definition reflected quite accurately the views held in the FOR both in 1914 and in 1940.

### Other Contributions

In early 1940 the PPU started to issue a series of pamphlets entitled "The Bond of Peace". The first one in the series was the Roman Catholic sculptor Eric Gill's The Human Person and Society, followed by Raven's The Starting Point of Pacifism.<sup>71</sup> Two years later the PPU issued a new series entitled "The Brotherhood of Peace" to which Davies contributed Religion and the Quest for Peace, the third pamphlet in the series. The pamphlets did not contain anything new as far as the FOR was concerned, but the interesting aspect is that FOR members proclaimed the FOR understanding of pacifism for a PPU audience. The same influence was noticeable in the literature of PAX, the 'Catholic' pacifist organization founded in 1936, perhaps not surprisingly with such members as Gliddon and Orchard.<sup>72</sup> Similarly, in Into the Way of Peace, edited by archdeacon Percy Hartill for the APF, the influence is found, for example, in Chapter 9 "Pacifism and Social Reform" by the former FOR General Committee member F.E.A. Shepherd, who saw social relations "as an essential concern in the practice of Christian

Pacifism."<sup>73</sup> Obviously, the FOR was providing single-issue pacifist organizations with a much broader scope of pacifism. But while PAX and APF members contributed to the theological debate in the FOR, there is no evidence in the literature that non-Christian PPU members contributed to the FOR.<sup>74</sup>

The APF's contribution can best be seen in the discussion on the understanding of Article XXXVII of the Thirty-Nine Articles in relation to just war theory, in the philosophy of Christian pacifism, and in the more sacramental approach. On the first point Anglicans went back to the Latin text which read "justa bella".<sup>75</sup> Later English translations had deleted "lawful". Hartill felt that participation in "just" wars was not a Christian duty but that it was lawful. Even so, using the criteria for a just war, APF (and PAX) members concluded that modern war could not fulfil the criteria.<sup>76</sup> APF and PAX members thus could be pacifists and yet abide by the traditions. Their basis was quite different from that of the majority of FOR members.

Hartill contributed also to the second point, the philosophy of Christian pacifism. His starting point was not the New Testament but the Creator-God. According to Hartill, the notion of a Creator-God ruled out the ultimate dualism between matter and spirit.<sup>77</sup> Hartill's point had been inadequately dealt with in FOR literature. As Eric Gill wrote, "Man is matter and spirit, but the primacy is of the spirit."<sup>78</sup> Here was a solid basis consistent with the FOR's non-dualistic approach to construct a theory of social concern.

The third point, the sacramental approach, concentrated mainly on the unity between peoples, the common bond which war destroyed. Raven thought, or at least hoped, that pacifism could provide a basis for a form of reunion because so many different denominations were included.<sup>79</sup> One of the prime interests of the early FOR had been ecumenism and during World War II it received renewed interest.<sup>80</sup> Natalie Victor headed her chapter in Into the Way of Peace "Unity: Sacramental and Fundamental".<sup>81</sup> That sacramental aspect was the thesis of Hayman's book Worship & the Common Life.<sup>82</sup> Hayman was impressed by such Roman Catholic writers as the Thomist Jacques Maritain and the historian Christopher Dawson, and such Anglican intellectuals as A.R. Vidler, Dorothy Sayers and T.S. Eliot in their attempts at an integrated sacramental life.<sup>83</sup> He summed up his own convictions in the following words:

Only a worship which is sacramental in its intention, its expression and its proved effect can be capable of total integration with the common life of man. Only such worship can progressively embrace the whole range and diversity of that life. Only in such worship can that life attain the divine consecration and acceptance, so that 'the two shall be one, and that which is without as that which is within'.<sup>84</sup>

Although Hayman did not use here the word pacifism, the statement may be regarded as possibly the fullest on the FOR's idea of integrated pacifism.<sup>85</sup>

The statement was also directed against the trend represented by Raven who emphasized human relationships as the key to inner meaning.<sup>86</sup> Hayman's assessment of Raven was probably correct, for although the latter wrote, in Lessons of the Prince of Peace, that sacramental



religion had to start with an affirmation of the sovereignty of God, his immanentist view of God made him search for an organic society ordered in personal terms.<sup>87</sup> This search, though always evident in Raven's work, was clearest in his writings on science and religion, using especially Rom. 1:18 - 23 as the basis for his natural theology.<sup>88</sup> It was a search, for though "Creation is Incarnation and Incarnation is Sanctification...and the three are one", there was still a need for a "unifying ideal, that is a world-wide religion." Christianity could not yet fulfil this ideal because of internal divisions. Perhaps it would be even more accurate to summarize Raven's view as stating that Christianity suffered much from obscurantism of such "reactionaries" as Barthians and fundamentalists.<sup>89</sup>

Apart from the APF inspired publications, few books dealt specifically with pacifism in a narrower sense. As Raven said in 1940: "There is no Theology of Pacifism or of any other ideology. There is a Christian Theology, the interpretation of God's revelation of Himself in Christ."<sup>90</sup> He himself did not even mention pacifism in a chapter called "The Conquest of Evil" in Good News of God.<sup>91</sup> Hayman's book was an example of Christian theology and so was regional secretary for Scotland Rev. Maclachlan's The Faith of Friendship. The book's tone and direction can be gathered from an early statement that friendship is the principle upon which God's world is conducted:

Christian faith is faith of Friendship. It is belief in Friendship. It is the conviction that the world was made for Friendship and that nothing but Friendship will work in it. It is the practice of Friendship. It is the worship of Friendship, for it is the recognition of Friendship as

the supreme value and power in life and the only real sanctity.<sup>92</sup>

Although Maclachlan's views and statements could be regarded as controversial, they were not polemical. As an FOR publication it certainly ought to be read in conjunction with Alan Balding's exposition of "The Basis", discussed in the next chapter. Maclachlan's book is an example of the different theological direction and tone of the 1940s. Gone is the emphasis on personalist and atonement theories of Halliday and Wilson. New is the emphasis on sacramentalism and friendship. Instead of a condemnation of all wars, Anglican FOR members condemn only modern wars. Opponents of pacifism, such as Niebuhr and Lewis, do not seem to have realized the changes and the complexity of the FOR. Yet, in spite of the changes and reversals there were still numerous similarities with the FOR of the first world war. FOR theologians still contributed to the building up of a pacifist's faith and, as should become evident in the next chapter, to the construction of a vision.

## CHAPTER 16 - ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>FOR 456; 1/5; 12-6-1933.

<sup>2</sup>For his resignation see his "Why I leave the F.O.R.," The Christian Century, Vol. 15, Jan. 3, 1934, pp. 17 - 19. See also Barton, "FOR", pp. 145 - 159. Barton implied that Niebuhr left after J.B. Matthews, the secretary, resigned in March 1934.

<sup>3</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 8, Aug. 1939, pp. 216 - 218. In 1935 the FOR's attention was given to Temple who, like Niebuhr, espoused an interim ethics.

<sup>4</sup>See e.g. Niebuhr's article "Is Peace or Justice the Goal?," The World Tomorrow, Vol. 15 no. 10, Sept. 21, 1932, pp. 275 - 277. Niebuhr's question is an example of his dualism.

<sup>5</sup>Charles E. Raven, The Cross and the Crisis, London: F.O.R., 1940, p. 72. Raven used the "Church" as an example to prove his point. It would be quite difficult for a Christian theologian to reject Raven's example. Niebuhr, like Cadoux, did not seem to have thought about this example.

<sup>6</sup>Rizzo, "Christian", p. 196. See also Richards' review of Raven's The Lessons of the Prince of Peace in The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 3, March 1942, p. 55: "Those who are bewildered by the Barthian and Niebuhrian endorsement of war will find that the book comes as a healthy antidote."

<sup>7</sup>It may be questioned if Raven interpreted Barth properly. Barth's "hiddenness of God" was much less absolute than Raven imagined.

<sup>8</sup>George E. Edwards, Jesus and the Politics of Violence, New York: Harper and Row, 1972, p. 109.

<sup>9</sup>Reinhold Niebuhr, Why the Christian Church is not Pacifist, London: S.C.M. Press, 1940, pp. 16 - 17. This is not non-violent resistance as pacifists interpreted it.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., section V.

<sup>11</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 2 no. 8, Aug. 1940, p. 193.

<sup>12</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Oct. 1940 - March 1941. The pamphlet appeared in 1941.

<sup>13</sup>The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 9, Sept. 1942, pp. 169 - 171.

<sup>14</sup>W. Robinson, Evil Confronted, London: F.O.R., 1946. E.L. Allen, Christianity and Society, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1950. See also John Yoder's pamphlet Reinhold Niebuhr and Christian Pacifism, 1953, reprint 1961, and Rizzo, "Christian", Ch. 6.

<sup>15</sup>G.H.C. Macgregor, The Relevance of an Impossible Ideal, New York: F.O.R., 1941, Ch. 2. See also Yoder, Niebuhr, p. 13.

<sup>16</sup>Macgregor, Relevance, p. 21. See also Robinson, Evil, pp. 5 - 8; Rizzo, "Christian", p. 230, wrote about Niebuhr that he was "hesitant to stress the regenerative power of Christ in history." Moss was probably correct when he wrote that Niebuhr's view of the Holy Spirit was not wrong but inadequate. (The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 9, Sept. 1942, p. 170).

<sup>17</sup>Macgregor, Relevance, p. 21.

<sup>18</sup>Robinson, Evil, p. 3, argued that Niebuhr was familiar with a type of pacifism that "was an utopian type which held an optimistic view of human nature, denied the radical nature of sin, ignored the relativities of history, based itself on the ethics of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount, and had no deep theological roots." On p. 5 he wrote: "Both pacifist and non-pacifist must recognize the radical nature of sin."

<sup>19</sup>Allen, Christianity, pp. 29 - 30. For Macgregor's views on human depravity see Relevance, pp. 1, 16. Moss, who thought that Macgregor was weak on the "fall", pointed out that Macgregor was anxious to deny man's "permanent disability".

<sup>20</sup>Lester, Occurred, 1937: p. 278; 1938: p. 202.

<sup>21</sup>Moss accepted the idea that some saw the Kingdom only as future. Macgregor (p. 26f) thought that the "Kingdom is and is not yet." For Robinson's review of this point see pp. 8 - 10. One would expect that in the new Kingdom nonresistance would not be necessary anymore.

<sup>22</sup>Rizzo, "Christian", p. 235.

<sup>23</sup>According to Raven, Christians had to risk "passing absolute moral judgments on the methods of war." (Rizzo, "Christian", p. 241). See also Orchard, "War", p. 2: man will "eventually come to see how stupid and futile war is."

<sup>24</sup>Macgregor, Relevance, pp. 22 - 23. See also Rizzo, "Christian", pp. 246, 249. Niebuhr fell back on the choice of two evils (Rizzo, "Christian", p. 263).

<sup>25</sup>Macgregor, Relevance, p. 23, used here Raven's The Gospel and the Church (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1939, p. 222) who argued that Niebuhr and those like-minded needed to withdraw from society - a reversion of roles!

<sup>26</sup>Robinson, Evil, p. 14. See also Ruth Fry's Every Man's Affair, London: Andrew Dakers, 1941, p. 43. She used the term "sacrificial nation".

<sup>27</sup>Orchard, "War," p. 105. Internal evidence suggests that the manuscript, now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, was written before Germany's invasion of the U.S.S.R. on June 22, 1941.

<sup>28</sup>John Ferguson, the secretary of the Cambridge University Branch, invited him to speak in 1941 on his recent book. CJC Box 31; 7-3-1941.

<sup>29</sup>CJC Box 31; 29-5-1941.

<sup>30</sup>CJC Box 32; 17-1-1942.

<sup>31</sup>CJC Box 33; 16-2-1943. Bartlett spoke for the CCPG. Bartlett's hopes could be expressed in a totally different form: the FOR lacked a charismatic figure like Orchard had been in World War I.

<sup>32</sup>CJC Box 33; 5-4-1943. Fuller thought the tribunals much fairer.

<sup>33</sup>Cecil John Cadoux, The Historic Mission of Jesus, London: Lutterworth Press, 1941, Introduction and A Pilgrim's Further Progress, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1943, pp. 189 - 190.

<sup>34</sup>Cadoux, "Christianity and the Problem of War," The Journal of Religion, Vol. 21 no. 3, July 1941, pp. 233 - 242. - CJC Box 46.

<sup>35</sup>Lewis, Case, the new Garland edition of 1973 has an introduction by Carl Marzani.

<sup>36</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 2 no. 12, Dec. 1940, pp. 284 - 285.

<sup>37</sup>Cadoux, Christian, p. 32. See also pp. 107, 157 - 158, 167 - 168.

<sup>38</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 2 no. 12, Dec. 1940, p. 284. These ideas had been held in 1914.

<sup>39</sup>Carl Marzani, introduction, p. 9.

<sup>40</sup>Sir William G.S. Dobbie, A Very Present Help, London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1944, p. 31. Dobbie's conclusion was based on Jer. 51:19 - 21. If anyone needed to be accused of a literalistic interpretation it should be Dobbie. From an exegetical viewpoint, Dobbie's use of the Bible is a horror story. Dobbie, a member of the Open Brethren, was governor of Malta for about two years, 1940 - 1942. In 1947 he published Active Service with Christ which is equally honest and equally incompetent as A Very Present Help.

<sup>41</sup>Lewis, Case, Ch. 5 and pp. 26 - 28.

<sup>42</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 73.

<sup>43</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 14 and Ch. 2. Lewis had been a member of the FOR and NMWM (p. 5), so he could have known better.

<sup>44</sup>Although Lewis' accusations were invalid for the FOR, this does not mean that they were invalid for individuals. The simplistic basis for many PPU members could easily be undermined by Lewis' arguments. As the statistics in Ch. 15 indicate, Lewis convinced few if any FOR members.

<sup>45</sup>Swomley, Introduction, p. 10. Probably Artinstall's remark, quoted on p. 534, footnote 29, needs to be seen in the context of a controversy.

<sup>46</sup>Cadoux, Christian, p. ix; see also pp. 39f, 113 - 115.

<sup>47</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 222.

<sup>48</sup>*Ibid.*, see e.g. p. 217.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, p. ix; see also pp. 105 - 112.

<sup>50</sup>Cadoux, Historic, part II, Ch. 6.

<sup>51</sup>The majority in the FOR wanted the FOR to take a more non-political approach.

<sup>52</sup>See this thesis ch. 5.

<sup>53</sup>Cadoux, Christian, Ch. 6.

<sup>54</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 227; see also p. 125.

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid.*, p. ix; see also pp. 26ff, 62f. This point may be regarded as Cadoux' view on jus in bello.

<sup>56</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 10, where he also gives reasons why he does not discuss science, socialism, humanism, history and sociology.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., see p. 227.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., pp. 29 - 33.

<sup>59</sup>P.T. Forsyth, The Christian Ethic of War, London: Longmans & Green, 1916, p. 30. Forsyth called his first chapter "Killing No Murder". Forsyth could have benefitted from reading Carl von Clausewitz's book On War.

<sup>60</sup>Cadoux, Christian, p. 38.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., pp. 41, 43 - 44.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., p. 227.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., p. 48.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., pp. 48, 49, 50.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., pp. 60 - 61, Chs. 4 and 5. As stated on p. 103, these tests should be taken cumulatively.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., pp. 65 - 66.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>69</sup>See e.g. Temple, Niebuhr, Lewis.

<sup>70</sup>Cadoux, Christian, p. 163.

<sup>71</sup>For a discussion of the series, which included Wilfred Wellock's Money Has Destroyed Your Peace and John Middleton Murry's The Brotherhood of Peace, see Bennett, "Testament", pp. 140 - 147. Her exposition of the pamphlets is quite accurate but she is wrong in saying that Raven's pacifism was "richly steeped in the theology of the Sermon on the Mount" (p. 145). For Gill (1882 - 1940) see Donald Attwater, A Cell of Good Living, London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1969 or Walter Shewring, ed., Letters of Eric Gill, London: Jonathan Cape, 1947.

<sup>72</sup>PAX' first three chairmen were E.I. Watkin, D. Attwater and Eric Gill. The organization was open to all as is evident from the 1943 Governing Council which included Gliddon, George MacLeod, John Middleton Murry, Orchard, Max Walker. For a short review of its history see Scarf, Catholic, Introduction. The book contains a number of short essays.

<sup>73</sup>Percy Hartill, ed. Into the Way of Peace, London: James Clark, 1941, p. 155. Archdeacon Hartill was a member of the FOR General

Committee in 1941 - 1943; F.E.A. Shepherd was a General Committee member between 1929 and 1934.

<sup>74</sup>The difference may be due to the different constituencies and tasks of the two bodies.

<sup>75</sup>See e.g. Hartill, ed., Into, Ch. 3 by D.D.A. Lockhart, or Hartill's article Article XXXVII and War, London: APF, n.d. (SCPC; CDG-B Box 64 no. 1339).

<sup>76</sup>Hartill's argument seems to anticipate much of the modern debate on what constitutes a just war. Orchard's unpublished manuscript "War and the Will of God" contains a most intriguing attempt to prove that no war is just. The 1983 U.S.A. Pastoral Letter on War and Peace, The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response, NCCB/USCC, could have benefited from Orchard's manuscript.

<sup>77</sup>Hartill, ed., Into, Ch. 4.

<sup>78</sup>Eric Gill, The Human Person and Society, London: P.P.U., 1940, p. 10. See also Hayman, Worship, pp. 1 - 3.

<sup>79</sup>In Hartill, ed., Into, Ch. 8.

<sup>80</sup>See e.g. Gilbert S. Shaw, in Hartill, ed., Peace on Earth, London: James Clarke, 1944, Ch. 8. It is not clear if the 1937 Oxford Conference had any influence on this renewed interest.

<sup>81</sup>In Hartill, ed., Into, Ch. 5.

<sup>82</sup>At the time of publication, 1944, Hayman was an "Anglican Friend". A letter to Archbishop Temple by Rev. Gilbert Shaw, dated Sept. 17, 1943, suggested that Hayman "be confirmed and to become a regular communicant" while remaining a Friend. See Temple Papers, Vol. 41. Temple had no objections (21-9-1943). Hayman's wife Mary was Anglican. Later Hayman gave up his membership in the Society of Friends.

<sup>83</sup>Hayman, Worship, pp. 89 - 90.

<sup>84</sup>Ibid., p. 88. See also pp. 9 and 151. The quote is from the Second Epistle of Clement §12. According to J.B. Lightfoot's introduction to the epistle, in The Apostolic Fathers, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956, 1974, reprinted from 1891 edition), p. 43, the author is unknown. For Hayman's discussion on integration see his Ch. 7.

<sup>85</sup>The word pacifism was not really necessary. As Raven wrote in The Cross and Crisis, p. 9, there was no theology of pacifism.



<sup>86</sup>Hayman, Worship, pp. 13 - 14, 145. For Raven see especially Gospel.

<sup>87</sup>Raven, Lessons, p. 9; Cross, p. 74; Starting, p. 21. Raven set himself off against political-economic terminology - see Starting, p. 19. See also The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 15, March 1943, p. 56. J.W. Ashley Smith pointed out that Raven was shocked at C.S. Lewis' notion that "salvation is wholly from outside." He found Raven naive in believing that salvation comes from within.

<sup>88</sup>See e.g. Science, Religion and the Future, Cambridge: University Press, 1943, p. 96.

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., pp. 82, 118; Good News of God, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943, pp. 6, 30, 34. Raven was very upset by C.S. Lewis' Broadcast Talks. (p. 65) See also Science, p. 22. Raven seemed to miss Lewis' point.

<sup>90</sup>Raven, Cross, p. 9. The book contained the address of the 1940 Summer Conference.

<sup>91</sup>Raven, Good, ch. 6.

<sup>92</sup>Lewis Maclachlan, The Faith of Friendship, London: F.O.R., 1942, p. 12. Friendship was both an end and a means (p. 22).

## CHAPTER 17

### THE FOR'S PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGNS

Although pacifists had difficulties in propagating their views during the war, they certainly were not silenced. For example, the Marquis of Tavistock, who became the Duke of Bedford in 1942, made strident speeches in the Lords, especially against Lord Vansittart, the embodiment of Germanophobia.<sup>1</sup> Tavistock was possibly also the most prolific pamphlet writer.<sup>2</sup> The opportunity to propagate pacifist ideas differentiated Britain from the totalitarian regimes it was fighting. The FOR made use of this freedom in two ways: external and internal propaganda. During the first few years of the war the propaganda was directed to those outside pacifist circles. Much of this propaganda was theological. After 1942 the "Campaign Towards a Christian Peace" was essentially directed at FOR members. The Campaign was possibly a reaction to Allied war aims and post-war reconstruction principles, while at the same time it re-emphasized pacifism in all spheres of life.

#### The Literature Sub-Committee and External Propaganda

Minute 353(c) of the FOR Executive Committee of January 20, 1938, initiated the Literature Sub-Committee in order to "consider literature requirements, subject matter for future pamphlets and details of cost, and to present definite recommendations to Executive Committee from time to time."<sup>3</sup> The first meeting of the new committee was held on

February 21, 1938, attended by E. Hayman, A. Balding, B. Brown, I. Goss, L. Stevenson, L. Artingstall, R. Wood, M. Eyres and P. Gliddon. The committee was not responsible for Reconciliation or The Christian Pacifist, but it sometimes made suggestions such as the series "How I came to the pacifist position", which featured among others H. Roser, a past French IFOR general secretary, and Siegmund-Schultze. The committee invited several people to write on particular topics. William Robinson, the principal of Overdale College, was asked to trace the growth of pacifism in the O.T.

Robinson's pamphlet, Pacifism in the Old Testament and Afterwards, drew heavily on his 1933 book Christianity is Pacifism.<sup>4</sup> At almost the same time J.R. Coates published his book War--What Does the Bible Say?, perhaps the first book by an FOR member trying to analyze more thoroughly the O.T. material. Coates used such chapter headings as "The Wars of God", "War as Duty", "War as Problem", "War as Judgment" and "War Against War".<sup>5</sup> In contrast, Robinson's treatment was more old-fashioned as is apparent from the closing words in the first section: "If we are to understand the message of the Old Testament, we must frankly face the fact that many documents within it present us with a conception of the character of God which is far below the level of the Christian conception, and this we will proceed to do."<sup>6</sup> Robinson adhered to the dualism between word and action, for according to him revelation was "founded entirely upon facts, i.e. upon concrete historical events--something done rather than something said."<sup>7</sup> With these presuppositions Robinson viewed the O.T. and never came close to

Coates' treatment. Ultimately Robinson was not so concerned with the O.T. as well with the N.T. and the present.

In his survey Robinson made two statements which both show his closeness to and divergence from Raven and early FOR authors. Discussing the problem of compromise, he argued, like Carl Heath, that compromise of itself was not evil and that even Jesus made compromises. Early FOR writers had always seen any compromise as wrong, but Robinson distinguished between compromise "of inevitability which is involved in historicity itself" and compromise "of deliberate moral failure". Early FOR authors had not made this distinction, although they generally wrote against compromise of the second type. This type was based on standards and here Robinson differed from Raven and early FOR authors. In the life of the church, according to Robinson, there was "always the possibility of both a relative and an absolute Christian Ethic (both being Christian)." The Christian ethic, however, was "neither absolutist nor relative but eschatological. It therefore stands for neither revolution nor for gradualness."<sup>8</sup> Robinson thus undermined the basic concept of both the "Christian Revolution Series" and Raven's evolutionary approach. Nevertheless, he concurred with Raven that if pacifists were wise, they "will not regard themselves as perfectionists, but will take up their pacifist stand because they believe that the 'ripe time' has come for the vicious circle to be broken."<sup>9</sup> Thus Robinson's pamphlet clearly indicated that the older liberal theology was still very much alive in the FOR and yet had changed quite considerably. At the same time the pamphlet showed that there were

various options within the more modern liberalism and that Raven should not be regarded as the only liberal FOR spokesman.

Various pamphlets came out before the decision was made, in 1942, to produce a series, called "New Series", to reach non-FOR members.<sup>10</sup> Several pamphlets were reprints including J. Stevenson's A Disarmed Church in an Armed World, H.C.R. Heywood's Christian Pacifism and E.L. Yates, A Christian Attitude Towards Air-Raid Precautions. D. Soper's Thy Will Be Done was the text for a broadcast.<sup>11</sup> That so relatively few new pamphlets were produced shows a failure of the FOR to come to grips with the new circumstances. The pamphlets were restatements of the past. This trend was set by the first two pamphlets in the New Series, Its Basis and Its Aim and Its Work. The first pamphlet looked much like the one issued in 1915, although it contained some revisions. The most notable change was that "no literalistic theories of non-resistance, no prohibitions of the use of force, no mere negations, can of themselves cure our social diseases or eradicate war, nothing but the positive overcoming of evil with good."<sup>12</sup> The statement incorporated something of the development in FOR thought since 1915. The second pamphlet looked at some of the FOR's history and its organization. Both pamphlets were the result of a revision made in 1938 and introduced in Reconciliation by Hayman in an article called "Pacifism is not Enough".<sup>13</sup> Hayman expressed the hope that the article would be the start of a series "designed to rediscover for this generation of members the extraordinary depth and insight of the foundation statement." The New Series only partially fulfilled his

hope. Rather, the best expression of the FOR's "depth and insight" came in 1943 with vice-chairman Alan Balding's "Studies in the Nature of Christian Discipleship", No Other Foundation.<sup>14</sup> Before discussing this important book some of the pamphlets deserve attention because they brought out the FOR's scope of vision and direction of thinking.

Two pamphlets in the series were characterized by a mystical tendency, namely Evelyn Underhill's A Meditation of Peace and Soper's Thy Will Be Done. Underhill looked at Paul's lists of the fruit of the Spirit, remarking that "Joy, the spirit of selfless delight, and Peace, the spirit of tranquil acceptance, are the first fruits of the Eternal Charity." Peace, according to Underhill, could not grow apart from love and joy: "An embittered pacifist is like a poisoned chalice."<sup>15</sup> Soper argued that trouble started when human methods of achieving peace were equated with God's, for in that way the Kingdom of God could not come.<sup>16</sup> The two pamphlets represented a significant stream in the FOR, as is evident from The Christian Pacifist which carried, like News Sheet had done, a section on prayers.<sup>17</sup> The Cambridge branch secretary was asked "to explore possibilities of holding some kind of regular devotional meetings",<sup>18</sup> while Doris Nicholls mentioned in a London Union Executive Committee meeting that there was a need of deepening devotional life.<sup>19</sup> Balding's book was generally close to this mystical tradition which was usually non-polemical.

The non-mystical pamphlets were somewhat more concerned with the war and a future peace settlement. In this respect they link up with the "Campaign Towards a Christian Peace". BPF chairman Rev. Ingli James

started his undated pamphlet The Justice of the Kingdom by arguing that Christ did not come "to satisfy the claims of justice...but to amend our conception of justice", meaning that the justice of the Kingdom was personal and moral, rather than legal and moralistic. James stands here clearly in the early FOR tradition of the Kingdom of God, rejecting at the same time William Temple's position. James ended his pamphlet with a look towards the future:

We shall hear much in the next few months of Leagues and Pacts, and plans for the resettlement of Europe. If they are designed as the League of Nations largely was, to establish what is called security rather than to effect reconciliation, they will fail and our children will pay a bitter price for our failure.<sup>20</sup>

Ethel Comber thought that whatever the outcome of war, life would be considerably more regimented in the planned state she expected to emerge.<sup>21</sup> Hayman argued that Christianity as merely a program was "irrelevant to the world men are now making", because "Europe has set up its own gods." This meant that Christ was "irrelevant to all those things we really desire." In return, the ways and outlook of modern man, living in an unreal world, were irrelevant to Christ.<sup>22</sup> Such blunt speech was quite novel in FOR writing.

Hayman raised essentially two problems--one was the relevancy of the FOR's message to the world and the other was the relevancy of a Christian to Christ. Throughout its existence the FOR had tried to deal with both problems. Early FOR leaders had been relatively optimistic that they could soon usher in the Kingdom of God. Perhaps the growing influence of the "Nonconformist conscience" and the excitement created by the New Theology before World War I had caused these early leaders to

ignore the actual decline in formal religious commitment among the population as a whole. Thus the awareness of the significant secularization of society did not appear in FOR literature until the second half of the 1930s. But it was really Hayman who drew the consequences of the new observation. He now questioned the adequacy of the FOR's attempts at relevance. According to Comber, the relevancy was found in sharing in the redemptive work of Christ which consequently gave Christians a task in the community.<sup>23</sup> The Congregationalist minister Alan Knott, who during World War I had been an editor of News Sheet, argued that Jesus' message was related to concrete situations yet contained a message of universal application.<sup>24</sup> Yet these answers do not satisfy Hayman's charge. The problem may be explained through Stephen Hobhouse's 1941 pamphlet Christ and our Enemies. Hobhouse posited that Jesus manifested two new ideals, namely love for enemies and forgiveness while yet sinners.<sup>25</sup> However, many people were apparently not interested in loving enemies or did not see themselves as sinners. For them the uniqueness of Jesus was therefore completely irrelevant. In other words, the FOR authors had accepted a basic assumption and from these had tried to show that their position was reasonable and logical. Their books, pamphlets and articles made sense only in a Christian environment.<sup>26</sup> Hayman's charge was directed against the basic assumption and perhaps his charge may be formulated in two ways: "How relevant is the Christian message to those who have not accepted the basic assumption?" and "How can those unconverted be brought to conversion?". Both questions were not really answered or



dealt with in FOR literature except on the general premise that Christianity is a reasonable religion. For the overwhelming number of non-churchgoers the FOR's message was thus irrelevant. Conversely, the FOR, without the apparent knowledge of the members, had become an example of the marginalization process of religion.

One final pamphlet should be mentioned here. Harold A. Moody's Christianity and Race Relations, published probably in mid-1943, was the last one in the New Series and in subject matter quite different. Hobhouse, Andrews, Lester and Harrison had kept India constantly in the FOR light, but really nothing had been written on race relations. Moody, a negro himself, attempted to show that the "Herrenvolk mentality" of the Germans was not foreign to the British. In his indictment he remarked that "at one time she [Europe] took the Africans away from their lands, now she takes their land away from the Africans and all to achieve the one dominating end of European policy--selfish aggrandisement."<sup>27</sup> The pamphlet was the start of a greater FOR concern about apartheid in South Africa, noticeable immediately in the "Campaign Towards a Christian Peace" which included John Mellor's Black and White in South Africa and Moody's The Colour Bar.<sup>28</sup>

FOR vice-chairman Rev. Alan Balding's No Other Foundation (1943) could be regarded as a bridge between the external and the internal campaigns. The book is not only an exposition of "The Basis"--the five points are discussed in five chapters--but also a summary of much of what had been written. Although Balding frequently illustrated his points with reference to the present circumstances, the book should be

regarded as crucial to the understanding of the FOR for the period described in this thesis. Since the book in so many ways is a summary of what has already been discussed, only a few items will be highlighted to indicate in Hayman's words "the extraordinary depth and insight of the foundation statement" (see p. 557).

The book appropriately starts with the Kingdom of God which only can come through Love that is at once discriminating and indiscriminate, a Love that comprehends and transcends justice while setting limitless value upon the individual.<sup>29</sup> Hence a society based on justice, in spite of its being one of man's noblest conceptions, "must of necessity impose limitations on the individual for the sake of the common good." This could lead to conflicts of rights and duties. Love, anchored in Jesus, called for self-imposed restrictions which made service to society possible.<sup>30</sup> Unfortunately, many allowed war to "masquerade as the minister of justice." This was an "unpardonable sentimentality", for "to identify justice with the way of war is to take the apparently practical but really ineffectual way of dealing with evil." Nevertheless, Balding thought that skepticism about the allied war aims (see next section) was an unjust attitude because the evil as presented by the Nazis was greater than that perpetuated by, for example, the English in India.<sup>31</sup> As Cadoux had said, it was necessary to recognize wickedness and condemn it as it deserved, otherwise the FOR paralyzed in practice its power of moral assessment.<sup>32</sup>

Although Balding argued that the state had no rights in itself, he did not deny that for an ordered society a government which had some

power to enforce obedience was necessary.<sup>33</sup> The quality of such government was shown in the usage of the power to secure justice for minorities. Often it was difficult to achieve justice between individuals and between nations. Balding could imagine that this was impossible: "to ask for a world-order based on justice is to ask for the impossible." From this perspective he thought it a great advance if national armies could be replaced by an international police force. But even this hope he thought illusory. With many opponents of pacifism he accepted that "nations cannot order their relationships in love for the sufficient reason that nations cannot have relationships of any sort." The relationship was between people who had a choice between "recurrent barbarism and a Christian world-order", that is, between continual war and the Christian way of love. Noteworthy is Balding's denial of three two-choice options. He rejected Lansbury's suggestion that the option was between socialism and capitalism. Nor was the choice, as some in the AFOR had thought, between communism and fascism. The third option he rejected was that of the theologians of interim ethics who argued that the choice was between the present conflict of nations and ideal justice.<sup>34</sup> Richards probably said it best when he wrote that the choice was between two faiths, not between faith and no faith.<sup>35</sup>

By granting some rights to power for a government Balding realized that a citizen should only withhold services sparingly and reluctantly. Services could only be withheld when the essence of witness was impeded, for the absolute and unconditional loyalty was to do the will of God, whatever the cost.<sup>36</sup> And the essence was that in

Christ's life and death God had shown a better way than war.<sup>37</sup> This better way was the Christian evangel which proclaimed the Kingdom of God and God's offer of personal and social salvation.<sup>38</sup>

Although the book was an exposition of "The Basis", Balding disagreed with it on one point. He admitted that he had "never been quite happy about the opening words of the Basis leaflet: 'The Fellowship of Reconciliation is composed of man and women of the various Churches, and of others not connected with any Church...'." According to Balding, the detachment was "an interim and an unsatisfying state."<sup>39</sup> From the statistics it is clear that Balding was not fully representative of the FOR in this regard. This is also apparent in his greater sympathy for the Athanasian Creed which contained words of "abiding relevance", and in his attitude towards Jesus' miracles which he interpreted as a challenge to action.<sup>40</sup> With the possible exception of Balding's disagreement on one point, the book can hardly be regarded as polemic. The book's irenic approach contrasts markedly with the "Christian Revolution Series", yet many of the same topics are mentioned. Such topics as the state or war aims and future peace were, however, more fully discussed in pamphlets printed for the "Campaign Towards a Christian Peace".

#### Campaign Towards a Christian Peace

On August 14, 1941, a joint declaration, signed at sea by Roosevelt and Churchill, was officially issued. This declaration, known as the Atlantic Charter, contained eight points expressing the

principles on which a post-war society could be based. The Charter was incorporated in the Declaration of the United Nations which was signed by twenty-six states on January 1, 1942. The Declaration stated the war aims of the Allied powers. Between August 21 and October 7, 1944, U.S., British, Chinese and Soviet representatives discussed proposals for a post-war security organization at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C. At the Yalta Conference, February 4 - 11, 1945, these proposals were refined and became the basis for negotiations in San Francisco. There the U.N. charter was drawn up on April 25, 1945, signed on June 26 and put into force on October 24, 1945. In between these political conferences there were conferences on, for example, refugee relief (UNRRA), and food and agriculture (FAO).<sup>41</sup> Whatever the shortcomings of these conferences, they contained, according to the FOR, rays of hope for a reasonably just peace. In contrast, the Casablanca Conference of January 1943 between Roosevelt and Churchill resulted in a call for "unconditional surrender". Since its inception in 1914, the FOR had strongly opposed such a demand because it was antithetical to the construction of a Christian peace. Although the "Campaign Towards a Christian Peace" pamphlets did not specifically mention Casablanca, they implied a total rejection of a condition which was regarded as detrimental to the future cooperation among the peoples. It is against the background of these political and non-political conferences that the FOR's campaign must be placed.

Although Artingstall specifically mentioned the idea of a campaign at a General Committee meeting of December 1942, general "peace

proposals" had been made since the start of the war. Tavistock published his "Peace Proposals" in The Christian Pacifist of November 1939, calling for new territorial arrangements, political freedom and economic justice.<sup>42</sup> In March 1940 the magazine published Macgregor's five foundation principles for "A Christian Peace": repentance, equality, sacrifice (of the old order), service and cooperation, and reconciliation.<sup>43</sup> In the same year the Friends Peace Committee published Charles Roden Buxton's pamphlet The Case for an Early Peace.<sup>44</sup> In October 1940 Corder Catchpool naively suggested to George Davies that he approach the aged Lloyd George who was "perhaps the only one who could meet Hitler in the endeavour to reach an agreed settlement."<sup>45</sup> Probably in the same year the APF published Peace Now--At What Price?, a pamphlet by W. Mauleverer and Margaret V. Travers giving different answers to the question.<sup>46</sup> APF members also wrote Peace on Earth, edited by Percy Hartill. Although not published until 1944, the chapters were written in 1942. Some of the chapter headings give a good idea of the direction Christian pacifist thinkers took: "The Necessary Conditions of Peace" by canon T.B. Scrutton (Ch. 5), "Post-War Society" by R.H. Le Messurier (Ch. 6), "The Pacifist Contribution to Post-War Society" by Fred Pinder (Ch. 7), and "The Church's Conception of Victory" by Ethel Comber (Ch. 10).<sup>47</sup> Thus before the campaign idea was even mentioned, FOR members had considered the basis for a possible peace.

When Artingstall mentioned the campaign idea in December 1942 he envisioned a committee looking into the meaning of a Christian peace as

applied to the world situation.<sup>48</sup> Three months later commissions had been struck to look at cultural, political and economic approaches.<sup>49</sup> Possibly these commissions were a follow-up to Can the Fellowship Outline a New World Order?, an undated pamphlet researched by a group of members and published (in 1942?) as a basis for discussion.<sup>50</sup> The pamphlet stated unequivocally that the FOR was committed to finding a social policy.<sup>51</sup> It attempted to show how Christian principles related to such societal aspects as religion, economics, politics and government, home life, education and recreation.<sup>52</sup> Save for the language, the pamphlet could have been written during World War I.

After the campaign had been adopted the commissions produced four introductory statements formulating Christian principles for treaties.<sup>53</sup> E.L. Allen, a Presbyterian theology professor at Durham University, produced Cultural (no. 1), Carl Heath, since 1932 chairman of the India Conciliation Group, Political (no. 2), W.H. Marwick, a leading Quaker and an extramural lecturer at the University of Edinburgh, Economic (no. 3), and Glyn Lloyd Phelps, general secretary of the Christian Auxiliary Movement, Christianity and the State (no. 4). The first three introductory pamphlets were probably printed in December 1943.<sup>54</sup> A few pamphlets were added, all of them probably pre-dating the Campaign. Some members of the General Committee regarded Marwick's pamphlet as not entirely in keeping with FOR principles!<sup>55</sup> With the publication of the pamphlets the membership finally got involved, at a time when several crucial political and non-political conferences leading to the founding of the U.N. had already been held.

The method adopted was that of cell groups in which these basic statements could be studied. It was hoped that prior to the meetings the members would "acquaint themselves with some of the necessary literature as a background."<sup>56</sup> According to the London Union, the Campaign had a "big influence on the planning of both central and group activities." For example, in May 1944, Vera Brittain, a leading PPU spokeswoman and Alex Wood, chairman of the PPU and vice-chairman of the FOR, spoke on the subject "Germany, what is the Solution?" at a public meeting. A month later, at the time of the Normandy invasion, two German pastors, Willi Oelsner and Richard Ullmann, spoke on "Inside Germany Now". In July, Henry Carter and Dr. Evgheny Lampert, a Russian living in Britain, spoke on "Russia and the Future". While 400 people attended the first meeting, "flying bomb raids caused a big drop in the attendance at the other meetings,...[to] 100 and 80 respectively."<sup>57</sup>

Apart from these public meetings the members made "valiant efforts...to tackle the pamphlets." Admittedly, many groups found this task difficult and only a minority finished the course. Some groups also studied the historian E.H. Carr's book Conditions of Peace (1942), for which the FOR produced a special booklet with questions.<sup>58</sup> The Cambridge FOR preferred the NPC's "Campaign for a Constructive Peace" which had a wider appeal and included non-pacifists as well.<sup>59</sup> On the other hand, Martin Tupper, the APF general secretary, urged APF members to participate in the campaign for he could not think of a "more vital work in which we can engage, and the success of the Campaign will very largely depend on the degree of preparedness and co-operation which is



shown by all those who desire a true peace."<sup>60</sup> Since the FOR thought the campaign so vital, it spent much of its energy during 1943-45 on this drive.

The first stage ended in June 1944 when supposedly the members had studied the campaign literature. On June 3 the General Council adopted a Campaign Declaration which introduced the second stage: the presentation to the churches and the public at large.<sup>61</sup> The declaration consisted of three parts. The "credimus" announced the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man through Jesus whose way of life and death called people to be peacemakers. The declaration stated that lasting peace would only be possible in accepting the "credimus" which implied disarmament and renunciation of power politics. The third section consisted of eight points of which only a few points coincided with what became the U.N. Charter: 1) Peace should not be based on retribution and punishment but on common needs. 2) National sovereignty should be subordinated to a new world society. 3) All nations should work towards total disarmament. 4) Freedom of religion, speech and assembly should be assured. 5) Imperialism and racism should be ended within a specified time. 6) Natural resources should be shared. 7) People should be encouraged of the sense of vocation and reject regulations which frustrate such vocation, especially conscription. 8) There should be recognition of the right to work.<sup>62</sup> The FOR put the emphasis on Christian service. Hence its critical reaction to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference in November. Although thankful for the reassertion of the principle of world government, the conference

proposals on the whole contained "some very grave defects", because the emphasis was put on military preparedness to prevent war.<sup>63</sup>

The reasons for the second stage were best summarized by the London Union. Firstly, it was essential to create, chiefly in the churches, an informed Christian public opinion and counteract eisegesis such as general Dobbie's. Secondly, something had to be done to create the kind of atmosphere necessary for the making of a lasting peace. Finally, the second stage emphasized the understanding of the implications of "The Basis" regarding world-wide affairs.<sup>64</sup> Tupper listed various ways in which the Declaration could be made known to churches and public. The easiest way was through informal discussions with friends. A more formal way was speaking to such church organizations as Mothers' Unions, Youth Fellowships, Men's Societies or Sunday Schools. Another way was through speaking to non-church organizations such as the Rotary Club, Guilds, secondary schools, or the YMCA. Finally, one could cooperate with groups having similar concerns, such as Friends, PPU and LNU.<sup>65</sup> Where this reach-out was attempted, which was not always possible due to V-1 and V-2 bombardments, members felt that the work "on the whole had been justified by what has been achieved", for the results had been "most encouraging".<sup>66</sup>

There was something like a third stage in the Campaign. Towards the close of the war a new committee was formed to continue the campaign. However, the emphasis shifted from the international situation to local conditions and recovery. The new campaign was an attempt to discover what actions needed to be taken--politically,

financially, economically--to meet human needs.<sup>67</sup> The new campaign was probably a reaction to the help needed in the relief of famine and distress in Europe.<sup>68</sup> This stage resembled closely the FOR's post-1918 reconstruction.

As has been stated, the Campaign was a form of propaganda for which several pamphlets were printed. Some exposition of their contents is necessary to show that the world and life view first presented at the 1914 Cambridge Conference was still very evident. Characteristically, the pamphlet prefaces stated that the pamphlets represented the personal views of the selected authors rather than the views of the FOR as a whole. Moreover, the pamphlets were regarded as study material for the members and not intended for general distribution. They were thus internal education pieces rather than external propaganda material.

The first Campaign pamphlet was E.L. Allen's Cultural, published probably in December 1943. Allen first surveyed the contemporary situation, selecting three characteristics, namely the disintegration of social and private life, the loss of absolute standards, and the rise of the masses to power.<sup>69</sup> Over against these three Allen placed some Christian principles such as the stewardship of man, the wholeness of communal and individual life, the unity of body and soul, and the purpose of God.<sup>70</sup> He realized that the characteristics and principles were often at variance. In order to bring them into closer harmony Christians were called "not merely to tell the world what should be done, but to show it actually done" in marriage, the family, education, art, science and the church.<sup>71</sup> To achieve such harmony careful planning

was necessary. Allen quoted Karl Mannheim's phrase "planning for freedom".<sup>72</sup> Richards used the phrase as title for his 1943 Swarthmore Lecture, combining the nineteenth century emphasis on liberty with the twentieth century stress on planning. In his lecture Richards made the point that liberal socialism was the only type of socialism "consistent with the Christian ideal of freedom to obey the will of God."<sup>73</sup> Richards' statement could be regarded as the political form of Allen's words that "we must seek rather the closest possible approximation to the Christian view of the free person finding fulness of life in co-operation with other free persons in a society governed by God's will."<sup>74</sup>

Allen's pamphlet set the stage for Carl Heath's Political. In the first section Heath made three points. Firstly, all Christian thinking starts with God who is the "central reality of Man's social and communal life." Secondly, politics and political organization are directly related to the Fatherhood of God. Thirdly, the state is the servant of the community,<sup>75</sup> a point developed further in Phelps' pamphlet Christianity and the State. In the second section Heath looked at seven conditions in the world which made peace, if achieved, at the utmost only partially Christian. If a Christian peace were to be achieved these seven issues had to be faced realistically. Heath's first point was similar to Hayman's critical remark: only a part of the world accepted some degree of Christian ethics. Heath drove home this point even further when he stated that the vast majority of people in the West was drifting away from current Christianity.<sup>76</sup> Conversely,

there was a reversion to an "earlier heathen integration." Furthermore, the barbarisms of war had generated calls for vengeance and retribution, while some of the results of war could be observed in the huge number of uprooted people and in starvation. Finally, the existing economy was fundamentally at variance with Christianity, a point worked out further by Marwick.<sup>77</sup> So far these conditions had not been faced realistically and hence the campaign organizers realized that it was going to be a long and arduous journey "Towards A Christian Peace".

In the third section Heath drew the consequences of the two previous sections: "The lines of a Christian Peace have then to be sought in the double setting of the political duty of the City of God in the world, and of the barbaric collapse of the City of Man."<sup>78</sup> Heath saw the collapse world-wide and on this collapsed society a new order could be constructed with central unity and federalism as key features.<sup>79</sup> The result would be "a common society under God."<sup>80</sup> His ideas entailed that there could be no ostracism as practised in the post-World War I period. There could be no absolute national sovereignties. There would be a common world economics, disarmament and consequently the outlawry of war, as well as racial equality and religious freedom.<sup>81</sup> Contrary to Allen and Richards, Heath thought that the seven conditions made planning very difficult. Hence, his emphasis on bringing about Christian peace was on spirit. As he said in a long sentence in the closing paragraph:

In the Christian faith we grow aware of the fact that no peace can be possessed of lasting and creative qualities unless it be one that so attracts men's spirits by its beauty and truth, its fairness and its caring qualities,

its justice to and equality amongst human beings, that it becomes something men appreciate the deep values of, and are prepared to live and die for, as they are for God, for religion, for the country, for their kith and kin.<sup>82</sup>

Like the two previous pamphlets, Marwick's Economics was also divided into three sections. In the first section he propounded the Christian principles; in the second one he analysed the present situation and in the third one he proposed the Christian solution. Marwick's first section presented six principles relating Christianity to society. According to Marwick, Christianity was not indifferent to the nature of the economic order. It was actually radically opposed to the existing social order. Thus the struggle for existence through competition and conflict could not be accepted as the basis of society. Admitting that man was a mixture of self-interest and self-sacrifice meant consequently that man was not inevitably dominated by material forces. Furthermore, Christianity rejected facile secular optimism as well as existential despair. In his sixth principle Marwick argued that the mere practice of personal values and moral exhortation would not bring about a better society.<sup>83</sup> Perhaps this principle raised questions for some Council members because it undermined the FOR's basis. But there were more remarks which must have made members uncomfortable.<sup>84</sup> For example, Marwick had some critical "sympathy with the economic ideals of Communism." He was relatively negative about the "post-war reconstruction of the Left." Sir William Beveridge's report on Social Insurance and Allied Services (1942) constituted the key to the coalition government's plans of post-war reconstruction. It was to be the blue-print of the new welfare state. Its popularity was not

completely shared in FOR circles. Marwick, who otherwise does not appear to have played a prominent role in the FOR, exemplified one segment of the Fellowship when he stated that the Beveridge Plan did not satisfy the ideals of Christian pacifism. Thus he could only give lukewarm support to the plan.<sup>85</sup> Moreover, Marwick thought that Christian pacifists could not belong wholeheartedly to any existing political party.<sup>86</sup> Each of these four remarks could easily have upset a segment of the FOR. In his analysis Marwick made three other observations. As a variation on a Norman Angell theme, Marwick stated that war was "economically a gross form of luxury expenditure."<sup>87</sup> Furthermore, Britain's economy was caught in a downward spiral and the British had become "economic losers". Finally, Marwick thought that the potential resources of the world were inadequate to support a high standard of living for a greatly increasing population.

In the third section Marwick tried to apply the principles of the first section. He realized from the outset that the "one idea panacea" was untenable and needed to be replaced by multiformity.<sup>88</sup> In addition, elaborate schemes could be inappropriate because they tended to be imposed by a centralized authority rather than "working from the bottom upwards".<sup>89</sup> Like the late Victorian socialist visionary William Morris and unlike most FOR members, Marwick seemed to have had a great sympathy for the Middle Ages and the Arts and Crafts movements. Moreover, he thought that the principles implied a "functional" organization,<sup>90</sup> serving recognized common interests. Furthermore, Marwick regarded the debate between private enterprise and state

ownership as somewhat outmoded, for in practice the state was already deeply involved in the economic enterprise.<sup>91</sup> Like many FOR authors, he saw land as "the basis of all economic activities", and with them he rejected "autarkic self-sufficiency" as an un-Christian ideal.<sup>92</sup> Finally, he was enamored by planning yet realized that, applied by a "huge impersonal modern state", planning could create serious problems.<sup>93</sup> Marwick's pamphlet seems to be an act of tightrope walking as he probably realized, for there was an "acute internal strife among economists as to the nature and scope of Economic Science."<sup>94</sup> The pamphlet certainly gave the members something to think about. Few, if any, FOR pamphlets were so controversial.

Apparently only three introductory pamphlets were planned. For reasons as yet unknown, a fourth introductory statement, Phelps' Christianity and the State, was added to the set of three. Its format differed from the other three: it was not divided into three sections nor did it contain study questions. Rather, the pamphlet conforms to the rest of the series. As will be argued shortly, Phelps' essay was probably written a year or so before the other three. Phelps distinguished four types of view on the state: 1) the state is of the "world"; 2) the anarchist view; 3) the state as a social contract; 4) the state is a necessity for the proper organization of society. Phelps rejected the first three and by doing so he rejected the Mennonite, Tolstoyan and Rousseauite views of the state.<sup>95</sup> The fourth view Phelps qualified as a tension between "the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:1) and "we must obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29).<sup>96</sup> This



tension was not to be seen as competitive but as complementary.<sup>97</sup> When the harmonious tension was disrupted both sides suffered. Since the state belonged essentially to this fallen world it could never be more than sub-Christian, yet the state, in partnership with the church, had as task to make "the good life possible for its citizens."<sup>98</sup> The partnership could never mean that the church could use the power of the state to enforce its own spiritual authority. The partnership did mean that the spheres of the two kingdoms were not as sharply divided as Lutheran theology suggested. Yet, the values, purposes and methods differed though interacted. The example Phelps gave is worth mentioning because it avoided the one-sidedness frequently found in articles on love or justice: "The justice of the State needs the continual fertilising of the Church's teaching about Love...[while] the Love preached by the Church often needs the moral stiffening of Justice."<sup>99</sup> This interaction is also noticeable in the conscientious objector who "brings the injunctions of the State to the bar of the individual conscience, checked by the teaching of the New Testament."<sup>100</sup> In other words, the partnership and interaction set limits both to the authority of the state and to the freedoms of the individual. For Phelps these limits meant the rejection of the fascist, totalitarian and the exploitative capitalist state.<sup>101</sup> Ultimately Phelps opted for a Tawneyan kind of socialism, realizing and warning that the structure of some so-called socialist state could have great similarities with that of a fascist state, a warning not all FOR members may have appreciated.<sup>102</sup>

Several other pamphlets were added to the four introductory statements. Four of these additions used to form a series called "Essays in Social and Economic Reconstruction". Artingstall's Economics and the Christian was the first one in the series and was probably published in 1942. The third essay was Richards' Social Control and Personal Freedom which in wording resembles at several points his 1943 Swarthmore Lecture and may have been preparatory to it. K.G. Robinson's Report on Social Policy, the fourth pamphlet, was published in 1943. The second essay was Phelps' Christianity and the State which became the fourth introductory essay in "Towards a Christian Peace". It seems therefore likely that Phelps' essay was written around 1942 - 1943. Since these pamphlets became part of the Campaign a few remarks are here in place.

Robinson's essay was essentially an expanded version of Can the Fellowship Outline a New World Order?, which, as has been suggested, may have been the starting point of the Campaign. Consequently, what Robinson wrote was further enlarged in the pamphlets discussed above. Similarly, Artingstall's essay covered much the same ground as Marwick's though there was a much stronger emphasis on biblical ethical principles. Like Marwick, Artingstall rejected the materialist idea that man was primarily an economic being. Furthermore, he preferred a socialist state which incorporated a Soviet-like "Central Planning", even though he found "no encouragement in the use of power made by our present bureaucrats!" Again like Marwick he stated that there was no ideal economic system.<sup>103</sup> This may explain why it is difficult to form

a precise picture of the FOR's post-war reconstruction. Some FOR leaders admired the central planning of the U.S.S.R., but rejected the communist ideology. They advocated some kind of socialism, but warned against a stifling bureaucracy. Most objected to the existing capitalist system, yet the FOR had accepted dividends since its early days. Such seemingly contradictory views often cohered from the perspective of the Kingdom of God.

One final remark of Artingstall's paper deserves attention because it shed light on the lukewarm reception of Ingli James' pacifist party and on the reason why the FOR as a group was not directly politically involved:

Imagine, if it is possible, an organisation like the F.o.R., or the P.P.U., finding themselves with a majority in the House of Commons and therefore having to carry on the Government of the country. In order to carry it on they simply could not at once disband the armed forces, however much they might wish to do. They would have to bring in reforms, gradually, and that involves compromise, or else provoke a bloody revolution, which, just because they were pacifists, they could not do.<sup>104</sup>

Artingstall's statement is probably the most succinct observation of the pacifist's political dilemma. Richards' essay intersected with Artingstall's, Marwick's, Heath's and Allen's. He was the most critical of the Soviet system, seeing it as an example of a doctrinaire scheme of economic reconstruction. As far as Richards was concerned, mechanical socialism was just as ruthless as capitalism.<sup>105</sup>

Even though these four pamphlets have been dealt with in a very summary fashion, it is clear that the range was wide and that the views did not always coincide. Exegesis of biblical texts was rarely

presented, although Phelps, L.W. Grensted in Justice and Alan G. Knott in The Christian and the State made some good attempts at it. The scope, the contradictions, the absence of good exegesis make it understandable why many FOR members found the campaign material difficult. The material required of the readers great interest and a good intelligence. At the same time, all the pamphlets in the campaign indicated that the FOR, as thirty years before, was essentially concerned with a new, Christian world-order, which, if achieved, would have peace as concomitant. The FOR had come full circle, though the wording, many of the details and even some of the theological-philosophical positions had changed. What is striking in the pamphlets is the absence of a discussion as to how the present war could be stopped and immediate peace be proclaimed. Instead of such a discussion the pamphlets dealt with the things that make for ultimate peace in the long run. Peace would only come when the right cultural, political and economic components had been put into place.<sup>106</sup> The necessary changes could only be implemented in a right Christian order. However, this new order was not equated with the Kingdom of God as earlier FOR members tended to do, but was viewed as a milestone towards it.<sup>107</sup>

The contents of the pamphlets would suggest that those in the FOR who thought that the Fellowship's program "was no mere addendum to their pacifism but...part of its very essence" were behind the campaign, rather than those who saw the Fellowship's essential task as "fostering...a real brotherhood of consecrated men and women."<sup>108</sup> Ceadel implied that the majority of the FOR was "quietist",<sup>109</sup> but his

conclusion is based on a misunderstanding of the FOR's interpretation of the nature of the relationship between politics and pacifism.<sup>110</sup> Even the only "quietist" Ceadel mentioned by name, George Davies, had been an M.P.! The more mystical interpreters of pacifism<sup>111</sup> saw their primary task in fellowship but were not averse to political involvement.<sup>112</sup> Ceadel's interpretation contrasts starkly with K. G. Robinson's advocacy in his Report on Social Policy that members should be active in party politics, even though he realized that no party was remotely equivalent to what the FOR stood for.<sup>113</sup>

One other observation needs to be made in connection with the propaganda campaigns. The books and pamphlets either tried to show or assumed that war was unacceptable to Christians. By condemning war before it had even started the FOR did not need to give much attention to the jus in bello. War activities and atrocities, such as the fire bombing of Dresden in February 1945, only confirmed the evil nature of war. Here the FOR members differed from those who adhered to a just war theory. The latter did not only have to apply criteria to decide on the justice in going to war (jus ad bellum), but also had to apply the criteria on the individual events within the war (jus in bello). This led them to advocate the humanization of war.<sup>114</sup> FOR members thought that the nature of war was such that it could not be humanized. War events were, as it were, incidentals which, as the FOR had already said to Herbert Gray in March 1915, were not the general principles with which FOR members were concerned. Consequently, the campaign pamphlets dealt with these basic general principles. In spite of the numerous

changes and variations documented in this thesis, the campaigns were  
Cambridge 1914 revisited.

## CHAPTER 17 - ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Vansittart (1881 - 1957) had been principal private secretary to the foreign secretaries and prime ministers before becoming permanent undersecretary at the foreign office in 1930. He held this post till 1938 when Chamberlain railroaded him to the office of chief diplomatic adviser. He was raised to the peerage in 1941. For his anti-German views see his The Black Record: German Past and Present, London: H. Hamilton, 1941.

<sup>2</sup>His topics ranged from the explanation how Lord Halifax in effect killed his peace proposals in Jan. 1940 to his running feud with financiers who were held largely responsible for the war. The PPU has a large number of these pamphlets, including those of his speeches.

<sup>3</sup>FOR 456; 3/6; 20-1-1938 and 4/4; 21-2-1938.

<sup>4</sup>W. Robinson, Christianity is Pacifism, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1933. The pamphlet is undated and was re-issued in the "New Series" as no. 7. Since Robinson acknowledged the use of another article dated July 1939, it is likely that the pamphlet came out late 1939 or possibly early 1940.

<sup>5</sup>J.R. Coates, War--What Does the Bible Say?, London: Sheldon Press, 1940.

<sup>6</sup>Robinson, Pacifism in the Old Testament and Afterwards, New Series no. 7, n.d., p. 7.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 10. See also p. 11 on Jesus: "What He does becomes of more importance than what He says." See also pp. 13 and 24.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 25.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 27.

<sup>10</sup>FOR 456; 4/4; 24-3-1942.

<sup>11</sup>Stevenson's article was published in 1935; New Series no. 3. Heywood's pamphlet came from Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 7, July 1937, pp. 172 - 176; New Series no. 4. Yates' article was published in 1938; New Series no. 5. Soper's pamphlet is undated but was probably produced in 1939; New Series no. 9. Most of the New Series pamphlets can be found in SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2.

<sup>12</sup>Its Basis, New Series no. 1, n.d., p. 2.

<sup>13</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 16 no. 3, March 1938, pp. 76 - 78.

<sup>14</sup>Alan Balding, No Other Foundation, London: F.O.R., 1943.

<sup>15</sup>Evelyn Underhill, A Meditation of Peace, New Series no. 8, n.d., pp. 1 - 2. See also The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 11, Nov. 1939, p. 289. Underhill was born in 1875 and married Hubert Stuart Moore in 1907. She continued to write under her maiden name. She published a large volume on Mysticism and was influenced by Baron Friedrich von Hügel, who influenced other FOR members as well. She died in 1941.

<sup>16</sup>Soper, Thy Will Be Done, New Series no. 9, n.d., p. 2. See also Eric Hayman, Christ and Tomorrow, New Series no. 13, n.d., p. 1.

<sup>17</sup>See e.g. The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 22, Oct. 1943, p. 197.

<sup>18</sup>Cambridge FOR minutes, 18-3-1943.

<sup>19</sup>London Union minutes, 29-9-1944. See also M. Lester, Let your Soul catch up with your Body, 1942 and When We Call, 1945, a devotional series. SCPC; CDG-B, Box 2, file 5.

<sup>20</sup>Ingli James, The Justice of the Kingdom, New Series no. 12, n.d., [1939/40?], p. 4.

<sup>21</sup>Ethel Comber, The Church in the World of Tomorrow, New Series no. 16, n.d., p. 3.

<sup>22</sup>Hayman, Christ, pp. 2 - 3. The marginalization of Christianity is at the heart of Alan D. Gilbert's book, The Making of Post-Christian Britain, London: Longman, 1980.

<sup>23</sup>Comber, Church, p. 6.

<sup>24</sup>Alan G. Knott, The Times of Jesus Christ, New Series no. 15, 1941, especially p. 13.

<sup>25</sup>Stephen Hobhouse, Christ and our Enemies, New Series no. 14, 1941, p. 2.

<sup>26</sup>One may recall here that on Oct. 6, 1942, the PPU and the FOR held a conference at Jordans at which the special task of the FOR was regarded to be to convert the churches. See ch. 13, p. 422. See also ch. 16, Cadoux, p. 540.

<sup>27</sup>Harold A. Moody, Christianity and Race Relations, New Series no. 20, n.d. [1943?], p. 9. The pamphlet was probably published between



Feb. 1943 and Sept. 1943. Moody was the founder and president of the League of Coloured Peoples. The pamphlet was co-published with the League.

<sup>28</sup>See also The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 9, Oct. 1942. The U.S. army in Britain maintained its colour bar. This led to the sharpening of racism in the U.K.; see The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 15, March 1943, p. 45. The AFOR had been involved in the racial issue for many years. More than likely the FOR pamphlets were a reaction to the discrimination in the American army.

<sup>29</sup>Balding, No, Ch. 1. For a book review see The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 9, July 1943, pp. 139 - 140. For similar ideas see Heywood, Christian Pacifism, New Series no. 4, point 5; Reconciliation, Vol. 15 no. 7, July 1937, p. 173 III and IV; Leyton Richards, The Christian Foundation of Peace, New Series no. 6, 1938, p. 7.

<sup>30</sup>See Richards, Foundation, Ch. 6, p. 31: the price of peace is not self-assertion but self-abnegation. See also Heywood, Christian, p. 5, point 4.

<sup>31</sup>Balding, No, Ch. 1, p. 16. See also Hobhouse, Christ, p. 1. The authors speak of Nazis not of Germans. See also The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 33, Sept. 1944, p. 417, for this distinction. The condemnation thus falls on an ideology and not upon a nation.

<sup>32</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 10, Oct. 1939, p. 257.

<sup>33</sup>Balding still maintained that the real basis for an ordered society was found in cooperation, not in force. Balding's argument is an attempt to come to grips with an actual society. See also Richards, Foundation, p. 7.

<sup>34</sup>Balding, No, Ch. 2, especially pp. 33 - 35.

<sup>35</sup>Richards, Foundation, p. 6. See also his Christ's Choice of a Battlefield, New Series no. 11 (Radio Broadcast, Feb. 11, 1940), p. 4. For the context of this pamphlet see Bennett, "Testament", pp. 207 - 208.

<sup>36</sup>See also Heywood, Christian, point 6.

<sup>37</sup>Balding, No, Ch. 3.

<sup>38</sup>*Ibid.*, Ch. 4.

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 53.

<sup>40</sup>*Ibid.*, Ch. 5, especially pp. 80 - 83.

<sup>41</sup>Already in 1945 Henry Carter reviewed the various conferences for the National Peace Council in a book called Towards World Recovery. Its subtitle suggests that the book was written before the U.N. charter was drawn up: "Plans and Proposals for International Functional Co-operation". Baldwin, No, p. 16, wrote in 1942 that "scepticism about War Aims ill-becomes us." For the diplomacy involved, see Herbert Feis, Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957; Robert Dallek, The Roosevelt diplomacy and World War II, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.

<sup>42</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 1 no. 11, Nov. 1939, p. 291. Tavistock still had an imperialistic mentality: he thought the demand for the return of the former German colonies reasonable. See also his The Fate of a Peace Effort, 1940, which describes what happened to the proposal.

<sup>43</sup>The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 2 no. 3, March 1940, pp. 77 - 78.

<sup>44</sup>The pamphlet was really a political feasibility argument.

<sup>45</sup>GD 659; 3-10-1940. Was Catchpool perhaps thinking about Davies' role in the Irish situation? At any rate, Lloyd George had no political clout in 1940.

<sup>46</sup>The pamphlet is undated. See also Phelps "Against Negotiations Now," The Christian Pacifist, Vol. 3 no. 4, Apr. 1941, pp. 67 - 68.

<sup>47</sup>Hartill, ed. Peace.

<sup>48</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 21-12-1942.

<sup>49</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 23-3-1943. See also The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 22, Oct. 1943, p. 201.

<sup>50</sup>The group's convenor was K.G. Robinson who published a pamphlet in the series.

<sup>51</sup>In the 1951 revised edition the first sentence reads: "The Fellowship is clearly committed to finding and declaring a social policy." (p. 5).

<sup>52</sup>Sections A, B, and C.

<sup>53</sup>See The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 20, Aug. 1943, p. 161. The Council Meeting was probably held on May 20. There are no minutes for the Council after 1937. Artingstall may have destroyed them in 1945.

<sup>54</sup>For a discussion on the inclusion of the fourth pamphlet see p. 578. The printing may have been delayed due to paper shortage. At the same time Davies tried to get his "Politics of Grace" published by the FOR, but Maclachlan wrote him that there was no paper to print it and suggested publishing the manuscript somewhere else. GD 680: 5-10-1943; for Politics of Grace: GD 253 - 255.

<sup>55</sup>FOR 456; 1/6; 16-6-1943. Perhaps this was not the published version which was accepted until the end of September. But see my remarks on p. 576.

<sup>56</sup>The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 22, Oct. 1943, p. 201.

<sup>57</sup>London Union Annual Report, Feb. 1944 - Jan. 1945, p. 2. The Report states nothing about the contents of the speeches.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., p. 5. That the intelligence of many FOR members was less than the leadership imagined becomes also clear from a discussion on The Christian Pacifist which was by some regarded as a "high brow" magazine for a special clientele. See FOR 456; 4/3; 15-4-1943.

<sup>59</sup>Cambridge FOR minutes; 13-9-1944. Alex Wood was Cambridge FOR chairman.

<sup>60</sup>APF Monthly Letter no. 10, March 1944.

<sup>61</sup>The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 31, July 1944, p. 383. The London Union was obviously ahead of the second stage when it planned its public meetings.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid. See also Annual Report, 1944 - 1945, pp. 14 - 15.

<sup>63</sup>The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 35, Nov. 1944, pp. 449 - 450.

<sup>64</sup>London Union Minutes, 26-1-1945.

<sup>65</sup>APF Monthly News Letter no. 10, March 1944.

<sup>66</sup>London Union Annual Report, 1944 - 1945, p. 6, London Union Archives: Report East London (South).

<sup>67</sup>See The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 44, Aug. 1945, p. 649; London Union Minutes 27-4-1945: The Report of Group Officers Conference and the New Campaign Policy.

<sup>68</sup>Some groups had already responded to appeals; see London Union Report 1944 - 1945, p. 6. Although the FOR's Campaign was unique, there were close connections with similar activities and ideas.

<sup>69</sup>E.L. Allen, Cultural, London: F.O.R., n.d. [1943?], pp. 3 - 4.

<sup>70</sup>Allen was a Presbyterian minister and undoubtedly thought of the Westminster Confession when he chose the notion of "glory".

<sup>71</sup>Allen, Cultural, pp. 6, 9 - 15.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 7. Karl Mannheim published his significant book on social control and social change, Man in Society in an Age of Reconstruction, in 1940.

<sup>73</sup>Leyton Richards, Planning for Freedom, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1943, p. 53. The Swarthmore Lectureship was established by the Woodbrooke Extension Committee in 1907. The first lecturer was Rufus M. Jones in 1908. Richards' lecture was given on Aug. 5, 1943. Since 1939 Richards was at Woodbrooke but he did not become a Quaker until 1946. In his lecture he made no reference to Mannheim.

<sup>74</sup>Allen, Cultural, p. 7.

<sup>75</sup>Carl Heath, Political, London: F.O.R., n.d. [1943?], pp. 3 - 5.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 6 where he quotes the Christian News Letter of Feb. 10, 1943: "the Christian mind has not yet adjusted itself to the startling fact that 90 percent of our people have drifted away from organised religion." Cf. Gilbert, Making.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., pp. 6 - 8.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>79</sup>Heath had long advocated federalism.

<sup>80</sup>Heath, Political, p. 9.

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., pp. 9 - 16.

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., p. 16.

<sup>83</sup>W.H. Marwick, Economic, London: F.O.R., n.d. [1943?], pp. 3 - 5.

<sup>84</sup>See footnote 56.

<sup>85</sup>There was not much discussion on the Beveridge Plan in FOR literature. Phelps liked it. He actually lauded it as a one-man's report which did not suffer from committee compromises. The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 13, Jan. 1943, pp. 6 - 7. Charles Stimson was much more critical in "Beveridge Report or Kingdom of God?," The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 16, Apr. 1943, pp. 73 - 74. According to

Stimson, the Plan raised the question "whether this method of slowly attiring ourselves in state-tailored garments of very relative social righteousness, and scanty decency, is at all appropriate to the Christian or in the least calculated to hasten the Kingdom of God." See also Davies, Essays, Ch. 5. For Beveridge see Jos. Harris, William Beveridge, Oxford: University Press, 1977; Paul Addison, The Road to 1945, London: Cape, 1975.

<sup>86</sup>Marwick, Economic, pp. 6 - 7.

<sup>87</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>88</sup>Ibid., pp. 9 and 11. Marwick acknowledged borrowing the word multiformity from the Webbs.

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., p. 9. His borrowing from the Webbs was obviously limited.

<sup>90</sup>Marwick borrowed and followed here R.M. Maciver, Elements of Social Science, London: Methuen, 1921.

<sup>91</sup>Marwick, Economic, p. 10.

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., pp. 12 and 14.

<sup>93</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>94</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>95</sup>The Tolstoyan view was still quite popular among pacifists. There were few English Mennonites.

<sup>96</sup>Glyn Lloyd Phelps, Christianity and the State, London: F.O.R., n.d. [1942?], p. 5.

<sup>97</sup>Ibid., see p. 9: "Their ideal relationship to each other is best described in the words harmony and tension not unison and separation."

<sup>98</sup>Ibid., p. 7. Theologically it can be argued that the state belongs to the creational order and is not a consequence of the fall.

<sup>99</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>100</sup>Ibid., p. 11. Phelps, like Cadoux, argued that the individual conscience alone was not sufficient.

<sup>101</sup>Ibid., pp. 13 - 18.

<sup>102</sup>See also Can the Fellowship Outline a New World Order?, p. 8, which rejected rigid state controls. Phelps' kind of socialism could also be described as a "socialism of concern".

<sup>103</sup>Leslie Artingstall, Economics and the Christian, London: F.O.R., n.d. [1942], pp. 8 - 15.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

<sup>105</sup>Leyton Richards, Social Control and Personal Freedom, London: F.O.R., n.d. [1943?], especially pp. 4 and 14.

<sup>106</sup>See for example Can the Fellowship Outline a New World Order?, p. 3, which stated that one could not concentrate on the war issue only.

<sup>107</sup>The notion of the Kingdom was not ignored, see e.g. Can the Fellowship, p. 5: "We place first the necessity of proclaiming the Gospel of the Kingdom..."

<sup>108</sup>Ibid., p. 3 - 4. In this pamphlet it is very apparent that these two broad streams existed in the FOR.

<sup>109</sup>Ceadel, Pacifism, p. 286.

<sup>110</sup>See e.g. Evelyn Underhill's Postscript in Hartill, ed., Into, p. 191: "The pacifist who stoops to controversy is by that very act setting up a new centre of conflict."

<sup>111</sup>The term "mystical" is more precise than "quietist".

<sup>112</sup>Methodologically FOR members could be regarded quietists, but Lansbury, Sorensen, Salter or Cecil Wilson showed that there were very important exceptions to this "rule".

<sup>113</sup>K.G. Robinson, Report on Social Policy, p. 20. See also Frank R. Hancock, The Sixth Day, London: James Clarke, 1942, p. 107: "Before we Christians can organize our lives on the basis of the Sermon on the Mount, we must capture the government under which we must live." And p. 113: "As governments alone can outlaw war, and equitably distribute the natural resources of the nation, the Christian community, as such, must take an active and commanding place in political life."

<sup>114</sup>Vera Brittain thought that war could be, had been and should be humanized. See her "Should We Humanise War?," The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 31, July 1944, pp. 372 - 377. The article is one of the few in FOR literature which dealt with the jus in bello.

## EPILOGUE

During the war the focus of attention for the FOR had been almost exclusively on Europe. Very little attention had been given to the conflict in the Japanese theater. After Germany's surrender on 8 May 1945, The Christian Pacifist exclaimed that "at last it [peace] has come!"<sup>1</sup> The exclamation was both naive and preposterous for the peace which the FOR called peace had not been ushered in. The initial euphoria gave way to horror at the news of the dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August. The editor of The Christian Pacifist stated that war was now "exposed in its naked and barbarous shame." The appalling nuclear events, nevertheless, gave the editor some hope:

The conscience of the whole world has been stricken by the news of the atomic bomb and its unimaginable possibilities of destruction. Though we have often been warned that there is no horror short of which modern war can stop, the new weapon may well give the Churches cause to revise their judgment of war as an instrument of justice.<sup>2</sup>

Events since suggest that this fervent hope of the FOR has not been fulfilled. The rise of liberation theology, especially but not exclusively in the so-called Third World, indicates that generally the churches' views on pacifism have not changed very much. The laudable concern for the poor has led many liberation theologians to condone violence if it contributed to the liberation of the politically, economically and socially oppressed. As a recent Pastoral of Roman

Catholic bishops in the United States makes clear, the largest church in Christendom still adheres to the just war theory. The Pastoral did not even make a firm statement on a limited nuclear war.<sup>3</sup>

The year 1945 was not the "annus mirabilis" that Ruth Fry hoped it would be, nor was it a "tabula rasa" as she thought it was.<sup>4</sup> In spite of the fact that much FOR literature made reference to the newly unleashed atomic powers, the churches scarcely deplored war more than before and people carried on in much the same way as before. August 6 was the day of the bomb on Hiroshima as well of the Feast of Transfiguration, but the bomb did not substantially transfigure the thinking of human beings. Despite the lamentable persistence of violence, many FOR members continued through their writings to advocate means for a better world. A few instances should suffice. In 1945 George MacLeod published We Shall Re-Build, a discussion of the work of the Iona Community, a clear reminder of the various communities in the earlier FOR history.<sup>5</sup> In 1946 W. Robinson published his pamphlet Evil Confronted, dealing with Niebuhr's attack on pacifism.<sup>6</sup> In the same year George Davies published his Essays Towards Peace, a collection of essays dating from 1915 to 1945. The last essay was "The End of Political Man" in which Davies asked if pacifists had adequately confronted the issue of evangelical politics. His own answer, though perhaps somewhat harsh, summed up the negligible achievement for the previous thirty years: "It is singular that while adolescent pacifists still play at big boy's political meccano, the pundits of politics, like Professor Laski and G.D.H. Cole, are warning us against mere map-reading



and the megalomania of mass movements in politics."<sup>7</sup> In 1947 Herbert Gray published The Secret of Inward Peace which reiterated much of earlier liberal theology such as "God is not the fiend implied by Calvin's theology", "God is not the God of some of the earlier parts of the Old Testament" or "God is revealed through all beauty, all truth and all goodness."<sup>8</sup> A year later Leyton Richards' Christian Pacifism After Two World Wars, was published. He acknowledged that Hitlerism and total war had rendered some earlier expositions redundant. Yet the inclusion of some earlier material is indicative of the fact that the FOR's basic ideas were not abandoned.<sup>9</sup> So one could go on with MacLachlan's Defeat Triumphant of 1949, Raven's 1950 lecture series the Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism or George MacLeod's 1954 lectures, Only One Way Left. Generally speaking the emphasis was on theology. Even the articles in The Christian Pacifist became more theological, evoking at least one complaint from a reader.<sup>10</sup>

Many of the changes were rather superficial or harked back to an earlier period. For many years there had been dissatisfaction with the name of the magazine and in January 1947 the old name Reconciliation was adopted again.<sup>11</sup> A year later John Mellor, who had been a regional secretary, reported that the FOR was numerically barely holding its own. Although there had been 13700 members and sympathizers at the end of the war, the branches were collapsing.<sup>12</sup> One is immediately reminded of the situation after World War I. Another parallel may be found in the change of personnel. Artingstall's seven years appointment had expired in 1943 but it was renewed for another two years till January 31,

1946.<sup>13</sup> He was replaced by Hampden Horne and Doris Nicholls as joint secretaries on July 1, 1945.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, Raven had let it be known for quite some time that he wanted to retire as chairman. In order not to lose his services completely the new, largely honorific, office of president was created. Alan Balding, who had already done much of Raven's work, became chairman, while Lewis MacLachlan, Alex Wood and Garth Macgregor became vice-chairmen.<sup>15</sup> Although this change of personnel involved more people than in 1918 it was probably not as serious a dislocation. All the administrative people of 1945 had been involved for a number of years and their new functions differed only marginally from their old. Unlike 1918-19 there was no such burning issue as the question of possible discontinuation of the Fellowship. Nevertheless, the tasks at hand were not so dissimilar. Such parallelism is perhaps best indicated by two issues of The Christian Pacifist. Early in 1945 one issue dealt specifically with the World Church, a reminder of the ecumenical aspect of the FOR. Later in the year another issue was devoted to India, an FOR concern which first emerged during World War I but which only rose to prominence in the 1920s. The worldwide scope of the FOR was thus not something of the past. Yet it seems fair to say that the range of involvement was narrower than in the 1920s. There were other organizations through which one could work to achieve social or political ends. To mention only one example, the Methodist Church had a Temperance and Social Welfare Department, of which Henry Carter had been general secretary. The FOR tried to provide a basis on which its members or other

organizations could build. During the war this was evident in the "Campaign Towards a Christian Peace" which was continued for some time after the war in a slightly new format. In 1952 a new series was started which addressed the broad scope of the FOR. Raven delivered the first address, a memorial lecture on the man who gave his name to the series, Alex Wood. To mention some aspects of his career is to indicate the scope of the series. Wood, a Presbyterian, had been a Fellow and tutor at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. He had been a pupil of Lord Kelvin, doing research in the physics of sound. In 1925 he joined the Labour Party and became an alderman on the Cambridge Borough Council and the chairman of its housing committee. During World War II he had been chairman of the PPU, vice-chairman of the FOR and the National Peace Council, and chairman of the local Cambridge FOR branch. Throughout his career he was active in Bible classes and did Red Cross work. Like so many FOR members he was a teetotaler, a reflection of nineteenth century Nonconformist conscience and philanthropic values.<sup>16</sup> Although it would be incorrect to call Wood the standard FOR member, it would not be unfair to regard him as a typical member whose activities show what the FOR meant by a world and life view.

But if this period sketched so far is one of continuity and of many familiar problems, the deaths of so many early prominent members spoke of a break with that past. In 1945 Richard Roberts, Alfred Salter and Cecil Wilson all died. Others soon followed: in 1947 Cadoux, in 1948 Leyton Richards, in 1949 George Davies and Oliver Dryer, in 1950 Alex Wood and Carl Heath, in 1951 Henry Carter, in 1952 Leslie Artingstall,

Corder Catchpool, Marian Ellis, and Fred Pope, and in 1953 the Duke of Bedford. The latter's accidental death brought about the closing of an FOR chapter, for his heir called up the lease of 38 Gordon Street with the result that the FOR had to move. For a number of years they stayed at 29 Great James Street where now the London Union has a tiny office, while the headquarters are now in New Malden, Surrey. The change in office clearly reflected the decline in FOR membership. The decline, similar to that of the 1920s, should be seen in the perspective described by Alan D. Gilbert in The Making of Post-Christian Britain. Christians, according to Gilbert, had become, like the seventeenth century Quakers, a "peculiar people", whose values placed them outside the mainstream of social life and culture. They were members of a society in which "to be irreligious is to be normal, where to think and act in secular terms is to be conventional, where neither status nor respectability depends upon the practice or profession of religious faith."<sup>17</sup> The FOR shared in the attenuation of Christianity as a moral force in British society. Admittedly, the FOR had shared in this process since its birth in 1914. However, World War II accelerated the marginalization process. Thus the FOR's Christian message was irrelevant to the vast majority of people. The surprise is, therefore, not that the FOR membership declined, but that the FOR has managed to survive at all.

## EPILOGUE - FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup>The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 42, June 1945, p. 593.
- <sup>2</sup>The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 45, Sept. 1945, p. 653.
- <sup>3</sup>The Challenge of Peace, May 1983.
- <sup>4</sup>A. Ruth Fry, Annus Mirabilis, pamphlet 1945, p. 5.
- <sup>5</sup>George MacLeod, We Shall Re-Build, Glasgow: The Iona Community, n.d. [1945].
- <sup>6</sup>Robinson, Evil.
- <sup>7</sup>Davies, Essays, p. 135.
- <sup>8</sup>A. Herbert Gray, The Secret of Inward Peace, London: S.C.M. Press, 1947, pp. 14, 17, 19.
- <sup>9</sup>Richards, Christian.
- <sup>10</sup>The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 59, Oct. 1946, p. 953. See also FOR 456; 4/3; 15-4-1943 for the complaint of "high brow".
- <sup>11</sup>The requests for a name change started at least in early 1945 and probably earlier. See FOR 456; 1/7; 25-9-1945. Late 1945 the General Committee decided to change the name; FOR 456; 1/5; 18-10-1945.
- <sup>12</sup>Reconciliation, Vol. 25 no. 2, Feb. 1948. For the numbers, see The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 42, June 1945, p. 607.
- <sup>13</sup>FOR 456; 3/6; 18-2-1943; see also Annual Report, 1944 - 1945, p. 4.
- <sup>14</sup>FOR 456; 1/7; 20-3-1945. Horne had been regional secretary of the Midlands, while Nicholls had been assistant to Artingstall. For the reasons of having two secretaries, see Annual Report, 1944 - 1945, p. 4. They were also liaison with ecumenical-missionary circles. They took over piecemeal.
- <sup>15</sup>456; 1/7; 19-6-1945. Maclachlan took Balding's place as vice-chairman.
- <sup>16</sup>Charles E. Raven, Alex Wood, London: F.O.R., 1952.
- <sup>17</sup>Gilbert, Making, p. IX.

## CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis two main topics have been addressed: namely, the history of the FOR as an organization and the development of the FOR's theological-philosophical framework. Secondary literature has given scant attention to the first issue and nearly totally ignored the second. Yet, it is the theological-philosophical framework which provides the key to the FOR as an organization. Like the biblical prophets, leading FOR members formulated a vision of a new world in which people would be obedient to God's word. This vision, the Kingdom of God, could be regarded as a holistic world and life view of which pacifism was an integral part. Hence, peace was much more than the absence of war. As the 1945 - 1946 Annual Report of the London Union stated, the past year had "brought a Peace that is but a mockery of the name."<sup>1</sup> Rather, peace should be, according to Executive Committee member canon Grensted, a state in which people's energies could find "full and free expression in some service of a positive ideal."<sup>2</sup> The absence of war was essentially only a portion, albeit a major part, in a program. As so many early FOR authors stated, war was an obstacle to the inauguration of the Kingdom of God on earth. It was with the nature and the coming of the Kingdom that the first "generation" of FOR members in particular was concerned. Thus, the Fellowship did not just address issues and problems related to war but those of life as a whole. Therefore, FOR authors wrote on the role of the state and government, on

the nature of justice, on controversies over rehabilitation and capital punishment, on the need for better education, on just relationships between employer and employee, on a possible transformation of the economic and political systems, on the value of the family, on the place of science and technology in society, on the propriety of vegetarianism and the horror of vivisection, on the function of the church and on the meaning and future of the society as a whole. The justification for such a broad approach was found in the understanding of religion. For the FOR, man was a religious being whose religion infused all aspects of life. Hence, there could be no separation between the sacred and the secular, and it would be best to speak about ways and things for or against God, for or against the Kingdom. Every aspect of life could either contribute or hinder the inauguration of the Kingdom. War was regarded as one, albeit an extremely serious, obstacle to its inauguration.

That the complexity of the FOR's pacifism was misunderstood in the secondary literature may be illustrated by an example from Ceadel. His relatively short chapter "After the Great War" says very little about the FOR. Admittedly, Ceadel was concerned with the pacifist movement as a whole, and thus was bound by different limitations than this thesis. Moreover, Ceadel's definition of pacifism further delimited the scope. But the 1920s provided an excellent opportunity for Ceadel to test whether his definition did justice to the FOR, for it was precisely in this period that the FOR made several interesting attempts to implement some of its ideas. One may be reminded of the

Riverside and Grange experiments, of the FOR school, of Davies' intermediary role, or of the work done with the unemployed both before and after the General Strike. Admittedly, there were those like Walter Ayles who wanted a more active involvement in dealing with society's ills and a much stronger anti-war propaganda. However, their methodology was often not in accordance with the FOR's basic aim. If there had been more money the FOR might have been more involved, but the Fellowship was unwilling to condone tactics at variance with the desired ends. Individual members could and did participate in a more confrontational approach. The divergence of views on the involvement in strikes clearly indicates that the FOR was not a uniform body, but rather a conglomeration of individuals who agreed on some and differed on other points. The divergence also indicates the tension between the Fellowship and the individual. The FOR incorporated many opposing views but the Fellowship never adequately resolved its theological understanding of a fellowship vis à vis its members. Again, this diversity within the FOR has been overlooked in the secondary literature.

During the 1920s, however, a slow change took place. By the end of the decade there was much less discussion of the Kingdom of God, and with the "Christ and Peace Campaign" of 1929-1931 the FOR came to see its function more as an "Order", though it never became one. As the discussions with the PPU made clear, the FOR saw its primary calling to the churches even though a large number of members apparently did not belong to a denomination. These discussions could be regarded as



consultations leading to a division of labour between the PPU and the FOR. The result contributed to the persistent claim that the FOR was a quietist pacifist organization. Indeed, the FOR tried to avoid confrontation as a method and certainly did not witness aggressively to those outside the churches. In that sense only was the FOR quietist. And undoubtedly most members in the 1930s perceived themselves as pacifists rather than visionaries. It was this perception which has entered the secondary literature. Yet, even during the 1930s the vision was not completely ignored. Quietism for an FOR member did not mean a withdrawal from the world as it had meant for so many Mennonites. It was precisely because the FOR was so concerned about the world and attempted to be involved in it that the Fellowship called for a revolutionary change. The word revolution may be unfortunate because of its connotation with violence, but there can be no doubt that the implementation of the FOR's views would have transformed society radically. Many early FOR members were convinced that if they worked hard enough they could usher in the Kingdom. Their optimistic view of such a possibility was based on an inadequate view of the reality of sin - a weakness most leading FOR theologians gradually came to recognize. This recognition did not mean renouncing all attempts to change the world. Rather it meant a refining of approach. More precisely, the new realization inexorably led to the conviction that if the world was going to be changed the first change had to occur in the churches.

In order to bring the change about, the FOR used different approaches to explain its message. During the 1930s the variety of

explanations became most apparent. Older views were abandoned, refined or contradicted. Not all views were adequately researched. The influx of Anglicans created a new category within the FOR, the "just war absolutists". They did not reject all war as unacceptable, but argued that with modern weaponry no just war could occur. According to Ceadel's nomenclature they would be pacificists, at least in theory, while in practice they would be pacifists. In general, the FOR from its inception combined pacificist and pacifist views and the two were usually inseparable. This combination helps to explain why the FOR was often willing to cooperate with such different organizations as the NCF and the LNU. Similarly, the combination helps to understand why the FOR could incorporate such nineteenth century fundamental peace shibboleths as a call for arbitration, a desire to implement arbitration treaties, a suggestion to create an international authority or tribunal or congress, an attempt at codification of international law, and a call for disarmament.<sup>3</sup> In other words, the FOR's creed was a mixture of old and new views. However, during the second world war, when the FOR gradually moved back to its earlier world and life view, the question was raised as to whether the FOR's message was relevant to the majority of the British. Members had been aware of the marginalization process of organized religion, but probably because they did not view the FOR as a form of organized religion, they had rarely applied this observation to the FOR. While the FOR's theological changes can be viewed as part of the development of religious ideas in Britain, their vicissitudes also give insight into the secularization of intellectual thought.

Methodologically and theologically the FOR strongly resembled the Society of Friends. Though there need be no doubt about the important role the Friends played both in the formation and in the further organization of the FOR, it would be a serious mistake to regard the FOR as a Quaker-dominated body. At the first meeting of the steering committee on January 13, 1915, only three out of the nine members were Friends. Much of the impetus came from Presbyterians and Congregationalists and later from Anglicans, Methodists and Baptists as well. That the Friends were not dominant may also be gathered from "The Basis" which reflected Free Church theology. It is more accurate to say that the FOR stood in the tradition of the "Nonconformist conscience" which in the late Victorian period had shown a remarkable influence. This influence, according to D. W. Bebbington, had waned by 1910.<sup>4</sup> As this thesis has suggested, the FOR attempted to extend the influence. Furthermore, the FOR, as an interdenominational organization, often functioned as a forum for discussion. Many of the ideas discussed by the FOR influenced the Society of Friends and other pacifist organizations such as the NCF and PPU, and even non-pacifist organizations. The present second literature has not given much attention to the FOR's influence on other organizations. Yet, the FOR's theological foundation probably became the foundation for most Christian pacifists. Although not all may have caught the FOR's vision, they at least realized that pacifism was not an addendum to life but, as a way of living, had consequences for all of life.

#### CONCLUSIONS - ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>London Union Annual Report, 1945 - 1945, FOR 456; 1/7.

<sup>2</sup>The Christian Pacifist, NS no. 38, Feb. 1945, p. 517.

<sup>3</sup>Brock, Twentieth-Century Pacifism, p. 8.

<sup>4</sup>Bebbington, Nonconformist, p. 159.

## APPENDIX I

### "The Basis"

1. 'That Love, as revealed and interpreted in the life and death of Jesus Christ, involves more than we have yet seen, that it is the only power by which evil can be overcome, and the only sufficient basis of human society'.
2. 'That, in order to establish a world-order based on Love, it is incumbent upon those who believe in this principle to accept it fully, both for themselves and in their relation to others, and to take the risks involved in doing so in a world which does not as yet accept it'.
3. 'That, therefore, as Christians, we are forbidden to wage war, and that our loyalty to our country, to humanity, to the Church Universal, and to Jesus Christ, our Lord and Master, calls us instead to a life service for the enthronement of Love in personal, social, commercial and national life'.
4. 'That the Power, Wisdom and Love of God stretch far beyond the limits of our present experience, and that He is ever waiting to break forth into human life in new and larger ways'.
5. 'That since God manifests Himself in the world through men and women, we offer ourselves to Him for His redemptive purpose, to be used by Him in whatever way He may reveal to us'.

## APPENDIX II

### Papers for Wartime

Only those pamphlets are included which were published between November 2 and December 14, 1914.

1. W. Temple, Christianity and War.
2. R. Roberts, Are We Worth Fighting For?
3. Mrs. Elma K. Paget, The Woman's Part.
4. Edwyn Bevan, Brothers All.
5. J. H. Oldham, The Decisive Hour Is it Lost?
6. W. R. Maltby, Active Service.
7. A. Herbert Gray, The War Spirit in Our National Life.
8. W. H. Moberly, Christian Conduct.
9. X, The Witness of the Church in the Present Crisis.
10. W. E. Orchard, The Real War.
11. G. H. Leonard, Love Came Down at Christmas.

## APPENDIX III

### "The Christian Revolution Series"

- Vol. 1 Henry T. Hodgkin, Lay Religion. 1918.
- Vol. 2 W. Fearon Halliday, Reconciliation and Reality. 1919
- Vol. 3 C. J. Cadoux, The Early Christian Attitude to War. 1919.
- Vol. 4 N. Micklem, The Open Light-An Enquiry into Faith and Reality. 1919.
- Vol. 5 G. B. Robson, The Way to Personality. 1917. 1919.
- Vol. 6 W. E. Wilson, The Christian Ideal. 1919.
- Vol. 7 J. R. Coates, The Christ of Revolution. 1920.
- Vol. 8 Rufus M. Jones, The Remnant. 1920.
- Vol. 9 G. B. Robson, The Kingdom of God. 1920.
- Vol. 10 T. S. Attlee, Man and His Buildings. 1920.
- Vol. 11 C. H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for To-day. 1920.
- Vol. 12 N. Micklem and H. Morgan. Christ and Caesar. 1921.
- Vol. 13 N. L. Robinson, Christian Justice. 1922.
- Vol. 14 A. T. Cadoux, Essays in Christian Thinking. 1922.
- Vol. 15 E. E. Unwin, Religion and Biology. 1922.
- Vol. 16 Samuel Dickey, The Constructive Revolution of Jesus. 1923.
- Vol. 17 Henry T. Hodgkin, The Christian Revolution. 1923.

## APPENDIX IV

### FOR New Series Pamphlets

1. The FOR Its Basis
2. The FOR Its Aims & its Work
3. J.W. Stevenson, A Disarmed Church in an Armed World
4. H.C.L. Heywood, Christian Pacifism
5. E. Leighton Yates, A Christian Attitude towards Air Raid Precautions
6. L. Richards, The Christian Foundations of Peace
7. W. Robinson, Pacifism in the Old Testament and Afterwards
8. Evelyn Underhill, A Meditation on Peace
9. D. Soper, Thy Will Be Done
10. Father Andrew, S.D.C., Logic of Faith
11. L. Richards, Christ's Choice of a Battlefield
12. H. Ingli James, The Justice of the Kingdom
13. E. Hayman, Christ and to-morrow
14. S. Hobhouse, Christ and our Enemies
15. A.G. Knott, The Times of Jesus Christ
16. E. Comber, The Church in the World of To-Morrow
17. S. Hobhouse, Retribution and the Christian
18. L.W. Grensted, Justice
19. A Youth Service A.B.C.
20. H.A. Moody, Christianity and Race Relations

### Towards a Christian Peace Campaign

1. E.L. Allen, Cultural
2. C. Heath, Political
3. W.H. Marwick, Economic
4. G.L. Phelps, Christianity and the State

### Essays in Social and Economic Reconstruction

1. L. Artinngstall, Economics and the Christian
2. G.L. Phelps, Christianity and the State
3. L. Richards, Social Control and Personal Freedom
4. K.G. Robinson, Report on Social Policy

## APPENDIX V

### Significant Church and FOR Conferences

1. Edinburgh, 14-23 June, 1910, World Missions
2. Constance, 2 August, 1914, World Alliance
3. Llandudno, 25-30 September 1914, Society of Friends
4. Cambridge, 28-31 December, 1914, FOR
5. Berne, 25-27 August, 1915, World Alliance
6. Uppsala, 14-16 December, 1917, Neutral Churches
7. Oud-Wassenaar, 30 September - 3 October, 1919, World Alliance
8. Bilthoven, 4-11 October, 1919, IFOR
9. Bilthoven, 31 July - 7 August, 1920, IFOR
10. Geneva, 9-12, August, 1920, Life and Work
11. Geneva, 12-20 August, 1920, Faith and Order
12. Oxford, 9-16 July, 1923, International Missionary Council
13. Birmingham, 5-12 April, 1924, COPEC
14. Stockholm, 19-30 August, 1925, Life and Work
15. Lausanne, 3-21 August, 1927, Life and Work
16. Jerusalem, 24 March - 8 April, 1928, International Missionary Council
17. Oxford, 12-26 July, 1937, Life and Work
18. Edinburgh, 3-18 August, 1937, Faith and Order
19. Amsterdam, 22 August - 4 September, 1948, World Council of Churches



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

#### I Private Papers

George Bell: Lambeth Palace Library, London

Vera Brittain: McMaster University, Hamilton

Cecil John Cadoux: Bodleian Library, Oxford

George M.Ll. Davies: National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth

Henry T. Hodgkin: Friends House Library, London

George Lansbury: British Library of Political and Economic  
Science, London

William E. Orchard: Bodleian Library, Oxford

Richard Roberts: United Church Archives, Toronto

Maude Royden: Fawcett Library, London Polytechnic, London

Reginald W. Sorensen: House of Lords Record Office, London

William Temple: Lambeth Palace Library, London

#### II Archival Records of Peace Organizations

FOR: British Library of Political and Economic Science, London;  
Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore

AFOR and Nevin Sayre Papers: Swarthmore College Peace Collection,  
Swarthmore

London Union: 29 Great James Street, London

Cambridge FOR: c/o Mr. John Saunders, 6 Fendon Road, Cambridge

APF: c/o Rev. Sidney Hinkes, St. Mary's Vicarage, Bays Water Road,  
Headington, Oxford

SQS: Friends House Library, London

PPU: 6 Endsleigh Street, London

### III Contemporary Journals and Newspapers

<u>APF Monthly Letter</u>	1937-1945
<u>The Christian Pacifist</u>	1939-1946
<u>Congregational Quarterly</u>	1925-1936
<u>The Friend</u>	1914-1915
<u>Hornsey Journal</u>	1914-1915
<u>Labour Leader</u>	1914-1918
<u>News Sheet</u>	1915-1923
<u>The New Crusader</u>	1917-1918
<u>Peace News</u>	1940-1943
<u>The Ploughshare</u>	1912-1915
<u>Reconciliation</u>	1924-1938, 1947-1967
<u>Reconciliation Quarterly</u>	1974
<u>The Venturer</u>	1915-1919
<u>The Venturer New Series</u>	1919-1921

\* Unless otherwise indicated the books and pamphlets were published in London.

### IV. Books written by FOR members

Allen, E.L. Christianity and Society. Hodder & Stoughton. 1950.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Purpose of Jesus. F.O.R. 1951.

Artingstall, Leslie. Towards a Christian Economic. F.O.R. [1941].

Attlee, T.S. Man and His Buildings. Swarthmore Press. 1920.

Balding, Alan. No Other Foundation. F.O.R. 1943.

Bartlett, Percy W. Quakers and the Christian Church. Friends' Book Centre. 1942.

Belden, Albert D. Pax Christi. George Allen & Unwin. 1942.

- Belden, Albert D.; Dimond, Alex; Storr, Ernest B. Three Views of Pacifism. Epworth Press. 1937.
- Cadoux, A.T. Essays in Christian Thinking. Swarthmore Press. 1922.
- Cadoux, C.J. The Early Christian Attitude to War. George Allen & Unwin. 1919.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Message About the Cross. George Allen & Unwin. 1924.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Christian Crusade. J.M. Dent. 1924.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Early Church and the World. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1925.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Case for Evangelical Modernism. Hodder & Stoughton. 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christian Pacifism Re-examined. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1940. New York: Garland. 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Historic Mission of Jesus. Lutterworth Press. 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Pilgrim's Further Progress. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1943.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Life of Jesus. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 1948.
- Carter, Henry. The Pacifist and the League of Nations. Epworth Press. 1936.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Liberty and Authority in the Modern World. Merttens Lecture Ctee. 1939.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Towards World Recovery. National Peace Council. 1945.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. For Christ and Humanity. Epworth Press. 1935.
- Carter, H.C. Human Relations in the Light of Christ. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons. 1924.
- Catchpool, T. Corder. On Two Fronts. Headley 1918. New York: Garland. 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Letters of a Prisoner. George Allen & Unwin. 1941. Friends Book Centre. 1972.
- Coates, John R. The Christ of Revolution. Swarthmore Press. 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. War-What Does the Bible Say?. Sheldon Press. 1940.

- \_\_\_\_\_ ed. The Gospel of the Cross. London: Macmillan. 1918.
- Davies, George M.Ll. The Politics of Grace. F.O.R. 1925.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Essays Towards Peace. Sheppard Press. 1946.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Pilgrimage of Peace. F.O.R. 1950.
- Dickey, Samuel. The Constructive Revolution of Jesus. Swarthmore Press. 1923.
- Dodd, C. Harold. The Meaning of Paul for to-day. Swarthmore Press. 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Parables of the Kingdom. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1936.
- Dunkerley, Roderic. The Proclamation. Heanor: Walter Barker. 1918.
- Fry, A. Ruth. Everyman's Affair. Andrew Dakers. 1941.
- Fry, Joan M.ed. Christ and Peace. Headley. 1915.
- Gray, A. Herbert. Love: The One Solution. Rich & Cowan. 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Secret of Inward Peace. S.C.M. Press. 1947.
- Grensted, L.W. A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 1920. (1962).
- \_\_\_\_\_. Psychology and God. Longmans, Green. 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. The Atonement in History and in Life. S.P.C.K. 1929.
- Halliday, W. Fearon. Reconciliation and Reality. Headley. 1919.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Psychology and Religious Experience. Hodder & Stoughton. 1929.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Personal Freedom Through Personal Faith. Hodder & Stoughton. 1934.
- Hancock, Frank R. The Sixth Day. James Clarke. 1942.
- Hartill, Percy. ed. Into the Way of Peace. James Clarke. 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. On Earth Peace. James Clarke. 1944.
- Hayman, Eric. Worship & The Common Life. Cambridge: University Press. 1944.

- Hobhouse, Stephen. Forty Years and an Epilogue. James Clarke. 1951.
- Hodgkin, Henry T. Lay Religion. Headley. 1918.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Christian Revolution. Swarthmore Press. 1923.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jesus Among Men. SCM. Press. 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. Seeing Ourselves through Russia. New York: Ray Long & Richard R. Smith. 1932.
- James, Stanley B. The Men Who Dared. C. W. Daniel. [1917].
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Adventures of a Spiritual Tramp. Longmans, Green. 1925.
- Jones, Rufus M. The Remnant. Swarthmore Press. 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. The Church the Gospel and War. New York: Harper. 1948.  
Garland. 1971.
- Lansbury, George. These Things Shall Be. Swarthmore Press. 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. What I Saw In Russia. New York: Boni and Liveright. 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. My Life. Constable. 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Why Pacifists Should Be Socialists. Fact. 1937. New York: Garland. 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. My Pilgrimage for Peace. New York: Henry Holt. 1938.  
Garland 1972. English title My Quest for Peace.
- \_\_\_\_\_. This Way To Peace. Rich & Cowan. n.d. [1940].
- Lester, Muriel. Entertaining Gandhi. Ivor Nicholson and Watson. 1932.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Why Worship?. Independent Press. 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Kill or Cure?. Nashville: Cokesbury Press. 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. It Occurred to Me. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Dare You Face Facts?. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1940.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Gandhi World Citizen. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal. 1945.
- \_\_\_\_\_. It So Happened. New York: Harper. 1947.
- Lewis, John. The Old Testament in the Twentieth Century. George Allen & Unwin. 1923.

- \_\_\_\_\_. A Faith to Live By. Williams and Norgate. 1931.
- Macgregor, G. H. C. The New Testament Basis of Pacifism. F.O.R. 1936.  
1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Relevance of an Impossible Ideal. New York: F.O.R. n.d.  
[1941].
- Maclachlan, Lewis. The Faith of Friendship. F.O.R. 1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Defeat Triumphant. Hinsdale: Henry Regnery. 1949.
- MacLeod, George F. Speaking the Truth-in Love. S.C.M. 1936.
- \_\_\_\_\_. We Shall Re-Build. Glasgow: Iona Community. nd. [1945].
- \_\_\_\_\_. Only One Way Left. Glasgow: Iona Community. nd. [1955].
- \_\_\_\_\_. The New Humanity Now. F.O.R. 1964.
- Martin, Hugh. The Calling of the Church. S.C.M. 1916.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christ and Money. S.C.M. 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. The Ministry of Reconciliation. Headley Brothers. 1916.
- Mellor, Stanley A. Jesus Christ & Social Change. Swarthmore Press.  
1920.
- Micklem, Nathaniel. The Open Light: Enquiry into Faith and Reality.  
Headley. 1919.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Galilean. James Clarke. 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. What is the Faith?. Hodder & Stoughton. 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Theology of Politics. Oxford University Press. 1941.
- Micklem, Nathaniel, and Morgan, Herbert. Christ and Caesar. Swarthmore  
Press. 1921.
- Orchard, W. E. Modern Theories of Sin. James Clarke. 1909.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Advent Sermons. James Clark. 1914.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Necessity of Christ. J. M. Dent. 1916.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Outlook for Religion. Cassell. 1917.

- \_\_\_\_\_. The True Patriotism and Other Sermons. George Allen & Unwin. 1918.
- \_\_\_\_\_. No More War and Other Sermons. George Allen & Unwin. 1922.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christianity and World-Problems. Hodder & Stoughton. 1925.
- \_\_\_\_\_. From Faith to Faith. New York: Harper. 1933.
- Phillips, Mary E. The Responsibility of the Christian Investor. S.P.C.K. 1933.
- Plowright, B. C. Christ or Caesar?. Westminster: Livingstone Press. 1934.
- Ratcliffe, Edith. "Not Every One...". H. R. Allenson. 1932.
- Raven, Charles E. The Creator Spirit. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Truth and Tradition. Ernest Benn. 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Wanderer's Way. Martin Hopkinson. 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christ and Modern Education. Hodder & Stoughton. 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Quest of Religion. S.C.M. 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Church's Task in the World. Cambridge University Press. 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Musings and Memoirs. Martin Hopkinson. 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jesus and the Gospel of Love. New York: Henry Holt. 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Signs of the Times. Cambridge: University Press. 1932.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Is War Obsolete?. George Allen & Unwin. 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. War and the Christian. S.C.M. 1938. New York: Garland. 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Gospel and the Church. Hodder & Stoughton, 1939.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Cross and the Crisis. F.O.R. 1940.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Lessons of the Prince of Peace. Longmans, Green. 1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Good News of God. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1943.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Science, Religion, and the Future. Cambridge: University Press. 1943.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism. New York: Fellowship Publ. 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Natural Religion and Christian Theology. Cambridge: University Press. 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christianity and Science. Lutterworth Press. 1955.
- Raven, Charles E., and Raven, Eleanor. The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ. Cambridge: University Press. 1933. 1959.
- Richards, Leyton. The Christian's Alternative to War. S.C.M. 1929
- \_\_\_\_\_. Realistic Pacifism. Chicago: Willett, Clark. 1935. New York: Garland. 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Planning for Freedom. George Allen & Unwin. 1943.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christian Pacifism After Two World Wars. Independent Press. 1948.
- Robbins, G. N. Is the Christian Church Necessary?. Williams & Norgate. 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Security By Disarmament. Williams & Norgate. 1932.
- \_\_\_\_\_. World Chaos and the Only Way Out. Birmingham: Cornish Brothers. 1941.
- Roberts, Richard. The Renaissance of Faith. Cassell. 1912.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The High Road to Christ. Cassell. 1912.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Personality and Nationality. Headley. 1914.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christ and Ourselves. S.C.M. 1915.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Church in the Commonwealth. New York: Frederick A. Stokes. 1917.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Red Cap on the Cross. Headley. 1918.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Unfinished Programme of Democracy. Swarthmore Press. 1919.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Untried Door. S.C.M. 1921.



- \_\_\_\_\_. The Gospel at Corinth. New York: Macmillan. 1924.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The New Man and the Divine Society. New York: Macmillan. 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Christian God. New York: Macmillan. 1929.
- \_\_\_\_\_. For the Kingdom of God. S.C.M. 1933.
- \_\_\_\_\_. That Strange Man Upon His Cross. New York: Abingdon. 1934.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Contemporary Christ. New York: Macmillan. 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. For God and Freedom. Sackville: Mount Allison University. 1945.

Robinson, Norman L. Christian Justice. Swarthmore Press. 1922.

Robinson, W. Christianity is Pacifism. George Allen & Unwin, 1933.

Robson, George B. The Way to Personality. Headley. 1917.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Kingdom of God. Swarthmore Press. 1920.

Rowntree, Maurice L. Mankind Set Free. Jonathan Cape. 1939.

Soper, Donald. Christ and Tower Hill. Hodder & Stoughton, 1934.

\_\_\_\_\_. Question Time on Tower Hill. Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.

\_\_\_\_\_. Christianity and Its Critics. Hodder & Stoughton. 1937.

\_\_\_\_\_. Popular Fallacies About the Christian Faith. Hodder & Stoughton. 1938; Epworth Press. 1957.

\_\_\_\_\_. All His Grace. Epworth Press. 1957.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Advocacy of the Gospel. Hodder & Stoughton. 1961.

\_\_\_\_\_. Aflame with Faith. Epworth Press. 1963.

Sparkes, Malcolm. Modern Industry. S.C.M. 1927.

Stevenson, Jack W. Christ and the Economic Crisis. Williams & Norgate. 1932.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Incredible Church. James Clarke. 1937.

Stevenson, Lilian. Amor Vincit Omnia. S.C.M. 1914.

- \_\_\_\_\_. A Child's Bookshelf. S.C.M. 1917.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Towards a Christian International. Vienna: I.F.O.R. 1929.
- Unwin, E. E. 'As a Man Thinketh...'. George Allen & Unwin. 1919.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Religion and Biology. Swarthmore Press. 1922.
- Walke, Bernard. Twenty Years at St. Hilary. Methuen, 1935.
- Wilson, Theodora Wilson. The Last Weapon. C. W. Daniel. 1916.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Weapon Unsheathed. C. W. Daniel. 1916.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Wrestlers. C. W. Daniels. 1916.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Last Dividend. International Bookshop. n.d.
- Wilson, William E. Christ and War. James Clarke. 1913. rev. ed. 1914.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Atonement and Non-Resistance. Swarthmore Press. 1914. 1923.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Foundations of Peace. Headley. 1918.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Christian Ideal. Swarthmore Press. 1919.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Problem of the Cross. James Clarke. 1929.
- V. Pamphlets and Articles by FOR members.
- Allen, E. L. Campaign Towards a Christian Peace no.1 Cultural. F.O.R. n.d [1943].
- \_\_\_\_\_. Pacifism as an Individual Duty. CBCO. 1946.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Pacifism and the Free Society. Peace News. 1948.
- Father Andrew, S.D.C. The Logic of Faith. F.O.R./A.P.F. n.d.
- Artinngstall, Leslie. Economics and the Christian. F.O.R. n.d. [1942].
- Bartlett, P.W. Disarmament - The Christian Demand. F.O.R. 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Economic Approach to Peace. E.o.R. n.d. [1938].
- Bedford, Duke of/Marquis of Tavistock. The Fate of a Peace Effort. 1940.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Parliament and Peace. 1941.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Why Have This War?. 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Diplomacy and War Guilt. 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The War and the Empire. 1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Wholesale Bombing. 1944.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Some Essays on War and Peace. 1944.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Financiers' Little Game. 1944.
- \_\_\_\_\_. War Aims. 1944.
- Belden, A. D. What Should the Church Do About War?. Pax Christi. n.d. [1950?].
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christian Pacifism-Objections Answered. F.O.R. n.d.
- Cadoux, C.J. "The Cross and the Bayonet," Friends' Quarterly Examiner. Volume 52. Nov. 1918. pp. 376-399.
- \_\_\_\_\_. An Appeal to the People of the Christian Church. F.O.R. 1919.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Politics of Jesus," Congregational Quarterly. Vol. 14 no. 1 Jan. 1936. pp. 58-67.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Christianity and the Problem of War," The Journal of Religion. Vol. 21 no. 3. July 1941. pp. 233-242.
- Can the Fellowship Outline a New World Order?. F.O.R. n.d.
- Carter, Henry. Battlefield Or Council Table?. E.o.R. 1938.
- Chirgwin, A.M. Under Fire. F.O.R. n.d.
- Coltman, Claud. Should Conscription Be Opposed?. N.C.C. n.d.
- Comber, Ethel. The Church in the World of Tomorrow. F.O.R. n.d.
- Davies, G. M. Ll. Religion and the Quest for Peace. P.P.U. 1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Words of Peace. P.P.U. n.d. [1944?].
- Fry, A. Ruth. Christianity or War?. Friends Peace Ctee. 1931. 1936.
- \_\_\_\_\_. An International Force?. Edgar G. Dunstan. 1934. 1937. 1943.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Fear: The Dictator. Dunstan. 1935.

- \_\_\_\_\_. The Effect of Disarmament. F.O.R. 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Pacifist Replies to the Archbishop of York. 1935. 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. No! Not Safety First. Saxmundham: H. G. Crisp. 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Victory Without Violence. Saxmundham: H. G. Crisp. 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Quite Impossible. Saxmundham: H.G. Crisp. 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Blue Funk. Saxmundham: H. G. Crisp. 1939.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jupiter's Moons. 1939.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Atlantic Charter. Glasgow: Strickland Press. 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Annus Mirabilis. Dunstan, 1945.
- Gill, Eric. The Human Person and Society. P.P.U. 1940.
- Grensted, L. W. Justice. F.O.R. n.d.
- Halliday, W. Fearon. Personality and War. F.O.R. 1916.
- Hancock, Frank R. Peace or Party?. Peace News. 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Were We to Blame Too?. Peace News. n.d.
- Hartill, Percy W. Pacifism and Christian Common Sense. A. R. Mowbray. 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christians in War-Time. Lichfield: A. C. Lomax's Successors. 1940.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Article XXXVII and War. A.P.F. n.d.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Greater Power. F.O.R. n.d.
- Hayman, Eric. "The Challenge of the Kingdom," Friends' Quarterly Examiner. Vol. 52. Jan. 1918. pp. 49-65; and issued by Headley. 1918.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Pacifist Dilemma. Friends' Peace Ctee. 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christ and Tomorrow. F.O.R. n.d.
- Heath, Carl. Pacifism in Time of War. Headley. n.d. [1914/5].
- \_\_\_\_\_. Campaign Towards a Christian Peace No. 2, Political. F.O.R. n.d. [1943].

- Heywood, H. C. L. Christian Pacifism. F.O.R. n.d.
- Hobhouse, Stephen. Christ and our Enemies. F.O.R. 1941.
- Hodgkin, Henry T. The Church's Opportunity to the Present Crisis.  
Headley. 1915.
- \_\_\_\_\_. How to Check the Spirit of Militanism. F.O.R. 1915.
- Horwill, Herbert W. The Cost to Humanity. F.O.R. 1915.
- Hughes, M. L. V. Empire Day and Armistice Day. F.O.R. n.d.
- James, H. Ingli. The Justice of the Kingdom. F.O.R. n.d.
- Knott, Alan G. The Times of Jesus Christ. F.O.R. 1941.
- Lansbury, George. Why I Joined the FOR. F.O.R. n.d. [1915].
- Lester, Muriel. "Let Your Soul Catch Up With Your Body". Independent  
Press. 1942.
- Macgregor, G. H. C. A Christian Peace Settlement. Church of Scotland  
Peace Society. n.d.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's  
Thought," New Testament Studies. Vol. 1. 1954-55. pp.17-28.
- Maclachlan, Lewis. Fellowship Prayers. F.O.R. 1951.
- Macpherson, Hector. The Church, The Bible, and War. Leicester:  
Blackfriars Press. 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Christian As Soldier. S.C.M. 1939.
- Marwick, W.H. Campaign Towards a Christian Peace No. 3, Economic. F.O.R.  
n.d. [1943].
- Moody, Harold A. Christianity and Race Relations. F.O.R. n.d.
- Orchard, W. E. The Real War. Oxford University Press. 1914.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Religion and Life," Guildhouse Monthly. Feb. 1929. p.  
41.
- Owen, Douglas J. J. Absolute Conscience and the Refusal to Kill.  
Manchester: Owen. 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Compulsion and the Right of Private Judgment. 1942.

- Phelps, Glyn Lloyd. Christianity and the State. F.O.R. n.d. [1942].
- Plowman, B. C. "The Misgivings of a Modernist," Congregational Quarterly. Vol. 9 no. 3. July 1931. 289-297.
- Raven, Charles E. Social Righteousness and the Christian Gospel. Shaftesbury Society & Ragged School Union. 1934.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "We Will Not Fight," Let Us Honour Peace. Cobden-Sanderson. 1937. ch. 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Religious Basis of Pacifism," The Universal Church and the World of Nations. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co. 1938. pp. 287-315.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Starting Point of Pacifism. P.P.U. 1940.
- Raven, C. E.; Dodd, C. H.; Macgregor, G. H. C. The Bases of Christian Pacifism,. C.C.P.C. 1939. 1940.
- Richards, Leyton. A Christian Substitute for Armaments. F.O.R. 1936.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Christian Foundation of Peace. F.O.R. 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christ's Choice of a Battlefield. F.O.R. 1940.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Social Control and Personal Freedom. F.O.R. n.d. [1943].
- Robbins, G. Norman. Suggestion for a Christian Party. Birmingham: Cornish Brothers. 1937.
- Roberts, Richard. Are We Worth Fighting For?. Oxford University Press. 1914.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Faith for the New Age. F.O.R. n.d. [1915/16].
- Robinson, K.G. Report on Social Policy. F.O.R. n.d.
- Robinson, W. Pacifism in the Old Testament and Afterwards. F.O.R. n.d.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christian Social Action. B.C.A.F. 1944.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Evil Confronted. F.O.R. 1946.
- Royden, A. Maude. The Great Adventure. Headley. 1915.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Can We Set the World in Order?. Athenaeum Press. 1921.

- Soper, Donald. Will Christianity Work?. Lutterworth. 1939.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Answering Back. Epworth Press. 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. It is hard to work for God. Epworth Press. 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christian Socialism. C.S.M. 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Thy Will Be Done. F.O.R. n.d.
- Spooner, P. J. Facing the Disarmament Issue. F.O.R. 1931.
- Stevenson, J. W. Is there a Christian Revolution?. Lutterworth Press. 1933.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Disarmed Church in an Armed World. F.O.R. 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Christian Social Order. The Individualist Bookshop. 1942.
- Underhill, Evelyn. A Meditation of Peace. F.O.R. n.d.
- Wood, Alex. Christian Pacifism and Rearmament. P.P.U. n.d.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Science, Wisdom and War. Peace News. n.d.
- Yeaxlee, Basil A. Towards a Full-Grown Man. The Brotherhood Movement. 1926.

## VI. Contemporary Books and Pamphlets

- Aldington, Richard. Death of a Hero. Garden City: Garden City Publ. 1979. (1929).
- Angell, Norman. The Great Illusion. William Heinemann. 1911. New York: Garland. 1972.
- Attwater, Donald. Bombs Babies and Beatitudes. James Clarke. 1939.
- Beales, Arthur C.F. The History of Peace. New York: The Dial Press. 1931. Garland. 1971.
- Berdyaev, Nicholas. Christianity and Class War. tr. Donald Attwater. Sheed and Ward. 1932.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Bourgeois Mind and Other Essays. Freeport: Books for Libraries Press. 1966. (1934).
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Fate of Man in the Modern World. Ann Arbor: University of

- Michigan Press. 1935. 1963.
- Bevan, Edwyn. Christians in a World at War. S.C.M. 1940.
- Brailsford, Henry Noel. The War of Steel and Gold. G. Bell and Sons. 1914. New York: Garland. 1971.
- Briant, Keith, and Wilkes, Lyall. Would I Fight?. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1938.
- Brinton, Henry. The Peace Army. Williams & Norgate. 1932.
- Brittain, Vera. War-Time Letters to Peace Lovers. Peace Book Co. 1940.
- Brockway, A. Fenner. Bloody Traffic. Victor Gollancz. 1933. Also in Burns, Richard Dean. ed. International Trade in Armaments. New York: Garland. 1972.
- Brown, H. Runham. Cutting Ice. Middlesex: W.R.I. 1930.
- Burt, Cyril. The Young Delinquent. New York: D. Appleton. 1925.
- Buxton, Charles Roden. The Alternative to War. George Allen & Unwin. 1936.
- Cadoux, A.T. Jesus and Civil Government. New York; George H. Doran. 1923.
- Cairns, D. S. The Army and Religion. Macmillan. 1919.
- Campbell, R.J. The New Theology. New York: Macmillan. 1912 (1907).
- Carr, Edward Hallett. Conditions of Peace. New York: Macmillan. 1942.
- Chamberlain, William Joseph. Fighting for Peace. N.M.W.M. 1928. New York: Garland. 1971.
- Christianity and War. Congregational Union of England and Wales. 1929.
- Clutton-Brock, A. What is the Kingdom of Heaven?. Methuen. 1919.
- Cole, G.D.H. Guild Socialism Re-Stated. Leonard Parsons. 1920.
- Coulton, G.G. The Main Illusions of Pacificism. Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes. 1916.
- Darby, W. Evans. The Claim of 'The New Pacificism'. Peace Society. 1913.
- Dearmer, Percy. ed. Christianity and the Crisis. Victor Gollancz. 1933.



Dobbie, Sir William G.S. A Very Present Help. Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1944.

\_\_\_\_\_, Active Service with Christ. Marshall, Morgan & Scott. 1947.

Duncan, Ronald. The Complete Pacifist. Boriswood. 1937.

Eliot, T.S. The Idea of a Christian Society. Faber & Faber. 1939.

Field, Guy Cromwell. Pacifism and Conscientious Objection. Cambridge: University Press. 1945.

Foakes-Jackson, F.J. ed. The Faith and the War. Macmillan. 1916.

Foot, Michael; Freeman, R.G.; Hardie, Frank; Steel-Maitland, Keith. Young Oxford & War. Selwyn & Blount. 1934.

Forsyth, P.T. The Christian Ethic of War. Longmans, Green. 1916.

Friends and the War. Headley. 1914.

Gardner, Lucy, ed. The Hope for Society. G. Bell & Sons. 1917.

Gill, Eric. And Who Wants Peace?. James Clarke. 1937.

Glover, Edward. War, Sadism & Pacifism. George Allen & Unwin. 1933.

Gooch, C.P. ed. In Pursuit of Peace. Methuen. 1933.

Graham, John W. Conscription and Conscience. George Allen & Unwin. 1922. New York: Garland. 1971.

Graves, Robert. Goodbye to All That. Garden City: Doubleday. 1957. (1929).

Gray, A. Herbert. The War Spirit in Our National Life. Humphrey Milford. 1914.

Gregg, Richard B. The Power of Nonviolence. James Clarke. 1934. 1960.

Grubb, Edward. Authority and the Light Within. James Clarke. 1908. 1909.

\_\_\_\_\_. The True Way of Life. Headley. 1909.

Hall, W. Clarke. The State and the Child. New York: Frederick A. Stokes, 1917.

Harnack, Adolf. Militia Christi. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr. 1905. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1981.

- Heard, Gerald. Social Substance of Religion. George Allen & Unwin. 1931.
- Heering, Gerrit Jan. De Zondeval van het Christendom. 1928 tr. J. W. Thompson, The Fall of Christendom. New York: Fellowship Publications. 1930. 1943. Garland. 1972.
- Hemleben, Sylvester John. Plans for World Peace Through Six Centuries. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1943. New York: Garland. 1972.
- Hershberger, Guy Franklin. War, Peace, and Nonresistance. Scottdale: Herald Press, 1942.
- Hirst, Margaret E. The Quakers in Peace and War. Swarthmore Press. 1923. New York: Garland. 1972.
- Hobhouse, L. T. "The Historical Evolution of Property, in Fact and in Idea," in Property Its Duties and Rights. New York: Macmillan. 1922.
- Hobhouse, Rosa Waugh. The Records of Senelder. C.W. Daniels. 1898/1940.
- Hobson, S.G. Guild Principles in War and Peace. G. Bell. 1917.
- \_\_\_\_\_. National Guilds. G. Bell. 1919.
- Hogg, A. G. Christianity and Force. Humphrey Milford. 1915.
- Housman, Laurence. What Can We Believe?. Jonathan Cape. 1939.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Preparation of Peace. Jonathan Cape. 1941.
- Huxley, Aldous. What Are You Going To Do About It?. Chatto & Windus. 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_. An Encyclopaedia of Pacifism. Chatto & Windus. 1937. New York: Garland. 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Ends and Means. New York: Harper. 1937. Greenwood Press. 1969.
- Ingram, Kenneth. The Defeat of War: Can Pacifism Achieve It?. George Allen & Unwin. 1939.
- Jameson, Storm. ed. Challenge to Death. Constable. 1934.
- Joad, C.E.M. Why War?. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 1939.
- Keynes, John Maynard. The Economic Consequences of the Peace. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe. 1920.

- \_\_\_\_\_. The End of Laissez-Faire. Hogarth Press. 1926.
- Laski, Harold J. The Foundations of Sovereignty. New York: Harcourt, Brace. 1921. Freeport: Books for Libraries Press. 1968.
- Lee, Umphrey. The Historic Church and Modern Pacifism. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 1943.
- Let Us Honour Peace. Cobden-Sanderson. 1937.
- Lewis, John. The Case Against Pacifism. George Allen & Unwin. 1940. New York: Garland. 1973.
- Lightfoot, J.B. The Apostolic Fathers. Macmillan. 1891. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1956. 1974..
- Ligt, Barthelemy de. The Conquest of Violence. New York; E.P. Dutton. 1938. Garland. 1972.
- Livingstone, Dame Adelaide. The Peace Ballot. Victor Gollancz. 1935.
- Mellanby, Kenneth. Human-Guinea Pigs. Victor Gollancz. 1945.
- Mellor, William. Direct Action. Leonard Parsons. 1920.
- Milne, A. A. Peace With Honour. Methuen. 1934. New York: Garland. 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. War With Honour. Macmillan. 1940.
- Montague, C. E. Disenchantment. New York: Brentano's. 1922.
- Mumford, Philip S. An Introduction to Pacifism. Cassell. 1937.
- Needham, Joseph. ed. Science Religion and Reality. The Sheldon Press. 1925.
- Nichols, Beverly. Cry Havoc!. Toronto: Doubleday, Doran & Gundy. 1933.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. Moral Man and Immoral Society. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1932. 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Why the Christian Church is not Pacifist. S.C.M. Press. 1940.
- O'Brien, Mary. The Oneness of Religious and Secular Life. Brotherhood Press. 1898.
- Oldham, J. H. The Decisive Hour Is It Lost?. Humphrey Milford. 1914.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. Foundations of Ecumenical Thought. Willett, Clark. 1937.

- Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1966.
- Oman, John. Grace and Personality. Cambridge: University Press. 1931. (1917).
- Page, Kirby. War Its Causes, Consequences and Cure. New York: George H. Doran. 1923.
- Plowman, Max. The Faith Called Pacifism. J. M. Dent & Sons. 1936.
- Ponsonby, Arthur. Falsehood in Wartime. George Allen & Unwin. 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Disarmament A Discussion. Hogarth Press. 1932.
- Priestman, A. T. Socialism an Essentially Christian Movement. Brotherhood Press. 1901.
- Peace Year Book. 1933. 1935. 1938.
- Rathbone, Eleanor F. War Can Be Averted. Victor Gollancz. 1938.
- Rauschenbusch, Walter. The Social Principles of Jesus. New York: Association Press. 1921.
- Reason, Will. ed. The Proceedings of C.O.P.E.C.. Longmans, Green. 1924.
- Remarque, Erich Maria. All Quiet on the Western Front. Greenwich: Fawcett Publ. 1958. (1928).
- Russell, Bertrand. Why Men Fight. New York: The Century Co. 1916. 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Roads to Freedom. George Allen & Unwin. 1918.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Education and the Good Life. New York: Avon. 1926.  
Reprinted as Education of Character. New York: Philosophical Library. 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Which Way to Peace?. Michael Joseph. 1936.
- Sadler, Gilbert T. Our Enemy the State. C. W. Daniels. 1922.
- Sassoon, Siegfried. Memoirs of a Fox-Hunting Man. New York: Coward-McCann. 1929.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Memoirs of an Infantry Officer. New York: Coward - McCann. 1930.
- Scarfe, Hubert Grant. ed. A Catholic Approach to the Problem of War. Green End, Radnage, High Wycombe: PAX. n.d. [1944].

- Shaw, Bernard. Major Barbara. New York: Penguin. 1961. (1907).
- Sheppard, H. R. L. The Impatience of a Parson. Hodder & Stoughton. 1927.
- Sherriff, R. C. Journey's End. New York: Brentano's. 1929.
- Shillito, Edward. Nationalism: Man's Other Religion. S.C.M. 1933.
- Simmons, Percy G. For His Friends. Oxford: Alden. n.d. [1917].
- Steed, Henry Wickham. Vital Peace. New York: Macmillan. 1936.
- Stratmann, Franciscus. The Church and War. Sheed and War. 1928. New York: Garland. 1971.
- Suttner, Bertha von. Lay Down Your Arms. tr. H. Holmes. Longmans, Green. 1894. New York: Garland. 1972.
- Swanwick, Helena M. Builders of Peace. Swarthmore Press. 1921. New York: Garland. 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Roots of Peace. Jonathan Cape. 1938.
- Tawney, R. H. The Acquisitive Society. New York: Harcourt, Brace. 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Religion and the Rise of Capitalism. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World. 1926. Gloucester: Peter Smith. 1962.
- Temple, William. Christianity and War. S.P.C.K. 1915.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christianity and Social Order. New York: Penguin. 1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. Is Christ Divided?. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 1943.
- The No-Conscription Fellowship. A Souvenir of its work during the years 1914-1919. 5 York Buildings Adelphi.
- Thomson, Basil. My Experiences at Scotland Yard. Garden City: Doubleday & Page. 1923.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Scene Changes. Garden City: Doubleday & Doran. 1937.
- Watt, W. M. Can Christians Be Pacifist?. S.C.M. 1937.
- Wells, H. G. The End That Will End War. New York: Duffield. 1914.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Mr. Britling Sees It Through. New York: Macmillan. 1916.

- Wilkins, W. G. Brotherhood in Social Service. Headley. 1912.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christianity and Brotherhood. John G. Pike. 1923.
- Willis, Irene Cooper. England's Holy War. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1928. Garland. 1972.
- Woolf, L. S. International Government. New York: Brentano's 1916. Garland. 1971.
- "Whence Come Wars?". Headley. 1916.
- X. The Witness of the Church in the Present Crisis. Humphrey Milford. 1914.
- Zeeland, Paul van. Report presented by Monsieur Van Zeeland to the Governments of the United Kingdom and France on the Possibility of Obtaining a General Reduction of the Obstacles to International Trade. His Majesty's Stationary Office. Jan. 26, 1938. Cmd. 5648.

## Secondary Sources

### I. (Auto)biographies

- Anet, Daniel. Pierre Ceresole Passionate Peacemaker. tr. Marjorie Taylor. Delhi: Macmillan of India. 1974 (1969).
- Ashley, A. M. D. Joyful Servant. Abingdon: Abbey Press. 1968.
- Attwater, Donald. A Cell of Good Living. Geoffrey Chapman. 1969.
- Barnes, John. Ahead of His Age. Collins. 1979.
- Bartlett, Percy W. Barrow Cadbury. Bannisdale Press. 1960.
- Bell, G. K. A. Randall Davidson. 2 vols. Oxford University Press. 1935.
- Brittain, Vera. Testament of Experience. Victor Gollancz. 1957. Virago/Fontana. 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Pethick-Lawrence. George Allen & Unwin. 1963.
- Brockway, Fenner. The Life of Alfred Salter Bermondsey Story. George Allen & Unwin. 1949.
- Bullock, Alan. The Life and Times of Ernest Bevin. 3 vols. Heinemann. 1960; 1967; 1983.

- Burne, Kathleen E. The Life and Letters of Father Andrew S.D.C. A. R. Mowbray. 1948.
- Busch, Eberhard. Karl Barth. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1976.
- Davies, G. M. Ll. Joseph Rowntree Gillett. George Allen & Unwin. 1942.
- Dillistone, F. W. Charles Raven. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans. 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. C. H. Dodd. Hodder & Stoughton. 1977.
- Fawell, Ruth. Joan Mary Fry. Friends Home Service Ctee. 1959.
- Greaves, Jean C. Corder Catchpool. Friends Home Service Ctee. 1953.
- Harrison, Irene. Agatha Harrison. George Allen & Unwin. 1956.
- Hobhouse, Stephen. Forty Years and an Epilogue. James Clarke. 1951.
- Hughes, William R. Indomitable Friend. Corder Catchpool 1883-1952. George Allen & Unwin. 1956. Housmans. 1964.
- Hunter, Allan A. White Corpuscles in Europe. Chicago: Willett, Clark. 1939.
- Iremonger, F. A. William Temple. Oxford University Press. 1948.
- Jasper, Ronald C. D. George Bell. Oxford University Press. 1967.
- Lansbury, George. My Life. Constable. 1928.
- Lawson, McEwan. God's Back-Room Bay. Lutterworth Press. 1952.
- Lea, F. A. The Life of John Middleton Murray. Methuen. 1959.
- Lotz, Philip Henry. ed. Creative Personalities. New York: Association Press. 1940.
- Marquand, David. Ramsay MacDonald. Jonathan Cape. 1977.
- Micklem, Nathaniel. The Box and the Puppets (1883-1953). Geoffrey Bles. 1957.
- Miles, Susan. Portrait of a Parson. George Allen & Unwin. 1955.
- Morris, A. J. A. C. P. Trevelyan 1870-1958. Belfast: Blackstaff Press. 1977.

- Postgate, Raymond. The Life of George Lansbury. Longmans and Green. 1951.
- Purcell, William. Portrait of Soper. Mowbrays. 1972.
- Raven, Charles E. A Wanderer's Way. Martin Hopkinson. 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Musings and Memoirs. Martin Hopkinson. 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Alex Wood. F.O.R. 1952.
- Rawson, Wyatt T. Kees Boeke. Purmerend: J. Muusses. 1956.
- Reckitt, Maurice B. As It Happened. J. M. Dent. 1941.
- Richards, Edith Ryley. Private View of a Public Man. George Allen & Unwin. 1950.
- Roberts, R. Ellis. H. R. L. Sheppard. John Murray. 1942.
- Royden, Maude. A Threefold Cord. New York: Macmillan. 1948.
- Russell, Bertrand. The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell. Vol. 2. 1914-1944. Toronto: McClelland Stewart. 1968.
- Scott, Carolyn. Dick Sheppard. Hodder & Stoughton. 1977.
- Shewring, Walter. ed. Letters of Eric Gill. Jonathan Cape. 1947.
- Sinclair, Margaret. William Paton. S.C.M. Press. 1949.
- Symons, Julian. Horatio Bottomley. Gresset Press. 1955.
- Terrill, Ross. R. H. Tawney and His Times. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1973.
- Thompson, Douglas. Donald Soper. Nutfield: Denholm House Press. 1971.
- Unwin, E. C. Henry Carler, C. B. E.. Epworth Press. 1955.
- Walke, Bernard. Twenty Years at St. Hilary. Methuen. 1935.
- White, J. R. Misfit. Jonathan Cape. 1930.
- Wood, H. G. Henry T. Hodgkin. S.C.M. Press. 1937.

## II. Monographs

- Addison, Paul. The Road to 1945. Jonathan Cape. 1975.



- Bainton, Roland H. Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace. New York: Abingdon Press. 1960.
- Barker, Rachel. Conscience, Government and War. Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1982.
- Barnes, Roswell Pankhurst. A Christian Imperative. New York: Friendship Press. 1941.
- Bebbington, D. W. The Nonconformist Conscience. George Allen & Unwin. 1982.
- Bedborough, George. Arms and the Clergy (1914-1918). Pioneer Press. 1934.
- Bell, Julian. ed. Reminiscences of War Resisters in World War I. Cobden-Sanderson. 1935. New York: Garland. 1972.
- Benda, Julien. The Treason of the Intellectuals. tr. Richard Aldington. New York: W. W. Norton. 1969. (1928).
- Berdyaev, Nicolas. The Destiny of Man. New York: Harper & Row. 1955. 1966.
- Berkhof, L. The Kingdom of God. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1951.
- Binfield, Clyde. So Down to Prayers. J. M. Dent. 1977.
- Birn, Donald S. The League of Nations Union 1918-1945. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1981.
- Bisceglia, Louis. Norman Angell and Liberal Internationalism in Britain, 1931-1935. New York: Garland. 1982.
- Blamires, E. P. War Tests the Church. F.O.R. 1958.
- Blunden, Edmund. War Poets 1914-1918. Longmans, Green. 1958.
- Bondurant, Joan V. Conquest of Violence. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1965. (1958).
- Boulton, David. Objection Overruled. Macgibbon & Kee. 1967.
- Branson, Noreen. Britain in the Nineteen Twenties. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1976.
- Branson, Noreen, and Heinemann, Margot. Britain in the 1930s. New York: Praeger. 1971.
- Brinton, Crane. The Anatomy of Revolution. New York: Random House.

1965. (1938).

Brittain, Vera. The Rebel Passion. Nyack: Fellowship Publ. 1964.

Brock, Peter. Twentieth-Century Pacifism. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold. 1970.

\_\_\_\_\_. Pacifism in Europe to 1914. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1972.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Roots of War Resistance. Nyack: F.O.R. 1981.

Bussey, Gertrude, and Tims, Margaret. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. George Allen & Unwin. 1965.

Butterfield, Herbert. Christianity and History. G. Bell. 1949.

\_\_\_\_\_. Christianity, Diplomacy and War. Epworth Press. 1953.

\_\_\_\_\_. Writings on Christianity and History. ed. C. T. McIntyre. New York: Oxford University Press. 1979.

Calder, Angus. The People's War. Jonathan Cape. 1969.

Carlton, David. Anthony Eden. Allen Lane. 1981.

Carpenter, S. C. Church and People, 1789-1889. S.P.C.K. 1933.

Carsten, F. L. War Against War. Batsford Academic & Educational. 1982.

Caute, David. The Fellow-Travellers. New York: Macmillan. 1973.

Ceadel, Martin. Pacifism in Britain 1914-1945: the Defining of a Faith. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1980.

Chatfield, Charles. F.O.R. Peace and Justice. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press. 1971.

Chickering, Roger. Imperial Germany and a World Without War. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1975.

Choate, Joseph H. The Two Hague Conferences. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1913. Reprint 1970.

Clausewitz, Carl von. On War. ed. and tr. Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1976. [1832].

Cline, Catharine Ann. Recruits to Labour. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press. 1963.

- Coffey, Thomas M. Agony at Easter. Baltimore: Penguin. 1969.
- Collini, Stefan. Liberalism and Sociology: L. T. Hobhouse and Political Argument in England 1880-1914. Cambridge: University Press. 1979.
- Cowling, Maurice. The Impact of Labour 1920-1924. Cambridge: University Press. 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Impact of Hitler. Cambridge: University Press. 1975.
- Cox, Jeffrey. The English Churches in a Secular Society. New York: Oxford University Press. 1982.
- Craigie, Peter C. The Problem of War in the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1978.
- Curtis, S. J., and Boulton, M. E. A. A Short History of Educational Ideas. University Tutorial Press. 1953. 1961.
- Dallek, Robert. The Roosevelt Diplomacy and World War II. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 1970.
- Dangerfield, George. The Strange Death of Liberal England 1910-1914. New York: G. P. Putnam. 1980 [1935].
- Davies, Horton. Worship and Theology in England. Vol. 5: The Ecumenical Century 1900-1965. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1965.
- Dennis, Peter. Decision by default. Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1972.
- Devlin, Patrick. Too Proud to Fight. Oxford University Press. 1974.
- Douglas, J. D. ed. The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church. Grand Rapids: Zondervan. 1974.
- Dowse, Robert E. Left in the Centre. Evanston: Northwestern University Press. 1966.
- Durland, William R. No King But Caesar?. Scottdale: Herald Press. 1975.
- Dymond, Jonathan. War An Essay. 1829. New York: Garland 1973.
- Earl of Avon. The Memoirs of Anthony Eden. Facing the Dictators. Houghton: Riverside Press. 1962.
- Edwards, George R. Jesus and the Politics of Violence. New York: Harper & Row. 1972.

- Eller, Vernard. War and Peace. Scottdale: Herald Press. 1981. [1973].
- Ellul, Jacques. Violence. New York: The Seabury Press. 1969.
- Enz, Jacob J. The Christian and Warfare. Scottdale: Herald Press. 1972.
- Erickson, Millard J. Contemporary Options in Eschatology. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 1977.
- Feiling, Keith. The Life of Neville Chamberlain. Macmillan. 1946.
- Feinberg, Joel. ed. Moral Concepts. Oxford University Press. 1969.
- Ferguson, John. The Enthronement of Love. F.O.R. 1950. 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Place of Suffering. Cambridge: James Clarke. 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Politics of Love: the New Testament & Non-Violent Revolution. Cambridge: James Clarke. n.d. [1977].
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. Studies in Christian Social Commitment. Independent Press. 1954.
- Feis, Herbert. Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Fischer, Fritz. Germany's Aims in the First World War. New York: W. W. Norton. 1967.
- Fussell, Paul. The Great War and Modern Memory. Oxford University Press. 1975. 1977.
- Gilbert, Alan D. The Making of Post-Christian Britain. Longmans. 1980.
- Glass, S. T. The Responsible Society. Longmans. 1966.
- Goudzwaard, Bob. Capitalism & Progress. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation. 1979.
- Grant, John W. Free Churchmanship in England 1870-1940. Independent Press. n.d.
- Graves, Robert, and Hodge, Alan. The Long Weekend. New York: W. W. Norton. 1963. (1940).
- Greenwood, John Ormerod. Quaker Encounters. Vol. 1: Friends and Relief. York: William Sessions. 1975.
- Harris, José. William Beveridge. Oxford: University Press, 1977.

- Harrison, Roland Kenneth. Introduction to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1969.
- Hasel, Gerhard. New Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1978.
- Havighurst, Alfred F. Twentieth Century Britain. New York: Harper & Row. 1962. 1966.
- Hayes, Denis. Conscription Conflict. Sheppard Press. 1949. New York: Garland. 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Challenge of Conscience. George Allen & Unwin. 1949. New York: Garland. 1972.
- Hearnshaw, L. S. A Short History of British Psychology 1840-1940. New York: Barnes & Noble. 1964.
- Henig, Ruth B. ed. The League of Nations. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd. 1973.
- Hinsley, F. H. Power and the Pursuit of Peace. Cambridge: University Press. 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. British Foreign Policy Under Sir Edward Grey. Cambridge: University Press. 1977.
- Hornus, Jean-Michel. It Is Not Lawful For Me To Fight. Scottdale: Herald Press. 1980.
- Horton, Walter Marshall. Contemporary English Theology. New York: Harper. 1936.
- Howard, Michael. Studies in War and Peace. New York: Viking Press. 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. War and the Liberal Conscience. Temple Smith. 1978.
- Hyams, Edward. The New Statesman. Longmans. 1963.
- Hyde, H. Montgomery. Neville Chamberlain. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. 1976.
- Hynes, Samuel. The Edwardian Turn of Mind. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1968. 1975.
- Isichei, Elizabeth. Victorian Quakers. Oxford University Press. 1970.
- Jenkins, Roy. Asquith. Collins. 1964.

- Johnson, Paul Barton. Land Fit For Heroes. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1968.
- Jones, Peter d'A. The Christian Socialist Revival 1877-1914. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1968.
- Jones, R. Tudur. Congregationalism in England 1662-1962. Independent Press. 1962.
- Karp, Walter. The Politics of War. New York: Harper & Row. 1979.
- Kennedy, Thomas C. The Hound of Conscience. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press. 1981.
- Klaassen, Walter. The Just War: A Summary. Dundas: Peace Research Institute./Peace Research Review. Vol. 7 no. 6. 1978.
- Koss, Stephen. Asquith. Allen Lane. 1976.
- Ladd, George Eldon. The New Testament and Criticism. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1967.
- Langford, Thomas A. In Search of Foundations English Theology 1900-1920. Nashville: Abingdon Press. 1969.
- Lasserre, Jean. War and the Gospel. James Clarke. 1962.
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott. Christianity in a Revolutionary Age. Vol. 4: The 20th Century in Europe. Grand Rapids: Zondervan. 1961.
- Lewis, John. The Left Book Club. Victor Gollancz. 1970.
- Lind, Millard C. Yahweh is a Warrior. Scottdale: Herald Press. 1980.
- Lloyd, Roger Bradshaigh. The Church of England 1900-1965. S.C.M. 1966.
- Lowndes, G. A. N. The Silent Social Revolution. Oxford University Press. 1969. [1937].
- Maclachlan, Lewis. C.P.F.L.U.. F.O.R. 1952.
- MacLeod, Iain. Neville Chamberlain. Frederick Muller. 1961.
- Marrin, Albert. The Last Crusade. Durham: Duke University Press. 1974.
- Marshall, Paul. Thine is the Kingdom. Basingstoke: Marshall, Morgan & Scott. 1984.
- Martin, David A. Pacifism. Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1965.

- Martin, Hugh. The Student Christian Movement. S.C.M. 1929.
- Martin, Laurence W. Peace Without Victory. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1958.
- Marwick, Arthur. The Deluge. New York: W. W. Norton. 1965. 1970.
- Mayer, Peter, ed. The Pacifist Conscience. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 1966.
- McIntyre, C. T., and Wells, Ronald A. ed. History and Historical Understanding. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1984.
- McKibbin, Ross. The Evolution of the Labour Party 1910-1924. Oxford University Press. 1974.
- McLeod, Hugh. Class and Religion in the Late Victorian City. Croom Helm. 1974.
- McSorley, Richard. New Testament Basis of Peacemaking. Washington: Center for Peace Studies. 1979.
- Middlemas, Keith. Politics in Industrial Society. André Deutsch. 1979.
- Miller, William Robert. Nonviolence. George Unwin & Allen. 1964.
- Moore, Robert. Pit-men, Preachers and Politics. Cambridge: University Press. 1974.
- Morgan, Kenneth O. The Age of Lloyd George: The Liberal Party and British Politics, 1890-1929. George Allen & Unwin. 1971.
- Morris, Leon. The Gospel According to St. Luke. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1974.
- Morrison, Sybil. I Renounce War. Sheppard Press. 1962.
- Mouw, Richard J. Politics and the Biblical Drama. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1976.
- Murray, Gilbert. The League of Nations Movement: Some Recollections of the Early Days. David Davies Memorial Institute of International Studies. 1955.
- Naylor, John F. Labour's International Policy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1969.
- Neill, Stephen. The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1961. Oxford University Press. 1975. [1964].

- Nelson, John Oliver. ed. The Christian Conscience and War. Scottdale: Herald Press. 1950.
- Newman, Simon. March 1939: the British Guarantee to Poland. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1976.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. Christ and Culture. New York: Harper & Row. 1951.
- Noel-Baker, Philip John. The First World Disarmament Conference, 1932-1933, and Why it Failed. New York: Pergamum Press. 1979.
- Nuttall, Geoffrey F. Christian Pacifism in History. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1958.
- Oliver, John. The Church and Social Order. A. R. Mowbray. 1968.
- Orr, Edgar W. Christian Pacifism. Ashington: C. W. Daniels. 1958.
- Padgett, Jack F. The Christian Philosophy of William Temple. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1974.
- Page, Robert J. New Directions in Anglican Theology. New York: The Seabury Press. 1965.
- Park, Joe. Bertrand Russell on Education. George Allen & Unwin. 1964.
- Pauck, Wilhelm. Harnack and Troeltsch. New York: Oxford University Press. 1968.
- Peden, G. C. British Rearmament and the Treasury 1932-1939. Edingburgh: Scottish Academic Press. 1979.
- Phillips, G. A. The General Strike. Weidenfels & Nicolson. 1976.
- Pimlott, Ben. Labour and the Left in the 1930s. Cambridge University Press. 1977.
- Rae, John. Conscience and Politics. Oxford University Press. 1970.
- Ramsey, Arthur Michael. From Gore to Temple. Longmans. 1960.
- Robbins, Keith. The Abolition of War The 'Peace Movement' in Britain, 1914-1919. Cardiff: University of Wales Press. 1976.
- Rouse, Ruth. The World's Student Christian Federation. S.C.M. Press. 1948.



- Rouse, Ruth, and Neill, Stephen Charles. ed. A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517-1948. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1954.
- Russell, Ebert W. Christianity & Militarism. Oakville: Canadian Peace Research Institute/Peace Research Review. Vol. 4 no.3. 1971.
- Seerveld, Calvin. Rainbows for the Fallen World. Toronto: Tuppence Press. 1980.
- Shay, Robert Paul. British Rearmament in the Thirties: Politics and Profits. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1977.
- Sherman, A. J. Island Refuge. Paul Elek. 1973.
- Sider, Ronald J. Christ and Violence. Scottdale: Herald Press. 1979.
- Skidelsky, Robert. Politicians and the Slump. Macmillan. 1967.
- Smart, James D. tr. Revolutionary Theology in the Making Barth-Thurneysen Correspondence 1914-1925. Richmond: John Knox Press. 1964.
- Soffer, Reba N. Ethics and Society in England-The Revolution in the Social Science 1870-1914. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1978.
- Spinks, G. Stephens; Allen, E. L.; and Parkes, James. Religion in Britain Since 1900. Andrew Dakers. 1952.
- Springhall, John. Youth, Empire and Society. Croom Helm. 1972.
- Stannard, David E. Shrinking History. New York: Oxford University Press. 1980.
- Stansky, Peter. ed. The Left and War: the British Labour Party and World War I. New York: Oxford University Press. 1969.
- Steiner, Zara S. Britain and the Origins of the First World War. Macmillan. 1977.
- Stevenson, John, and Cook, Chris. The Slump. Jonathan Cape. 1977.
- Stewart, W. A. C. Quakers and Education. As Seen in their Schools in England. Epworth Press. 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Educational Innovators. Macmillan. 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Progressives and Radicals in English Education 1750-1970. Macmillan. 1972.

- Swartz, Marvin. The Union of Democratic Control in British Politics During the First World War. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1971.
- Swomley, John M. Liberation Ethics. New York: Macmillan. 1972.
- Tatlow, Tissington. The Story of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland. S.C.M. Press. 1933.
- Taylor, A. J. P. The Trouble Makers. Hamish Hamilton. 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Origins of the Second World War. New York: Fawcett Premier. 1961. 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. English History 1914-1945. New York: Oxford University Press. 1965. 1970.
- Tuchman, Barbara W. The Proud Tower. New York: Macmillan. 1966.
- Vellacott, Jo. Bertrand Russell and the Pacifists in the First World War. Brighton: The Harvester Press. 1980.
- Vidler, Alec R. The Church in an Age of Revolution. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 1971. 1974.
- Wallis, Jim. ed. Waging Peace. San Francisco: Harper & Row. 1982.
- Walters, F. P. A History of the League of Nations. 2 vols. Oxford University Press. 1952.
- Wasserstein, Bernard. Britain and the Jews of Europe 1939-1945. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1979.
- Webb, R. K. Modern England. New York: Harper & Row. 1980.
- Wilkinson, Alan. The Church of England and the First World War. S.P.C.K. 1978.
- Williams, Daniel Day. What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking. New York: Harper. 1952. 1959.
- Williams, David. A History of Modern Wales. John Murray. 1950. 1977.
- Winter, J. M. Socialism and the Challenge of War. Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1974.
- Wright, Anthony W. G. D. H. Cole and Socialist Democracy. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. British Socialism. Longmans. 1983.

Yoder, John Howard. Reinhold Niebuhr and Christian Pacifism. Scottdale: Herald Press. n.d. [1953].

\_\_\_\_\_. Peace Without Eschatology?. Scottdale: Mennonite Publishing House. n.d. Reprint 1958.

\_\_\_\_\_. Karl Barth and the Problem of War. Nashville: Abingdon Press. 1970.

\_\_\_\_\_. Nevertheless. Scottdale: Herald Press. 1971. 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Original Revolution. Scottdale: Herald Press. 1971. 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Politics of Jesus. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 1972.

Younger, Calton. Ireland's Civil War. Fontana/Collins. 1968. 1970.

\_\_\_\_\_. A State of Disunion. Frederick Muller. 1972.

Zahn, Gordon C. German Catholics and Hitler's Wars. New York: Sheed and Ward. 1962.

### III. Secondary Articles

Cassels, Alan. "Repairing the Entente Cordiale and the New Diplomacy," The Historical Journal. Vol. 23 no. 1. 1980. pp. 133-153.

Ceadel, Martin. "Interpreting East Fulham," By-Elections in British Politics. ed. Chris Cook and John Ramsden, ch. 5. Macmillan. 1973

\_\_\_\_\_. "Popular Fiction and the Next War, 1918-'39," Class, Culture and Social Change. ed. Frank Gloversmith, ch 6. Sussex: Harvester Press. 1980.

Clements, K. W. "Baptists and the Outbreak of the First World War," The Baptist Quarterly. Vol. 26 no. 2. April 1975. pp. 74-92.

Dubin, Martin David. "Toward the Concept of Collective Security: The Bryce Group's "Proposals for the Avoidance of War", 1914-1917," International Organization. Vol. 24 no. 2. Spring 1970. pp. 288-318.

Gilles, John R. "The Evolution of Juvenile Delinquency in England 1890-1914," Past & Present. Vol. 67. May 1975. pp. 96-126.

Hobhouse, L. T. "The Historical Evolution of Property, in Fact and in Idea," ch. 1 of Property Its Duties and Rights. New York:

Macmillan. 1922.

Kennedy, P. M. "Idealists versus Realists: British Views of Germany, 1864-1939," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Fifth Series. Vol. 25. 1975. pp. 137-156.

Kennedy, Thomas C. "The Quaker Renaissance and the Origins of the Modern British Peace Movement, 1895-1920," Albion. Vol. 16 no. 3. 1984. pp. 243-272.

Kirby, N. M. "The Politics of State Coercion in Inter-War Britain: the Mines Department of the Board of Trade, 1920-1942," The Historical Journal. Vol. 22 no. 2. 1979. pp. 373-396.

Lukowitz, David C. "British Pacifists and Appeasement: the Peace Pledge Union," Journal of Contemporary History. Vol. 9 no. 1. Jan. 1974. pp. 115-127.

\_\_\_\_\_. "George Lansbury's Peace Missions to Hitler and Mussolini in 1937," Canadian Journal of History. Vol. 25 no. 1. April 1980. pp. 67-82.

McKibbin, Ross. "The Economic Policy of Second Labour Government 1929-1931," Past & Present. Vol. 68. Aug. 1975. pp. 95-123.

Morgan, Kenneth O. "Peace Movements in Wales, 1899-1945," The Welsh History Review. Vol. 10 no. 3. June 1981. pp. 398-430.

Narvesen, Jan. "Pacifism: A Philosophical Analysis," Ethics. Vol. 75 no. 4. July 1965. pp. 259-271.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. "The Doctrine of the Trinity and the Unity of the Church," Theology Today. Vol. 3 no. 3. Oct. 1946. pp. 371-384.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. "Pacifism and the Use of Force," The World Tomorrow. Vol. 11. no. 5. May 1928. pp. 218-220.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Political Action and Social Change," The World Tomorrow. Vol. 12 no. 12. Dec. 1929. pp. 491-493.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Is Peace or Justice the Goal?," The World Tomorrow. Vol. 15 no. 10. Sept. 21, 1932. pp. 275-277.

Parker, R. A. C. "British Rearmament 1936-9: Treasury, Trade Unions and Skilled Labour," English Historical Review. Vol. 96. Apr. 1981. pp. 306-344.

Peyton, W. W. "The Crucifixion and the War in Creation," The Contemporary Review. Vol. 78. Oct. 1900. pp. 518-531; Dec. 1900. pp. 835-857.

- Pugh, Michael. "Pacifism and Politics in Britain, 1931-1935," The Historical Journal. Vol. 23. 1980. pp. 641-656.
- Renshaw, Patrick. "Anti-Labour Politics in Britain, 1918-27," Journal of Contemporary History. Vol. 12. 1977. pp. 693-705.
- Robbins, Keith G. "Lord Bryce and the First World War," The Historical Journal. Vol. 10 no. 2. 1967. pp. 255-277.
- Weinroth, Howard. "Left-Wing Opposition to Naval Armaments in Britain Before 1914," Journal of Contemporary History. Vol. 6. 1971. pp. 93-120.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Norman Angell and The Great Illusion: an Episode in pre-1914 Pacifism," The Historical Journal. Vol. 17 no. 3. 1974. pp. 551-574.
- White, Stephen. "Soviets in Britain: The Leeds Conference of 1917," International Review of Social History. Vol 19. no. 2. 1974. pp. 165-193.

#### Unpublished Works

- Bailey, Charles Edward. "Gott mit uns: Germany's Protestant Theologians in the First World War." Ph.D. University of Virginia. 1978.
- Barton, Betty Lynn. "The Fellowship of Reconciliation: Pacifism, Labor, and Social Welfare, 1915-1960." Ph.D. Florida State University. 1974.
- Bennett, Yvonne Aleksandra. "Testament of a Minority in Wartime: the Peace Pledge Union and Vera Brittain, 1939-1945." Ph.D. McMaster University. 1984.
- Berkman, Joyce Avrech. "Pacifism in England, 1914-1939." Ph.D. Yale University. 1977.
- Calahan, Peter James. "The Treatment of Belgian Refugees in England During the Great War." Ph.D. McMaster University. 1977.
- Harley, David Bruce. "A Critical Exposition of Russell's Solution to the Mind-Body Problem." M.A. McMaster University. 1975.
- Hunter, George Gill III. "Evangelistic Rhetoric in Secular Britain: The Theory and Speaking of Donald Soper and Bryan Green." Ph.D. North-Western University. 1972.
- Kerr-Wilson, Andrew David. "The Sword and the Light: the Evolution of

the Peace Testimony of the British Society of Friends, 1914-1918." M. A. McMaster University. 1985.

Rizzo, Robert F. "Christian Vision and Pacifism: A Study of Charles Earle Raven with a Comparison to Reinhold Niebuhr." Ph.D. The Catholic University of America. 1971.

Socknat, Thomas Paul. "'Witness Against War': Pacifism in Canada, 1900-1945." Ph.D. McMaster University. 1981.

Sherington, Geoffrey Edgar. "World War One and National Education Policy in England." Ph.D. McMaster University. 1975.

Stitt, James Wilson. "Whitley Councils: Their Conception and Adoption During W.W.I." Ph.D. University of South Carolina. 1976.

Supina, Dale. "Norman Angell and the Years of Illusion 1908-14." Ph.D. Ball State University. 1969.