The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society

Volume 55 Number 7

CONTENTS

Page

205 The Campaign against Conscription in Australia – 1911 to 1914. *William N. Oats*

220 Unfinished Pilgrimages: Geoffrey Maw and Jack Hoyland in India. *Marjorie Sykes*

238 John Bright – Quaker Politician: A Centenary Appreciation. *Keith G. Robbins*

250 Early Friends in North Cumberland. *Geoffrey F. Nuttall.*

252 Recent Publications

256 Notes and Queries

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

President 1989 William R. Aitken
1990 Hope Hewison
1991 Neville H. Newhouse
1992 Edward H. Milligan

Clerk (secretary): Edward H. Milligan

Treasurer: Jon E. North

Editor of the Journal: Gerald A.J. Hodgett

Annual Membership Subscriptions (Personal) £4 (U.K. Institutional) £6 (Overseas Institutions) US$11. Subscriptions should be paid to the Treasurer and Membership Secretary, FHS, 32 Bolehill Road, Bolehill, Wirksworth, Derbyshire, DE4 4GQ. Orders for single issues and back numbers should be sent to FHS c/o The Library, Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ.

Volume 55 Number 7 1989

THE JOURNAL OF THE FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Communications should be addressed to the Editor of the *Journal*, c/o The Library, Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ.

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST CONSCRIPTION IN AUSTRALIA - 1911 to 1914

The establishment of a General Meeting of Australian Friends in 1902 at last made possible united action on an issue which had been held by Friends to be of crucial relevance to their historic testimony against war.[1] The establishment of a Federal Parliament, also at the turn of the century, brought to the forefront of national politics the question of national defence which now came under the control of the Commonwealth Government and compulsory military training was being increasingly hailed as an essential component. In the 1901 Conference of Australian Friends, which preceded the first General Meeting of 1902, action was taken to bring Friends' views on compulsory military training before the Government while the proposed Defence Act was still being drafted and debated. A petition was drawn up expressing the Quaker conviction that war was inconsistent with the teachings of Jesus and therefore Quakers could not take part directly or indirectly in war-service. Friends had therefore already laid down the lines on which they might take political action. A 'watchdog', lobbying role was given to an appointed committee. Deputations and letters to individual members of both Houses of

Parliament were to be the recommended courses of action. This role continued throughout the first decade during which the Defence Acts were threatened but had not yet been translated into law.

JANUARY 1911

The critical phase of the struggle began with the coming into force on 1 January 1911 of the new Defence Acts, whereby all boys aged 12 – 14 were to be registered as junior cadets and those aged 14 – 18 as senior cadets with prescribed hours of training. There were to be no exemptions. Prosecution would follow failure to register or to report for drill. Australian Friends were not alone in their resistance. Parallel developments were taking place in New Zealand.

It was then that English Friends offered to give whatever help they could to strengthen Friends' efforts in the colonies. John Barrett in his study of the struggle against conscription in the years 1911–1914 acknowledged the crucial role played by Quakers in arousing public opinion on this issue. 'The Quakers', he said, 'managed to be nearly everywhere in the anti-conscription movement'.[2] 'Wherever peace and anti-conscription were mentioned in those years, up sprang a Quaker, fighting and trying to force his government's hand'.[3] But Barrett draws the conclusion that the spearhead of the anti-conscription movement, the Australian Freedom League, emerged 'less as an Australian Movement than as a British Quaker organisation'.[4]

It will therefore be important to examine the extent of British Quaker involvement in these years and analyse the truth or otherwise of Barrett's assertion. The English Friends, Herbert and Mary Corder, reported to a meeting of the Australasian Committee on 5 January 1911 on their return from a visit to Australia and New Zealand. They spoke of the growing concern in the colonies of the way the Press was stirring up fears of Asian aggression to justify the introduction of compulsory military training. A small joint committee of London Yearly Meeting's Australasian Committee and its Peace Committee were formed to act in an advisory role to Friends in Australia and New Zealand in their opposition to the Defence Acts. This committee, called the Joint Committee of Australian Defence Acts, offered to provide pamphlets, raise funds to meet the expenses of campaigns and support a legal challenge to the Australian Defence Acts. It was made clear from the start that English Friends saw their role as supportive, not directive. W.H.F. Alexander, a member of this committee, explained this role.

> In the press we feel it will be best for you Australians to write to Australians. For

> us to write would probably be hurtful rather than helpful, as it would open the charge to 'outside influence'. But we shall be glad to help freely in financing the circulation of any matter which you think will appeal to those amongst whom you can see your way to circulate it.[5]

English Friends saw that Australian and New Zealand Friends were in the front-line in the fight against conscription. Alexander concluded his letter by expressing the feeling 'that you may be having the honour to win this fight for the whole British people, and if you fail, the struggle will pass on to other parts of the Empire'.

'AGITATORS, ESPECIALLY OF THE INTERNATIONAL QUAKER KIND'

This was the label J.E. Barrett[6] fixed on the small band of Quakers who came out to Australia and New Zealand in 1911–1912 to fight against the spreading of the tentacles of militarism into the schools. They came, however, not to direct an anti-conscription conspiracy or to encourage law-breakers on the streets, but to give support to an already dedicated and determined core of Australian Quakers who, having failed to accept the validity of the Quaker refusal to compromise with militarism, were now facing the lonely and daunting task of taking the consequences of this refusal. It was this core of Australian and New Zealand Friends who were hailed in England as holding 'the post of honour' in the 'struggle for the soul of boys and young men'.

The first English Quaker to enter the 'struggle' was Dr J. Herbert Thorp. Early in 1911 he had expressed his concern to the Australasian Committee and at the end of that year an opportunity came for him to visit Australia to act as headmaster of The Friends School, Hobart, during the absence overseas of Edmund Gower. On his way to Hobart, he called in to visit Friends in Adelaide and was soon caught up in anti-conscription moves of Adelaide Friends. With Edward Fryer and Edwin Ashby he called a public meeting at the Friends Meeting House, North Adelaide, and made a special point of inviting the ministers of the Christian churches. This meeting on 23 January 1912 marked the beginning of the outreach of Quakers on the issue which had concerned them from the beginning of the century. The following Easter three Friends, John Hills and Thomas Hubbard, together with the English Friend, John Fletcher, planned a strategy to launch the anti-conscription campaign. Gawler, 40 kilometres north of Adelaide, was chosen as the target-town for the try-out. Barrett, consistent with his assumption that Fletcher, the Quaker "international agitator", had been sent out by

English Friends to master-mind the campaign, says that Fletcher 'took two Adelaide Quakers, Thomas Hubbard and John Hills, to the prosperous country centre of Gawler'.[8]

I can find no evidence that English Friends sent Fletcher out to Australia, still less that he was commissioned to 'master-mind the campaign'. He came out towards the end of 1911 as a free-lance Quaker, intending to investigate social conditions in the colonies. Instead he found himself in the midst of the controversy concerning boy conscripts, the only people opposing the government and the military authority being the Quakers and the Socialists. Fletcher unreservedly acknowledged the initiative taken by Australian Quakers, particularly J.F. Hills. 'To him more than any other man', Fletcher said, 'is the credit of the movement which grew with such remarkable rapidity and which achieved remarkable success.'[9] Fletcher goes on to say that Hills suggested an anti-conscription caravan tour and asked him to accompany him, but the caravan was not available and so they went by train to Gawler. There they hired a farm cart and a very slow horse, stencilled posters and drove up and down the town advertising the meeting. Fletcher labelled the meeting a 'great success' and added, 'This is the beginning of the most extraordinary movement that I had until then been connected with'. Hills then, not Fletcher, appears to have been the initiator. He had shown his uncompromising mettle on the question of the conscription of twelve-year olds by writing a pamphlet, *Child Conscription*, which was published in 1912 with funds supplied by English Friends. When he was faced with having to register four junior cadets, boys in his school who were reaching the age of 12, he wrote a defiant letter to the Acting Area Officer on 27 June 1912[10] refusing to follow this military direction. The letter concluded with the words, 'Whatever trouble it brings me I must follow my conscience... I am compelled by my conscience to take the grave responsibility of breaking the law, if need be, rather than assist in the slightest degree this military enrolment'.

Hills was a somewhat gaunt, gangly figure, who in his first years in Australia as a master at The Friends School, Hobart, had seemed to be a rather prickly individual. In 1900 during a staffing crisis at the school he resigned and went to Adelaide.[11] From that time until his death in 1948 he became a key figure in the South Australian Peace Movement, exercising something of the influence of the old Hebrew prophets, speaking out fearlessly in the market-place against the injustice of boy-conscription, enduring scorn in his reslove to 'speak truth', even if it meant a ducking in the River Torrens by his opponents. He had the commanding presence, the flowing white hair of a prophet. He was in

constant demand as a speaker and pamphlet-writer. As a result of Hills' unwavering energy and single-minded pursuit of his fight againt injustice we have a well-documented record of the years when Quakers were on trial because of their faith. He blazed against militarism with something of the Voltaire he quoted – *"Ecrasez l'infame"*. Militarism and capitalism had produced, he trumpeted, 'an infamy', a Frankenstein monster, (how prophetic this sounds of the nuclear madness). 'Militarism must go', he said, 'or humanity will go down'.

THE AUSTRALIAN FREEDOM LEAGUE

On the Thursday after the Easter Gawler meeting the Australian Freedom League was launched at a meeting held in the Friends Meeting House in North Adelaide. Though Friends were the mainspring of the new organization, the committee elected was representative of a wider circle than the Society of Friends. The Rev. M.C. Murphy, a Baptist minister, was elected chairman, George Everett, a councillor, chairman of the propaganda committee, the Quakers, John Barry and Edward Fryer, joint secretaries and another Quaker, Mrs H.S. Robson, treasurer. The League now gathered momentum. Meetings followed in quick succession at Mount Barker on 20 April 1912, in Melbourne on 27 April, where there was strong backing from the churches, particularly from the Rev. Leyton Richards of the Independent Church and the Rev. Charles Strong of the Australian Church. Fletcher went on from Melbourne to Hobart where a meeting was held on 1 May. Later, after Fletcher paid a brief visit to New Zealand, a branch was formed at a meeting in Sydney with a Quaker, Stanley Allen as secretry and in Brisbane, again with a Quaker, F. Lister Hopkins, as secretary. In all States therefore Quakers played an active part in the new movement. They also carried the message to the two political parties, Edwin Ashby to the Liberal Party and J. Herbert Thorp to Saddleworth branch of the Labour Party, which then went on to move a motion against conscription at the Labour Party conference in Adelaide, the motion being lost on a 3:2 vote for conscription. Members of the Australian Freedom League were active not only in organizing meetings but in writing a succession of pamphlets, the finance for publishing much of this "propaganda" coming from English Friends. More than a million pamphlets were distributed. John Hills' *Child conscription: our country's shame* had a wide circulation, selections being on sale from newsagents at the cost of one penny.

QUAKERS AND THE AUSTRALIAN FREEDOM LEAGUE

The Australian Freedom League was the offspring of Quaker religious conviction and socialist activism. The leadership clearly came first from the Quakers. Barret confirms this.[13] Initial enthusiasm for the common cause, anti-conscription, blunted the basic differences, thus enabling a united front to be presented. Quakers at first were not troubled by being labelled as "peace workers-cum socialists". English Friends through the newly formed Joint Committee of Australian Defence Acts readily responded to appeals for funds from the League. In the Minutes of a meeting of the English committee on 5 December 1912 letters of thanks were recorded from George White, secretary of the Industrial Workers of the World Club Sydney, and from J. MacDonald, secretary of the Australian Socialists. The English committee admitted that Australian Friends not being numerous could not achieve much without the cooperation of others, yet it also reminded W.H.F. Alexander and Alfred Brown, two English Friends sent out by London Yearly Meeting to help Australian Friends in their campaign, that the basis of Friends' approach was religious, not political. It decided to issue a statement setting out the religious grounds for peace. This religious-political tension is one which must inevitably and continually confront Friends. In pursuit of what is held to be a worthy political objective how far can Friends work together with those who may be differently motivated? To what extent can Friends, obeying a religious imperative, act with others to achieve a desired political objective?

This dilemma surfaced in *The Australian Friend* before the General Meeting of 1912 when it was the major subject of discussion. In the issue of February 1912 the Friend, Edward Fryer had reported on a meeting which some Friends had had with the Socialists, the meeting which led ultimately to the foundation of the Australian Freedom League.

> Dr Thorp has started a movement here, called "The Anti-Compulsory Military Training League"; we do hope this new society will be progressive and not adopt the passive methods of the Peace Society, Society of Friends, and other bodies who are supposed to be champions of peace.

This sparked a reaction in the following issue from the editor of *The Australian Friend*, J.F. Mather, under the heading, 'Our tesimony against war. Whence? Wither?' Mather clearly had Fryer's statement in mind when he wrote, 'judging from their utterances and demeanour some of our members are anti-militarist mainly on political grounds... The

advocacy of a righteous cause may be marred by a spirit that is not Christ-like'. With the arrival of English Friends who had come out to help the anti-conscription movement Mather was uneasy lest Australian Friends, who had been opposing war on a spiritual basis in direct obedience to what they had felt had been Christ's command, might be diverted from this task by those who opposed war for materialist, socialist or political reasons. The spirit of Christ, and none other, was acceptable as his guide. He saw Friends called to be the conscience of the Christian Church and he therefore urged that Friends' first responsibility was to remind the Church community of the need to be faithful to the spirit of Christ. The best way to help fellow Christians to a better understanding of Christ's life was for Friends to make Christ's spirit more apparent in their own lives.

It is not surprising therefore that the General Meeting of 1912 reflected the doubts and self-queryings which had followed the thrusting of Quakers into the political spotlight of the anti-militarist movement. There was a certain natural exaltation amongst young Friends at having found a cause to champion. J. Elliott Thorp wrote:

> Our present work is bringing us into touch individually and collectively with all sorts and conditions of men... Quakerism has become recognized by pulpit, press and politician as a national force – as never before.

How far then would the General Meeting go in providing direction for this new-found sense of mission? Three extracts will reveal the trend of the discussion.

J.P. Fletcher:

> Our religious liberty is at stake... We are not working for Australia alone... If we win in Australia, we shall help our brothers in New Zealand and in England... If we succeed, we shall have won again that priceless liberty which means so much to us today.

J.F. Mather:

> Are we gathered as a political meeting for protesting against infringements of personal liberty, or are we a religious assembly waiting to receive guidance from the Divine Spirit?

Samuel Clemes:

> And in a good cause let us not be afraid to associate ourselves with any of our brothers, whatever they may be labelled.

The General Meeting Minute, having reminded Friends of the political objective of working for the repeal of a "retrograde" law, concluded:

> Meanwhile we desire to remind Friends that our testimony as to war and its relationships goes far deeper than opposition to any specific Act of Parliament and ask them to be careful lest, in their association with other persons or bodies for the purpose of this opposition, our ancient testimony be in any way compromised.

PROSECUTIONS

One of the first Quakers to be prosecuted under the Defence Acts was 'the grand old man' of Rockhampton Quakerism, Francis Hopkins,[15] who was summoned to the Rockhampton Police Court on 20 December 1912 to answer the charge of having failed to register his grandson. Hopkins claimed exemption under Section 116 of the Commonwealth Constitution which stated that everyone should have 'liberty to exercise his religion'. He was fined £1 with costs of £2.5.6., a lenient fine, in view of the liability to a minimum fine of £5 and a maximum of £100. Francis Hopkins died not long afterwards. His son attributed his death to the anxiety his father had suffered during the period of the trial.

Few people today realise to what lengths military authorities in 1912 were prepared to go to enforce acceptance of compulsory training of boys. One of the few cases where both father and son were imprisoned was that of the Quaker, William Ingle, who had emigrated in 1911 from Scarborough, England, with his son, Herbert. In April 1913 the father was brought to court on the charge of refusing to allow his son to drill. His defence and the magistrate's naive view of the role of the churches is worth quoting:

Ingle:
> My defence is that I am here as a Christian, as a follower of Christ: and to obey this Defence Act my conscience and my religion will be violated...

Magistrate:
> To put it shortly, you object to this Act?

Ingle:
> How can my child love and serve his fellow-men if –

Magistrate (interjecting):
> We don't want that. That is a matter for the churches.

Ingle:

I was told there was a conscience clause, but my child would be compelled to take an oath to serve the King. If a child agrees to join the military and in a battle an officer said to him, 'carry that box of ammunition to the men fighting', is he compelled to obey that officer?

Magistrate:

Don't you understand discipline? The officer must be obeyed.

Ingle:

Yes, well, there is no difference between carrying the ammunition and shooting a man.[15]

Apparently there was loud applause at this in the court, applause which was promptly suppressed by the magistrate. Ingle was ordered to pay £1.10.0, in default fourteen days in prison. He chose prison. The authorities sensing that the imprisonment of parents was getting unwanted publicity,[17] decided to change tack and ordered area officers not parents, to register all eligible boys in their areas. The son, Herbert, was thereupon caught in the dragnet, refused drill and was sentenced to detention at Fort Largs where continual refusal to cooperate brought him solitary confinement, a diet of dry bread and unsweetened tea and an alleged beating with a cane by an officer. William Ingle had had enough of his adopted country. After his son's release he returned to England.

The case which brought to an end the use of solitary confinement to break the boys' spirit was that of Tom Roberts, whose family were members of Melbourne Friends' Meeting. His case received considerable publicity so that June 1914, according to Barrett,[18] 'became something of a Tom Roberts month in press and parliament'. Tom Roberts was confined to a solitary confinement cell at Fort Queenscliff for 21 days for refusing to train under the Defence Act and after visiting him his father, Fred Roberts, released to the press details of the 'inhuman' conditions of solitary confinement 'only used in the case of refractory criminals of the worst type'. Letters from a variety of sources were directed to the government and these resulted in instructions being issued to the military authorities that solitary confinement was not to be used for trainees refusing drill.

COOPERATION BETWEEN ENGLISH AND AUSTRALIAN FRIENDS

London Yearly Meeting, conscious of the importance of the anti-

conscription issue in Australia to Friends in England, gave not only moral and financial support, but also sent a delegation of Friends, J. Herbert Thorp, Alfred Brown and W.H.F. Alexander, to participate personally in the campaign.[20] Indeed, these three Friends were on occasion available to give full-time help in organizing public campaigns against conscription. That the Australian Freedom League depended on Friends for its leadership is unquestioned. Thus when there was need to find a replacement for the Secretary, the Friend John Barry, who was returning to England, Alfred Brown wrote to the secretaries of the State branches of the League, suggesting that since most of the League's key members would be in Adelaide in September 1913 for General Meeting,[21] a meeting of the League could be called to appoint a new secretary. Alfred Brown himself was in the chair and the Friend, Arthur Watts, was appointed Barry's successor.

Cooperation between English and Australian Friends in the common cause was probably at its peak in the first half of 1914, before the declaration of war inevitably put a brake on English Friends' participation on the Australian front. Yet English Friends, while willing to do all they could to help, were sensistive of the danger of appearing to direct rather than to support Australian Friends. On the other hand Australian Meetings were still directly linked as Monthly Meetings with parent London Yearly Meeting and therefore expected London Yearly Meeting to feel some sense of responsibility for nurturing the fledgling Meetings in the colonies. By August 1914 it seemed that the activity of the Australian Freedom League was slowing down. The Joint Committee of Australian Defence Acts in London received a letter from the secretary of the League indicating that operations had been suspended for the time being. The Government was now involved in a war, boys in prison had been released and no further prosecutions were likely to be pressed. It was clear that the considerable financial support which had flowed from English Friends in the preceding three years would now dry up because of the war. Charles Howie wrote on behalf of Australian Friends who had been involved with the League: 'You cannot conceive how grateful we are to you. Without your help from England we should be almost powerless'.[22]

Alfred Brown, who had been very active in the League, had returned to England by way of Japan, where he had been engaged in positive peace-making, meeting with representatives of the government and schools to promote understanding between Australia and Japan, for Japan had been regarded as a threat by many in Australia and this had led therefore to general acceptance of compulsory military training as a

response to this threat. It was Alfred Brown who had kept the Defence Acts Committee informed of events in Australia and who had recommended what funds should be sent out. J. Percy Fletcher was not so close to Australian Friends as Alfred Brown had been. His time had been divided between Australia and New Zealand. After the initial launching of the Australian Freedom League in four Australian States it was in New Zealand that Fletcher's main contribution lay. It was there too that he had a fortaste of what later was to be a much longer period of imprisonment in England. Friends in England decided that their peace workers should be recalled and Fletcher was advised in July 1914 that there could be no extension of his year in Christchurch. He worked his way back as a cook on board a ship in mid-1915. W.H.F. Alexander and his wife Harriet had returned by April 1914. It seemed almost like the recall of the distant members of a fishing fleet at the warning of the approaching cyclone.

1911–1914 ANTI-CONSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN – EFFECTIVE OR FUTILE?

Barrett claims[24] that in *Conscription under Camouflage*, published in 1919, Fletcher and Hills distorted the extent of public opposition to the conscription of boys in the period 1911–1914. Barrett's thesis is that 'most Australians readily accepted the introduction and continuation of compulsory military service, if circumstances seemed to warrant it'[25] and he plays down the extent of resistance to the campaign of the military authorities. Fletcher and Hills, on the other hand, claimed that the figures of enrolments and prosecutions revealed 'great and ever-growing opposition of the boys and youths of Australia and New Zealand to compulsory military training',[26] basing this judgement on figures supplied to the Australian Freedom League by the Secretary to the Defence Department.[27] They labelled the scheme 'a ghastly failure'.[28]

SUMMARY OF PROSECUTIONS UNDER THE DEFENCE ACT

	No. of prosecutions for 2 years to 30.6.1913	Yearly average	No. for year ending 30.6.1914	Total 3 years to 30.6.1914	No. for year ending 30.6.1915	Totals to 30.6.1915
Queensland	1,249	624	1,422	2,671	364	3,035
N.S.W.	4,871	2,436	6,211	11,082	2,982	14,064
Vic.	4,573	2,286	3,513	8,086	2,040	10,126
S. Aus.	1,327	664	1,372	2,699	247	2,946
W. Aus.	860	430	889	1,749	211	1,960
Tas.	775	388	687	1,462	349	1,811
Totals	13,685	6,828	14,094	27,749	6,193	33,942

These figures provide an opportunity for analysis, though it must be admitted that it is easy and tempting to make figures justify the reasons for which one sought them.

The first striking fact is the number of prosecutions, 27,749, in the period from January 1911, when the Act came into force, to the outbreak of war in August 1914. No analysis is possible of the reasons for this number of defaulters that warranted prosecution. A very small percentage would have been attributable to religious conscientious objection, or to conscientious objection on other grounds. Many would have failed to turn up to drill for reasons of inertia, apathy, or an Australian reluctance to be "pushed around" by "them", the authorities. Barrett attempts to relate the number of prosecutions to the number liable for training and takes his figures for mid-1914 when there were 123,487 liable for training and 14,094 prosecutions, giving a percentage of 11.4 per cent prosecutions. Even on Barrett's calculations the percentage would seem to be a significant one, bearing in mind that prosecution would represent a forbidding ordeal to a lad of teenage. Jauncey estimates the proportion somewhat differently by stating that there were four-and-a-half boys at drill for one prosecution.[29]

Barrett also belittles the quality as well as the quantity of the opposition labelling the boys presecuted as "reluctant compliers", who needed compulsion before agreeing to conform. But whatever the hidden reason for non-compliance the proportion of those resisting would seem to be significant.

Another possible deduction from the figure is that, granted the machinery of compulsion may have taken some time to operate smoothly, the number of prosecutions for the year ending 30 June 1914 is greater than the sum of the previous two years, given in the first column. This would suggest that compulsion was not reducing the number of non-compliers – the justification suggested by Barrett – but that indeed non-compliance increased significantly. The number of detentions in military barracks and 'fortresses' is alleged to have exceeded 5,000 by 30 June 1914. This indicates that there was a significant number of boys who were willing to risk imprisonment rather than conformity, for whatever reasons. The Australian Freedom League did much to arouse a public conscience *re* the criminalizing penalties imposed on young boys for non-compliance with the military authorities.

The Australian Freedom League by mid-1914 was beset by internal problems stemming from the split in Labour supporters over loyalty to the party or to the League. English Quaker support, both in finance and personnel had been withdrawn at the outbreak of war. Australian Quakers had not yet resolved the poltico-religious tension within their own Meetings. The Australian Freedom League therefore seemed to have reached the limit of its effectiveness. Had it then been an exercise in futility?

In my view this was far from the truth. The Australian Freedom League had undertaken the daunting task of awakening Australian public opinion on an issue on which tradition and current fears of invasion by "coloured Asian hordes" had hitherto permitted no contrary opinion. Defence of one's country, right or wrong, was an unquestioned sacred duty. Apart from a small group of Quakers, which Barrett reminds us represented only .015 per cent of the population, there was no peace movement, no will to resistance of the military establishment. The Labour Party was also more fearful of exposure to an Asian threat of invasion than supportive of an international socialist brotherhood. There was however a lurking unease that a conscript army might be used, as had happened in France in 1910,[30] against the working-class. The Australian Freedom League may have aggravated this unease, but it at least aroused the sleeping giant, the Labour Party, or, to change the metaphor, the League provided the seed-bed for the growth of the successful anti-conscription referenda of 1916 and 1917, though the issue then became, not the boy-conscription of 1911–1914, but conscription for overseas service in time of war. The issue had changed, but the seeds of questioning and resistance had been sown. Fletcher and

Hills believed that the answer to the future of the anti-conscription issue lay with the Trade Unions. The three years of their association with the Australian Freedom League had given them cause for hope that 'soon there will be a sullen roar of water bursting through dykes, and those misleaders who have prated about citizen soldiers, a nation in arms and the blessings of Empire and who have sold themselves to the London financiers and the National Service League in England will be swept away into obscurity like helpless driftwood'.[31]

It could be said that while the Quakers provided initial leadership for the Australian Freedom League, the League provided Quakers with the opportunity to move out from what had been a limited circle of action into the public arena. This brought with it a marked increase in the number applying for membership of the Society of Friends. At General Meeting in 1913 the increase in membership was 41, 22 of whom probably came in by convincement through association with Friends in the peace movement. Alfred Brown on return to England said that opposition to the Defence Acts was 'the nearest thing to a common cause'.[32] In a sense Quakers found not only a cause but for the first time in their Australian history, from being a rather private Society of Friends, they found a public '*raison d'être*'.

William N. Oats

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] *Christian Faith and Practice in the experience of the Society of Friends*, Headley Bros., London, 1961, No. 614.
[2] J. Barrett, *Falling in*. Hall and Ironmonger, Sydney, 1979, 108.
[3] *Ibid.*, 109.
[4] *Ibid.*, 116.
[5] W.H.F. Alexander to William Cooper, 8 January 1911.
[6] Barrett, *op. cit.*, 115.
[7] Minutes of Defence Acts Committee, 3 July 1913, Friends House Archives, London (FHAL).

[8] Barrett, *op. cit.*, 112.
[9] J.P. Fletcher Uncatalogued Papers, FHAL.
[10] J.P. Fletcher and J.F. Hills, *Conscription under camouflage.* Adelaide, 1919, 38.
[11] W.N. Oats, *The Rose and the Waratah.* Blubberhead Press, Hobart, 1979, 152–53.
[12] Fletcher and Hills, *op. cit.*, 8.
[13] Barrett, *op. cit.*, 108–109.
[14] *The Australian Friend*, 21 December 1912, 612.
[15] W.N. Oats, *A Question of Survival.* Brisbane, University of Queensland Press, 1985, 325–27.
[16] Fletcher and Hills, *op. cit.*, 58–9.
[17] There was a public meeting in Adelaide, chaired by Professor Darnley Naylor, which demonstrated in favour of freedom of conscience.
[18] Barrett, *op. cit.*, 190.
[19] *The Australian Friend*, 29 April 1914, 765.
[20] All three Friends were also involved in positions of temporary responsibility at The Friends School, Hobart.
[21] Barrett lists these, *op. cit.*, 108–109.
[22] Minutes of the Defence Acts Committee, 1914, 121, FHAL.
[23] Alfred Brown said that he went to Japan to investigate at first hand 'race relations in the Pacific Area which affect the alleged justification for the Colonial Defence Acts'. Proceedings of London Yearly Meeting, 1914, 121.
[24] Barrett, *op. cit.*, 2.
[25] *Ibid.*, 286.
[26] Fletcher and Hills, *op. cit.*, 120.
[27] *Ibid.*, 67.
[28] *Ibid.*, 245.
[29] L.C. Jauncey, *The story of Conscription in Australia.* Macmillan, Melbourne, 1968, 53.
[30] M. Briand, formerly a Socialist Deputy, used troops to break a railway workers' strike and the strikers were prosecuted under military law.
[31] Fletcher and Hills, *op. cit.*, 122.
[32] MS. Box 17(1), FHAL.

The above is a slightly amended text of the presidential lecture given to the Friends' Historical Society on 28 June 1986 (Ed.).

UNFINISHED PILGRIMAGES: GEOFFREY MAW AND JACK HOYLAND IN INDIA

The map of India is rather like an irregular diamond, with its long axis lying north and south. The northern point of the diamond is in the mountain barrier between Kashmir and Tibet, the southern at Kanya Kumari (Cape Comorin). Westward, the diamond is fairly regular; the peninsular of Kutch, north of Bombay, forms its western point. But eastward there is a great bulge, as the frontier of India follows the giant curve of the Himalayas from furthest north to furthest east, where the mountains of Nagaland merge into those of China and Burma. That eastern region was familiar terrain to many Friends Ambulance Unit men during the 1940s, as they flew "over the hump" from India to their service in western China. But if one does not use wings, the journey to that eastern point from southern Cape Comorin by train, bus, and jeep can take a full week, as your speaker personally knows.

It was not however to the wild beauty of the east that the great ancient pilgrimages were made. Pilgrims from furthest south and west turned instead to the central region of the great Himalayan curve, where Mother Ganga, the river Ganges, rises among the eternal snows. Pilgrims still travel in their thousands along those ancient routes, and some of the pilgrimages we shall describe in this lecture followed the same paths.

Geoffrey Maw and Jack Hoyland spent much of their time in India very near the centre of the Indian diamond, in the Hoshangabad district of what was then the Central Provinces of colonial India. Hoshangabad town lies on the south bank of another great river, "Mother Narmada", at about the middle of its course. The Narmada rises among forested hills 400 miles or more to the east, and runs westward for a total of over 800 miles to reach the sea at Bharuch (Broach) north of Bombay. Very close to its source is that of the Sone, which turns away north-east to become one of the major tributaries of the Ganges and discharge its waters into the Bay of Bengal. Narmada, Sone and Ganga together practically turn the Indian peninsula into an island. But they are not formidable barriers. Hoshangabad itself is an ancient ferry town, and in

spite of its modern rail and road bridges the ferry boats are still in very active use. Alive and active too is the old Narmada *parikrama*, the great pilgrimage which circumambulates the whole course of the river, The pilgrim, keeping the sacred river on his right and (wherever physically possible) within view, traverses its whole length from source to mouth, and back again along the other bank. The great bathing ghats and temples at Hoshangabad are a favourite starting point. This pilgrimage too, with its inward and outward spiritual disciplines, is part of the background of our study today.

Geoffrey Maw and Jack Hoyland came to India in 1910 and 1912 respectively and the legacy of thought and achievement they have left to us was shaped very largely by their experiences during the next 20 years. It was a time of "the shaking of the foundations", of far-reaching political, intellectual and spiritual upheavals in India, which preceded, accompanied and followed the first world war. Before dealing with those creative 20 years, however, we should attempt briefly to set them in the context of what had gone before, of the contacts which Friends from the British Isles had already established in India.

The roots of British Quaker concern for India go back to their part in the long struggle against slavery in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Their allies in that struggle were men whose compassion, and whose crusades for justice to the weak and down-trodden, had been inspired by the evangelical movement in the English church. Quakers themselves had been concerned for public righteousness from the beginning of their history; William Penn had declared in the earliest years that true religion 'don't turn men out of the world but enables them to live better in it and excites their endeavours to mend it'. But from the beginning of the eighteenth century Quakers had tended to withdraw from the world, and many of them needed the stimulus of the evangelical inspiration to send them back to their own tradition. As they became aware of things going wrong in the India of the East India Company, of famines, indentured labour and so on, a number of Quakers, including the noble statesman John Bright, felt called to intervene.

Many other Quakers, influenced by the evangelical movement, were strongly drawn to the foreign missionary work which their friends in other churches were undertaking, and in 1866 they finally founded their own Friends Foreign Mission Association. Its leaders included many of the wealthiest and best-known Quaker families, the Quaker "establishment" of London Yearly Meeting, and there is no doubt about their sincerity and devotion. But there were elements in their attitude which were

more controversial; their compassion was not unmixed with a patronising paternalism. In England and India alike they offered the poor and illiterate a "simple Gospel" of salvation very much like that of their fellow missionaries, and neglected the distinctively Quaker witness to the divine Seed in every human heart. Their paternalism was strengthened by the great British complacency of the later nineteenth century; most of them shared the assumption that Britain's mission, both in politics and in religion, was to bring a superior "Christian" civilisation to replace the inferior and positively evil systems of the "heathen" world.

From the beginning there were voices within the Society itself which questioned these attitudes. A few Quaker missionaries, whose roots were in what was regarded as the "old-fashioned" conservative tradition, wanted to see the full Quaker message emphasized – but they carried little weight with the FFMA committees. Increasingly, however, as the century drew to its close, a younger generation of university-trained Quakers were calling on the Society to study and re-assess its whole religious inheritance and think out its relevance to a modern world of scientific discovery and increasing global communication. These sensitive and articulate thinkers carried increasing weight in the Society; their influence led to the founding of Woodbroke in 1903, when Geoffrey and Jack stook on the threshold of young manhood.

The divergence between "evangelical" and "conservative" in Quaker missionary work was brought dramatically into the open at a Quaker missionary conference in 1896. An FFMA missionary had insisted that non-Christian India should be thought of as living entirely in "black" darkness with no relieving gleam of light. The Chairman of the meeting intervened, and reminded those present that Quakers had always borne witness to a different faith. The human heart, he said, is a kind of palimpsest, a document in which the original (divine) writing has been hidden and over-written by something else. With care, the original may be brought to light again. As we have seen, there had always been *some* Quaker missionaries who recognized and responded to that divine writing in the heart of India, though they were a small ignored minority and among FFMA recruits the evangelical outlook remained understandably strong.

In the early years of the twentieth century Quakers in touch with religious thought in the English Universities were learning to combine the passion for social righteousness of men like Joseph Pease and John Bright with an appreciation of much they might *learn* from India in matters of spiritual insight. In 1907, when Jack Hoyland entered

Christ's College Cambridge, University circles were being stirred by C.F. Andrews, fresh from the impact of his first years in Dehli and the creative Indian nationalist thinking he found there. Andrews was one of the chief catalysts for a great deal of what Douglas Steere was later to call 'mutual irradiation', which was going on among thinkers of many traditions during the decade precedng the first world war.

This situation was reflected in microcosm at a Young Friends Conference in 1909 at which Geoffrey and Jack were both present. Jack's father, John William Hoyland, who had just returned from a visit to the Quaker "mission field" in the Hoshangabad district, was one of the senior participants, and among others were an FFMA missionary Joseph Taylor, and William Paton, a non-Quaker "missionary statesman" who represented the new outlook. Joseph Taylor had lived in India for 20 years; he was the only FFMA missionary of his generation to offer sympathy and friendship to the independent Indian Quaker group in Calcutta which had found its way to Quakerism outside the Missionary framework.[1] In that very year, 1909, the most articulate member of the group had completed a kind of testimony to their experience of 'the universal religion of God on earth', the "Substance" (he used Isaac Penington's phrase) of which our various human insights into truth are the "Shadows". The next year, 1910, another member of the group was to visit England and talk, in Jack's rooms, to the Young Friends at Cambridge.

Of the Young Friends themselves, no less than six were to give some significant service in India. Along with Geoffrey and Jack there were Horace Alexander, Howard Somervell, Frank Cheshire and Roderick Clarke. There was also Amy Montford, later to become secretary of the Friends Service Council, which from the 1920s onwards strove to unite Quaker spiritual and social concerns in one integrated witness to truth. From the Netherlands came Kees Boecke, who later did some revolutionary social thinking which was amazingly akin to Mahatma Gandhi's, and was rooted, as Gandhi's was, in the life of his own country. There was 'mutual irradiation' here too, and some of the ideas put before the conference are relevant to our whole discussion today.

Joseph Taylor spoke of the 'open-minded agnosticism' of many educated men in India, which if it met no sympthetic response, could easily slide into 'careless materialism'. William Paton emphasized how much India and the west had to learn from one another: 'We need India as much as India needs us'. John William Hoyland spoke of the 'sheltered Christian education' he had seen carried on in Hoshangabad,

in the weavers' colony at Khera and the industrial school at Rasulia, and of the need for excellence in all such endeavour. Someone raised the profound question of a salvation which could only be wrought by personally accepted suffering, not by any "Cross" external to ourselves. Probably the speaker did not know that Mahatma Gandhi was even then leading *satyagraha* in South Africa, based on the same principle of the redemptive power of willingly accepted suffering.

The concept of "sheltered education" has a certain ambiguity. Many missionaries undoubtedly used it to mean that Christian children should be protected from too much contact with a non-Christian society which might "contaminate" their minds. In the thought of Rabindranath Tagore the phrase has a different connotation; he believed that there is a psychological need for the young human plant to be protected from too much exposure to the rough and tumble of the world until it has developed its own inner strength. Is "sheltered education" a valid concept, and if so, how? Geoffrey and Jack were both to be concerned with finding answers to such questions.

The next year, 1910, an International Missionary Conference was held in Edinburgh, a conference which was in many ways a landmark, signalling a new phase, more open and sympathetic, in western Christian relationships with Asia. Geoffrey and Jack were both present, acting as door-keepers and listening in to the proceedings. Soon after that Geoffrey and his fiancée, Mildred Brison, went straight to India to work in the FFMA. They were sternly separated as soon as they got there, sent to places as distant as possible from one another, and forbidden to think of marriage till they had learned Hindi and passed their examinations. A very powerful incentive to study, and it worked! Both passed with flying colours, Geoffrey at the top of the first class. They started work, quietly and sensitively, in the Boys' Boarding Home at Seoni Malwa, itself a piece of "sheltered" Quaker education.

Jack had a different experience, and one very significant for the future. He spent 1911–12 in U.S.A., studying theology at Hartford, but also partnering Rufus Jones in an effort to bring into closer fellowship the different branches of American Quakerism. In U.S.A., as in U.K., there were "evangelical" and "conservative" Quakers, as well as a third group, the "Hicksites", who strongly emphasized the universal element in the Quaker tradition and tended to reject the "orthodox" or "evangelical" theology. Differences had become so acute that these groups had separate Yearly Meetings, almost completely isolated from one another. Jack had already been successful, as a student in Christ's College, in bringing together two "rival" Christian student organisations,

one "evangelical" the other "liberal", into one College Christian fellowship. The divided, mutually suspicious American Quakers were a tougher proposition, but real progress was made. 'The conservatives are the key', reported Jack. 'They have a spirtual robustness which the Hicksites often lack'. His work culminated, in July 1912, in a summer gathering of Young Friends to which "Old Woodbrokers" in U.S.A. invited six Young Friends from U.K. A young "orthodox" Quaker, Clarence Pickett, discovered there to his astonishment how "Friendly" Hicksites might be! In later years, as a distinguished secretary of the AFSC, he was to work happily with them all. Since then these pioneering efforts have been followed up, and some of the rival groups have come together again. But in 1987 it is still possible, as a concerned American Friend Jack Willcutts has recently reminded us, for "evangelical" and "liberal" Quakers on both sides of the Atlantic to hold misleading and unFriendly sterotypes of one another. Here is one of Jack's "unfinished pilgrimages" which we do not need to go to India to share.

Jack Hoyland reached Hoshangabad in December 1912, to be warmly welcomed by Joseph Taylor. He rode over from Khera, outside Itarsi, on the sturdy bicycle his father had given him, and looked with a friendly eye at the little town but he did not at once settle down there. When he had returned home from U.S.A. the previous summer C.F. Andrews and his friend S.K. Rudra, principal of St. Stephen's College Delhi, hd been visiting England, and Andrews' newly-published book *The Renaissance in India* was being eagerly read in University circles. At his invitation Jack moved on to Delhi, then newly-proclaimed as the capital of India, to study the language and see the "renaissance" for himself.

Thanks to Andrews, Jack met there Gokhale, the great Indian liberal statesman whom Gandhiji regarded as his "political guru." Gandhiji himself was still in South Africa, and Gokhale inspired Jack, as he had inspired so many others, with a deep concern for the issues at stake there, issues of national self-respect and racial equality. Back in Hoshangabad a few months later Jack began demonstrating racial equality by sharing a little bazaar house with Percy Herring, a young man of Gurkha extraction who had been cared for by John William Hoyland while he studied commerce in Birmingham, and who now planned to open a commercial training school in Hoshangabad. Jack also tried to get a public meeting in support of Gandhiji's work in South Africa, only to be harassed, as Andrews had been in Delhi, by suspicious police spies. In the face of this official hostility he got no public support,

and little sympathy from his fellow Quaker missionaries, with the exception of Joseph Taylor.

Andrews also took Jack to visit the Gurukul, the school at Hardwar which trained boys in the Arya Samaj's ideals of renascent Hinduism. He met its great Principal, Mahatma Munshi Ram, and was deeply impressed. 'He is a shining example', he wrote, 'of the fact that those who follow the light within must come to the fulness of truth'. 'The Quaker missionary's duty is to help men to follow truth by whatever road lies open to them'. Such suggestions met with even less sympathy from evangelical fellow missionaries, who insisted that there was only one path on which to follow truth. Jack on his part found Hoshangabad meetings for worship very uncongenial; they were 'more Methodist than Quaker'. There was none of the silent waiting on God to which he was accustomed; instead the time was filled with what he called "hot air" – evangelical hymns, readings and preachings. 'Words are not real things', he exploded: 'they can be used to hide truth instead of set forth truth... in a *real* Quaker meeting the difficulty does not arise'. He found it true in India as in U.S.A., though in a different context, that "*both* intellectual re-statement *and* living spiritual experience are needed'. Intellectually, they must be able to speak to the condition of Joseph Taylor's 'openminded agnostics', and must be able to offer them also that 'spiritual robustness' which knows the Light within not as theory but as reality.

In Delhi, Jack had also been involved in the debate about missionary methods which centred on Andrews. Andrews said, in effect: 'Live your faith, don't talk about it; let your life speak: be content with the slow permeation of the life of India by the living spirit of Christ'. Others, equally sensitive, said that was not enough, there should be a positive witness also. How, Jack asked himself, should a Quaker give that witness? Over the next few years, as he married and settled down, re-opened and began to develop the Quaker High School at Hoshangabad, he found some answers to that question.

The search for "answers" was not carried on in isolation. By the early months of 1914, when the High School was re-opened, Geoffrey and Mildred Maw were living close by, looking after the Boys' Boarding School in Hoshangabad. There were other young recruits, the farmer Ratcliffe Addison, and Basil Backhouse. There were Indian friends such as Dr Johory from Bhopal and Eliathamby of the Y.M.C.A. There were young Indian teachers in the school, as well as congenial older folk like Joseph Taylor and "uncle" A.H. Smith. They sought and found "answers" together; if in describing them I use Jack's language, it is for

two reasons: that it is his letters and comments that have been best preserved, and that he was undoubtedly the most articulate of the group and the most disposed to think aloud on paper.

The Quaker witness, said Jack, is something India understands well: that religion is not just a matter of creed and ritual but is involved with the whole of life. In school it is not just a matter of the Bible class, but of the whole social and intellectual life of the community, including the life of the play-ground, so every boy in the school was encouraged to join in games and sports for sheer fun, for pride in skill and for practice in unselfish team work, scrupulous fair play and honesty. Boats were built and launched on the river, excursions took off to the jungles on the further side. There were camps to which other schools were invited, where active fun of this kind was combined with worship and Bible study, and where Dr. Johory, at 55 years of age, delighted everyone by demonstrating how to turn cart-wheels. The boys put on plays, with all the practical mutual cooperation that involves; *Hamlet* was orientalised and performed in Urdu to appreciative audiences, and enlivened, on the boys' iniative, with topical comic entr'actes. School elections showed that in this open friendly atmosphere the boys could and did chose those best fitted for the job in hand, regardless of their caste. 70 per cent of the school was Hindu, but to a committee of six they elected three Muslims, one Christian, one non-Brahman Hindu and one Brahaman.

Another aspect of Quaker witness, said Jack, is that a living religious experience inspires ethical enthusiasm and practical programmes for righting wrong. Noble human example has a powerful appeal, and the more living ones there are the better. But above all daily regular Bible study should set before the boys the life and example of Jesus as a great human leader, one who met wrong-doing with 'humble self-forgetful love', and challenged them to follow. 'We aim', he wrote, 'at a character like Jesus Christ, and this is impossible without the personal experience of the divine which is the essence of religion. We do not aim at winning proselytes for a particular social unit, but at calling out impulses which may lead the pupil into a fuller life'.

This matter of regular definite religious teaching was, and is, of wide general interest. In 1913, when Jack was preparing to re-open the High School, the Government of India issued a statement of educational policy which called this 'the most important educational problem of our time': Recognizing that 'the most thoughtful minds lament the tendency to develop the intellectual at the expense of the moral and religious faculties', but bound by its own commitment to religious neutrality, it invited the public to provide 'practical solution'. One suggestion was a

"conscience clause" permitting individuals to opt out of the religious education programme of their school. Jack himself strongly opposed it, and quoted Edward Thring: 'the practice which separates brain-work from religion and morality and calls it education is simply the devil let loose'. The devil is still loose in India; the "practical solution" for which the Government hoped in 1913, if it has been found, has not yet been accepted. We still have more to say of Jack's unfinished educational pilgrimage, but this is part of it.

Though no written record remains we know that Geoffrey, among his younger boys, was engaged in the same faithful daily Bible teaching and "life education". But Geoffrey's thoughts were turning also to another possible dimension of Quaker witness. The Friends' compound on the outskirts of Hoshangabad over-looked the great river; Geoffrey's children, with their Indian friends, would lie on the high bank watching the crocodiles below. Geoffrey himself was fascinated by "Mother Narmada", and by the pilgrims who had undertaken the *parikrama* and trudged past on their way downstream. There were others too, devotees for whom the holy river was the centre of their life. Geoffrey made friends with them. 'You are a lover of the Narmada', said one of them to him. 'So am I, therefore we are brothers'. He was strongly attracted to these men, *sadhus* and *sannyasis* who had renounced all worldly ties for the sake of that 'personal experience of the divine' which Quakers too recognize as the heart of religion. He longed to enter into a more intimate spiritual dialogue with them.

Meanwhile, the first world war had begun, and as the years went by its impact was felt more and more in India. Communications with England became more difficult, there were serious money shortages. Missionary allowances had never been more than barely adequate. By 1916 Geoffrey and Mildred had been in India nearly six years; Mildred's health had broken down and their youngest child had died. A furlough was overdue. As the time for leaving approached, Geoffrey felt restless and depressed. 'Do you think I should come back?' he said to Jack. 'There seems to be no real sphere of work for me here in the FFMA'. 'I'm sure you are mistaken', pleaded Jack urgently. 'You must indeed come back'.

And in fact the year that followed, 1916–17, proved significant for both of them. During his summer holiday in 1916 Jack met Sadhu Sundar Singh at Kotgarh near Simla, and was greatly impressed. A little later he was visited in Hoshangabad by a man named Sherwood, who had been at Cambridge with him, and who had now become a Christian *sannyasi*. Jack admired his sincerity and pluck, but wondered whether

the witness of such a life would not be too "defuse". It was the same question that had arisen in Delhi about the "silent witness" of men like C.F. Andrews. But he invited Sundar Singh to Hoshangabad, and at the end of the year the Sadhu took part in the Christian *mela* at Makoriya. In the High School at Hoshangabad the boys hung on his words, and he spoke to packed meetings, mainly of non-Christians, in the Meeting House.

Later in 1917 Geoffrey returned alone to India; the sea voyage in war had become too potentially dangerous for him to bring Mildred and the children. On board ship he too came into contact, through books, with the *sannyasi* ideal among Christians. *The Love of God*, by Samuel Stokes, told how in 1908 he had joined with Sundar Singh and a young English friend of C.F. Andrews, Frank Western, to from an "order" of christian *sadhus*, "The Brotherhood of the Discipleship of Christ". The Brotherhood as such had not lasted long (Stokes married an Indian lady and gave his service henceforward as a "householder"; Western became a much-loved Bishop of the English church) but it had started Sundar Singh upon his life-long vocation. The other book was by Jack's friend Sherwood, telling the story of his own chosen vocation as a Christian *sannyasi*. One can imagine, though there is no record, how eagerly Geoffrey and Jack must have shared their thoughts when Geoffrey got back to Hoshangabad. What appealed to them both was the commitment "one hundred percent" to try to live out the Christian life.

Both men had felt this keenly with regard to the Quaker peace witness in wartime. 'It is our chief religious business', Jack had written in 1915, 'to see that in the midst of this criminal madness there is a little enclave of the kingdom of love... We need to get back to the ideal of our Society as a real kingdom of God, ("a peculiar people") in which Christ must be followed at all costs... The salvation of the world comes by this little kingdom, so long as its members do not compromise its ideals.'

In 1917, after some uncertainty, all Quaker men of military age in Hoshangbad district were given exemption as conscientious objectors from military service. The test had come for Geoffrey on board ship. As they passed through the Mediterranean they had a narrow escape from being torpedoed and sunk. When they reached the safe waters of the Red Sea passengers and crew celebrated their deliverance and paid tribute to the army and navy. Geoffrey gladly drank the toast to the navy, but the speaker for the army made some unjust remarks about conscientious objectors which he could not ignore, so he remained

seated and did not drink. He was summoned to a passengers' meeting to explain his conduct. 'I fully share your respect for the courage of the army', he told them, 'but I know the criticism of C.O.'s to be unfair'. It was decided to ostracise him for the rest of the voyage, but long before the ship reached Bombay some of its passengers were reflecting that this friendly, gentle man had after all shown considerable pluck in standing up all alone for his beliefs, and were beginning to talk to him again.

Then came a tragic interlude. In the autumn of 1917 Jack fell seriously ill, at a time when Helen and the children were away. Dengue fever was followed by enteric, and he went to Makoriya to be cared for by Ratcliffe Addison's doctor wife Gail, so weak that Ratcliffe had to carry him from the railway train to the waiting bullock-cart. By doctor's orders he did not return to Hoshangabad till the rains had set in in July 1918. He set to work again, full of vigour and creative ideas, but barely three months later, in early October, the disastrous influenza epidemic struck the district. Jack himself, and his family, were among the first and mildest cases.

Nowadays, even in India, the extent of that disaster has been largely forgotten. Official census figures show that during the final months of 1918 the population of India as a whole was reduced by 10 per cent; in the Central Provinces alone the mortality during those terrible few weeks was greater than the war casualties of the whole British Empire during the whole war. Bad harvests and near-famine conditions made things worse. Some villages were practically wiped out, many lost 50 per cent of their people, the Quaker weavers community at Khera near Itarsi, where Jack had spent his first weekend in India, lost 111 out of 262. Geoffrey and Jack plunged into their first experience of major relief work. Geoffrey, now posted in Itarsi, would begin each day by getting a huge supply of medicine made up from the prescription given by the local Government doctor; he spent the whole morning giving it out to all comers in the tiny Friends Hospital. In the afternoons, for as long as light lasted, he visted every village he could reach, after darkness fell there were the Christian families in Khera and Itarsi to be cared for. Jack did the same sort of thing in Hoshangabad and the villages round about. High School boy volunteers went out two by two, with a tonga or a bicycle, giving out medicine and persuading people to take it. They all worked furiously, 14 to 16 hours a day, week after week, snatching a little food when they could. The need was equally desperate in Bhopal, and in answer to appeals for help Jack sent two of his best boys there. Friendly officials supplied a bullock cart, and a soldier to guide them

and give them authority; local doctors supplied the medicine and the instructions, and magnificent work was done. Jack was proud of his volunteers; his one regret was that there were not more of them, and he suspected that at least in some cases parents had intervened to forbid it.

By mid December the epidemic was over, but for Jack the greatest tragedy of that time was yet to come. At the end of the month Helen gave birth to a baby boy, Peter. A few days later she died from what proved to be enteric fever. She was indirectly a victim of the epidemic; the infection was bred in the insanitary conditions inevitable when nearly all the municipal scavengers were themselves sick or dying of influenza. Baby Peter surived only a few weeks, and Jack, desolated, took the two older boys back to England to be cared for there. It was the end of an era.

In the spring of 1919, when the war was over, a number of new Quaker enterprises were in the air. Joseph and Katherine Taylor, retired from the Hoshangabad district, were about to take up their long-felt concern for service in Calcutta. A new generation of Quakers was less interested in conventional missionary work than in the possibility of witnessing to their faith while doing some ordinary "secular" job in India, earning an independent livelihood. Preparations were beginning for an All-Friends Conference in 1920 at which for the first time Indian Friends would be present. There seemed, however, to be no such new inspiring vision for the Hoshangabad district. There the mission seemed to be suffering, in Jack's words, from 'a species of malignant dry rot'.

Early in the year, soon after Jack reached England, he was visited by two young men, Hugh Maclean and William Pitt, who had got to know Geoffrey during his furlough in 1917, when they were in the Friends Ambulance Unit. They now planned, with the blessing of the FFMA, to try to earn their own living in India, if possible in agriculture, and give their witness through their work. Jack was interested and attracted; he had never met any Quakers quite like them, 'very strongly Quaker, and at the same time evangelical'.

By the end of February Hugh and William had reached Itarsi, and Geoffrey was telling them of his and Jack's concern for the "dry rot" in the meetings, and the need for a new spiritual vision and power. He invited two Indian Friends to meet them, who shared the same concern. The older man, Khushilal, came from a village on the Bhopal side of the river; the younger, Kampta Prasad, had been three or four years earlier one of Jack's boys in the High School and shared in the schoolboys'

camps. The little group sat down together, Quaker fashion, to wait on the Lord, and felt among them the living Presence and Power. Then, and at many meetings in the days and weeks that followed, Khushilal spoke as the spirit 'gave him utterance', others were rapidly drawn in, and there was a remarkable spiritual awakening which spread, through a worker called Samuel Harry James, to Sohagpur also. After two or three weeks Hugh and William moved on to find their own work, but Khushilal's inspired leadership continued. The spirit of the Khera weaving community was transformed, and people from outside were also attracted, among others a remarkable Hindu *sadhu* who, convinced of the reality of the experience, cast in his lot with Friends.

Was there any link, one wonders, between the devastating sufferings of Khera in the epidemic a few months earlier, and this reponse to the new spiritual vision? Jack Hoyland had known a deep religious experience during the exhaustion of body and mind that followed his illness in 1917; during the influenza epidemic he and Geoffrey had both been profoundly moved as they had travelled the death-stricken villages and felt themselves so powerless to help. Some of the young men who had been Geoffrey's best fellow-workers at that time now became close comrades in the new spiritual adventure. Khushilal became a very close friend.

It was not long before Khushilal asked that he might be released from the paid service mission in order to live as a Christian Quaker *sadhu*, depending for his daily needs, as other *sadhus* did, on the freely-offered gifts of the people. He turned first to the villages north of the river, in his own home region, and Geoffrey joined him there whenever he could free himself from the routine of his own regular mission work. Soon another mission worker, Dharma Sevak, also asked for release from paid service and joined the little team. It was among those villages that Geoffrey first discovered and used his own gift of spiritual healing, praying in faith for the sick they encountered on the way. Geoffrey was grateful to be used as a channel of healing power, but he spoke little of this gift, and not many records have survived; those that do are mainly from these Bhopal villages.

As Geoffrey talked once more with pilgrims and *sadhus* along the banks of "Mother Narmada", and with those who each year at the time of Mahasivaratri (the great annual festival of Siva, also named Mahadeo) climbed to the mountain shrine of Mahadeo beyond Pachmarhi, in the south-east corner of the district, his mind turned more and more to the greatest pilgrimage of them all, to the three sources of Mother Ganga herself at Badrinath and Kedarnath and Gangotri in the central

Himalayas. Could not he and Khushilal undertake this pilgrimage together, travelling as other pilgrims did, sharing the same experiences, making friends, meeting and talking with fellow-seekers of the divine Reality? Khushilal was very willing, and the Friends in Itarsi became interested also, and gave Geoffrey his first set of *sadhu's* robes – the long saffron-coloured shirt and the dhoti or waist-cloth, and the saffron-coloured turban. Quaker as he was, Geoffrey added a plain Cross on a chain around his neck. He wanted no deceit, and this would proclaim without words that he was a disciple of Jesus. He found that it gave no offence, and that his fellow pilgrims accepted him naturally as one of themselves. He and Khushilal had great fun with the turban. Geoffrey's own attempts to wind it with his unaccustomed fingers met with no approval. 'It makes you look like an unemployed waiter!' declared Khushilal, and took the matter in hand. The cloth would be fanned out on Geoffrey's head into a jaunty crown, while his spine was protected from the sun by the long end hanging down the back.

Geoffrey and Khushilal made their first Himalayan pilgrimage in the summer of 1923; they went again in 1930 and in 1934. From the railhead at Hardwar where the Ganges emerges from the Himalayan valleys into the plains of North India, the pilgrim track stretched before them for 225 miles, climbing and descending, and climbing steeply again. Here and there, especially at the "prayags" where major tributaries join the stream, are little clustered bazaars. One of them is Rudraprayag, whose name is well known to those who have read Jim Corbett's account of the man-eating leopard which once terrorised the area. When Geoffrey made his first pilgrimage in 1923 the leopard was still at large. The scenery was breath-takingly beautiful; Geoffrey feasted his eyes on some of the most magnificent mountains in the world. The lure of these mountains had from time to time brought climbers like F.S. Smythe, and botanists, as well as compassionate hunters such as Jim Corbett, along the pilgrim route. But Geoffrey's journeys were unique; he was, so far as we know, the only foreigner in those days that followed that track as a pilgrim among pilgrims, sharing their spirtual aspirations and the hardships and accidents and many minor irritations of the journey. It is an experience that cannot now be repeated; since the 1940s the old pilgrim track has become a motor road, and most pilgrims now travel by bus. Those who still walk, on principle or from necessity, have new irritations to contend with, in the choking dust and stinking fumes which pollute every stretch of the way. The friendly comradeship of the road and the road-side camps, the goodwill and good temper and mutual helpfulness which were among Geoffrey's pleasantest memories, are largely gone.

In 1934 Geoffrey was already crippled with the arthritis that troubled his later years, and was often in great pain. He did not expect to make the pilgrimage again, but shortly before he left Indian in 1948 he did go, travelling by bus as far as it would then take him and walking the remaining 50 miles or so. Later, in England, he put together from his diaries a consolidated account of his experiences on all four pilgrimages, of the people he met, the intimate friendships he made, the daily incidents – some comic, a few tragic, all very human – the saints and the scoundrels, and the plucky patient ordinary folk, who were part of the great panorama. It is a wonderful story.

Hardships there certainly were. The old track was rough, narrow and in places extremely dangerous, especially for people with no head for heights. Yet Geoffrey met one blind man, quite alone, who pluckily edged round those dangerous corners with his two sticks, and got there. So did the old woman with one leg, who travelled on two rough bamboo crutches with no padding under the arms. At some halts the only firewood available produced a most acrid smoke, while mosquitoes, scorpions, and the swarms of flies and inevitably inadequate sanitation all added to the physical strain. What tried Geoffrey's patience most however were the "sharks" who set themselves to make every possible profit out of the pilgrims. Many of these were *pandas*, priests attached to the various temples. Poor simple people, many of whom had saved for a lifetime in order to make this pilgrimage, would be ruthlessly told that unless they gave so and so at this shrine or that, their pilgrimage would not be "successful".

Yet angry as Geoffrey could be at this callous exploitation of the poor, he takes pains to record times when the divine spark shone out even from the *pandas*. On one pilgrimage he was struggling alone up the last steep climb to Badrinath (for Khushilal had been left behind sick at an earlier halt). He was shivering with malaria, stung by a fierce storm of hail, and near exhaustion. A party of *pandas* overtook him, looked at him, and saw his condition. One of them took and carried his bag, another took off his own coat and put it over his shoulders, they took his elbows and supported him up the slope. Arrived at Badrinath they took him to an inn, settled him comfortably, and brought him blankets and hot tea –all in pure disinterested kindness.

On another occasion Geoffrey and Khushilal were being cross-question by an official of one of the temples, one of the very few unfriendly people they met. 'What right have you, a foreigner, to wear the *sadhu's* robe?' he demanded, deliberately speaking in Sanscrit to humiliate Geoffrey who did not know it. Khushilal, who did know it,

answered for him, quoting chapter and verse from the Hindu scriptures: any genuine seeker may wear these garments. The bully changed ground.'Why do you Christians go round preaching? Where is the need? Let the people come to you of themselves!' Khushilal indicated the group of *pandas* who were sitting listening to the debate. 'What do these men do in the winter?' he asked, 'when the mountain shrines are blocked with snow? Don't they go down to the plains and preach to the people, and persuade them to make the pilgrimage?' Geoffrey had come away depressed, thinking what a poor show he had made. To his surprise he found himself surrounded by a friendly crowd of *pandas*. 'You had the best of it', they said. 'You are quite right, we do go round preaching. And he lost his temper but you didn't, you remained calm, and smiling. Yes, *you* had the best of it!'

By 1923, when Geoffrey found his special sphere of service with the pilgrims and the *sadhus*, Jack had been back in India for over three years, not in Hoshangabad but in Nagpur, at the Hislop College of the Scottish church mission. The decision to take up work there was in some ways the outcome of much earlier thought, for at Hoshangabad he had often reflected about how Friends might best cooperate with others in providing a Christian higher education, and he had talked his ideas over with other missionaries both in Jabalpur and in Nagpur. He believed that Quakers had their own distinctive religious witness to make, but that did not prevent them from cooperating with others in the task of 'forming a character like Jesus Christ'. From the beginning of 1920 he had taken charge of a hostel, and a teaching programme, in Nagpur. It was a stirring place to be, just then. 1920 saw the start of Mahatma Gandhi's first great non-cooperational movement, and Nagpur itself was the venue of a critical session of the Congress. Gandhiji had called, among other things, for a boycott of colleges, and when Hislop College reopened in 1921 four students were present out of a total of 320. Maharashtrians were a militant race; in spite of all that Gandhiji could do there was much fanatical hatred of the British, and before the year was out one student had attempted to murder Jack. Jack's response, when later the boy was threatened with TB, was to do all he could to secure him the proper treatment in a sanatorium. His patience, good humour and athletic enthusiasms, his knowledge of Tagore, of Kabir, of the Gita, steadily changed hostility into friendliness; boys who a few months earlier had torn up their Bibles began willingly to attend scripture classes.

The experience of the influenza epidemic had made Jack, like Geoffrey, keenly aware of the oppressions of the poor. One result was

that he put together a book of Bible studies called 'Christ and National Reconstruction', for study in High School or college classes. It studied Jesus' attitudes to the national problems of his own day in relation to those of modern Indian. In Nagpur, he again and again led parties of college students to help in cholera epidemics and other emergences in villages, as he had led the High School Boys in 1918 into the stricken villages of Hoshangabad. But he remained critical of *political* nationalism as such. Mahatma Gandhi won his admiration in 1922 by his courage in calling off a movement that had failed in non-violence, even at the risk of alienating his own followers. Jack himself had risked unpopularity among his own students by insisting that Jesus was *not* a "nationalist" in the accepted sense of the word.

It is interesting that at the time of the next India-wide non-cooperation movement in 1930, after Jack had been forced by ill-health to withdraw permanently from India, Geoffrey felt compelled to raise the same questions with Gandhiji: did not "non-cooperation" inevitably, even if unintentionally, give scope for hatred and inhumanity? Was there not a better way? Gandhiji answered his letter with his usual courteous thoughtfulness, writing from his salt camp at Dandi on the west coast, where he had that very morning scooped up his illegal and historic handful of salt!

In 1926 Geoffrey visited Jack in Nagpur. They must have had much to share with one another about their respective "pilgrimages". Jack arranged for Geoffrey to give a series of public lectures about his experiences in 1923. The meetings were crowded out; all kinds of people flocked to hear him, far more (reported Jack) than even for a political meeting. And in those days before Independence political meetings were the great draw, especially in such a politically conscious place as Nagpur.

There, in Jack's home in Nagpur, we will leave them, looking back together over 15 years of an Indian friendship in which, throughout, each had held a deep respect for the different pilgrim paths followed by the other. We still need to get side by side with the serious thinkers of the other religious traditions of India, not only the Hindu but also the Sikh and the Jain, the Muslim and the Parsee, hoping that in open-hearted friendship we may help one another, by the faithfulness of each to the guidance of the Inward Teacher, to follow Truth "by whatever path lies open to us". That perhaps is a pilgrimage that will never be finished. And its counterpart is the call to explore further those questions which Jack asked nearly 70 years ago, about the relation of Quakerism to the Christian tradition in India. 'Our function', he wrote

in 1921, 'is not to be a sect, but a vitalising force in all, including the "United church" of the future'. Now, the United Church of North India is an accomplished fact, but Indian Quakers stand officially outside it, a tiny local sect. Is it possible to carry forward Jack's dream of a non-credal basis for Christian unity?

Finally we turn to the other side of their common witness, the search for a "sheltered education" in community, in which children may grow into a wholeness of physical well-being, mental alertness and spiritual understanding. Here we must add one more element to our picture of Jack's own inward pilgrimage on this path. It came to him in 1918 as he rode his faithful bicycle from one desolate jungle village to the next scene of helpless human misery. 'There should be a school especially for the underdog, which could help them to economic independence of the landlord. It must cut clean loose from the Government educational machine, syllabuses, examinations. It should offer every oppressed group the best indigenous craftsmanship in their own caste occupation (tanning, basketry or whatever); it should offer agriculture for all. Teaching must be by the best Indian craftsman obtainable. Along with this there should be the right kind of scripture teaching and the training of character through many cooperative activities'. How close Jack's dream comes to the educational vision which Mahatma Gandhi was to place before India nearly 20 years later! But there is a long pilrimage ahead before we can come near it.

Marjorie Sykes

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] For further details see M. Sykes, *Quakers in India*, 1980.

The principal sources for this article are:

1. Printed reports of FFMA (India).
2. Copies of letters in Friends House Library from Geoffrey Maw to FFMA 1912–22, describing a) the "revival" at Itarsi, and b) his experience of healing through prayer.
3. Unpublished accounts by Geoffrey Maw of the Himalayan and Namarda pilgrimages with other notes by him in the Central Library Selly Oak Birmingham.
4. John S. Hoyland's letters from India 1912–27, chiefly written to his father, now in the possession of his daughter Rachel Gilliatt.

The above is a slightly amended text of the Presidential lecture given to the Friends' Historical Society on 17 October 1987 (Ed.).

JOHN BRIGHT – QUAKER POLITICIAN: A CENTENARY APPRECIATION

Anniversaries are always awkward affairs. They provide opportunities for rejoicing and reappraisal and the two processes do not invariably blend happily. Our meeting this evening constitutes a kind of family celebration and a biographer of Bright who is neither related to him by blood nor a member of the Society of Friends feels doubly privileged to have been entrusted with the task of composing an appreciation on the centenary of Bright's death.

It is undoubtedly appropriate, in the first instance, that Friends should have taken the energetic interest that they have done by arranging for this lecture. That John Bright was a Quaker was fact about him that all his public contemporaries knew. It is probably not an exaggeration to say that he was the best-known Friend of his time. Indeed, it is also probably the case that there has not been a Friend in twentieth-century British party political life who has equalled Bright's prominence. We all know that there have been MPs of Quaker descent or adherence who have made valuable individual contributions to public life, but I cannot think of any other Quaker who has matched Bright in the sustained vigour of his impact on his age. Historians, whether in school or university, continue to stress to their pupils that Bright was a Quaker, though alas this clue to his identity is not as meaningful to many of them as one might hope. Bright has become for many the representative Quaker and, for good or ill, the society has been linked with his life and career ever since.

However, we ought to probe more deeply, even or perhaps particularly on an occasion like this. We might have started by talking about John Bright as orator, John Bright as businessman, John Bright as parliamentarian, or John Bright as Lancastrian. He was all of these things and we shall seek to give them due weight but I think we must first of all wrestle with John Bright as Quaker. Was it the central aspect of his being from which everything else flowed or was it a badge whose significance diminished with the passage of time and the weight of his other activities? Naturally, in this sensitive area we can only speak tentatively and with some humility. There is no more difficult task

before the historian than that of seeking to unravel the inner sources of behaviour and the historian is not God.

At one level, we can confidently assert that John Bright was a Friend at birth and a Friend at death. He came of Quaker stock, regularly went to meeting in Rochdale and attended schools maintained by Friends at Ackworth, York and Newton-in-Bowland. His two wives were Friends and his children were reared in the bosom of the Society. He attended Westminster meeting when in London during the parliamentary session. However, whether at Rochdale or Westminster, he left testimony to others. A man whose facility with words was legendary sat silent as others stumbled to pray and give testimony. There are thus few clues as to his spiritual life from his own words, though we know from contemporaries that he could appear to be deeply moved, even to tears, in meeting. He appears to have felt no temptation to align himself with any other religious body and was critical of the social reasons which he supposed explained the attractions of Anglicanism for some Friends. His hostility to established religion did not abate. It had been hostility to church rates in Rochdale which had first drawn him into local political action. It was a particular pleasure that he had first entered parliament as MP for Durham City in 1843 – despite clerical influences at work there. His encounters with the Church of Rome, not least in Rome itself, reinforced a dislike and distrust of its pretensions and structure. He was not attracted by ritual or liturgical elaboration. In these respects he did not deviate from the traditions and practices of his youth. On the other hand, like many of his generation, he saw no need to insist upon the external manifestations – in speech or dress – of his allegiance. He was irritated by a certain narrowness of spirit amongst Friends though, unlike some members of his family, did not feel it so acutely as to withdraw from its affairs.[1] However, he felt no call to labour mightily in the internal affairs of the Society. He was called into the world.

Participation in political life, whether at local or national level, was not attractive to most Friends in the early decades of the century and indeed it was only as John grew to manhood that it even became a serious possibility. The objections either stemmed from a quietism which viewed the temporal goals of politics with suspicion or from a belief that there was something about political life which in itself corrupted the soul. Bright's first wife was not at all pleased, prior to marriage, about the prospect of his 'interference' in politics. John had to concede that violent political partisanship could destroy domestic harmony and, further, that politics seemed to give men 'a restless turn of mind'. Nevertheless, he endeavoured to argue that he took part in

election contests from a sense of duty rather than a love of excitement and never encouraged dissipation or drunkenness. There were injustices which could only be put right by political means.[2] It was possible to have a 'calling' to politics.

It was after the death of his first wife in 1841, when he was 30 that Bright began to emerge from the obscurity of Rochdale and started on the course which was to make him a major national politician. The difficulties of his position were inherent from the outset. The franchise had been modestly widened after 1832 but historians have been at pains to stress how little fundamental change in the structure of politics took place over the next few decades. The House of Commons remained a largely Anglican assembly. The Society of Friends was itself such a small body that there was no prospect that it could itself provide, either locally or nationally, the kind of support which any aspiring politician would need in such circumstances. A politican is in the business of seeking to build bridges and construct interest-groups and establish a 'constituency' which would identify with him. There was no parliamentary constituency in the country, under the existing franchise – and indeed under any conceivable franchise – where Quakers would be in a majority. In this sense, Bright was never a 'Quaker politician' whose position could depend upon solid sectarian backing. He was a politician who was a Quaker. Conceivably, as the voice of religious Dissent, there might be majority support in particular constituencies and a more general 'constituency' in the country at large, but Quakers were on the fringe of organized Dissent rather than at its heart. In Rochdale Bright was accused by the Church party of being the local agent of London Dissenters. In reality, however, he was not at home among Baptists, Congregationalists and Methodists. On one occasion he expressed his indifference to the discussions about the duties and talents of preachers which he found among them. He was not interested in the differences of opinion amongst the Dissenters. He could share many of their concerns, but he could not be their leader.

The youthful MP for Durham gained his seat in rather exceptional by-election circumstances because of the reputation he had gained over the previous couple of years as a campaigner and orator on behalf of Free Trade. His Quakerism was incidental rather than crucial to that success. It was a fame gained by mastery of the spoken word. Here again is a paradox. Lacking 'insider' links with the world of 'high politics' Bright was driven to communicate directly with whosoever would listen in the manner of a travelling evangelist. Where did his 'oratory' come from? In a sense, of course, the question is unanswerable. No doubt

great orators are born, not made, but the point about Bright is that his mode of rhetoric stemmed neither from the classically-based models of his public school and university educated contemporaries nor from a personal nurturing in an alternative tradition of pulpit oratory[3] We have already noted a somewhat contemptuous indifference to talk about preachers. It appears, therefore, that one of the greatest nineteenth-century orators sprang from an environment and a religious body which was least-disposed to revel in rhetoric. Perhaps this fact helped to ensure that his speaking derived its strength from its immediacy and relative directness. He learned his trade the hard way, on the job. Late in his life Bright accepted that the fame of an orator is even more evanescent than the fame of a writer. Unfortunately, we can have no means of assessing for ourselves the impact his speeches would have made on his varied audiences. So much depends upon intonation, speed and stress and in the nature of the audience itself. In any event, it is clear that there was little decorative trimming about the early speeches against Corn Laws. They were clear, vivid and combative. Thus the young 'Quaker politician' reaches Westminster with a style and manner which was far removed from the silence and eirenic disposition more generally associated with Friends.

That was not the only problem. There was more to politics than oratory. There was a need to meet and mingle with all sorts and conditions of parliamentary men. Was it necessary, for example, to join a club? Bright initially told his mother-in-law that he did not think it would be needful. He had a great distaste for the mode of life often led in such great houses of assembly. By such statements Bright appears to have thought that he could detach himself from the social conventions, indeed the social life of the classes whose *mores* still prevailed in parliament. The fact that he was a widower insulated himself from some of these pressures in the short term.

The phased repeal of the Corn Laws, announced by Peel in January 1846, seemed a triumph for the Anti-Corn Law League, or was at least so represented by its leaders. The success raised fresh issues for Bright himself. He could withdraw from politics altogether, remarry and devote himself to business and family responsibilities, or he could carry on. There was strong pressures on him to take the former course, but he resisted them. There were other issues of concern besides the Corn Laws which needed to be addressed. Besides, he rather liked the House of Commons, and he liked even more the prospect of representing Manchester at Westminster. Mid-century Manchester, despite all its problems, stood for the future. It symbolized the dynamism and energy

of the North, with its commerce and industry, over against the stagnant and conservative south.[4] Bright understood the problems and opportunities of the cotton industry at first hand. His other commitments prevented him from playing a leading role in his own family business but its welfare was always important to him, not least for financial reasons. Relations between masters and men in Rochdale were more harmonious than in some nearby towns and districts.[5] So far as can be judged, the Brights were humane employers by the standards of their time, but in his attitude John fully shared the predominant values of local capitalists. Naturally, he became vulnerable to charges that it was commercial capitalism rather than Quakerism which provided his basic values. Bright refused to see a contradiction. He saw his kind of middle class as progressive and humanitarian.[6] The entire country would benefit if its ethos preponderated. The dominant nexus of church, army, university and the Foreign Office sought to preserve an archaic order which preserved their interests but threatened the possibility of war. Britain needed a truly 'middle-class' party which was neither Whig nor Tory. Bright aspired to be its leader.

From this perspective, the ensuing decade from 1847 (when Bright began to represent Manchester at Westminster) proved a disappointment. It was easier to talk about the need for a middle class party than to bring one into being.[7] In a year like 1848 men of commerce were not in a mood to undermine the existing political structure. It proved difficult to identify issues on which 'Radicals' could effectively unite. This was not only a matter of politics. Bright was rather appalled to discover that the commercial elite of Manchester liked to ape the aristocracy and was not content merely to amass money. There were Manchester merchants of considerably greater wealth than Bright himself who began to wonder whether they had made a mistake in allowing their noted city to be represented by a man who seemed relatively indifferent to display and had few of the cultural attributes they at least professed to admire. Plain speaking was all very well, but one could have too much of it. In addition, at Westminster, it began to emerge that Bright also seemed indifferent to the need to cultivate 'group-identity' amongst Radicals of somewhat disparate provenance. Bright was too much his own man.

There were occasional strains even in his dealings with Richard Cobden, and this is the point to say a little more about their relationship. It is extremely rare in British politics to find an effective and enduring political partnership and the fact that we do so often speak of 'Cobden and Bright' is extremely significant. The two men were not from the same stable. Cobden was an Anglican and came originally from the

South of England. He was a rather unsuccessful businessman but he also had a mind that was generally more wide-ranging than Bright's, though it would be wrong to convey the simple impression that Bright was entirely dependent upon Cobden's ideas for the content of his own speeches. In short, their backgrounds and temperament were different, but for a considerable period they were more effective as a pair than either could have been individually, The relationship, however, served to obscure the extent to which Bright was still *au fond* a Quaker.

The difficulty before both men in the early 1850s, when British party politics as a whole were in a state of more than usual confusion, was to discover an appealing platform. Bright interested himself both in Irish and Indian affairs and, in the light of the 1851 religious census, continued to expostulate on the subject of 'that overgrown & monstrous abuse', the Church of England, but the impact of his efforts seemed minimal. It seemed that Britain remained a country where accident of birth was supreme over almost every description and degree of merit, as he put it. Bright tried to develop a campaign for a further measure of electoral reform, but it got nowhere.

Then, in 1854, came the Crimean War. Bright denounced British intervention as unnecessary and calamitous. He despised anyone who spoke a word in favour of the war merely because the press and a portion of the people urged the government to enter into it. The war would have grave consequences for commerce, the economy and the posperity of the people. Here was the 'Broad-brimmed hawker of holy things' in action, or, alternatively, here was the authentic voice of a Quaker politician re-emerging from the constraining meshes of party. We need not question that Bright preferred peace but in his initial speech in the Commons he claimed to be subjecting intervention not to the scrutiny of a 'peace at any price' advocate but to the kind of tests which would be applied generally throughout the House. Around this date Bright was being distinctly grumpy when approached for a subscription to the Peace Society and it was only with reluctance that he spoke at the Edinburgh Peace Congress in October 1853. His attacks on the 'war machine;' were not explicitly rooted in the peace testimony of the Society of Friends. Of course, he may have considered it redundant to make clear the ultimate source of his convictions, but there may also have been an element of calculation. He was already in difficulties enough with some Manchester men, particularly those who were angry at his refusal to contribute to a Patriotic Fund set up by the supporters of war. He did not want the breach to become any wider and he did not campaign actively against the war. He restricted himself to a small

number of set speeches. The 'Angel of Death' speech of 23 February 1855 remains the best-known to this day. The appointment of Palmerston as Prime Minister appalled him but he continued to urge the merits of a diplomatic solution to the war. He believed that the press gave him considerable space, despite general hostility to his views, because he put more earnestness and originality into what he had to say than the old Party talkers. His stance was ineffective but he had attained a distinctive postion as a 'Quaker politician' in special circumstances.

There was, however, a price to pay for this status. In January 1856 he had a breakdown which prevented him speaking for many months and compelled him to undergo various treaments in the hope of restoring his vitality. It would be rash to pick on any single fact to explain this event but we certainly cannot rule out the strain brought on by his rather lonely stand over the previous couple of years. He believed that he had been true to his conscience but he had to suffer in consequence. Even more, in 1857 he returned to England from a continental tour no longer an MP. The men of Manchester had elected another in the General Election which had taken place in his absence. Naturally, in all the circumstances, he was under pressure from his wife to give up politics and help her in raising their increasingly large family. Bright himself commented after his defeat that it was far better to fall against than rise with the wretched cry that had lately been raised in Manchester. Perhaps that meant that it was not possible to be a 'Quaker Politician'.

However, in the summer of the same year, 1857, while pleasantly enjoying a picnic in a Scottish glen, he received an invitation to stand for Birmingham at an impending by-election. He was to represent the constituency for over 30 years. The terms of the relationship were made clear from the outset. Bright would keep his home in Rochdale and would make only occasional visits to Birmingham. He had no wish to involve himself in local politics to the extent that had been unavoidable in Manchester.[8] He was a national figure who had found a new home. The electors of Birmingham should feel proud to have this talisman of radical politics as their member. At the same time, Bright distanced himself somewhat from those Birmingham Quakers who assumed that he would give full voice to their concerns.[9] Now that he had decided to return to parliament he wanted to stay. He had no wish to go through the painful Manchester experience all over again. At least that is my interpretation of correspondence between Bright, Sturge and Southall around this date. With regard to the Indian Mutiny, he made it clear that he would never have conquered India and believed that its government would have to be reformed but he accepted that the British on the spot

had now no alternative but to put down the rebellion. He told Sturge bluntly that he had no intention of attending a possible Peace Conference in Manchester. All the activities of the Peace Society in late years had been of no use, indeed they might even have been of positive harm. He disliked working for an impossible cause and he had come to the conclusion that nothing could be done in the direction in which he wanted his fellow countrymen to travel. He indicated that he could only preserve himself from a debilitating misery by becoming callous about crimes and follies which he could not prevent. He also shocked Sturge by distancing himself from the temperance movement, a cause of his early manhood. He confessed that he took a little beer and wine, on medical advice, and did not want to be paraded as urging others to abstain totally when he did not do so himself.[10] He believed he was the better for taking a little claret. The Birmingham Bright therefore appeared to be more pragmatic and worldly-wise. A Quaker politician has no right to assume that his constituents would defer to his views and he, in turn, had to accept that there were certain political facts which would not change.

However, that did not mean that he relapsed into a supine acceptance of the status quo. Indeed, he embarked on a considerable public campaign designed to achieve franchise reform. It would be up to the body of the nation to decide and no one should be frightened by that monstrous body, the House of Lords. It was a 'miserable delusion' that the 300,000 inhabitants of Birmingham should only have two members. However, it was not only to the people of Birmingham that he appealed in a majestic series of speeches up and down the country. Queen Victoria was amongst those not to be amused by his tone. After the 1858 election Palmerston suggested that Bright be made a Privy Counsellor but she would not agree. It would be interpreted as a reward for his systematic attacks upon the institutions of the country. There had also been the possibility of some kind of appointment under Palmerston but he was rather relieved that it came to nothing since Bright believed that he would be miserable in Court dress and official fetters. So, he continued to agitate for parliamentary reform and worry about his business affairs and his family. He also firmly committed himself to the cause of the North in the American Civil War. It was an unusual experience for him to have supported a winning side and it was with renewed confidence that he embarked upon another franchise crusade. After all, Palmerston could not go on for ever.

It is generally agreed that Bright was at his mature best as a speaker for parliamentary reform in the mid-1860s. This time, at last, he did

appear to be generating substantial support in the country, though its scale remains a matter of dispute. So does the relationship between the campaign in the country and the parliamentary manoeuvres of both Whig/Liberal and Tory politicians on how a particular measure might be turned to their own best advantage. On all sides it was recognized that Bright was a force in the land and he had to be treated with some deference. However, Brights in-House position was not such that he could dominate these complex moves. As always, Bright could not seem to bring his public role into line with party arithmetic in the Commons. Of course, while it was sometimes convenient to paint Bright as a wild man, it was recognized that he had no intention of advocating one man one vote. There would remain a substantial 'residue' who were simply not capable of exercising the responsibility which possession of the franchise gave. Such restraint can no doubt be interpreted as bourgeois conceit or mere prudence. Perhaps it also reflected the conviction that the 'residue' was likely to harbour xenophobic sentiments at odds with the internationalist preferences of a Quaker politican. In a general sense, Bright can take a certain credit for the 1867 Reform Act, though of course it was not his measure, and when the Liberals won the 1868 General Election, Gladstone had little option but to offer Bright a post in this first properly Liberal administration. In letters to his family, John claimed that he resisted appointment more than any other man ever did, but agreed because that was what his friends in the country appeared to want. It was indeed the case that the balance of the new Liberalism required the presence of Bright.

He became President of the Board of Trade, an office he accepted in preference to the India Office. The Queen intimated that he could do as he liked about kneeling before her. She would not make difficulties for her first Quaker Cabinet Minister. Superficially, the Board of Trade was the ideal appointment. Here was the embodiment of provincial and commercial England at the helm. Quaker capitalism was commanding at the height. Even from the outset, however, there were presentiments of disaster and by 1869 Bright was again confessing that he was weak and unable to read or work. He found the additional attendance at the House, required of a minister, very exhausting. He did not find it easy to work as a member of a Cabinet team. Hitherto, throughout his political life, he had been an individual; now he had to accept responsibility for decisions he either did not like or had not participated in. Perhaps, also, the stress occasioned by long separation from wife and family became too much for him. He had to undergo a long convalescence and was not able to make much of a contribution to other issues - education and

Ireland in particular. He was, therefore prostrate and helpless, to use his own words, for most of the life of the Liberal government. Practically the only thing which caused him to become animated was the issue of female suffrage. Bright wrote that he had little sympathy with the score or two of women who were miserable because they were not men. 'My gardener' he concluded, 'says that there is nothing he dislikes so much in his poultry yard as a 'crowing hen' and men-women are not a pleasant addition to our social arrangements'.[11] It was not an attitude which commended itself to his own sister and separated him sharply from his own brother Jacob.

However we explain this second debilitating illness, it marks the end of Bright as a career politician. Even if the Liberals were to return to power – and they began six years of opposition in 1874 – Bright could not be entrusted with a major office of state. He was a spent force, if the ultimate goal of politics is conceived to be the exercise of power. He was a figure to be admired, cajoled, cosseted and displayed but no longer was he a man to be feared. He spoke his mind on occasion on issues of the day. His words continued to be treasured and repeated by his admirers up and down the country. He became an elder statesman in the Liberal Party without ever having been a statesman. It was inevitable that he would again be offered office when Gladstone returned in 1880. This time he would be Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, a post in which there was not even the latent prospect of difficulty. He was consulted with appropriate deference, but it could not be supposed that he belonged to that inner circle where decisions were made. There was surprise, however, in 1882 when he resigned from the government in protest against the decision to bombard Alexandria. It seemed that the true Dissenting John Bright had re-emerged in old age. He had finally tired of the compromises and obfuscations of government. He knew a moral issue when he saw one and he had found the right note to end on. Yet it was not the end. He fiercely resisted and resented Gladstone's Home Rule proposals for Ireland.[12] Throughout his political life hitherto he had invariably been seen as a 'friend of Ireland' whether on land or ecclesiastical issues. He himself saw no contradiction between his previous attitudes and his opposition to Gladstone. That was not how many of his erstwhile supporters saw the position. They believed that he had finally submitted to the forces of conservatism.

In the last years of his life, therefore, Bright's stance appeared ambiguous, and perhaps that was what he wanted. Those who chose to do so could uncover the return to a pristine purity which they supposed must have existed. To be a Quaker politician was to foresake power and

to safeguard personal integrity even if such a stand could not make any difference to the political outcome. Equally, however, those who chose to do so could see in Bright's final attitudes a tired acceptance of the world as it was. He liked to be fêted and lauded in his last years. That was not how he appeared to the young Asquith, however, who praised him as a shining example of a man who had never yielded in his convictions or succumbed to the temptations of the social world in which he had come to move, though testimony from that source may not give complete comfort.[13] We will place the emphasis where we will as we survey his life as a whole. Whatever our conclusion, reflection on the career of John Bright inevitably brings us to that troubled border country where politics, ethics and religion confusedly interact. He struggled to reconcile personal insight with collective responsibility, and to blend prophetic conviction with the requirements of party politics and representative government. The study of his career suggests that he did not find a 'solution' and perhaps, in this life, there never can be one. Even so, on the centenary of his death, it is appropriate to celebrate his life without either simple-minded adultion or unrelieved cynicism. In other words, perhaps he will allow us a glass of claret with which to toast the memory of a great Quaker-politician.

Keith G. Robbins.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] Keith Robbins, *John Bright* (London, 1979), 118.

[2] *Ibid.*, 20.

[3] See H.C.G. Matthew, 'Rhetoric and Politics in Great Britain, 1860–1950' in P.J. Waller, ed., *Politics and Social Change in Modern Britain* (Brighton, 1987), 34–58.

[4] Keith Robbins, *Nineteenth-Century Britain: Integration and Diversity* (Oxford, 1988), 9–10.

[5] Anthony Howe, *The Cotton Masters, 1830–1860* (Oxford, 1984): P.T. Phillips, *The Sectarian Spirit: Sectarianism, Society and Politics in Victorian Cotton Towns* (Toronto, 1982).

[6] T.A.B. Corley, 'How Quakers coped with business success: Quaker industrialists 1860–1914' in D.J. Jeremy, ed., *Business and Religion in Britain* (Aldershot, 1988), 164–187.

[7] Keith Robbins 'John Bright and Middle Class Politics' in J. Garrard *et al.*, eds., *The Middle Class in Politics* (Farnborough, 1978), 14–34: Angus Hawkins, *Parliament, Party and the Art of Politics in Britain, 1855–59* (London, 1987), 158–62.

[8] E.P. Hennock, *Fit and Proper Persons: Ideal and Reality in Nineteenth-century urban government* (London, 1973).

[9] Quakers made up just over 1 per cent of the 'churchgoing' population of Birmingham in 1851. On this point and more generally see Dennis Smith, *Conflict and compromise: Class Formation in English Society 1830–1914: a comparative study of Birmingham and Sheffield* (London, 1982), 56.

[10] Keith Robbins, *John Bright* (London, 1979), 131–3.

[11] *Ibid., 214.*

[12] *See Keith Robbins, 'John Bright and William Gladstone' in Chris Wrigley, ed., Warfare, Diplomacy and Politics: Essays in Honour of A.J.P. Taylor* (London, 1986), 29–41.

[13] R.B. Haldane, *Autobiography* (London, 1929), 103–4.

The above is the text of a lecture given by Professor Keith Robbins at Westminster meeting house on 10 March 1989 at the joint invitation of the Friends' Historical Society and Westminster Preparative Meeting (Ed.).

EARLY FRIENDS IN NORTH CUMBERLAND

Fresh evidence has recently appeared for the remarkable extent of early Quakerism in North Cumberland, both numerically and geographically. In 1676 incumbents were requested to complete a questionnaire concerning the numbers of communicants, papists and nonconformists in their parishes. The idea came from the Earl of Danby, who hoped to persuade the King that nonconformists were too few to be politically dangerous. The questionnaire was issued on the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury and administered by the Bishop of London, Henry Compton. The incumbents' returns, or copies of them, have been located for most dioceses, with variations in the amount of detail they provided, and are now in print, in a volume of 800 pages, the magnificent achievement of many years of patient research.[1]

The strength of Quakerism in the North-West in the 1650s is well known and has been much studied, but the position 20 years later, following the Declaration of Indulgence of 1672 and what William Charles Braithwaite calls 'an invaluable breathing space of three years',[2] has been relatively obscure. Now, for North Cumberland, we know a great deal; for in the diocese of Carlisle incumbents were so sensitive to the presence of Quakers in their parishes that in their returns they recorded the number of Quakers separately from that of other nonconformists – a distinction made in only one other diocese.

The number of Friends in a parish was often no more than two or three. What is remarkable is their dispersion throughout the area, for their presence is recorded in all four rural deaneries,[3] and in as many as 54 parishes out of 113 in the diocese as a whole. In Cumberland (Penrith) Deanery there were Quakers in only nine parishes (or chapelries) out of 33, and in Westmorland Deanery in 10 parishes out of 32, with 19 Friends in the large parish of Kirkby Stephen and as many as 32 at Ravenstonedale; but in Carlisle Deanery they were in as many as 21 parishes out of 36, with 19 in Carlisle, 20 at Wetheral, 18 at Burgh by Sands and 17 at Orton (i.e. 10 or 11 per cent in these last two parishes), and in Alndale (Wigton) Deanery in 13 parishes out of 22, with 40 at Wigton, an astonishing 70 at Caldbeck (11 per cent), 30 at Bridekirk, 22 at Isell (10 per cent), 21 at Kirkbride (20 per cent), 14 at Bromfield and 13 at Dearham.

Even then, the statistics are incomplete. In *The First Publishers of Truth* (1907), documents dating from the years 1690–1720 and edited by Norman Penney, we gain information of the presence of Friends not only in Carlisle, Scotby (Wetheral), Wigton, Caldbeck, Isell and Kirkbride, but at Holme Cultram (Abbey town) and Kirklinton, two parishes for which no returns were made in 1676. The account of Kirklinton happens to be unusually full and mentions several houses, then the homes of Friends, which still stand, such as Stubb, Hetherside, Sikeside, Rigghead, Broomhills and Newberry.

The only other diocese for which separate statistics for Quakers were provided in 1676 is Canterbury. Here also Friends were well dispersed, but their numbers in a parish rarely reach double figures. For this diocese other 'radicals' were also identified. Kent was a Baptist stronghold, as it still is; in 1676 there were also (in distinction from Independents) Brownists in as many as 19 parishes and Muggletonians in five.

Geoffrey F. Nuttall

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] *The Compton Census of 1676: a critical edition* (O.U.P. for British Academy), edited by Anne Whiteman, with the assistance of Mary Clapinson.

[2] W.C. Braithwaite, *The Second Period of Quakerism*, 87–8.

[3] For the fifth deanery in the present diocese (Copeland), which in 1676 was in the diocese of Chester, no returns have come to light.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

The Quakers and the English Legal System. By C.W. Horle. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.

The history of the persecution of Friends during the later seventeenth century has been well documented; the new ground broken by Craig Horle's important book is the examination of this continuous harassment in the context of the contemporary legal system, its administrators and procedures and the reaction of contemporaries, both Quakers and Anglicans.

The main problem stemmed from the failure of both the Crown and Parliament to provide a unified approach to the problems posed by religious dissent; lack of direction and a vacillating policy towards nonconformity made coherent implementation of the legal code by the judiciary impossible. Without co-operation between all the different echelons of society involved there was little danger that the rigours of the penal code would successfully stamp out nonconformity despite the fact that many Quaker beliefs and practices were bound to clash with both civil and ecclesiastical authorities. Refusal to pay tithes or attend divine service contravened long standing statutes and could not be ignored; travelling and opening shops on Sundays conflicted with law and custom and caused grave disquiet; insistence on plain speech and the northern origins of the movement – obscure to many southerners – created suspicion and led to assertions of vagrancy; refusal to swear led to a multitude of processes in statute law which proclaimed Friends' criminality. All these aspects of Friends' refusal to compromise are discussed in full with numerous examples culled from all over the country.

Transgression of laws which Friends believed to be wrong was a conscious decision; prosecution by procedures which left them in ignorance of the charge or even its existence was another matter and by the mid-1670s Friends were finally convinced that the best way to combat legal connivance was the adoption of legal tactics in their own defence. A fascinating story emerges of the opinions – not always correct – taken from laywers sympathetic to dissenters and the development of tactics to minimize the effects of punitive procedures on individuals. Although not all Friends were prepared to undertake legal action in their own defence the establishment of Meeting for Sufferings in 1676 marked an important step towards a more professional response to persecution based on the experience of London Friends who were increasingly accustomed to lobbying the Crown, Parliament and the judiciary. In particular the introduction of delaying tactics meant that the prosecution of Quakers became a time-consuming and costly process with a decreasing chance of success.

Laws against nonconformists may have been harsh but the picture was not all black. It is made quite clear that many of the authorities who had the power to persecute and prosecute Friends turned a blind eye to transgressions or rendered positive assistance. Many instances were recorded by contemporaries of kindness and help proffered, whether by justices in refusing to allow the wilder excesses of some of the informers or in the more humble efforts of neighbours in replacing goods distrained from Friends' houses.

This detailed study of the most intense period of Quaker persecution throws valuable

light on the effects of weak kingship, the legal system, which was largely unable to cope, and the increasingly sophisticated defence systems established by the persecuted; it also emphasizes the fact that basic humanity was not far below the surface despite the severity of the legal code. Craig Horle has done historians a great favour in looking at the problems afresh and coming up with new insights.

Helen Forde

Abiah Darby 1716–1793 of Coalbrookdale Wife of Abraham Darby II. By Rachel Labouchere. W. Sessions, York, 1988. £10, paperback £5.

Abiah Darby was the second wife of the second Abraham Darby. She lived therefore at the centre of an important aspect of the Industrial Revolution in England at Coalbrookdale where she was hostess to many visitors when not pursuing her other vocation as a travelling minister among Friends. Rachel Labouchere has really written a more wide-ranging family history than her title implies since she has been able to draw extensively on other family papers including the journal of Abiah's daughter-in-law Deborah as well as her main source, Abiah's journal, now in the Library at Friends House. Rachel Labouchere provides a very detailed chronological recital of Darby family life with an emphasis on domestic events and Abiah's travels often in her subject's own words through some imaginative recreations of the eighteenth-century atmosphere which may paraphrase original sources. There are constant lists of the names of visitors and correspondents with many well-known names among them including those of a number of American Friends. While Abiah's journal may in part have followed the traditional pattern of eighteenth-century Friends' journals, as recounted here the strong domestic element and examples of the considerable range of contacts built up through generous hospitality help to give us a picture of life in a prosperous Quaker household that is very valuable even though the individual incidents may be of minor importance by themselves.

Hugh Barbour's brief introduction points out that women in the family, particularly Abiah and Deborah, were the strong religious characters. He stresses the religious aspects of Abiah's life though these do not emerge so clearly from the text that follows. A biographical supplement of 42 pages is very helpful in coping with the stream of names and compensates in part for the scanty footnotes and indications of sources. Today's readers might have welcomed a note on the significance of the Lisbon earthquake and an explanation that Abiah was interested in astronomy rather than in astrology as we now understand it. Two clearly set out family trees are also useful and remind us of the complexity of Quaker inter-relatedness as well as high infant mortality. However, more careful proofreading and editing with consistent citation of printed works and capitalisation could have made this a better book. The somewhat oversimplified glossary of Quaker terminology may help some readers who are not Friends though it is sad to see the business meeting described as 'a patient endeavour to find consensus'.

David J. Hall

A History of the Adult School Movement. By J. Wilhelm Rowntree and Henry Bryan Binns, with a new introduction and additional notes by Christopher Charlton. Department of Adult Education, University of Nottingham, 1985.

This reprint of a classic study of the Adult school movement, first published in 1903, has offered an opportunity to set it in context and provide additional – and copious – notes on the issues and personalities involved. In his Introduction Christopher Charlton rightly stresses the continuing validity of the analysis made by Rowntree and Binns and the importance of their influence in the development and expansion of the work of Friends.

With the benefit of 80 years of hindsight it is possible to begin to disentangle some of the emotive issues which lay behind the debates on the relationship between the Society and the adult education classes, the desirability, or otherwise, of destroying the unsectarian nature of the schools, the division in the Society about the wisdom of expanding the curriculum and the social side of the movement and the perceived threat of the PSA (Pleasant Sunday Afternoon) meetings. At the time it was not so easy, nor were the visionaries always distinguishable from the pragmatists. Rowntree and Binns' concept of the regeneration of the Society was with the development of personal responsibility and social duty and they were not to know that within the next 15 years society and the state would be subjected to drastic upheaval. Nor could they have foretold that the post-war generation of workers in the Adult education movement would find the maintenance of the school buildings, so proudly erected for social and educational purposes, an impossible burden. But their firm convictions about the need for debate and the importance of involvement of Friends is very clear.

To contemporaries, and in particular to Friends, the leading protagonists were well known; many of them held public office or were in the forefront of the work of the Society. The very full biographical notes on their attitudes and careers provided by Christopher Charlton are essential for those who may read this book now with an interest in education but without the contemporary background. Friends will also be grateful for a clear picture of the issues which were dominating the Society at the turn of the century. The Adult school history project has made a most useful start with this publication; if, in future, the publications could offer a slightly more professional format – a contents page, for instance, and a rather less confusing numbering of the pages – the directors would only gain the credit they undoubtedly deserve.

Helen Forde

Talking Across the World: the love letters of Olaf Stapledon and Agnes Miller 1913–1919. Edited by Robert Crossley. University Press of New England, USA & London, 1987.

Olaf Stapledon, science fantasy writer, philosopher and member of the Friends Ambulance Unit from 1914 to 1919, came from a non-Quaker Cheshire family, though related by marriage to the Barnard family, Friends of Reigate. Margaret Barnard emigrated to Australia in 1893. In 1913 her daughter Agnes came to England for a European holiday, spending some time with Olaf, a distant cousin. He fell in love with

her; but at the start of the first world war she sailed back to Sydney, remaining there until 1919, when she married him at Reigate Meeting House.

Talking Across the World consists of extracts from the hundreds of letters between them during their separation. Agnes's letters are glimpses into a privileged life; holidays and picnics punctuated by part-time war work. She writes to Olaf of the referenda of 1916 and 1917 (both of which rejected conscription), and elides together cowardice and the labour movement with some vehemence. We are given this lively, if politically contradictory, reaction to the 1917 Sydney tram strike: 'Perhaps I'll be driving a tram before the month is out! Russian women do things – it would be nice if we did things too'. Of the 1916 referendum on conscription: 'The Quakers stuck to their no. Mother is one of their black sheep...' Crossley perhaps overstates when he comments 'a renegade in Sydney Friends Meeting...' for neither Agnes nor her mother appear in Australian members' lists of this period, nor those for Reigate for that matter. Further Agnes's war work was on behalf of French soldiers, rather than for Sydney Friends' relief work. The unanimity of Australian Friends *vis-à-vis* the war, and political involvement generally, is more complex than Crossley infers. Australia General Meeting of 1915 admitted 'several of our members have joined the ranks of his Majesty's army...' and the next year the *Australian Friend* noted, of a speaker at an anti-conscription rally, that 'the strongest protests at our Friend's presence and action have come from members of his own meeting...'

Agnes empathized with Olaf's work, though she was uneasy at his pacifism; accepted that the pacifist viewpoint had little publicity in Australia, while herself supporting conscription. Her letters are vivacious above all, showing ebullience as well as the "devastating sanity" which Olaf was to salute in the preface to his *Last and First Men* (1937).

Olaf was not a Friend, but the letters show him a troubled man in 1914, for he would not fight. Four factors made possible his entry into the FAU. He was determined to perform paramedical work; his wealthy father provided an ambulance for the Unit; his Quaker aunt and Michael Graveson, prominent Liverpool Friend, sponsored his application.

At the same time Olaf wrote 'my not being a Friend shall not stand in the way'. He reluctantly accepts that the FAU are assisting the prosection of the war, yet feels some shame at travelling on leave, in his Unit uniform. There is some account of the division in the FAU over the 1916 Military Service Acts, under which so many (Friends included) were to be imprisoned – 'for those who stay at home there is persecution, and I escape that under cover of khaki...' We have vivid letters written at his post (not "at the front": the French army did not permit civilian units there) and some written during infrequent home leaves. In the former, Olaf could not divulge military information, nor reveal much of the rancour within the FAU over conscription. He writes of '.. sons of strict quakers... far from strict quakers themselves' while at the same time writing affectionate cameos of a number of Friends in the Unit. The portraits and poems sketching Olaf and his comrades in *The Little Grey Book* (1920), and his own published account of his FAU work [in *We did not fight* (1935)] are fleshed out thanks to Crossley.

The edition informs us about the formative years of a strong, lifetime adult relationship; about three national cultures in wartime (Australia, England and France); about a significant episode of Quaker witness this century, from the viewpoint of a non-Friend participant, and of course about part of a major writer's life. The typography is pleasing, the illustrations evocative and the index well-constructed.

Josef Keith

NOTES AND QUERIES

CARICATURES OF FRIENDS

A few Friends may have had the chance to work through the 11 volumes of F.G. Stephens and M.D. George, *Catalogue of the Prints and Drawings in the British Museum* or the collection itself. For those without the opportunity, the publication of the selection *Religion in the Popular Prints 1600–1832* (Cambridge, 1986) by John Miller which accompanies a microform collection and reproduces 154 typical satirical prints with explanatory captions may be very welcome. The majority of the prints in this printed collection are anti-establishment but others satirise, often quite viciously, Methodists, Jews, Friends, Catholics, the Southcottians or tithe. Though only eight seem to refer directly to Friends there are others of interest directed at Ranters and Seekers. Unlike the Methodists, Friends appear rarely in the satirical prints of the eighteenth century. The reader usually has to refer back to Stephens and George for details of the sources of the prints. Naturally the reduced size of the reproductions means that some of their detail is not clear; there may well for example be much more of interest to Friends in the Thomas Hood caricature of 1825 satirising expressions of religious enthusiasm than the references to Elizabeth Fry's work. A few of the images such as Bugg's 'The Quaker Synod' of 1699 will be familiar, others incorporate Friends among other dissenters.

David J. Hall

MARY WESTWOOD, publisher for the fringe of Quakerism?

An extensive paper 'Mary Westwood, Quaker publisher', By Maureen Bell in *Publishing History*, vol.23 (1988), pp.5–66, studies for the first time the publishing activity of one of the little-known figures responsible for spreading Quaker pamphlets in the turbulent years around the Restoration. A checklist of 59 items (1659–1663) is given.

Maureen Bell has written a doctoral dissertation on 'Women publishers of puritan literature in the mid-seventeenth century' and her essay here deals with the content of the pamphlets issued by Mary Westwood in various fields, as 'signs' (using Kenneth Carroll's published evidence), prophecy, and the place of women, and she concludes 'that there is a tendency to favour "old style" early Quaker activities and the authors associated with them... [and there is] a thread of dissent from the hardening Quaker orthodoxy' (p.39).

Perhaps the lack of information about Mary Westwood is due more to the vagaries of chance rather than conscious jettisoning of one whom Friends in a more sedate generation might have though of as publishing for outdated enthusiasts.

Russell S. Mortimer

QUAKERS, 1656

> 'They are a growing evil, and the greatest that ever was. Their way is a plausible way; all levellers against magistracy and propriety'.

J.T. Cliffe: *Puritans in conflict: The Puritan gentry during and after the civil wars* (Routledge, 1988) in a chapter entitled 'The twilight of godliness', quotes this from the declaration of the strict Puritan Sir William Strickland, in Parliament, when the Nayler case came before the House at the end of 1656. *The Diary of Thomas Burton* (printed 1828)

giving some accounts of the Interregnum Parliaments is quoted as the source.

Russell S. Mortimer

LICHFIELD FRIENDS

Nigel J. Tringham of the Victoria County History has written an article 'Faith outside the city: early Quakers in the Lichfield area' which appears in *Staffordshire studies* – Essays presented to Denis Stuart, edited by Philip Morgan (Keele University, 1987), pp.105–112. It is well documented, and is illustrated by two reproductions of etchings by Robert Spence, from Friends House Library, London.

Russell S. Mortimer

EUROPEAN *AMERICANA*

The location indicator "London: Friends" is given to works noted as being in Friends House Library in *European Americana: a chronological guide to works printed in Europe relating to the Americas, 1493–1776*, vol.5. 1701–1725: edited by Dennis Channing Landis (John Carter Brown Library; New Canaan, Conn., Readex Books, 1987). Volumes 3 and 4 (1651–1700) and later volumes have yet to appear but this volume lists many Friends' books. Some items are picked out with analytical notes identifying the American interest among general titles (*e.g. Piety promoted*) which might otherwise have escaped the net.

Arrangement is by years, and alphabetical by author within years. Ample indexes of printers and booksellers, titles, authors and subjects are provided. The compilation is heavily weighted with location indicators for United States libraries.

Russell S. Mortimer

FRIENDS AROUND SNAITH

Life in the past around Snaith, edited by Margaret Noble (Snaith Historical Society, 1988) has a short section on Quakers in the district. Sufferings in the period before the Act of Toleration, and distraints for non-payment of tithe or church rates after that time, are referred to. The names of families in the Heck, Pollington, Rawcliffe and Snaith area which are mentioned include Chesman, Cutforth, Dawney, Halkon, Law and Musgrave. A difficulty over the title to the Friends' burial ground at Pollington is mentioned – and this surfaced also at Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting in 1823 [see Pearson Thistlethwaite's *Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting*, 1979, p.88]. An extended study of the subject would be welcomed.

Russell S. Mortimer

TOLERATION BEFORE THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION

W.A. Speck's *Reluctant revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford University Press, 1988) points out that the General Pardon of 1686 temporarily lifted, and the Declaration of Indulgence of 1687 ended the repression which had marred the 1680s. 'James was converted, not to religous toleration, but to the view that... the Protestant Dissenters could become valuable allies.' (p.174).

Quakers had 'most to benefit from the King's policy. It was largely for this reason, and not from motives of self-aggrandisement, that their leader William Penn worked closely with James, actually helping to draw up the Declaration of Indulgence. But while he kept the Friends in line, the other nonconformists soon got cold feet.' (p.183).

The author points out that when it came to the Statute Book the Toleration Act was more restricted than the Declaration of Indulgence. The Corporation and Test Acts were reinforced, and tithes continued to be levied.

Russell S. Mortimer

TEMPERANCE OF TEETOTAL?

Lilian Lewis Shiman's *Crusade against drink in Victorian England* (Macmillan, 1988) is a well-documented study of a movement in which Friends played some small part. Friends firmly supported the temperance movement. The author says that 'the Society of Friends, like the Methodists, had a tradition of temperance in the old moderation sense of the word'. As the nineteenth century advanced teetotalism came more to the fore, although it was never obligatory for Friends to embrace total abstinence, but Friends were encouraged to support it in a 'spirit of self-denial for the good of others'.

From the early years of the Society one finds Friends being discouraged from 'the unnecessary frequenting of alehouses', but it took a couple of hundred years before Yearly Meeting (in 1874) asked Friends to retire if possible from the brewing trade. Individual Friends, like Joseph Eaton and Samuel Bowly among others, were active in the temperance movement, and William Martin is credited with having persuaded Father Mathew to sign the pledge, but the Society did not take on temperance in the same spirit and with the same organised drive as it had espoused the anti-slavery causes nearly a century before.

Russell S. Mortimer

BINNS FAMILY OF SKIPTON AND AMERICA

A collection of more than 50 items of family correspondence from the American branch of a family which emigrated from Skipton (then in Knaresborough Monthly Meeting) in 1818 to Pennsylvania, and then went westward, first into Ohio and later Iowa, has been deposited at the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds (Carlton Hill Archives) by Mr Alan P. Binns of Burnley, Lancashire.

The letters were written to members of the Holden family, agriculturalists in the Craven district, and range from 1828 to the early years of the twentieth century. Those which survive here are mainly from the 1860s to the 1880s, when those who emigrated with their parents after the Napoleonic Wars were living in Ohio surrounded by their grown-up families.

Three generations of Davids are writing, one (born 1815) who crossed the ocean at the age of three and settled finally in Harrisville, Ohio (died 1877): Jonathan (nine letters) born 1804, became Clerk of Ohio Yearly Meeting, retired from banking at Mount Pleasant in 1874 and lamed himself by falling out of a cherry tree in 1876; William (10 letters, 1868–1885) born 1807 is the third of the correspondents from the children who emigrated as little boys. The letters continue with writers from the third generation and end with a couple of letters from a member of the Holden family who, as a young man, went to America in 1908, and made straight for Adena, Ohio, where he found J.A. Binns.

The letters include encouraging reports on agriculture in America, comments on trade and politics, on living conditions and the climate, as well as much family news and enquiries. Requests for news from England, for books about Yorkshire and for the Craven newspapers are frequently made, but the third generation admitted that it was thoroughly American. Things may not have been so at the beginning, because Jonathan when well on in his 70s, recalled that his mother (Margaret Binns the emigrant) when asked how she like America, said 'I did not come to like, I came to stay'. And stayed they did, to good purpose.

Russell S. Mortimer

GLOUCESTER FRIENDS

The Victoria County Histories continue to appear in measured time. Volume 4 of the

Gloucestershire series (The City of Gloucester) edited by N.M. Herbert (Oxford University Press, 1988) has references to the history of Friends in the city from 1660 to 1981. Information covers early religious controversies, persecution under Charles II, anti-slavery and temperance work by Samuel Bowly, ragged Sunday schools and other non-denominational and moral mission work in the nineteenth century, including the 'Home of Hope' – training women and girls for domestic service and laundry work – led by Eliza Sessions.

Russell S. Mortimer

BOOKS AND READERS IN COLONIAL PHILADELPHIA

Edwin Wolf's *The book culture of a colonial American city: Philadelphia books, bookmen and booksellers,* Lyell lectures in bibliography, 1985–6. (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1988) is a fruit of the author's researches into the history and holdings of Philadelphia libraries, supplemented by his reading of bookmen's correspondence, analyses of booksellers' advertisements in Philadelphia newspapers and a sampling of the books listed in Will documents in the colonial period.

The author produces a detailed picture of many of the books owned (and probably read) by Pennsylvanians in a variety of fields, from children's books to history, law and medicine.

Russell S. Mortimer

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE HISTORICAL MONUMENTS OF ENGLAND

An inventory of nonconformist chapels and meeting-houses in central England. London: HMSO (1986).

BUCKS. 1a
Amersham 3b-5a plan
Aylesbury 5b-6a plan illus.
Jordans 7b-9 plan illus
Chesham 14a plan
Newport Pagnell 22b
Sherington 24a
Weston Turville 26b
Woburn Sands 29b

DERBY 31a
Bakewell 33b illus
Chesterfield 38b-39b illus.
Derby 45b–46a illus.
Heanor 50a
Monyash 52b-53a illus.
New Mills 53b
Toadhole Furnace 55-56a plan illus.
Tupton 56b

GLOS. 59a
Bristol 65a-b illus.
Cheltenham 76b-77a
Broad Campden 78a-b illus.
Cirencester 80a illus.
Gloucester 84b
Nailsworth 90b–91a plan illus.
Olveston 92a
Painswick 92b-93a plan illus.
Stow-on-the-Wold 94b
Tewksbury 100a-b
Thornbury 100b-101a illus.
Frenchay 104 illus.

HEREFS. 107a
Almeley 107a-b illus.
Bromyard 108b-109a illus.
Hereford 110a
Leominster 112a
Ross-on-Wye 114a-b

LEICS.
Castle Donington 120a illus.
Hinckley 123b

NORTHANTS. 135b
Eydon 140a
Wellingborough 152a illus.
(inc. Finedon)

NOTTS.
Blyth 155a-b
Mansfield 159a-b illus.

OXFORD 167a
Banbury 170b illus.
Burford 172b-173a plan illus.
Charlbury 173b illus.
Chipping Norton 174a
Henley-on-Thames 176a-b
Hook Norton 177a
Shutford 180b-181a plan
Sibford Gower 181a illus.
South Newington 181a-b illus.
West Adderbury 182a-183 illus.
Witney 184b-185 plan illus.

RUTLAND
Oakham 189a-b plan illus.

SHROPSHIRE 191a
Broseley 192b-193a
Dawley (Coalbrookdale) 193a-b
Shrewsbury 202a

STAFFS.
Cheddleton (Basford) 211a-b
Leek 214a
Stafford 218a elevation
Uttoxeter 222b-223a plan illus.

WARWICK 225a
Atherstone 227a-b illus.
Baddesley Ensor 228a-b plan illus.
Birmingham (Bournville) 231b illus.
Ettington 233b-234 plan illus. 244 illus.
Hartshill 235a
Long Compton 236b
Shipston on Stour 237a-b plan
Sutton Coldfield (Wiggins Hill) 239b
Tredington 241b plan
Warwick 243b illus.

WORCS. 245
Bewdley 245b-246a illus.
Evesham 249b
Stourbridge 253a-b illus.
Worcester 259a illus.

Page references for Friends' properties (past and present).

Russell S. Mortimer

See *Journal of the Friends Historical Society*, Vol. 55, Nos. 3 & 4, 125–26.

BRISTOL PROBATE INVENTORIES

Guide to the probate inventories of the Bristol deanery of the diocese of Bristol (1542–1804). By E. and S. George. (Published by Bristol Record Society and the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society. 1988.)

Among the 7,133 inventory documents at the Bristol Record Office listed in this volume there are some 70 which can be identified as being for seventeenth or eighteenth century Bristol Friends. These are listed below, together with a few 'very near certainties'. Examination of the originals might well reveal more.

Bristol deanery encompassed a substantial country area in south Gloucestershire – the Frenchay, Hazel and Olveston districts; but Friends there did not belong to Bristol Two-weeks (later, Monthly) Meeting until the junction of Bristol and Frenchay in 1869, and their names do not appear among the Bristol membership.

The list gives date of inventory bundle and numerical reference, name, parish or area, occupation, value, and other notes (including whether a Will exists or not, indicated by letter W).

The editors have contributed a valuable introduction, and they point out that the valuations are for moveable property, and also that many probate records went not through Bristol but through the Probate Court of Canterbury.

In the Friend items listed below, notes from the following sources have been added in square brackets, in abbreviated form, to supplement the information given in the *Guide*:

J. Besse: *A collection of the sufferings.* 2 vols. 1753,
Bristol Record Society Volumes –
XXV *The inhabitants of Bristol in 1696.* 1968,
XXVI *Minute book of Men's Meeting, 1667–1686.* 1971,
XXX *Minute book of Men's Meeting, 1687–1704.* 1977,
T. Morford: *The cry of oppression.* 1659.

Russell S. Mortimer

Page		Ref. no.	Name	Location	Occupation	Value
6		1683/1	Arnold, Thomas	City of Bristol	cordwainer	£16
		[Thomas Arnold, shoemaker died Nov. 1683 'a prisoner in Newgate', buried 4 ix 1683. BRS.XXVI,193; Besse]				
7	W	1729/1	Atwood, Barnaby	SS. Philip & Jacob	soapmaker	£329
		[buried 26 or 27 x 1728. BRS.XXX,234]				
12	W	1715/3	Barnes, Robert	St. Thomas	cordwainer	£69
		[*query*: perhaps noticed in BRS.XXX,234]				
15		1704/4	Baugh, Hester	City of Bristol	widow	£212
		[buried 7 vi 1702. BRS.XXX,234]				
19	W	1698/3	Bennett, Samuel	City of Bristol	writing-master	£206
		[buried 7 iii 1698. BRS.XXX,235]				
21	W	1680/9	Bird, Israel	City of Bristol	freemason	£90
		[buried 9 xi 1680/81. BRS.XXVI,194]				
22	W	1711/7	Blackway, Hannah	City of Bristol	spinster	£131
		[died 10 vii 1711, of St. James' parish. BRS.XXV,11; Besse]				
26	W	1684/8	Boyce, Thomas	Castle Precincts	tailor	£33
		[buried 10 i 1684/5]				
33		1689/45	Bulgin, John	City of Bristol	serge-maker	£147
		[buried 28 vi 1689, of Temple parish. BRS.XXVI,195]				
33	W	1711/9	Bullock, William	City of Bristol	tiler	£34
		[buried 26 iii 1711. BRS.XXVI,195, XXX,236]				
36	W	1716/9	Butcher, William	City of Bristol	upholsterer	£1,134
		[buried 17 xi 1716/17. BRS.XXV,178]				
36	W	1723/7	Butler, Ann	City of Bristol	widow	£22
		[buried 6 iii 1723, of St Nicholas' parish. BRS.XXV,153]				
41		1687/18	Chandler, Joseph	SS. Philip & Jacob	cordwainer	£14
		[buried 9 xi 1687; sufferer 1682–83; BRS.XXVI,166; Besse]				
42	W	1754/13	Cherry, Sarah	City of Bristol	widow	£8
		[buried 12 xi 1752, widow of John; St. Thomas' parish]				
48		1692/11	Cole, Abraham	City of Bristol	merchant	£33
		[buried 22 vii 1692, of Maryport parish; sufferer 1664; *Calendar of Treasury books 1689–92,* p.1394; married Margaret Thomas, 30 x 1666]				
48	W	1711/12	Cole, Hezekiah	Winterbourne	yeoman	£821
		[BRS.XXX.238]				
48	W	1716/11	Cole, Margaret	Winterbourne	widow	£320
		[widow of Hezekiah Cole; BRS.XXX,238]				

48	W	1678/19	Cole, Robert	Winterbourne (Hambrook)	clothier	£73
		[*First Publishers of Truth*, p.104; see John S. Moore, ed., *The goods and chattels of our forefathers*, 1976, no.117]				
48		1733/12	Cole, Thomas	City of Bristol	mariner	£12
		[buried 21 xi 1731, of St. Philip's parish]				
49	W	1699/–	Collings, John	City of Bristol	cordwainer	£–
		[buried 26 vii 1698; BRS.XXVI,197 (John Collins)]				
50	W	1687/17	Comberbatch, John	City of Bristol	horner	£666
		Will 1685; see also 1689/CP. [BRS.XXVI,197–98]				
58	W	1714/11	Crow, Frances	Barton Regis		£3
		[buried 25 iii 1714, of SS. Philip & Jacob Out parish]				
59	W	1689/CP	Cumberpatch, John		horner	£666
		[cause papers] [Inventory see 1687/17; Will 1685; account only]				
59	W	1748/21	Curtis, Sarah	City of Bristol		£10
		[buried 18 xii 1747/8, of Maryport parish]				
63	W	1716/19	Dawson, Isaac	City of Bristol	cork-cutter	£902
		[buried 9 i 1715/16, of St. James' parish (Horsefair)]				
64	W	1716/20	Dedicott, Mary	City of Bristol	widow	£26
		[buried 22 x 1715; BRS.XXX, 240; Besse]				
67		1717/17	Dole, Tobias	Barton Regis	cordwainer	£13
		[*query:* perhaps T.D. of St. Philip's parish, buried 12 iii 1718, see BRS.XXVI,199]				
69	W	1681/20	Drew, John	Castle Precinct	house-carpenter	£182
		[buried 27 iv 1680; BRS.XXVI,199]				
70		1728/12	Dutton, William	City of Bristol		£125
		inventory (1718) and account [*query:* perhaps W.D. of Castle Precincts buried 6 or 7 vii 1718; BRS.XXV,8]				
73		1674/18	Edwards, Daniel	City of Bristol	shoemaker	£227
		[*query:* perhaps D.E., shoemaker, died 28 ii 1675; BRS.XXVI,199]				
75	W	1720/13	England, Joan	City of Bristol	widow	£76
		[buried 9 vi 1720, of Christ Church parish; BRS.XXX,242]				
81	W	1700/4	Finney, John	City of Bristol	merchant	£5,060
		[*query:* perhaps John Finny, BRS.XXX,243; his widow married Richard Champion, 24 vii 1702]				
85	W	1675/24	Fry, William	St. Mary-le-Port	cordwainer	£387
		[one W.F., shoemaker, buried 26 vi 1668; BRS.XXVI,200]				
87	W	1676/26	Gibbons, John & Elizabeth	SS.Philip & Jacob		£93
		[*query:* John d.25 vii 1666; Elizabeth d. 7 vii 1666; of Barton Regis; buried in their garden; Besse]				
88		1704/13	Gibbons, Robert	SS.Philip & Jacob	farrier	£277
		[buried 16 xii 1703; BRS.XXX,244]				
91	W	1682/21A	Graves, Sarah	Christchurch	widow	£9
		[buried 16 iv 1682; BRS.XXVI,201]				
104		1697/21	Hathaway, Josia			£30
		[*query:* perhaps Josiah Hathaway, buried 19 xi 1696, of SS. Philip & Jacob parish]				

106		1683/25	Heathcott, Thomas	City of Bristol	schoolmaster	£96
		[buried 14 ix 1683, of Castle Precincts; BRS.XXVI,203]				
115	W	1687/9	Hopkins, John	City of Bristol	tobacco-roller	£26
		[buried 30 x 1687, of St. James' parish; BRS.XXVI,204]				
116	W	1689/28	Hopkins, Mary	St. Peter	widow	£16
		[*query:* M.H., of St. James' parish, widow, buried 13 x 1689; BRS.XXVI,204]				
116	W	1683/24	Hopkins, Thomas	St. Peter	salt-maker	£90
		[buried 25 iv 1682; BRS.XXVI,204]				
116	W	1675/35	Horseman, Bridgett	Christchurch	widow (stocking-maker)	£54
		[buried 9 iii 1675]				
120	W	1695/19	Hurne, John	City of Bristol	joiner	£181
		[joiner, Baldwin Street; marr. Mary Brown 1 v 1666]				
123		1680/32	James, Benjamin.snr	City of Bristol	mariner	£932
		[buried 22 vii 1680; [BRS.XXVI,205]				
125	W	1694/31	Jelson, Joel	Barton Regis	grocer	£409
		[buried 21 vi 1694; BRS.XXVI,201, XXX,244 – Gilson]				
136		1701/18	Langforde, Henry	Temple		£3
		[buried 16 ix 1700; BRS.XXVI,207, XX,251]				
146	W	1691/35	Lux, Robert	City of Bristol	wool-comber	£183
		[buried 28 iii 1691; BRS.XXVI,208, III,252]				
158		1684/40	Moore, Elizabeth	City of Bristol	widow	£30
		[buried 30 x 1684; of St. Philip's parish; widow of Joseph; BRS.XXVI,210; Besse]				
158	W	1681/52	Moore, Joseph	SS. Philip & Jacob	felt-maker	£63
		[buried 3 ix 1681; BRS.XXVI,210; Besse]				
163		1668/41	Neeve, James	St. Mary Redcliffe	glover	£51
		[buried 4 viii 1667; sufferer, 1664; Besse]				
164	W	1668/40	Neeve, John	Temple	tobacco-roller	£226
		[buried 20 ix 1667; sufferer, 1664; Besse]				
166	W	1695/27	Noakes, Robert	City of Bristol	baker	£196
		[BRS.XXVI,210; Besse]				
166	W	1679/51	Noble, Agnes	City of Bristol	widow	£41
		[buried 22 v 1679; of St. Michael's parish]				
166		1674/31	Noble, Katherine		widow	£5
		[buried 10 v 1674]				
166	W	1672/41	Northall, Joan	St. Mary Redcliffe	bone-lace weaver	£90
		[buried 26 xi 1672]				
167		1682/34	Nutt, John	City of Bristol	cordwainer	£22
		[BRS.XXVI,210; Besse]				
169		1671/30	Ouldston, Roger	Castle Precinct		£170
		[sufferer 1664; Besse; wife Frances died 1693; BRS.XXX,255]				
169	W	1704/23	Osborne, Elizabeth	Castle Precinct	widow	£76
		[buried 2 xii 1703; BRS.XXX,255]				
170	W	1675/58	Packer, Hannah		widow	£63
		[buried 28 ix 1675; son Nathaniel died 1670]				
182		1694/42	Plumley, John	City of Bristol	glazier	£5
		1694/48	[duplicate]			
		[buried 19 iv 1694, of Redclift parish]				
184	W	1681/56	Powell, William	St. Augustine	gardener	£110
		[*query:* buried 26 v 1681; W.P. of St. Michael's Parish]				

195 1677/39 Roe, Anne SS. Philip & Jacob widow £20
[buried 17 v 1677]

199 W 1676/40 Sampson, Joan City of Bristol widow £85
[buried 15 ix 1675, "an Antient Friend"] 3 documents

204 1689/60 Selman, Edward cooper £11
[BRS.XXVI,109, 144]

204 W 1711/41 Sessell, Richard City of Bristol victualler £19
[buried 2 or 3 xii 1711, R.S., of Nicholas Shambles]

205 W 1674/40 Shatford, William St. Mary-le-port £21
[sufferer 1664; Besse; son Wm. born 20 iv 1661]

207 W 1745/25 Short, Samuel St. Thomas cordwainer £13
[buried 13 ix 1745; shoemaker]

212 W 1731/81 Smith, Susanna City of Bristol widow £14
[buried 6 v 1731; (widow of Charles S., BRS.XXX,261)]

215 W 1667/70 Sowle, Andrew St. Leonard painter-stainer £18
[died 21 xii 1665; "Andrew Sole, a painter"; BRS.XXVI]

220 1678/51 Stockman, Thomas St. James carpenter £69
[buried 13 vii 1678; Besse; see BRS.XXVI,32n]

222 1717/52 Summers, Benjamin SS. Philip & Jacob butcher £36
[buried 28 iii 1717]

226 W 1668/53 Terrett, Thomas snr SS. Philip & Jacob blacksmith £45
[*query:* sufferer 1664; Besse; Morford, *Cry*, p.13]

227 1690/47 Thomas, Henry St. Thomas cooper £98
[buried 16 vii 1690; BRS.XXVI,217]

233 1741/46 Trotman, John saddle-tree maker £42
[buried 17 or 18 xii 1740, of SS. Philip & Jacob, 38 years]

234 W 1732/70 Tully, Samuel jnr. City of Bristol meal-man £866
[buried 17 vi 1732, of St. James' parish]

241 1687/64 Ware, John Castle Precinct silk-weaver £132
[BRS.XXVI,220 (John Weare)]

241 W 1688/51 Warren, Ann City of Bristol widow £147
[*query:* Ann Warren, of Castle Precincts, bur. 30 x 1686]

241 1663/67 Warren, Henry St. Thomas cordwainer £191
[*query:* sufferer 1655-57 (St. Thomas' parish); Besse]

242 1718/39 Waterford, Elizabeth City of Bristol widow £18
[buried 12 xii 1717, of St. Peter's parish, BRS.XXX,244]

243 W 1693/34 Watkins, Joseph SS. Philip & Jacob soapmaker £621
[buried 25 i 1692/3; of Lawford's Gate; Besse]

247 W 1686/55 Webb, Joyce St. Nicholas spinster £8
[buried 28 v 1686, sufferer 1683–84]

254 1711/48 Willcox, Joan City of Bristol widow £20
[*query:* buried 17 ii 1711; of Christ Church parish]

255 1728/42 Willcox, Richard City of Bristol corn-chandler £115
[buried 9 i 1727/8, of St. Nicholas' parish]

257 W 1698/35 Wills, Richard City of Bristol pin-maker £15
[buried 28 ix 1698; BRS.XXX,267]

261 1688/48 Wootten, William £23
[*query:* sufferer 1686]

Supplements to the Journal of Friends' Historical Society

12. ELIZABETH HOOTON, First Quaker woman preacher (1600–1672). By Emily Manners. 1914. 95pp., £3.00.

20. SWARTHMORE DOCUMENTS IN AMERICA. Ed. Henry J. Cadbury. 1940. £1.50.

21. AN ORATOR'S LIBRARY. John Bright's books. Presidential address 1936 by J. Travis Mills. 1946. 24pp., 50p.

22. LETTERS TO WILLIAM DEWSBURY AND OTHERS. Edited by Henry J. Cadbury. 1948. 68pp., £3.00.

23. SLAVERY AND "THE WOMAN QUESTION". Lucretia Mott's Diary. 1840. By F.B. Tolles. 1952. £2.00, cloth £3.00.

24. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY OF EARLY FRIENDS. Presidential address by Frederick B. Tolles, 1952. £1.00.

28. PATTERNS OF INFLUENCE IN ANGLO-AMERICAN QUAKERISM. By Thomas E. Drake. 1958. £1.00.

29. SOME QUAKER PORTRAITS, CERTAIN AND UNCERTAIN. By John Nickalls. 1958. Illustrated. £1.00.

32. JOHN WOOLMAN IN ENGLAND, 1772. By Henry J. Cadbury. 1971. £2.00.

33. JOHN PERROT. By Kenneth L. Carroll. 1971. £2.00.

34. "THE OTHER BRANCH": LONDON Y.M. AND THE HICKSITES, 1827–1912. By Edwin B. Bronner. 1975. £1.25.

35. ALEXANDER COWAN WILSON, 1866–1955. By Stephen Wilson. 1974. £1.00.

Back issues of the *Journal* may be obtained: price £2.00 each issue.

Journals and Supplements Wanted

FHS would be glad to receive unwanted copies of back issues of the *Journal* and of the Supplements. Address to FHS, c/o The Library, Friends House, London NW1 2BJ.

JFHS 55 7

ISSN No. 0071 9587

E & E Plumridge Ltd, Linton, Cambridge