

PACIFISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1930-1937

CLIVE BARRETT

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds

Department of Theology and Religious Studies

November 1997

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

ABSTRACT

PACIFISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1930-1937 CLIVE BARRETT

1937 was the high-point of Anglican pacifism. Every major peace organisation was led by an Anglican pacifist: Lansbury at War Resisters International, Sheppard then Morris at the Peace Pledge Union, Raven at the Fellowship of Reconciliation and Bishop Barnes at the National Peace Council. It was the year both that the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship was formed and also that the charismatic, irreplaceable Sheppard died.

Christian pacifist origins are traced back to the Early Church. In England, Wyclif's interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount led some Lollards to pacifism. Following Erasmus, Anabaptists and Quakers, William Law produced the first Anglican pacifist address in 1761. Thomas Clarkson and others were 19th century pacifists in the Peace Society, promoting international arbitration. In 1914-1918, the Fellowship of Reconciliation was formed, with Maude Royden particularly active, and Anglican conscientious objectors in a minority. Post-war, there was a pacifist statement at the C.O.P.E.C. conference of 1924. George Lansbury, Charles Stimson and Bernard Walke were among those active in the 1920s.

At the start of the 1930s, a Church and Peace campaign was underway across Britain. The Peace Army concept, promoted by Royden et al, was an innovation. Sheppard's initiative was in promoting a peace pledge, leading to the founding of the Peace Pledge Union. In 1937, the P.P.U. held a successful camp at Swanwick, Sheppard was elected to the Rectorship of Glasgow University and then died suddenly. The P.P.U. is compared and contrasted with the C.N.D. later in the century in the principles they enshrined, the personalities involved and the issues they faced.

The legacy of the Versailles Treaty dominated international affairs after 1919, leading to the Disarmament Conference of 1932. Lansbury, with his Christian socialist pacifism, became Labour leader until the dramatic events of the 1935 party conference. He then addressed the Church Assembly and worked with the Embassies of Reconciliation, including visits to Roosevelt, Hitler, Mussolini and others, trying to promote an International Conference to prevent war. The realism of his position is analysed.

The 1930 Lambeth Conference Resolution 25 on the incompatibility of war with Jesus' teaching and example encouraged Anglican pacifists. Until 1937 there were small groups but no national organisation. Following an initiative by Robert Gofton-Salmond, concerned at William Temple's attitude to war, a group of Anglo-Catholics around W. C. Roberts in East London became significant. After a disappointing debate in the Church Assembly early in 1937, Sheppard promoted a large rally and procession to Lambeth, after which Paul Gliddon and others in the group resolved to form a national organisation, the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. Active early members included Percy Hartill, Tom Scrutton and Ursula Roberts. Given the nature of Establishment and Article 37, the appropriateness of pacifists within the Church of England is considered.

Stuart Morris, Kenneth Rawlings, Dick Sheppard, Bishop Barnes and especially Charles Raven, all contributed to the religious expression of pacifism. Raven objected to Temple's accusation that pacifists were 'heretical in tendency', he opposed Niebuhr, made a substantial submission to the 1937 Oxford Conference on Church, State and Community, and subsequently produced a retort to Barthian and Lutheran theologies. The use of scripture by Anglican pacifists generally is considered, as is their eschatological approach to ethics.

Post 1937, Lansbury continued to work for an International Conference. The P.P.U. concentrated on mutual support in wartime, with Vera Brittain its most influential Anglican. Raven produced more pacifist theological texts. The A.P.F. consolidated by focussing its attention on the Church of England. It continues its work today.

PACIFISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1930-1937

Contents

Abstract

Acknowledgements

Selected Abbreviations

Part 1: The Origins of Anglican Pacifism

- | | |
|----------------------------------|----|
| 1. Anglican Pacifism Before 1914 | 2 |
| 2. Anglican Pacifism 1914-1918 | 27 |
| 3. Anglican Pacifism 1918-1930 | 58 |

Part 2: A Chronicle of Anglican Pacifism, 1930-1937

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. The Chronology of a Campaign | 83 |
| 2. A Political Chronology | 125 |
| 3. An Anglican Chronology | 162 |
| 4. Chronology of Religious Argument | 202 |

Part 3: Analysis of Anglican Pacifism, 1930-1937

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Pacifist Campaigning | 232 |
| 2. Pacifist Politics | 250 |
| 3. Pacifism and the Church of England | 262 |
| 4. Pacifism and Theological Argument | 277 |

Postscript 299

Selected Bibliography 304

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As no person is an island, so no one can produce a thesis of this extent without the support and assistance of others. The final product, however, does not necessarily reflect the opinions of those who have given their assistance.

The support of the following is particularly appreciated:

The Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, for continuing moral and material backing;
The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, for welcome financial aid;
The Diocese of Ripon, for the initial study leave which enabled the project to get underway;
The ecumenical team of chaplains at the University of Leeds Chaplaincy, for moral support and acceptance of this dimension of my ministry.

Alan Bishop, for insights into Vera Brittain;
Keith Edghill, for providing invaluable guidance into 19th century Anglicans;
Peter Brock, Martin Ceadel and Peter van den Dungen for examples of pacifist history;
Jeremy Brown, Francis House and Alan Wilkinson, for Anglican insights;
Valerie Flessati, for indicating Anglicans in the Pax story;
Dick Rempel, for allowing me to borrow the den Boggende thesis;
Bill Hetherington, for delving into the P.P.U. treasures.

Dozens of interviewees (many of whose accounts are not here represented as they related to a later period), some now departed, who contributed their stories to an A.P.F. sound archive, amongst whom were: Peggy Attlee, William Barnes, Rowena Bingham, John Chapman, Patricia Churchill, Diana Collins, Philip Dransfield, Winifred Golding, Father Gregory CSWG, Alfred Jowett, Ronald Mallone, Jeffrey Maples, Hilda Morris, Faith Raven, Mary Raven, Lady Peggie Richardson, Margaret Scrutton, Michael Segal, Donald Soper, Dorothy Stimson and Arthur Towner.

Of the many librarians I troubled in the period of this study, particular thanks go to those who rendered assistance beyond the call of duty, especially the staff of the Brotherton Library at the University of Leeds, the Commonweal Collection at Bradford, and the McMaster University Library, Hamilton, Ontario.

Adrian Hastings, my supervisor, for providing challenge, support and a sense of order.

Jenny Barrett, Stephen Barrett and Simon Barrett, for tolerating my obsession.

SELECTED ABBREVIATIONS

A.P.F.	Anglican Pacifist Fellowship
CB	The author
C.I.C.C.U.	Cambridge Inter-Collegiate Christian Union
C.C.N.D.	Christian Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
C.C.P.G.	Council of Christian Pacifist Groups
C.E.M.S.	Church of England Men's Society
C.N.D.	Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
C.O.	Conscientious objector
C.O.P.E.C.	Conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship
E.P.F.	Episcopal Pacifist Fellowship
F.O.R.	Fellowship of Reconciliation
F.S.J.M.	Franciscan Servants of Jesus and Mary
I.C.F.	Industrial Christian Fellowship
I.F.O.R.	International Fellowship of Reconciliation
I.L.P.	Independent Labour Party
I.V.S.	International Voluntary Service
L.N.U.	League of Nations Union
M.T.C.I.	Movement Towards a Christian International
N.A.T.O.	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
N.C.C.	Non Combatant Corps
N.C.F.	No-Conscription Fellowship
N.W.M.W.	No More War Movement
N.P.C.	National Peace Council
P.C.C.	Parochial Church Council
P.P.U.	Peace Pledge Union
S.A.L.T.	Strategic Arms Limitation Talks
S.C.I.	Service Christian International
S.C.M.	Student Christian Movement
U.D.C.	Union of Democratic Control
W.I.L. / W.I.L.P.F.	Women's International League (for Peace and Freedom)
W.R.I.	War Resisters International

PACIFISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1930-1937

PART 1: THE ORIGINS OF ANGLICAN PACIFISM

ANGLICAN PACIFISM BEFORE 1914

The Inheritance: Catholic

“Christ, in disarming Peter, ungirdled every soldier.”¹ Thus Tertullian (c.160-c.225) encompassed the belief of the first generations of Christians, that pacifism² was normative. It was not simply that Christians would refuse to join the Imperial army through fear of the idolatry of emperor-worship, although that was a factor for many, but that they believed the work of the army itself to be unacceptable. Although counter-examples have been discovered, of early Christians who were serving soldiers, it is clear that these were exceptions to the norm. The fact that little explicit condemnation of the practice is found before the mid second century is an indication that there was no substantive challenge to the norm before that time. Justin Martyr (c.100-c.165) and Irenæus (c.130-200) both spoke of Christians fulfilling the prophecy of turning swords into ploughshares.³ Tertullian was amazed that Christians could even consider the military profession: “Shall the Son of Peace, for whom it is unlawful to go to law, be engaged in battle?”⁴ he asked. He went further: “How will a Christian take part in war, nay, how will he serve even in peace?” Origen (c.185-254) argued against Celsus that Christians defended the Empire in a better way than the sword. “No longer do we take the sword against any nation, nor do we learn war any more, since we have become children of peace through Jesus who is our leader,” he said.⁵ It was Jesus himself, said Origen, who taught that “it was never right for his disciples to go so far (as the taking of human life) against a man, even if he should be very wicked.”⁶ Cyprian (c.200-258) lamented that the crime of murder was called a virtue when committed wholesale in war.⁷ “God has willed that iron be used for tilling the earth,” he said, “therefore he has forbidden its use for taking human life.”⁸ Clement of Alexandria (c.150-c.215) spoke of Christians, male and female, being trained for peace, not war.⁹ Even Lactantius (c.240-c.320), supporter of the Christian empire, announced that “It will not be lawful for a just man to engage in warfare.... It is the act of putting to death itself which is prohibited....”¹⁰ By the end of the third century, serving soldiers who were converted to Christianity were being tried for laying down their weapons. Tarachus (d.c.303) proclaimed “Because I was a Christian, I have now chosen to be a civilian.”¹¹ Maximilian was martyred in 296, announcing, “I cannot be a soldier. I cannot do evil. I am a Christian.”¹² Two years later Marcellus was martyred, preferring the language of spiritual warfare: “I have thrown (my weapons) away, for it is not fitting that a Christian who fights for Christ his Lord should be a soldier according to the brutalities of this world.”¹³

With the conversion of Constantine in 311, and his coming to greater power two years later, persecution turned to acceptance and later to establishment, but the relief from suffering brought with it new dangers. Christianity was now closely aligned with those who had responsibility for the defence, even the expansion of the Empire. Some, notably Martin of Tours (316-397), were content to be in the army in a policing capacity whilst still refusing to take part in battle. Unable to accept the Emperor's donative on the eve of battle, Martin left the army announcing "I am a soldier of Christ: it is not lawful for me to fight."¹⁴ To prove that his was a moral stand and not a failure of courage, he offered to face the enemy alone and unarmed. The offer was not taken up as the battle was deferred at the last moment.

Martin's stand was one of the last of his generation. In an attempt to justify some wars, notably in defence of the Empire, Augustine recast the classical pagan concept of a Just War in Christian language. By the end of the fourth century, the Roman Army was substantially Christian. The exemption of the clergy from military call-up was all that remained of previously accepted doctrine and practice. The orthodoxy of Christian pacifism became a feature of a former age.

The Inheritance: Reformed

With the Church, East and West, committed to the State with its soldiery, wherever pacifism arose in the centuries ahead it would necessarily be in sects deemed heretical or in groups at the furthest edges of the Church. Amongst the dualist and ascetic sects of the early Middle Ages, some of the Bogomils and the Cathari, including the Albigenses, rejected war, if not always defensive war.¹⁵

Contemporaneous with Albigensian persecution in southern France was the attempted suppression of the Waldenses, followers of the itinerant lay preacher of the gospel of poverty - and forerunner of Francis of Assisi (1181-1226), whose tertiaries were at first forbidden to bear arms¹⁶ - Peter Valdès from Lyons. Valdès (d.c.1206) was less obedient than Francis, and, following his excommunication, his disciples became a condemned sect in 1215. The Waldensians, like a number of pacifist groups from that time to the Reformation, based their beliefs on the distribution and knowledge of scripture not least the Sermon on the Mount.¹⁷ Thus the first sign of pacifism in the English Church came in the fourteenth century when a similar approach to scripture was taken by the Master of Balliol College, Oxford, John Wyclif (c. 1329-1384). He not only urged a translation of the Bible but also sent out itinerant preachers. Again, the Sermon on the Mount was the basis of Wyclif's opposition to war.¹⁸ He was not

himself a pacifist, but his opposition to war led to a firm pacifism in some of his Lollard followers after his death. In the first pacifist petition laid before the House of Commons, the Lollards presented “Twelve Conclusions” to Parliament in 1395, the tenth of which was a condemnation of war.¹⁹ Four years later a law was passed for the burning of heretics. The Lollards went underground and much of their early pacifism was lost.²⁰

Wyclif’s writings were particularly influential in Continental Europe, where the path of pacifism was to prove rocky, interspersed with violent persecution met with equally violent resistance before breakaway groups reasserted the essential gospel nature of pacifism. Amongst those influenced were Jan Hus (d.1415) in Prague and Petz Chelcicky (c.1390-1460), inspiration for the Unitas Fratrum, or Bohemian Brethren (later to become the Moravians) who vowed not to defend themselves by force of arms.²¹

The English Church also played a significant part in the development of one of the greatest reformers, who was also the most noted pacifist apologist of his day. Desiderius Erasmus (c.1466-1536) studied in Oxford in 1499 and in Cambridge from 1509 to 1514, during part of which time he was the nominal incumbent of a parish in Kent.²² In 1517 he presented the King of France with *The Complaint of Peace*, a remarkably powerful condemnation of war.

Ideas were now in circulation, even if movements were repressed. Conrad Grebel (d.c.1526), a likely reader of Erasmus²³ and once a member of Zwingli’s bible-study groups in Zurich before separating on the issue of infant baptism (which Grebel opposed), concluded that Christians could not use the sword of war, and in the 1520s the Zurich Anabaptist groups of Swiss Brethren became a centre for the idea of absolute love and non-resistance.²⁴ As Anabaptism, often violent, spread north into Germany and beyond, its nonresistant element spread too. One wing became communitarian, the Stäbler led by Jacob Hutter (d.1536), who settled at Slavkov (Austerlitz).²⁵ With the conversion of the ex-Catholic Dutch priest, Menno Simons (1496-1561), there arose a figure who was able to unite the various peaceable Anabaptists of the Netherlands and northwest Germany.²⁶ As there were many commercial links between eastern England and the Netherlands in particular, it was not long before Anabaptist influence spread across the English Channel, to (amongst other places) areas of East Anglia where Lollardry had been strong the previous century.²⁷ The impact (or the fear) of Anabaptist groups in the reign of Elizabeth I of England is shown in the way that the emergent

Church of England defined itself in its Articles against the Papacy on the one hand and against Anabaptists on the other. In 1563, Article 37, permitting men to fight in Just Wars (the word “Just” was later omitted in translation), was intended as a direct rebuttal of the Anabaptist position.

In seventeenth century England, radical and sometimes bizarre groups proliferated. There was a longing for a new order, a “world turned upside-down.” The Family of Love, derived from the teaching of the Dutch mystic Hendrik Niclaes, was one such group.²⁸ Alongside the Levellers, the Diggers, the Muggletonians,²⁹ the Tryonites and the Ranters was the group gathering around another itinerant preacher, George Fox (1624-1691.) The Quakers were to become the principal proponents of Christian pacifism in England, from their first official pacifist pronouncement in January 1661,³⁰ their convictions strengthened by the teaching of Robert Barclay (1648-1690) and the positive American experiences of William Penn (1644-1718.) If those who formulated the Articles of the Church of England had hoped that the condemnation of Anabaptism would thwart the rise of pacifism, they were to be undone by the Society of Friends. For all that the Quakers have been amongst the least proselytising of Christian denominations, their cumulative influence on Anglican thought, spirituality and practice, not least in the realm of pacifism, has been substantial, not to say subversive.

Pioneers of Anglican Pacifism

William Law (1686-1761) was a Non-juror, unwilling to sign an oath of allegiance to the Protestant King George I, as a consequence of which he forfeited his Cambridge Fellowship in 1716. He became something of a controversialist, writing various doctrinal and moral tracts. In his *Practical Treatise Upon Christian Perfection* (1726) he described “the highest Degree of Christian Perfection” as “also the lowest Degree of Holiness which the Gospel alloweth.”³¹ There could be no compromise with Love, even for one such as Law who was used to being verbally attacked by those with opposite opinions. “It is impossible,” he said, “to be a *true* Christian, and an *Enemy* at the same time.”³² Three years later Law published *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*, an account of practical living for which the previous work provided the theory. As for loving enemies, “there is nothing that makes us love a man so much, as praying for him,”³³ said Law. In the years that followed, Law became especially influenced by the mystical works of Jakob Böhme, and he moved towards mysticism himself. His High Church tradition meant that he distanced himself from the Quakers, but the more he became open to the Spirit, enthusiasm even, the more he grew sympathetic towards them. Towards the end of his life the Seven Years War broke out across continental Europe (1756), Clive in India (1757 - the year a militia bill was enacted) was forcibly

increasing British possessions and Wolfe in Canada (1759) was engaged in further conflict. In such a context, with his well-laid theological and spiritual framework, Law was led by the Spirit to pacifism. The summit of his work came in 1761 with *An Humble Earnest and Affectionate Address to the Clergy*. It was his last work - he died in April within two weeks of finishing writing - but it was the first substantive exposition of Christian pacifism to be written by an Anglican. He lamented over the wars between different Christians; he described war as "the Murder of an hundred thousand," which murder was as forbidden to nations as to individuals; he bemoaned the fate of those forced or tempted "to forget God, Eternity, and their own Souls, and rush into a *kill or be killed*". "O Christendom," he bewailed, "thy Wars are thy certain *Proofs*, that thou art all over as full of an Ignorance of God, as the Waters cover the Sea."³⁴ The Christendom that Law desired was one "that neither wants, nor allows of War." Instead,

It is my Complaint against, and Charge upon all the Nations of Christendom, that this Necessity of murdering Arms is the Dragon's *Monster*, that is equally brought forth by all and every Part of fallen Christendom; and that therefore all and every part, as well Popish as Protestant, are at one and the same Distance from the Spirit of their Lord and Saviour the Lamb of God, and therefore all want one and the same entire Reformation.³⁵

Following the French Revolution of 1789, tension began to rise in England and for twelve years from 1 February 1793 the two nations were at war. For much of this period there were annual "Fast Days" to increase national morale, days that produced various sermons and articles on the spirit of war by Anglican clergy and others. Vicesimus Knox (1752-1821) suggested that the total abolition of war may not be impractical and in 1794 he translated the Erasmus essay, *Dulce Bellum Inexpertis*, publishing it under the title *Antipolemus* ("Many rejoice, with Erasmus, in the persuasion that an unreserved adoption of Gospel principles would utterly abrogate war among Christians...."³⁶) Excerpts from Law's *Address to the Clergy* were also republished at that time (1799) by one they had converted, B. Flower of Cambridge.

On the Fast Day of 25 February 1795 John H. Williams (c.1747-1829) of Wellsbourne, Warwickshire, argued that "The SWORD of Christianity is the WORD OF GOD, and it will not admit of carnal warfare, either for its propagation or its defence."³⁷ Significantly, however, both Knox and Williams left open the possibility of a nation waging a defensive war.³⁸ Others, though, went further. *The Antidote*, a political poem on the spirit of liberty, addressed to the king in 1795 by John Webster Hawksley (1766-1856; Rector of Turvey, Bedfordshire, from 1827), appealed to reason for defence: "Enough for British Valor to oppose / Her Ranks resistless to her NATION'S

Foes.”³⁹ Several tracts were published at that time by “A Clergyman of the Church of England.” *Thoughts on the Lawfulness of War* (1796), was actually based on correspondence between the anonymous “Member of the Establishment”⁴⁰ and another clergyman three years earlier. Similarly pseudonymous was *The Lawfulness of Defensive War Upon Christian Principles Impartially Considered* (1798) which argued against defensive war on the grounds that it would be “committing a real and certain evil in order to avoid that which is only supposed an uncertain.”⁴¹ It has been suggested⁴² that the author of this tract, who was supportive of the witness of the Quakers, critical of Article XXXVII and hoped his writing would lead to disaffection from the army, could have been J. Bradley Rhys, the writer of a second tract under the same pseudonym to be published that year, *An Answer to Some Passages in a Letter from the Bishop of Rochester to the Clergy (dated May 1st, 1798) upon the Lawfulness of Defensive War*. For Rhys, any distinction between private and public enemies was “mere trifling, a distinction without a difference.”⁴³

These works were particularly significant in that they dealt with defensive war, so often the one issue avoided by opponents of war, and at a time when the threat of invasion was high. Richard Warner (1763-1857), the curate of the high-profile church of St. James’, Bath, delivered the period’s most controversial sermon on pacifism on 25 May 1804, the more so as two companies of Volunteers were in the congregation that day to hear his advocacy of non-resistance in the face of invasion. For all the debate that ensued,⁴⁴ Warner, whose own acceptance of pacifism was fairly recent,⁴⁵ must have stood by his position as he repeated the sermon on 20 February the following year and arranged its publication under the title *War Inconsistent With Christianity*.⁴⁶

Thomas Clarkson (1760-1846), a non-practising deacon, was the most prominent - and most well-travelled - Anglican pacifist of the time. He was publicly known for his leadership in the campaign against slavery, which brought him into close contact with a number of Quakers. As a result of the relationships he built up, he reckoned that he had a better picture than most Anglicans of the thought and lifestyle of members of the Society of Friends, and in 1806 he published a substantive study of them. It included careful consideration of the pacifism of the Early Church and Clarkson’s own critique of the Quaker position. He was completely convinced by their arguments and converted to pacifism.⁴⁷

At the end of the war came the start of the organisation of peace sentiment in England. Although discussions involving the Quaker William Allen and his associates first took place in 1814, no serious attempt was made to follow them up until the pacifist and

cross-denominational Society for the Promotion of Permanent and Universal Peace (the "Peace Society") was formed in 1816, by which time similar initiatives had already arisen in the United States. Thomas Clarkson was a founder Committee member, and his brother John Clarkson (1764-1828) was the first treasurer of the new body and to be the author in 1827 of the pacifist tract, *The Substance of a Letter, addressed to a Clergyman of the Established Church, on the Subject of War*. Four of the earliest pamphlets published by the Peace Society were: a tract by Noah Worcester (who had read Knox's *Antipolemus*⁴⁸), founder of the Massachusetts Peace Society;⁴⁹ followed by a 1796 paper by the Anglican-influenced Nonconformist, John Scott, entitled *War Inconsistent With the Doctrine and Example of Jesus Christ*; then Thomas Clarkson's work on the Fathers; and Knox's translation of Erasmus.⁵⁰

A number of Anglicans were involved with the Peace Society, although as not all branches ("auxiliaries") were pacifist, that alone does not necessarily prove their pacifism. Amongst the most likely pacifists, at least for a period, in the years that followed were Charles Day (b.1793/4; from 1826 he was Vicar of Rushmere and Playford, the Suffolk parish in which Thomas Clarkson was resident), Dr. John Lee (b.1783; an astronomer and geologist, he briefly chaired the pacifist London Committee of the Peace Society), Robert Marsden (b.1769/70; a stockbroker and a member of the Clapham Sect), Thomas Pyne (c.1802-1873; in 1840 he described war both as "national duelling, - as unreasonable, anti-christian, and incapable of rendering true satisfaction as is the private affray" and as "the most fruitful *Parent of Crime* of all the evils with which the earth is afflicted"⁵¹), Stephen Rigaud (1777-1861; an historical painter and the Society's Continental Agent) and William Rose Stephenson (1779/80-1841; Rector of Corringham, Essex from 1818). There were other Anglican pacifists too, not active in the Peace Society. Two officers, presumed Anglican, resigned from the army in India in 1813 as a result of the influence of a Congregationalist missionary who argued "It is unquestionably correct to reduce your inquiry to the single point, - 'Is the profession of arms right, on *Bible* proof, or is it wrong?' If wrong, if sinful, it must be abandoned, come what may...."⁵² The popular writer Legh Richmond (d.1827) protested that he could never consent, on conscientious grounds, to one of his sons joining the army.⁵³ In 1836, when George Pilkington of the Peace Society toured the country preaching pacifism, he found unequivocal support from various Anglican clergy including William Grice of Horncastle, George Park of Hawkshead, and Samuel Sunderland of Penistone.⁵⁴

The optimism of liberal philanthropy, triumphant in such causes as Free Trade and slavery abolition, led to a series of seven international peace congresses from 1843 to

1853, a movement that ended with war in the Crimea. That war was opposed by Alfred Bowen Evans (1811/12-1878; a High Churchman and “unrivalled preacher”) who lectured at St. Andrew’s Marylebone in Lent 1855. Having cited Jeremy Taylor’s “War is as contrary to the Christian religion, as cruelty is to mercy, tyranny to charity,” Evans concluded by affirming the witness of the Early Church, that “We are Christians, and therefore we cannot fight.”⁵⁵ The philanthropic evangelical Frederic Baldey from Portsmouth spoke out against the launch of the *Inflexible* in 1876.⁵⁶ Amongst the high-profile Anglican politicians in the second half of the century, Cobden, who argued in Parliament for international arbitration, and Gladstone were not pacifists, but they were prepared to champion the opposition to particular wars.

The Hope for an Ordered World

After 1870 the Peace Society became no longer the sole agency for peace in Britain. The Workman’s Peace Association, later the International Arbitration League, was formed in July that year by W. Randall Cremer, and three years later a resolution on arbitration was passed by the House of Commons. The more middle class International Arbitration and Peace Association for Great Britain and Ireland⁵⁷ was founded by Hodgson Pratt in 1880 and by 1889 the movement to develop international structures to prevent war was gathering momentum. That year, not only was the Inter-Parliamentary Union formed, but also a Universal Peace Congress was held in Paris, the first of what became almost an annual institution. By the end of the century, the Bureau de la Paix (International Peace Bureau) had been founded in Berne (1892), and, influenced by Bertha von Suttner,⁵⁸ Tzar Nicholas II had called together the 1st Hague Conference (1899).⁵⁹ Even the idea of a United States of Europe was gaining ground, as a preparation for the general reduction of armaments.⁶⁰ Despite the continuation of wars and rumours of wars, hopes for peace through international law were running high. Few saw the need to consider the alternative approach of, say, Tolstoy (1828-1910). If international agreement and arbitration were going to prevent wars occurring, there was little need for individuals to think through their own attitudes to war. Accordingly, although Anglican involvement in peace initiatives began to increase, not least during the Boer War, few if any completely espoused pacifism.⁶¹ Within Anglican circles, the most original thinking of the time was done by A. J. Waldron, Curate of St. Luke’s, Camberwell, who lectured on the ethics of war at the Earl’s Court Military Exhibition in May 1901. In an address packed with the anti-war writings of nineteenth century literature⁶², he dared to ask rhetorically whether the soldier could give not only his life but his conscience. Could moral authority be transferred from the individual to the Government so that the

soldier would be exonerated if the Government committed murder?⁶³

Although he answered his own questions in the negative, as with so many other Anglicans at that time Waldron himself believed in the theoretical acceptability of some defensive war, and so was not strictly pacifist. However, his assertion that each individual was a responsible being, and that ethical issues concerning war were not confined to the morality of arbitration and other matters of international politics, was unusual, at least for an Anglican. According to Waldron, opponents of war must do more than complain about the Government that engaged in that war, those opponents must themselves refuse to participate in it. For the time being, however, hopes in the Edwardian age continued to be focussed on the progress of internationalism. The Hague Tribunal was instituted in 1901, the year of the first Nobel Peace prizes; the first museum of war and peace, founded by Jan Bloch, opened in Lucerne in 1902; the first National Peace Congress, in Manchester in 1904, led to the formation of a National Peace Council; in amongst the annual national and universal peace congresses was a huge Inter-Parliamentary Union assembly in London in 1906 and the Second Hague Conference in 1907.⁶⁴ This optimistic mood of internationalism was captured on 5 October 1910 by Anglicans who founded the Church of England Peace League, members agreeing that the Church “should take a definite part in promoting unity and concord among nations by encouraging the growth of international friendship, and by working for arbitration in the place of war as a means of settling international disputes.”⁶⁵ From a peak in 1910 the Peace Society’s influence began to wane. Although still apparently strong, it distributed only a fraction of its previous literature totals in 1913.⁶⁶ There was an illusion of peace and stability, but Britons in post-Edwardian times lived in an increasingly militaristic society, with large numbers of growing boys uncritically absorbing the para-military values of the Boys Brigade and other similar organisations.⁶⁷ Despite resolutions of concern about the “ever-worsening burden of armaments,” from the I.L.P. and the various peace societies, in 1913 Churchill still announced a large increase in military expenditure.⁶⁸ The strong State was exalted above the righteous State. Caroline Playne later remarked that “The Churches, the teaching profession, the Press had bad records in the pre-war years. The clerics failed.... Clerics no longer lead the masses, they are led by them.”⁶⁹ When the whole world view of the Edwardians fell apart, every philosophy was challenged and its adherents divided. In August 1914, internationalism as a means of war prevention failed catastrophically. As Europe descended into chaos and the Peace Society into a long-drawn-out slide into oblivion,⁷⁰ the questions asked by A. J. Waldron became the most relevant for the future of pacifism. Peace advocates, socialists,⁷¹ feminists,

Christians all found that within their number there would be those who supported the government's call to war, and there would be those who opposed any involvement either in this or in any war.⁷² The peace structures of the past were sunk almost without trace as the Titanic had been two years before.⁷³

ANGLICAN PACIFISM BEFORE 1914: ENDNOTES

1. *On Idolatry*, 19, cited in Mustoe, p35 and Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace*, p73.
2. For the purposes of this volume, "Christian pacifism" is used in the sense implied in the pledge of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, whose members believe that their "membership of the Christian Church involves the complete repudiation of modern war," and pledge themselves "to renounce war and all preparation to wage war, and to work for the construction of Christian peace in the world." The term "pacifist" was originally coined by Emile Arnaud, a Frenchman who was President of the International League of Peace and Liberty, at the 10th Universal Peace Congress in Glasgow in 1901. (Robbins, p10.) More etymologically accurate, "pacificist" was the word favoured by some Britons. At no time did the two terms have separate meanings and they were often used interchangeably. Arnaud's use, which remained the commonest use of the word until 1914, was to describe an anti-militarist who was working to create or perpetuate peace. Thus, the *Arbitrator*, no. 409, June 1913, p65, notes that "A pacifist is not necessarily a non-resistant, but the name rightly belongs to every man who is against any unjust war, and who holds that international disputes should be settled by the arbitrament of reason rather than by that of the sword." Undoubtedly, "pacifist" had become the more dominant word (used, for example, in *Concord* in April 1905, p60, with a familiarity that implied it was common parlance in peace circles). By the time of the Great War, when so many of those internationalists who had previously wanted to perpetuate peace came instead to justify war, "pacifist" soon came exclusively to mean those who refused to take part in any war, the sense indicated above. After this date, whenever "pacificist" was used, it was for the purpose of etymological correctness, not to indicate any distinct earlier meaning. (Dick Sheppard, for example, used both words interchangeably - normally using "pacifism", but referring to his "Pacificism" in *Church Times*, 2 August 1935, p110, and in his address to the Church Congress in October that year.) Note that Maude Royden wanted to return to the pre-war indistinct use of the word: on 1 July 1917 she told the City Temple Executive Committee, "I am more and more convinced that the word 'pacifist' should not be claimed only by those who hold my position, but belongs to all those who hope and work for a time when we shall find some other way of settling international differences than war." (Fletcher, p133,134.) Her having to say that is confirmation that by that time the word had totally come to have its present meaning. "Pacifist" was the dominant word, and, Royden notwithstanding, it was used in the sense of total war-refusal. In recent years Ceadel et al have described internationalists, anti-militarists and those who speak peace when there is peace and war when there is war as "pacificists," reclaiming that word's original meaning, distinct from the present meaning of "pacifist". There may be good reason to coin a word for such people, but the historic interchangeability of "pacifist" and "pacificist" means that "pacificist" is not a good choice. "Pacificist" is here used only in quotation, and the meaning is always the same as "pacifist".
3. E.g. in *Dialogue with Trypho* (cited in Mustoe, p35) and *Adversus Haereses*, IV, 34,4 (cited in Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace*, p73) respectively.
4. *Cor.* XI, cited in Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace*, p73.
5. *Contra Celsum*, V, 33, cited in Mustoe, p36.
6. *Contra Celsum*, III, 7, cited in Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace*, p78.
7. *Ad Donatum*, VI, 10, cited in Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace*, p73.
8. *De Habitu Virginum*, XI, cited in Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace*, p73.

9. *Stromata*, IV, 8 and *Paedagogus*, I, 12, cited in Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace*, p73.
10. *Divine Institutes*, VI, 20.15, cited in Mustoe, p37.
11. *Acta Tarachii*, cited in Hornus, p139.
12. "Non possum militare; non possum malefacere. Christianus sum," cited in Hornus, p133.
13. Mustoe, p43,44.
14. "Christi ego miles sum: pugnare mihi non licet." Sulpicius Severus, *Vita Martini*, 4.3, cited in Hornus, p144,291.
15. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace*, p115. Brock, *Freedom From Violence*, p8,9.
16. C. J. Cadoux, *Catholicism and Christianity*, p613,615. Cited in Nuttall, *Christian Pacifism in History*, p21.
17. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace*, p119.
18. This is shown in his teaching on the Lord's Prayer: "Men that lyven in werre ben unable to have ther axinge: but thei axen ther owne dampnyng in ye fifte petition, for ther thei axen that God forgyve men ther dettis that thei owen to hym, rigt as thei forgyven men that ben dettours to them.... And so in this fifte axinge thes men that werren now-a-daies, axen him as thei wolden mene,- forgyve us for we ben even with thee, or ellis take venjaunce in ire of us, as we taken vengeaunce of oure bretheren. And this is noo good praier, but more axinge of Goddis venjaunce." (Sermon LI, 5th Sunday after Easter; Arnold, *Select Works of John Wyclif*, vol. 1, p148,149.)
 There was a similar expression of opinion cautiously but erroneously attributed by Arnold to Wyclif, but later attributed by Bainton (p119,120, citing Herbert E. Winn, *Wyclif, Select English Writings*, p113), Nuttall (p23) and Brock (*Quaker Peace Testimony*, p1) to the Lollard leader Nicholas of Hereford, prior to his 'recanting' in 1391. (Brock, *Studies in Peace History*, p6, following Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, later notes that while the tract is definitely Lollard, it may not have been by Hereford.) The text itself held that "no mon scholde take vengeaunce bot if God move hym, and teche hym as his instrument how God wil have vengeaunce." But the writer, Hereford or not, noted that in practice, "an erthely prince is comynly proude, and wantis witte to teche when men schulden fecht; and herfore it is lickly that prince of the worlde is auctor of batels that men now usen." He contrasted the fiend who would cite the old law that it was permissible for men to fight by the authority of God, with Christ who "is kynge of pees and charite, and moves men to pacience." Thus men "schulden not fecht now ffor no men. Bot fals men stiren now to batel; ffor tyme is comen that Ysaie spekes of Crist,- that men schal welle hor swerde into plowgh-schares, and tho irne of hor speres into sythes or sikles." Furthermore, he added, "Ffor Seynt Poule bidde pat alle oure dedes be done in charite; and by Gods lawe we schulden luf oure enemyes, and so make hom frendes by tho strenght of charite." The writer's conclusion was that "men schulden not now fecht. And herfore Jesus Crist, duke of oure batel, taght us lawe of pacience, and not to fecht bodily." It was the argument of the Antichrist to suggest that one might have to be prepared to fight to obtain peace, and the writer replied that "tho fende disseyves mony men by falsenes of his resouns, and by his fals principlis.... And wise men of the worlde holden hor strenghtes, and thus venguschen hor enemyes withouten any strok; and men of the gospel venguschen by pacience, and comen to reste and to pees by suffryng of deth. Right so may we do, if we kepen charite; thof men revischen oure lordshipp, or elles oure mehlis [furniture], we schulden suffre in pacience, ge,

thof thei diden us more. These ben the counseils of Crist." There could be a cost, "ffor charite sekes not propur gode in this lif, bot comyne gode in heven by virtuouse pacience... And so Gods lawe techis men to cum bifore in dedes of charite and werkes of worschip; bot I rede not in Gods lawe that Cristen men schulden cum byfore in feghting or batel, bot in meke pacience. And this were the mene whereby we schulden have Gods pees." The writer continues by examining the fiend's claim that Christ's comment to his disciples to sell their coats and to buy swords meant that fighting was lawful. Christ bade them do that, said the writer, "not to feght bodily, bot to speke mekely, bothe in cause of God and worldly causis," for which two swords was enough." Furthermore, "werres and feghtynges ben now unleveful.... Ffor mony men ben preysid now for fendes werkes, and honour and worschip that the world gyves hom is comynly for vicis and not for virtues; ffor worldly men tellen more by vicis then by virtues. Lord, what honour falles to a knyght, for he killes mony men?... Tho passiou of Crist is myche for to preyse, bot sleeing of his tormentoures is odiousse to God. Lord, sith kynge of al this world preyses so myche passioun, and hatis such accioun, why schulde not men do so?" Finally, the writer condemned the concept of Crusades: "Ffor wil I rede that Crist blame Seynt Petre, for he wolde deffende Cristis lif by smyting of swerde.... Also Crist is a gode hyrde for this condicioun, that he puttis his owne lif for savyng of his schepe; bot Anticrist is a wolff of raveyn, for he dos ever the reverse; he puttis mony thousande lyves for his owne wrecchid lif. And by forsakyng of thing that Crist biddes prestis forsake, he myght cees al this stryve. Why is not he a fende? Tho prestis that feghten in this cause synnen foule in homycide; ffor if men-sleeing in seculeres be odiousse to God, myche more in prestis that schulden be Cristis vikars." (*On the Seven Deadly Sins*, chapters XIII-XVI; Arnold, *Select Works of John Wyclif*, vol. 3, p136-141.)

Wyclif was, in a sense, the intellectual successor at Oxford of the Franciscans Duns Scotus (c.1265-1308) and William of Ockham (c.1285-c.1349). The Franciscans had arrived in England c.1224 (Hutton, p9) and despite Wyclif's late opposition to their increasing wealth, it has been said that "No Englishman not a friar had more in common with the Franciscans than Wyclif," not least because of their shared reforming agenda. (Hutton, p200.)

19. "The tende conclusiun is, that manslute be batayle ... with outen special revelaciun is express contrarious to the newe testament, the qwiches is a lawe of grace and ful of mercy. This conclusiun is opynly proud be exsample of Cristis preching here in erthe, the qwiche most taute for to love and to have mercy on his enemys, and nout for to slen hem.... The lawe of mercy, that is the new testament, forbad al mannislaute:... be mekeness and suffraunce our beleve was multiplies, and fythteres and mansleeris Ihesu Crist hatith...." Cited in Nuttall, p23,24 and Brock (*Quaker Peace Testimony*, p1, and *Studies in Peace History*, p3.)

20. Even in 1384, some months before Wyclif's death, John Corynham, a country vicar who had been influenced by Wyclif at Oxford, faced various charges including that he taught that it was wrong to take human life under any circumstances. (Brock, *Studies in Peace History*, p2.) Neither the movement nor the pacifism were quickly crushed, however; amongst those tried of heresy in Norwich between 1428 and 1431 were: Robert Cavell, chaplain of Bungay; Hewisia Moone of Loddon ("Every man should remit all vengeance ... to the sentence of God," she said); and an illiterate Flixton miller, John Skilly, who was condemned to seven years' imprisonment on bread and water for holding such Lollard beliefs as "it is not lawful for any man to fight or do battle for a realm or [an inheritance], or to go to law for any right or wrong." (Brock, *Studies in Peace History*, p4, and *Quaker Peace Testimony*, p3,299.) Similarly, in 1443, Thomas Bikenore, a clerk, told the Bishop of Salisbury that "It is not lawful to plead [at law] for right, nor to do battle for heritage [i.e. an inheritance] nor for the realm, nor to put a man to death for [any] cause by process of law or otherwise." (Brock, *Studies in Peace History*, p5.) How long the pacifist strain within Lollardy continued is unclear, but as late as 1521 five hundred Lollards were arrested by the Bishop of London. (Nuttall, p24.)

21. Brock, *Freedom From Violence*, p18-31. Chelcicky's *The Net of True Faith* later influenced

Tolstoy.

22. It had to be nominal as Erasmus knew no English; the income it gave him allowed him to continue in Cambridge. Amongst the English humanists of the period, Thomas More (1478-1535) and John Colet (c.1467-1519) both stressed the strictest adherence to the conditions of the Just War (Bainton, p130.) Thus Colet's Good Friday sermon, 1512, in the presence of Henry VIII and the Court, included: "Scarcely is brotherly love, without which none can see God, scarcely is it compatible with plunging a sword into the bowels of a brother." (Cited in Bainton, *Erasmus*, p130.)

23. Brock, *Freedom From Violence*, p34,35.

24. The Schleithem Confession of Faith, drawn up by the Anabaptist Swiss Brethren in 1527, included the movement's first official statement of nonresistance. (Brock, *Quaker Peace Testimony*, p299, *Freedom From Violence*, p36.) Not all Anabaptists were to remain peaceable.

25. The Stäbler refused to carry the customary sword, instead holding a wooden staff as a symbol of nonviolence. Under Jacob Widemann (d.1528), they had split from the congregation of Balthasar Hubmaier - an earlier opponent of Grebel - on the issue of pacifism. (Brock, *Freedom From Violence*, p49.)

26. Nuttall, p43-46. Brock, *Freedom From Violence*, p42,97-100.

27. 'S.B.', a semi-literate East Anglian carpenter, noted in 1575 that "I thought it not lawful for me to revenge my wrongs done unto me by extremity of law, nor to requite any blows given me with the like, concluding thereby that I need wear no weapon." He accepted that kings might be in a different position, but ordinary and genuine followers of Christ must be ready to suffer, for "Christ is the true expounder of the law, and saith, resist not, and gave us an example to follow his steps." (Brock, *Quaker Peace Testimony*, p3,4.) Later, movement across the Channel was to go in the opposite direction. John Smyth (d.1612), a Cambridge fellow and Church of England clergyman, set up the first Baptist church for exiles in Amsterdam in 1609. Influenced by the Mennonites, he urged nonresistance on his congregation. (Brock, *Quaker Peace Testimony*, p4,5.)

28. For this sect, the carrying of weapons was forbidden, though members could carry staves to prevent themselves becoming marked men. (Brock, *Quaker Peace Testimony*, p3.)

29. Even in 1914-1918, some applicants for exemption from military service were claiming to be Muggletonians. (Rae, p76,77.)

30. Having agreed to embrace pacifism in 1660, Fox and others declared: "We utterly deny all outward wars and strife, and fightings with outward weapons, for any end, or under any pretence whatever; this is our testimony to the whole world. The Spirit of Christ by which we are guided is not changeable, so as once to command us from a thing as evil and again to move unto it; and we certainly know and testify to the world, that the Spirit of Christ, which leads us into all Truth, will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the kingdom of Christ, nor for the kingdoms of the world." (Brock, *Quaker Peace Testimony*, p25.)

31. *Christian Perfection*, ch. 1.

32. *Christian Perfection*, ch. 2.

33. *Serious Call*, ch. 20.

34. *Address to the Clergy*, p91,92.

35. *Address to the Clergy*, p92,93.

36. *Extracts from Erasmus* (1814 edition), p32. Knox, Master of Tonbridge School and sometime Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, preached on 18 August 1793 and wrote about his sermon the following year. In the spirit of Enlightenment, he realised the immense change that had taken place in scientific understanding and practice following Newton's discoveries, and he looked forward to a Newton in the political world. (Knox, *A Narrative of Transactions Relative to a Sermon* Cited in Ceadel, *Origins of War Prevention*, p80.)

37. *War, the Stumbling-block of a Christian, or The Absurdity of Defending Religion by the Sword*, p6.

38. E.g. For Williams, see his 1 June 1892 *A Thanksgiving Sermon for the Peace*, p8, and his Fast Sermon of April 1893, p21.

39. Talk not of Blood! OH GOD! that BRITISH Zeal,
Should seek with BRITISH Blood her Hopes to seal!
Can Brother against Brother take up Arms?
They whom one Country feeds one Spirit warms?
Enough for British Valor to oppose
Her Ranks resistless to her NATION'S Foes:
Enough, when *foreign Arms* provoke the Offence,
And PEACE *disclaim*, to *bleed* in her Defence.
Union at home, nor Wars, nor Arms afford:
Nor is Opinion sanction'd by the Sword.

ALBION *attend!* though created Pow'r suppress
Her Subjects' Right, and madly rouse Redress;
Still let the Interests of *Peace* prevail;
For Reason *must* succeed, where Arms *must* fail.
Let but her thund'ring Voice the Council move,
To Discord, Peace ensues; to Vengeance, Love....

Fly not to Arms! the voice of History cries:
'Tis not the *Sword* the *Arts of Peace* supplies. -
Hear how oft War hath Virtue's Cause betray'd!
And weep to think what virtuous Men have bled!
History can prove that *Arts of Peace* alone
Can *save* YOUR NATION'S Rights, and *fix* YOUR THRONE:...

(*The Antidote*, p9,10,14.)

40. The accreditation of the first English edition.

41. "For a nation to send its thousands into the field of battle, or into a foreign land to meet those enemies, who otherwise might become the invaders, is committing a real and certain evil in order to avoid that which is only supposed and uncertain.

The dread of being destroyed by our enemies, if we do not go to war with them, is the effect of a guilty

conscience ... it is a plain and unequivocal proof of our disbelief in the superintendence of Divine Providence, and that we had rather depend for protection upon man, the child of dust and creature of a day, than on that Supreme Almighty Governor, in whose hands are the issues of life and death." (*The Lawfulness of Defensive War Upon Christian Principles Impartially Considered*, p15,16.)

42. See Ceadel, *Origins*, p176-180 for the debate on authorship. The author of the first-cited tract also condemned Article 37. (Brock, *Freedom from War*, p7.)

43. He asked, "When we lift our arm to plunge a dagger in a human breast, even in our own defence, why does the hand tremble? why shudders the heart? whence that *still small voice* within - that sometimes (even in the tempest and whirlwind of passion) pleads for non-resistance? Is it not the voice of that Power, under whose inspiration the apostle thus addressed those to whom he wrote - *dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves; for it is written, vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord.*" (*An Answer to Some Passages*, p6.)

44. Reported both in Ceadel, *Origins*, p188-192 (Ceadel's charge of careerism is not proven) and Cookson, p33,34.

45. He had been commended for his patriotism ten years earlier.

46. Of the controversy, Warner commented that: "much indignation has been excited, because I have denounced WAR *in general* as being inconsistent with Christianity; and have made no distinction between *offensive* and *defensive* hostilities, between warfare of *aggression* and *repulsion*. The simple reason of this omission was, because the New Testament (the only authority appealed to in my Sermon) furnished me with no distinction of this nature." (*War Inconsistent*. 4th edition, pxiv. Discourses by Warner on the Beatitudes in 1840 were also consistent with his earlier expressed pacifism: *The Sermon on the Mount: in Five Discourses*.)

47. In an imaginative passage he considered a "superior being" from an alien planet trying to understand religious attitudes to war on earth. Such a being would discover, said Clarkson, that the religion of the Great Spirit no where says, that any constituted authorities among them can take away the responsibility of individual creatures, but, on the other hand, in the most positive terms, that every individual creature is responsible wholly for himself. And this religion does not give any creature an exemption on account of any force which may be used against him; because no one, according to his precepts, is to do evil, not even that good may come.... The impossibility, therefore, of breaking or dissolving individual responsibility, in the case of immoral action, is an argument to many, of the unlawfulness of these wars. And those who reason in this manner, think they have reasoned right, when they consider besides, that, if any of the beings in question were to kill one of his usually reputed enemies in the time of peace, he would suffer death for it, and be considered as accountable also for his crime in a future state. They cannot see, therefore, how any constituted authorities among them can alter the nature of things, or how these beings can kill others in time of war, without the imputation of a crime, whom they could not kill without such an imputation in time of peace. (*A Portraiture of Quakerism*, vol. III, p67,68.)

48. Cited in Worcester's *Solemn Review of the Custom of War*.

49. First, though, was the founder in 1815 of the New York Peace Society, David Low Dodge (1774-1852) an opponent of the slave-trade opponent who had read Clarkson on the Fathers (cited in Dodge's 1812 volume, *War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ*.)

50. It has been suggested (Keith Edghill in correspondence with CB) that Mary Roberts (1788-1864), pseudonymous author of the highly scholarly Tracts VIII and X, may have become an Anglican when parting from the Quakers on the death of her father. Her remarkable pacon of praise of the natural order, *The Progress of Creation* includes a commendation of a bishop (p224), delight in the bells of a village church (p221) and a poem by Keble (p220,221), all of which could suggest an Anglican sympathy.

51. *An Address to all Nations* by a Clergyman of the Church of England (i.e. Pyne), p3.

52. Cited in Brock, *Freedom From War*, p9,10. The missionary was Gordon Hall.

53. "Hating war as I do from my very heart; convinced as I am of the inconsistency of it with real Christianity, and looking on the profession of arms as irreconcilable with the principles of the gospel." (*Domestic Portraiture*, p104-6.) Richmond was Hawksley's more evangelical predecessor as Rector of Turvey as well as being a popular novelist.

54. *Testimonies of Ministers*, p29,47,55.

55. *War: Its Theology; Its Anomalies; Its Incidents and Its Humiliations*, p20.

56. Jeremy Brown, p17.

57. The Bishop of London, the Bishop of Durham and Lord Hobhouse were among its Vice-Presidents in 1892. (*Concord*, 16 August 1892.) The Bishop of Durham spoke at the Annual Meeting of the Association in the summer of 1892 (op.cit., p143) and later that year he told the clergy of his own diocese that he hoped for a "close confederation" of European nations, and for that "courage of body and soul" demanded by peace, not least to overcome social evils. (*Concord*, 17 December 1892, p216.) Bishop Percival of Hereford presided at the Annual Meeting on 28 June 1900 (*Concord*, June 1900, p81.)

58. In 1892, in a letter of support to Bertha von Suttner, the Bishop of Durham had looked forward to the time when "natural works of peace will be found able to furnish nations with the invigorating discipline, wrought through self-sacrifice, which is now supplied by the preparation for war." (Cited in *Concord*, 16 August 1892, p154.)

59. Charles W. Stubbs, Dean of Ely, and W. H. Fremantle, Dean of Ripon, both preached in The Hague at the time of the Peace Conference of 1899. (*Herald of Peace*, 1 September 1899, p274, and 1 June 1900, p72.)

60. Advocated by, for example, Holman Hunt in the *Pall Mall Gazette*. (Cited in *Herald of Peace*, 11 December 1891, p330.)

61. At the start of this period there was hardly any Anglican peace activity at all, and Cremer's organisation in particular mocked the Archbishops for their uncritical support of British military actions in north Africa. "The Mahdi and the Archbishop are both supplicating the same deity for success, and both alike are violating reason and religion." (*Arbitrator*, no.157/158, February/March 1885, p1.) A lay initiative in 1883, by James Henderson from Twickenham, who circulated a letter to clergy asking them to preach hatred of war produced little effect. Requests that he himself should be allowed to preach produced no response at all from Anglican clergy, although some Nonconformists were more hospitable. (*Concord*, 27 May 1887, p54.)

The tide turned in 1889, the year that Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901), then Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge (supported by Canon Fremantle, who called for an annual day of prayer for

unity, peace and concord), addressed the Canterbury Diocesan Conference on international relations and peace. (*Herald of Peace*, 2 June 1890, p78.) In reporting this speech, the *Arbitrator*, no. 209/210, July/August 1889, p3, refers to "the anti-war movement which has been lately started by some leading Anglicans and other divines...." Westcott's initiatives led to various ecclesiastical bodies passing resolutions in support of arbitration. (*Echo*, cited in *Herald of Peace*, 1 March 1890, p40.) Westcott's preferment to the See of Durham was seen by the Peace Society as encouraging endorsement of his stand. (*Herald of Peace*, 2 June 1890, p78.) Following a Peace Society deputation to Lambeth Palace, the Bench of Bishops passed a resolution early in 1891 noting their desire "to do all in their power to hasten the time at which unity, peace, and concord shall be given to all nations; for which they are bound to pray, and do continually pray, to Almighty God." (Peace Society Annual Report, 1890-91, p11; *Herald of Peace*, 1 January 1891, p181, 2 February 1891, p193.) This was regarded by the Peace Society as an endorsement of their institution of the fourth Sunday in Advent as an annual "Peace Sunday," even if the bishops refused to endorse the occasion as an official national event. (*Herald of Peace*, 2 February 1891, p199.) Peace Sunday was an attempt to promote peace preaching in churches across the land. Canon William Benham (1830/31-1910), Rector of St. Edmund's, Lombard Street, member of the Christian Social Union and soon to become Vice-President of the Peace Society, was one of the few Anglicans to preach on the first Peace Sunday, 23 December 1889. He argued that the difficult text "resist not evil," could be regarded as "seed words" to be sown on the ground to take root after being hidden for a while. Having been "covered by the rough clods of trampled battle-fields" it had now germinated, with the result that "Christian men are coming daily to accept it as a truth, self-evident, an unassailable principle of action, an eternal law of the Kingdom of God...." (*Herald of Peace*, 1 February 1890, p14-16.)

Anglican preachers in and around London in December 1891 included: A. B. Boyd Carpenter, (Rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury), C. E. Esoceet (Vicar of St. Andrew's, Stockwell), S. A. Griffiths (Vicar of Christ Church, St. Giles), Daniel Bell Hankin (Vicar of St. Jude's, Mildmay), Marmaduke Hare (Vicar of Christ Church, Watney Street), A. E. King (Vicar of Sydenham), J. Jeakes (Rector of Hornsey), W. E. Oliver (Vicar of Ealing) and J. S. Whichelow (Vicar of St. Stephen's, Spitalfields). (*Herald of Peace*, 1 January 1892, p2.) Two years later the list included Benham, Cox (Scrapington, York), Cullin (Clapton), Ewing (Menchworthy, Devon), Grenville (Haslemere), Hankin (Mildmay Park), Harrison (Haslemere), Jeakes, Moore-Ede (Gateshead), Molesworth (Washington), Tadman (near Honiton), Vaughan (Hull), and Webb-Peploe (St. Paul's). (*Herald of Peace*, 1 February 1894, p16.) When J. W. Geldert, Rural Dean of Wetherby, brought the issue before local clergy, he discovered they believed that promoting the prestige of England was necessary to maintain world peace. (ibid.) The 1896 Peace Sunday was marked by 277 Anglican clergy (out of 3,200) across eight dioceses. (*Herald of Peace*, 1 February 1897, p199.)

In Advent 1890, Septimus Buss preached in Shoreditch Parish Church. He regretted the state of military preparedness of much of continental Europe, and the way that emperors, kings and princes could conduct wars for their own private purposes. "We want no more strife and contention in the world, no more iron-clad ships, no more hundred-ton guns, no more vast military establishments," said Buss, who viewed such things as anachronisms. As superstition, necromancy, astrology and witchcraft had been got rid of, could not war also be disposed of, he asked? He looked forward to swords and spears, rifles, guns and bayonets being relegated to a museum of antiquities where children could look at amazement at the implements people once used, with little reason, for fighting and destruction. Benham agreed, and in April 1894 he commended the stance of the Quakers and claimed that "the time is near when people will realise that you cannot reform the world with muskets and guns." (*Herald of Peace*, 1 May 1894, p61,62.)

The bishops were unenthusiastic about the concept of Peace Sunday, even those who were generally supportive of the Peace Society. The Bishop of Coventry was one of the first to take part, in 1893. (*Concord*, December 1903, p179. Peace Society Annual Report, 1893-94, p13.) A request from Canon Fremantle to the Archbishop of Canterbury to provide an Annual Day of Prayer for Unity, Peace and Concord was rejected. (*Herald of Peace*, 2 June 1890, p78. Episcopal rejection of the idea was reported

in *Herald of Peace*, 2 February 1891, p199. By 1894, the Bishop of Ripon was prepared to promote the Peace Society in the Diocesan Gazette. *Herald of Peace*, 2 April 1894, p41,42.) Yet the minds of individual bishops were turning. The Bishop of Ripon advocated the Peace Society in his Diocesan Gazette in 1894 (*Herald of Peace*, 2 April 1894, p41,42.) John Percival of Hereford was appointed a Vice-President of the Peace Society in 1895 (*Herald of Peace*, 1 June 1895, p209.) Percival's witness was the most consistent of senior Church figures. Amongst gatherings he chaired or addressed were the 1896 Church Congress, those assembled for the 1899 Hague Conference, the 1900 International Arbitration and Peace Association, the 1904 13th Universal Peace Congress in Boston - "the jingo spirit which swaggers in its pride and delights in warfare and aggression is in the main a survival of those brutal instincts that should be eliminated from every civilised and Christian life" (Wilkinson, p24,25), the 1905 2nd National Peace Congress and the 1908 Christian Conference on Peace. Also prominent was Westcott of Durham, a reconciling figure in industrial disputes who was also an advocate of arbitration, although in 1894 he only agreed to sign a petition on arbitration "on the understanding that the Government does not think it inopportune." (*Herald of Peace*, 2 July 1894, p81. Two years later the Archbishops of Canterbury and York refused to sign a similar petition at all. *Herald of Peace*, 1 April 1896, p46,47.) To the disappointment of many, Westcott supported the war in South Africa, though he did insist on prayers for both sides. (*Herald of Peace*, 1 October 1904, p276.) By 1897 the Lambeth Conference was stating "that nothing more strongly makes for Peace than a healthy and enlightened public opinion," and urging "upon all Christian people the duty of promoting by earnest prayer, by private instruction, and by public appeal, the cause of International Arbitration" (cited in *Herald of Peace*, 1 October 1897, p303), such reference to prayer being taken by the Peace Society as endorsement of the institution of Peace Sunday. The Bishop of Lichfield circulated Lambeth motions to his diocesan clergy with the message, "You are ambassadors of the Prince of Peace... Preach peace; pray for peace; strive for peace." (*Herald of Peace*, 1 February 1898, p20. The Peace Society later produced fifteen thousand copies of his letter as a separate leaflet. *Herald of Peace*, 1 June 1898.) When the Peace Society did a similar mailing prior to that year's Peace Sunday, they found that not all clergy were impressed. One Anglican cleric responded, "I take my orders from my Bishop, not from the irresponsible schismatical leaders of a godless undenominationalism." (N. G. Armytage, St. Aidan's, Boston. *Herald of Peace*, 1 January 1898, p9.)

For some, ecumenism was as much a problem as loss of national sovereignty through arbitration. With the founding of a group of Christian undergraduates at Cambridge, that, at least, was beginning to change. The S.C.M., which began life as the Student Volunteer Missionary Union in Cambridge in 1892, increasingly addressed social issues once they were first raised at a Versailles conference in 1900 (at which the Quaker, Henry Hodgkin, 1877-1933, was present.) There was also an international dimension to S.C.M., the World Student Christian Federation, formed in 1895. Particularly influential was the S.C.M. conference which William Temple, headmaster of Repton, chaired at Mallock in 1909, when the theme was social concern. (Wilkinson, p282.) The ecumenical dimension received a boost with the Edinburgh Missionary Conference on 1910. S.C.M. was the principal focal point for many educated young Christians and a considerable number of future Anglican leaders were influenced by S.C.M. concerns. Although only about five per cent of S.C.M. members were pacifists, the Movement later risked disapproval by defending its right to employ pacifists. (Wilkinson, p52.) Maude Royden (1876-1956) and the Marquis of Tavistock were two of many Anglicans to be involved in both S.C.M. and the F.O.R. Future F.O.R./S.C.M. links included: Kees Boeke (1884-1966); Cecil John Cadoux (1883-1947); Lucy Gardner (1863-1944); Herbert Gray (1868-1956); Charles Raven (1885-1964); Richard Roberts (1874-1945); Roger Soltau (1888-1953); Malcolm Spencer (1877-1950); Lilian Stevenson (1871-1960); Alex Wood (1879-1950); and H. G. Wood (1879-1953). At one time the F.O.R. appointed McEwan Lawson, a Congregationalist minister, specifically as its S.C.M. representative. (den Boggende, p34.)

Although the number of Anglican voices in the wider peace movement in the 1890s slowly increased, few felt the need to express themselves in explicitly pacifist terms, particularly with regards to defensive war. With the main campaigning bodies emphasising arbitration and also wanting to attract the

Anglican establishment (and hence wanting to eschew controversy), there was no requirement to consider a strict pacifism. The most prominent Anglicans involved with the Peace Society all held that a defensive war could be legitimate, though they did not expect that such a conflict was likely. They approached issues of war and peace with an attitude akin to that of supporters of the Just War concept who demanded such meticulous adherence to its conditions that few, if any, wars could be deemed acceptable. Certainly war of imperialist expansion, such as in South Africa, could be roundly condemned without those involved being completely pacifist. Months before the outbreak of war in South Africa, Moore Ede, Rector of Gateshead, had condemned "the annexation of territory" as being the "cause of cruel and unnecessary wars ... frequently associated with injustice to the rightful proprietors of the soil." (Proposing a resolution to the effect at the Annual Meeting of the Peace Society, Newcastle, 1897. *Herald of Peace*, 1 November 1897.) Others who opposed the war included: Canon Barker of Marylebone; Canon Samuel Augustus Barnett, the Warden of Toynbee Hall, who realised not only that military expenditure could be diverted for social benefit, but also that the spirit of war brutalised and degraded the population (*Herald of Peace*, 1 June 1899, p233,234); Canon Benham; W. H. Fremantle, Dean of Ripon (Fremantle attended the 1899 Hague Conference; his main objection to the Boer War was that it had not been offered for arbitration - *Herald of Peace*, 1 June 1900, p72-74); Canon Edward Lee Hicks (1843-1919), Rector of St. Philip's, Salford; G. W. Kitchin, Dean first of Winchester then of Durham; and Prebendary H. W. Webb-Peploe (who addressed the Annual Meeting of the Peace Society on 21 May 1901 on the duty of the Church militant to seek peace and pursue it. - *Herald of Peace*, 1 June 1901, p76-78.) As well as such notable opponents of the war as Leonard Courtney, some members of the Christian Social Union, principally Gore and Scott Holland, publicly opposed the South African conflict on the grounds that it was an expression of British imperialist arrogance. Barnett and Kitchin were amongst a group of "influential and well-known leaders of thought" who signed a statement claiming there was "a special duty laid on those who disapprove of the war to express their disapproval...." (*Herald of Peace*, 2 April 1900.) Barnett's appointment as a Canon of Bristol did not lessen his criticism of the conflict. Was the spirit which drove England to war the Christian spirit, he asked?

There have been spirits which have been strong, which have come in the garments of Christian light, which have been popular, and are now seen to have been the spirits of Antichrist. The spirits, for example, which roused Christians in the name of Christ to persecute the Jews, or Royalists to force their neighbours to own the divine right of Kings, or Englishmen to break the independence and compel the loyalty of Colonists.

Is, then, the present war directed by the Christian spirit? When many Christian leaders and teachers - learned and highly revered - approve the war, Christians who think differently are bound to examine their grounds and modestly offer the result for others' consideration.

Barnett argued that belief in Christ as the Son of the Almighty must mean that "His way of meekness or forbearance is above the way of self-assertion and force." He held that Christians "are to see something worthy of respect in every human being, because they see in every one the likeness of Christ."

If the English people who are now approving the war were meek and charitable - if, in other words, sweet reasonableness ruled their daily conduct, and if they had set their minds on other than material objects - it would be more possible to believe that a Christian spirit directs the present war. But the people are not so, and the war is their war, and the war is not Christian. Statesmen might have blundered in their diplomacy, conspirators might have conspired and set race against race, capitalists might have corrupted the Press; but, if the people had been Christian, there would have been no war. The fault for the war, if it lies with anyone, lies with the Christian teachers - with us who, being commissioned to teach the unity of power and love, have let the minds of the people worship the power without love. (*Herald of Peace*, 2 April 1900, p45,46.)

Hicks and Kitchin both founded themselves embroiled in controversy, Kitchin for rebuking drunken celebrations in Durham on the Sunday news came of events in Mafeking. Kitchin told the Darlington

Peace Association that it was a blasphemy the way the pulpits of the land had gone in favour of the war, and that the people of Britain would pay for what the satirist Horace had called the "follies and madnesses the rulers of your people are guilty of." (*The Dean of Durham on the War*, pamphlet, p2. The National Peace Council later described Kitchin, the President of the Tyneside International Arbitration and Peace Association, as "A Liberal who speaks his mind boldly and has no fear of temporary unpopularity.") Hicks courted controversy when he preached a well-publicised anti-war sermon. Though not a pacifist, Hicks did once tell the Manchester Women's Peace Association that he was "prepared to question" the view that war was a necessary condition of civilisation. (*Herald of Peace*, 2 December 1895, p308.) Late in the war, Hicks told the Oldham Peace Society that "people were beginning to doubt the expediency" of the conflict, and if they had known the cost at the beginning they might have tried harder to avoid it. (*Herald of Peace*, 1 February 1902, p185.)

Other critics of the war included Barker who held that the saying "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword" was proven by the downfall of the empires of Babylon, Assyria, Greece and Rome, which events were a warning for the British people to "think twice before they launched thoughtlessly into another war." (*Herald of Peace*, 1 October 1901, p126,127.) Bishop Percival of Hereford also continued to be associated with the peace party throughout this period and, with others, was labelled "Pro-Boer." Following revelations by Emily Hobhouse, Percival was shocked to discover that nearly two thousand children had died in the brutal British-run concentration camps in South Africa. He was appalled by such a "holocaust of child life." (*Times*, 22 October 1901, cited in Koss, p228-230.)

62. In particular he cited examples from the work of Carlyle, Tennyson and Longfellow.

63. Waldron said: "You may remember Hosea Biglow's saying:-

'Ef you take a sword and dror it,
An' go stick a feller thru',
Guv'ment ain't to answer for it,
God'll send the bill to you.'

Personally, I believe that the ethics of the question ought to be applied to the individual soldier. I know what will be said - that it is impossible to allow the soldier the right to the exercise of his individual conscience; that whatever the Government decides the soldier is bound to do. If the Government makes war, the soldier is not to ask any question; and if the Government murders, the soldier is to be exonerated. Personally, I hurl that from me. I believe - and, I think, the feeling is growing in this country - that no Government in the world, no tribunal in the world, can answer for the individual conscience, that every man is responsible, to himself if not to some higher power, for the right of the faculties which he possesses.... I know the argument adduced is, that, if he did, he would leave the Army. Then so much the worse for the system. It is condemned on the face of it....

But the question is: Is the soldier responsible for the acts of the Government? I hold that no man has any right, by any system, legalised or not, to hand over his personal responsibility to any Government, or to any other power. And therefore, he, the man, intelligent and moral, should be allowed to be the judge of what is right for him to do in any war...." (*Herald of Peace*, 1 August 1902, p265-267, 270-272.)

64. The cause of international law and arbitration had become so fashionable within liberal-minded middle-class circles that a number of senior Anglican clerics consented to become Vice-Presidents of the Peace Society. Alongside Percival in that rôle came Hicks, Bishop of Lincoln from 1910; alongside the Dean of Ripon were the deans of Bristol, Carlisle, Hereford and Worcester (Moore Ede); as well as Canon Benham there were Canons H. B. Bromby, Leighton Grane and J. H. B. Masterman (the brother of the Liberal politician C. F. G. Masterman, he was to become Bishop of Plymouth in 1922. Wilkinson, p26.) Masterman and A. J. Waldron became members of the Executive and Canon G. T. Head (1840/41-1911) of Bristol and Caroline Playne were amongst two hundred names on the Society's Council. (Peace Society Annual Report: 1909-10, p2-5; 1910-11, p2-5; 1912-13, p2-5. The 1912

Council also included the Rt. Revd. J. E. Mercer of Hobart.) This was all part of an expansion of activity which reached a peak in 1909/10 with the Peace Society sending out over forty thousand invitations to ministers of religion to take part in the 1909 Peace Sunday (resulting in over five thousand sermons) and the distribution of more than half a million papers, pamphlets and other forms of literature. (Peace Society Annual Report, 1909-10, p14,15.)

65. National Peace Council Year Book, 1911, p92. The 1912 Year Book cites the foundation date as 4 October 1910. The objects of the League included encouraging members of the Church of England to recognise the duty of "combatting the war-spirit as inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, and of working actively for peace as part of the divine ideal of human society." They also aimed to promote universal and permanent peace, to encourage the growth of international friendship and to work for the adoption of arbitration and conciliation in place of war. The first President, from 1910 until his death in 1919, was Hicks. Canon J. W. Horsley (b.1845), the Rector of Detling, Kent, was in the Chair; he wrote one tract for the Church of England Peace League, *The Prayer Book and Peace*, as well as editing Dr. Channing's *Wise Words on War* (National Peace Council Year Book, 1912, p156.) The posts of honorary treasurer and secretary were taken by two sisters, F. S. and M. H. Huntsman. The latter had also been Assistant Secretary of the National Peace Council since 1907, the editor of *Peace Bibliography*, and had taken an active part in the seventeenth Universal Peace Congress in London. (National Peace Council Year Book, 1914, p229.) The League was based at St. Stephen's House, Westminster (as was the International Arbitration League.) The League was one of the constituent groups on the National Peace Council; the representatives for 1918 being F. A. Evelyn, J. W. Horsley, William Corbett Roberts and a Miss Strachan. The Bishop of Oxford became the President in 1921, but by then the days of the League were numbered. Although pre-war membership of the League was only around one hundred, there were over twenty vice-presidents, including the Labour M.P. George Lansbury. Other Vice-Presidents included: the bishops of Oxford (Charles Gore), Hereford (John Percival), Southwark (Hubert Burge), Northern & Central Europe, and Kilmore, Elphin & Ardagh; the deans of Carlisle (Barker), Lincoln and Worcester (Ede); Canons S. Barnett (Westminster), Horsley, McCormick (St. James' Piccadilly), J. H. B. Masterman and H. D. Rawnsley; Prebendaries James Jeakes (St. Paul's) and H. W. Webb-Peploe; the clergy W. H. Frere, T. J. Lawrence and William Temple; and the laity Mrs. Barnett, Mrs. Creighton, and R. C. Lambert, M.P. (National Peace Council Year Book, 1917, p54.) Members who put pen to paper on behalf of the League included: Hewlett Johnson, author of *Why Wars Must Cease* (National Peace Council Year Book, 1912, p156); Frank Lascelles; T. J. Lawrence - the 1911 Church Congress, in Stoke, asked T. J. Lawrence to speak on "The Church's Duty in Furthering International Peace;" Lawrence was the author of two more of the League's early publications, one on arbitration and one on the ideal of universal peace (National Peace Council Year Book, 1912, p156); Carolyn Playne, who edited the writings of Westcott for the League. (National Peace Council Year Book, 1912, p156); and A. J. Waldron. In 1911 Bishop Hicks circulated 823 Rural Deans, requesting clergy support for arbitration. The League was always going to be a more respectable than radical organisation, as was shown by aspects of its 1913 circular to diocesan bishops, protesting against the advocacy of compulsory military service, a circular which allowed that in certain circumstances "a State might be justified in summoning to arms its whole manhood." (den Boggende, p18.) Not surprisingly, it made little impact once war was declared; Hicks, for example, despite being aware of how armament manufacturers would benefit from war, felt the cause of Belgium and the pledges made by the British Government were sufficient causes for Britain to take part. One year into the war, the League was arguing both that Christianity alone could prevail against militarism, whilst claiming that the then conflict had been "forced upon us." (Cited in *Goodwill*, vol.2, no.1, 1 January 1916.) Pacifists were welcome as members, however. When one clergyman, Thomas Briggs, a missionary to the Jews, was arrested (for unknown anti-war reasons) in November 1917, breaking down at his court-martial three weeks later, he received an application form to join the League. (Letter from Walter Hohnrodt, to Lester Smith, 28 December 1917; P.P.U. archive.)

In April 1913 Canon William Leighton Grane of Chichester preached for the Church of England Peace

League, regretting the way that the Church had neglected the teaching of Jesus and upheld the military. It was almost as if there were new benedictions, he said: Blessed are the violent, blessed are the war-makers. (Cited in Playne, p184.) Grane, again an internationalist rather than a pacifist, was the author of one of the most substantial Anglican studies of war. Writing at a time when Norman Angell, echoing Jan Bloch a decade earlier, had extended Cobden's argument that, pragmatically and economically, war was a *Great Illusion*, Grane, whilst not refuting Angell, stated that "history holds no record of selfish motives ever having compassed any great reform in the whole story of the world's progress." (Grane, p3.) Grane's own argument in 1912 for *The Passing of War* was based on moral and religious grounds rather than economic ones. "In War itself, in war *quâ* war," said Grane, "there is not, nor can be, any good. War is nothing but a barbarous anachronism, of which the civilised world ought to be utterly ashamed." (pxxxiv, 3rd edition, 1913.) He also argued that "since the essence of war is Hate, and the essence of religion is Love, no sophistry can atone these antinomies.... Here ambiguity spells treachery, and compromise is absurd. For War is not crime only: it is sacrilege. If it be true that 'God is Love,' war violates the very shrine of the eternal." (p123.) Noting Clausewitz's dictum that "War is an Act of Violence which in its application knows no bounds" (*On War*, bk. i, ch. i, cited on p175,182), Grane quoted with approval a contrasting comment from R. W. Church, sometime Dean of St. Paul's:

It was a great reversal of all accepted moral judgment, and of all popular traditions, when the teaching of the Gospel put in the forefront of its message God's value for Peace, and His blessing upon it; when it placed Peace as a divine and magnificent object, to be aimed at with the earnestness with which men aimed at glory.... [H]owever in practice Christians have fallen short of it, this standard of what is true and right never has been and never can be lowered.

Do not let any one cheat us out of our inheritance of Peace by saying that God means it for Heaven, not for earth. He means it for Time as well as for Eternity.... (Cited on p158.)

Grane lamented that war was often regarded as a lesser evil, with its wrongs regarded as being outweighed by some justifying benefit. Although "the Call of Religion in regard to War's passing is imperative and clear," that call "has been habitually made to sound indefinite and doubtful, by being qualified unduly." (p159.) He particularly urged the clergy to preach peace, faithfully and frequently. Grane's thesis was that a universal appreciation of the laws of right and wrong would bring about a moral resistance to war, far more powerful than economic logic. The seeds of the passing of war were already liberally sown. Properly educated, people would not want to make war, and nations, even in times of conflict, would seek justice by peaceful methods and would not choose to fight. He believed in "the now practically simultaneous development of ideas in all civilised lands" (3rd edition, p236) which would allow moral education to be worldwide. Grane, though, despite refusing to admit the inevitability that there could be worse evils than war, (note on the American Civil War, in 3rd edition p297) was by no means a pacifist. For all his recognition of the ruinous cost, danger and evil of European armament competition, he argued that only internationally arranged and concurrently effective reduction was acceptable. Grane was another internationalist, an advocate of arbitration, of international law and such internationally agreed structures that would prevent war. His advocacy of the passing of war was not, despite his book's title, a claim that war had indeed passed, but an attempt to show a moral case for people to choose to make it pass. Altogether, the combined effect of the efforts of Angell and Grane was to encourage the belief that international disputes could - which for some readers became "would" - henceforth be settled by saner, more peaceful methods. Angell's book alone sold around two million copies from 1910 to 1913. (den Boggende, p20.) Many people, even bishops, would have regarded themselves as pacifists, simply because they supported some - any - movement for peace, for arbitration, for international goodwill.

66. The Peace Society of 1913 was still, superficially, upbeat, commending its members and friends for "brightening the horizon of international politics." It rejoiced that "[t]he clouds seem at last to be passing away; the dangers which have threatened so long the peace of Europe and the progress of the world have been removed." There was particular satisfaction that "Peace in the Balkans seems to be once

more assured," added to which good work was being done by the International Court in the Hague (although there were setbacks, as in 1912 when Italy did not go to The Hague before going to war with Turkey.) Despite some clamouring in the country in favour of conscription, there was "a growing body of pacific sentiment." (Peace Society Annual Report, 1912-1913, p7,8.) Such growth was an illusion, as the Peace Society's own operations revealed. In the three years since the peak of 1910, literature production and distribution had slumped to less than eight per cent of its former total. Even allowing for a change in publicity methods for Peace Sunday, which accounted for a large part of the disparity, much of the slump was real and reflected a reduction in the influence of the Society.

67. den Boggende, p22.

68. Robbins, p25.

69. Playne, p185,188. By "clerics" she meant all spiritual leaders, philosophers and opinion-formers.

70. The Peace Society in particular was unable to respond with peaceful unanimity to the challenge of war. Two years before the outbreak of war, the *Herald of Peace* had bemoaned that many members had said they were not "Peace-at-any-price" men, when they were hardly "Peace-at-any-price-at-all." (*Herald of Peace*, July 1912, cited in Robbins, p13.) Indeed, the Peace Society President, J. A. Pease, became a member of the war cabinet, thereby compromising every value that the Society's founders had held dear a century earlier. F.O.R. members like C. J. Cadoux felt that the Peace Society was irrelevant and insufficiently pacifist. (Robbins, p193.) Even so, the centenary Annual Meeting of the society on 22 May 1916 had to be cancelled when the lessors revoked an agreement on hiring a hall, presumably because of the inacceptability of the Society's message or because of the fear of mob violence. (Playne, p273,274.) Peace Sunday did, however, continue to be observed in December each year, and in May 1917 a perceptive Dr. Darby told the annual meeting of the remnant that "You cannot enforce peace ... and for a League of Nations to come into existence with military force at its back, however you may conceal the fact, is simply a repetition of what has already convulsed the world...." (*Herald of Peace*, October 1917, cited in Robbins, p134.)

In 1916, Herbert Dunnico took over the Secretaryship of the Peace Society and although in the inter-war years he maintained the Society as a forum for Labour and Liberal M.P.s to discuss disarmament and related issues, it never regained its earlier eminence. Dunnico later became Labour M.P. for Consett, 1922-1931 and an Honorary Director and Vice-President of the International Peace Bureau, Geneva. (*Peace News*, 16 October 1953, p1.) He continued as Secretary of the Peace Society until his death, aged 77, in October 1953, by which time the Society, though technically extant, was well and truly defunct, having "not been very active in recent years." (*Peace News*, 16 October 1953, p1.)

71. Keir Hardie's Independent Labour Party had always been anti-militarist, more likely to advocate a general strike than a violent revolution. Many socialists believed, or at least hoped, that the spread of humanitarian values and international socialist solidarity would be enough to make war impossible; socialist would refuse to kill socialist and there simply would not be enough people willing to fight. On 1 August 1914, Keir Hardie and Arthur Henderson signed a manifesto of the British Section of the International Socialist Bureau, calling for a "vast demonstration against war in every industrial centre." The following day crowds gathered in Trafalgar Square to listen to George Lansbury, with Margaret Bondfield, Keir Hardy, Arthur Henderson, Mary Macarthur, Will Thorne and others, and to shout "Down With War." Lansbury recalled "[we] pledged ourselves to take no hand in war but to oppose it with all our strength." (*My Life*, p206.) Yet, following the invasion of Belgium, within a few days most of the I.L.P., like most of the rest of the population, had been convinced by the power of the press that one's duty to the State was greater than one's loyalty to humanity and that the "honour" of the State compelled one's participation in the forthcoming war. Even members of the Church Socialist League were divided, with George Lansbury and Lewis Donaldson opposed to the war, and Conrad Noel in full

support. (Groves, p156.)

72. Even the Quakers were divided. Reduced emphasis on the historic peace testimony during the 19th century meant that nearly one third of the Society of Friends joined the army in 1914-1918.

73. Only the National Peace Council, formed in 1904 and restructured in 1908, was to exist in any recognisable form in 1919, largely because it was more of a co-ordinating body than an independent voice, which concentrated more on looking to the future peace than on commenting meaningfully about the war. Thus, a N.P.C. statement in 1915 stressed the need to uphold treaties to preserve a neutral and independent State, a clear reference to Belgium, without actually saying explicitly that Britain was right to be at war. The main thrust of the statement was towards the nature of a post-war peace. (*Goodwill*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1 June 1915, p133,134.) When specific tasks were required, such as supporting conscientious objectors or campaigning for a negotiated peace, separate umbrella organisations needed to be formed, in these cases the Joint Advisory Committee and, in April 1916, the Peace Negotiations Committee, which brought together representatives from the Quakers, F.O.R., I.L.P., N.C.F., U.D.C., W.I.L. and the Peace Society. (Robbins, p96.)

ANGLICAN PACIFISM, 1914-1918

1914: Initiatives for a New Order

The new circumstances of European war demanded completely new organisations. The Union of Democratic Control - a cross-party alliance favouring international links between democracies and a negotiated end to the war¹ - and the No-Conscription Fellowship were amongst the first off the mark, in the closing months of 1914.² For most pacifists, the more important organisation was the largely socialist (including Christian socialist) N.C.F., founded by Labour activists Lilla³ and Fenner Brockway (the son of a clergyman) following announcements on 12 and 19 November in the Independent Labour Party's *Labour Leader*, a journal Fenner Brockway edited.⁴ The first body to begin to address Waldron's concerns, the N.C.F., issued a Statement of Faith referring to the effect on human conscience of the sanctity of human life:

The No-Conscription Fellowship is an organization of men likely to be called upon to undertake military service in the event of conscription, who will refuse from conscientious motives to bear arms, because they consider human life to be sacred, and cannot, therefore, assume the responsibility of inflicting death. They deny the right of Governments to say, 'You shall bear arms,' and will oppose every effort to introduce compulsory military service into Great Britain. Should such efforts be successful, they will, whatever the consequences may be, obey their conscientious convictions rather than the commands of Governments.⁵

Christian pacifists, like most of the rest of the British population, were taken completely by surprise by the outbreak of war in August 1914. The *Herald of Peace* lamented that "Even the foremost pacifist leaders of the Churches have surrendered.... Up to a certain point they were firm. At that point their Christianity failed them, and they had to leave it, as unworkable."⁶

Bernard Walke, the Tractarian (yet ecumenical) priest of St. Hilary, Cornwall, had the "sensation of being in the centre of a cataclysm," fast approaching, in which "the most generous natures would offer themselves willingly to this monster that was about to destroy them." He felt "strangely alone standing there in the pulpit before all these people, with nothing to say, with no word of comfort or assurance to offer them. I was certain only that I could have no part in what was coming."⁷

The feminist and pragmatic pacifist, Agnes Maude Royden (1876-1956), waited in vain for some Christian body or newspaper or person to speak out and condemn "not only war in general but *this* war."⁸ In the third week of the war she wrote to the *Challenge*

journal, "We are all agreed ... that war is an evil; but to what purpose, if we justify each war as it arises?... I hear of no Christians who refuse to shoot down Christians."⁹ The response was universally hostile, with her views described as traitorous and unfit reading for loyal English people. Royden replied by suggesting that the only way to end war was to refuse to make war. "It is useless to wait till we find a war we can condemn, for we justify each as it arises," she argued. "Even now it is contended that the present conflict is a 'war to end war' and those who hate war most persuade themselves that *this* time at least war is justified for the sake of peace.... No illusion is more common, no hope more undying."¹⁰

A new alignment of pacifists with an explicitly Christian basis came about as a result of the intertwining of several different strands of activity. One strand involved the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches (later to be incorporated into the World Council of Churches) which planned two conferences for 1914.¹¹ The second conference, for Catholics, was pre-empted by the outbreak of war. The first, however, for Protestant Christians, was timed for the fateful first weekend of August. Around ninety delegates,¹² including the Quaker Henry Hodgkin and Moore Ede, the Dean of Worcester, did gather briefly in Constance on 2 August.¹³ The meeting between Hodgkin and the German pastor Siegmund-Schültze, or, more accurately, their departure, became part of Christian pacifist mythology. They travelled back from Constance to Köln in the same train;¹⁴ as they shook hands in Köln, Siegmund-Schültze stated that the war would make no difference to their work. "Whatever happens," he was reported as saying, "nothing is changed between us. We are one in Christ and can never be at war."¹⁵ In the subsequent interchange of various committee and personal letters, Hodgkin affirmed to Siegmund-Schültze that their friendship could not be broken by the war.¹⁶ The content of a personal letter to that effect was similar to a public "Message to Men and Women of Goodwill," largely written by Hodgkin and published on 7 August 1914 by the Friends Meeting for Suffering.¹⁷ Anticipating much of the thinking that would come after, this "Message" reflected the beginnings of a Quaker response to the war.

A second strand involved an initiative by Richard Roberts (1874-1945), Presbyterian minister at Hornsey. He was taken aback, on the first Sunday of the war, by the absence of young German businessmen, normally regulars in his congregation. Distressed, he telephoned a number of his friends, including George Bell, then Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and invited them to his home to discuss a response to the war. It was a "bewildered" gathering that could agree on little else than that war was unchristian and that they should meet again.¹⁸ Their own subsequent

attempts to clarify thinking led to the publication of a series of position papers, *Papers for War Time*, edited by the young Rector of St. James', Piccadilly, William Temple.¹⁹ Pacifists in the group, however, soon tired of the increasing acceptance of the war expressed in the *Papers*.²⁰

The break away arose in the aftermath of a predominantly Quaker conference held in Llandudno at the end of September, and addressed by Roberts, Hodgkin, Gardner and other Friends.²¹ On 4 December, a post-Llandudno meeting took place at the Collegium, the Pimlico base of the Swanwick Free Church Fellowship.²² Anglicans Maude Royden and Mary E. Phillips²³ were among those present. Hodgkin presented a memorandum containing several points for debate, namely the belief that all war was wrong for the Christian, that the cause of the State could not be identified with the cause of the Kingdom, that the greatest forces were moral and spiritual and that the exorcism of the spirit of war required a reconstruction of the whole fabric of society. For some of those present, such statements were too political. Royden, whose pacifism was always to be more pragmatic than principled, stated that she had no interest in seeking martyrdom. Phillips and Basil Yeaxlee called for a "peace army," an idea Royden later took up with vigour. The practical conclusion of the Pimlico conference was the call for "a school of study and prayer," to be held in the Christmas vacation.²⁴

Thus, on the evening of Monday 28 December 1914, over 120 people (only half of whom were Quakers) assembled at Trinity College, Cambridge to consider their personal and corporate response to the war. Anglicans present included George Lansbury (just back from a visit to France to see the devastation caused by the war²⁵), Mary Phillips, William Corbett Roberts, Maude Royden and William Temple. The dominant figure was Richard Roberts, who presided over the conference and who presented a draft "Basis" for the new organisation on that first evening to allow participants to consider it in good time, "waiting upon God." The following morning Maude Royden spoke on "The Nature of Christian Obedience," an obedience that must be greater than one's obedience to the nation, and an obedience that could not be deferred until some later date when humanity, somehow, might be more receptive.²⁶

The General Committee elected to promote the new Fellowship included Mary Phillips and Maude Royden.²⁷ On 31 December, the final day of the conference, it was agreed that a new organisation be formed to enable Christian pacifists to face up to what was already threatening to become a lengthy war. The Fellowship of Reconciliation was born, and its "Basis" became one of the formative statements of Christian pacifism.

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.

It was held to be a matter of principle that the Fellowship would state its message of reconciliation "positively and constructively," and "not spend itself in mere protest."²⁸ Although at times the new organisation would be tempted to branch out into considering a plethora of social ills, political action would be more likely to be taken up by the Union of Democratic Control and the No-Conscription Fellowship. For a few, the F.O.R. was essentially a political pressure-group, but most members of the F.O.R. desired rather "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."²⁹ Nothing less than "a new order of life" was desired, though the immediate task was "the call to make clear the Christian witness in relation to war."³⁰ The key concern for the F.O.R. would be the pacifist commitment of its members to a refusal to wage war, albeit as part of an all-encompassing world-view. The F.O.R. would be less concerned with immediate political action than with the (eschatological) theology of the Kingdom of God.³¹

Maude Royden's Great Adventures, in Theory and Practice

Maude Royden was the most prominent Anglican in the Fellowship of Reconciliation. The daughter of a wealthy Liverpool shipping-line owner, she had been associated with the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies from 1908, becoming the editor of its journal, *Common Cause*, in 1913. She was the first Chairman of the Church League for Women's Suffrage, upon its founding in 1909,³² and the first woman to address the Church Congress, in 1913.³³ When an International Congress of Women was planned for The Hague at the end of April 1915, Royden intended to go. Holding the opinion expressed by Olive Schreiner, that "No woman who is a woman says of a human body, 'It is nothing.'"³⁴ she declared, in the days before the Congress, that "the vast mass of

the women of the country were only waiting for a lead to perceive that peace and the women's movement went together."³⁵ Getting to the Netherlands, however, proved harder than expected. The British Government regarded the gathering as inconvenient, and declined to issue passports except to "selected women who represented organisations and well-known sections of thought,"³⁶ of whom Royden was one. At the same time as issuing the passports, however, the Government was planning to close the North Sea to all shipping. The twenty-four selected women were stranded at Tilbury, with a cynical press mocking the "Peacettes" who wanted "to talk peace with German fraus over the teapot."³⁷

Despite missing the historic Congress, Royden and the other women committed themselves to the Women's International League that was formed as a consequence of the Hague gathering. She became the first vice-chair, and spoke and chaired numerous meetings across the country. In December 1915 she spoke at the Portman Rooms, Baker Street, "To Present the Women's Case Against Conscription." Those present agreed that "the introduction of any form of industrial or military conscription in Great Britain would be a grave blow to liberty and social progress," and "far from contributing to the successful prosecution of the War, it would constitute the greatest victory of German militarism."³⁸

One of Royden's principal contributions to the thinking of the F.O.R. came with the publication of *The Great Adventure* in January 1915. It was a powerful presentation of Christian pacifism and its thesis - that pacifists and disarmed nations should take a risk for peace, should embark on the adventure of peace even at risk to themselves - was one that stayed with Royden for the next twenty-five years. For Royden, those who sought peace, both individuals and nations, must necessarily put their peacemaking ideals into in action.³⁹ She believed that the German invasion of Belgium did not, as was widely held, give Britain a choice of war or a dishonourable neutrality that betrayed the weak. Neither was the peacemaking way of Christ.⁴⁰ She felt that "we are dishonoured, for, though we did not do the worst thing, neither did we do the best..." Not only would Britain have been better placed to make peace if the British record of disregarding treaties and exploiting other nations, most recently Egypt and South Africa, had not been blood-stained, but high levels of British armaments had encouraged German fears of a British attack, and the belief of many German people that they were fighting a defensive war. Without such fears, Royden suggested, socialists in the Reichstag would not have supported the war votes, and a high proportion of the German army would have refused to march. She imagined men and women peace-lovers the world over flinging themselves in front of troop trains and being ready to show as much

courage as those who marched to war - dying if necessary - in the cause of peace. "And had they been organised and ready, there would have been no war."⁴¹ In 1915, she was aware that her proposal to disarm and to appeal to the love and pity of humanity would have sounded strange:

Yet no stranger surely than the Sermon on the Mount, still read aloud in our churches, by apparently serious priests, to seemingly receptive congregations. And as certainly as I believe that if we lived after the pattern there set forth, we should realise the kingdom of Heaven on earth, so certain am I that if we had disarmed in the first week of last August - not by an arbitrary decision of the Foreign Office, but on a demand from the people - there would have been no war. So great a moral miracle would have had its effect. The world would have been changed. No nation would have rushed into war "in self-defence." There would have been no war.⁴²

In that way alone, she argued, Belgium - people, cities, industry - would have been saved.⁴³ Royden's approach led her into some situations of danger herself. Her own adventure came in the summer of 1915, following the F.O.R. Summer Conference at the S.C.M. centre at Swanwick from 5-12 July.⁴⁴ At that Conference, various women asked her what they could do whilst their brothers were fighting. Royden,⁴⁵ at once replied, "There is the country! Go! Convert England to Christian pacifism!"⁴⁶ Attempting precisely that through the counties of the east Midlands, en route for London, Royden led a group of nine women and eight men who took part in a Caravan Campaign, or "Pilgrimage of Peace." They took with them a horse-drawn caravan to hold literature and stores, and to provide sleeping quarters for the women, whilst other young men and women cycled or walked alongside. Royden was the principal preacher, but a number of the F.O.R. party attempted open-air preaching. Each day began with prayers around the caravan, reports back of the various meetings of the previous evening, and planning for the day ahead.

Those taking part knew there was a risk attached to such an exercise,⁴⁷ and on 30 July, unaware that a local battalion had recently been destroyed during an attack in the Dardanelles, fifteen Pilgrims visited Hinckley. Meetings there created uproar. A hostile crowd, many of whom were drunk (it was payday), had decided - following the line promoted by certain national newspapers⁴⁸ - that the preachers were pro-German, either spies or funded by Germany. A mob overturned their caravan, before setting it on fire and destroying it completely.⁴⁹ The crowd sang "Tipperary" as the roof fell in. The tents were pillaged and destroyed. The horror lasted for two or three hours, as the shouting and the flames attracted more and more people, between two and three thousand in all. The circle of prayer did at least protect some of the missionaries, disconcerting and disarming some of their attackers.

We remained in their hands and at their mercy ... saved from physical attack that night by our sheer pacifism. Not one of us - there were about a dozen, including Ebenezer Cunningham, later Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, and Reginald Sorenson, later a member of Parliament - made the slightest resistance or protest ... and not one of us received a blow. Many times some of the crowd would threateningly approach us ... with raised fists and with violent reproaches threaten what they were going to do to us, but they always stopped at the last moment. One man seized Maude Royden by the throat, but was the worse for drink and, looking foolish when no one interfered, released her. Several of the men in khaki dragged two Church of England young curates to the burning caravan, now a big bonfire, to throw them on it, but refrained at the edge of the fire.⁵⁰

As the flames died down so the crowd began to disperse, and eventually members of the party were able to creep away to the police station for safety.⁵¹

Obedience to God or the State?

The State's harassment of pacifists was an unrelenting feature of the Great War, coming to a head with the Military Service Act of 1916. Despite one last voluntary recruiting drive by Lord Derby ("intimidation" was the F.O.R. description of such campaigns⁵²), Asquith saw the Military Service Bill through Parliament in January 1916.⁵³ The Act would take effect from 10 February. Whether they consented or not, unmarried men between eighteen and forty-one were regarded as having been "duly enlisted in His Majesty's regular forces ... for the period of the war."⁵⁴ The refusal of many individuals to consent, on the grounds of pacifist conscience, and the response of the State to that conscientious refusal, were to determine the direction of pacifist theology, theory and practice for the rest of the century. The F.O.R. News Sheet brought the Fellowship openly, if reluctantly, into the political arena. "We refuse to participate in war, whether voluntarily or under compulsion," it stated, "because our submission to Jesus Christ and our salvation through Him commit us to an endeavour to bring in His Kingdom in His way."⁵⁵ It was now clear that there would be a cost to being a pacifist, and many would have to pay the price. It has been estimated that only around seven per cent of conscientious objectors were Anglicans, a lower figure than for almost any other Church, and fewer than the twelve per cent who were atheists.⁵⁶ The lack of a rebellious tradition and the bellicosity of the Church leaders - in particular Winnington-Ingram - meant that Anglicans had a particularly hard time in front of tribunals.⁵⁷ It was not uncommon for a tribunal to ask an applicant if he had actively protested to the bishops about their attitude to the war. A negative response would contribute to the grounds for turning down his application for exemption.⁵⁸ A journalist present at a number of tribunals reported one thus:

Mr. C. was a letter sorter at the G.P.O. and he claimed total exemption. He had

been a member of the Church of England since infancy and had held his opinions since the South African war. He said that he conscientiously objected to taking life, though he would not object to Red Cross Work if it were voluntary.

Question: Do you believe in the Bishops?

Answer: Yes.

Question: In the Bishop of London?

Answer: I do not agree with his going to the front.

Question: We are defending ourselves and Christianity, what would you do to help us?

Answer: Trust in God.

Question: Do you Trust Him in everything?

Answer: Yes. He always does what I ask Him.

Question: Do you simply ask God and do nothing yourself?

Answer: I spread the Gospel.

Question: Do you make an effort yourself?

Answer: Yes.

Question: What are you doing now?

Answer: I am preaching Christianity.

Question: How can that stop war?

Answer: Are not all the men fighting, Christians?

A member of the Tribunal interjected: Faith without works is dead - what will you do?

Answer: I am leading the life of a Christian.

Another member of the Tribunal: If you pray, should you not make some effort to get what you want?

Answer: I believe I must make some effort.

Question: What do you do to stop war?

Answer: I preach the Gospel to others.

Question: Do you think that sufficient?

Answer: I do think it sufficient. If people believed the Gospel it would stop war.

Question: Do you try to get hold of the responsible people?

Answer: I can't say I go as far as that.

Question: Have you taken action with regard to the Bishop of London? Did you protest?

Answer: I did nothing.

Question: You are employed by the Postmaster-General, do you object to serving the Government?

Answer: No. I have already tried also to do Red Cross work but was refused as of military age.

The application was refused.⁵⁹

When a conscientious objector had had his case turned down by two tribunals, or even accepted by one but with an inappropriate form of exemption, he would be handed over to the military and placed under military authority. At the first refusal to salute or to don military uniform he would be confined to a cell, awaiting court martial. Even in detention, refusal to participate in drill or to obey other orders was regarded as further disobedience leading to further punishment. Physical and psychological torture was commonplace, with beatings, enforced nakedness (for those unwilling to wear military khaki) and the most minimal diet being close to the norm. Across the country threats were made that the punishment would be execution. In the most extreme case, the

punishment the Army had in mind for a group of objectors taken forcibly to France, was exactly that.⁶⁰

A F.O.R. Conscription Committee was set up, including the Anglican Thomas Attlee,⁶¹ which continued to meet for the next three years. It worked closely with the N.C.F. and the Friends Service Committee in the Joint Advisory Committee, an umbrella body formed at the time of the national register in July 1915. Before arrest, conscientious objectors were given legal assistance by the National Council Against Conscription,⁶² and after arrest the N.C.F. took up responsibility. So when J. H. Brocklesby sent the N.C.F. an official postcard ingeniously amended to read "I am being sent to b ... ou ... long," prompt action by the N.C.F. and the Friends' Service Committee meant that some of the men taken to France received a brief visit by the Revd. F. B. Meyer and the Quaker journalist Hubert Peet. That action helped to convince the authorities that no executions could be undertaken without causing a public outcry, and it may well have contributed to the C.O.s' ultimate survival.⁶³

The F.O.R. Conscription Committee retained contact with conscientious objectors, and set up an emergency fund to provide relief for them and their families. There were frequent calls for clothing to be donated. In due course this led directly into hospitality and convalescent work,⁶⁴ with medical assistance, holidays and light training for recently released C.O.s. A F.O.R. Employment Bureau was set up to assist C.O.s who lost their jobs, and later to find employment for men granted conditional exemption.

Great War Pacifists and the Church of England

Two years into the hell of war, the Church of England attempted to instigate a morale-boosting National Mission of Repentance and Hope, effectively an extended version of the Fast Days of previous centuries. Even people who themselves supported the war were disgusted by the lack of critique from the Anglican leadership.⁶⁵ For all the effort expended, their Mission largely by-passed those most affected by the war. Following the Mission, the Archbishops were content to set up a number of committees, membership of which included some pacifists.⁶⁶

Anglicans who did have something distinctive to say invariably found themselves in trouble. Edward Gordon Bulstrode (1885-1953), a semi-itinerant Franciscan evangelist known as Brother Edward, was barred from addressing the troops at Horsham because of his pacifist preaching.⁶⁷ Thomas Attlee spent over two years in prison for his conscientious objection, at great cost to his own health and that of his family.⁶⁸ Ernest

William Barnes, Fellow of Mathematics at Trinity, Cambridge, supported lecturer Bertrand Russell in his conflict with the College; Barnes' own Fellowship was not renewed.⁶⁹ George Lansbury struggled against the odds to keep the *Herald* afloat throughout the war years and beyond.⁷⁰ Charles Casson Stimson (1889-1964) was forced out of his curacy and Tom Pickering his youth-work at St. Mary's, Sheffield. Henry Cecil, on the staff of Sheffield Cathedral, was mauled by crowds hostile to his pacifist meetings.⁷¹ Bernard Walke was accused of being a German spy.⁷² Across the Atlantic, Paul Jones, Bishop of Utah, was forced by his fellow bishops to leave his post because of their hostility to his pacifism.⁷³ In India, Charles Freer Andrews (1871-1940) was reinforced in his commitment to nonviolence by the combined influence of Christ, Gandhi and Tagore, with the result that he vowed to embrace suffering in the peaceful fight against injustice and imperialism.⁷⁴

ANGLICAN PACIFISM, 1914-1918: ENDNOTES

1. Charles Trevelyan, E. D. Morel, Ramsay MacDonald and Norman Angell were amongst the leaders, not a united group by any means with the radical Morel of a rather different persuasion to the cautious neutralist Angell. Carl Heath, the secretary of the National Peace Council, was a member of the General Committee. (Robbins, p45.) The U.D.C. did not become the mass-movement successor to the pre-war peace groups, as some of its leaders had hoped, but it did provide valuable support for the parliamentary opponents of the war. E. W. Barnes and Maude Royden were among its supporters. (Royden contributed to the 1915 U.D.C. anthology, *Towards a Lasting Settlement*.)

2. den Boggende, p79; Wallis, p7; Ceadel, p61; Robbins, p38-45. There was some overlap of membership; Leyton Richards, for one, was a founder member of the N.C.F. as well as being active in the F.O.R. The Independent Labour Party was also a focus for opposition to the war; Marian Ellis was F.O.R.'s unofficial representative at the I.L.P. (den Boggende, p169.)

3. It was Lilla's idea. Rowbotham, p34.

4. Kennedy, p43. Fenner Brockway had also been sub-editor of the *Christian Commonwealth* (Hobhouse, *I Appeal to Caesar*, p19.)

5. Graham, p174. In the light of moves towards conscription in 1915, the Statement was then extended: "The members of the Fellowship refuse to engage in any employment which necessitates taking the military oath. Whilst leaving the decision open to the individual judgment of each member, the Fellowship will support members who conscientiously resist compulsory alternatives to military service involving a change of occupation." (Graham, p174,175.)

6. *Herald of Peace*, October 1914, cited in Robbins, p31.

7. *Twenty Years at St. Hilary*, p61,62. Recalling the answer of George Fox to an enquiry about the wearing of swords, "Wear it as long as thou canst," Walke resolved to follow Fox's advice.
 'Wear it as long as thou canst.' I could wear it no longer. As I stood looking down on the people on that Sunday night in August 1914, I saw no way of reconciliation between the way of the Gospel that I had been called to preach and the war that was approaching. I was not, as far as I know, carried away by my emotions; I was empty of all feeling but an awareness that this rejection of war as an altogether evil thing, was at one with whatever intelligence I possessed. (*Twenty Years at St. Hilary*, p63,64.)

8. Winnington-Ingram, Bishop of London wrote to her on 13 August, describing the war as "the last Armageddon" after which "the great sun of Love ... will shine out in its permanent strength." (Cited in Fletcher, p112.) On 28 January 1915 he told her that "Even God can only get out of each age the morality of which the age is capable.... Your 'ideal morality' is not possible yet." (Cited in Fletcher, p126.) He would soon revel in the crudest, most bloodthirsty and gospel-denying recruiting sermons.

9. *Challenge*, 21 August 1914. Cited in Fletcher, p110.

10. *Challenge*, 2 October 1914, p616. Cited in Fletcher, p111. Royden was disturbed to discover that even Gilbert Murray, opponent of the Boer War, had contributed to a pamphlet supporting this war. Under the weight of such opposition, Royden began to wonder if she was the one who was mistaken. But, she wrote to Murray, "I am only interested to know what the teaching of Christ is. If I thought

this teaching might be wrong, I should cease to be a Christian and should begin to argue the question afresh, from the point of view you support." (17 October 1914. Cited in Fletcher, p111.) And again, "Your difficulty is 'Is war ever right? Is this war right? Were we bound in honour to make war?' Mine is, 'What is the teaching of Christ about war?' I do not know whether I am again sounding horribly insolent, because I am assuming that you do not argue the case from a Christian point of view? If so, forgive me, I have read your pamphlet with great care, and I do not find in it any question of the teaching of Christ on the subject of war...." (Cited in Fletcher, p111.)

11. The World Alliance had its roots in 1907, when various denominations prepared to make presentations to the Second Hague Conference of that year. It marked increasing international ecclesiastical concern for issues of peace. In the following two years there was a substantial exchange programme between Christians in England and Germany, including the 130 or so German Church dignitaries - Lutheran, Roman Catholic and Nonconformist - who attended the Seventeenth Universal Congress for Peace, in London in the summer of 1908. (*Goodwill*, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1915, p3. Also Brittain, *Rebel Passion*, p27. Earlier moves included an Anglo-German Conciliation Committee, for whom Archbishop Davidson expressed support in 1905, and a British Committee for the Study of Municipal Institutions which invited a party of German mayors to visit Britain in 1906. In 1907, some of the Germans were in a Congress delegation received at Buckingham Palace. The British party in 1908 were received by the Kaiser.) The return visit the following year, warmly received by the Kaiser, included four Anglican bishops in a party of over one hundred. One of their guides was the secretary of the German Committee, Dr. Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze. (Brittain, *Rebel Passion*, p27,28.) At the end the two groups sang "Now thank we all our God." (Wilkinson, p22.) From this continuing programme evolved the Associated Councils of Churches in the British and German Empires for Fostering Friendly Relations between Two Peoples, launched in London in February 1911. (National Peace Council Year Book, 1911, p91.) Seven thousand people joined in the first year. (Wilkinson, p23.) On one of the visits to Berlin at this time, Bishop Talbot of Winchester spoke of greater ideals than patriotism: "The Christendom of Europe is one; the Human Race is yet another; and the Kingdom of God upon earth, that is a third. Loyalty to the country is splendid; but there are other loyalties. Patriotism is a noble ideal; let us not make of it an idol.... What we need to cherish is the spiritual force which binds man to man, and nation to nation, by an inner bond, stronger than selfishness, or ambition, or any material thing." (Cited in Grane, p99,100.)

Two Liberal M.P.s, the Quaker J. Allen Baker and the Anglican Willoughby H. Dickinson, were in the forefront of this movement with Dickinson raising funds for a journal, *The Peacemaker*, the circulation of which was to grow to 67,000 by 1914. (Robbins, p18.) With financial backing from Andrew Carnegie, who endowed £400,000 to generate income for "uniting the Churches of Christendom for Peace, and in promoting Conferences of their representatives," (*Goodwill*, Vol. 1., No. 1, January 1915, p4. Also Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p3.) the vision grew beyond Europe and provisional committees were formed to organise the conferences intended for August 1914.

The World Alliance proved a huge disappointment to pacifists. As it came to uphold Britain's position in the war, it showed itself to be part of the old order after all. A British committee, including Moore Ede, Dickinson, Hodgkin, Ruth Rouse (travelling secretary for women students in the World Student Christian Federation), William Temple, Bishop Boyd Carpenter and others met on 17 November 1914. Their declared objects included: "To aid the development of the national Christian conscience and to promote all measures that will lead the nations to realize that the progress of humanity demands that the reign of law and the principles of love shall prevail in international affairs." (*Goodwill*, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1915, p7.) The approach of the British Committee was reflected by J. H. Rushbrooke, the editor of its journal, *Goodwill*. Rushbrooke stated that "Christian men who hold it a first duty of the British nation at the present moment to concentrate all its energy upon the war have not departed from their conviction that military force can of itself settle nothing, although it may, and it is hoped will, prepare the way for the dominance of a reasonable attitude...." (*Goodwill*, Vol. 1., No. 6, 29 July 1915, p137.) Such an attitude appealed to the episcopal supporters of the World Alliance, namely the bishops

of Winchester (E. S. Talbot), Kensington and Southwark (Burge). Clearly, for all the fine words of Constance, the World Alliance would not be a happy home for pacifists, though some, like Ellis, Hobhouse, Hodgkin, Orchard, and Richard Roberts tried to be of influence. In 1919, Christian pacifists formed their own organisation which became the International Fellowship of Reconciliation. By that time the World Alliance had become, if it had not always been, a highly respectable organisation, with its journal reporting the well-meaning speeches of well-heeled leaders of Church and State. There was no sense of incongruity in the juxtaposition of articles on "Famine in Europe" and "King George and President Wilson at Buckingham Palace: Speeches at State Banquet ..." (*Goodwill*, Vol. 3, No. 6, 31 March 1919, p269,270.)

12. The intention had been to have 153 delegates from twelve nations and representing some thirty-three religious bodies. (*Goodwill*, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1915, p4.)

13. En route on 30 July, Baker saw the Archbishop of Canterbury with a view to getting him to sign a memorial to Prime Minister Asquith urging non-intervention; Davidson's erastian response was that he could not sign it "without an assurance that it was on lines which the Government would find helpful and not harmful." (Cited in Wilkinson, p18.) Rebuffed, Baker continued his journey to the former Dominican monastery where, five hundred years earlier, the Council of Constance ended in the tragedy of the condemnation of Huss. This conference ended in the tragedy of war. Moore Ede noted hopefully that: "Huss appeared to fail, but the principles he advocated eventually prevailed. Our Conference appeared to militarists a failure.... But the ideas and principles which we met to advocate will eventually prevail, and perhaps sooner than many expect.... A Conference for Promoting Friendly Relations between the Nations held at the moment when the nations were entering on the greatest and most disastrous war in history may seem to some a ridiculous fiasco. That is a mistake. The horrors of the war prove the sanity of the ideals of those who met at Constance, and show the necessity for action by the Churches when the war comes to an end. Had the Churches exercised the influence they can and ought to exercise sooner, the war-makers would have found it more difficult to make war. The Churches have been too slow in taking action. They must never be too late again." (*Goodwill*, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1915, p6. As for the "ridiculous fiasco," the station-master at Constance laughed scornfully when he heard that the departing delegates had been part of a Peace Conference.)

Prayers in many languages were said on the Sunday morning, with the noise of troops movements audible outside. Before the delegates hurried home on the Monday they passed four resolutions which later influenced the direction taken by the F.O.R. The first two resolutions were:

I. That, inasmuch as the work of conciliation and the promotion of amity is essentially a Christian task, it is expedient that the Churches in all lands should use their influence with the peoples, parliaments, and governments of the world to bring about good and friendly relationships between the nations, so that, along the path of peaceful civilization, they may reach that universal goodwill which Christianity has taught mankind to aspire after.

II. That, inasmuch as all sections of the Church of Christ are equally concerned in the maintenance of peace and the promotion of good feeling among all the races of the world, it is advisable for them to act in concert in their efforts to carry the foregoing resolution into effect. (*Goodwill*, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1915, p5.)

The third resolution called for appropriate councils to be set up by the Churches in each country, with an international bureau to co-ordinate the work of the Alliance. The fourth set up an interim committee, including Baker and Dickinson, who was the Honorary Secretary to the Constance Conference (Robbins, p18. *Goodwill*, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1915, p4.), with Moore Ede, Siegmund-Schültze and others. Siegmund-Schültze was the young Pastor of the Lutheran Church at Potsdam, Chaplain to the Kaiser, and Conference organiser and chairman. On 5 September Hodgkin was invited to join this group and he immediately became the treasurer. Despite the war this group continued to function, and Moore Ede, Hodgkin, Siegmund-Schültze, John Augustine Kempthorne (1864-1946; the Bishop of Lichfield), et al met again in Berne in August 1915. One achievement was the setting up of "Caritas inter arma,"

to provide aid to interned civilians and prisoners of war. (Wilkinson, p199.)

14. Though not, apparently, in the same carriage. (den Boggende, p55.)

15. Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p4. Brittain, *Rebel Passion*, p30.

16. den Boggende details the various letters and statements of that time (p55,56.) Five years later, Hodgkin, Siegmund-Schülze and around fifty others (including Thomas Attlee) met at the house of Cornelis Boeke in Bilthoven, Holland to form the Movement Towards A Christian International, later to become known as the International Fellowship of Reconciliation.

17. This stated that the “war spells the bankruptcy of much that we too lightly call Christian.... If we apportion blame, let us not fail first to blame ourselves and to seek forgiveness of Almighty God.” It continued with calls to have faith, to love all people, to make preparations for life after the war, to avoid a spirit of vindictiveness, and to pray daily. (Cited in den Boggende, p57.) 475,000 copies were printed in England and 50,000 in the U.S.A.

18. They did appeal to the Archbishop to bring together leading Anglicans to consider the Church’s duty in wartime. (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p5.)

19. Temple wrote the first tract, *Christianity and War*, published on 2 November 1914, arguing both that “all war is contrary to the mind and spirit of Christ,” and that Britain was right to declare war because it defended a just cause. He stated both that pacifists were necessary because “the nation could ill do without them” and that “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.” (Cited in den Boggende, p64. Other Anglicans involved in the *Papers for War Time* group included Percy Dearmer, Archdeacon Gresford Jones, W. H. Moberly and J. H. Oldham. den Boggende, p86.) Temple was to become an infuriating but friendly adversary of pacifists for the next thirty years. Given the sentiments he expressed, and the fact that he rejected a pacifist article by Hodgkin, it was hardly surprising that the *Papers for War Time* group soon split into two, with a pacifist section breaking away from those like Temple prepared initially to tolerate and subsequently to promote the war. The first papers suggested an acceptance by most of the group of Britain’s honourable intentions in taking part in the war, although moderate papers were written by Richard Roberts, Gray and Orchard. The basis for publication of later papers went even further, stating that Britain should “carry the war to a decisive issue.” (Playne, p193; den Boggende, p67.)

20. The pacifist group still maintained contact with Temple, however. He was invited to the Fellowship of Reconciliation General Committee on 19 March 1915 in order to consider the respective positions of pacifists and influential peace-minded non-pacifists, and how it might be possible to work together without antipathy. “[T]he interpretation of secular history in relation to the Kingdom of God” was discussed. (den Boggende, p156.) The F.O.R. wanted to make some criticisms of Temple in an atmosphere which would not hamper future co-operation, and Temple wanted to state that he saw peace coming not through disarmament but by an international use of an impartial body of armies (implying that at that time he accepted that such armies were being used for selfish interest.) Temple upheld the decision of the Church at the time of Constantine to move away from the threat of obscurity and to accept the compromises of having wider influence. There was disagreement over the potential for love in international relations. Temple suggested an evolutionary model whereby a single state could potentially be based on love, but international affairs had yet to evolve into such a position. Hodgkin replied that such a process depended on “the infusion of the moral dynamic of those who stand ahead.” (F.O.R. General Committee Minutes, 19 March 1915. Box 1/1, p40-45.) He added that the continual outbreak of the Divine Order was only possible when people took risks, as Christ did. The parties

agreed to disagree, but parted on amicable terms. It was a promising start to a relationship that was to lead to Temple being one of pacifism's fiercest critics, yet beloved by many pacifists for his friendship and tolerance for their position.

21. After various follow-up meetings, Roberts wrote to Hodgkin advocating "foundations for a deliberate and forthright propaganda of the Kingdom of God outside the ordinary ecclesiastical channels;" in other words a new organisation which he suggested should make use of touring caravans, taking preachers to street corners around the country, who would preach a reconciliation that was not only personal but social and international as well. (den Boggende, p68,69.)

22. den Boggende, p69-71. The Collegium was Lucy Gardner's home in St. George's Square. (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p8.) A. D. Belden, Cadoux, Gardner, Gray, Stephen Hobhouse, Hodgkin, J. S. Hoyland, Orchard, Gilbert Porteous, Richard Roberts, Spencer and other F.O.R. figures were also involved at one time or another in the Swanwick Free Church Fellowship, founded in 1911, in response to Free Church complacency on social problems. (den Boggende, p35,36.) A further influential group was the Socialist Quaker Society, founded in 1898, which included amongst its members Corder Catchpool and Alfred and Ada Salter; it held that war was an adjunct of capitalism and that people needed liberation from both. (den Boggende, p29-31.)

23. Mary Phillips worked for many years with the Y.W.C.A., and "was an authority on industrial problems especially in relation to girls." (*Christian Pacifist*, October 1939, p256.) In 1914 she pointed out that there were 159,000 industrial injuries due to neglect and bad working conditions. "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," she said. (den Boggende, p127, citing the *Venturer*, vol.1, no. 6, March 1916, p182 and no. 12, September 1916, p370. In 1933 Phillips wrote *The Responsibility of the Christian Investor*.) She found the day-long F.O.R. committee meetings at the Collegium - with decision-making based upon concensus - both peaceful and uplifting. (den Boggende, p150. After only a few months it was found that the Collegium was too small and the F.O.R. moved to new premises at 17 Red Lion Square. den Boggende, p175. The property had an artistic heritage, having been associated with Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Edward Burne-Jones and William Morris. Morris wrote the appropriate assertion that, "Fellowship is heaven, and lack of fellowship is hell: fellowship is life, and lack of fellowship is death: and the deeds that ye do upon the earth, it is for fellowship's sake that ye do them." *The Dream of John Ball*, ch.4.) When F.O.R. debated materialism, Phillips condemned poor labour conditions and argued that the Christian concern should be not with wealth but "well-th," by which she meant a right sharing of the resources God had given to humankind: "the rich need to learn how to live efficiently on less, and the poor how to live wisely on more." (*Venturer*, vol.1, no.12, September 1916, p369,370. Cited in den Boggende p126,127.) She served on F.O.R.'s Conscription Committee, set up following the introduction of compulsory military service in 1916. (A later member was Thomas Attlee. den Boggende, p217.)

24. Cited in den Boggende, p71. Royden was one of the initial members of the planning group for the study school, along with Hodgkin and Richard Roberts. In turn these invited Lucy Gardner, McEwan Lawson, J. St. G. Heath (Warden of Toynbee Hall), William Fearon Halliday (1874-1932, Presbyterian) and (later) Roderic K. Clark to join them. (den Boggende, p71.) On their behalf, pacifist student Randal Wyatt (later, as a conscientious objector, to be sent to France) asked Ebenezer Cunningham (1881-1977; a deacon of Emmanuel Congregational Church and a mathematics fellow at St. John's College - Thompson, p550) to find an appropriate venue in Cambridge, after which correspondence with the Vice-Chancellor led to the offer of the Arts Theatre as a meeting place. (den Boggende, p72.) The conference was to take place the week of an extraordinary unofficial Christmas truce during which soldiers from opposing armies fraternised in no-man's land. Details of such events were not known to the conference participants, however.

25. *My Life*, p183-185. He met some French socialists, but "got little pacifist change from them." Lansbury (1859-1940) first considered Christianity under the influence of J. Fenwick Kitto, Vicar of Whitechapel in 1875. Returning from a failed attempt to settle in Australia, Lansbury entered active politics in 1885. Although courted by the Liberals, he joined the S.D.F. in 1892 and campaigned openly against the Boer War. He started to go to church again around 1900 (Postgate, p55.) In the parish of Bow, encouraged by a visit of Cosmo Lang, then Bishop of Stepney, (J. G. Lockhart, p160,161) and particularly by the continuing support of a curate, William Corbett Roberts, he became a committed Christian, understanding Christianity to be both socialist and pacifist. He became vice-president of the Church Socialist League (*My Life*, p5; Holman, p35) and was elected M.P. for Bow and Bromley in 1910, but resigned in 1912 over suffrage and lost the ensuing by-election.

26. It was clear to Royden that Jesus himself rejected the nation's claim to be absolute:

His refusal to take the "national" position, and become the leader of a national revolt against oppression, is the more significant that - by our own standards - it was not an unjust cause that He was desired to lead.... It was His refusal that turned the people against Him. When they cried "Crucify Him!" they expressed their hatred of the man who might have helped his people, and who would not.

The impression left upon His disciples was that they must follow His example. They offered no resistance to persecution. Their women and their children suffered, and themselves; but it did not occur to them that they had a right to resist, or that the example given to them by their Master could be for any reason set aside. They seemed to have felt, with Tertullian, that when He disarmed St. Peter, Christ disarmed them all....

Christ came to a world not ready for Him - so unready that it crucified Him. He taught His disciples that they must not be overcome with evil, but must overcome it with good; and by "good" He does not seem to have meant swords and other arms but love and patience and kindness and meekness. He rebuked a disciple who imagined that he might defend his Master with the sword, and those others who desired to punish a village which rejected Him. He did not wait to come until the world was sufficiently advanced at least not to crucify Him and torture His disciples. He did not tell them that some day, when good was stronger and men better than now, it would be their duty to rely wholly on love and put aside earthly weapons of defence. He told them to overcome evil with good *now*, and in this command there was surely contained a promise - the promise that good is really stronger than evil; not to be stronger some day, but stronger *now*. They were, they believed, to stake everything on this promise, and to go on believing it, even if it resulted in their death. For Christ, believing in the triumph of love, was crucified, and so they knew that the most frightful risks and the most abject (apparent) failure were to be accepted with unshaken confidence in His promise. They were to "be perfect" not at some future time when other people also were better, and they no longer tied and bound with the chain of their own sins; but *now*. (Royden in Fry, *Christ and Peace*, p38-40.)

In his refusal to lead a national revolt, Jesus was true to his own ideal, said Royden:

If we had followed Him without compromise, as did His first disciples, we should have been accused, as they were, of being "bad citizens," disloyal to the State; but we should by now have made war impossible, and saved the world from evils unspeakable, and hatred and disunity. If we had accepted in August, 1914, His teaching in its glorious idealism, we should even then perhaps have saved Belgium and the world from a devastating conflict. If now we did so, not because the sacrifices of war are too great, but because we see that peace is better, and love a greater force than war - what then would happen? (Royden in Fry, *Christ and Peace*, p42.)

Such practice, argued Royden, would reflect a loyalty to the one who said, "I am the Way."

There is no time at which our Saviour ceases to be the Way. There is no time at which good is

less strong or evil stronger than before. We plead that *now* is not the time, and point to our own sins as ground and excuse for putting off the hour of the ideal. We "make a god of our own weakness and bow down to it." And it is true that every succeeding sin has made it harder to turn to Christ, but it is not true that any sin has absolved us from doing so. It is true that in putting off so long our attempt to make the will of God prevail "in earth as it is in heaven," we have made a world very unlike heaven; but it is not true that at any time we are justified in putting it off a little longer, until it is a little easier. It will never be easier. If we do not believe in the Sermon on the Mount in such sense that we consent to live by it when it is dangerous, we shall not find the world ready to listen to it when it is safe. (Royden in Fry, *Christ and Peace*, p43.)

27. Along with C. Franklin Angus, Roderic K. Clark, Marian Ellis (1878-1952, a Quaker; she later became Lady Parmoor), Lucy Gardner (honorary secretary), W. Fearon Halliday, J. St. G. Heath, Henry T. Hodgkin (chairman), McEwan S. Lawson, W. E. Orchard, Richard Roberts and Lilian Stevenson. (Fry, *Christ and Peace*, p107.) In autumn 1915 George Lansbury was invited to join the General Committee, and although he declined he did agree to write a pamphlet, *Why I Joined the F.O.R.* (den Boggende, p176.) Lansbury was critical of the "indefiniteness" of the original conference, and of the F.O.R.'s stand in general: "We were rather nebulous in our conclusions and did not, as an organised body, do very much against the war. William Temple, when I met him later, seemed to have given up any idea of being able to put an end to the slaughter till it reached its appropriate high-water mark.... We talked a lot about Christian witness, but few among us were willing to say war was murder." (*My Life*, p211.)

28. General Principles of Propaganda, 1. Fry, p106.

29. Fry, p104,105.

30. General Principles of Propaganda, 2. Fry, p106. The F.O.R. would always be at its most effective when it focussed on the specific issue of war and peace, rather than on the ills of society in general.

31. Mary Phillips expressed the position as "first to BE before to DO." Although the F.O.R. in general tended to shy away from overtly political issues, one group of members was an exception. This was the New Commonwealth Group, of which Mary Phillips was a member. They attempted to define political principles which would be consistent with the values of the F.O.R. Their proposals were described as being

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. (Cited by den Boggende, p208.)

Any recommendations - moderate, left-wing proposals that would not have been out of place expressed in the U.D.C. or the I.L.P. (den Boggende, p210, cited "open diplomacy, free trade, international parliaments, arbitration, disarmament, co-operation between capital, management, labour and consumer, limitations of individual incomes, education for all and of the whole person and the abolition of capital punishment") - were never developed into F.O.R. policy, and remained the work of a handful of selected members. The Group appears to have disbanded soon after a New Year's conference at Jordans at the start of 1918 to which Lansbury, Royden and Hewlett Johnson had been invited. (den Boggende, p224.) Although, following national publicity given to Lord Lansdowne's proposals to end the war by negotiation, F.O.R. members took part in an anti-war march from Canning Town to Victoria Park, Bow, in April 1917 (the subsequent rally was broken up by a mob), and although they collected

signatures for a W.I.L. petition, (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p28, and Brittain, *Rebel Passion*, p42) political action generally remained on the F.O.R. fringe. Possibly the most politically activist members of F.O.R. were Walter Ayles and Theodora Wilson Wilson. Among the more politically figures was Thomas Attlee who reminded the 1916 F.O.R. Summer Conference at Swanwick that members present 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. (Cited in den Boggende, p214,215.)

Attlee cited his own situation of possessing shares in a South American railway without any idea about the conditions of the railway workers. His uncomfortable conclusion was that "Reconciliation means Revolution." (den Boggende, p129,130, citing F.O.R. *Newsheet* insert, 25 August 1916. For five years from 1918 the F.O.R. produced a series of booklets entitled "The Christian Revolution Series.")

Many in the F.O.R. felt that the necessary social change would be assisted by social action and by the adopting a peaceful spirit, a prayerful and reconciling approach to life and theology. Attempts were made to set up an international day of prayer for peace. (den Boggende, p201. One suggested date was Easter Day 1916, ironically the date on which the Republican rising in Dublin took place.) At Christmas 1916, the F.O.R. and the Society of Friends flew in the face of hostile public opinion by distributing Christmas gifts as a sign of friendship and sympathy to the families of Interned Aliens. (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p25.) Work within the Church included forty thousand circulars sent to clergy, eliciting a mere seventeen "entirely sympathetic" replies, and many that were abusive. (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p31,32.) More encouragingly, the Church of England sent an official delegation to the 1917 F.O.R. Conference in an attempt to gain the Fellowship's participation in the doomed National Mission for Repentance and Hope. (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p32.)

The most active of the early F.O.R. subcommittees were those responsible for the production of Christian pacifist literature - pamphlets and leaflets abounded - and a separate Children's Committee considering how practically to educate the younger generation in F.O.R. values. Late in 1915 a Social Service Committee was formed. In February 1916 it was agreed to support a colony of young offenders, providing kindness and patience instead of the traditional régime of birch and corporal punishment. Maude Royden was one of the members of the Commune Committee appointed, and in June the Riverside Village experiment was started at Syonsby Knoll in Melton Mowbray. It was not a success, with complaints to the police from nearby residents about the conduct of the delinquent children sent to Riverside by the Probation Service, with financial difficulties, overworked staff and a lack of both industrial and religious training. A damning Home Office report led to the temporary closure of Riverside, and when it reopened in 1919 the emphasis changed to being a small Co-operative Industrial Society, living in community. (den Boggende, p202-204. Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p23,24.) Initially there were once more some delinquents involved, but the new scheme was hardly more successful than its predecessor, falling apart in 1921 and being finally discontinued in 1925. (den Boggende, p332,333.) Equally short-lived, but more successful while it existed than its predecessor at Riverside, was Grace Costin's Fairby Grange centre at Hartley in Kent.

32. Fletcher, p140.

33. Fletcher, p102-104. At that time women were not even allowed to sit on Parochial Church Councils. Even at that time she was having discussions with Ursula Roberts, another Anglican pacifist, about the possibility of women's ordination. (Fletcher, p143,144.)

34. Cited by Royden in Buxton, Lowes et al, p135.

35. Elsewhere she wrote of the impossibility of conducting war without deceit: "The assumption that

lies are permissible not only between the sexes but between the nations creates an atmosphere of suspicion and hostility which make the solution of international problems impossible except by war - if war may indeed be a solution. Honour becomes a term as arbitrary in the masculine as in the feminine sense. And from this disastrous contempt for truth flows a poison which destroys the life of the State." (*Women and the Sovereign State*, p131,132.)

36. Wiltsher, p89.

37. *Daily Express*, 27 April 1915, cited in Wiltsher, p89.

38. *W.I.L. Yearly Report*, 1916, p8,9. Also Fletcher, p136. The principal rôle of W.I.L. at that time was educational and Royden played her full part in this. Her addresses in the first six months of 1916 at the Fabian Rooms, Westminster, show the breadth of her concerns: "What has Investment of Money to do with War and Peace?"; "Is it Unpatriotic to be a Pacifist?"; "What has the Woman's Movement to do with Foreign Policy?"; "Patriotism"; "Nationalism, Internationalism and the Churches"; "The Declining British Birthrate." (*W.I.L. Yearly Report*, 1916, p9,10.) On 30 April 1915 she had written on Morals and Militarism in *Common Cause*, denouncing slips being circulated urging British men "to forego no opportunity of paternity." She called this policy, "the reduction of woman to the status of mere breeders of the race." In the second half of the year she spoke on "Women and the Sovereign State." George Lansbury also gave two of the talks in these series, on "War and the Journalist" and, at Christmas, on "Peace to Men of Goodwill." (*W.I.L. Yearly Report*, 1917, p11.) Lansbury was also one of the signatories, with Royden, Lewis Donaldson (Rector of St. Mark's, Leicester), the Bishops of Hereford and Lincoln, and others in supporting a suffrage letter to Asquith in June 1916. (*W.I.L. Yearly Report*, 1916, p12.)

39. She was inspired by the words of Alexander Mackennal, written in 1900: "If England, in the plenitude of her power, should lay down every weapon of carnal warfare, disband her armies, call her fleets from the sea, throw open her ports, and trust for her continual existence only to the service she would render to the world, and the testimony she would bear to Christ, what would happen?... It might be that Christ, Whose 'finished work' is the trust of His people, would declare that the purpose of such a sacrifice is sufficient, and that the example would be enough, and that the nation would continue to be, living and strong in the gratitude of all peoples." (*Life and Letters of Alexander Mackennal, D.D.*, by Dugald Macfadyen, p257, cited in Royden, *The Great Adventure*, p3.)

40. "War was better than neutrality, if these were the only alternatives. But is it not tragic that, nineteen hundred years after the Crucifixion, we Christians should still conceive of peace in terms of *neutrality*? Was Christ, the, "neutral" on the Cross? Or was His life one long act of "non-resistance"? Was it not rather a perpetual resistance to evil, and in spite of apparent failure, a triumphant resistance? Christ was not neutral between God and man, but neither did He make war. He chose another alternative - He made peace." (*The Great Adventure*, p4.)

41. *The Great Adventure*, p6. Presumably influenced by the Peace Army concept, she had quickly moved a long way from her 4 December 1914 disavowal of martyrdom. Some years after the war Royden would start a national recruitment campaign for a Peace Army, for people "ready to die for peace."

42. *The Great Adventure*, p7.

43. "Had we been willing, for the peace of the world, to risk all, and had we suffered for it, our suffering would, like the Crucifixion, have been redemptive, and outward failure truest victory. For such a nation could not die, though for nations as for individuals, it is true that they must sometimes lose their lives

to save them." (*The Great Adventure*, p8,9.) Behind the pledge to Belgium was the threat of German militarism. Royden acknowledged the ends but not the means.

Thousands of our soldiers have gone out to give up their lives in order to destroy a false ideal - militarism. For militarism is an ideal. It is not armies and navies, but the worship of armies and navies - the belief that might is right, and that the strongest nation has the right to force its government and its ideals on the less powerful. Against this idea we are now fighting, and I also desire to fight.

But is it not time that we abandoned the hope of exterminating heresies by killing heretics? The history of the Christian Church is stained with blood shed in this belief. And it is true that, though very rarely, "heresies" have sometimes been for a time crushed out in blood. But to do this is to fall into a worse heresy - it is to believe that such cruelty is justifiable. We no longer torture those who disagree with us theologically; but we seek to put a nation to the torture still. For war is nothing less than this. It is not a matter only of those who fight, though that is bad enough. It is a matter also of economic pressure, of slow exhaustion, of the inconspicuous unheroic deaths of those who never come near the field of battle. It is children unborn, and babies who die because their mothers are pressed to death with anxiety and fear and overwork. The infant death rate in Great Britain has gone up with a leap since the war began. What it is in Germany we do not know. But it makes our rules for the protection of non-combatants seem farcical when we face the fact that the desired exhaustion of Germany means - and must inevitably mean - the deaths of women and children. (*The Great Adventure*, p9,10.)

If, in the end, Germany was beaten, what would that prove, Royden asked? "That we have larger armies and more powerful navies, and greater financial resources!" But that would be all, and at the risk of establishing the heresy of militarism at home.

Once more we seek to destroy a heresy by violence, and we enthrone that very heresy in our own hearts. The desire to "avenge Scarborough," the determination to crush the enemy altogether, the hatred of individual "alien enemies," the belief that war is after all a good thing, as well as an inevitable thing - all this, which is the very opposite of Christianity, is openly professed by people who are quite unaware that they are not Christians. We seek to convert the Prussian from his heresy, but we ourselves know not what spirit we are of.

There is only one way to kill a wrong idea. It is to set forth a right idea. You cannot kill hatred and violence by violence and hatred. You cannot make men out of love with war by making more effective war. Satan will not cast out Satan, though he will certainly seek to persuade us that he will, since of all his devices this has been throughout the ages the most successful. To make war in order to make peace! How beguiling an idea! To make Germans peaceable by killing them with torpedoes and machine-guns - that does not sound quite so well. Yet this is what we set out to do when we "fight German militarism" with the weapons of militarism.

You cannot kill a wrong idea except with a right idea. This warfare is the most heroic of all, and heroism will always move mankind.... Well, I tell you that there is a mightier heroism still - the heroism not of the sword, but the cross; the adventure not of war, but of peace. For which is the braver man when all is said - the man who believes in armaments, or the man who stakes everything on an idea? Who is the great adventurer - he who goes against the enemy with swords and guns, or he who goes with naked hands? Who is the mighty hunter - he who seeks the quarry with stones and slings, or he who, with St. Francis, goes to tame a wolf with nothing but the gospel? We peace people have made of peace a dull, drab, sordid, selfish thing. We have made it that ambiguous, dreary thing - "neutrality." But Peace is the great adventure, the glorious romance. And only when the world conceives it so, will the world be drawn after it again. "I, when I am lifted up, will draw all men unto Me." (*The Great Adventure*, p11,12.)

Those who sought peace must give no less than their best, she said.

For the truth, as they see it, men are laying down their lives to-day in Belgium and in France.

And we who see another truth - shall we be less true to it than they? Not so does the world go forward. "We are all trying to see," said one to me the other day; "if you think you see something we do not, tell it us. *Truth is more to us than Victory.*" Let us, also, believe this. We cannot sacrifice the Christian ideal even to a national necessity. Truth is more than victory. Christ indeed consecrated patriotism, as He consecrated every earthly love. He taught us that love is all one, and all divine, because it is love. But in spite of His own love for the Jewish race, His anguish as He foresaw the destruction of Jerusalem, He would not sanction war. He might have led a revolt against the cruel tyranny of Roman rule in Palestine, and - whether in success or failure - have added another name to the long list of patriot-heroes who shed their blood for their country. Yet He refused. Was He more or less true to humanity by that refusal?

Truth is more than victory. We cannot tell whether defeat or triumph is best for a nation, or whose success upon the battle-field is better for the world. But we know that only he who is ready to die for an ideal can truly be said to be loyal to that ideal, and this hard saying is true of nations as of men. What is the Christian ideal? Submission to evil? Resignation to the sufferings of others? No. "Be not overcome with evil - *but overcome evil with good.*" (*The Great Adventure*, p15,16.)

44. Membership by that time had already risen to nearly two thousand. (den Boggende, p168.)

45. Her own brother Thomas, the Deputy Chairman of the Cunard Line, had advised the Government on the most efficient transporting of the expeditionary force and its supplies to France (Fletcher, p128.)

46. The account of Constance Coltmann (née Constance Todd) and Claude Coltmann, cited in Fletcher, p129.

47. The sinking of the *Lusitania* in May had provoked riots in Liverpool; London had also experienced aerial bombing. W. E. Orchard had earlier had to abandon a public meeting in Beaconsfield because of the disturbance it provoked. Initially, however, the F.O.R. caravan prompted little more than curiosity as it made its way through Derbyshire. There was some discontent at Mansfield, (*Mansfield Reporter*, 23 July 1915. Cited in Fletcher, p131) but the caravan moved on to Nottingham and then Leicestershire. At Loughborough, the mayor's sister-in-law, a supporter of Royden's suffrage work, offered her hospitality, even though the mayor was in charge of recruiting. ("1915 - Mission to England," *Reconciliation*, February 1964, p26.)

48. On 4 August the *Daily Express* described Royden's *Great Adventure* as "Peace Crank's Mad Plea." It appealed for details in advance of any anti-war meetings, presumably with the aim of creating derision if not disruption. (Fletcher, p131.)

49. One of the missionaries later recalled: "The only preparation Maude Royden made was for all of us to leave the caravan, where supper was being prepared, and sit in a circle on the ground in silence and prayer, waiting for any attack. Hundreds of people headed by the local recruiting sergeant and a man, half drunk, clanging a big bell, poured down the lane leading to the farmer's field where we were camping." ("1915 - Mission to England," *Reconciliation*, February 1964, p26,27.)

50. "1915 - Mission to England," *Reconciliation*, February 1964, p27. Claude Coltmann added that "For 90 minutes we were at the absolute mercy of a mob quite beside itself with rage and hatred." ("1915 - Mission to England," *Reconciliation*, February 1964, p27.) The events were later used in the plot of Theodora Wilson Wilson's novel, *The Last Weapon*. The owner of the caravan, William Cook, demanded £300 compensation. (den Boggende, p182.)

51. Sorensen later said that at first even the police thought they were Germans because of a "strange Bible sort of book" found in the ashes of the caravan. It turned out to be a copy of the Apocrypha! (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p14.) Reassured, the authorities stopped a passing night train to move them on from the scene of the disturbance. To the surprise and delight of the missionaries, the Hinckley stationmaster poked his head into their departing carriage and said, "Keep on with it! I share your beliefs," a welcome message of comfort after a traumatic evening. The Pilgrims had been a close range object of hate and had seen the hatred in the faces of those whose "husbands, fathers, sweethearts and sons had been mown down in Suvla Bay. They could not hear or see us without hatred, convinced as they were we were betraying the cause sealed with that blood," Royden later commented. "If I must be killed by an enemy, may I be killed at long range!" (Fletcher, p131,132.)

Despite her Hinckley experience, Royden was confirmed as travelling-secretary of the F.O.R. by the General Committee meeting of 27 September 1915. (den Boggende, p175.) Campaigning lessons had been learnt though, and subsequent speaking engagements were less confrontational. When Royden addressed an audience of almost two thousand in Birmingham Town Hall, the event passed peacefully and her message was well-received. (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p15.) Later, small groups of members across the country tried to promote Christian pacifism on "peace tramps" or cycle tours. (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p27.) From the end of 1917, by which time Stanley James had become Travelling Secretary, the mood of the country had changed and large indoor and open-air meetings were successfully held - sometimes jointly with the I.L.P. - in Bristol, Leeds, London and elsewhere. It was even possible for local groups to set up shops for the sale of pacifist literature. (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p29.) By the end of the war membership of F.O.R. had grown from the initial 120 to around eight thousand. (den Boggende, p152.)

52. Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p18.

53. Only 38 M.P.s objected, mainly U.D.C., I.L.P. or Quaker members; in the upper chamber Lord Courtney spoke on the history of conscientious objection from the Mennonites of Holland in 1580, but his attempt to permit objections to any actions that supported the war and not merely to military service was rebuffed by the war-obsessed and far from conscientious Bishop of London. (Graham, p59-61.) Winnington-Ingram did not accept that any conscience, sufficiently educated, could differ from his own. He was too busy recruiting and informing congregations that it was their Christian duty to "Kill Germans." The attitude of ecclesiastical authorities to the introduction of conscription was, however, mixed. Looking back to the years of the conscientious objectors, Dick Sheppard later commented, "I was not a Pacifist in the first year of War: as a professing Christian I ought to have been." (Sheppard, in Bell, *We Did Not Fight*, pvii.) Others, though proponents of the war, were uneasy about both the assessment of conscience and also the treatment of objectors. Bishops Gore and Hicks both wrote letters to the *Times* advising tribunals to be "more respectful" of conscientious conviction, and in between Gore, Temple and Free Church leaders had a similar letter published. (Graham, p74. The three letters to the *Times* appeared on 14 March, 30 March and 4 April 1916 respectively. Kennedy, p103,104.)

In May 1916 concern was growing about the initial workings of the Military Service Act. Twenty-one people, including Scott Holland and Bishop Hicks, together with H. G. Wood (Master of the Temple), other prominent Church leaders and members of the F.O.R. and the N.C.F., made "An Appeal to Christians," expressing that concern.

At such a time as this we are reluctant to add anything to public controversy, but we are constrained to do so under a deep sense of the danger which at present threatens us of losing the very treasure for which we are assured our country has gone to war - the priceless treasure of freedom. We cannot, even in such an hour of danger as this, see the rights of conscience ignored without immediate protest, whether we ourselves agree with the "conscientious objector" or not.

Many - indeed, most of us - do not agree with him. But we hold that respect for conscience is of the very stuff of which freedom is made. It is bound up with the whole history of our

country. It is the provident and the best of the traditions our fathers fought for and left to us, their descendants, to hold in trust. So truly has it become a part of our national being, that, at perhaps the greatest crisis in our history, it has been preserved and embodied in the Military Service Act. We are proud to know that the rights of conscience were admitted and safeguarded at such a time.

But on this point both the letter and the spirit of the Act have been repeatedly violated by those who administer it. In spite of the terms of the Act itself, in spite of instructions, issued from headquarters, some tribunals have denied their right to grant absolute exemption on conscientious grounds; others have derided the claim of the objector to a conscience at all; and yet others have refused to recognise a genuine conviction because it was based on moral rather than purely religious grounds. In all these things the tribunals have actually defined the law which it was their duty to administer in an impartial spirit....

We contend that in violating the Military Service Act the tribunals have violated the finest traditions of our race....

The signatories urged an enquiry into the methods of the tribunals, some of which had been known to state that they could not deal with questions of conscience but rather intended to "stop this rot." Pending an enquiry, the signatories felt that C.O.s should be put under civilian and not military authority.

And we appeal to all Christian people, however convinced in their minds of the necessity or the duty of war, to reflect upon their own religious history, to remember by what great sacrifices in the past their present liberties have been won, and what grievous harm has been done to the cause of religion by persecution and intolerance. Let us who call ourselves Christians, to whatever communion we belong, continually urge upon our friends, our churches, the Press, the public, and above all those in authority, the great fact that, while we have a right at all times to seek to convince those who disagree with us, we cannot persecute them for opinions conscientiously held, without cheapening our own conscience, coarsening public morality, destroying the foundations of all freedom. (*An Appeal to Christians*, 20 May 1916. Friends House archive.)

On 24 May 1917, the Archbishop of Canterbury harshly criticised the conscientious objectors, whilst backing Lord Parmoor's attempt in the House of Lords to improve the conditions of those imprisoned. (Graham, p294,295.) Parmoor's case, as he told his sister-in-law Margaret Hobhouse, was that

It is a fundamental principle that punishment should be imposed in reference to the nature of the offence. Judged by this standard there is no justification for the terms of successive imprisonment inflicted on Conscientious Objectors who are recognised to be straightforward and sincere. This punishment is, moreover, contrary to the express declarations of responsible Ministers when the Military Service Act was under debate in Parliament.

The severity of the punishment, inflicted by successive terms of imprisonment, is in sinister contrast with the national appeal for a higher standard of right and justice, and negatives any claim we may make to maintain the supreme test of Civil Liberty, viz. the determination to give full protection to an unpopular minority at a time of national excitement. It is forgotten that obedience to conscience is a primary duty in Christian Ethics, and there is a curious confusion of thought in stigmatising a deep sense of religious duty, as though it were a mean attempt to evade the claims of a National obligation. (Hobhouse, *I Appeal to Caesar*, pxvi.)

In the House of Lords, Davidson argued that

nobody can doubt that there are at this moment men undergoing terms of imprisonment whose character is high, whose motives are unimpeachable, however extraordinary and illogical we may deem them to be; and you are not going to shake them by the adding of month after month or year after year of penal infliction upon them. (Hansard, XXV, col. 333, cited in Wilkinson, p50. The wording in Hobhouse, *I Appeal to Caesar*, p12,13 is slightly different.)

Davidson also made special pleadings for individual conscientious objectors on various occasions during and after the war. (Wilkinson, p50.) Bishop Gore also spoke on three occasions on behalf of C.O.s, his sympathies increasing when the sale of his own 1896 book, *The Sermon on the Mount*, was banned by

the chief constable of one area, as being likely to undermine the national interest. (Wilkinson, p51.) For his part, William Temple regarded the "contemptuous approach" of many of the tribunals as "a reproach to our civilization." (Iremonger, p388.)

Calls for an end to the practice of re-arrest on release (so called "cat-and-mouse") and the reduction of periods of hard-labour - the severest punishment short of hanging - to avoid risk to life or sanity, were rejected by the Government. In November 1917, the Committee of the (non-pacifist) Howard Association, including the signatories the Bishop of Lincoln, Moore Ede and Scott Holland (Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford), called the Government's attention to

a grave contravention of justice that men should be subjected to repeated sentences of imprisonment for what is in reality the single 'offence' of refusing on conscientious grounds, obedience to military orders.... The Committee therefore earnestly requests the Government at once to release from prison, and to discharge from the Army, all men who have proved the genuineness of their conscientious objection to any form of military service. (*Tribunal*, 8 November 1917.)

In January 1919 a N.C.F. petition calling for the release of the fifteen hundred men still detained, was signed by a number of clergy and was presented to the Prime Minister by E. W. Barnes, Lord Parmoor and others. (Graham, p309.) George Lansbury, as editor of the *Herald*, handed to the Home Secretary another petition of 130,000 signatures collected by the newspaper, calling for the release of the prisoners. (Kennedy, p268.) In the short term it had no effect and tales of health deterioration and cat-and-mouse arrests continued. Not until April did the first releases take place, for those who had been imprisoned longest. Almost all were released by the end of July, the end of the story for the prison system but not for the men of broken bodies but unbroken conscience who had to try to rebuild their lives in a world which initially despised them - even those who had legally been awarded exemption were now disenfranchised and much discriminated against - and only later came to appreciate the principles for which they suffered.

54. A Liberal Prime Minister could conceive that particular individuals or communities might have specific practical skills or needs that required certain men to continue in their present employment, and that members of historic peace churches could have religious objection to combatant service, so he was prepared to tolerate some exemptions to the Act. M.P.s whose support his coalition Government required extended the possibility of exemption through conscientious objection to three categories: temporary, conditional or absolute - a last minute addition promoted by two Quaker M.P.s, T. Edmund Harvey and Arnold Rowntree. (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p18,251.)

The precise working of the Act was to be determined by local tribunals with few guidelines to help them, though many would have concurred with the Prime Minister's sentiments. In any case there was always an armed forces representative in attendance to guide the Tribunals appropriately. Those whose task it was to rate the conscience of appellants did not gain a reputation for knowledge, wisdom or impartiality. There were examples of one who believed Tolstoy to be a place-name and another who was astounded that the New Testament was written in Greek because he held that Jesus "was British to the backbone!" (Graham, p70,71.) A piano-tuner was turned down for having an inconsistent conscientious objection because he must have known that his pianos could be used for playing military marches and patriotic tunes. Similarly, a baker's application for exemption was rejected because he could not prove that his bread was never eaten by soldiers. (Adrian Stephen in Bell, *We Did Not Fight*, p380,386.) As one commentator observed, most of the tribunals were "revealing a total inability to understand either a conscience or an Act of Parliament." (*Nation*, cited in Playne, p272.) Another said later that "not since Lord Jeffrey's Bloody Assize have judicial bodies left to posterity a reputation so closely identified with bias and injustice." (Rae, p60.) The first to be tested were young single men, but the Bill was extended on 25 May to include married men, and on 18 April 1918 to include those aged up to fifty-one.

Unconditional exemption was very rarely granted, only to 350 men in total, (Ceadel, p39. Almost all were Quakers.) largely because tribunals were faced with a far more bewildering range of conscientious objections than the Government had considered, not all of which were religious or pacifist. There were

those whose religious principles had more to do with the refusal to recognise external authority (e.g. the Plymouth Brethren; also the largest single group of objectors, more than ten per cent, Christadelphians, who were even prepared to make munitions provided they were not placed under military discipline - Ceadel, p43. The most thorough breakdown of such religious groups is in Rae, p73-78.) There were those who objected (e.g. anarchists) on the grounds of personal freedom, to the principle of State coercion of individuals. In these cases, the objections were as much about conscription itself as about the war. There were those who objected, on political grounds, to this war in particular but not necessarily to all wars (e.g. some socialists or revolutionary communists) - this objection was rarely recognised by tribunals. There were those whose objection was the same, but on religious grounds (e.g. Christians taking a Just War perspective.) There were humanitarian or political pacifists who objected to all war. (In general, non-religious pacifists received much harsher treatment from tribunals than those who could argue from religious conviction; secular socialists were often told they could not have a conscience. - e.g. Graham, p84,87,88.) There were religious pacifists who objected to all war (e.g. members of the F.O.R.), but with a variety of different reasons for their decision. There were also those who objected to all acts of violence against any living creature. It was not unknown for cynical tribunals, unsympathetic to the liberal exemptions with the Act, to assume that unless an objection could be proved to be in this final, most absolute category then it was invalid. In fact, many applicants would base their objections on a mélange of religious and political arguments. Charles Raven later commented that "In the First World War ... pacifism was apt to be the creed of uncompromising individualists, men or women inheriting the fine tradition of independence which its critics were apt to stigmatize as the 'Nonconformist Conscience.'" (*Alex Wood: The Man & His Message*. F.O.R. 1952, cited in Ceadel, p37.)

Not only were there different types of objection for differing reasons, but there was also a variety of approaches to alternative occupations. The first groups, above, would obviously not tolerate any State-imposed activity of any kind. (There were divisions of opinion within the N.C.F., though not within the F.O.R., about the validity or adequacy of those who were not "Absolutists." In practice, most objectors were not, but the demands of those who refused any compromise with the State, for whatever reason, were to have the most lasting impact.) Some objectors refused all alternative occupations because any work would, in some way or another, assist the war effort. Such objectors were "Absolutists." Some objectors only believed that that applied to work with the military, and were prepared to consider civilian "work of national importance" (such as agricultural, educational, shipbuilding or Red Cross work, including the Friends' Ambulance Unit which bravely provided medical aid on the battlefields.) Other objectors were content to be freed from the demand to kill, and were prepared even to don military uniform to contribute to the needs of the nation, even a nation at war. Such people could join the Non-Combatant Corps, formed on 10 March 1916. (Harold Bligh, Congregationalist, the first husband of the Anglican pacifist Margaret Eurich - Tom Scrutton was the second - worked in the sanitary section of the Royal Army Medical Corps but came to argue that "the Pacifist should avoid any sort of work wh. assists in the working of the whole military machine." den Boggende, p195.) Those who resented and refused to co-operate with tribunal decisions were not necessarily all absolutists; they could as easily have been wrongly assessed. Thus an objector who might have been prepared to undertake agricultural work would refuse to wear a military uniform and be placed in the Non-Combatant Corps; he would then be imprisoned alongside absolutists and others whose objections had been mis-diagnosed. All told, the mosaic of reasons for objection and attitudes to work was so complex as to be beyond the comprehension not only of most of the local worthies who were invited to sit on tribunals, but of the Government and its officials as well. Despite the generally helpful advice from the Government's own Pelham Committee, which processed 3,964 objectors of whom only fifty-one were known Anglicans (Rae, p250,251), there was more conflict because the nature of an objection had been so misunderstood that inappropriate alternatives were offered, than because a valid objection was not recognised in the first place. The overall effect was that many conscientious objectors, of many and varied backgrounds, found themselves brutally treated in prisons throughout the country. The conditions of the Quaker - formerly and latterly Anglican (he is referred to

as "Our member" in the A.P.F. Newsletter, June 1953) - Stephen Hobhouse, son of Margaret Hobhouse, became a cause célèbre, and led to a campaign for prison reform.

Socialist objectors to all war would often have much in common with Christian (F.O.R.) objectors to all war; members of exclusive Christian sects, e.g. Plymouth Brethren, would steer clear of political debate; on the other hand there were communists and other, sometimes violent, political extremists who could well despise their pacifist neighbours as much as the authorities did. One conscientious objector would not necessarily have any more in common with the another than he would with men in the armed forces, a situation which reinforced the popular feeling that conscientious objectors were all troublemakers.

The extent of the variety of objectors became apparent to Bernard Walke when he took up George Hodgkin's suggestion to get Home Office permission to visit the conscientious objectors at Princetown. The bleak Dartmoor prison was a 'work centre' for C.O.s. Walke was able to stay with them for one week in February 1918. Little had he realised the diversity of the group and the destructive individualism of so many within it. A meeting Walke held with six hundred of the men was a depressing experience.

Was there ever gathered together so strange a collection of individuals? - quiet Quakers who sat unmoved while men stood up and shouted around them, wild-looking men from the Clyde and Rhondda Valley whose hopes for the regeneration of society lay in a class war, strange melancholy men whose message was the immediate coming of the Messiah and the end of the world, men of all trades and professions, mathematicians, scholars, musicians, actors, miners and farm labourers, with nothing to unite them but a refusal to bear arms in the present war.

I was distressed and dismayed by the clash and conflict of theories and personalities with which I was confronted. Some brandished Bibles, accusing me of not knowing the Word of God as revealed in the Book of Daniel, others with red flags proclaimed me as a traitor for not accepting class war and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

I had come, expecting to find, in this assembly of youth, some hope for the future, but failed to discover among these men who talked ceaselessly, waving flags and Bibles, the kind of material out of which a new world might be constructed. (*Twenty Years at St. Hilary*, p120,121.)

Yet there was still work to be done here. Rising early, Walke would wait for the prison gates to open at 6a.m., so that he would be available to hear confession and to say Mass at a time when those men who wished to could attend. Being unable to obtain permission to use the Anglican chapel, he set up an altar in the Wesleyan meeting-house, and the daily service was attended by a few young men of "the Catholic Faith" and a number of silent Quakers. He felt his visit had not been in vain.

55. Cited in den Boggende, p192.

56. Wilkinson, *The Church of England and the First World War*, p47. In Margaret Hobhouse's study of 307 prisoners in 1917, 17 were Anglicans. (*I Appeal Unto Caesar*, p16,17.)

Approximate figures for conscientious objectors suggested that 6,261 were arrested (of whom some 1,350 were Absolutists), a further 3,964 were found alternative work by the Pelham Committee, a further 3,300 joined the Non-Combatant Corps, 1,200 joined the Friends' Ambulance Unit, 900 worked directly under the tribunals, 200 were allowed to undertake alternative service by working for the War Victims' Relief Committee (e.g. restoring French villages, pure water supply, maternity hospitals), 100 joined the Royal Army Medical Corps and around 175 managed to evade the Military Service Act altogether, making a total of 16,100 objectors. (Graham, p349.) A more detailed breakdown (p350) indicates:

Absolutists

released April 1919 after at least two years	843
released July 1919	221
released on medical grounds after Dec. 1917	334

incomplete records	55
deserted while awaiting court martial	49
other deaths	14
released in exceptional circumstances	19
released on medical grounds before Dec. 1917	8
	1543
Home Office Scheme	3750
Accepting combatant or non-combatant service	351
Discharged on medical grounds	267
Deserted	21
Released in exceptional circumstances	12
Deported	2
Evading or on indefinite furlough at time of general release	45
Records incomplete	<u>270</u>
	6261

So only a small number, 351, of those arrested were ultimately persuaded to join the armed forces, and many of those would have entered the N.C.C. Graham's figure for deaths (14) does not tally with his list of names (10) on p323. The total for Absolutists could be reduced by up to 285, being the 158 (up to 30 July 1917) deemed "not genuine" by the Central Tribunal - e.g. anarchists who did not recognise the authority of the tribunal, or those whose presentation was inconsistent - and thus ineligible for the Home Office Scheme. There were also around 127 imprisoned at the end for various other reasons. Graham estimated that an accurate total for Absolutists would be around 1,350. They may have been few but they - and especially the much smaller number of Absolutists - exerted a long-term moral influence far beyond their own immediate groups.

57. "In religious terms the unpredictable source of conscientious objection was a Christian pacifism that was unsupported by a specific teaching of the applicant's Church.... In this the Anglican pacifists were particularly vulnerable. In the past the Anglican communion had not accepted a pacifist interpretation of scripture and showed no inclination to do so in 1914.... [I]t is hardly surprising that the tribunal members tended to regard the Bishop of London as the authentic voice of Anglicanism. In this context, the Anglican pacifist seldom found it easy to establish the merits of his case." (Rae, p78,79.) Winnington-Ingram, who himself had no sons, was advocating conscription even before the outbreak of war. (*Arbitrator*, no.422, July 1914, p75.) Some individual churches were more sympathetic. At St. Martin-in-the-Field, Trafalgar Square "it is the custom to pray for conscientious objectors as well as for soldiers and sailors," reported a C.O. journalist, who commented that "We are indeed glad to see that some clergymen, at any rate, are prepared to put into practice the principles of the Sermon on the Mount." (*Tribunal*, 8 November 1917.)

58. Adrian Stephen in Bell, *We Did Not Fight*, p386.

59. Adrian Stephen in Bell, *We Did Not Fight*, p389,390.

60. Of those sentenced to death, denominational affiliation (if any) is in most cases unclear: it is possible that H. Stuart Beavis from Lower Edmonton, John H. Brocklesby from Rotherham, W. E. Law from Darlington, Frank Shackleton from Harrow and A. W. Taylor from Lower Edmonton could all have been Anglican. (Annotation in Friends House copy of *N.C.F. Souvenir*, p47.) Beavis taught languages (French and German) at Crowndale Road Working Men's College, North West London (Graham, p93 and Hobhouse, *I Appeal to Caesar*, p24,25.)

61. Thomas Simons Attlee (1880-1960), an architect, was active in the C.S.U., the Fabian Society and the I.L.P. From 1912 he had been resident in Poplar with his brother Clem (Prime Minister in 1945).

In 1913 he married Kathleen Medley, a Labour member of Poplar Borough Council, alongside George Lansbury. (She may have been godmother to one of the Lansbury children - Peggy Attlee to CB, 23 October 1992.) She, and Edgar Lansbury, sat on the Committee of the C.O. Dependents' Maintenance Fund, linked to the Poplar and Stepney branch of the N.C.F. With Kathleen pregnant with their second son, Tom was called up in January 1917, courtmartialled and sent to Wormwood Scrubs. Following a second courtmartial in May he was sent to Wandsworth. In May 1918 a third courtmartial led to a further eighteen months of imprisonment. He was finally released in April 1919. The events produced long-term difficulties in health for both Tom and Kathleen. (Peggy Attlee, *With a Quiet Conscience*.)

62. George Lansbury was on the executive. Robbins, p75. This organisation was soon to become the National Council for Civil Liberties, though not connected with a later organisation of the same name. (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p20.)

63. Graham, p123. According to Peet (*N.C.F. Souvenir*, p44), Meyer was not himself a pacifist but a supporter of liberty of conscience.

64. Principally at Dr. Salter's Fairby Grange property at Hartley, Kent, later to be used as a centre for delinquent girls, run by Grace Costin. (den Boggende, p334,335.)

65. A memorandum from the S.C.M. to the Committee on the Evangelistic Work of the Church, noted that although most students had accepted the arguments for the war, they thought that "the Church has had nothing distinctive to say to a world at war. It has done little more than support the State. The result has been a marked weakening of allegiance to the Church since the outbreak of war, and in some quarters a strong desire to see the Church find new leaders." (Cited in Wilkinson, p85,86.) Caroline Playne commented on the Church's failure that "It was left to the fighting men to realize that the religion of Christ is incompatible with the brutal savagery of modern warfare." (Playne, p215.) She reported an embarrassed and disgusted railway carriage of soldiers when a clergyman came in and said "So you are going to fight God's war." Far more than that absurd cleric, the soldiers knew only too well that it was not God's war they were fighting. (Playne, p216.) It was hardly surprising that the poetry of men at the front came closer to capturing Christian faith and the human condition than many of the utterances of clerics. E.g. Sassoon's *They*:

The Bishop tells us: 'When the boys come back
 'They will not be the same; for they'll have fought
 'In a just cause: they lead the last attack
 'On Anti-Christ; their comrades' blood has bought
 'New right to breed an honourable race,
 'They have challenged Death and dared him face to face.'
 'We're none of us the same!' the boys reply.
 'For George lost both his legs; and Bill's stone blind;
 'Poor Jim's shot through the lungs and like to die;
 'And Bert's gone syphilitic: you'll not find
 'A chap who's served that hasn't found *some* change.'
 And the Bishop said: 'The ways of God are strange!'

66. E. W. Barnes sat on the Committee on The Teaching Office of the Church. with Scott Holland, Gore, Temple and others. (Wilkinson, p81.) Lansbury sat on the Committee on Christianity and Industrial Problems, alongside bishops Talbot (the chairman), Gore and Kempthorne, with George Bell, and other ecclesiastical dignitaries. (Wilkinson, p86.) Lansbury's politics were too much for many church leaders to handle, and they made little progress despite months of struggle. "There were no end of bishops, deans, and canons present," he wrote, "together with W. C. Bridgeman, M.P., and R. H. Tawney.... Nobody denied capitalism and landlordism were of the devil, but all, except Tawney, jibbed

at Socialism." (*My Life*, p220, 221.) Lansbury saw that the Church that preached the Magnificat also blessed property and riches.

Had I the power I would shout from the porch of every church and chapel every day of the week, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve: ye cannot serve God and Mammon." I tried to get this view expressed by the ... Archbishop's Committee, but my colleagues were all too clever, too intellectual and more theological than I was, so I was just a voice in the wilderness with the almost solitary exception of Tawney and, on occasions, Bishop Gore. (*My Life*, p222.)

During the National Mission. Dick Sheppard of St. Martin-in-the-Fields offered a platform to George Lansbury. In a subsequent meeting between the two men, in December 1916, Sheppard (yet to become a pacifist) apparently thought they could promote a lay Crusade, with a joint statement on matters of social concern. Lansbury told him there was no escaping the Church's attitude to war: "I cannot believe that war does anything else but debase and demoralise mankind. I believe that a triumph won by war and force is simply a triumph of force. To me war is only part of the tremendous problem of social relationships which have their root in the fact that we strive to live our lives for ourselves; and the result is begging, both morally, intellectually and spiritually.... Therefore, unless the Crusade is going to tackle social evils in this kind of spirit and is prepared to tell men in clear language that profit making at the expense of the people must cease and that instead of competition we must co-operate, then I think, like you, I must be counted out." (Lansbury to Sheppard, 18 December 1916. Richardson papers.)

67. "I am now not allowed to speak any more to the troops in Horsham.... The officers of the Artillery complained to the vicar that what I said to the men the Sunday before last had had a depressing effect and they did not like what I had said about being men of peace. So the vicar asked me to take a certain line with them which I could not in faithfulness do. I *cannot* tell beforehand what the Lord shall put into my mouth. I try to ask the Holy Spirit to speak through me and I cannot limit His operation. So I offered to cease my ministrations and the offer was accepted." (Palmer, *Men of Habit*, p137.)

68. After the war they moved to Cornwall to recuperate and Attlee worked alongside Bernard Walke in schemes for the economic improvement of tin-mining areas. (*Twenty Years at St. Hilary*, p206.)

69. Although they had very different personalities, Barnes (1874-1953) and Russell were both members of the U.D.C. and Barnes chaired a U.D.C. meeting in Cambridge in March 1915 when Russell and E. D. Morel both spoke. Barnes preached pacifism to a hostile congregation in Trinity Chapel, but did not make himself as unpopular as Russell; even in 1942, however, he still said that "The bitterness of College feeling in 1915 against those of us who were pacifists was such that even now I do not like to recall it." Barnes (who had by then become Master of Temple) wrote a letter of support to Russell in July 1916 when the College Council decided to remove Russell from his lectureship. (*Ahead of His Age*, p59-66.) Barnes told the Church Assembly in February 1937:

My conversion to extreme pacifism dates to the latter part of August 1914. The war had broken out, men had flocked to the colours, and a camp had been established in Cambridge, where I was then a don. I was asked to speak to some of these men on a Sunday morning. I accepted without hesitation and then began to write out my address. I wrote it once, then I went back to Christ's teaching and tore it up. I did the same a second and a third time, and then I ventured an address which seemed to me ludicrously inadequate. I still have that address but I have never since spoken in favour of war." (*Ahead of His Age*, p59.)

Barnes preached a highly controversial Oxford University Sermon in 1915 on the theme of pacifism, and repeated the event in October 1936. (The Bishop of Birmingham, *Blessed are the Peacemakers*, pamphlet. Also, *Church Times*, 23 October 1936, p443.)

70. Lansbury's journalism in the *Herald* (the *Daily Herald* from 31 March 1919) inspired many but

irritated others. The newspaper called for a general strike to try to force an election with a proper register. It supported various examples of industrial action. It opposed British imperialism in Ireland, Egypt, India. It was banned from getting to the armed forces. Having survived the war on a shoestring, at the height of its power the *Herald* had a readership exceeding three and a quarter million. Lansbury's period of influence at the newspaper lasted from the first issue on 15 April 1912 through to February 1925, "one of the most worrying and happy episodes in my life." (*My Life*, p170.) Explaining the *Herald's* attitude to the outbreak of war he wrote: "There is no excuse for British statesmen, none for the Tsar or Kaiser: bloodguiltiness rests on them all. So when the War came that was the attitude we took up. We could not support our own people in such a war, and of course could give no support to her enemies, so we stood by waiting for a chance to make propaganda for peace.... As I was editor we found it very easy to make our stand against all war a very definite one on Christian lines. My correspondence during the War years and since convinces me that much more than many churches or clergy, the *Herald* helped people to preserve their faith in religion." (*My Life*, p182,185.) Adding to his influence on the left was the independent *Lansbury's Labour Weekly*, first published on 28 February 1925, which gained a circulation of 172,000. (Postgate, p230,231) before joining with the I.L.P.'s *New Leader* in July 1927.

71. Wilkinson, p54. A fictional indication of the threat to clergy and their families is seen in Ursula Roberts' (semi-autobiographical? - her husband W. C. Roberts was Vicar of Crick) 1934 novel *Blind Men Crossing A Bridge* (written under the pen name Susan Miles). A group of drunkards attack a vicarage because there are pacifists inside. Later the family are denied the hire of a pony and trap when the owner says it is "Not for hire, I told y', to pashfists and Fritzes." (p469.)

72. "Half your pay do come from the Pope and the other half from the Kaiser," was the accusation he faced (*Twenty Years at St. Hilary*, p84), an understandable one given his churchmanship. "It had been my custom to say daily, after Mass, the prayer for the ending of the war composed by the saintly Pius X, who when asked to bless the armies of Austria replied, 'I bless peace and not war.' I had also instituted the service of Benediction on Sunday evenings, as an act of reparation to the Sacred Heart for the wrongs of war, and as a means of uniting ourselves with our enemies in that Sacrament that knows no frontiers." (*Twenty Years at St. Hilary*, p109.) He constantly feared arrest for his peace activities. Support came from local Quakers, and Walke attended many of their meetings. By the time he joined the F.O.R. in the spring of 1917, he was writing almost daily articles and letters to the press, and speaking at meetings in London, Liverpool, Bristol and in many of the towns and villages of Cornwall. He believed he was living out his priestly vocation.

The message that I had to deliver was the one I had been charged to preach on the day of my Ordination. I could not regard that commission as having come to an end because the world was at war. It was still a message of 'Peace and good will'; an affirmation that peace did not depend on the armies in the field; that there was no other way to peace for nations or individuals but the way of Jesus who had met and overcome the forces of evil on the cross, and offered to those, who could receive it, a share in His victory. If that message of peace was ever to be effective among the nations, there must be some to witness to this power at a time when men had ceased to believe in it. To keep silence now was to seal our lips for ever. The world would rightly distrust a message of peace that could not stand the test of war. (*Twenty Years at St. Hilary*, p110.)

One meeting, in the Labour Hall in Penzance, was broken up violently by a gang of one hundred and fifty men from the Naval Reserve, a "howling mob" with faces "changed by hate." As the furniture and windows were smashed, Walke was covered by a curtain, and he received a blow which laid him out. Eventually he, his wife Annie, and a Quaker woman who was also on the platform at the meeting, were escorted to safety by two soldiers home on leave from France, who were repelled by the tactics of the mob. (*Twenty Years at St. Hilary*, p111-116.) Undaunted, Walke continued to speak out for peace. Together with George Hodgkin, a Quaker, he travelled around Cornwall on foot, talking to those they

met about seeking peace within themselves and avoiding occasions of war. Walke reported that cobblers, basket-makers and other tradesmen were among the most attentive listeners.

73. Pierce and Ward, p87-90. Amongst other anonymous Anglican pacifists were a Durham vicar who declared "I cannot square the way of war with the way of Christ," (Wilkinson, p54) and a theological student who "provided the test case of whether an essentially political objection could be regarded as conscientious within the meaning of the Act;" (Minutes of the Central Tribunal, 2 May 1916, cited in Rae, p79.) Philip Carrington, later Archbishop of Quebec, was also an ordinand pacifist. (Wilkinson, p53.)

74. Andrews was an Anglican priest who suspended exercising his orders because of intellectual difficulties in reconciling an openness to the truths of Eastern religions with an exclusive doctrinal absoluteness of much Christianity. He maintained his Anglican identity and later resumed his priestly ministry. (*What I Owe to Christ*, p269,270.) He first met Gandhi in South Africa on New Year's Day, 1914 and a life-long friendship and mutual respect ensued. (Andrews was inspired by Gandhi's sense that "long-suffering and redeeming love is alone invincible." - *What I Owe to Christ*, p246,247. Gandhi said that they "met as brothers and remained such to the end." - cited in Clark, p33.) At the outbreak of war in 1914, Andrews was nearly enthralled by the propaganda, but was pulled back by a combination of Christ, Tagore and Gandhi. Of Christ he said:

He was unmistakeably clear in His utterance: 'Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, pray for them that spitefully use you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven.'

Clearly the whole character of God was at stake in this very issue. Either I must choose the tribal idea of God from the Old Testament, or Christ's idea of God from the New. In the end, I saw that I had very nearly betrayed Christ, my Master, when I had allowed the war fever to get possession of me. Now Christ Himself had cleansed me by His word, and I was back in my right mind. (*What I Owe to Christ*, p276.)

Tagore, prophet of Ahimsa, harmlessness, had studied the Sermon on the Mount. "'What are you Christians doing?' he asked me. 'You have the clearest moral precepts. Why do you not follow them?'" It was Gandhi who lived out those precepts: "What he called Satyagraha, or Truth Force, was obviously Christian; while the savage brutality of war was the reverse." (*What I Owe to Christ*, p277.)

As the three influences converged, Andrews resolved that he would refuse any order to military service, even if such refusal lead to imprisonment. (As things turned out, it didn't.) His sense of closeness to the living Christ led him to the conviction that Christ himself was suffering amidst all the human misery of war. Also, it was a war caused by the same evils of exploitation and commercial rivalry that had produced the racial treatment of the African and Indian people in South Africa. "Now Christ was with the oppressed," wrote Andrews, "and He was saying to them with pity, 'Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest.'" Andrews was being called, not to the war being fought in the trenches of Europe, but to "Christ's own war on behalf of the down-trodden peoples all over the world." He wanted to do more than take up a "negative" attitude towards conscription and military service. "There was a positive duty to perform, and I had to fight the good fight of faith on a wider battlefield." (*What I Owe to Christ*, p280.) He later wrote,

By this time, I had become a Christian pacifist without any reservations. Ways must be found of showing a loving spirit even to those who were bitterly hostile to the things I held most dear and of keeping my thoughts quite clean from hate. However lacking in what the world calls "realism" such an attitude might seem to be, I had to grasp firmly its supreme inward strength which came from God alone. It might mean suffering beyond anything I had ever known before; but in the end it would bring nearer the victory, not of my own country, or of any other country, but of the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. (*The Inner Life*, p103.)

ANGLICAN PACIFISM, 1918-1930Conferring for Peace

At the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month, 1918, the war came to a close and the process began which was to lead to the next conflagration of Europe. The election of December 1918 affirmed Lloyd George and dealt crushing blows to many former M.P.s who had opposed the war, and who would have to wait until 1922 to regain their parliamentary seats. Even as the Prime Minister began to turn away from the rhetoric of reparation the French became even more determined to exact a vengeful territorial and financial price on Germany.¹ By the time the Treaty of Versailles was signed on 28 June 1919, parts of German territory - north, east and west -- were transferred to neighbouring nations, with the Rhineland neutralised and the population of the Saar valley placed under League of Nations control for fifteen years. German colonies were confiscated and administered by Britain and other victorious nations. What remained of Germany had to produce substantial payments in reparation for war losses, on the spurious grounds that Germany alone had been responsible for the start of the war. There was also an enforced disarmament, with the size of the German army restricted to 100,000 men. This was justified on the grounds that it would, in any case, be a prelude to a general disarmament, the route to the achievement of which was unspecified.

The one ray of hope to emerge from the settlement was the League of Nations, the formation of which was agreed in principle on 25 January. Theory and practice, however, were not the same. Even advocates of the League, like Willoughby Dickinson, admitted that the final form of the institution was far from perfect.² Some critics noted that only national governments would be represented and that other groups and institutions would have no voice. The League would not be a worldwide forum but an intergovernmental institution. A door was left open for the possibility of the League imposing sanctions, even military sanctions on recalcitrant nations. Particularly damaging, especially across the Atlantic, was the linkage of the League with a manifestly bad, vindictive and imperialist peace agreement. In November 1919 the U.S. Senate refused to ratify the League.³ Together with the refusal of the Belgian and French governments to admit the German Government to the League, such action meant that the new institution for world peace was a pale shadow of that promoted by many supporters of the League concept in the past. It would be seen as little more than an alliance of victors in a balance of power.

The greatest hope in the mid 1920s was that diplomatic progress would be made to bring a lasting peace out of the unsatisfactory texts of Versailles. The Locarno Pact of 1925, signed by Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Poland and Czechoslovakia, attempted to guarantee a demilitarized Rhineland, and the permanence of Germany's western (but not eastern) borders. More important was the Kellogg-Briand pact of 1928, otherwise known as the Pact of Paris. Sponsored by the U.S. and French politicians after whom it became known, the first of whom (an Episcopalian) won the 1929 Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts, it was initially signed by fifteen nations and later ratified by sixty-two. The intention was for nations to agree to settle all conflicts by peaceful means, and to renounce war as an instrument of national policy. As such it could be seen as the culmination of the efforts of the nineteenth century and turn of the century peace societies for multilateral agreement for peace. In practice it proved to be too little, too late, comprising well-meaning words but little substance. As well as undeclared war, and war of self-defence, war as an instrument of international policy was not included, and post-Versailles that was always going to be a threat to world peace.⁴

The Church Confers

The slaughter of the war was such that bishops of the Anglican Communion could no longer hide behind the walls of ecclesiastical concerns, and the 1920 Lambeth Conference was their first substantive - if highly ambiguous - attempt to face up to the reality and the aftermath of war. Considering reports of life in the trenches the bishops commented, "Comradeship ennobled war. To-day men are asking, Can it ennoble peace?"⁵ Being shocked by the scale of a conflict between essentially Christian nations, the bishops recommended a search for Christian unity,⁶ but they could not bring themselves to criticise the concept of the nation-state itself: "We cannot believe that the effect of the coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth will be to abolish nations."⁷ Indeed, "nationality itself will be redeemed," they argued, and nations urged to seek fellowship. Hence the Conference heartily endorsed "the principles which underlie the League of Nations, the most promising and the most systematic attempt to advance towards the ideal of the family of nations which has ever been projected."⁸

By the time of the Lambeth Conference, preparations were already under way for what would be a far more significant conference for the advance of Christian pacifism. The Conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship (C.O.P.E.C.) was held in Birmingham from 5-12 April 1924.⁹ One of the endorsed preparatory volumes for C.O.P.E.C. was entitled *Christianity and War*.¹⁰ The extent of pacifist input to the

Commission which produced this report was remarkable, especially so close to the end of the war. They were also better able to put their case than they would have been but a few years earlier, partly due to pacifists' own experience and reflection and partly due to a recent (1919) publication by C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude to War* (soon to be expanded into *The Early Church and the World*) which not only reclaimed Christian pacifist history but also gave pacifism a more coherent theology than hitherto. When it came to drawing conclusions from scriptural texts, the members of the Commission diverged. "The Position of those who do not accept Pacifism" was stated, followed by a substantive "Statement of the Pacifist Position." The very headings seemed to imply that pacifism was now the norm from which divergence might take place, rather than the previously assumed opposite. The conscientious objectors of the Great War had achieved more than they realised.¹¹ This was the first instance that a Commission with significant Anglican representation had produced an official report commending Christian pacifism.

The Pacifist Position was, simply, that "war is a means that disgraces the holiest cause,"¹² whereas the life, activity and death of Jesus revealed "a method of overcoming evil which, entirely repudiating all means that injure or destroy human life, conquers the evil in it by good, and only by good."¹³ The conclusion was stated thus:

It comes to this, we cannot overcome hatred by hatred or war by war, but only by the opposites of these. Evil can only be effectively overcome by the mightier power of love. The Church is the custodian of that mighty power, committed unto it by Christ Himself. It will only overcome the world as it makes gentleness its might and love its transmuting flame. The positive duty of the Church is to help men and women to see that the *real struggle* in life is not with external enemies which may for the moment embody the "spirits evil," but *within themselves*; to demonstrate that it is possible for the power of God to work within us an amazing sublimation of all those lower tendencies and to transmute our abounding energies into a mighty driving power which shall work in continuous harmony with the will of God. Men and women of the Christian Church will then seek the expression of these harnessed powers not for ignoble purposes of self-interest, but in a co-operative effort to remove the appalling results of man's sin, and to establish in its place a new social order in which the spirit of war and hate shall be unknown. They will be guided by the wisdom that differentiates between the victim of evil and the evil itself, and will seek to meet the wrongdoer only with weapons chosen from the armoury of God. This will involve a break with much of tradition of the past, but at the same time it will be a return to the simple yet passionate faith of the early days in the history of the Christian Church. There must be a wholehearted acceptance of Christ's standard of values, and thus a complete revision of many tragic compromises with the standards of the world.¹⁴

Echoing Maude Royden's language, the acceptance of such an alternative to war would require a Holy Crusade, "a Great Adventure on the part of the Christian Church." And it was time to set out upon it:

Is it too much to ask of the Church of Christ to believe that *now* is the accepted time when she should once and for all abandon her reliance on the method of war even to resist the wrongdoer? Let us not flinch from the consequences which such an Adventure of Faith might involve for us. At the heart of the world's redemption stands a Cross, and to hope that we can fully and fearlessly proclaim the Gospel of Reconciliation without it is to miss that strait and narrow way which leads to Calvary.¹⁵

The full Commission's conclusions, while not as radical as the Pacifist Statement above, nonetheless reflected just how far the Churches had moved in the previous ten years. The Churches were "to refuse to support in any way" a war that had not been submitted to arbitration. They were to protect conscientious objectors and to promote a spirit of international reconciliation that would transcend national enmities.¹⁶ For all the reports of conferences and commissions, however, many Anglican congregations remained hostile towards pacifists.¹⁷

Pacifist Actions: Lansbury, Stimson, Walke, Donaldson et al

After the war, the various peace organisations considered their future. The N.C.F. decided to close down,¹⁸ but the F.O.R. opted to continue because a truly Christian society had yet to be achieved. The F.O.R. tried various social schemes and talked about economic justice but lost sight of its origins of war-resistance. Its unadventurous approach did not inspire Maude Royden who became a "sympathiser" instead of a full member, whilst still campaigning for feminism (not least for the Church to recognise the ministry of women¹⁹) and peace.²⁰ It was a time when the League of Nations seemed to be the principal vehicle of hope for the future. Such hopes for internationalist pragmatism took other pacifists away too, for whom personal commitment to principle seemed irrelevant in the new order of the 1920s. Such moves were generally temporary, for as pragmatism began to fail, many - Royden included - would return to the explicitly pacifist fold.

George Lansbury, friend of Lenin,²¹ was consistently both a pacifist and a radical socialist. He described Christ as "the lonely Galilean - Communist, agitator, martyr - crucified as one who stirred up the people and set class against class."²² He was appalled by injustice but distinguished between direct action and violence as means to overcome it, arguing that "the struggle of men and women on strike is passive resistance," and adding, "History records the fact that this is the only effective weapon of the physically weak and those who lack material resources."²³ It was a weapon he was himself to take up in the struggle to bring about a redistribution of wealth in favour of the poor in Poplar, Lansbury's district of London. This local campaign for economic

justice, known as Poplarism, was a model of nonviolent action.²⁴ Even the Liberal Nonconformist cleric who had preceded Lansbury as Mayor was moved to claim that “George Lansbury is the patron saint of Poplar.”²⁵

Far away from the corridors of political power were the wanderings of Charles Stimson. On St. Francis’ Day, 4 October, the seven hundredth anniversary of the saint’s death, having been inspired by a commemoration service in Newcastle Cathedral, Stimson drew up a rule of life for what was soon to be called the Brotherhood of the Way. The Preamble, based on the Sermon on the Mount, included a commitment to “The Pacifist and non-coercive nature of the Christian ethic.”²⁶ The First Order of Christian Tramp Preachers was to consist of confirmed and communicant members of the Church of England, respecting other denominations but resisting any moves to form a new sect. They were to follow the injunctions given to the Twelve and to the Seventy in the Gospels to carry with them on their journey only the bare necessities. A Third Order would give community and other support.

They shall abstain from war and the making of munitions, from the police force or from serving as civil magistrates, and from usury in all its forms: they shall pray regularly for the work of the Brotherhood and support it in any way they can. They will obey to the best of their ability the commands of the Sermon on the Mount.²⁷

On Shrove Tuesday, 1 March 1927, the date they came to regard as their Passover when they came out of Egypt, Charles Stimson, Leonard Ames and Ernest Elworthy (soon to be joined by Tom Pickering), set out “in much fear and trembling” on their exodus from the “unworkable” compromise between Christianity and the existing economic system in an attempt to discover their Promised Land. It was an age of five-year plans, and the three Brothers pledged themselves to each other for five years of open-air preaching and the renunciation of both war and capitalism. They intended no break with the Church but with the “capitalist and war based life” with which the Church was entangled. Within the Church there should be a haven, they felt, “in which it could be taken for granted that the capitalist system was ethically heretical, and war was an appeal to the devil.”²⁸ In the spirit of St. Francis they set out “without purse or scrip” in order to build just such a Church. They would sleep on floors, in vicarages or in barns, preaching as they went. They became “proper tramps,”²⁹ shocking people not only by their appearance but also by their anarchist, socialist, pacifist Christian message. As the numbers within the Brotherhood grew,³⁰ a colourful story emerged, with the tramps frequently in trouble for upholding rights of free speech in public places, being arrested and imprisoned for obstruction or provoking an affray in Glasgow, South Shields, London, Carlisle, Sheffield.... At Portsmouth, in October

1928, Howard Hazlehurst's "clear preaching of the pacifism of Christianity, and that soldiers and sailors would have to face up to it and come out of their present position, went right home to the people." Stimson reported that "He spoke from the highest ground, and made us all feel both the reality of his own conversion, and the daring and greatness of the Gospel stand."³¹

At one time Stimson was sought out by Gandhi who was so impressed by the basis of the Brotherhood of the Way that he invited Stimson to join him in India. Stimson spent some time talking over the invitation with C. F. Andrews. His decision not to go was based partly on his greater dogmatism than Andrews' on the primacy of the Christian faith, partly on his distrust of any form of nationalism and partly because he suspected that Gandhi's movement must ultimately depend on some kind of appeal to violence.³²

Bernard Walke, no stranger to tramping himself, influenced Muriel Lester and W. C. Roberts by advocating chapters of voluntary poverty, called "Brethren of the Common Table."³³ He also took part in ecumenical prayers for peace during the dark days of the Black and Tans in Ireland. In a Roman Catholic Church in Truro, the local Irish priest and congregation joined with Anglicans, Nonconformists and Quakers to pray for peace before the Blessed Sacrament. The Catholic Cardinal put an end to that gesture of reconciliation.³⁴ (Other British brutality, in Amritsar in 1919, saw C. F. Andrews working alongside the Sikh victims and reporting to Gandhi the scale of the massacre.³⁵ Andrews would often be at Gandhi's side during the 1920s,³⁶ though from 1928 he came to be regarded as Gandhi's ambassador in the West.)

Along with George Lansbury, one of the prominent figures in the Church Socialist League was Lewis Donaldson. In 1905 he had led a march of the unemployed from Leicester - where he was a parish priest - to Westminster Abbey,³⁷ and he had been one of the members of the C.S.L. who had opposed the 1914-1918 war.³⁸ As a Canon of Westminster he continued to play a part in the No More War Movement and he became President of the London Council for the Prevention of War. In December 1925 he issued a passionate Christmas Message under the title *War Is Anti-Christ!* Considering the escape of the Holy Family from the massacre of the innocents he concluded that "No brute force can ever finally avail against the will of God. We cannot kill the spirit by the sword." Of the recent past he wrote,

In the Great War we said in effect "Evil, be Thou my good"; we set out like Herod to destroy the Christ with the sword; we cursed Bethlehem and the Star in the East. We made martyrs of the innocent; we sent the flower of our youth to

their doom; we appealed outwardly to God, inwardly (though we did not know it) to Satan and all his hosts.... The fact we must all face is that all this killing, whether in the Great War, or in China, or in Iraq, or in Syria, or in Morocco, or elsewhere, is violently anti-Christ. Herod is at his work "up and down the earth and to and fro in it." We must cleanse the nations of this foulness, or else discard, openly and finally, the name of Christ.³⁹

Donaldson was not the only member of the clergy to make a stand for peace. In continental Europe an international alliance of clergy was being organised. It caught the mood of people across the continent. Forty thousand people in Switzerland signed a petition demanding alternatives to military service, a government bill to that effect was introduced in Finland, and in France in 1924 there was a proposal to form a society for the legal recognition of conscientious objectors. In 1926 in Geneva an International Committee of Anti-Militarist Clergymen was formed. This body issued an international Anti-Conscription Manifesto, promoted by seventy distinguished signatories including C. F. Andrews, Gandhi, and Tagore, as well as some less notably religious figures such as Angell, Einstein, Russell and H. G. Wells. Amongst the statements of the manifesto was the assertion, "It is humiliating to human dignity to compel men against their will ... to sacrifice their lives or to kill others."⁴⁰

A Growing Anti-War Culture

After a ten year period when the Great War was too close to be criticised, the years 1928-1930 saw a spate of anti-war literature published. In the U.S. there was the work of E. E. Cummings and Ernest Hemingway. On the European side of the Atlantic the novels, poetry, plays and films included R. C. Sherriff's *Journey's End*, Edmund Blunden's *Undertones of War*, Siegfried Sassoon's *Memoirs of a Fox-hunting Man* and *Memoirs of an Infantry Officer*, Laurence Housman's *War Letters of Fallen Englishmen*, Richard Aldington's *Death of a Hero*, Robert Graves' *Goodbye to All That* and the English translation and film of Erich Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front*.⁴¹ Echoing the title of its own 1915 publication, *Christ and Peace*, the F.O.R. launched a national mission in 1929. It was an auspicious time as the grim reality of the nature of war was coming home to those who had not themselves take part in it, together with an impatience towards politicians who had yet to deliver that disarmament which would ensure a continued peace. Charles Raven was one of several former critics of pacifism who changed their minds in this period, partly as a result of the F.O.R. campaign.⁴²

In Anglican circles, the most significant book of the period was *The Impatience of a Parson*, written by a recent convert to pacifism, Hugh Richard ("Dick") Lawrie

Sheppard (1880-1937). Sales reached 100,000, with seven reprints required in the first three months. Amongst Sheppard's circle of close friends in the 1920s were a number who supported pacifism. In particular, he had dealings with George Lansbury,⁴³ Arthur Ponsonby (Sheppard signed his Peace Letter⁴⁴), Maude Royden, and Laurence Housman. It was in correspondence with Housman in February 1927 that Sheppard first admitted to being a pacifist.⁴⁵ His conversion was reflected in *The Impatience of a Parson*, being finished at that time ready for publication later in the year. Sheppard confirmed to Housman that the book would emphasise that "a Christian cannot enlist to kill his brothers and that no Christian church can touch war and that no war was ever a Christian war."⁴⁶ As he wrote in the book, "We cannot any more think of war as anything but a damnable arrest of development and decency; it is not only the willingness to suffer agony, it is the willingness to inflict it. War cannot be reconciled with Christianity: there is no such thing as a Christian war."⁴⁷ Yet, he added,

If war broke out again to-morrow, the Churches would be just where they were in August 1914. They still have no mind on the subject. The Christian Institution should not leave outside organisations like C.O.P.E.C. to do its thinking for it. It should wage a great campaign to end all war before the rumblings of a fresh war are heard on the horizon, and it should wage that campaign solely and simply because Jesus Christ cannot be identified with the bestial brutalities that war produces at the Home Base as well as at the Front.⁴⁸

Impatience received mixed reviews. Sheppard's long-standing friend, Archbishop Lang, found it "tiresome and unhelpful,"⁴⁹ and the *Times* was damning. Maude Royden commented that "My only consolation is that it is exactly what the *Times* would have written about St. Francis." She was a staunch supporter: "I would rather be a door-keeper in the house of Dick Sheppard than dwell in Lambeth Palace," she said, and readings from Sheppard even replaced the second lesson at her Guild House church.⁵⁰ When, in 1928, Muriel Lester and a group from Kingsley Hall started an annual protest at the Hendon Air Pageant, they distributed leaflets containing the pacifist passages from Sheppard's book.⁵¹

Within days of the publication of *The Impatience of a Parson*, Sheppard broadcast an Armistice Day sermon to the nation. He expressed thankfulness and respect for those who had given so much. "To me it seems a blasphemy even to suggest that one single life that was laid down was given in vain." He imagined them saying that "as you remember our death in war, see to it, oh, see to it for Christ's sake, that that hell never happens again."⁵² When, in March 1929, Housman suggested a tour of the country to preach pacifism, Sheppard replied, "I am a trifle reluctant to make pacifism my only

love.”⁵³ That would come soon enough.

As the decade drew to a close there were few who did not realise just how catastrophic the conflict of 1914-1918 had been. Hope still resided in the League of Nations, especially following the Kellogg-Briand agreement, but it was clear that a disarmament conference was needed urgently or else international affairs could once again get out of hand. After a few years when pacifism had seemed peripheral to the hopes for European reconstruction, there was a small but growing realisation of the precarious nature of internationalism. The essentially Christian stance of pacifism, of individual refusal to participate in war in any circumstances, a stance upheld as worthy by the suffering of the conscientious objectors, would play a growing part in the political and the religious life of the decade ahead. It would even impinge on the Church of England....

ANGLICAN PACIFISM. 1918-1930: ENDNOTES

1. George Lansbury visited Lloyd George in Paris (he was there for the Peace Conference) in January 1919, to petition for the release of those conscientious objectors who were still imprisoned. Soon afterwards Lansbury visited Germany. He saw a country being sucked dry by what Wilfred Wellock called the capitalists' "merciless, soulless Peace, that like a swamp-mist breathed death over everything." (*Crusader*, 20 February 1920, cited in Rigby, p32.) Lansbury was taken round children's hospitals "to see the ravages our food blockade was making. I saw babies whose bodies were transparent, others whose limbs were twisted and distorted because of malnutrition suffered by their mothers. In the streets I met people whose faces bore the imprint of starvation. The clothing of the people in the streets was very bad. The British troops, who were well fed, often shared their food with children." (*My Life*, p219.) The humanity shown by the ordinary soldiers in such circumstances contrasted sharply with the brutal attitudes of the politicians. Lansbury's comment was that "We do not need more of such great men, we need more wisdom and understanding among the masses. It is the few who bring about wars: it is the many who must put an end to the conditions which make wars inevitable." (*My Life*, p220.)

2. Robbins, p184.

3. Robbins, p185,186.

4. The churches were certainly pleased with the agreement. Two hundred religious leaders across Britain and the United States signed a document in support of the treaty, with Barnes, Sheppard and Hewlett Johnson joining with Bell, Raven, Gore, and half a dozen other bishops (including the unlikely figure of Winnington-Ingram) in giving their endorsement. (*Goodwill*, Vol.4, No. 3, 15 July 1929, p113-119.)

5. *Lambeth Conferences, 1867-1930*, p23.

6. *Lambeth Conferences*, p24.

7. *Lambeth Conferences*, p31.

8. *Lambeth Conferences*, p31. The Conference said that "all Christians should welcome with both hands" the institution of the League of Nations. (*Lambeth Conferences*, p57.) The exception was a group of erastian bishops from the United States who, slavishly following their Government's line, would only welcome it with half a heart.

9. "The basis of this Conference is the conviction that the Christian faith, rightly interpreted and consistently followed, gives the vision and the power essential for solving the problems of to-day, that the social ethics of Christianity have been greatly neglected by Christians with disastrous consequences to the individual and to society, and that it is of the first importance that these should be given a clearer and more persistent emphasis." (*Christianity and War*, piv.) The origins of the Conference were back in a Student Christian Movement conference at Matlock in 1909, following which an inter-denominational group (some of whom were to share a common residential life) was formed to consider social issues. A Quaker and early member of F.O.R., Lucy Gardner, was the secretary, and William Temple (a deacon at the time of Matlock) was in the Chair. Another strand was the coming together of the Social Service Unions of different denominations, following the founding of the Anglican Christian Social Union in 1889. Given the historical legacy of such figures as Maurice, Stewart Headlam, Westcott, Scott Holland

and Gore, with their high doctrine of Church and Incarnation, this could in no way be described as some shallow liberal humanist movement with an over-optimistic view of human nature. In 1911, a united conference of such Unions set up an annual summer school at Swanwick. The leading figures in that movement were Bishop Gore, the Jesuit Father Plater, the Congregationalist Revd. Will Reason and Lucy Gardner for the Society of Friends. (Raven, *War and the Christian*, p30.) The C.O.P.E.C. gathering was first suggested in 1919. The four years of preparation encompassed the work of twelve commissions and the processing of the results of 200,000 questionnaires. Along with Lucy Gardner, the other organising secretary was Dr. Charles Raven, Rector of Blechingley, and sometime Fellow and Dean of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. The work of Gardner and Raven was commended by one worthy participant who described the initials as standing for Conference Obviously Prepared with Extraordinary Care! (Söderblom, cited in Dillistone, *Charles Raven*, p118.)

The Conference has been described as "one of the most notable efforts ever made to apply Christian principles to contemporary social problems," (Dillistone, *Charles Raven*, p117) and "the most considerable effort made up to that date anywhere in the world to focus Christian thought and action on the urgent problems of the day." (From *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, cited in Dillistone, p117.) Temple's biographer said that the Conference affected the whole ecumenical movement, giving to Christian thinking and planning "a sense of direction which was to prove of first-rate importance in the subsequent history of that Movement." (Iremonger, p335.)

Bernard Walke (in the F.O.R. delegation) and Mary Phillips were among the Anglican pacifists present at the Conference. (den Boggende, p264.)

10. The report had been produced by a Commission chaired by Alfred E. Garvie, the President of the National Free Church Council. Among those on the Commission were: Bertram Appleby, a Congregational Minister who was a member of the National Committee of the No More War Movement; George Maitland Lloyd-Davies, M.P., Assistant Secretary of the F.O.R.; Oliver Dryer, of the United Free Church of Scotland, and General Secretary of I.F.O.R.; William E. Wilson, Professor at Selly Oak and a founder-member of the F.O.R, whose writings included *Christ and War, Atonement and Non-Resistance* and *The Foundation of Peace*; as well as assorted academics and serving and retired military officers. Gardner and Raven assisted the Commission. Lady Parmoor (Marian Ellis) of the F.O.R. and Evelyn Underhill also contributed to the Report. (*Christianity and War*, p19,x.)

11. In a markedly contrasting tone to the erastianism of Lambeth 1920 the Report stated that "Patriotism as love of country has to be distinguished from loyalty to the State, and may sometimes demand even defiance and disobedience.... For history has shown the State as the wrongdoer, as the enemy of advancement.... The individual conscience cannot be relieved of the responsibility of moral judgment and decision by loyalty to the State or love of country, great and enduring as ordinarily is the claim of the State to submission, and of country to any service or sacrifice which conscience allows." (*Christianity and War*, p29-31.)

12. *Christianity and War*, p62,63.

13. *Christianity and War*, p64.

14. *Christianity and War*, p70,71.

15. *Christianity and War*, p72.

16. In full, the recommendations were:

1. That the Christian Churches should in their public testimony and with all their influence oppose all policies that provoke war, and support all conditions in the relation of nations favourable to peace, and the agencies which promote peace.

2. That they should unreservedly condemn, and refuse to support in any way, a war waged before the matter in dispute has been submitted to an arbitral tribunal, or in defiance of the decision of such a tribunal.
3. That they should exert all their authority in securing protection from any form of persecution for those whose conscience forbids their rendering any kind of war-service.
4. That by study of the New Testament in the light of the guidance of the Spirit, they should seek to reach a common Christian conscience in regard to war.
5. That they should cultivate such intimate fellowship with the Churches of other lands that through the one Church of Jesus Christ the spirit of reconciliation shall triumph over all national prejudices, suspicions, and enmities, and that the churches of many lands may unitedly formulate a Peace-programme which can be commended to all who profess and call themselves Christian, so that Christ shall reign as Prince of Peace.
6. That the Churches should hold these principles, not only in times of peace, when their practical denial is not threatened, but that also, when war is imminent, they should dare to take an independent stand for righteousness and peace, even if the Press and public opinion be at the time against them. (*Christianity and War*, p99,100.)

One of the distinguished visitors who was present at C.O.P.E.C. was Nathan Söderblom, the Archbishop of Uppsala in the Church of Sweden and a pioneer of ecumenical gatherings. The preparatory written material and the volumes endorsed by the C.O.P.E.C. were to be used as a valuable work of reference by the major ecumenical "Life and Work" Conference in Stockholm in 1925, which attracted representatives from almost every western Church except the Roman Catholics, including Christians from both France and Germany with all their mutual national tensions. This was the first international ecumenical conference on social ethics and the largest ecumenical conference since Nicaea, with five hundred delegates attending from thirty-seven countries, including George Bell, Dean of Canterbury. The Stockholm Conference "was impressive not only as the first attempt ever made by Christians to discuss internationally the problems of collective life," wrote Raven, later, "but as the first occasion since the war in which victors and vanquished had met as fellow-believers to debate the very issues over which they had so recently been struggling." (*War and the Christian*, p25.) Echoing the C.O.P.E.C. resolution of the previous year that "all war is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ," (cited in Raven, *Is War Obsolete?*, p22) the World Conference stated that "We believe that war, considered as an institution for the settlement of international disputes, is incompatible with the mind and method of Christ, and therefore incompatible with the mind and method of his Church." (R. C. D. Jasper, *George Bell: Bishop of Chichester*, p94.) What was to become a famous formula for Christian pacifism was beginning to take shape.

17. Indeed, the Congregationalist minister, George Humphreys, was told by one Anglican Church in 1925 "never to enter their Church no more [sic]," because of his pacifism. (den Boggende, p356.) At times F.O.R. even struggled to get enough pacifist Anglicans on its General Committee. In 1928 it had to specially co-opt an Anglican. The names of F. E. A. Shepherd, Bernard Walke, Eric Hayman, Edgar Dunstan and Hughes Riley were suggested, with Shepherd being the favoured candidate. (F.O.R. General Committee Minutes, 8 October 1928 and 21 January 1929.) By 1932 both Hayman and Dunstan were also on the General Committee. (F.O.R. General Committee, June and September 1932.) Hayman, who in July 1924 had written in *Reconciliation* on the "pacifism of God," (den Boggende, p261) may have been an Anglican at that time, but he also had at least one foot in the Quaker fold, which joint membership was reflected in his ecclesial but pietistic theology. In 1944 he described himself as having "some thirty years' membership of the religious Society of Friends." Yet he also felt a sense of being "a member of the universal Church of Christ," which universal bond was "far stronger than any denominational loyalty." (*Worship and the Common Life*, pvi.)

18. Although she had previously been highly critical of some of the tactics of the N.C.F., Maude Royden spoke at the closing convention at the end of November 1919. (Graham, p341.) Some members

were soon to regret the decision to disband and the *Crusader* group of Christian pacifist socialists, including Lansbury, (Ceadel, p72) were frustrated with the subsequent inactivity of the pacifist left, particularly as many others on the left were becoming supportive of violent revolution. They started a No More War Movement in 1921, just before Wilfred Wellock and others went to a Balthoven meeting which launched PACO (pronounced Pahtso, the Esperanto word for Peace.) The PACO membership pledge stated, "War is a crime against humanity: I therefore am determined not to support any kind of war, and to strive for the removal of all causes of war." (Rigby, p37,38.) PACO later changed its name to War Resisters International. By the summer of 1925, membership of the N.M.W.M. had risen to two thousand, with thirteen thousand signatures collected in a petition calling for the British Government to implement total disarmament by example. (Rigby, p46,47.)

19. By 1918, Royden was not only preaching regularly at City Temple, but, at St. Botolph's, she had with some trepidation become the first woman to read the lessons in an Anglican Church. Her patience, and that of Shaw, with the ecclesiastical authorities finally came to breaking point in late summer that year. On Thursday 19 September, to a packed standing-room-only church, Maude Royden delivered the address at the midday service. The first woman to preach in an Anglican church preached pacifism. Her title was "The League of Nations and Christianity."

Can we really do nothing but sit down and watch the crucifixion of the youth of the world!...

Must we face the returning soldiers after all with empty hands and bankrupt hearts? Must we admit that, after all, their friends have died and they have suffered in vain?...

Humanity must change or it will commit suicide. We can go on developing the means of destruction, or we can re-organise the world for peace: 'See I have set before you this day, life and good and death and evil. Therefore choose life that both thou and thy seed may live'. (Cited in Fletcher, p179.)

She was not going to shrink from preaching peace. She saw early the injustice and the consequences of Versailles, and in a sermon entitled "The Passion of Christ," preached on Palm Sunday 1919, she spoke of

the coming destruction that must follow upon the world that *will* not know the things that belong to peace. We are trying to get peace by the methods of hatred, cruelty and revenge. *We do not know the things that belong to peace.* We desire the effect; we *will* not have the cause.

We are worn with war, shattered by the strain and stress of the last four and a half years from 1914 to 1918. We desire peace, but we will not have the things that belong to peace. We know that the laws of nature cannot be broken. We know that if you injure one part of your body the whole of the body suffers. We know that if you injure one nation the others suffer. But we will not accept it. We persist in trying to build our new civilisation on hatred and revenge. And our Lord, looking down upon us, must see what ruin we are bringing on our heads because we will not know the things that belong to peace.

Do you think it belongs to peace to starve a generation of children in Austria? Does it belong to peace to try to hold Ireland against her will? Or to force from Germany what Germany cannot pay?...

All I want to say is that you cannot get peace out of war any more than you can get grapes from thistles, because you are trying to do what is impossible, because you are trying to break the laws of nature. (*Political Christianity*, p37,38.)

In this sermon she was critical of Lloyd George and those engaged in "the supreme farce, ... the supreme folly" of trying to injure another nation without injuring oneself: "We cannot spend money on education. Our people live in houses that are slums because we have to prepare for the next war.... We prefer Barabbas, and we will not seek the things that belong to our own peace." (*Political Christianity*, p40, 41.) She considered the "little group of peasants" who stood at the foot of the Cross:

To-day it seems to me as though there were nothing left for most of us but just to pray that we may be found worthy to stand with these. That in a world where the hatred of nations seems undying, where, if it dies, it seems only to give place in men's hearts to a not less cruel

hatred of class, that there should be anyone alive who still believes in love, that there should be anyone left at all who perceives in crucified, defeated Christ their God and King is, I think, the only hope for the future of the world. But it is a hope which cannot be conquered, which can never die. (*Political Christianity*, p42.)

During a conference on International Women's Suffrage in June 1920, having been invited to be the first woman to preach from Calvin's pulpit in Geneva Cathedral, she again delivered a sermon on the League of Nations. It was to become a popular sermon subject throughout the decade ahead. (Fletcher, p207,208.) From Easter 1920, she and the liturgist Percy Dearmer worked together to build up a Fellowship Guild, and their Guildhouse became the base for numerous anti-war sermons and activities in the years following.

20. Despite her lameness, she took part in a modest peace pilgrimage in 1921 from Southend to London (Fletcher, p227) and in a much more substantial 1926 pilgrimage organised by the W.I.L.P.F. This time she joined the latter stages of the "Tanned and Tired but Triumphant" (*Western Daily Mail*, cited by Liddington, p145) march from South Wales. Sympathetic to the miners' cause, she told her congregation that "These are the men whose sons and brothers have shed their blood and left their bones where your sons and brothers left theirs." (Fletcher, p218. During the General Strike, the F.O.R. tried its hand at strike mediation. Also, the Anglican pacifist Margaret Bligh, representing F.O.R. youth, helped deliver soup to hundreds of men, women and children at a site near Bolton where conditions were particularly serious. Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p64.) Half a century later, women walking a similar route past Greenham Common, would have a dramatic effect on the Government and the peace movement of their day.

In the course of the 1926 pilgrimage, Royden also spoke at a rally in St. Albans, pleading for England to take the lead in justice, equity, disarmament and peace, so that even the strongest pacifist would be proud of the country's example. (*Friend*, 25 June 1926, p566.) After three days walking Royden was too exhausted to speak at the final rally on 19 June and her place was taken by Millicent Fawcett. (*Friend*, 25 June 1926.) Over eight thousand women converged from four corners of Hyde Park in brilliant sunshine, for a final mass demonstration and pageant. Banners announced 'War is Hell,' and 'The World is a family, not a barracks.' Each procession was headed by a woman horse-rider wearing a blue robe with the dove of peace hand-painted on it in silver. (*Observer*, 20 June 1926, cited in Fletcher, p227.) One eye-witness described the scene:

Here were the women of the Guild House in blue cassocks and white collars, bearing their banners aloft; behind them walked members of the League of Nations Union, with bannerettes representing various countries of the world. Here was a carriage filled with women graduates robed in black and scarlet and purple; there was a group of miners' wives. At the head of each procession rode a woman in a Madonna-blue cloak on a white horse; a notable figure was Miss Sybil Thorndike who carried a banner embroidered with doves. (Cited in Bussey and Tims, *Pioneers for Peace*, p51.)

The Guildhouse banner proclaimed "Better is wisdom than weapons of war." The Church Militant were also prominent, and the Glastonbury Players presented a symbolic scene, "The Coming of Peace." From each of twenty-two separate platforms a resolution was put to the crowds urging the British Government to agree "to submit all disputes to conciliation or arbitration, and by taking the lead in the proposed Disarmament Conference of the League of Nations, to show that Great Britain does not intend to appeal to force." (*Friend*, 11 June 1926, p521.) A bugle call brought the rally to a close. (Liddington, p146.) One journalist was deeply moved by the occasion;

The march of the women peace pilgrims to Hyde Park was one of the most significant demonstrations London has seen since the war. One has often felt that if the burning passion devoted to the old Suffrage movement could be rekindled the country might well be on the road to making war impossible, and Saturday's demonstration was impressive because it gave one an earnest that this was happening. (*Daily News*, cited in the *Friend*, 25 June 1926, p566.)

Two weeks later Royden was in the Pilgrimage deputation which met the reluctant Foreign Secretary,

Austen Chamberlain, to press the case for disarmament. (Bussey and Tims, p54.)

21. Back in 1907 Lansbury had helped to arrange finance for the penniless Lenin and Trotsky to come to a conference in London - it was repaid in 1921! (*My Life*, p245.) In 1920 he met Lenin again and was generally impressed by him, admiring his anti-capitalist commitment, though regretting that he was neither religious nor pacifist. Lenin did not think Lansbury would be able to win Socialism without bloodshed, but wished Lansbury well in his efforts. "It is up to you and those who agree with you in Britain to prove you are able to do it," he told his visitor. (*My Life*, p243.) At a big Albert Hall rally on 22 March 1920, Lansbury delivered a message from Lenin: "If you can bring about a peaceful revolution in England, no one will be better pleased than we in Russia. Keep in your trade union movement; keep in your labour movement.... Keep together till you are homogeneous and do not be led into resorting to violence." (Postgate, p207.) Through Lansbury, the *Herald* campaigned against Churchill's policy of blockading Russia. On 8 August 1920, the headline in the *Herald* was "NOT A MAN, NOT A GUN, NOT A SOU," as opposition was aroused to any possible war against Russia. Lansbury's continued support for Communist Russia led to attempts to prevent him addressing the Church Congress of 1922. (Edgar Lansbury, *George Lansbury, My Father*, p121.) In the summer of 1926 Lansbury returned to Russia with his wife, Bessie, and gave pacifist speeches there. *My Life*, p257,258. For Lansbury there was nothing incongruous in all this: "In this matter of pacifism, I have remained as inconsistently consistent all my life. I have actively opposed every war and spoken against all assassinations and violent upheavals. All the same, it has been my pleasure to assist in sheltering Russian and other foreign nihilists, anarchists, and Socialists, Irish nationalists and Sinn Feiners. I always defend those struggling for freedom. These opinions of mine are by now fairly well known. The world war is anathema to me. It is not possible for me ever to believe that killing or injuring people is productive of good. All the same I am blessed with a pugnacious disposition, am always up in arms against injustice." (*My Life*, p39.)

22. *Daily Herald*, 27 August 1921. Cited in Schneer, p1.

23. *Daily Herald*, 4 October 1919. Cited in Schneer, p149.

24. At the snap post-war General Election, with only a quarter of the uniformed forces eligible to vote, Lansbury just failed to regain his parliamentary seat. He would find other ways to be politically active. He and his family lived at 39 Bow Road, Poplar, preferring to be "where the unemployed can put a brick through my window when they disagree with my actions, than be in some other place far away where they can only write me a letter. It's good for me, and it's better for them." (St. J. Groser, *Politics and Persons*, p22.) They soon found themselves at the centre of remarkable grass-roots resistance against the oppressive social policies of the government. In November 1919, local elections in Poplar, one of the poorest areas of London with a population of 162,000, most of whom were on the verge of destitution, produced a Labour majority for the first time. Labour won an astonishing thirty-nine of the forty-two seats in the borough, signalling an end to a period of rule by a Municipal Alliance, dominated by local employers. The mood was one of a desire for substantial change for the people of the borough. Muriel Lester later wrote "We began to plan for setting up the kingdom of heaven!" (Lester, p70.) The strategy would be to make people outside the borough realise that poverty and unemployment were not caused by local conditions, but were a national problem, precipitated by war, and aggravated by the economic terms of the Versailles Treaty (Lester, p70.) and by government legislation. The responsibility for relieving poverty should be shared by people across the country, or at least across London. The tactic to be used to bring that about would be nonviolent resistance.

Lansbury, in his acceptance speech as mayor, suggested that the new council should confront central authorities about the unjust rating system under which "the poor had to keep the poor." (Branson, p18,19.) The issue was to come to a head after Lansbury's year of office as mayor, at a council meeting which he chaired on 22 March 1921. The rating system at the time forced local boroughs to pool their

contributions for the expenditure of London County Council, the Metropolitan Police, the Metropolitan Water Board and the Metropolitan Asylum Board. Yet there was no such spreading of the financial burden to assist poor boroughs on whom the costs of increasing unemployment largely fell. This meant that those living in poor boroughs had to pay larger rate bills than those living in rich ones. What was required was an equalisation of rates. Parliamentary lobbying having failed, the members of Poplar Council decided on direct action. To spare the people of Poplar from increased rate demands, they would not collect the rates for London County Council and the other outside bodies. In full knowledge that their actions could lead each councillor to the bankruptcy court, the full Council took responsibility for the decision, with the only opponent being the Rural Dean, the Revd. Kitkat, whose election had been backed by the Municipal Alliance. Other clergy were more supportive. Father St. John Groser, a prominent Anglo-Catholic parish priest who had once written off Lansbury as a political agitator but who later came to regard him as one of his closest friends, noted that "the thing which first struck me forcibly on coming to Poplar was the essentially religious nature of the revolt which was taking place." (St. J. Groser, *Politics and Persons*, p22.) He also observed that in justifying their stand in a later pamphlet, *Guilty and Proud of It*, the rebels started by quoting James 1v.27: "Pure religion and undefiled before God is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction." (*Politics and Persons*, p22.)

The legal system was swiftly brought in to bring the offending authority to order. Lansbury argued that the Council should stand firm, that there were times when it was necessary to take a stand for that justice which was above the law. "We have got nothing by being passive and quiet and we are going to be passive and quiet no longer," said Lansbury at a Council meeting. "If we have to choose between contempt of the poor and contempt of Court, it will be contempt of Court." (Branson, p46.) The legal process led to the councillors being arrested, beginning on 1 September. Those arrested had learned from Lansbury's pacifism; when one councillor, John Scurr, was arrested he told the assembled crowd, "No rioting on any account. You have one weapon; that is passive resistance." (*Daily Herald*, 3 September 1921, cited in Branson, p64.) George Lansbury himself was arrested on 3 September and taken to Brixton. His daughter-in-law Minnie Lansbury, one of the youngest of the councillors, was one of five women imprisoned at Holloway on 5 September and whose arrest had been accompanied by a procession of ten thousand people. A postman arrested the following day again told the crowd, "No violence and we will win." (*Daily Herald*, 7 September 1921, cited in Branson, p66.) Inside Brixton prison conditions for the twenty-five men were atrocious. George Lansbury, whose own health suffered badly, later suggested that the experience shortened the lives of five of the councillors, including Minnie Lansbury who died of pneumonia on the following New Year's Day, aged thirty-two. Muriel Lester from the F.O.R. was nominated to replace her as Alderman, but declined, agreeing instead to chair the politically sensitive Maternity and Child Welfare Committee. (Lester, p72.) Even the otherwise hostile Councillor Kitkat, who visited the prison, was moved to join with other clergy to organise a petition complaining about the treatment of prisoners and urging their release. A breakthrough came on 11 September when the imprisoned councillors were first allowed to meet together as a group, initially in the cramped conditions of Lansbury's cell. As a result of petitioning the Home Secretary they were allowed to conduct Council business from the prison boardroom once or twice a day from 17 September, an event unique in local government history. Altogether there were thirty two Council meetings in Brixton Prison. By the time of the councillors' release, Bethnal Green and Stepney councils had agreed to follow the Poplar example of refusing to levy outside rates. Eleven Labour mayors met with the Brixton prisoners on 27 September, and for the first time the four remaining women prisoners (the fifth had been released early because she was heavily pregnant) were brought from Holloway to attend too. By this time the whole situation was becoming a considerable embarrassment to the Government, to the London County Council, and indeed to the more constitutional wing of the Labour Party. It appeared to be in everyone's interest to release the Poplar councillors from prison, even if they were still technically in contempt of court by refusing to set a rate. Six weeks after their arrest, the Lord Chief Justice ordered the councillors to be released. Heads high, the defiant councillors were piped to their homes by an Irish band. Muriel Lester called their stand "the high-water mark of citizenship,"

adding: "We voting citizens of Poplar likened our imprisoned mayor to St. Paul, who embarrassed another Imperialist government by refusing to come out of jail until he had gained his point." (Lester, p71,72.)

The political consequences of the Poplar stand were dramatic. The issue of equalisation of rates was now high on the agenda of the Government, and of the various authorities for London. In the ensuing discussions an alternative suggestion was made, that outdoor relief for the unemployed should be pooled across London, to the benefit of areas of high unemployment, like Poplar, at the expense of the richer boroughs. Poplar's illegal rate strike had won the day, causing one disgruntled Tory M.P. to say of the legislation to pool costs for outdoor relief, "This clause, I understand, is popularly known as 'Lansbury's victory.'" (Ormsby-Gore, M.P. for Stafford, cited in Branson, p110.)

25. William H. Lax, *Lax His Book*, p291. This political adversary referred to three sources of Lansbury's power:

First, his passion for social righteousness. Moral fervour carries him far. He is dominated by a stern sense of right and wrong. He will have nothing to do with compromises where the poor are concerned; they have rights, and these he demands. He suffered imprisonment once for such a cause, and would do so again if necessary.

Second, a rich supply of the milk of human kindness. He is the friend of all. He knows everybody, and everybody knows him. He is entirely devoid of the sense of class distinction. He is at home in Bow, and wants no better place.

Third, Religion. Three facts form the basis of his life - God, conscience, religion. Ask him what he regards as the moving principles of his whole existence, and, quite simply, he will point to these. It is true that to him Socialism and Pacifism are something of a religion, and he professes them with all the ardour of profound conviction. He cannot understand how or why anybody can hold any other political faith. But God, conscience and religion are the beginning and end of things for him, and it is from that source that he derives his strength and courage. (*Lax - His Book*, p292,293.)

In Lansbury's words:

I hope some who follow us will understand that we, poor and unlettered as we are in Poplar, also possess the vision that society is made up of women and men, that all peoples of all races, climes, and tongues are of equal value in the sight of God; that there is no God of the British, but one Father or Creator of the human race, and because this is so, all wars are civil wars - wars between brothers - and consequently we have always struggled for peace, peace not imposed but accepted because it must and will be based on truth and justice, love and brotherhood. (*My Life*, p287.)

26. *The Price to be Paid*, p168,169. The three Orders were later described by Pickering as preachers, guilds and workers. (Dransfield typescript of the *Scotsman*, 3 January 1928.) Stimson's attraction to Christian pacifist anarchy dated from his reading, as a youth, works by Tolstoy on his father's bookshelves. (*The Price to be Paid*, p1-9.)

27. *The Price to be Paid*, p169-171. Stimson summarised those commands in his own words.

1. Never to be angry or contemptuous with a brother without real and sufficient cause. If any quarrel has occurred, to seek to be reconciled as soon as possible.
2. To be pure, even in thought, at any cost.
3. Never to take an oath, but to keep our speech truthful and restrained.
4. In our struggle with evil, to abandon the appeal to brute force - that is, to throw away the sword and rely on the Cross as our weapon.
5. To be as kind and considerate towards our enemies as to our friends.
6. Never to do religious deeds from motives of display, but to cover up our tracks in this field as far as possible.

7. To have one governing aim in life - the Kingdom of God and its justice and love; and never to allow security, or anxiety about the future to turn us from this aim.
8. To avoid a censorious spirit and the desire to identify men with their sins, but to seek instead to forgive and release. As far as we feel condemnation to be necessary, to make sure we are not guilty of the same fault.
9. To be discreet in the way we teach these truths, seeking to give them to those most likely to receive them, and not to those likely to be provoked by them.
10. To seek the necessary strength and guidance for this way of life from God the Holy Spirit. (*The Price to be Paid*, p173.)

28. *The Price to be Paid*, p55.

29. Dransfield typescript of the *Crusader*, April 1928, p52. A.P.F. archive.

30. Although Stimson's first two companions failed to stay in the First Order for their pledged five years (Ames left after one year, but was much involved later; Elworthy was to leave due to ill health), in the twelve years that the Tramp-Preachers exercised their distinctive ministry, their numbers were swelled by a variety of men. All regarded themselves as Anglicans. Eight had received a university education. Three, including Pickering and Jimmy Riddle, were already ordained, although Pickering's circumstances were so irregular that he was ordained again in 1940 (deacon) and 1941 (priest). Three others members of the Brotherhood were also subsequently ordained, including Elworthy, who was briefly (1937-1938) on the Executive Committee of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. The others to be ordained eventually were Ben Ross and Hugh McCallum, recruited via the Third Order. McCallum was not the best speaker of the group, but he continued to the Brotherhood's end and beyond with his supportive wife, Elspeth. Other members of the Brotherhood included: the former chartered accountant Hazlehurst (also known as Howard Walton); there was a "cattle farmer on a very large scale," (Dransfield typescript of *Bolton Evening News*, 4 September 1930); a chemist; a solicitor's clerk; an artist; a bank clerk; a "jack of all trades (son of a parson)" (Dransfield typescript); and door-to-door salesmen. All but two were from middle-class backgrounds. Stimson acknowledged that they were hardly a representative cross-section of society: "Psychologically they were mainly of the ethical, visionary type.... They possessed any amount of heroism, very little worldly wisdom. One or two were emotionally gifted, the rest were of the aesthetic or rational type, about equally divided." (*The Price to be Paid*, p88.) Peacemaking gifts were frequently required to maintain a harmonious order among a group of such strong personalities.

The normal recruiting process was via the open air meeting, with men who had attended one or more meetings being attracted to the Brotherhood's message and lifestyle and requesting to join. Most of the men were single, but one, Stanley, unsuccessfully tried to combine the Brotherhood with marriage. Another, Ronald Monaghan (author of a pamphlet, *Land of Dope and Tory*) was more successful as his wife Beth fully supported the work and backed Monaghan's antagonism towards the middle-class. John Dennis, a chemist, questioned the Brotherhood's "condescending to men of low estate" and wondered whether their appeal should be broader. He left the movement when he married. Joe Wilcox was one of the earlier working-class members, having worked in a Lancashire cotton mill from the age of eleven. He had been a choirboy and a server in his church, and he retained a strong sense of class-consciousness. Alf Opie, a Cockney Tolstoyan, was also married, and he and his wife continued the preaching lifestyle on behalf of the Peace Pledge Union, even after the Brotherhood ended and war broke out with all its blackouts, restrictions and animosity. There was also the handsome Charlie Jory, from Guernsey, who had once been convicted of poaching. (Alan Johnston, "On the Road," *New Socialist*, January 1985, p48.) He and Leonard Ames were the same age, some ten years younger than Stimson. Other men associated with the Brotherhood of the Way included: David Anderson (an artist from Glasgow, who was in the Third Order for many years), Dick Dunsford, Stanley Fletcher, Alf Flight, Peter Hamilton, Arthur Harrison (a teacher), John Davenport Hocking, David Lyth, George Reeves (who was not

himself one of the preachers but had travelled round with them, in support), Benjamin Rosenberg (one of the younger members), Bill Stone, Bruce Sumner, George Vigar, Alec Walker and William Henry Wilkey. (*The Price to be Paid*, group photographs between p107 and 108; Dorothy Stimson in conversation with CB, 31 October 1991; Dransfield to CB, 29 May 1995.) The men worked in teams of three, each team consisting of one full member of the first order, one associate and one novice. They all met together three times each year, to divide into fresh groups. They continued their itinerant ministry throughout Britain until the late 1930s brought a prophetic challenge from the radical Christian community movement.

31. *The Price to be Paid*, p137-139.

32. *The Price to be Paid*, p143,144.

33. *Twenty Years At St. Hilary*, p148. In a separate project, Walke set up a small centre for delinquent children in *The Jolly Tinnors*, a disused public house opposite his church. A project that F.O.R. support and continued work F.O.R. had been associated with in Kent, it was run initially by Grace Costin, later Mother Teresa, F.S.J.M. (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p49.)

34. *Reconciliation*, 1935, p252.

35. Andrews' first attempt to visit to the Punjab, immediately after the massacre, led to him being detained under house arrest as his presence in Amritsar was deemed to be "not in the public interest." (Chaturvedi and Sykes, p131.) He was eventually allowed to visit the area, as a member of the Congress committee gathering evidence into the atrocity. He was welcomed with enthusiasm and many people thronged his house to tell him their stories. His letters showed Gandhi that the atrocities had been even worse than had been reported. There was much mediation work to do between the people and the Government, and Andrews managed to negotiate significant concessions from the authorities. He toured the local villages with Gurdial Mallik who regarded C.F.A. as standing for "Christ's Faithful Apostle." (Chaturvedi and Sykes, p136.) Shortly before a Lahore rally Andrews had been refused entry to a nearby Christian church on the grounds that "This House of God is not for rebels." (Chaturvedi and Sykes, p137.) At that rally he urged his audience "not to dwell upon vengeance but rather upon forgiveness; not to linger in the dark night of hate but to come out into the glorious sunshine of God's love." (*Tribune*, 16 November 1919, cited in Chaturvedi and Sykes, p137.) Three years later, Andrews returned to Amritsar to urge Sikh reformers to work nonviolently when challenging their religious leaders. (Clark, p50; Chaturvedi and Sykes, p186,187.)

36. Through Ahimsa, wrote Andrews, Gandhi showed the world "that it is possible to-day to overcome even the violence of war by the purely voluntary suffering of corporate moral resistance," i.e. Satyagraha. (Radhadrishnan, ed. p52.)

37. Groves, p326.

38. Groves, p156.

39. *No More War*, Vol.V, No. 3, December 1925, p1. Three years later, Donaldson was asked why he supported the No More War Movement. He listed four distinct reasons:

Because the No More War Movement stands for Permanent Peace.

Because it proclaims that the "next war" is being made or *prevented* NOW, that it is useless to agitate for peace when war is imminent. The agitation must be long beforehand.

Because Peace does not "happen." Like war Peace must be *made*. "Blessed are the peace-makers." Peace must be worked for; it requires watchfulness, political knowledge and

education. The price of Peace, like that of liberty, is eternal vigilance. The N.M.W.M. is an active agency, ceaselessly working for the conversion of the people in the cause of Peace.

Because the N.M.W.M. commits us to a definite personal act of faith in the possibility of the abolition of war, and counters in the nations the triple enemies of peace, ignorance, fear and competition, by knowledge, faith and co-operation. (Chamberlain, *Fighting for Peace*, p142.)

40. *Rebel Passion*, p46. The International Committee of Anti-Militarist Clergymen, an initiative of the Dutch ecumenical peace group Kerk En Vrede, convened an International Congress of Anti-Militarist Clergymen which took place in Amsterdam from 13-15 August 1928. There, over one hundred clergy from ten lands issued a declaration stating:

- (1) that the moral principles of Christianity, as they are revealed by the Gospel of Jesus Christ, are in irreconcilable opposition to war;
- (2) that war, especially modern warfare, by its very character violates all Christian values;
- (3) that the State which makes preparation for war and forces its citizens to share in the business of war, de-christianizes the nation.

They appealed to the Christian churches to consider it a sacred obligation:

- (1) To bear testimony in a strictly anti-militarist sense against the sin of war;
- (2) to protect the refusal of military service from conscientious reason as a Christian attitude against the State;
- (3) to convince the peoples that they should disarm nationally, renounce the sinful exploit of war and, confiding in the help of God, should embark on the adventure of peace.

To the statement was later added, "The office of army chaplain is declared to be incompatible with the Gospel," although some concern was expressed that that did not mean that soldiers were not in need of spiritual care, rather that a minister holding an army-commission could not do justice to the Gospel. (*War Resister*, No.21, October 1928, p22; Heering, p275,276.) At the end of the Congress was instituted the International Union of Anti-Militarist Ministers and Clergymen, "pioneers," according to Dr. Hector Macpherson, Chairman of the Executive and a member of the National Committee of the No More War Movement, "who are prepared to cut their path, at the cost of personal unpopularity and sacrifice, through the undergrowths of fear and prejudice, and whose aim is to outlaw the very idea of war from the hearts of Christian people." (Heering, p276,277; Chamberlain, *Fighting for Peace*, p125.)

41. Not all of this literary activity was welcomed within the Church of England. P. T. R. Clayton thought some of the writing gave a bad impression of British soldiers, (*Church Times*, 17 January 1930, p65.) and Provost MacNutt, Archdeacon of Leicester, regretted the bad effect - as he saw it - that it was all having on public opinion. (*Church of England Newspaper*, 11 April 1930, p15.)

42. Raven, whose own conversion to pacifism dated from 1930, later said that until autumn 1928 "it needed some courage to renounce war from a public platform." (*Is War Obsolete?*, p23.)

43. In 1926 Dick Sheppard was criticised for inviting Lansbury to contribute to *St. Martin's Review*. In his defence Sheppard told one correspondent that Lansbury was "an outstanding Christian." Sheppard attempted to understand Lansbury by differentiating between the political Lansbury and the Christian Lansbury. He admitted that he "generally cannot agree" with the former, whilst exclaiming, "thank God the Christian Lansbury is still alive." (Sheppard to "Waller". Richardson papers.) Lansbury found even the best Church figures infuriating for their lack of awareness of the consequences of the class nature of society, and of society's need for fundamental change. Despite a growing friendship with Dick Sheppard, Lansbury was quick to challenge the man who made his name at St. Martin-in-the-Fields.

The late Vicar of St. Martin's is a fine, good-living man: he is in despair about the Church because his life in East London made him understand why people care very little, if anything, about the teachings of the Church. Yet he, good as he is, will not take the only course that is logical and come out boldly on behalf of an entirely new social order. (*My Life*, p221.)

Sheppard had become famous for opening St. Martin's up as a place of refuge during the war. Lansbury had even been ambivalent towards that gesture.

No doubt it helped many people, but what a grander, nobler piece of work would have been done had the Vicar boldly and without reservation declared against war and taken his stand with those who demanded peace.... During a war the Churches try to serve the God of War and the God of Peace. It cannot be done. (*My Life*, p222.)

44. In October 1925 Arthur Ponsonby M.P. launched a Peace Letter campaign, getting 140,000 (Ponsonby, in an unpublished, undated tribute to Sheppard, Richardson papers; Ceadel, p80, follows Brittain, *Rebel Passion*, p46, in giving the figure 128,770) signatures for a refusal to fight, in the course of which campaign he held a huge Albert Hall rally in 1926. His initiative was to be copied by Dick Sheppard some years later, but then it was developed into a powerful pacifist movement. In 1928 Ponsonby published an influential book *Falsehood in Wartime*, the title echoing Studdert Kennedy's much-reprinted 1919 volume *Lies*: "This post-war world is black with lies.... There's a bad smell about ... it is like the smell of the dead." (Wilkinson, *Dissent or Conform ?*, p95.) Ponsonby's book was also to run into numerous impressions - nine by 1940. His message was that many of the supposed German atrocities of 1914-1918 could be shown to be fabrications, inventions of the British Government and press in order to stir up public opinion. National propaganda was deemed to take precedence over truth.

45. Housman was a lapsed Anglo-Catholic ("the Church of England and I were no longer on friendly terms: we had parted." *What Can We Believe?*, p11.) He was, though, consistently pacifist. His correspondence with Sheppard reflected their common concern for matters of faith and society. Sheppard kept Housman in touch with the Christian faith; Housman drew Sheppard ever closer to pacifism. His *Little Plays* brought Sheppard closer to the Franciscan tradition, so that Sheppard could write that "I always think that after Jesus Christ St. Francis seems to have the first place in that great procession of the saints." (Sheppard to Housman, 25 October 1926. *What Can We Believe?*, p56.) Housman, for his part, could see the desirability of a "Quaker-Catholic" position: "If you had pacifist groups in different countries, all doing the forbidden thing with the same form of worship for symbol, the primitive Christian atmosphere might come again." (Housman to Sheppard, c. October 1926. *What Can We Believe?*, p54.) Sheppard himself was later to speak of "the kind of sacramental Quakerism that I myself have bumped towards." (Sheppard to Ronald Sinclair, cited in R. Ellis Roberts, p173.)

The first sign that Sheppard was coming round to espousing pacifism came in 1926. He claimed that Royden had been the inspiration behind *The Impatience of a Parson*, "by telling me not to be so damned diffident." On 20 August he told Housman what he was trying to achieve: "I am going out and out for pacifism, disestablishment, the removal of every barrier between sect and sect, and other things that may even shock you and cause you to remind me how in many more ways than one I am totally unlike St. Francis - especially in my impenitent impatience. My whole idea is that no one - not even a backbiter, a profiteer, a truth-seeker or a murderer - can be excommunicated from the Universal Church unless he or she excommunicates himself or herself; and that the full hospitality of God must be given by the Church to anyone who merely says with *reverence* 'Lord I believe, help thou mine unbelief'." (*What Can We Believe?*, p45,46.)

Other correspondence passed between them before, in a powerful and important letter of January 1927, Housman said that he himself held to "a much more literal acceptance of Christ's teaching in the 'Sermon on the Mount' than the Church has ever allowed herself to preach or her followers to practise." This made him wonder whether, despite his rejection to traditional doctrines, he might be more of a Christian "than those millions of professing Christians who, at the bidding of so fallible and one-sided an authority as the secular power, are willing to cut each other's throats in war? (And the Church at their backs telling them it is their moral duty to do it!...)" He continued by considering the nature of twentieth century war: "Once embarked on war (with its necessities of conscription and propaganda) you *must* be dishonest, you must override the rights of neutrals, and the rights of conscience; you must tell lies about your opponents doings, while you whitewash your own; you must make unclean treaties to

reconcile divergent interests and win fresh alliances; committed to the arbitrament of physical force, over a dispute which you loudly proclaim to be a moral one, you must - if you would contend successfully - be ready to do all kinds of moral wrong. It seems to me absolutely hypocritical to say that you can hope to win a war without throwing to the winds the bulk of the moral laws which man has made and ascribed to God.

Therefore I don't see how God can be the God of battles (though the Church and the Bible both say that He is), or how we can hope to improve our position by asking Him to take a hand in it. It is an ugly, dirty, dishonest business."

Despising people's worship of the nation state, and regarding patriotism as 'My country, right or wrong,' Housman turned his attention to the decline and fall of empires. "Most nations die, I suppose, because of their sins; but if one nation died because of its righteousness, as the Christ of history died upon the Cross, what a wonderful new faith for the troubled nations it might give rise to; it might convert nation-worship back to Christianity again." (Housman to Sheppard, January 1927. *What Can We Believe?*, p69-73.)"

Housman's letter clearly set Sheppard thinking. In a brief reply written on 26 January 1927, Sheppard stated, "With regard to what you say about war, I am wholeheartedly in agreement and shall be bound to say so." (Sheppard to Housman, 26 January 1927. *What Can We Believe?*, p75.) In another short letter, written on 4 February, Sheppard admitted for the first time, "I cannot but identify myself with pacifism, for I am a pacifist and am not prepared to pretend I am anything else." (Sheppard to Housman, 4 February 1927. *What Can We Believe?*, p82.) Sheppard's substantive reply came on 12 February 1927.

It reflected the mind of a man whose thinking was on the move, away from old certainties, towards a new world view. "I believe that a fresh edition of Christianity, with the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount as its creed, is years overdue," he wrote. He admitted to Housman that,

"I myself, am now a pacifist and do not think a Christian can take part in any work of killing or propagating lies, or stirring up passion to kill, or doing anything that he cannot believe that Christ would have done; or for which he cannot ask a blessing 'for Jesus Christ's sake'."

He added that he "would rather go to prison than engage in another war," even though he held grave reservations about the unattractive, uncompromising harshness of many pacifists in the past. "Frankly, while I hold to the cause of Pacifism I am badly in need of wisdom on the whole subject. I believe - and shall continue to believe - that the ordinary honest man, who gave his life in the last War for what his conscience told him was right, was in all cases a martyr. In most cases he was an infinitely finer type than the majority, I only say the majority, of the Conscientious Objectors. It was my fault and the fault of other Christian teachers that we had not outlawed War in the years that preceded the time when it seemed inevitable even to high-minded people, i.e. August of 1914. Don't be cross with me for saying this, but while I am able to love Conscientious Objectors from afar, just as I am able to love Bulgars from afar, I cannot love them when I am in their presence either in Trafalgar Square or in Bulgaria. Is it possible to be a Pacifist by conviction and yet respect the views of some of those who hate pacifism? Perhaps it isn't, but that is where I stand."

He continued by referring to the national, rather than the personal consequences, of the position to which he was drawn: "Certainly there is a very wicked doctrine called: 'My Country - right or wrong', but there is also a very beastly doctrine called: 'My Country - always wrong', which is all too prevalent to-day amongst the fanatics and freaks who rush into every progressive cause, getting badly in the way of its triumph. What *is* worrying me terribly is that, speaking generally, the youth of to-day, especially at the Public Schools, is still being taught patriotism in terms of war, when of course, except for the hardness of our hearts and the dullness of our understanding, it has nothing to do with war. I, too, believe that war can only be ended by some great Power laying down its life, as Christ did on the Cross, for the World's sake, and I, too, who yield to no one in love of my country, would be proud if it went down for that great sake, and went down in history besides as the Great Empire that gave its very life so that the way of Christ, at least in one respect, might prevail."

his pioneering radio broadcasts, Sheppard held that there was an irony in a comfortable Church, preaching a sentimental Jesus, yet which upheld State violence. "We falsify Jesus by too much use of the word gentle, forgetting that much of His teaching was shouted in the teeth of a mob brandishing stones and howling for his life. There was only one weapon that Christ condescended to use - that weapon was love." (*The Impatience of a Parson*, p121,122.) Sheppard remarked that "It is far easier to accept the dogmas of Christianity than its ethics" (*The Impatience of a Parson*, p37), including the ethics of the "purely bestial and devilish affair" that was war. "We cannot any more think of war as anything but a damnable arrest of development and decency; it is not only the willingness to suffer agony, it is the willingness to inflict it. War cannot be reconciled with Christianity: there is no such thing as a Christian war." (*The Impatience of a Parson*, p52.)

Sheppard's suggested way forward was to look to the 1930 Lambeth Conference for a lead. He posited a series of specimen resolutions for the Bishops to commend, on various aspects of the Church's mission and practice. One such, number IX, read:

That the Anglican Communion denies that the brotherhood of all men - irrespective of their class or nationality or race - can be reconciled with any competitive ideal of human life which necessitates that the weak must go to the wall for the benefit of the strong or that requires men to slay their brother men. It is obliged to outlaw all war and to demand from its members that they should refuse to kill their brethren. (*The Impatience of a Parson*, p216.)

There was no time to lose.

I feel that Western civilisation will go up in the smoke of another World War long before Christianity, moving at its present pace, takes possession: it is horrible to think that some who read these pages may themselves be the victims of the next war. As I see things, it is a close race now between Christianity and Catastrophe, and the issue will be decided within the lifetime of many of my readers. (*The Impatience of a Parson*, p17.)

47. *The Impatience of a Parson*, p52.

48. *The Impatience of a Parson*, p170.

49. J. G. Lockhart, p375.

50. Royden's relationship with the Church of England was a stormy one. In her University days she was a High Anglican, speaking in 1899 of "we Ritualists." (Royden to Kathleen Courtney, 17 October 1899. L.M.H. Surprisingly, given their later involvement in social and international affairs, the correspondence between these undergraduate friends showed little interest in contemporary issues, barring passing references to Dreyfus.) She was even briefly attracted to Roman Catholicism as a result of contemplating some of the art treasures of Italy. The attraction led her to read the Bible more carefully, which in turn produced the conviction, "I should like to be a philanthropic radical! Doubtless the young and foolish always start with this idea!" (Royden to Courtney, 5 April 1900. L.M.H.) Her practice of radical philanthropy started with a period working at the Victoria Women's Settlement in the slums of Liverpool. It was the start of her social and political education. By the time she returned to Oxford as a University Extension lecturer in 1905, she was politically aware and deeply committed to the suffrage movement, soon becoming a formidable speaker in its cause.

Royden stated categorically in 1918 that "The Church of England is the Church of my baptism. I am her child by temperament and by conviction as well." (*The Hour and the Church*, p26.) Nine years later she affirmed that "In ecclesiastical matters I am a 'soul naturally Anglican.'" (*I Believe in God*, p3.) She was also committed to ecumenism, though her baptism of four babies when acting as "pulpit assistant" at the City Temple was not received well in Anglican circles. The Principal of Cuddesdon, Seaton, refused to let her sleep in the College when the Life and Liberty Council of which she was a part, were visiting. Her most pioneering work was centred on St. Botolph's, Aldgate, where she not only read the lessons, but dared to preach as well.

Following opposition to her actions from Bishop Winnington-Ingram, Royden joined with the liturgist Percy Dearmer in setting up the Guildhouse, Eccleston Square, as a base for her prophetic preaching and his demand for excellence in liturgy and music. From the Guildhouse, Royden made such an impact that, not only was she made a Companion of Honour in 1930, but she was delighted to host a visit from Gandhi in September 1931. Gandhi was to be a lasting influence upon her. As he approached his seventieth birthday, at a time when Europe was once more moving towards war, she noted that: "Power politics' with all their false appeal and false philosophy have misled even the workers for peace, in Europe to-day. Many of them now believe that to "enforce justice" is possible, and that it will lead to peace...."

To read the words of Gandhi ... is to be lifted above this senseless noise and confusion into a purer and a clearer air - clearer, for it enables us to see above the dust of battle and purer, because it is inspired by such utter fidelity to truth." (Radhakrishnan, ed., p255.)

51. Wallis, *Mother of World Peace*, p91.

52. McCormick et al, *St. Martin-in-the-Fields Calling*, p106-112.

53. Sheppard to Housman, 12 March 1929. *What Can We Believe?*, p139.

PACIFISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1930-1937

PART 2: A CHRONICLE OF ANGLICAN PACIFISM, 1930-1937

THE CHRONOLOGY OF A CAMPAIGN

New Alignments

Just as the outbreak of war in 1914 had prompted a reordering of peace movement activity and the formation of new campaigning agencies to fit the new circumstances of war, so the end of the war in 1918 led to a reconsideration of the most appropriate structures to carry the lessons learned into peacetime. The first question to be faced was whether or not to continue at all. The No-Conscription Fellowship decided to wind itself up in 1919, but other groups - the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Women's International League, decided to carry on and to adapt to the new circumstances.

The F.O.R. moved quickly to become international in structure and outlook. Within a year of the Armistice, a meeting in Bilthoven, Holland, hosted by the deported former Birmingham F.O.R. Secretary Cornelius Boeke, led to the formation of the Movement Towards a Christian International, a name which reflected the founders' socialist as well as Christian pacifist aspirations.

Those who enter such a movement place the claims of Christ and humanity above those of any state, while none the less serving their own nation in every possible way. They cannot, therefore, kill their fellow-men on any pretext whatever, or take any part in military service. They are utterly opposed to Capitalism and Imperialism. The cause of the oppressed is their cause. They are determined on a revolution so radical that, if sought through violence, it would surely fail. They are pledged to a life service for the whole human family.¹

A spin-off of that conference was another at the same venue the following year when one of the participants, Pierre Cérésole, led moves to found the Service Civil International dedicated to promoting voluntary cross-frontier social work, aid and reconstruction programmes in order to rebuild international friendship and trust.²

Within Britain, the F.O.R., branched out from war-resistance to a much broader movement supportive of various kinds of social good works that could be said to advance the Kingdom of God. With membership already in decline due to near-universal hope that the League of Nations would always prevent future war and thus there would never again be a need to confront the issue of war-participation versus pacifism, this broadening of outlook and blurring of focus meant that the F.O.R. in the 1920s was ineffective and lacking in direction. The lack of activism was felt early on by the radical nonconformist socialist group who rallied around the *Crusader* broadsheet. They particularly regretted the demise of the more politically attuned N-C.F. and in February 1921 the No More War Movement was born. The following month an

international version of the same, PACO, was formed after yet another Bilthoven conference.³ Anglican supporters of the N.M.W.M. included Lewis Donaldson, Charles Raven, Maude Royden and the Marquis of Tavistock.⁴ The F.O.R. and the N.M.W.M. remained on friendly terms, and in 1929 even considered merging.⁵ Cooperation was close enough for the N.M.W.M. to delay a planned national campaign so as not to interfere with a F.O.R. initiative, the Christ and Peace Campaign.⁶

The Christ and Peace Campaign

Originally proposed at the Cambridge F.O.R. Conference of 1925, the Christ and Peace Campaign took over four years to come to fruition. It was intended to be a large-scale mission to the churches, undertaken with the support of other sympathetic, even if not pacifist, agencies.⁷ The World Alliance agreed to recommend the mission⁸ and the League of Nations Union grudgingly accepted what must have seemed an intrusion on to their territory. Ironically, as the Campaign began to take on a life of its own, there were even questions asked within F.O.R. as to whether F.O.R. should withdraw as the pacifist message would be diluted through association with non-pacifists. It was decided to continue as the opportunities for promoting pacifism would outweigh any risk to the integrity of the message.⁹

The inaugural meeting of the Campaign eventually took place in Central Hall, Westminster, on 22 October 1929. Dick Sheppard, invited to co-ordinate the Campaign along with the nonconformist Herbert Gray, had to withdraw through illness, but he sent an apology declaring that he did not feel any follower of Jesus Christ would be justified in killing his brother: "Institutional Religion ought to refrain from any compromise on the matter of war." International support included a message from the pacifist Bishop Paul Jones of the United States. The Marquis of Tavistock spoke of the need to apply all parts of Jesus' teaching; the teaching on love of enemies could not be deferred to some distant millennium. Bishop Bell, who had agreed to join the co-ordinating team, concentrated on arbitration, saying that the Church should link a "general" repudiation of war as incompatible with the mind of Christ with an assertion that "in no circumstances whatever as citizens can they assist or take part in a war when the government of their own country has refused to offer to submit the issue to arbitration."¹⁰ Bell was never a pacifist but was held in high regard by pacifists and agreed to work with them not only in the Church and Peace Campaign but also later, during the Second World War, on the Bombing Restriction Campaign. Bell and Sheppard were appointed to the Campaign council, and W. C. Roberts and Canon L. S. Hunter were elected to the Campaign executive. There followed a number of gatherings

around the country, with an eminent speakers list including the Bishops of Chichester (George Bell), Winchester (F. T. Woods), Kingston (F. O. T. Hawkes) and Chelmsford (Guy Rogers), Canon Donaldson of Westminster, Canon Raven of Liverpool, the Marquis of Tavistock, the Nonconformist Dr. Leslie Weatherhead and many others.¹¹ At a Liverpool meeting on 1 April 1930 where the attendance was over two thousand, including many clergy and young people, the speakers included Bishop Bell and Canon Raven. Raven called on those present to dedicate themselves to the cause of peace and to repudiate personal success, for peace would only come when partnership was seen to be a more thrilling and splendid thing than war, and service than success. Raven then seconded a resolution, passed unanimously, which stated that the way of war and the way of Christ were unalterably opposed and called on the churches to 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 in its support."¹²

By the end of 1930, despite the number of meetings in both London and the provinces, there was disappointment that the scale of the campaign was less than had been hoped for. Herbert Gray attributed this failure to insufficient Anglican support. Perhaps some Anglicans were distracted by the Lambeth Conference. Gray's feeling was more likely based on his experience of 1 March 1930 with the Dean of Westminster, who refused to pray for disarmament, changed the hymns and omitted some prayers at a Christ and Peace intercession service.¹³ Also there were difficulties in finding suitable Anglican speakers for some of the meetings; when St. Clair Donaldson, Bishop of Salisbury, spoke in Manchester on 20 May 1930, his anti-pacifist address clashed with Gray's.¹⁴ Within the campaign, leadership had not been very charismatic; the Fellowship of Reconciliation was not noted for its efficient organisation. Despite that there had been some notable recruits who would make a major contribution in the future. Before the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in September 1931 popular expectation was that the League of Nations would be the world's most effective agent for war prevention; accordingly, converts to pacifism at that time were not motivated by strategic considerations but because (and especially in the light of the Church's shameful behaviour in 1914-1918) they felt that it was theologically, eschatologically and morally the right decision. This strength of faith was to prove a sound basis for the next few years, a success for the campaign even though the membership increase of the F.O.R. had been a mere 4 per cent. In 1931, however, the slight numerical gain was regarded as disappointing and plans for a large closing convention in Manchester were replaced by a more modest and more devotional gathering in Oxford.

The Oxford Convention

The Christ and Peace campaign consisted of thirty five meetings attended by some 25,000 people. When it came to its predetermined end there was some concern that work for disarmament would continue, so there was a call - taken up by seven denominations including the Church of England, despite some suspicion of "trespassing" by some involved in the World Alliance¹⁵ - for Churches to set up disarmament committees in preparation for the Disarmament Conference planned for 1932.

The Oxford Convention to close formally the Christ and Peace campaign took place at Somerville College on 15-18 April 1931. Amongst the hundred or so participants, reflecting the breadth of the movement, were Anglican pacifists Maude Royden, Stuart Morris, Percy Hartill, F. E. A. Shepherd and the Marquis of Tavistock, overseas visitors Siegmund-Schultze (Chairman of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation) and Professor G. J. Heering,¹⁶ sympathisers like Charles Raven and Bishop Bell, League of Nations devotees like Lord Robert Cecil, minor ecclesiastical dignitaries like the Bishop of Carlisle, together with Canons Leslie Hunter, Pat McCormick and T. W. Pym.¹⁷ Father Andrew was asked to assist on the devotional side.¹⁸

In the speeches, Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, speaking as an Anglican, conceded that "the Nonconformist Churches have been more vigorous in the cause of peace than we have."¹⁹ Siegmund-Schultze warned that the friends of peace in Germany would be powerless if the forthcoming Disarmament Conference produced no results. Maude Royden regretted that so few pacifists in the past war had given the "sublime impression," and she hoped that the Church's contribution, based on Good Friday, would produce "an intensive school of peacemakers recognisably the followers of the Prince of Peace." In particular, she asked, "Was it possible for the churches to give a more positive content to pacifism?" In his keynote speech, Bishop Bell said that those assembled had gathered because war was on their consciences. Mindful of their sense of debt to those who had died in the last war, they wished to do all they could to prevent war coming again. Christians, he said, should pray that governments and peoples might be led by the power of the Spirit to lay down their arms and their fears, so that Britain might give a powerful lead in disarmament. The Church should recognise that there was something inherently anti-Christian in the system of war: "war between Christians ought to be absolutely and for ever excluded simply because they were members together of the Body of Christ." With regard to the forthcoming Disarmament

Conference, Bell believed that the Church should give a lead to the politicians, so that fear and suspicion would be replaced by a deep religious and moral appeal for trust. As Germany had been disarmed, so other nations should disarm, he argued, and the means could be found, through international courts or the League Assembly, for revision of the most contentious parts of the existing treaties.²⁰

The variety of opinion represented at Oxford was reflected in the Message “generally approved” by the Convention. On the one hand those present wanted to ask the Churches throughout the world to declare that in the event of a war in violation of the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Kellogg Pact they would urge their members not to serve.

Such a candid declaration made at this time would, we believe, reinforce the determination of statesmen to sustain their agreements and would increase the feeling of security which is essential to the acceptance of substantial measures of disarmament.²¹

On the other hand, the preamble to this request to the Churches, which spoke of profession being translated into action, was tempered by the rider, “Leaving on one side the question of the use of armed forces for police purposes, ...” Already the cracks were showing which, within a few years, were to lead to irreconcilable division. Within the F.O.R., the Christ and Peace campaign had been intended in the late 1920s to create a sympathetic climate for the promotion of a broadly defined pacifism within the churches. Increasingly, this had led to a focus on disarmament, especially in response to contemporary political events. The F.O.R. was becoming a peace organisation, rather than a motley collection of campaigners against various forms of social sin. More perhaps than it realised, the F.O.R. had been shaped by the Christ and Peace campaign into an organisation that was fit for the struggles of the 1930s.

The Background of Dick Sheppard

The man who was to become the most significant clerical advocate of Anglican pacifism in the 1930s started the decade already very well known, but not especially for his attitude towards war. Hugh Richard “Dick” Lawrie Sheppard was famous across the country for his pioneering work in religious broadcasting. His broadcasts from St. Martin-in-the-Fields started early in 1924.²² In November 1924, Sheppard filled the Albert Hall for a special service for broadcast listeners.

He was in the Albert Hall again the following year, after leading a successful protest over plans to hold an inappropriate Charity Ball there on Armistice Day. The previous

month he had written to the *Times*: “A fancy dress ball on a vast scale as a tribute to the Great Deliverance which followed on the unspeakable agony of 1914-1918 seems to me not so much irreligious as indecent...”²³ Even though plans for the Ball were well advanced at that stage, the clamour was so great that the event was cancelled. Instead, Sheppard himself led a great meeting “In Memory” in the Hall, attended by the king and queen, that raised more money than the ball would have done.²⁴ The General Council of the League of Nations Union gave Sheppard a formal resolution of thanks for the stand that he had made.²⁵ The pacifist Arthur Ponsonby told him that “To have succeeded single handed in substituting a service for an Albert Hall Fancy Dress Ball is an achievement no one in this country could have done but you.... I feel my campaign is quite unnecessary. A word from you will stop the next war.”²⁶

As much as his other works, his campaign around the 1925 Armistice Day led to Sheppard being made a Companion of Honour in the 1927 New Year’s Honours List.²⁷ Later in the year he became an Honorary Doctor of Divinity at the University of Glasgow. Everyone had heard of Dick Sheppard. He had the ear of the people in a way that no other priest or bishop had. If Sheppard were to become a pacifist, then the people would take notice.

Sheppard resisted the call to pacifism for many years, but when he eventually embraced it he adopted pacifism wholeheartedly. As a seventeen year old in 1900, he had attempted to enlist for the South African War, only to receive a permanent leg injury in an accident on the way to the station. With experience of Oxford House in East London, of Cuddesdon and of an elite London parish, Sheppard deferred a 1914 appointment to St. Martin-in-the-Fields in order to be an army chaplain in France. It was a decision against the express wishes of the king (Sheppard’s father was Chaplain to the king, as Sheppard himself was to become later.) The experience of France sowed the seeds of Sheppard’s later pacifism. In 1935 he wrote of the first soldier he saw die:

As I bent to catch his painfully-spoken words I discovered that he had little need of my ministry. He was thinking of a life that was still unborn. His wife was expecting a baby about Christmas. And he died thanking God that, if the child was a boy, he would never have to go through the hell of war.... That man believed what he had been told - that he was fighting in the war to end war. Innumerable others also believed it and died, as he did, at least happy in the thought that their sons would be spared their Calvary. These sons are of military age to-day.²⁸

The strain of such a ministry affected Sheppard’s invariably delicate health, and he returned home before the end of October, to take up his ministry in Trafalgar Square. His transformation of St. Martin’s was the first act to bring him to the attention of the

general public. The church was open all hours for the use of soldiers in transit, there was a centre for the homeless in the crypt, and liturgical innovations included “the custom to pray for conscientious objectors as well as for soldiers and sailors.”²⁹ At the time of the National Mission, Sheppard gave a platform for George Lansbury, and was so impressed by Lansbury’s integrity that he wondered if he should move out of his rectory into smaller premises as an expression of social concern, and if they could promote a lay crusade on such issues. It was the start of an outspoken friendship between the two men, as was shown in Lansbury’s uncompromisingly pacifist reply:

It seems to me that, admitting that in the present circumstances - and I don’t - humanity is not sufficiently developed for us to trust ourselves unarmed before all nations, yet it seems to me that this is the only ideal Christ would have put before the world. I cannot believe that war does anything but debase and demoralise mankind. I believe that a triumph won by war and force is simply a triumph of force. To me war is only part of the tremendous problem of social relationships which have their root in the fact that we strive to live our lives for ourselves; and the result is beggaring, both morally, intellectually and spiritually.... It seems to me that the Crusade, as at present mapped out, will leave us where we were. We shall enjoy the pleasure of our service in Church, our prayers and our hymns and even our prayer meetings, but in the end the great world of mankind will be untouched.³⁰

Sheppard’s first attempt to reform the Church came in 1917 when he persuaded his neighbouring incumbent, William Temple at St. James’, Piccadilly, to join with him in forming Life and Liberty. The movement brought an element of democracy into ecclesiastical structures, but “the great world of mankind” remained untouched.

The publication of *The Impatience of a Parson* in 1927 reflected a wider agenda. It also marked the public admission of the most popular priest in the country that he had become pacifist. The question was, would that make a difference to his life? Initially, the answer was No, as in March 1929 Sheppard (by then, Dean of Canterbury) rejected Housman’s suggestion that they make a tour of the country preaching pacifism. “I am a trifle reluctant to make pacifism my only love,” he said.³¹ Subsequent events would change that decision dramatically.

The Peace Army

Sheppard’s first appearance on a pacifist platform eventually came at the Albert Hall on 19 November 1931, and on that occasion - an Armistice-tide “No More War” rally with George Lansbury, Laurence Housman and Maude Royden amongst the other speakers - his speech so drained him that he suffered an asthmatic attack in public. The press took more notice of his collapse than the content of his speech. Within a few weeks,

however, Sheppard, Royden and the Presbyterian Herbert Gray attracted considerable public scrutiny with a radical proposal for a "Peace Army." Although Gray called Sheppard "Our real leader,"³² the prime mover was Maude Royden.

At the time of Gandhi's visit to the Guildhouse in September 1931, China had just appealed to the League of Nations for assistance against Japanese aggression in Manchuria. C. F. Andrews and Hewlett Johnson were considering a fact-finding mission to China.³³ Royden (who told Sheppard, "I was deeply impressed with Gandhi last night."³⁴) wondered whether she, Sheppard and Gray could do any more about this. Royden could not stand aside from the China-Japan conflict on the grounds that it did not and would not concern the people of Britain. Irrespective of moral considerations, given that the enormity of the Great War had spread from the obscurity of the assassination of the Archduke in Sarajevo, such right-wing claims seemed unreal.³⁵

Gray and Charles Raven, recent converts to pacifism as a result of the Christ and Peace campaign,³⁶ had been consulting for the previous year with Henry Brinton, a pacifist on the staff of the League of Nations Union, who was writing a book about the concept of a "Peace Army."³⁷ Royden recalled her own Great War discovery that the idea of preventing war by going between the combatants unarmed had an ancient pedigree. At the pre-F.O.R. Pimlico gathering of Christian pacifists on 4 December 1914, at which Royden was present, Mary Phillips and Basil Yeaxlee had called for a "peace army."³⁸ At the same time there had been similar appeals in the suffrage circles in which Maude Royden was prominent. In the first week of the war in August 1914 Rosika Schwimmer, a Hungarian journalist living in London, had called for a "Foreign Legion" of women to support "any serious effort organised to urge mediation."³⁹ In October 1914 a wealthy member of the Women's Labour League, Dorothea Hollins, had proposed a thousand strong Women's Peace Expeditionary Force, otherwise known as the Women's International Peace Crusade, to interpose itself between the combatants in the trenches.⁴⁰ At a Church Socialist League meeting in 1915 George Lansbury suggested that wars would cease if unarmed men and women would interpose their bodies between the fighting forces.⁴¹ In her own 1915 booklet *The Great Adventure*, Maude Royden wrote:

We could have called forth the peace-lovers in the world to fling themselves - if need be - in front of the troop trains. If millions of men will go out to offer their lives up in war, surely there are those who would die for peace! And if not men, we could have called out women! It would not be for the first time, nor would they have been slow to respond. There are those who are as ready to die for

peace as any of the millions who with such generous courage go to war. And had they been organised and ready, there would have been no war.⁴²

She also referred to the possibility of a Peace Army in an article she wrote in 1917;⁴³ John A. Hall revived the idea in *Reconciliation* in April 1929;⁴⁴ and in *My Hopes and Fears for the Church*, Sheppard spoke of “the disciples of Christ dying unarmed on the frontier, rather than engaged in killing their brothers” in any future war.⁴⁵ By March 1930 Royden was discussing the idea of enlisting a Peace Army willing to die for Peace, and an Australian correspondent volunteered to join.⁴⁶ She repeated the call at the April 1931 Oxford conference of the Christ and Peace campaign.⁴⁷ She was thus on familiar territory when, following the Japanese invasion of Mukden in 1931, she recruited at the Guildhouse a small group of people to study constructive ways of peacemaking and “to seek to establish the way of Christ as the basis of civilisation,”⁴⁸ such people being consecrated at a Guildhouse service just before Christmas. She had already appealed in a sermon for more active volunteers.⁴⁹ By the end of the following February she was referring to “a small band of people” who had answered that appeal.

Her difficulty was that whereas she had expressed the idea of a non-partizan Peace Army in readiness for any war, she originally had in her mind that such a war would probably involve a nation geographically close to Britain. The Manchurian war was on the other side of the world and no European nation was a protagonist. It would only be possible for a handful of people to afford to journey such a distance and take the necessary risks. Indeed, one legendary incident around this time (March 1932?) recited by Donald Soper, “a story that we cherished” although “it wasn’t very significant at the time ... it didn’t make much of a mark,”⁵⁰ had Royden, Sheppard, Soper himself, Frank Crozier and Herbert Gray setting out on their own to Tilbury Docks to board a ship bound for the Far East, with the ultimate intention of interposing themselves between the belligerents at Chopei.⁵¹ Their lack of progress must have brought back to Royden memories of her abortive attempt to get from Tilbury to The Hague for the Women’s International Congress of April 1915.

As the Manchurian crisis developed into January 1932, Maude Royden contacted Sheppard⁵² and Gray asking them to join her at a fourteenth century cottage owned by her close friend Hudson Shaw, “a little paradise”⁵³ two miles outside Sevenoaks, for a few days retreat in the last week of February. They were “to ask the guidance of God on our actions with regard to the Sino-Japanese War.”⁵⁴ Royden explained their thinking:

We were at a complete loss until the idea came to us that a Peace Army - an army of peacemakers who should place their bodies between the warring forces in Shanghai - was what was wanted. It was an unparalleled opportunity, for the fighting there was not guerilla warfare, nor in the air, nor along a vast front of trenches; it was across a street.... Chinese and Japanese soldiers were facing each other and firing at each other across the streets of Shanghai, and even a few thousand unarmed volunteers would have been seen, would have been effective, and could, by their acceptance of death without resistance, have stirred the conscience of the human race.⁵⁵

The significance of the proposal that emerged was that the unarmed interventionists would not be an independent group of civilians but volunteers from all nations working in a formal capacity on behalf of the League of Nations and under the control of the League. Such action, it was hoped, would relieve the League of the necessity to consider military sanctions. For Royden, the outcome of the Kent retreat brought new light to her wrestling with possible new ways to bring about Far Eastern peace.

And I believe it is the light. It is necessary that we should be faithful to our obligations under the League of Nations. It is necessary, in my opinion, that we should save the League of Nations, for it is the only attempt to organise the world for peace; it is the only really constructive thing that exists in the world for organising peace. It is necessary to save it. And it is also necessary not to go to war!

Let us, therefore, ask the League to send us, unarmed, to the scene of the conflict. It is not one country against another; it is those who believe in spiritual power against those who believe in material force. This is the only issue that is raised to-day. It is a recognition that the supreme need of the world is peace. It is a recognition of the real sufferings of Japan and China. And it is a recognition of the fact that war can never cure them, for it creates more wounds than it heals.⁵⁶

The immediate outcome of the Sevenoaks retreat was the sending of letters to the Secretary General of the League of Nations and to the press signed by Gray, Royden and Sheppard. In that it reflected the first feelings of unease of advocates of the League of Nations, and acknowledged the incompatibility between pacifism and the League's theoretical power to impose armed sanctions, the letter to the press was a portentous statement of the difficulties that would beset the rest of the decade, ultimately leading to the demise of the League and the outbreak of yet another world war.

In view of the present situation in the Far East we desire to express certain convictions. In doing so we represent nobody but ourselves.

First of all, we declare that we can no longer believe that the cold wisdom of this world is equal to the task of making peace, and we refuse to be intimidated by those who tell us to leave the matter to various sets of experts in the several countries. We distrust them as profoundly as they distrust us.

Our own religion compels us to the view that war is wrong, and we believe that this is true of other spiritual religions, with whose followers we desire to co-operate, as well as with all whose convictions lead them to the same conclusion. We have worked for the League of Nations, believing it to be the main hope of a world that must conquer war or perish, and in the faith that through it

international control would become effective. We have never believed that these ends could be accomplished by war, and have hoped that the League of Nations would never employ armed force.

At the present moment, although we pronounce no judgment on the issue between China and Japan, we think it vital that the League of Nations should employ all possible means of constraint - short of killing and the withholding of necessary food - in order to stop the fighting, and that only so can the League be preserved in the respect of mankind, and the real sufferings and grievances both of China and of Japan be considered and remedied.

We believe that these steps would prove effective; but we realised that others believe that they would immediately provoke war. These others may be right, and therefore we are compelled to face the possibility and to ask ourselves what might then be done to save the world.

We have come to the conclusion that the only way which would prove effective in that case is that men and women who believe it to be their duty should volunteer to place themselves unarmed between the combatants.

The natural instinct of man is to call on men only to face this danger, but as we know that already many women are contemplating this action, we make our appeal to men and women alike.

We have at present no organisation behind this proposal, and cannot undertake to answer all correspondence, but we will gladly keep the names and addresses of any who have written to the Secretary General of the League of Nations at Geneva volunteering for this service, and we will keep them informed of any further developments.⁵⁷

Part of the difficulty for the League, in its attitude to war, was as perceived by Maude Royden, the slippery slope of sanctions. There was a series of measures possible for expressing disapproval of a nation's actions: by withdrawing ambassadors, by boycotting arms, refusing loans, extending a boycott to all trade except food, imposing a starvation boycott and finally the taking of military measures to enforce the decisions of the League. The fear was that one step could quickly lead to another if it had no effect and very soon the League would proceed to the final step of war. ("Our idea is that the last step in the chain should be not war but the army of peace."⁵⁸) The intention was that, under the control of the League of Nations, a Peace Army would take the place of military action as the League's final sanction. Being thus freed from the fear of the slippery slope to war, the League could then safely embark on a programme of lesser sanctions, which, it was hoped, would bring an end to the conflict in any case. For Royden, Sheppard and Gray it was a proposal at once practical and an act of faith.

We suggest that, instead of the League finally asking its member States what ships, soldiers, munitions, and aeroplanes they are prepared to send, they should instead ask them how many they could send who are willing to stand unarmed, between the contending forces. Let it, instead of calling for the soldiers of war, call for the soldiers of peace.

If it is able, through its member States, to provide transport, commissariat, means of landing, and so forth for soldiers of war, it can equally provide them for soldiers of peace.

All the difficulties that are raised by everyone who first hears of this proposal are overcome by the project of offering our lives for the service of the League itself. What it can do for warships and guns and for soldiers, it can do for us.

We should volunteer exactly as soldiers do, prepared to obey, to be sent where we were needed. Only, unlike soldiers, we should be unarmed, and we should be pledged neither to attack, to injure, nor to kill.

We believe that such a force would not merely be so many men and women standing between two armies: we believe that it would generate a spiritual power which would make us immeasurably greater than we are. By our acts in life, or by our deaths, we should release into the world a new spirit.⁵⁹

As to who should volunteer, conscience and awareness of one's other responsibilities should be a guide. Children should not go under any circumstances as it is for their sakes that others would be going. Indeed, it would be better to have older rather than younger volunteers.⁶⁰ The first to sign up was a former Grenadier Guardsman, ("A magnificent call. Please enrol me."⁶¹) Within three days there were 320 volunteers including many ex-soldiers, parents whose sons had died in the war, and clergy. On the other hand, the daughters of Sybil Thorndike were rejected when they secretly applied to enrol on the grounds that they were under twenty-one.⁶² Within a month there were over 800 offers of co-operation, and this soon passed the thousand mark, including such well-known names as Oswald Sitwell and Beverley Nichols.⁶³ One volunteer, writing in the *Friend*, spoke of the need to show a courage and a loyalty greater than that of a soldier; it was in line with the decision of Jesus to choose the Cross, he said: "Jesus might have remained away from Jerusalem and continued to preach his doctrine of love till old age, and then the probability is that we should never have heard of him."⁶⁴

Muriel Lester was delighted with those who had signed up to use "the tremendous spiritual weapon of active creative good-will."⁶⁵ Everything considered, the progress was most heartening, especially as Sheppard was more concerned with quality of commitment than with quantity of volunteers. He told the Guild House congregation,

What we want is the most sincere and earnest prayer that this may be used of God. I think we may be tried to our utmost later, and that we shall want all the physical courage that we win from God. Do not persuade people impetuously to come to a decision which it may be difficult for them to hold to later. The movement wants to be very quiet, very simple and very sincere.⁶⁶

The proposal seized the imagination of many, and press response was positive. The *Manchester Guardian* regarded it as "intelligent and apt," and "well worth considering." "Is it really ... more fantastic than the actual fact of war?... That a pacifist army, once ... in position, would ... embarrass the ... belligerents is not to be denied."⁶⁷ The "STARTLING STOP-THE-WAR OFFER" was the front page story in the *News Chronicle*.⁶⁸

Political progress was slower than recruitment. Although Sir Eric Drummond, the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, ensured colossal press coverage by handing out copies of the Gray-Royden-Sheppard letter to the press in Geneva,⁶⁹ he then answered the request to transport the volunteers into the fighting area by saying that only schemes approved by a Government of a Member State could be considered by the League.⁷⁰ ("Moreover," Maude Royden commented later, "we never had more than just over a thousand volunteers and, with so small a number, could not expect the League to take us seriously."⁷¹) A Parliamentary question about the Peace Army on 16 March caught the Foreign Secretary unprepared but the following week Sir John Simon was able to tell the House of Commons that "since there are good grounds for hoping that active hostilities are now at an end, the conditions which inspired the gallant and humanitarian offer of Miss Royden and her co-signatories will not again arise."⁷²

So it transpired. Yet Peace Army activity continued into the early months of 1933: there was a Peace Army Sunday at the Guildhouse, with Royden, Soper and Gray;⁷³ the services of the Peace Army were offered to the Danish Government;⁷⁴ and Royden was engaged in correspondence with her one-time ally Ramsay MacDonald who had moved so far to the right that he now supported aerial "police bombing" and accused Royden of encouraging a Chinese Government which carried considerable responsibility for the situation in the Far East. Royden continued to press him unsuccessfully for an assurance that the Peace Army would be used in any future emergency.⁷⁵

The Peace Army principle was still very much alive when Mussolini started to prepare aggression against Abyssinia. Sheppard consulted with Kingsley Martin, editor of the *New Statesman*, as to whether it would be a good idea for the Peace Army to go to Geneva where the League were discussing starting on the slippery slope of sanctions. Martin's critical response was that it would be better going as tourists to Rome and demonstrating there, even though it would mean certain arrest for some.⁷⁶ Royden later felt that the nature of the fighting in Ethiopia - so unlike the Shanghai street fighting - made intervention in that conflict inappropriate for a Peace Army.⁷⁷

With lack of support for the Peace Army even amongst committed pacifists it was not altogether surprising that the idea soon fell into abeyance. An attempt by Vera Brittain to revive it through the Women's International League in 1934 came to nothing, and it was technically disbanded in June of that year.⁷⁸ Levels of enthusiasm for the original proposal never regained the heights reached in 1932. One volunteer, Joyce Pollard, did try to maintain an embryonic organisation for several more years. She too wrote

unsuccessfully to the League's General Secretary.⁷⁹ At the end of 1935 she was advertising that the original ideals had been maintained ("We believe the League would be enormously strengthened if its final sanction were a peaceful one."⁸⁰) She claimed that Peace Army intervention would have made an effective difference in both Shanghai and Abyssinia, and she advertised that a permanent register was open for those who would like to join a future Peace Army action should the need arise.

Pacifists are constantly challenged as to what alternative to fighting they can offer, and we know that many feel themselves that a refusal to take part in war is not in itself enough. The intervention of a Peace Army would make it possible for peace-loving people to enter war and to use it as an occasion for peacemaking.⁸¹

In 1937 the focus moved to Palestine. Maude Royden outlined the thesis of her book *The Problem of Palestine* at a London Conference organised by the Peace Army in June. In July Joyce Pollard reported that an initial visit to Palestine had shown the need for "a willingness to help whenever opportunities for conciliation and service arise".⁸² There was a request for volunteers from the British peace movement to carry out reconciliation work with Jewish and Arab areas of Palestine.⁸³ From November 1938 a couple of volunteers did begin "positive and adventurous peacemaking" - hardly the scale of operation envisaged in 1932 - and one of those was soon shot in error and fatally wounded.

The Sheppard Pledge

Sheppard wanted to build on the progress that the Peace Army had made in its early months in galvanising those committed to working for peace. He even tried to persuade Lloyd George - no friend of pacifists - to lead what might become a large movement of people concerned at the direction that world affairs were taking in the aftermath of the failing Disarmament Conference. The meeting between the two men in October 1932 left neither impressed, with Sheppard finding Lloyd George "more intellectual" than he had imagined and unwilling to co-operate in the proposed project.⁸⁴ For his part, Sheppard spoke and wrote frequently about his commitment to pacifism, not least in his regular religious column in *Quiver* magazine. He admitted that he had changed his mind since his time in France in 1914: "I believe, now, that war is wholly evil; as a professing Christian, I should have no lot or part in it, unless as an unarmed person standing between combatants in the name of God."⁸⁵ He distinguished between human nature and human conduct and showed how human conduct could be changed, arguing that the urgent case for pacifism was based not on any suggestion that people were

peaceful and war unlikely but on the realisation that people were quarrelsome and war extremely likely unless pacifist behaviour and policies were adopted.⁸⁶

By autumn 1934, Sheppard wanted to have a stronger indication of the strength of pacifist feeling in the country than would be provided by the League of Nations Union's Ballot. In conversation with Frank Crozier, a Brigadier-General who had resigned his commission in protest at the Black and Tan atrocities in Ireland, he suggested sending a letter to the press asking those who would refuse to fight to send a postcard back to that effect. The aim was not to start a new movement, merely to test the strength of public opinion on pacifism in a more helpful way than would be achieved by the Peace Ballot. In September 1934, the same month he accepted a canonry at St. Paul's, and before he went abroad for convalescent purposes, Sheppard wrote the letter. Crozier sent it to the press on 16 October.

The main reason for this letter, primarily addressed to men, is the fresh urgency of the present international situation, and the almost universally acknowledged lunacy of the manner in which nations are pursuing peace.

The situation is far graver than we allow ourselves to acknowledge, and the risks we are running by our present methods far graver than those which a more enlightened policy would involve.

Up to now the Peace Movement has received its main support from women, but it seems high time now that men should throw their weight into the scales against War.

I represent no Church and no peace organisation of any description, but merely, I suggest, the mentality to which the average man has recently arrived without, as it seems, the knowledge of his accredited leaders in Church and State, or, for that matter, without their assistance.

It seems essential to discover whether or not it be true, as we are told, that the majority of thoughtful men in this country are now convinced that war of every kind or for any cause, is not only a denial of Christianity, but a crime against humanity, which is no longer to be permitted by civilised people.

Have we reached that state of belief? I believe that we have, but I am certain that the time has come when we must know if that is a false or true statement.

The idea behind this letter is not to form any fresh organisation, nor to call pacifists together to abuse those who conscientiously are not able to agree with them, but to attempt to discover how strong the will to peace has grown.

For myself, I believe that a vast number of male citizens who do not belong to any peace society and even dislike some of the methods of those who do, are only waiting an opportunity to declare once and for all that they have done with wars of every kind.

Many persons are avowing their determination not to use violence, not only between nations, but within the nations.

An ever-increasing dependence on excessive force is evident in the movements known as Communism and Fascism.

It is time that those men who have not hitherto acted in any public way, but who wish the repudiation of methods of violence, should come into the open.

Would those of my sex who, so far, have been silent, but are of this mind, send a postcard to me within the next fortnight, to say if they are willing to be called together in the near future to vote in support of a resolution as uncompromising as the following:-

We renounce war and never again, directly or indirectly, will we support or sanction another.

If the response to this letter be as large as conceivably it may be, a notice will be sent at the earliest possible moment with full particulars of the day and date on which the demonstration will be made.⁸⁷

The idea of a pledge was not new. As far back as 1847, Elihu Burritt's League of Universal Brotherhood had had something similar, if wordier.⁸⁸ W.R.I. and the N.M.W.M. had taken the same path, and happily reported of people prepared to make such statements as, "I for one will not serve, will not help, will not pay, and am prepared to take the consequences."⁸⁹ Arthur Ponsonby had produced a "Peace Letter" in 1926, to which petitioners subscribed.⁹⁰ By the time of the signing of the Kellogg Pact, 130,000 people had signed this petition to the Prime Minister. A similar document was in circulation in Germany, and in Saxony alone over 200,000 signatures were collected.⁹¹

The principle was endorsed, at least for parishes, by "Five Young Men" who had sparked off pacifist debate in the *Church of England Newspaper* in August 1931. The concept was further taken up in 1933 by Eleanor Barton of the Women's Co-operative Guild;⁹² she issued a Peace Pledge Card committing signatories (a few thousand guildswomen and their friends) to take no part in war or preparations for war.⁹³ In April 1934, signatories of the Manifesto of Christian Pacifist Groups had stated that "Because war is against the character and purpose of God, I will not only take no part in it, I will strive to make it everywhere and always impossible."⁹⁴

In August 1932 Sheppard had been to a peace rally in Amsterdam, called by Einstein and Freud, to the chagrin of the French Government and the League of Nations.⁹⁵ He had come back with Einstein's words echoing in his head: "I appeal to all men and women to declare that they will refuse to give any further assistance to war or the preparations for war. I ask them to tell their Governments in writing."⁹⁶ Sheppard also knew that tentative appeals were being made in the United States. There, leaders of the Christian movement against war invited young men to sign:

I have quietly considered what I would do if my nation should again be drawn into war. I am not taking a pledge, because I do not know what I would do when the heat of the war mood is upon the country. But in a mood of calm consideration I do to-day declare that I cannot reconcile the way of Christ with the practice of war.⁹⁷

Sheppard was particularly receptive to the text of an Armistice Day 1933 sermon, "Apology to the Unknown Soldier," by the New York Minister of the Riverside

Church, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdike. It had ended:

I renounce war for its consequences, for the lies it lives on and propagates, for the undying hatred it arouses, for the dictatorships it puts in the place of democracy, for the starvation that stalks after it. I renounce war and never again, directly or indirectly, will I sanction or support another.⁹⁸

It was upon Fosdike's sermon that the text of the Dick Sheppard Peace Pledge was based. Replies were to be sent to Crozier's address at Walton-on-Thames. Press attitudes to the appeal varied. Some prominent newspapers ignored it altogether; the *Church Times* had one small paragraph, preferring instead to concentrate on the Bishop of Birmingham's attitude to miracles; some other papers carried the letter in full. Would anybody respond? At first Crozier was disappointed as no replies seemed to be forthcoming. Then the village postmaster telephoned to ask what to do with all the sacks of postcards. There were 30,000 cards received in the first few weeks, over 50,000 replies by November, and before long the 100,000 mark was passed. Not only did Sheppard, with his stature, integrity and public standing, have immense appeal but he had acted at the critical psychological moment. From now on, the name of the man who had once been reluctant to make pacifism his only love, was inextricably bound to the pacifist movement in Britain.

In the Wake of the Pledge

By the summer of 1935, international tension had increased with Italy poised to invade Abyssinia, threatening to expose the weaknesses in the League of Nations' illusion of collective security. An invitation was sent out to every signatory of Sheppard's peace pledge to attend an Albert Hall rally on the evening of 14 July. Special invitations were sent out to pacifist clergy who might bring members of their congregation with them.⁹⁹ The organisation of the meeting was dependent financially on "one devoted pacifist and his generosity" whom Sheppard did not name.¹⁰⁰ Although it was nearly nine months since Sheppard's letter to the press, this was the first test of the new movement. On a sweltering Sunday, would there be a few hundred people in the hall or the thousands Sheppard hoped for? - "And then to our amazement and astonishment, young and old men, mostly young, some of them ex-service people, packed into the Hall."¹⁰¹

In the event, over seven thousand men ("who represented over 50,000 others in all parts of England"¹⁰²), many of whom had travelled long distances, attended the rally, sitting in their shirt sleeves owing to the sultry atmosphere. Half those present had been through the last war (there were some blinded ex-soldiers present) and the other half

were young men now eligible to fight.¹⁰³ Sheppard was delighted with the turn out. "Never before have so many men come together to declare their abhorrence of war," he said. In his speech he refused to condemn his opponents, whilst wishing they would see the consequences of the horrific nature of modern warfare.

We are here, not to curse the other fellow who disagrees with us, but to affirm our adherence to our position as pacifists, with courtesy, joy and courage.

'Thou shalt not kill' is perhaps the greatest Christian ethic, but in the matter of peace the Churches have no courage whatsoever. I would say to the Archbishops and the leaders of the Free Churches and to all that if they do not hear the call of God summoning them and their Churches to go completely pacifist, it is because they have left the receiver off.

War is not merely suicidal, futile and damnable, but at all times and in all circumstances contrary to the mind of God and a blasphemous betrayal of the future of man.¹⁰⁴ It is a slayer of the souls of men as well as their bodies.¹⁰⁵

The older he became, Sheppard continued, the more astounded he became, not only at the lack of moral courage in the so-called leading men in Church and State, but at their shattering and abysmal ignorance of what was going forward in the minds and conscience of ordinary people. "Stand fast to the pledge you have taken," he urged the assembled company. "At the moment it may cost you nothing, but it may cost you something you cannot foresee." He declared that there were many more people in step with them than was generally realised, but that they could not bring their campaign to a successful conclusion without some sort of faith - the power of the living God.¹⁰⁶

Other speakers on the platform included Siegfried Sassoon, who read his poetry, and Maude Royden, the only woman in the building and the best speaker on this occasion. She spoke of the causes of war, of the world being divided into the "haves" and the "have-nots." Britain was more prosperous than some other countries, and was amongst the "haves" in the world. Instead of futile discussions about armaments, she suggested, it would be a good deal better if statesmen were to sit down and think out how the wealth of the world could be better distributed. "If we dared to do that," she said, "we need not bother any more about arms. There is enough for all if they will share it." The need was to recruit more people to the cause. "It is when the mass of the people identify themselves with the cause of peace," she added, "that those on top will begin to move."¹⁰⁷

The rally was an undoubted success, and a tremendous boost to the hitherto embryonic pacifist movement. "It was alive, and there was a sense of leadership," wrote one commentator.¹⁰⁸ General Crozier's comment after the event reflected his admiration for Sheppard:

I doubt if there is any other man alive who could, off his own bat and on his own responsibility, almost fill the huge hall with men - for an unpopular cause which was boycotted by the press throughout (with glorious exceptions) and doomed to failure by many false prophets who should have known better and would have known better had they only known their man....

It [pacifism] is a big idea put over by a big man with a big heart. It means nothing less than the conquest of man by himself, the triumph of mind over matter, the practice of three essential modes of life simultaneously: feeling, willing, thinking.¹⁰⁹

The reference to the press had been made during the rally itself, with cries of "Shame" greeting the announcement that no help whatever had been received from large sections of the religious press and the leaders of the Church.¹¹⁰ After the rally they had no choice but to take notice. It had been a triumph, the first of a new movement. The "big man" himself was impressed with the way things had turned out. He told Ponsonby that it was "the most impressive show" he was ever at, not because of the speakers but because of the "astonishingly young and keen" audience.¹¹¹ To Arthur Wragg (who had designed the programme's powerful cover - a sponge of vinegar offered to a Great War soldier on the end of a spear, with the caption "Weep not for me but for yourselves"¹¹²) he admitted that the speaking was nothing to write home about "except Maude Royden," but that hadn't seemed to matter in a meeting characterised by its spirit, determination and its youth ("mostly under 35").¹¹³ There were to be other Albert Hall meetings in the months to come, "but never again one like this, unforgettably inspiring, intensely exciting, and over-whelmingly successful."¹¹⁴ It was following this rally that Sheppard agreed to waive his original objection to starting a new society. With an initial 100,000 members the H. R. L. Sheppard Peace Movement was born.

From that time on, prominent pacifist speakers would be in demand across the country. By Christmas an average of four hundred people a day were signing the pledge, so many in fact that Sheppard worried that they were a "phantom army". As he confided to Laurence Housman, "it seems the tide or the gale of God is with us - blowing almost too strong (too strong to last)."¹¹⁵ The wind continued to blow in the New Year, with Canon Stuart Morris in particular making several outspoken pacifist radio broadcasts. The pledge was opened to women, whom Sheppard had always assumed would be naturally opposed to war. The feminist writer Vera Brittain, best known for her personal account of 1914-1918, *Testament of Youth*, was one of many converts from the League of Nations Union, in Brittain's case the result of being transfixed by the power of Sheppard's witness at a Dorchester rally in June 1936.

The Founding of the Peace Pledge Union

During that summer of 1936, not only was a new pacifist newspaper *Peace News* launched, but also it was announced that the idea that H. R. L. Sheppard's Peace Movement was a personal possession of a Canon of St. Paul's needed to come to an end. There would be a change of name to the Peace Pledge Union. Up until that time, Sheppard had run the movement in the paternalistic way that some clergy ran their parish. He now hoped that both the name change and also the appointment of famous Sponsors would dispel the idea that it was his movement alone.

The intention of the newly-named campaign would be to obtain "not only the signatures of a million citizens of both sexes to renounce all war," wrote Sheppard, "but the gathering of the keenest of these into groups throughout the country, that they may train themselves locally in the technique of non-violence."¹¹⁶ The development of the movement he foresaw on the lines he had indicated the previous year in his book *We Say "No"*. Then he had advocated the concept of "a great Peace Circus," which would travel not only across Britain but around the world giving great gatherings of people the opportunity to listen to the message of peace and to sing the songs of peace. Sheppard admitted it was only a dream, but dreams had been known to change the world. He envisaged holding traditional marches and demonstrations that would be like advertisements, rather as an old-fashioned circus advertised itself by a parade in the town where it pitched its tent. "But the essence of the Peace Circus," said Sheppard, "as I see it in my dream, would be Personality."¹¹⁷ By which he meant the involvement of "certain men and women whose names are household words, who are recognized, throughout the world, as leaders in their own particular sphere of thought and activity,"¹¹⁸ especially those prepared to abandon the work they were doing in order to dedicate themselves to saving civilization. He wanted the famous to say,

We are dedicating ourselves, therefore, to the cause of Peace. We are embarking on a crusade to open men's eyes to the folly and wickedness of war. It is the only way in which we can ensure that all our effort, all our achievement in the past - and all the effort and achievement of the others who have gone before us, and whose work we continue - shall not be wasted.¹¹⁹

Sheppard envisaged the coming together of such an unlikely group as Einstein, Wells, Russell, Gandhi, Tagore and others, alongside such campaigners as Royden, Ponsonby, Lansbury, Milne and Gray. Perhaps Shaw and Chesterton, and even Lloyd George could be persuaded to join them. Then there were Church leaders. Sheppard mused, somewhat fancifully:

I would like to see the Archbishop of Canterbury on the same platform as Einstein and Lloyd George and Gandhi, proclaiming the world's need for Peace, vowing himself to Peace. I should like to see all the Churches, setting aside their differences of rite and dogma and government, joining to declare their unalterable opposition to war, their allegiance to the Prince of Peace. Because I am an Anglican, I want the Church of England to take a foremost part in this.¹²⁰

The Church of Rome, with its world wide influence, could play an even bigger part, thought Sheppard. Perhaps the Pope himself could lead a new Peace Crusade. There were also the opportunities that could come from using the mass media (Sheppard's broadcasting experience meant he was well aware of the impact of the media, that it transcended national boundaries and could be used to spread ideas of peace.¹²¹) Peace films could be made - maybe Charlie Chaplin could help? - and there could be greater involvement with the Press.

In so far as we create a public opinion which repudiates war and pursues Peace, we must influence the Press in the same direction. And public and Press together will influence Parliament.

That is why I believe that this idea of the Peace Circus is an important one, that it holds out a new hope to Humanity.¹²²

The Peace Pledge Union was to be based upon Sheppard's dream of the Peace Circus. His hope of involving the influential and the famous was achieved by the appointment of Sponsors. The Sponsors were chosen as "representing all kinds of hundred per cent pacifism, and not just the Christian, or even the religious element alone." Sheppard added, "We have no use for the 95% pacifist!"¹²³ The appointment of Sponsors was typical of the way in which Sheppard worked. On the one hand it was undoubtedly paternalistic, keeping him in control, and allowing - as yet - no scope for democracy within the movement. On the other hand it was a brilliant stroke of imagination, using the best contacts he had built up over the years, particularly in the influential world of literature and art. The list of Sponsors read like a *Who's Who* of British culture. If Sheppard wanted to show that people from the widest cross-section of society would be welcome in the P.P.U., the names of the Sponsors conveyed his message exactly. Although he was himself a man of great faith, he had listened to and understood those who could not relate to Christianity, and was inviting pacifists from any background to unite in this crusade against war. Rose Macaulay said Sheppard

had a gift for running a mixed team, and a very mixed team his Peace Pledge Union members were.... [H]e was probably the only person who understood all their various points of view and angles of approach. A Christian [pacifist] himself, ... so far from regarding this as the only creditable or genuine approach, he said that it made pacifism simple and easy for him, as compared

with that of his non-Christian friends.¹²⁴

The first “mixed team” of Sponsors were Storm Jameson, Ellen Wilkinson, Frank Crozier, James Hudson, Aldous Huxley, George Lansbury, Arthur Ponsonby, Charles Raven, Siegfried Sassoon, Donald Soper, and Arthur Wragg.¹²⁵ They would soon be joined by Vera Brittain, Ursula Roberts, Maude Royden, Runham Brown, Eric Gill, Herbert Gray, Gerald Heard, Laurence Housman, Stuart Morris, and John Middleton Murry.¹²⁶ There was general approval for Sheppard’s approach, with the only criticism of his policy coming from Maude Royden, who thought that such a group was too intellectual, in need of more passion.¹²⁷ The Sponsors met together regularly, if casually (there was no official secretary, treasurer or chairman of the group at the beginning, although Sheppard himself would chair) to direct the affairs of the P.P.U. from rented premises in Grand Buildings, overlooking Trafalgar Square. The P.P.U.’s first Secretary was Margery Rayne, who had to process pledges arriving at the rate of 200 a day. Ursula Roberts found those early meetings unforgettable: “There was a warmth of fellowship and a frequent ripple of mirth - most of it, of course, deriving from “Dick’s” amazing love, wisdom, and humour, that was a boon for ever.”¹²⁸

Another indication of Sheppard’s style came from Max Plowman, who became the Secretary of the P.P.U. Of one meeting in Amen Court with Macaulay, Heard, Wilkinson, Kingsley Martin and others, he wrote (with not the most appropriate choice of metaphors):

Crozier was there. Sheppard spoke his bit near the end, and I was awfully pleased with him. His simplicity and sincerity really carry the guns that are going to count when the firing begins. It’s always the way. The man who knows something out of his own experience knows something which makes the finest and wisest opinion look shadowy. And with all his obvious faults, Dick Sheppard is a truly devoted soul, who is ready to go down before the truth every time he sees it.¹²⁹

In a meditation on Jesus on the Cross, written for a symposium compiled by P.P.U. Sponsor Gerald Heard, Sheppard himself saw his colleagues in apostolic terms.

The world has not changed very much since His day, and the rate of its progress in peace-making compels us to believe that there is room for a little company who will try and take their Lord and Master seriously. God’s fools let us call them, if we wish. We shall go on bumping from one catastrophe to another until Christ’s Royal Way of loving men into penitence is attempted....¹³⁰

On 2 September George Lansbury wrote Sheppard a birthday note of appreciation. “Somewhere sometime,” he said, “ the cause of Peace you are striving to serve will

triumph. Truth is Truth & cannot be overcome by error.”¹³¹

The P.P.U. in Action

There was certainly no chance of it being overcome through lack of effort. Later in September, Stuart Morris, already a Sponsor of the Peace Pledge Union, having been proposed by Arthur Wragg and seconded by Arthur Ponsonby, was asked to become the P.P.U.’s Travelling Secretary. He resigned his parish, but with the goodwill of the pacifist Bishop Barnes he retained his Canonry and some diocesan work in Birmingham.¹³² Support for pacifism elsewhere within the Church of England was so lukewarm that Sheppard even considered following Morris’ example of resignation. He not only expressed his concern from the pulpit of St. Paul’s but asked Max Plowman, a religious seeker close to the fringes of the Church, whether he too “ought to come out of the Church.” Plowman initially thought the question was a joke, but then he recognised that Sheppard was serious. His reply was highly affirmative of Sheppard, and reflected the evangelistic appeal of the Christian pacifists’ stand. As Plowman later told Geoffrey West,

I said that I knew of only two men who I thought might be said to have “Kept the Divine Vision in the day of trouble” & they were Dick Sheppard & George Lansbury, & both of them were in the Church of England! So the question might as lief be asked should we come *in*, or they *out*?¹³³

Sheppard resolved to stay and to work for pacifism from within the Church of England. By the New Year he was taking part in a hectic round of campaigning for the P.P.U. In a packed three weeks of engagements from Dundee to Southampton, Sheppard had fifteen bookings, Morris nine, with other speakers including Vera Brittain (speaking for the first time on a P.P.U. platform), Bertrand Russell, Mary Gamble, Charles Raven (about to consider the issue of pacifism and Officers’ Training Corps, on behalf of the P.P.U.¹³⁴) and Canon Denis Fletcher from Manchester.¹³⁵ Even though Sheppard contracted influenza and Morris scarlet fever (which Brittain at one point also thought she had gone down with), causing them to miss various of their engagements, the campaign was adjudged to have been a success.¹³⁶ One “quietly convincing” meeting was held in Oxford Place Chapel, Leeds, on 20 January. The chair was taken by the Vicar of St. George’s, Leeds, P. Don Robins, who was the local P.P.U. group leader. One of the audience of more than six hundred people reported that Robins “put the position with the calmness of absolute sincerity.” Crozier, Mumford and Ruth Fry were the other speakers.¹³⁷

The rejection of pacifism by the Church Assembly in February was followed by a P.P.U. rally in atrocious weather in Hyde Park. Sheppard, Morris and Brittain were among the speakers struggling to be heard above the conditions. Sheppard's message was simple: "I deny absolutely the right of the Archbishop of York or the Bishop of London to say a Christian has a right to kill. If what they say is right, then the Sermon on the Mount is not the word of God and we should tear it out of our New Testaments and have done with it."¹³⁸ Soon after the rally, Sheppard asked the principal speakers and others to contribute to a new symposium, *Let Us Honour Peace*. Morris, Brittain and the others continued to speak at numerous meetings, while Sheppard's popularity was such that he could take his arguments in writing to the most unlikely quarters. He expanded on the Evensong versicle "Give peace in our time, O Lord," for the *Modern Woman* magazine.¹³⁹ He even argued for pacifism in the regular column he was permitted to have in the otherwise right-wing *Sunday Express*.¹⁴⁰

In March 1937, swallowing its reservations about the "bourgeois pacifism" of Sheppard's more middle-class and less democratic organisation (whose simple pledge omitted any commitment to work politically to transform society and remove the causes of war - as indeed did their own original pledge) the older No More War Movement agreed to merge with the Peace Pledge Union.¹⁴¹ The link was reinforced later in the year when Lansbury and Sheppard were appointed to key positions in War Resisters International.

Swanwick, August 1937

By the summer of 1937 the Peace Pledge Union was an extremely effective campaigning organisation. It could attract thousands of people to its public meetings, there were local groups in all corners of the country, the leadership had regular access to the radio airwaves and both men and women were being attracted to the pledge to renounce war. As yet, however, there had been no attempt to bring together grass-roots members from across the country, to bond and to inspire, to learn and to organise. Such was the purpose of the first P.P.U. Summer Camp at Swanwick, from 30 July to 6 August 1937.

There were high expectations for the camp, with the likelihood that all of the P.P.U.'s sponsors would attend. There would be "extremely important and valuable" opportunities for comradeship. Sheppard even predicted that the camp "might be the making of our movement."¹⁴² For the 270 members who attended, it did indeed prove to be a unique experience, something of a refreshing oasis in an anxious world. "[T]he

stories differ, as stories do," wrote one commentator, "but there is an extraordinary sense of something happening that was like a kind of miracle."¹⁴³ When asked, "What made it so extraordinarily inspiring, so revolutionary?" another replied that "the answer of every camper was 'Dick'".¹⁴⁴

Despite his poor health (an asthma attack forced him to curtail a Sunday evening answer to a question about his attitude to the Church) and despite recent personal difficulties and loneliness, Sheppard was in fine form at Swanwick. He made no set speech himself, but he was the host of the entire gathering, holding it all together; he was "the life and soul of the camp and saw to it that no-one had a dull moment."¹⁴⁵ He radiated high spirits, motivating people with praise. He was available for any who might need pastoral counselling, and encouraged everyone with his infectious humour and laughter. Thus, there was a vegetarians versus carnivores cricket match,¹⁴⁶ and on one occasion Sheppard and Crozier exchanged rôles, with Sheppard donning a white moustache and war medals and Crozier taking on a walking stick and respirator.¹⁴⁷

On the Sunday morning, 1 August, there was an Anglican communion. The major preacher of the day, one of the principal organisers of the camp, was not present at that service, and did not actually arrive at the camp until the following day. He was however heard by everyone gathered together that evening, as his radio broadcast sermon from Birmingham was relayed to the campers. Stuart Morris, according to Max Plowman, was "genuinely impressive ... at his *very* best."¹⁴⁸ Later in the camp, Murry's lecture on "God and the Nation" was complex, but those who heard it found it "really profound."¹⁴⁹ Murry introduced his own romantic conception of the village-community, gathered around the parish church, with the priest as "the father of his parishioners, their guide, philosopher, and friend," a rôle that he was (temporarily) contemplating for himself. He predicted that the betraying Church would die and be reborn, such rebirth coming, he anticipated, through the revival of the village community.¹⁵⁰ One of the outcomes of the Swanwick camp was a decision by a number of those present to establish the foundations of a pacifist community.¹⁵¹ It was a decisive step in what was to become an important dimension in the next, wartime, phase of pacifist experience in Britain.

After the bustle and activity of the P.P.U.'s first year, the spirit of fellowship experienced by the camp was highlighted by Sheppard's suggestion on the final night, when all were assembled around the camp fire, that there should be a moment of silence and stillness. When all had absorbed the nature of the experience that so many different

and varied people had shared together, Sheppard said quietly, "That is unity."¹⁵² One week later he wrote, "camp was the most worthwhile experience of my life."¹⁵³ Plowman agreed that it was "a huge success."¹⁵⁴

Glasgow

The highlight of the following Autumn, though it all too rapidly proved to be something of a false dawn, was the election of the Lord Rector of Glasgow University by members of the University. That October there were four candidates: Churchill, Dixon, Haldane and Dick Sheppard, who had been awarded an honorary doctorate by the University some ten years earlier. The leaders of the principal political parties had assumed that the contest would be won either by the Tory, Winston Churchill, or by the Nationalist, Macneile Dixon. According to the rules for the election, the candidates themselves were not allowed to campaign, but that did not prevent their supporters making public appeals to influence the student electors. George MacLeod, C. E. M. Joad, Aldous Huxley, Middleton Murry and Rose Macaulay all spoke on Sheppard's behalf, the latter needing to be rescued from kidnapping and paper bombs. Laurence Housman and Bertrand Russell sent messages of support.¹⁵⁵ Pacifist students paraded through the city wearing sandwich boards adorned with Arthur Wragg's posters. Sheppard's campaign was masterminded by Andrew Stewart, who tried hard to ensure that all support for Sheppard was a genuine expression of support for pacifism, and not a hollow sham. Thus, it was all the more gratifying when the surprising but conclusive result was announced on 23 October that Sheppard was the clear winner with 538 votes. A late nationalist surge had succeeded merely in relegating the far-right candidate, Churchill, into a poor third place with 281 votes, ahead of Haldane on 220, but behind Dixon on 364.¹⁵⁶ Stewart was delighted. He complimented Sheppard on being an inspiration: "His fine personality symbolized all we stood for and his victory has been so popular that when he comes North to deliver his Rectorial address he is certain to receive a tumultuous welcome."¹⁵⁷ Stewart also commented that "in the first contest between the old, discredited policies and this novel approach to peace, pacifism has emerged triumphant."¹⁵⁸ The accuracy of such an analysis was acknowledged by the often sceptical national press:

Canon Sheppard's election as Lord Rector of Glasgow University is a symptom, or a portent; a reminder of the enormous revulsion against war and warlike ideas in this country - particularly amongst the young.¹⁵⁹

[Sheppard's] election as Rector of Glasgow University ... was a tribute from the young to a man who had never lost the hopes of his youth or let them make

compromise with hard reality.¹⁶⁰

Sheppard's own comment was that

The pacifist candidate was elected because the people who were courageous enough to record their vote had come to this conclusion, which is the conclusion of the Peace Pledge Union - that war is futile, that there is another way.¹⁶¹

The immediate consequence of the election was that pacifism was seen to be at its highest point, both numerically to date and in terms of morale. At a time when much of the press was deliberately ignoring pacifists and refusing to report their vast public meetings,¹⁶² Sheppard's election, in his words, definitely "put pacifism on the map."¹⁶³ This was arguably the pacifist movement's, and Sheppard's, finest hour. A vast number of congratulatory telegrams, postcards and letters were soon showered upon Sheppard. Laurence Housman, who had originally advised Sheppard not to stand, for fear of exposing a numerical weakness, exclaimed, "Thank God, my timid counsels were not regarded!" adding, "Is *L'audace, et l'audace, et toujours l'audace* henceforth to be our policy?"¹⁶⁴ George MacLeod told Sheppard to "Read Psalm 29 and apply to Rome for immediate canonisation." Lansbury rejoiced at the glorious news: "This is a great sign of youth's revolt against barbarism and resolve to follow advice of Christ to fight evil with good. God bless and strengthen you."¹⁶⁵ Vera Brittain, on a speaking tour of the United States, cabled her congratulations from St. Louis.¹⁶⁶ Sheppard's next public meeting, at Wellingborough, was filled to overflowing, with twelve hundred people in the local theatre to hear him and Morris, and a further nine hundred in the cinema.¹⁶⁷ "Something has happened within the last three weeks," claimed Sheppard, opening an enormous post-bag from people who admitted they were moving towards pacifism; "A change is coming."¹⁶⁸ The change that came, however, was not the one expected. The sense of euphoria was to be short-lived. On 26 October Sheppard commented, "*Now* it doesn't matter if I die this week."¹⁶⁹ He did.

The Last Day

On the morning of Saturday 30 October, there was a Chapter meeting at St. Paul's, where, to Sheppard's delight, it was agreed that members of the P.P.U. could celebrate the Eucharist in the crypt once a week.¹⁷⁰ Given the internal politics of the Cathedral, this was a major triumph for Sheppard, and helped to renew his faith in the Church in general and St. Paul's in particular. He immediately contacted a Quaker friend and invited him and others to partake of the elements; for Sheppard it was the sense of united worship that really mattered.¹⁷¹ The weekly Eucharist at St. Paul's came to be

regularly conducted by Paul Gliddon, and was greatly valued by the few who attended.¹⁷²

Back at his home, there were matters both private and public for Sheppard to consider. He had a sermon on pacifism to prepare for St. Paul's for the following day. Alison, his wife, who had just come to the end of a failed affair, was pleading for a reconciliation, and he agreed to talk with her after that service. For all their disagreements, he still valued his long-standing friendship with Lang, whose birthday was also the following day; there was the sending of flowers to arrange. He had invited Ursula Roberts to see him concerning the future of her tiring husband. It was possible that Sheppard might be able to influence those in positions of authority to offer an appropriate parish to W. C. Roberts. She reported that Sheppard would not countenance her suggestion that she was a burden to him:

He would take no refusal, because he knew that he could help, and if he could help he would always make time, however bad his asthma or however urgent the larger claims of his calling. I found him on the telephone speaking to George Lansbury. When he rang off - making profuse apologies for keeping me, a nobody, waiting a moment, and meaning them - he was jubilant. He had been telling Lansbury about yet another indication of "the landslide." This time the movement was in the ecclesiastical world. The circumstances ... had cheered and delighted him beyond measure.¹⁷³

Letters written by the exhausted Sheppard were found on his desk next day. So was his body. Doubtless gasping for air, he died of heart-failure in the early hours of 31 October 1937. The passing of the man marked the passing of an era.

One hundred thousand people paid their respects to Sheppard as his body returned "home" to St. Martin's. His funeral, on 4 November, was broadcast on the B.B.C. and four-deep crowds lined the street from Trafalgar Square to St. Paul's for the funeral procession. Policemen saluted and boatmen on the Thames removed their hats.¹⁷⁴ Tributes poured in, including one from Gandhi who called Sheppard's death a "sad blow" and asked for sympathy to be conveyed to "all who came under his magnetic influence."¹⁷⁵

"This Movement will stand without me," Sheppard had told a companion, shortly before he died. "We have it within us to be his greatest memorial," said Stuart Morris to a packed Albert Hall soon afterwards.¹⁷⁶

Whether Dick is lost to us or not depends upon how far we have really caught his spirit and are prepared to make the P.P.U. the body which will enshrine that

spirit as surely as the body which he has now laid on one side has been the instrument through which his love for all men everywhere was able to express itself.¹⁷⁷

The press statement issued by the P.P.U. spoke of the movement being “overwhelmed with grief at the news of its founder’s death,” but being committed to going “forward with redoubled vigour in fulfilment of the conviction he so strongly held and often expressed.”¹⁷⁸ The immediate reaction to Sheppard’s death by the Sponsors and the Executive of the P.P.U., those with responsibility for making the P.P.U. into Sheppard’s “greatest memorial,” was that “Canon Morris must play an increasingly important part in the work of the Union.”¹⁷⁹ The Extraordinary Meeting of the P.P.U. Executive Committee on 8 November 1937 asked Morris to take over from Sheppard. This was awkward for Morris as he had just been offered the post of Archdeacon of Birmingham by Bishop Barnes. There was no way even his present P.P.U. commitments could be combined with that post, let alone the extra demands being proposed. The Executive decided, after a lengthy discussion, that Morris should write to Raven and the Raven should approach the Archbishop of Canterbury on this matter, and that the P.P.U. should offer Morris a full salary and engage his services for the next year. By 1 December Morris was telling the P.P.U. Sponsors that he would probably decline the Birmingham position and accept the P.P.U. offer.

One Anglican reader of *Peace News* who was stirred by Sheppard’s death was Ronald Mallone. He wrote that Sheppard would not want his passing to be mourned, but rather

wishes us to carry on where he left off, at the moment of Glasgow triumph. His life and death is a challenge to every one of us to work harder than ever. If only we can each be one hundredth as enthusiastic, hard working, and inspiring as Dick Sheppard, England will become pacifist... That is a challenge to all of us to give every possible moment, every penny, and every ounce of our energy to pacifism. We, and especially those of us who are young, must write, speak, and work for peace with redoubled zeal, striving always to attain the lofty standard that our leader set us.¹⁸⁰

For campaigning Anglican pacifists, 1937 ended with mixed feelings of apprehension and hope. There was the commitment to continue along the path that Sheppard had marked out, but combined with that commitment was the realisation that without Sheppard, the movement’s greatest asset, the task would be hard indeed. Morris and the others gave their all, but something of the heart had been taken out of the pacifist movement with Sheppard’s death, and the new era would not be half as hopeful as the one that had ended on 31 October 1937.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF A CAMPAIGN: ENDNOTES

1. Cited in Rigby, p31. From 1923 the M.T.C.I. changed its name to the International Fellowship of Reconciliation. Thomas Attlee was an Anglican in the F.O.R. delegation to the Bilthoven conference.
2. Anet, chs.5,6. In Britain, S.C.I. was known as the International Voluntary Service, following the first British workcamp at Brynmawr, Wales, in 1931. (Perry, *50 Years of Workcamps*, p5,6.)
3. PACO (the Esperanto word for peace, pronounced 'pahtso') soon changed its name to War Resisters International. The PACO membership pledge was that "War is a crime against humanity: I therefore am determined not to support any kind of war, and to strive for the removal of all causes of war." (Rigby, p37,38.)
4. Chamberlain, *Fighting for Peace*. Hastings Russell, Marquis of Tavistock, was denounced by his aristocratic family when he rejected a position in the Grenadier Guards. During the First World War he and his wife ran the canteen at the Portsmouth Y.M.C.A. At various times he was active in the Prisoners' Aid Society, the Student Christian Movement and on the committee of C.O.P.E.C. Attracted by the ideas of Douglas Social Credit, he campaigned as strongly for that cause as for pacifism. For many, the impression of a benign eccentric was to be tempered by his naïve association in later years with those linked with the political far-right.
5. Rejected by the F.O.R. General Committee in April 1929. Wallis, p56,57.
6. Wallis, p76.
7. The brief for the Mission would be that:
 - (1) the Church should be urged to withdraw its support, hitherto practically taken for granted, from the institution of war.
 - (2) it should seek definitely to turn its members' interests and energy towards the support and development of the institution of peace so as to bring a positive and efficient Christian contribution to help the cause of peace.
 - (3) it should have regard to specific cases of international disturbance and conflict and foster Christian interests in efforts to promote good-feeling and reconciliation.
 - (4) it should appeal to sister churches throughout the world to co-operate in a common movement towards identifying Christianity with the cause of peace.
 (Wallis, p55,56.)
8. Though not without reservations about being aligned with "extreme and cantankerous pacifism". (den Boggende, p361.)
9. Wallis, p57,58.
10. Wallis, p58.
11. *Reconciliation*, March 1930, p52.
12. *Reconciliation*, May 1930, p88,89.
13. den Boggende, p362, 363.

14. den Boggende, p363.
15. Notably Dr. Garvie. den Boggende, p366.
16. Chairman of the International Association of Anti-militarist Clergymen, from the University of Leyden, Heering had recently published his anti-militarist philosophy in *The Fall of Christianity*.
17. Conference Report. See also *Reconciliation*, May 1931, p336. Other reports describe Heering rather as President of the Inter-Denominational Union of Anti-Militarists, Ministers and Clergymen; *Church Times*, 6 March 1931, p295. A further list is in den Boggende, p364 and note.
18. Christ and Peace Executive, 28 January 1931.
19. *Reconciliation*, June 1931, p347.
20. Conference Report.
21. *Christ and Peace* Convention report, F.O.R. papers.
22. In the summer of 1923 there were discussions between Sheppard and John Reith at the B.B.C. about the regular broadcasting of church services. It was a delicate issue, as some felt that radio religion would stop people going out to their own churches. An unsuccessful resolution was put before Convocation to ban the broadcasting of religious services. One critic even complained that a man might listen to a church service in a pub, with his hat on - the kind of argument more likely to persuade Sheppard than to dissuade him. (Carolyn Scott, p129.) Neither Westminster Abbey or St. Paul's were prepared to be first, so St. Martin's was chosen. Before that could be put into effect, Sheppard made an unscheduled religious broadcast on eight different radio stations. He had arranged for a "National Call to Righteousness" service on Armistice Day 1923 in Trafalgar Square. Speakers were to include the Prime Minister, Baldwin, various colonial Prime Ministers and Viscount Grey (who had become famous for his 1914 comment, "the lamps are going out all over Europe"). At the last moment Baldwin and Grey withdrew. Sheppard immediately stepped in, cancelling the other speakers and taking the entire service himself. (Carolyn Scott, p120,121.) It was the first religious meeting in the Square, and the first such meeting to be broadcast. (R. Ellis Roberts, p103.) The first broadcast service from St. Martin's was the 6.15p.m. on Epiphany Sunday, 6 January 1924. It was designed by Sheppard, for whom the unity of the Church was immensely important, to be as acceptable to Nonconformists as to Anglicans. He subsequently invited at least two Free Churchmen to occupy the pulpit each year. A later time (8.15p.m.) was chosen (to prevent a clash with other services) for the regular monthly broadcasts which started on 13 April. The one negative consequence of it all, for someone obsessed with conscientious work, was that Sheppard needed to stay up two whole nights each week answering correspondence that followed each broadcast. Sheppard's voice, his skillful sermons and his straightforward message soon became known across the entire country. No bishop or archbishop could approach him in terms of popular appeal. Rose Macaulay spoke of one of his broadcasts as being "quite the best sermon I have ever heard, very stirring and keen." She said that "He really did make goodness sound like an urgent and desperately important job to be tackled." (Carolyn Scott, p220.)
23. Cited in Carolyn Scott, p140.
24. R. Ellis Roberts, p 145.

25. Carolyn Scott, p141,142.
26. Carolyn Scott, p142. Ponsonby's campaign, launched in October 1925, was based on a peace letter, getting people's signatures for a refusal to fight. It may be seen as a forerunner of Sheppard's own pledge.
27. R. Ellis Roberts, p164.
28. *We Say "No"*, p1.
29. *Tribunal*, 8 November 1917.
30. Lansbury to Sheppard, 18 December 1916, Richardson papers.
31. Sheppard to Housman, 12 March 1929. *What Can We Believe?*, p139.
32. *Reconciliation*, April 1932, p75. On 26 May 1932, Royden asked Sheppard if he would let his name be the most prominent on the Peace Army notepaper, ahead of Raven, Crozier, Soper, Gray and herself. (Royden to Sheppard, 26 May 1932. Richardson papers.) Gray and Sheppard knew each other well, having both been Vice-Chairmen of the Christ and Peace campaign. Sheppard had caused an ecclesiastical storm in May 1931 by concelebrating the Eucharist with Gray in Crouch End Presbyterian Church, preaching on the Church's need for "amiable anarchists." (*Church Times*, 8 May 1931, p574; *Church of England Newspaper*, 8 May 1931, p12.)
33. Hughes, *The Red Dean*, p68-73. Hewlett Johnson left for China in February 1932, returning to Britain in July.
34. Royden to Sheppard, 24 September 1931. Richardson papers.
35. "It is almost incomprehensible that anyone should think that the path of safety (disregarding for the moment the question of honour) lies in allowing China and Japan to go on fighting, in the belief that it need not and will not involve the rest of the world.
But then what? Are we who love peace and whose hope it has been to see armaments diminish and war finally abolished - are we to stump the country calling for war? Are we driven into so paradoxical a position that, while the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Express* speak for peace, we, who have devoted our whole lives to peace, must now begin to clamour for war?" (*The Peace Army*, A Sermon by Maude Royden.)
36. Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p93.
37. Henry Brinton, *The Peace Army*, p10. Royden had worked with Raven and Gray in the inter-denominational - but largely Anglican - Society for the Ministry of Women; they were both prominent members and she was the President. (Fletcher, p252.)
38. den Boggende, *The Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1914-1945*, p70. The concept was approved at the founding meeting of the F.O.R. later that month. (den Boggende, p77.)
39. *Pall Mall Gazette*, cited in Anne Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women*, p8.
40. Hollins wrote in *Women's Dreadnought*, the journal of Sylvia Pankhurst's East London Federation of Suffragettes: "Let this unarmed force ... attempt to cross Europe in the teeth of the guns ... dressed in

a quiet grey uniform, and carrying a white banner whose symbol should be a dove....

When thousands of men are dying for their country in a cause they understand little of, ... cannot we women lay down our lives for a mighty cause?... The Women's Crusade must be *international*.... Let us get French, Belgian, American and even German women to join us if we can." (Cited in Jill Liddington, *The Long Road To Greenham*, p91.)

41. Alan Wilkinson, *Dissent or Conform?*, p119.

42. Maude Royden, *The Great Adventure*, p6.

43. *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, 18 March 1917, p7. Cited in den Boggende, p388.

44. Cited in den Boggende, p372.

45. *My Hopes and Fears for the Church*, p14.

46. Cited in Fletcher, p258-9.

47. den Boggende, p372.

48. *Guildhouse Monthly*, December 1932 (re. Christmas 1931). Cited in Fletcher, p259.

49. "I would like now to enrol people who would be ready if war should break out to put their bodies unarmed between the contending forces, in whatever way it be found possible - and there are ways you do not think of now in which it would be possible." (*New World*, November 1931. Cited in Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945*, p94.)

50. Soper in conversation with CB, 18 October 1992.

51. William Purcell, *Odd Man Out*, p124-5.

52. Royden to Sheppard, 27 January 1932. Richardson papers.

53. Royden to Sheppard, cited in Fletcher, p262.

54. Maude Royden in Paxton (ed.), *Dick Sheppard: Apostle of Brotherhood*, p76. "They made a strange threesome, fiery, infirm and idealistic, convinced that Dick was right when he dismissed the creed of Collective Security as meaning that if war came, everyone would be in it. A small raised garden overlooked thirty miles of Weald, and from it, the wide horizons of a new Peace Army were born." Carolyn Scott, *Dick Sheppard: A Biography*, p190.

55. Maude Royden in Paxton (ed.), *Dick Sheppard: Apostle of Brotherhood*, p76-7. Royden later recounted the tension of their retreat, as the proposers themselves faced up to the decision they might also ask others to take: "I shall never forget Dick Sheppard's words or tone when, realizing what his death must mean to those who depended on him materially or spiritually, Herbert Gray and I urged him not to volunteer himself. He went out of the room for a time and, when he came back, he said that he must go. He added, half under his breath: 'The cup that my Father gave me shall I not drink it?'" (Maude Royden in Paxton, ed., *Dick Sheppard: Apostle of Brotherhood*, p78.)

56. *The Peace Army*, A Sermon by Maude Royden, 28 February 1932.

57. *Manchester Guardian*, 26 February 1932. For his part, Gray hoped that the Peace Army might have an evangelistic effect on the peace movement: "Thousands who have held themselves aloof from the peace movement, because it seemed to them a poor and negative affair, will probably be found eager to render positive service, if only the chance can be offered them. And we believe that the sacrifices demanded by the cause of peace will be found not less than those demanded by war. It would seem to me that so great an evil as war cannot possibly be overcome unless those who wish for peace are at least willing to rise to the level of the hundreds of thousands of brave men who in the last war went gladly and proudly to death in the faith that through that war, war would be ended. The method which was employed in their case failed. Another method may succeed, but not at a lesser price.

It is time that Christians showed in some fresh and adventurous way that the power of action has not wholly deserted us.... It is time that a mobile Christian force should come into existence ready to be sent anywhere and to express by its united action the faith that goodwill is a stronger thing than military power, and that the methods of peace are the only roads to justice and the common good." (*Reconciliation*, April 1932, p75.)

The ever-practical Royden realised that the involvement of the League would solve the considerable transportation problems faced by the volunteers: "A good many people had been thinking for a long time about some such idea, but the difficulty of getting to the war zone seemed insurmountable. Private individuals could not organize or finance such a scheme. Suddenly a ray of light came to us, and we saw that as it is really the existence of the League of Nations as an effective force that is at stake it was up to the League to get us there." (*Manchester Guardian*, 27 February 1932.)

58. Maude Royden in *Manchester Guardian*, 27 February 1932. Without any new initiative there remained a reluctance in many quarters to consider taking any steps at all that might produce war: "Now it is most natural that people should hesitate to take even the first step along a path which may lead to that conclusion. The nations of the world are in no position to go to war. Their economic position alone would make such an act almost suicidal. A world that has been through war is not prepared to go through it again while its dreadful memory lasts.

But then what? Must there be a complete disregard of the pledges that we made when we entered the League of Nations, a disregard that is cynical and stupid, and must end in complete disregard of the League itself?" (*The Peace Army*, A Sermon by Maude Royden.)

"When the war ended, many eminent people were asked to give their opinion about the terms of the Peace. Nine out of ten said that they thought the terms of the Peace Treaty left very much to be desired, but that so long as it contained the Covenant of the League of Nations, everything might still be hoped. To that League of Nations all of us then pinned our hopes.

It is true that the Covenant, like the terms of the Treaty itself, was not perfect. Some thought it did not go far enough in one direction; some thought it did not go far enough in another. Those who most disbelieved in war were troubled by the possibility of war arising through the League itself. And one of the chief reasons why the United States kept out of the League was that they believed it was committed under Article XVI of the Covenant to use even war to enforce its decisions.

Nevertheless, in this country and all over the world, the lovers of peace began to work with increasing enthusiasm and hope for the League of Nations, believing that it could, by degrees, be adapted, modified, and improved so as to become a perfect instrument for organising the world for peace. I was one of those; and Dr. Sheppard and Dr. Herbert Gray have also worked, ever since the end of the war, for the League of Nations. I still think that we were right to do so.

I am too practical to expect that anything, when it is first put into shape, shall be perfect; and if I had to choose again, I should again do all in my power for the establishment of the League of Nations. And to idealists, like Lord Cecil and others, who went on working for a thing which was so poor a caricature of what they had dreamed; and who, by their faith in it and unwearying toil for it, kept it in being, the world can never be sufficiently grateful.

Yet these men, like the rest of us, always realised that it was a race between the makers of peace and the makers of war. None of us perhaps realised how close a race it would be; how neck and neck indeed

those forces were; so that, at the very moment when the Disarmament Conference at last meets in Geneva, war is actually in progress between two members of the League of Nations.

That is the position to-day. The League at Geneva talks of Disarmament, and two of its members - both of them with seats on the Council of the League - are at war in the Far East. And it seems as though the League were helpless to prevent it." (*The Peace Army*, A Sermon by Maude Royden.)

59. *The Peace Army*, A Sermon by Maude Royden. She continued: "When people say: "What do you imagine you could do? You could only stand there until people were tired of you!" they do not realise the power of the spirit. Those who went in the spirit of our Saviour Christ would release into the world a spirit that was true, potent, and victorious.

"God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, to the end that all who believed in Him might not perish but have everlasting life."

To what end was the crucifixion? What could Christ do at last against his enemies? They could and they did merely take him and nail him to a cross! What use was this, after all - this nailing to a cross of a helpless body? Is that all, you think? I suppose it seemed all to those who looked on. But it released into the world a Spirit which conquered in defeat, and which will always conquer. That Spirit may still be released and is day by day released by those who follow Christ."

60. "The young gave their lives to put an end to war. It has not ended. Now let the older generation give theirs.

This is to us the most important thing in the world.... In the presence and in memory of the Great War, I record my own conviction that war and the fear of war is the worst of the evils that torment us now. Let those who believe this unite." (*The Peace Army*, A Sermon by Maude Royden.)

61. *Manchester Guardian*, 27 February 1932.

62. Fletcher, p260.

63. Scott, p195.

64. William A. Wharton of Guernsey, in the *Friend*, 18 March 1932, p241.

65. Lester, p129. Relationships between the Peace Army and Kingsley Hall were particularly close. Following Gandhi's return to India after the Round Table Conference, up-to-date, uncensored information about him was available in London through Muriel Lester, who received letters smuggled out of India via Belgium.

On 24 June, London dock labourers refused to load a ship, the *Ben Alder*, with munitions bound for Japan. This was the cue for Royden to make use of the contacts she had gained to organise a demonstration at the docks against the sending of arms shipments. The police refused the procession access to the West India Dock, so Royden, Soper, Gray and Muriel Lester addressed the gathered crowd from the top of a car at the Dock entrance, while Peace Army volunteers distributed leaflets protesting at the trade in arms. (Lester, p129, and Wallis, *Mother of World Peace*, p115.)

In August 1932, the Kingsley Hall unemployed made placards of events in India not published in the newspapers, and the East London branch of the Peace Army carried the placards through the streets to a rally addressed by Maude Royden. (Wallis, *Mother of World Peace*, p111,112.) The following year, when Muriel Lester travelled the Far East, she went officially as a Peace Army representative, visiting Kagawa and Gandhi, as well as conflict zones in China. (Wallis, *Mother of World Peace*, p115, 119-137.)

66. *The Manchester Guardian*, 29 February 1932.

67. 27 February 1932. Cited in Fletcher, p259, and Wallis, *Mother of World Peace*, p115.

68. Cited in Fletcher, p259. Another journalist asked Maude Royden if she thought a world which had looked on at so many scenes of horror would be impressed by the sight of non-combatants going to their death. She replied in terms that deliberately avoided heroism: "I do not know in the least what the effect on the world would be, or how many people would be willing to come with us, but I am inclined to think that it might create a great impression. I have a hope that the hour has arrived and that the world will respond. It may be the psychological moment for such action. If so, well and good. If not, well, we shall have tried." (*Manchester Guardian*, 27 February 1932. That newspaper also reported that Frank Crozier, who, with his wife, had offered immediate support, was particularly confident. He believed that governments of the world would be forced to bow before the Peace Army strategy: "What would they do, supposing Dick Sheppard and I were to walk with 10,000 unarmed people along No Man's Land, or if we were to send over from forty to a hundred civil aeroplanes between the opposing armies? If our people were shot public opinion would be shocked.") In the *Church of England Newspaper*, (4 March 1932, p12) it transpired that Christians in Japan, praying for both sides in the current conflict, already regarded themselves as something of a peace army.

69. Maude Royden in Paxton (ed.), *Dick Sheppard: Apostle of Brotherhood*, p77-8.

70. Herbert Gray, *Reconciliation*, April 1932, p74.

71. Maude Royden in Paxton (ed.), *Dick Sheppard: Apostle of Brotherhood*, p78.

72. Cited in Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945*, p95.

73. Royden to Sheppard, 18 January 1933. Richardson papers.

74. Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945*, p96.

75. Fletcher, p260,261.

76. Martin, *Editor*, p198. Also Scott, p195. Martin was not the only potential ally who was sceptical. Clifford Allen, former Chairman of the No-Conscription Fellowship, had his doubts. He thought it was a major step to move from opposition to killing people in war to supporting killing people in an attempt to stop a war. Canon Donaldson of Westminster Abbey dismissed the scheme as "not practicable." Even *Reconciliation* said that "There was something a little quixotic, not in the original proposal, but in the first popular understanding of it as an army that could be hurriedly enough recruited and organised and graciously enough provided with travelling facilities by encouraging governments to reach the Far East in time to persuade the combatants to allow them to fling themselves between them." (April 1932, p80) However, Gerald Bailey (Secretary of the National Peace Council) recognised its strong appeal and thought it would do as much as anything to make hostilities impossible. (*Friend*, 4 March 1932.) Sheppard realised that many people who read the press article "will laugh at it and us." (Sheppard to Housman, 26 February 1932. *What Can We Believe?*, p171.) Although the editor of the *Friend* admitted that the idea was "mocked as sentimental folly," (*Friend*, March 1932, p188. Cited in Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945*, p97.) he commended the proposers of the venture: "they are right in insisting that peace is not a dull, drab, sordid and selfish thing. Peace may bring risks which we should be willing to take if we really believe in God and our common humanity." (*Friend*, 4 March 1932, p188.) Writing to Laurence Housman on 26 February, Sheppard admitted that the Peace Army trio should have sought the advice of both the playwright and Charles Raven before going the press, but that there had been insufficient time. Housman was not going to laugh, but he was not convinced. He told Sheppard that his own preference was for political pressure to be put on governments that were

supplying arms to both sides and for the Labour Party in particular to take its internationalist principles to the point of a national strike for peace. He could see a rôle for pacifist deserters leaving the ranks of the opposing armies, but as far as the Peace Army proposal was concerned: "As a *symbol* it is all right, and will I hope attract sympathy; as a *practical* proposal I think it is addressed to the wrong organization, and under circumstances when it could not be made to 'work'. Even if the League of Nations accepted the offer, what at the best would happen? You and your fellow volunteers would be sent out - by aeroplane to save time? - and set down somewhere between the opposing forces. And just where you were set down, or wherever you moved, they would carefully fire over your heads to avoid hitting you, until you were tired of nothing happening and of being of no use except to provide the papers with picturesque headlines which would cut no ice and put out no fire." (Housman to Sheppard, 28 February 1932. *What Can We Believe?*, p171-3.)

Raven, a recent convert to pacifism, was also unhappy at the way things had happened. Although he had some sympathy with the principle, he would have preferred an organisation on the lines of the S.C.I., a completely different project altogether. (*Reconciliation*, January 1934, p6, and the Halley Stewart Lecture, 1934, expanded in Raven, *Is War Obsolete?*, p179-183.)

With half a century's hindsight, Soper argued that Sheppard's infectious enthusiasm had blinded them to the colossal practical difficulties involved. "It was like little boats today going into the South Pacific to protest against nuclear tests," (Cited in Scott, and in Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p92.) he said, ironically citing one of the most effective forms of non-violent protest in the 1980s and again in 1995. The principle of unarmed interposing continued to be practised throughout the rest of the century. At the Annual Meeting of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship in York in 1991, an account was given of how a party of unarmed international volunteers camped in the Iraqi desert during the Gulf War.

77. Maude Royden in Paxton (ed.), *Dick Sheppard: Apostle of Brotherhood*, p79.

78. Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945*, p96.

79. Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945*, p96.

80. *Friend*, 22 November 1935, p1084.

81. *Reconciliation*, November 1935, p298. For Maude Royden the failure of the Peace Army to make a more substantial impact on world affairs was due to the lack of response from pacifists. She wanted more from pacifists than just conscientious objection in war-time. It was the beginning of the end of her relationship with pacifism: "I shall always think this failure of pacifists at least to try to make an offering for peace which should be more dangerous and more difficult than war was the measure of our failure to realise the emptiness of a mere refusal to fight." (Fletcher, p274.)

82. *Reconciliation*, July 1937, p176.

83. *Peace News*, 3 July 1937, p1.

84. Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945*, p96.

85. *Quiver*, January 1933, p311.

86. *Quiver*, September 1933, p197.

87. *I Renounce War*, p99-100.

88. Burritt's pledge read: "Believing all war to be inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity and

destructive of the best interests of mankind, I do hereby pledge myself never to enlist or enter into any army or navy, or to yield any voluntary support or sanction to any war, by whomsoever or for whatsoever proposed, declared or waged. And I do hereby associate myself with all persons, of whatever country, colour, or condition, who have signed, or shall hereafter sign this pledge, in a League of Universal Brotherhood, whose objects shall be, to employ all legitimate and moral means for the abolition of all war, and all the spirit and manifestations of war throughout the world; for the abolition of all restrictions upon international correspondence and friendly intercourse, and of whatsoever else tends to make enemies of nations or prevent their fusion into one peaceful brotherhood; for the abolition of all institutions and customs that do not recognize and respect the image of God and a human brother in every man, of whatever clime, colour, or condition of humanity." (*Peace News*, 28 May 1938, p6.)

89. H. M. Tomlinson, in *Harper's Magazine*; cited in Chamberlain, *Fighting for Peace*, p127.

90. Ponsonby's text was longer than Sheppard's: "We the undersigned, convinced that all disputes between Nations are capable of settlement either by diplomatic negotiations or by some form of international arbitration, hereby solemnly declare that we shall refuse to support or render war service to any Government which resorts to arms." (Jonathan Schneer, *George Lansbury*, p155.)

91. Chamberlain, *Fighting for Peace*, p127.

92. The organisation introduced the white poppy for peace on Armistice Day 1933, having discussed it the previous year. (See Housman to Sheppard, 8 November 1933. *What Can We Believe?*, p219.)

93. Jill Liddington, *The Long Road To Greenham*, p161.

94. *Reconciliation*, April 1934, p89.

95. Sheppard to Housman, 17 August 1932. *What Can We Believe?*, p178,179.

96. Carolyn Scott, *Dick Sheppard, A Biography*, p192.

97. *We Say "No"*, p69,70. The American churchman Henry H. Crane expressed similar sentiments more forcibly: "So help me God, I will never bless, sanction, nor participate in another war! ... How do I know? I don't. I simply assert the deepest conviction of my being - while I am still sane, emotionally stable and utterly sincere. Should another war come, I might go. I'm all too fallible, weak and capable of cowardice. That's why I want to go on record *now*. So that, should I go, no one shall salute me, eulogize me, nor attempt to glorify me. Rather they must hiss, revile and condemn me for what I should be revealing myself to be: a moral coward, a propagandized puppet, a mob-minded murderer, a world traitor, a Christ crucifier." (Cited by Sheppard in *We Say "No"*, p70.)

98. *I Renounce War*, p8. The sermon was preached on 12 November 1933. (Brittain, *Thrice a Stranger*, p210.)

99. *Church of England Newspaper*, 5 July 1935, p12.

100. *Peace*, May 1935, p27.

101. Sheppard, cited in Scott, p211.

102. *Church of England Newspaper*, 19 July 1935, p2.

103. *Friend*, 19 July 1935, p666.
104. *Church of England Newspaper*, 19 July 1935, p2.
105. *Church Times*, 19 July 1935, p39.
106. *Church of England Newspaper*, 19 July 1935, p2.
107. *Church of England Newspaper*, 19 July 1935, p2.
108. *Friend*, 19 July 1935, p666.
109. *Peace*, May 1936, p27.
110. *Church of England Newspaper*, 26 July 1935, p12. The *Church Times* was not impressed with Sheppard's meeting, the editorial announcing that "There is an immense danger at this critical time in world history that the souls of the righteous should be content with splutter." Given Sheppard's vast skills in public speaking, the charge of "splutter" was totally misplaced. Sheppard, explaining that for him neither pacifism nor patriotism was enough, but rather that the Spirit of Christ would suffice, soon extracted an apology for the accusation.
111. Ceadel, *Pacifism*, p180.
112. Scott, p211.
113. 25 July 1935. P.P.U. files.
114. Sybil Morrison, *I Renounce War*, p10.
115. Sheppard to Housman, 12 December 1935. Richardson papers.
116. *Church Times*, 3 July 1936, p4.
117. *We Say "No"*, p154.
118. *We Say "No"*, p154.
119. *We Say "No"*, p154,155.
120. *We Say "No"*, p157.
121. *We Say "No"*, p164.
122. *We Say "No"*, p160.
123. *Peace News*, 22 August 1936.
124. Marshall, Howard, et al, *Dick Sheppard by His Friends*, p178.
125. *Church Times*, 3 July 1936, p4.

126. *Church Times*, 3 July 1936, p4 and Morrison, *I Renounce War*, p11. Morris, for example, was nominated by Wragg, seconded by Ponsonby and unanimously appointed at the Sponsors' Meeting of 29 July 1936.
127. Paxton et al, *Apostle of Brotherhood*, p74.
128. *Pacifist*, November 1967, p7.
129. To Mary Marr, 18 July 1936. *Bridge Into the Future*, p573.
130. *Father Forgive Them*, in Heard et al, *The New Pacifism*, p127.
131. Richardson collection.
132. Sybil Morrison, *I Renounce War*, p12.
133. 21 October 1936. *Bridge Into the Future*, p578.
134. P.P.U. Sponsors' Meeting, 1 February 1937.
135. P.P.U. files.
136. Brittain to Sheppard, 26 January 1937. (Richardson papers.) Brittain's theme in these addresses may be deduced from a letter written to a Miss Stancer the following day when she says that "the sacrifice of our empire, or part of it, would be the greatest contribution to peace that we could make." (A year earlier she had hosted a London tea for Nehru, president of the Indian Congress. Diary, Tuesday 28 January 1936, *Chronicle of Friendship*, p247.)
137. *Friend*, 5 February 1937, p136.
138. Accounts of the rally are found in: Brittain, *Chronicle of Friendship*, p309,310; Sheppard et al, *Let Us Honour Peace*, p57; *Peace News*, 13 March 1937; and Sheppard to Brittain, 1 March 1937.
139. Proof of *Modern Woman* article, "Peace in our Time". P.P.U. collection.
140. See *Christianity and War*, an article in the Sunday Express, cited in Sheppard, *God and My Neighbour*, p133-137.
141. *I Renounce War*, p22.
142. *Peace News*, 15 May 1937, p1.
143. Morrison, *I Renounce War*, p23.
144. John and Irene Barclay, in Marshall, Howard, et al, *Dick Sheppard by his Friends*, p104,105.
145. *Peace News*, 7 August 1937, p2.
146. Plowman to R. H. Ward, 3 August 1937. *Bridge Into the Future*, p609.

147. The *Friend* reported: "Tears and laughter are often close kin, and certainly grave and gay were very closely interwoven in our camp. The combination was admirably blended by Dick Sheppard himself, who harmoniously united spiritual leadership with the rôle of a first rank comedian." (*Friend*, 27 August 1937, p796,797.) Looking at Dick Sheppard, John Middleton Murry admitted "with astonishment and gratitude that the thing I had despaired of ever seeing was there before my eyes: laughing at me and I at him - a great democratic and Christian *leader*. It is not possible to be one without the other. The love of men that is required of the democratic leader cannot endure without the love of Christ." (*Adelphi*, Vol. 14, No. 3, December 1937, p68.)

148. Max Plowman to R. H. Ward, 3 August 1937. *Bridge Into the Future*, p609. The text is found in Sybil Morrison, *The Life and Work of Stuart Morris*, p17-19.

149. Plowman to R. H. Ward. 3 August 1937. *Bridge Into the Future*, p609. The text of Murry's address was later published as *God or the Nation?*

150. *God or the Nation?*, p23,24.

151. *Peace News*, 28 August 1937.

152. *Peace News*, 14 August 1937, p2. Also Marshall, Howard, et al, *Dick Sheppard by his Friends*, p110.

153. Cited in Marshall, Howard, et al, *Dick Sheppard by his Friends*, p110.

154. Plowman to Kay Gill. *Bridge Into the Future*, p610.

155. Scott, p238.

156. Scott, p239.

157. *Peace News*, 30 October 1937, p1.

158. *Peace News*, 30 October 1937, p1.

159. *Daily Mirror*, cited in *Peace News*, 30 October 1937, p1.

160. *Manchester Guardian*, cited in *Peace News*, 6 November 1937, p11.

161. *Peace News*, 6 November 1937, p1.

162. *Peace News*, 6 November 1937, p1.

163. *Peace News*, 6 November 1937, p3.

164. Housman to Sheppard, 25 October 1937. The French is a misquotation of Jacques Danton's speech to the Legislative Committee of General Defence, 1792: "De l'audace, et encore de l'audace, et toujours de l'audace."

165. Scott, p239.

166. *Peace News*, 25 December 1937, p6.

167. *Peace News*, 30 October 1937, p1.

168. *Time and Tide*, 6 November 1937, p1465.

169. R. Ellis Roberts, p309.

170. The Service Scrap Book, 1930-1944, in the archives of St. George's, Leeds, suggests that Sheppard spent the night of 29 October with Don Robins in Leeds. This is not corroborated elsewhere (e.g. by Scott or R. Ellis Roberts).

171. *Peace News*, 6 November 1937, p11, citing the previous day's *Friend*.

172. During the war, the pacifists' Eucharist became something of an embarrassment to the Dean and Chapter and though the memory of Sheppard was too strong for them to scrap it, they refused to publicise it. (A.P.F. Newsletter, January 1940.) Later it was moved to the more hospitable premises of St. George's, Bloomsbury. (A.P.F. Newsletter, April 1942, implies the move had been some time back.)

173. *Time and Tide*, 6 November 1937, p1465. She was referring obliquely to the Chapter decision to permit pacifists to celebrate weekly Eucharists at St. Paul's.

174. Scott, p245,246. Also *Peace News*, 25 December 1937, p6.

175. *Peace News*, 13 November 1937, p2.

176. Cited by Sybil Morrison at a Memorial Service for Stuart Morris, St. Martin-in-the-Fields, 1 December 1967.

177. *Peace News*, 6 November 1937, p6.

178. *Peace News*, 6 November 1937, p1.

179. Special Joint Meeting of the Sponsors and the Executive Committee, 2 November 1937.

180. *Peace News*, 6 November 1937, p11.

A POLITICAL CHRONOLOGY

The Naval Conference, London

After the establishment of the League of Nations as part of the Versailles Treaty of 1919, progress to secure the conditions that would prevent future war was painfully slow. Some, but not all, European borders were more firmly agreed upon in the Locarno Pact of 1925, and the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 provided an opportunity for nations to renounce war as a means of national policy. That Pact in particular was the straw being most firmly clutched at the turn of the decade. The one decisive area, however, where little progress had been made was disarmament.

In January 1930 a Naval Conference opened in London. Naval disarmament conferences in Washington (1922) and Geneva (1927) had taken some steps forward, and in 1930 representatives from Britain, France, Italy, Japan and the U.S.A. met for what the Archbishop of Canterbury described as being in some respects "the most important international Conference which has taken place since the Conference of Paris of 1919."¹ Bishop Barnes was one of the signatories of a letter to the Prime Minister from the National Council for the Prevention of War, calling for substantive reduction in fleet numbers and tonnage.² He also seconded a resolution at the Canterbury Convocation which hoped for the success of the Naval Conference and paved the way for the Lambeth Conference later in the year by stating that "war as an instrument of national policy is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ."³ When King George V opened the Five Powers Naval Conference by expressing a desire for naval strength to be reduced "to a point consistent with national security," the editor of *Reconciliation*, Gilbert Porteous, commented, "This does not concede nearly all that the pacifist perceives is necessary; but it is a very large and important part,"⁴ and the F.O.R. Executive wrote a letter of support and encouragement to the Government. The F.O.R., with the Archbishops and Free Church leaders, called for the Sunday immediately prior to the Conference (19 January 1930) to be a day of prayer for peace.⁵ A powerful *Church Times* editorial expressed the view that "Every priest and every minister should be a preacher of peace, which in the long run depends on the acceptance of the hard fact that there is no one chosen people on earth, and that in the eyes of the Almighty all peoples are the same."⁶ The Bishop of Chichester described the Conference as "critical" for the Kellogg Pact and two thousand people took part in a "procession of intercession" in Central London, organised by the Christ and Peace Campaign.⁷

Despite these hopes and prayers, however, the Naval Conference proved to be the first of many disappointing conferences of the new decade. Minor agreements on submarines and ship construction were cancelled out by differences on battleship tonnage which led to the French and Italians refusing to sign. As Bell had feared, the Kellogg Pact was in difficulty within a year of being signed.

The Disarmament Conference

Two years on from the Naval Conference, the long-awaited Disarmament Conference was called. Such a Conference had been on the international agenda since 1919, but prevarications led to delays and missed opportunities during the 1920s. By 1932 the world political climate was once more moving in a direction where fear and distrust would outweigh the impetus for disarmament and co-operation. The coincident Japan-China conflict was a reminder of the fragility of world peace, and the difficulties that would face the Conference.

The Disarmament Conference opened in February 1932 at the Salle de la Reformation, Geneva, under the Presidency of Arthur Henderson. It followed a final year of intense campaigning, attempts to persuade public opinion and political representatives of the vital need to make real progress towards disarmament. The W.I.L.P.F. collected three million signatures to an international petition under the slogan "War is Renounced - Let Us Renounce Armaments" which urged delegates "to examine all proposals for disarmament that have been or may be made, and to take the necessary steps to *achieve disarmament*."⁸ The Vicar of Congleton, Wilfrid T. F. Castle (Junr.) urged that this International Declaration on World Disarmament should be posted on church noticeboards, and that churches should organise door-to-door visits to get signatures.⁹ The Church Assembly was not convinced, however, and in June 1931 reckoned a resolution on the Declaration to be not worth discussing.¹⁰

In the summer of 1931 there were various gatherings of the powerful to align themselves with the Disarmament Conference.¹¹ Representatives of the Christian Organisations Committee of the League of Nations Union and the British Council of the World Alliance came together to promote such gathering elsewhere in the country.¹² On the streets, popular feeling was shown by two processions, one from Lambeth and one from Kingsway, which converged on Trafalgar Square in October 1931. Hundreds gathered to listen to Reginald Sorenson and to witness W. C. Roberts first placing the processional cross on the plinth of Nelson's Column and then pronouncing that Christian conscience could not tolerate war.¹³ In Lincoln, the diocesan Bishop was in a

gathering of two thousand people assembled to hear Maude Royden speak on disarmament. "We want to urge this country to go as far as any nation in the world is willing to go," she said.¹⁴ A few weeks earlier she had joined Housman, Russell and a number of prominent literary figures in writing to the new National Government urging an immediate reduction in armaments, "an extravagance utterly beyond our resources."¹⁵

Others expressed their concerns in the correspondence columns of the press. Throughout that summer, a sustained debate took place in the pages of the *Church of England Newspaper*, following an initial letter by five young Londoners of military age. Their main message was directed at the Churches, but they also expressed the opinion that the Disarmament Conference would fail, "*unless* at least one country is determined to take drastic action, regardless of the assent of others. If suspicion is to be overcome by trust, fear by courage - and they can be overcome in no other way - one nation must be willing to take the lead. Until a first-class power such as Great Britain is prepared to disarm *without guarantees*, the fear psychology will continue to dominate international relations and war is inevitable." It was because the authors felt that the future of the world could depend on the decisions of British statesmen, that they appealed firstly to Church leaders to declare unequivocally that all war was contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ, and to urge the Government to adopt the policy of disarmament by example. They also urged Christian ministers to pledge not to take up arms in any circumstances and recommended a similar pledge for Church members.¹⁶ In the course of the ensuing debate, the five young men wrote a further letter urging each sympathetic parish to hold a ballot on the issue of "Disarmament by Example" and to open a roll for the signatures of "those who pledge themselves never to fight under *any* circumstances."¹⁷ Such proposals were farsighted in that both ideas were taken up by peace campaigners in the years ahead.

The Oxford Convention of Christ and Peace in April 1931 reflected both the hopes and the fears of people across the world:

The Disarmament Conference next February offers the nations an opportunity to move away from the institution of war which they cannot afford to let slip. A substantial all-round limitation of armaments is the logical sequel to the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy. A failure to achieve it would almost inevitably start the nations along the road to another war and to the breakdown of our civilisation. It would be dangerously wrong not to honour the repeated pledges made to Germany that general disarmament will be carried out. The true and only sure hope of security for the lives of the nations lies not in dependence on arms but in trust and goodwill. The present economic plight of the world with its grave moral and spiritual consequences makes criminal the

wastage of material resources involved in competitive armaments.¹⁸

Arthur Henderson was in no doubt of the significance of public pressure for the outcome of the Disarmament Conference. He sent a warm and appreciative reply when George Bell, on behalf of a Conference monitoring committee set up by the Christ and Peace Convention, wrote to him that:

Disarmament is an indispensable step to world Peace. If the politicians hesitate and the experts bargain, it is for Christians to make a plain demand. 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. Convinced of the critical importance of the coming months, we appeal to our fellow Christians to prefer the risks of peace to the risks of war and declare for disarmament....¹⁹

That the Disarmament Conference would take place in a climate where such statements still needed to be made was in itself ominous.²⁰ When the Conference eventually happened, its story was not a happy one. The prevarications of the previous decade and the cumulative ill-will and fear generated by reparations had taken their toll; the kairos had been missed. International collective action had failed to guarantee peace. Another way had to be found. The principal hope for many was pacifism, but would that win over the Government any more than the more modest agenda of the Disarmament Conference? Added to which, time was short. Five years on from the hopes of 1932, as war loomed ever closer, Anglican pacifists pointed to the Disarmament Conference as the pivotal moment of the decade. To Anglican shame, such hopes had been destroyed by the intransigence of a British Government, backed by the established Church. As the 1937 pacifists claimed:

had the Church given a fully idealistic lead, the world would have followed it. When the Disarmament Conference began, Germany was under a very different rule from that of Hitler; Italy, though under the rule of Mussolini, was in a mood very much less intransigent than her present mood. It is not always remembered that "anti-God" Russia - supported by Turkey and Persia, both mainly Moslem - at the first session of the Disarmament Conference in 1932, proposed a resolution that the delegates should consider a world scheme for the abolition of all armaments: "parity at zero," as it was strikingly expressed. The Christian nations treated this resolution with distrust and contempt. Had a similar scheme been put forward by Great Britain, following a lead from the Archbishops and Bishops of the Anglican Communion, supported by the laity, the history of the last five years would (we believe) have been very different. "It could be done and England should do it," was the belief of some of us in 1932.²¹

But England didn't, and the descent to war had begun.

Ballots for Peace

One year into the Disarmament Conference came a clear sign that the political climate was changing and that there was a growing peace constituency in the country. On 9 February 1933, within two weeks of Hitler's appointment as German Chancellor, the Oxford Union voted 275 -153 in support of Cyril Joad's motion "That this House will in no circumstances fight for its King and Country."²² Members of the establishment, feeling that their own prejudices should always be reflected by such bastions of privilege as the Oxford Union, were horrified and the protests of alumni led to a failed attempt to overturn the motion three weeks later.²³ The myth that grew up around these Oxford Union votes grew out of proportion to their substance, heartening pacifists across the country. Many universities and colleges passed the original Oxford motion, and newspapers and journals carried extensive columns of correspondence, all of which provided opportunities for pacifist opinions to be expressed.²⁴

The publication of Beverley Nichol's *Cry Havoc!* that summer kept the issue of pacifism in the forefront of people's minds, and in a heated by-election at East Fulham on 25 October 1933, a safe Conservative seat was lost to John Wilmot of Labour, whose stand for disarmament was seen as attractive at a time when there was considerable disillusionment with the National Government.²⁵ The following January, the editor of the *Ilford Recorder*, active in the League of Nations Union, conducted a local poll of attitudes towards the League, the Disarmament Conference, the Locarno Treaty and the manufacture of armaments. Lord Cecil was so impressed that he convened a gathering of representatives from the main political parties, the Churches, peace societies, women's organisations, co-operative groups, and others to set up a committee to run a National Declaration on the League of Nations and Armaments, otherwise known as the Peace Ballot.²⁶ Amongst the Ballot's supporters were both Archbishops, more than fifty bishops, Dick Sheppard, Sybil Thorndike, Rose Macaulay, Arthur Henderson and "people of influence in all walks of life."²⁷ The Ballot was conducted by half a million volunteers carrying out door-to-door polling across the country.²⁸ By June 1935 over eleven and a half million citizens had recorded their opinions. Although it was by no means a pacifist exercise - the questions on pacifism were confusing and late in being added - the Ballot's effect was to maintain a high level of interest in peace issues, an interest that Dick Sheppard was able to tap with his postcard campaigning even before the Ballot was complete.

Lansbury's Initiative

In February 1932, as the Disarmament Conference was beginning, George Lansbury spoke alongside Muriel Lester in Tottenham, North London, decrying "the curse of competition" in economic and international affairs. Pleading for complete disarmament, and recognising that "If you have war-machines you will find a way to use them," he said: "If we could only get the people of England to-day to rally with trumpet and drum as enthusiastically for peace as they did for war, we would be able to get complete disarmament."²⁹

In the summer of 1935, the international crisis in Abyssinia worsened. Lansbury wrote a hasty personal note to Dick Sheppard³⁰ and also a propitious epistle to the *Times*. In his letter, Lansbury argued for the League of Nations to summon a world economic conference. "No one will say there is not enough room, enough raw materials, enough markets for us all. I am certain that with the true Christian spirit applied the white and coloured races can cooperate to create a better civilization than has yet been dreamed of." Lansbury believed that religious leaders had the power to start that process.

Surely in this crisis the voice of Christendom and all religions should be heard. I appeal to our Archbishops to take the lead in this matter. I propose they appeal to his Holiness the Pope to join in and call a solemn convocation or congress representative of every phase of Christian and other religious thought, call the gathering to meet in the Holy Land at Jerusalem, and from Mount Calvary "call a Truce of God" and bid the war spirit rest.... My beloved country has power with America, France and Russia over most of the earth's surface. All four nations owe allegiance to the principle of cooperation and service. Surely the Churches, led by his Holiness the Pope in cooperation with our own leaders, will not fail the world.³¹

Building on Sheppard's Albert Hall rally of 14 July, Lansbury's letter marked a "new phase in the Peace Movement."³² Lansbury received hundreds of letters of approval for his initiative, which the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups "welcomed with deep appreciation,"³³ and there were mildly sympathetic responses from the Archbishops of Canterbury and Westminster and from the Chief Rabbi. Yet although religious leaders called for prayer, none backed the proposal for a Holy Land summit. Sheppard, encouraged by his own recent success, was thrilled with Lansbury's suggestions but said that for politicians not to know what was moving in people's hearts was "sufficiently ominous"; for the leaders of Christianity to be either ignorant of their faith or unwilling to proclaim it seemed "tragic beyond expression."³⁴

At a packed C.C.P.G. rally in Westminster Central Hall on 13 September, Lansbury

received a "tremendous reception."³⁵ He recognised that his letter to the press had captured people's imagination, but reminded them that his own commitment to peace had been lifelong and his appeal related not only to the Italo-Abyssinian crisis of the moment but to the world-wide build-up of arms.

If I were Prime Minister with a mandate from the nation, backed by a majority in the House of Commons, I should go, myself, to the Assembly of the League of Nations and say that our nation had once and for all renounced imperialism and war and was determined at once to disarm and would invite all other nations to follow our lead.

British-controlled waterways like Suez he would hand over to the League of Nations, similarly airports and even "the enormous territories of raw materials." Such unilateral actions he believed would do much to remove the envy and the other grievances that would be the causes of future war. He added:

I would apply all this also without waiting for other nations, because I am certain that if Great Britain took the lead in renouncing imperialism and war and adopted the economic measures I have mentioned, all other nations would follow. Somewhere a start must be made. There is no nation so well placed as we are to throw down this challenge to the world. I repeat, the material price to be paid for peace in our time may appear heavy. It would, however, be but tiny compared with the cost of the next Great War.³⁶

Sheppard at that rally described what Lansbury had to say as "the voice of a righteous man crying in the wilderness." It was a prophetic comment. Whereas Lansbury's imagining of political power was not fanciful - he was after all Leader of the Opposition at a time when an unpopular Government was approaching an election - his days of office were numbered: the following month he stepped down as leader of the Labour Party.

The Background of George Lansbury

Lansbury, an Anglican layman, was the foremost pacifist politician of the age. He was the working-class, socialist editor or assistant editor of the *Herald* newspaper from 1912-1925. Having resigned in 1912 and failed to regain his seat, Lansbury was re-elected to Parliament in 1922.³⁷ Labour in opposition benefited from his presence on the front bench, but Labour in minority Government only offered him a non-cabinet position, which he refused.³⁸ With back bench freedom, he increased his involvement with the No More War Movement and was a prominent supporter of Ponsonby's Peace Letter.³⁹ Labour's hold on office was short-lived, but not Lansbury's Parliamentary pacifism. In March 1926 he proposed the abolition of the Royal Navy, receiving the

support of twenty other M.P.s.⁴⁰

Lansbury's pacifism and socialism were inseparable features of his understanding of Christianity. "Socialism has for years meant for me the finest, fullest expression of everything learned from religion," he said.⁴¹ Likewise his pacifism:

I hope some who follow us will understand that we, poor and unlettered as we are in Poplar, also possess the vision that society is made up of women and men, that all peoples of all races, climes, and tongues are of equal value in the sight of God; that there is no God of the British, but one Father or Creator of the human race, and because this is so, all wars are civil wars - wars between brothers - and consequently we have always struggled for peace, peace not imposed but accepted because it must and will be based on truth and justice, love and brotherhood.⁴²

When the second minority Labour administration was elected in 1929, Lansbury was at last offered a cabinet position, albeit the minor post of Minister of Works. In a Government almost immediately thrown into disarray by the New York stock crash and subsequent global depression, Lansbury was the only minister to emerge with his reputation enhanced.⁴³ He pulled down railings in Royal Parks, provided countless sports pitches, opened the Serpentine for public bathing by women and children as well as by men,⁴⁴ and generally made the green spaces of Britain's cities into public places. Collective Cabinet responsibility was not something Lansbury took to easily, especially as disarmament and the abandonment of imperialism were not on the Government's agenda. His unwillingness to compromise on matters of great principle came to a head in August 1931, when an austerity budget was proposed including cuts in unemployment benefits. Lansbury was amongst those unable to accept such measures, and when Prime Minister MacDonald formed a new Government with Tory and Liberal support, Lansbury said "They have capitulated to the moneylenders."⁴⁵ The National, overwhelmingly Tory, Government won the subsequent General Election, with Labour losing five-sixths of its seats. The 72 year old Lansbury was one of the few to be returned. After Henderson's resignation in the autumn of 1932, Lansbury became leader, with the responsibility of rebuilding the Labour Party from its lowest ebb. The Christian pacifist and socialist was Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons. At least in theory, Britain could have been but one election away from an Anglican pacifist Prime Minister.

Lansbury as Labour Leader

Four years before becoming leader, Lansbury wrote that "If the Labour movement for

the sake of office becomes wedded to the devil's doctrine of mere expediency, it will inevitably perish."⁴⁶ For such a man to become party leader ensured that the movement could not escape facing up to the intertwined challenges of nationalism, fascism, imperialism and war. Fascism, a consequence of Versailles, was "the gospel of decadence and despair,"⁴⁷ "the greatest of all enemies to human progress,"⁴⁸ "the most foul tyranny of all the ages."⁴⁹ It was the task of British Labour, he said, to challenge fascism and "show the world how a new social order should be built."⁵⁰ Such a new social order had implications for the whole world, as it meant sharing the natural sources of wealth which were associated with Empire. "All Socialists are anti-Imperialist," said Lansbury.⁵¹ "The British nation which leads the world so far as possessions go," he wrote, "must hammer out a scheme which can be placed before a world conference."⁵² That, he believed, was the only road to peace and security. The British should be prepared "to put our all on the altar of peace and good will," he said, "and cease singing 'God Who made us mighty, make us mightier yet.'"⁵³ On New Year's day 1934 he told Stafford Cripps that Britain must unilaterally renounce imperialism and war. "There is no nation so well placed as we are to throw down this challenge to the world."⁵⁴ Later that year he stressed that the British people must give up all right to hold any other country, renounce imperialism and stand unarmed before the world. Britain would then "become the strongest nation in the world fully armed by justice and love."⁵⁵ Lansbury aimed to prevent war by removing the economic causes of conflict. This approach was in complete contrast with that of Churchill, on the far right, who argued for faster re-armament in order to maintain the Empire and Britain's control of the rest of the world.⁵⁶ It was Christian socialist pacifism versus *Rule Britannia* and *The White Man's Burden*. Lansbury had no doubt that only one was rooted in the Gospel.

Following the death in 1933 of his wife Bessie, a formidable figure herself in local politics, Lansbury became emotionally and physically tired. In December that year he missed a step at Gainsborough Town Hall, fell and broke his thigh. Friends expressed their support,⁵⁷ and even political adversaries expressed sympathy.⁵⁸ A long convalescence followed, with Lansbury remaining in hospital until July 1934. There was much time for meditation,⁵⁹ for the strengthening of faith, and for the writing of a powerful Christian socialist manifesto, *My England*. The urban dweller from Bow was driven by a vision of an England "where freedom of body, soul and spirit is as widespread as natural beauty in spring-time,"⁶⁰ where socialism banished "the fear and dread of man-made poverty."⁶¹ In the struggle to achieve this goal, one had to recall the law of life according to the teaching of Jesus - the love of God and of neighbour.

By this statement of fact, he once and for all destroyed the terrible doctrine that out of violence and slaughter connected with war, and out of the competitive struggle for wealth, the best traits of human character are developed. It is not possible to gather figs from thistles or develop love from violence and destruction.⁶²

Lansbury urged those who believed that Jesus was the Son of God to accept without equivocation that Jesus' words were true and applicable in the present.

Kneeling with others at the altar of the sacraments will and can bring no real peace unless those who so kneel spend their lives as brothers and sisters, and this is quite impossible within a system of life which depends for its existence on the ability of all the children of God to dispute, quarrel, and fight for their daily bread.⁶³

The same applied for nations as for individuals. Neither, said Lansbury, could live at peace if they relied on force to become wealthy, in a system where ruthless competition for raw materials and markets was the way of life.⁶⁴ Competitive economic conditions meant that the League of Nations, in which so much hope had been invested, was a "ghastly failure,"⁶⁵ in need to drastic reform, not least by the inclusion of African and Asian nations.

I feel now that there is no chance for either disarmament or peace until the nations who desire peace determine to abolish the economic conditions that create and keep going the war spirit.... All desire to hold what they, by force, have stolen, and to have the power to take more should necessity arise. Until this condition of things is changed there is no hope for permanent peace.⁶⁶

In a world of plenty, Lansbury felt that it was ironic that fear was the "most terrible enemy."⁶⁷ The task of a future Labour Government would be to make a move from fear to trust, he said, creating "a new international order within which Imperialism will have no place,"⁶⁸ and England would have "neither armies, navies, nor air forces."⁶⁹ It was for Britain to take a new lead:

Great Britain under Capitalism leads the world in Imperialism. Our far-flung empire is in all parts of the world. We have most to give up. We shall be safer, stronger, and wealthier because we shall have discovered that the true bulwarks and defence of nations are to be found, not in the strength and power of its armaments, but in the truth and justice displayed in its relations with other nations; in its faith that the good of each people is the good of all; that in this beautiful world there is room for all, and that with faith in our ideals of universal brotherhood we shall establish that federation of the world by which alone we shall escape the terrors of war and enter on the blessings of peace.⁷⁰

Lansbury's vision of a Christian pacifist England⁷¹ did not resonate favourably,

however, with some of the atheistic socialist members of the Labour Party. His long hospitalisation meant that he was less aware than before of the mood of the Party he had rescued from the disaster of 1931. He always realised that there could arise problems of squaring his pacifist principles with Party policy.

Speaking for a party means speaking on behalf of the policy of that party, and as in and out of Parliament the question of peace and war became more and more dominant in our discussions, I found myself in conflict with my colleagues. They never professed to be members of a pacifist party, though usually they voted against money for armaments.⁷²

Matters finally came to a head in the party conference season of Autumn 1935.

The Labour Party Conference, 1935

In Britain, the first week of October saw the annual conferences of both the Conservative Party, when Churchill argued for rearmament in order to “preserve the coherence of the British Empire,”⁷³ and the Labour Party. In Africa, that week saw Italian troops move forward into Abyssinia. Feelings in Britain about the issue were strong. Many pacifists and the Labour left would have tolerated an economic blockade of Italy, but were united in opposition to any war.⁷⁴ Others held that the Tory-led Government, presumed to support the League of Nations, could be trusted to deploy justly and wisely working class British troops as part of an international war against Italy. Their spokesman within the Labour Party was Ernest Bevin, the Transport Workers’ leader. Following advocacy of military sanctions by Walter Citrine from the Electrical Trade Union at the earlier T.U.C. conference, Lansbury told the Executives afterwards how strongly he felt in his conscience about war. Bevin was present, and despised that mention of “conscience.”

Within the Labour Party, the crucial debate was on 1 October. Lansbury was received rapturously, loved even by those who disagreed with him.⁷⁵ He was in no mood to compromise, to defuse the debate by calling for economic sanctions. He readily accepted the difficulties that arose for the Party in having a leader who disagreed with Party policy.⁷⁶ He was quite prepared to face criticism, he said, and would stand down if wished, but he had never been so convinced that the Movement was making a mistake in proposing to accept violence.

I believe that force never has and never will bring permanent peace and permanent goodwill to the world. I believe also that we in our Movement have really said that in dealing with our own striving for Socialism. We have said to

the workers: 'We are sorry for your plight, but you must wait until you have converted the rest of the people to your point of view.' I have gone into mining areas, I have gone into my own district when people have been starving or semi-starving; I have stood in the midst of dockers who have been on the verge of starvation (before there was any 'dole' or Poor Law Assistance, excepting the workhouse), and I have said to them: 'No, you must not rise, you must have no violence, you must trust to the winning of this through public opinion.' I have never at any time said to the workers of this country: 'You must take up either arms, or sticks, or stones, in order to force your way to the end that you seek to attain.' And when I am challenged on these issues, I say to myself this: I have no right to preach pacifism to starving people in this country and preach something else to people elsewhere. It has been a belief that we should sooner and later in the world win our way with waiting. I have said the same thing on the continent when I have had the privilege of speaking abroad. I have said it in Russia when my Russian comrades allowed me to see a review of their air force, and when they took me on one of their warships. I have never under any circumstances said that I believed you could obtain Socialism by force.

And why have I said that: I have said it, first, because 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.' All history right down the ages proves that....

We are told that the only means of defence against air attacks - this was not a statement made by a pacifist, but by a leading member of the present Government - is that we should massacre more women and children than those who might attack us. War becomes more bestial, more sickening every day. Christ said that we had to love one another. I try to, and I dare say most of you do. I cannot believe that the Christ whom you worship, or the saints whose memory you all adore, that for any reason or any cause, they would be found pouring bombs and poison gas on women and children or men for any reason whatsoever. Not even in retaliation, because also it is written: 'Vengeance is mine, I will repay.'

As for the League of Nations, Lansbury could see no difference between mass murder organised by the League and mass murder organised between individual nations:

If I had the power to go to Geneva backed by our people I would go to them and say ... that Great Britain - the great imperialist race - led by the common people of our race were finished with imperialism, that we were willing that all the peoples under our flag, wherever you can establish Government, should be free to establish their own Governments, that there should be no such thing as domination either in our lives or in our actions, but that we should be willing that the whole of the resources which are under our control should be pooled for the service of all mankind. Not handed out here and there to individual nations to exploit, but put under the positive control of an International Commission. And I would further say that ... we would be willing to become disarmed unilaterally.

I believe that the first nation that will put into practice practical Christianity, doing to others as you would be done unto, that nation would lead the world away from war and absolutely to peace. And when I am asked: 'Would the nation ever agree to pay the price?' I maintain what John Bright maintained - that if you put against the gains from imperialism the cost of those gains in human life and in values of all descriptions, you are the losers all the time; that there is no real gain for the toiling masses of the world; and that this Christianity with its psalm-singing and prayers - this Christianity is the realist principle of life, because it says: 'We are willing that you shall carry out the doctrine of those

who are strongest, helping with the strength of their brain and their power the weak.' I know that you will say to me: 'Say that to Mussolini, or say that to Hitler.' If I had had power during this period I would have gone and faced these men at Geneva and I would have let the world know what it was I was proposing to do.

This is no mere ideal; it is no greater international ideal than the national ideal of common service for each other within our own nation. We have got somewhere and at some time to begin, and I want our people to begin. And that is the message that somehow I must put to the world wherever people will hear me.

Lansbury realised that this could be the last speech he would make to such a gathering, even though some cried "No, No" at the suggestion. He wanted those present to know what he had been thinking in hospital, that "the only thing worth while for old men to do is at least to say the thing they believe," in his case "to warn the young of the dangers of force and compulsion." He spoke of knowing that

during the last war the youth, the early manhood of my division was slaughtered most terribly, and now I see the whole world rushing to perdition. I see us, as someone has said, rattling into barbarism again. If mine were the only voice in this Conference, I would say in the name of the faith I hold, the belief I have that God intended us to live peaceably and quietly with one another. If some people do not allow us to do so, I am ready to stand as the early Christians did, and say, 'This is our faith, this is where we stand, and, if necessary, this is where we will die.'⁷⁷

Such a moving exposition fuelled the contempt of Bevin who replied with "not an argument, but calculated bad temper."⁷⁸ Even his supporters described it as "a virulence distasteful to many of the delegates."⁷⁹ Lansbury found it "hard and bitter, ... telling and scathing."⁸⁰ Bevin complained to Lansbury that he was taking "his conscience round from body to body asking to be told what to do with it." Lansbury was furious. The Conference was stunned, but still, the following day, passed overwhelmingly the motion which Lansbury had opposed. On 8 October Lansbury went to the Parliamentary Labour Party. Although they voted 38-7 for him to reconsider, Lansbury insisted.⁸¹ Clement Attlee, brother of the conscientious objector Thomas Attlee, was elected in his place.⁸²

The Church Congress

On the same day that Lansbury resigned from the leadership of the Parliamentary Labour Party, Archbishop Lang told the Church Congress in Bournemouth that, whilst he conceded the case for an international economics conference, "our own armaments must be made sufficient to meet our international requirements" and members of the League "are bound to use whatever means they think necessary to restrain the

aggressor.”⁸³ Two days later those attending the Congress heard a rather different message. Lansbury, in his first major engagement freed from the restraints of party leadership, delivered one of the great speeches of Anglican pacifist history, setting out the philosophy to which he would hold for his five remaining years of life.⁸⁴ Even Lansbury’s opponents acknowledged the strength of his argument and the integrity of the speaker: “A dangerous Socialist because he is so sincere,” was the tribute from Bournemouth’s Conservative M.P., himself described as a “Kipling Imperialist.”

Speculation concerning Lansbury’s future was rife. The following month, he wrote to Sheppard to make his position clear. “I do not wish to join in starting a new League or any kind of organisation or party there are too many already (sic),” he wrote, pledging his loyalty to Labour, despite its faults. “I do however want to work for peace most of all as I am certain we shall get nowhere if War comes again.”⁸⁵ An indication of the direction that Lansbury’s thinking was leading came when, on 5 February 1936, he moved a resolution in the House of Commons:

That this House affirms its profound belief in the futility of war, views with grave concern the worldwide preparations for war, and is of the opinion that, through the League of Nations, His Majesty’s Government should make an immediate effort for the summoning of a new international conference to deal with the economic factors which are responsible, such as the necessity for access to raw materials and to markets and for the migration of peoples, with a view to arriving at an international agreement which will remove from the nations the incentive to pile up armaments and establish the peace of the world on a sure foundation.⁸⁶

The likelihood that war would come again increased dramatically on 7 March, when Germany reoccupied the Rhineland and refused to demilitarise the area.⁸⁷ Although to one later commentator, “there was almost unanimous approval in Great Britain that the Germans had liberated their own country,”⁸⁸ the National Peace Council ended a stormy meeting by condemning it as an act of fascist militarism.⁸⁹ Lansbury met with F.O.R. leaders in Kingsley Hall and a letter from an ecumenical group of pacifists “representing many thousands of people of all sects and classes in London, especially in East London” was sent under Lansbury’s name to Hitler and to other international leaders who were in London attempting to redraft the Locarno agreement. The German ambassador volunteered to Lansbury that he had communicated the letter to Hitler by telephone. The letter argued that each should recognise that all had sinned and that there was a need for a willingness to forgive each other: “Experience has shown that coercion and force ultimately fail. Let us try the other way - the Christian way of love and co-operation.” The only way to peace, said the letter’s authors, was “a way which calls for mutual courage and trust and the sacrifice of immediate glory for the establishment of

justice and understanding among nations.”⁹⁰

Embassies of Reconciliation: The Launch

Rhineland questions affected more than the peace of Europe. In May 1936, Lansbury embarked on a speaking tour of the United States, to be greeted by many crowds of more than one thousand, including 2,500 in New York, 3,000 in Philadelphia and 4,000 in Kansas City.⁹¹ The tour, in which Lansbury was accompanied by Alfred Salter, was in response to an invitation from Kirby Page of the Emergency Peace Campaign.⁹² It opened with an engagement in Washington, after which he made a broadcast address advocating a new League of Nations, based on the principle of equality of rights for everyone.⁹³ En route he met a tired Kellogg, whose Pact had been too little, too late to preserve the peace. Near the end of the tour, Lansbury had a private interview with President Roosevelt. Mindful of U.S. business interests, Roosevelt was not very enthusiastic about an economic world conference, which would need “preparation,” but there was a suggestion that he might be prepared to convene an international conference to discuss how peacefully to remove the causes of war. Lansbury hoped that Roosevelt, being the one statesman standing above European quarrels, might be able to give a lead, and he made a specific proposal. He wanted Roosevelt to invite Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, Chautemps, Chamberlain, and representatives of Japan and China to a war and peace conference in the Azores, with Roosevelt himself as president of the conference and his Secretary of State Cordell Hull (whose slogan “Nations must trade or fight” impressed Lansbury) as the secretary. To Lansbury, this proposal was “reasonable and possible.” Roosevelt hesitated, but the seeds of an idea had been sown. One journalist reported Lansbury’s visit as “One of the greatest personal contributions to the cause of peace in the United States in the last few years.”⁹⁴

During Lansbury’s trip to the U.S. a new and independent body, the Embassies of Reconciliation, was set up in order to facilitate such visits in the future. Details were finalised at the Cambridge Conference of the I.F.O.R. from 28 July to 4 August 1936, where Raven spoke of the need for men and women to be sent out as ambassadors to bring the spirit of peace into any situation showing a risk of becoming acute.⁹⁵ The object of the new organisation was

to make new efforts to bring the message and action of Christian pacifism to bear on the critical situation in the world, to promote peace embassies to various parts of the World where the difficulty was greatest, to realise the need for the service of peacemakers in connection with the problems presented by Abyssinia,

Palestine, China, Spain, Poland, etc, to make a Christian pacifist contribution to the discussions in Geneva and elsewhere on the reform of the League of Nations, to approach church organisations and missionary societies and to help the expression of a world Christian conscience in relation to the peace and war issue.⁹⁶

In practice, the Embassies were to have a more specific rôle, with most of the work being carried out by just a few travelling diplomats, namely Salter, Carter, Bartlett and most of all, Lansbury. Summing up his mission later, Lansbury said,

I went from capital to capital for one purpose only - to try and persuade each Minister that wars are not inevitable; that increasing armaments made war more certain; and to urge them to join in a conference to discuss how to prevent war by removing the causes of war.... I do not go as a leader or even as a politician; but as one ordinary man talking to other ordinary men, striving to bring the minds of statesmen down to earth, asking them to realise whither they are travelling, and before it is too later to come together and at least try to find a way out.⁹⁷

Despite this disclaimer of influence, however, Lansbury's ability to gain access to national leaders across the world was the result of his own political record. As a former party leader he was able to go where the "ordinary man" could not. Yet being now freed from political responsibility, he was able to go where governments could not, arguing the case for an international conference in both dictatorships and democracies, freed from any temptation to act according to narrow national self-interest. Some saw him as the realist in a world of dreamers, the one who could see a way out of the mess created by Versailles, the practical pacifist who wanted not only ultimate but present vindication for his principles. Paul Gliddon was to describe Lansbury's campaign as "one of the most audaciously impertinent expeditions" ever undertaken by an experienced politician.⁹⁸

Embassies in Practice

The first visits under the explicit auspices of the Embassies of Reconciliation received far less publicity than the earlier transatlantic journey. On 20 August 1936, Lansbury met with the French Prime Minister, Léon Blum, in Paris. Like Roosevelt, Blum expressed general support for Lansbury, but stressed the need for "much preparation," especially given intense French hatred of dictatorship and foreign intervention in neighbouring Spain.⁹⁹ The following month Lansbury was in Belgium, being the F.O.R. delegate to an International Peace Congress organised by Lord Cecil.¹⁰⁰ It gave him the opportunity to have an interview with the Belgian Prime Minister, Paul van Zeeland, which cheered Lansbury, who reported that "He came down to earth and

remained there during our talk, and spoke in clear-cut terms.”¹⁰¹ Later that month, in the company of another Socialist pacifist, Rudolph Messel, Lansbury visited Scandinavia. In Copenhagen he met the Senior Mayor and had interviews with the Danish Prime Minister, Stauning and Foreign Secretary, Dr. Munch. He also attended meetings organised by local pacifists. In Oslo, he met several ministers, including the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister Johan Nvgaadsvold, who “considered that everybody should unite in an effort to deal with the economic plight of the world,” wrote Lansbury later, “and every statesman should start by accepting the principle of international co-operation.”¹⁰² In Stockholm the morning after a general election, Lansbury found much in common with the newly elected Prime Minister, Per Albin Hansson, who was also concerned about the “Fascist menace” of Germany. The overall effect on Lansbury of visiting the countries of Scandinavia which were too small to be able to have substantial international impact on their own but would support other nations bold enough to take a lead, was that responsibility for peace lay with Britain and the U.S. “A joint word from Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Chamberlain would bring together a very solid block of large and small nations,” wrote Lansbury, “who would gladly follow a lead to sweep away all trade barriers and start the world along the line of collective peace through the establishment of co-operative sharing.”¹⁰³

Those in positions of power, especially those claiming to be re-arming in the interests of peace, were not prepared to take such risks. It was left to the pacifist Lansbury to take the initiative. Thus six months later, in April 1937, Lansbury risked the wrath of the Labour movement and arranged a personal visit to Hitler.¹⁰⁴ By way of contrast, the churches gave considerable support for his action, with representative leaders of various denominations on both sides of the Atlantic urging their congregations to say special prayers for Lansbury’s mission. Many cards were sent to Lansbury, giving him an indication of how many people rested their hopes on his mission. “I am quite conscious of my own weakness to do more than try to live up to their expectations,” he commented, adding that he did not expect miracles. “All the same we have faith that our message of conciliation, justice and peace is true and this binds us all together.”¹⁰⁵

A group left London on Saturday 17 April 1937, consisting of Lansbury, Bartlett and the Quaker Corder Catchpool who was well experienced in German affairs having been an ambassador for the Society of Friends in Berlin from 1931 to 1936. The Sunday morning, after escaping from the bustle of pressmen and representatives from the German Government and the British Embassy, was spent in the Friends’ Meeting House. Lansbury was moved by the prayers of those around him, and himself prayed for Jews in Germany.¹⁰⁶ The following afternoon Lansbury went to the Foreign Office

to see Hitler. It was a private conversation, via the official interpreter, with just a couple of others in silent attendance. The two men could not have had more widely differing outlooks. Lansbury brought up the prisons, camps and executions. He gained the impression that Hitler was “a mixture - dreamer and fanatic.”¹⁰⁷ Despite the familiarity of some of the arguments, Lansbury could still not comprehend the German leader’s bitter logic. “It is incredible and beyond my belief that the German people as a whole should accept this creed of hatred and bitterness. It is so soulless and inhuman,” he wrote. Mindful of his task, he added “I am certain that if once this great nation can be brought to believe they will get a fair deal with other nations in regard to trade and international relationships, this phase of bitterness will pass.” Lansbury’s aim was to get Hitler’s agreement to attend a new world economic conference which would address the cumulative injustice done to Germany in such a way that would avoid unilateral German military action. Mindful of recent history, Hitler expressed some doubts as to the likely success of such a conference but was still prepared to give his consent to the statement that:

Germany will be very willing to attend a conference and take part in a united effort to establish economic co-operation and mutual understanding between the nations of the world if President Roosevelt or the head of another great country will take the lead in calling such a conference.¹⁰⁸

Lansbury’s mission was vindicated. Here was the sign that a war-avoiding economic conference was possible if only the governments of either the United States or Britain could be persuaded to take the lead. Reports of the Lansbury-Hitler meeting travelled quickly around the world, with M. Delbos, the French Foreign Minister, arguing for hearts and minds to be disarmed: “Surely Mr. Lansbury’s method, even if unusual, may result in some measure of such disarmament - where ‘the usual diplomatic channels’ have not been conspicuously successful.”¹⁰⁹ As *Peace News* reminded its readers, “Niceties of diplomatic prestige must not be allowed to stand in the way of the hopes of the millions of ordinary people who have to pay the price for diplomatic failures.”¹¹⁰ That comment was made at the same time as Baldwin was telling the House of Commons on 22 April that only a “thorough and comprehensive investigation”¹¹¹ could clear the way for such a conference, by which he indicated that the British Government had no willingness to undertake such investigation and would not take the chance that was being offered. What was to be almost the last opportunity for peace was ignored.

Undaunted by the reaction to his Berlin visit, Lansbury prepared for another, equally momentous visit. On 8 July, Lansbury, Bartlett and Messel, waved on their way by Sheppard and other well-wishers, set off for Rome to engage Mussolini.¹¹² As their

train passed through Italian towns and villages, Lansbury identified with the working people he saw, reinforcing his belief that any war against such people would be civil war, a crime against humanity. He also realised the responsibility that the Churches had for the future state of the world:

As I approached Rome I was quite certain ... that if those who claim to represent the Author and Giver of the Christian faith would with one accord fling out a challenge to all Governments demanding that all war should cease and the building of armaments be stopped while statesmen gathered together to discuss how to bring peace and not barbarism to the world, there would rise from all lands such a response as would compel every Government not only to listen but to act.¹¹³

There was a brief meeting between Lansbury and Mussolini soon after the travellers arrived in Rome, but Lansbury was tired and they agreed to meet again two days later. By that time Lansbury had also met Mussolini's son-in-law Foreign Minister, Count Ciano and Senator Marconi. The second interview with the Duce was more substantive, with Mussolini explaining that he felt that in Abyssinia and in Spain he was not doing anything that Britain had not done before. The only hopeful sign was an indication that just as representatives of the major powers were meeting for discussions on how to stop the Spanish fighting spreading to other countries, so it might be possible to negotiate a complete standstill on armaments, monitored by observers from the smaller nations. Overall, however, Lansbury was far less impressed with the Italian leader than with the city of Rome:

my interview with Mussolini closed with my trying to tell, as clearly as was possible, why I thought it was quite impossible for Germany, Japan, or Italy to recreate old or build new empires, and why it is impossible for Great Britain or any other power to retain power and domination over others. The Gospel for which the early Christians were persecuted and slain is the only gospel which can save the race.... Force has failed, not the power of love as taught by Jesus. The words: "Thou has conquered, O Nazarene" are truer to-day than ever. The old Rome perished, but the message of the Nazarene still lives in the world and is calling all peoples to renounce force, violence, and domination and rest their security on truth, equality, and love. This is a summary, as far as I remember them, of my concluding words. There was silence: we walked down the room and with a "Good night, we must do the best we can," we parted.¹¹⁴

Lansbury was not impressed with Mussolini, seeing in him characteristics he associated with his political opponents at home, notably "the fire and rhetorical expression of Lloyd George and all the ruthlessness of Winston Churchill." In Lansbury's eyes, "It is not possible to be a dictator and not be ruthless."¹¹⁵ There was small consolation in the verdict on Lansbury in the Italian press. The newspaper *Tribuna* noted that "We do not know if men like George Lansbury can influence the course of history, but it is certain

that contact with him does one good, because it makes one feel more serene. His great sincerity appears beyond discussion.”¹¹⁶

Hardly had Lansbury arrived back in England than he, Stuart Morris and other British pacifists set off once more to Denmark. Again Lansbury met Danish Government ministers, including Dr. Munch, but on this occasion the principal purpose of the visit was the triennial conference of War Resisters International. The final resolution of the Conference summed up precisely what Lansbury was trying to achieve.

We affirm that the right way to oppose tyranny is not to kill the tyrant but to refuse to co-operate with him in his wrong-doing. Not only will we refuse to take up arms or to assist in the preparation for armed violence, but we dedicate ourselves anew to strive for the removal of economic and political barriers which make life intolerable for so many peoples, and to work for social justice and the abolition of all class distinctions, preparing ourselves to make whatever sacrifices are necessary for the establishment of a new order of society and more just relationships between nations.¹¹⁷

On the last day of the Conference, which had seen Sheppard elected to the International Council of the W.R.I.,¹¹⁸ Lansbury succeeded Lord Ponsonby as Chairman of W.R.I., announcing “I have been a War Resister all my life.”¹¹⁹ There was now an Anglican clean sweep in the leadership of all the principal peace organisations, with Barnes the President of the National Peace Council, Raven at the F.O.R., Sheppard at the P.P.U. and Lansbury at the W.R.I.

Embassies to Central Europe

1937 ended for Lansbury, in the company of Bartlett and Carter, with a tour of the capitals of Central Europe. The first interview was on 10 December in Prague with the Czechoslovak Prime Minister, Dr. Hodza, followed by a second with the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Kamil Krofta, after which Lansbury lunched with the President, Dr. Benes. With hope that the mission of Van Zeeland might bring proposals leading to greater international stability, Lansbury felt “more hopeful” when he left Prague than when he had left Berlin and Rome.¹²⁰

Next stop for the travelling ambassadors was Poland, where the Government regarded the resident Jewish population as excess and treated them as a segregated and economically persecuted group.¹²¹ Lansbury ensured he discussed Jewish poverty with the Minister for Home Affairs, Count Emeric Hutten-Czapski. The party also interviewed a number of other senior politicians: Colonel Joseph Beck, the Polish

Foreign Secretary; Marshal Edward Smigly-Rydz, Inspector-General of Defence; Felician Slawoj-Sladkowski, the Prime Minister; and Ignacy Moscicki, the President. Again, the Van Zeeland report was eagerly awaited. At the end of it all, the Government's official communiqué noted that:

Strong emphasis was laid on the importance of a concentration in an international conference on industrial, social, cultural, and humanitarian activities as contributing to the solution of the problem of peace. Other matters discussed in a frank and friendly manner were the Jewish question, the question of migration, the minorities question and freedom of religious worship.¹²²

The third stop in this tour was Vienna, which the party visited on 16 December. As well as the usual press briefings there was a meeting with various representatives of W.R.I., F.O.R. and the Society of Friends. Lansbury was especially impressed by the Quakers, realising "how much these quiet unassuming people are able to do when all others seem doomed to fail."¹²³ The first official interview was with Dr. Schmidt in the Austrian Foreign Office, and the final interview was (briefly) with President Miklas. In between, on 18 December, Lansbury had a personal interview with the Austrian Chancellor, Dr. Kurt Schuschnigg. As in Warsaw, Lansbury's questions were not restricted to international matters, but included internal human rights, particularly those of political prisoners and their dependants. He asked for, and received, an assurance that some prisoners would be released at Christmas.¹²⁴ Lansbury's major speech of the tour was delivered to the Kulturbund on 17 December:

I come to you as a Pacifist Socialist, a member of the British House of Commons elected to oppose violence and war of every kind, and to work for the establishment of peace and security through international co-operation between all peoples.

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. When Jesus bid men and women to pray to be forgiven their sins, and to forgive others as they hoped to be forgiven; to love their enemies and to do to others as they would be done unto, he was not talking sentimental nonsense, but telling people in a simple, realist manner that all of us need forgiveness because all of us, individuals and nations, have sinned against the light, and are continually doing so. And of this there will be no end until we are willing to accept the simple truth that we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God.

He recognised some points in common between the various politicians he had interviewed in different countries.

Every statesman to whom I have spoken asserts that his country is arming for

defence. Every statesman of any authority in every land declares that another great war will result in the destruction of civilisation and in chaos.... War cannot be destroyed by war. We shall kill the war spirit when we substitute co-operation for competition and are willing to be partners in a world commonwealth within which peoples will live at peace, because collective justice has taken the place of violence and war.

As far as his own mission was concerned, he said:

In pursuit of my quest for peace I have appealed to every leading statesman in the world to give up the tiresome business of talking at each other across the air or through the medium of the Press, and instead to come together and talk with each other. In effect, I have asked for a peace conference now - without any further loss of time.

Asserting that "It is possible for us to kill one another but impossible to destroy truth: for truth is eternal," Lansbury argued that

Neither Fascism, Socialism, Communism, or any other form of government will last if based on force.... How can we boast of progress if we continue to try and defend greed and selfishness, and imperialist nationalism, with the use of the most diabolical methods of destruction?

He ended on a rousing, religious appeal:

If Jesus Christ came through that door with Julius Cæsar and Napoleon beside him, to whom would you kneel? You know, as I do, that we should kneel to Jesus Christ. And so I appeal that we make up our minds to-night to reject violence and accept the way of love, and become citizens of the Kingdom of Heaven.¹²⁵

A POLITICAL CHRONOLOGY: ENDNOTES

1. *Church Times*, 10 January 1930, p31.

2. *Reconciliation*, April 1930, p62.

3. The full motion, proposed by Bishop Woods of Winchester and carried unanimously was: "That this House, believing that war as an instrument of national policy is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ, welcomes the steps towards world peace involved in the League of Nations, the Kellogg Pact, and other political instruments; hopes for the success of the present Naval Conference; and more especially urges upon clergy and lay teachers the duty of giving clear and continued expression to the doctrine of our Lord, and of thereby helping to create that Christian public opinion upon which the issue must ultimately depend." (*Church Times*, 21 February 1930, p233.)

4. *Reconciliation*, February 1930, p31.

5. Wallis, *Valiant For Peace*, p79.

6. *Church Times*, 17 January 1930, p64,65.

7. *Reconciliation*, March 1930, p47,48.

8. Bussey and Timms, p94,95.

9. *Church of England Newspaper*, 24 July 1931, p12.

10. *Church Times*, 26 June 1931, p822. The best that could be done was for Bishop Bell to ask the Social and Industrial Commission to watch the work of the Disarmament Conference. The attitudes of the Anglican hierarchy left much to be desired in the approach to the Conference. Bishop Masterman of Plymouth held that "Unquestionably the British Empire is solidly on the side of world peace," (*Church of England Newspaper*, 7 November 1930.) In late summer 1931, he told the World Alliance Conference in Cambridge that the time had not come, and might never, when the nations of the world could beat *all* their swords into ploughshares. (*Church of England Newspaper*, 4 September 1931, p7.) He also relished preaching aboard H. M. S. Rodney on the subject of the value of beautiful places of worship in the ships of the Royal Navy. The following week the Bishop of Portsmouth toured the same battleship and preached to its company. (*Church Times*, 22 January 1932, p108.) Archbishop Lang was not much better. A service of prayer for the Disarmament Conference was held in St. Paul's Cathedral on 15 December 1931, one of a series of such services and days of prayer throughout the country. The Prime Minister, various ambassadors and other dignitaries were present. The intercessions included prayers for the King and the British Empire. (*Church Times*, 18 December 1931, p715.) In his sermon, the Archbishop of Canterbury encouraged not only those who wished the Conference well, but also those who did not. Britain, it appeared to him, had already made more substantial reductions than any other country: "Indeed, there are many who think that she has already reached the lowest point consistent with her safety and obligations. This very fact creates a difficulty which her representatives will have to face. It may not be possible for them to accept some general reduction by a fixed common percentage." The *Church Times* was appalled at the Archbishop's efforts, which it found to be "felicitous in phrase and admirable in sentiment; but it was an amiable political speech rather than a sermon. The times demand a large measure of Christian audacity from the leaders of the Church. What is wanted is the stern denunciation of St. Thomas of Canterbury, not the pleasant sentiment of the

country rectory. Dr. Lang criticized "selfish nationalism." He did not denounce it as the new and most pernicious paganism." (*Church Times*, 18 December 1931, p711.) The editor of *Reconciliation* also deplored the Archbishop's words. "If this is the spirit in which each of the nations is going to Geneva," he wrote, "there is little hope of any progress being made." The question was, "Do we really believe in disarmament?" (*Reconciliation*, January 1932, p11.)

11. Cecil, Temple, et al spoke in Central Hall in June; Baldwin, Lloyd George and others spoke in the Albert Hall in July. (*Church Times*, 19 June 1931, p792.)

12. *Church of England Newspaper*, 10 July 1931, p12.

13. *Church Times*, 16 October 1931, p443.

14. *Church of England Newspaper*, 20 November 1931, p2.

15. *Reconciliation*, October 1931, p447.

16. *Church of England Newspaper*, 5 June 1931, p11. The five young men were Geoffrey Trease, T. M. E. Bryant, W. N. Warbey, A. N. Walker and J. R. Evans. In the course of the next three months letters of support were printed from, inter alia: Helen Allan, Miss L. Dobell, C. V. England, H. A. Golding, E. M. G. Jayne, R. C. Neil, W. Noble, H. Nussbaum, C. Renton, W. A. Reynolds, L. E. Roberts, S. Gordon Sloan, W. B. Stanbury, Robert Trease, Audrey Wicks, R. Harker Wilby, Thomas Wilson, 'An Ex-Soldier', 'Modern Girl', 'Another Modern Girl' and 'Modern Youth'.

17. *Church of England Newspaper*, 14 August 1931, p12.

18. Christ and Peace archive.

19. *Reconciliation*, February 1932, p38. Also *Church Times*, 8 January 1932, p27. The letter continued: "We ask that [the British Delegation] shall be instructed to work for a substantial reduction of armaments, prepared to proposed a definite plan and empowered to offer large reductions in the land, sea and air forces of this country.

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. We ask our Churches to unite their members in a clear testimony for peace...."

20. On the opening day of the Disarmament Conference, the English Churches combined to pray for its well being at a large Disarmament Demonstration at the Albert Hall, with crowds "reminiscent of the most enthusiastic of the Anglo-Catholic Congresses." (*Church Times*, 5 February 1932, p174.) Under the presidency of the two Archbishops, over twenty bishops, various representatives from the Free Churches (including the young Leeds Wesleyan Leslie Weatherhead who was to speak about his debt to half the world each morning before he had finished his breakfast), together with representatives of the Jesuits, the League of Nations Union and also the Chief Rabbi sat on the platform. The Archbishop of Canterbury spoke of hopes for reductions in armaments, if only to the levels required for national and international "defence," although he did hope for the elimination of bombing aircraft and submarines. He added, portentously, "We are bound in honour to implement the pledges given at Versailles, that the compulsory disarmament of Germany was to be the first step in a general disarmament throughout the world. If the nations who signed it do not mean what they say, if they are prepared to make those solemn declarations scraps of paper, to be put aside when there is pressure against them, then it will be a pitiful and humiliating confession that civilization cannot honour its own word." (*Church Times*, 5 February 1932, p174.)

The Archbishop of York spoke of armaments as the chief expression of the conception of the national state as an ultimate object of loyalty, subject to no direction from a higher authority (by which he meant not God but the community of such states.) He asked for understanding for the people of France, whose difficulties with disarmament proposals were due to their country having been invaded twice within living memory. He also said, in another portentous expression, that it was "not tolerable" that the open quarters of a civilian town should be bombed from the air.

Later that week the Church Assembly debated a resolution, proposed by the Bishop of Lichfield, supporting the Disarmament Conference. Although the motion was carried, a considerable minority backed the view that Britain should "refuse to pledge itself to any further measure of Disarmament" until after other countries had made substantial cuts themselves. (*Church Times*, 12 February 1932, p206.) If the Church, with its supposedly greater vision, could not agree on the need for disarmament, it was hardly surprising that national politicians, with their narrower, selfish agendas, failed to make progress.

The Bishop of Lichfield was also behind a more positive statement which came from the ecumenical Council of Christian Ministers on Social Questions, including Barnes, Raven and a variety of other dignitaries of different denominations. It stressed the iniquities of the Versailles spirit of vengeance ("We cannot exaggerate the stress our Lord laid on forgiveness") and that not only at a personal level: "Nations as well as individuals must learn to forgive. As we look back on the horrors of the Great War, and contemplate its disastrous consequences, we are persuaded that the nations are called to a great and comprehensive act of reconciliation. We must abandon the spirit of recrimination and the dark war-spirit of suspicion and hatred. It may be that the abandonment of reparations will become compulsory through the collapse of Germany. Our appeal is that, while there is yet time for an act of grace, those who believe in Christ should make their voices heard in the demand for a cancellation by forgiveness of all reparations and international war debts, in the name of Jesus, the Prince of Peace." (*Church of England Newspaper*, 22 January 1931, p9.)

Five months later the same Council again expressed support for the Conference, with Barnes, Raven and others backing suggestions for a general reduction in armaments of one third, with a complete abolition of submarines. (*Manchester Guardian*, 29 June 1932.)

21. *The Church Should Take the Lead*, p6. A.P.F. archive.

22. Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945*, p127. Although in March 1927 the Cambridge Union had passed a motion "That lasting peace can only be secured by the people of England adopting an uncompromising attitude of pacificism," that had been little noticed at the time.

23. The wording of the motion was not half as radical as was sometimes assumed. It was not a strictly pacifist motion as it only ruled out one form of war, nationalistic war, and did not address attitudes to such issues as collective security. Any rebellion being shown by the undergraduates was against nationalism at least as much as militarism. Irrespective of other considerations, the first vote would have been a reflection of the debating skill of the participants and the second was a deliberate snub to interfering elders. The high levels of publicity reflected the newsworthiness of the antics of the upper classes as much as any upsurge of pacifist feeling.

24. Thus, in the *Church Times* (24 February 1933, p220), H. H. E. Peacock of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford cited Joad's Union speech and commented that a far more effective way to prevent war than the peace conferences of the rulers of the nations would be "to forward this world movement of practical pacifism." Other contributors to the discussion in the *Church Times* included: 'R. E.', C. Paul Gliddon, John Gordon, Francis Harrold, Harry Kerswell, Tom Scrutton, and the Marquis of Tavistock.

25. Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945*, p134,135.

26. The questions were:

1. Should Great Britain remain a Member of the League of Nations?
2. Are you in favour of an all-round reduction of armaments by international agreement?
3. Are you in favour of the all-round abolition of national military and naval aircraft by international agreement?
4. Should the manufacture and sale of armaments for private profit be prohibited by international agreement?
5. Do you consider that, if a nation insists on attacking another, the other nations should combine to compel it to stop it by (a) economic and non-military measures?
(b) if necessary, military measures?

Nowhere in the questions was there space for advocates of unilateral disarmament to state their beliefs, nor was the division of Question 5 into two sections sufficient to allow pacifist opinion to be distinctively revealed. It was later decided to allow the statement "I accept the Christian pacifist attitude" as an alternative to a Yes or No answer to either or both sections of this question. That "Christian" and "Pacifist" were side by side indicated the assumptions both of the drafting committee and many of the population who regarded pacifism as springing from Christian commitment. That may have been true for many pacifists, but certainly not for all.

The highest turnout in a Parliamentary constituency was 86.6% in Montgomery. Throughout the country there was an overwhelmingly positive response to the first two questions (over eleven million and ten and a half million votes respectively), hardly surprising given their blandness. Encouragingly and perhaps more surprisingly, a similar majority was produced for Question 4 - with majorities even in areas with a high level of military industry - and only a slightly smaller majority (nine and a half million voting Yes) for Question 3. There were over 855,000 abstentions to the question about non-military sanctions and a huge division at 5(b). Both parts of Question 5 were affirmed, but 5(b) had less than 58.7% of the vote. Over 2,350,000 people voted against, with even more abstaining. The somewhat unclear "Christian pacifist" option was taken up by 14,121 voters to 5(a) and 17,482 to 5(b). (Livingstone, *The Peace Ballot*, Supplementary Sheet.) That that in no way accurately reflected the strength of pacifist opinion was already being shown by Sheppard's Pledge, launched while the Ballot was still underway.

27. Dame Adelaide Livingstone, *The Peace Ballot*, p9,10.

28. The vicar of a Coventry parish promoted the ballot by replacing an Evensong sermon by a graphic play based on the suffering inflicted by war on outcast Belgian women. (*Church of England Newspaper*, 9 November 1934, p14.) The Dean of Peterborough enrolled as a ballot worker and canvassed the precincts of his cathedral. (*Church of England Newspaper*, 1 February 1935.)

29. *Reconciliation*, March 1932, p60.

30. "My strong feeling is that we who think we are Christians shld strive might and main to [*illegible* - 'raise'?] our fellow Christians to the imminence of war the end of which will inevitably smash all that has been accomplished over the centuries & fling what remains alive of humanity into a material barbarism such as the world has never known.

I can't believe this is inevitable. If only we Pacifists and true Socialists will have faith in our principles and stand up for them as you are doing at all costs. More people realise there is room enough, raw material enough & markets enough for all. We need only common sense and common honesty to enable all to enjoy the bounties of nature. Seek ye first the Kingdom of God wh is no idle sentimental saying it simply means love one another.... G. B. Shaw and Wells say it in other words. So do many others in the H. of C. Somehow we must be bold & courageous enough to say that our gospel is "common sense" because it is founded on the plain teaching of our Lord...." (Lansbury to Sheppard, 16

August 1935. Richardson papers. The letter to the *Times* was published on Monday 19 August.)

31. *Times*, 19 August 1935.

32. Paul Gliddon in *Reconciliation*, July 1938, p214.

33. *Times*, 5 September 1935.

34. *Times*, 20 August 1935. Charles Raven preached in support of Lansbury's position and his opposition to imperialism in a sermon at Liverpool Cathedral. If it was wrong for one people to exercise sole dominion over another, he said, then Britain was the country which should set an example, otherwise the League of Nations would be no more than an instrument for maintaining the status quo. (*Times*, 9 September 1935.)

35. *Church of England Newspaper*, 20 September 1935, p9. Four thousand people attended in the main hall, with an overflow meeting downstairs and fifteen hundred turned away disappointed.

36. *Reconciliation*, October 1935, p269-272.

37. He had been a M.P. before the war, but failed to hold his seat in 1912 when he resigned over the lack of progress towards women's suffrage.

38. There was strong suspicion that the king had intervened directly to keep Lansbury out of office. Lansbury's comment was that "George five should keep his fingers out of the pie." (Postgate, p251.)

39. When "Tom Mann, the brothers Buck, and Guy Bowman were charged with printing and publishing a document addressed to men in the army, appealing to them during labour disputes not to fire on their fellow workers," Lansbury, elected to Parliament in 1910, called for a division and succeeded in getting an adjournment debate. "After much private and public negotiations, we got the prisoners released before their sentences were quite finished." (*My Life*, p117.) Fifteen years later, when the Labour Government tried to prosecute J. R. Campbell, editor of the Communist *Workers' Weekly*, for a "Don't Shoot" article addressed to troops, Lansbury held a huge Albert Hall rally in support of the defendant and made the assembled crowd stand and repeat after him the supposedly offensive appeal. He was treasurer of the committee to defend and support the arrested leaders. The Government dropped the charges in embarrassment amidst Liberal and Tory condemnation.

40. Postgate, p237.

41. Lansbury, *My Life*, p8.

42. *My Life*, p287.

43. Lansbury "was the one Minister to retire with laurels," was one adversary's comment at the next election. (*Evening Times*. Cited in Holman, *Good Old George*, p130.)

44. It became known as "Lansbury's Lido." (Holman, *Good Old George*, p124.)

45. Postgate, p274. As Lansbury had written in 1928, "If the Labour movement for the sake of office becomes wedded to the devil's doctrine of mere expediency, it will inevitably perish." (*My Life*, p11.)

46. *My Life*, p11.

47. Hyde Park May Day rally, 1933; *Daily Herald*, 8 May 1933. Cited in Schneer, p161.
48. *Manchester Guardian*, 31 July 1933. Cited in Schneer, p161.
49. *My England*, p139.
50. *My England*, p13.
51. *My England*, p152.
52. *Daily Herald*, 10 September 1933. Cited in Schneer, p162.
53. *Clarion*, 12 May 1934.
54. Schneer, p163.
55. Lansbury to James Middleton, 8 September 1934. Cited in Schneer, p160.
56. Relations between Lansbury and Churchill were particularly strained. It was reported that at one late night debate in May 1932, Churchill sauntered into the House of Commons and interrupted the proceedings in an arrogant tone. Lansbury rose on behalf of other M.P.s who had waited for hours in the hope of being able to speak. "I will tell the right hon. Gentleman what ought to have been told him long ago, and it is that he usurps a position in this House, as if he had a right to walk in, make his speech, walk out, and leave the whole place as if Almighty God had spoken." (Postgate, p291.) A heated discussion ensued, with Churchill's arrogant pride wounded. Lansbury's son, Edgar, was in no doubt that in his father's mind Churchill stood for all that was wrong with Britain. "Winston Churchill personifies the spirit of the real rulers of England today - their determination to hold on at all costs to their privileges, their wealth, their power. Ease and luxury, pomp and ceremony mean everything to them.... Churchill is a dictator in the making, and when the complete collapse of capitalism in England takes place he will be the first to lead the counter-revolution. I am sure that father perceives all this, and would make an exception in Churchill's case to his usual disclaimer that he blames the system, not individuals, for the existence of class war." (*George Lansbury: My Father*, p162.)
57. E.g. Gandhi sent a telegram. British Library of Political and Economic Science.
58. The normally hostile *Evening News* commented: "We think little of Mr. Lansbury's politics but a great deal of his deep sincerity, his kindly and unassuming personality and the courage and industry which he brings to the thankless task of leading the Labour party through the dismal wilderness of Opposition." (11 December 1933. Cited by Edgar Lansbury in *George Lansbury, My Father*, p178.)
59. "My illness and nearness to death had made some things clearer to me," (cited in Postgate, p291) commented Lansbury, such as "We do not live by bread alone, even though we must have bread.... It is impossible for me even to imagine a Socialist society based merely on the supply of material needs. My stay in hospital, my doubts and misgivings, my communing with myself, and the thoughts of those who have passed on, my reading and my prayers have all united to confirm my faith that Socialism, which means love, co-operation and brotherhood in every department of human affairs, is the only outward expression of a Christian's faith." (*My England*, p34-37.)
60. *My England*, p15.

61. *My England*, p29.

62. *My England*, p31,32.

63. *My England*, p34,35.

64. *My England*, p184. Lansbury told a story of the Versailles Conference, when the national leaders professed their readiness to disarm until Clemenceau indicated the need to link this with France giving up North Africa, the United States leaving the Philippines, Britain pulling out of India and so on. Whereupon, according to Lansbury's story, the various statesmen said that that was not what they intended at all and proceeded to draft clauses which disarmed Germany alone.

65. *My England*, p189.

66. *My England*, p187,188.

67. *My England*, p176.

68. *My England*, p191.

69. *My England*, p176.

70. *My England*, p191,192.

71. "Every instinct I possess is against war. If ever I have prayed more sincerely than at other times, it is when I have sung or said the words, "Give to us peace in our time, O Lord." I neither want to kill or be killed, wound or be wounded. My life is not worth the sacrifice of another's. I do not want to be protected by shot and shell, poison gas, or the terrors of the submarine. Certainly my life is very valuable to me, it is the one personality I understand and appreciate. Because life is of value to me I cannot ask that others should risk so valuable a possession on my behalf. Especially we old people should dishonour war. We have no right to allow the young and middle-aged to be sacrificed for us. But Christians whose faith rests on the incarnation, who believe that the coming of Jesus as the Son of God sanctified all human life, cannot possibly believe it is God's will that men should fight and destroy each other. I have listened to sermons and speeches by good, clean living, honourable men trying to defend in the same breath religion and war, Capitalism and the love of one's neighbour. Always it has seemed to me a pitiable exhibition of sheer weak reasoning. There is no half-way house for Christians between Socialism and Capitalism, or between war and complete reliance on peace by disarmament. Once we concede the rightness of wars, no matter for what purpose, we give our case away. "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord." "Put up thy sword, those who take the sword perish by the sword," ring down the ages, explicit and true; compromise lands us into the slough of destruction and death.

The churches cannot escape the dilemma which the life and example of the master presents us with. he proclaimed the oneness of life, the brotherhood of the human race, and in the moment of supreme trial rejected reliance on weapons of destruction....

Some leaders of the church are speaking out bravely on behalf of peace and against war, and are urging our nation to give the world a great, noble lead by declaring our willingness to rely always on the justice of our cause before the tribunals of the world. It is up to us laymen, and especially those who like myself wish to establish Socialism, to support such bishops and others by every means in our power. If we can induce Christians to renounce war of all kinds, and face whatever may befall us, we shall, I am sure, lead the world. One thing is certain. A new England will be a truly Christian England. War at home or abroad will be impossible, for we shall refuse to fight, and will leave our welfare to the care of him who said, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (*My England*, p41-

43.)

It has been suggested (Postgate, p293) that, especially after Temple and Gore had opened the eyes of many clergy to conditions in society, Lansbury's voice was more influential in the Church than that of the average bishop.

72. *My Quest for Peace*, p16.

73. *Times*, 4 October 1935, p8.

74. Writing of Aneurin Bevan, who for a while had been Lansbury's Parliamentary Private Secretary, Michael Foot argued later that "Cripps, Bevan and Lansbury, for whatever curious reasons, were the hard-headed realists who had their finger on the kernel of truth." (*Aneurin Bevan, vol.1, 1897-1945*, p212.)

75. *Times*, 2 October 1935, p9.

76. During Lansbury's time in hospital, a policy document *For Socialism and Peace* was published. "It is not a scheme which out-and-out pacifists will be able to support," said Lansbury at the time, but he did recommend it for study, upholding "anything that appears to turn men's minds away from reliance on brute force." (*My England*, p81,82.)

77. *My Quest for Peace*, p24-31.

78. Postgate, p304.

79. Postgate, p303.

80. *My Quest For Peace*, p25,31.

81. *Times*, 9 October 1935, p12.

82. Bevin's action was electoral suicide for Labour. Within a fortnight, a gleeful Government, aware that Labour had lost a popular leader, called a General Election. Labour had no distinctive alternative policy and was yet again trounced, with neither the League nor Abyssinia seeing any noticeable benefit. Within four years, the Tory Government elected would take Britain into yet another world war. In his own election address to his constituents, Lansbury concentrated on the causes of war: "I appeal to my fellow Christians, to people of all creeds, Jew and Gentile, rich and poor, old and young, to join me in a great crusade against this madness of war. Send me to Parliament with a mandate to call the nation to one great supreme effort for peace. If a strike threatens, or breaks out, everybody urges arbitration and conciliation. If peace is to be saved this is what we must do in international affairs.... The day and the hour has come when, because of our faith in the Gospels, because we believe that Christ had, and still has, the words of eternal life both for this world and the next, we must put our all into the common pool of service. At Geneva we must renounce imperialism, call upon all nations to join with us in a great endeavour to abolish the causes of war; and by so doing, usher in the days of Peace. Do not believe that this is a dream. It is the only realist policy for preventing war. Modern wars are always waged for territory or markets.... Great capitalist combines, with the aid of the Government, control, for private gain, production and distribution of cotton and wheat, iron and steel, copper and tin, nickel and tea, rubber and pepper. Surely Governments which can unite, organise, and sacrifice for war, can, if they so determine, organise together for peace. Why should we aid private enterprise and restrict and expand production and markets, and create conditions that ultimately lead to war? It is much easier to co-operate in friendly relationship than to fight and beggar ourselves and others." (*My Quest For Peace*, p32,33.)

It was Lansbury's most successful election ever, as his personal majority rose to a record 13,357.

83. *Church Times*, 11 October 1935, p405; *Times*, 9 October 1935, p12.

84. "We meet as members of the Church of England. I speak as a communicant member of that Church. Our religious faith comes to us from Him Who was crucified on Calvary. From the day when He was tempted of the devil till His death He proclaimed love and service as the way of life by which mankind could live at peace with one another. At the supreme moment of His life, when arrested and being led to death, he refused all assistance from His disciples and in memorable language proclaimed the simple truth: "Those who take the sword perish by the sword."

After His death a tiny handful of disciples, following His commandment, went forth into the world, preaching his Gospel of love and brotherhood. They started as Communists, holding all things in common. They denounced the sin of usury and abolished it from their lives. They declined to serve in the Roman or any other armies. They believed that the teaching of their Lord and Master was for this world as well as for life eternal. Their faith was supreme and above all State control or expedience. Those among them who were learned or wealthy shared all personal gifts with their fellow-disciples.

This band of men and women grew in numbers and strength even though many were persecuted, crucified, and torn to pieces by wild beasts. They were charged with wanting to turn the world upside down, and in fact were daily turning men and women from a life of strife to a life of co-operation and love.

After nearly four centuries of struggle, the Powers of this world took our great religion to their bosom, and crushed spiritual values out of it. So effectively has this been done, that to-day leaders of religion, on the plea of that necessity which, we are told by military men, knows no law, support the creation of every foul device in the form of poison gas and scientific machinery for the destruction of human life. Christians of all denominations are organized to carry out mass murder. The most accursed disregard of human life is sanctified and blessed by those who speak to us in the name of our Master Who is the Prince of Peace.

Prelates of our Church publicly regret that our nation has reduced armaments, and join in the clamant demand for more and more weapons of destruction. We are told that if others do this evil thing, we must follow their example. This means, if it means anything at all, that we do not accept the Gospel message, 'Overcome evil by good.'

This is a most terrible betrayal of our religious faith. We become, in fact, not standard bearers of great principles, but followers of the gospel of expediency. All such teaching is blasphemy and sin against the Holy Ghost.

Let me be quite clear; this brutal, hell-begotten business of war has been blessed by the leaders of religion as a necessary though unpleasant evil. During the last war, those in all lands who claimed to speak for the Prince of Peace, persuaded and cheered the youth of the world to slaughter each other in the name of Him Who said, 'Vengeance is Mine, I will repay,' and Who gave His life to save us all from the curse of strife and war. The slogan then was, 'War to end war.' We know now it was a war like all wars, to make the world safe for more devastating, soul-destroying war.

I ask in all reverence, what becomes of the Christian doctrine "Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, today and for ever"? If He is, then surely his message is as true and practicable as ever.

Let any impartial person look back over the centuries that have passed since the message of "Peace on earth, goodwill to men" first came to Bethlehem. Powerful churches have accepted this message as an ideal, but at the same time have declared by word and deed that it was only an impracticable ideal. As a consequence war, pestilence and famine have again and again decimated and desolated the world....

Can any one of us measure the mental agony and bloody sweat of a battlefield? And can anyone weigh in the balance the bitterness and sorrow of those who realise their suffering was given in vain - a sadness which must come over those who, knowing what has been, now see mankind organising for an even greater slaughter and destruction?

Apart altogether from the Italo-Abyssinian dispute, the youth of the world is now being urged to make

ready for another war to end war. From one end of the world to the other a most terrific race of armaments is in full swing. Whatever happens in Abyssinia, this race is to go on. It is said these armaments are needed to secure collective security. Just fancy: all nations are pledged against war; all claim to be ardent and sincere in their desire for peace; and at the same time each nation sets to work piling up all the most bestial and effective means of pursuing war. This is called being a realist. I call it lunacy of the worst description, because it is conscious lunacy....

Where does our faith come in? Do not tell me faith is not enough; that because others arm themselves with the terrible weapons of warfare, we too must rely, not on the power of our Lord's gospel but on the contrary, must rely on keeping our poison gas more deadly than others, in order to conquer, not by the spirit and practice of love but by force. Remember, a leading statesman tells us our only defence is offence, which means we must kill more women and children more quickly than our enemy.

Do you honestly believe that Jesus Christ, for any reason you can conceive, would in retaliation or for any other reason murder little children or engage in mass murder of this or any other kind? Do you think St. Francis or any of those whose memory we all revere would in any conditions support the use of poison gas against either armed or unarmed people?

I appeal to all who hear or read what I have to say to understand that war abroad and class war at home, with all its horrors of depressed areas, hunger, privation and destitution in the midst of plenty, are not the acts of God nor the will of His Son. These evils are caused by the wickedness and stupidity of man. I neither explain nor palliate the evil wrought in the world because of the failure of Governments or individuals to follow the law of God, but I am challenging the action of those who, speaking for the Master, sanction preparations for war and endeavour to show that in using the bestial weapons of war, men are fulfilling the will of God. Expediency may be the curse of people like me who are politicians; of those who earn their bread in the market place. Those who teach us that God is love and that the law of our life is love cannot without becoming themselves apostate teach us that expediency may be a guiding principle of our lives.

With great humility I challenge my fellow-Christians, leaders, and followers, to join in a new missionary effort. Perhaps I was wrong in asking the chiefs of Christendom and other religions to meet at Jerusalem. I hope not. I believe the next move for world peace must come from them. In any case, my appeal is to you; we must go back to Calvary, and with humility ask forgiveness for our own individual and national sins and for power to take our stand before the world, declaring our faith in the truth of Gospel messages and our willingness to give up all imperial domination, and with Julian say, 'Thou has conquered, O Galilæan,' and mean it as the first disciples meant it....

This is the faith which in my foolishness sustains me. People ask what would happen if my requests were responded to by leaders of religion. I cannot say. Do you remember the words of Jesus on the Cross, dying a terrible death, forsaken by everyone except a few humble, powerless followers? No word of failure, no word of bitterness, of hatred, but a clear, ringing cry of love and forgiveness. "Father forgive them, they know not what they do." Remember also St. Francis, who, in the square of Assisi, stripped of everything, renounced war, riches and position so as to follow the Master he loved through loving service to God and the people.

Often in these days I have thought of these great lives, and have wished my own faltering inconsistent life could have been a more worthy one. I beg you, especially the young who may feel as I do; do not give up. Our Father knows us, judges us as no one else can.... We must cast aside all fear, leave all expediency to those who would follow the road of ease and comfort which leads to ruin and barbarism. Let us all blaze a trail on the simple truth of the Master, facing with confidence and faith all the troubles which may beset us. We know that by faith we shall conquer.

All Christian nations must give up this senseless nationalism which creates bitterness and war, and in its stead we must be willing to join in a great international effort, to rebuild the world on the basis of co-operative service. We who are powerful and great must become servants and be willing to put all our gifts, material and moral, into the common pool....

I call you to a holy struggle against war, against the sin of Mammon-worship. I ask you to believe our Lord's message as a message of life here and now, and I beg you all to oppose by every means in your

power all war, whether it be national or international; and always remember that war is a bestial, barbarous, unchristian crime which men adopt because they refuse to believe the Lord's promise: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."" (*Church of England Newspaper*, 11 October 1935, p1, and *Church Times*, 18 October 1935, p437,438.)

85. Lansbury to Sheppard, 16 November 1935. Richardson papers. The Richardson papers include undated manuscript notes of a Lansbury sermon from soon after this time, probably early 1936. In this, he contrasted the distance he felt the Church to be from the issues of the world with the extraordinary relevance of the teachings of Jesus.

"Government and Parliament, Press and Pulpit are all sinning agst the Light. They know armaments must lead to war because Prime Ministers and clergy of all lands tell us so. They have also told us the next war will end in barbarism.

I ask, why should the youth of the world be sacrificed to establish Barbarism. Why shld babies Women Aged Sick and Infirm all be sacrificed in order to create Desolation & Woe. What Realism is there in a policy which its authors tell us must end in 'catastrophic anarchy' No this policy is one of despair. We who base our policy on the teachings of Jesus, the only realist policy is Christ's Policy of Love Cooperation & Sharing. Our Lord knew as we know There is room enough resources enough for all. War & Imperialism has brought us to where we find ourselves.

Nations, like individuals must face facts, and understand we are living in an entirely new world, a world within which nationalism must be replaced by Internationalism. Jesus put it that he who would save his life must lose it & find that life in the life of the community. Christians must demand that our National Sovereignty shall be sunk in the Sovereignty of All Peoples.

If you say, look at the Dictators of Spain, Abyssinia & Manchuria, I can only reply ... [i]t is true to say to all Imperialist Powers let him who is without sin cast the first stone. be it as it may, The time has come when the Churches should write in a great appeal to all Govts to summon, through the League of Nations, a conference representing all nations to discuss how to deal in a peaceful manner all the territorial Economic & Financial difficulties which are the causes leading to armaments & war. Surely the only Realist Policy is that Christian policy laid down by Jesus Do unto others as you would be done unto. This has not yet been tried. Finally we, who do our poor best, in no self righteous way, to fw the pure & simple pacifist policy of Christ, are not responsible for the condition the world is in. Over & over again the words choose ye this day whom you will serve have round challenging round the world. Won't you, gathered in the name of Christ in this historic Place, Go away determined to organise & work for a true Revival of Religion. A Revival which will enable us to see ourselves in others & God in us all. A revival which will enable us to meet Hatred with love, to forgive our enemies and above all give us grace to become sharers and cooperators with all peoples & to accept as absolutely true that no matter what colour our skin, or creed we may believe in we are all children of one Father who has made of one blood all Nations of the earth. My love and best wishes to you all."

86. The motion received Labour and Liberal support, but the Tory Government was not impressed; the resolution was defeated 137-228. (Lansbury, *My Quest For Peace*, p92,93.)

87. "The last remnants of Versailles had gone, and Locarno with them. It was the end of an epoch: the capital of 'victory' was exhausted." (A. J. P. Taylor, *Origins*, p100.)

88. A. J. P. Taylor, *Origins*, p99.

89. Vera Brittain's Diary, 19 March 1936. *Chronicle of Friendship*, p257,258.

90. *Reconciliation*, April 1936, p104,105.

91. Lansbury to Sheppard, 18 May 1936. Richardson papers.

92. Sheppard led crowds to Waterloo Station to see these ambassadors on their way. In his parting message, Lansbury said that pacifists were trying to be "the truehearted followers of the Prince of Peace, who was crucified on Calvary because he preached the only realist way of life. His message to the world has stood the test of time. Statesmen and others fear to accept his realism and continue to pin their faith in the worn-out policy of armaments, which can only end once again in universal destruction." (*Reconciliation*, May 1936, p126.) Salter claimed that Lansbury was "doing more for real peace than all the official politicians of all the camps put together." (Cited in Brockway, *Bermondsey Story*, p199.)

93. In the broadcast, Lansbury spoke of his understanding of the Gospel: "That each one of us, when any chance or danger or war comes near, should make a definite decision not to have anything to do with it, but to oppose it in every way. No matter how difficult the circumstances, Christian pacifists must themselves firmly say 'No'. Unless we are prepared to see the whole of our present civilisation wrecked, we must turn to Jesus of Nazareth and without any reserve accept as true his statement that love and service are the law in life, and that taking the sword against those we think of as enemies, means death. Christian nations must make a stand on this question and make it now. There is no time to lose if we are to escape destruction. Is there a Christian listening to me who imagines that Jesus loved and cared for little children would, for any reason, ascend in an aeroplane and rain bombs on children whose only crime is that they are the children of their parents? Does anyone think St. Francis of Assisi would be found doing such a thing? Of course not. Then I ask you: Why do we old men and women ask our brave, courageous young people to do anything of the kind? Our realist religion demands of us that we shall find the way to remove the causes of war. The Kingdom of Heaven is within us. Our duty is, by God's good grace, to bring that Kingdom out of ourselves and by our actions demonstrate that it is possible to live as Christ teaches us we should live." (*My Quest For Peace*, p67-69.)

94. *Christian Science Monitor*, cited in Lansbury, *My Quest For Peace*, p89.

95. Raven appears to have regarded the Embassies as, in some way, an extension of the Peace Army concept. (*Reconciliation*, September 1936, p238.) Others at the Conference included John Nevin Sayre, George Lansbury, Muriel Lester, Henri Roser, Siegmund-Schultze and Pierre Cérésolle. (Reports of the Conference are in: *Reconciliation*, September 1936, p237,238; Wallis, *Valiant For Peace*, p96; *Friend*, 14 August 1936.)

96. F.O.R. Council Minutes, August 1936. Cited in Wallis, *Valiant For Peace*, p97. The Executive Board included Charles Raven, Henry Carter, H. Runham Brown (Secretary of War Resisters International), John Nevin Sayre and F. Siegmund Schultze. Percy Bartlett (having given up being Secretary of F.O.R.) was the Secretary with Barrow Cadbury the Treasurer. A list of Sponsors included W. C. Roberts alongside such names as Cérésolle, Berdyaev and Harry Emerson Fosdick. (den Boggende, p436.)

97. *My Quest For Peace*, p39,42. Lansbury's own disregard for his own status was matched by his lack of deference towards any office that another may hold. Although he had grown up in a generation which "had very great respect for bishops and statesmen, and, indeed, for all kinds of people considered great," it never occurred to Lansbury "to think of any of them too great to be approached by ordinary people." (p39.)

98. *Reconciliation*, July 1938, p214.

99. In July 1936, General Franco started the revolt in Spanish Morocco which led to the Spanish Civil War. The Peace Army, such as it was, led at that time by Maude Royden, Joyce Pollard and Gwen

Paine, wrote to the F.O.R. in the autumn asking if they could help to bring about a truce and offer mediation. The F.O.R. General Committee passed the request over to the I.F.O.R. and the Embassies of Reconciliation. On this occasion Carter and Bartlett took action, securing invitations from the Republican Government to visit Barcelona, Valencia and Madrid in the early part of 1937. They were not able to meet with any Roman Catholic leaders, or to visit territory held by Franco, and had to be content with meeting the Duke of Alba, Franco's representative in London. (den Boggende, p437.) Dick Sheppard also tried to make an impact on the Spanish situation, and considered reviving the Peace Army to stand between the belligerents, but he discounted the idea. He too tried to get to Madrid to speak to Franco, but was unable to obtain permission to fly over Spain. (R. Ellis Roberts, p287.)

100. Lansbury soon realised that he should have followed the example of Sheppard and the P.P.U. delegation and withdrawn, for "just as oil and vinegar will not mix," he wrote, "so it is impossible to mix the policy of collective security through massed force with the pacifism which says 'never again' and means it." (*My Quest For Peace*, p97.)

101. Although Van Zeeland was neither socialist nor pacifist, he was a religious man, which endeared him to Lansbury. "There is a bond of unity which no words can express between two people who hold some great faith in common, especially when that faith finds its foundation in what some of us believe is our spiritual existence. There was no need to stress the anti-Christian character of war or its complete futility." (*My Quest For Peace*, p98.) Although Lansbury did not make such a claim himself, it has been suggested that his visit may have helped to prepare the way for the subsequent Anglo-French invitation to Van Zeeland to investigate obstacles to international trade. (den Boggende, p436.)

102. *My Quest For Peace*, p115.

103. *My Quest For Peace*, p119,120.

104. Tongue in cheek, Lansbury admitted to Sheppard, "I tell them that it may be I shall by God's good grace get a tiny bit better result than when I speak at a Labour Conference or to the House of Commons." (Lansbury to Sheppard, 11 April 1937. Richardson papers.) Sheppard himself had tried to get permission from Hitler to preach in Germany in the summer of 1936. Having argued that "a constructive pacifism is alone capable of saving the fabric and soul of the world," it is not surprising that his request came to nothing. (*Peace News*, 8 August 1936, p1.)

105. *Peace News*, 10 April 1937. One reader of *Peace News* also suggested that postcards should be sent to Hitler to encourage him in his meeting with Lansbury. (*Peace News*, 3 April 1937, 17 April 1937.)

106. He wrote: "Whatever substance there may be in our reliance on prayer as a means of strengthening our faith in work we are undertaking, the fact that many thousands were thinking of me and praying sincerely for help and guidance to be given me, did most materially help me to overcome the cynicism which some I met poured out on me. I think we left this small gathering refreshed in mind and spirit. I am utterly and completely unable to explain God and eternity, but experiences of this kind, both alone and with others, always leave me much more certain and sure about any piece of work I may be engaged in." (*My Quest For Peace*, p132.)

107. "We each tried to understand the other's point of view, though I doubt if Herr Hitler fully understood or appreciated the pacifist case any more than I could understand his intense hatred of Bolshevism and the Jewish race.... I went to Herr Hitler knowing that were I a German citizen or a Jew I would not be allowed to say even in private the things he patiently listened to from me. During more than two hours we had together, his whole conversation was impersonal and understanding and clear-cut. he did not attempt to deny the suppression of Jews and Bolsheviks.... Herr Hitler and his friends believe

they are serving the best interests of the German people by ruling in this way. Again and again as I listened to him I imagined myself listening to speeches that I had heard in our House of Commons defending concentration camps in South Africa and the actions of the Black and Tans in Ireland. Policies of repression may differ in their form and expression, but in essence they are the same." (*My Quest For Peace*, p134,135,138.)

108. *My Quest For Peace*, p139.

109. *Peace News*, 24 April 1937, p1. An Irish newspaper headlined, "Germany Ready for New World Peace Conference - Results Widely Acclaimed: Führer Waiting for a Lead" (*Northern Whig and Belfast Post* cited in den Boggende, p438.) The *New York Times*' headline was "Hitler Backs Idea for World Parley on Trade and Arms" (cited in den Boggende, p438.) An Essen newspaper conceded Lansbury's socialism and pacifism and commended his "courage" in going to the German leader (*Rheinland Westfälische Zeitung*, cited in den Boggende, p438.) *Reconciliation* rejoiced that the success of Lansbury's interview was "acknowledged in varying degrees of cordiality by almost the entire press of the world," adding that "No one rejoices more in this gallant action for peace, and none will congratulate Mr. Lansbury more heartily and sincerely than those who have long admired and followed him as a leader of the peace movement." (May 1937, p113.) *Peace News* (24 April 1937, p6) spoke of "the world's great chance," asking "Can the world afford not to take it?"

For some pacifists, Lansbury had begun to take on the stature of a saint. It was the time of year for St. George's Day celebrations and Paul Gliddon referred to George Lansbury "despising the burden of his years and setting forth unarmed to slay the dragon of war with Christian love and reasonableness." There was a new meaning to the phrase, Saint George. (*Peace News*, 29 May 1937, p9.)

110. 24 April 1937, p1.

111. *Peace News*, 1 May 1937, p1.

112. Lansbury was under no illusion as to the scale of the task that confronted him. In 1932 Mussolini had written that "above all, Fascism, ... believes neither in the possibility nor the utility of perpetual peace. It thus repudiated the doctrine of Pacifism.... Thus a doctrine which is founded upon this harmful postulate of peace is hostile to Fascism." (*Enciclopedia Italiana*, vol. 14, cited in Sheppard, *We Say "No"*, p30.)

113. *My Quest For Peace*, p158,159.

114. *My Quest For Peace*, p166,167.

115. *My Quest For Peace*, p168.

116. Cited in *Peace News*, 24 July 1937, p1.

117. *My Quest For Peace*, p258.

118. *War Resister*, no. 43, Winter 1937, p48.

119. *War Resister*, no. 43, Winter 1937, p40. The Conference was especially notable for an eloquent address from Morris. (ibid. p42-44.)

120. *My Quest For Peace*, p205.

121. Visiting a Jewish school, Lansbury noted that the children were "a little less boisterous" than he expected, appearing "rather more anxious looking and sad than is the natural attitude of children." (*My Quest For Peace*, p219.) Although Lansbury was prepared to support the greater opening up of Palestine for those Jews who did wish to emigrate there, he emphasised that "It is not segregation which will remove this persecution madness from the world." In the spirit of the American Constitution, he called for people to unite "in saying without reservation that Jews the world over must be treated on an equal status with all others." In particular, "Jews must have the same rights as other races to live where they please so long as they conform to the laws of the country in which they reside."

122. *My Quest For Peace*, p227.

123. *My Quest For Peace*, p238.

124. Also as a result of this interview, Percy Bartlett was able, through Quakers in London, to send Corder Catchpool to Vienna with a scheme (approved by the Chancellor) for the support of dependants of political prisoners.

125. *My Quest For Peace*, p269-286.

AN ANGLICAN CHRONOLOGY

The Lambeth Conference of 1920 had in many ways been a step forward in the Church's thinking on issues of war and peace, though that was largely due to the dearth of such thinking in previous Conferences. The Church had been forced out of its ecclesiastical ghetto and had to take the agenda of the world seriously. Yet despite its moving words against hatred, it had nowhere hinted at the need for repentance. Indeed, more than once it had reflected a self-congratulatory tone: "The nation that had the best trained army in Europe has been defeated. The nation that was the richest in munitions of war has lost, because against her were the moral forces of civilization."¹

Charles Raven was one of many pacifist, or soon-to-be pacifist Anglicans who hoped for better things from the Lambeth Conference of 1930. "Nothing is more deplorable than the failure of the churches to stand for peace: mankind looks to them for a lead; and with a few honourable exceptions they are silent and shame-faced," he said, adding, "It may be difficult for the bishops, few of whom had any experience of warfare except as voluntary recruiting officers, to speak and act decisively on such an issue. Can they really doubt that in refusing to do so they are evading a plain responsibility?"² Raven's comments came in a volume designed to lobby the Conference at its preparatory stages, a book edited by Dick Sheppard. Sheppard himself was unambiguous about what he wanted to see from Lambeth:

Cannot the Lambeth Conference declare what is, after all, the mind of most thinking people to-day - that Christianity and war are not compatible? Do we need further guidance to discover the attitude of Jesus Christ on this matter? Should another war break out, I should wish to see the disciples of Christ lying unarmed on the frontier, rather than engaged in killing their brothers. And if the Church loses caste, credit, and everything it possesses as a result, well, in so far as there would come to it an access of Christ-likeness, I should know it would be of service to the world.³

Meetings and Days of Prayer linked with the Naval Disarmament Conference, which began in February 1930, all served to increase the pressure on the bishops.⁴ Discussion on Christianity and war was taking place at every level of the Church. In March, P. T. R. Kirk, Vicar of Christ Church, Westminster and Director of the Industrial Christian Fellowship, addressed the Bristol Council of Christian Churches. He spoke of the I.C.F. as being one body that was moving ever closer to an anti-war position: "It is now certain that if war should loom on the horizon it would be quite easy to move this organisation, and that it would become a very strong influence and power towards the suppression of war."⁵ In June, the Bishop of Birmingham preached in Westminster Abbey on the social contribution of Christianity. "The Church of England, since it was

inspired by Maurice, Kingsley and their Christian Socialist followers," he claimed, "has been one of the most socially progressive communions in the world." Added to which he rejoiced that "increasingly Christian thought finds war intolerable."⁶

The combination of ecclesiastical activity and international disarmament discussions (although limited) produced an atmosphere of great optimism at the time of the bishops' assembling. For a brief period there was genuine hope that war could be rejected and that the message of peace would at last be heard and acted upon. Much of that hope was to find expression in the Lambeth Conference of 1930 in ways that would encourage pacifists throughout the tragic decade ahead.

The Bishops' Sub-Committee on Peace and War

In the summer of 1930 bishops from across the Anglican Communion met for the seventh Lambeth Conference. After a visit to Canterbury on 5 July, where they were received by the Dean, Dick Sheppard, they returned to London for a month's work together.⁷ Under a heading on "The Life and Witness of the Christian Community" there was a Sub-Committee of the Conference on "Peace and War" chaired by Bishop Kempthorne of Lichfield. Among the fourteen bishops who took part was Bell of Chichester,⁸ although he gave most of his attention to being Secretary to the Committee on the Unity of the Church, which was debating the controversial South India scheme. It was largely through the influence of George Bell, Chairman of F.O.R.'s Christ and Peace campaign and Secretary to the Lambeth Conference, that the first tentative steps were taken to produce an Anglican theology of peace. It was Bell, with over a decade of experience of international ecumenical conferences behind him, who was largely responsible for the most influential Resolution of this Conference. As Dean of Canterbury he was prominent at the Stockholm World Conference on "Life and Work" in 1925. Echoing the C.O.P.E.C. statement that "all war is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ,"⁹ the World Conference stated that: "We believe that war, considered as an institution for the settlement of international disputes, is incompatible with the mind and method of Christ, and therefore incompatible with the mind and method of his Church."¹⁰ In 1929, Bell, recently enthroned as Bishop of Chichester, was present at the Stockholm Continuation Committee in Eisenach. In "one of the most courageous and far-sighted actions that the ecumenical movement has taken,"¹¹ he presented a resolution endorsing the Stockholm "incompatibility" statement. A consensus seemed to emerge in ecumenical circles on the value of a statement of the "incompatibility" of war with the way of Christ. Not that such wording was new, for as far back as 1796 John Scott had produced his article entitled *War Inconsistent with the*

Doctrine and Example of Jesus Christ, soon to be followed by Richard Warner's sermons on *War Inconsistent With Christianity*. Continuing the theme in an address on 1 March 1930, part of a procession between City Temple and Westminster Abbey organised by the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Bell declared that "By our very discipleship to Jesus Christ we are deeply committed to peace," adding, "We believe that war as a means of settling international disputes is incompatible with his mind, his teaching, his way of life."¹²

The Lambeth Peace and War Sub-Committee commenced its report with an adaptation of the Stockholm statement. Carried as a separate Conference Resolution (number 25), it has been reaffirmed time and again at subsequent Lambeth Conferences, the most important comment on war made by the Anglican Communion in the 20th century: "War, as a method of settling international disputes, is incompatible with the teaching and example of Our Lord Jesus Christ."

This assertion was music to the ears of Christian pacifists. Surely all Christians were committed to following the teaching and example of Jesus? For the bishops to assert that war was incompatible with this basis for one's actions must surely mean that they realised that Christians could have no part in war, that Christianity was a pacifist faith. The Committee's first comment on their assertion reinforced this interpretation: "We believe that as the Christian conscience has condemned infanticide and slavery and torture, it is now called to condemn war as an outrage on the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of all mankind."¹³ Their second comment, however, showed considerable ambivalence: "We do not deny the right of a nation to defend itself if attacked, or to resort to force in fulfilment of international obligations..."¹⁴ Mindful of the attempted justifications given for war in 1914, one critic called this "an unfortunate statement," by which the Sub-Committee had "to some extent, left the way clear for the recruiting sergeant."¹⁵ Yet there was a very clear difference in tone between this report and that of Lambeth 1920. Ten years earlier, the bishops had been wrestling with a society that had "won" the war (whatever that meant) but which seemed poised to lose the peace. In contrast, the mood of 1930 Lambeth was decidedly upbeat. The bishops could even speak of "The Progress of International Goodwill, 1920-30."¹⁶

In this mood of optimism, the Sub-Committee attempted a more thorough analysis of the things that make for war and peace than had been attempted before by Anglican leaders. They noted three causes of war: "inflamed and aggressive Nationalism,"¹⁷ distrust¹⁸ and "unrestricted competition, especially when it involves the exploitation of

weaker peoples.”¹⁹ The task of building peace would fall upon nations, the Church and individual Christians. As in 1920 the World Alliance and the League of Nations Union were commended.²⁰

In considering what they called “The True Idea of Peace” and “The Task of the Church”, the bishops seemed to echo the tone of Maude Royden in a powerful sermon.

The idea of peace seems dull and uninspiring when it is so presented as to mean little more than the maintenance of the existing order and concentration on material well-being. War has called into exercise some of the noblest qualities of our nature, by its demand for sacrifice, endurance, and co-operation for unselfish ends. Unless we can show that peace affords at least equal scope for these, we shall not succeed in evoking passionate enthusiasm for international peace. We must present an ideal of peace that is not static but dynamic; we must show that, if “peace hath her victories, no less renowned than war,” those victories are only won by effort and sacrifice. The call of the Cross is not a call to ease and security but to conflict, danger, self-discipline and self-sacrifice. To nations, not less than to individuals, peace offers the alternative of ignoble self-indulgence or high tasks of service. War is a waste of material and spiritual resources that might be used in a nobler war against all that degrades and debases human life.... If we could make men hear the call of Christ as clearly as they heard the call of their country in the Great War, they would find the way of peace in the fellowship of common service....

Our prayers for peace must always be associated with the prayer “Renew a right spirit within me.” Side by side with the building up of safeguards for international peace, we are called to work for the transformation of human character that will inspire a passionate hatred of injustice and falsehood and a passionate devotion to the living Christ.

We are often told that we cannot change human nature. If that were true, Christianity would be founded on a delusion, for the purpose of Christ’s redemption is to bring to men a new heart and a right spirit. We are told that the Church has in the past never condemned war, and has therefore forfeited its right to pose to-day as the champion of peace. We are not called upon to judge our fathers, but we are called to follow the light as we see it, and if God, the Great Educator, has revealed more clearly to this generation the fundamental inconsistency between war and the fact of His Fatherhood, the more tremendous is our responsibility for witnessing to this truth. We dare not be disobedient to the heavenly vision of a world set free from the menace of war, or shrink from any effort or sacrifice that will make that vision a reality.²¹

Plenary Resolutions

When the bishops met in plenary session, the deliberations of the Sub-Committee on Peace and War were translated into six uncontroversial resolutions, all of relatively positive form, under the heading “The Life and Witness of the Christian Community.”²² Resolution 25 was the famous statement on incompatibility. The next three resolutions also showed the clear influence of Bell, reflecting the general optimism in the achievements and possible achievements of international diplomacy. Resolution

26 appealed for “religious and ethical standards” to prevail in international relations.²³ Resolution 27 carried this welcome further and echoed Bell’s Eisenach motion by daring to suggest that the Church could take a unique stand in opposition to governments that declare war.²⁴ The bishops’ faith in international diplomacy was reflected in Resolution 28, where, having noted “that the existence of armaments on the present scale amongst the nations of the world endangers the maintenance of peace,” they expressed their hopes for “further reduction by international agreement.”

Responses to Lambeth

Across the Atlantic, the 1931 General Convention of the Episcopal Church echoed the Lambeth Resolutions.²⁵ In England, however, the situation was less clear cut. Several bishops urged the Lambeth Resolutions to be noted at Armistice Day, 1930²⁶, and Bishop Burroughs of Ripon was part of a Leeds gathering of Anglicans and Free Church people early in February 1931 who issued “A call to all Christians to end war.”²⁷ It was not until later that month that the Lambeth resolutions on war and peace were eventually debated by the Church Assembly. Far from promoting an atmosphere in which the war spirit was exorcised, the mood was one of indifference and embarrassment. It was not a happy occasion. In a thinly attended chamber, all that could be agreed was “That in view of the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference relating to peace and war, this Assembly urges all Churchpeople to give their active support to the League of Nations.” The statements of the Lambeth bishops were not so much as welcomed.²⁸ The Fellowship of Reconciliation described the event as “an almost pitiable discussion.” The pacifist task was clear: “Our duty is to convert the Church.”²⁹

With reservations, Anglican pacifists generally regarded Lambeth 1930 (though obviously not the Church of England’s response to it) as a step forward for the Anglican bishops’ attitude to peace. Those within the Fellowship of Reconciliation found Resolution 25 a great encouragement. William George Downie, the new Vicar of St. Luke’s, Ilford, called it “a direct challenge to the Christian conscience of this country,” the same challenge made by the witness of conscientious objectors in 1914–1918.

If war, as a method of settling international disputes, is incompatible with the teaching and example of Jesus Christ, then it follows that as a disciple of Jesus Christ, I can take no part in war.... If you agree with the Bishops, your course, as a Christian, is clear; in loyalty to the teaching and example of Jesus Christ you must refuse to allow yourself to be compelled to take any part in the destruction of human life.³⁰

An article in the Parish Magazine for St. Michael and All Angels, Bromley-by-Bow (where the pacifist Kenneth Ashcroft was Vicar) welcomed Lambeth Resolution 28 (on the dangers of possessing armaments) so far as it went and used it to argue for disarmament initiatives.³¹ To Eric Bilton and James Wilkinson (the latter probably the Vicar of St. Luke's, Birmingham) the Lambeth resolutions marked a substantive change in the Anglican attitudes to the military. The question was whether or not this change would make for any difference in Church policy towards the armed forces.

However righteous a nation's intentions may be, the Church now says that that nation definitely puts itself in the wrong by going to war in support of them. And this applies to every country. It is not confined to the opponents of the Church's own country. War, wherever and whenever it occurs, is wrong; and it is as wrong for Britain as it is for Germany. The Church can no longer say to the Armed Forces, "You have our blessings and our prayers." If it did say that its declaration would amount to this: "We believe that all war is wrong, and we know that in going to war you are going into the perpetration of crime. Nevertheless, we urge you to do this wrong, and may God bless you." If the Church be reasonable it cannot say that.³²

One contributor to *Reconciliation* wrote of the Lambeth resolutions, "Of course they do not go as far as the pacifist would wish; but they are extremely useful.... The next task is to persuade local Anglican groups to discuss these findings."³³ However, one of the difficulties for Anglican pacifists was that there was no single pacifist group operating and organising exclusively within the Anglican Communion. It would take nearly seven years for that situation to come about.

The Beginnings of Organisation

Through 1933 and 1934, there was a trend within the Fellowship of Reconciliation for nonconformist denominational pacifist groups to emerge.³⁴ There was such diversity that a separate body, the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups (which included Anglican representation, indeed Charles Raven was a significant figure within the Council), was needed to co-ordinate activities.³⁵ From 1936, even Roman Catholics had their own group, Pax, despite intense hierarchical opposition, after an initiative by Donald Attwater, Eric Gill and others.³⁶ Pax was founded on Just War principles, interpreting those principles in an uncompromisingly pacifist way.³⁷

While other denominational groups were starting and consolidating, the Anglican pacifist scene was notable for its lack of organisation. There was actually more scope for non-pacifists to express themselves. In March 1931, following a postal questionnaire to thousands of clergy, fifty-two priests attended a Caxton Hall,

Westminster, meeting to inaugurate the Association of Clergy for World Peace, otherwise known as the League of Clergy for Peace. The objects of the Association (which explicitly banned bishops from membership) were admirable:

- (1) To uphold the principle that “war as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ” (*vide* Lambeth Conference report, 1930).
- (2) To strengthen the “will to peace” in ourselves, our own nation, and other nations.
- (3) To encourage the appeal to international law and to arbitration, as the means of maintaining international friendship and co-operation, and of settling disputes if and when they arise.
- (4) To support the cause of international disarmament.
- (5) To promote, publicly and privately, knowledge of the causes which lead to war.
- (6) To aid the growth of mutual understanding among the nations in all the spheres of social life and in the arts of peace.
- (7) To enlist the co-operation of all clergy in communion with the Church of England for these objects.

The initiative for the League came from its first chairman and acting secretary, F. Lewis Donaldson, Canon of Westminster, who had written so passionately for pacifism at Christmas 1925. Pacifist clergy would not initially have felt out of place in such a group, and from time to time various pacifist speakers were invited to their meetings. However, the future direction of the League was determined in June 1933 when, in order to obtain financial resources, office space and a secretary, the League affiliated to the League of Nations Union and invited E. N. Porter Goff (the Secretary of the Union’s Christian Organizations Committee) to act also as the Secretary of the League of Clergy for Peace.³⁸ As the League of Nations came increasingly to favour military sanctions, the tone of the league of Clergy for Peace became more bellicose and openly hostile to pacifists.³⁹

Almost the only explicitly Anglican pacifist activity was on a local level. In 1935 and 1936,⁴⁰ the F.O.R. regarded Canon Stuart Morris of Birmingham as the contact for a Church of England pacifist group.⁴¹ Morris, as Vicar of St. Bartholomew, Birmingham, had been preaching pacifism for some time when he contacted Dick Sheppard about pacifist organisation within the Church. The two clergymen met in the summer of 1934, following a sermon by Sheppard in Birmingham Cathedral. During a subsequent conversation between them it was agreed that Morris would try starting a pacifist group for Anglicans.⁴² In the autumn of 1934, Morris “took the initiative in forming a Church of England Peace Fellowship.”⁴³ This was simply a local clergy group, set up after Morris had contacted all the clergy in the Diocese of Birmingham. Those who responded positively to the enquiry met to form an Anglican Peace Group.

Their basis for membership, published a few weeks after the Sheppard pledge, was:

We feel bound, in loyalty to Christ, to affirm that, because war is against the character and purpose of God, we will take no part in it, and will strive to make it everywhere and always impossible. We believe that, as Christians, we must take all the risks involved in positive peacemaking both for ourselves and for those whom we love.⁴⁴

Initially there were over twenty members, presumably including F. E. A. Shepherd, and possibly including James Wilkinson and the quietly pacifist Clement George St. Michael Parker.⁴⁵ However, they made little collective impact outside their diocesan boundaries and there is no evidence of any co-ordination of diverse individual efforts in different parts of the country.

Another, and ultimately more significant, local initiative was the Church of England Pacifist Group formed late in 1934 in the Rural Deanery of Finsbury and Holborn, consisting of five clergy and “a considerable number of laity.” The Rural Dean was W. C. Roberts, Vicar of St. George’s, Bloomsbury.⁴⁶ Three of the clergy members were probably Robert Gofton-Salmond, Vicar of All Saints, City Road, his Curate, Philip Charles Rowe, and John Chappell Sprott, Curate of St. George Martyr with Holy Trinity, Holborn. At that time, Mother Teresa and Sister Margaret of the Franciscan Servants of Jesus and Mary were based at St. Clement, City Road, and they could also have been involved. Although the intention was to spread the Christian pacifist view in their own deanery, those within the group hoped that they might attract members from across London and have influence beyond their own boundaries. The contact person was Charles H. Cunningham of London, N.10.⁴⁷ The founding seems to have been linked to an eloquent speech Cunningham gave at a Ruridecanal Conference when moving the resolution that “This Conference believes war to be contrary to the mind of Christ.” Forty-two percent support was good but insufficient to stop the addition of a watering-down amendment, “save for a righteous cause.” Nonetheless, Cunningham was pleased that his support included no less than eight of the deanery clergy.⁴⁸

A further attempt to pull together at least one section of Anglican pacifist opinion was the revival of the Society of Catholic Friends. The original Society had been founded during the Great War by Percival Gough⁴⁹ and A. J. Bott, (Vicar of St. John the Baptist, Stockton-on-Tees), “with the object of uniting pacifists within the Church, and expressing side by side with the doctrine of the (in the widest sense) Catholic Church, the social and ethical views of the Society of Friends. From this union of creed and practice came the name Catholic Friends.” Gough was to become the President of the

revived Society of Catholic Friends. The revival was aimed at those who were troubled by the Church of England's attitude towards war, and who wanted to join a society "based on a Catholic foundation." It was an attempt to avoid a schizophrenic existence where "Catholicism must be practised in one body and pacifism in another." Technically, the Society was open to members of other denominations, but the Anglican Catholic theology was so strong it was hard to see other Christians being attracted in.⁵⁰

The Society of Catholic Friends stands primarily for this belief: that an active and self-sacrificing pacifism is the real challenge to-day of the Christian ethic: that we are unable to separate the Christian ethic from the corporate worship to which we are accustomed and in which our faith alone is nourished. The Sacrament of the Altar, in particular, is for us "the Bread of Life", and we believe that when we partake of it we are brought into a relationship with God that forbids us to acquiesce in anything that regards the organised taking of human life as well-pleasing in His sight.

Mytton-Davies believed that war was contrary to the Christian way of life, yet too often Christians found the Church - especially the Church of England - divided against itself on this.

Because it is a state established church its bishops speak with two voices, the one the voice of their apostolate, the other that of the officer of state; and too frequently these voices conflict with one another. The result, where the matter of peace and war is concerned, is that many churchmen and women have come to wonder whether they have any rightful place, as pacifists, in the Church of England, whose official voice claims that war is not in every case wrong and sinful; and one can well believe that there are men and women who have left the Church on this account.

It was in order to prevent this that the Society of Catholic Friends was recently revived....

Anglicans who feel that the official attitude of their Church towards war is wrong, need not despair of its faith or teaching, for the voice of the Church is the voice of God in the hearts of Christians, and not the words only that their leaders speak with their mouths; and how shall the Church ever come to renounce war and declare it always to be sinful in the sight of Heaven if those who believe and work for this have to leave their Church and withdraw their influence from its councils?...

It was to His own Temple that Christ first went to challenge the sincerity of faith. It is to our own Church, we believe, that the challenge of pacifism comes, and we feel that it is the original challenge of Christ and the early Church to the world. Within the faith and practice of our own branch of the Catholic Church, our spiritual home, we aim at re-creating by life and teaching the pacifist teaching of Christ. We do not believe that material force can ever be sanctified, even for the best of motives, if it involves, as it must do, sinning against the will of God.⁵¹

Given the difficulties that many Christian pacifists had in obtaining pertinent moral or spiritual advice from clergy who held conflicting world-views, the Society of Catholic Friends attempted to form a list of priests who would offer such counsel or spiritual

comfort to pacifist enquirers. Those seeking such counsel, advice or absolution could then be confident that they were being ministered to by priests they could trust to be sympathetic to their own views.⁵² By November 1937 membership had grown sufficiently for the country to be divided into areas “for local secretaries to organise catholic peace activities,” particularly within Anglican structures of parish, deanery and diocesan councils.⁵³ There was even some thought given to having a Canadian branch.⁵⁴ The revival of the Society of Catholic Friends was, however, short-lived and - despite regionalisation - confined to a small number of members. That was not only due to lack of publicity, but the eventual rise of a permanent and more active group of Anglican pacifists. The above reference to “His own Temple” may well have been a deliberate pun, as the Archbishop of York was the foremost public critic of Christian pacifism. The seeds of a future lasting organisation of pacifist Anglicans may be found in the furor aroused by a national radio broadcast made by the William Temple on 1 September 1935, and the response to it by one member of the Finsbury group, above.

The Origins of Organisation

The Archbishop of York supported the principle of the use of armed force by the League of Nations. “If it becomes necessary to uphold Law by force,” he said, “it is of primary importance that there should be enough force available. To resort to force and then be worsted is to wound fatally the cause of justice.”⁵⁵ Pacifists, aware that such a policy would mean that the League of Nations would have to have at its disposal greater weaponry than the most heavily armed state, were horrified at this rejection of disarmament. The F.O.R. and the C.C.P.G. immediately called a meeting at Central Hall where over four thousand people heard Charles Raven condemn any attempt to justify modern war by the use of “police action” analogies,⁵⁶ George Lansbury criticise Temple for not having strong enough faith in God, and Dick Sheppard announce that he felt Temple’s giving leave for a Christian to kill his brother was “dreadfully unacceptable.... I do not believe it to be Christian.” Sheppard added:

If I thought that for certain causes, and even for the better ordering of the kingdoms of this world, we might be called or allowed by our Church once more to kill, maim, starve, and torture - for this is what war means - our brothers and sisters of another breed, I should leave the Church to-morrow and seek to follow and worship the Christ outside.

It is only because I am clear that there is stealing into the souls of professing Christians everywhere to-day an ever-deepening conviction that Christianity and war are entirely incompatible that I refuse to despair.

The spirit of Jesus is the only asset of the Church, and I deny that His spirit can ever give you or me leave to take human life.⁵⁷

Grassroots protest spread to the columns of the church press, with Temple being accused of believing “as in 1914, that a God of Love can be served by smashing human flesh,”⁵⁸ and that “there is no method of violence forbidden to a Christian, if only he can persuade himself that he has good reason for adopting it,”⁵⁹ One writer who used the pseudonym “Perplexed Server” noted that the bishops were the descendants of the Apostles, and doubted whether the Apostles would have held the same views as the Archbishop on whether war was justifiable. He even suggested the issue was so important that priests and bishops might consider breaking away to form a Catholic and pacifist Church of England.⁶⁰ In reply to the “Perplexed Server”, another pseudonymous writer, “Pax”, pleaded that pacifists should stay in the Church of England and form “some live movement” where those who were like-minded could “pledge to veto war, slums, cruelty, and other social evils.”⁶¹ The seeds of such a movement were sown in another reply in the same correspondence column in the *Church Times* of 20 September 1935. Having doubted that the Archbishop voiced what he called “the conscience of Churchmen”, Robert Gofton-Salmond ended his letter with a significant appeal:

Catholics believe that the divine energy can pervade and sanctify material things. Can God express Himself through the fruits of the earth, in the ploughshare, in bricks and mortar, in machines, in the artist’s brush, in the surgeon’s knife? Can He express Himself in Bread and Wine and in a Cross of wood? But surely it is akin to blasphemy to say that He can express Himself through poison gas, liquid fire, bayonets, bombing machines, spies, lying propaganda, and all the other commitments of war?

Every Churchman, be he archbishop, bishop, priest or layman, has to face the question. It is no good asking, “What else can we do?” or “Are we going to stand by and see a Christian nation wiped out by a bully?” These are merely escapes.

And I respectfully suggest that it is incumbent upon every Churchman who feels that in this crucial matter the Archbishop is in error, to say so publicly and without delay, lest silence should be interpreted as assent.

May I ask that those who believe that war in all circumstances is contrary to the mind of Christ, and, being a sin, is unlawful for Christians, will write to me at once and also show this letter to their friends?⁶²

Not many would have seen this request. Fewer would have responded. In the immediate future there was little to show. But from those who did respond to this unlikely example of postcard politics, there would, in time, spring the organising group of founders of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship.⁶³ Initial steps taken included making informal contact with Morris’ existing group of pacifist clergy in Birmingham, and affiliating to the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups.

The first statement signed by Gofton-Salmond as “Secretary of a Group of Priests”⁶⁴

reflected something not only of his own Catholic roots but also the dominant Catholic theology of the Group (hardly surprising given that the appeal had been made in the Anglo-Catholic press.) There was a strong ecclesial theology, with the Church referred to as the “Sacred Body.” The Church was understood as being at a distance from the State (an opinion held by many followers of the Oxford Movement since the time of Keble’s Assize Sermon) and worthy of a greater loyalty than that due to the State. The appeal of the group would be through the orthodoxy of Catholic theology, rather than their style of presentation.⁶⁵

It was not until the following summer that the group was heard of again. On 21 July 1936, around twenty-five pacifist clergy, most of whom had responded to Gofton-Salmond’s appeal, attended an informal conference in St. George’s, Bloomsbury, under the chairmanship of W. C. Roberts.⁶⁶ An indication of the predominant churchmanship of those present was their desire to see what literature needed to be produced “to complete the case for pacifism from the point of view of catholic orthodoxy in the Anglican Church.” There was also a felt need to bring the pacifist case not only before rural deaneries, but also before the Church Union, C.E.M.S., and other such bodies. To help with this work, those present decided to form an Anglican Pacifist Group for the Home Counties.⁶⁷ One of their first acts was to institute a weekly study session for clergy “to secure comprehensive teaching on the Christian attitude toward warfare and to train people in non-violent activity.” It would be a contact point “where those who are convinced of the necessity of Christian action could train, and meet others like-minded.” The base would be St. George’s, Bloomsbury. Gilbert Shaw would be in charge for a short service of an address and prayers, with occasional assistance from Dick Sheppard and Paul Gliddon.⁶⁸ There would also be class meetings for those who felt the need of instruction in the “evangelism” of peace.⁶⁹

The Church Assembly, February 1937

If the origins of organisation had come out of reaction to the Archbishop of York, then the consummation of the process can be traced to reaction to deliberations of the Church Assembly. The November 1936 sitting of the Assembly rapidly moved “the previous question” to prevent discussion of a disarmament motion. Paul Gliddon commented that “The Church Assembly may have come to some unfortunate decisions during the years of its existence, but it is safe to say that of no vote will it learn more bitterly to repent than of this craven one.”⁷⁰ The editor of *Peace News* simply responded by echoing the prophet’s question, “How long, Lord, how long?”⁷¹

Appropriately, therefore, following a debate on “Negligence and Misbehaviour,” the February 1937 Assembly did finally agree to consider the Christian attitude to war. Dean Selwyn of Winchester successfully proposed, and the Archdeacon of Coventry seconded,⁷² a motion that the Assembly:

- (1) Endorsed the Resolution of the Lambeth Conference, 1930, that war as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ.
- (2) Deplores the general re-armament throughout the world.
- (3) Calls upon all Christian people to redouble their efforts to promote international good will.
- (4) Assures the Government of its moral support in all efforts to remove the political and economic causes of war, and in securing a general reduction of armaments by international agreement.
- (5) Welcomes the declared policy of the Government to adhere to the Covenant of the League of Nations, and to use armed force only for the defence of the country and in the interests of international security and peace.
- (6) Recognizes the right of the Government to the support of Christian citizens in maintaining such forces as it deems necessary in the pursuance of this policy.

For pacifists (whom the unrepentant recruiting-sergeant Winnington-Ingram described as the real danger to the peace of the world⁷³), the first three or four clauses of the resolution were innocuous, the fifth left much to be desired, and the last handed over to the Government a moral *carte blanche* on rearmament. The net effect was the worst kind of Erastian sycophancy by the Church towards the Government.

During the debate, the pacifist case was put by several speakers. Bishop Barnes, recently appointed the President of the National Peace Council, gave his own testimony since 1914, and condemned modern warfare with its requirement to kill women and children more quickly than the enemy. “Our younger educated people are, many of them, extreme pacifists, not always because they are Christians, but because they are humane,” he said. They wanted to live according to the highest ideals, “and we cannot live according to those ideals if we are to take part in modern warfare.”

Percy Hartill, Archdeacon of Stoke, said that he would not have agreed with Barnes in 1914, but the events of that war and the light shed on them in retrospect by the intervening years had convinced him that Barnes had been right then and was right still.⁷⁴ In modern warfare, said Hartill, it would be impossible to discriminate between the innocent and the guilty. “Can we make the excuse,” he asked, “that we will go to any lengths of devilry provided others do it first?”⁷⁵

Although Dick Sheppard had been a member of the Church Assembly almost since its

inception, and had been a guest speaker at Bournemouth in 1935, this was the occasion of his maiden speech in an Assembly debate. The *Church Times* reported:

He believed that war was the ultimate expression of man's futility and wickedness, and that it was the duty of Christians to have nothing to do with it. He had seen war, and he spoke of what he knew. War was a tumour in the body corporate, which must be cut out. Modern war was mass murder; it was morally wrong and could never produce good results. A dropped bomb, with a label on it, "with love from Geneva," was no less devastating and no more Christian than one dropped by this or that dictator. Modern war was barren of romance; in a modern gas attack, St. George himself would not be able to see the dragon.

He continued by saying that he

deeply regretted that the Christian Church hesitated to describe war as vile and a betrayal of God. Those who raised their hands in horror of what was going on in Spain might realize that, if they believed in the brotherhood of man, then all war was civil war. Pacifism was more misunderstood and misrepresented by Churchpeople than by others. But he believed that it was the vocation of the Christian Church to be pacifist, that it was intrinsic in the Christian Faith. A clear, passionate lead from Christendom might arouse the world from its nightmare of terror, and give it some hope for the future, but in so far as any Church counselled or blessed preparations for war or any form of killing, it was not only desperately misunderstanding the mind and spirit of Christ, it was apostate. "I do not believe," he concluded, "that this Recall to Religion⁷⁶ can really be of service to our people unless the note of prophecy in the great issue of war be prominent in the message that it gives."⁷⁷

The Assembly greeted Sheppard's words with a hostile silence, followed by an opposing speech by the Archbishop of York. Others gave some support for Barnes, Hartill and Sheppard, not least the St. Alban's layman Herbert Upward, a convinced pacifist who believed that the Church was losing thousands of young men because its challenge was not high enough. He even thought that, should war be declared, large numbers would be prepared to go to concentration camps for their opposition to war: "It was not because they did not love their country. They simply could not tolerate the way in which the Church was watering down the challenge of Jesus Christ."⁷⁸

For all the pacifist speeches, the motions were never in jeopardy. William Temple closed the debate by denying suggestions that life was something sacrosanct and arguing that one's first duty was the establishment of law and only then could one go forward to the still higher planes of the Gospel. What had been anticipated by many as an opportunity to advance Christian pacifism, left Anglican pacifists more isolated than ever.

Press reaction in Church circles was highly critical. The *Church Times* spoke of the

“confusion of the Christian mind.”

The Assembly has said that, generally speaking, war is wicked, but that, for certain ends, a British Government may lawfully wage war in any manner it thinks advisable.... The blank truth, of course, is that if war is waged, it must be waged with all its ultimate beastliness.⁷⁹

There was more than a hint of despair in the reaction of the *Church of England Newspaper*: “With regard to the debate on the Christian attitude to war, the less we say about it the better. We have seldom listened to more heart-breaking speeches from Church leaders - episcopal, clerical, lay.”⁸⁰

Reaction to the Church Assembly

The heart-break was felt most deeply by Sheppard. Once again he needed persuading, this time by Dean Matthews at St. Paul's, to continue with his ministry.⁸¹ He continued it ever more energetically. On 21 February he spoke at the King's Weigh House; five days later he preached a powerful and moving pacifist sermon at St. Mary Woolnoth;⁸² the following week he paraded along Oxford Street with sandwich boards advertising a P.P.U. rally in Hyde Park, at which he also spoke; added to which the constant flow of journalistic articles continued. Not that Sheppard was a lone voice: Morris, Hartill, Lansbury, Brittain and others had full diaries of speaking engagements,⁸³ with Brittain and Raven being amongst the contributors gathered by Sheppard for a symposium, *Let Us Honour Peace*, which developed the themes of their recent speeches.⁸⁴

Immediately after the Assembly, Sheppard invited “dismayed and disheartened” pacifist clergy from London and the provinces to attend a gathering in Amen Court for “a private discussion.”⁸⁵ The outcome was a decision to hold a rally for clergy - in fact laity attended too - at Westminster Central Hall on Monday 5 April. There was an irony for Sheppard in the venue being the same one in which he had received such a hostile reception from the Church Assembly.

The chief organiser of the Westminster rally was Paul Gliddon. It was to prove a highpoint of Anglican pacifism.⁸⁶ With Dick Sheppard in the chair at the Central Hall, speeches were made by Percy Hartill, Paul Gliddon, Father Andrew S.D.C. and Stuart Morris.⁸⁷ At the end of the rally a resolution was passed overwhelmingly:

That this meeting of clergy and laity of the Church of England declares its passionate conviction that Jesus Christ would refuse in any cause whatever to

employ the methods of modern war. It denies that the disciples of Christ ought ever to employ means their Master would not sanction. It therefore deplors the attempts made at the Church Assembly to reconcile the teaching of Christ with the practice of war, and urges all members of the Church to maintain that war is essentially evil and as such incapable of advancing the kingship of Christ.⁸⁸

After the meeting, several hundred Anglican pacifists, including dozens of becassocked clergy, marched over Lambeth Bridge to the Archbishop's Palace. The four deep, half-mile long procession was headed by a wooden cross, accompanied by bearers of torches and storm-lanterns. At the gates of Lambeth they paused while Dick Sheppard entered to present the resolution and the following letter to the Archbishop's Chaplain for forwarding to Archbishop Lang:⁸⁹

We, being priests of the Church of England who are gravely troubled in conscience by the resolutions on the subject of war passed by very large majorities at the last session of the Church Assembly, wish to present to you a brief statement of our position.

We realise that, as citizens of this country, and as members of the Church of England, we are men under authority and are bound to our fellows by ties of common loyalty; that we cannot evade responsibility for the well-being of the society to which we belong nor for its guilt; and that unless we have misunderstood the meaning of the Incarnation, it must be our duty to work out the implications of our Faith within the fellowship of Nation and of Church. We acknowledge and confess that our lives often belie our profession and are unworthy of our calling.

Yet for us the obligation to renounce all participation in modern warfare has a constraining power which we believe to be of God. We believe that God is always and everywhere the Father, Almighty because All-loving, that the way of suffering love is the way of the Cross and the only means for the redemption of the world, and that the marks of the Cross must be borne by the Church as the Body of Christ. If this be true, then modern warfare, whose chief method of defence lies in the wholesale slaughter of non-combatants, is a deliberate rejection of the Christian method of redemption from sin. Thus the renunciation of all war appears to us as an inevitable consequence of our faith and a crucial issue of the Church.

Our Christian pacifism necessarily commits us to a positive ministry of reconciliation, to the effort to develop friendship with men of other nations, to the study of the economic and political causes of war, and to the support of such action as may hasten their removal.

We are grateful for the assurance given to a delegation of our members when they waited upon yourself and the Archbishop of York that you do not regard our pacifism as inconsistent with our loyal membership of the Church of England or with the continued exercise of our ministry. But the resolutions of the Assembly have created a widespread impression that we are under the censure of authority and that our loyalty and sincerity are suspect. We would therefore ask whether your Grace would allow a motion to be put before the next session of the Assembly stating that Christian pacifists have in its judgment a legitimate place within the fellowship and ministry of the Church of England.⁹⁰

The generally hostile *Church Times* was forced to admit that "The courage and sincerity of the pacifist clergy are beyond all praise." Recognising the ways of the Anglican

establishment, it added, “they must know that their fearless proclamation of pacifist principles will probably be a bar to their receiving further promotion in the Church.”⁹¹ The success of the rally had been hoped for, but not anticipated in the sense that any clear strategy had been formed regarding a follow-up. From that point of view, an organisational and recruitment opportunity was missed. However, inspired by the Westminster gathering, the W. C. Roberts et al group, spurred on by Gliddon and Sheppard who wanted to build on the momentum gained,⁹² resolved that immediate action was needed to take advantage of the newly-tapped groundswell of support for Anglican pacifism.⁹³ A meeting was planned for the capital, with Gliddon, Raven, Morris, Sheppard and Gofton-Salmond all involved, when the whole day would be given over to:

- [1] the framing of an organisation intended to deal with English parishes in general;
- [2] the consideration of the relationship of this body to existing pacifist societies.
- [3] the manner in which the pacifist message can best be presented to the thought and conscience of the Church of England.

St. Barnabas' Day, 11 June 1937: the Birth of a Fellowship

The date chosen was Friday 11 June, St. Barnabas' Day, and the venue was Paul Gliddon's base at the King's Weigh House. Admission was by ticket only, obtainable in advance from Gliddon. It was a long day. The Marquis of Tavistock presided. Stuart Morris gave the most boisterous, even “aggressive” speech criticising the leaders of the Church for their blindness and their clinging to outworn ideas inapplicable to modern warfare. Were they faithless to their own affirmation of Lambeth 1930, he asked?⁹⁴ After three sessions the meeting ended with a late-evening Devotional Service conducted by a tired Dick Sheppard, recently returned to England after a disastrous and physically draining fund-raising trip to the United States, where the duplicitous organisers had themselves been inadequately funded.⁹⁵ The theme of his address was that only those whose opposition was founded on their loyalty to Christ were likely to maintain their faith throughout and consistently work for God and His peace. The formation of an Anglican Pacifist Fellowship would strengthen their resolve and give them brotherly support.⁹⁶ One of those present, Margaret Bligh, was to remember Sheppard's presence over fifty years later.⁹⁷ For Sheppard, it was arguably the longest day of his life; it needed great courage to be there at all. One listener recalled that “There was a touch of sadness about DS that evening.”⁹⁸ Unbeknown to others at the meeting, that was the day his marriage ended, the day his wife eventually left home and moved in

with her lover.⁹⁹ At a time of great personal loss, Sheppard was involved in an act of creativity - the formation of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship - that would be a lasting tribute to him. Sheppard's message that evening was "that only those whose opposition was founded on their loyalty to Christ were likely to maintain their faith throughout and consistently work for God and His peace."¹⁰⁰ The A.P.F. was to be composed of those who agreed with a declaration that had echoes of a former N.M.W.M. pledge:

We, communicant members of the Church of England, believe that our membership involves the complete repudiation of modern war. We pledge ourselves to take no part in war, but to work for the construction of Christian peace in the world.¹⁰¹

An Executive Committee, on this occasion chaired by Morris although the decision on a permanent chairman was deferred, met at 5p.m. that evening. The Executive was not to meet often, the day to day running of the Fellowship being carried out by a Propaganda Committee. This consisted of Paul Gliddon (who provided liaison between the A.P.F. and the F.O.R.), Robert Gofton-Salmond, Gilbert Shaw, Ursula Roberts and R. H. Le Messurier who would be the Honorary Secretary, the Fellowship headquarters being based at his Holy Cross Vicarage, Argyle Square.¹⁰² They were later joined by Tom Scrutton, Vicar of Kingston-on-Thames. As well as those aforementioned, the early members of the Executive Committee were: Percy Hartill (in the Chair), John Warren Barnsley, Alfred Cheetham, Ernest Elworthy, Dennis Fletcher, Mary Gamble, R. C. R. Godfrey, Jeffrey Maples, Thomas Brock-Richards, and Rev. Mother Teresa, F.S.J.M.,¹⁰³ along with Kenneth Budd, Hugh Goodrich, H. C. L. Heywood, Deaconess A. C. Hunter, Douglas Lockhart, W. M. M. G. Mauleverer, Don Robins, Arthur Shrewsbury, Dame Sybil Thorndike Casson, Mrs. M. Thornhill and Mrs. M. Vernon.¹⁰⁴ At his own request, Dick Sheppard was not asked to take any official position as he feared that A.P.F. might be associated in some people's minds with his other pacifist activities in the P.P.U.¹⁰⁵

As well as having the good-will of the F.O.R.,¹⁰⁶ the new Fellowship was quick to engage with other Christian Pacifist bodies. Stuart Morris' Church of England clergy pacifist group soon merged with A.P.F.¹⁰⁷ Delegates were appointed to the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups¹⁰⁸ and discussions were planned with Percival Gough of the Society of Catholic Friends.¹⁰⁹ As notices about the new organisation were appearing in various journals, the Propaganda Committee was already hard at work, with its first meeting taking place only one week after the founding of the Fellowship.¹¹⁰ Five thousand copies of an introductory explanatory leaflet and membership form were

distributed in the first six months.¹¹¹ Mother Teresa undertook to write to all religious communities of women.¹¹² Hugh Goodrich attempted to get Anglicans in the P.P.U. to make themselves known to *Le Messurier*.¹¹³ Following a debate in the columns of *Peace News* between John Middleton Murry (arguing that disaffected Christians should “stay out” of the Church of England) and Ursula Roberts (arguing for a penitential “stay-in” strike instead), the pseudonymous “Sidesman” said that all pacifists in the Church of England - Catholic, Moderate or Evangelical - should join the new A.P.F.

If all the pacifists who are themselves (rightly) critical of the Church and at the same time church people were to set about getting together in their parishes groups of this fellowship we might before long find a very different state of things existing in the Church of England.¹¹⁴

Le Messurier, for his part, was radical in his preaching. He criticised the Archbishop of York’s support for rearmament; he rejected tattoos; and he declared in an interview that “I am convinced there is no greater sin a man can commit than to make war.”¹¹⁵ As for A.P.F., Le Messurier stated that “our aim is to get the Church of England officially to renounce war completely,”¹¹⁶ by which he meant,

Our aim should be to make every communicant member of the Church of England realise the pacifist implication of his communicant status; and when the communicants’ roll of the Church of England is coterminous with our list of members, then there will be no further need for the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship.¹¹⁷

An initial membership of over two hundred enrolled by the end of August,¹¹⁸ and by the end of 1937 membership reached five hundred, growing at around fifty per month. In its first year of existence, A.P.F. obtained seven hundred and fifty members.¹¹⁹ Requests for speakers and special meetings came in from all over the country. It was the general youthfulness of the membership which filled Le Messurier with optimism for the future: “We may have been slow to start, but I feel we shall not be long in catching up,” he remarked. Looking forward to Lambeth 1940, he argued that “If only we can convert a sufficient number [of communicants] to pacifism, the pressure exerted on the Bishops will be so overwhelming that they will be forced into the pacifist position.”¹²⁰

Publicity, preaching and prayer were the principal methods chosen in the campaign to recruit new members. The joint meeting of Propaganda and Executive Committees on 18 November, chaired by Percy Hartill who was himself writing a book on Christian pacifism,¹²¹ decided that Brock-Richards would get a literature stall at the next Church Congress in Bristol and that Evelyn Underhill would be asked to write a pamphlet.¹²² A

list of churches was earlier drawn up where intercessions for peace were offered.¹²³ Following a retreat conducted at Holy Cross, St. Pancras, by Gilbert Shaw, a series of quiet days were organised for the New Year at the same venue. The first conductor was be Father Andrew. A series of January Sunday evening sermons at Holy Cross included Gofton-Salmond, Scrutton Shaw and Father Andrew as preachers.¹²⁴

An article by Hugh Heywood in the September edition of *Reconciliation* was subsequently published jointly with F.O.R.¹²⁵, and Heywood himself was soon invited to join the Propaganda Committee.¹²⁶ In October, A.P.F.'s first independent pamphlet was published, *The Church Should Take the Lead*, a critique of Lambeth 1930 in the light of the attitude of English bishops in 1937.

If it was true in 1930 that "the risk involved in trusting one another is far less grave than the inevitable consequences of mutual distrust," it is true in 1937. If war is the *inevitable* consequence of mutual distrust, the nearer we seem to war the more urgent is the need to show a better way. If in 1930 the Church's responsibility for witnessing to this generation "the fundamental inconsistency between war and the fact of God's Fatherhood" was "tremendous," it is even more tremendous in 1937. It is far harder now for the Church to take the lead, but it is even more imperative. The aim of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship in appealing for disarmament as a step towards true peace is to bear witness to "the fundamental inconsistency" which cannot be slurred over for any reason whatever. We believe that "our greatest need now is the spread of a passionate aspiration for peace and goodwill among all Christian people," and that "great as is the debt that a man owes to his Fatherland" (or to his Empire) "the claims of Christ remain supreme."¹²⁷

At last Anglican pacifists, with all their faith and energy, had an vibrant organisation within which to support and encourage each other and to build a pacifist base inside the Church of England. The momentum towards war would prove unstoppable, but for the rest of the century, in times of both war and peace, the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship would continue to witness for pacifism within the Church of England.

AN ANGLICAN CHRONOLOGY: ENDNOTES

1. *Lambeth Conferences, 1867-1930*, p57.

2. Sheppard (ed.), *My Hopes and Fears for the Church*, p216.

3. Sheppard (ed.), *My Hopes and Fears for the Church*, p14. Later, Sheppard did not have far to travel to embrace the concept of the Peace Army.

4. One Day of Prayer was called for the start of March, when several dozen clergy and hundreds of others joined an ecumenical procession from City Temple to Westminster Abbey. Several thousand people were in the Abbey to hear the Bishop of Chichester give a peace address. (*Church Times*, 7 March 1930, p283.) That such Days of Prayer were having an effect on public opinion was shown later that month by an astonishing action by the Government. It tried to ban intercessory prayers by members of the armed forces for Russian Christians on two days of prayer with that intention set aside by the Archbishops. The order went out to Army chaplains that "his Majesty's Government have decided, in view of the political character the controversy has assumed, that it is undesirable that intercessory prayers for Russian subjects should be read at religious services in the Army." (*Church of England Newspaper*, 7 March 1930, p1.) In a political context, prayer could be a very dangerous activity.

5. *Church of England Newspaper*, 28 March 1930, p15.

6. *Church of England Newspaper*, 6 June 1930, p10. At the same time, an ecumenical Crusade was underway in Barnes' Diocese of Birmingham. One of the organisers, Canon Guy Rogers, invited local Congregationalist Leyton Richards to present "the full pacifist position." Richards said he wanted the Church "to multiply conscientious objectors in the name of Christ." Don Robins was also one of the speakers at an open air rally for young people. (*Church of England Newspaper*, 6 June 1930, p2.)

Barnes was to be the only English pacifist at the Lambeth Conference. However, he devoted his attention not to peace and war but to "The Doctrine of God." In a later plenary he also spoke on the ministry of women, provoking this reaction from one of his peers: "Barnes interposed a curious and characteristic speech advocating complete equality - he could even look forward to female bishops - on the ground of the latest biological science. He is a striking figure, the very model of a 'heresiarch'. He might have been Huss in front of the fathers of Constance, or Luther at the Diet of Worms. Tall, pallid with much study, with stooping shoulders, and a voice at once challenging and melancholy, he commands attention as well by his manner and aspect as by his opinions, which are almost insolently oppugnant to the general mind. He is a good man, but clearly a fanatic, and in a more disciplined age, could not possibly have avoided the stake!" (Hensley Henson, *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, vol. ii, p270.)

In years past, Barnes had been called "the Erasmus of our day." He himself kept a portrait of Erasmus in his study (John Barnes, *Ahead of His Age*, p135-6.) - he admired his desire to restore the Church, to make reason prevail and to see peace on earth. Now he was likened to Huss, another reformer, admirer of Wycliffe, and inspiration for the pacifist Bohemian Brethren. Barnes would have regarded the comparison as a compliment.

7. During the bishops' gathering Sheppard preached a broadcast sermon at St. Martin-in-the-Fields on the need to discern when to be patient and when to be impatient. It was one last attempt at lobbying: "We cannot stand for truth, righteousness, justice, peace, beauty, and the power of God, and for the good news of Jesus Christ," he said, "unless there is fire and passionate enthusiasm in our hearts for the values which Jesus Christ said were supreme and absolute...."

Perhaps the Gospel of Jesus Christ is dangerous to States. Well, we can take our choice. We can cast it aside - at least that is reasonable - but we cannot tame it, merely for national, imperial, or personal advancement. I yield to no one in my love of my Homeland, but God is not primarily interested in the domination of the British race. We cannot combine the Jehovah of the Old Testament, Who bids us exalt ourselves over our neighbour, with Jesus of Nazareth, Who has no weapon in His armoury save wise and passionate love.

Perhaps this same Gospel does tell us - aye, and in times of national peril - to feed our enemies and to forgive them; to visit the prisoners ...

Perhaps the Gospel does tell us to refuse to kill our brother, be he black or white; to be ready, if necessary, to reduce our income if by so doing we can help the deserving and needy.

Perhaps the Gospel does demand all these things. I think it does. We, we can throw it aside and call it foolish, that is reasonable, but to bid Christians to step lightly and keep quiet in times of grave emergency, for fear lest public opinion, the government of the day, the member of parliament or city councillor, or the labour agitator or capitalist might be offended, and never to live out their creed, is to reduce the teaching of Christ to so great a mockery as to make those Churches which profess to be of Him simply not worth while preserving.

Religion was not meant to be a dope to keep us insensitive to what is happening in the market place. There must at times be conflict between Christ and Cæsar, and by Cæsar I mean the State, and our place is every time with Christ.

The time is at hand, I am sure, when we must either proclaim that Christianity is unworkable, too great for us, charming if you like, but not practical or possible, that the Galilean is too great for our small hearts - or else, that it is the last word in practical wisdom and must be lived out, cost what it may." (McCormick et al, *St. Martin-in-the-Fields Calling*, p70-77.)

8. Other participants included the Bishops of Lewes (Hordern), Plymouth (Masterman) and Salisbury (Donaldson). (*Lambeth Conferences*, p195.)

9. Cited in Raven, *Is War Obsolete?*, p22.

10. R. C. D. Jasper, *George Bell: Bishop of Chichester*, p94.

11. R. Rouse and S. C. Neill (eds.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, p564. Cited in Jasper, *George Bell*, p94. The resolution also supported Kellogg-Briand, promoted arbitration and added an appeal "to the respective authorities of all Christian Communion to declare in unmistakable terms that they will not countenance any war or encourage their countrymen to serve in any war, with regard to which the government of their country has refused an offer to arbitration." (Jasper, *George Bell*, p95.) Barnes, Bell and the Kempthorne (again in the Chair) were among sixteen bishops - the episcopal influence was spreading - who joined with other leading Anglican and Free Church clerics in the Council of Christian Ministers on Social Questions who consented to and promoted the Eisenach resolutions on the Kellogg Pact, on incompatibility and on arbitration. (*Church of England Newspaper*, 3 January 1930, p14 and *British Weekly*, 2 January 1930.)

12. *Reconciliation*, March 1930, p47.

13. *Lambeth Conferences*, p206.

14. *Lambeth Conferences*, p206.

15. W. G. Downie, in *Reconciliation*, October 1930, p207.

16. "The League of Nations has now become an indispensable organ of international co-operation, and

has successfully dealt with several crises that menaced the peace of the world. By the Kellogg-Briand pact, 58 of the nations of the world have renounced war as an instrument of national policy, and by the ratification of the "Optional Clause," most of them have agreed to submit all disputes, with few reservations, to arbitration. The organization of the World Court, the admission of Germany to the League of Nations, the final evacuation of German territory, the settlement of the Reparations question and the agreement for the limitation of Naval Armaments, are among the events of recent years that justify the hope that the world is being guided into the way of peace.

We note also with thankfulness that the spirit of hatred is giving place to a kindlier spirit among the peoples of the world....” (*Lambeth Conferences*, p206.)

17. *Lambeth Conferences*, p207. Although the bishops upheld the rights of the nation state in even stronger terms than in 1920 - "Nations exist by the Will of God as expressed in history" (*Lambeth Conferences*, p207) - in what one critic (W. G. Downie, in *Reconciliation*, October 1930, p217) called a "magnificent statement," they rejected explicitly the sentiments expressed in the phrase "My country, right or wrong." They said: "Great as is the debt of service that a man owes to his Fatherland, the claim of Christ remains supreme, and the State can only demand the wholehearted loyalty of its citizens when its action is guided by the same moral principle taught to apply in his relations with his neighbours. The Machiavellian doctrine of the non-moral character of the State, to which Bolshevism is committed, is contrary to the whole Christian ideal. If the Christian Church in every nation could refuse to countenance or support a declaration of war by its own government unless that government had inaugurated or accepted a bona fide offer to submit the dispute to arbitration, it would be doing no more than insisting on the fulfilment of pledges solemnly made." (*Lambeth Conferences*, p206,207.) It was an irony of history that before the next Lambeth Conference, influential Niebuhrian theology had opposed pacifism and tried to justify war by claiming the near amoral character of the State.

18. "Before the war the nations of Europe were hag-ridden by this distrust of one another, and sought security in the piling up of armaments till the crash came. We must convince the peoples of the world that the risk involved in trusting one another is far less grave than the inevitable consequences of mutual distrust." (*Lambeth Conferences*, p207.) Examples of trust that were offered included the huge undefended frontier between the United States and Canada, and the statue of Christ on the summit of the Andes representing a will to peace on behalf of the people of both Chile and the Argentine.

19. *Lambeth Conferences*, p208. "[I]t is unquestionable that the war spirit is engendered by selfishness and greed in industrial and economic relationships; while the increased strain of modern industry and the contrast between excessive wealth and poverty tend to foster a spirit of unrest which reacts on the international situation." (*Lambeth Conferences*, p210.)

20. A sermon of Archbishop Lang was cited with approval. "I am persuaded," he said, "that the principles of the League of Nations are in accord with the Spirit of Christ. If this be true, then it is upon the citizens who bear the name of Christ that the duty of standing by and behind the League of Nations is most clearly laid.... With whatever authority belongs to the office which I hold, I call upon all my fellow-Churchmen to be foremost in their support of the League of Nations, and of the Union which in this country exists to strengthen its cause." (*Lambeth Conferences*, p208.)

21. *Lambeth Conferences*, p211-212.

22. Most of the attention and debate under this heading was given to a resolution on marriage and sex that did not condemn all use of contraceptives within marriage. Of the six resolutions produced by the Sub-Committee on Peace and War, the last two (29 and 30) reflected the concerns of C.O.P.E.C. six years earlier, being principally concerned with social justice. The latter referred to drug traffic and the former reaffirmed a whole section of Lambeth 1920 on industrial life: "the world is still faced with

grave social and economic evils which are an offence to the Christian conscience, and a menace to peace." This Resolution, rather than the more substantive Resolutions 25-28, struck a chord with the Archbishop of Canterbury. Although in his Encyclical Letter accompanying the Conference Report, Lang had conceded that "the Christian must condemn war not merely because it is wasteful and ruinous, a cause of untold misery, but far more because it is contrary to the will of God," he still found it much easier to talk of the need "to make war on injustice, falsehood, and covetousness." The sentiment may have been admirable, but his language of war could easily be used to deny the things that made for peace. (This section of the Encyclical Letter also included the assertion that "the Church should take the lead," a sentiment echoed by the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship in its first pamphlet in 1937.)

23. Resolution 26 alluded warmly to the Kellogg-Briand pact: "The Conference welcomes the agreement made by leading statesmen of the world in the names of their respective peoples, in which they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another and agree that the settlement of all disputes which may arise among them shall never be sought except by pacific means."

24. "When nations have solemnly bound themselves by Treaty, Covenant or Pact for the pacific settlement of international disputes, the Conference holds that the Christian Church in every nation should refuse to countenance any war in regard to which the government of its own country has not declared its willingness to submit the matter in dispute to arbitration or conciliation." This was potentially a most significant motion and the most ignored in the years ahead. When, by its words and actions, the British Government moved away from its Kellogg obligations, the Church of England raised no objection. Collectively, neither the bishops nor the Church Assembly were ever prepared to "refuse to countenance" any likely British military action.

25. Pierce and Ward, *The Voice of Conscience: A Loud and Unusual Noise?*, p4.

26. *Church of England Newspaper*, 7 November 1930, p13.

27. A commentator at this "great meeting" said, "It is the business of the Churches to create an atmosphere in which the war spirit is exorcised and the settlement of international disputes by force is regarded as barbarous and unthinkable." *Church of England Newspaper*, 13 February 1931. p8.

28. The Bishop of Ripon (though going out of his way to stress that the Lambeth resolutions did not commit the Church to pacifism) and the Bishop of Lichfield both supported H. J. Torr of Lincoln, who moved a resolution welcoming Lambeth Resolutions 25 and 27 and urging support for the agencies commended in Resolution 26. This annoyed Lord Hugh Cecil who not only wanted the debate abandoned but who was also highly critical of the bishops, thinking that "the Anglican Episcopate was, like Mr. Pickwick, always on the side of the largest crowd. When war was popular, they gave eloquent speeches about the opportunities of heroism and self-sacrifice it afforded. Ten years afterwards, when war had become unpopular, the Bishops passed resolutions in favour of peace." The Dean of Winchester had not even moved on in the way to which Cecil referred. He still lived the fantasy of his predecessors, opposing Resolution 25 completely, bemoaning the shortage of recruits for the army and wanting clergy to urge young people to join the armed forces. R. Eaton White of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich and Lt. Col. Oldham tried to divert the Assembly to considering a more pietistic use of the word "Peace." In contrast, T. H. Aggett of Exeter wanted to strengthen Torr's motion by explicit reference to disarmament. Aggett had fought in France in 1914 and was acquainted with the horrors of war. He no longer thought it was a wonderful thing to fight for one's country, believing that it was far nobler to live and serve one's country in the atmosphere of peace. He considered it altogether wrong that in any so-called civilized and Christian State a person made in the image of God should be called upon deliberately to murder fellow human beings. The Bishop of Winchester brought the sorry debate to a

premature end to avoid further embarrassment, commenting that it would be a grave reflection on the Church of England if the Assembly continued to debate a subject of vital importance in so thin a House and with so little possibility of arriving at a considered opinion. (*Church Times*, 13 February 1931, p200.)

29. *Reconciliation*, March 1931, p290.

30. The Report's reference to the "right" of a nation to defend itself or resort to force in the fulfilment of international obligations was a disappointment to Downie, but he took solace in that Report having no authority other than that of the Sub-Committee by whom it was prepared. The Resolutions of the whole Conference were more significant, and for Downie these gave a great boost to the pacifist position advocated by the Fellowship of Reconciliation. "To some of us it is clear that there is only one way in which the future can be made secure against such disaster [the outbreak of another war]. We must have a sufficient number of men and women who are determined, and who are prepared to stand by their determination, that, come what may, they will take no part in war. And those of us who are members of the F.o.R. have no doubt whatever in our minds that a right understanding of the Gospel of Jesus Christ will inevitably lead a man to adopt this uncompromising attitude. Can we say that our position has been approved by the Bishops of the Anglican Communion? I think we can....

We are profoundly thankful, then, for much of what the Bishops have said. The general impression left upon the mind of the writer is that the Lambeth Resolutions and Reports mark a real advance on the part of the Church in the direction of the position represented by the F.o.R. It would be a mistake to assume that all the Bishops would unreservedly bestow their blessing upon us; the Church of England is not, any more than any other Church, the ideal Church of which the members of the F.o.R. sometimes dream. But I think we may expect that the F.o.R. point of view will, in the future, command the sympathy and possibly the full approval of not a few of those who have given to the world the Lambeth Resolutions and Reports." *Reconciliation*, October 1930, p205-7, 217,218.

31. "We must dare for peace as we would dare in war," said the writer. "It is certainly not possible for a nation of cowards to disarm; but it is possible for a nation of brave men and women. After all, someone *must* be brave enough to take risks for God. God can do amazing things when heroes are on His side; and we believe that if England were brave enough to disarm, the whole civilised world would thank God and follow her example.... We must build up a body of clear-headed and determined people - men and women with the spirit of the martyrs - who are ready to go to any lengths permissible to a Christian in their campaign against war. On the day when a Government realises that, no matter what is said by politicians or by the press, a vast number of people in the country have determined neither to fight nor to make munitions nor to assist in any way in the prosecution of war; but to do all they can to obstruct and hinder it - on that day, we may be in prison, but the victory will be won. And every convert we make to this great cause will bring the day nearer." (Cited in the *Friend*, 27 March 1931.)

32. Bilton and Wilkinson argued that a change had taken place in the relationship between the Church and the armed forces. It was no longer the intimate and sympathetic thing that it was, they said, "but has become an impossible partnership between parties whose ideals are mutually exclusive." They focussed on four specific points of difference: that for each individual responsible to God, there was the principle of liberty of conscience, denied by and a hindrance to the armed forces; that truth was the first casualty of war, and so a war which may have begun in the faith that honour demanded it, "is continued through the slime of devilish untruth, and the vision of honour fades into nothingness"; that in wartime, immorality is excused on the grounds of abnormal conditions; and that the weapons used (specifically, poison gases and disease germs) were "obviously not within the province of Christianity." Could the Church remain in the present relationship to army and navy, asked Bilton and Wilkinson? Services to consecrate regimental colours and to keep the same in church buildings were surely inconsistent with resolutions that condemned the use of that armed force in which they would be held.

Was it possible to simultaneously be a good soldier and a loyal Christian? Echoing the practice of the early Church they argued, "The Christian Church should prevent, by every means available, the entry of its young men into an occupation where the Christian Ethic is so completely violated." Bilton and Wilkinson also questioned the practice by which the government which enlisted the armed forces also appointed the chaplains to those forces (and gave them a rank and a uniform.) This would have been a personal issue for Wilkinson who held a chaplaincy post to the Reserve of Officers. They noted a recent letter to the *Daily Telegraph* by Brigadier-General F. P. Crozier. "I don't want a chaplain to help me take my coat off to fight," he had said, "but I do believe that some chaplains might prevent me from having to do so." Bilton and Wilkinson commented, "That is the choice in a nutshell. Shall the Church continue in its present position, passing resolutions that condemn its own actions? Or shall its action be eloquent comment on its resolutions, proving the sincerity of its repentance?" (*Reconciliation*, December 1932, p226-228.)

33. *Reconciliation*, September 1930, p171,172.

34. A Baptist Ministers' Pacifist Fellowship was founded by W. H. Haden in 1934 (the Welsh Baptist denomination had accepted total pacifism, much to the disquiet of the local League of Nations Union - Ceadel, *Pacifism*, p174); the Congregational Christian Pacifist Crusade - originally founded in 1926 - had been revived in May 1933 by Leyton Richards of the Carr Lane Congregational Church, Birmingham, as the Congregational Pacifist Fellowship; Henry Carter's Methodist Peace Fellowship, formerly launched on 3 November 1933, was expanding rapidly (there had been a Primitive Methodist Fellowship of Freedom and Peace and a Wesleyan Methodist Peace Organisation back in 1917, but neither had come to much. (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p32. Carter was for many years Secretary of the Methodist Social Welfare Department. Wilkinson, *Dissent or Conform?*, p291. He is not to be confused with the minister of Emmanuel Congregational Church, Cambridge from 1910 to 1944, Henry Childs Carter, 1875-1954, who was converted to pacifism after hearing Maude Royden speak in February 1915. Andrew C. Thompson, p552,553.) There were also peace societies for Presbyterians (the work of Lewis Maclachan), Ministers in the Church of Scotland, Unitarians and others. (Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p94,95.)

35. The initial manifesto of the C.C.P.G. was explicitly pacifist: "The word of God to us this day is to live without fear under his will, refusing war and creating peace.... We know in the actual experience of our own time that war can solve no human problem. In spiritual forces alone is there any hope of so changing the relationships of men as to lay the foundations of community between the nations. God is calling the Church to make peace.... A God showed Himself in Jesus Christ, so he has always been.... We dare not go on pretending that the ways of war are the ways of the Father of all men nor dare we any longer tolerate the continuance of political and social systems that, leading inevitably to war, frustrate the will of God.... Christ Himself refused the methods of war and faced the Cross instead.... He calls us every one of us to commit himself entirely to this way of life.... Each of us is bound in loyalty to say 'Because war is against the character and purpose of God, I will not only take no part in it, I will strive to make it everywhere and always impossible.'... So shall we find release from our fears and from our enmities as we surrender ourselves to God's sovereignty and to the service of our fellows, recognising in every other man a brother whose life must not be crippled and whose blood must not be spilt." (Cited in I.F.O.R., *Towards a Christian International*, 1936 edition, p58.)

36. Pax had links with the Guild of the Pope's Peace, a small group of Catholics who had come together in 1916 to distribute the peace messages of Benedict XV. (Flessati, p7.) In the intervening years, *The Church and War*, by the exiled German Dominican Fr. Franziskus Stratmann, had been influential. In the first years of its existence, Pax was to be the most persecuted of the denominational peace societies, the oppressor being the Roman Catholic Church itself, not least in the person of Cardinal Hinsley of Westminster. In a rigidly hierarchical and authoritarian Church - especially one

seeking respectability through patriotism (Flessati, p58) - there were many questions that arose about an unofficial grouping of anti-war Catholics. Should the society even describe itself as a "Catholic organisation," or as an organisation trying to apply Catholic principles to a practical problem? In practice, Pax was open not only to Roman Catholics, but also to those Anglicans who, spiritually and theologically, were content to call themselves Catholic. By not being an official Catholic Society, Pax was able to be distanced from the hostility towards it that emanated from the Archbishop of Westminster.

At a time of official Catholic support for Spanish fascists, relations between Pax and the Roman Catholic hierarchy were strained to breaking point by the organisation's pacifist interpretation of the Just War theory, even before questions of ecumenical relations were considered. (In November 1926, Cardinal Bourne, the Archbishop of Westminster, had reminded Anglicans of the words of Margaret Clitherow: "I will not pray with you, nor shall you pray with me; neither would I say Amen to your prayers, nor shall you say it to mine." Clitherow's circumstances hardly applied to the twentieth century, and the use of her words did not assist ecumenism. - Sheppard, *Impatience of a Parson*, p40,41.)

After the formation of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship there was close co-operation between Pax and A.P.F., with mailing exchanges, joint meetings, etc. By 1939 it was being suggested that Pax might merge with the, by then, stronger Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. The idea was not acted upon, but there was considerable co-operation between the two organisations during the war years. There was even a small Pax group at the Anglican theological college at Mirfield (Flessati, p123) with one of their number, Mervyn Truran, serving on Pax Council for a time (Flessati to CB, 26 January 1993.) Other Anglicans associated with Pax included: the Vicar of Christ Church, Ealing, H. L. Hayes, who attended one of the earliest meetings in May 1936 (Flessati, p5); and the Librarian of Pusey House, Oxford, Humphrey Beavor, who addressed the London Pax group in 1937, appealing for greater recognition of worldwide Christian unity as the basis for Christian opposition to war. (Flessati, p29.) Pax distributed across the country a notice displayed by Kenneth Rawlings in Lewes that the church would always be open with a priest ready to lead prayers of penitence for the sin of war and to pray both for the suffering and for the enemy (Flessati, p14.) A Pax member, Eugene Yoors, was commissioned to produce a commemorative window for George Lansbury at Kingsley Hall (Flessati, p180.) By 1943, Paul Gliddon, Middleton Murry and Charles Stimson were all on the Pax Council. (Flessati, p124.)

37. A 1939 Pax leaflet said of Just War conditions, "if only one is lacking, then the war is unjustifiable and Catholics are *obliged by the Church* to refuse to take part in and support it." (Flessati, p52.)

38. *Church Times*, 30 June 1933, p780.

39. In that Porter Goff and H. W. Fox, the Honorary Secretary of the World Alliance, were close (see, e.g. *Church of England Newspaper*, 20 January 1933), that latter organisation was no obvious home for pacifists either. One ecumenical attempt to cross the increasing divide came when a "Church and World Peace" Committee was set up after a meeting at Percy Dearmer's house on 17 March 1933. Although the pacifist Donald Soper joined Porter Goff and Fox in a team of Secretaries planning an extensive campaign across the country, it proved to be an unfruitful initiative. (*Church of England Newspaper*, 24 March 1933, p1 and 7 April 1933, p8. Also *War Resister*, no. 34, Summer 1933, p15.)

Another couple of meetings, at Canon Dearmer's house and Canon Barry's house, led William Temple to produce his *Christ and the Way to Peace*. Temple explicitly distanced himself from pacifism: "There are some Christians who hold that loyalty to Christ forbids all participation in fighting. We respect that view, but we don't share it." (*Christ and the Way to Peace*, p19.) There would be no home for pacifists in the corridors of power of the Church of England.

40. See *Reconciliation*, September 1936, piv.

41. *Reconciliation*, March 1935.
42. Morrison, *I Renounce War*, p12.
43. *Peace Year Book*, 1935, p103. Also, *War Resister*, No.37, Spring 1935, p10,11.
44. *Church of England Newspaper*, 16 November 1934, p11. Also, *War Resister*, No. 37, Spring 1935, p10,11.
45. Michael Parker, educated at Christ Church, Oxford and Ely, had been curate in Morris' parish of St. Bartholomew, 1923-1926, since when he had been the unlicensed curate to his brother-in-law at St. Jude, Birmingham; (John Barnes, *Ahead of His Age*, p392.) Bishop Barnes, who did not give Parker a licence until 1937, then rapidly changed his opinion of this rebel and appointed him Vicar of King's Heath in 1939 and Archdeacon of Aston in 1946; later, Parker became Bishop of Aston and then Bishop of Bradford.
46. Susan Miles, *Portrait of a Parson*, p79.
47. *Reconciliation*, 1935, p23.
48. *Church Times*, 22 March 1935, p340. In his address, Cunningham's approach had been to explore the phrase, "the mind of Christ": "What then, so far as it can be expressed in words, does the mind of Christ mean to us? What have we learned about this mind from His life, His death, His resurrection, and from His teaching, from the Lord's Prayer, from the Beatitudes, from the Sermon on the Mount, from His words at the Last Supper?
It is a mind possessed by love, active, energising, transforming, healing, redeeming, love not counting the cost, triumphant unto death. It is a mind full of faith, of calm confidence in God that banishes fear.... Free from guile, sophistry, casuistry, clear and penetrating because completely untrammelled by convention or by fear. And it is this mind which is to be our example. We are to be like Him....
And what is war? It is the deliberate and organised attempt on the part of the members of one community to kill, maim, starve and torture the members of another community until the latter are compelled to submit. It is a tyrant which mocks at our feeble attempts to conserve some decency, some charity, some sense of the value of truthfulness, compassion or human dignity. It is a terrible and horrible thing which may have the sanction of the State, which, alas, has always had the sanction of the Church, and which it is now proposed shall have the sanction of the League of Nations.
But no sanction can divest the individual, combatant or non-combatant, man or woman of his or her personal responsibility either in the matter of waging war, of consenting to war or of relying on the resort to arms for security....
Let us imagine ourselves saying our prayers in war time. For we must pray! This dreadful thing is going on, and we must pray! For what can we pray? We may pray that our men may be defended and that victory may be given to our army. But what does this mean? It means that we are praying that our men may shoot straight, our bombers drop straight, that there may be no shortage of high explosives or poison gas, that our blockade of the enemy may be tightened effectively; in short that the agony which we inflict on them may be more intolerable than that we ourselves are suffering. Or we may pray that peace may be restored. But we cannot expect such a prayer to be heard while we are at war in our hearts." (*Reconciliation*, 1935, p34-36.)
49. Following an Oxford education, Gough, who had been made deacon in 1902 at the start of a curacy in Southport, was ordained priest in 1903. He served a second curacy at Tulse Hill in the Diocese of Liverpool from 1904 to 1906, after which he moved to the Wakefield Diocese, serving further curacies in Normanton, 1906-1910 and Halifax, 1910-1912, before briefly becoming vicar of St. Thomas,

Charlestown, Halifax in 1921-22. He then moved to the parish of St. Mark, in St. John's Wood, London, until 1928 when he became Rector of Acton. In an address first published in the *Christian World Pulpit*, Gough said, "We demand of our leaders, whose voice alone gets audience, that they tell if they really believe Jesus has any meaning for the present, not just as a philanthropist - there were many such before His time - but as a Friend of charity, peace and love. And if they do believe it, will they take this gospel into the midst of a world-order in which war-feeling, war-lust, and national greed make it worth while going, and where alone the light of His life can shine in its real glory and meaning?"

50. "There are already plenty of pacifist organisations working among the general public," reported Cynric Mytton-Davies, the Harpenden-based Secretary of the Society: "the sphere in which Catholic Friends influence is most vitally needed is inside the Church of England." *Reconciliation*, November 1937, p306.

51. *Reconciliation*, October 1936, p266,267.

52. *Reconciliation*, August 1937, p223. The scheme was slow in starting. (*Reconciliation*, October 1937, p279.)

53. *Reconciliation*, November 1937, p306.

54. *Reconciliation*, December 1937, p335.

55. *Church Times*, 6 September 1935, p249,250.

56. This was taken further (not surprisingly, given Raven's involvement) in the lengthy and meticulous statement of objection issued by the C.C.P.G.: "When did the police in this country ever seek to break a strike or bring to book those responsible for disorder by inflicting violence on their dependants, a procedure which is inseparable from the policy of effective military sanctions? There is not real parallel between the application of military sanctions and police action. It involves the methods of war and *is* war." (*Reconciliation*, October 1935, p276.)

57. *Reconciliation*, October 1935, p263-275.

58. F. E. Jones in *Church Times*, 6 September 1935, p228.

59. Kenneth Rawlings in *Church Times*, 6 September 1935, p228.

60. "There must be hundreds of priests who would pledge themselves not to preach war or engage in recruiting activities, and surely also enough Bishops (assistants or retired) to ensure the Apostolic Succession. Such a Church would appeal, I am convinced, to very many men and women like myself who must be deeply perplexed to know where they stand and what they must do; relinquish their membership of the Church that means much to them, or continue in it and refuse to acknowledge the teaching of their leaders, and, if necessary, disobey them in it." (*Church Times*, 13 September 1935, p260.)

61. *Church Times*, 20 September 1935, p288.

62. *Church Times*, 20 September 1935, p288,289.

63. Although the request for respondents had not specified clergy only, it was an exclusively clerical group that emerged. "The possibility of forming a laymen's group is also under consideration, but it

presents considerable administrative difficulties.” (*Reconciliation*, November 1935, p309.) An indication of the likely membership of Gofton-Salmond’s group can be seen in a multiply-signed letter in the *Church of England Newspaper* on 25 October.

“Sir,- Uneasy in our conscience at the attitude towards war adopted by many Christians at this time, we, the undersigned clergymen of the Church of England, declare publicly that we believe that military sanctions are tantamount to war as commonly recognised; and as such we believe them to be contrary to the mind of Christ and therefore not permissible to Christians. - Yours, etc.,

Kenneth Ashcroft, B. F. Betteridge, Armar de Candole, J. V. L. Casserley, W. H. Stewart Dumphreys, C. Paul Gliddon, R. Gofton-Salmond, Percival Gough, Eric P. Hammond, P. H. Harley, B. C. Hopson, P. W. A. Knox, C. G. Langdon, Douglas Lockhart, R. H. Le Messurier, Stuart D. Morris, T. D. Powell-Davies, Kenneth Rawlings, T. Brock-Richards, W. C. Roberts, P. Rowe, P. W. Seymour, Gilbert Shaw, F. E. A. Shepherd, H. R. L. Sheppard, Albert J. Short, J. C. Spokes, J. C. Sprott, Rowland W. Taylor, D. C. Tibbenham, J. R. Windsor-Garnett, E. P. Woollcombe.” (*Church of England Newspaper*, 25 October 1935, p7.)

Many of the signatories were younger clergy. Including Gofton-Salmond, there was a decided London weighting, with a central and East End dominance. Kenneth Fry Ashcroft had been curate of St. James, Enfield Highway from 1919-1922, during which time he had been in charge of the Royal Small Arms Factory Church. He had been Vicar of St. Michael and All Angels, Bromley-by-Bow since 1925, and was about to become (1936) the Rural Dean of Poplar; Julian Victor Langmead Casserley was a curate in Norwood; Dumphreys was based at Holy Trinity, Kingsway; Cuthbert Paul Gliddon had just moved to St. James’, Walthamstow; Gough was Rector of Acton; Harley was Vicar of St. John the Baptist, Hoxton; Ralph Huie Le Messurier was Vicar of Holy Cross, St. Pancras, where Spokes was about to obtain permission to officiate; William Corbett Roberts was Vicar of St. George’s, Bloomsbury; Rowe was Gofton-Salmond’s Curate at St. Clement’s, City Road; Seymour was Vicar of St. Peter’s, Vauxhall; Gilbert Shuldham Shaw, a former barrister and Organising Secretary for the Association Promoting Retreats, was Curate-in-Charge of Sydney Mission, Poplar; Sheppard was a Residentiary Canon of St. Paul’s; Short was Curate at St. Michael-at-Bowes, Southgate; Sprott (who in 1940 became Provost of Dundee) was Curate of St. George Martyr with Holy Trinity, Holborn; and Woollcombe had been Rector of Sutton since 1922. Only Morris and Shepherd (from Birmingham), Rawlings (from Lewes), Brock-Richards and Hammond (Incumbent and Curate of North Gosforth), Taylor (Curate of Chalfont St. Peter) and Windsor-Garnett (Vicar of Tatham Fells, in the Diocese of Blackburn) represented the provinces. Lockhart (an Oxford-educated historian, something of a liturgist, and the Rector of Holy Trinity, Paisley) represented Scotland.

64. Presumably the thirty-two signatories who signed the letter of 25 October, above.

65. This was reflected in the somewhat laboured approach of the first group statement: “We are convinced that the main difficulty in understanding what the Christian attitude towards warfare should be is due to confusion in thought between that which is proper to the natural man and that which our Lord expects of a fully-converted Christian....

War is not a restriction of personal action, but it leads to the extinction of the material life of the individual, for the essential part of warfare is the death of the adversary. Between nations, with the loss of man power, one or other of them becomes so weak that it is no longer able to resist, with the result that it is conquered or else makes peace. The logical conclusion of this is clear to-day in that any and every means of destruction are employed, and the morale of the civilian population is definitely attacked. If ever there was a justification for the statement that a “just war” was being waged, there can be no justification to-day, when the victims of warfare are not restricted to those who have accepted the military obligation, but include the women and children, the factory worker, the docker, living in the open towns, far removed, it may be, from the scene of the conflict.

The Church in times past (though not in the first stage), in its alliance with the kingdoms of this world, allowed that it was permissible for a loyal subject to kill in a “just war,” and that only the priest

and the Religious were freed from that national obligation; while at the same time the Christian conscience did all it could to limit both the scope and brutality of actual war-fare to the actual combatants.

There is no statement either in the Gospel or in the teaching of the Church that war is a Christian duty, or that men and women should continue to make war. In fact, the Christian life must, if it is to be lived consistently, repudiate warfare. The Christian life is the life of a body that knows neither race nor class nor colour nor any natural divisions, for it is united in a supernatural unity.

For Christian to murder Christian is a clear disruption of the intimate life of the Christian brotherhood, and is a mockery of the Gospel. In so far as the Christian life is thought of in terms of nationality there will be no end to war. It is only when Christians are convinced that war is not permissible for them and that all Christians in all nations refuse to fight, that war will be brought to an end.

We feel, therefore, that war is against the spirit and the Gospel of Christ because it is against brotherhood; it implies murder; between Christians it divides the Sacred Body; it is clean contrary to the way of reconciliation and redemption which is to be the Christian life; war and preparation for war imply lack of faith in God by putting the kingdom of this world before the Kingdom of God, which must be sought first.

In so far as the Christian is a citizen of the world he must obey the world's ordinances, but only in so far as they are compatible with his first and essential allegiance to Christ his head. We feel to-day that no war can be termed "just," in view of the methods of modern warfare, and considering that whole nations are driven to the shambles through conscription, and the civilian population is laid open to destruction." *Church Times*, 1 November 1935, p480.

66. The organisers found the number attending "far from discouraging," given the number of men away on holiday or working single-handed through the absence of others. After Mass of the Holy Spirit, Fr. Gofton-Salmond opened the morning session with a talk on the practical issues facing pacifist priests, including the advisability or otherwise of co-operating with: (1) peace organisations that did not accept the pacifist position - e.g. the League of Nations Union - as some had experienced difficulties when sharing a platform with non-pacifists (the meeting urged pacifist priests to stand solidly for pacifist methods, anticipating that "unwanted invitations" would then dry up); or (2) pacifist organisations that did not accept the Christian position - e.g. the newly-established Peace Pledge Union - where co-operation could still be encouraged as Christian pacifists would agree with secular colleagues about the method to be employed, even though they might disagree as to the final reason for its employment (besides, it would be a serious error to neglect such an opportunity for Christian propaganda.) The afternoon session was more sombre as they considered the attitude that priests should adopt in the event of war, e.g. what to do about anti-gas drill. The principal speaker for this session was Gilbert Shaw.

67. The provisional committee consisted of: Gilbert Shaw; Paul Gliddon; Julian Casserley, by that time Curate of St. Nicholas', Plumstead; Leslie William Hamilton Whiteside, Curate of St. John's, Reading; and Kenneth Ashcroft, who had recently become a founder-member of the Poplar and Bow branch of F.O.R. (*Reconciliation*, 1935, p136.) Robert Gofton-Salmond would act as secretary. (*Reconciliation*, November 1936, p302,303.)

68. Gliddon was about to receive episcopal approval for an ecumenical ministry at the King's Weigh House, a setting once associated with the Congregationalist pacifist preacher, Dr. W. E. Orchard. (*Church Times*, 18 December 1936, p726.)

69. *Peace News*, 10 October 1936. Around this time, W. C. Roberts displayed a P.P.U. recruiting poster on the railings outside the church, inviting passers-by to enter and sign the peace pledge. (*Peace News*, 12 December 1936, p2.)

70. Gliddon wrote: "The glee displayed by some of the members of the Church Assembly when that

body refused to discuss a group of resolutions and amendments on the problems of peace and war reminds one of Walpole's famous words in the presence of another blunder: 'They are ringing their bells now; they will be wringing their hands soon.' With Christians still engaged in fighting in Abyssinia, with many of our own countrymen at war in Spain, with the nations spending their wealth on the accumulation of vast armaments, it seems strange that a representative body of priests and lay people should, when asked to express their views on such an issue, have nothing more helpful to say than, 'Mum's the word.'" (*Church Times*, 27 November 1936, p613.)

71. *Peace News*, 28 November 1936.

72. Selwyn argued that the Sermon on the Mount was not applicable to the issue of war because although Jesus' teaching over-rote the Mosaic law of retaliation that was quite a different thing from the "legitimate" use of force. The Archdeacon of Coventry sounded as if the world had not moved on since 1914; his principal concern was pacifist propaganda in the universities and the elite public schools which, he said, was having a serious and deplorable effect on recruiting.

73. In the columns of *Peace News*, the Methodist Minister of Rossendale regarded that assertion as "laughable were it not so untrue." He added that one might just as well say, "St. Francis, George Fox, Mr. Lansbury and their followers will be the cause of the next world war." (*Peace News*, 20 February 1937.) W. Rathbone of Greenford asked: "Who is best qualified to judge whether pacifists are a 'danger to the peace of the world' - the patriotic bishops who 'did their bit' blessing the shells on the 'Home Front,' or the pacifists of today who 'did their bit' stopping them on the Western Front?" (*Peace News*, 27 February 1937.)

74. Hartill, *Pacifism and Christian Common Sense*, p5,6.

75. *Church of England Newspaper*, 12 February 1937, p7.

76. The theme of several broadcast appeals to the nation by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the end of 1936. Sheppard's response to the Recall was to ask "What religion?" Did the religion the Archbishop had in mind include Jesus' teaching on peace, and one's duty to one's neighbour in economically distressed areas?, he asked. "Does 'recall to religion' suggest to us a nation imbued with a passion for righteousness, or merely a nation resolved on respectability?" (*True Christianity*, an article from the *Sunday Express*, cited in Sheppard, *God and My Neighbour*, p68.) A schoolmaster, L. B. Pekin, switched off the Archbishop's appeal before the end: "it was so irrelevant, so hopelessly inadequate to the realities of that tremendous moral and social revolution which Christianity is. For a capitalist-imperialist nation to profess the Christian faith appears to me simply a horrible blasphemy. I am not sure that every pacifist is bound to be a Christian but I am sure that every Christian is bound to be a pacifist." (Sheppard et al, *Let Us Honour Peace*, p36,37.)

77. *Church Times*, 12 February 1937, p197. For Leslie Keeble of the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups, this was a "splendid speech ... this very difficult and courageous effort...." He wrote to Sheppard in laudatory tone: "We rejoice in your witness, a great host are with you. Lead us on, sir, with this glorious campaign. We will follow! Thousands of us thank God for you every day, for your saving salt of Christianity in a flavourless Church...." (Keeble to Sheppard, 10 February 1937. Richardson papers.)

78. *Church Times*, 12 February 1937, p197,198.

79. *Church Times*, 12 February 1937, p184,185.

80. Cited in *Peace News*, 13 March 1937. The *Church of England Newspaper* took up Winnington-Ingram's comment that "Christianity is fighting for its life." The editor remarked: "Christ cannot fail, but we believe the *Church* as we know it to-day is fighting for its life. We deplored the tone of the Assembly debate because we felt it was unworthy of the representative body of the Anglican Church. It is for the Church to preach and practise those high ideals of love and peace proclaimed by God." *Church of England Newspaper*, 19 February 1937, p8.

81. Matthews wrote, "Don't be an ass! Why on earth should the fact that the Archbishop of York and others disagreed with your views on the application of Christianity to war make you give up being a Christian minister? Quite the opposite conclusion seems to me the more rational. You should emphasize all the more that you *are* a Christian minister; and that your views, though not accepted by the majority, are accepted by many within the Church, and are recognized as legitimate. We haven't yet, I hope, assented to the dogma of the infallibility of the Archbishop of York." (R. Ellis Roberts, *H. R. L. Sheppard*, p296.)

82. He closed the sermon by saying: "I am a pacifist first and last because I wish to be a sincere disciple of Jesus Christ. For me Christianity is the following of Jesus Christ in incorruptness of living; and I think we follow not merely when the going is good - by the shining lake of Galilee - but out beyond Jerusalem where the redemptive power of suffering love was perfectly and effectively consecrated for the salvation of the world.

I cannot pray to God or try to look in the face of Jesus Christ at Cana of Galilee or at Calvary and then prepare to kill my brother.

And I want to ask the leaders of the Christian Church this question:...

WHY, WHY, WHY - do you hesitate to denounce war now, to-day, yesterday, as the vile thing it actually is - the betrayal of God, the self-abuse of nations and a blasphemy against the future of man?

History records with dreary monotony how easily the ecclesiastical mind drifts away from the mind of Christ.

I am persuaded that the supreme test today of adherence to Christ as Lord and Master is provided by the conflict between those who say that war is inevitable and under certain unhappy circumstances justifiable, and those who when asked to prepare for it and take part in it are able to answer: Not on my life - God being my helper." (H. R. L. Sheppard, *The Christian Attitude to War*, P.P.U. pamphlet.)

83. Morris spoke powerfully on *The Creed of a Christian Pacifist*, to the Co-operative Congress in Bath (text published in a Co-operative Union pamphlet with the same title); Hartill told a meeting in Nottingham that he was concerned at the way the Church seemed content to bow down to the State (*Church of England Newspaper*, 12 March 1937, p8), and he prepared a book, *Pacifism and Christian Common Sense*, wherein he took Temple to task for his inadequate understanding of the State; Lansbury, recently appointed the President of War Resisters International, included a speaking tour of Scotland and a visit to Hitler amongst his diary engagements; Brittain joined Sheppard on the platform of a "Great Pacifist Convention" in Manchester on 24 April, whilst her journalism ranged from the *Willesden Chronicle* (16 April 1937) to the *World Review of Reviews* (May 1937, p14-19). The Assembly would have reinforced Brittain's opinion expressed to Harold Latham the previous 16 December (McMaster) that "Some of us hope that the chance to press for the disestablishment of the Church of England will come in our time. Long ago Charles Kingsley wrote: 'There will never be a decent world for men and women until the Canon law is civilised off the earth', and it is equally true that we shall never get an honest morality in this country until the Church is no longer able to colour and misinterpret, for political or ecclesiastical ends, the laws by which the State permits us to regulate our lives."

84. All this activity caused Paul Gliddon to reflect on the unique impact of pacifists within the Church of England: "If George Lansbury, Canon Morris and Canon Sheppard were removed from the pacifist

movement on the ground that they were members of the Church of England and, therefore, associated with a Church that was associated with a state that was associated with war, pacifist logicians might have gained a point but pacifist tacticians would have lost a goodly number. For it does so happen that the Church of England, called the most lady-like of the churches, has the aristocratic habit of giving birth to sons who, in a most unexpected way, combine loyalty with rebellion.... [T]hese preachers of peace, who, to their fellows, seem so out of place in the Church of England, are, by outsiders, recognised as essentially standing for that which the Church in general should be witnessing. The average ecclesiastic may regard them as dangerous, but that non-existent and omni-present person, the man-in-the-street, is inclined to think of them as being the right sort of people for their position and levels the charge of treachery to Christ and His Church not against the little pacifist crowd but against the ordinary run of church dignitary. This does not mean that the ordinary man is either a pacifist or a churchman, only that he thinks that, if anyone suffers from the queer malady of wanting to be a parson, then he ought also to be a pacifist."

85. *Church Times*, 12 February 1937, p181.

86. Vera Brittain retained her order of service as a memento of this historic occasion, writing across the top of her copy, "The first pacifist meeting ever held by the Church of England." (McMaster.) Anglican pacifists attended from across the country, including Don Robins who travelled to London from Leeds.

87. Charles Raven and Peter Green had agreed to speak, but were not able to be in London at the time. (*Church of England Newspaper*, 25 March 1937, p13.) Green might have been uneasy on a pacifist platform for although he could write movingly against war (e.g. in Bell, ed., *The War and the Kingdom of God*, p56-58) he had tolerated the 1914-1918 war and was criticised in Heywood's *Christian Pacifism* (p4,9,10) both for his ethical relativism and his dismissal of pacifism as other-worldly.

In the Westminster speeches, Sheppard argued that "If you want to follow in the footsteps of Christ, if you read your New Testament, if you look at the life of our Lord and His works, if you watch Him on Calvary, you cannot avoid the conclusion that the Christian must be a pacifist." (*Church Times*, 9 April 1937, p446.) Hartill argued that the Church Assembly suggestion that war could be acceptable in the interests of international security and peace was a contradiction: "You do not take part in drunkenness in the interests of temperance, you do not take part in lust in the interests of purity. How can you take part in war in the interests of peace?" (*Reconciliation*, May 1937, p123.) Gliddon's concern here was less with the victims of war than with the perpetrators: "Jesus Christ, if He were a soldier, would have to take part in war as we know it to-day, and to obey any and every order that might come his way.... Can we really imagine someone being bombed by Jesus? If we are able to imagine that, then we are entitled of course to support war. But if we are not able to imagine Jesus Christ doing the sorts of things that to-day in modern war are allowed, then surely there is no alternative for any of us but to reject war in its entirety and fight for all we are worth against this hateful thing." (*Reconciliation*, May 1937, p123.) In his speech, Father Andrew answered the rhetorical question, "If somebody hits me and I hit back, what do I do? I simply add to the sum total of hitting. But if somebody hits me and I will with faith in God love back, I am striking at the root of all hitting." (*Reconciliation*, May 1937, p124. A revised version of this speech was published by the A.P.F. and the F.O.R. in 1939 under the title, *The Logic of Faith*.) Stuart Morris distinguished between the Church as it should be and the Church as it was: "The first peace society is the Christian Church, and we must affirm with all respect that our Archbishops and Bishops are doing an ill service when they associate it in the mind of men with modern war, which is the most flagrant denial of Christian principles that we can know." (*Reconciliation*, May 1937, p126.)

88. *Reconciliation*, May 1937, p121. There were only two dissentients. For one of these, the wording was not strong enough. Revd. W. M. Teape, of Winton, Bournemouth opposed all wars in history and would not sign unless the word "modern" was omitted. (*Peace News*, 10 April 1937.)

89. *Church Times*, 9 April 1937, p446.

90. *Church Times*, 7 May 1937, p567.

91. *Church Times*, 9 April 1937, p427. The two most likely candidates for the fulfilment of that prophecy were Raven and Hartill, either or both of whom could have expected to be raised to the episcopacy. Whilst their pacifism may well have been the principal obstacle to preferment, Hartill, known for his advocacy of disestablishment, and Raven, who was well known for championing the ordination of women to the priesthood (even noted in fiction: Susan Howatch, *Ultimate Prizes*, p69) may both have been seen as too radical for such a conservative office.

92. Gliddon and Sheppard were cited as the prime movers in the A.P.F. Newsletter, July 1947.

93. The tardiness of such action, coming after the pacifist enthusiasm which had peaked in 1935 and 1936 had begun to wane, was acknowledged in the group's own advertisements: "Although pacifists in the Church of England have rather lagged behind others in the building up of an adequate organisation, there has been considerable awakening of late and the procession to Lambeth which followed the Central Hall meeting last month showed that a substantial effort is now possible." (*Reconciliation*, June 1937, piv.)

94. Unsigned typescript in A.P.F. Executive Committee file. Possibly by Margaret Bligh/Scrutton.

95. R. Ellis Roberts, p299,300.

96. Unsigned typescript in A.P.F. Executive Committee File.

97. Margaret Scrutton in conversation with CB, 23 December 1990. As Margaret Eurich she had also been one of the earliest members of F.O.R. After her first husband's death she married Canon Scrutton, remaining an active Counsellor of A.P.F. until her death.

98. Unsigned typescript in A.P.F. Executive Committee file.

99. R. Ellis Roberts, p302. The lover was Archy Macdonnell. (Scott, p232-234.) This emotional upheaval, coming on top of the U.S. débâcle, so drained Sheppard that the week after the A.P.F. inaugural meeting he needed to go to a Harrogate nursing home to convalesce. (R. Ellis Roberts, p302,303.)

100. Unsigned typescript in A.P.F. Executive Committee file.

101. *Reconciliation*, July 1937, p194.

102. A.P.F. Executive Committee minutes, 11 June 1937.

103. A.P.F. Executive Committee minutes, 18 November 1937.

Scrutton was first referred to in the Executive minutes of 18 November 1937. His first attendance was on 25 January 1938. A natural leader - not least of A.P.F. in later years - he came from a notable legal family. He had been Vicar of Kingston-upon-Thames since 1934.

Barnsley, whose election was specifically noted in the minutes of 11 June - presumably he was elected in absentia - had been Hartill's curate in West Bromwich from 1931-1935. He had become Curate in Charge (later Vicar) of St. Martin Conventional District, Rough Hills, Wolverhampton. In 1939 he became the A.P.F. Secretary for Lichfield Diocese. (*Christian Pacifist*, August 1939, p224.)

Cheetham, who had spent several years of his ordained ministry in America, was made Rector of Bletsoe since 1936.

Elworthy was a former tramp-preacher who had since become curate of St. Paul's, Foleshill, Coventry. (His resignation was reported to the Executive on 4 April 1938, as a forthcoming move from Coventry to Northumberland would make London meetings difficult to attend.)

Canon Fletcher was Vicar of Swinton and Rural Dean of Eccles, Manchester. As a military chaplain in the Great War he had been mentioned in dispatches. His other duties included being a member of the Regional General Purposes Committee of the P.P.U. and, for five years, he chaired the Manchester and Salford branch of the F.O.R. He was an undergraduate friend of the William Temple, who said on Fletcher's death in April 1942 that he was "a man of very wide sympathy and singular sincerity," who impressed with "his singleness of mind and the energy with which he gave himself to any cause which claimed the assent of his conscience". (*Manchester Guardian*, 4 May 1942. Cited in *Christian Pacifist*, June 1942, p114.)

Gamble, with her "very wide experience as a speaker, having done a great deal of work as a missionary for the Industrial Christian Fellowship," (Parish magazine of St. George's, Leeds, February 1939) was elsewhere described as a "pacifist Portia and Labour parliamentary candidate." (*Reconciliation*, 1938, p353.)

Godfrey was a young curate at St. Helen's, Ipswich.

Maples was an undergraduate in English and theology at Downing College, Cambridge, given to cycling to Thaxted on Sundays to hear Conrad Noel. (Maples in conversation with CB, 28 October 1992. The author's teenage years were spent in Maples' parish in Portsmouth.) A subsequent ecclesiastical career included being first Curate (1940-1946) and later Vicar (1967-1973) of St. James', Milton, Portsmouth. It culminated in his appointment as Archdeacon of Swindon in 1974. Maples was not the only Anglican pacifist at Cambridge in this period: Alfred Jowett, the Junior Treasurer of the Cambridge University Socialist Society had just finished as an undergraduate (Jowett in conversation with CB, 27 October 1992) and both Jack Churchill and his future wife Patricia were soon to become members of A.P.F. (Patricia Churchill in conversation with CB, 13 December 1992.)

Brock-Richards, recently (1936) appointed Warden of the Community of Sisters of Charity, Knowle, Bristol, had previously been the incumbent of North Gosforth for fourteen years.

Rev. Mother Teresa F.S.J.M., having worked (as Grace Costin) with Bernard Walke in Cornwall, was a founder of the Franciscan Servants of Jesus and Mary. A vow of nonviolence and membership of the A.P.F. were included in the principles of the order. Mother Teresa remained on the A.P.F. Governing Body into the war years. The order's base since 1942 - Posbury, Devon - has often been used for A.P.F. retreats.

104. These were involved either in 1937 or in 1938 (appointments announced on 21 July 1938).

Budd was Curate of Immanuel, Streatham.

Goodrich was a layman, also from Streatham, where he was soon involved in a lively A.P.F. local group. (A.P.F. Newsletter, July/August 1958.)

Heywood had been Dean of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, since 1928 and was to become Dean of Southwell in 1945. A specialist in liturgy, he had a strong sense of the corporate, arguing "that the Church as the act of God is no human institution, and that its nature is essentially corporate - that there is, in fact, no room for the solitary Christian." (*The Worshipping Community*, p71.) Hence the Eucharist was "never private and individual because there is no sacrament apart from the Community as its context." (*The Worshipping Community*, p81.) Translating that to the context of moral living, he argued that "our witnessing is a corporate affair," (*The Worshipping Community*, p130.) and "corporate conscience is a source for truth beyond itself." (*The Worshipping Community*, p118.)

Hunter was based in Willenhall, a large Staffordshire parish in the Diocese of Lichfield.

Lockhart, another liturgist, moved from Scotland to become Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Brighton, during 1937. In a volume he wrote to promote the Parish Communion movement, he argued that "the Church ... ought to be the closest and most united body in the world! And how it must hurt Our Lord

when one communicant cold-shoulders another communicant, or quarrels with him; or when, in wars between nations, communicants hate, fight against, and kill brother-communicants! For, when you make your Communion, you are pledging yourself to unity, not only with all other communicants kneeling at the same altar at that particular service, but with every other communicant in the whole world.” (*God's Family at Worship*, p33.) As far as Baptism was concerned, Lockhart held that for who was baptised, “every other baptised person, whatever his denominational attachment, nationality, class, or colour, is his brother in Christ. War thus becomes fratricidal strife of the worst kind. To fight against a brother by baptism becomes even more hideously unnatural than to fight against a blood-brother.... And “fellow-communicants” means not only those kneeling before the same altar, but every other communicant in the world.... The link that binds me to a baptised German ought to be closer than that which unites me to an unbaptised blood relative. My fellowship with German communicants ought to transcend my fellowship with non-communicants, however unquestioned may be their claims to British nationality.” (*Christian Pacifist*, April 1939, p100.)

Mauleverer was a priest (later the Vicar) serving in the Conventional district of St. Francis, Salisbury. He held that “Jesus Christ, both in His teaching His example, is a pacifist. If Jesus be the ‘express image of the invisible God’ (as we believe), it follows that Almighty God is a pacifist, i.e. that God deals with people and things by the non-violent method demonstrated by Jesus, which we have come to call ‘Pacifism.’” (*Reconciliation*, July 1937, p186.)

Don Robins was the Vicar of St. George’s, Leeds. (Robins’ election is specifically noted in the minutes of 11 June - presumably he was elected in absentia.) Robins’ ministry was modelled on Sheppard’s at St. Martin-in-the Fields, even to the extent of using a crypt for the support of the homeless. Of military might he wrote,

“Fools that we are! that we trust in such power,
Which comes from the beast and is not of the Lord;
Curséd our blindness which at this dark hour,
Perceives not that love shall yet vanquish the sword.”

(*Who Shall Redeem*; p6 of “*Love's Triumph*” and *Other Poems*.)

Shrewsbury was Rector of All Saints, Chevington, Bury St. Edmunds, having started his ministry in Australia.

Thorndike was the renowned actress. Also a Sponsor of the P.P.U., she was to write after the Munich crisis of 1938, “Always there is the cry, ‘You must fight (and kill) to preserve Freedom - to save Democracy,’ but we Christians must *live* to preserve democracy, and that is a far harder thing to do. The ‘more excellent way’ is the one which we must explore - the old way of killing young people has proved abortive.” (*Reconciliation*, November 1938, p357,358.)

Mrs M. Thornhill was based in Erith, where R. W. Thornhill was the Vicar.

Mrs. M. Vernon came from London. (Supplementary list from the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship Annual report, 1943-1944, p3.)

It was later noted that there was a need for a greater proportion of laypeople on Executive, which was dominated by clergy. (A.P.F. Executive Committee minutes, 4 April 1938.) It was also very male dominated, as was evident in the Propaganda Committee minutes, 10 May 1938, presumably drafted by Le Messurier, which stated that there was need for “a pamphlet on very simple lines for use in women’s fellowships, etc.”

105. Anglican Pacifist Fellowship Annual Report, 1943-1944, p3.

106. The two organisations were always on friendly terms, despite the failure of an early attempt - master-minded by Paul Gliddon (A.P.F. Propaganda Committee minutes, 25 January 1938), refined by Le Messurier and F.O.R.’s Leslie Artingstall (A.P.F. Propaganda Committee minutes, 24 February 1938) to make Anglicans in only one of A.P.F. or F.O.R. automatically members of the other Fellowship as well. (*Reconciliation*, April 1938, p128, and May 1938, p158.)

107. *Peace Year Book*, 1938, p106.
108. *Reconciliation*, July 1937, p194.
109. *Reconciliation*, August 1937, p223 and September 1937, p250. The A.P.F. Propaganda Committee of 14 September 1937 noted that "until such time as the two Organisations adopt a working rule together, great care will be exercised in referring to each other in the monthly notes in *Reconciliation*." The Society of Catholic Friends, however, refused all overtures from A.P.F. and caused some frustration to A.P.F. Le Messurier's first draft of the Propaganda Committee's minutes for 10 May 1938 spoke of a decision to write to the editor of *Reconciliation* with a view to having "the 'rival communications' suppressed." The minute was amended to read "the appearance of rivalry removed."
110. The first meeting of the Propaganda Committee was at Holy Cross Vicarage on the afternoon of 18 June. The meetings would have a rotating chairperson, with Gilbert Shaw, Ursula Roberts, Paul Gliddon, Roberts again and Tom Scrutton chairing the first meetings, with Le Messurier as secretary. At the first meeting they drafted an initial explanatory leaflet (later amended by Le Messurier - A.P.F. Propaganda Committee minutes, 25 January 1938) and asked Roberts and Shaw to produce papers on Anglican pacifism in the light of Lambeth 1930. Shaw's paper was referred to W.C. and U. Roberts for further comment, whilst Ursula Roberts' paper became A.P.F.'s first independent pamphlet, published anonymously in October with the title, *The Church Should Take the Lead*. (*Reconciliation*, October 1937, p279.)
111. *Reconciliation*, January 1938, p61.
112. A.P.F. Propaganda Committee minutes, 6 July 1937.
113. *Peace News*, 10 July 1937, p10.
114. *Peace News*, 31 July 1937.
115. *Daily Herald*, 21 June 1937, *Glasgow Bulletin*, 21 June 1937, and *Hornsey Journal*, 25 June 1937. (A.P.F. archive.) Also *Peace News*, 26 June 1937.
116. *Reconciliation*, November 1937, p306.
117. *Reconciliation*, January 1938, p32.
118. *Reconciliation*, September 1937, p251.
119. *Reconciliation*, July 1938, p222. It was not only in England that Anglican pacifism was beginning to have an impact. Across the Cheviots, a conference was held for members of the Scottish Episcopal Church from 29 June to 1 July 1937 at Balhousie Castle, Perth. Several Episcopalians had met there for a small conference in 1936, then deciding that a larger gathering should be attempted, especially given the considerable interest in pacifism expressed by younger clergy. At the conference, Stuart Morris, H. Stuart from Comrie, Donald Mackinnon, Lillian Russell and Douglas Lockhart were speakers. As a result of this gathering, a Scottish group of the A.P.F. was formed, with H. Stuart in the Chair and Alan Edulf Swinton of Duns as the secretary. (*Peace News*, 26 June 1937 and 10 July 1937.) Antipodean interest in A.P.F. was shown by enquiries received from Australia (*Reconciliation*, September 1937, p251), but although there were reports of a "fairly substantial" New Zealand group being formed in 1938 (*Reconciliation*, July 1938, p222), another analysis of the situation in that

country reported that the pacifist movement there was largely anti-Christian and that most church people "hated pacifism." (*Anglican Pacifist*, Vol. II, No. 4, March 1963, p15.) A lasting A.P.F. presence in New Zealand did not arise until the founding of a Christchurch group in 1948. (R. P. Taylor to Harry Mills, 28 January 1948. A.P.F. archive.) Across the Atlantic there was an A.P.F. presence in Canada (*Reconciliation*, November 1938, p364), probably centred on William James Silverwood of British Columbia who had written to *Reconciliation* in November 1936. The most encouraging developments were in the United States, where there had been a strong and indigenous F.O.R. since 1915 (Pierce and Ward, p1.) Early Anglican activists included Bishop Paul Jones, Tracy Mygatt and Frances Witherspoon. John Nevin Sayre became President of F.O.R. and in September and December 1938 he led delegations to Roosevelt arguing for an international conference to prevent a European war (Pierce and Ward, p5,7.) By April 1939, the American F.O.R. was wanting to foster denominational pacifism. Two months later, Sayre gathered together known pacifists Katherine Pierce, W. Russell Bowie, Elmore M. McKee, Eric M. Tasman and Luke White, the last four being prominent New York area rectors. The six produced a public statement, signed for them by three bishops - Jones, W. Appleton Lawrence of Western Massachusetts and Walter Mitchell of Arizona - which led to an assembly of five hundred people in the Church of the Incarnation, Madison Avenue, New York, on 9 October 1939. It was agreed to form an Episcopal Pacifist Fellowship and 117 of those present immediately signed up. The formal launch of E.P.F. took place in the same church a month later on Armistice Day, with Bishop Lawrence the first chairman and Kathleen Pierce the first secretary. From that time on, A.P.F. has had a sister organisation.

120. *Reconciliation*, December 1937, p335. There was a vital need to increase membership as the first question that the Church authorities would put to A.P.F. would be "How many communicants do you represent?"

121. *Pacifism and Christian Common Sense*, published by Mowbray in 1938.

122. It was already at the printers by the time of the A.P.F. Propaganda Committee of 24 February 1938. The 18 November 1937 meeting also drew up a list of those who would be invited to form an advisory Council of the Fellowship, with no specific responsibilities but with right of attendance at Executive meetings. Those proposed for membership of such a Council were Bishop Barnes, Evelyn Underhill, John Middleton Murry (who responded by offering to write a letter to all members; it turned out to be too eccentric to publish as a pamphlet and became a *Reconciliation* article instead, in July 1938 - A.P.F. Propaganda Committee minutes, 10 May 1938), Maude Royden, Charles Raven, Father Andrew and George Lansbury. (A.P.F. Executive Committee minutes, 18 November 1937.) All agreed, with the exception of Bishop Barnes and Father Andrew. (A.P.F. Executive minutes, 4 April 1938.) The Marquis of Tavistock was invited to become the Chairman of the Fellowship, which invitation he accepted. (A.P.F. Executive Committee minutes, 18 November 1937. The Propaganda Committee first proposed this on 14 September.) He was to remain Chairman until 1939.

123. A.P.F. Propaganda Committee, 14 September 1937.

124. *Reconciliation*, January 1938, piii.

125. It was a cause for embarrassment, as F.O.R. omitted to note that it was a joint publication and separate errata slips had to be inserted. F.O.R. was also approached for a small financial contribution to the new society. (A.P.F. Propaganda Committee, 18 June 1937.) Within a year more substantive assistance was offered in order to relieve pressure on *Le Messurier* caused by A.P.F.'s rapid growth. F.O.R. proposed that one of the administrative assistants at their Red Lion Square offices could spend three days per week on A.P.F. affairs.

126. He made an immediate impact, drafting a letter for the Fellowship to send to the Archbishop of Canterbury. (A.P.F. Propaganda Committee minutes, 25 January 1938, 10 May 1938. Executive Committee minutes, 4 April 1938.)

127. *The Church Should Take the Lead*, p7,8.

CHRONOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS ARGUMENT

The Theology of Charles Raven

The pacifists, including the Christian pacifists, of 1914-1918 were more noted for their courage and their conscience than for their organisation or for any coherent or unified philosophy. For the Christians that situation began to change with the influential *Early Christian Attitude to War*, published in 1919 by C. J. Cadoux. The substantial "Statement of the Pacifist Position" at the C.O.P.E.C. conference of 1924 built on the foundations laid by Cadoux. Lambeth 1930 took matters a stage further, despite its limitations, and by the middle of the decade a pacifist theology was emerging which reinforced its adherents' belief that Christianity was a pacifist faith. In the words of Charles Raven, "Pacifism, like baptism, is a revolution, a turning round of the whole personality to the acceptance of a wholly new outlook upon life."¹

Raven, as Rector of Blechingley, Chaplain to the King, former editor of *Challenge* and sometime army chaplain, had been the Joint Secretary and organiser of the C.O.P.E.C. gathering.² The C.O.P.E.C. experience, together with the growing realisation that the Great War might not be the war to end wars after all, led Raven to reconsider his previous position to the extent that in 1928 he was prepared to give cautious support to the No More War Movement for reasons personal and general:

Personally because I took part in the World War believing that it was to end war. Many of my friends gave their lives for that ideal. We were perhaps mistaken in our means; our end remains, and is for me an obligation to the dead. Generally, because war is a manifestation of evil against which all people of good-will could and should combine. Christianity, commonsense, and recent experience testify that it is the wrong method of settling disputes.³

Following the Christ and Peace Campaign, Raven joined the F.O.R. in 1931. The following year he not only became Chairman of the F.O.R. but also Professor of Divinity at Cambridge and a Fellow of Christ's College. For the next generation he would be the academic, theological and intellectual voice of Christian pacifism. In particular, Raven would be to the fore in most of the theological arguments on war and peace in the 1930s.

In 1934, Raven, following in the footsteps of such figures as Gore (*Christ and Society*, 1927) and Tawney (*Equality*, 1929), delivered the 1934 Halley Stewart Lectures on the subject *Is War Obsolete?: A Study of the Conflicting Claims of Religion and Citizenship*.⁴ Although the title suggested a throwback twenty years to Angell's *Great*

Illusion, recently revised and reissued, Raven was not attempting to prove that modern war was impossible, but wrong. He was particularly careful not to be critical of Christians in the past, whether they be succumbing to Constantine in the 4th century or, like himself, taking part in world war in the 20th. Indeed, he claimed his own experience gave his work added authority. "If there is any strength in my plea for peace - for the outlawry of war, for disarmament, for the refusal to fight - it will arise from the fact that I have seen war without horror and can appreciate and share its appeal to mankind."⁵ He could also appreciate that war was only one of many evils in the world, yet circumstances were such that "peace happens to be the issue on which at present others depend: we cannot deal with them until the dread of war has been removed."⁶

Although not himself a High Church Anglican, and on other issues he had profound differences with those of that persuasion, with regards to pacifism much of Raven's theology would have been acceptable to Anglo-Catholics. Essentially, it was social, incarnational and eschatological. Thus he refuted Niebuhr's claim that the individual was more moral than the group by arguing that collective action by agents who were of one mind and one soul, "transcends the uttermost that its members could separately accomplish; and they find themselves sustained and impelled by its influence."⁷

Aligned with this corporate emphasis was Raven's refusal to make any division between the sacred and the secular. Diverse traditions within British theology, he said, had all recognised that the Incarnation of Christ meant that there was no antithesis between God and the world. "With us, ever since Fox and the Quakers, or, in the Church of England, since F. D. Maurice, it has been clear that individual salvation and social redemption could not be set in contrast; that the Christian must work to bring all life within the rule of Christ."⁸ This was the background to Raven's longstanding criticism of Barth and other Central European theologians whom, in their discrimination of sacred and secular, he regarded as at least a generation, if not a century, behind in their thinking.

In ethical terms, Raven held that as love was indiscriminate and not calculating, the expected immediate outcomes of one's actions were not to be taken into account. To consider vindication was to enter the world of eschatology, not ethics. It was sufficient to know that one's actions were in accordance with what was right and true, according to "the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ." Thus, he argued,

The Christian is, after all, not primarily concerned with questions of expediency. He professes an allegiance to truth and righteousness for their own

sakes and not as means to his own comfort or success. It is not enough for him to argue that war involves untold suffering or even that war would mean the ruin of civilization: earnestly as he must strive to allay pain, deeply as he must value culture and security, these cannot be his first concern. He claims to order his life in accordance not with the dictates of human prudence, but with the will of God as embodied in the life and example of Jesus Christ. He claims to seek no personal nor national nor universal advantage but God's Kingdom, in which alone all true values can be realized. As such, he must examine this matter of warfare in the light not of his own fears or desires but of his faith and knowledge, in the Spirit, so far as he can understand it, of his Master, and by applying to the circumstances of to-day the principles which that Master expresses and reveals.⁹

Morris, 1934

Especially in the early years of the decade, one of those most associated with Anglican pacifism was Stuart Morris. As a preacher whose addresses were broadcast on several occasions, he had opportunities to promote Christian pacifism which were denied to many other of its exponents.¹⁰ Thus, on the eve of the final session of the Disarmament Conference in 1934, Morris broadcast from Leyton Richard's Church in Carr's Lane, Birmingham on Mark 10.32, the approach of Jesus and his disciples to Jerusalem. He made considerable use of the imagery of the passion narrative as a commentary on contemporary attitudes.¹¹ It was all a question of redemption, as he told the F.O.R. Conference at Blandford that year, which involved laying hands on "this amazing world, with all its possibilities of production and all its international contacts," seeking the Kingdom of God, finding peace, losing life and in the very losing finding it.¹²

Morris held that peace was not an end in itself, rather it was "the atmosphere of Kingdom of God." As such, it was so important that he would not wish to co-operate with those for example in the League of Nations Union who would tolerate the use of weapons in particular circumstances. It was a matter of absolute principle.

They are only seeking to avoid war - we are seeking the Kingdom of God. Their attitude therefore admits the possibility of argument about method when the threat of war arises - they might even speak again of a war to end war - but my future action must depend not on the experience of the future but on the Truth about God and life as I see it now....¹³

Armistice 1934: The Preaching of Kenneth Rawlings

One of the first activities of the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups was to organise a packed Armistice meeting in Central Hall, Westminster. This was to become a very

successful annual event, with overflow meetings frequently required. Although there was yet to be any organised Anglican pacifist society, the Church of England was well-represented at the November 1934 gathering with Raven, Barnes and Sheppard all speaking from the platform. Barnes was the most persuasive of the speakers, referring to the illusory nature of war's victories.

If the last war has shewn us one thing more clearly than another it is that out of war you do not get peace. Force seems supremely effective when it is used successfully, it ends by being a complete disappointment. That is why Christianity is so wise in teaching that we must win men, not force them. The nation that by considerate and fair dealing has gained the good-will of a rival has done more for its own security than if it had double its so-called defensive forces. When that Christian truth is more fully realised, the cult of armaments will decline.¹⁴

The most remarkable pacifist gathering at that time was not, however, in the capital, but in the Sussex market town of Lewes. The annual Service of Remembrance in Lewes Town Hall was conducted in 1934 by three ministers, each of whom was pacifist. Along with a young Congregationalist, John Newton Holder, and a Quaker, sometime imprisoned conscientious objector for many years associated with War Resisters International, Frank Hancock, was the Rector of St. Michael's, Lewes, Kenneth Rawlings.¹⁵

Rawlings it was who delivered the address, with all the passion of a revivalist. He spoke of his own experience of war, and the conclusions to which it had led him.¹⁶ He refused to compare the death of people slain in war with the sacrifice of Calvary. The analogy was false, both because Christ did not die attempting to slay other people, and because his death won redemption for humankind, whereas, he asked, "Can we point to any solitary gain or blessing that has come to mankind because these ten million people went through that Hell of torture and bloodshed?" Rawlings held that the debt owed to the slain was, above all, to bring even at the eleventh hour some benefit to the world from the death, namely the realisation that war was essentially evil, and that to resort to it or to countenance it in any shape or form, in any circumstances, was an affront to God and a crime against humanity. Nothing less than a final repudiation of war would be commensurate with the ghastly price that had been paid. It was not acceptable that war could still be contemplated on the grounds that it was not possible to change human nature.

I believe there is Someone who *can* change human nature, and does. But, at all events, human *behaviour* can be changed. In spite of human nature, civilised nations have abolished cannibalism, human sacrifices, slavery, torture, duelling

and other evils once regarded as incurable. Why, then, should not war be abolished through the awakening of the collective conscience to the monstrous wickedness of wholesale slaughter?

One of Rawlings' principal complaints was that war depended for its existence upon the deliberate fostering of the vilest passions of which human nature was capable, in particular the passion of hatred. He looked back with disgust at bayonet practices designed to stimulate blood lust, to grenade attacks where those who returned were asked "How many of the devils did you get?" Modern war necessarily involved such shameful degradation of the human soul. Nothing could induce ordinary kind-hearted people like those there assembled, said Rawlings, to slay their fellow creatures unless they were first inoculated with the damnable virus of hatred. As for Christian ministers who told their people that Christ commanded his disciples to resist not evil, to love their enemies, to overcome evil with good, to be merciful and pitiful like their Father in Heaven, as soon as the drums of war begin to beat, they explain it all away. The rulers of this world, thought Rawlings, seemed have power to suspend the laws of the King of Kings. The Gospel of Jesus Christ must be put on the shelf for the duration of a war. "Christianity must go out when the guns begin to go off."

As Rawlings implored his listeners to set their faces against the evil of war, and made his own pledge to "hate and denounce and oppose war; war in every shape and form; war of aggression or war of defence; war in any circumstances; war under any pretext or provocation." He pledged to do all he could to root out of his own heart and the hearts of others those evil passions that led to war, in particular pride and jealousy and false patriotism. Finally, he asked for those who echoed his pledge in their hearts to have the courage to indicate the same by rising in their seats. "With one of two exceptions," recorded the local newspaper, "the assembled hundreds rose in their places."¹⁷

Sheppard in Print

Although Dick Sheppard's persuasive arguments were best delivered from platforms and on the airwaves, he was not averse to expressing himself in print. Some of his pacifist thought was published in 1935, principally in a book, *We Say "No"*, and a leaflet addressed to men in political power, a *Candid Letter to the "Men Who Matter"*. In the leaflet he spoke of his own adherence to the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," adding that when God so commanded, "He meant to prohibit the killing of millions in cold blood, which we call war, as well as the crime of murder." Sheppard hoped that the ripples from his Peace Pledge would spread around the earth and break down that

“tribal spirit magnified” which was collective security. With a future war threatening the end of close on two thousand years of Christian civilisation, the only hope was to accept Christianity as a way of life not only in private affairs but in all public and international contacts as well. The common people of the world, said Sheppard, no longer trusted governments to save them from war, but knew that if they themselves refused to go to war, the reign of universal peace would dawn at last.¹⁸

We Say “No” developed a similar theme, with Sheppard blaming Christian men and women in all nations, but especially Christian men, for being unwilling to accept the practical implications of Christianity. People had worshipped God for an hour on Sunday and tried to safeguard the rest of the week by means of a “gentlemen’s agreement” with the Devil. People had left responsibility for peace to politicians who had then produced armies, warplanes, bombs and poison gas. Although most of the world’s statesmen wanted peace, they were hypnotized by the Devil’s paradox, “If you want Peace, prepare for war.” In contrast, Sheppard presented the case for Christian folly, the renunciation of war absolutely and unconditionally, for, he said,

the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God, and I am God’s servant, pledged to obey His word. I believe that, at this time, a special responsibility rests upon all individual Christians and upon the Christian Churches. I believe that the world is drifting towards war largely because we have not had the courage of our Christianity, and that, even at the eleventh hour, we may yet transform the situation if we forget all that we have been told about “practical politics” and try instead a little practical religion.¹⁹

Sheppard rejected the arguments of those who used the Old Testament to justify modern war. Because something could be found in the scriptures, e.g. the polygamy of Solomon, did not make it acceptable to Christians. Besides, even the bloody campaigns of Joshua paled into insignificance beside the indiscriminate horrors of poison gas and the aerial bombing of cities. As for New Testament passages such as the Pauline exhortation to “put on the whole armour of God,” Sheppard felt that the description of wrestling “not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places” accurately summed up what the conscientious objector did when refusing to bear arms.²⁰ Sheppard preferred to direct people to the Sermon on the Mount, and the saying, “Ye cannot serve God and mammon.”

Whom do you think that the war-mongers serve? Whom would we be serving if we listened to them, if we marched away to war? Wouldn’t the roll of the drums be a defiance of God, as well as a defiance of whatever enemy we had to fight?...

No ingenious sophistry, no twisting of words and phrases, can alter the fact that Christ is against war, even when undertaken in defence against aggression. Therefore the Christian must be against it. As Lowell wrote in the *Biglow Papers*:

Ez fer war, I call it murder -
 There you hev it plain an' flat;
 I don't need to go no further
 Than my Testyment fer that.²¹

The trouble was, rued Sheppard, precisely that people did not go to their Testament.

Reaction to Temple, 1

At the time of the Italo-Abyssinian crisis, a radio broadcast by the Archbishop of York on 1 September 1935, wherein he advocated the use of "sufficient" force to uphold international law, stung Christian pacifists across the country. A crisis rally in Westminster Central Hall was organised by the Committee of Christian Pacifist Groups, in which Raven was a key leader, which responded immediately to the Archbishop's broadcast. The C.C.P.G. also issued a statement which took Temple to task on four of his central assertions.

The first of these concerned the question of the duty of a Christian citizen in a world not yet directed by Christian principles. The C.C.P.G. found no reason for the Christian to necessarily identify with the acts of a nation state. The example of Jesus, whose own life for the greater part of his ministry was guaranteed by a Roman Empire, was to live simply and by his life and witness promote an entirely new order. "We believe that creative activity is an inescapable duty of all Christians, and that one prime obligation is that of seeking to transform the whole of the present social order into a community based on goodwill and service." That was a very different model from accepting the mores of the state.

Secondly, Temple had asserted that love could not be enforced, clearly true where external force was concerned. Where the C.C.P.G. differed from Temple was in the suggestion that "man cannot compel himself to love." When Jesus advocated love of enemies, he regarded such an attitude as being within the capability of his listeners there and then. Not only would he not have asked people to do what he knew they could not perform, but he realised that the love of God shed abroad in their hearts should be the distinguishing mark of his followers. "So far from the Christian being unable to 'love to order'", said the C.C.P.G., "he is one who cannot help loving, and the counsel of the whole of the New Testament is 'Let love have its way'".²²

Thirdly, Temple had noted that Jesus, prior to delivering the counsels of perfection in the Sermon on the Mount, had stressed that he was coming not to destroy but to fulfill the Law. The Archbishop then argued that “the stage of the Law must precede that of the Gospel.”²³ The C.C.P.G. commented that whilst Jesus accepted that the aim of the law was a good society, he saw that that aim could not be achieved by coercion and so for that basis he substituted love. Percy Hartill later commented that Temple’s seeming suggestion that the Christian Gospel could not be brought into play until prior recognition had been given to the supremacy of the law was closely akin to the attitude of the Judaizers against whom St. Paul argued strongly.²⁴

Fourthly and unsurprisingly, the C.C.P.G. rejected Temple’s advocacy of the use of military sanctions against Italy. They accepted that the use of military force by international agreement might be in a higher moral category than that of a war undertaken by a single nation, but that did not necessarily make it Christian, “any more than the fact that C sharp is above A flat in the bass clef makes it treble.” Wars inevitably deteriorate, argued the C.C.P.G., so “could Christians who approved or supported the first act, disown their responsibility for what ensued on the act, or could they disown it when such a change took place? Obviously not. Whoso wills an act, wills both the means and the predictable consequences....”²⁵

Reaction to Temple, 2

With press articles and correspondence largely critical of Temple’s broadcast, the Archbishop hit back in the *York Diocesan Magazine* of October 1935, wherein he accused pacifists (and by implication, his former friend and neighbour Sheppard, who since the launch of his pledge was the effective mouthpiece of Christian pacifism) of heresy.²⁶ In the following month’s issue, in an article reprinted in the *Times*,²⁷ Temple tried both to ameliorate the damage he had caused and to explain his position in more depth. He denied he had called any individual a heretic, although he felt there were some whose personal devotion, even saintliness did not prevent them holding opinions that were heretical. As far as pacifism was concerned, he wished to amend his charge to “heretical in tendency.” In particular, he believed that pacifists were Marcionite, Manichæan and Pelagian, seeming to him

to adopt a view of the relation of the New Testament to the Old which is essentially Marcionite (that is to say, a view of the New as so superseding the Old as to abolish it), or a view of the relation of spiritual to material forces which is essentially Manichæan (that is to say, a view which makes a sharp contrast between them and holds that the material cannot be completely

subordinated to the spiritual), or a view of man's capacity apart from conversion and sanctification to obey the Counsels of Perfection which is essentially Pelagian (that is to say, a view which regards man as capable by the action of his own will of living by love only); and in many cases I have thought that all these heretical tendencies were combined.²⁸

Raven dismissed the initial charge of heresy as little more than an attempt by Temple to strengthen an insecure debating position by vilifying his opponents. The retraction to "heretical in tendency" was seen as being, in effect, "a complete withdrawal" of the charge, especially as "heretical tendency is a vague and almost universal evil" which Raven showed could easily apply to Temple himself in other situations. The particular accusations, however, still required careful response.

The first charge was of Marcionism. Raven accepted that he held, with St. Paul and the Church in general, that the Gospel did indeed replace the Law. Marcion's error, he said, was that he set justice and love in antithesis with such a sharp contrast that it was necessary to choose between them. For Raven, it was ironic that it was Temple himself who seemed to be doing something very similar, rejecting the law of love as Marcion rejected the law of justice.

[B]oth Marcion and Dr. Temple seem to be in error in setting the two in opposition. We believe that all human relationships must ultimately be based upon love; that the method of the Law as set out in the Old Testament is an attempt, a fine and worthy but essentially a pre-Christian and sub-Christian attempt, to achieve a right relationship; that Christ showed a more excellent way; and that in the light of His revelation justice is seen not as a preliminary to love but as a necessary condition for love's fullest expression. We believe that justice is an outcome of love, not love a consequence of justice; and that we can in fact only establish justice as we aim not at it but at the love of which it is a consequent. This is, I think, the basal difference between our position and Dr. Temple's. He argues that we deny the God of the Old Testament: we reply that he denies the God of the New.²⁹

Raven elaborated on his position when chairing an Armistice Day rally at Central Hall. "Justice will only be established in the world if men aim not at justice but love," he argued. Justice could not be a bare end in itself, rather it was achieved as people were inspired to seek for that right relationship to which Christ bids people in the name of love. There was no other way to cast out indignations and rebellious passions, said Raven, except as love casts out fear. "It is only as you and I rise above the red heat of passion, the dust of despair, as we learn something of the mind of Him whose we are, that we shall be fit for His message of reconciliation."³⁰

Temple's second charge was of Manichæanism on the grounds that pacifists, by rejecting the use of physical force, imply that matter is evil. Raven felt that the number

for whom that was true was very small indeed, not least because it was an oversimplification to suggest that pacifists who rejected the violence of warfare totally repudiated the use of physical force in all circumstances. It was not only because his Halley Stewart lectures had firmly indicated his own incarnational and sacramental basis that Raven felt Temple's charge to be unjust. He felt the attack could not be sustained even when applied to the extreme position of the Society of Friends who refused particular sacraments on the ground that all life had a sacramental character.

Their whole teaching, and especially their devotion to social service, springs from the conviction which Dr. Temple shares "that matter and material forces can be completely subordinated to the spirit and that spirit normally manifests itself by directing and controlling what is material". They only differ from him as to the mode in which this control is exercised. They deny that the use of matter for the indiscriminate murder of human beings is or can ever be a manifestation of the spirit.³¹

The third charge, of Pelagianism, the belief in human free will, was harder for Raven to get to grips with, largely because he was indeed sympathetic to such a view. It was not a perspective explicitly condemned by the Church, only by the doctrine of Augustine which itself verged on the Manichæan. Thus Raven was further confused by Temple accusing pacifists of holding two errors usually regarded as contradictory. The context of Temple's complaint concerned the desire of Christian pacifists to deal with non-Christians according to the way of love rather than law, a way he felt was only appropriate for those within the operation of God's grace, which he seemed to assume was restricted to the completely converted. Such an opinion begged various questions, which Raven was swift to ask. Was any display of love to a pagan not only futile but heretical? Why was it Pelagian to believe in the law of love but apparently orthodox to believe in the law of force? Raven was especially shocked by Temple's statement ("more terrible than any that I have ever seen expressed by a Christian leader") that "The law of love is not applicable to nations consisting in large measure of unconverted or very imperfectly converted citizens." Raven replied:

If this be true, then it would indeed seem that Christ and Christianity have been wholly at fault. The Jews were imperfectly converted in our Lord's day: yet God so loved that He gave, and Jesus triumphed on the Cross. Was His Cross, love's supreme achievement, inapplicable? Was St. Paul wrong when he preached the more excellent way to the heathens of Corinth? Are Christian missionaries to establish justice before they proclaim love? Is there indeed, on this showing, any room at all for the Gospel? If the law of love is not applicable, then it necessarily follows either that God is not love or that God is not God.

If God is love, then His law of love is the ultimate basis of the Universe: if God is God, that law can never be inapplicable.³²

There were two lasting effects of the Temple debates. One was damaging to pacifism in that many people, pacifists and non-pacifists alike, were to remember the charge of heresy, even when the particular accusations had long been forgotten. The second effect was that the public debate of Autumn 1935 led ultimately to the founding of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. To that extent, Temple inadvertently helped to promote the very movement he wished to condemn.

Morris' Broadcasts

With Sheppard's success as a religious broadcaster, the power of radio as a medium of communication was well appreciated by pacifists. Stuart Morris and J. S. Whale were pleased to be invited to present their point of view across the airwaves early in 1936. Lansbury was unhappy because he was not asked as well. In the event, Whale's broadcast was cancelled due to a change of schedule following the death of King George V. Morris' broadcast, however, went ahead as planned. He conveyed his Christian pacifist faith at length to the listening public on 19 January.

Morris was concerned about people's conception of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. Just as a pupil at a big school may start by thinking of the head teacher in terms of aloofness and punishment, but go on to see him in terms of personal friendship, so the Children of Israel, having seen God in terms of punishment (and hence able to think of Him as a God of War), passed through various stages of education until they were ready for the revelation of God in terms of personal fellowship: "It is not the headmaster who changes, it is the boy's conception of him. It is not God who changes, it is man's knowledge of Him." For Morris, this God was the ultimate authority in a way that the State could never be.

Idolatry to-day consists in such an acquiescence in the pre-Christian conception of God as allows us to erect such false gods and so justify our own interests and ambitions. It is therefore the business of the Christian community to shatter, as Christ shattered, the old idea of a tribal God who leads his people out to war and finds in force the final authority. It is for them to confront the totalitarian State with the vision of the totalitarian Christ to whom alone the final loyalty must be given.

War was a sin for the way in which it divided up the God and Father of all into the old tribal, national deities. War was so contrary to the Fatherhood of God that no person could have any part or lot in it at all. The only acceptable obedience was obedience to truth, which might involve the acceptance of suffering rather than denial. As Morris remarked, in protest at suggestions that there could be bombing by the League of

Nations in the Abyssinian crisis, "There is only one way to consecrate death and that is to be ready to die for the truth, but never to take the life of anybody else." The supreme example of this was Christ on the Cross.

Had Christ sought to protect Himself or His friends, had He been swayed by the immediate claims of those who required His help, or by the thought of the suffering His way involved, there would have been no Cross, but there would have been no resurrection, no setting free of the redemptive power of love, no vindication of God's attitude to life. You can show the evil of the attitude which inflicts suffering not by a willingness to use the same weapons in defence, but only by showing that given its chance in the long run the new attitude renders the aggressor powerless. The almightiness of God does not consist in the power to intervene and do anything, but in the fact that you cannot check His love. You can spit on Him, deny Him, crucify Him, you cannot change His attitude - you are still His friend. Against love of that quality in the long run you are powerless. The bully meets his match not when he is knocked out by the use of his own methods (that will not make him see they are wrong), but when he is won by the application of a new method.

Morris mused on the possibility of one nation being ready to be crucified by not resisting its enemies. It might lose material life, "but it would set free such a flood of spiritual life as would save the world." A nation would be truly great only if it was great morally, not great in terms of the British model of empire and armaments. "How can we seek first the Kingdom of God and so find all the other things added to us if our first concern is for the kingdom of this world?" asked Morris. The Christian way, he maintained, would be to abandon imperialism as it was not in empire that greatness consisted, sharing with others, bearing their burdens and healing their sorrows.³³

Four months later on the Sunday before Ascension Day, Morris' voice was once again heard on the airwaves. The subjects of nationalism and empire were obvious themes for the impending Ascensiontide, when the supremacy of the sovereignty of God over the affairs of the world would be celebrated. Christ showed real patriotism, said Morris, by being ready to be crucified for the truth rather than by pandering to popular nationalism which would have made him a different sort of king.

From the beginning of his ministry until the end he knows that his Kingdom is to be won not by an appeal to the world's method of fraud and force but only by the way of the Cross. He cannot accept the offer of the kingdoms of this world or the glory of them on the devil's terms. He cannot show his patriotism on the battlefield, but only on Calvary....³⁴

For Morris, nationalism was the great curse, for it dethroned Christ and substituted force as the ultimate authority. Nationalism was associated with warring nations praying to their gods for the blood of their enemies. Nationalism made all religions subservient

to the interests of the state, whereas one's supreme allegiance had to be to Christ. The Ascension was the assurance that Christ's alternative way would prove victorious. "The power which would prove sufficient is ours if we would but use it," said Morris, and it "is the love which accepts the way of defeat and seeming loss and remains the only glory of the ascended King, the only right by which he rules, the only weapon which his followers dare use."³⁵

Barnes' University Sermon

In 1915, Ernest Barnes had been much criticised for preaching a pacifist sermon to Oxford University. In October 1936, as Bishop of Birmingham, he was invited back and once more delivered the University Sermon on the text, "Blessed are the peacemakers." Again, controversy followed, with Duff Cooper, the Secretary of State for War, denouncing his words, and Ormsby-Gore, the Colonial Secretary, attacking Barnes in the Commons.³⁶ Barnes, who felt that an even bigger catastrophe was imminent in 1936 than was taking place in 1915, argued that preparing for war necessarily brings war and even if that war should bring victory, the victory would be contaminated by injustice from which further wars would spring. The most ingenuous casuist would struggle to make a case for Christ blessing war, said Barnes, who believed that the Sermon on the Mount was very close to the authentic words of Jesus. To "Blessed are the peacemakers," one might reply, "But what about those who are unjustly attacked?" Christ's words came down the centuries, "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake." Barnes' point was that the one who spoke like that would have made a very poor recruiting sergeant and a lamentably poor Minister for War demanding cannon fodder. Wells had correctly described Jesus as "the saint of non-resistance."

Barnes continued by using the story of Jesus' arrest, complete with the maxim that those who took the sword would perish by the sword, not so much as evidence of Jesus' attitudes (in deference to doubts on authenticity raised by textual analysis) but of the attitudes of the Christ's followers towards the end of the first century. Such words showed clearly what they understood to be his teaching.

Those who listened to Barnes were largely young men, who could so easily be the victims of the next war, men who could anticipate having to decide between being killed in the trenches or facing the ignominy and shame, even cruelty and death which could be associated with being conscientious objectors. They heard the rhetorical question, "Which is the nobler service to Christ; which the more useful service to civilisation?" In

the face of political attitudes which warned potential foes, "if you overwhelm our civilian population, our women and children, so we will treat your women, your children," Barnes showed how such an Old Testament stance, "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," was contrary to Christ's teaching, "But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil." He argued for a new political outlook, with economic nationalism abandoned, Crown Colonies placed under League of Nations control, financial rivalries and fears of inflation replaced by generous co-operation between peoples. The terrible alternative could leave a failed, imperfectly-trying, Christianity lying dormant, possibly for centuries, the possession of the humble and meek. "But it will emerge again," said Barnes, "and then, in loyalty to Christ, men will try anew to build the Kingdom of God upon earth."³⁷

Morris, Summer 1937

The ideas that Morris had previously expressed in his radio broadcasts were developed further in an address, *The Creed of a Christian Pacifist*, delivered to the Co-operative Congress in May 1937 and in another broadcast sermon on 1 August 1937. The Co-operative Congress in Bath were presented with an evangelistic choice between Christ and the fear which led to rearmament and war. "[I]f you shut Christ out by the door, fear comes flying in through the window. If you will not walk with Christ, you must find your steps dogged by the ghosts of fear."

Jesus, said Morris, refused to be called the sort of king who would have used violence because he knew that that was not the way to obtain freedom and break oppression. Christ seemingly turned a deaf ear to the sorrows and suffering cries of his own oppressed nation; his victory could not be won on the battlefield or by any physical violence but only on the Cross. The triumph of the Resurrection justified the belief that only the love which endured all things and never failed could win victory.

Christ knew that His end could not be achieved by the method of violence.... So we must assert that those eternal principles of the Kingdom of God for which Christ dies are of actual application to the immediate needs of this war-weary world, that peace cannot be enforced by treaties or won if it is sought as an end in itself. It is the atmosphere of the Kingdom of God only to be found by following the road up which Christ goes to seek the Kingdom, never to be won by methods which are foreign to the Kingdom or at a lower cost than the price which Christ was prepared to pay - not peace at any price, but love at any cost. Peace can only come when we create the conditions under which it becomes inevitable - when we renounce not only war but the causes of war, as we seek to get deep down and find the answer to our fears in the realm from which fear springs.

For Morris, the choice, as always, was between Christ and Barabbas, the Saviour or the murderer. The stock exchange speculator, thriving on insecurity, and the armament maker, gambling in human lives, would be among those crying for the release of Barabbas. Christ, stripped and crucified, was the universal expression of love. "Strip Barabbas of his clothes - take from war all the false romance and adventure with which we clothe it - and he stands revealed for what he is - the murderer. And modern war is murder however we try to justify it or disguise it."³⁸

Three months later a Morris sermon from Birmingham was broadcast. It was the Sunday morning of the first Peace Pledge Union Summer Camp at Swanwick, and the assembled company listened to their radios avidly to hear what Morris had to say. He parodied those who asked the blessing of God for their piling up of armaments for premeditated and indiscriminate slaughter. Perhaps more care should be taken in the singing of "Sufficient is thine arm alone...", or the Prayer Book responses could be revised to read "Give us armaments in our time, O Lord, because there is none other that fighteth for Thee, but only we, O God." Morris asked his listeners:

Can you really stand in the presence of Christ who came to shatter the old conception of the god of battles and lord of armies, and believe that you are face to face with one whose blessing you can ask upon instruments of destruction, or upon a victory won by such methods? If so, what mean those marks in his hands and feet and side? They are there because of the way in which those principles, which our prayers must express, take shape in his life, when, stripped of all that might tie him down to membership of one race or period of time, he hangs before men as the universal expression of the Purpose and Method of God.

Morris considered whether war could ever be the lesser of two evils. His first response was to say that war was the gravest sin which people can commit against God or other people because it involved the repudiation of the Fatherhood of God "and the disruption of the brotherhood of man." Beyond that, he argued that belief in the sovereignty of God meant that there never be a choice restricted to two evils, for that would have meant that Christ would also have had to do evil that good might come.

The truth is that we are never faced with a dilemma of that kind. There is always God's way out, and we only talk of the choice of two evils because we are not prepared to run the risk of taking that way. If we as a church have no contribution to make to the problem except in terms of the world's method of violence, we are in effect saying that Christ has given us no distinctive revelation at which the world could not have arrived without him.

If the Christian Church is to be God's agency for peace-making, then individual Christians must testify openly by their attitude to war, however it may be disguised, that they believe it to be irreconcilable with Christian principles and Christian practice. They must teach and live the alternative way of non-violent

resistance to evil and their refusal to co-operate with what they know to be destructive to all their ideals.³⁹

Oxford, 1937: Raven's Submission

“[T]he problem of war is the dominant moral and religious issue of the day.... It was at the Oxford Conference on Church, State and Community in July 1937, that the signal importance of the issue not only for individual Christians but for the whole future of the ecumenical Church became manifest.”⁴⁰

The Life and Work side of the worldwide ecumenical movement followed its 1925 Stockholm gathering with a conference in Oxford Town Hall, twelve years later. It was a key stage in the movement which culminated in the foundation of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam in 1948. 425 delegates from 120 churches from forty countries made their way to Oxford in 1937.⁴¹ “We did not agree,” admitted Raven, but “our views, right or wrong were sincere and the result of our whole life’s history.... [W]e welcomed diversity, knowing that beneath all our differences we were in the depths of our experience at one.....”⁴² Living and particularly worshipping together helped to break down suspicions and to build up trust. The discussion of war became possible without reviving old grievances and hates even between French and German representatives. There were differing views about the possibilities of accepting or rejecting the forces of war, but, Raven noted, “we were united in our detestation of them and in our refusal to conceal their true nature by a glamour of false glory.”⁴³

Raven’s theology was in many ways distinctively Anglican but his chosen sphere of operation was more often than not the world of ecumenism. C.O.P.E.C., the F.O.R., the C.C.P.G. were all interdenominational activities. Theological thinking reflected but was not restricted by confessional, or for that matter national, boundaries. It could be used to build barriers, or, with goodwill, to hasten reconciliation. The task of the Oxford gathering was the latter, to reconcile both French and German Christians as well as continental, British and American theologians. For Raven it was such an important gathering that he worked on his part of the preparations for two years before the Conference.⁴⁴ For that Conference he was to produce some of his most thorough philosophy and theology, under the heading “The Religious Basis of Pacifism.” Once again he justified treating war in isolation, not only because it was such a obvious peril, but because progress had generally been achieved by concentrating on a particular manifestation of sin.⁴⁵ His approach was Trinitarian, starting with the Second Person.

For Raven, Jesus combined “the insistence upon uncompromising perfection with the tenderest patience in welcoming and encouraging the first motions of the awakened

conscience.”⁴⁶ He brought the finite and the infinite together in harmony, showing people a wider horizon and at the same time bidding them set out towards it. The reality of the incarnation meant that the prophetic teachings were applicable to the present world and were not to be postponed to some period outside history, as Raven held some commentators (including Barth) would have them.⁴⁷ The immediacy of the application was not to be delayed by too much consideration of the failures of the past (Jesus said nothing about the fall, little about sin, but a lot about forgiveness.⁴⁸) It was enough, he said, for the pacifist to urge “that now, when at last the conscience of the Church has become aware of the iniquity of war, we must seize the opportunity which that awareness offers and act upon it.”⁴⁹

As for the Cross, Raven held that that could not be isolated from that which preceded or followed it. Jesus, he said, “chose the Cross, refusing to allow that physical force could speak the last word.... [T]he result vindicated his choice.” Raven’s three-fold conclusion on the meaning of the Cross was:

that we must renounce any form of compulsion which treats human beings as less than persons....
that we cannot overcome evil by evil: Jesus, bearing the effects of man’s sin in His own body, yet forgave and did not cease to love....
that the only redemptive power in the universe is the power of the love that is ready to give and suffer to the uttermost: Jesus triumphed upon and by Calvary.⁵⁰

For Raven, the love of God and love of neighbour was the end to be attained, and the means of attainment must be consistent with that end.

God cannot deny Himself, and if God is love then love’s way is universally applicable, and the use of any method that denies love will lead to damnation and ultimate disaster. We cannot do evil that good may come.... It is to love’s way that the Christian is committed when he accepts the Cross as the token of his allegiance.⁵¹

Raven’s study of the First Person of the Trinity included further thinking on Temple’s accusation of a Marcionite tendency. He acknowledged that Jesus “not only revered but endorsed” the Old Testament, but still claimed that many Old Testament concepts were “strictly irreconcilable with Christ’s religion.” Raven continued to refuse to set up a false contrast between love and justice.⁵²

As a naturalist himself, Raven heard other scientists arguing that violence within nature showed that conflict was a biological necessity. Raven’s reply acknowledged the suffering, ruthlessness and evil inherent in the creative process, and claimed that “if we

accept the Cross as congruous with the love of God, we ought not to be surprised that a similar method is adumbrated at every stage of His activity.” As for the evolutionists’ argument of the survival of the fittest, what determined fitness - the ability to struggle or to co-operate? Raven believed in a different approach to evolution:

It is difficult not to feel that human history enforces the lesson, which evolution indicates, that the pioneers of progress are not the secure and successful, the heavily armed and violently aggressive, but the sensitive and the suffering, who live humbly and dangerously.⁵³

Hence further progress for the world would not be achieved by self-sufficient, warring nations, claiming unrestricted rights to private ownership, but by co-operative unity and human commonwealth. “The cut-throat competition alike in industry and armaments means ultimately not merely disaster for others but suicide for itself.”⁵⁴

In his treatment of the Third Person of the Trinity, Raven considered the life of the disciples in the Holy Spirit, regarding their example as normative, not as an impossible, interim ideal. In the spirit of Pentecostal koinonia, the Church ought to be the supreme community, held together by loyalty to Christ, dedicated to his kingdom, and exhibiting a strength and permanence beyond all other human institutions, including the state.⁵⁵ Certainly, there were duties of citizenship, and in a world permeated with evil, there would necessarily be some compromise and some share in collective guilt, yet there were limits to such compromise.

No Christian can admit the divine right of the state to order him to abjure Christ - else the martyrs were slain to no purpose. No Christian can believe that to do God’s will can be anything less than to serve the highest interests of his country - else God is either not God or not love. We are forbidden to do evil that good may come - and wilfully to do what we are convinced is wrong is to fall into open sin. Our problem comes back to the simple question Is warfare, modern warfare, an instrument which a Christian can use?

Giving a negative answer to this question, Raven added that a Christian would thus be bound to contest any suggestion that what was wrong for an individual might somehow be right for the state.

For all Raven’s efforts, the Conference was not persuaded. It would condemn war - which Raven regarded as a success - but not participation in and preparation for war.⁵⁶ It accepted that there were different Christian approaches to the issue and would not challenge their bases.⁵⁷ Sheppard was furious as he decried the “subtle, timid and inglorious” report produced when “the uncompromising separation of the Christian

Church from any and every war" was what was needed.⁵⁸

Raven Beyond Oxford

For his part, Raven returned to his Cambridge study to write a critique of the Conference, with particular criticism reserved for the position of Barthian and Lutheran positions. He also considered the nature of war and the significance of Christian scriptures and tradition.

When commenting on the nature of war, Raven spoke from experience and from personal awareness of how people under fire revealed great human qualities of cheerfulness, fortitude and comradeship. He did not deny that in war as elsewhere, people could triumph over their environment. Yet this reminder of the quality of human nature emphasised even more the wastage and the misuse of lives in war, the prostitution of lives created for better and creative ends. War was not creative but corrupting, both of individuals and society. "If our faith is, as every Christian will maintain, centred in God as love, in the Word of truth, and in the beauty of holiness, then war is always and absolutely to be condemned." His principal argument against war was not so much that it involved killing, for, arguably, it may be less evil to kill than to debauch even though there is a finality about destroying life; nor was it that it involved suffering, as for the Christian suffering lay near to the heart of the redeeming Cross, not that that justified the crucifiers; nor that there would be destruction of material and resources, for people did not live by bread alone, though the squandering of wealth upon weapons and the impoverishment of culture by their use were hard to bear. For Raven, the case against war went deeper, being an offence against what made people to be persons and God to be God. War destroyed the fellowship which existed and should be fostered between human beings as children of God and members one of another, persons in relationship. The doctrine of God centred upon the personal qualities of love, life and light, and the doctrine of the Incarnation bore witness to the sanctity of personality as the unique medium capable of revealing the Son of God. The Holy Spirit was primarily manifested in the *koinonia*, the communion and community of believers, the blessed society which was the body of Christ. It was that primary tenet of faith which was outraged and blasphemed by war.⁵⁹ War was an outpouring of hate and lies, an offence against love and truth. Modern war, said Raven, was

not a matter of heroism, but of butchery, the smashing into poisoned pulp of the innocent and the defenceless, the stamping out of all semblance of humanity by torture and panic, the destruction of every decent human quality in victors and vanquished alike.

War is evil, and for the Christian a flat denial of his faith.⁶⁰

With regards to scripture and tradition, Raven moved on from the earlier Marcionite accusations, describing the New Testament as normative, the Old Testament as preparatory, to be interpreted in the light of the New. Neither were to be approached in a spirit of bibliolatry but with due regard to the witness of Christian theologians of whom those of the early and undivided Church (when the Church was largely pacifist) were generally the most important.

In the Old Testament Raven argued that in spite of the occasional primitive and savage element, the emphasis was nearly always upon peace. War was a punishment for apostasy, a judgement upon a sinful nation. David, the man of war, could not build the house of the Lord. The prophets almost without exception strove to turn people from reliance upon force and statecraft. Jeremiah, the greatest of them, advocated non-resistance with a courage that compelled the admiration of those he castigated. Always it was by a faithful remnant, suffering unto death, that salvation was won.

Raven saw Jesus, who accepted the Old Testament, as being in the succession of prophets not warriors. From the Temptations onwards his rejection of war was unquestionable; the Beatitudes proclaimed the worth of the poor and the meek; the Sermon on the Mount declared the duty of non-resistance and replaced the *lex talionis* by the golden rule. Jesus was determined to prevent an outbreak of nationalist violence by the excitable Galileans, and uncompromisingly refused their offer of kingship. When the disciples recognized his Messiahship, he stripped the title of its military glory and revealed himself as the suffering servant of God, bound not for a throne but for a Cross. The Cross, to Raven, was the supreme revelation of God's method of dealing with evil.

It is Christ's witness to the weakness and folly of the sword, to the triumphant power of non-resistance, to the new way of overcoming evil with good.... Jesus is acknowledged as the Saviour precisely because He challenged and overthrew man's reliance upon military power, man's arrogance in claiming for himself the right to torture and slay.⁶¹

That was the unveiling of the power and the wisdom of God, which St. Paul recognised as a scandal to Jews and foolishness to Greeks. Comparison of the fruits of the spirit with the works of the flesh (Gal.5) showed how incompatible were the Christian virtues with the fact of war. That catalogue came not from a coward or a weakling, "but from Paul the Dauntless, one of the supreme creative geniuses in history, whose influence far outweighs that of all the captains and kings of the world." It was an example that

continued beyond the period recorded in the scriptures, only coming to a disastrous end with Constantine. "No candid student can be blind to the degradation of Christianity that accompanied its rise to secular power," was how Raven expressed it. "When the Church strove to win the kingdoms of the world by becoming itself a kingdom after their pattern," he said, "it ought to have torn up the Beatitudes and replaced the cross by a throne, even as it substituted the triple tiara for the crown of thorns."⁶²

In contrast with this the pacifist is convinced that the faith of Jesus is universally valid, that the Cross is the instrument of salvation, that by it alone is the *koinonia*, the communion and community of the Holy Spirit realizable, that man is made for such community, that he can only attain it by using means consistent with his end, that war is a denial of those means, a frustration of that end, that here and now spiritual resources are available, that they are in the long run the most potent factors in history, and that the urgency of the issue challenges every Christian to take the risk of an uncompromising rejection of war. Acting on those convictions he may fail, or seem to fail. Nevertheless, both for himself and for the world, both as an individual and as a citizen, it is better for him to obey God rather than man. Indeed the alternative is so plain that he can do no other.⁶³

A CHRONOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS ARGUMENT: ENDNOTES

1. Raven, in Sheppard, ed., *Let Us Honour Peace*, p48.

2. Raven was the son of a barrister and a mother whose life was “saturated with religion.” Born 4 July 1885, he rejected Christianity in his late teens, thinking “Better no paradise at all than a paradise of fools.” (Raven, *A Wanderer’s Way*, p35.) The following year he had a kind of religious experience on the peak of Great Gable in the Lake District: “the stark strength of the mountains ushers you into the presence chamber of the eternal.... You, this tiny, tragic, transient creature are at one with the universe...” (Raven, *Musings and Memories*, p148, cited in Dillistone, *Charles Raven*, p46,47.) The created world, especially natural history, would always be Raven’s second passion. Although he could not relate his experience to the God of the naive and literalist C.I.C.C.U. student group at Cambridge, neither was he attracted to the opponents of religion. In contrast, Chesterton seemed to present an intellectually credible Christianity, credible enough for Raven to change his own studies from Classics to Divinity. Taking a year out to help with a boys club and a Sunday School in a slum area of Liverpool, he revelled in a Church of service, where the pomps and ceremonies mattered little. Together with a sense of Jesus “alive and present” during a visit to a sick college friend, (*A Wanderer’s Way*, p91-93) the Liverpool experience led Raven to offer himself for ordination and at the age of only 24 he became Dean of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Never a man for half-measures, Raven tried unsuccessfully on several occasions to enlist after August 1914, despite being in clerical orders. It was not until April 1917 that he eventually went to France, as an Army Chaplain. He saw the extremes of warfare and discovered the extremities of his own personality. At times he was exhilarated, at others broken. His faith and sense of God saw him through: “for the next nine months He was never absent, and I never alone, and never save for an instant or two broken by fear. If He who was with me when I was blown up by a shell, and gassed, and sniped at, with me in hours of bombardment and the daily walk of death, was an illusion, then all that makes life worth living for me is illusion too; and I can only thank God that in this mockery of existence there has been a dream so beautiful, so realistic, so potent in its effects.” (*A Wanderer’s Way*, p157,158.) At his lowest point, when a much-needed home leave was cancelled, he wrote that “at the bottom of me I loathe this life out here - partly the physical side, the sheer recurrence of death in its most ghastly forms, & the ceaseless expectation that one will have to face it oneself & may do so quite literally at any moment - and partly the spiritual side, the constant sense that one is crying (or ought to cry) in the wilderness, and that nobody much wants to listen - but mainly ... on the sympathetic side, this place tears one’s heart. You see I read a deal with every letter that comes to our casualties, as well as writing to the wife or mother of each man who falls. One learns to know so well the cry of the widow: one reads her artless letters when her man is dead and she not yet informed & one receives the heart-broken gratitude for one’s own letter.... And then in despair one flies to the trenches to lose oneself & one’s fears in the society of our brotherhood of death - and as one goes one meets the shattered smashed body that once was a husband and a father and one goes through his poor keepsakes - the picture of his wife and babes so similar to that which I carry next my heart.

Well all that and more came over me, and for an hour I was simply a torn bleeding thing that wanted to die & could not, & wanted to weep & could not, and tried to find the Master & could not for the veils of self-pity.” (Raven to S. W. Burgess, 29 July 1917, Faith Raven collection.)

At times he was ashamed to have come through alive (Raven, *Our Salvation*, p64.) Far from being a pacifist at this time, Raven supported the idea of continuing the war to its victorious end, to the permanent victory which would ensure that none of the combatants would take up arms again in the life-time of that generation (Raven to S. W. Burgess, c.27 June 1917, Faith Raven collection.) The fading of this dream in the post-war years was one factor in Raven’s move towards pacifism. He was in the thick of the fighting at Bourton Wood at the end of 1917, then transferred to the Headquarters of the Chaplains’ Department, away from the Front, and in April 1918 he returned to this former post in

Cambridge to write the definitive history of *Christian Socialism, 1848-1854*. He said that his wartime experiences led him to "fulness of life" (Raven, *Jesus and the Gospel of Love*, p37,38) and admitted to pacifist readers twenty years later that "Some of us in the hour when every earthly security was shattered found God as the sole reality." ("We Will Not Fight", in Sheppard, ed., *Let Us Honour Peace*, p47.) Post-war reassessment, in which C.O.P.E.C. and the Christ and Peace Campaign played their part, led him to rethink his attitudes: "We ... came back to find our friends dead or maimed, our comrades unemployed, our hopes and ideals openly repudiated, and every position of leadership in Church and State filled by those who had stayed at home and profited by our sufferings.

[T]he poisoning of our own outlook, added to the manifest evidence of a general corruption of private and public life, inevitably convinced us that war was not only wastage and folly, but wickedness and futility. We had been trying to cast out devils by Beelzebub the prince of devils, and they had returned each with seven others worse than himself. There must be, there is, a more excellent way. We had caught a glimpse of it in the naked loneliness of battle; we came to see it revealed plainly in Christ..." ("We will not Fight", in Sheppard, ed., *Let Us Honour Peace*, p48.)

3. Chamberlain, *Fighting For Peace*, p143.

4. Review of the published version of Raven's lectures in 1935 led to extended correspondence about pacifism in the columns of the *Church Times*. In the period 15 March - 12 April 1935, correspondents included, inter alia: Frances E. Jones, W. R. Jones, Harold Fothergill, Harry Kerswell, H. F. Runacres, Charles H. Cunningham, Margaret Yonge, Michael McCormick, Archibald K. Campbell, "Pedagogue", Henry Hammond, Effie Freemantle, Frederick Philpott, Kenneth Rawlings, Charles Strong and J. V. L. Casserley.

5. *Is War Obsolete?*, p44.

6. *Is War Obsolete?*, p51,52. Raven, who at the end of the war had written the substantial history of *Christian Socialism, 1848-1854*, continued: "Those of us who are most conscious that the evils of competitive capitalism are as manifest and not less unclean, may yet agree that it is in the campaign against war that we must first engage against them."

7. *Is War Obsolete?*, p170.

8. *Is War Obsolete?*, p98,99.

9. *Is War Obsolete?*, p26,27.

10. Morris was born in London on 13 August 1890. After reading theology and history at Cambridge (Sybil Morrison, *The Life and Work of Stuart Morris*, p4) he opted for ordination rather than a law career, and served an East London curacy. A military chaplain during the Great War, ministering to a unit of airmen based in Britain (Yorkshire?), he began to appreciate their fear of the horror of war and he was asked to resign because of his pacifist sermons. (Hilda Morris in conversation with CB, 12 December 1992.) As Vicar of St. Bartholomew, Birmingham, he was appointed to a canonry by Bishop Barnes, who also recognised his administrative gifts and invited him to become Bishop's Secretary. He turned down an invitation to become Archdeacon in order to take extra responsibilities within the P.P.U., succeeding Sheppard at the helm in 1938, and becoming the movement's first General Secretary. Apart from a gap from 1942 to 1945 (as a consequence of his undergoing nine months imprisonment under the Official Secrets Act) he was to hold this leadership position within the P.P.U. until his retirement in 1964, three years before his death. Although he continued to argue from the New Testament in his speeches, his particular contribution to Anglican pacifism ended in 1939 when he resigned his Orders, having presided at the Eucharist for the final time at the P.P.U. Summer Camp at

Pannal Ash School, Harrogate. Partly his action was a protest at the lack of Church of England opposition to war, partly it was recognition that domestic difficulties (his marriage had just broken up) meant that he would not be able to exercise his priesthood again in any case. In 1934, however, the renunciation of Orders was still five years away, years in which Morris played a prominent part in the development of Christian pacifism in Britain.

11. *Reconciliation*, 1934, p173-176.

12. *Reconciliation*, 1934, p235.

13. *Reconciliation*, 1934, p307,308.

14. *Reconciliation*, December 1934, p318.

15. Rawlings was brought up a Methodist in Birmingham. Becoming the regular organist in the slum parish of St. Jude's, he came under the influence of the Pinchard brothers, and not only became involved in a small way with the Pilgrim Players (the forerunner of Birmingham Reperatory Theatre) but recognised his vocation to the priesthood. After being trained in Durham, Rawlings was made deacon in Birmingham in 1909, and ordained priest the following year. In 1914, as a curate in Handsworth, he attempted to become an army padre but his bishop refused. Accordingly, Rawlings, together with a clerical friend of similar persuasion who was soon to be killed, joined the army in a combative capacity, seeing a considerable amount of war action both as an infantry officer and doing medical work in the R.A.M.C. His first steps towards pacifism were taken in France, but they did not crystallise until much later. He returned to his parish after the war, and after a Birmingham incumbency, he moved to Lewes in 1925, where he was to remain until his death in 1969. Rawlings gained some national notoriety in 1933 for promoting the rights of the unemployed, especially those who did such part-time work as would ordinarily be allowed those in regular employment yet who found their meagre benefits stopped as a result. He won a celebrated legal ruling on their behalf. His support for those out of work was not welcomed by all members of his P.C.C., the more upper class of whom frowned on the hours he would spend visiting the poorer areas of his parish, and who objected when he opened the church hall for the unemployed. Some of those jobless men were later to become servers at St. Michael's. (Rowena Bingham in conversation with CB, 30 October 1992.) Neither were local dignitaries impressed by Rawlings' opinions. Lewes was the county town and St. Michael's part of the Established Church. It had been the obvious setting for civic and mayoral services and the twice yearly visit of the judge sitting in the assize court - complete with military trumpeters escorting his car along the High Street. Before long it was felt that another church might be a more appropriate setting for such ceremonies. (Arthur Towner to CB, 25 April 1992.) Other sections of the local community were to find him a friend for his enthusiastic support for the arts. He wrote and promoted Christmas and Easter plays in St. Michael's Hall (one of his plays, "Christ the King" ended with a clear pacifist statement) and this led to him founding and becoming the Director of the Lewes Theatre Club in 1937, arranging the purchase and conversion of a derelict chapel into a Little Theatre. A Theatre Club obituary for Rawlings described him thus: "His burning convictions and ideals he never surrendered in the least degree. Some of us were not always in agreement with him, and yet there was never any question of our friendship being impaired. He was a most dogged adversary in debate, a brilliant speaker, yet always tolerant of the other person's point of view, never attempting to impose his beliefs on others." (Arthur Jenner, Lewes Theatre Club Newsletter, 1969/70, no.1.) Amongst the Anglican pacifists in St. Michael's congregation were Natalie Victor, sometime Chair of Lewes F.O.R. and author of *A Catholic Looks At War* (A.P.F. Newsletter, September 1940), the P.C.C. Secretary, Arthur Towner in the choir, and Rowena Bingham. Bingham was only 16 when she heard Rawlings' 1934 address, but she was greatly influenced by it. She was later closely involved with Rawlings in the Theatre Club. (Rowena Bingham in conversation with CB, 30 October 1992.)

16. Rawlings' oratory was amongst the most powerful of the time:

"Tonight we remember ten million men sent to premature and violent death. To what purpose do we remember them? We must make up our minds about that, or we shall be in danger of vague sentimentality, or something worse....

What do we owe them these ten million slain who in the prime of their manhood turned their backs upon all the beauty and sweetness of life, who lived for years in mud and squalor and terror, who were thrust through with bayonets, or had their limbs torn off, or their faces smashed, who were blinded or driven insane or hung like scarecrows on barbed wire and riddled with bullets, who were choked with poison gas, or scorched to death by liquid flames, or were drowned, or were imprisoned rats in submerged submarines or collapsed dug-outs, tearing with bleeding fingers at their prison walls, fighting frantically for breath, suffering, gasping, dying with blackened faces and protruding eyes - in God's name what do we owe them for this? What compensation can we offer them? If they look down upon our Armistice Day futilities, our pomp and pageantry, our solemn marchings to and fro with drums and flags, and sometimes - God help us! - with the very weapons of death by which they perished, do they feel that they are well repaid?...

Whom did our soldiers fight in the last war? Oppressors? Tyrants? The enemies of God? Of course not; they fought ordinary decent men like themselves. Our airmen dropped bombs on harmless civilians like you. They killed women and children, just like your mothers and wives and babies. Modern warfare is indiscriminate mutual slaughter by people who have no quarrel with each other until their minds are poisoned by war propaganda. And it is just here that the essential vileness of war is most apparent. No war can begin, still less be carried through, until the people who are to do the actual fighting have been tampered with in order to get their fighting blood up. National pride, fear, jealousy and hatred - these are things that cause wars, but they are dormant in the average person until they are deliberately stirred into activity by propaganda....

Men and women! - and especially you young men and women in whose hands lies the only hope of the future, I implore you while there is yet time - while you are still sane and kindly, before the demon of war bursts his fetters and takes possession of you and turns you into beasts - I implore you in the name of God, in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the name of humanity, in the name of the ten million slain whose eyes are surely fixed upon us now; for the sake of your children, as yet perhaps unborn, but for whose tender flesh and pure blood the god of war is even now hungering and thirsting, I implore you to set your faces against this evil and to resolve that you will never rest until it has been thrust back into the pit of hell from whence it came....

I most solemnly declare that if war comes again in my time I will have neither part nor lot in it. I will denounce it and oppose it until my mouth is stopped, so help me God!"

17. *We Shall Not Forget*, An Address by Rev. Kenneth Rawlings. (A.P.F. archive.) The newspaper was the *Sussex Express*. A Tory Alderman, one of the Churchwardens at St. Michael's, was one of those who remained firmly in his front row seat.

As a follow-up to this meeting, there was another gathering a few weeks later when 500 people attended a public debate in Lewes at which Rawlings argued the case against League of Nations' militarism. Soon afterwards, Rawlings and the Quakers organised a joint meeting to build on their success, with the text of the Armistice Day address circulated liberally with the invitations. In a crowded church hall, with the sympathetic Mayor of Lewes presiding, Percy Bartlett of the F.O.R. spoke on Christian pacifism, with supporting speeches from Rawlings and Holder. (*Reconciliation*, January 1935, p13.) A large majority present voted to form a branch of the F.O.R., with Rawlings in the Chair. Stuart Morris spoke at the launch meeting on 22 January 1935. (*Reconciliation*, March 1935, p52.) The new group was to have considerable local campaigning success, not least of which was persuading the local League of Nations Union to repudiate the sanctions clauses of the Covenant. The League of Nations Union headquarters threatened to disaffiliate the Lewes group, probably the first time a group was threatened with disownment on account of having become pacifist. (*Reconciliation*, 1935, p136.) In 1936, the

Lewes F.O.R. group organised an open-air rally to which 3000 people came, with Lansbury, Morris and Sheppard among the speakers. 450 new pledge signatories were added that day. (*Peace News*, 1 August 1936, p1.)

18. *Dr. Sheppard's Candid Letter To The "Men Who Matter."* Sheppard explained that he felt that women were already committed to peace: "The women, I think, saw it first, because their vision was sharpened by the love they bore their sons. But the men are awakening also." The pamphlet was issued to encourage that awakening.

19. Sheppard, *We Say "No"*, p3,4.

20. Sheppard, *We Say "No"*, p18.

21. Sheppard, *We Say "No"*, p21,22, citing the American poet James Russell Lowell, 1818-1891.

22. *Reconciliation*, October 1935, p277.

23. *Church Times*, 6 September 1935, p249.

24. *Pacifism and Christian Common Sense*, p24.

25. *Reconciliation*, October 1935, p276-279.

26. Alan M. Suggate, *William Temple on Pacifism*; *Modern Churchman*, 1986, no.1, p8.

27. Max Plowman wrote to Geoffrey West, "Did you see the Archbishop of York in *The Times* today? Oh Gawd! Equivocation is the toboggan on which the righteous go to hell." 29 October 1935. *Bridge Into the Future*, p541.

28. *Reconciliation*, December 1935, p322.

29. *Reconciliation*, December 1935, p320,321.

30. *Reconciliation*, December 1935, p326. The rally was one of three organised by the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups. The organisers doubted whether anyone else outside the great political parties could have managed simultaneously to fill three halls in the capital. 5500 people filled Central Hall, Kingsway Hall and Church House under the revived banner of "Christ and Peace." In Central Hall, Raven was in the Chair and speakers included Sheppard and Lansbury. In Kingsway Hall, Herbert Gray was in the Chair and speakers included Soper and - doubling up - Lansbury. In Church House, Morris was in the Chair and the speakers included - again, doubling up - Sheppard and Soper. (*Reconciliation*, November 1935, piv.) In his speeches, Sheppard referred to the country he loved and considered the cry of Christ over Jerusalem. "There was a sob in His heart, and a catch in His voice when he said, 'Surely, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, didst thou know the things which belong to peace....' He could not ever have denounced without love in His eyes and tenderness in His heart; it must have cost Him God alone knows what to look upon a people who knew not the things that belonged to its peace. And there is that sort of tenderness in the atmosphere to-day." (*Reconciliation*, January 1936, p14.)

31. *Reconciliation*, December 1935, p320,321.

32. *Reconciliation*, December 1935, p320,321.

33. *Reconciliation*, February 1936, p32-36. Also available as a separate F.O.R. pamphlet, *Christianity and War!*, April 1936.

34. *Reconciliation*, June 1936, p144.

35. *Reconciliation*, June 1936, p146,147.

36. John Barnes, *Ahead of His Age*, p348. Barnes assessed the political climate and his own part in it a few days earlier when he addressed the Congregational Union in Birmingham, telling them, "I fancy that I myself am more to the Left politically, socially, theologically than most of you here. My Church, for all its factions and absurdities, is alive with Modernists and pacifists and socialists. Civilisation bears under its Left Wing the hopes of the future." (*Church of England Newspaper*, 16 October 1936, p6.)

37. *Blessed Are the Peacemakers*, Bishop of Birmingham, (pamphlet). Also, *Church Times*, 23 October 1936, p443.

38. Stuart Morris, *The Creed of a Christian Pacifist*, Co-operative Union pamphlet. Morris concluded his address with a rousing plea: "If you believe war to be wrong because it violates every principle of justice, freedom, and brotherhood, then be bold enough to say so, and, without fear of consequence, affirm: 'Because war is a denial of the Sovereign Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, because it is contrary to the character and purpose of Christ, I renounce it once and for all. I will take no part in it whatever be its cause, moral or economic - whatever be its shape, civil or international. I will strive to make it always and everywhere impossible, taking all the risks that are involved in positive peacemaking.' For we are not for the mastery of markets but for the mastery of ourselves and the Lordship of Christ - not to take life but to redeem it, and to share with all life as it is in God."

39. Sybil Morrison, *The Life and Work of Stuart Morris*, p17-19.

40. Raven, *War and the Christian*, p26.

41. One of the American participants was Katharine Pierce, a member of the National Council of the Episcopal Church. She was soon to be one of the founders of the Episcopal Pacifist Fellowship. (Pierce and Ward, *The Voice of Conscience: A Loud and Unusual Noise?*, p7.) An absentee was Martin Niemöller, who had been arrested and imprisoned on 1 July. (Jasper, *George Bell*, p223,226.)

42. Raven, *War and the Christian*, p40.

43. Raven, *War and the Christian*, p43.

44. F.O.R. General Committee, 3 June 1935. Also *Reconciliation*, September 1936, p238.

45. "It is our belief that the problem of war illustrates in a manageable compass the central difficulties of the Christian's way of life; that by dealing with it we shall be facing the outstanding issue of our day; and that if we can see our way here we shall discover both the vision and the power for other and cognate tasks." (Raven, in Lothian et al, *Universal Church*, p291.) Raven outlined the issues raised by war: "[T]he problem raised by war is at once basic and representative. Here in a single concrete issue are focussed all the elements which in fact underlie every conflict of loyalties, every attempt to combine dedication to God in Christ with the maintenance of human contacts and obligations. Ultimately a decision involves a range of data as wide as life itself. For its discussion there is need to examine fundamental principles in Christian doctrine and ethics, our conception of the nature and purpose of God as revealed in Christ, our interpretation of sin, and of the means and character of redemption, our

concept of the world and of history, our theory of the function of the state, our attitude towards the compromises involved in the attempt to live Christianly in a sinful society. In addition it is necessary to consider a large number of practical and intricate questions regarding the place of force in political life, the proposals and machinery for the promotion of peace, and the experience of recent movements in the sphere of international affairs." (Raven, in Lothian et al, *Universal Church*, p291.)

46. Raven, in Lothian et al, *Universal Church*, p293.

47. "In regard to pacifism this tendency has led some theologians to exaggerate the transcendental and other-worldly aspect of Christ's teaching and to denounce the faith that God's will can be done on earth as it is in Heaven - indeed to condemn the effort to secure peace and social righteousness as mere humanism." (Raven, in Lothian et al, *Universal Church*, p293.)

48. Raven, in Lothian et al, *Universal Church*, p297. Raven was not averse to producing a critique of the past however: "It might be possible to argue in the old days of restricted conflicts and professional armies that military action was only an extension of police action, or at least that an analogy existed between the enforcing of civil order and the settlement by arms of international strife. That analogy is, indeed, still employed, though the changed character of modern war has destroyed whatever validity it may have possessed. There was always a fallacy in it; for in civil life both hangman and victim are subject to a higher authority than themselves, while the nation, owing no superior allegiance, is itself both judge and executioner. But today, when, warfare means not a duel on the grand scale, but wholesale slaughter by thermite and mustard-rain dropped from aircraft, all semblance to police action has disappeared...." (p307,308.)

49. Raven, in Lothian et al, *Universal Church*, p294.

50. Raven, in Lothian et al, *Universal Church*, p298.

51. Raven, in Lothian et al, *Universal Church*, p297.

52. "Marcion's real error was not so much in rejecting the Old Testament, as in regarding it as a rival competitor for allegiance, in ignoring history, and in setting up a false contrast between love and justice. If God is love, then we can recognise that justice has its proper task in purifying, regulating, and stabilizing the relationships which love originates: justice divorced from love, justice which does not spring from and subordinate itself to love is, as St. Paul saw plainly, arbitrary and impotent." (Raven, in Lothian et al, *Universal Church*, p302.)

53. Raven, in Lothian et al, *Universal Church*, p304,305.

54. Raven, in Lothian et al, *Universal Church*, p308.

55. Raven realised that apologists for the State would cite Mark 12.17, Romans 13.1-10, 1Peter 2.13-17 and Titus 3.1, yet he believed that although "these passages may justly be taken as forbidding recourse to civil strife, they cannot be quoted as endorsing blind obedience." (Raven, in Lothian et al, *Universal Church*, p312.) Hence, "unless this clearly contravenes his loyalty to Christ," a pacifist would accept the obligations of citizenship.

56. "War involves compulsory enmity, diabolical outrage against human personality, and a wanton distortion of the truth. War is a particular demonstration of the power of sin in this world, and a defiance of the righteousness of God as revealed in Jesus Christ and Him Crucified. No justification of war must be allowed to conceal or minimize this fact." (*The Churches Survey Their Task*, p178. Cited

by Katherine C. Pierce in "Peace in the Ecumenical Movement, Oxford to Amsterdam," in Temple, ed., *Peace is Possible*, p75. Also in Hartill, *Pacifism and Christian Common Sense*, p12 and Raven, *War and the Christian*, p55.) Raven's reaction was reported to the Lunteren Conference of the I.F.O.R. (*Reconciliation*, September 1938, p265.)

57. "Some believe that war, especially in its modern form, is always sin, being a denial of the nature of God as love, of the redemptive way of the Cross, and of the community of the Holy Spirit.... They are therefore constrained to refuse to take part in war themselves, to plead among their fellows for a similar repudiation of war in favour of a better way, and to replace military force by methods of active peace-making.... Some would participate only in 'just war.'... Some believe that the State is the agent divinely appointed to preserve a nation from detrimental effects of anarchic and criminal tendencies amongst its members, and to maintain its existence against the aggression of its neighbours." (Cited by Katherine C. Pierce, "Peace in the Ecumenical Movement, Oxford to Amsterdam," in Temple, ed., *Peace is Possible*, p75,76.)

58. "Because of what this report reveals of the Church's hesitation to renounce uncompromisingly the sin of war which it **verbally** denounces there is all the more need for the protest of those who feel they must go the whole length of the road on which the report started.

I do not think the mind of Christ on this subject is obscure, and I would maintain that to compromise here is the final disloyalty and an act of apostasy. May I be allowed to protest at the colourless final paragraphs in which the conference hides the fact that, in this issue of peace and war, it is not proposing to demand that the churches should take their Lord and His redemptive plan seriously.

Today any church that is merely timid and polite is bound to be omitted from the consideration of earnest people. She will never die at the hands of opponents, but she will be in grave danger of suicide when her judgments provoke the moral indignation or the ridicule of enlightened men and women.

I think this report on Church and war, as a whole, will cause men to say that the churches do not mean business and have no courage for the Christian fray. I fear they will be justified in so saying." (Sheppard, in *Peace News*, 31 July 1937, p1.)

59. Raven, *War and the Christian*, p47-49.

60. Raven, *War and the Christian*, p51.

61. Raven, *War and the Christian*, p125-128.

62. Raven, *War and the Christian*, p131.

63. Raven, *War and the Christian*, p139,140.

PACIFISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1930-1937

PART 3: ANALYSIS OF ANGLICAN PACIFISM, 1930-1937

PACIFIST CAMPAIGNING

Part 1: Christian Campaigning

The F.O.R.'s decision to continue after 1918 had been taken on the grounds that the Kingdom of Heaven had not arrived. A decade of diverse social activism did not regain its pacifist focus until the Christ and Peace Campaign launched by Bishop Bell at Central Hall Westminster on 22 October 1929. By the time of the closing convention at Somerville College, Oxford on 15-18 April 1931¹ there had been thirty-five campaign meetings around the country, attended by some 25,000 people. Although Sheppard (who was often ill), Bell, Raven and the Marquis of Tavistock all took part, there were some difficulties in attracting enough Anglican speakers.² Despite being run by the F.O.R.,³ albeit somewhat inefficiently, it was not an exclusively pacifist campaign and F.O.R. membership rose by only four per cent during this period. Amongst those members, however, were Charles Raven and Herbert Gray, who became significant apologists for pacifism in the future. The F.O.R.'s original intention had been to create a sympathetic climate for the promotion of a broadly defined pacifism within the churches. Increasingly, this led to a focus on disarmament and the rediscovery of the F.O.R.'s primary opposition to war rather than to a variety of forms of social sin. The F.O.R. was better at motivating individual Christians, irrespective of their background, than at working within the structures of any particular denomination. Campaigning within the Churches required separate organisations with denominational identity. Although the new groups were on friendly terms with the F.O.R., a separate umbrella body needed to be set up to facilitate communication between the denominational groups, and the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups was formed in 1934.

The Church of England was one of the most influential bodies in the nation, and moves towards pacifism within the Church could have been expected to have profound consequences for the British state and Empire and the rest of the world. Dick Sheppard, however, was content to let Stuart Morris make the first attempts to organise pacifists in the institutional Church of England. Sheppard, for all his awareness of the variety of backgrounds and beliefs of many who would call themselves pacifist, revealed his Anglican assumptions by regarding all the people, and not merely worshipping Christians, as his constituency. He even regretted that peace rallies often opened with prayer or a Bible-reading. As he told Vera Brittain, "I am sure it is the wrong note, and I am doing my best to scotch it. It so often chokes off just the right fellow."⁴

Partly, Sheppard's approach was a reflection of his frustration with the structures and

the leadership of the Church of England, but partly it was an indication of his ability, all too rare, to see beyond the narrow confines of ecclesiastical agendas to the issues which affected most of the people in society. As he showed in *The Impatience of A Parson*, his own field of concern was far wider than the merely denominational, being rather the moral and spiritual wellbeing of the nation as a whole. He would not be confined by sectarian boundaries, but attempted to build a broadly-based yet narrowly-focused single-issue campaign. People would be welcome from diverse backgrounds and religious and political persuasions,⁵ united solely by the words of the Sheppard Pledge. Whereas the A.P.F.'s sphere of activity was concentrated on the Church of England, on converting Anglicans to pacifism, the P.P.U.'s goal was to convince all people, Christian or not, of the rightness of the pacifist path.

Sheppard's initiative was to relaunch the concept of the Pledge. What Ponsonby had tried in 1925-27, Sheppard would attempt once more, with the three significant differences: there was no longer the domestic distraction of a General Strike; international events in the intervening period, not least the failure of the Disarmament Conference, had raised people's awareness of the urgency of peace initiatives; and Sheppard's popularity and charisma were guarantees that this initiative would have to be taken seriously by those in the press and the Government. Although the numbers subsequently joining the Peace Pledge Union (up to 136,000) were similar to those backing Ponsonby's pledge, the impact of Sheppard's personality meant that they were part of an influential movement affecting public consciousness, rather than an ephemeral campaign. Indeed, the importance of Sheppard's charisma was shown by the inability of Morris, for all his organisational gifts, to maintain the high morale of the P.P.U. after the founder's death.

Part 2: The P.P.U. Compared and Contrasted With The C.N.D.

There have been two substantial mass movements for peace in Britain in the twentieth century. The first was the Peace Pledge Union in the 1930s; the second was the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, with its first phase around 1960 and its second phase in the 1980s. The three movements had much in common, but there were also some dissimilarities which indicated subtle but significant differences between them. Consider: (a) Individual, Principled and Tactical Pacifism; (b) Personalities and Structure; (c) Use of the Media; (d) Peace Campaigning and Party Politics; (e) The Rôle of the Law; (f) Gender Issues; (g) The Relationship with Internationalism.

(a) Individual, Principled and Tactical Pacifism

The character of the pledge was that it was (a) individual, and (b) capable of interpretation either as a tactic of war prevention or as a principle of war resistance. Where it was seen as the response of an individual to an awakened conscience, its demands would be absolute for that individual, but would they necessarily be so for others (whose conscience may direct them into different paths) or for society as a whole? After 1914-1918, the pacifists had come close to winning the right not to be forced to kill, but now they were concerned not only to persuade other individuals to take the same stand in their own lives, but to persuade sufficient numbers to change Government policy in order to outlaw war. But having asked society to respect the pacifist conscience, pacifists implied that they would, in their turn, respect those whose informed consciences led them to different conclusions. Charles Raven admitted that "Absolute truth is and remains beyond us," concluding that "Hence it by no means follows that a judgment valid for me is necessarily valid for another."⁶ However, that admission did not lessen for Christian pacifists the sense that it was imperative to share with others the insights into God and humanity that were part of their pacifist faith.

The principled, including those who regarded pacifism as theologically imperative, would remain pacifists and members of the P.P.U. irrespective of events on the world stage. Pacifism was an article of faith, for Christian pacifists it was part of the nature of life, part of the nature of God, of Truth, and hence not only did they regard it as non-negotiable but they believed in it as a world view which all people should embrace. The principled pacifists would themselves have nothing to do with war whatever, and they would urge the same attitude on the rest of society, regarding opposing views as simply mistaken. Their commitment to pacifism was absolute, irrespective of events on the international stage, irrespective even of the immediate consequences of their belief. For some individuals in the P.P.U., any political gains would have been a bonus. What mattered was standing up for what was right, irrespective of whether or not it was immediately practical.

Following the Disarmament Conference débâcle, the tactical pacifists, often converts from the League of Nations Union, aware of the obvious failings of the League and of the Versailles Treaty, hoped for real political change. They saw pacifism, not so much as a matter of principle and of individual conscience but as probably the most practical policy in the circumstances. It was not an end in itself but a means to an end. They wanted to be part of a mass movement which would put sufficient pressure on the Government to follow policies which led to disarmament, international justice and

reconciliation, and a lasting peace. If nothing else, there was the hope that if numbers could grow sufficiently so that many thousands of potential soldiers were likely to resist any call to arms, no government in Britain would be able to consider war as an element of foreign policy because of its inability to muster the necessary human resources to put such a policy into action. When such hopes were dashed at the Government's declaration of war in 1939, the tacticians were the more likely to discard pacifism as being, for them, no longer practical or relevant. This explains both the recanting of some prominent pacifists in the early months of 1939-1945 at the same time as membership of some pacifist organisations, particularly religious groups like the A.P.F., continued to increase.⁷ The much-opposed reintroduction of conscription in May 1939 led to an increase of support for pacifist organisations, as potential conscripts made clear their individual pacifist opposition to war.

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (phase one),⁸ on the other hand, whilst it was also chaired by a pacifist Anglican, Canon Collins,⁹ involved no individual decision. It was a corporate, political movement, rather than a fellowship of individual consciences. Indeed, the organisation was formed after the ending of conscription, in an age where individuals were no longer faced with the need for a personal decision on issues of conscientious objection to war. During and after the war, individual pacifists were a marginalised minority, most of the population accepting that there were certain circumstances - such as those of 1939 - where war could be justified. Hence the new peace movement was not standing against war itself, but protesting against weapon systems associated with obliteration bombing of civilian populations. In practice that meant that those who were later called "nuclear pacifists" would oppose the fast developing atomic weapons systems, as used against Hiroshima and Nagasaki, whilst tolerating the "conventional" weapons used to equally devastating effect on Dresden and Hamburg. Some pacifists, Stuart Morris was one, were critical of this "partial" approach by the C.N.D.¹⁰ The principal aim of the C.N.D. was unashamedly political, namely to change British Government policy so that atomic weapons (but not necessarily conventional weapons) would be scrapped. (In the second wave of the movement, in 1983, it was ironic that, despite London street demonstrations against nuclear weapons by 500,000 people, it was the jingoism provoked by the conventional war over the Falklands-Malvinas which swept aside a Labour Party tentatively backing some of the C.N.D.'s aims.) For many, the motivation was self-preservation, with much of Britain likely to be destroyed by any nuclear war, whether deliberately or accidentally caused. 1980s campaigning which focussed upon the mobility of ground-launched first-strike Cruise missiles increasing the likelihood of a large area of mainland Britain becoming a nuclear target, reinforced this attitude. There was also the belief of a large proportion of

the membership of the C.N.D., of questionable accuracy in the late 1950s and even more so in the early 1980s, that such a course of action by Britain would lead to other atomic powers following suit. In this respect, it could be argued that the P.P.U. in the 1930s was more realistic in its international ambitions than the C.N.D. in later years, simply because the sheer scale of the British Empire (and its armed forces) at the time would have made unilateral disarmament by Britain an event of far more considerable world significance. However, in so far as there was an issue of principle for the C.N.D. - the reason why many pacifists did feel able to join and to participate fully in the campaign - it was the belief of many of its members that unilateral nuclear disarmament was deemed to be a morally correct course of action irrespective of its effect on other nations. A pacifist who opposed all weapons of war would necessarily oppose nuclear weapons and thus would be expected to support the aims of the C.N.D.

(b) Personalities and Structure

In both of its most successful phases, the C.N.D. was led by a prominent clergyman, just as the P.P.U. had been in the 1930s. For both the P.P.U. and the first wave of the C.N.D., having a prominent Anglican founder (or co-founder) not only gave considerable moral force to the organisation's argument, but also, given the nature of British society at the time, ensured that the organisation would be noticed by the establishment itself. Canon John Collins had been a junior member of the staff of St. Paul's in the days of Dick Sheppard, but their interaction had been minimal, not least because Collins was more right-wing than Sheppard at that time. Having founded Christian Action while he was Dean of Oriel College, Oxford, he returned to St. Paul's as a residentiary canon in 1948. The war, with its obliteration bombing and especially the destruction of Hiroshima, made him a changed man.

For me, 6 August 1945 is a day which lives in my memory. It was on that day that I finally decided against the whole concept of the Just War and became what, I suppose, would be called a Christian pacifist.... I soon realized that my old attitudes towards war could no longer stand, and that I must do everything possible by way of protest.¹¹

Like Sheppard before him, Collins used St. Paul's as a base from which to promote peace and justice - against racial politics in South Africa, against capital punishment and, from 1954, against the hydrogen bomb.¹² As a well-respected man of the establishment, committed to abolishing nuclear weapons, he was an obvious choice to be invited to be the first Chairman of the newly-formed Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, in 1958.¹³

By the late 1970s, the C.N.D.'s membership had declined to a remnant. The voluntary chair was a Roman Catholic parish priest, Monsignor Bruce Kent. He received reluctant permission from Cardinal Hume to become the movement's Secretary from January 1980, just as the new Conservative Government was announcing not only that Britain would host American cruise missiles but that Polaris would be replaced by hugely expensive Trident submarines.¹⁴ Public protest was instantaneous, and Kent was in the forefront of the mass campaigns of the early 1980s.

Bruce Kent had been secretary of the Schools Commission in the Diocese of Westminster, when Cardinal Heenan invited him to become one of his personal secretaries. After a two year appointment he left with the status of Monsignor, a label which was to convince the general public that this was no ordinary cleric, but a churchman of substance. Whereas both Sheppard and Collins would be regarded by the public as having added status through their links with St. Paul's, Kent's increased status came from this designation, "Monsignor".¹⁵ The continually changing nature of the Roman Catholic Church helped Kent's acceptance as a public figure. As it moved ever closer to the centre of the establishment in a way which would have been inconceivable in the 1930s, it became possible both for a Roman Catholic priest to speak on behalf of many and for the many to accept a Roman Catholic priest as their spokesman. He was able to lend the same kind of moral weight to campaigning as his predecessors, which would otherwise have been lacking. Of all previous campaigners, perhaps Morris was most similar to Kent. Issues of personal relationships led to both men ended up moving away from the priesthood and becoming full-time peace campaigners.¹⁶

Externally, there were similarities in the way that the leaders of both movements were surrounded by a host of celebrities from the worlds of literature, music, academia, politics, etc. Sheppard, taking full advantage of the connections he had built up during his time at St. Martin-in-the-Fields, in the heart of London's cultural West End, had in the past conceived of "a great Peace Circus," the essence of which he called "Personality," by which he meant the involvement of "certain men and women whose names are household words, who are recognized, throughout the world, as leaders in their own particular sphere of thought and activity."¹⁷ Although his vision was of "the Archbishop of Canterbury on the same platform as Einstein and Lloyd George and Gandhi,"¹⁸ his actual choice of Sponsors for the P.P.U. was made up of those "representing all kinds of hundred per cent pacifism, and not just Christian, or even the religious element alone."¹⁹ He reasoned that this would both make the movement more noticeable to the general public, and also give an indication of the breadth of support

which it enjoyed. Similarly, those involved at the start of the C.N.D. in January 1958 included Richard Acland, General Adams, George Bell, Ritchie Calder, James Cameron, John Collins, Peggy Duff, David Owen Evans, Michael Foot, Arthur Goss, Julian Huxley, Mervyn Jones, Sheila Jones, Doris Lessing, Rose Macaulay, Kingsley Martin, J. B. Priestley, Joseph Rotblat, Bertrand Russell and A. J. P. Taylor.²⁰

Internally, there were differences between the organisations in their early days. It took Sheppard a year and a half to move from the first pledge request to formally setting up an organisation. In that period, the movement had become known as the Sheppard Pledge, totally linked with the name of its founder. By the time the organisational side of things was tightened up and the P.P.U. officially formed in 1936, Sheppard was used to being in the driving seat. The Sponsors met together regularly, if casually, without official secretary, treasurer or chairman, although Sheppard himself would chair.²¹ His benevolent rule was not unlike that which might be expected by a parish priest running his Parochial Church Council. It was not until Sheppard's death that Morris developed a more democratic structure for decision-making within the P.P.U.

By way of contrast, the C.N.D. was, from the outset, established with a formal democratic constitution. Bertrand Russell, as President, and John Collins, as Chairman, may have been the figureheads for the movement, but the organisational efforts were supplied by Peggy Duff, formerly the organiser of the National Council for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons Tests. Before long there were internal elections, Regional Councils and for the 1961 Conference Peggy Duff drafted proposals for a fully democratic constitution.²²

For all that the C.N.D. has been associated with prominent Christian leaders in each of its successful phases, the decline of the Church in the nation and the early prominence of Bertrand Russell ensured that there was never any likelihood of the movement choking off "just the right fellow" by being excessively Christian. Not that there weren't large numbers of Christian members. An ecumenical subgroup, the Christian C.N.D. was founded in the months following a May 1959 *Christian Action* (another of Canon Collins' initiatives) and Friends' Peace Committee meeting in the Royal Albert Hall. Sidney Hinkes of the A.P.F. was one of the key early figures in the C.C.N.D. Imaginative and distinctive campaigning by the C.C.N.D. meant that opponents of the C.N.D.'s aims were less able to claim that the movement was merely a front for the political Left.²³

(c) The Use of the Media

Both the P.P.U. and the C.N.D. were products of the 20th century in that they were dependent on the communications technology of their age. 19th century Peace Society leaders had toured the country (slowly), addressing public meetings far and wide. Their 20th century counterparts, addressing a more highly educated and war-experienced public, moved more quickly and also had recourse to broadcasting. This was Sheppard's forte, although he himself would not use the radio to promote pacifism. The radio, however, had given him a popular respect and appeal which drew large crowds to him wherever he appeared and which meant that his writings in journals and newspapers (though seldom profound) were read avidly by hundreds of thousands of people of various persuasions. Others, notably Morris, did use the radio to preach pacifism and despite occasional grumbles from Lansbury the issue of censorship for pacifists did not arise to any great extent until the Second World War (when Raven, in particular, was affected.) By the time of the C.N.D.'s second wave, the principal means of communication was television, and (national demonstrations apart) although public meetings about nuclear weapons were still sizeable for the time, they did not in general draw the huge crowds that were commonplace in the pre-television era. The power of television as a political instrument for changing people's minds in favour of the peace movement was most clearly acknowledged by the Government which banned the broadcast of the film *War Game* throughout the period that C.N.D. was a realistic political threat.

(d) Peace Campaigning and Party Politics

Like Clarkson's successful campaign to bring an end to slavery, the P.P.U. was a single-issue campaign. It was at its strongest when it stuck closely to that issue alone. Unlike the F.O.R. in the early 1920s, or the delegates at the C.O.P.E.C. gathering, it did not (in the period up to 1937) attempt to have an agreed view on issues that were not directly related to peace and disarmament. It was only later that Murry and Plowman led the move into pacifist communities which drew attention to a number of serious issues of pacifist lifestyle, but which were peripheral to if not a diversion from the primary tasks of the P.P.U.

The vast majority of P.P.U. members would have sympathised with the political left, (and so would have distinguished between the pacifist call for a renegotiation of the Treaty of Versailles in order to produce a just and peaceful Europe, and the Tory policy of appeasement, based as it was on nationalistic and imperialistic motives of Empire-

retention and the gaining of time for rearmament). The difficulty, for pacifists, with the political Left was that many socialists believed that the fascism of Hitler, Mussolini, or (especially) Franco could only be opposed by violence. Although the weakness of this position was later exposed by Orwell,²⁴ no friend of pacifism, many on the Left felt that only armed resistance to the far-right would make any difference. The Labour Party retained the support of pacifists, and pacifists remained within the Parliamentary Party, but their influence lessened with the resignation of Lansbury from the leadership.

Within such a large organisation as the P.P.U., it was not surprising that there were a few embarrassing and damaging examples of individuals flirting with the far right which was strong at the time and which was supportive of the Hitler Government in Germany. Most of the peace movement found the rise of the Mosleyites abhorrent. Sheppard was shocked by scenes at a fascist rally at Olympia in June 1934: "I witnessed ... scenes of great brutality such as I had never thought to see in England."²⁵ Some were less forthright. The idiosyncratic Tavistock's espousal of social credit led him to respect 'strong' government and to criticise capitalism's banking system (and hence, by implication, the Jewish influence within it). When, just before the war, he associated himself with ex-Mosleyites, and, during the war, he spoke in Parliament on behalf of imprisoned fascists, it was hardly surprising that many (incorrectly but understandably) regarded his pacifism as a reflection of a sympathy for the Nazis. Others, usually more politically astute, found themselves accidentally associated with the far-right; thus the undoubtedly left-wing Morris found himself embarrassed by his membership, from good peacemaking motives, of an Anglo-German friendship society that was uncomfortably close to the Nazis.

The growth of awareness of the issues of war and pacifism, and the promotion of such awareness, happened prior to the forming of the P.P.U. as a result of the actions of others. The Oxford Union debate and the L.N.U. Ballot were two events which stirred public consciousness. The P.P.U.'s aim was to raise the profile of the debate even higher. In particular, from the point of view of political tactics, it was necessary for a single-issue campaign to have an impact on the electorate and the policy of parties that could be elected to power. Without such influence, no amount of campaigning would seriously challenge the political status quo. Arguably, this was one area in which the P.P.U. was at its weakest, especially following Lansbury's resignation from Labour Party leadership. A secure Conservative Government can resist any amount of public pressure, as was shown with C.N.D. in the 1980s. The East Fulham bye-election of 1933 was regarded as a political success, although analysis of that event indicates more complicated factors were at work. In the period under consideration, Labour's best

chance of increasing in electoral support and significance, if not - given the parlous state of the Party after 1931 - in realistically hoping for an outright electoral victory, lay with upholding the leadership of Lansbury. When he felt forced to resign, Labour's subsequent electoral frailty was exposed within weeks. The reliance of the peace movement on the Labour Party has been a constant source of disappointment throughout the century, as was shown by the volte face of the Wilson Government in 1964 and the rightward drift of the Labour Party from 1983.

In 1958, there was a suggestion made - though quickly rejected - in C.N.D. circles that there should be a "voters' veto" of parliamentary candidates who did not support the C.N.D. line.²⁶ In the 1930s, however, some Anglican pacifists had gone further by floating the concept of a strictly pacifist political party. Ursula Roberts found little support for the idea, but by the end of the decade Ronald Mallone was already taking a prominent part in the Christian pacifist Fellowship Party, (of which he remains Chairman in 1997). One attraction of such a party is that it enabled those involved and their supporters to take part in the electoral process without engaging in the compromise of beliefs that inevitably happens when people come together in a broader grouping of other political parties. Single-issue political parties have seldom, however, had much impact at the ballot-box, where the electorate is aware that it is choosing a Government whose policies would affect many different aspects of living, rather than engaging in a referendum on a single issue. Even when the issue is that of war, which in the scale of its destructive power could make other issues redundant, there has rarely been much evidence that a separate single-issue party would have an impact on the broader political landscape.

Whereas broad-based political parties have a world-view that transcends, or can adapt to, the needs of different generations, the mass appeal of single-issue campaigns is invariably short-lived. There is an inevitable ebb and flow in their fortunes. They seem to arise most strongly in periods of Conservative Government, where there is a clearly perceived external enemy and an alternative foreign policy being advocated by many within the Labour Party, if not by that Party itself. Then conditions change, and what appears to be the overriding concern of one generation is ignored by another with its own priorities. The tactical supporters of the P.P.U. in the 1930s may well have ultimately faded away whatever had happened on the international scene, just as support for the C.N.D. faded when the 1964 Labour Government refused to abolish Polaris. For the remnant, the role of the principled few throughout history has been, principally, to continue to exist, to maintain a consistent witness until the next time greater influence became possible. The few who upheld the cause of the C.N.D. until 1979 could not

have expected the sudden surge of tactical supporters they would then experience. Some joined and stayed, the new upholders of principle; many more came and, a few years later, went. The explicitly pacifist A.P.F. experienced much lower (but more stable) growth at this time. In 1998, the A.P.F., the C.N.D., the F.O.R. and the P.P.U. all continue to exist.

(e) The Rôle of the Law

As well as attempting to exert influence through constitutional political channels, by working within the law to change the law, pressure groups have often resorted to direct action, irrespective of whether such action was permitted by the laws of the state. Although, following the experience of conscientious objectors during 1914-1918, the possibility of being faced with a moral imperative to disobedience was inevitably something to be considered by every member of any pacifist organisation, the tactics of the P.P.U. (if not the Brotherhood of the Way) prior to the reintroduction of conscription in May 1939 were entirely lawful. With the change of climate caused by the outbreak of war, some Anglicans (e.g. Michael Segal²⁷) once again fell foul of recruiting legislation and were imprisoned; John Chapman even found that selling *Peace News* on the streets of Kingston was likely to be interpreted as causing an obstruction.²⁸ Prior to 1939, however, there was little suggestion that pacifists might, deliberately or otherwise, come into conflict with the law of the state.

Throughout the sixty year history of A.P.F., its members have invariably opted for constitutional methods of change. Some individuals have been prepared to confront the law where they regarded such action as acceptable (e.g. Philip Dransfield's refusal to pay that proportion of income tax which could be regarded as being spent on the military; Anne Malins' participation in symbolic 'Snowball' military-base fence-cutting actions in the 1980s), but they have been in a small minority and the A.P.F. itself has been probably the most law-abiding of all British peace groups.

The question of whether to uphold or deliberately to break the law has been far more serious for the C.N.D., in both of its phases. In 1961, Bertrand Russell resigned the Presidency on the grounds that his advocacy of direct action and the Committee of 100 made it impossible for him to work with Canon Collins, who opposed such tactics.²⁹ There were pacifists on both sides: some held that although the moral law against murder was part of a greater law that could not be overridden by the state (and hence orders to take part in war would be disobeyed), they could still accept the laws of the state in all other circumstances; others held that any relatively minor laws of the state -

e.g. on civil disorder - could be disregarded if such action helped to prevent the state itself breaking the greater moral law and using nuclear weapons. Twenty years later, most members of the C.N.D. would be law-abiding, but would have accepted that some members would choose to engage in illegal campaigning methods such as the Snowball campaign. Indeed, the C.N.D. almost seemed an establishment body in contrast to the women's peace camp at Greenham Common.

(f) Gender Issues

The Sheppard Peace Pledge started as an exclusively male concern. When Sheppard and Crozier asked for postcards to be sent to them, their request was principally directed towards those men who would be liable to be called up for military duties in the event of a future war. This constituency was chosen for two reasons: firstly as a reflection of the faith, characteristic of the period, in a "youth" that would avoid the mistakes of their older but not manifestly wiser forebears; secondly because of the political impact of being able to claim that so many thousand potential soldiers intended to resist any call to arms. Sheppard also said later that the reason he had only asked for male respondents was because he had assumed that women were naturally opposed to war in any case. It was all the more surprising therefore that when, a year later, the Pledge was opened out to women³⁰ - conscription, even if only civilian conscription, being as likely for women as for men - the uptake was relatively disappointing with only twenty thousand women signatories compared to one hundred thousand men. Ursula Roberts argued that despite women not being eligible for call-up for combat, their signature of the pledge was even more significant than men's, "for when a woman signs, the very fact of her signing is in itself an affirmation that war is not just a question of fighting, or not fighting, but of the will's consent, the will's repudiation."³¹ Although Sheppard could hardly be said to have been in the vanguard of sexual politics, he was sympathetic to the cause of women in the Church, and his support was appreciated by such women as Brittain, Roberts and Royden, with their explicitly feminist outlook.

If gender was not a particular issue during the first phase of the C.N.D., the sexual revolution and the growth of awareness of sexual politics meant that it certainly was during the second phase, with the focus being on the women's peace camp at Greenham Common. As happened with other peace groups, notably the F.O.R., the camp soon came to be the focus for a whole range of issues of which opposition to the siting of Cruise missiles was but one. Although this broadening meant that a larger constituency was embraced, the breadth also led to fracture as different groups - who might otherwise have agreed on their hostility to nuclear weapons - were unable to agree on

their overall weltanschauung. The sacrifice made by the women was undeniable - conditions at Greenham were often desperate - and their bravery (in the face of threatening bailiffs or, during direct action inside the base, U.S. military police) was sometimes inspirational. The camp, however, was often viewed as a mixed blessing by more conventional activists within the C.N.D. who saw much of the publicity generated as being counter-productive and who regarded the broadening of issues as a distraction. Although some A.P.F. members were to be involved with Greenham at different times, traditional Anglo-Catholic hostility towards anything to do with the women's movement meant that there was always an ambivalent attitude towards the camp within the Governing Body.

(g) The Relationship with Internationalism

The international situation of the day had a marked effect on the peace campaigns of the 1930s, 1960s and 1980s. Not surprisingly, given the natural human urge for self-preservation, the peace movement, especially those parts of the peace movement (such as the P.P.U. and especially the C.N.D.) which have been explicitly political in their aims, has always been at its strongest when there has been a threat of imminent war. That threat has always been greatest when international diplomacy was failing.

In the 1930s the rising sense of urgency was caused by the rise of fascism, at a time when the failure of the League of Nations and the Disarmament Conference meant that internationalist solutions were unlikely to be available. Unless Lansbury was going to be listened to, there would be no renegotiation of Versailles and no means for diplomacy to avert a new war. There was never the prospect of Munich becoming 'Peace in our time' without the political will to make it so. To pacifist eyes, Britain appeared willing to demand sacrifice from Czechoslovakia without being prepared to offer any sacrifice itself, for example with regard to colonies. The result was war.

In the period leading up to the 1960s, a nuclear arms race had led to deadly arsenals being accrued by antagonistic political systems. In the early 1960s, the Cold War was at its height, not least at the time of the Cuba Missile Crisis. Only an extraordinary game of bluff averted another war, this one nuclear. Post-1945 there had been a majority view that war was not as terrible as fascism. The realisation of the closeness of worldwide nuclear catastrophe meant that even opponents of communism came to realise that nuclear war would be worse than anything that could be imposed by an oppressive political regime.

Twenty years later a new arms race was at its height following N.A.T.O.'s decision to implement land-based Cruise missiles; the accuracy of many of the weapons systems gave both sides a first-strike capability as the others' weapons could be destroyed before being launched; nuclear weapons no longer had (if they ever did have) a deterrent effect - it became possible for political rhetoric to refer to 'winning' a nuclear war by pre-empting a nuclear attack by the other side (the atomic clock came perilously close to midnight); "star wars" research went hand in hand with S.A.L.T. negotiations - producing uncertainty over whether proliferation or reduction would win. In such a climate the demand for Britain to have nothing to do with such an arms race was understandable. It was a moral demand, with an element of self-interest as campaigners looked for Britain to become a safer place (not a target), and there was the possibility that it may have had some international influence with other nuclear nations. By this time, the peace movement itself had become an international movement, and hundreds of thousands of demonstrators were seen on the streets of many western nations.³² It is doubtful if there would have been any significant arms control negotiations if it hadn't been for the size of popular revulsion against nuclear weapons across the northern hemisphere. Ironically, it was President Gorbachev who was most prepared to make unilateral concessions in arms negotiations, leading to a reduction in international tension. Both those who argued that a strong military threat had led to concessions, and those who argued that unilateral initiatives had always been the way to progress in arms negotiations, felt that their stance had been vindicated. The subsequent political and economic collapse of the Soviet Union and its satellite states showed how the high cost of attempting to run a military-industrial economy had taken its toll in the communist east earlier than in the capitalist west. As that collapse led to many areas of political instability and the dispersion of the former Soviet military arsenal around the world, the threat to British territory became much reduced even as hopes for world peace seemed, if anything, more remote than in the time of Sheppard et al.

Crises of internationalism are periodic events, whereas, for the principled pacifist, especially the Christian pacifist, peaceful relationships between human beings are part of the divine will for creation. Thus there has been a resilience within such organisations as the A.P.F. which has retained its essential character and pledge irrespective of the peaks and troughs of international diplomacy. There would be times when the pacifist would be aligned with more general peace campaigners the better to achieve intermediate goals, such as the abolition of nuclear weapons, but the pacifist faith remained unaffected by issues of pragmatism and short-term goals. For the Anglican pacifist, of 1997 as much as 1937, the principal goal is to convince other Christians that their faith necessarily implies the total renunciation of all war. Ephemeral

political campaigns are of but passing interest in the time scale of the Kingdom of God.

PACIFIST CAMPAIGNING: ENDNOTES

1. Participants at Somerville included Anglican pacifists Percy Hartill, Stuart Morris, Charles Raven, Maude Royden, and the Marquis of Tavistock. Others included Bishop Bell, Professor G. J. Heering (Chairman of the International Association of Anti-Militarist Clergymen), Siegmund-Schültze and - indicating the breadth of the movement - Lord Robert Cecil from the League of Nations Union. (*Reconciliation*, May 1931, p336; den Boggende, p364 and note.) Significantly, the preamble to the campaign's final message to the Churches included the rider, "Leaving on one side the question of the use of armed forces for police purposes...."
2. Thus, when St. Clair Donaldson, Bishop of Salisbury, spoke in Manchester on 20 May 1930 his anti-pacifist address clashed with that of Herbert Gray. (den Boggende, p363.) Other Anglican speakers during the campaign included: the Bishops of Chichester, Winchester, Kingston, and Chelmsford; Canons Donaldson and Raven; and the Marquis of Tavistock. The latter spoke at the opening assembly, complaining that "In England at the present time there is an enormous demand for a Church which approves of war under certain circumstances; a church which has chaplains in the army and navy who teach their men portions of Christ's doctrine but refrain from any comment on the mind of Christ on the actual question of their profession. Such a church might have a claim to be called a church of England, but do not call it the Church of Christ." (*Reconciliation*, November 1929, p203.)
3. Sheppard was on the council and W. C. Roberts on the executive.
4. Sheppard to Brittain, 6 July 1936. Brittain had initially raised this issue. Her criticism may have been a little unfair as the correspondence followed her conversion at a Dorchester rally which had, after all, been organised by the F.O.R.
5. There was a complaint at one time that the P.P.U. journal *Peace News* was too Christian. (*Peace News*, 30 January 1937.)
6. *Is War Obsolete*, p26. Cited in Ceadel, *Christian Pacifism in the Era of Two World Wars*, p400.
7. A.P.F. membership was 1,500 in 1939, 2,500 in 1940 and 2,600 in 1945. The P.P.U. membership peaked at 136,000 in April 1940, but declined to 98,000 by 1945.
8. Gertrude Fishwick, Anglican pacifist and founder of the Golders Green Committee for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons Tests in 1955, was instrumental in the process which led to the founding of C.N.D. (Christopher Driver, *The Disarmers*, cited in Minnion and Bolsover, p13.)
9. Collins was a conservative minor canon on the staff of St. Paul's in the days of Sheppard. (*Faith Under Fire*, p149,150.)
10. Duff, p127.
11. L. J. Collins, *Faith Under Fire*, p98.
12. L. J. Collins, *Faith Under Fire*, p294.
13. L. J. Collins, *Faith Under Fire*, p296. With the Hampstead-based National Committee for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons Tests considering a move on to the national stage, J. B. Priestley published an inspiring article on "Britain and the Nuclear Bomb" in the *Statesman* magazine, edited by

Kingsley Martin, in November 1957. With increasing demand for a prominent figure to lead a national campaign against the bomb, Peggy Duff introduced John Collins to Priestley and the decision that Collins should become Chairman was taken at a meeting in Amen Court on 16 January 1958. (Diana Collins, *Partners in Protest*, p230 and Peggy Duff, *Left, Left, Left*, p120,121.) Following the initial rally at Central Hall, Westminster on 17 February 1958, the policy of the group organisation was described thus: "The purpose of the Campaign is to press for a British initiative to reduce the nuclear peril and to stop the armaments race. We shall seek to persuade the British people that Britain must:

- (a) renounce unconditionally the use or production of nuclear weapons, and refuse to allow their use by others in her defence;
- (b) use her utmost endeavour to bring about negotiations at all levels for agreement to end the armaments race and to lead to a general disarmament convention;
- (c) invite the co-operation of other nations, particularly non-nuclear powers, in the renunciation of nuclear weapons." (J. Minnion and P. Bolsover, *The CND Story*, p10.)

14. Bruce Kent, *Undiscovered Ends*, p168,169.

15. Bruce Kent, *Undiscovered Ends*, p93-107.

16. Morris' marriage broke up at the end of the 1930s; in due course he married again. He was clear when he succeeded the late Dick Sheppard at the helm of the P.P.U. that his personal circumstances would make it impossible for him to continue in the Diocese of Birmingham.

Kent was informed by Cardinal Hume that working for peace was incompatible with a priestly vocation. His subsequent marriage to Valerie Flessati, former General Secretary of Pax Christi, completed the break.

17. *We Say No*, p154.

18. *We Say No*, p157.

19. *Peace News*, 22 August 1936.

20. Minnion and Bolsover, p14; Duff, p121-125.

21. The first secretary was Margery Rayne, who had to process pledges arriving at the rate of two hundred a day.

22. Duff, p155.

23. Flessati, *Waking the Sleeping Giant*, p49.

24. For example in his account *Homage to Catalonia*, where the writer's initial enthusiasm for the fight degenerates into despair as faction is turned upon faction.

25. Gollancz, *Fascists at Olympia*, p11. (In Brittain archive, McMaster.)

26. Minnion and Bolsover, p17.

27. Michael Segal in conversation with CB, 11 December 1992.

28. John Chapman in conversation with CB, 31 October 1992.

29. Diana Collins, p250.

30. E.g. *Church of England Newspaper*, 10 July 1936, p13.

31. *Peace News*, 23 April 1938.

32. There had been co-ordination between peace groups in the first wave. There were demonstrations in Germany in 1958 to protest against the installation of new N.A.T.O. nuclear weapons. The European Federation Against Nuclear Arms was set up in 1959. (Minnion and Bolsover, p15-17.)

PACIFIST POLITICS IN THE 1930s

To a principled pacifist, the political consequences of pacifism would not have affected any sense of the eschatological rightness of pacifism, the sense that ultimately (which could be regarded as including the political long term) the pacifist stand would be vindicated. Any immediate situation of violence or the threat of violence would be tested against the eschatological standard and options of violence would be rejected. Yet, many would still have held that pacifism was in any case the best policy in immediate practical conflicts. It was this argument which led to so many tactical pacifists joining the Peace Pledge Union in the mid-1930s, in order that the Government would be forced to pursue a foreign and economic policy, such as proposed by Lansbury, in which war would not be an option. With the Government decision to go to war in September 1939, any and every policy can be considered as having failed. Certainly the policies of the Conservative Government, in power - or at least the major coalition partner - for all but three years in the period 1915-1945, failed at vast human cost. Yet pacifists failed too, in that they were unable to break the stranglehold that Conservative policies held over the British people. For all the efforts of Sheppard, Lansbury, et al, the Government drifted towards international disaster faster than any domestic campaign could alert enough people to the need for a radical pacifist alternative.

In that accumulated Government policies contributed to a disastrous world war, a pacifist alternative could hardly have been any more costly. Appeasement, for example, though tolerated by some pacifists (as by the general public) for providing further opportunities to search for genuine peace, was condemned by other pacifists, Lansbury included. The pacifist critique of appeasement included a rejection of any policy which demanded concessions from others which Britain itself was not prepared to offer, and opposition to the maintenance of the status quo (as far as Britain was concerned) at a time when only a redistribution of world economic and political power and a rethinking of 19th century attitudes to imperialism could provide a lasting basis for peace with justice.

The Legacy of Versailles

The Treaty of Versailles brought one war to a close and started the countdown to another. For all the hopes of peace and the expressions of "never again" that accompanied the signing of the agreement in 1919, there were those who even then could see in it the seeds of future conflict. Even the Covenant of the League of Nations was a pale reflection of the ideal its protagonists had argued for in preceding

generations, and the exclusion of Germany and the non-participation of the United States weakened the institution still further. For a decade, though, it was possible to hope that lasting peace might be possible, a decade when the popularity of the League of Nations Union was at its peak, when the League seemed to be the mechanism for war-prevention, when the prospect of significant international disarmament appeared a realistic possibility, and when Germany's economic problems were regarded as an internal affair. The highpoint of optimism was the international agreement in 1928 that war, or at least some war, was contrary to international law. Lawful or not, within a few months the midpoint was reached - the next war would be closer than the all too painful last. The shortcomings of the Versailles Treaty were becoming increasingly apparent.

The Treaty of Versailles was intended to usher in a new era both in the handling of international conflict and in the prevention of such conflict through disarmament. Each of these issues, however, came to a head in the 1930s.

(a) Diplomacy and the Threat of War

The hope in the mid 1920s was that diplomatic progress would be made to bring a lasting peace out of the unsatisfactory texts of Versailles. The Locarno Pact of 1925, signed by Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Poland and Czechoslovakia, attempted to guarantee a demilitarized Rhineland, and the permanence of Germany's western (but not eastern) borders. At the time it was seen as a step towards a more stable and peaceful Europe.

The principal focus of hope was the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928,¹ welcomed by a variety of religious leaders across Britain and the U.S. The difficulty for pacifists was that war waged by the League was not ruled out by the Pact, and indeed Article XVI of the League's Covenant specifically permitted it. The Versailles documents also proposed a series of measures which, depending on one's viewpoint, could either be regarded as substitutes for war, or actions likely to prevent war, or conversely actions likely to begin the build-up to war. Chief of these actions was the possible imposition of international sanctions. Most pacifists held that sanctions could only be imposed on a recalcitrant nation by an international armed force which would take military measures to uphold the sanctions. Pacifists believed not only that the suffering of innocent civilians through sanctions was morally unacceptable, but also that attempts to enforce sanctions militarily could make war more rather than less likely.² They argued that the basis of any policy of sanctions was the assumption that war was the ultimate sanction.

If, in the future, economic sanctions were felt not to have worked, then war waged by the League would be the inevitable next step. In practice, the League never did take military action in the crises it had to face and the uncertainty concerning its rôle led to it making little impact on the various conflicts of the 1930s.

A major challenge for the League was the Japanese attack on Manchuria in 1931. When Gray, Royden and Sheppard informed the Secretary General of the League of Nations of their proposal for a Peace Army, under League control, they said that it was vital for the League to “employ all possible means of constraint - short of killing and the withholding of necessary food - in order to stop the fighting.”³ The Peace Army concept was rejected by the League, and condemnation of Japanese action was ruled out by those, principally Britain, which valued trading links with Japan. Instead, the Lytton Commission was set up to investigate the Manchurian situation, with the findings upholding most Japanese grievances whilst condemning the use of force, a condemnation which led to Japanese withdrawal from the League. An uneasy settlement was reached between China and Japan, whilst public opinion, perhaps harshly, regarded the incident as a betrayal of the League by the British Government.

In 1935, the League of Nations was faced with the far greater crisis of Italian aggression towards Abyssinia, and the greater instability it brought with it. Would Germany follow the Italian example and invade Austria? Would the Soviet Union exploit the instability for its own ends? Would France and Britain intervene militarily, as many urged them to do?

In response to the crisis, Sheppard called the first great Albert Hall meeting of his Pledge signatories, on 14 July, and told them unequivocally that “War is not merely suicidal, futile and damnable, but at all times and in all circumstances contrary to the mind of God and a blasphemous betrayal of the future of man.”⁴ Lansbury wrote to the *Times* advocating papal intervention and calling on the League of Nations to summon a world economic conference to consider the grievances of nations like Italy which felt the post-1919 allocation of colonies was inequitable. Raven, preaching in Liverpool Cathedral, supported Lansbury’s call and warned of the consequences of any clash of rival imperialisms; in any case, he said, if it was wrong for one people to exercise sole dominion over another, then Britain should set a good example. The League must not become an instrument for the maintenance of the status quo.⁵ He reiterated this argument in a C.C.P.G. rally at Westminster in September, when referring to the Kellogg-Briand Pact: “if we have outlawed war, as the nations have solemnly agreed to do, we cannot base our international policy upon it.”⁶

Such arguments, however, had little effect within the sphere of party politics, as Lansbury found to his cost the following month. The message of peace through anti-imperialism was defeated by the belief that the League of Nations, though regarded by some as little more than a club of 1918 winners, should be the self-appointed, highly armed police force of the world. Yet despite the Hoare-Laval diplomatic "solution" being rejected (it was later likened to the Munich agreement of 1938), the leading governments of the League could not bring themselves to increase the level of violence as permitted by the Covenant. Opposed to pacifism, unable to succeed with diplomacy yet unwilling to initiate the international war to which its own logic pointed, the League plummeted into further disrepute whilst Italy was seen to benefit from its imperialist and military adventure.

The final downfall in the League's credibility came in 1936, with the final defeat of Abyssinia, the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and the major bloodshed of the Spanish Civil War. On the first of these, Morris argued that it was not enough to save the Abyssinian victims of violence: "We have to save Italy as well - to proclaim a way of life which will lead the whole world to peace."⁷ That meant Britain being willing to share the pain in a Peace Conference which would address wider grievances.

If any single event was a turning point, it was the German re-occupation of the Rhineland on 7 March. A. J. P. Taylor commented that "The last remnants of Versailles had gone, and Locarno with them. It was the end of an epoch: the capital of 'victory' was exhausted."⁸ The British Government was less concerned over the fact of the occupation - which it favoured, albeit through a new Locarno agreement - than with the timing. Diplomacy, however, had been too slow to deliver justice, and the lesson that had been learnt by the Nazi Government in Germany was that direct military action brought results. Internationalism and collective security failed in a situation where implementing the pacifists' policies could have avoided a crisis.

For all the meddling of other nations, not least Italy, the tragic Civil War in Spain, following Franco's revolt in Spanish Morocco in July, was regarded as more of an internal than an international crisis. Despite that, for some that confirmed the ineptitude of the League of Nations. The might of the Roman Catholic Church was aligned with the fascists, whilst those on the Left were moved to support the Republicans, with many, like Orwell, joining the fighting forces. Vera Brittain was not impressed by such actions. "I detest Fascism and all that it stands for," she wrote, "but I do not believe that we shall destroy it by fighting it. And," she added, "I do not feel that we serve either the Spanish people or the cause of civilisation by continuing to make Spain the battle-

ground for a new series of Wars of Religion.”⁹ Throughout the long drawn out struggle, many socialist Christian pacifists felt alienated by both sides. All that could practically be done was to offer care and support. The W.R.I. and the P.P.U. worked together to distribute food and clothing in Valencia and Almeria.¹⁰ The Society of Friends took care of refugees fleeing from south and east from Madrid and Malaga.¹¹ Representatives of the Embassies of Reconciliation did visit Spain early in 1937, but were only granted limited access.¹² Barnes, Brittain, Lansbury, Raven and Sheppard, with other pacifists in Britain, France and the United States, argued for military non-intervention linked with active peacemaking by neutral groups or governments in order to secure a settlement which would “secure for all classes in Spain more than could possibly be secured by peace through exhaustion, and more than could ultimately be retained through victory by force of arms.”¹³

For most of the British public, the principal effect of the war in Spain was the realisation of just how far military technology had developed since 1918, particularly in the light of the failure of the Disarmament Conference. Non-pacifists were driven ever closer to pacifism by the scale and nature of the war in Spain. After the horrific bombing of Guernica in April 1937, the influential journalist Canon Peter Green wrote to the *Manchester Guardian*,

A man may say what he likes about the Guernica horror, he may pile adjective on adjective and sentence on sentence and when he has filled a column and a half he will have said nothing bad enough for this awful massacre of innocent non-combatants. But it could all have been expressed in four words: ‘THIS IS MODERN WAR’.

What we want to do is not to try to limit the horrors of war but to remove its causes. And that can only be done by an international conference which will honestly weigh all national grievances and needs.¹⁴

(b) Disarmament

Germany could only be made to accept the enforced disarmament of 1919 if it was accompanied by a general disarmament of its neighbours - the expressed hope of Versailles. After prevarication throughout the 1920s (there were minor naval agreements signed in Washington in 1922, Geneva in 1927 and London in 1930), a full-scale Disarmament Conference finally began in Geneva in February 1932, under the Chairmanship of the former Labour M.P. Arthur Henderson, at the same time as the Manchuria Crisis and the proposals for a Peace Army. By then the kairos had been missed. The crisis in the Far East did not help. Russia’s demands for total disarmament were rejected out of hand. Britain’s deplorable contribution, via the 1933 Air

Disarmament Conference, was its insistence on retaining bombing aircraft at a time when all other nations were prepared to outlaw that method of warfare. It was not that the British Prime Minister, Baldwin, was ignorant of the effects of aerial warfare. On 10 November 1932, in a speech that was to be much cited by pacifists in the months ahead, he told the House of Commons:

I think it is well for the man in the street to realize that there is no power on earth that can protect him from being bombed. Whatever people may tell him, the bomber will always get through.... [T]he only defence is in offence, which means that you have to kill more women and children more quickly than the enemy if you want to save yourselves.¹⁵

Apparently the Government believed that the capability to commit aerial slaughter was essential for the perpetuation of the British Empire, and in particular a useful “policing” technique on the North-West frontier of India. C. F. Andrews was dismayed that India should be used as the excuse for such a policy, especially when Lord Londonderry, the Secretary of State for Air, proudly boasted that when abolition was being discussed, he “had the utmost difficulty, amidst the public outcry, in preserving the use of the bombing aeroplane.”¹⁶ In demanding that “air-bombing for police purposes in certain outlying districts” should be exempted from abolition, the British Government not only deprived themselves of the moral initiative but allowed the world-wide retention of weaponry that would soon cause immense destruction, not least in Britain itself.¹⁷ Only seven years later British cities were devastated and thousands of people were killed by a form of warfare that, in 1932 at any rate, Britain alone was responsible for continuing.

In June 1933 a huge crowd gathered both inside and outside Birmingham Parish Church to protest at what the *Church of England Newspaper* called the “cold-blooded declaration of the British representative at Geneva.” The Rector, Canon Guy Rogers, begged “most earnestly for a reconsideration of the national policy.” Bishop Barnes pointed out that all other nations had agreed to forego the practice of bombing from the air. He forcefully contended that “to permit such methods to be used for police purposes in outlying regions is dangerous to the morale of the world.” He added, “Civilisation rests on moral bases. Destroy such bases and it is doomed.”¹⁸ Even an ex-major, C. Claxton-Turner, realised the terrible significance of the Government policy. Not only did he object to the indiscriminate effects of aerial bombing¹⁹, he held that it was “indefensible to retard the Disarmament of the whole civilised world in order to retain police forces for isolated cases.” With portentous accuracy he added that “England as an island is far more susceptible to enemy bombing than to any other form of attack.”²⁰ It could be argued that the future casualties of the blitz in London, Coventry, Portsmouth

and other British cities, were in part victims of the British Government's determination to hold on to the Empire by whatever violent means it had at its disposal. Following the timidity of Anglican leaders (Bell excepted) with regards to protesting against the obliteration bombing of civilian targets, such aerial bombing became regarded as morally acceptable.²¹ Vera Brittain regarded the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 as "the logical development of obliteration bombing."²² The failure of the British people and government to embrace pacifism in the 1930s not only contributed to the millions of casualties of 1939-1945 but also led to nearly half a century of Cold War which could, at any moment, have brought the world to its knees in a nuclear holocaust. In the absence of complete nuclear disarmament, it may yet.

In the chamber of the Disarmament Conference, Germany demanded parity of armaments with France and Britain, either by others reducing to the German level or by allowing Germany to increase to theirs. France, fearing for its national security, was adamant in refusing this, unless German compliance could be enforced, militarily if necessary (i.e. by instigating another war). Germany walked out, only to return a few months later. By then Hitler was Chancellor, and on 14 October 1933 he withdrew Germany permanently from the Conference and, the following week, from the League of Nations. Henderson continued to try to promote the Conference. On 15 December he spoke warmly of Lambeth Resolution 27 (on conciliation) to a gathering of over forty prominent Christians, including Dearmer, Gray and Carter, held at the house of Canon Carpenter, Master of the Temple.²³ The Disarmament Conference reconvened briefly in May 1934, but by then the agenda had shifted significantly from promoting disarmament to restricting rearmament. Henderson was awarded the 1934 Nobel Peace Prize for all his efforts, but the Disarmament Conference, the world's greatest hope for peace since 1918, had been a failure. As the Disarmament Conference ended in disarray, Hitler was left with greater determination than ever to rearm, and opportunity to do so. The failure in diplomacy by narrow and nationalistic politicians, rather than the presence of a pacifist minority in Britain, was a factor in subsequent German rearmament.²⁴

Realism

When tactical pacifists such as Royden moved to support the war against Hitler it was because they no longer believed that there was nothing worse than war; the horror of Nazism, most Britons held, was even worse than the horror of war. But the horror of Nazism was rooted in the policies which had enabled Hitler to come to power, which had reinforced the alienation of the German people with the vengeful peace of 1919,

who then looked to reverse the shame of an impoverished nation and looked to fascism to restore their pride. The pacifist case was that the 1918 victors, especially but not exclusively the French, part of whose country had been devastated by war, failed to see a wider reality beyond their own immediate concerns. The consequences of the reparations demanded by the French at Versailles, and the resolve of the British to retain the advantages of Empire, were amongst the factors permitting or promoting the subsequent rise of fascism in Europe and a Second World War. Whatever the likely effectiveness of pacifist policies, it was the anti-pacifist policy of collective security, often motivated by national self-interest, which failed to bring disarmament, international confidence and freedom from fascism and which ultimately led to war.

1930s pacifists are often regarded as naïve and unrealistic in the face of the complex political realities of their age,²⁵ their pacifism being a soft option which avoided difficult questions of facing up to the reality of evil. There was indeed a lack of tactical realism in the belief that it might be possible to get so many men to sign up that the British Government would be forced to abandon the option of war as an instrument of foreign policy. Yet, with regard to national policies, pacifism was no more impractical or unrealistic than the policies which were actually followed, with such disastrous consequences. Speculation may be futile, but a Lansbury Government, following pacifist principles and policy, could have gone some way to removing the suspicions that bred rearmament and war. It would certainly have played a more positive role in the Disarmament Conference, the costly failure of which contributed to the subsequent rearming of Germany. Pacifist policies, by increasing the chances of international agreement, were more likely to have prevented war, with its subsequent increase in persecution for Jews, travellers, gays, communists.²⁶ Undoubtedly there were errors and inconsistencies in aspects of the pacifists' ideas, but they could not have had a worse effect than the policies actually carried out by European governments in the 1930s. Far from being a comical figure, Lansbury may have been the most realistic politician in Britain. Yet he became the lonely prophet who would speak to the people though the people would not hear. An outspoken opponent of Empire, who would have reduced German envy at British wealth by liberating much of the world from British hegemony, he was prepared, even to the last, to try the only possible route he could see - an economic conference - to bring about a more just peace than Versailles. As the world slid into another war, pacifists found no consolation in having been the greater realists.

PACIFIST POLITICS IN THE 1930s: ENDNOTES

1. "We the undersigned clergy and ministers of religion, in loyalty to our respective countries and in the conviction that the welfare of each country is linked indissolubly with friendship for the other, unite in the following message, with the earnest hope that it may help to crystallise the thoughts which we believe are forming among multitudes of men and women in Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the time has come when the world must have done with war in fact, in expectation, and in planning.

We believe that another collision between great nations would be an assault upon civilisation and an offence against God, and we believe that the intelligence and the conscience of this generation are able to build the structure of a permanent peace.

We hail, as a standard around which the thought and will of the world can rally, the Multilateral Treaty against war, signed by representatives of Great Britain and the United States and others of the great nations, renouncing war and embodying the pledge of the signatory nations that 'the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.'

We believe that our nations when they signed this pledge meant what they said, and that a growing determination to make the Treaty effective must lift it above all doubt and contradiction.

We believe that the paramount obligation of political leaders in our respective governments is to shape the policies and programmes of these countries in accord with the Treaty renouncing war, to the end that the whole psychology of supposedly hostile interests and competitive armaments may be transformed into the creative faith which shall build and strengthen those arbitral treaties, courts of justice, and covenants between the nations by which peace can be assured.

As patriots, loyal to the solemn promise of our respective countries to renounce war, and as believers in a better future for the world which our nations can help to assure, we hereby pledge ourselves as individuals, to accept in spirit and in fact the words of the Treaty which we have already quoted; to discountenance any and all but pacific means for the settlement of disputes or conflicts; and to do our utmost to rally men and women of goodwill to unite with us in this same determination." (*Goodwill*, Vol.4, No. 3, 15 July 1929, p113-119.)

2. A general change in perspective was apparent some fifty years later at the time of the Gulf War, when pacifists, sometimes hesitantly, were prepared to embrace sanctions against Iraq on condition that the embargo excluded medicines and food ("if your enemies are hungry, feed them" - Romans 12.20.) Far more selective sanctions had been an effective tactic for change in Southern Africa, with patience, and the feeling at the time of the Gulf War was that, again given more patience than western governments were prepared to show, sanctions were more likely to prevent a war than cause one. In the 1930s, however, they were quite clearly perceived as the first step on the path to war.

3. *Manchester Guardian*, 26 February 1932.

4. *Church of England Newspaper*, 19 July 1935, p2.

5. *Times*, 9 September 1935.

6. *Reconciliation*, October 1935, p263,264.

7. *Reconciliation* February 1936, p32-36. Also available as a separate F.O.R. pamphlet, *Christianity and War!*, April 1936.

8. *Origins*, p100.

9. *Left Review*, 37. (McMaster, G527.) Brittain was well aware of the horrific reality of fascism, indeed her conversion to Christian pacifism came only three months after she witnessed large Goering and Hitler rallies in Nazi Germany in March 1936. (*Testament of Experience*, p148-155.)

Like Brittain, Lansbury was unimpressed with those on the Left who wanted to counter fascism by an international class war. At a rally in Penistone he said : "The terrible civil war in Spain is one more warning to us that we are living on the edge of a powder magazine which at any moment may send us all back to barbarism.... It is the duty of all Christian nations to cooperate in a great endeavour, by peaceful persuasion, to bring to an end the frightful happenings in Spain.... Those who condemn human slaughter must do so at all times.... Governments cannot teach their youth how to disembowel others or how to use bombs and poison gas for the interests of the nation without others teaching the same damnable doctrine in connection with class warfare." (*Peace News*, 29 August 1936.)

10. *Peace News*, 13 February 1937, p1.

11. *Reconciliation*, May 1937, p114.

12. den Boggende, p437.

13. *Friend*, 23 July 1937.

14. Cited in *Peace News*, 8 May 1937. Following the Guernica bombing, Lansbury, Raven, Morris, Sheppard, Barnes and others wrote to the *Times* under the name of the Embassies of Reconciliation, urging the British Government to put pressure on both sides in Spain to agree not to use aerial bombardment in pursuit of their cause. The signatories added, "Our appeal for this one measure of abatement does not in any way lessen our opposition to all war." (10 May 1937, cited in *Reconciliation*, June 1937, p163.)

15. Cited in Hartill, *Pacifism and Christian Common Sense*, p37.

16. Cited in *Time and Tide*, 6 November 1937, p1466. Charles Stewart Henry Vane-Tempest-Stewart was the seventh marquess of Londonderry. With a background of Eton, Sandhurst and the Guards, he became a Conservative M.P. in 1906 and inherited his title in 1915.

17. Cited in Macnicol, p71,72; Chaturvedi and Sykes, p282.

18. *Church of England Newspaper*, 23 June 1933, p8.

19. *Church of England Newspaper*, 14 July 1933, p12.

20. *Church of England Newspaper*, 28 July 1933, p13.

21. When a delegation from the A.P.F. (Hartill, Le Messurier and Raven) met with the Archbishops at Lambeth on 11 June 1940, they were assured that the Church would have to protest "if the bombing of open towns were undertaken, not as a reprisal, but as a part of our national policy." When such a policy was indeed carried out later in the war, the Archbishops remained silent.

22. *Testament of Experience*, p374.

23. *Friend*, 22 December 1933, p1157.

24. The British Government wanted a strong Germany to counter Russian communism. In November 1937, Halifax praised Nazi Germany for being "the bulwark of Europe against Bolshevism." He had also indicated that there could be "possible alterations" with regards to Austria, Danzig and Czechoslovakia. The next month Eden told Ribbentrop that people expected "a closer connection between Germany and Austria." (Taylor, *Origins*, p137.) The Anschluss, the German annexation of Austria, occurred on 13 March 1938.

25. Such is the underlying tone of, e.g., Ceadel's *Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945*.

26. Attitudes and events inevitably build upon what has gone before. As Taylor wrote, "statesmen are too absorbed by events to follow a preconceived plan. They take one step, and the next follows from it." Thus, although Hitler openly acknowledged his anti-semitic prejudices in 1925 in *Mein Kampf* (blaming the Jews in reaction to Anglo-French insistence on German war-guilt and the need for economically crippling reparations), and although from 1932 he "initiated measures against the Jews which were nothing less than a return to the worst cruelties of the Middle Ages," (Royden, *The Problem of Palestine*, p102) and although severe repression of the Jews occurred increasingly in the 1930s (e.g. Kristallnacht in 1938), the decision to proceed with the so-called 'final solution' was not made until well into the war, that is to say not until unmitigated violence in pursuit of one's ambitions had been accepted as a policy by all sides. The worst excesses of the holocaust, the "final solution," occurred during the war and, arguably, were the product of the war that the pacifists had tried harder than anyone to avoid. Commenting in 1945 on Hitler's atrocities Vera Brittain argued that "not one of the possible alternatives to war which our leaders rejected in and before 1939, could have brought so terrible a fate to so large a proportion of mankind and to its habitations." (*Letter to Peacelovers*, 19 April 1945.) Three years earlier she had noted that the "Degree to which Jewish suffering has been extended by war is immeasurable; the worst peace would not have caused one-tenth of it." (11 December 1942. *Wartime Chronicle*, p198. It was not until 17 December that Eden made the first public statement to the House of Commons that the Nazis were attempting genocide.)

Pacifist defence of the Jews in the 1930s may also have been inadequate, especially from those embracing Social Credit economic theories, and, given that pacifism attracted people from a wide variety of backgrounds and beliefs, it was inevitable that some - liberals and anarchists especially - did hold too high an opinion of human nature, thinking that the true scale of repression was beyond human capacity for evil, not conceiving the horrific depths to which humanity could sink, their political judgement clouded by wishful-thinking. Few of those with first-hand experience of 1914-1918 had such delusions; they knew too well the horrors of which human beings were capable. The leading pacifists were neither blind through wishful-thinking nor starry-eyed. Knowing the depths of human potential, they were spurred on even more to strive for the heights. The human capacity for depravity was not regarded as a sufficient excuse for militarism, for relying on evil to cast out evil. Sheppard's message was that sinfulness was to be overcome by good, by encouraging people to reach for the height of their human capabilities rather than to trawl the depths. In that, the first step was to reduce temptation, i.e. to restore such a sense of justice through an economic conference that the Nazis would lose much of their appeal and there would be no excuse for other Germans to scapegoat the Jews.

Most pacifists in the 1930s were neither more nor less aware than the rest of the British public of the persecution of the Jews. Some, involved in the Embassies of Reconciliation, were in constant contact with Jewish leaders in Britain in order to help counter anti-semitism, holding a day of intercession on 17 July 1938 (*Embassies of Reconciliation*, pamphlet, 1938, p9,10); Sybil Thorndike joined with the Archbishops and others in issuing an appeal for - mainly Jewish - refugees from Nazi Germany (*Church of England Newspaper*, 24 November 1933, p12); others, for example Ursula and W. C. Roberts (Miles, *Portrait of a Parson*, p80) took in Jewish refugees themselves; but all remained convinced that pacifism was right and/or the best policy. Raven was involved in discussions, not least with the Bishop in Jerusalem, to consider the destination of the increasing number of Jewish refugees from central

Europe (*Embassies of Reconciliation*, pamphlet, 1938, p16,17.) Royden, at the time in the late 1930s when she was aligned with the P.P.U. as a tactical pacifist, considered very carefully the implications of homeland policies both for Jewish and Palestinian people, and for parts of the British Empire which could have been made available, and she wrote and lectured on the issues involved (e.g. *The Problem of Palestine*, published in 1939.)

The British Government did not make any significant stand against the Nazi persecution of the Jews in the 1930s, and, like its U.S. counterpart, even limited numbers of refugees coming into the country. (Royden, *The Problem of Palestine*, p133f.) Vera Brittain noted in her *Letter to Peacelovers*, 3 May 1945 that "Amid the outbreak of horror which the conditions found in the camps have produced, it is necessary to remember that not only German civilians but, between 1933 and 1939, many responsible British politicians ignored their cruelties despite warnings by ... reliable refugees." If pacifists could be accused of limited vision in that period, so could many others. Although the wartime Government was willing to use bombing aircraft against civilian populations in Germany, no attempt was made to destroy railway lines known to be taking thousands of Jews to extermination camps.

After the war, pacifists were frequently challenged about how they might have better defended the Jewish populations of Central Europe. Implicit in the question was an *a posteriori* casuistry which came to justify the war on the grounds that it rescued the Jews and ended the Holocaust. After any war the dominant historical writing is produced by the victors, justifying their own behaviour, even their crimes and excesses. Yet in 1939, Britain did not go to war to uphold the rights of Jews nor even to defend the British mainland, but, as in 1914, as a result of international treaties and alliances. As Nazi domination of Central Europe spread, encompassing Austria and, especially after March 1939, Czechoslovakia, the threat to Poland (and hence to Britain, its ally) increased. The tragic irony was that the final spark which lit the pyre of war was the need to defend and liberate Poland, yet the Polish people were not effectively liberated until 1989, after sixty years of repression.

PACIFISM AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

The Church and the Nation's People

The Introduction traced the tradition of Anglican pacifists back to William Law. It has clearly been possible for a significant minority of Anglican men and women to uphold their Anglican spirituality, theology and outlook at the same time as advocating pacifism. That this may seem incongruous is due to the nature of the Church of England itself.

The Church of England is the Established Church of the land, that is, it is established by law to be the national Church. With such establishment come responsibilities towards all the people of the nation as well as a particular rôle within the structure of the nation state. In the early years of the Church of England's existence, the membership of Church and nation were regarded as being the same. In Hooker's words of 1648: "We hold that seeing there is not any man of the Church of England but the same is also a member of the commonwealth; nor any member of the commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England."¹

Even in the 1930s, it would have been assumed that an English man or woman was 'Church of England' unless otherwise stated. It did not necessarily imply that membership was regarded as being bestowed less by baptism than by mere virtue of being English; a large proportion of the population (or at least the middle classes) brought their children to be baptised in any case.² With every citizen having certain rights (e.g. to a marriage ceremony) regarding 'their' parish church, and every parish priest having some degree of pastoral responsibility for all people in his parish, there was a strong correlation between the Church and the English (especially middle class) people. Hence an upper-middle class figure like Sheppard, when establishing a pacifist campaign, was less interested in a denominational movement (he first left that to Morris and then to the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship) than in reaching the whole country. His Anglicanism meant that he saw the whole country as his parish, not only the church attenders. Although he was himself a passionately committed Christian, and much of his pacifism was expressed in explicitly Christian language, he was also aware that his was not the only approach. Not only did he promote ecumenism, but he also realised that not every person was Christian; thus he was able to be sympathetic to the claims that peace rallies were too religious. Opening meetings with prayer or Bible reading "so often chokes off just the right fellow," he told Vera Brittain.³ Despite Sheppard's promise "to scotch it", one choked off fellow complained that the movement's journal,

Peace News, was too Christian.⁴ Even figures for whom the Christianity was more an academic challenge than a living faith - Max Plowman and Laurence Housman, for example - would still express their moral arguments in explicitly Christian language. It reflected their upbringing, and the assumptions of their class. When the League of Nations Peace Ballot of 1934 was extended to allow for a pacifist position, the statement that participants were given to respond to was "I accept the Christian Pacifist attitude." Despite the diverse array of approaches to war resistance in 1914-1918, the public perception was that pacifism was necessarily Christian and that Christian pacifism was a clear philosophy with singular expression. In later years, with society becoming more secular, the P.P.U. became almost hostile to religious argument; but in the 1930s, Christianity - and Anglican Christianity at that - was the dominant outlook within the pacifist movement, and assumed to be so by those who observed from the outside.

The Church and the Militarised Nation State

The institutional beginning of the Church of England can be regarded as dating from the Act of Supremacy and associated measures of 1534. As one modern critic expressed it, within a two year period of legislation the Church of England passed from being

an England-located branch of a great trans-national company with headquarters in Rome to being a department of state whereby the monarch in Parliament catered for the religious welfare of his subjects.... [T]he State and the Church were one and the same people, under one and the same legislature, a legislature with a God-given charter to control and direct the whole way of life of all the subjects of the king, whether fiscal, or moral, or religious.... Thus the Church of England, through its Head and its organs of self-government, had both rid itself of any external claims to dominion over it from abroad, and had consolidated its own unity, as its very existence was merged into the common citizenship of the land. The whole Church of England was now sustained through the normal administrative power of the State organs of government over any department of State.⁵

Theories of the Divine Right of Kings perished with the dethronement of James II in 1689.⁶ Toleration of nonconformists followed, with the acceptance in law that the Church of England was less numerically than the total people of England and Wales, as governed by Parliament. With the 1707 union between England and Scotland, Parliament came to include men from beyond the frontiers of the Church of England (there being no union with the Presbyterian Church of Scotland). Within the Church of England, however, a new conformity was enforced, to the detriment of those who refused to revoke their oath of allegiance to the old king and swear again allegiance to the new regime. William Law was one such non-juror, and his subsequent persecution

encouraged in him that independence of thought that was ultimately to lead him to pacifism.

The Church of England has always had a totally different legal position from other denominations, with unique rights and responsibilities. With these responsibilities have been associated considerable privileges and historic wealth. At the forefront of the privileges was the position of monarch as head of the Church, of bishops - appointed by the government - in the House of Lords, and of parliamentary control of ecclesiastical legislation - an issue to the fore in the debate over the 1928 Prayer Book. In an era when bishops and many clergy would have been drawn from the upper classes, all this seemed natural to many: the Church was still sufficiently independent to have the right to criticise the government of the day, but so bound up with the machinery of State that it was hardly likely to want to rock the boat too much.

In particular, the State was - necessarily, in the eyes of most - a military-dependent institution. Indeed, at the end of the period of Empire the military dimension was perceived as essential for keeping the colonies in order and ensuring that trade routes stayed open to the benefit of the British people. Britain in the 1930s was the leading military nation in the world. The Church of England had long been actively associated with the military, with blessings given to weapons, to battleships, to fighting units, to those taking part in the wars of the State often with little thought given as to moral issues involved. Part of being the State Church involved giving spiritual succour to the State and its representatives when Governments decided on a policy of war. The attempted justification for having military chaplains was made on the grounds that the Church's duty to provide pastoral care for all people included being alongside those who were engaged in warfare, irrespective of one's opinions on that warfare. However, officer rank and uniform for those chaplains implied tacit, uncritical support for the wider purposes of the State. Three key reactions to chaplaincy in 1914-1918 were either to engage fully with the fighting process (like Raven, at the time, before his later reflection on his experience), to realise that the Church needed to make far greater efforts in its peacetime pastoral care, especially with regards to the working class (like G. A. Studdert Kennedy, "Woodbine Willie") or to react against war altogether (as Sheppard began to do.)

Criticism of the military nature of the State, especially extreme criticism by pacifists, went to the heart of the nation State and everything it stood for. For such criticism to come from Anglicans could have been seen as tantamount to treason, an internal rebellion from those whose primary duty was assumed to be to support the State and its

institutions. Thus the very existence of Anglican pacifists was extremely subversive. The further an institution was in its actions and outlook from the teaching of Christ, the more likely there was to be protest about it from Christians; such protest, however, was more likely to come from those who were themselves dissociated with that institution. One might have expected those who were further from the seat of power - Quakers, Nonconformists - to be critical of the State, but not Anglicans, especially Anglican clergy who had to take oaths of allegiance in order to take up their office. Most of all did the Church of England seem the wrong place or at least a paradoxical place for pacifism.

If anyone was to incorporate the enigma of Anglican pacifism it had to be Sheppard, chaplain to the King, Canon of St. Paul's, former Dean of Canterbury, close personal friend of both Archbishops; a supremely establishment figure. Much of that establishment he left unchallenged. He also accepted the Anglican responsibility for all people, that the Church should speak to and speak for the whole nation. The institution frequently drove him to despair, and on several occasions he flirted with resignation, but he was quintessentially Anglican, by history, temperament, theology (latitudinarian, with Catholic influence⁷), position and attitude. Which was not to say that he did not think the Church was in urgent need of reform. His attempts to achieve internal and democratic control for the Church through the Life and Liberty Movement, building on the Selborne Commission of 1916 and leading to the Enabling Act of 1919, had, in his eyes, failed. The Church Assembly (a development of the Convocation system of partial Church self-government, re-introduced by degrees in the second half of the nineteenth century) was no more sympathetic to pacifism than its successor General Synod was to be in 1983 towards the far milder report *The Church and the Bomb*. Sheppard's broad manifesto was published as *The Impatience of a Parson*. A key section, taken from his understanding of the gospel, enlightened by his own experience, was his commitment to pacifism. However paradoxical, even contradictory, it may have appeared to some, it was quite clearly possible to be an Anglican and a pacifist, for Sheppard and others were just that. Where conflict arose, the gospel could not be wrong; the Church, like the State, would have to change. Only in a very few instances did Anglican pacifists leave the Church of England to join other churches (e.g. the Duke of Bedford joined the Society of Friends during World War II, but to many he was an embarrassment in any case); most saw the essential integrity of Anglican theology and spirituality, but demanded that the error of acceptance of militarism be challenged from within Anglican structures. Indeed, the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship in its history has tended to concentrate on arguing for pacifism within Anglicanism at least as much as it has done outside the arena of the Church. Almost without exception, its campaigning focus in any decade from 1948 to 1998 has been the previous or the next Lambeth

Conference, an exclusively Anglican occasion.

The Anglo-Catholic Basis for the Church's Pacifist Movement

Organised pacifism within the Church of England was the initiative of Anglo-Catholic clergy in central and east London. The collection of such a group of like-minded men was not a coincidence; there were a number of reasons why this should have been so.

(a) The Oxford Movement and the State

It is not surprising that the roots and early strength of the pacifist movement were found in Anglo-Catholicism, as the seeds of dissent can be traced to the founding of the Oxford Movement and Keble's Assize Sermon of 14 July 1833. In 1800, when the Irish joined the Westminster parliament, unlike in the Scottish situation, the Church of Ireland joined with the Church of England to become the United Church of England and Ireland. Thus Parliament acted in Irish matters in 1833 in such a way as to provoke the wrath of Keble. Newly constituted, following the reforms of 1832, the Parliament reflected something of the pluriform nature of the nation, and Keble held it to be an inappropriate body to be the guardian of the Church of England, the historic Church of the nation, with its foundations in apostolic succession. The Tractarian tradition was to include continuing unease at the rule of a secular Parliament over the affairs of the Church Catholic.⁸ Parliament's rejection of the 1928 Prayer Book reinforced this attitude, with Anglo-Catholics feeling increasingly distanced from the State. As one pacifist wrote, "as a Catholic Christian, I object strongly to the suggestion that loyalty to the State must have precedence over every other loyalty."⁹ Disestablishment was firmly on their agenda.¹⁰ By way of contrast, evangelicals warmed more to the State, not merely because of their literalist reading of Romans 13, but because the State was seen to be the guardian of their interests. In more readily supporting the State, they would more readily accept the military functions of the State.

(b) The Emphasis on the Fathers

One of the achievements of the Oxford Movement had been a revival of interest in the doctrines and example of the Early Church Fathers. As has already been seen, this period of Christianity was largely pacifist. As Anglo-Catholics discovered the teachings of the Fathers on ethical as well as doctrinal issues, they would inevitably be challenged by the pacifism they discovered there.

(c) Church Membership by Baptism, not by Virtue of Establishment

As the Tractarians led something of a revival within the Church of England, their demand for greater commitment and the high value they put on the Eucharist meant that in practice many regarded Church membership as consisting of the faithful and committed, the baptised and confirmed, rather than every person in the parish just because this was England and the Church was established. Establishment could be regarded as providing a means by which the uncommitted could be Church members - not a position easily accepted by those who held a high doctrinal view of the sacrament of baptism.

(d) Commitment and the Call to Mission

Many of the Anglo-Catholic pacifist clergy (especially in working class, urban parishes) saw themselves as mission priests, demanding full acceptance of the gospel from those amongst whom they lived and worked. In such circumstances, there were no optional extras to faith, no room for the half-committed fringe. The life of faith made absolute demands and one such demand for them was pacifism. Time and again they expressed their pacifism in terms of the essential gospel discipleship. For those - for example, Gilbert Shaw - living in particularly deprived areas, the proximity of urban poverty also challenged a whole range of previously accepted political attitudes, thus facilitating the acceptance of pacifism.

(e) The Universality of the Church

Anglo-Catholics' increased sense of the universality of the Church Catholic meant a greater degree of loyalty and sense of unity with other baptised Christians in other countries, than with other citizens of the same country who were not baptised. The universality of the Church meant more than patriotism; it was unthinkable to try to kill others who had been baptised, whatever their nationality. So, when Gofton-Salmond argued that the indwelling of the Holy Spirit made each Christian's body the temple of the Holy Ghost, he concluded that

What applies to each Christian applies to all Christians, be they English, Italian or Abyssinian. Therefore, for a Christian to kill another Christian in any circumstances, even in self-defence, is to destroy a temple of the Holy Ghost - to destroy a member of Christ - and as such can rightly be called mystical decide.¹¹

Douglas Lockhart, a liturgist on the first Executive of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship,

said that for one who is baptised, “every other baptised person, whatever his denominational attachment, nationality, class, or colour, is his brother in Christ. War thus becomes fratricidal strife of the worst kind.” Lockhart added, “My fellowship with German communicants ought to transcend my fellowship with non-communicants, however unquestioned may be their claims to British nationality.”¹² R. H. Le Messurier, the first Secretary of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, extended the argument to Ordination:

The Priesthood of Christ which the human priest shares is a truly catholic, i.e., international priesthood; and this is borne out by the words of the Ordination Service: “Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God” (*not only in the Church of England*).¹³

(f) The Political Dimension of the Eucharist

Where the influence of Ludlow, Maurice and the early Christian Socialists met that of the Tractarians, late in the 19th century, the political dimension of the Eucharist came to be realised. It was seen to be a corporate event, expressed in its most extreme form by Headlam’s dictum, “Holy communion for holy communists.” Few may have wished to go to that extreme, not even W. C. Roberts who sat on the Committee of the Church Socialist League, but they would still have had a collective, community approach to Eucharistic liturgy, rather than the individualistic, pietistic approach of Sunday Matins. Many of the key early figures in the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship were linked with religious communities: Robert Gofton-Salmond was soon to found the contemplative Community of the Servants of the Will of God, Crawley Down; like Gofton-Salmond, the Franciscan Servants of Jesus and Mary were based on City Road; Gilbert Shaw was close to William Sirr of Glasshampton and later became the spiritual guide both for Gofton-Salmond’s community and for the Sisters of the Love of God, Oxford; Father Andrew of the Society of Divine Compassion, Plaistow and Evelyn Underhill were also outstanding spiritual guides closely associated with A.P.F.

Meditation on the part played by the elements in the Eucharist led Anglo-Catholics to be concerned about the right use of matter. In his initial letter to the *Church Times*, Gofton-Salmond showed how that concern led to war-resistance.

Catholics believe that the divine energy can pervade and sanctify material things. Can God express Himself through the fruits of the earth, in the ploughshare, in bricks and mortar, in machines, in the artist’s brush, in the surgeon’s knife? Can He express Himself in Bread and Wine and in a Cross of wood? But surely it is akin to blasphemy to say that He can express Himself through poison gas, liquid fire, bayonets, bombing machines, spies, lying propaganda, and all the

other commitments of war?¹⁴

Similarly, Father Andrew could not conceive of the possibility that hands that consecrated the Blessed Sacrament could make a bullet, a bayonet or a bomb.¹⁵ He contrasted the employment in 1914-1918 of female munitions workers with their Mass attendance:

from that high act of awful communion they went forth to desecrate matter by taking their share in the work of making munitions.... Surely matter has rights. It has the right not to be wronged. If we want to keep our Christian faith, still more if we want to be consistent Catholics, we cannot, as modern militarism does, defile and desecrate that which we are sure was meant to be hallowed and consecrated.¹⁶

Lockhart held that the Eucharist brought together every aspect of peace. It brought “peace with God ... before we approach the altar for Communion;” this led to “peace with ourselves and in ourselves;” then there was “peace with others,” symbolized by the Kiss of Peace at High Mass - “In the Sacramental Presence of the Lord Who gives us peace, we realize that we are brothers and that we should always behave to one another as brothers.”¹⁷

Alongside this incarnational and essentially socialistic political awareness may also have been a realisation that trades unions had shown that individuals joining together in corporate action could bring about real political change. Not only, therefore, would many Anglo-Catholics be open to pacifism as practical policy, but also open to the prospect of individuals of conscience working together in a united movement in order to bring about such political change.

(g) Ritualism and Dissent

Following the Tractarians there came something of a High Church revival, with liturgical and ceremonial reforms imported from Roman Catholicism. Opposition by ecclesiastical authorities led to years of protest and persecution which reinforced for ritualist Anglo-Catholics a willingness to challenge the powers that be. The experience of persecution increased the willingness to consider other matters for dissent.

A good example of this process was Bernard Walke, Anglo-Catholic vicar of St. Hilary, Cornwall, from 1913, who, when he joined the F.O.R. in 1917, turned a few nonconformist heads at that year’s conference with his cassock and portable altar.¹⁸ At the end of the war a F.O.R. project for delinquent children was based in his parish, run

by Grace Costin, later Mother Teresa, F.S.J.M. Walke also tried to establish small communities of sharing and voluntary poverty. One such "Brethren of the Common Table" involved an East London group including Muriel Lester and Mary Hughes, the daughter of early Christian Socialist Tom Hughes. A similar experiment was carried out with W. C. Roberts at St. George's, Bloomsbury. Walke's ritualism, however, brought him into conflict with the authorities in 1932, when a newly installed tabernacle - together with reredos, font and statuary - at St. Hilary was destroyed by a Kensitite mob. Walke refused to attend a subsequent Consistory Court on the grounds that the judges were appointed by the secular Privy Council: "As a citizen, I deeply regret having to place myself in conflict with the law of the land, but as a Catholic priest I am bound to defend to the best of my ability the spiritual rights of the Catholic Church in this country." The episode weakened him physically, however, and he contracted tuberculosis. A rota of Anglo-Catholic priests was drawn up to give him practical support week by week. Many of those priests came from parishes across the country in the south-east, including a number from W. C. Roberts' deanery in East London. It was in precisely those parishes that the initiatives were taken which led to the formation of A.P.F.

Article XXXVII

Although supported by many, disestablishment was not an article of faith for Anglican pacifists. The issue was however high on the political agenda, following the Disestablishment of the Church of Wales in 1920 and the Prayer Book crisis of 1927-1928, to which the Cecil Report of 1935 was a response. The Book of Common Prayer itself was one of the defining documents of Anglicanism - despite its inadequacies highlighted in the revision debate of the 1920s. Whereas the offices¹⁹ and the liturgy included many prayers for peace (the Second Collects at Morning and Evening Prayer, The Communion Blessing, Collects for Epiphany 2, Quinquagesima, Trinity 5, 21, etc.), the ordinal required explicit assent to the Thirty Nine Articles.²⁰ Surely Article XXXVII was the clearest reason why Anglicans could not be pacifist - "It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars"? This text was frequently used during the Great War to deny exemption from military duty to Anglican conscientious objectors.

The debate over Article XXXVII was a key one in Anglican pacifist circles in the 1930s. It ended with an attempt by Percy Hartill in summer 1939 to get a motion debated in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury:

That, inasmuch as there is an urgent need for the Church to give a clear guidance to Christian people on their duties in regard to peace and war, and inasmuch as there are difficulties in the interpretation of Article XXXVII,

This House respectfully requests His Grace the President and their Lordships of the Upper House -

1. To declare that the English text of the Article should be interpreted in the light of the Latin text, as referring only to “just wars” (*justa bella*); and
2. To appoint a Joint Committee to consider, in the light of traditional moral theology and of modern conditions, what is the proper significance of the phrase ‘just wars’.

The Lower House did not have sufficient time to debate the issue on that occasion, and by the time of the next session, in January 1940, war had broken out and the vote was to adjourn the debate until the close of the war.

Hartill’s motion indicated the Achilles’ heel of those who argued that Anglicans should participate in the nation’s wars without question. The original Latin text, of Article XXXIX of the XLV Articles of 1552, read, “Christianis licet, ex mandato Magistratus, arma portare, et justa bella administrare.” The XLII Articles of the following year read, in English, “It is lawful for Christians, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons and to serve in lawful wars.” Official approval of the Articles in 1562 was of the Latin text, which was further amended by the Convocation of 1571. Royal authority was given the same year to the English text, which was not intended to be dominant but equally authentic. In 1615, Article LXII of the Articles of the Church of Ireland read, “It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to bear arms, and to serve in just wars.” Thus, the Latin “*justa bella*” was translated in three different ways: “lawful wars” (1553), “just wars” (1615) and “the wars” (1662).

The precise meaning of “*justa bella*” was open to debate. There were those who argued that *justus* carried no moral associations and applied simply to the declaration of war by the legal authorities; this argument pointed to the definite article in the phrase “the wars” as indicating war involving the Government.²¹ However, that approach would make the use of the word “*justa*” superfluous, merely repeating what had been noted earlier in the Article. More significantly, it ignored twelve centuries of history behind the phrase “*bellum justum*,” in which moral factors certainly did play a part. The tradition of that concept may have been developed by Augustine in order to justify certain kinds of war, contrary to the pacifism of the first centuries of the Christian era, but it contained strict moral conditions for war, refined and developed further by the Thomists and Francis de Vittoria. Interpretation of “*bellum justum*” belonged more to the sphere of moral theology than to jurisprudence. A late 17th century commentary on Article XXXVII by Bishop Beveridge limited its application to “lawful war;” i.e. “nothing less but the just

defence of the Magistrate's person, kingdom, and prerogatives."²² A war would not be deemed "just" merely by virtue of being called by a Government; the cause and conduct of the conflict had to be considered as well. Resolution 27 of the 1930 Lambeth Conference reflected that position:

When nations have solemnly bound themselves by Treaty, Covenant, or Pact for the pacific settlement of international disputes, the Conference holds that the Christian Church in every nation should refuse to countenance any war in regard to which the Government of its own country has not declared its willingness to submit the matter in dispute to arbitration or conciliation.

The second feature of Article XXXVII of significance to pacifists was the opening phrase, "licet" - "it is lawful." Some of the Articles were forceful in expressing the duty of Christians, for example "obiendum est" - "we must obey" the civil magistrate, and "debet" - every man "ought" to give liberally to the poor. That was not the language of Article XXXVII, which rather reflected the usage of "liceat" in Article XXXIX - a man "may" swear, and in Article XXXII - "it is lawful" for clergy to marry. Thus the wearing of weapons and the serving in (just) wars was deemed "lawful," but it was not at all suggested that it was a Christian duty. Paul Gliddon summed it up as "an extraordinarily unenthusiastic way of summoning us to the colours ... paralleled by the lukewarm assent parents sometimes give to the marriage of their daughters, 'If she wants to marry him, we won't stop her'."²³

Thus analysis of Article XXXVII proved surprisingly encouraging for Anglican pacifists. Only general, not detailed, assent to the Articles was required, and then only of clergy who would not themselves be eligible to bear arms.²⁴ All Anglicans could be reassured that they were under no doctrinal obligation to bear arms and serve in "the wars", and even for those who would, such service would only be lawful insofar as "the wars" were *bella justa*, with all the conditions and caveats implied. Article XXXVII was hardly a statement of Christian pacifism, indeed it had been originally drawn up in order to refute the pacifism of 16th century Anabaptists, but at the very least it tolerated the position of Anglican pacifists, and at best could be seen to make the pacifist position almost the norm from which non-pacifists would have to depart.

Anglican Councils

Following Life and Liberty, the Church Assembly had the power to pronounce on issues brought before it. If Sheppard had hoped that opening the door to democracy within the structures of the Church would bring about a new, reviving radicalism, he was sadly disappointed. On issues of war and peace, the Assembly was conservative

almost to the point of being Erastian. At the time of the 1932 Disarmament Conference, a sizeable minority of the Church Assembly thought that Britain should “refuse to pledge itself to any further measure of Disarmament” until other nations disarmed first.²⁵ The same Assembly approved “the previous question” to avoid any discussion of disarmament in November 1936. The following February it did hold a debate on the subject, the results of which brought despair to many pacifists. The motion approved included the sentence that the Assembly “Recognizes the right of the Government to the support of Christian citizens in maintaining such forces as it deems necessary in the pursuance of [League of Nations] policy.” By freeing the Government of any possibility of moral critique in its determination of the size and operation of armed forces, the Assembly was being its most Erastian. Sheppard, for one, was devastated.

Not all Anglican gatherings brought such despair for pacifists. The ambivalence of Lambeth Conference statements, particularly in 1930, allowed for hope tempered with caution. Westcott persuaded the 1897 Conference to support International Arbitration; the 1920 Conference commended the embryonic League of Nations, but without any sense of shame or guilt at the part played by the bishops themselves in promoting the slaughter of the previous years. Under the influence of George Bell, the 1930 Conference, almost echoing the words of John Scott in 1796, affirmed that “War, as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of Our Lord Jesus Christ” (Resolution 25.) It even spoke of the Church refusing to support a warring Government that had not first taken its dispute to arbitration. Even though there were caveats, and even though Resolution 25 was not followed by a call for each and every Christian to renounce war and all preparation for war, the Lambeth Conference of 1930 provided succour for Anglican pacifists and a basis to build on in future years.

Anglican pacifists, then, were not disloyal to the Church; they were deeply committed to it, and to the principles of Anglicanism. They did, however, see themselves as something of a reform movement within the Church, wanting to turn the Church towards an attitude to peace that they regarded as being the true gospel position. Faith demanded integrity, which for committed Anglicans who were also pacifist presented numerous practical difficulties, but also brought the requirement for them to challenge that in the Church which they believed to be wrong.

PACIFISM AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: ENDNOTES

1. *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, book 8.
2. Not that that appeased Charles Gore. In 1926 he wrote that "the sort of Christianity which claims to embrace the whole of society, which it costs nothing to profess and into which children are baptised practically as a matter of course, appears to be as audacious a departure from the method of Christ as can well be conceived." *Reconstruction of Belief*, p968. Cited in Cornwell, *Church and Nation*, p18.
3. Sheppard to Brittain, 6 July 1936.
4. *Peace News*, 30 January 1937.
5. Buchanan, *Cut the Connection*, p13,15.
6. Buchanan regarded this date as "the beginning of the end of the establishment of the Church of England." p19.
7. Sheppard spoke of "the kind of sacramental Quakerism that I myself have bumped towards." R. Ellis Roberts, p173.
8. Ironically, similar concern meant that some Anglo-Catholics hesitated about joining the Peace Pledge Union as it was not exclusively Christian. The issue was discussed by Gofton-Salmond's group in summer 1936. Soon afterwards, Donald MacKinnon, concerned that "Christian pacificism often seems linked up with a liberal Protestant Christology and the knock-kneed spirituality of 'Songs of Praise,'" urged Anglo-Catholics to "muck in" and show there was also an incarnational, Catholic basis for pacifism. "There are many Anglo-Catholic pacifists who, despite their obvious differences from him, thank God daily for the courage of Canon H. R. L. Sheppard in 'doing something about it.' ... 'Dick' Sheppard acted. He gave to sane young Catholics, exercised beyond measure over the problem of peace and war, and seeking ... to hammer out a Catholic approach to pacificism, a chance to 'muck in' with men and women as varied in outlook as Aldous Huxley, General Crozier, Arthur Wragg, Gerald Heard and Ellen Wilkinson, in the fight for peace. It was his action which made it possible for Catholics to unite with non-Catholics in pursuit of a common social goal, without the malaise that seems to keep so many from definite association with the political left... Somehow, somewhere, English Catholics must 'muck in'; for they believe that it is the classical faith of the Incarnation that alone can save Europe; and they are right. Yet still they stand aloof from those who struggle at the social front. They do not want to get their fingers dirty. So Catholics fail in their task of leavening the lump. In the fellowship of the P.P.U., Catholics - those who are pacifists, that is to say - have a supreme opportunity of introducing outsiders to the supreme strength of the Catholic social outlook." MacKinnon called on "all Anglo-Catholic pacifists to ... stand four-square with the P.P.U., seeking in its fellowship to be apostles of the Catholic Gospel of Redemption." (*Church Times*, 9 October 1936, p384.)
9. Francis Harrold, *Church Times*, 24 February 1933, p220.
10. Separation of Church and State was not only favoured by Anglo-Catholics. Vera Brittain stated that "Some of us hope that the chance to press for the disestablishment of the Church of England will come in our time." Brittain to Harold Latham, 16 December 1936.

11. *Church Times*, 4 October 1935, p348. Gofton-Salmond realised that his argument did not apply where people of other faiths or none were involved. However, to kill them would be a betrayal of the work committed to Christians, to draw all people to Christ who died for them: "We are to bring others to Christ, and killing them is not the way to do it." It had been an issue for the peace movement in the Crimean War in the 19th century; some non-pacifist opponents of that particular war took their stand on the basis that the Russians were largely Orthodox Christians and therefore should be less of an enemy than the infidel Turks.

12. *Christian Pacifist*, April 1939, p100.

13. *Reconciliation*, August 1938, p237. On the following page Le Messurier considered one of the questions an ordinand was asked by his Bishop: "'Will you maintain and set forwards as much as lieth in you, quietness, peace and love among all Christian people, and especially among them that are or shall be committed to your charge?' Notice that this question implies no limit. It is not amongst Englishmen, or Europeans, or white men, that these verities are to be maintained and set forward. No, it is among *all Christian people*. And that is why his answer took the following form: 'I will do so, the Lord being my helper.'"

14. *Church Times*, 20 September 1935, p288f.

15. *The Life and Letters of Father Andrew*, p178.

16. *Reconciliation*, November 1938, p358,359.

17. Lockhart, *God's Family at Worship*, p94-96.

18. Wallis, *Valiant for Peace*, p48.

19. "'Give peace in our time, O Lord,' intones the parson. And the people answer: 'Because there is none other that fighteth for us, but only thou, O God.' But we don't really mean it. The fifteen hundred million pounds we are preparing to spend on 'defence' in the next few years hardly suggest that we are relying overmuch on God..." Dick Sheppard in *Modern Woman* (undated proof.)

20. The Declaration of Assent at that time was: "I assent to the Thirty-Nine Articles, and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. I believe the doctrine of the Church of England as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God; and in public prayer and administration of the sacraments I will use the form in the said book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." An Act of Parliament in 1571 only required from the clergy assent to those Articles which concerned the true Christian faith and the doctrine of the Sacraments. This was extended by a Canon of 1604 which demanded subscription to all the Articles. However, in 1865 Convocations with Royal Assent modified the form of subscription so that assent was once more to the *doctrine* of the Church of England (echoes of the Elizabethan form) as set forth in the Articles, rather than to the Articles themselves. Thus clergy from that time could give assent to the general sense of the Articles without regarding each one as being agreeable to the Word of God. Charles Raven regarded the Articles as "rather the trust deeds of an historic institution than a code of propositions to each of which assent must be given." C. F. Andrews was one pacifist who had difficulty with the Articles, his main objection being to their exclusive doctrinal rigidity. He felt he could only give general assent, without accepting every clause. He suspended administering the sacraments until he learnt that assent was not required by the new Church of South India. (*What I Owe to Christ*, p140,141; Chaturvedi and Sykes, p297,298.) Paul Gliddon suggested that if more than general assent to the Articles was required, "then it would not only be the pacifists but almost

everybody else who would have to withdraw, while the intellectual or moral qualities of those few who remain would certainly not be above suspicion." (*Reconciliation*, April 1937, p89.) There was never any obligation on the laity to give assent to the Articles at all.

21. This line was taken by R. H. Walden, Dean of Wells, in the Lower House of Convocation on 18 January, 1940.

22. Cited in Hartill, *Article XXXVII and War*, p9.

23. *Reconciliation*, April 1937, p89.

24. In an article, "War and the Church: Is the 37th Article of Religion Orthodox?" (*Reconciliation*, November 1936, p297-299), W. J. Silverwood argued that exemption of clergy from wearing weapons and serving in wars was logically unsustainable if it was indeed lawful for other Christian men to do so. Any legitimate Christian duty should apply to all. However, "if it is not permissible for a Minister of religion to take active part as a combatant in war, is it not logical to assume that it is wrong for any Christian man to take part in warfare?" Noting that Article 37 did not distinguish between wars, Silverwood argued that no war could be just, saying, with Erasmus, that war cannot be allowed if that which is necessary for it is prohibited: "They who would defend war must defend the dispositions which lead to war, and these dispositions are absolutely forbidden by the Gospel." Taking Christian orthodoxy as revealed in the examples of the pacifists of the Early Church, Silverwood held that "if a minister of religion is to preach the gospel to men under arms, he must of necessity be a traitor to the State, for I cannot conceive the State allowing a minister of religion to preach the precepts of the Gospel - and one is that we love our enemies."

25. *Church Times*, 12 February 1932, p206.

PACIFISM AND THEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

The Use of Scripture: The Teaching of Jesus

Resolution 25 of the Lambeth Conference in 1930 spoke of war being incompatible with “the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ.” That phrase summed up the approach of most of the leading Christian pacifists of the period, an indication that their pacifism was interwoven with other aspects of their faith, so that it became one with their whole understanding of Christianity. One early member of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship even stated that “The Christian pacifist bases his convictions upon the fact that Jesus Christ, both in His teaching and His example, is a pacifist.”¹ Such opinions were not based on any single proof text, although often there were favoured verses that appeared regularly in arguments. For example, one teaching which appealed to Lansbury was that one reaps what one sows, that it was not possible to gather figs from thistles or develop love from violence and destruction.²

Elsewhere in the teachings of Jesus, the Sermon on the Mount was most often referred to. In the aftermath of the Oxford Union vote of 1933 not to fight for King and Country, the pseudonymous newspaper correspondent “R.E.” not only mentioned the temptations and Gethsemane but he also wrote of Jesus’ “command of non-resistance. Turning the other cheek is the only Christian answer to aggression. He gives no other; He practises no other. Always it is Love that He emphasizes. ‘He that takes the sword shall perish by the sword’ is not a proverb, it is a statement of fact. In the wilderness He rejected all other methods of conquest but that of Love....”³

Kenneth Arnold wrote that “Christ told us to forgive our enemies and to turn the other cheek when we were struck. He put His teachings into practice by allowing Himself to be crucified when He had the power to defend Himself. The world thought that was foolishness, but Christ’s followers triumphed in the end.”⁴

The liberal Bishop Barnes preached the October 1936 Oxford University Sermon on the text, “Blessed are the peacemakers,” a teaching he regarded as being “as close as we can get to His very words in the Sermon on the Mount.”⁵ Regretting that the present age had resorted to an outdated ethic, Barnes remarked that “Today we are back to the Old Testament: ‘An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.’ And what was Christ’s teaching: ‘But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil.’”⁶

Others tried to cite more favourable parts of the Old Testament. Sheppard - whose gift

was principally as a public speaker; his written work was more simplistic than rigorous - referred to the Decalogue, arguing that “‘Thou shalt not kill’” is God’s commandment to humankind, and “perhaps the greatest Christian ethic.”⁷ It was the basis for his faith:

My pacifism begins and ends with the overwhelming conviction that the law of Christ cannot, in any circumstance and for any reason, permit me to kill my brother. I renounce war and all its ways, now and always, and I will never take part, directly or indirectly, in another, God being my helper. The task of the Church to-day, I believe, is to declare the Christian attitude to war, and that is crystallised in the Commandment: ‘Thou shalt not kill.’⁸

Others based their pacifism on the accumulated wrong of modern war, but for Sheppard, transgression against the sixth commandment was sufficient. Sheppard asked, “Will He accept the excuse that when we killed, we did it in His name, that we were going about His business? It seems to me that, if we make that excuse, we merely add blasphemy to murder.”⁹

Texts from the Epistles were also popular. As early as 1923 Sheppard commented (in relation to 1 Corinthians 13) that “love in its higher manifestation is the richest, most persuasive, loveliest, nicest thing that God has to offer - it is the only weapon we need.” Part of that same passage was paraphrased by Edwin Green, for whom the salvation of souls was a prime motivating factor. “What will it profit a man,” he asked, “if he fight to emancipate slaves, to free people from tyranny and lands from bad Governments, and in so doing lose his own soul?”¹⁰ Other texts from Epistles were cited by George Rust, who argued that Christians must not use violence even to protect themselves from violence; he listed Romans 12.17,19, 1 Thessalonians 5.15, and 1 Peter 3.9., all of which argued that one should not repay evil for evil.¹¹

The Use of Scripture: The Example of Jesus

From the example of the life of Jesus, the temptations and the arrest in Gethsemane were frequently quoted. In 1936, the editor of the *Church of England Newspaper* responded to Archbishop of York’s advocacy of rearmament by asking, “What is the use of our praying ‘Lead us not into temptation’ if we deliberately plan for, and toy with, temptation?”¹² As Lansbury told the Church Congress in 1935,

Our faith comes to us from Him who was crucified on Calvary. From the day when He was tempted of the devil till His death he proclaimed love and service as the way of life by which mankind could live at peace with one another. At the supreme moment of His life, when arrested and being led to death, he refused all assistance from His disciples and in memorable language proclaimed the

simple truth: "Those who take the sword perish by the sword."¹³

The aspect of the example of Jesus that appealed to Lansbury was the fact that he "lived among people, sharing their lives,"¹⁴ which could also be a description of Lansbury's own circumstances in Bow.

On the eve of the final session of the Disarmament Conference in 1934, Morris broadcast a radio meditation on Mark 10.32, the approach of Jesus and his disciples to Jerusalem. Morris imagined it could be Geneva to which Jesus was travelling.

And can we blind our eyes to the fact that there is every danger that men will repeat to-morrow their tragic decision of 1,900 years ago and that Christ will be crucified in this as in every other generation by the wilful blindness of men?

Now, as then, those who see God in terms of the tribal deity or the King to slay their foes and lift them high, who believe in the sovereign independence of their nation - my country, right or wrong - must inevitably cry, "Crucify Him", for he will not take them to their goal.

Those whose vested interests lie in the blood money that flows from the private manufacture of arms or in gambling with human lives will cry, "Release Barabbas". Those whose prejudices or whose fears are so overwhelming that they can only play for what seems to be safety will soon be persuaded to join their cry with the others', will even spit on him or deny him, rather than take the risk of the Cross.

Remember that in the last tragic moments men were faced with the alternative of Christ or Barabbas - the Saviour or the murderer - and they chose the murderer.... And modern war is murder, however much we try to justify it or disguise it; and Christianity still means the Cross, the love which endures all things and never fails, however much we try to persuade ourselves otherwise.¹⁵

The arrest of Jesus was a common theme, with the disarming of Peter in Matt. 26.52. E. Moss argued that "If ever there was a case for using arms in defence of righteousness, it was in Gethsemane, but our Lord definitely refused to have anything to do with them."¹⁶ Bernard Burnett felt that the meaning of that event was enhanced by Jesus' early suggestion that swords should be brought along. "By the procuring of a sword, and forbidding it to be used, he taught a valuable lesson - strength in arms is of no avail, it causes death to the stricken and to the striker, therefore, do not use force, but 'put up thy sword' ... disarm."¹⁷ For Bishop Barnes, the genuineness of the details of the Gethsemane event was less significant than its reflection of the (pacifist) faith of the early Church. The evangelical Edwin Green exclaimed that "Would that all humanity were so shocked that men everywhere put up the sword and accepted Christianity!"¹⁸ As for the trial, Green extrapolated from a comment of Jesus: "The universal application is that the principle is laid down that Christ's servants do not fight because His Kingdom is not of this world."¹⁹

Both Gethsemane and the Crucifixion were important for Paul Gliddon.

Christ broke the power of sin in a war in which He forbade the use of the sword, forgave his enemies, endured their wounds, overcame evil with good, healed the one man injured on the other side, and was Himself the only fatal casualty.

In the world into which Christ was born, the use of the sword was the accepted way of overcoming evil. This He deliberately rejected, believing that the Cross was the only finally effective weapon for the destruction of sin.²⁰

If following such a path led the Church to be exposed to risk, then even then, argued Gliddon, "the Church may be called to reveal the Christ, not honoured, or transfigured, or triumphant, but the Christ of Calvary who, though taken helpless from the Cross, in that death still conquers."²¹ Lansbury reminded the Church Congress of 1935 of the words of Jesus from the Cross: "No word of failure, no word of bitterness, of hatred, but a clear, ringing cry of love and forgiveness. 'Father forgive them, they know not what they do.'"

Barnes refused to separate out individual events within the Passion narrative. He asserted that "the whole doctrine of the Cross is the assertion of the value - the redemptive power - of innocent suffering."²² Arthur Golding said that "it is that Cross which is the basis and implication of the Christian pacifist Movement, and it is the method of the Cross which is its justification."²³ Morris told the 1934 F.O.R. Conference that the Cross was not just a fact of history, it had to be made a fact of experience, and it was for the redemptive group, the Church, to carry out the work of redemption. Theirs was a twofold task, to bear the burdens and suffering of the world and to be the conscience of the body politic, "standing not so much for a policy or a programme as for the eternal principles of the Kingdom."²⁴ For Morris, the theology of the Kingdom was dominant. Peace, he argued, was not an end in itself, rather it was "the atmosphere of the Kingdom of God."²⁵ He repeated that phrase three years later, saying it could only be found by following the road along which Christ went to seek the Kingdom, never by methods which were foreign to the Kingdom or at a lower cost than the price which Christ was prepared to pay: "not peace at any price, but love at any cost."²⁶ Morris saw the Cross as part of the journey between the conflict of John 6 and ultimate victory.

Christ refuses the method of war. If freedom could have been obtained and oppression broken by the method of violence, there was surely an unanswerable challenge from those who would have taken Him by force and made Him a King. He refuses that method and faces Calvary because His victory cannot be won on the battlefield but only on the Cross. Christ crucified declares that God

won his triumph through a readiness to accept defeat at the hands of men, and His Resurrection justifies the belief that it is only the love which endures all things and never fails that can win a victory on which we dare ask the blessing of God.²⁷

In other words, although there were preferred texts, with the New Testament dominant, Anglican pacifists so incorporated not only the teaching of Jesus but especially his example (principally the example of nonviolent love shown in the Passion narrative), that their pacifism became an integral part of their Christian faith. It was not merely an additional implication of a faith that could be somehow conceived of as distinct from pacifism. There was an integrity and internal consistency to Christian pacifist faith. Thus it was the total integrity of Sheppard and his message that converted Vera Brittain to pacifism at a Dorchester rally in 1936.

For what Dick Sheppard and his friends offered to their followers was not, in the last resort, a policy but a principle - the revolutionary principle put forward, and still rejected by the majority of mankind, in the Sermon on the Mount. It was a simple idea which derived its validity not from political calculation, but from the prophetic challenge of an inner compulsion; it was the belief, for which Christ died, in the ultimate transcendence of love over power.²⁸

The Challenge of Niebuhr

The dominance of Catholic theology in Anglican pacifist circles has already been noted. When critics of pacifism, especially Reinhold Niebuhr in the United States, suggested that there was an unrealistic disregard of human sinfulness in pacifist theology, he may or may not have been accurate in his own world of American F.O.R., but he was well wide of the mark with Anglican pacifism in Britain. Anglo-Catholic theology, with its emphasis on the Fathers, on Baptism, Eucharist and Church, on sacraments, matter and incarnation, was a totally different proposition to the extremely liberal approach of some on the other side of the Atlantic. Penitence, sacramental confession and a strong sense of baptismal regeneration and commitment were indications that the Anglo-Catholics were anything but soft on sin. Their pacifism was not due to some warm sense of bonhomie towards human beings in general, but an essential part of their relationship with God and with each other.

Within Anglican circles, the most theologically liberal apologist was Bishop Barnes. He had consistently espoused pacifism since the earliest days of the Great War, without ever seeking to be a leader of the pacifist cause. A more central theological approach was pursued by the most accomplished pacifist theologian of the time, Charles Raven. He would have embraced many of the attitudes of the Catholics, without their partizanship. He certainly rejected the outlook expressed in one of Niebuhr's most

influential works, that Christian discipleship was possible only in the dealings of private persons one with another: "We should repudiate the thesis of Dr. Niebuhr's book *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, as true only of the herd and not of the fellowship, and as flatly irreconcilable alike with our faith in the Church and our experience of the *koinonia*."²⁹

Earlier Raven produced his own volume on *Is War Obsolete?* and he led the theological retort to Temple's hasty accusations of heresy.³⁰ Much of 1937 and 1938 he spent engaging with the challenge to pacifism posed by the theologies of Barth and Luther.

The Challenge of Barth

Raven suggested that people outside the Church recognised that war was evil more readily than professing Christians. In asking why, he considered a religious teaching dominated by stories of the Old Testament God of Battles. To put these into perspective required an intelligent approach to scripture that most Christians had not yet grasped. "Protestantism has not yet outgrown its bibliolatry: Catholicism still professes it," he said, adding ruefully, "If Scripture as a whole is infallible, then warfare has its sanction."³¹

A difference in approach to scripture was one part, but only part, of his difficulty with Barth's theology. A more major obstacle for Raven was Barth's acceptance of Augustine's anti-Pelagian theory of a humanity totally depraved from birth, for whom the grace of baptism was the sole remedy. Raven, on the other hand, was more attracted to the British monk Pelagius, who had "insisted that man was not so corrupted by sin as to be incapable of free co-operation with God." Recognising that "As against Pelagius Augustine prevailed," Raven added that, however, "his teaching on the subject was never officially endorsed and in practice Catholicism has never accepted it."³² Luther's stress on salvation by faith, and Calvin's restatement of the Augustinian position meant that Barth's theology had its roots in the mainstream Protestantism of continental Europe. It was a theology for which Raven could "feel a profound reverence"³³ but not agree with.³⁴ He accepted that "in our deeper moments we acknowledge our creaturehood, our dependence, our worthlessness," and he refused to minimize the effects of sin and the need for human forgiveness from Almighty God. He did, however, reject any corollary that might suggest that all human endeavour was irrelevant, that Christianity was simply an individual renunciation of the world and its affairs, other-worldly and pietistic. Such an approach would see war (as with poverty or other social ills) as evil, but not one that can be avoided by human effort. War would

be accepted as disease was accepted, “a condition inherent in the world’s corruption, a demonstration of the need for redemption.” With the Church’s task restricted to the preaching of the Word, the only hope for the removal of war would come with the abolition of sin through the conversion of each individual. Whereas Raven could see the revivalist potential of a theology which “contradicts the temptation to appraise spiritual worth in terms of mundane activity and success, to equate the Kingdom of God with a reign of prosperity and peace,” he reasserted his opposition to the initial contentions of Barth’s position.

We cannot reconcile its estimate of nature or of man with the best thought of the Old Testament, with the teaching of Jesus in the Gospels, with a full appreciation of St. Paul, or, in the last resort, with a belief in the Incarnation and with an incarnational and sacramental view of the universe. In addition, it appears to perpetuate an inadequate and fundamentalist attitude towards Scripture and religion by reaffirming a radical dualism between sacred and secular, to confine the operation of the Holy Spirit to certain “covenanted” and ecclesiastical channels, to deny the importance of history and to leave no room for any human co-operation with God.... The whole ethos of such a faith is one of pessimism, almost of despair, utterly unlike the joy and confidence of the New Testament or the earliest Church. If its phrasing is closer to tradition than ours, its character seems appropriate to the mind rather of the sixteenth century than of the first or the twentieth.³⁵

Raven later criticised Barth’s “new Calvinism with its insistence upon the disparity of nature and grace, the futility of all human effort, and the total depravity of man’s fallen state.” It was one thing for Barth to counter the over-optimistic confidence of some American humanists, but quite another for him to descend into a simplistic dialectic of black and white.³⁶ The Anglican tradition of seeking a *via media* seemed to Raven to be particularly appropriate for British theologians, faced with the conflicting approaches of Barth and the Americans. He acknowledged that there was

some truth in the claim that America is too remote from and the Continent too close to the fact of war for an investigation that shall be both realistic and detached. Moreover, theologically this country stands midway between the centres of humanist and transcendentalist thought, and is thereby fitted to formulate and apply an incarnational philosophy, which shall contain and synthesize the truths exaggerated by each of them. To that great task a study of the concrete problem of war will be found an admirable preparation.³⁷

In such a spirit, although Raven rejected Barthian theology, he was prepared to be challenged by one of its conclusions, namely that war was merely one social evil among many and that it could not be tackled in isolation for its causes were interwoven with every other social malaise. According to this argument, the only way to remove war was to deal “with evil itself, with sin, with the self-centredness of the individual and

society.”³⁸ Raven countered by arguing that “conversion must show itself in dealing with particular issues.” An insistence upon the test of fruits, upon the doing of the work and upon social tasks, was, he said, characteristic of the method of Jesus. Hence Wilberforce, a monstrous mill-owner and exploiter of female and child labour (“the worst enemy of the English people,” according to Cobbett), could persist in his efforts to end slavery, which efforts enabled others to eradicate other evils to which he had been blind. “If there had been no Wilberforce there would have been no Shaftesbury,” claimed Raven, adding, “That is perhaps sufficient answer to those who refuse to isolate and concentrate upon war.”³⁹

The Challenge of Luther

Unlike Raven’s inclusive Kingdom theology, Barthian theology led to a dualism wherein the Church disregarded the affairs of society because of their inherent sinfulness. Lutheran theology was even further from Raven’s position, because certain strata of society were regarded as being not only separate from but superior to the Church. Lutherans would have been among those to concur with the Oxford Conference Report of 1937 when it claimed that:

The State is the agent divinely appointed to preserve a nation from the detrimental effects of anarchic and criminal tendencies amongst its members and to maintain its existence against the aggression of its neighbours. It is therefore a Christian’s duty to obey the political authority as far as possible and to refrain from everything that is apt to weaken it. This means that normally a Christian must take up arms for his country.⁴⁰

Whilst content that “such an attitude to the State is utterly alien to the British temper and tradition, ... that *Verboten* is to us a direct incentive to trespass,” Raven recognised the attraction of promoting respect for authority. He saw that German demands for military service sprang from more than a sense that such secular issues were of secondary importance for religion, for Luther had authorised the family and the State as orders, “divinely authorized for the maintenance of society.” The reformer who had rebelled against papal power had given princes almost as great a power. If it was possible, so the argument went, to have any vocation other than to an ecclesiastical calling, then it was possible for some to have a vocation to govern. Added to which, especially in a democracy, there could be a particularly strong moral case for obeying one’s government. Yet, argued Raven, there could still be “very exceptional circumstances” when alternative action was required.

Christians will obviously claim that their government, like all other ministers whatever their function, indeed like all mankind, should “seek first God’s Kingdom and righteousness.” They will therefore expect that authority shall be exercised by the State not solely for the sake of promoting its own security and aggrandizement, but with a view to the fulfilling of God’s will and for the benefit of all His human family. That the State serves no end except its own welfare is in fact an express repudiation of Christianity however important its own perpetuation, however obvious and immediate its responsibility for its own citizens, that responsibility cannot be primary: its autonomy is subject to God’s rule: any other concept amounts to a deification of Cæsar.⁴¹

Raven considered the most difficult situation for a pacifist, when a government, fully supported by a majority of the people, deemed that war was the best option available. To refuse to fight in such circumstances could cause the righteous to be defeated, the majority to be further burdened or endangered. Not surprisingly there were those who would argue that whereas it may be right to counsel against war in peacetime, should war arise then the duty of any citizen would be to bow to the will of the majority and to take part. Yet whereas Raven acknowledged the obligation to respect the orders of the State, he countered by arguing that “no Christian may pledge an unconditional obedience to any State or accept its orders without reference to the will of God.”⁴² He added that

Most of us cannot go so far as our Lutheran brethren in drawing a frontier between the functions of Church and State, and certainly cannot give our consciences into the keeping of the civil power or absolve ourselves from the duty of intelligent scrutiny and criticism.⁴³

There must therefore come some point when it was necessary to stand apart from friends and compatriots, when the demands of individual conscience outweighed those of collective fellowship. Determining such points required of each person “much thought and study and prayer,” and may bring with it “a time of tension and bewilderment that may well be full of pain.”⁴⁴ However beneficent a State may be, in ensuring the continuance of a common heritage of speech, custom, work, home, civic life, community and comradeship, there do still come points at which, asserted Raven, “our vision of God makes its protest.... Here is a line of action accepted more or less thoughtlessly in the past, accepted without question by the majority of our fellows, in which we cannot acquiesce. Conscience awakes and confronts us with a challenge.”⁴⁵

It was indeed to the health and benefit of the State, argued Raven, that its citizens cultivated “detachment and independence of mind.” Individuals may turn out to be “mistaken, ignorant, deluded,” but, said Raven, no-one “can discharge his citizenship more nobly than by seeking to express by it his deepest convictions as to Christ’s will

for him.”⁴⁶ For Raven that included recognising that “whatever excuses Thomas Aquinas or Luther might find for the local and professional conflicts of their days are wholly irrelevant to the mass-murder, the bestiality and terrorism of war as it is today.”⁴⁷

A State committed to rearmament could introduce conscription with the threat of disenfranchisement or even execution for non-compliance. For the pacifist, that would be one of the risks of peacemaking.

What he cannot do, and what the State has no right to expect him to do, is to betray his conscience and prostitute his citizenship by consenting to courses which he knows to be for him and for it physically disastrous, morally degrading and spiritually renegade.⁴⁸

Raven’s approach was consistent with the argument of Morris at the 1934 Conference of the F.O.R. Morris had said that,

We must recognise our duty of obedience and fall in with the demands of the State except that there will be cases in which it is clear from the Christian point of view that we must choose between defying Cæsar or denying Christ. Then we must claim the right to follow our conscience at the same time as we recognise the right of the State to imprison us or put us to death, if the interests of the State seem to demand it. So we render to God that which is God’s and to Cæsar that which is his.

Nevertheless we are justified in repudiating the contention that the only path of loyalty to the State lies along the road of being ready to fight and claim that in a world which has outlawed war the refusal to fight is the individual’s truest patriotism.⁴⁹

A final factor in attitudes toward the State was scientific advance, not least the development of forms of transport that brought distant people together. Raven claimed that there were particular implications for Britain, with its world-wide Empire.

A local patriotism was natural so long as the speed of transport was limited by the pace of horses and sailing-ships - the time-span between towns and countries was as large at Waterloo as it had been in the Iliad. The steam-engine, the steamship, the bicycle, the motor-car, the aeroplane have made the world one neighbourhood; telegraph, telephone, wireless have made us next-door neighbours. In consequence we are already living in a unified world, an international order. War has become civil war. All the jargon about States as ends in themselves, the autonomous sovereignty of the State as natural law, the primary duty of the citizen to defend his fatherland has always been to the Christian something of a blasphemy; it is now for us all an anachronism. To carry over into the new age the petty enthusiasms for flags and colonies and the idolizing of one land as against all others is to ignore the facts and frustrate the possibilities of the situation. The isolationism of the Little Englander and the jingoism of the Imperialist are equally out of date. In many spheres of life, education, science, the arts, music, literature, we are already internationalists:

even in religion there is a real measure of co-operation, and among Christians a vital ecumenical movement.⁵⁰

Pietistic Pacifism

One further approach to Anglican pacifism needs to be considered, as it was influential in the devotional practice, if not in the political thinking, of many. Early in the decade its principal advocate had been Eric Hayman, more properly associated with the Society of Friends, although the F.O.R. regarded him as Anglican in 1928.⁵¹ Influenced by visiting India on behalf of the F.O.R., Hayman argued for a pacifism of being, not doing. His theme was patience, of acceptance.⁵² A similar approach was taken later by Evelyn Underhill, and one of the first acts of the newly-formed Executive Committee of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship in 1937 was to invite her to express her thoughts on paper. Having started her own spiritual journey with an exploration of mysticism, then developing an appreciation of the centrality of Incarnation and corporate worship, she had come to realise by the mid-1930s that the spiritual life determined one's personal and political behaviour. "For though we may renounce the world for ourselves, refuse the attempt to get anything out of it, we have to accept it as the sphere in which we are to co-operate with the spirit, and try to do the Will."⁵³ She joined the P.P.U. around 1936 and her first contribution to the A.P.F. was a booklet, *The Church and War*. Following the example of those, above, who based their pacifism on the example of the Jesus in Gethsemane and on Calvary, she argued that

To defeat the power of evil by the health-giving power of love and thus open a channel for the inflow of the creative grace of God is ... the only struggle in which the realistic Christian can take part. No retaliation. No revenge, national or personal. No "defensive war" - i.e. destroying our brother to prevent him destroying us.

As has been seen, a number of pacifists cited the Sermon on the Mount in support of their belief that participation in war was wrong. What was distinctive in Underhill's message was her literal interpretation of "Resist not evil," not through any textual fundamentalism but because acceptance and non-resistance were essential ingredients of the spiritual life, of being at peace with God. Such an approach was prophetic in that it revealed the shallowness of any value-system which accepted war. Where it was vulnerable to criticism was from the very standpoint of incarnational theology that had first led Underhill to her pacifism. Non-resistance sounded like an opting out of the world rather than a radical engagement with it. Added to which, many of the leaders of pacifism were, perhaps necessarily, disputatious figures. After all, they were openly resisting the war-tolerating value system of their society. Although Underhill's

meditations inspired many, in practice few pacifists followed her non-resistant approach completely.

Ethics: Heywood's Standards

H. C. L. Heywood, Fellow and Dean of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, was a leading Anglo-Catholic theologian on the first Executive of the A.P.F. He argued that war led to permanent moral deformity. He believed that the moral law was grounded in the will of God, and was "independent of our choices and the chaos they produce." He could not accept a relativistic way of thinking which led to such questions as "What sins cease to be sins when the government tells you to do them?", and "Why and when does what is wrong for one A to do to one B be right and good for a million A's to do to a million B's?"⁵⁴ Heywood suggested that agreed standards of reference were required, proposing:

- i. The nature, purpose, will of God can be discovered through the life and character of Jesus.
- ii. That because of this, all persons, their bodies and their actions, express meaning and values.
- iii. That suffering may be far from being evil, and is often the way to victory.
- iv. That sacrifice is the most constructive agency known.
- v. That respect for persons as persons is of primary importance - they are never means, but ends: and because of this, loving is the only command, and loving is a profound reverent caring for others in their integrity as persons - no matter how black their sin.
- vi. That there is to be no compromise, no tinkering with conscience - whatever makes us stumble is to be cut off and cast from us.
- vii. That there is only one thing to be feared, and that is not death, but evil in all its forms.⁵⁵

Such a standard of reference meant that he would not argue that all killing was necessarily wrong (there could be a valid debate about euthanasia, for instance) or that all coercion was wrong (as restraining force was not identical with destructive violence.) The standard did, however, lead him to argue that war was wrong, "because it is the apotheosis of fear, hate and distrust. To achieve so-called good by war is to accept the devil's bargain - that to one who worships him he will give all the kingdoms of the world." Fear, said Heywood, was at the heart even (especially) of defensive war. Hate was an inevitable component of indiscriminate killing. ("Does not impersonal unrestricted violence deny your personality and that of your opponents, because in behaving as you do you treat neither him nor yourself as persons - and, can one who has killed ever really regain his soul?") Mistrust was the assumption of bad faith in others, a denial of human fellowship, that persons were made in God's image. As a

result, Heywood concluded that “To contemplate the possibility of engaging in war, of whatever kind, or with whatever motive, is to dethrone the God who speaks through a cross and to set up in his place a Trinity of fear and hate and suspicion - and the greatest of these is fear.”⁵⁶

Where Heywood’s ethics differed from those of many Anglican pacifists was in his treatment of consequences. He dismissed the most frequent attempts to justify war - by appeal to justice, or “national honour” - as implying a particular attitude to an existing system of property ownership which, in practice, benefitted a privileged few. He realised the consequence of such argument could be invasion, but suggested that that might not necessarily be a worse outcome than taking part in defensive war.

it is far from being self-evident that any such consequence [invasion] would be so great an evil as the fact of war itself. If its nature is as I have tried to describe it ..., it is fair to ask whether any consequences can outweigh its essential wrongness. This is not to say that consequences have no place in the ethical evaluation of an act: it is to invite a judgment, in terms of Christian principles, upon the relative ethical levels of the consequences and the essential nature of an act.

The cost of pacifism, in terms of suffering, may well be greater than the cost of war, similarly measured; but so long as the Cross stands where it does in Christian thought and symbolism, it would be difficult to deny that the constructive result of pacifism is bound to be greater than the hypothetically constructive result of any war.⁵⁷

Despite such dismissiveness of the concept of consequence, Heywood was rare among Anglican pacifists in considering it at all. The standard approach was to hold to an eschatological ethic, of a kind associated more with New Testament times than with the twentieth century.

Ethics and Eschatology

“Jesus understood his message and his ethics as deriving from the imminent or incipient kingdom of God.”⁵⁸ That is the light in which, say, the Sermon on the Mount is to be read. That was the basis for the actions and lifestyle of Jesus and the early Church. The power of the eschaton to influence human actions diminished with the reduced expectation of its imminence. The ethical approach of so many of the Anglican pacifists of the 1930s was eschatological not because they expected an imminent catastrophic or parousial eschaton, but because they had been influenced by the kingdom theology of Maurice and subsequent Anglican social thinkers, and by the theology of Schweitzer, Dodd, et al. Recent generations of theologians had provided an intellectual and theological framework upon which a pacifist ethic could be based. Whether Jesus’

eschatology was placed entirely in the future (its timing to be initiated by God, but with humans conforming to it, living it, extending it), or was regarded as totally realized (the nonconformist C. H. Dodd was a pacifist, arguing that the presence of the kingdom called people to appropriate conduct today), the expectation was that human actions would be consistent with the kingdom. The modern ethical theorist Schrage has argued that

the eschatological message of Jesus - more precisely, the promise of the unmerited kingdom of God, which cannot be established by human efforts - is a crucial motive for human conduct. "Repent, *for* the kingdom of God is at hand" (Mark 1:15). Human conduct is a consequence, not a condition, of the coming of God's kingdom, but when the kingdom does not lead to appropriate consequential action on the part of humankind, it becomes judgment.⁵⁹

For pacifists, such thinking would explain why non-pacifism led to the judgment of war. Beyond that, principled pacifists held their faith because of the expectation of eschatological validation, that is, that they would be proved right in God's way in God's time. As Morris said, "the real division comes between those whose pacifism is relative because they think in terms of consequences and those whose pacifism is absolute because it is a vital expression of their faith."⁶⁰ If the short-term consequences of the absolute pacifist stand were painful, even disastrous, then that would reflect the greater sin of a warring society, rather than any possible error in pacifism which was, supremely, conduct becoming of the kingdom. Schrage has claimed that the kingdom of God when found evokes conduct appropriate to the eschaton:

The kingdom of God is the foundation of ethics in the sense that it has already irrupted into the present as a joyfully acknowledged discovery, as something that even now brings salvation, joy and direction. For Jesus, ethics is a consequence of eschatology not merely in the sense that it serves to prepare humanity for the imminent eschaton, as in Luke 12.57ff. and the entrance sayings. It is also an inescapable consequence in the sense that it is the only reasonable response to the kingdom of God already at hand in Jesus.⁶¹

Tactical pacifists argued that the immediate consequences of their actions would be beneficial. For principled pacifists - and most of the Anglican pacifists came in this category - the immediate consequences of their actions were almost irrelevant. Justification would come with a wider perspective. What mattered was that their actions were right, that is consistent with the kingdom. If they also happened to be beneficial in the short term - and most held that more often than not they would be (thus Lansbury tried pacifist measures of war-prevention to the last) - then that would be a bonus. What mattered was that the pacifist stand would be vindicated *in the end*, as Jesus' willingness to submit nonviolently to crucifixion was vindicated by the resurrection.

Morris, for example, argued that ideals were to be defended by dying for them not killing for them even as they were seen to go down to the grave also, “because you know that in so far as they are true, they share in the eternity of truth.”⁶²

To critical external observers, this attitude seemed an unwillingness to face up to the destructive “reality” of the world in which they lived. By way of contrast, Christian pacifism seemed to those on the inside to be a new reality, consistent and with an internal integrity. Thus, for Evelyn Underhill, to do what was right, and in accordance with the Will of God, was more important than any short-term material or political benefit:

questions of expediency, practicality, national prestige and national safety do not as such concern [the Christian Church]. All these derive from human egotism and human fear. Her single business is to apply everywhere and at all times the law of charity; and so bring the will of man, whether national or individual, into harmony with the Will of God.⁶³

Likewise, Raven asserted that the Christian was not primarily concerned with questions of expediency. “He professes an allegiance to truth and righteousness for their own sakes.... He claims to order his life in accordance not with the dictates of human prudence, but with the will of God as embodied in the life and example of Jesus Christ.”⁶⁴ Morris, too, could not accept that pacifism was a policy dependent on particular political circumstances which could, conceivably change. Christian pacifism was an absolute with

nothing in common with those who will condemn the use of military force for any other reason which in any given set of circumstances would no longer hold. They are only seeking to avoid war - we are seeking the Kingdom of God. Their attitude therefore admits the possibility of argument about method when the threat of war arises - they might even speak again of a war to end war - but my future action must depend not on the experience of the future but on the Truth about God and life as I see it now....⁶⁵

Similarly, Sheppard concluded that “as one who would like to be a decent follower of Jesus Christ I am persuaded that, whatever the consequences, this killing business is not to be done by a Christian.”⁶⁶ Again, he argued, “So far as I can understand my Master, I am unable to believe that He would give a disciple permission at any time, or for any cause, to kill his brother. That is the beginning and end of my Pacifism. With the consequences for an individual or a nation I am not concerned.”⁶⁷ Remembering Sheppard’s part in her conversion to Christian pacifism, Vera Brittain reflected on the person of Jesus:

As a man he had died on the Cross believing that, whatever the immediate results of a course determined by conviction and ending in apparent total defeat, His father would reveal in time's long perspective that an action performed in accordance with the Divine Will would produce the results that he desired for His world.⁶⁸

As Lansbury wrote on a birthday note to Sheppard in 1936, "Somewhere sometime, the cause of Peace you are striving to serve will triumph. Truth is Truth & cannot be overcome by error."⁶⁹

PACIFISM AND THEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT: ENDNOTES

1. W. M. M. G. Mauleverer, *Reconciliation*, July 1937, p186.
2. *My England*, p31-33.
3. *Church Times*, 24 February 1933, p220.
4. *Church of England Newspaper*, 17 May 1935, p12.
5. *Church of England Newspaper*, 16 October 1936, p6.
6. *Church of England Newspaper*, 16 October 1936, p6.
7. *Church Times*, 19 July 1935, p39.
8. *Church Times*, 18 October 1935, p438, and *Church of England Newspaper*, 18 October 1935, p10. Sheppard was addressing the Church Congress in Bournemouth. Elsewhere, responding to the claim that politicians were doing their best in the circumstances, Sheppard replied: "We have to change the circumstances. We can do that by stating the Christian attitude towards war, the attitude that is crystallized in the words of the Commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill!' Suppose that the Christian Churches in this country discovered that Commandment, and stated it, and said quite simply that the words meant exactly what they said, and all the flags and drums and bugles in the world could not alter or modify them one jot or tittle. Suppose that all the individual Christians in this country did the same - and pledged themselves publicly, bound themselves by a solemn undertaking that they would have no part or lot in any future war, that no matter what the circumstances of that war might be, they would not take up arms. Suppose, in short, that we took God's word seriously, that we decided He meant what He said, and resolved to obey Him. Do you think that would have no effect? Don't you think that it would change the circumstances in which the politicians had to act and make their plans? Of course it would. They would be forced to find some other method of preserving Peace than armaments and Pacts of mutual assistance, which mean, in effect, agreements to fight." (*We Say "No"*, p4,5.) Sheppard argued that the moral aspect of killing was not changed by the killer wearing a uniform and being considered praiseworthy by fellow-countrymen. "I have to answer to my conscience for what I do, and my conscience can't get beyond that injunction, 'Thou shalt not kill!'" (*We Say "No"*, p7.)
9. *We Say "No"*, p56.
10. *Church of England Newspaper*, 22 March 1935, p13.
11. *Church of England Newspaper*, 31 May 1935, p11.
12. *Church of England Newspaper*, 9 October 1936, p8.
13. *Church of England Newspaper*, 11 October 1935, p1 and *Church Times*, 18 October 1935, p437,438.
14. *My England*, p32.
15. *Reconciliation*, 1934, p173f.

16. *Church of England Newspaper*, 14 September 1934.
17. *Church Times*, 23 October 1936, p444.
18. *Church of England Newspaper*, 10 August 1934, p12.
19. *Church of England Newspaper*, 5 July 1935, p12.
20. *Church Times*, 24 March 1933, p348.
21. *Reconciliation*, April 1937, p89.
22. *Church of England Newspaper*, 16 October 1936, p6.
23. *Church of England Newspaper*, 18 September 1936, p11. As a conscientious objector in World War II, Golding was one of a number of Anglican pacifists who agreed to be "human guinea pigs" in medical research into scabies. In 1977/1978, he was Mayor's Consort when his wife Winifred was Mayor of Sheffield. (Winifred Golding in conversation with CB, 11 January 1993.)
24. *Reconciliation*, 1934, p234.
25. *Reconciliation*, 1934, p307.
26. Morris, *The Creed of a Christian Pacifist*; Co-operative Union pamphlet.
27. Morris, *The Creed of a Christian Pacifist*; Co-operative Union pamphlet.
28. *Testament of Experience*, p169,170.
29. Raven, *War and the Christian*, p82.
30. In Anglican terms there was a spectrum of attitudes towards pacifism even amongst the most progressive thinkers. Thus Raven was totally at odds with Temple, who, though radical in so many ways, was a fierce critic of pacifism. Temple was, however, upon the outbreak of war, a defender of the rights of conscientious objectors and he was held in high regard even by those pacifists he so often infuriated. Between Raven and Temple was George Bell, who not only had experience of working with pacifists in the Christ and Peace Campaign, but was deeply concerned about the plight of Christians in Germany. Bell, following Just War principles to the letter, accepted the argument for taking part in the Second World War, but only if it was conducted along Just War principles, with no policies of starvation by blockade or of obliteration bombing which were intended to harm non-combatant civilian populations. During the war he worked alongside Corder Catchpool and Vera Brittain on such campaigns, but in general he was cautious about aligning himself with pacifists.
31. *War and the Christian*, p52.
32. *War and the Christian*, p61,62.
33. *War and the Christian*, p66.
34. "It is important, particularly for us to whom such teaching is not naturally congenial," he said, "to

recognize the permanent value of this position." *War and the Christian*, p63. Raven had earlier tackled some of the theological issues in *Is War Obsolete?*

35. *War and the Christian*, p66,67.

36. "To see the world as a chessboard with yourself and your friends white and everyone else black is no doubt soothing: it gives you just cause to denounce or to liquidate. But even if, in moments of inverted pharisaism, you see yourself black and accept the consequent damnation, the picture does not become more true to life. For with every respect to Augustine, Calvin and Barth life is multi-coloured - and in any case Jesus said 'Judge not'." *Science, Religion and the Future*, p76,77.

37. *War and the Christian*, p182.

38. *War and the Christian*, p69.

39. *War and the Christian*, p71.

40. Cited in *War and the Christian*, p75.

41. *War and the Christian*, p80,81.

42. *War and the Christian*, p83.

43. *War and the Christian*, p84.

44. *War and the Christian*, p89.

45. *War and the Christian*, p86.

46. *War and the Christian*, p88.

47. *War and the Christian*, p143,144.

48. *War and the Christian*, p159.

49. *Reconciliation*, 1934, p235.

50. *War and the Christian*, p144,145.

51. F.O.R. General Committee Minutes, 8 October 1928 and 21 January 1929. Hayman, who in July 1924 had written in *Reconciliation* on the "pacifism of God," (den Boggende, p261) may have been an Anglican at that time, but he also had at least one foot in the Quaker fold, which joint membership was reflected in his ecclesial but pietistic theology. In 1944 he described himself as having "some thirty years' membership of the religious Society of Friends." Yet he also felt a sense of being "a member of the universal Church of Christ," which universal bond was "far stronger than any denominational loyalty." (*Worship and the Common Life*, pvi.)

52. "There is not a programme to be applied, nor can we understand what such a programme might be. Our vision is too short, and our patience too limited, for us to envisage the way of reconciliation. In its very nature that way can never be defined in a policy. The patience for its fulfilment needs to be endless, and nothing less than the long-suffering of God can suffice. And so our way must be that of obedience

and great humility. If we feel these qualities to be grave limitations, we have forgotten that they are the marks of the redeemer, who humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death. He needs those who will continue His obedience, because his life is living in them. Through that indwelling life they have been called into a ministry which shall slowly and ceaselessly accept His pain, and share in his triumphant joy. He does not offer an alternative policy, nor is He baffled or turned aside by human sin. He is Himself, and He calls us to be the life of God in a world which still rejects Him.

We cannot appraise the way of reconciliation as a practical alternative to political methods. It seeks an end of which no party is conscious, and which no party can conceivably serve. Jesus seems to have been almost unaware of all the conceptions which men prize - for which they form parties and leagues. He did not seem to understand justice, security and freedom. He did not need an ideal environment for his redeeming love. He took no steps to avert the will of his enemies. He did not even safeguard Himself against His friends. He did nothing. We are burdened with some problem or danger immense to our tiny vision, and we cannot bear to let our days pass by, lest it should have been possible to do something, however small, to alter the evil conditions. But He saw the flowing tide of all the world's sorrow and sin, and He let it break upon Himself, unresisting, unevading, impotent with the powerless majesty of God.

We cannot do this for ourselves. The life which lives the way of reconciliation through our living does not belong to us. But - having watched Him there - we dare not do what must be so infinitely less." (*Reconciliation*, 1934, p156,157.)

53. *The Spiritual Life*, p90,91. Cited in Greene, p118,119.

54. Heywood, p4.

55. Heywood, p5.

56. Heywood, p8,9.

57. Heywood, p9,10.

58. Schrage, p24.

59. Schrage, p28.

60. Sybil Morrison, *The Life and Work of Stuart Morris*, p17-19.

61. Schrage, p29,30.

62. Stuart Morris, *The Creed of a Christian Pacifist*, Co-operative Union pamphlet.

63. *The Church and War*. Later, soon after the outbreak of war, she spoke of pacifism as "a supernatural vocation, a bringing of ultimate truth into the world of time," saying that "The pacifist is one who has crossed over to God's side and stands by the Cross, which is at once the supreme expression of that charity and the pattern of an unblemished trust in the Unseen. Thence, with eyes cleansed by prayer, he sees all life in supernatural regard; and knows that, though our present social order may crash in the furies of a total war and the darkness of Calvary may close down on the historic scene, the one thing that matters is the faithfulness of the creature to its own fragmentary apprehensions of the law of charity and its ultimate return to that tranquillity of order which is a perfect correspondence with the steadfast Will of God. His pacifism, then, is a judgment on existence. It is rooted in God and can only maintain itself by that contemplation which St. Gregory called the 'vision of the principle'." ('Postscript', in Hartill, *Into the Way of Peace*, p187ff.)

64. Raven, *Is War Obsolete?*, p26,27.

65. *Reconciliation*, 1934, p307,308.

66. *Christianity and War*, an article in the *Sunday Express*, cited in Sheppard, *God and My Neighbour*, p133-137.

67. *Church Times*, 2 August 1935, p110.

68. *Testament of Experience*, p170,172.

69. 2 September 1936. Richardson collection.

PACIFISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1930-1937

POSTSCRIPT

POSTSCRIPT

After 1937, things were never the same again for Anglican pacifists, and for seemingly contradictory reasons. As the world slid ever closer to war, the opportunity for pacifists to have influence in political affairs began to evaporate; pacifism was marginalised as a minority viewpoint, with pacifists increasingly disregarded by strategists and the general public alike. Conversely, within the Church of England there was for the first time an organisation which was committed to making the case that Christianity was a pacifist faith, and which would support Anglican pacifists in their marginalisation.

In campaigning terms, the principal vehicle for promoting pacifism in Britain, the Peace Pledge Union, was never able to regain the influence it came close to achieving during Dick Sheppard's lifetime. For all the efforts of Stuart Morris, the P.P.U. could not recover from Sheppard's death. International events moved too quickly from the start of 1938 for the P.P.U. to be anything other than a reactive agency; opportunities proactively to persuade people of the long-term relevance of a pacifist philosophy were limited when Nazi influence was expanding in continental Europe and domestic policy was dominated by calls for gas-mask training and the re-introduction of conscription. Membership numbers did not start to decline until well into the war, but by then the dominant demand from the membership was for mutual support, with the needs of conscientious objectors to the fore. The ideal of pacifist communities was developed, as promoted by John Middleton Murry at Swanwick in 1937, partly to provide agricultural opportunities for C.O.s and partly because there were those who believed that such communities held the key to changing society in favour of pacifist, communal values. Foremost of the advocates of this latter approach was Murry himself, who, as editor of *Peace News*, used that journal as a vehicle for his philosophy. As inevitable tensions arose within some communities, Murry became disillusioned, *Peace News* reflected his low morale, and his sojourn with pacifism came to an end.

By way of contrast, the most resilient pacifist campaigner during the war years and immediately after was Vera Brittain. The regular newssheet which she wrote and distributed to those who requested it, her *Letters to Peacelovers*, was by far the best pacifist commentary of the time and considerably more empowering than anything Murry produced. Her wartime book, *Humiliation With Honour*, although not technically a theological tome, reflected a thoroughly consistent theology of suffering. Having been hostile to Christianity during the First World War, she came increasingly to regard her pacifism as being essentially a Christian pacifism. By 1945 she was expressing her feelings concerning the end of the war in terms of religious experience.

Post-war, Brittain became President of the P.P.U., and helped to guide it through some of its more difficult years, until the peace movement reformed in opposition to atomic weapons.

On the political front, George Lansbury refused to stop trying to bring about an international economic conference that would so revise the terms of Versailles that, even at the last, a Second World War might be avoided. The Embassies of Reconciliation continued into 1938 and, indeed, into 1939. On the occasion of the Anschluss, and again during the September 1938 crisis, Lansbury sent telegrams to Hitler, reminding him of their talks the previous year. In August, Lansbury, Bartlett and Carter visited senior politicians in Bulgaria, Roumania, Jugoslavia and Hungary, in one more attempt to promote action along lines recommended in Van Zeeland's report. In the following month's crisis, Lansbury also wrote to Roosevelt, and to the beleaguered President Benes of Czechoslovakia. That Lansbury's concern was neither misplaced nor peripheral was shown by the warm reply sent by Benes to Lansbury in October 1938, when the full consequences of the Munich settlement became apparent.¹ It can be concluded by implication that Lansbury's efforts were regarded by the heads of state he visited as more likely to achieve justice and peace within Europe than the diplomacy of the major powers. Appeasement was Chamberlain's policy, not Lansbury's, and the beaten Benes recognised the fact.

As crisis led to greater crisis through 1939, Lansbury's efforts were largely confined to sending further telegrams and letters - to the Pope, Roosevelt, Hitler and Mussolini - and to the *Times* (19 June). In July, Lansbury and Bartlett made one last visit, to Belgium to see Prime Minister Pierlot and King Leopold. When, on the outbreak of war, King Leopold made offers of mediation, Lansbury supported him and telegrammed Roosevelt to urge the U.S. President to add his weight to the Belgian appeal. In January 1940, a group of members of Parliament nominated Lansbury for the Nobel Peace Prize. Having written a final article which appeared in *Tribune* on 26 April, Lansbury died of cancer on 7 May 1940. He had tried as hard as anybody to prevent a further war. No pacifist was ever again able to make such an impact on the political life of Britain, and, so nearly, on the prospect of peace in Europe.

After Lansbury, pacifism rapidly waned as a political force. Anglican pacifists, many of whom were forced to become conscientious objectors during the war, generally concentrated on the need for mutual support. The most notable project was Hungerford Club, providing shelter and food for the least socially acceptable of London's homeless, run by the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship. A.P.F.'s campaigning was largely confined to

ecclesiastical circles. In June 1940, an A.P.F. delegation of Hartill, Le Messurier and Raven visited both the Archbishops at Lambeth, extracting from them recognition of the unacceptability of the bombing of open towns as a feature of national policy, a statement that Temple was later to ignore, despite considerable pressure from Bishop Bell, Vera Brittain and others. Despite the war, A.P.F. was able to produce two substantial collections of essays edited by Percy Hartill on political, spiritual and theological aspects of Christian pacifism - *Into the Way of Peace* and *On Earth Peace*. The combined reduction in influence in society of both pacifism and the Church of England meant that the A.P.F. would never be numerically strong, but the affirmation of consecutive Lambeth Conferences of the 1930 Resolution 25 on "incompatibility" was a regular reminder that pacifism was normative within the Church, with war-acceptance the deviation in need of constant justification.

In any single post-war period, there was far less exploration of the theology of war than in the 1930s. Nonetheless, Raven continued to produce pacifist texts, not least his *Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism*, published by the F.O.R. in 1952. When issues of war and peace were considered by the Church, it was largely in the context of nuclear weapons (a peripheral issue for pacifists who opposed all weapons and regarded nuclear weapons as a development merely of scale not of degree) or arms transfers (where again, expressions of selective disapproval were insufficient for pacifists who wished to end all arms manufacture and transfer.) No Church body, Anglican or ecumenical, again allowed the freedom of expression for pacifists shown at C.O.P.E.C. Indeed the fate of pacifists at the Church Assembly in 1937 became a common pacifist experience as ecclesiastical assemblies continued to thwart those who hoped for better things.

Although Anglican pacifists today are marginalised both by the Church and by society, that there is any organisation at all offering mutual support and campaigning is due to the efforts of those who founded A.P.F. Sixty years later, membership of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship is greater than that of the Peace Pledge Union. The continuing resolve and resilience of A.P.F. is witness to the firm foundations laid by pacifists in the Church of England, 1930-1937.

POSTSCRIPT: ENDNOTES

1. *Embassies of Reconciliation* Annual Report, 1937-1938, p16.

PACIFISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1930-1937

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHYARCHIVES and ORIGINAL PAPERS

Anglican Pacifist Fellowship
Vera Brittain

held by CB
William Ready Division of Archives,
McMaster University Library, Hamilton,
Ontario

Fellowship of Reconciliation
(including:
Christ and Peace,
Embassies of Reconciliation)

British Library of Political and Economic
Science

George Lansbury

British Library of Political and Economic
Science

Peace Pledge Union
Charles Raven
Maude Royden (Kathleen Courtney letters)
Bertrand Russell (for Tavistock/Bedford)

P.P.U. headquarters
held by Faith Raven
Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford
William Ready Division of Archives,
McMaster University Library, Hamilton,
Ontario

St. George's, Leeds
Dick Sheppard
Society of Friends

St. George's, Leeds
held by Lady Richardson
Friends House, London

Also such published papers / journals of:
the International Arbitration League,
the National Peace Council,
the Peace Society,
the Women's International League and
the Workman's Peace Association,
as are available at the British Library of Political and Economic Science.

ORAL INTERVIEWS

Taped conversations took place with the following, inter alia, many subjects also providing associated personal papers:

Peggy Attlee,
William Barnes,
Rowena Bingham,
John Chapman,
Patricia Churchill,
Diana Collins,
Philip Dransfield,
Winifred Golding,
Father Gregory CSWG,
Francis House,
Very Revd. Alfred Jowett,
Ronald Mallone,
Ven. Jeffrey Maples,
Hilda Morris,
Faith Raven,

Mary Raven,
 Lady Peggie Richardson,
 Margaret Scrutton,
 Revd. Michael Segal,
 Lord Donald Soper,
 Dorothy Stimson,
 Arthur Towner.

JOURNALS

Anglican Pacifist
 Arbitrator
 Challenge
 Christian Pacifist
 Church of England Newspaper
 Church Times
 Concord
 Friend
 Goodwill
 Herald of Peace
 Manchester Guardian
 Peace
 Peace News
 P.P.U. Journal
 Reconciliation
 Times
 War Resister

SOURCES CITED IN THE TEXT

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Andrew, Father | The Life and Letters of Father Andrew, S.D.C. (ed. Kathleen E. Burne) | Mowbray; 1948 |
| Andrew, Father | The Logic of Faith | A.P.F.; 1939 |
| Andrews, C.F. | The Inner Life | Hodder & Stoughton; 1939 |
| Andrews, C.F. | What I Owe to Christ | Hodder & Stoughton; 1932 |
| Angell, Norman | The Great Illusion | Heinemann; 1913 |
| Arnold, Thomas | Select English Works of John Wyclif (3 vols.) | Oxford; 1869-1871 |
| Attlee, Peggy | With a Quiet Conscience | Dove & Chough; 1995 |
| Bainton, Roland H. | Christian Attitudes Towards War and Peace | Hodder & Stoughton; 1961 |
| Bainton, Roland H. | Erasmus | Lion; 1988 |
| Barnes, E.W. | Blessed are the Peacemakers | Pamphlet, 1936 |
| Barnes, John | Ahead of His Age: Bishop Barnes of Birmingham | Birmingham Collins; 1979 |
| Bell, George (ed.) | The War and the Kingdom of God | Longmans Green; 1915 |

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Bell, Julian (ed.) | We Did Not Fight | Cobden
Sanderson; 1935 |
| Branson, Noreen | Poplarism 1919-1925: George Lansbury and the
Councillors' Revolt | Lawrence &
Wishart; 1979 |
| Brinton, Henry | The Peace Army | Williams &
Norgate; 1932 |
| Brittain, Vera | Chronicle of Friendship: Vera Brittain's Diary of the
Thirties, 1932-1939 (ed. Bishop, Alan) | Gollancz; 1986 |
| Brittain, Vera | Humiliation With Honour | Dakers; 1942 |
| Brittain, Vera | The Rebel Passion | G. Allen & Unwin;
1964 |
| Brittain, Vera | Testament of Experience [Fontana edn., 1980] | Gollancz; 1957 |
| Brittain, Vera | Testament of a Peace Lover (eds. W. & A. Eden-Green) | Virago; 1988 |
| Brittain, Vera | Testament of Youth [Fontana edn., 1979] | Gollancz; 1935 |
| Brittain, Vera | Thrice a Stranger | Gollancz; 1938 |
| Brock, Peter | Freedom From Violence | Univ. of Toronto;
1991 |
| Brock, Peter | Freedom From War | Univ. of Toronto;
1991 |
| Brock, Peter | The Quaker Peace Testimony | Sessions; York;
1990 |
| Brock, Peter | Studies in Peace History | Sessions; York;
1991 |
| Brockway, Fenner | Bermondsey Story: The Life of Alfred Salter | Stephen
Humphrey; 1995 |
| Brown, Jeremy | Portsmouth and Gosport Anglican Evangelicals, 1850-
1950; A Survey | Portsmouth; 1992 |
| Buchanan, Colin | Cut the Connection | D.L.T.; 1994 |
| Bussey, Gertrude and Tims, Margaret | Pioneers for Peace | W.I.L.P.F.; 1980 |
| Buxton, Charles Roden, Dickinson, G. Lowes, and others | Towards a Lasting Settlement | G. Allen & Unwin;
1915 |
| Cadoux, C.J. | The Early Christian Attitude to War | Headley; 1919 |
| Cadoux, C.J. | The Early Church and the World | T. & T. Clark;
1925 |
| Ceadel, Martin | Christian Pacifism in the Era of 2 World Wars | Studies in
Christian History,
vol. 20; 1983 |
| Ceadel, Martin | Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945 | O.U.P.; Oxford;
1980 |
| Chamberlain, W. J. | Fighting For Peace | N.M.W.M.;
c.1929 |
| Chaturvedi, Benarsidas & Sykes, Marjorie | Charles Freer Andrews | G. Allen & Unwin;
1949 |
| Church of England | The Church and the Bomb | Hodder &
Stoughton; 1982 |

- Clark, I.D.L. C. F. Andrews - Deenabandhu I.S.P.C.K.; Delhi; 1970
- Clarkson, John The Substance of a Letter, addressed to a Clergyman of the Established Church, on the Subject of War York; 1827
- Clarkson, Thomas An Essay on the Doctrines and Practice of Early Christians as They Relate to War Flint; 1820
- Clarkson, Thomas A Portraiture of Quakerism, vol. III 1806
- Clergyman of the Church of England The Lawfulness of Defensive War Upon Christian Principles Impartially Considered 1798
- Clergyman of the Church of England Thoughts on the Lawfulness of War 1796
- Collins, Diana Partners in Protest Victor Gollancz; 1992
- Collins, L. John Faith Under Fire Leslie Frewin; 1966
- Cookson, J.E. The Friends of Peace: Anti-War Liberalism in England, 1793-1815 C.U.P.; Cambridge; 1982
- C.O.P.E.C. Christianity and War (Commission Report vol. VIII) Longmans, Green; 1924
- Cornwell, Peter Church and Nation Blackwell; Oxford; 1983
- Den Boggende, Gijsbert The Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1914-1945 McMaster PhD Thesis; 1986
- Dillistone, F.W. Charles Raven: Naturalist, Historian, Theologian Hodder & Stoughton; 1975
- Dodge, David Low War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ (includes "The Mediator's Kingdom") Ginn; Boston, U.S.A.; 1905 edn.
- Duff, Peggy Left, Left, Left Allison and Busby; 1971
- Evans, Alfred Bowen War: Its Theology; Its Anomalies; Its Incidents and Its Humiliations, A Discourse Pamphlet; 1855
- Flessati, Valerie Pax: The History of a Catholic Peace Society 1936-1971 Bradford PhD. Thesis; 1991
- Flessati, Valerie Waking the Sleeping Giant Christian C.N.D.; 1997
- Fletcher, Sheila Maude Royden; A Life Blackwell, Oxford; 1989
- Foot, Michael Aneurin Bevan, vol.1, 1897-1945 MacGibbon & Kee; 1962
- Fry, Joan M. Christ and Peace Headley Bros; c.1915

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| Gollancz, Victor
Graham, John W. | Fascists at Olympia
Conscription and Conscience | Gollancz; 1934
G. Allen & Unwin;
1922 |
| Grane, William Leighton
Greene, Dana
Groser, St. John B.
Groves, Reg | The Passing of War (3rd edn.)
Evelyn Underhill
Politics and Persons
Conrad Noel and the Thaxted Movement | MacMillan; 1913
D.L.T.; 1991
S.C.M.; 1949
Augustus M.
Kelley; New York;
1968. |
| Hartill, Percy (ed.) | Into the Way of Peace | James Clarke;
1941 |
| Hartill, Percy (ed.) | On Earth Peace | James Clarke;
1944 |
| Hartill, Percy | Pacifism and Christian Common Sense | A.R. Mowbray;
1938 |
| Hawksley, John Webster | The Antidote | W. Smith;
Bedford; 1795 |
| Hayman, Eric
Heard, Gerald, et al
Heering, G. J. | Worship and the Common Life
The New Pacifism
The Fall of Christianity | C.U.P.; 1944
Allenson; 1936
G. Allen & Unwin;
1930 |
| Henson, Hensley | Retrospect of an Unimportant Life, vol. II | O.U.P.; 1943 |
| Heywood, H.C.L.
Hobhouse, Margaret | The Worshipping Community
I Appeal to Cæsar | 1938
G. Allen & Unwin;
1917 |
| Holman, Bob
Hooker, Richard
Hornus, Jean-Michel | Good Old George
Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity
It Is Not Lawful For Me To Fight | Lion; Oxford; 1990
1648
Herald; Scottdale,
Pennsylvania;
1980 |
| Howatch, Susan | Ultimate Prizes | Harper Collins;
1996 |
| Hughes, Robert | The Red Dean | Churchman;
Worthing; 1987 |
| Hutton, Edward | The Franciscans in England, 1224-1538 | Constable; 1926 |
| I.F.O.R. | Towards a Christian International | (1) I.F.O.R.,
Paris; 1936
(2) I.F.O.R.; 1941 |
| Iremonger, F. | William Temple | O.U.P.; 1948 |
| Jasper, R.C.D. | George Bell, Bishop of Chichester | O.U.P.; 1967 |
| Kennedy, Thomas C. | The Hound of Conscience; A History of the No-
Conscription Fellowship, 1914-1919 | University of
Arkansas;
Fayetteville; 1981 |

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Kent, Bruce | Undiscovered Ends | Harper & Collins;
1992 |
| Knox, Vicesimus | Extracts From Erasmus | 1814 |
| Koss, Stephen | The Pro-Boers | University of
Chicago;
Chicago; 1973 |
| "Lady, A" | - see Mary Roberts | |
| Lambeth Conferences, 1867 - 1930 | | S.P.C.K., 1948 |
| Lansbury, Edgar | George Lansbury, My Father | Sampson Low,
Marston; 1934 |
| Lansbury, George | My England | Selwyn & Blount;
1934 |
| Lansbury, George | My Quest For Peace | Michael Joseph;
1938 |
| Lansbury, George | My Life | Constable; 1928 |
| Law, William | An Humble, Earnest, and Affectionate Address to the
Clergy (Works, Vol. IX) | M. Richardson;
1761 |
| Law, William | A Practical Treatise Upon Christian Perfection (Works,
Vol. III) | J. Richardson;
1726 |
| Law, William | Reflections on War, by William Law, A.M., Extracted
from ..., etc. | B. Flower;
Cambridge; 1799 |
| Law, William | A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life (Works, Vol.
IV) | J. Richardson;
1729 |
| Lax, William H. | Lax, His Book | Epworth; 1937 |
| Lester, Muriel | It Occurred to Me | S.C.M.; 1938 |
| Liddington, Jill | The Long Road to Greenham | Virago; 1989 |
| Livingstone, Adelaide | The Peace Ballot: The Official History | Gollancz; 1935 |
| Lockhart, Douglas | God's Family at Worship | Centenary; 1939 |
| Lockhart, J.G. | Cosmo Gordon Lang | Hodder &
Stoughton; 1949 |
| Lothian, Marquess of, etc | The Universal Church and the World of Nations | G. Allen & Unwin;
1938 |
| McCormick, Pat, et al | St. Martin-in-the-Fields Calling | Athenæum; 1932 |
| Macnicol, Nicol | C.F. Andrews: Friend of India | James Clarke;
1944 |
| Marshall, Howard, et al | Dick Sheppard by His Friends | Hodder &
Stoughton; 1938 |
| Martin, Kingsley | Editor: A Volume of Autobiography 1931-1945 | Hutchinson; 1968 |
| Miles, Susan | Portrait of a Parson, William Corbett Roberts | G. Allen & Unwin;
1955 |
| Miles, Susan | Blind Men Crossing A Bridge | Constable; 1934 |
| Minnion, John and Bolsover, Philip | The C.N.D. Story | Allison and Busby;
1983 |

Morris, Stuart	Christianity and War	F.O.R. pamphlet; 1936
Morris, Stuart	The Creed of a Christian Pacifist	Co-operative Union pamphlet; 1937
Morrison, Sybil	I Renounce War	Sheppard; 1962
Morrison, Sybil	The Life and Work of Stuart Morris	P.P.U.; c.1968 (?)
Murry, John Middleton	God or the Nation?	P.P.U.; 1937
Mustoe, Winifred J.	Pilgrimage of Discovery	booklet; 1990
N.C.F.	N.C.F. Souvenir	N.C.F., n/d
Nichols, Beverley	Cry Havoc!	Jonathan Cape; 1933
Niebuhr, Reinhold	Moral Man and Immoral Society	Scribner; New York; 1948
Nuttall, Geoffrey F.	Christian Pacifism in History	Blackwell; Oxford; 1958
Palmer, Bernard	Men of Habit	Canterbury Press; Norwich; 1994
Paxton, William, et al	Dick Sheppard; An Apostle of Brotherhood	Chapman & Hall; 1938
Peace Society	A Solemn Review of the Custom of War	Hamilton, Adams; 1832
Peace Society	Extracts from the Writings of Erasmus	Hamilton, Adams; 1832
Perry, Harry	50 Years of Workcamps	I.V.S.; Leicester; 1981
Pierce, Nathaniel W. and Ward, Paul L.	The Voice of Conscience: A Loud and Unusual Noise?	Episcopal Peace Fellowship; Washington, D.C.; 1989
Pilkington, George	Travels Through the United Kingdom Promoting the Cause of Peace on Earth and Goodwill Towards Men	Edmund Fry; 1839
Playne, Caroline E.	Society at War 1914-1916	G. Allen & Unwin; 1930
Plowman, Max	Bridge Into the Future; Letters of Max Plowman	Dakers; 1944
Postgate, Raymond	The Life of George Lansbury	Longmans, Green; 1951
Purcell, William	Odd Man Out: A Biography of Lord Soper of Kingsway	Mowbray; 1983
Pyne, Thomas (A Clergyman of the Church of England)	An Address to All Nations	1840
Radhakrishnan, S.	Mahatma Gandhi: Essays and Reflections on his Life and Work	G. Allen & Unwin; 1939

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Rae, John | Conscience and Politics | O.U.P.; 1970 |
| Raven, Charles E. | Christian Socialism 1848-1854 | Frank Cass; 1920 |
| Raven, Charles E. | Is War Obsolete? | G. Allen & Unwin;
1935 |
| Raven, Charles E. | Jesus and the Gospel of Love | Hodder &
Stoughton; 1931 |
| Raven, Charles E. | Our Salvation | Martin Hopkinson;
1925 |
| Raven, Charles E. | Science, Religion and the Future | C.U.P.;
Cambridge; 1943 |
| Raven, Charles E. | The Theological Basis of Christian Pacifism | F.O.R.; 1952 |
| Raven, Charles E. | A Wanderer's Way | Martin Hopkinson;
1925 |
| Raven, Charles E. | War and the Christian | S.C.M.; 1938 |
| Rhys, J. Bradley | An Answer to Some Passages in a Letter from the Bishop of Rochester to the Clergy (dated May 1st 1798) Upon the Lawfulness of Defensive War | 1798 |
| Richmond, Legh | Domestic Portraiture | Seeley & Burnside;
1833 |
| Rigby, Andrew | A Life in Peace | Prism; Bridport;
1988 |
| Robbins, Keith | The Abolition of War | University of
Wales; Cardiff;
1976 |
| Roberts, Mary (A Lady) | An Examination of the Principles... | R. Clay; 1832 |
| Roberts, Mary (A Lady) | Historical Illustrations of the Origin and Consequences of War | R. Clay; 1834 |
| Roberts, Mary | The Progress of Creation | Smith, Elder; 1837 |
| Roberts, R. Ellis | H.R.L. Sheppard: Life and Letters | John Murray; 1942 |
| Robins, P. D. | <i>Love's Triumph</i> and Other Poems | private; n/d |
| Rowbotham, Sheila | Friends of Alice Wheeldon | Pluto; 1986 |
| Royden, A. Maude | I Believe in God | Ernest Benn; 1927 |
| Royden, A. Maude | Political Christianity | G.P. Putnam;
1922 |
| Royden, A. Maude | The Great Adventure | Pamphlet, 1915 |
| Royden, A. Maude | The Great Adventure | Headley; 1917 |
| Royden, A. Maude | The Hour and the Church | G. Allen & Unwin;
1918 |
| Royden, A. Maude | The Peace Army | Pamphlet, 1932 |
| Royden, A. Maude | The Problem of Palestine | Hutchinson; 1939 |
| Royden, A. Maude | Women and the Sovereign State | Headley Bros;
1917 |
| Scheer, Jonathan | George Lansbury | M.U.P.;
Manchester; 1990 |
| Scott, Carolyn | Dick Sheppard; A Biography | Hodder &
Stoughton; 1977 |
| Scott, J. | War Inconsistent with the Doctrine and Example of Jesus Christ | Flint; 1820 edn. |
| Sheppard, Dick & Housman, Laurence | What Can We Believe? | Jonathan Cape;
1939 |
| Sheppard, H.R.L. | The Christian Attitude to War | P.P.U. pamphlet;
1937 |

- Sheppard, H.R.L. Dr Sheppard's Appeal to the "Men Who Matter" Pamphlet; 1935
- Sheppard, H.R.L. God and My Neighbour Cassell; 1937
- Sheppard, H.R.L. The Impatience of a Parson Hodder & Stoughton; 1927
- Sheppard, H.R.L., et al Let Us Honour Peace Cobden Sanderson; 1937
- Sheppard, H.R.L., et al My Hopes and Fears for the Church John Murray; 1930
- Sheppard, H.R.L. We Say "No" John Murray; 1935
- Shrage, Wolfgang The Ethics of the New Testament T & T Clark; Edinburgh; 1988
- Stimson, Charles C. The Price to be Paid; "The Tramp Preachers" Peaceprint; Pontefract; 1988
- Stratmann, Franziskus The Church and War; A Catholic Study Sheed and Ward; 1928
- Suggate, Alan M. William Temple on Pacifism Modern Churchman; 1986
- Taylor, A.J.P. Origins of the Second World War Hamish Hamilton; 1961
- Temple, Sydney (ed.) Peace is Possible New Era; Deep River, Connecticut; 1949
- Temple, William Christ and the Way to Peace S.C.M.; 1935
- Underhill, Evelyn The Church and War A.P.F.; 1938
- Victor, Natalie A Catholic Looks at War James Clarke; c.1939
- Walke, Bernard Twenty Years at St. Hilary Methuen; 1935
- Wallis, Jill Mother of World Peace Hisarlick; 1993
- Wallis, Jill Valiant For Peace F.O.R.; 1991
- Warner, Richard The Sermon on the Mount: In Five Discourses Pamphlet; Bath; 1840
- Warner, Richard War Inconsistent with Christianity: A Fast-Sermon by the Rev. Richard Warner of Bath (Fourth Edition) Pamphlet; Bath; 1805
- Wilkinson, Alan The Church of England and the First World War S.P.C.K.; 1978
- Wilkinson, Alan Dissent or Conform S.C.M.; 1986
- Williams, J. H. A Thanksgiving Sermon for the Peace G.G. & J. Robinson; 1802
- Williams, J. H. Two Sermons Preached on Public Fasts G.G. & J. Robinson; 1794

- Williams, J. H. War the Stumbling Block of a Christian, or The Absurdity of Defending Religion by the Sword
G.G. & J. Robnson; 1795
- Wiltsher, Anne Most Dangerous Women
Pandora; 1985
- Worcester, Noah A Solemn Review of the Custom of War
County; Ipswich; 1816

ASSOCIATED READING

- Anon. (A member of the Peace Pledge Union)
H.R.L. Sheppard Cobden Sanderson; 1937
- "Author of Tract 8" Historical Illustrations of the Origins and Consequences of War
Hamilton, Adams; 1834
- Ashley, A.M.D. Joyful Servant: The Ministry of Percy Hartill
Abbey Press; Abingdon; 1967
- Bailey, Hilary Vera Brittain Penguin; 1987
- Barker, G. The Expediency of Principle. An Attempt to Show What is Erroneous or Defective in the Thirty-Seventh Article of the Church of England
Pamphlet; 1862
- Barrett, Clive (ed.) Peace Together; A Vision of Christian Pacifism
James Clarke; 1987
- Bennett, Yvonne A. Testament of a Minority in Wartime: The Peace Pledge Union and Vera Brittain, 1939-1945
McMaster PhD.; 1984
- Berry, Paul and Bostridge, Mark
Vera Brittain: A Life Chatto & Windus; 1995
- Brittain, Vera Chronicle of Youth: Vera Brittain's War Diary 1913-1917 (ed. Bishop, Alan)
Gollancz; 1981
- Brittain, Vera England's Hour
Futura; 1981
- Brittain, Vera Poems of the War and After
Gollancz; 1934
- Brittain, Vera Testament of Friendship [Virago edn., 1980]
MacMillan; 1940
- Brittain, Vera Testament of a Peace Lover (eds. W. & A. Eden-Green)
Virago; 1988
- Brittain, Vera Verses of a V.A.D.
Erskine MacDonald; 1918
- Brittain, Vera Wartime Chronicle: Vera Brittain's Diary 1939-1945 (eds. Bishop & Bennett)
Gollancz; 1989
- Brittain, Vera and Holtby, Winifred
Testament of a Generation (ed. Berry & Bishop)
Virago; 1985
- Brock, Peter A Brief History of Pacifism
Toronto; 1982
- Brock, Peter Twentieth Century Pacifism
Van Rostrand, Reinhold; New York; 1970

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| Ceadel, Martin | Thinking About Peace and War | O.U.P.; Oxford; 1989 |
| Cecil, Viscount, et al | Challenge To Death | Constable; 1934 |
| Cropper, Margaret | Evelyn Underhill | Longmans, Green; 1958 |
| Dearmer, Percy (ed.)
De Ligt, Bart | Christianity and the Crisis
The Conquest of Violence | Gollancz; 1933
Routledge; 1937 |
| Edghill, Keith | Directory of Anglican Clerical Peace Protest, 1792-1865 | Private; 1996 |
| Franciscan Servants of Jesus and Mary | Mother Teresa and the Franciscan Servants of Jesus and Mary | Posbury St. Francis; 1980 |
| Gliddon, C. Paul | But Who Was Don Robins? | James Clarke; 1949 |
| Gliddon, C. Paul
Gorham, Deborah | Fourteen Points of a Pacifist Priest
Vera Brittain: A Feminist Life | Peace News; 1936
Blackwell; Oxford; 1996 |
| Gough, Percival | Outspoken Addresses | H. R. Allenson; 1932 |
| Grane, William Leighton | War: Its Curse and Cure | G. Allen & Unwin; 1935 |
| Gray, Tony | Champions of Peace | Paddington; Birmingham; 1976 |
| Hacking, R.D. | Such a Long Journey: A Biography of Gilbert Shaw, Priest | Mowbray; 1988 |
| Hastings, Adrian | A History of English Christianity 1920-1985 | Collins; 1986 |
| Helgeland, John, Daly Robert J. and Burns, J. Patout | Christians and the Military: The Early Experience | S.C.M.; 1987 |
| Hill, Christopher | The World Turned Upside Down | Penguin; 1984 edn. |
| Hinton, James | Protests and Visions | Hutchinson Radius; 1989 |
| Hobhouse, Stephen | Selected Mystical Writings of William Law | C.W.Daniel; 1938 |
| Hobhouse, Stephen | William Law and 18th Century Quakerism | G. Allen & Unwin; 1927 |
| Hoyland, John S. | C.F. Andrews: Minister of Reconciliation | Allenson; 1940 |
| Ingram, Kenneth | Fifty Years of the National Peace Council, 1908-1958 | N.P.C.; 1958 |

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Johnson, Hewlett | Searching for Light | Michael Joseph;
1968 |
| Lansbury, George | Looking Backwards and Forwards | Blackie; 1935 |
| Lansbury, George | My Search For Peace | Michael Joseph;
1938 |
| Lansbury, George | This Way to Peace | Rich & Cowan;
1940 |
| Law, William | The Works of the Reverend William
(in 9 volumes) | Law, M.A., (in 9
G. Moreton;
Brockenhurst;
1892/1893 |
| Le Messurier, Ralph H. | The Hope of Glory | Faith Press; 1944 |
| Lea, F.A. | John Middleton Murry | Methuen; 1959 |
| MacGregor, G.H.C. | The New Testament Basis of Pacifism | James Clarke;
1936 |
| Martin, David A. | Pacifism: An Historical and Sociological Study | R.K.P.; 1965 |
| Matthews, C.H.S. | Dick Sheppard; Man of Peace | James Clarke; n/d,
c.1947 |
| Meller, Hugh | St. George's, Bloomsbury | St. George's
Church; 1975 |
| Miles, Susan | Dunch [Adventurers All, vol. 18] | Blackwell; Oxford;
1918 |
| Milne, A.A. | Peace with Honour | Methuen, 1935
(4th edn.) |
| Murry, John Middleton | The Betrayal of Christ by the Churches | Andrew Dakers;
1940 |
| Murry, John Middleton | Between Two Worlds | Jonathan Cape;
1935 |
| Murry, John Middleton | Looking Before and After | Sheppard; 1948 |
| Murry, John Middleton | The Necessity of Communism | Jonathan Cape;
1932 |
| Murry, John Middleton | The Necessity of Pacifism | Jonathan Cape;
1937 |
| Murry, John Middleton | The Pledge of Peace | Herbert Joseph;
1938 |
| Musto, Ronald G. | The Catholic Peace Tradition | Orbis; Maryknoll,
New York; 1986 |
| Northcott, R.J. | Dick Sheppard and St. Martin's | Longmans, Green;
1937 |
| Overton, J.H. | The Life and Opinions of the Rev. William Law, A.M. | Longmans, Green;
1881 |

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| Randle, Michael | Civil Resistance | Fontana; 1994 |
| Raven, Charles E., Dodd, C.H. and MacGregor, G.H.C. | The Bases of Christian Pacifism | C.C.P.G.; 1938 |
| Rees, Richard | J. Middleton Murry; Selected Criticism | 1916-1957
O.U.P.; 1960 |
| Roberts, Ursula | The Cause of Purity and Women's Suffrage | Church League For
Women's Suffrage
[no.2]; 1912 |
| Robins, Alva (ed.) | Don Robins: A Miscellany | Harrison; Ripon;
1951 |
| Robins, Don | Everyday Sermons, 1st Series | Whitehead &
Miller; Leeds; 1950 |
| Robins, Don | Everyday Sermons, 3rd Series | Whitehead &
Miller; Leeds; 1950 |
| Robins, Don | The Message of Don Robins | private; n/d
(c.1948) |
| Robins, P.D. | <i>A Call</i> and Other Poems | private; n/d |
| Robinson, W. | Christianity is Pacifism | G. Allen & Unwin;
1933 |
| Soper, Donald | Calling for Action: An Autobiographical Enquiry | Robson; 1984 |
| Stephenson, A.M.G. | Anglicans and the Lambeth Conferences | S.P.C.K.; 1978 |
| St. George's, Leeds | The Story of St. George's | St. George; Leeds,
c.1965 |
| St. George's, Leeds | Their Father's House | St. George; Leeds;
c.1955 |
| Stimson, Charles C. | Community as the Social Application of Pacifism | Pamphlet; n/d |
| Stimson, Charles C. | The City Set on a Hill
Way; | Brotherhood of the
Hitchin; 1942 |
| Stimson, Charles C. | You Christ and the Bomb | Committee of 100,
Christian Group;
n/d |
| Swartz, Marvin | The Union of Democratic Control in
During the First World War | British Politics
Clarendon; Oxford;
1971 |
| Thompson, Dorothy (ed) | Over Our Dead Bodies | Virago; 1983 |
| Thorndike, Sybil | Remain in the Church of England | A.P.F.; 1941 |
| Underhill, Evelyn | A Meditation on Peace | A.P.F.; 1939 |
| van den Dungen, Peter | From Erasmus to Tolstoy | Greenwood;
Westport,
Connecticut; 1990 |
| van der Linden, W.H. | The International Peace Movement, 1818-1874 | Tilleul;
Amsterdam; 1987 |

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Walke, Bernard | Plays from St. Hilary | Faber & Faber;
1939 |
| White, E.M. (ed.) | Peace and Progress Through World Fellowship | World Fellowship
of Faiths; 1938 |
| Yoder, John Howard | The Pacifism of Karl Barth | Herald Press,
Scottsdale,
Pennsylvania;
1968 |