

THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION'S PROPAGANDA
AND THEODORA WILSON WILSON'S LITERARY
CONTRIBUTION 1914–1917

Bert den Boggende

Brooks, Alberta, Canada

ABSTRACT

During World War I Theodora Wilson Wilson, who shortly before the war had returned to her ancestral Quaker faith, made a unique contribution to the Fellowship of Reconciliation's (FOR) propaganda. Instead of the usual expository writings aimed at the well educated, she wrote simple stories directed at casual readers. They emphasised the kind of activity, 'doing', the FOR leadership had decided to curtail after an attempt at tramping in the Midlands in the summer of 1915 had resulted in a near riot. Her perspective reflected that of many Friends. Some very limited attention has been given to these stories, but their contexts have not been explored adequately. This essay attempts to correct this deficiency and provides insight into an important Quaker stream within the FOR.

KEYWORDS

Fellowship of Reconciliation, World War I, propaganda, Theodora Wilson Wilson, activist pacifism

He who destroys a good book, kills reason itself, kills the image of God, as it were, in the eye

—John Milton, *Areopagitica*

FOR FOUNDING AND PROPAGANDA

The Quaker conference at Llandudno, Wales, held on 25–29 September 1914, not only reinvigorated Friends, but also decided to acquaint other Friends unable to attend, and interested non-Friends, with the results of the meeting.¹ The conferees immediately convened meetings with other Friends, but the first tangible result with non-Friends did not come until a meeting on 4 December.² After much discussion the attendees took the momentous decision to hold a conference at Cambridge after Christmas and present it with the idea of integrated pacifism, a pacifism that would

infuse all areas of life, entail the reorganisation of personal lives and of nations, and be a positive force. They also suggested a name, the Order of Reconciliation. The term 'Order' implied an organisation akin to a Franciscan tertiary order, with 'the enrollment and training of a definite corps of men and women... who feel called to devote themselves entirely to proclaiming and working out these ideas'. Hence, the preamble of the proposed constitution called on people who were 'prepared to devote some time and energy towards making an effective difference'.³ This active understanding of pacifism was reinforced by the term 'Reconciliation'. Based on 2 Cor. 5.17-19, it was, Presbyterian Reverend Richard Roberts argued, a universal principle at the heart of Christian ethics that would turn enemies into friends and that should be practised in every department of life. For him, pacifism was a by-product, while the Kingdom of God was the 'central thing to which [they had] to testify' and which in turn required the reconstruction of the whole fabric of society.⁴ That the group met at 92 St George's Square, London, shed some further light on the direction. The building housed the Collegium, founded a few years earlier to 'assist the solution of the social problem and revive the sense of the power of God in Christ'.⁵

On 28 December the planned conference, 'a school of study and prayer', opened at Cambridge. The 120 to 130 conferees, about evenly divided between Friends and non-Friends, discussed the various proposals made at the 4 December meeting. After several speeches and much discussion the conferees made several changes in the proposals, most notably to the name. They substituted 'Order' with 'Fellowship', a term that was popular at the time, as, for instance, the names Swanwick Free Church Fellowship and No-Conscription Fellowship indicate. More important, it had biblical roots, with the Greek word *koinonia* connoting not only friendship and partnership, but also active participation and sharing.⁶ The few cosmetic changes in the proposed constitution, the five point *Basis*, did not alter the emphasis that the love as revealed in the life and death of Jesus Christ was the only sufficient basis of human society and that this love had personal and national consequences. War stood condemned as hindering the coming of God's Kingdom and the service in all areas of life. This notion of service to His cause in all areas of life, suffering service if necessary, attracted many conferees. Quaker theologian William E. Wilson could be regarded as representative when he later wrote to Henry Hodgkin, the first FOR chairman, that the FOR had to be 'something very much more than a Peace Society, even a *Christian Peace Society*. It must stand for the Ideals of Jesus Christ in *every department of life*'.⁷ When the conferees departed on 31 December, a new organisation with a radical perspective on society had come into existence.

A number of attendee Friends felt that their own Society offered all they needed and did not become FOR members. Other conferees felt uneasy about socio-economic issues, ecumenicity, and theology, while some thought there had been too much talk and too few concrete proposals. Moreover, some issues had not been dealt with adequately, notably loyalty to the nation, as Lucy Gardner, the Collegium's warden and the FOR's first honorary secretary, observed. In addition, although there had been agreement that ends and means had to be in harmony, it was left up to the members to devise the means.⁸ As will become evident, external difficulties limited the means.

Some activities had already been suggested before the conference convened. In late November Richard Roberts had written to Henry Hodgkin that the new organisation should disseminate 'deliberate and forthright propaganda of the Kingdom of God outside the ordinary ecclesiastical channels'. Moreover, since not everyone would read such propaganda, he also suggested the use of a caravan, or of crusaders like Quaker tramps, with preaching on village greens and city street corners, something he himself had done in the mid-1890s in Wales.⁹ Mary Phillips, an Anglican, had already made a similar suggestion at the Llandudno conference, calling for 'a regiment of men, between the ages of 18 and 35...walking from town to town, going forth as Christ sent His disciples'. At the 4 December meeting she and Congregationalist Basil Yeaxlee went one step further, suggesting a peace army.¹⁰ With such varied suggestions the FOR General Committee had to make some important decisions about the methods for disseminating its ideas. In the first three months of 1915 it asked Marian Ellis to represent the FOR unofficially at the Independent Labour Party and supplied a Mr Dyson, a travelling Student Christian Movement secretary, with FOR literature for his theological colleges tour. The Committee also lined up a number of speakers willing to help, including the Quakers Joan Fry, John W. Graham, Edward Grubb, and William E. Wilson, as well as Congregationalists J.R. Coates and Nathaniel Micklem.¹¹ It accepted the idea of tramping, but when the caravan encountered violence, about which more will be said later, the written word became the main method. For that purpose the General Committee established, in the fall of 1915, two sub-committees: the Propaganda Committee and the Literature Committee.¹²

The Propaganda Committee dealt with various possible activities, such as using an FOR choir (regarded as impractical and too expensive), sending Christmas and prayer cards, making posters, and organising meetings. It proposed appeals to ecclesiastical leaders, including the Archbishops of Canterbury and Westminster and the President of the Free Church Council. Most of these activities were peaceful, but those involving the public frequently experienced difficulties. Representative was a proposed women's procession. The committee was unable to obtain a hall until Dr Alfred Salter helped secure the I.L.P. Institute at Bermondsey. When this problem had been solved, the police, fearing violence, urged abandoning the procession. Such opposition prevented the committee from further large public activities, much to the dismay of the 'doers'.¹³

On 1 March 1915 the FOR began publishing *News Sheet*, a pamphlet intended to keep FOR members informed, although Henry Hodgkin, introducing the first issue, admitted that there was not much to report 'Since Cambridge'. But the FOR had begun publishing small-sized pamphlets, including later Labour leader George Lansbury's *Why I Joined the FOR*. More extensive were *Christ and Peace*, written by FOR leaders and edited by Joan Fry, and Maude Royden's *The Great Adventure*. The title of the latter was echoed in the FOR journal *The Venturer*, 'an endeavour to commend and to justify the *whole* Fellowship position to the reading Christian public'.¹⁴ Its first issue appeared in October, edited by Reverend Richard Roberts, who had resigned from Crouch Hill Presbyterian Church in mid-1915 and had become the first FOR general secretary. Thus, when the Literature Committee began its meet-

ings in November 1915 the pattern had already been set. It would discuss books and pamphlets for approval, make suggestions for textbooks for study circles and children's literature, and address problems with the distribution of *The Venturer*. Most often the publications were of an expository nature, such as *The Ministry of Reconciliation* (1916), edited by Hugh Martin, and directed at a higher level of reading public. Yet even at the first meeting the committee members expressed a concern that casual readers were not adequately reached. In order to correct this deficiency they approved Theodora Wilson Wilson's *The Last Weapon*, 'with the specific purpose of setting out the Fellowship point of view, in regard to war'.¹⁵ This interest in the widest possible reading public expressed a Victorian faith in popular education: readers would be exposed to a clear, logical, and forceful portrayal of the FOR position and would be readily willing to accept it.¹⁶

The endorsement of Wilson's book deserves further comment, since the early FOR rarely made use of the arts. Indeed, the FOR was generally unimaginative in its use of the creative arts. A clue for this failure becomes apparent in a remark made at the October 1915 General Council meeting: 'indiscriminate propaganda is bound to be a mixture of good and evil, and stand [sic] to produce a spirit contrary to the life of the Fellowship'. Half a year later Hodgkin expressed himself in a similar vein when writing to Wilson: 'I do not feel sure that the F.o.R. has yet discovered the methods of propaganda which are the true expression of the spirit of the Fellowship'. Rather than propaganda demonising the enemy, the FOR wanted the right propagation of faith, for if ends and means were not in harmony, the right peace could never be established.¹⁷ Hence, some possible propaganda pieces were rejected. While the Literature Committee broke new ground with its endorsement, no one else followed in Wilson's footsteps.

As already alluded to, the FOR experienced difficulties disseminating its ideas. The public was often hostile to their pacifist propaganda and the government feared that such propaganda would hamper its war efforts. Before the war the government had relied on voluntary censorship, but with the outbreak of the war it decided that such voluntary cooperation was inadequate and on 7 August 1914 Home Secretary Reginald McKenna introduced a censorship bill. The bill, known as the Defence of the Realm Act (DORA), passed through all the necessary Parliamentary stages on the same day! Later extensions and amendments gave the government extensive control in many areas of life, ranging from the acquisition of land to the regulation of the liquor trade.¹⁸ However, the press objected to some of the DORA regulations, fearing a loss of civil liberty. Although by mid-1915 the press had secured a victory—press offences were removed from court martial jurisdiction—the written word remained strongly censored. If a journalist or publisher could not be charged under the censorship regulations, he could still be charged and fined under some other regulation. For instance, Regulation 27C required that every pamphlet and leaflet dealing with the war or the making of peace had to have the names and addresses of the author and printer as well as a stamp showing that it had passed the inspection of the Official Press Bureau. If these requirements were not met the offenders could face a court trial. In fact, the whole of Regulation 27 was a key component in the war against dissent with its reference to the spreading of reports likely to create

dissatisfaction or alarm among the armed forces or civil population. Its provisions included regulations on impeding the recruitment of soldiers, attempting to change society, and discussing peace proposals. It was the weapon to penalise dissenting authors and speakers. For instance, two women FOR members were convicted and fined for distributing the FOR pamphlet *To Christ's Disciples Everywhere* and pope Benedict's peace appeal.¹⁹ According to the DORA-favouring ultra high Tory *Morning Post*, pacifists organised meetings all over the country, influencing people with their poisonous nonsense. It therefore agitated for the prosecution of pacifists.²⁰ Given the intensity of public hostility and the possibility of being prosecuted for using even the Sermon on the Mount to advance its Christian pacifist position, the FOR had to be circumspect in its propaganda efforts.²¹

In mid-July 1915 the FOR gave some credence to the *Morning Post's* accusation. After the FOR Swanwick Summer Conference, held on 5–12 July, nine women and eight men set out on a peace pilgrimage in the Midlands.²² Nearly a decade earlier, in 1906, the Young Friends Movement had organised a similar pilgrimage in honour of John Wilhelm Rowntree, a leader in the Quaker Renaissance who had died in 1905. Six parties of young men tramped Yorkshire, holding missionary meetings in the open air as well as in Quaker meeting houses.²³ The FOR campaign had a similar intent. The peace pilgrims, led by Maude Royden, preached the gospel. However, their audience, according to peace pilgrim Claud Coltman, was 'firmly convinced we were Germans or German spies, at least financed by Germany'. On 30 July, while in Hinckley, Leicestershire, a mob destroyed the caravan and injured some pilgrims. Although the press downplayed the incident, it may have been the first large-scale violent action against pacifists. It was, according to Coltman, a frightening experience: 'For 90 minutes we were at the absolute mercy of a mob quite beside itself with rage and hatred'. In spite of the violence, five members spent a whole day in the town, setting 'powerful reconciling influences at work'.²⁴ The unanticipated violence made the FOR reassess its methods. The caravan campaign came to be regarded as a disaster that made clear that a simple exposition of pacifism would not automatically convert the hostile attitude of the public. While Coltman asserted that the FOR's pacifism had passed a vital test and experienced a supreme vindication that deserved another campaign, the FOR leadership turned to the 'leaven approach' that would prevent further public confrontation. The government, however, was not aware of this change in method. From its perspective the Hinckley incident provided evidence that the FOR consisted of troublemakers. The image was reinforced when on 28 July 1917 a large crowd disturbed a regional FOR meeting in Hackney and manhandled Henry Hodgkin, Edith Ellis, and Henry Harris.²⁵

Indeed, the FOR's radical image was sufficient for the government to include it among pacifist and anti-war groups chosen for special scrutiny following the successful Leeds Convention of 3 June 1917, celebrating the Russian Revolution.²⁶ The government asked Basil Thomson, head of Scotland Yard's Criminal Investigation Department since June 1913, to investigate. As far as Thomson was concerned, pacifists were British revolutionaries, since 'pacifism, anti-Conscription, and Revolution were...inseparably mixed. The same individuals took part in all three movements. The real object of most of these people, though it may have been sub-

conscious, appeared to be the ruin of their own country'. Not only did they hamper the pursuit of war, but their societies 'had marshalled quite a respectable little army of conscientious objectors...[who] gave great trouble to government officials, from the tribunals down to prison warders'. DORA Regulation 51A gave the police power to raid offices and in the autumn he made use of that power, raiding thirteen dissenting organisations, including the FOR on 14 November. After the raids Thompson reported that the FOR leaders were not spies and that they were not supported by German money but by 'cranks'.²⁷ It was in this atmosphere of opposition, suspicion, and FOR's changing methods that Theodora Wilson Wilson, whose home also was raided in 1917, wrote her novel *The Last Weapon* for the casual reader. Her background made her quite suitable for the task.

THEODORA WILSON WILSON

Theodora was born on 13 January 1865, the eldest daughter and fourth child of Isaac Whitwell Wilson, a Westmorland JP, and Anne Bagster, whose father was a Bible publisher.²⁸ Her grandparents had severed their ties with the Religious Society of Friends during the Beaconite controversy in 1835²⁹ and had become Plymouth Brethren. As Theodora's education at Stramongate Friends School indicates, the ties were not completely broken. In fact, she returned to her ancestral faith around 1913.³⁰ She spent two years studying music in Germany, a country regarded as having a higher standard of education.³¹ For about two decades she was involved in Fellside Sunday school, an interest reflected in several story books she wrote on the Old and New Testaments.³² Before the turn of the century she opened evening home for young women working in Kendal, a service the YWCA would later provide. This kind of social work led in 1901 to her first novel, *T' Bacca Queen*.³³ She authored about sixty books and numerous stories, many intended for children and frequently cast in a Westmorland setting, even after she moved to London in 1910. After Wilfred Wellock was imprisoned as a CO in February 1917, she volunteered to edit *The New Crusader*.³⁴ In spite of her voluminous output, her literary work has been largely forgotten.

Wilson attended the Llandudno conference, where she spoke briefly about the necessity for sacrifice and the possibility of persecution,³⁵ and the Cambridge organisational conference. In February 1915 she joined the General Committee and remained a member until 1922. She also was a member of the Literary and Propaganda sub-committees, and was a frequent speaker for the FOR. She spoke at the women's procession at Bermondsey, as well as to several Liberal groups before she switched allegiance to the Labour Party sometime in 1915. As a Birmingham Branch report for 1916 indicated, she spoke impressively to several organisations.³⁶ Her pacifist activities were not restricted to those of the FOR. She was a member of the Friends' Service Committee. During the last week of February 1915 she attended a meeting in Amsterdam, where the attendees agreed to organise a much larger conference in April in The Hague. She was to represent the FOR at this conference, which would inaugurate the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, but the government prevented her from attending.³⁷ After the war she became involved in

the No More War Movement. She died on 8 November 1941. Until Angela Ingram drew attention to Wilson in 1993 historians had ignored these pacifist activities. But while Ingram mentioned Wilson's FOR connection, she did not consult any FOR-related archives.³⁸

WILSON'S PROPAGANDA CONTRIBUTION

Before the outbreak of the war, Wilson, according to an advertisement in the *Labour Leader* of 23 November 1916, had written *The Wrestlers*, but it was published after *The Last Weapon*.³⁹ The book not only anticipates some important elements of the FOR's ideology, but also places Wilson's remarks about suffering love—reflecting 1 Pet. 3.13–19 and familiar to Friends since George Fox—at the Llandudno conference in the context of her work. Its story takes place at the end of the nineteenth century and deals with a mental and spiritual conflict embedded in a sacrificial and transforming love.

The family of Clement Pendragon,⁴⁰ a wealthy Westmorland squire's son, expects him to 'keep up the family honour in the Army'. His engagement and marriage, in Germany, to Marya Khrenofski dashes the expectation. Marya's father, outspoken Russian journalist Paul Khrenofski, had been banished to Siberia for an editorial condemning the Russian government's handling of a 'terribly successful bomb outrage', probably a reference to the assassination of Czar Alexander II in 1881.⁴¹ Clement's father, deeply disturbed by the engagement, suffers a fatal heart attack, the reason why his mother hates Marya. While in Berlin, Dr Bertram, an old man who until recently had attempted to care for Russia's persecuted Stundists, an evangelical sect founded in 1862, invites Clement to return with him to Russia and Siberia, an invitation Marya strongly resents, even after hearing that her father is still alive and not dead as she had thought. Clement asks Marya to accompany him, saying 'I have just been wondering...whether...you and I would not be happier if, in spite of all the pain of the past, we sacrificed something of ourselves and our money in some great campaign of Love. Perhaps old wounds would heal if we tried to do something to help'. Marya's selfish, possessive love keeps her in Berlin with their son August, while Clement goes to Siberia, where he finds Marya's father. Clement and Paul exchange positions, with the latter getting Clement's passport with the intention that, as soon as he has reached safety, he would reveal the exchange and thus free Clement. Unfortunately, Paul dies during the escape and Clement remains in the Siberian camp for about seven years. As the reviewer of the *Times Literary Supplement* observed, 'the rest of the book deals with Marya's gradual awakening through suffering and through love for her boy to a more normal outlook on the present and the future, and with the return of Clement from his Siberian wanderings long after his supposed death'.⁴² Even Clement's mother is finally willing to accept August as her grandson and Marya as her daughter-in-law. Her stubbornness cannot resist this sacrificial and transforming love.

The Last Weapon takes up this theme, but in a setting of England at war. The language of war had become part of public discourse through civil, sex, and class wars as well as music hall songs, serials, and novels, while war itself, through the

spread of popular Social Darwinist ideas, had come to be regarded as the natural state of the human being.⁴³ Before 1910, war stories often dealt with invasion, best known among them William Le Queux' 1906 novel *The Invasion of 1910*. Thereafter, spy stories became in vogue. Another important strand was science and war, popularised by H.G. Wells, whose often futuristic books included planes, tanks, and submarines as well as atomic power.⁴⁴ This strand can also be detected in the work of avant-garde Vorticist artists, England's counterparts to continental Futurists, who celebrated this new technology and speed, and glorified war. Some authors, like Edmond Gosse, thought that war was good for England and for art.⁴⁵ Planes may have seemed futuristic, but soon after the Wright brothers successfully flew the first plane the military showed interest. As early as 1905 a British officer visited the Wright brothers. Interest in aviation heightened in 1909 after Blériot flew across the Channel.⁴⁶

Wilson's books tie in with these literary strands and actual events. She made reference to a possible invasion and incorporated the aviation interest in two different ways. In its destructive form she notes that the enemy 'dared to ascend against [the English] from above, and had shot down fire and death upon the innocent', a reference to the Zeppelin raids that had started in January 1915.⁴⁷ Constructively, she has pilot Percival Garnett drop peace pamphlets over Ironland (Germany).

Her novels connect to science and war in still another way. During the war civilian scientists began to work in close cooperation with the military services, drawing quickly the conclusion, according to Carol Gruber, 'that they would reap a large reward from the new public awareness of the potentialities of science'. One area of interest was gas, and World War I has often been regarded as a chemists' war, even though gas was not a particularly efficacious weapon. The government looked into the utilisation of new inventions, apparently hoping for something comparable to Wilson's Hellite, the deadly invention of Mr Rotenson of Neutralia (United States).⁴⁸ Its inventor thought that it was 'the greatest Peace-making power the world has ever known... [which] travels swift as lightning—distance is of no consequence... [and which] can as easily destroy ships, armies, fortifications, cities, as the whole vegetation of a country... [while its] beauty is that it kills as lightning kills—painless—perfectly satisfactory'. The statement, resembling modern nuclear armaments, is reminiscent of what Alfred Nobel wrote about the security powder he hoped to discover, 'a weapon so terrible that it would make war eternally impossible'.⁴⁹ Similarly, historian G.P. Gooch expected that this new technology meant that people could now look forward 'with something like confidence to the time when war between civilised nations will be considered as antiquated as the duel, and when the peacemakers shall be called the children of God'.⁵⁰

Wilson's use of war imagery, however, conflicted with the government's propaganda. On 2 September 1914 C.F.G. Masterman, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Chairman of the National Health Insurance, had called a meeting of a group of eminent authors, including G.K. Chesterton, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, H.G. Wells, and George Trevelyan, for the purpose of producing literary war propaganda.⁵¹ Their work stifled critique and only a few authors were critical of the war, among them Bernard Shaw, who in November 1914 published *Common Sense About the War*. A slight change came in 1916, when experiences in the trenches

found their way into the literature, perhaps most noticeable in Wells' *Mr Britling Sees It Through*, published in September. Wilson, who made reference to these experiences, published her novel at this time of changing mentality.

Although *The Last Weapon*'s setting is England at war, the framework is a heavenly court, accounting for the book's subtitle, *A Vision*. The story opens with an enthroned Christ surrounded by a silent multitude, a reference to Rev. 7.9 and 8.1. A Child, a messenger from Paradise who breaks the silence, is sent on a tour to Earth to observe what is going on. The book ends with another court of heaven scene, with the Child returning from its tour. In some thirty vignette-like chapters the tour describes the influence of the Prince of Fear and his final Weapon, Hellite, and of Christ's final weapon, Perfect Love. This frame not only links *The Last Weapon* to *The Search of the Child for the Sorrows of God*, published in 1910, but also to its sequel *The Weapon Unsheathed: A Spiritual Adventure*, published in 1917. The latter's subtitle, *A Spiritual Adventure*, alludes to the FOR monthly *The Venturer*, whose encompassing understanding of pacifism was meant, according to editor Richard Roberts, to recall and restore the adventurous quality of Christian living.⁵² The book contains another clue: an approving reference to John Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress*.⁵³ Like Bunyan's pilgrim, Wilson's peace pilgrims are on a spiritual adventure, whose encounters with many earthly obstacles exemplify Eph. 6.12, which states that the battle is not against flesh and blood, but against the spiritual host of wickedness. Moreover, her characters, with their frequently symbolic names, are also conveyors of ideas. For instance, Sir Joshua Power, promoter of Hellite, symbolises the power of arms manufacturers. Sir Percival Garnett, a pilot-adventurer, recalls the legend of Perceval or Parsifal, the adventurous knight bringing healing, and whose legend Richard Wagner had set to music as recently as 1882. His wife, Lady Eirene, who initially approves of her minister's comment that 'if Christ were on earth He would be found using a bayonet against our dastardly foes' and who thought that those 'stupid C.O.s' deserved to be imprisoned or shot, accepts the symbolism of her name after she acquires a new spiritual awareness, realising that her ideas of 'Righteous Indignation', 'Righteous Vengeance', 'Self-Righteousness', and 'National Righteousness' are unbiblical. Transformed, she agrees to accompany her husband; in the process of showering peace pamphlets over Ironland they are shot down, thus exemplifying suffering love.

The books received a mixed reception. The *Times Literary Supplement* dismissed *The Last Weapon* in one sentence.⁵⁴ Even *The Friend* gave little attention to the book, although it carried an advertisement proclaiming the book as 'one of the most striking contributions to the literature of the war yet published'. Its brief comment only admitted that this 'striking War and Peace story' had run through several editions, including one in Esperanto. It did, however, publish Elizabeth Spence Watson's letter, which argued that it was 'a powerful and beautiful story...giving much food for thought' and deserving wide recognition.⁵⁵ More supportive was the *Labour Leader*, whose reviewer commented that if he had the wealth of Henry Ford, he would not bother with Peace Ships, but translate Wilson's book into every language and distribute it by the hundred million, because 'the wide circulation of this book would do more to bring about a permanent peace than all the political agitations of a century'.⁵⁶ The book's publisher, C.W. Daniel, could hardly have wished for a

better sales pitch. Indeed, the book sold well in spite of opposition as exemplified by the following incident. In January 1917 Newark-on-Trent's public library committee refused a copy that a Quaker family wanted to donate. According to the committee, the book's advocacy of pacifism could 'have but one result—to embarrass the military and naval authorities, to denude the country of its defences, and, in the hour of our supreme need, to paralyse our sense of virility'.⁵⁷ By the time *The Weapon Unsheathed* was published the *Times Literary Supplement* had turned very hostile, denouncing its 'rhapsodic pacifism' that made the 'peace enthusiasts win the day' and disparaging its format as 'a medley of fantastic and theatrical emotionalism...interspersed with allegory and with poetry'. In contrast, the *Labour Leader* stated that the book should not be reviewed as a novel, drama, allegory, or even as a pamphlet, but as 'a massed assault upon the fearful and wonderful product, the Christian Conscience of the orthodox churches throughout Europe today'. And *The Friend* noted that the story began 'with an imaginative use of the last Yearly Meeting Epistle', carrying 'the reader forward past many dramatic situations' and presenting 'an inspiring vision of that which *might* be'.⁵⁸

For Wilson, pacifism entailed activity, resembling to some extent the women's movement's slogan 'Deeds not words'. Significantly, George Graham, a shepherd turned peace pilgrim, remarks in *The Weapon Unsheathed* that 'the time for talk is over. We must do'. The world could not be won by being passive, as many 'non-fighters' thought. Pacifists, he argues, should have come out en masse 'right from the beginning, laying down all we possessed in the cause of Peace and Reconciliation'. His argument hints at Wilson's disappointment with the FOR's curtailment of its public encounters. Her approach to this issue is apparent in the centrality of the FOR caravan experience in *The Last Weapon*. In Wilson's version the Peace Pilgrims preach the gospel of Love at Thorough, where posters had announced them and where 'the chief authority on righteousness' had told his congregation that the pilgrims must be resisted. The pilgrims, three women and two men, intend to preach near the statue of a great man against slavery. The allusion to William Wilberforce was not meant to provide local colour. Instead, the statue was a reminder how another evil, slavery, had been overcome. FOR leaders expected the twentieth century to be the century of the abolition of war. But little comes of the preaching, since people throw stones at the pilgrims, blinding one of them, and calling them traitors, enemies, spies, and cowards. One of the local leaders, Sir Joshua Power, posits that the country is 'infested by a plague of so-called Peace organisations—run by the enemy's gold—which are blithering out infamous doctrines and quack remedies'. His comments reflected the *Morning Post's* article 'Traitors in the Camp' of 21 June 1915, that castigated directly the Independent Labour Party and indirectly the FOR and called upon the government to enforce DORA to stop 'this puling, peace-mongering, and treasonable anti-war campaign of traitors' who were supported by German money.⁵⁹ In a surprising twist, Lady Power, who had objected to her minister's comments, rescues the pilgrims, taking them to her home and inviting one of the women to talk to her son George, an officer whose experiences at the front had left him bewildered. After coming to grips with the fact that he has killed, George starts reading the Bible, especially the New Testament. This new attitude is

what the FOR hoped for, but which in Sir Joshua's opinion 'isn't natural. Morbid'. He realises that the message of the New Testament could undermine the ideas he has propounded all his life. Arriving at a similar conclusion, the government censored the Sermon on the Mount as a separately printed issue.

In *The Weapon Unsheathed* two peace armies replace the caravan activity. The idea of a peace army, mentioned at the 4 December 1914 Collegium meeting and discussed by the FOR General Committee on 10 June 1915, can be traced to Thomas More's *Utopia*, republished in 1910.⁶⁰ There is no evidence that Wilson read *Utopia*, but the way she connects the peace army and the subsequent just peace suggests that she might have. In *The Weapon Unsheathed* the first peace army is the result of the adventurous pilot and plane builder Sir Percival Garnett, who renounces his war successes, and of his wife, Lady Eirene Napier. One of the peace pamphlets they shower over the capital of Ironland falls into the hands of Princess Ida,⁶¹ who, impressed, organises a peace army of thousands of women, 'wearing across their breasts a white band bearing a golden star and the motto 'Love Omnipotent''. When she marches them between the two fighting forces, the soldiers do not want to fire at them, resulting in a forced truce, much to the disgust of the new prime minister of Imperia, Sir Reginald Marvel (Lloyd George), who damns pacifism, 'a deadly poison', because he realises that 'if men won't fight, war simply can't be carried on'.⁶² Later a second peace army gathers on the English beaches in an attempt to stop the enemy's fleet carrying Hellite. After gunfire from Imperia's army kills some of the Peace Followers, a single lad on horseback, carrying a flag, calls for a halt to the firing. After he is hit it is realised that he is the king. The firing stops and all fraternise on the beach, reminiscent of the fraternisation that occurred in the trenches during the first Christmas of the war. Again a truce is arranged, leading six months later to a formal peace.

This suggestion of peace came at a time when there were several actual attempts at making peace. In July 1916 there was a Women's Peace Crusade in Manchester. In December German Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg launched a peace offensive, while President Wilson called on the warring nations to state their war aims and made an appeal for peace without victory. Pope Benedict XV sent his envoy Eugenio Pacelli, later pope Pius XII, to emperor Wilhelm with peace proposals. Although the British became involved in some of these peacemaking attempts, including one in which later Dutch Prime Minister Colijn played a mediating role, Lloyd George wanted Germany's unconditional surrender. While Wilson's truce and formal peace were fictional, they clashed with DORA's prohibition to discuss peace proposals.⁶³

The various activities sometimes introduced contentious issues. Theodora Wilson, like the FOR, argued that those touched by love showed evidence of a transformation in their lives, while those resisting love suffered and caused suffering. Although even those possessed by an outgoing love might suffer, their suffering differed significantly from the suffering experienced by those resisting love. They knew that love could be costly and yet were willing to pay the price so that love could bring redemption. This idea hints at the doctrine of vicarious atonement, a doctrine which not all FOR members accepted. For instance, Quaker theologian William E. Wilson held that sin could not be transferred and that Jesus' 'death came to Him because He

testified to the principles of non-resistance'.⁶⁴ Yet even William Wilson would not deny that suffering love was an important justification of FOR activities.

Another contentious issue was church attendance. Wilson took issue with the theology of ministers supporting the war, setting the tone early in *The Last Weapon*. In heaven's court Christ explains that those proclaiming his name 'have woven a thick veil of untruth between the peoples and Myself'. A Reverend Matthew Waters, for instance, had posited that 'visions in the Bible were necessary theological beliefs, but now-a-days they were signs of a want of balance', ignoring Prov. 29.18, quoted elsewhere by Wilson, that 'where there is no vision the people perish'. Such leaders contributed to the fact that many Christians everywhere were praying for victory and death to the enemy, as if Christ were a God of Battles, and that many Christians put their trust in the wrong spirit, and, not knowing the Truth, continued committing evil deeds. The Prince of Fear wants to keep it that way and therefore tries to thwart Peace Pilgrims, whose proclamation of Truth—creating 'new men', people with a fearless, greedless, and selfless love that would 'link man to man and cast down the barriers of nationality, class and race'—would mean loss of his power.⁶⁵

To ensure the defeat of Love and Truth, the Prince of Fear attacks in two different ways. His first strategy entails his cronies hindering Christians, especially pacifists, from proclaiming the true vision through 'mockery, perplexity, diffidence, procrastination, national loyalty, family love, pride in our noblest victims'. Among the clergy this method had already achieved tremendous success. An Anglican clergyman, for instance, preached that 'if any of us fail in this awful hour to give our utmost to the God of Battles, we deserve to be ranked as traitors to the Highest, and worthy of the scorn and contempt of mankind'. Recruiting officers soon realise that such sermons contributed to successful recruiting, for people 'came like lambs, straight from Church, as you might say. The fact is, the Church and the Bible Class leaders and all the pious religious associations are doing heaps better for us than the pubs'. However, such war sermons did not always have the wished-for effects and some people were ceasing to attend church services. Understandably, FOR members objected to these war sermons, but FOR leaders disapproved of members ceasing attending church. They wanted their members to be leaven in their denomination, adopting at a 1916 summer conference in Swanwick the idea of working first and foremost in and through the churches. In the ensuing debate some members argued that the churches lacked all sympathy for pacifists and that there was no opportunity to work usefully and harmoniously within the churches.⁶⁶ Wilson's portrayal of the churches, while somewhat one-sided, is, nevertheless, reasonably accurate.⁶⁷

The Prince of Fear's second stratagem ensures that church leaders put the state's sovereignty before God's sovereignty. At a meeting of several leading figures, called by Sir Joshua Power, Hellite's inventor Mr Rotenson, sounds like an actual advertisement in the *American Machinist*, which proclaimed that it had material of high tensile strength that had the 'tendency to fracture into small pieces upon the explosion of the shell' and had 'more power than anything of its kind yet used'.⁶⁸ Sir Joshua, while 'kind-hearted and generous' in his personal relations, argues in favour of Hellite, which is no surprise, since he is the embodiment of the so-called merchant of death, having fanned the flames of war before 1914 by arming friend and foe alike

through his immense international enterprises.⁶⁹ In addition to Sir Joshua and Mr Rotenson the attendees include a Church Ruler, a mixture of the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duchess of Moorland, the wealthiest woman in the empire, Theobald Rogers, an influential Free Church minister, Michael Forward, the proprietor-editor of a leading newspaper, and John Dissart, a disguised Prime Minister Asquith. They discuss the logic of the just war position, admitting that 'when once an enemy has plunged us into war, there is nothing for it but for us to defend ourselves and our friends by the most practical and scientific use of war methods'. Consequently, they decide to go ahead with the production of Hellite.⁷⁰ The FOR constantly battled this logic, accusing church leaders of giving in to the state's temporary needs and placing God's sovereignty below the state's, an accusation with a centuries-old history.⁷¹ Moreover, they also argued on the basis of Rom. 12.21, which states that evil could only be overcome with good, that evil means could never bring forth good results. Missing in Wilson's and the FOR's argument is the question of whether the secular state can be expected to adhere to personal Christian ethics.⁷²

As the FOR's *The Basis* stated, love was a positive force, changing peoples' lives. Since war was the negation of love, its barbarities could easily have led the FOR to portray soldiers unsympathetically. Instead, they were usually pictured as a mixture of fiends and angels. As the first FOR pamphlet, *To Christ's Disciples Everywhere*, published in January 1915, made clear, not the soldiers but the ideology, the false doctrines, and the system that caused them to go to war stood condemned. The FOR called for tolerance, which Wilson exemplified in her sympathetic portrayal of Sir Joshua's son George, a shell-shocked officer, who, while convalescing, felt he had become a stranger at home. His experience was similar to R.H. Tawney's in 1916, who, on his return home after the battle of the Somme, noted that 'There are occasions when I feel like a visitor among strangers whose institutions are kindly, but whose modes of thought I neither understand nor altogether approve'.⁷³ What these troubled soldiers on furlough needed was a sympathetic ear, and, in Wilson's opinion, someone who could properly explain the biblical notion of love. In some cases the experiences in the trenches contributed to soldiers changing their mind, as is apparent from Captain Harry Trueman, a hero decorated with the Star of Honour. At a church meeting to honour him Sir Joshua steals the limelight by announcing Hellite and positing that 'it would be worthwhile that the whole of our race was swept away rather than that we should give place to injustice, unrighteousness and slavery'. To the surprise of the gathered, Trueman does not support Power, arguing that the only weapon that can ever right the wrong is Christ's Power of Fearless Love. At the front he had come to realise that its horrors, often perpetrated in the name of Christ, were an indictment of the church. The crowd angrily turns against him and only George Power comes to his defence. Both men suffer for their new understanding, badly mauled by the mob; in fact, as the *Weapon Unsheathed* indicates, their injuries were fatal. As the FOR had stated, standing up for the Truth could be a costly affair.

Although Wilson portrays pacifism as the answer to war, she also acknowledges that pacifists experienced at least three problems. The first difficulty was to remain a

pacifist. This was not so much due to violence, but to the enormous intellectual and psychological pressures the immediate environment exerted upon them. The FOR devised two ways to withstand those pressures, directly through fellowship and indirectly through *News Sheet*, expressly published to support the members. The second problem concerned guilt. According to Wilson and the FOR, not only Germany but everyone was guilty of the coming of this war. This willingness to share the guilt was a recognition of one's own sin. Yet, before the war many FOR members, influenced by R.J. Campbell's modernism, had little to say about personal sin. This shallow understanding of sin changed somewhat during the war, when they argued that people, due to their sinful nature, could not be trusted with any weapon and that a recognition of one's guilt and sin was the first step to personal healing and reconciliation.⁷⁴ The third problem involved justice. Nobody had a fair trial in war, Wilson remarked, for innocent people were robbed, hurt, and killed. War was therefore not a form of justice. In fact, its means and ends were not in harmony, and thus war, the wrong means, could not bring about true peace, the desired end. Prime Minister John Dissart had come to realise this, acknowledging that Imperia had forsaken the spiritual weapon with which it had started the war and that 'true ideals cannot be won by false methods'. Twenty years later Aldous Huxley reached a similar conclusion in *Ends and Means*,⁷⁵ but with a secular interpretation. For Wilson and the FOR, however, the issue had a deeply religious basis. As one of Wilson's character states, 'We are finding out that nothing matters in the universe except winning the Master's 'Well Done!' and that all our service for the world depends on our personal faithfulness to His call'. For Wilson war was a form of injustice, an 'awful delusion, engineered by the Prince of Darkness and Fear', which needed to be dispelled. Admittedly, most FOR opponents acknowledged that war was evil, but they also felt that not going to war was a greater evil. The FOR rejected this choice between two evils, which in its opinion made God the instigator of evil. Instead, God had provided a way out, the way of Jesus.⁷⁶

Injustice and the 'renewed mind' also are apparent in the treatment of COs. When in 1916 the Military Service Acts were passed, the government did not anticipate many requests for exemption. It was also poorly prepared to deal with COs. Tribunals denied many applications and some COs, now deemed to be soldiers, were sent to France where their disobedience to army orders made them liable to the death sentence. Although no one was shot and they were recalled from France, their treatment had been poor.⁷⁷ Wilson, whose interest was not so much the treatment of the COs or the differences between alternativists and absolutists, but the cost for pacifists, the results of their actions, and their peace of mind, uses the incident in two ways. Contrary to actual events, in *The Weapon Unsheathed* one CO dies, but his death is not in vain, for his ordeal changes the mind of a soldier who had been justly punished. Another CO, Harry Peterson, admits that his prison experience was a terrible strain, going nearly 'dazed and dotty', and feeling the 'utter helplessness and the intolerable sense of degradation of humanity'. He draws the conclusion that the prison system is 'an abomination and a humiliation of Christian civilisation', and, like so many FOR members, believes it needs to be reformed.⁷⁸ Yet, the experience has not demoralised him, since his faith enabled him to withstand the pressure and

preserve his peace of mind. It was this frame of mind that the FOR encouraged. As one CO wrote in *News Sheet*, 'Thanks to His guidance and presence, my days in prison and guardroom cell have been ones of joy. I have converted prison into a monastery, a home whereby I can meditate upon Him'.⁷⁹ It was this mentality that set FOR members frequently apart from many secular COs.

The second way Wilson uses the incident concerns prime minister John Dissart. *The Weapon Unsheathed* contains a number of conversations between Dissart and an old college friend, identified only as the Author, who, although not a pacifist, had begun to understand something of the Vision. From these conversations it becomes apparent that Wilson regarded Asquith, a man 'accomplished in national pulse-feeling', as sympathetic to the pacifist cause. Although not published until early 1917, *The Weapon Unsheathed* was already advertised in November, shortly before Asquith's (Dissart's) resignation on 5 December, 'ostensibly on the question of shooting disobedient conscripts who refused to fight'. The reason may be fanciful, but Wilson correctly anticipated the change in Britain's political leadership.⁸⁰ Sir Reginald Marvel, a man of more extreme views and less sympathetic to pacifists, replaces Dissart. Ironland interprets Dissart's fall as evidence of Imperia's and Sir Joshua's desire to fight to the victorious finish, a reference to Lloyd George's 'knock-out' speech of 28 September 1916.

Dissart's conversations with the Author brought to the fore another issue important to the FOR: the accusation that pacifists seldom came to grips with practical facts that mattered; that pacifism was utopian. There was some truth to the accusation. For instance, the Quaker publication of 7 August 1914, *Message to Men and Women of Goodwill*, admitted that it could offer no course of action, only certain principles.⁸¹ Many FOR leaders regarded the dissemination of principles as the FOR's main task, assuming that their acceptance would bring about a complete change of mind, a truly Christian revolution, and a transformation of society. While Wilson hoped for the same changes, she also made it clear that dissemination of principles was not enough.

CONCLUSION

During the war many FOR members wrote about the Fellowship's vision of the Kingdom of God in propositional or expository form. Wilson's unique contribution explained the vision more dramatically in literary form. She portrayed that those touched by Love would not only talk and write about it, but would be willing to become actively involved. 'Doing', Wilson affirmed time and again, was the logical outcome of 'being'. The two together, as part of the vision, would ensure that means and ends were in harmony. Only with this right methodology could society be transformed. While some authors, including D.H. Lawrence,⁸² regarded the war as causing the end of civilisation and expressed hopelessness, Wilson portrayed a vision of hope.

In the process of explaining suffering love, Wilson also touched upon such FOR issues as peace of mind, toleration, guilt, role of churches, the religious press, and socialism. Like so many other FOR members, she expressed the hope that through a just peace the 'poor old folly' of the competitive system would disappear, not by 'smashing one another's heads over it', but by 'aiming to work with as little hardship

as possible to the individual', but there is nothing resembling Quaker FOR member Malcolm Sparkes' attempts at bringing reconciliation in the world of labour or the FOR's involvement in the rehabilitation of young offenders. Only after the war and an 'unjust peace treaty' did she turn her attention to this aspect of the FOR's integrated pacifism in *The Last Dividend; an economic romance*.⁸³

Wilson left no doubt that service could be costly. Clement Pendragon suffered in Siberia; Sir Percival Garnett and Lady Eirene were killed. Whatever the cost of service, however, there would be positive results. Garnett's action ultimately led to Princess Ida's peace army, which in turn led to a truce. Frequently Wilson used women as activists and spokespersons. For a feminist that is not surprising, but it should be kept in mind that the FOR since its inception had recognised the important role of women, deliberately electing several to its ruling body, the General Committee. Their service, however, has received little scholarly attention. It is not clear if the role of women in Wilson's books contributed to the fact that the books sold very well. More than likely the thousands sold reached far more people than other FOR publications. Their simple stories without profound theological arguments still stand as a window on the mind of the early Fellowship of Reconciliation.

NOTES

1. For the early announcement of the conference, see *The Friend* 54.16 (17 April 1914), pp. 263-64; for the speeches at Llandudno, see *Friends and the War*, London: Headley, 1914; for its context in the Quaker renaissance, see Kennedy, T.C., *British Quakerism 1860-1920: The Transformation of a Religious Community*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

2. For the delay, see den Boggende, B., 'Richard Roberts' Vision and the Founding of the Fellowship of Reconciliation', *Albion* 36.4 (Winter 2004), pp. 608-35.

3. Lillian Stevenson, in an undated letter to Henry Hodgkin, probably dated between 4 and 28 December 1914, in Henry Hodgkin archives, Box 1 file 16, Friends Library, Temp. MSS (hereafter cited as HTH); Horace Alexander (1889-1990), private communication to author, dated 10 April 1984.

4. For the minutes of this meeting, see HTH, Box 1 file 16.

5. The Collegium was founded by the Swanwick Free Church Fellowship. For its founding and meetings, see Micklem, N., *The Box and the Puppets (1883-1953)*, London: Geoffrey Bles, 1957; Lawson, M., *God's Backroom Boy*, London: Lutterworth Press, 1952; 'Private Invitation to a Conference', 30 April 1911, in C.J. Cadoux' archives, Box 5, at Bodleian Library, Oxford (hereafter cited as CJC); 'The Story of the Covenant', in Richard Roberts' papers, Box 7, at the United Church Archives, Toronto (hereafter cited as UCA, RR)

6. For a discussion of the biblical meaning, see Ferguson, S.B., and Wright, D.E. (eds), *New Dictionary of Theology*, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988, pp. 254-55.

7. William E. Wilson to Henry Hodgkin, letter dated 1 June 1918, HTH, Box 1 file 14, underlining in the original. For the FOR, see Brittain, V., *The Rebel Passion: A Short History of Some Pioneer Peace-makers*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1964; Wallis, J., *Valiant for Peace: A History of the Fellowship of Reconciliation 1914 to 1989*, London: FOR, 1991; Ceadel, M., *Pacifism in Britain 1914-1945: The Defining of a Faith*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980; den Boggende, G.G.J., 'The Fellowship of Reconciliation 1914-1945', PhD diss., Hamilton, McMaster University, 1986.

8. *The Friend* 55.2 (8 January 1915), p. 30. Horace Alexander was one of those who did not become a member (letter to author dated 10 April 1984). Lucy Gardner to Henry Hodgkin, HTH, Box 1 file 17, memorandum undated.

9. HTH, Box 1 file 16, undated letter, but likely written before 30 November 1914. In the mid-1890s he had been involved in the evangelistic Forward Movement.

10. For Phillips' suggestion, see *Friends and the War*, p. 99. The notion of a peace army was not novel. It seems to have circulated among some women's groups. William Orchard hinted at it in his *Advent Sermons* (London: James Clark, 1914, p. 251) when he stated that the churches should have mobilized Christians and 'resolved that before the armies [came] to grips it [should have been] across the dead bodies of all Christian people'.

11. The FOR archives are at the British Library of Political and Economic Science, London, Coll. Misc. 456. For General Committee, see FOR 456; 1/1; 21 January 1915 and 17 February 1915.

12. I leave the Education Committee outside of consideration; it produced curricular material for schools.

13. FOR 456; 4/2; Propaganda Committee Minutes 1915–1918. For Salter, see Brockway, F., *The Life of Alfred Salter: Bermondsey Story*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1949.

14. *News Sheet*, 24 September 1914, p. 8. The title came from F.W.H. Myers' poem 'St Paul' and was first announced in *New Sheet*, 21 May 1915, p. 6.

15. FOR 456; 4/1; 8 December 1915; Literature Committee Minutes.

16. For a secular parallel of this Victorian faith, see Lord Milner's 'Round Table' group. Gollin, A.M., *Proconsul in Politics: A Study of Lord Milner in Opposition and Power*, London: Anthony Blond, 1964.

17. FOR 456; 2/1; 11 October 1915; HTH, Box 1 file 14, 14 April 1916. For the demonisation of the enemy, in, among others, the Viscount Bryce Report of 1915, see Read, J.M., *Atrocity Propaganda 1914–1919*, New York: Arno Press, 1972. According to R.M. Bracco, minor fiction relied on a spiritual rather than on demonic imagery (*Merchants of Hope: British Middlebrow Writers and the First World War, 1919–1939*, Oxford: Berg, 1993, p. 3).

18. For censorship, see Lovelace, C., 'British Press Censorship during the First World War', in Boyce, G., Curran, J., and Wingate, P. (eds), *Newspaper History from the Seventeenth Century to the Present*, London: Constable, 1978, Chapter 17; Towle, P., 'The Debate on Wartime Censorship in Britain', in Bond, B., and Roy, I. (eds), *War and Society: A Yearbook of Military History*, New York: Holmes & Meier, 1975, Chapter 7. Censorship had a long tradition; see for instance Hall, D.J., 'The Fiery Tryal of their Infallible Examination': Self-control in the Regulation of Quaker Publishing in England from the 1670s to the mid 19th Century', in Myers, R., and Harris, M. (eds), *Censorship and the Control of Print in England and France 1600–1910*, Winchester: St Paul's Biographies, 1992, pp. 59–86. For DORA, see Bone, A.G., 'Beyond the Rule of Laws: Aspects of the Defence of the Realm Acts and Regulations', PhD diss., Hamilton, McMaster University, 1994; Rose, T., *Aspects of Political Censorship 1914–1918*, Hull: University of Hull Press, 1995. The most notable extension came on 27 November 1914, the Defence of the Realm Consolidation Act, or DORA as it is usually understood.

19. Hynes, S., *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture*, New York: Macmillan, 1990, p. 147. In November 1915 the socialist Quaker J.T. Newbold was fined £25 in Buxton, while in Leeds in December T.H. Ferris and Sydney Overbury received a jail sentence of six months for publishing and distributing literature of the pacifist and ethical-socialist Brotherhood Church. See also *Parliamentary Debates*, Commons, 1915, 77, cols. 481–482, 22 December 1915.

20. *Morning Post*, 21 June 1915, 'Traitors in the Camp'.

21. For censoring the Sermon on the Mount, see Richards, L., *The Christian Alternative to War*, London: SCM Press, 1929, p. 89. The extent of censorship may also be gleaned from the fact that dead soldiers were not permitted to be photographed, drawn, or painted. Bell, F., 'The Spirit of Our Time', *Queen's Quarterly* 111.1 (Spring 2004), p. 15.

22. The campaign had been announced in *News Sheet* of 15 March 1915; see also 4 June 1915, p. 8; it was thus not a reaction against the National Registration Act of 15 July 1915.

23. Greenwood, J.O., *Quaker Encounters*. Vol. 1. *Friends and Relief*, York: William Sessions, 1975, pp. 171–76; Kennedy, *British Quakerism*, pp. 290–91.

24. For Royden as leader, see Reginald William Sorenson, House of Lords Records, Historical Collection 102, files 159, 230 (unpublished biography). Coltman to Cecil Cadoux, CJC Box 8, letter 11 August 1915. Mr William Cook, the owner of the van, claimed £300 damages; see FOR 456; 5/1; 13 December 1915. According to MacDonough, M., *In London during the Great War: The Diary of a Journalist*, London: Eyre & Spottiswood, 1935, p. 100, people were hunted and stoned in the country's interest. For hatred, see Buitenhuis, P., *The Great War of Words: British, American, and Canadian Propaganda and Fiction, 1914–1933*, Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987, p. 108; Haste, C., *Keep the Home Fires Burning: Propaganda in the First World War*, London: Allen Lane, 1977, pp. 79, 81; Wallace, S., *War and the Image of Germany: British Academics 1914–1918*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1988, p. 154.

25. HTH Box 4 file 41, letter 29 July 1917 and RR Box 2 file 39 8 August 1917. Wood, H.G., *Henry T. Hodgkin*, London: SCM Press, 1937, pp. 164–65, confused both date and place. Compare HTH Box 4 file 41, letter 17 July 1915 and RR file 38, letter 9 August 1917. Ingram, following Wood, also confused it with the peace pilgrimage.

26. White, S., 'Soviets in Britain: The Leeds Conference of 1917', *International Review of Social History* 19.2 (1974), pp. 166, 185.

27. Thomson, B., *My Experiences at Scotland Yard*, Garden City, NY: Doubleday Page, 1923, Chapter 23; Thomson, B., *The Scene Changes*, New York: Doubleday, 1937, p. 359; Thomson, B., *Queer People*, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1922, pp. 268–69. Everything in the FOR office was taken to the police station. On 11 December Leyton Richards, FOR general-secretary, was instructed to write about the material which still had not been returned. The ostensible reason for the raid was German financial support; see *News Sheet* NS 19, January 1918, p. 2. See also FOR 456; 5/1, Business Committee 13 December 1915.

28. For information about Theodora, see her obituary in *The Friend* 99.46 (14 November 1941), p. 534; 99.47 (21 November 1941), p. 539; *Who Was Who 1941–1950*, p. 1250. She was about a decade older than most other FOR leaders, such as Roberts (1874), Hodgkin (1877) and Richards (1879). The double Wilson appears also in the name of her younger sister Mary.

29. For the controversy, see Isichei, E., *Victorian Quakers*, London: Oxford University Press, 1970, Chapter 2.

30. According to Theodora's obituary, she joined during WWI, but Ingram provides evidence for an earlier date. See Ingram, A., "'In Christ's Name—Peace!': Theodora Wilson Wilson and Radical Pacifism", in Ingram, A.C., and Patai, D. (eds), *Rediscovering Forgotten Radicals: British Women Writers, 1889–1939*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993, p. 179.

31. For Victorian women's accomplishment education, see Theobald, M.R., "'Mere Accomplishment'?: Melbourne's Early Ladies Schools Reconsidered", in Prentice, A., and Theobald, M.R. (eds), *Women Who Taught: Perspectives on the History of Women and Teaching*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991, Chapter 3. See also Vicinus, M., *Independent Women, Work and Community for Single Women 1850–1920*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985. For the importance of German education, see Albisetti, J.C., *Secondary School Reform in Imperial Germany*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983, and Gruber, C.S., *Mars and Minerva: World War I and the Uses of the Higher Learning in America*, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1975.

32. See, for instance, *Stories from the Bible, More Old Testament Stories, and More New Testament Stories*, all written in 1914, and *Bible Stories for Children* (1916).

33. It was republished in 1908 as *The Factory Queen*.

34. In 1918 the journal contained an FOR column. According to Graham, J.W., *Conscription and Conscience*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1922; repr., New York: Garland, 1971, p. 205, her *Crusader* was in effect a voice of the FOR. It was probably in her function as editor that her home was raided. For the raid, see her 'An Open Letter to the P.M.', *The New Crusader* 2.4 (25 January 1918), p. 1.

35. Wilson, T.W., 'A Wider Call', in *Friends and the War*, p. 98.

36. For the Birmingham report, see HTH, Box 1 file 14, 9 March 1917. Until 1915 Wilson was involved in the Women's Liberal Association. There is some evidence, not mentioned in Cline,

C.A., *Recruits to Labour*, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1963, that the FOR contributed to the change of political allegiance from the Liberal Party to Labour.

37. *News Sheet*, 1 March 1915. For the conference, see Addams, J., Balch, E.G., and Hamilton, A., *Women at The Hague: The International Congress of Women and its Results*, New York: Macmillan, 1915; Bussey, G., and Tims, M., *Women's International League for Peace and Freedom*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1965; Moorehead, C., *Troublesome People: Enemies of War: 1916-1986*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1987, p. 25; Wiltsher, A., *Most Dangerous Women: Feminist Peace Campaigners of the Great War*, London: Pandora, 1985. For the English context, see Pugh, M., *Women and the Women's Movement in Britain 1914-1959*, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1992. The women's delegation that visited London met with FOR leaders.

38. Ingram and Patai, *Rediscovering Forgotten Radicals*, Chapter 9. For NMWM, see Chamberlain, W.J., *Fighting for Peace*, New York: Garland, 1971; [London, NMWM, 1928], p. 118.

39. *Labour Leader*, 23 November 1916, p. 1. See also *The Friend* 56.47 (24 November 1916), p. 925 and 57.7 (16 February 1917), p. 130. Wilson, T.W., *The Wrestlers*, London: C.W. Daniels, 1916. The reasons for its delayed publication are unknown. *The Last Weapon: A Vision*, London: C.W. Daniels, 1916.

40. Names have frequently a symbolic meaning; Pendragon (means foremost leader) may be a reference to King Arthur.

41. Paul's banishment could be regarded as a form of censorship and in 1916 could have been interpreted as an indirect attack on DORA.

42. *Times Literary Supplement*, 16 October 1916, p. 548. The reasonably sympathetic synopsis is about a quarter-column long.

43. Clarke, I.F., *Voices Prophesying War 1763-1984*, London: Oxford University Press, 1966; Dangerfield, G., *The Strange Death of Liberal England 1910-1914*, New York: H. Smith & R. Haas, 1935; Haste, *Keep the Home Fires Burning*; Hynes, *A War Imagined*.

44. Travers, T.H.E., 'Future Warfare: H.G. Wells and British Military Theory', and Gooch, J., 'Attitudes to War in Late Victorian and Edwardian England', in Bond and Roy (eds), *War and Society*, Chapters 5 and 6; Mackenzie, N., and Mackenzie, J., *H.G. Wells: A Biography*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1973; Kern, S., *The Culture of Time and Space 1880-1918*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983, pp. 229, 242.

45. In the spring of 1914 F.T. Marinetti, the founder of Italian Futurism, visited London. According to Dutch author-critic Maria Viola, reviewing an exhibition of four Futurists in Amsterdam in 1912, Futurism was 'an intoxication, a hate, a passion, a madness, a rage' ('De Futuristen', *Van Onze Tijd*, 1912, quoted in Brandt Corstius, J.C. [ed.], *Nederlands Literatuurboek*, vol. 2, Amsterdam: J.M. Meulenhoff, 1960, p. 181.) Vorticists published *Blast*; the first issue came out on 20 June 1914. See also Bergonzi, B., *Heroes' Twilight: A Study of the Literature of the Great War*, New York: Coward-McCann, 1966, pp. 26-19. For Gosse, see Hynes, *A War Imagined*, p. 17.

46. Holley, I.B., *Ideas and Weapons: Exploitation of the Aerial Weapon by the United States During World War I; A Study in the Relationship of Technological Advance, Military Doctrine, and the Development of Weapons*, Hamden: Archon Books, 1971, pp. 26-30; Saunders, H.A.St.G., *Pax Ardua*, London: Oxford University Press, 1944, pp. 6-19.

47. For the raids, see Thomson, *My Experiences at Scotland Yard*, Chapter 6. Already on 15 November 1915 the Dutch newspaper *De Amsterdammer* showed the 'Skull-Flyer', John Braakensiek's cartoon of a Zeppelin, showing an attack on civilians.

48. Gruber, *Mars and Minerva*, p. 108; Doel, R.E., 'Scientists as Policymakers, Advisors, and Intelligence Agents: Linking Contemporary Diplomatic History with the History of Contemporary Science', in Söderqvist, T. (ed.), *The Historiography of Contemporary Science and Technology*, Amsterdam: Harwood academic publishers, 1997, Chapter 2; Edgerton, D.E.M., 'Science and War', in Olby, R.C., Cantor, G.N., Christie, J.R.R., and Hodge, M.J.S. (eds), *Companion to the History of Modern Science*, London: Routledge, 1990, Chapter 61; Fuller, S., *Thomas Kuhn: A Philosophical History for Our Times*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000, pp. 43, 75, 104-5; Haber, L.F., *The Poisonous Cloud: Chemical Warfare in the First World War*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986;

Watson, W.H., 'Scientists and State Security', *International Journal* 10.3 (Summer 1955), pp. 171-78. In 1917, for instance, the government appointed an Inquiry Commission looking into the utilisation of halakite (see Dearle, N.B., *Dictionary of Official War-Time Organizations*, London: Humphrey Milford Oxford University Press, 1928, p. 305). Halakite turned out to be a new propellant that was little more than cordite and some lead salts.

49. Quoted in Goudzwaard, B., *Idols of Our Time*, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1984, p. 65.

50. Quoted in Clarke, *Voices Prophesying War*, p. 11.

51. Buitenhuis, *The Great War of Words*; Haste, *Keep the Home Fires Burning*, Chapter 3; Hynes, *A War Imagined*, Chapter 2; Sanders, M.L., and Taylor, P.M., *British Propaganda during the First World War, 1914-18*, London: Macmillan, 1982; Squires, J.D., *British Propaganda at Home and in the United States from 1914 to 1917*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.

52. *The Venturer* 1.1 (October 1915), p. 8. According to Reverend Leyton Richards, Roberts gave the monthly a 'snap and bite'. Richards to George Davies, George Davies archives, National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth, GD 456-12; 15 February 1927.

53. According to Buitenhuis (*Great War of Words*, p. 21), 'The evangelical tradition of the pamphlet was often reinforced by a moral schema drawn from John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*—surely one of the most influential books of the Great War'.

54. *Times Literary Supplement*, 17 February 1916, p. 83. 'Miss Wilson, as in "The Search of the Child for the Sorrows of God" has for her principal figure a child—a messenger from the other world; who moves among scenes of to-day in which the problem is whether the "Last Weapon" is to be Fearless Love or a deadly invention called Hellite'.

55. *The Friend* 56.7 (18 February 1916), p. iv; 56.11 (17 March 1916), p. 162. Theodora wrote to Hodgkin: 'I am having wonderful letters about my book, and am sending it to America-Colonies &c., and am having it translated into Esperanto'. HTH, Box 1 file 14: 3 March 1916.

56. *Labour Leader*, 9 March 1916, p. 2, 'View and Review'.

57. Morley, J., 'Libraries at Newark-on-Trent, 1698-1960', F.L.A. Thesis, Library Association, 1968, pp. 205-6; Ellis, A., *Public Libraries and the First World War*, Merseyside: The Frynnon Press, 1975, p. 32. The book was banned in US libraries for soldiers. For a broader context of literary censorship, see Hiley, N., "'Can't you find me something nasty?'" Circulating Libraries and Literary Censorship in Britain from the 1890s to the 1910s', in Myers and Harris (eds), *Censorship & the Control of Print in England and France 1600-1910*, pp. 123-47.

58. Wilson, T.W., *The Weapon Unsheathed: A Spiritual Adventure*, London: C.W. Daniels, 1917; *Times Literary Supplement*, 8 February 1917, p. 71a; *Labour Leader*, 15 March 1917, p. 8; *The Friend* 57.8 (23 February 1917), p. 146.

59. *The Morning Post*, 21 June 1915, p. 6, Editorial.

60. FOR 456; 1/1; 10 June 1915. Wilson was present at this meeting. It was suggested that a group of non-combatants would fling themselves between the combatants. In a section on religion More wrote, 'For it is well known that when their own army hath reculed, and in despair turned back and run away, their enemies fiercely pursuing with slaughter and spoil, then the priests coming between have stayed the murder and parted both the hosts, so that peace hath been made and concluded between both parts upon equal and indifferent conditions'. More, T., *Utopia*, London: Dent, 1982 [1516], p. 126. The idea resurfaced in the 1930s and is usually associated with Dick Sheppard, Herbert Gray, and Maude Royden. League of Nations staff member H. Brinton published *The Peace Army*, London: Williams & Norgate, 1932.

61. Her name may be an iconographical reference to Tennyson's *The Princess* (1847), whose Ida represented the 'new woman'. See Kilham, J., *Tennyson and The Princess: Reflections of an Age*, London: University of London Athlone Press, 1958; Houghton, W.E., *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957, p. 348; Vicinus, *Independent Women*, p. 151. Gilbert and Sullivan turned it into the operetta *Princess Ida* (1884).

62. Sir Reginald Marvel's comment may be a reference to Crown Advocate Archibald Bodkin's remark that 'war would become impossible if all men were to have the view that war was wrong',

a remark pacifists frequently used as propaganda. Bodkin's remark resembles that of Celsus, a second-century Roman, who argued that if all were Christians there would be no one to defend the empire.

63. Fischer, F., *Germany's War Aims in the First World War*, New York: W.W. Norton, 1967, pp. 293-309; Link, A.S., *Woodrow Wilson: Revolution, War, and Peace*, Arlington Heights: AHM Publications, 1979; Musto, R.G., *The Catholic Peace Tradition*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1986, pp. 171-73; Hinton, J., *Protests and Visions: Peace Politics in Twentieth-Century Britain*, London: Hutchinson Radius, 1989, Chapter 6; Haste, *Keep the Home Fires Burning*, Chapter 7; Puchinger, G., *Colijn: Momenten uit zijn leven*, Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1961, pp. 97-98.

64. Wilson, W.E., *Atonement and Non-Resistance*, London: Swarthmore Press, 1914, p. 32. William (1880-1955) was Theodora's cousin once removed. It has been argued that the doctrine of vicarious atonement contributes to violence. See Weaver, J.D., *The Nonviolent Atonement*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001, and his 'Violence in Christian Theology', in Weaver, J.D., and Biesecker-Mast, G. (eds), *Teaching Peace: Nonviolence and the Liberal Arts*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003, Chapter 3.

65. This is not the new man of expressionist literature. For such a new man, see Richard, L., *The Concise Encyclopedia of Expressionism*, Toronto: B. Mitchell, 1984, pp. 130-32. For the confused teaching of church leaders, see one of the earliest FOR pamphlets, Roberts, R., *Faith for the New Age*, London: FOR, 1915.

66. For the conference, see *News Sheet*, 25 August 1916, p. 5; for the debate, see 15 February 1916; 25 August 1916; 25 September 1916; and 25 November 1916.

67. Marrin, A., *The Last Crusade*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1974; Wilkinson, A., *The Church of England and the First World War*, London: SPCK, 1978, and *Dissent or Conform? War, Peace and the English Churches 1900-1945*, London: SCM Press, 1986.

68. Noel-Baker, P., *The Private Manufacture of Armaments*, New York: Dover, 1972 [London, Victor Gollancz, 1936], p. 36.

69. Cf. Noel-Baker, *The Private Manufacture of Armaments*, p. 89. See also Hinton, *Protests and Visions*, p. 38; Doel, 'Scientists as Policy Makers'; Pigou, A.C., *The Political Economy of War*, London: Macmillan, 1921, 2nd edn, 1940.

70. Sir Joshua's wish to retaliate with Hellite after Ironland bombed Imperia was thwarted when it was supposed that Ironland also possessed Hellite, thus cancelling Imperia's advantages. In *The Weapon Unsheathed*, p. 102, Wilson indicates that the enemy had bluffed: 'All the world knew that Ironland did not and never had possessed the dangerous secret. She had merely been guilty of a consummate act of bluff'.

71. Riley-Smith, J., 'Religious Authority', in Martland, P. (ed.), *The Future of the Past: Big Questions in History*, London: Pimlico, 2002, Chapter 1.

72. For a discussion of this issue, see Ellul, J., *Violence: Reflections from a Christian Perspective*, trans. Kings, C.G., New York: The Seabury Press, 1968.

73. Quoted in Hynes, *A War Imagined*, p. 116. Siegfried Sassoon had a similar experience. For FOR tolerance, see Cadoux, C.J., *The Venturer 2.4* (January 1917), p. 118.

74. For a strong accusation, see Niebuhr, R., *Why the Christian Church is not Pacifist*, London: SCM Press, 1940; in the late 1920s Niebuhr was chairman of the American FOR. See Campbell, R.J., *The New Theology*, London: Chapman & Hall, 1907. For an example of early FOR understanding of sin, see Orchard, W.E., *Modern Theories of Sin*, London: James Clarke, 1909.

75. Huxley, A., *Ends and Means*, New York: Harper, 1937. He made no reference to the FOR.

76. The best FOR exposition on this issue is Richard, *The Christian Alternative to War*.

77. See Boulton, D., *Objection Overruled*, London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1967; Chamberlain, *Fighting for Peace*; den Boggende, B., 'Reluctant Absolutist: Malcolm Sparkes' Conscientious Objections to World War I', *Quaker Studies* 10 (2005), pp. 67-86; Graham, J.W., *Conscription and Conscience*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1922; repr. New York, Garland, 1971; Hayes, D., *Conscription and Conflict*, London: Sheppard Press, 1949; Kennedy, T., *The Hound of Conscience*, Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1981.

78. Probably the best known prison reformer with CO experience was Stephen Hobhouse.
79. *New Sheet*, 25 December 1916, p. 5.
80. Havighurst, A.F., *Twentieth-Century Britain*, New York: Harper & Row, 1966, p. 126.
81. It was published in *The Friend* 54.33 (14 August 1914), p. 594; see also *London Yearly Meeting*, 1915 (September 1914). According to the *Hornsey Journal* (14 August 1914, p. 2), Richard Roberts admitted that he had no practical solution, stating in his sermon on the first war Sunday that since the British were at war, they had to see it through. At the Llandudno conference in September he made the same point. For utopia, see Cioran, E.M., *History and Utopia*, trans. Howard, R., New York: Seaver Books, 1987.
82. Zytaruk, G.J., and Boulton, J.T. (eds), *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence*, vol. 2, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981, p. 390, letter 983 to Lady Ottoline Morrell, dated 9 September 1915.
83. For Sparkes, see den Boggende, B., 'Pacifism and British Labor Relations: Malcolm Sparkes's Industrial Parliament Scheme', *Fides et Historia* 33.1 (Winter/Spring 2001), pp. 89-107; Wilson, T.W., *The Last Dividend: An Economic Romance*, London: International Bookshop, n.d.

AUTHOR DETAILS

Bert den Boggende emigrated from the Netherlands to Canada in 1967. He alternated teaching at Christian elementary schools with various studies, obtaining graduate degrees in Art History, Christian Studies, and History. In 1986 he completed his PhD at McMaster University, Hamilton, on 'The Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1914-1945'. He has published a variety of articles, the most recent ones about Richard Robert's vision of the FOR, Malcolm Sparkes, and chivalry.

Mailing address: Bert den Boggende, 77 Greenbrook Village, Brooks, AB, T1R 0R8, Canada. Email: bertdenb@yahoo.com.