The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society

Volume 56 Number 2

CONTENTS

Annual Membership Subscriptions due 1st January (Personal) £4 US $8 (U.K. Institutional) £6 (Overseas Institutions) $15. 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 56 Number 2 1991

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.

EDITORIAL

Although this number of the *Journal* is not devoted to the commemoration of the tercentenary of George Fox's death, it is satisfying to have in it two articles bearing on the life of the founder of the Religious Society of Friends. The Friends Historical Society has played some part in the numerous events that have linked the year 1991 with 1691.

Preliminary research showed that Friends in 1891 took little notice of the bicentenary and some members of the Society were sceptical as to any commemoration in 1991. However, in 1987 an *ad hoc* committee was formed, upon which the executive committee of the Friends Historical Society was represented, to consider what appropriate steps might be taken to commemorate Fox's death. At first, enthusiasm generally was not overwhelming but gradually throughout the world-wide family of Quakers the conviction grew that "something should be done".

We cannot here detail the many events that have taken place or will take place throughout this year but members of the Historical Society may wish to be informed of some of the principal occasions.

Christopher Hill delivered lectures on 'George Fox and Millenarianism' at Friends House and in Norwich and also took part in an international Conference held at Lancaster University 25-28 March to mark the tercentenary of George Fox's death and to consider aspects of the history of the Society of Friends. Speakers from USA and USSR as well

as from Great Britain read papers to the Lancaster meeting. Five lectures at Friends House in June and early July deal with Fox and the development of the Society of Friends. David Blamires organized an exhibition 'Quakerism and its Manchester connexions' held in the John Rylands Library from 6 February to 23 May and Leicester Preparative Meeting is arranging a visit to Fenny Drayton. Yearly Meeting and the Summer Gathering at Bradford together with meetings organized by FWCC in the Netherlands, Honduras and Kenya this year expect to make some reference to George Fox's life and work.

In Volume 55, Number 5 of the *Journal* we referred to the number of centenaries (p.129) between 1989 and 1991. The executive committee was able to give some help through the Library to enquirers about the Toleration Act. Hugh Pyper delivered a lecture at Friends House on 5 October 1990 to mark the tercentenary of the death of Robert Barclay. This lecture was also given to Friends in Scotland and we hope that arrangements can be made for its publication.

The death of Dr Arthur Raistrick has deprived the Society of Friends and the Historical Society, of which he was President in 1937, of a respected and well-loved member. He was a pioneer in the study of industrial archaeology and industrial history with an international reputation and the preservation of Ironbridge owes much to his energy and wise guidance in the 1950s and '60s. Dying at the advanced age of 94 he was active almost to the end of his long life.

THE EXCOMMUNICATION OF GEORGE FOX, 1678

The broad outlines of the dispute between George Fell, only son of Judge Thomas and Margaret Fell, and his mother have long been known. More than 125 years ago, Maria Webb used the collection of letters and other documents that became known as the Swarthmore Manuscripts for her book on the Fell family. She related details of the disagreement between Margaret Fell, one of the most important figures in the early period of the rise of the Children of Truth, and her son. As Webb told the story, the basis of the disagreement was Margaret Fell's active involvement in the affairs of the Quakers, the pejorative tag early attached to the Children of Truth, an involvement culminating in 1669 in the marriage of the widowed Margaret to George Fox, founding organizer of the sect. A letter Webb included in her book from Fell's son-in-law Thomas Lower suggested that her son George, a lawyer of no little wealth, prominence, and influence, may even have connived to have his mother re-committed to the county jail in Lancaster in 1670.[1] According to Norman Penney, who examined the evidence in the early 1930s, King Charles II granted George ownership of Swarthmoor Hall in 1665 after Margaret was imprisoned and her property confiscated.[2] The relationship between the two family members was hardly friendly, and the son failed even to mention his mother in his will, although he did bequeath forty shillings to each of his parents-in-law to buy a ring.[3]

When Isabel Ross, a descendant of the Fells, published a biography of her forebear Margaret in 1949, she added to this picture of disagreement in the family but charitably ventured that George may have been encouraged by his wife's father, Edward Cooke. Ross concluded that George wanted his mother to leave the family estate of Swarthmoor Hall voluntarily, apparently promising her an annuity if she would move, threatening her with prison if she did not.[4] Ross mentioned a dispute over Thomas Fell's will, a dispute in which George claimed that he had a legal right to at least part of his late father's large estate, but she failed to develop the issues involved in it. She did point out that the hard feelings continued long after George's death when his widow Hannah

insisted on her rights and exacerbated relations by such minor irritants as closing a path from Swarthmoor to Ulverston.[5] The latest study of Margaret Fell, still unpublished, by Bonnelyn Y. Kunze, asserts that George was correct about his father's will - that is, based on the common law of primogeniture, if his widow married again she automatically forfeited her claim to the estate.[6] In 1965, Alfred W. Braithwaite examined the legal aspects of the situation, particularly regarding Judge Fell's will. Giving a more favourable interpretation to George Fell's motives than previous researchers, he read the will to mean that Fell granted his son the real property not specifically bequeathed his surviving wife, namely. his estate beyond Swarthmoor Hill, its gardens, and 50 acres.[7]

One fascinating new aspect of the dispute, however, has just come to light. Housed among the faded, weathered, and poorly written parchment and papers in the hefty volumes of court documents in the Public Record Office in Chancery Lane (London) is a copy of a decree of excommunication against George and Margaret Fox and the three unmarried Fell daughters still living at Swarthmoor.[8] We have rendered it from its original Latin, and our translation appears below.

We know about the decree because it became a weapon in the legal struggle between members of the Fell family over land at Osmotherley Fells that had been part of the Fell holdings going back four score years, to 1598. The immediate dispute began on 20 August 1678 when John Rouse and his wife Margaret (Fell), Thomas Lower and his wife Mary (Fell), Isabel (Fell) Yeamans, Sarah, Hannah, and Rachel Fell, and George and Margaret Fell Fox filed a bill of complaint in the Chancery Court of the County Palatine of Lancaster against Hannah Fell (widow of George) and her young son Charles.[9] Three weeks later, on 13 September, Hannah Fell and her son asked to be excused from responding to the complaint because the plaintiffs had been excommunicated, and they attached a copy of the decree to support their plea.[10] It is possible that Hannah and Charles Fell's attorney was trying to argue that, as in civil courts where failure to answer a summons could result in issuance of a writ of outlawry and prevent use of the courts, failure to purge oneself of the evils leading to excommunication could have the same result.[11] On the same day, he filed a cross suit on their behalf from which we can learn the facts they considered relevant for their case.[12]

Simply put, the court case involved whether the lands were leasehold or freehold: if the former, they could be bequeathed at will; if the latter, they could be entailed and passed unencumbered to male heirs. On

behalf of her son, Hannah Fell claimed, but could produce no deed to prove, that the lands had been freehold, while the rest of the Fell family insisted, but likewise had no deed to show, that they were leasehold.

In addition Hannah Fell contended that her son had yet another basis for ownership of the disputed land, namely, that in March 1665 Margaret Fell agreed in writing to surrender her rights under her husband's will of 1658 to her son George, and he in return would pay her an annuity of £100 (to be raised on 8 March 1668, by £10).[13] Hannah also alleged that her son's aunts, the sisters Fell, had pledged on 20 September 1672, that if this agreement was carried out Charles could enjoy Osmotherley 'free from the title or claims' of George and Margaret Fox.[14] She averred further that George Fell received income from the land for several years after his father's death, which presumably indicated that he was considered the rightful owner. The petitioners demanded that the defendants bring into court any deeds, as their plea phrased it, 'contained in bag or box or shelf, locked or unlocked'.

On the other side the Fell family members charged that the executors of Thomas Fell's will, Richard Radcliffe and Thomas Coulton, had sided with George Fell - 'confederating and combining themselves together' were their words - and permitted George to take possession of Osmotherley.[15] The two executors received a discharge and indemnity for £20,000 for all judgments and suits arising from her husband's will from Margaret Fell on 25 January 1662, because they had led her to believe that they had faithfully fulfilled the will's provisions. The Fells, of course, denied that the land in question was freehold but asserted that the other side, because of the executors' control of Thomas Fell's papers, had the original lease and other documents.[16] They asked the court to order delivery of all relevant written materials, but no evidence of such documents survived. The final resolution of the case was apparently lost in some dark recess of the past.

We do not know what specifically occasioned the excommunication, which came about as a result of the annual visitation of a deputy of the Bishop of Chester, John Pearson,[17] to Ulverston parish. Prior to such a visit, a bishop customarily presented a series of queries to the clergymen and churchwardens of the parish. Often a diverse list, these disciplinary questions aimed to ensure regular, acceptable, and well-attended services, the good repair and proper use of the building and its furnishings, the orthodoxy of members of the parish community, and the collection of tithes, among other matters. Fox, his wife, and her

unmarried daughters still living at home had, sometime prior to 5 September 1678, when this copy of the decree was dated, been adjudged guilty of some offence meriting excommunication and had suffered this extreme penalty, the heaviest sentence an ecclesiastical court could impose.[18] We do not know what their offence was, but Quakers often found themselves faced with this punishment. Indeed, the very individual before whom they were supposed to appear at the visitation, Joseph Craddock, the commissary who represented Bishop Pearson in the archdeaconry of Richmond, had a dozen years earlier drawn Fox's wrath for wielding the excommunication weapon against members of the Society of Friends in the north.[19]

Of course as Quakers, neither Fox nor the other Fells had an interest or concern to attend to any such churchly affair, no matter how odious and final the penalty seemed to those who imposed it; they certainly saw no need to seek absolution for their alleged sins, an action that would have freed them of the ban. As for the matter involved in the earthly dispute, the Quaker family of Margaret Fell retained the land, so Charles and Hannah Fell got no immediate satisfaction: in 1691, after Fox's death, Margaret Fox's son-in-law, Daniel Abraham, paid Charles £3900 and extinguished all his claims to the estate; Abraham now controlled the Fell properties.[20] Hannah, a proud woman, left the area about this time, her shadow no longer falling across the pages of Quaker history.[21]

The copy of the excommunication document itself, dated 5 September 1678, is about one page in length. The Latin of the text is of a variety suggesting that the copyist did not know very much about the language he was using. The affixed signature of Richard Trotter, a notary public, rather than Bishop Pearson suggests that the present copy of the earlier decree was made especially for use in this case before the Chancery Court.

****

[We,] John, by divine providence bishop of Chester to the faithful in Christ, [greetings]. etc. Know ye that indeed George Fox and Margaret his wife, Sarah Fell, Susanna Fell and Rachel Fell, all of the parish of Ulverston, the Deanery of Furness, of the Archdeaconry of Richmond, and also Chester, our diocese, and in the county of Lancaster, were duly cried to appear before the right worshipful Joseph Craddock, knight, doctor of laws, the lawfully appointed commissary[22] in and throughout the entire Archdeaconry of Richmond and diocese of Chester or his

lawfully designated substitute at a certain day, hour, and place, [which have] already passed, to answer to certain grave articles or interrogatories concerning the welfare of their souls and the reformation of their manners. And also they were permitted to have the charges and those things which we have discovered in our annual examination.[23] And because according to the intent of the citation aforesaid, they did not appear, they did not comply with the mandates of the church in this matter, we have excommunicated these same people, thusly, George Fox and Margaret, his wife, Sarah Fell, Susanna Fell, and Rachel Fell (for their contempts aforesaid). And you proclaim in the church in the parish of Ulverston aforesaid [these things which] we have taken great care and ordered to be denounced and declared. Indeed in which sentence of excommunication the aforesaid George Fox and Margaret, his wife, Sarah Fell, Susanna Fell, and Rachel Fell stood and still stand entangled and embroiled, having been questioned for their own sakes and having been proved [to seek] no absolution in the sentence aforesaid of excommunication. Yet they remain wickedly disdaining the keys[24] of the church. In witness to which matter [we], as the ones duly appointed so to act in the present case, [set] our seal which we use in these matters. On the fifth day of the month of September 1678.

Rich[ard]: Trotter
Not[ary]: Pub[lic]:
H. Larry Ingle
Jaan Ingle

NOTES AND REFERENCES

The first named author is responsible for the background commentary, the second for the translation. They would like to express their appreciation to Stephen Schierling Associate Professor of Classics of Louisiana State University and Melanie Barber Deputy Librarian and Archivist of the Lambeth Palace Library for their advice and assistance.

[1]See Maria Webb, *The Fells of Swarthmoor Hall,* London 1865, 256-63.

[2]Norman Penney, 'George Fell and the Story of Swarthmoor Hall', *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* 30 (1933), 30. There is still a murky aspect here: Penney cited only a royal order for the attorney general to prepare a bill giving George ownership, not the grant of ownership itself.

[3]Fell's will is reprinted in Helen G. Crosfield, *Margaret Fox of Swarthmoor Hall,* London [1913], 262-65. Crosfield adds to the picture of animosity by noting that Hannah Fell, George's widow, continued to dispute with Margaret after her husband's death. *Ibid.,* 145.

[4]Isabel Ross, *Margaret Fell, Mother of Quakerism,* York, 1984, 221-22.

[5]*Ibid.*, 224-25, 227-28. The exact extent of the senior Fell's holdings is unclear, but it is evident that, as one of Lancashire's most influential men, he was probably the largest landholder on the Furness peninsula, with his estate stretching in a continuous band some seven miles from Morecambe Bay in the east to Duddon Sands in the west. For further details on Fell's career and life, see H. Larry Ingle, *'First among Friends: George Fox and the Quakers'*, chapter 8, forthcoming.

[6]Bonnelyn Y. Kunze. *'The Family, Social and Religious Life of Margaret Fell'*, PhD dissertation, Univ. of Rochester 1986, 69-70, 96n92. Thomas Fell's will itself so provided. It is conveniently reprinted in Ross, *op. cit.*, 398-400, and confirms that Swarthmoor was to be Margaret's only so long as she did not remarry, 'and no longer'. The residue of the estate, after payment of debts and obligations, was to go in its entirety to the seven daughters of the family. Alfred Braithwaite took this to mean that absent determined and positive language indicated that Fell wished to flout the strong seventeenth-century tradition of leaving real property to the eldest male heir; his son in fact received all the real property not designated for Margaret. (Alfred W. Braithwaite. 'The Mystery of Swarthmoor Hall', *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* 51 [1965], 23). This interpretation certainly clears up why, after his father's demise, George received rents from the estate. The will specified that George Fell was to receive only his father's law books.

[7]Braithwaite, *op. cit.*, 23. One problem is that no one has determined the exact extent of Fell's large holdings.

[8]PL7/64, No. 12, 13 September 1678, Records of the Chancery Court of the Palatine County of Lancaster (all subsequent references to such documents from this collection), Public Record Office, London (hereinafter cited as PRO). Historians of Quakerism have not used these voluminous records, so it remained for a tireless genealogist, Angela Barlow of Surbiton, Surrey, to ferret out the decree. Barlow is preparing an 'Index to the Equity Proceedings up to 1700 of the Chancery of the Palatine of Lancaster preserved in the Public Record Office, primarily for the use of other genealogists. She and H. Larry Ingle met in April 1988 in the Library of the Society of Friends, London, where she kindly called his attention to these and other materials that he has been using in his developing biography of George Fox. He takes this occasion to express his deep appreciation for her continuing assistance and invaluable advice, particularly concerning seventeenth-century legal procedures.

[9]William Rawlinson to John Otway, 20 August 1678, PL6/32, No. 171. The fact that leading Friends of the stature of Fox and his wife Margaret believed that this case merited resorting to the courts speaks volumes about their willingness to use a system that they publicly considered evil, corrupt, and unjust. For striking examples of Fox's previous view of the legal system, see George Fox, *To the Parliament of the Comon-wealth of England*, London 1659, 3-7. For the broader picture, see Craig W. Horle, *The Quakers and the English Legal System, 1660-1688*, Philadelphia, 1988, 170-71. Of course, it is possible that their status as plaintiffs in a civil matter rather than defendants in a criminal case gave them a different view of the permissibility of using the court system.

[10]Thomas Stringer to Otway, 13 September 1678, PL7/64, No. 12. If the defendants had not included the copy to bolster their case, it is unlikely that this document would have come to light.

[11]I am indebted to Angela Barlow for this suggestion.

[12]Stringer to Otway, 13 September 1678, PL6/33, No. 4.

[13]Braithwaite asserted that the annuity was £200 (Braithwaite, 'Mystery', 27), but he did not indicate where he found the larger figure.

[14]The fact that such specific dates were cited strongly suggests that the lawyer for Charles Fell was working here from documents; on the other hand, he (and Hannah Fell, his presumed source of other information) did not know the exact date of Thomas Fell's death.

[15]The document did not mention that on 17 January 1677/8, confirmed by a deed of 22 March 1678, they had conveyed to Charles Fell certain named properties in Osmotherley, but apparently they were ones additional to those in dispute in the present case. See Conveyance of John Rous, *et al.*, to Charles Fell, 22 March 1678, Thirnbeck Manuscript, 23, Library of the Society of Friends, London. Why either side filed a suit following this sale - the price was not mentioned - remains a mystery.

[16]The specificity with which Thomas Stringer, Charles Fell's lawyer, detailed the 1598 agreement - he gave a figure of 20 shillings, 11 pence annual rent, whereas the Fells' attorney said that the nominal rent was one peppercorn for 10,000 years - suggests that the executors did indeed have some relevant documents, if not the disputed lease. Also the fact that the case was decided against the Fells suggests that the court found the original 1598 arrangement was for a freehold, even though in Charles Fell's own pleading the reference was to rent. On three occasions, 28 December 1677, 27 July 1678, and 1 August 1678, Margaret Fell paid fees to her attorney, Richard Simpson, in payment for his handling of the suit over the Osmotherly lands. *Household Account of Book of Sarah Fell,* ed. Norman Penney, Cambridge 1920, 445, 505, 507.

[17]Pearson (1612-86) was bishop from 1673 until his death. S.L. Ollard, *et al.* (eds), *A Dictionary of English Church History,* London 1948, 463-64.

[18]Church of England, *The Ecclesiastical Courts, Principles of Reconstruction.* London, 1954, 19-20.

[19]In 1665, Fox personally confronted Craddock, who had, charged the First Friend, 'excommuniciated abundans both in Yorksheer & Lancashere... Thou hast excommunicated us both olde & younge...' *Journal of George Fox,* ed. Norman Penney, Cambridge 1911, ii, 98-99. Fox had castigated Craddock in 1663. See Henry J. Cadbury, ed. *Swarthmore Documents in America,* London, 1940, 67–8.

[20]Ross, *op. cit.*, 228-29. The delay in resolving this matter until after Fox's death does point to the possibility that he may have been a block in the way of a family effort to reconcile the Fells.

[21]Crosfield, *Fox,* 145.

[22]The officer exercising jurisdiction as a bishop's representative.

[23]Refers to the required annual visitation of the bishop's representative.

[24]Requirements.

GEORGE FOX AND WILLIAM PENN,

unlikely yokefollows and friends

When one begins to think of George Fox and William Penn, the tendency is to emphasize comparisons and contrasts. George Fox, the solid, uncompromising, ill-educated, man of the people; and William Penn, the graceful, sophisticated, member of the upper classes.

A century ago the American poet Walt Whitman, while writing about Quakers in *November Boughs,* compared George Fox with William Shakespeare, who came from a similar background, was born in an adjoining county, and died less than ten years before Fox was born. He wrote, 'One to radiate all of art's, all literature's splendor - a splendor so dazzling that he himself is almost lost in it... Then the other - may we indeed name him the same day? What is poor plain George Fox compared to William Shakespere [*sic*] - to fancy's lord, imagination's heir? Yet George Fox stands for something too -... the thought of God, merged in the thoughts of moral right and the immortality of identity. Great, great is that thought - aye, greater than all else.'[1]

The contrast between these two Quakers is nowhere near as dramatic as the one outlined by Whitman, but it is striking nevertheless. We do not know what George Fox looked like, except for a description in William Penn's Preface to Fox's *Journal,* and a few other fleeting references, and there are no authentic portraits. He was said to be large, to have dressed neatly but plainly, including his leather breeches, and to have eaten simply.[2] There are portraits of Penn, both before he joined Friends and late in life. He dressed well, but avoided lace, ruffles and the other appurtenances of his class. Vigorous and handsome, he put on weight in his later years; likely because he was very fond of good food.[3] It is worth noting that Fox, who lived simply, always seemed to have enough money to take care of his needs, and felt free to give money to others. Penn, who inherited money and married women with money, never seemed to have enough to cover his expenses. He too was generous to others except when his debts caught up with him.

Fox married Margaret Fell in 1669 when he was 45 years old, and she was ten years his senior. He implied that it was a marriage of companionship, and probably never consummated.[4] Penn, on the other hand married twice, once in 1672 to Gulielma Springett when they were both 28, and again in 1696 to Hannah Callowhill who was 25, and Penn 52. He fathered 15 children, or possibly only 14; the youngest was born in 1706.[5]

While Fox presumably had some schooling, for there were those who thought the boy should study for the priesthood, his family apprenticed him to a shoemaker who also dealt in wool and cattle. He read avidly, particularly the Bible and other religious literature, but he never learned to write properly, (his handwriting was crude and his spelling creative), and dictated most of his epistles amd essays, as well as his journal.[6] Penn, on the other hand, spent a number of years in Chigwell School, near Epping Forest northeast of London, and then when the family moved to Ireland in 1656 studied with tutors until he entered Christ Church at Oxford in 1660. After being sent down for religious nonconformity in 1662, his father sent him to Europe on the Grand Tour, which allowed him to study for some months with Moses Amyraut at the Huguenot academy in Saumur on the Loire, near Nantes. He later studied at Lincoln's Inn from early in 1665 until it was closed by the plague.[7] Penn began to publish as soon as he joined Friends in 1667, using his learning to buttress his arguments in scores of volumes over more than half a century.[8]

They were both 23 years old when they embraced what is now called the Religious Society of Friends. George Fox, after an agonizing struggle for four years to find a religious faith which met his needs, records in his *Journal,* 'then, Oh then, I heard a voice which said, "there is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition," and when I heard it my heart did leap for joy.'[9] This experience in 1647 marked the turning point in his life, though it was not until five years later that he seemed to break forth into a new level of faith and effectiveness. After hearing the preaching of Thomas Loe whom he had heard before, at a Quaker gathering in Cork, Ireland, in late summer or early autumn in 1667, William Penn realized that he had found the answer to his inward longings, and cast his lot with Friends. He too had moved gradually toward this decision for several years, but apparently never went through the trials and tribulations of the older man. He was swept into the work of the movement almost immediately, publishing tracts, and joining with other Friends to intercede with the Duke of Buckingham for the release of imprisoned Quakers.[10]

Both men suffered imprisonment for their religious beliefs soon after their convincement. In 1649 Fox was jailed in Nottingham, first in 'a pitiful stinking place', and later in the sheriff's home. In the following year he was jailed for many months at Derby for blasphemy. He was not imprisoned again until 1653, but was jailed eight times in all for various periods. His last time was in Worcester prison from 1673 to 1675, and William Penn was instrumental in obtaining his release.[11] Penn was thrown into the Tower of London for blasphemy in 1668, he was jailed briefly in 1670 after the Penn-Mead trial, and for a longer period in 1671 for preaching in violation of the Five Mile Act.[12] He was never jailed again as a Quaker, and was not arrested until after the Glorious Revolution when he was accused of treason because of his friendship with the deposed James II.

While many persons have written about both men in studies of seventeenth-century Quakerism, only two, Samuel M. Janney and Harry Emerson Wildes have written full length biographies of each of them. Janney, a Friend in Virginia who was active in what was called the Hicksite wing of Quakers, published his biography of William Penn in 1851, and two years later issued a book about George Fox. Even today scholars refer to the Penn book, for it included a number of documents, some of which have been lost in the intervening time.[13] Janney, who deeply regretted the separation of Friends hoped his biography would 'enable me to do something towards promoting a reunion between the two branches of the Society of Friends'.[14] It was well received by English Friends and *The* (London) *Friend* published a four part review in 1852.[15] On the other hand, his biography of George Fox, which included 85 pages of selections from his writings concerning "The Doctrines of the Christian Church", and his views concerning "Christian Testimonies" was rejected after John Allen (1790-1859) published a critical letter in *The British Friend.* However, both books were reprinted in the United States many times.[16]

Harry Emerson Wildes published his *Voice of the Lord, a biography of George Fox* in 1965, and nine years later issued *William Penn.* Rather than holding himself close to the *Journal,* he wrote a full biography which placed Fox in his historical context. He included more about Margaret Fell Fox than many earlier biographies, and wrote extensively about his ministry in America from 1671 to 1673.[17] The Penn biography is marred by a great many errors, and cannot help being compared with the numerous recent biographies and monographs about Penn.[18] Neither book was reprinted.

We do not know when these two men first met, for Penn left no record of an encounter with Fox until the time of his marriage to Margaret Fell in Bristol in October, 1669. Fox did not record the presence of the young convert on that occasion and first referred to him in regard to the Penn-Mead trial a year later.

One author suggested that Fox knew about the young William Penn's spiritual searching and appointed Thomas Loe to pursue him and snare him for Quakers. He adds that Loe exerted an "hypnotic" influence on the young man.[19] William I. Hull is the only other biographer who mentions this tale, which first appeared in 1904, and he dismissed it out of hand.[20]

Another story about Penn and Fox, regarding the younger man's sword, and Fox's admonition, 'wear it [his sword] as long as thou canst,' suggests that the two men met not long after Penn became a Friend. Janney is the source of this report, which first appeared in his biography of Penn in 1851. Hull and others have attempted to authenticate the anecdote, but without success.[21]

This brings us to the first time a meeting is mentioned by one of the two principals. At the beginning of his journal describing his visit to Ireland in 1669, Penn noted that he went to Bristol on October 22, 1669, where he met George Fox, and Margaret Fell who were about to marry. Penn and Fox must have exchanged information about Ireland for the older man had returned from there a few days earlier. Penn expressed approval of the marriage in a meeting for worship, but he had sailed for Cork before the union on October 27.[22]

During his travels in Ireland Penn noted in his diary that he wrote to Fox at the end of November 1669, at the same time he wrote to his father and to Gulielma Springett.[23] In May of 1671 Fox wrote to Penn urging him to complete the text of a tract in answer to an attack by Thomas Jenner, a Puritan minister in Ireland.[24] The next record of a meeting of the two of them is found in Fox's *Journal* and elsewhere, referring to a small group of supporters who bade farewell to Fox and his 12 companions just before they sailed for America in August, 1671.[25] Penn left shortly for his first visit to Quakers in the Netherlands.

When George Fox returned from America at the end of June, 1673, Penn and his bride Gulielma were among those who went to Bristol to greet him, along with Margaret Fell, two of her daughters, Sarah and Rachel, a son-in-law, Thomas Lower, and others.[26] Fox and his wife travelled together for a period after his return, and soon visited the Penns at their home in Rickmansworth, Herts, called Basing House. [27]

In the months which followed, the two couples drew closer together. While Gulielma Penn and Margaret Fox seldom saw one another. they carried on a correspondence in the years ahead. Penn and Margaret Fox developed a close relationship which lasted until her sons-in-law, especially William Mead, turned her against him in the 1690s. When Fox was unable to gain his freedom from Worcester prison through the intercession of his customary supporters he turned to Penn, and the two worked together on many issues until the older man's death in 1691.

Fox and Penn had time to talk about the state of the Society in England during this period, and possibly something about America, but there is no record of what transpired. Thomas Lower, husband of Mary Fell, joined the Fox party, which soon headed north. Fox hoped to see his mother at Fenny Drayton one last time before she died, and Margaret Fell Fox planned to return home to Swarthmoor Hall. While Fox and Lower were visiting John Halford at Armscote, Worcestershire, they were seized by the authorities on December 17, 1673 and taken prisoners at Worcester.[28] This eighth and last imprisonment dragged on until February 12, 1675, and left Fox in broken health.

Many friends and others who knew him and respected him, sought to gain his release. Craig Horle has written an excellent description of these efforts, and has shown how his supporters were often at cross purposes.[29] Various persons petitioned Charles II to step in and release him, either in person or through others. Fox, who insisted he had done nothing wrong, refused to accept a pardon, for it implied guilt, and this made it more difficult to gain his freedom. Ellis Hookes, the paid "recording clerk" of Friends, George Whitehead, Thomas Moore, an influential Friend from Reigate, the attorney Thomas Rudyard, and others sought his release.[30]

Though Penn was apparently not involved during the first six months, Fox wrote to Margaret Fell in May asking her to enlist his help.[31] Penn went to see Fox at Worcester in the summer and began to exchange letters with him in late August.[32] In the first letter we have found, Fox and Lower mentioned the work being done by Thomas Moore, but went on to write about various Quaker issues such as the trouble Friends were having with the authorities in Maryland.[33] In Penn's letter of September 5 he referred to some of the same issues, described his visits with local Friends on his way home from Worcester, and wrote, 'I find, that a person of some quality has undertaken' to speak with the King about his imprisonment.[34]

Fox wrote the following month to ask Penn to become acquainted with William Cecil, younger son of the Earl of Salisbury, who was showing considerable interest in Friends, and also had some influence at court. Penn responded, and the two kept up a correspondence over the following weeks.[35] Fox was becoming discouraged about his situation, for, as he wrote later, he had been kept a prisoner and 'tossed to and from Worcester to London and from London to Worcester again three times'.[36] In the end, Fox was brought before the King's Bench in London where his case was thrown out because of errors, and a praemunire sentence for refusing to take an oath was dropped.[37] It is impossible to determine how influential Penn had been in all of this, but it is clear that Fox turned to him more and more as the months dragged on.[38] Both men published tracts against oaths, Penn, with others in May, and Fox in October.[39] By that time Fox had travelled to Swarthmoor Hall where he remained for more than 20 months to recuperate, and to dictate his journal to Thomas Lower.

One of the issues mentioned in the 1674 correspondence between Penn and Fox was the so-called Story-Wilkinson controversy.[40] John Story and John Wilkinson were both farmers in Westmorland who heard Fox at Firbank in 1652 and joined in the itinerant preaching with those called the Valiant Sixty. They were attached to the informal ways of Friends in the first generation, and came to resent the manner in which Fox organized monthly and quarterly meetings, and began to create a discipline. Wiliams Rogers, a Bristol merchant, joined the other two by 1676 and continued the controversy long after the death of the original separatists.[41]

Story probably began to object to the direction Friends were following in 1672 while Fox was in America, and a sizeable group of men and women were expressing opposition to his leadership and authority by the time of his return. Eventually some Friends in several counties withdrew from the main body. They objected to separate business meetings for women, and to the provision that couples wishing to marry under the care of Friends should present themselves to the Women's Meeting for consent. In turn, some in the larger body accused the Separatists of meeting in secret to avoid persecution, and paying tithes to the Anglican Church to avoid heavy fines. Fox tried to stay on the sidelines, and sought, indirectly, to find ways to settle the dispute and return Friends to a unified state. [42]

At the 1675 yearly meeting an epistle was drawn up to send out to all Friends which were regarded as extremely authoritarian by the Story-

Wilkinson wing. Penn was probably the author of the epistle though others also signed it, and this left no doubt that he, along with George Whitehead, Alexander Parker, and John Burnyeat supported Fox.[43] Because Margaret Fell was regarded as the architect of women's meetings, she was also rejected by the separatists.[44] In early April, 1676 Penn made a rare trip to Swarthmoor Hall to see Fox and his wife, and then went with Margaret Fell, Thomas Lower, and Sarah Fell to Drawwell, near Sedburgh to meet Story, Wilkinson and others including Rogers who came from Bristol.[45]

While travelling with the party of ministers in Holland and Germany in 1677 both Fox and Penn wrote back to England to urge Friends to put aside their differences and come together. Margaret Fell reported that the Separatists would not allow these letters to be heard. [46] In 1678 the two men went to Bristol together to seek some solution and end the controversy, for Friends in that area had responded to the schismatic leadership of Rogers.[47] In 1681 Penn joined others in endorsing a tract by Richard Snead, *An Exalted Diotrephes Reprehended,* which sought to end the controversy.[48] He followed this with his own pamphlet, *A Brief Examination and State of Liberty Spiritual...* in late November of the same year. This was a conciliatory essay asking for tolerance within the church, and called for his fellow Friends to keep 'in the Simplicity of Truth, and Cross of Jesus'.[49] Troubles continued in Bristol even after Fox had died, and in 1692 Penn issued one more conciliatory pamphlet, *Just Measures, in an Epistle of Peace and Love...*[50]

The two men next met at the 1677 yearly meeting, which Fox attended as he began his travels once more. When the sessions ended in mid-June, Fox, John Burnyeat and others accompanied Penn on his return to his country home in Sussex, called Worminghurst. During the next several weeks Robert Barclay, George Keith, Isaac Penington and others joined them to hold public meetings, both at Worminghurst and in the surrounding countryside.[51] Presumably Fox, Penn, Barclay and Keith discussed their mission to Holland and western Europe which began late in July. Fox and Burnyeat worked long hours on a reply to Roger William's *George Fox Digg'd out of his Burrowes* (Boston, 1676), written after a long, inconclusive debate between Williams and several Quakers in the summer of 1672.[52] While Fox had departed for Long Island before the debate was held, Burnyeat, with two other visiting ministers defended the Quaker side. In 1678 the reply appeared in London, *A New-England Fire-Brand Quenched.* The two men, and perhaps others in the group, halted their work and left Worminghurst on July 13.[53]

While George Fox had never visited the Friends in Holland and the German states to the east, he had written to them many times, and his words had appeared in Dutch and German language tracts for two decades. In 1677 he desired to travel to Holland to help Friends establish a yearly meeting and local business meetings, in addition to carrying on an ambitious programme of ministry in the area. He invited Robert Barclay and George Keith to accompany him as well as William Penn, who had visited the continent earlier in 1671. Keith's wife Elizabeth, Isabel Yeamans, daughter of Margaret Fell, and others were in the party, including Edward Haistwell who kept a journal of Fox's ministry and travels. Penn also kept a journal which he published in 1694.[54]

The party left Harwich on July 26 and after an uneventful crossing landed near Rotterdam where they stayed with Benjamin Furly. After holding meetings in that city, the group moved north to Amsterdam where they spent several days. Holland Yearly Meeting dated its founding from this time.[55] On August 6 Penn, Barclay, Furly and Keith started southeast, and two days later Fox, accompanied by Jan Claus as a translator headed northeast. They visited Friends meetings and families, getting as far north as Friedrichstadt where Fox set up both a men's meeting and a women's meeting. Along the way they stayed in Emden, Bremerhaven, Bremen and Hamburg, travelling most of the time by wagon. Back in Emden, the little group passed through Friesland, down toward Amsterdam and soon rejoined Penn at a place called Harlingen on September 11.[56]

In the meantime, Penn and his companions travelled to Osnabrück and on to Herford where they spent several days with Princess Elizabeth, granddaughter of James I of England and a cousin of Barclay. She had been drawn to Friends for some time, and this religious visit was an important event in the three months on the continent.[57] Barclay returned to Amsterdam and the remainder of the group headed south to Paderborn, Kassel, Frankfurt and Mannheim before starting down the Rhine toward Cologne, Nijmegen, and Utrecht.[58] As they neared Amsterdam Keith and Furly took a wagon for Rotterdam and Penn went to Amsterdam, and on north to Harlingen.[59]

After Fox and Penn spent three days together, the latter and Jan Claus, started toward Emden, Bremen and back to Herford while Fox returned to Amsterdam where he did a good bit of writing during the following weeks, in addition to visiting Friends in the area. While at Bremen, Penn was rejoined by George Keith and Benjamin Furly, who accompanied him as they visited Princess Elizabeth from September 22

to the 25th.[60] They journeyed to Lippstadt, and on to the Rhine at Wesel, and saw a number of groups of Friends and their sympathizers on the way back to Amsterdam, which they reached on October 7.[61]

During the next two weeks Penn and Fox were often together, along with Furly and Keith. During this time Penn and Keith held two debates with Galenus Abrahams, leader of the Collegiant Mennonites. Fox was present but refrained from joining the fray.[62] On other occasions Penn and Furley went to visit persons who might be responsive to Friends, and Fox joined them on one trip. By October 18 the party had moved to Rotterdam, where a large meeting was held, and then on October 21 they boarded the packet boat at Briel, bound for Harwich. This time it took three days and two nights to cross the Channel, but they landed safely, and the next day went their separate ways.[63]

While Fox and Penn appeared in meetings together frequently in the following months, and were sometimes guests in the same home. Penn's energies were turned toward two goals which were different from the ones claiming Fox's fullest attention. The first of these was political activity in 1678 and 1679, seeking the election to parliament of Algernon Sidney as a Whig, and enactment of new guarantees of religious toleration. He published tracts to support these goals, in addition to tireless campaigning and lobbying.[64] The second major emphasis was related to Quaker colonies in North America, beginning with his involvement in West New Jersey in 1675, and his request for a province of his own, addressed to Charles II in 1680. Although Fox was primarily concerned with the spiritual well-being of Friends, he did display an interest in these colonies, especially when thousands of Quakers migrated to West New Jersey and Pennsylvania. As a result, the two men consulted with one another on many occasions about affairs in America.

During his ministry in the English colonies George Fox had seen the Delaware Valley and New Jersey region in 1672 as he travelled from Maryland to New England and back. In May he had crossed the Delaware River at New Castle and made his way north toward Middletown where Richard Hartshorne (*c.* 1641-1722) lived. In late August he returned, travelling from Hartshorne's home to the spot where Burlington was founded on the Delaware five years later, and made his way down the west side of the river back to New Castle.[65]

Edward Byllynge and John Fenwick, two Quakers who purchased West New Jersey from Sir John Berkeley in 1674, began to quarrel over the colony, and William Penn was named by Friends to arbitrate the

matter later that year. Because the financial affairs of the two men remained muddled, Penn and two of Byllynge's creditors took control of the purchase in 1675.[66] Not waiting for the trustees to make decisions, Fenwick led a group of colonists across the Atlantic in 1675 and planned a colony near the mouth of the Delaware River which he named Salem. The trustees moved ahead more deliberately and arranged for a community to be developed in 1677 some 75 miles upriver, not far below the fall line, which was named Burlington.[67] Fox, aware of the unsettled state of affairs sent an epistle "To Friends in New Jersey in America" in the same year. He urged them to keep 'in the fear of God... For many eyes of other governments or colonies will be upon you; yea, the Indians, to see how you order your lives and conversations...'.[68] In 1681 he sent a similar epistle, "To Friends in Burlington, West Jersey".[69]

There were questions about the manner in which West New Jersey had been transferred from the Duke of York to Lord Berkeley and then to Byllynge and Fenwick. He had granted the land, but said nothing about the government, and Edmund Andros, governor of New York claimed West New Jersey was under his authority. Because James Stuart, Duke of York, was in Scotland late in 1679, both Fox and Penn asked Robert Barclay, his kinsman, to intercede with the Duke on behalf of Byllynge and the Friends in West New Jersey. After James responded favourably to this request in August of the following year, Penn's involvement decreased, and he turned more and more to his own province west of the Delaware.[70] Penn and Fox met from time to time for several years in an effort to straighten out the controversies in which Byllynge continued to find himself.[71]

Scholars who have written about the career of George Fox put much stress on his contribution to the creation of the "Holy Experiment" in Pennsylvania. Wildes, in a chapter entitled "Holy Experiment" admitted that there was no evidence the two men discussed the proposal, but adds 'it is unthinkable' that Fox and Penn were not in 'steady, close consultation'. He claims that Penn's fair treatment of the Indians, 'stemmed straight from Fox'.[72] Vernon Noble concluded that it was Fox who guided Penn's thinking about a Quaker colony in America, but found no evidence to support his theory. His chapter about Pennsylvania's "Holy Experiment" in the Fox biography, scarcely mentions Fox after the first two pages.[73] Henry Cadbury was more circumspect, suggesting that the men likely discussed Pennsylvania and other matters when they met in London.[74] Janney, in his biographies of

Penn and Fox did not discuss this question. Penn himself wrote that 'I had an opening of joy as to these parts in the Year 1661 at Oxford'.[75]

In his letter to Friends in Ireland, quoted above, Penn strongly suggests that he conferred with Fox about his promotional pamphlets. He said that the tract was 'first read to Traders, Planters & Shipmasters that know those parts, & finally to the most eminent of fr[ien]ds hereaway'.[76] In replying to criticism of his Frame of Government, Penn wrote that 'Dear George Fox, Alexander Parker, Geo. Whitehead... & an hundred more honest Friends have liked it...'.[77] As an expression of his admiration and respect for Fox, and to indicate that he had an interest in the new plantation, Penn granted Fox 1,250 acres and a city lot in December, 1681.[78]

The older man regarded the Friends in America as an important part of the Quaker community, and he soon wrote two epistles to them. One was addressed 'to all Planters and such who are Transporting themselves into Foreign Plantations in America', and the other was addressed 'to Friends in New Jersey and Pennsylvania'.[79] He asked that they let him know how many meetings they had, 'how Truth spreads and prospers amongst you', and urged them to send an annual letter or epistle to London Yearly Meeting. He continued to write from time to time as long as he lived.[80]

We find few references to meetings between the two men, and no letters, during the 18 months from the time Penn obtained his charter until his departure for Pennsylvania in August, 1682. Fox witnessed a letter to William Markham, Penn's cousin who was sent to Pennsylvania in the autumn of 1681 as Deputy Governor, and it is believed that the two men appeared at the Gracechurch Street Meeting during the summer of 1682, where authorities sought to prevent them from preaching.[81] Before sailing to Pennsylvania Penn went to visit Fox at Enfield, and reported on his health to Margaret Fox. He wrote, 'My soul loves him beyond [expression], and his dear love and care and counsel are in my heart. A sweet parting we had'.[82]

The two men corresponded a few times while Penn was in Pennsylvania.[83] Persons dissatisfied with their treatment at the hands of the proprietor would seek Fox's support, but I have found no indication that the older man took the complaints seriously. Concerned for Gulielma Penn, living down in Sussex at Worminghurst during her husband's absence, Fox went to visit her in March 1683 not long after the birth of her seventh child.[84] Gulielma Penn and Margaret Fox corresponded during Penn's absence.[85] Penn returned in the autumn of

1684, landing at Worthing, not far from Worminghurst early in October. After staying with his family for a time, he went up to London where he saw many Friends, including George Fox, and then wrote a letter to Margaret Fox to report that her husband was well. He also described affairs in Pennsylvania to her, and mentioned that he had found some Quakers critical of him, but made it clear that she and George were not among those. [86]

The two men met and consulted with one another during the next few years, but followed separate ways much of the time. Fox, who had made a brief visit to Holland in 1684, remained near London for the remainder of his life. He lived with Sarah Fell Mead and her husband William in Essex near Barking, or with Margaret Fell Rous and her husband John at Kingston opon Thames much of the time, but stayed with friends in London when he came into the city for Quaker affairs.[87] He met with Penn and others about problems in New Jersey, as well as about the suffering of Friends. He attended yearly meeting, Meeting for Sufferings, and other official gatherings as well as meetings for worship.[88] He continued to write epistles, memorials of deceased Friends, and other short works. In the notes kept about his daily activity in this period, called the Itinerary Journal, we see that Penn and Fox met or appeared together some two dozen times in the five years, 1685-1689.[89]

Penn was caught up in different matters during this period. After Charles II died in 1685, his friend James II became king, and the Quaker spent much time with the Roman Catholic monarch despite their differences of opinion and belief on many issues. Furthermore, the affair of his proprietary colony in America claimed his attention during these years. He went to the continent in 1686, to visit Friends and to meet secretly with William of Orange for James II, and sometimes travelled in England with the monarch, or for personal reasons.[90] After James II fled England in December, 1688, Penn was under suspicion for treason; he was arrested and held prisoner on three occasions during the next two years, but was never convicted of any wrong-doing.[91]

Though the two men seldom met during these years, they were close to one another in spirit. After Fox took a chill on Sunday, January 11, 1691 following the meeting at Gracechurch Street, and took to his bed at Henry Gouldney's home nearby, he asked frequently for Penn, who was out of town.[92] Fox seemed to realize this was the end, saying, 'I am clear, I am fully clear'.[93] Many friends came to visit him in the next two days, and Penn joined them as soon as he heard the news and could

come. After George Fox died Tuesday night, Penn wrote to tell Margaret Fox of his death. '... thy dear husband and my beloved and dear friend, G. Fox, has finished his glorious testimony this night about half an hour after nine, being sensible to the last breath.' In a postscript Penn added, 'He died as he lived, a lamb minding the things of God and His church to the last in an universal Spirit'.[94]

On the following morning, after the mid-week meeting, several ministers gathered to make plans for the funeral. These Friends, including William Penn, Stephen Crisp, George Whitehead and a dozen others found they were unable to deal with the situation at first. An unnamed Friend, describing the gathering said 'It was long before their grief allowed other expression than deep sighs, groans and tears'.[95] The funeral, planned for noon on Friday, drew close to 4,000 persons. Robert Barrow, in another letter, listed twelve ministers who preached or prayed in the two hour meeting, including Penn, and he was one of the five who spoke once more at the graveside service.[96]

Penn was asked by the editorial committee to prepare a preface for George Fox's *Journal,* and he took care to write one of his most polished and persuasive essays about his dear friend, his place in Christian history, and the development of Friends. In this essay he said:[97]

> I write my knowledge and not report; and my witness is true, having been with him for weeks and months together on divers occasions, and those of the nearest and most exercising nature, and that by night and day, by sea and by land, in this and in foreign countries; and I can say I never saw him out of his place, or not a match for every service and occasion.
>
> For in all things he acquitted himself like a man, yea, a strong man, a new and heavenly-minded man, a divine and a naturalist, and all of God Almighty's making... I have done when I have left this short epitaph to his name. Many sons have done virtuously in this day, but dear George thou excellest them all.
>
> *Edwin B. Bronner*

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1]Floyd Stovall, ed., Walt Whitman, *Prose Works* (New York, 1964), 652, 653.

[2]A. Neave Brayshaw, *The Personality of George Fox* (London, 1933), 26-28, 31-33, 165, 166; Vernon Noble, *The Man in Leather Breeches* (New York, 1953), 92, 250.

[3]William I. Hull, *William Penn, A Topical Biography* (New York, 1937), 129-131, 294-307; Mary Maples Dunn and Richard S. Dunn, eds., *The World of William Penn* (Philadelphia, 1986), Richard Dunn, 'Penny Wise and Pound Foolish: Penn as a Businessman', discusses his extravagent tastes, 41.

[4]John L. Nickalls, *The Journal of George Fox* (Cambridge, 1952), 554, 555, 557; Brayshaw, *Personality of Fox,* 126-129; Noble, *Man in Leather Breeches,* 213-217.

[5]The latest information on these marriages may be found in Dunn and Dunn, *The Papers of William Penn* (Philadelphia, 1981-1986), *1,* 68, 237-239; *3,* 413, 435-437 (hereafter, *PWP*); Catherine Owens Peare, *William Penn* (Philadelphia, 1957), 145-147, 341-349.

[6]Brayshaw, *Personality of Fox,* 7, 8; Noble, *Man in Leather Breeches,* 35-38; Nickalls, *Journal,* 1-3. Professor Larry Ingle, at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga is writing a new biography.

[7]Hull, *William Penn,* 67-77, 81, 82, 86, 87; Melvin E. Endy, Jr., *William Penn and Early Quakerism* (Princeton, 1973), 95-101. *PWP, 1,* 31, 32.

[8]See, Edwin B. Bronner and David Fraser, *The Papers of Wiliam Penn, 5, Wiliam Penn's Published Writings* (Philadelphia, 1986).

[9]Nickalls, *Journal,* 11; Hugh Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England* (New Haven, Conn., 1964), 34-38.

[10]Endy, *William Penn,* 95-105. He was in error about the date of his convincement. *PWP, 5,* 90-99; *PWP, 1,* 49, 50, 70, 72.

[11]Nickalls, *Journal,* 40-42, 52-70.

[12]*PWP, 1,* 81-97, 171-180, 191-212.

[13]Samuel M. Janney, *The Life of William Penn* (Philadelphia, 1851).

[14]*Memoirs of Samuel M. Janney* (Philadelphia, 1881), 128.

[15]*The Friend,* X (Seventh Month, 1852), 116 ff.

[16]*British Friend,* XII (Second mo., 1854), 46, 47, 50; Janney, *The Life of George Fox* (Philadelphia, 1853). Jacob Post published two biographical pamphlets in London at this same time. His *A Popular Memoir of William Penn* (London, 1850), was dedicated to delegates to a Congress at Frankfort, Germany, with the hope that it would contribute to the creation of 'Permanent Peace throughout the World'. Post's *A Brief Memoir of the Life and Public Character of George Fox* (London, 1854), included selections from Fox's 'Letter To the Governor of Barbados', a strong statement of Christian doctrine, not unlike the Apostles' Creed. It may have been issued to counteract the Janney biography.

[17]Philadelphia, 1965.

[18]New York, 1974. Wildes was not well at the time he completed the Penn biography, and apologized to me for the numerous errors.

[19]Augustus C. Buell, *William Penn as the Founder of Two Commonwealths* (New York, 1904), 67-69. Buell referred to an anti-Quaker tract published during the reign of William and Mary as his source, and said that Fox also sent ministers after Isaac Penington, Thomas Callowhill and Lord Coventry.

[20]Hull, *William Penn,* 110, 111. He had written a long review of the book in the *Friends Intelligencer* in 1904, 'William Penn - A Satire or a Eulogy', in which he tore the biography to shreds. *61* (1904), April 16, 241-243; April 30, 275, 276; May 14, 306-309. Hull had not located the unnamed tract, nor have I. It sounds like Francis Bugg (1640-1724?).

[21]Janney, *William Penn,* 42, 43. He said he had been told the story by 'J.P.' of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, who had it from James Simpson (1743-1811), who lived in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, in his early years; Hull, *William Penn,* 308.

[22]*PWP, 1,* 103, 132; Isabel Ross, *Margaret Fell* (London, 1949), 216; Henry J. Cadbury, *Narrative Papers of George Fox* (Richmond, Indiana, 1972), 77, 82, 86, 87.

[23]November 27, 1669, *PWP, 1,* 109.

[24]May 24, 1671, *PWP, 1,* 191, 208. Penn was in Newgate prison at the time, his second imprisonment in less than a year. The reply to Jenner, *A Serious Apology for the Principles and Practices of the People Call'd Quakers* ([London], 1671), written by Penn and George Whitehead, (*c.* 1636-1723), appeared in June, *PWP, 5,* 128-130.

[25]Nickalls, *Journal,* 579-581.

[26]*Ibid.,* 665.

[27]*Ibid.,* 670; Peare, *William Penn,* 159.

[28]Nickalls, *Journal,* 670; Ross, *Margaret Fell,* 247; Peare, *William Penn,* 159; *PWP, 1,* 287.

[29]Craig Horle, 'Changing Quaker Attitudes toward Legal Defense: The George Fox Case, 1673-75, and the Establishment of Meeting for Sufferings', J. William Frost and John M. Moore, eds., *Seeking the Light, Essays in Quaker History in Honor of Edwin B. Bronner* (Wallingford, Pennsylvania, 1986), 17-39.

[30]Nickalls, *Journal,* 674-677; *PWP, 1,* 289.

[31]*Ibid.,* 691.

[32]*PWP, 1,* 288-293.

[33]28 August, 1674, *PWP, 1,* 288-291.

[34]*PWP, 2,* 291-293. He began the letter, 'In the unalterable love of god, I salute thee, & my spirit visits thee, whom I Cannot but remember with all endeared affection'.

[35]Fox and Lower to Penn, 10 October, 1674, *PWP, 1,* 295; Penn to Fox, 20, 21 November, 1674, 'The Papers of William Penn', Microfilm edition (Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1975), 1:660; to Penn from George and Margaret Fox, 25 November, 1674, *Ibid.,* 1:665; Penn to Fox, 1 December, 1674, *PWP, 1,* 297; Fox to Penn, 11 January, 1675, *PWP, 1,* 298; Horle, 'Changing Quaker Attitudes', *Seeking the Light,* 30, 31.

[36]Nickalls, *Journal,* 705.

[37]Horle, 'Changing Quaker Attitudes', *Seeking the Light,* 34; Nickalls, *Journal,* 704, 705. Fox had refused the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy in January, 1674.

[37]Peare, *William Penn,* 166; 'Their correspondence demonstrates the growing bond between the two leaders...'. *PWP, 1,* 287.

[39]*A Treatise of Oaths..., ([London], 1675), signed by William Penn, Richard Richardson and eleven others, PWP, 5,* 201, this tract went through many printings; Fox, *A small Treatise concerning Swearing...* (London, 1675), reprinted in *Gospel Truth Demonstrated* (London, 1706), 469-482.

[40]Fox and Lower to Penn, 28 August, 1674; Penn to Fox, 5 September, 1674, *PWP, 1,* 288, 292.

[41]William Charles Braithwaite, *The Second Period of Quakerism* (Cambridge, 1961), Chapter XI, 'The Wilkinson-Story Separation', 290-323; *PWP, 1,* 327, 328; Endy, *William Penn,* 133, 134.

[42]Richard T. Vann, *The Social Development of British Quakers, 1655-1755* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), 102-106; Braithwaite, *Second Period,* 296, 297, 309; Nickalls, *Journal,* Henry J. Cadbury's 'George Fox's Later Years', 718.

[43]It contained provisions for disciplining or condemning a meeting which was unruly, and outlined how couples wishing to marry were to appear before the Women's Meeting as well as the Men's Meeting. *PWP, 1,* 328-333.

[44]Penn wrote to Fox, 4 March, 1676 about various matters, including the criticism of Margaret Fell by the Story-Wilkinson group. '... Poor Margaret is so much smitt at, and run upon... as if she were the Cause...' *PWP, 1,* 360.

[45]Braithwaite, *Second Period,* 304, 305, note, p. 679; Ross, *Margaret Fell,* 288.
[46]*PWP, 1,* 514.
[47]Norman Penney, *The Short Journal of George Fox* (Cambridge, 1925), "The Haistwell Diary", 263-265, 375; Braithwaite, *Second Period,* 313, 314.
[48](London, 1681), *PWP, 5,* 277, 278.
[49](London, 1681), *PWP, 5,* 279-281.
[50]*PWP, 5,* 378-380.
[51]Penney, *Short Journal,* "Haistwell Diary", 235; Nickalls, *Journal,* Cadbury, 721.
[52]*Ibid.;* Arthur J. Worrall, *Quakers in the Colonial Northeast* (Hanover, New Hampshire, 1980), 35-37.
[53]The second part, *Something in Answer to Roger Williams his Appendix,* was signed G.F., J.B., 5 Month [July], 1677, and was undoubtedly completed at Worminghurst. While preparing Volume *5* of *The Papers of William Penn* I endeavoured to discover whether Penn had contributed to this volume, but never found any evidence to confirm that theory. Hull, *William Penn,* 219, claims that Penn was a co-author, but offers no evidence.
[54]Nickalls, *Journal,* Cadbury, 722-728; Penney, *Short Journal,* "Haistwell Diary", 236-255; *PWP, 1,* 425-508; *An Account of W. Penn's Travails in Holland and Germany* (London, 1694), *PWP, 5,* 420-423. Text also available in *A Collection of the Works of William Penn* (London, 1726), I, 50-116. In the seventeenth century the word "travails" was sometimes used to describe important, serious travels. Did Penn publish his *Travails* in 1694 to emphasis his close relationship with Fox, when he was under serious criticism from some Quakers?
[55]*Short Journal,* "Haistwell Diary", 239; *PWP, 1,* 439.
[56]*Short Journal,* "Haistwell Diary", 239-247.
[57]*PWP, 1,* 439-469. Fox wrote a letter to Princess Elizabeth which was delivered to her by Isabel Yeamans during this visit, *Short Journal,* "Haistwell Diary", 239.
[58]*PWP, 1,* 446.
[59]*PWP, 1,* 468; *Short Journal,* "Haistwell Diary", 248; *PWP, 1,* 469.
[60]*Short Journal,* "Haistwell Diary", 249-251; *PWP, 1,* 473-488; arrival of Keith and Furley, 484.
[61]*PWP, 1,* 488-493. A map portraying Penn's two journeys is found on page 429.
[62]*Short Journal,* "Haistwell Diary", 253, 254; *PWP, 1,* 493, 499. I believe Henry Cadbury was in error when he wrote that this debate was on September 8, for Penn, Keith and Fox were not together in Amsterdam until October 7, Nickalls, *Journal,* Cadbury, 726.
[63]*Short Journal,* "Haistwell Diary", 254, 255; *PWP, 1,* 500.
[64]For a biographical sketch of Algernon Sidney see *PWP, 1,* 511, 547; for brief summaries of Penn's three political pamphlets written at this time see *PWP, 5,* 237-242, 245-247, 248-250. Mary Maples Dunn wrote about this period in Penn's life in *William Penn, Politics and Conscience* (Princeton, 1967), 34-43.
[65]Nickalls, *Journal,* 618, 619, 630-634; for Hartshorne, see *PWP, 2,* 342n.
[66]John E. Pomfret, *The Province of West New Jersey* (Princeton, 1956), 65-68; *PWP, 1,* 383; *PWP, 5,* 221, 222.
[67]Pomfret, *West New Jersey,* 71-73, 102-106.
[68]T. Canby Jones, *The Power of the Lord Over All* (Richmond, Indiana, [1989]), No. *340,* May 4, 1677, 351, 352.
[69]*Ibid.,* No. *367,* n.d., 392, 393.
[70]Pomfret, *West New Jersey,* 111, 112; *PWP, 2,* 23-25.

[71]Penney, *Short Journal,* "Itinerary Journal", 103, 308; Pomfret *West New Jersey,* 141; Nickalls, *Journal,* Cadbury, 735, 736.

[72]Wildes, *Voice of the Lord,* 412-418, quotations, 413.

[73]Noble, *Man in Leather Breeches,* Ch. 21, 254-265. Rufus M. Jones, in *George Fox, Seeker and Friend* (New York, 1930), 163, stated that Fox's visit to America 'led to the launching of the "Holy Experiment" in Pennsylvannia', but provides no supporting evidence.

[74]Nickalls, *Journal,* Cadbury, 735, 736.

[75]To Robert Turner and others, 12 April, 1681, *PWP, 2,* 89; Hull, *Wiliam Penn,* 218.

[76]To Robert Turner and others, *PWP, 2,* 89.

[77]To Jasper Batt, 5 February, 1683, *PWP, 2,* 348. Beyond this reference there is no indication that Fox was involved in writing the Frame of Government, and his interests did not lie in that direction, *PWP, 2,* 135-238, "The Frame of Government of Pennsylvannia, 1681-1682".

[78]*PWP, 2,* 643; for a copy of the deed, see Penny, *The Journal of George Fox* (Cambridge, 1911), II, 365-367. Fenn apparently gave 1,000 acres to Alexander Parker, and 500 acres to both John Burnyeat and George Whitehead; the latter was also given a city lot, *PWP, 2,* 634, 639, 656.

[79]Jones, *The Power of the Lord,* No. *376,* [1682], 404; No. *379,* 22 February, 1683, 407.

[80]*Ibid.,* Nos. *404, 405, 408, 412,* 1686-1688, 455-457, 459, 460, 467, 468.

[81][28 October, 1681], *PWP, 2,* 129; Cadbury, *Narrative Papers of George Fox,* 55, 57.

[82]14 August, 1682, *PWP, 2,* 277.

[83]WP to Jasper Batt, 5 February, 1683, *PWP, 2,* 346-349; James Claypoole to WP, 1 April, 1683, *PWP, 2,* 369, Batt to WP, [August, 1683], *PWP, 2,* 463, 466n. In Cadbury's *Annual Catalogue of George Fox's Papers* Philadelphia, 1939), he found references to three letters from Fox to Penn in this period, pp. 173, 174, 179.

[84]Claypoole to WP, 1 April, 1683, *PWP, 2,* 370; Gulielma Penn to Margaret Fox, 21 August, 1683, *PWP, 2,* 460; Nickalls *Journal,* Cadbury, 736, 746, 750.

[85]Gulielma Penn to Margaret Fox, 21 August, 1683, *PWP, 2,* 460, 461; 24 August, 1684, *PWP, 2,* 597, 598. There are references to other letters, Ross, *Margaret Penn,* 322-324; Cadbury, *Narrative Papers,* 240, 241.

[86]29 October, 1684, *PWP, 2,* 605, 606.

[87]Ross, *Margaret Fell,* 330; Nickalls, *Journal,* Cadbury, 747.

[88]Penney, *Short Journal,* "Itinerary Journal", xiii-xix, xxiii-xxvii.

[89]*Ibid.,* 95-199.

[90]*PWP, 3,* 18, 19.

[91]*Ibid.,* 217, 236, 251, 252, 283, 284; Joseph Illick, *William Penn the Politician* (Ithaca, New York, 1965), 103-111.

[92]Henry Gouldney to John Rodes, 15 January, 1691, Mrs. Godfred Locker Lampson, *A Quaker Post-Bag, Letters to Sir John Rodes* (London, 1910), 51, 52.

[93]Many volumes contain descriptions of Fox's last illness, this quotation is from Nickalls, *Journal,* Cadbury, 752. See, Penny, *Short Journal,* "Itinerary Journal", 222, 353; Penney, *Cambridge Journal,* II, 369-371, 495; William Beck and T. Frederick Ball, *The London Friends' Meetings* (London, 1869), 154-157.

[94]13 January, 1691, Helen G. Crosfield, *Margaret Fox of Swarthmoor Hall* (London, n.d.), 188, 189; "Papers of William Penn", microfilm edition, 6:532.

[95]The quotation was paraphrased by Beck and Ball, *The London Friends' Meetings,* 156, presumably from the letter by an unnamed Friend to John Airey, 15 January, 1691, Penney, *Cambridge Journal,* II, 369-371.

[96]*Ibid.,* 495.

[97]Nickalls, *Journal,* xlvii, xlviii; the pages of the Preface were unnumbered in the 1694 edition, and it was omitted from some copies. These quotations come from pages, xxxvi, xxxvii in the 1831 edition of the *Journal* as part of an eight volume reprinting of *The Works of George Fox.* This edition has just been reissued as a New Foundation Publication (State College, Pennsylvania, 1990). For a discussion of the printing of the Preface, and its reissue as *A Brief Account of the Rise and Progress of the People Called Quakers* (London, 1694), see *PWP, 5,* 410-416.

A COLLECTION OF QUAKER WRITINGS AT NIJMEGEN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

In the second half of the seventeenth century and in the early eighteenth century contacts between English and Dutch Quakers were frequent and often intensive. Famous English Quakers like George Fox, William Penn and Stephen Crisp visited Holland, and several of their works were translated into Dutch. The Quaker merchant Benjamin Furly, who lived at Rotterdam for many years, and the Quaker historian William Sewel, born of English parents at Amsterdam, played an important role in the relations between English and Dutch Quakers in their day. In view of this it is rather surprising to find that the number of early English Quaker writings in Holland, at least in the public and university libraries, is relatively small.[1] However, the University Library of the Catholic University at Nijmegen forms an exception in this respect. This library - perhaps one of the last places where one would have expected to find such a collection - possesses a substantial and coherent body of early English Quaker writings. The person responsible for this is Dr. L.J. Rogier, who was Professor of History at Nijmegen University from 1948 to 1964 and had a special interest in church history.[2] In December 1949 Dr. Rogier bought for the University Library a large number of mainly eighteenth-century English Quaker pamphlets and books from the London bookseller Alfred Wilson.[3] The Nijmegen collection consists of works nearly all of which belong to the second large period of Quakerism, extending from the Toleration Act in 1689 to the evangelical movement in the 1830s. Only a few of the pamphlets and books in the Nijmegen collection are also present in other public and university libraries in Holland.[4] After arriving in Nijmegen early in 1950 the collection has remained virtually unnoticed, both in Nijmegen itself and elsewhere, and the present article attempts to redress that situation.

The items in the collection range in date from 1675 to 1840, and in the list that follows all the works, except for the first two, have been arranged chronologically. The list opens with two collections of Epistles

from the Yearly Meetings, the first extending from 1675 to 1759, published as one book in 1760, the second a collection of the separately published Epistles from 1760 to 1840, bound together in one volume. The description of each item in the list has been limited to the following entries: author, title, place of publication, printer (only if relevant for identification), date of publication, format, the Nijmegen University Library class-mark and the bibliographical reference. Joseph Smith's *A Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books* (2 vols., London, 1867) is the primary bibliographical source and further the Wing, ESTC, NSTC[5] or *National Union Catalog* reference number, if available, is given. Provenance inscriptions and other manuscript notes are recorded as well.

Viewing the collection as a whole one sees that especially the middle of the eighteenth century is well represented. Furthermore, Stephen Crisp, John Crook, Joseph Besse and Sophia Hume are all present with more than one work. Over one third of the pamphlets and books was published by the well-known Quaker printers Luke and Mary Hinde. A remarkable feature of the provenance of the collection is that more than half of the items were once, in the 1840s, in the possession of "Thomas Westcombe", and this makes it likely that the collection, as it figured in the 1949 Wilson catalogue, remained intact between 1840 and the present. One of the 49 items of the list - Bishop Hayter's *An Examination* (1742) - is a vehemently anti-Quaker book but it has been included because it naturally goes with Joseph Besse's *A Vindication* (1741). One item is not a printed publication, but a manuscript, viz., a manuscript copy of the 1826 Epistle from the Yearly Meeting.

Frans Karsten

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1]I have checked the holdings of the Royal Library at The Hague, all the university libraries and several of the "likely" public libraries. The Library of the "Quaker Centrum" in Amsterdam has a fair number of seventeenth-, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century English Quaker writings, almost all of them acquired through gifts in the past fifty years.

[2]Prof. Rogier wrote a history of the church in Europe in the eighteenth century: *De Kerk in het Tijdperk van Verlichting en Revolutie (1715-1801)*, Hilversum - Antwerpen, 1964, vol. VII of L.J. Rogier, R. Aubert, M.D. Knowles (eds.), *Geschiedenis van de Kerk*, 9 vols., Hilversum - Antwerpen, 1963-1973.

[3]See B.L. S.C. Wilson (2), *A Catalogue of Books of the 16th to the 18th Century. Catalogue Number Eight* [London, 1949], pp. 14-15. The items in question were numbers 151, 153-157, 159, 160, 162, 63, 165, 166. On 24 December 1949 Nijmegen University

Library paid to Wilson the sum of £15.12.6d for the collection. The only book in the present Nijmegen Quaker collection that was not obtained in this way is George Fox's *Journal* (1827); this was bought by the University Library at some time between 1959 and 1963.

[4]The Library of the "Quaker Centrum" in Amsterdam has four: Stephen Crisp, *A Memorable Account* (London, 1694), William Penn, *A Collection of the Works* (London, 1726), Joseph Gurney Bevan, *A Refutation* (London, 1800) and George Fox, *A Journal* (London, 1827).

The University Library of the "Vrije Universiteit" in Amsterdam has one: Stephen Crisp, *A Memorable Account* (London, 1694).

The Library of the "Internationaal Institut voor Sociale Geschiedenis" (IISG) in Amsterdam has one: Anthony Pearson, *The Great Case of Tithes* (7th ed., London, 1762).

[5]Wing, *Short-Title Catalogue... 1641-1700,* New York, 1972; ESTC Eighteenth-Century Short-Title Catalogue, British Library; NSTC Nineteenth-Century Short-Title Catalogue.

- *Epistles from the Yearly Meeting of the People called Quakers Held in London to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings in Great Britain, Ireland and elsewhere; from the year 1675 to 1759 inclusive. With an index to the principal subjects of advice,* London, 1760, fol.

NUL 5000-01[1] Smith I, p. 712
inscribed (end-leaves): "Tho: Westcombe 1840" ESTC t 084115
"Thomas Westcombe 1842"

- [*Yearly Epistles 1760 to 1840;* complete set of separately paginated epistles, bound in one volume]

NUL 5000-01[2]
inscribed (end-leaves): "Thomas Westcombe 1842"
inscribed (p. 1 of the Yearly Epistle for 1775): "Samuel Isaac Epistle 1775".

- [Stephen Crisp], *An Epistle to the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings of Friends,* [London, 1692] brs.

NUL 5000-01[1] (inserted between p. 56 and p. 57) Smith I, p. 728
inscribed: "To John Berut [Beret?]" Wing C6935

- Stephen Crisp, *A Memorable Account of the Christian Experiences, Gospel Labours, Travels and Sufferings of that Ancient Servant of Christ Stephen Crisp, in his Books and Writings herein Collected,* London, 1694, 4^0

NUL 5070-06 Smith I, p. 472
inscribed (f.al[v]): "John Bassford, Leicester 1793" Wing C6920
(f.d2l[v]): "John Clarke Eujus [*sic*] Liber"
(p. 118 and p. 121): "John Rolin"

(p. 539): "John Bassford His Book 1796"
(end-leaves): "John Clarke his Booke, Eius Liber"
:"Elizabeth Craven"
:"Sarah Frost"
:"Cozen White"

-Joseph Wyeth, *Anguis Flagellatus; or: a Switch for the Snake. Being an answer to the third and last edition of the Snake in the Grass, London, 1699,* 8^0

NUL 5070-05 Smith II, pp. 965-6
inscribed (tp): "James Baker 1813" Wing W3757

-*An Epistle from the Meeting for Sufferings in London, the 16th of the Second Month, 1714... signed Benjamin Bealing,* [London, 1714], fol.
NUL 5000-01[2] Smith I, p. 728
ESTC t 032818

- William Penn, *A Collection of the Works of William Penn. In Two Volumes,* London, 1726, fol.
NUL 5070-09[1,2] Smith II, p. 323
Inscribed (end-leaves vols. 1 and 2): "Mary Alexander to Sarah Hall. 1811" ESTC t 08863
(end-leaves vol. 2): "Sarah Halls"

- Samuel Fuller, [*Some Queries offered to the consideration of the people called Quakers*]. *A Serious Reply to Twelve Sections of Abusive Queries... concluding the works of Joseph Boyse...,* Dublin, 1728, 8^0
NUL 5080-02 Smith I, p. 826
inscribed (end-leaves): "Jer. Thistlethwaite own Book 1794" ESTC t 102508
: "Jn[0] Turner of Lurgan in ye North of Ireland, his Gift to Mary Richardson 8[mo] 9th 1729"
: "Mary Richardson Booke 1736"
: "Mary Richardson Booke 1755"

- Joseph Besse, *A Confutation of the Charge of Deism: wherein the Christian and Orthodox Sentiments of William Penn are fully demonstrated,* London, 1734, 8^0
NUL 5070-10 Smith I, p. 253
ESTC t 129695

- *From our Yearly-Meeting, Held at Philadelphia... from the 17th, to the 21st day of the 7th Month. 1737... sign'd... John Kinsey,* Philadelphia [rep. London], [1737], fol.
NUL 5000-01[1] (pasted in at the end) Smith I, p. 761
ESTC w 005873

- *Rules for Removals and Settlements of Friends, Agreed on by the Yearly Meeting held in London, 1737,* [n.p., 1737?], 4^0
NUL 5000-01[2] Smith I, p. 714
NUC NF 0392515

- [Joseph Besse], *A Vindication of a Book, intituled, A Brief Account of many of the Prosecutions of the people called Quakers, &c. Presented to the Members of both Houses of Parliament: In answer to a late Examination thereof, in Defence of the Clergy of the Diocese of York,* London, 1741, 8^0
NUL 5080-03 Smith I, p. 256
ESTC t 084126

-[Thomas Hayter], *An Examination of a Book lately printed by the Quakers... intituled, A Brief Account of many of the Prosecutions of the people called Quakers,* London, 1742, 8^0
NUL 5080-04 not in Smith's *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana* (London, 1873)
NUC NH 0211516
ESTC n 006945

- Alice Hayes, *A Legacy, or Widow's Mite; left by Alice Hayes to her Children and others. Being a brief relation of her life,* 2nd ed., London, 1749, 8^0
NUL 5070-07[6] Smith I, pp. 927-8
MS list of contents for the whole volume (front fly-leaf)
ESTC t 103816

- Sophia Hume, *An Exhortation to the Inhabitants of the Province of South-Carolina, to bring their Deeds to the Light of Christ, in their own Consciences,* Bristol, 1750, 8^0
NUL 5070-01[6] Smith I, p. 1019
inscribed for whole volume: "Thomas Westcombe 1840"
ESTC t 098606
MS list of contents for the whole volume in Westcombe's hand (front fly-leaf)

- *To the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings of Friends in Great Britain, Ireland and America.* [From the Meeting for Sufferings in London, the sixth Day of the Seventh Month, 1751: on the Act of Parliament "for regulating the Commencement of the Year, and correcting the Calendar now in Use"], [London, 1751], fol.
NUL 5000-01[2] Smith I, p. 729
ESTC t 051349

-[Joseph Besse], *A Letter concerning the Glory and Excellency of the peaceable state of the Kingdom of the Messiah,* London, 1755, 8^0
NUL 5070-07[3] Smith I, p. 258
ESTC t 069236

- Humphry Marshall, *A few Observations concerning Christ, or the Eternal Word,* London, 1755, 8^0
NUL 5070-07[4] Smith II, p. 148
ESTC t 093381

- Benjamin Bangs, *Memoirs of the Life and Convincement of that worthy Friend Benjamin Bangs... by Joseph Hobson,* London, 1757, 8^0
NUL 5070-01[2] Smith I, p. 164
ESTC t 094570

- *A Collection of Acts of Parliament and Clauses of Acts of Parliament, relative to those Protestant Dissenters who are usually called by the name of Quakers, from the Year 1688,* London, 1757, 4^0
NUL 5070-04 Smith II, p. 266
inscribed (front fly-leaf): "This Book belongs to Bromyard Monthly Meeting" ESTC t 106741

- Stephen Crisp, *An Epistle to Friends concerning the Present and Succeeding Times,* [7th ed.], London, 1757, 8^0
NUL 5070-01[9] Smith I, p. 467
ESTC t 064486

- John Crook, *A Short History of the Life of John Crook... written by himself,* 2nd ed., London, 1757, 8^0
NUL 5070-01[3] Smith I, p. 491
ESTC t 115899

- John Fry, *A Serious and Affectionate Address to the People called Quakers,* London, 1758, 8^0
NUL 5070-07[1] Smith I, pp. 817-8
ESTC t 068076

- Daniel Roberts, *Some Memoirs of the Life of John Roberts. Written by his son Daniel Roberts,* London, sold by Luke Hinde in George-yard, Lombard Street, [175-?], 8^0
NUL 5070-01[8] Smith II, p. 498
NUC NR 0318939
ESTC n 023694

- John Crook, *An Epistle for Unity, to prevent the Wiles of the Enemy,* London, 1760, 8^0

NUL 5070-01[4] Smith I, p. 485
ESTC t 115898

- [Sophia Hume], *Extracts from Divers ancient Testimonies of Friends and others, corresponding with the Doctrines of Christianity,* [London?], [Printed and sold by Luke Hinde, in George-yard, Lombard Street], [1760?], 8^0

NUL 5070-07[2] Smith I, p. 1020
ESTC t 098610

- *Tender Advice and Caution to Friends, respecting their putting out Lights on those call'd rejoycing Nights, and the not opening their Shops, on Days appointed by human Authority for publick Fasts, Feasts and Thanks-givings* [Second-day's Morning-meeting, held in London the 10th of the Third Month, 1760]. [London], 1760, fol.

NUL 5000-01[2] Smith I, p. 754
ESTC t 049956

- *The Liberty of the Subject and the Right of Juries asserted, in the Remarkable Trial of William Penn and William Mead, at the Old-Bailey... the 1st, 3rd, 4th and 5th of September, 1670,* London, Printed for J. Major in Three Tun Court in Ivy-Lane, near Newgate-street, [about 1760?], 8^0

NUL 5070-01[1] Smith II, p. 285

- Deborah Bell, *A Short Journal of the Labours and Travels in the Work of the Ministry. Of that faithful Servant of Christ, Deborah Bell,* London, 1762, 8^0

NUL 5070-01[5] Smith I, p. 233
ESTC t 099027

- Anthony Pearson, *The Great Case of Tithes truly stated, clearly open'd and fully resolv'd,* 7th ed., London, 1762, 8^0

NUL 5070-08[1] Smith II, p. 276
ESTC t 097514

- William Shewen, *Counsel to the Christian-Traveller: Also Meditations and Experiences made publick,* London, 1764, 8^0

NUL 5070-01[10] Smith II, p. 569
NUC NS 0504410
ESTC n 028220

- John Alderson, *Some Useful Observations and Advices taken from the Mouth of John Alderson, deceased,* London, 1765, 8^0

NUL 5070-07[5] Smith I, p. 7
ESTC t 061901

- Robert Barclay, *The Anarchy of the Ranters and other Libertines, the Hierarchy of the Romanists, and other pretended Churches, equally refused, and refuted,* London, 1771, 8^0

NUL 5070-08[2] Smith I, p. 179
ESTC t 060237

- [Catherine Whitton], *A Testimony for the Lord and his Truth: given forth by the Women Friends at their Yearly-Meeting at York.* [London?, 178-?], fol.

NUL 5000-01[1] (pasted in at the end) Smith I, p. 794
NUC NF 0393729

- Catharine Phillips, *Reasons why the People called Quakers cannot so fully unite with the Methodists, in their Missions to the Negroes in the West India Islands and Africa, as freely to contribute thereto,* London, 1792, 8^0

NUL 5070-08[4] Smith II, pp. 405-6
ESTC t 084250

- Samuel Crisp, *Two Letters writ by Samuel Crisp, (About the Year 1702) to some of his Acquaintance, upon his Change from a chaplain of the Church of England, to join with the people called Quakers,* 5th ed., London, n.d.

NUL 5070-07[7] Smith I, p. 465
(4th ed. pbd. in 1746)

- Sophia Hume, *A Caution to such as observe Days and Times. To which is added, An Address to Magistrates, Parents, and Masters of Families, &c,* n.p., n.d., 8^0

5070-01[7] Smith I, p. 1019
NUC NH 0610366?

- Joseph Gurney Bevan, *A Refutation of some of the more modern Misrepresentations of the Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers; with a Life of James Nayler;... Also... A Summary of the History, Doctrine and Discipline of Friends,* London, 1800, 8^0

NUL5070-08[3] (lacks pp. 63-96, the Life of James Nayler)
Smith I, p. 260
ESTC t 055233

- *From the Yearly Meeting of Friends held in London, by adjournments, from the 20th, to the 30th inclusive, of the fifth month, 1818... signed... by William Dilworth Crewdson* [on training the children of Friends "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord"], [London, 1818], 4^0

NUL 5000-01[2] Smith I, p. 717

- "to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings of Friends in Great Britain and Ireland... Signed in and on behalf of the Yearly Meeting held in London, by adjournments from the 24th of the 5th month to the 1st of the 6th month, inclusive, 1826, Josiah Forster..." [MS copy of the 1826 Epistle from the Yearly-Meeting], fol.

NUL 5000-01[2]
inscribed: "(copy William Manley)"

- George Fox, *A Journal or Historical Account of the Life, Travels, Sufferings, Christian Experiences, and Labour of Love in the Work of the Ministry of... George Fox,* 2 vols., London, 1827, 8^0

NUL 5070-03[1,2] Smith I, p. 690
inscribed (inside cover vols. 1 and 2): "Friends Library Buiten Street, Cape Town No. 5... No. 6" NSTC 2F12948

- [Advertisement leaflet] *Just published, by W. Philips, George Yard, Lombard Street, London. A Journal of the Life of George Fox, in two vols. 8vo. price 24s. boards. Printed verbatim from the original Edition of 1694./ The select works of William Penn, in three volumes octavo, price £2.2s. boards,*
[London, 1827], $\frac{1}{2}^0$

NUL, inserted in 5000-01[2]

- *At a Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, held in London, by adjournments, from the 20th of the 5th month, to the 29th of the same, inclusive, 1829... signed... by Josiah Forster* [on the diffusion of anti-christian doctrines among "our brethren on the American Continent"], London, [1829], 4^0

NUL 5000-01[2] Smith I, p. 719
NSTC 2F 16911

- *A brief statement of the reasons why the religious Society of Friends object to the payment of Tithes, and other demands of an ecclesiastical nature: issued by the Yearly Meeting of the said Society, held in London, in the fifth Month 1832,... signed... by Samuel Tuke,* [London, 1832], fol.

NUL 5000-01[2] Smith I, p. 720
NSTC 2F 16918

- *Yearly Meeting, 1833. 1. We believe that at times the Lord is pleased, in an especial manner, to visit nations by his judgments... signed William Manley,* [London], Darton and Harvey, Printers, Gracechurch Street, [1833], fol., pp. 3 [1]

NUL 5000-01[2] NSTC 2F 16928?

- *At a Meeting for Sufferings held in London, the 6th of the 9th month, 1833:*
  - *The Queries and Advices as agreed upon by the last Yearly Meeting are now printed and circulated, agreeably to its direction,* [London, 1833], fol.

NUL 5000-01[2] Smith I, p. 736

- *Epistle of Counsel, from the Yearly Meeting, held in London, by adjournment from the 18th of the 5th month, to the 28th of the same, inclusive, 1836... signed... by Samuel Tuke* [on the attendance of meetings for worship], [London, 1836], 4^0

NUL 5000-01[2] Smith I, p. 721
NSTC 2F 16942

- *An Epistle from the Meeting for Sufferings, held in London by adjournment, the 5th of the 12th month, 1836... signed... Peter Bedford* [address to Friends on publications being circulated against some of their christian views], [London, 1836], 4^0

NUL 5000-01[2] Smith I, p. 736
NSTC 2F 16943

- *A Testimony to the Authority of Christ in His Church, and to the Spirituality of the Gospel Dispensation; also against some of the corruptions of professing Christendom... signed... by George Stacey,* [London, 1840], fol.

NUL 5000-01[2] Smith I, p. 722
NSTC 2F 16975

IRISH QUAKER PERSPECTIVES ON THE ANTI-SLAVERY MOVEMENT*

Introduction

Discussion of the anti-slavery movement inevitably in an Irish context involves discussion of Quakers, or 'Friends', members of the Religious Society of Friends. If the pursuit of a concept of a wider humanity was in nineteenth-century Ireland, and earlier, polarised and distorted by nationalistic and sectarian assumption, some middle ground remained. To this, Quakers, at all periods, were attracted even if they were excluded and self-excluded from direct party political activity.

A study of the evolution of the Quaker anti-slavery position in Ireland and the related internal doctrinal considerations and accommodations involved in their humanitarian stance might be expected to throw some light on any wider Irish advocacy of the abolition of slavery. Quaker activity provides a consistent biographical and structural link that enables an analysis of the development of the various anti-slavery societies that were from time to time to emerge during the nineteenth century in Ireland. Material for such an analysis is conveniently available in the Quaker records of their 'Yearly', 'Quarterly' and 'Monthly' administrative 'Meetings' and in family documents. Apart from that, the material must be derived chiefly from newspaper reports. These are somewhat disparate and must be used in an impressionistic way. Nevertheless the major themes and assumptions of administration, organisation and activity used by secular anti-slavery societies clearly emerge. In most of these Quakers were active.

Quaker consensual structures ensured that the promotion of secular philanthropic or, for that matter, of business and joint-stock companies, proved singularly congenial to them. They derived their humanitarian stance from a conception of the indwelling Christ in the human heart. From that resulted both individual obligations and communal disciplinary implications. The Society nurtured a variety of responses in individuals that drove them to undertake the promotion of "anti-slavery" as a matter of burning concern. Its structures of close interrelated family groups, of transatlantic business and philanthropic

contacts reinforced by the constant patterns of mutual review implicit in their discipline ensured that its membership had a powerful incentive towards informed humanitarian action.

Ireland's direct involvement in the slave-trade was minimal to the point of invisibility in comparison with that of England. It may be supposed that some Irish Quakers like other merchants were involved in the West Indies provision trade but their chief links 1720-70 were with mainland North America where their brethren were significantly not associated with the slave trade.[1] Occasionally, in newspaper reports from Cork and Belfast negro servants or negro runaways were advertised.[2] In one such case in Cork in 1769, two merchants with names indicating Quaker antecedents were censured for volunteering to aid in the recapture of such negroes.[3] The merchants in question, Devonshire & Strettell were chiefly associated with the export of goods to the West Indies and the import of flax-seed from North America.[4] They had been disowned several years before for offences against the Quaker discipline. [5]

During the two decades from 1770 on, a sharpened awareness of slavery had developed among Irish Friends as well as a wish to assist their American brethren in the abolition of the slave-trade. It reflected the concern of their American and English brethren and partially derived from their contacts with them. Epistles with anti-slavery sentiment from London Yearly Meetings (L.Y.M.) were formally read in Irish 'meetings'. The Irish National Meeting in 1776 issued an edition of the 'Journal' of John Woolman, the American Quaker who urged the necessity of the manumission of slaves.[6] Further examples might be adduced. Anti-slavery emerged also in business areas in which Friends were active. Following the promotion of an anti-slavery petition from the Dublin Committee of Merchants in 1788 a similar move was promoted among Cork merchants in 1789 by the erstwhile Quaker, Cooper Penrose.[7] The cause was popular also in the political circle of the Belfast Republicans and reflected in publications originating in Cork and Dublin.[8] The issue was in Ireland pushed to one side as a result of the Rising of 1798 and the ensuing Act of Union of 1800. Irish Quakers, had further problems also in the internal discipline of their own religious society.

A constant factor in the background of early nineteenth-century Irish Quakerism was to be internal doctrinal dissent. It was to colour the various phases of Quaker anti-slavery activism. Such dissent involved views on the position of scripture but also, and more, views of the function of the Quaker 'discipline'. The contemporary orthodoxies of

Irish Quakers inclined to a variety of evangelicalism but were qualified by the disciplinary and corporate assumptions of Quakerism. Doctrinal dissent had been most acute in the Ulster 'Quarterly Meeting'.[9] Many Friends there were seen not alone as undervaluing the written words of scripture but also as infected by democratic assumptions derived from Republicanism, perforce of a non-violent nature.[10] Central to the doctrinal dissent in Carlow 'Monthly Meeting' was Abraham Shackleton of Ballitore, the proprietor of the private Quaker school there.[11] His father Richard had been associated with American Quaker anti-slavery activists and was a friend of Edmund Burke. [12] Abraham was a man of strong character. His critical view of scripture and of the Quaker discipline eventually led to his resignation and in 1801-2 to the brief closure of his school. Like other Quakers he abstained as a moral protest from the use of sugar and other slave-produced goods. His interest in every aspect of philanthropy was transmitted to his pupils and also through the influence of his sister, the writer Mary Leadbeater.[13] Imperfectly resolved doctrinal emphases associated with the atmosphere of Ballitore school, may inadvertently have fuelled later tensions in Dublin between the orthodox and the more 'liberal' Friends over anti-slavery and other philanthropic activities. Among Quaker anti-slavery activists with a high public profile and who were pupils at the school should be mentioned Joshua Beale, James Haughton, Joshua Abell and Richard D. Webb.[14]

II

The slave-trade was abolished in 1807 but slavery continued to exist not only in America but in the British Colonies,[15] For a while campaigning enthusiasm was in suspense particularly as a result of the absorbing issues of the Napoleonic wars. In 1821 each Irish Quaker local 'Meeting' was requested to consider raising funds for anti-slavery activity. Such funds were probably destined for the support of the central anti-slavery society in London, itself dominated by Quaker personnel and finance. Joseph Bewley of Dublin was the treasurer to whom sums were to be sent. The collector in Limerick Meeting was Benjamin Clarke Fisher.[16] His name is to be noted in the context of later anti-slavery activity in that city. Decisions on such subscriptions as on all other matters were regarded as binding. Cork Monthly Meeting failed to subscribe indicating a variety of dissent or at least a lack of informed interest. Further subscriptions were fulfilled by them.[17]

A new phase in the campaign for the abolition of slavery was signalled in 1823 when L.Y.M. took up the question again.[18] Ireland

Yearly Meeting (I.Y.M.) in 1824 followed with a petition on the subject to the British Parliament. This had the signatures of 175 Irish Friends including those of Joshua Abell. Richard Allen and Richard D. Webb who were all to be very active in the anti-slavery campaign.[19] One unusual feature of Quaker anti-slavery in 1824 was that some individual Quaker meetings sent off their own petitions to the Parliament, thus undertaking a type of activity usually associated with the 'National Meeting'. A Communal petition promoted by Quakers is believed to have been sent from Moyallon, a traditional Quaker centre,[20] Another, with 203 names was sent from the Friends in Clonmel.[21]

Of personal rather than corporate significance was the visit in 1824 of the English Quaker James Cropper. He was a ship owner and corn merchant dealing with America and Ireland. He was concerned about both Irish poverty and the slave trade and believed that both problems could be simply solved. All that was necessary, he supposed was to purchase East Indian cotton (and incidently helping the people there), to manufacture it in Ireland and to boycott West Indian cotton thus provoking the emancipation of negro slaves. Cropper visited Limerick, Clonmel, Waterford, Mountmellick, Cork and Dublin where he finished his journey in December 1824.[22] His approach was pragmatic and involved acting through committees of landowners and merchants who could exercise both political, economic and organisational power. Ecumenical and trans-party political co-operation was implied. Cropper was facilitated by Irish Quakers with whom he stayed and they arranged interviews with leading Irish politicians such as Thomas Spring-Rice, an intimate friend of the Quaker Harvey family of Limerick. Daniel O'Connell also displayed much interest and was stimulated to a closer activity on behalf of anti-slavery. The plan, did not in the end come to anything although it probably resulted in the Quaker Malcomson family of Clonmel setting up their effective and powerful cotton manufacture at Portlaw, County Waterford.[23]

An anti-slavery society existed in Carlow in 1824 but the first consistent reports of such a society originate from Cork. Its origins and operations are detailed in two letters written by Joshua Beale to Mary Leadbeater.[24] A picture of the operations of the Cork Anti-slavery Society (C.A.S.S.) and its links with the wider anti-slavery movement can be built up in conjunction with newspaper reports. Joshua Beale was a leading figure in its establishment. He had been a Quaker and maintained close connections with the Religious Society of Friends in addition to a continuing adherence to Quaker scruples such as those in favour of the Quaker 'plain language'. He had been disowned for the

infringement of marriage regulations of the Society as well as for his dissent from Quaker doctrinal orthodoxies.[25] He was long renowned for his philanthropic activities and was a prime promoter of the Cork Humane Dispensary in 1787. [26]

In 1826 Joshua Beale then probably 63 years old, felt called to undertake the promotion of the C.A.S.S. In his two letters to Mary Leadbeater he transmits his enthusiasm for this new phase of the anti-slavery campaign, encouraging her to use her good influence for the cause among young people in Co. Kildare. He had anticipated opposition from the powerful West India merchants. Support including that of Lord Carbery came from people who had already been involved in the Cropper-inspired committee. Beale explained how committees might be set up and patrons found among prominent and respected citizens. He anticipated a positive response from the use of Quaker administrative structures and family networks, hoping to time his propaganda for the forthcoming 'Ulster Quarterly Meeting'. He suggests that propagandist journals be circulated and petitions promoted among members of the chief religious communities including 'if necessary' the local 'popish priest'. He felt that his chief successes had been among 'dissenting people'.[27]

The C.A.S.S. was an auxiliary of the London Anti-Slavery Society and used its influence to stimulate the formation of similar auxiliaries in other parts of the country, in particular in Cork and Kerry. The satirical Cork journal, the *Freeholder,* commenting on it proposed first petition, advocated that 'everyone should sign it, no matter it emanating from a body hostile to freedom at home'.[28] The 'body' was not further defined but may be presumed to have involved persons affected by a proselytising evangelicalism. Several Friends were to take administrative and promotional roles in anti-slavery societies. Their presence at public meetings was frequently commented on and such meetings were often held in their meeting-houses. Some of them also were affected by the current evangelicalism and its associated activism, but this was qualified by their own quietish approach and wish to act in terms of their own organisational assumptions.[29]

Internal Quaker concern about the slave is indicated in national subscriptions raised in 1826 and in 1827 to help the anti-slavery cause. These sums were probably mediated by the London Friends and their 'Meeting for Sufferings'.[30] Increasing Quaker interest from contacts with Friends in L.Y.M. is shown in a letter from James Henry Webb to his friend Richard Allen. Both were to become activists. The letter details his attendance at the L.Y.M. and later at an anti-slavery meeting

which was addressed by Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton and J.J. Gurney. With an awakened concern he notes the part which women are taking in the new established women's slavery societies. The younger Friends are so far moved by the events as to give a standing ovation, a departure from conservative Quaker practice.[31]

Belfast conceivably was not fertile ground for the promotion of an anti-slavery society. A search of Belfast newspapers leads to the conclusion that although they carried information about the state of the slaves, and about London based anti-slavery activity there was no local auxiliary. This apparent lack of local activity might perhaps be attributed to the powerful West Indies interest in Belfast as also to residual ambivalence about any liberal activities.[32] The lack of a Belfast anti-slavery society at this period is indicated by a report of the arrival in its port of two ships said to contain slaves. Contact was made, interestingly, with the members of the Society of Friends, members of the Moyallon Anti-Slavery Society. The Friends Wakefield, Christy, Sinton, and Dawson 'waited on several of the magistrates' one of whom turned out to be the brother of the Governor of Bermuda, the proprietor of four of the slaves.[33]

The Dublin Anti-slavery Society (D.A.S.S.) was possibly set up in 1827. The *Freeman's Journal,* acidly comments on the fashionable and religious appearance of its widely advertised meeting.[34] This perception shows a different slant on the reported operations of, for example, the C.A.S.S. The early anti-slavery societies were generally conducted with a due appreciation of the delicate nature of the political exercise. Gradualism and ecumenical endeavour might have been their keywords. Daniel O'Connell was present at a C.A.S.S. meeting in Cork on 2 September 1829 where this resolution was passed, 'May the proud exhibition of this day - the union of all sects and parties in the sacred cause of humanity be ever in the recollection of the citizens of Cork'.[35]

An early, if not the first, secretary of the D.A.S.S. was Joshua Abell, another Cork Quaker. Only a few years before, in 1824, he had founded the Hibernian Peace Society.[36] Associated with him in the D.A.S.S. was the noted evangelical the Rev W. Urwick, Dr C.H.Orpen and Henry Grattan Curran. At the Second Anniversary Meeting in 1829 the Chairman was Robert Fayle, a Quaker of High Street. The committee of 13 included the Quakers Mark Allen, Henry Bewley and Dr Joshua Harvey of Youghal. Non-Quakers included the prominent Tory Sir George Whiteford, later to be Lord Mayor of Dublin. Several of them such as John David Le Touche of Castle Street and John Purser

jnr., of James' Gate were known for their commitment to varieties of evangelicalism. A particular member who must be noted was Thomas Lonergan whose address was the same as that of Richard Lonergan of the *Dublin Morning Post* which gave much publicity to the D.A.S.S. [37]

Daniel O'Connell was already very central to the preoccupations of the anti-slavery movement in Ireland, England and the U.S.A. He was to become very friendly with the English Quakers Joseph Sturge and Joseph Pease as well as several Irish Quakers. However, as may be noted there was a degree of mutual ambivalence in the views of O'Connell and of the Quakers. Daniel O'Connell was present in 1830 at the Third Anniversary Meeting of the D.A.S.S. in the Rotunda where over 2,000 people were present. His increasing support for the movement coincided with a massive increase in public interest in the issues involved.[38]

A new factor in increasing public awareness of the anti-slavery issue was the inauguration 9 July 1830 of the Hibernian Negroe's Friend Society (H.N.F.S.) This was run in tandem with the D.A.S.S. but obeyed its own organisational imperatives. Its chief aims were the circulation of the scriptures, the abolition of slavery and the promotion of negro freedom.[39] A special part was seen in the establishment of Free Labour Produce Warehouses. One of these was managed by Henry Russell, a Quaker grocer at 36, South Frederick Street, Dublin.[40] The H.N.F.S. role was chiefly informational and did not trespass on the local auxiliary anti-slavery societies. In 1830 it apparently employed an agent, Captain Stuart, to travel round the country and give lectures. As far as his tour has been traced it took in New Ross, Waterford, Cork, Bandon, Clonakilty and Skibbereen followed by Killarney and Limerick. He reached Belfast towards he end of 1830 where his meeting was held 31 December. [41] Many of his meetings were held in Wesleyan meeting houses. Whilst Quakers were active in the H.N.F.S., it is probably correct to see the organisation as primarily supported by the Wesleyan community. In both England and Ireland their awareness of the privations of the slaves in the West Indies and threats to their missionary territories induced them to further open their doors to the anti-slavery activists.[42] Their more aggressive missionary activities at home may have led one commentator to see some members of the C.A.S.S. as tinged with anti-catholicism.[43]

The period 1830-3 marked a concentrated peak of anti-slavery activity. Disappointment at the poor results achieved by the policy of gradualism, as well as a new awareness of the power of the middle-class vote as a result of political reform, stimulated a more aggressive phase of

anti-slavery activity; this first emerged in Cork in time for a by-election 4 August 1830. Efforts there were directed away from petitions to voting only for candidates who would pledge themselves to substantial anti-slavery legislation. The committee of the C.A.S.S. at that time had for its secretary Abraham Beale, a Quaker iron merchant of Patrick's Quay. The document expressing C.A.S.S. policy was dated in the 'plain Language' as 26 Seventh-month (July). [44]

Not all Quakers felt it necessary to refrain from the import of West India sugars and there was no formalised disciplinary pressure on them so to do.[45] There is not further literary evidence available to draw a wider conclusion from this. The L.Y.M. in Fourth-month (April) 1831 sent a petition on anti-slavery to Parliament.[46] Whilst such petitioning was acceptable Irish Quakers were nevertheless in the same year advised by their Yearly Meeting to 'refrain fom being improperly engaged in public or political questions'.[47] A further petition was sent by the L.Y.M. in 1833.[48] Such concern was partially a sign of retreat to their own sectarian safeties in the face of nationalism with overtones of resurgent Roman Catholicism, and of movements to parliamentary and electoral reform. It was partially a wish not to permit any external detraction from proper attention to the internal imperatives of the religious life. It showed an awareness of the corruption and violence so often associated with electioneering and party or sectarian politics. Quaker aloofness caused popular criticism as occurred during a Protestant boycott of businesses in Youghal where Quakers were found amongst both the liberal and conservative interests.[49]

III

Slavery in the British colonies and dominions was ostensibly abolished on 1 August 1834. In place of slavery the category, of 'apprenticeship', was created.[50] The anti-slavery campaign went now for a time into abeyance, although there was great general dissatisfaction about the morality and the practicality of the legislation. It was already clear by 1836 that the apprenticeship was not going to work. Irish Quakers continued interested in the wider issue of emancipation and in the same year raised a subscription to help charitable efforts for the negro in the North Carolina Yearly Meeting. [51]

A new phase in the anti-slavery campaign opened in 1837 on the revelations of the oppressed state of the West Indies 'apprentices'. This followed on a trip of investigation to the West Indies by the English Quaker Joseph Sturge, the son-in-law of James Cropper.[52] An

immediate ending of the unjust negro apprenticeship was now demanded. Awareness in Ireland took second place to national electoral considerations. The *Dublin Morning Register,* editorialised, 'How will the Quakers vote?'. Taking into account their known stance on anti-slavery and peace as well as their historical sufferings for the refusal of tithes, it could not see them as consistent Tories. The fact that several of them had voted the previous day for Daniel O'Connell and Robert Hutton was admiringly mentioned.[53]

In Dublin, as first step to informing themselves and a wider public. Edward Baldwin the secretary of the H.N.F.S. (which now apparently subsumed the role of the D.A.S.S.) in Dublin invited the well-known lecturer George Thompson to address a meeting on 11 August 1837. [54] This meeting was to prove seminal for several Dublin Quakers, in particular for Richard Davis Webb, a young Quaker printer. Thompson's influence and that derived from reading Harriet Martineau was eventually to lead him to correspond with several American abolitionists including William Lloyd Garrison. Webb was thus projected into a central position in the transatlantic abolitionist network.[55]

A significent reorganisation of the H.N.F.S. took place on 18 September 1837 when it was reconstituted as the Hibernian Anti-slavery Society. Its address continued at 28, Upper Sackville Street, Dublin. Its secretaries were Dr. Charles E.H. Orpen and Richard Allen, Quaker draper of High Street. Six out of its nine committee members were Quakers. Other Irish anti-slavery societies, such as that in Cork, participated in this new phase of the campaign but without any apparent changes in personnel or structure.[56] In London, the Central Negro Emancipation Committee (C.N.E.C.), was set up by Sturge to forward a more aggressive pressure on the government, as well as to side-step the ineffectual temporizing of the older London anti-slavery committee.[57] The C.N.E.C. summoned on three successive occasions urgent delegate meetings to coincide with the introduction of abolitionist motions in the British Parliament. Delegates from Dublin and Cork, and including James H. Webb and his brother Richard D. Webb, were present on these.[58] On 27 February 1838 the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society (B.F.A.S.S.), was set up in London to spearhead ongoing abolitionist activity.[59] This was eventually to take over the functions and inherit the structures of the C.N.E.C. and the older anti-slavery society. Its centralist assumptions, to the irritation of some local groupings, were to be those of England and London.

Following the defeat in the House of Commons, of Sir George Strickland's motion for the abolition of the apprenticeship, the *Dublin Morning Register,* criticised Joshua Abell for his accusations against Hutton the Dublin member who had voted against it. Hutton was seen as in favour of abolition but not so immediately as both the *Dublin Morning Register,* or Joshua Abell would like. Joshua Abell, had however stated that Hutton was pledge bound by a public meeting to vote for the motion. Abell was seen as inconsistent in his apparent liberalism. He had, in the last election, voted for Hamilton West, the Tory candidate, who was defeated.[60]

For the information of Quakers, the I.Y.M.'s standing Committee paid Richard D. Webb on 21 Fifth-month (May), to reprint a Philadelphia Yearly Meeting 'Address on Slavery'.[61] The same committee undertook to prepare and forward a petition for the Abolition of the Negro Apprenticeship.[62]. On 1 August 1838 the British Parliament by a majority of three abolished the 'Apprenticeship'. Co-operation with the English Quakers extended to Richard Allen's borrowing a pair of Joseph Sturge's silk stockings for the delegate levee that had been summoned to lobby M.Ps. The power of as yet unemancipated women was shown when on the following day a petition from 75,000 Irish women was presented to Queen Victoria.[63] The news of the anti-slavery victory was conveyed by the secretary of the B.F.A.S.S. to Abraham Beale, secretary of the C.A.S.S.[64]

The campaign did not now cease. Co-operation with American anti-slavery societies to help in the abolition of slavery in the United States was to be the next phase. Sturge promoted the holding of a World Convention in London, and in this he was encouraged by Daniel O'Connell. Sturge undertook to visit, Dublin, Belfast and Scotland, and G.W. Alexander to visit Waterford and Cork to inform the people about the event.[65] The World Anti-slavery Convention began in London on Friday, 12 June 1840[66] and continued for two weeks. Some of the delegates were from auxiliary anti-slavery societies in Cork and Belfast, but most of the Irish delegates were from the H.A.S.S. in Dublin, and were Quakers including Richard D. Webb and James H. Webb.[67] For them, the Convention crystallized a new set of human relationships and doctrinal emphases. They were exposed to a whole series of radical ideas on non-resistance and women's rights which were introduced by the American delegates under the leadership of William Lloyd Garrison.[68]

Irish Friends were exceedingly touchy about even the discussion of doctrinal matters, and in the 1840s were suffering the effects of a minute

secession by the eccentric and anarchistic group of 'White Quakers'.[69] The 'radical' American connexions present at the Convention were highly repugnant to the conservative majority of both Irish and English Quakers also. These new ideas coincided with a new and radical phase in philanthropic reform and sparked off ardent controversy in the *Irish Friend.* Several Friends cancelled their subscriptions as a result.[70] They disliked the secular and political overtones implicit in co-operation with some of the supposedly radical reformers. Much of the criticism focused on William Lloyd Garrison, the American abolitionist. His views were seen as allied to the discredited Hicksite doctrines of some separated Quaker Yearly Meetings in America. As such they were identified with similar doctrines that had caused hurtful doctrinal dissent among Irish Friends in the early nineteenth century. Webb was friendly with Lucretia Mott a delegate and a Hicksite who had been excluded, as a woman, from the World Convention. For many Friends such issues as non-resistance and women's rights were seen as extraneous to anti-slavery and detracting from the central cause.[71]

The committee of the H.A.S.S. was essentially formed of Richard D. Webb, his two brothers, Richard Allen, James Haughton, and R.R. Moore. All were Quakers, except Haughton who had resigned his membership to become a Unitarian and R.R. Moore. The committee was an important clearing-house of unique anti-slavery information derived from the international contacts and correspondence of its members. They held regular meetings in the Royal Exchange and made a creative use of the press. Their audiences, favourable to teetotalism were seen as open to other philanthropic reforms. In different combinations the H.A.S.S. committee formed the Hibernian Peace Society. The Hibernian British India Society and the Hibernian Temperance Society.[72] All had links of friendship with Daniel O'Connell, perforce qualified by ambivalence about him as a politician. James Haughton was a member of the Loyal National Repeal Association, Richard D. Webb printed material for him, and Richard Allen had co-operated with him in the abolition of the Dublin Guild system.[73]

An important local intervention was organised by the H.A.S.S. in 1840 when it was discovered that Irish people were being inveigled to go to the West Indies as part of a system of indentured labour akin to slavery. The system was to be operated through Limerick. The influence of the H.A.S.S. and its secretary Richard Allen, with Daniel O'Connell and with the editors of newspapers was effective in putting an end to it.

The Limerick auxiliary of the B.F.A.S.S. co-operated and, like the H.A.S.S. faithfully kept the B.F.A.S.S. informed. Samuel Grey, the Chairman and Samuel Evans the secretary of the Limerick Auxiliary were both Quakers and Quakers were noted in publicly rallying the oppositions in the city.[74]

A more successful nation-wide series of meetings was organised by the H.A.S.S. for Charles Lennox Remond, a 'man of colour'. To do this they used their pre-existent Quaker network. In Waterford he stopped with Webb's Quaker in-laws. His visit to Cork was arranged by William Martin the well known Quaker advocate of teetotalism and in Limerick he was welcomed by Benjamin Clark Fisher, yet another Quaker. Most of his meetings were held in Quaker meeting-houses and in Independent chapels. The Methodist community was not favourable to him on account of his forthright attacks on the slave-holding propensities of their American brethren.[75] His visit stimulated activity by the Cork Ladies Anti-Slavery Society (C.L.A.S.S.) and other female anti-slavery groups. When Remond returned to America he brought with him an 'Address' drawn up by Webb and Haughton and signed by 60,000 Irish people including Daniel O'Connell and Father Mathew.[76] The Address was designed to persuade Irish Americans to use their influence against slavery. At least one Cork Friend expressed a dissenting position from the petition which for him involved not only an internal inconsistency but advocated a 'christian republicanism' that should be seen as contrary to Friends principles. The petition was to be rejected as spurious by prominent Irish-Americans.[77]

An extensive discussion of Richard D. Webb is not really pertinent to the broader aims of this study but it is enough to remark on his centrality to all propagandist Irish anti-slavery activities. Whilst consideration of him may be illuminating it might also introduce an element of distortion into this study. The less vocal and more conservative Friends were the norm against which he often reacted. Besides their quietist penchants it is clear that they felt a distinct distaste for propagandist activity and a preference for practical schemes of relief. Webb himself was forced to admit that it was their money that kept much of the anti-slavery cause alive.[78] For Webb abolitionists gave him a sense of freedom from the restrictions of the religious society to which he belonged as well as from the restrictions and sectarian bigotries which he felt in his own country.[79]

Outside of Dublin such radicalism does not seem to have been reflected in any other Irish Quaker community, except in isolated instances as with Webb's cousins, the Poole family of Wexford.[80] The

C.A.S.S., an auxiliary of the B.F.A.S.S. continued to reflect a pattern of trans-sectarian activity centred on the 'Independent' community of the Dowdens and the Jennings.[81] An increasing sense of Protestant cohesion was likely to have heightened the more introverted disciplinary sense of the smaller Cork Quaker community. As a community they seemed content to take a back seat. In Belfast the overwhelming Presbyterian milieu by then perhaps discouraged consistent anti-slavery activity. For the few radical Dublin Friends the reforms they were promoting became implicitly a vehicle for criticism of their more conservative brethren. For many Friends, at a time when they were excluded or self-excluded from formal political activity, philanthropic activity provided a vicarious substitute for political action. They were not all equally critical of their brethren and Richard Allen espoused a variety of evangelicalism not inconsistent with the doctrinal base of the Society.[82] A number of Quaker sympathisers to Repeal may also be assumed. Among these was Ebenezer Shackleton a grandson of Abraham of Ballitore. He could not see much difference between slavery and the condition of his impoverished fellow countrymen.[83]

Irish Friends were perceived as 'conservatives' by Richard D. Webb, who felt that 'Nineteen out of twenty English Quakers are decided radicals or at least Whigs. Nineteen out of twenty Irish Quakers are rank Tories and bigoted enemies to the Catholics - political enemies I mean'.[84] This view was certainly in keeping with one popular perception of Quakers. It was expressed in an invitation to an anti-slavery breakfast and contained in a letter from Walter R. Osborne to Richard Dowden of Cork. The letter encouraged the influencing of Quakers during the forthcoming election and stated, 'Some are honest and although they would not care a pin for us poor whites or our liberties, yet the blacks across the sea are very precious'.[85]

O'Connell saw it as inconsistent with the anti-slavery of Irish Quakers that they took so little interest in Repeal, but on the same occasion praised their community, 'I believe that almost all of them voted for me'.[86] Their introverted stance and principled avoidance of party politics left them open to misunderstanding. Their supposed Toryism like their commitment to Free-trade was however likely to have been qualified by a pragmatism derived from their non-dogmatic approach to religion. Abraham Beale, secretary of the C.A.S.S., during an election in Cork, under the terms of the 'Municipal Reform Act' permitted his name to go forward as a candidate. In itself this was a remarkable occurrence for a contemporary Irish Quaker but his acceptance was still qualified by principle. He explained that he would

not canvass votes or take a party-line. The shrewdly political Cork conservatives saw him as a variety of crypto-liberal and witheld their votes from him.[87]

The heady confidence of the earlier years of the decade when it seemed that any reform was and would be obtained was replaced gradually by a despondency. For Webb this came to a new head in 1843. The I.Y.H. refused to accept an epistle from a breakaway group of the Indiana Yearly Meeting.[88] The breakaway group had been formed by anti-slavers whose enthusiasm had been disappointed in a letter published in the abolitionist Boston *Liberator* and ostensibly reporting on the recent 1843 London Anti-Slavery Convention, Webb challenged Irish Quakers about the refusal.[89] If the letter was noticed by Friends or regarded as a challenge there is no sign that they took any disciplinary action, perhaps hoping that patience would mend the hurts.

Further causes of tension between Dublin's anti-slavery activists and Friends surfaced when Frederick Douglass, an escaped slave came on a visit in 1845. His forthright criticisms of Methodist slave-holders naturally enough annoyed Dublin Methodists. Dublin Friends were offended that their meeting-house should be used for such criticisms and withdrew its use for future meetings. Richard D. Webb and his brother James Henry Webb accused Friends of being more concerned about their good reputation than helping in the proclamation of anti-slavery truth, James and Richard D. Webb went public with a letter in the *Liberator.*[90] From then on they began to be more and more estranged from Friends, although Richard D. Webb took a part in the administration of relief during the 'Great Hunger'.[91]

The Famine also led to tension. The Central Relief Committee (C.R.C.) turned down a subscription from a concert in London but accepted one collected by known slave-holders. The inconsistency of this was very clear to Webb, Allen and Haughton. Webb printed an open letter addressed to the C.R.C. and written by Henry C. Wright, a visiting American Garrisonian.[92] Interestingly, even at the height of the Famine the Irish Friends were not forgetful of the erstwhile slaves of the West Indies. Dublin Friends, reported in third-month (March) 1847 that they had raised a subscription of £137, 'for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of the coloured population in the West Indies, Mauritius etc'.[93]

IV

During the period from the Famine to the American Civil War varieties of anti-slavery activism continued. A central part was played in

this by the Ladies anti-slavery organisations of which the chief was the Dublin Ladies Anti-slavery Society (D.L.A.S.S.).[94] Its subscriptions lists are made up of primarily 'Quaker' names. The 1858 committee of the D.L.A.S.S. included 14 such out of 15 and the secretary was the Friend Mary Edmundson.[95] The subscription lists include the names of several men Friends not previously noted as vocal in the anti-slavery cause such as Thomas and William H. Pim and Samuel Bewley jnr.[96] Their funds were devoted to issuing addresses to emigrants, providing information on the cause and helping negro fugitives. Some local auxiliaries of the B.F.A.S.S. such as the C.A.S.S. continued to organise public meetings. The C.A.S.S. in 1851 organised a meeting on the 'Fugitive Slave Law'. This was attended by the Lord Mayor, James Lambkin and its Quaker secretary Samuel Beale.[97] In Belfast, it was remarked that except among Quakers there was no longer any interest in the subject of anti-slavery.[98] During 1859, Sarah Parker Remond, sister of Charles Lennox Remond visited and gave a series of public meetings in Dublin, Cork, Clonmel and Waterford.[99]

Webb's anti-slavery activities were to continue, although as the culmination of a long period of dissent he had left the Religious Society of Friends in 1851.[100] He edited and published the *Anti-Slavery Advocate*.[101] The American Civil War provoked a new series of Irish reactions, much polarised in terms of pro and anti-English perceptions.[102] Webb the idealist found it hard to reconcile his peace views and his anti-slavery views.[103] Those Friends who had maintained a studied neutrality based on their historic adherence to the Christian gospel of peace were not faced with such a conflict. Nevertheless by a strange paradox many Irish Friends found initial sympathies for Northern Federalists replaced by sympathy for the Southern Confederates.[104] If anti-slavery activism was now at a stop some Irish Friends found a practical role. In Waterford, in 1862, a sum of £460 was collected to help the Lancashire cotton operatives who had been put out of work by the war-induced cotton famine. Of this sum £270 was contributed by the Friends.[105]

With the ending of the Civil War a massive relief and reconstruction effort began. The I.Y.M. acting on information mediated from its own 'Committee' and from the London 'Meeting for Sufferings' set up a committee of 27 members to organise the collection of funds for relief to the emancipated slaves and to the victims of the war including American Friends.[106] By the next year a total of £1,450. 8s. 10d. had been collected.[107] Such continuing humanitarian work was seen as a measure of acknowledgement for American help to Irish people during the 'Great Hunger'.[108] During 1864 Levi Coffin the American organiser

of the 'Underground Railway' visited Ireland. A meeting was arranged for him in Dublin at the Friends Institute, and several notables were invited to discuss ways of raising relief funds. Present at the meeting was the Lord Mayor of Dublin as well as such Friends as Samuel Bewley, William Barrington, Jonathan Pim, and James Haughton J.P. A sum of £200 was immediately subscribed.[109] Levi Coffin followed up this meeting with visits to Cork, Waterford, Belfast and Moyallon being assisted in each place by Friends, who arranged meetings with prominent citizens.[110]

To summarise, the Religious Society of Friends provided sustaining structures which permitted and encouraged individual members to take up the cause of the slave. All were not equally vocal or active but whenever a humanitarian movement went into popular abeyance they were able with their practical organisational skills and financial assistance to initiate it once again. These advocates of abolition were important to the formation in Ireland of a sense of responsibility and co-operation in the cause of a wider humanity. Their political ambivalence and reticence set them apart, but left them with a consistent practical role that could be responded to by the public.

Richard S. Harrison

NOTES AND REFERENCES

*I express my thanks to the Dublin Friends who made available a bursary fund that enabled me in 1982 to visit the Boston Public Library, where I consulted some of the material used here. I am likewise grateful for the use of the Dublin Friends Historical Library and for the assistance of Patricia McCarthy of the Cork Archives Institute, and of Noel O'Mahony of the Bantry Public Library. I am also indebted to Dr David Dickson (T.C.D.) whose comments on an earlier and more primitive draft encouraged me to the writing of this study.

[1]Thomas H. Truxes, *Irish American Trade 1660-1783*, [hereafter Truxes, *Trade*] (Cambridge, 1988) p. 141 and p. 76. For drawing my attention to these references I am grateful to Dr David Dickson (T.C.D.).

[2]*Cork Journal*, 4 Dec. 1769.

[3]*Ibid.*, 4 April 1769.

[4]Truxes, *Trade*, 78.

[5]Cork Monthly Meeting [hereafter C.M.M.] Minutes. 24 Fifth-month (May), and 24 Tenth-month (Oct) 1756 (Dublin Friends Historical Library [hereafter D.F.H.L.] MM VIII A.5(1752-6).

[6]Dublin Monthly Meeting [hereafter D.M.M.], Minutes, 22 Eighth-month (Aug), (D.F.H.L.), MM II A,13(1767-9).

[7]Louis M. Cullen, *Princes and Pirates*. (Dublin, 1983), 54 and Minutes of the Committee of Merchants, 7 Jan. 1789 (Cork Museum, Fitzgerald Park, Cork).

[8]Henry Joy, *Historical Collections relating to the Town of Belfast,* (Belfast, 1817), p. 374 and, Mary McNeill, *The Life and Times of Mary Ann McCracken 1770-1866,* (Dublin, 1960), p. 295, A typical publication to be cited might be *An Essay on the Slave Trade: enumerating its Horrors and showing the Vice of encouraging it by the Consumption of West India Productions: and also showing the necessity of its Abolition by the Disuse of them,* published by Anthony Edwards, 3 Castle Street. (Cork, 1782).

[9]Neville I. Newhouse, 'The Irish Separation of 1800' in *Friends Quarterly,* XVII, 3, (1971), 123-9 and XVII, 4, (1971), 169-79.

[10]E. Wakefield, *An Account of Ireland Statistical and Political,* (London, 1812), II, 734 and, Rufus M. Jones, *Later Periods of Quakerism,* (London, 1921), I, 298.

[11]see above n. 4.

[12]Jones, *Later Periods,* I. 319.

[13]John Hancock, *A Sketch of the Character of Abraham Shackleton of Ballitore,* (Dublin, 1818), see also, R.D. Webb, *Recollections of the Character of Mary Leadbeater,* (Dublin, 1829).

[14]Mary Leadbeater, *The Leadbeater Papers,* I, (London, 1862), Appendix.

[15]Howard Temperley, *British Anti-Slavery 1833-70* [hereafter, *Anti-Slavery],* (London, 1972), 6.

[16]Limerick Monthly Meeting, Rough Minutes (11 Seventh-month (July) 1820 - 15 Twelth-month (Dec.) 1829). 14 Eighth-month (Aug.) (In keeping of John and Helen Grubb, Limerick).

[17]C.M.M. Minutes, 19 Fourth-month (April) 1827, (D.F.H.L.), MM VIII. A, 8(1807-29).

[18]Jones, *Later Periods,* I, 328.

[19]Anti-slavery Petition from Ireland Yearly Meeting. 1824 (D.F.H.L.), Port. 13,33.

[20]Draft Petition of the Inhabitants of Moyallon and its Vicinity in the Co. of Down, Ireland n.d., (P.R.O.N.I.) D. 1762/50.

[21]*Southern Reporter,* 3 July 1824.

[22]Kenneth Charlton, 'The State of Ireland in the 1820s: James Cropper's Plan' in *Irish Historical Studies,* XVII, 67, (1971), 320-9.

[23]*Ibid.*

[24]Petition from Carlow Anti-Slavery Society, *Hansard* (Commons), 2nd ser., XI, 1406, 15 May 1824, and Joshua Beale to Mary Leadbeater, 23 First-month (Jan.), 1826 (D.F.H.L.) Mss. Box 32. The relevant letter is also printed in, Isabel Grubb, An Anti-Slavery Enthusiast, *Journal of the Friends Historical Society [hereafter, J.F.H.S.],* XXXI, (1934), 21-6.

[25]*Ibid.,* p. 21. Joshua Beale may well have been disowned on two separate occasions. Cork Monthly Meeting disowned him for a different disciplinary offence from that mentioned by Isabel Grubb. See C.M.M. Minutes, 9 Eleventh-month (Nov.), (D.F.H.L.), MM VIII A, 8.

[26]N. Marshall Cummins, *Some Chapters of Cork Medical History,* (Cork, 1957), 33-4.

[27]Grubb, *Enthusiast,* 24.

[28]*Freeholder,* (Cork), 1 Jan. 1826.

[29]*Freeman's Journal,* [hereafter, *F.J.*], 17 May 1824, where O'Connell accused younger Dublin Quakers of being Orangemen. The Quaker rejection of his remarks was reported in *F.J.* 24 May 1824.

[30]Ireland Yearly Meeting [hereafter, I.Y.M.] Minutes. Fifth-month (May) 1826, (D.F.H.L.), Half YM A. 6(1809-52), and, see, C.M.M. Minutes, 19 Fourth-month (April), when Robert Going and James Simpson collected £10.15s., (D.F.H.L.) MM VIII A.8., Temperley, *Anti-slavery,* 10.

[31]James H. Webb to Richard Allen, 17 Fifth-month 1828 (D.F.H.L.) Port. 8 (9).
[32]*Northern Whig,* 26 Jan. 1826 notes mainly direct imports of West Indies sugar (1824), 5, 441 hogsheads and 1,614 casks and (1825), 4,558 hogsheads and 931 casks.
[33]*Northern Whig,* 4 Sept. 1828.
[34]*F.J.*, 2 Nov. 1827.
[35]*Cork Institution,* [hereafter, *C.C.*], 3 Sept. 1829.
[36]Richard S. Harrison, *Irish anti-War Movements 1824-1974,* (Dublin, 1986).
[37]*Dublin Morning Post,* 22 April 1829.
[38]*Ibid.*, 12 April, 1830.
[39]*Ibid.*, 23 June 1830, 15 July 1830.
[40]*Ibid.*, 6 Nov. 1830.
[41]His tour may be traced in part from *Waterford Chronicle,* 7, 10, 14 Aug. 1830, *C.C.*, 11, 21 Sept. and 20 Nov. 1830, *Limerick Chronicle,* 25, 29 Sept. 1830, *Belfast Newsletter,* 31 Dec. 1830, 1 Feb. 1831.
[42]David Hampton, *Methodism and Politics in British Society 1750-1850,* (London, 1984), 208-10.
[43]W.T. Fagan, *The Life and Times of Daniel O'Connell,* (Cork, 1847-8), II, 239-40.
[44]*C.C.*, 31 July, 1830.
[45]See *Limerick Chronicle,* 26 Feb. 1831.
[46]I.Y.M. Minutes, Fourth-month (April) 1831(D.F.H.L.), Half YM A, 6(1809-52). The petition was presented by Phillip Cecil Crampton, Solicitor-General.
[47]D.M.M. Minutes, Fifth-month (May) 1831, (D.F.H.L.), MM II A, 19(1824-33).
[48]I.Y.M. Minutes, Fifth-month (May) 1833 (D.F.H.L.).
[49]Ann Barry and K. Theodore Hoppen, 'Borough Politics in O'Connellite Ireland. The Youghal Poll Books of 1835 and 1837'. *J.C.H.A.S.*, I. XXXIII, 238 (1978), 106-46, 111.
[50]Henry Richard, *Memoirs of Joseph Sturge* (London, 1864) see, 104-9 and Temperley, *Anti-slavery,* 16-8.
[51]Yearly Meeting's Committee [hereafter, Y.M.C.] minutes, 18 Fourth-month (April), (D.F.H.L.), YM D. 4(1834-53).
[52]Richard *Memoirs,* 133-62.
[53]*Dublin Morning Register,* 19 Aug. 1837.
[54]*Ibid.*, 11 August 1837 and, George Thompson to Edward Baldwin, 26 July, 1837, see, Clare Taylor, *British and American Abolitionists,* [hereafter, Taylor. *Abolitionists*], (Edinburgh, 1974), 58.
[55]Richard D. Webb to Anne W. Weston. 5 July 1847 (Boston Public Library), MS A. 9. 2 Vol 24 (81).
[56]*Irish Friend,* [hereafter, *I.F.*], 1 Seventh-month (July) 1837, I, 1, 7.
[57]Richard, *Memoirs,* 165, and Temperley, *Anti-slavery* 39-40.
[58]See, for example, 17 Nov. 1837, James H. Webb, Richard D. Webb, William Eltoft, Edwin Baldwin and James Lane (of Cork) in (D.F.H.L.) Port. 5B, 23 b.
[59]Temperley, *Anti-slavery,* 66-7.
[60]*Dublin Morning Register,* 16 April 1838. The way in which Irish M.P.s voted is noted in *F.J.*, 3 April 1838.
[61]Y.M.C. Minutes, 21 Fifth-month (May) 1838, sum of £6. 7s. 6d. noted, (D.F.H.L.) YM D4(1834-5).
[62]*Ibid.*, also see *I.F.*, I, 9, 2 Seventh-month (July) (1838).
[63]Hannah Maria Wigham, *A Christian Philanthropist of Dublin: A Memoir of Richard Allen,* (London, 1886), 29-32.

[65]Richard Dowden to ?. 26 May 1838, (Cork Archives Institute, [hereaftr, C.A.I.], Day papers, U 140 Class C. 56.
[66]Richard, *Memoirs,* 213.
[66]Temperley, *Anti-slavery,* 89-92.
[67]*Anti-Slavery Reporter,* 17 July 1840 (n.s.) See also, 'From the Conventants' Sixth-month (June) 1840 (Boston Public Library, [hereafter, B.L.P.]) MS A. 1. 2 Vol 9(1) Anti-slavery letters to Garrison no. 6 The Webb Manuscript. (Reprinted in Taylor, *Abolitionists,* 94-101).
[68]Taylor, *Abolitionists,* 94-101.
[69]Isabel Grubb, *Quakers in Ireland.* (London, 1929), 126-30.
[70]The correspondence can be followed in the *I.F.,* III, 9(1840) to IV, 1, 1841.
[71]Richard D. Webb to Wiliam L. Garrison, 30 Fifth-month (May) 1841 (B.P.L.), MS A. 1. 2 Vol 12.1, 35. Partially reprinted in Taylor, *Abolitionists,* 152.
[72]J.A. Collins, 'Irish Philanthropists', in *Liberty Bell.* (Boston, 1843) 170-4, also see Wigham, *Philanthropist,* 15-17.
[73]Wigham, *Philanthropist,* 11-12.
[74]Wigham, *Philanthropist,* 40-1, and Carl Senior, Limerick 'Slaves' for Jamaica, in *Old Limerick Journal.* 19, (1986), 33-40.
[75]*Liberator,* 24 Sept. 1841.
[76]Samuel Haughton, *Memoir of James Haughton* (Dublin, 1877), 58-9.
[77]*C.C.,* 9 Oct. 1841, letter from a 'member of the Society of Friends'. A discussion of the issues relating to the American 'Address' are to be found in Douglas C. Riach, 'Daniel O'Connell and American Anti-Slavery', *I.H.S.,* XX, 77, (1976), 10-11.
[78]R.D. Webb to Maria W. Chapman, 22 Second-month (Feb.) 1842 (B.P.L.) MS. A. 1. 2 Vol 12 (2) no. 30, reprinted in Taylor, *Abolitionists,* 168.
[79]Richard D. Webb to Edmund Quincy, 2 Second-month (Feb.) 1844 (B.P.L.) MS 960, reprinted in Taylor, *Abolitionists,* 213-6.
[80]Their co-operation was limited to preparing contributions for the Boston Anti-Slavery Bazaar and subscribing to anti-slavery journals.
[81]A general account of Richard Dowden is to be found in, Robert Day, 'Richard Dowden', *J.C.H.A.S.,* XXII, (1916), 21-24. Dowden's newspaper scrapbook gives more specific information on anti-slavery. (C.A.I.) Day Collection.
[82]Wigham *Philanthropist,* 16.
[83]*F.J.,* 26 Aug. 1840.
[84]See n. 89.
[85]Walter R. Osborne to Richard Dowden, n.d. (C.A.I.), Day Collection. U. 140, C. 67.
[86]*F.J.,* 3 Aug. 1841.
[87]*C.C.,* 21 Eighth-month (Aug.) 1841, letter of Abraham Beale, and *Cork Examiner,* 3 Oct. 1841, Abraham Beale received 16 votes.
[88]Drake, *Slavery,* 165-7.
[89]*Liberator,* 28 July 1843.
[90]*Ibid.,* 24 Oct. 1845.
[91]*Transactions of the Central Relief Committee of the Society of Friends during the Famine in Ireland in 1846 and 1847,* Appendix III, 198-204.
[92]Henry C. Wright, *Slaveholders or Playactors, Which are the Greatest Sinners?* (Dublin, 1847).
[93]D.M.M. Minutes, Third-month (Mar.) 1847, (D.F.H.L.) MM II A,20 (1833-58).

[94]See, *Dublin Ladies Anti-Slavery Reports,* [hereafter, *D.L.A.S.S.], (1858-61), Anti-Slavery Advocate,* Aug. 1853, 88, mentons that contributions are being received for the Boston Anti-slavery Bazaar, those from Belfast being care of Miss Ireland, Royal Institution, Belfast, *Anti-Slavery Advocate,* Mar. 1854, 142 mentions that money has been received from Ladies Anti-Slavery Societies of Waterford, Clara, and Clogher, Co. Tyrone.

[95]*D.L.A.S.S.,* (1858).

[96]*Ibid.,* and *D.L.A.S.S.,* (1859). Samuel Bewley jnr, (1806-77).

[97]*C.C.* 31 May 1851.

[98]McNeill, *McCracken,* 295.

[99]*C.C.,* 19 April 1859, and D.L.A.S.S. (1859).

[100]Richard D. Webb to D.M.M., 24 Sept (*sic*) 1851 (D.F.H.L.) Rm 4 SH, N BOX 1, Bundle B, 10 E.

[101]The *Anti-Slavery Advocate,* was published from 1852-63.

[102]See, in particular, Joseph M. Hernon jnr., *Celts, Catholics and Copperheads,* (Ohio; 1968).

[103]Temperley, *Anti-Slavery,* 252-3.

[104]N. Harvey, *Autobiography,* (Waterford, 1904), 37, and 40, also George G. Willauer, 'An Irish Friend and the American Civil War; Some Letters of Frederick W. Pim to His Father in Dublin'. *J.F.H.S.* 53, 1 (1972), 62-75.

[105]Harvey, *Autobiography,* 40.

[106]*Proceedings of Dublin Yearly Meeting,* 27 Fourth-month (April) - 5 Fifth-month (May) 1864, 11-12.

[107]*Proceedings,* 1865, 24. By 1871, the totals collected by I.Y.M. were to amount to £9,961. (for which see *Proceedings,* 1865-71). Temperley, Anti-Slavery, 260 notes for, L.Y.M. a total of £25,000. Whilst he notes a contribution for I.Y.M. he does not state if that is included in his figure.

[108]Levi Coffin, *Reminiscences of Levi Coffin,* (London, 1876), 682-3.

[109]*Ibid.,* 685.

[110]Advertisement of a meeting held for Levi Coffin at Waterford, 22 Ninth-month (Sept.) 1866 (D.F.H.L.), PB 20 (121), and, Coffin, *Reminiscences,* 688.

"HUMAN PROGRESS AND THE INWARD LIGHT"

The position of Thomas Hodgkin (1831-1913) in relation to his contemporaries

It was tantalising while working on *Hedge of Wild Almonds*[1] not to be able to spend more time on some of the Quaker personalities of the period, to look more closely for instance at W.H.F. Alexander as a committee man or at the diplomatic skills of Francis William Fox. I am glad, however, that I have since been able to pursue a little further my interest in the thinking of Thomas Hodgkin (1831-1913) and to share this today with members of the Friends Historical Society of which he was himself the first president 87 years ago.

My initial interest was prompted by the fact that during the Anglo-Boer War he stood apart from those Friends who, like himself, had come to espouse the theory of evolution and to accept the findings of Biblical criticism. While they were expressing sympathy for the Boer cause and criticizing British policy, *he* was seeing the war as understandable and inevitable, if not wholly justifiable. Even so, one could not readily place him with the evangelical remnant who were distrustful of evolution and higher criticism and, while not identifying with the cruder excesses of patriotism, did see the British Empire as a force for human progress in the world, and now saw it in jeopardy on the high veldt of South Africa.

Other Christian denominations were similarly divided, though in opposite ratio. The Liberal Party and the Fabian Society were split down the middle. Thomas Hodgkin was unhappily divided within himself, holding a position not wholly accounted for by the fact that his son Robin had joined a volunteer regiment. By 1906, however, four years after the war, he had come to think differently and to believe he had seriously misjudged the causes of the conflict.[2]

This was no capricious change of mind but the serious taking up of a new position in the light of new evidence and as the result of further experience. Nor was it an isolated instance. A similar process, what he would have called a clearing of thought, took place regarding his views on war in general, evolution, biblical criticism, Home Rule in Ireland,

higher education for women, Quakerism itself, silence in meeting, the character of Lord Roberts, the rightness of Home Mission work and the newly invented motor car. In every case whether the process was long or short, whether the matter momentous or not, the outcome was the result of the intellectual activity of a trained mind. In every case, moreover he allowed his family and friends, his readers and his listeners to see and follow the workings of it. We shall ourselves be following it in relation to evolution and Biblical criticism which were connected with human progress as he saw it, and to war which he came to see as the chief obstacle to it.

It was on the people involved in issues and situations that his mind was chiefly focused, whether they were the invaders of Italy, the builders of the Roman Wall, the family at home, Friends in the local meeting, colleagues at work, people caught in crisis or beset by problems, or contemporaries thinking about the same things as himself, whether he knew them personally or not, whether he agreed with them or not. By nature a traditionalist, never a pipe for fortune's finger to play what wind she choose, but equipped with a warm heart, an open mind, an above average intellect, he was devoid of conceit, a born communicator, a lover of learning and wisdom and truth, limited by privilege, but never prejudiced on account of it. He met the challenges of his day, sensibly and studiously, working his way through fog and muddle till the mind was clear and convinced, and he was ready for the new commitment.

His was an unusually balanced personality, a historian as well as a banker - like Grote - a letter writer as well as a man of letters, a traveller and a good host, a man of affairs and a good companion, ready with words but open to the thoughts and needs of others and, both before and after marriage, a family person, whose home was the centre of his life. And for all his involvement in the wider secular and academic world he was a Quaker of the Quakers, a pedigreed and public Friend.

He was born in the then pretty little village of Tottenham on 29 July 1831, his father John, a conveyancer; his mother Elizabeth, the daughter of Luke Howard; his father's brother Thomas, the physician, reformer and philanthropist of the blue plaque on 45 Bedford Square, and the family's beloved Uncle Doctor. Our Thomas had an elder brother Eliot and two sisters, Mariabella who married Edward Fry, later to become Lord Chief Justice, and Elizabeth who married Alfred Waterhouse, the architect. Their mother died when Thomas was four. His father's second marriage was to Ann Backhouse (Jonathon B. Backhouse was their son) and, on her death, his third wife was Elizabeth Houghton who bore him six children.

There was good company for the young Quakers of Tottenham; they even had their own essay society, a very lively intellectual and sociable affair.[3] After attendance at the Grove House School locally and a continental trip with his father, brother and uncle, he went at the age of 15 to University College London, itself only three years older than he was. He lodged in the Hampstead Road with two medical students, one of whom was Joseph Lister then a Quaker. His studies, however, were seriously interrupted by ill health, depression and the strain of over work - largely self-imposed. He completed his degree however in 1851 with Honours in Classics and having formed a rare and lasting friendship with Edward Fry. Another breakdown in 1853 meant he had to abandon the training for a legal career which he had begun in Joseph Bevan Braithwaite's chambers. After rest and another continental trip, this time with Alfred Waterhouse he started a career in banking at Whitehaven where, in his spare time, he added Hebrew to his Greek and Latin and read widely in theology, including Niebuhr and Pusey. In 1859 he accepted partnership in a new bank at Newcastle upon Tyne with William Edward Barrett, Jonathan Pease and Robert Spence, who was aged 41, the eldest of the four. He was there till he retired, 44 years later at the age of 72.

In 1861 he married Lucy Anna Fox of Falmouth and five years later they went to live at Benwelldene, a house designed for them by Alfred Waterhouse where they lived for 28 years and where all their children were born, Lucy Violet was 25 when they moved to the keep at Bamburgh Castle for five years, and in 1893 they moved to their last home Barmoor, still in Northumberland. His whole life was punctuated by visits and travel, in the early days to Falmouth, Ackworth Villas, the home of the Howards, and with his father to Ireland. The frequent continental trips, the visit to the East in 1889 and to Australia and New Zealand in 1909 were also family affairs even when undertaken in the cause of history or Quakerism.

On 31 July 1931 Arthur Rowntree had a leading article in *The Friend* entitled *Thomas Hodgkin, Historian* celebrating the hundredth anniversary of his birth.[4] Oxford University Press marked the occasion by a reissue of *Italy and her Invaders* of which the first two of its original eight volumes had appeared in 1880 and the last at the close of the century. In 1901 when he was 70 *The History of England from Earliest Times to the Norman Conquest* was published. Louise Creighton lists five pages of historical, antiquarian and archaeological publications, and another three of other books, articles and addresses mostly religious and Quaker.[5] Of his work as a historian the editor of *The Friend* wrote a few days after Thomas's

death, 'He cared more to emphasize the great historical ideas and principles which pass like a thread through the beads of facts, looking for the propelling power, the ethic, the inner meaning. He was a student of tendency'.[6] Both Oxford and Durham awarded him the DCL and Dublin a LittD. He had also given a lifetime's loyal service to the Society of Friends, not so much as a committee man as by the quality of his ministry, his support for meetings for church affairs, participation as speaker in many a conference and summer school, the pastoral visit to Australia and New Zealand and throughout all his life the invaluable service of his writing on specifically Quaker matters. He wrote and delivered the Swarthmore Lecture in his 80th year, less than two years before his death at Falmouth on 2 March 1913.

The Swarthmore Lecture represents a lifetime's coming to terms with the new concepts of God, of God's world and God's word, which had almost simultaneously burst upon England when Thomas was in his twenties. It reflects the revolution that had taken place in public thought and it can almost be seen as a summary of the last chapter in his own spiritual progress. It was entitled 'Human Progress and the Inward Light' and was delivered on 23 May 1911 at Devonshire House with the previous year's lecturer Joan Mary Fry, the eldest daughter of his sister Mariabella and his friend Edward Fry, in the chair.

The first section begins with a resounding tribute to the theory of evolution and expresses amazement at the change in the outlook of educated people. Instead of believing that everything was the same as it had always been, organic life was now seen as one of continuous development, with mankind taken hold of by its maker, renewed generation after generation and even enabled to understand something of the process. The Galileos, Newtons and Darwins, whether aware of it or not, had been messengers of God, doing his bidding. God is Light and though in evil we see the shadow, the light is there for the intellect as well as the spirit. Though the civilized, and still more the uncivilized races of earth have still a long way to go, it is all part of the process in evolutionary time. Life is, as it were, on two planes with humankind leaving the one behind and stretching forward to what is before.

He then speaks about the Inward Light, it universality and its revelation of the purposes of God, something more than conscience, something constraining as well as restraining. He quotes the experience of Socrates, and Paul's speech on Mars Hill and points to the witness of other religions in which he sees no clash with God. Regarding the miracles and the supernatural elements in the bible which were a stumbling block to the scientific mind, he distinguishes between

supernatural happenings and descriptions of spiritual experiences. In view of the miracles of modern science he is less likely to write them off than he had been before. Miracles he said had in fact not been encouraged in the Old Testament and were actually rebuked in the New. The still small voice would bring us nearer to God than any miracle.

The third section focuses on co-operation with God. Our progress depends on this. God does not treat us as automata but as fellow workers with himself, as sons, with free will. God depends on individual faithfulness. Unless we obey his voice and follow the light nothing will be done towards the accomplishment of this purpose. Thomas Hodgkin proceeds to encourage his hearers with the lifestory of William Savery who, at the end of the eighteenth century, in Philadelphia, Virginia, Maryland, Germany, France and Britain, even in times of war, obeyed the Divine Voice. For all the noble singleness of his aim, his lifetime's work might have been judged a failure but for the fact that one of his converts in the worldly city of Norwich had been a vain little motherless miss in purple boots laced with scarlet who became a prison reformer and the founder of the first nursing sisterhood where, shortly afterwards, Florence Nightingale began her training.

The spirit's route from inward to upward and outward is the subject of the last section, with emphasis on the effect of the Gospel on the human race. He saw a new universal spirit in literature and, instead of the old introspective testing of spiritual muscles there was an opening of windows and signs of greater obedience to the upward calling. He wonders, nevertheless, whether for all the new mechanical inventions in steam and electricity there had really been progress. He quotes Elizabeth Barratt Browning "twere but power within our tether, no new spirit power". Were we really any better than our forebears and his answer is a fairly hopeful yes. We had seen the end of the blood feuds of the Celts and the Teutons, the weakened influence of old superstitions, slavery theoretically abolished, a little more religious toleration, advances in science and the art of healing, a better understanding between understanding between classes and a clearer recognition of the fact that if *one* suffers, all may be affected. But there was still a long way to go and he instances the relationship between the civilized and the uncivilized: for the few who did great things there were many who debased and defrauded; the advent of the European had not always brought benefit. Above all, war was still with us, with all its pomp and circumstance and its energy and skill employed in the destruction of other human beings. If Christianity does not destroy war, he declares,

war will destroy Christianity. In conclusion, he returns to the image of the journey between two planes, the way of holiness, the way of progress open to us all if only we will listen to his voice and obey the gentle pressure of his hand.

It would be interesting to know whether the spoken lecture differed from the published text. The Quaker journals clearly used the latter for their reviews. *The British Friend's,* probably by its editor, Edward Grubb, had a few reservations about it.[7] It referred to the length of the passage devoted to William Savery (it was 17 pages!), the section on the miraculous which it felt needed different treatment; and the unnecessarily strong antagonism in which secular and Christian had been placed. 'The central difficulty' it said, 'of combining evolution with the Christian view of human progress had been made more serious than it need'. Cosmic progress was not just about strength and survival of the strongest but suggestive of the greater force of co-operation. (Frances Thompson, in fact, though this was not mentioned, in her address on Social Questions to the Manchester Conference in 1895 had quoted as a scientific fact Darwin's dictum that those communities which included the greatest number of the most sympathetic members would flourish best).[8] Half a century after the publication of the *Origin of the Species,* the subject of human progress was in 1911 still topical. The previous number of *The British Friend* contained a review of Bergson's *Creative Evolution* and in this same one, notes of an address given at the Annual Meeting of the Friends Social Union by Ramsay Macdonald on *The Spiritual Aspects of Progress.*

The text of the Lecture is followed by two notes, the first on *Is the Work of the Christian Church to make the world better?* added, he says, so that readers might see that his own hopeful views were not everyone's. He quoted from theologians prophesying doom - and said he had himself found the expectation of a tragic end coming from a certain type of evangelical rather than from the disciplinarian high churchmen. In answer to the second question as to whether war was the only persistent evil against which Christians must contend he lists sweated industry, gambling, speculation, alcoholism, millionarism, the vicious movie and the adulterous drama - some of which he saw as not unconnected with the war industry. But he also instances the fine qualities of those working in lifeboats, fire brigades, hospitals, missions and the shepherd on the Cheviots in a snow storm. He also notes that that section of the Christian church which insists on the necessity of listening to the Divine Voice, is also the one most committed to belief in the essential incompatability between war and Christianity.

The style of the lecture, as one would expect, is different from that of the notes, but it is also in marked contrast to that of his writings in letters and papers even on the same or similar subjects. It is the style of a preacher and of one going out of his way to present scientific discovery in scriptural terms, orthodox rather than evangelical. It is so heavily laden with Christian imagery and biblical texts that one wonders if he had felt the need, even as late as 1911, to soften the blow of his uncompromising commitment to modern thought for those close friends and relatives to whom it was still a stumbling block. Or was he perhaps just revelling in the fact that so much biblical language was still applicable and relevant? One does however miss the deftness, wit and charm that was so characteristic of his prose style.

Nor does what he has to say seem very momentous to us today; but it has to be seen in the context of contemporary thinking and it is difficult at this distance to appreciate the force of the joint impact in 1859 of the theory of evolution and biblical criticism on traditional beliefs and assumptions or, for example, the effect of geological discoveries on the prevailing, literal interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis. The theory of evolution and biblical criticism were referred to together as 'modern thought' and positive discussion about them conducted in what was called 'the spirit of free enquiry'.

There had, of course, been evolutionists before Darwin; and the literal veracity of the Scriptures had been questioned before Higher Criticism, as such, had percolated through to England from Germany - notably in Coleridge's *Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit* (published posthumously in 1840 and questioning the absolute inerrancy of every word in the bible and denying any inherent opposition between the development of modern science and the essence of Christianity).

And in the world of Quakerism, there had been a stirring of the waters which by 1895 was to become a flashing stream - John Stephenson Rowntree's prize essay in 1858 criticising the Society's shibboleths and, from the position of a 24-year old, pointing to the causes of its feebleness. In the same year there was the founding of the Manchester Institute for young men - for self-culture, study and the pursuit of truth.[9]

But for all, the real turning point came in 1859 - when in the same year, *The Origin of the Species* was published, Tischerndorf discovered the *Codex Sinaiticus,* the Greek manuscript of the Bible; and, for good measure, John Stuart Mills *On Liberty* appeared.

Stephen Jay Gould in *The Panda's Thumb* believes the genius of Darwin lay in his taking a middle path between inductivism and what he

calls *eurekaism,* from his combining the concise productive search conducted in a ramifying but ordered manner together with a broad range of insights from disciplines other than his own, philosophy, poetry and economics. He bases this belief on his study of notebooks written by Darwin during the two years immediately following the Beagle voyage (1831-5) which had given him a sense of space and time to think in independent self stimulation. While acknowledging the fact that Darwin later seemed to suggest allegiance to slavish inductivism it seems to Gould the new evidence has prior significance. There is some support for this view in a letter of Thomas Hodgkin's to Howard Lloyd in 1887.[10] It refers to a review of Darwin's life and to Darwin's own admission that he had lost what he once had, all power of enjoying poetry - that this part of his mind had become atrophied by disuse and he regretted this should have been so - he had let himself dwindle into a mere scientific machine for grinding out laws from facts.

Janet Browne of the Darwin Letters project at Cambridge has recently pointed to another aspect of the Beagle voyage, namely the sympathetic attitude of Darwin and Captain Fitzroy to the work of missionaries. Fitzroy was bringing back with him three Fuegians whom he had taken previously to London for education and in 1836 he and Darwin sent a joint letter to a South African newspaper about the value of missionary work.

It was no surprise to me when I read this in a History of Science Society Newsletter.[11] I had known since childhood that Darwin (impressed by the results of missionary work among people he had formerly thought incapable of progress) had paid a life subscription to the work of the South American Missionary Society.[12]

In 1909, 50 years after the publication of *The Origin of the Species,* Thomas Hodgkin wrote to his son Edward 'In 1858, we the men and women in the street, all looked upon species as immutable things and the doctrines of development a foolish dream; and now I suppose we all believe in it up to a certain point and almost all are persuaded that we never thought otherwise'. At the time he had confessed to jibbing at the thought of being descended through apes from reptiles but felt nevertheless that neither Christianity nor religion was threatened and that, in fact, the sense of God's power and of ourselves as fellow workers was heightened.

My father, who had spent the first 20 years of his life in the Australian backblocks, then five in a missionary training college in the East End of London and then five in the High Andes of Peru, caught up with *The Origin of Species* in the Maori King country of New Zealand when he was

30. He wrote in his diary on 20 June 1912 'I can see no objection to adopting the theory of evolution in its entirety' and he recorded his astonishment that Christians could even have thought or spoken of Darwin as the enemy of Christianity.

Cardinal Newman, in a different league but the same profession as my father, was the object of heavy criticism from Thomas Hodgkin regarding the Apostolic Succession and Sacerdotalism but, despite his tractarianism, he was also an evolutionist, not disabused, of the Christian faith by the theories of Charles Darwin.[13] It might be added, not irrelevantly, that Newman's brother was a scientist and evolutionist. Though he never took up the position he had been appointed the first principal of University College London. Thomas Hodgkin the young student, sharing rooms with Joseph Lister, attending lectures at the 'godless institution in Gower Street'; near where Darwin himself had been living from 1838-42, and going on to visit Uncle Doctor at 45 Bedford Square must have been for years in an evolutionary atmosphere.

There were, however, many Christians whose faith was shaken, if not shattered. There are still those today who say they find Alfred Russell Wallace more acceptable than Darwin for his allowing a place for external intervention in the development of conscience and morality.[14] In spite of Huxley's work in adult education and his consideration of *The Ethics of Evolution* Thomas Hodgkin seems to have been uneasy about what he saw as Huxley's materialist views and the distress they had caused. Thomas Hodgkin was a convinced Darwinian and remained so for the rest of his life, so that in 1912 he was still saying "Thank God for Charles Darwin".

His reactions to Higher Criticism were more complicated, possibly because of the solid Quaker orthodoxy of his upbringing. But he was always a learner and several letters to Richard Westlake in 1912 refer not only to his debt to Darwin but also to Coleridge whose book he described as epoch-making and how acceptance of the fact that there were things in the Bible which could in no sense be accepted as messages for their souls, had determined his attitude for the last half century of his life far more than the minute dissection of biblical manuscripts by the Higher Critics. Long before them, thanks to Coleridge, he had renounced the claim of absolute inerrancy for every word of the bible but had not felt the need to abandon its inspiration. He was sure they had been right both in renouncing and retaining.[15]

Much, however, had happened during those 50 years. In 1860 there was the publication of *Essays and Reviews* - a collection of essays written in

a 'spirit of free enquiry'. The subjects included *Biblical Researches, Evidences of Christianity,* the *Mosaic Cosmology,* and *Tendencies of Religious Thought in England.* The last essay was by Benjamin Jowett on *Interpretation of Scripture* and the first by Frederick Temple on *The Education of the World.*[16] He concluded with these words, 'No service that man can render to his fellows is to be compared ... with a life of holiness. But next to that must be ranked whatever makes men think clearly and judge correctly for we are now adults governed by principles - if governed at all - and cannot rely any longer on the impulses of youth or the discipline of childhood.' That was the theme of the essay.

The book was instantly regarded as scandalous. It was popularly called, "Seven Against Christ". There was a protest of 200 clergy against Temple's appointment to the see of Exeter and an attempt by four bishops to stop his consecration at Westminster Abbey. London Yearly Meeting nearly inserted a warning against it in the General Epistle. *The Friend* reviewed the lecture on it at the Manchester Institute by David Duncan.[17] It said 'Believing as we do that the obvious tendency if not the aim of that work is to weaken the faith of its readers in the authority of the Bible, to induce doubt or disbelief in some of the distinguished doctrines of Christianity we cannot but regret that the lecture before us should have emanated from a member of the Society of Friends.' As for the essays themselves the reviewer could only quote Dr Pusey who had said that except for the geological contributions they contained nothing with which those acquainted with the writings of unbelievers in Germany had not been familiar during the past 30 years.

In October 1861 *The Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record* carried a 17-page article entitled "Remarks on Dr Temple's Essay 'Education of the World' "[18] It was by Thomas Hodgkin. 'While dissenting', he said, 'from most of Dr Temple's scheme, we accept the general outline and welcome any attempt made in an earnest, reverent and Christian spirit to solve the main problem' but he did not feel that Temple was equipped to deal with the promise of the Spirit's coming and noted that the words of Christ, not one of which can fall to the ground, had been wholly left out of the picture. He deemed it hopeless therefore for Temple to construct a scheme for the education of the world and the progress of the species. He deplored Temple's choice of words and described his theory as unsatisfactory, indefinite and inadequate. Thus did the 30-year old banker berate the 40-year old headmaster of Rugby.

He attended the British Association meeting in Newcastle in 1863 helping with the arrangements for it, accommodating four guests and revelling in the company of the scientifically learned. He wrote to his father saying that though there were practically no direct attacks on the Bible in the frequent discussions on the antiquity of man and the common origin of the human race the Scriptures were counting for nothing compared with geology and the chasm between science and faith was being widened; geology he felt was being too hasty and would have to retract.

The following year 1864 he was writing to Edward Fry to say that mystery could not easily be elbowed out of the way by reason, and to Frederick Seebohm deploring the prevalence of facile, flippant criticisms of the Bible and Christianity. In 1865 however he produced a pamphlet of his own on *Thoughts on the Inspiration of the Scripture*[19] which he distributed privately. It was addressed particularly to young doubters and maintained that inspiration was independent of infallibility and authenticity. Inspiration stood for communication between God and Man. Christianity was not primarily a system of theology and even less of philosophy. It was a declaration of the fact of the presence of the Holy Spirit; truth was the first attribute of Christianity and the Holy Spirit was still guiding, teaching and leading us into truth even though we had to be prepared to change our views on certain detail in the light of new discoveries in astronomy, geology, ethnology and anthropology. The message he said was the same even if the original messenger had mispronounced some of the words. This was nearly 50 years before the Swarthmore Lecture and it had John Hodgkin worried lest it should delay the recording of his son as a minister. It may well have done just that for Thomas was not, in fact, recorded until 1869.

Modern thought was however gradually gaining greater acceptance in the churches. In 1865 Bishop Colenso in Natal had been excommunicated for his liberal theology and critical work on the Pentateuch. Seven years later the Canterbury convocation appointed an ecumenical committee to make such minor alterations to the King James text as modern scholarship required. And in 1897 Frederick Temple, an avowed evolutionist and the author of a once offending essay, was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury.

Friends too were working their way through and coming to terms with new ideas, not without casualties[20] but helped by their own Quaker scientists like Alfred Bennett, Silvanus P Thompson and Leonard Doncaster, by their own Biblical scholars notably Rendel

Harris and above all by their love of truth. In the first number of the *Friends Quarterly Examiner* in 1867 Thomas Hodgkin had an article, 26 pages long, in the form of a dialogue between a Hugh and an Arthur 'Concerning Grove's Inaugural address to the British Association' *(The Law of Continuity)* - a fine example of the way he had to argue a matter out with himself. Arthur had found it depressing, Hugh the best thing in the whole meeting. Apart from a quoted remark of Huxley to the effect that it was difficult these days to get an audience without either a heresy or a famous person, it is all very serious and detailed with quotations from Socrates and Bacon, the main point at issue being the existence or non-existence of a Divine Intelligence in the creation of the world. There was no real winner or loser - only Thomas seeking clearance. He once told Mariabella that he could sometimes see the other side better than his own.

1884 saw the publication of *A Reasonable Faith,* and, causing less sensation, in 1886 came Edward Worsdell's *A Gospel of Divine Help.* (By 1905 this was a text book in a Leeds Theological College). In both books there was more than help for doubters; there was the expression of a newly found confidence in Christianity. Like their seventeenth-century ancestors released from doctrines and dogmas, many Friends, including Thomas Hodgkin, were now discovering greater significance and new relevance in the life of Jesus.

In 1888 the Richmond Declaration, the statement of evangelical faith from Indiana, anticipated with alarm by some Friends including Roger, son of Edward Fry, was presented to Yearly Meeting by the patriarchal Joseph Bevan Braithwaite, discussed quietly, with several Friends including Thomas Hodgkin, exerting liberal influence, and finally simply put in the Minute Book, its danger defused. Thomas referred to this at the time in a letter to Joseph Rowntree. 'It is not this goody goody, determined to be orthodox, vapid and diffuse Confession of Faith which helps me to believe!'[21] Jesus Christ, he said, speaks more powerfully than ever before. And in a letter to Anne Wakefield Richardson on 2 January 1912 he refers to the time when they had had to contend for breadth of freedom to argue about the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration and, he went on, 'to prevent the dear evangelicals putting a yoke on our necks which neither our fathers nor we had been able to bear'.[22] He goes on, however, to agree with her about the necessity of keeping in touch with the old-fashioned evangelicals and to speak of the new duty laid upon them to see that Christianity did not become practically Christless.

At the Manchester Conference in 1895 Thomas Hodgkin was in the chair for the session on 'The Relationship of Quakerism to Modern Thought'. In his own address he spoke of aestheticism, pessimism, socialism and "scientism" arguing with himself a little, as he liked to do, but generally urging caution regarding over-indulgence in aesthetic pursuits, pleading for the early Quaker view of the universal and saving light of Christ which, he said, was more efficacious than Calvinist teaching and Roman Catholic purgatory, and, again beginning with Galileo and ending with Darwin, he declared there had been more rapid and revolutionary changes in the past half century than ever before.

The four ensuing papers of that session varied in subject and style, with the main emphasis on progress made and still to be made if, to use Roger Wilson's words,[23] 'it were to fulfil its mission in a changing world and bring to bear on its religious life the liberating resources of modern thought in theology, sciences, education, social change and corporate worship.' The vibrant spirit of the 27-year old John Wilhelm Rowntree pervaded the whole exhilarating conference. His faith was infectious but he had a warning too - of danger in new, perhaps more subtle forms of authoritarianism coming from an unfocused Inward Light.

Many of the speakers were specialist scholars, none more so than Silvanus P. Thompson physicist and biographer of Lord Kelvin. He was essentially a communicator both of his own subject and of his religious and political convictions. At the Manchester Conference he followed Rendel Harris who had pleaded for co-operation between science and religion and for a generous statement of our belief in evolutionary theory that we might take our right place amongst the intellectual forces of the world. Silvanus P. Thompson spoke of the function of scientific reasoning, its concern with things demonstrably true or false and the danger of accepting anything on authority alone. There are truths as old as the hills, he said but also errors as old as the pyramids. The illumination of the divine within the soul is a fact which scientists cannot explain or investigate but the intellect itself is God-given; we have no right to neglect it or neglect to exercise it on the accretions of human error. Quakers had developed the habit of accuracy in thought and speech. Modern thought could clear away much that had choked and hindered the clear instirring of the divine light. The heart could not say to the head: 'I have no need of thee'.

John William Graham, speaking next said that belief in the mechanical infallibility of the Scriptures rested on the uninformed views of the bishops of early centuries against whose dictates Friends were in revolt. There was some protest at the end of the session that

there had not been enough time to question the views put forward. 'If all these things go forth to the public as the views of the Society of Friends the position will be exceedingly serious' cried Jonathon B Hodgkin, the Chairman's half-brother.

The FFMA conference at Darlington in October 1896 on 'The Work of the Society of Friends in the Foreign Mission Field' highlighted, in the clash of ideas there between Charles Terrell and Thomas Hodgkin, the continuing differences in Quaker concepts. In reply to Charles Terrell's comments on the blackness of the heathen heart Thomas Hodgkin spoke of the special responsibility laid upon Friends 'to read the palimpsest of the human heart and the characters written and traced by the hand of God on every human soul'. This is itself evidence of how far he had himself come since 1865. His own mind in fact was like a palimpsest for all to read - each layer having to be seen in the context of its own time, and the earlier one comprehended before the significance of the later appreciated.

In 1897 he wrote to Richard Westlake, who shared so much of his thinking over the years, saying that we had to adapt ourselves to the idea of creation by evolution even as Christians in the seventeenth century had had to adapt to the Copernican theory - a point he had made in his 1865 pamphlet on *The Inspiration of the Scriptures.*

The Anglo-Boer War began on 12 October 1899 and ended on 31 May 1902. The debate between Friends all through the war regarding the major issues underlying British policy down to detailed matters like milk for Boer babies; and particularly the one in 1900 on "The Fatherhood of God" have to be seen in relation to the theological and scientific crises of the years preceding it.[24] Friends had taken one further step in freeing the truth from all the Church had done to embellish and condition it. Religion and politics were intertwined: the peace testimony was challenged: concepts of the fatherhood of God were connected with attitudes towards Lord Roberts. Those who had led the way forward at the Manchester Conference were the outspoken critics of British policy. John Willhelm Rowntree called the war a carnival of hell and Silvanus P. Thompson in the Westminster Meeting House on 25 November 1900 spoke of what he saw as the wrongness of a war, then turned against non-combattants. He said that responsibility would continue to rest on Britain unless some protest was heard from those who claimed that the Sermon on the Mount had never been repealed. His speech, reported in *The Times,* is said to have lost him his place on the shortlist for an academic post in Cambridge.

Thomas Hodgkin was thinking differently, and differently from his own later conclusions about both the Anglo-Boer War and war in general. In November 1899, a few weeks after the outbreak of war he wrote to *The Friend* quoting from the writings of his late brother-in-law Sir Robert Fowler, [25] Lord Mayor of London in 1883, to show that the seeds of the dispute were in the Boer treatment of the natives. This he said had been behind Sir Robert's refusal to receive Boer envoys at the Mansion House. Ellen Robinson replied on the instant to say that despite her esteem for Thomas Hodgkin she deplored his attempt to influence Friends by evoking opprobrium rather than sympathy for the Boers and she produced up-to-date facts to prove that the British were just as bad in their treatment of the natives. Jane Smeal Thompson, a professional journalist and the wife of Silvanus, had also been surprised and pained; and she also referred to our bloodstained record. Eliza Sturge thought our own present record more important than Sir Robert's past; and she quoted from the Aborigines Protection Society (of which, incidentally, Uncle Doctor had been a founder member).[26]

In February 1900 Robin Hodgkin wrote to *The Friend* saying that though the worst features of war should be attacked each man should rely on his own conscience and that those not convinced of the unlawfulness of all war should not shelter behind the conscience of their forefathers. His father also believed in individual freedom from external authority. But the war was grief to him and he felt, to use his own words, 'embittered, blasted by this dreadful, humiliating, spine-chilling war'.[27] Still thinking his own way through he wrote an *'Essay on War with special reference to the war in South Africa'*, distributed privately to family and friends. He again used dialogue form this time between A and B who agreed at the outset to drop the odious terms 'pro-Boer' and 'Jingo'. There is much about capitalism and the quest for gold, whether it was Chamberlain's war or Kruger's and the possibility of the Society of Friends petitioning the Government. Part II is an imaginary extract from *The Friend* written by A, in anticipation of this; and then, under the title *The Great Disarmament* there is (also imaginatively) a chapter from a Short History of the English People by J. R. Green Jr! The dialogue resumes with B saying that forecast is not prophecy and prophecy not argument. A concludes with the belief that by the year 2000 war between nations will be as impossible as it was already between Britain and America; and abolished even as slavery had been.

Writing to Mariabella with a copy of this essay he said there was a sense in which he longed to maintain his testimony against war but he felt it would not be right to press for immediate, instant disarmament.[28]

He wrote again in reply to her comments on the essay. He said that the question was too large, and too depressing for any little personal feelings of offence if they failed to convince each other of their views. 'Thou talkest', he wrote 'of my having changed my views. I would rather say "cleared them" ' and goes on to elaborate the argument, feeling he has failed to make her understand that though he does not believe that those who suffer for peace principles are wrong, he cannot believe that in *all* circumstances war is wrong for Christians. 'I am amused' he continues 'to see how purely warlike you find its tone. To those not brought up in a Quaker atmosphere it is absurdly anti-war'.

When he wrote to her husband, Edward Fry in 1906 from Holland he said 'You know that I was rather disposed to think the Boer War an inevitable one but I am rather sliding away from that opinion and am more and more feeling what a terribly expensive luxury Joseph has been to England. To think of such a friendship as this (with Holland) lost and our good name among the nations stained for the sake of those dirty speculators on the Rand in indeed exasperating.[29] He was also beginning to feel that the possibility of a mutual pact between Christian states in favour of disarmament should not be dismissed.

It is clear that he was coming to see war as the major obstacle to human progress. In 1907, writing to A. Marriage Wallis he dreams of the day when the use of physical force to settle the quarrels of nations may be as rare as it had become to settle the disputes of individuals and he adds simply 'I want to be on the side of those working towards that end'.[30] In 1906 he was feeling that it should be the aim of every true Christian patriot to make his State a Christ-State among the nations strong, brave and courteous without the expression of rancour or rudeness in what had become an increasingly efficient world of communication. In 1912 to Richard Westlake he wished that the Bible Society, in the dissemination of its literature, would put more emphasis on the quality of the material rather than the quantity. He said there was an excellent precedent for this in the case of Ulfilas, the scholarly fourth-century Gothic bishop who, in translating the Bible, left out the Books of Samuel and Kings, believing that his people's warlike ways needed the curb rather than the spur.[31] He adds that he thinks he has a little of Uncle Doctor's spirit in being made miserable on hearing of injustice. More and more he began to associate himself publicly with such causes as those of the Africans in the Congo, the Bulgarians, and the victims of the Boer War.

Lucy Violet Hodgkin's notebooks sum up the change that took place in their whole attitude to war. She writes of the significance of her father's presence in the chair at the York Peace Conference in 1913 shortly before he died, though not well and not up to his usual form. She wrote 'We have both become so much more Quakers in our outlook than we were in the days of the South African war when we should, he and I, have volunteered with Robin had we been eligible. He has made me feel much more clear as to the paths he means George and me to tread at a difficult time'.

The 'difficult time' was due to the deteriorating relations between England and Germany. He had been distressed about these for a long time and had been corresponding with Francis William Fox about them. In the context of this address it raises the question of the effect of disasters - acts of God, like the Lisbon earthquake or home-made ones like the Anglo-Boer war - on human progress; and of both crises and disaster on belief in it. By the time of the Swarthmore Lecture, as we have seen, Thomas Hodgkin was convinced that in what Quakers called the Inward Light, the power of God within the human heart, rather than external omnipotence lay the possibility of progress even against fearful odds.

Poets, psychologists and philosophers as well as theologians and scientists had been caught up by the intellectual revolution of their time. Poetry meant much to Thomas Hodgkin; he wrote it and lectured on it. I have quoted one line of the long passage of Elizabeth Barratt Browning which he used in the Swarthmore Lecture. In Browning himself, whom he had met at least once there was a man who had also had to come to terms with Higher Criticism and the God of evolution. In *Death in the Desert* he had written 'Yet now I wake in such decrepitude, feeling for footholds in a deep profound'. From that, however, emerged faith and a new strength. *Bishop Blougram's Apology,* with all its complicated concentration on the question of doubt, comes out on the side of pure faith. 'The sum of all is Yes. My faith is greater, my faith remains'.

William James was another contemporary of Thomas Hodgkin. He also found the answer within the human being. In *The variety of religious experience* (1902) he points to the existence of 'specific and various reservoirs of consciousness, like energies with which we can make specific contact in time of trouble, a store of saving power - *"the more"* with which saving contacts can be made; and, in communion with it, a new force comes into the world, new departures are made which produce regenerative effects unobtainable otherwise'.[32]

It is particularly appropriate here to mention Claude Montefiore (1858-1938)[33] the Jewish scholar and philanthropist associated with the Froebel Institute, Hartley College Southampton and the Liberal Jewish Movement. His father's uncle was Moses Montefiore whose personal physician and friend was our Thomas's Uncle Doctor. The two of them, baronet and Quaker, Jew and Christian, banker and doctor, travelled the Middle East together administering relief and ensuring the continuity of aid in areas of distress. In 1911, the year of the Swarthmore Lecture, Claude Montefiore was involved in the establishment of a Liberal Jewish Synagogue in London. Jews as well as Christians in Germany and in England had been following textual discoveries affecting the understanding of their scriptures and they too had been influenced by the new spirit of free enquiry accompanying the publication of evolutionary theory. Some of them were beginning to see that there were things in *their* Bible which were questionable, even morally questionable, that human error could have occurred, and that every word was not necessarily true nor every law necessarily obligatory. Liberal Judaism developed within orthodox Jewry and is recognised as legitimate if not acceptable to all. Both the Swarthmore Lecture and the liberal Jewish Synagogue expressed, in different ways, a faith renewed by modern thought and applicable to modern circumstances. As a member of the Council responsible for the establishment of the State of Israel it was Claude Montefiore who successfully insisted on having it designated not *the* but *a* home for the Jewish people.

Every period of time, as the Chinese like to remind us, is a bridge between the past and the future. We have been concentrating on the years spanned by the life of Thomas Hodgkin DCL. We conclude with a look at Aristotle's definition of progress and a few references to human progress from our own contemporaries. 'The idea of progress' said Aristotle 'implies that a particular course of change leads towards that which is beneficial or desirable for humanity as a whole'.[34] It is those last three words which furnish the safeguard against self interest and subjectivity. Are we getting any further than Thomas Hodgkin and his contemporaries did? Is there any way of knowing? Is progress possible to assess? Is development necessarily progress? Can we really think of the whole as global in every circumstance? Can we improve on Aristotle's definition? How can human progress, locally or globally, be measured? How important to progress is belief in progress? How far does language reflect human progress and how far influence it? How far do we have to recognise and allow for changing values and moral standards?

David Brion Davis in his book *Slavery and Human Progress*[35] reminds us that slavery was once regarded as a progressive force and crucial to the expansion of the western world. (Was it not in fact originally an advance on extermination of the enemy?) It was not till the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that it began to be seen as a retrograde institution. He comments on the infinite human capacity for dignifying and even ennobling acts of repression and the problem of conceptualising and implementing human change. He analyses in detail the role of Quakers in the anti-slavery movement and how they were the first Christians to regard the renouncing of slave trading and slave holding as a test of faith. The excesses of industrialisation, imperialism and nationalism, he says, led to a waning commitment to the idea of progress.

Two chapters of David Babbington's book *Patterns of Progress in History*[36] deal with the way the values of eighteenth-century enlightenment spread downwards to the lower social groups with the development of the printing press, and what he sees as the association of current thought about progress with evolution, the remodelling of history in the scientific manner and the blows inflicted on progress by disaster. He asks whether liberty is the supreme value, whether morality is absolute, where do evil and suffering come in and was H.A.L. Fisher right in believing there is no sense of purpose in history?

The rhyming couplets of Tony Harrison enshrine wry comments on progress. *The Trackers of Oxyrhynchus* is based on a fragment of a Satyr play by Sophocles about the satyr Marsyas being flayed alive for rivalling the God, Apollo, in playing the lute.

> When it suddenly dawns on him the swine
> the pearl is cast before by one divine
> knows it's a pearl and not some novel food
> and aspires beyond dumb servitude
> When he enters the enclave it represents
> they reach for their skin removing instruments

and, from a chorus of Satyrs

> We have to keep a proper distance though
> We're meant as Calibans to serve a Prospero
> Deferential, rustic, suitably in awe
> of new inventions is what your satyr's for.
> It confounded the categories of high and low
> when Caliban could outplay Prospero.

and a comment from a satyr on progress at the expenses of nature referring to the tortoise shell used in the making of Apollo's lyre

> When nature gets made use of for man's needs
> My heart, at least the horse part of me bleeds
> But when I see the outcome, all the rest
> of me, the two thirds human is impressed.[37]

That second line, "My heart, at least the horse part of me bleeds" would seem to indicate that we have at least come some way from the use of such words as 'brutish' and 'bestial' which occurred naturally, and presumably acceptably in Thomas Hodgkin's Swarthmore Lecture in 1911. The message of the play, moreover, regarding the potential of the not-so-dumb but also regarded as inferior beings would seem to suggest that we have come a long way from the attitude behind the utterances 80 years ago even by people like Thomas Hodgkin. These, in their assumptions of the God-given inferiority of so-called 'lower races' now make uncomfortable, embarassing reading. But it also makes me wonder whether any of the things we are saying today - also in good faith - will seem just as appalling to our children's children's children in the coming century.

Of our own potential, as Quakers, Kenneth Boulding spoke in the Backhouse Lecture in 1964 when he declared his faith in and stated his case for the *Evolutionary Potential of Quakerism.* He believes it is far from exhausted and because of Quaker emphasis on perfectionism and experimentalism it has a loyalty to the future rather than the past (as President of the Friends Historical Society may I say I wish he had said "as well as" instead of "rather than"?). The religious experience, the ethical conclusions, the type of culture derived from it which is peculiarly Quaker have special relevance to the world of the future. The growing point of the Society of Friends is in an evolutionary potential which is both spiritual and intellectual, in knowledge sanctified by love. Thomas Hodgkin would have agreed with this though he, like ourselves, would not, I think, have been so dismissive of the past.

It is now 17 years since Bronowski's televised and published lectures under the title *The Ascent of Man.*[38] His last sentence was as follows:

'Every man, every civilisation, has gone forward because of its engagement with what it set itself to do. The personal commitment of a man to his skill, the intellectual commitment and the emotional commitment working together as one has made the ascent of Man.'

Thomas Hodgkin would have liked that too - the rhythm and precision of the prose and the underlying emphasis on the continuity of human endeavour. His own life had been well governed by those three commitments. His particular contribution to the life of the Society of Friends however went further than that and included spiritual commitment. For almost the whole of his life he and the Society of Friends had lived in a period of confusion and crisis. Throughout it all, in his life, even more than by his words, he showed that a caring person could be a thinking person; that the mind, a gift from God, could be dedicated to the service of God, that after 150 years of the disownment of the intellect, firstly by Quietism and then, in a different way by evangelicalism, it was right and needful for the Society to think - and above all, that for personal and corporate progress, heart, mind and spirit had to work together as one in the commitment of obedience to the Inward Light.

Hope Hewison

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1]Hope Hay Hewison, *Hedge of Wild Almonds,* London, 1989.
[2]*Op. cit.,* 223.
[3]Autobiography (typescript) on Ilmington MSS. reel 15, LSF. Mic. 192. inscribed on cover of the autobiography: "For Robin and his family with LVH's love 24 iv 1951".
[4]*The Friend,* 31, vii 1931, 701-3.
[5]Louise Creighton, *Life and Letters of Thomas Hodgkin* (2nd edn. London, 1918), 419-27.
[6]*The Friend,* 7 & 14 iii 1913, 145-50 and 161-6.
[7]*The British Friend,* 26 May 1911.
[8]Frances Thompson, *Manchester Conference,* p. 142 *et seq.*
[9]Roger Wilson, 'Friends in the nineteenth century' in *Friends Quarterly* 1984, p.354.
[10]Creighton, *op. cit.,* 149.
[11]History of Science Society Newsletter, Autumn 1990.
[12]The pioneer of the S.A.M.S.'s work was Capt. Allen F. Gardiner R.N. whose son the Revd. Allen W. Gardiner married my great aunt Ann Watts.
[13]Clifford Longley in *The Times* 3 Feb. 1990.
[14]See Alfred Russell Wallace 'Theistic Darwinism' in *Theological Review* (King's College, London), XII, 2, Autumn 1989.
[15]Creighton, *op. cit.,* 390.
[16]John W. Parker, London, 1860.
[17]*The Friend,* 1860, p. 153.
[18]At pp. 13-30.
[19]Alfred W. Bennett, London, 1865, see also *Annual Monitor,* 1903, 115-7.
[20]*Friends Quarterly Examiner,* 1867, p.53.

[21]Creighton, *op. cit.*, 337.
[22]*Ibid.*, 349.
[23]*Friends Quarterly*, 1984, p.363.
[24]Hewison, *op. cit.*, 8, 9.
[25]*Ibid.*, 106.
[26]*Ibid.*, 107.
[27]Creighton, *op. cit.*, 237.
[28]*Ibid.*, 241-2.
[29]*Ibid.*, 243.
[30]*Ibid.*, 245-7.
[31]*Ibid.*, 340.
[32]William James, *Varieties etc.*, 1902, p.520.
[33]Edward Kessler, *An English Jew: The Life and Writings of Claude Montefiore*, London, 1989.
[34]*Politics* I : 5.
[35]David Brion Davis, New York, Oxford, 1984, 107 *et seq.*
[36]Inter-Varsity Press, 1979, ch.4.
[37]Pp. 51-65.
[38]J. Bronowski, *The Ascent of Man*, BBC, London, 1973, 438.

A QUAKER INITIATIVE TO END THE KOREAN WAR

This article is being written as war rages in the Gulf, and Quaker energies are directed to the search for a just peace. The situation is in many ways similar to the Korean war 40 years ago. Then, as now, the crisis was precipitated by an act of aggression, in the Korean case confirmed by UN observers, in the Gulf case admitted by the aggressor. In both cases, the United States, with British support, took the issue to the UN Security Council. In both cases, the Security Council authorized military action to expel the invader and restore international peace and security. In the Korean case, the Security Council created a Unified Command under the United States of America, and the United States provided the bulk of the combat forces: in the Gulf, the United States assumed the leadership of the Coalition and again provided the major part of the military force.

Both wars caused grievous disappointment to those Friends and others who had conceived of the UN as an agency for peace, persuasion, and conciliation rather than for coercive military action. The Charter had declared that the UN's purpose was to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, and Friends were unhappy that military coercion was used before non-military measure had been given a proper chance.

British Quaker peace efforts in 1950-53 were entrusted to the East-West Relations Group (hereafter referred to as the EWRG). A Russia Group had been established by the Friends Peace Committee in 1946, with Geoffrey Wilson as chair, and a China Conciliation Group in 1947. The functions of these two Groups were merged in 1950 and the new EWRG was formed, with Gerald Bailey as secretary. It was intended that the EWRG should work closely with the American Friends Service Committee. The first meeting of the EWRG was held on 14 May 1950, six weeks before the outbreak of the Korean war.

The negotiations for a Korean armistice began on 8 July 1951, as the war entered its second year. Two US diplomats had travelled into Manhattan in a limousine with Soviet ambassador Malik, followed shortly afterwards by two hush-hush meetings between Malik and George Kennan, a senior US diplomat who happened at that time to be on leave of absence at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton. Shortly after the second meeting, Malik made an important broadcast over UN radio, proposing that the two sides in Korea should open negotiations for a cease-fire and withdrawal of forces, but making no reference to other issues on which China and the United States were at loggerheads.

The negotiations opened at Kaesong but were later moved to Panmunjom. By the following Spring, much of the text of the armistice had been agreed, but two issues had not been resolved. China and North Korea had proposed that complaints of alleged breaches of the armistice should be investigated by neutral nations, and the Unified Command had agreed to this. There then ensued seemingly interminable discussions about which nations had been truly neutral in the Korean war, and particularly over the proposal of North Korea and China that the Soviet Union should be one of the neutrals.

The other and more intractable issue concerned the future of prisoners of war and whether, when they were released at the end of hostilities, they should be compelled to return home or could choose to stay on the detaining side or even go to some other country. This was difficult to resolve because of a contradiction between the humanitarian principle that released POWs should not be compelled by the use of force to go anywhere against their will, and the clear wording of the Geneva POW Convention: 'Prisoners of war shall be released *and repatriated* without delay' (my italics).

On 28 April 1952, the Unified Command had presented to the Communist side a package deal, containing all the provisions already agreed and compromise proposals on outstanding issues. This had been rejected by North Korea and China, and negotiations had thereafter languished.

The EWRG had been actively concerned to end the fighting in Korea from the outset. Four of us (Gerald Bailey, Percy Bartlett, Agatha Harrison and myself) had discussed the negotiating deadlock at Panmunjom with Selwyn Lloyd (Minister of State at the Foreign Office)

on 3 April. The deadlocked armistice negotiations at Panmunjom arose at each meeting of the EWRG, and when we met on 27 June, we had to decide whether any further Quaker action was indicated following the Communist rejection of the Unified Command's package proposal. The armistice issues had by now been complicated by the fact that nine days before our meeting, the Soviet Union had raised in the UN Security Council the allegation that US forces in Korea had resorted to germ warfare, and the *Manchester Guardian* (as it then was) had suggested in a leading article that Quakers might have a role in investigating the Communist charges.

> If the International Red Cross is not acceptable to the Russian, Chinese, and North Korean Governments, what about the Quakers? A year ago Mr Malik himself received a delegation of British Quakers and treated them with many signs of respect and friendship. Would he and his Government now approve an investigation by an international commission of Quakers, with the help of such scientists as they may select?[1]

This referred to a delegation of British Friends to the Soviet Union the previous year, which was notable as the first occasion since the onset of the Cold War that a non-Communist group had visited Moscow and engaged in frank talks with Soviet leaders.

After heart-searching discussion, the EWRG came to the conclusion that the investigation proposed by the *Manchester Guardian* was probably not a proper Quaker responsibility or within the competence of Friends. 'Nevertheless [the minute continued] we do feel that Friends need to be constantly alert to all opportunities of assisting in the bringing of peace to Korea .....'

Attention then turned to a suggestion made by Pandit Nehru the previous week that India might be able to help over the POW deadlock, and the EWRG approved a proposal of Roger Wilson that a statement be prepared welcoming Nehru's suggestion and expressing the hope that it would be supported by all Commonwealth countries.[1b] Roger Wilson was asked to draft a suitable statement and to consult the American Friends Service Committee, and Gerald Bailey was asked to write to Selwyn Lloyd at the Foreign Office commending Nehru's suggestion.

Roger Wilson's draft was sent to the EWRG's parent body, the Friends Peace Committee, which agreed to publicize Roger Wilson's draft statement. Marion Parmoor was asked to present the draft to Meeting for Sufferings on 4 July. After slight amendment, the draft was approved. It stated that Friends had met under a sense of grave concern

for the situation in Korea, the recent large-scale bombing of North Korea by the Unified Command, an increased risk of extending the war, and the deadlocked negotiations at Panmunjom. Fresh initiatives were urgently needed to stop the fighting. Friends warmly welcomed Nehru's offer of help, were confident that it would be sympathetically considered by HMG, and hoped it would be vigorously commended at the United Nations. Copies of the statement were to be sent to (among others) the Prime Minister (Churchill), the Foreign Office, and Krishna Menon, who was in the process of giving up his job as Indian High Commissioner in London. Marion Parmoor died two days later.

The third World Conference of Friends was due to convene in Oxford at the end of July. Inevitably, there were many references to the Korean war and the armistice deadlock. Two sessions on 2 August had concerned 'Christianity in a World of Tension', and minute 13 had read:

> The continuing tragedy of the war in Korea has rested heavily upon us. It is our earnest hope that all those in positions of political authority will make renewed and constructive efforts to achieve peace. In particular we hope that the willingness of the Government of India to use their good offices in the cause of peace may be followed up actively. It is our desire that all Friends everywhere should unite in prayer for those in authority that they may be led into the paths of peace.

The conference asked that copies of the minute be sent to the foreign ministers of China, the Soviet Union, the United States, and Britain; to the two teams of negotiators at Panmunjom, and to the prime ministers of North and South Korea; to UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie; and to Nehru. The EWRG and the equivalent committee of the American Friends Service Committee were asked to decide whether the minute should be given wider circulation.

The EWRG, meeting at the end of August, considered the request of the Friends' World Conference, and also some suggestions for ending the deadlock at Panmunjom which had been prepared by Horace Alexander. After minor amendment, these suggestions were approved and transmitted to the Peace Committee, which on 4 September forwarded them to Meetings for Sufferings. The draft was introduced by Horace Alexander, and during the discussion, reference was made to a statement by Churchill in the House of Commons, that if Quakers had "new suggestions", these should be sent to him in writing. A decision would then be made by HMG about receiving a Quaker deputation.

The statement from the EWRG was approved with some slight modifications, which are not indentified in the minutes.

The statement began by expressing appreciation for the 'unflagging efforts on the part of the negotiators at Panmunjom in a situation of unparalelled difficulty ...' It then went on to make four specific proposals.

1. That a mutual cease-fire be effected in Korea on the conditions already agreed in the negotiations, leaving the POW issue to be resolved later. This was suggested so as to release the Unified Command negotiators from 'their exacting and exhausting labours': fresh minds could then be brought to bear on outstanding problems. Friends admitted that a cease-fire without resolving the POW issue would necessarily lead to some delay in the release of those POWs who were willing to be repatriated, but it would mean an earlier end to carnage and destruction.

2. On the question whether POWs should be sent home against their will, Friends admitted that this was required by adherence to the strict letter of the Geneva Convention. On the other hand, the statement continued, the drafters of the Convention had hardly anticipated a situation in which some prisoners might be reluctant to be repatriated. (This was not correct: a proposal by Austria that a POW should be entitled to ask for transfer to a country other than his own had been submitted but rejected at the conference which led to the adoption of the Geneva Convention in 1949). The statement went on to say that after the second world war, Quaker relief workers had been 'profoundly disturbed at being involved in forced repatriation which ignored the fears of individuals.' (This was a reference to the experience of a Friends Relief Service team at Goslar in 1946).[2] The statement suggested that re-screening and release of POWs should be put in the hands of a commission composed of Asian governments or 'a mixed commission of two appointed by each side'. the problem should be resolved in accordance with the spirit rather than the letter of the Geneva Convention, and prisoners rejecting repatriation should be 'given asylum in areas where they cannot be used in any further fighting'.

3. The statement went on to commend 'the good offices of India ...'

4. Finally, Friends asked that "all Governments" should urge the media to exercise restraint and not impute evil motives to the other side.

Although we did not know it at the time, the second paragraph of the statement was in many ways similar to a proposal which Mexico had

been discussing with the United States. The US Joint Chiefs of Staff had reservations about any agreement to stop fighting that left crucial issues unresolved, but the State Department thought that the Mexican proposal was worth pursuing, and UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie was given information to this effect.[3] An amended version of the Mexican plan was subsequently submitted to the UN General Assembly but later withdrawn in favour of a compromise promoted by India.[4]

The Recording Clerk, Stephen J. Thorne, sent the Meeting for Sufferings statement to Churchill on 8 September. With the agreement of No. 10 and the Foreign Office, the statement was issued to the press on 17 September, and (according to the minutes of the EWRG) was 'widely noticed by all the principal papers'. I have a copy of an accurate summary printed in *The Times* on 18 September. As Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden were both absent from London, our request for a meeting with a member of the Government was referred to Selwyn Lloyd, who agreed to see a Quaker group on 24 September.

Monthly meetings of the EWRG were, at the time, spread over three days. When we met on 19-21 September, we were told that a copy of the statement had been sent to Clarence E. Pickett, general secretary of the American Friends Service Committee, and that the substance had been discussed with the Indian High Commissioner. It was decided that copies should be sent to officials in China, and that our proposals should be discussed at a forthcoming meeting with the Counsellor at the Soviet Embassy. The EWRG, conscious of Quaker protocool, delicately informed Stephen Thorne that Gerald Bailey and I 'would be willing to participate' in the meeting with Selwyn Lloyd 'if desired', and the EWRG also suggested the inclusion of 'Wilfrid Littleboy or some other Friend not a member of this Group ...'

In the event, the Quaker group consisted of Gerald Bailey, Agatha Harrison, Percy W. Bartlett, and myself. A Foreign Office memorandum noted (correctly) that I was 'apparently no relation to Mr. Gerald Bailey' and that, so far as the Foreign Office knew, Percy Bartlett was no relation to Vernon Bartlett (a well-known journalist then with the *News Chronicle*).[5] Another Foreign Office memorandum described the Quaker statement as "helpful in tone" and as containing "useful, if unoriginal suggestions for ending the deadlock ..."

In preparation for Selwyn Lloyd's meeting with Friends, Foreign Office officials had prepared a detailed and cautious brief on the issues raised in our paper. Selwyn Lloyd (according to his own account now in the Public Record office) began our meeting by saying that he had read our memorandum with great interest: he was glad to find that 'there was

no real point of difference between our two points of view'. He would like to comment on our points in reverse order: this, presumably, was so as to take the easier issues first.

Restraint. Lloyd's brief had said that HMG deprecated any dogmatic or contentious comment in the press. Lloyd himself went a little further: 'It was indeed a major consideration ... to try to make it possible for the Chinese to accept [the Unified Command's] terms without too much loss of face.'

Role of India. The brief stated that HMG recognized the role that India might play. Lloyd was more forthcoming, for he told us "in confidence" that the fullest possible use would be made of Indian good offices. This was not widely known, he said, because Nehru believed that his most useful contribution could be made 'if he appeared to be acting independently and not at the instance of one of the parties to the conflict.'

Re-screening and release of POWs. Lloyd's brief dwelt on the difficulties, especially the intransigent approach of the Communists at Panmunjom and their negative attitude to the International Committee of the Red Cross. There was also a note for Lloyd on the legal aspects of the Geneva POW Convention, repeating what had recently been stated in a White Paper: that nothing in the Convention required forcible repatriation, but disregarding the fact that a proposal that POWs should be entitled to *reject* repatriation had been defeated when the Geneva Conventions were adopted in 1949.

Lloyd said that our proposals were "entirely acceptable" to HMG, though he thought they would be rejected by China.

Conclusion of an armistice with the POW problem unresolved. Lloyd's brief said that our proposal had been considered but that HMG could not conclude a cease-fire or armistice that did not provide for the immediate return of all POWs held in North Korea.

Lloyd said, for our own most confidential information only, that an immediate armistice on the basis of the agreement already reached, but deferring the question of POWs refusing repatriation, would "probably" be acceptable to HMG. He hoped that it would be possible to put forward new proposals at Panmunjom before the convening of the UN General Assembly. (The new proposals were submitted a fortnight later.) 'My visitors [wrote Lloyd] expressed great satisfaction at this information which they undertook to treat as strictly confidential.'

One other issue arose during the general discussion following Lloyd's exposition. We raised the bombing policy of the Unified Command, not

knowing that Anthony Eden had already made forceful representations to Washington on this issue.[6] Lloyd, perhaps with a slightly uneasy conscience, assured us that the air offensive was a matter of strict military necessity.

After the meeting, copies of the Meeting for Sufferings' memorandum were sent by the Foreign Office to British embassies in Washington, Moscow, and Beijing, and to the High Commissioners in all Commonwealth countries (plus the Irish Republic and Southern Rhodesia). The US State Department later reciprocated by giving the British embassy in Washington a memorandum from the American Friends Service Committee (which, except in one detail, covered much the same ground as the Meeting for Sufferings memorandum) and an account of a conversation on 15 October between two AFSC representatives (Lewis Hoskins and Richard Wood) with two State Department officials. The State Department line was a degree harsher than that of the Foreign Office. One of the officials pointed to a similarity between the AFSC proposal and that advocated by 'Communist publicity organs all over the world.' The proposal of POWs was inherently dangerous as there would be no guarantee that POWs of the Unified Command would be repatriated. 'In view of the traditional Communist disregard of human lives, it is improbable that the Communists are overly concerned about the early return of their prisoners.' A Foreign Office note on the AFSC memorandum commended one section, to the effect that as the operation in Korea was a police action, not a war, the objective was not military victory but the restoration of peace and order.

The EWRG had previously made an appointment to see John Addis, a senior China specialist in the Foreign Office, two days after the meeting with Selwyn Lloyd. An issue concerning India's role was clarified, there was some discussion about future Quaker relief work in Korea, and Addis was told that Friends were considering sending a mission to Beijing. This visit took place in 1955.[7]

A report of the meeting with Selwyn Lloyd was given to Meeting for Sufferings in October. It is not clear how much of the information which Selwyn Lloyd had given us in confidence or in strict confidence was reported to the Meeting. The short minute simply stated: 'Gerald Bailey has given an encouraging account of this confidential interview.' The subsequent minute of the EWRG was slightly more detailed: on the re-screening of POWs, the minute said that Lloyd 'was unable and unwilling' to be more specific about the new proposals of the Unified Command at Panmunjom, and there was no reference in the minute to

Lloyd's "most confidential information" about the possibility of stopping the fighting with aspects of the POW issue unresolved. Tom Driberg asked Eden in the House of Commons what consideration he had given to the Mexican and Quaker proposals. On the letter, Eden said that the Quaker proposal for screening of POWs under neutral supervision was "generally acceptable" to HMG. In the first draft of Eden's reply prepared in the Foreign Office, it was said that, if the Communists would be willing to postpone the question of POWs rejecting repatriation until after the armistice, 'that would be a development to which we would give most careful attention.' This was deleted from a revised version, and in the event, Eden simply said that it would be impossible to conclude an armistice that did not provide for 'the safe return of our own prisoners from North Korea.'[8] In a note for Eden for dealing with possible supplementary questions, a Foreign Office official wrote that there had been no sign from China or North Korea that the Quaker proposals contained any matter that would provide a basis for further discussion.

The question of POWs in Korea was the main item on the agenda of the UN General Assembly in 1952. Dean Acheson, the US Secretary of State, was now a beleaguered man, assaulted from all sides: the Pentagon, the US China Lobby, Syngman Rhee of South Korea, and the UN Members providing combat or medical units to the Unified Command in Korea. Moreover, the US election took place during the General Assembly, leading to the election of Dwight Eisenhower as President and the appointment of John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State-designate. Truman and Acheson were thus lame-duck office-holders from 4 November 1952 to 20 January 1953.

Acheson complained bitterly in his memoirs of a hostile Cabal at the UN consisting of Selwyn Lloyd, Lester Pearson of Canada, and Krishna Menon of India.[9] Pearson, who was President of the Assembly, pressed (as had Meeting for Sufferings) for an immediate cease-fire without resolving the POW question, but Acheson was "quite disturbed" by the idea, and Selwyn Lloyd told Eden in a personal and confidential letter that it would be "a highly dangerous arrangement."[10]

Britain initially co-sponsored a US proposal calling on China and North Korea to agree to an armistice which recognized the right of POWs to be repatriated, but with no use of force. But when Krishna Menon arrived later in the session with an elaborate Indian plan for re-screening POWs under neutral auspices, Britain decided to support the Menon plan, which was finally approved on 3 December.[11] All other proposals were withdrawn.

The armistice was finally concluded seven and a half months later. North Korea and China dropped their proposal that the Soviet Union should serve on the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, so it was composed of officers from Czechoslovakia and Poland (nominated by the Communist side) and from Sweden and Switzerland (nominated by the Unified Command). Its main supervisory functions were suspended in 1955-6, but it is still present in the demilitarized zone separating the two parts of Korea, where it performs a useful conciliatory role.

The disposal of POWs was referred to a Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission (NNRP) consisting of the four states mentioned in the previous paragraph plus an Indian chairman, assisted by an Indian Custodial Force. The NNRP was never a harmonious body. It encountered acute difficulties because of the intimidation of some POWs by other POWs, the refusal of the majority of POWs to hear explanations about their rights, and the uncooperative attitudes of the two military commands. The NNRP took custody of some 23,000 non-repatriated POWs from the two sides, and these were disposed of as follows:

	POWs held in *North Korea*	POWs held by the *Unified Command*
Refusing repatriation and remaining on the detaining side	347	21,839 (of whom 14,235 went to Taiwan)
Eventually opting for repatriation	10	628
Went to a neutral country (Brazil, Argentina, or India	2	86
Died or disappeared	—	51
	359	22,604

It is interesting that the percentages accepting and rejecting repatriation were exactly the same for the two sides (96.6 and 2.7 respectively)

Looking back on this episode 40 years later, what conclusions can one draw about the Quaker peace effort?

The EWRG was deeply concerned with the Korean war from its outbreak in 1950 until the armistice in 1953, and thereafter. To some extent this concern was expressed in language that the secular world may have found platitudinous such as the Meeting for Sufferings statement of 4 July and part of the first and the fourth points of the Meeting for Sufferings Statement of 5 September. But we all know how difficult it is to find suitable language to express deep religious concern.

It is noteworthy that the EWRG was not simply concerned with general principles of peace and justice, but immersed itself in the technical details of the issues to be resolved. This is illustrated by the fact that the *Manchester Guardian* should have thought that Friends were competent to investigate the germ warfare charges, and by the September statement of Meeting for Sufferings which contained a number of specific proposals for resolving the difficulties at Panmunjom.

Friends were, of course, in touch with all the parties involved, in some cases face-to-face, though in the case of the two Korean governments and the negotiators at Panmunjom only by correspondence. Whatever they may have thought privately, none of those we were in touch with seemed to doubt our over-riding commitment to peace and justice, our impartiality and independence.

The AFSC was less fortunate when a State Department official stressed the similarity between Quaker proposals and those contained in Communist propaganda. As it turned out, when the Menon plan was presented to the General Assembly later in the year, it was strongly opposed by the Communist bloc, which cast the only negative votes.

I think we were all grateful at the time to Agatha Harrison and Horace Alexander, and other members of the India Conciliation Group, for building relations of trust with Indian leaders over two decades. Krishna Menon was not the easiest man to deal with, and I recall one occasion when Nehru became quite short-tempered with a Quaker delegation on Korean issues; but doubtless there were some difficult characters on the Quaker side too.

It is interesting how easy it was in those days to see Ministers and senior Foreign Office officials when we had questions to ask or matters to discuss. This became even easier after we launched the Conferences for Diplomats in August 1952. I recall several relaxed meetings with Anthony Eden at his home in London after the breakup of his first

marriage. My impression is that Ministers and officials are more remote nowadays than they were 40 years ago, but also busier.

Friends, like governments, agonized over the conflict between international law as expressed in a treaty (the Geneva POW Convention) and the humanitarian principle, dear to Friends, that force should not be used to compel people to act contrary to conscience. Both sides in the Korean war used the POW issue for propaganda purposes. What we did not know for certain at the time was that the United States had decided as early as 1950 that 'the treatment of POWs ... shall be directed toward their exploitation, training and use for psychological warfare purposes ...'[12] Friends, with the experience of the FRS Goslar team in mind, stressed 'the spirit of the Geneva Convention rather than its letter ...' It has been a Quaker tradition from the start that individual conscience overrides secular law.

One has a certain sympathy for Selwyn Lloyd, who in my experience always did his best to be accommodating in his meetings with Friends. The brief prepared by the Foreign Office staff rejected any cessation of hostilities that left the POW issue unresolved. Lloyd, as Minister of State, was fully entitled to overrule his officials, though he stressed that he was speaking in strict confidence when he told us that our proposal for an immediate armistice on the basis of the agreement already reached, with the question of prisoners refusing repatriation to be remitted forward for later discussion, would "probably" be acceptable to HMG. The trouble was that this was not what we had proposed: we had suggested deferring 'the unresolved issues, especially the matter of the release of prisoners,' and not, as Lloyd put it, 'the question of prisoners refusing repatriation'. In any case, the British position was made abundantly clear by Eden in the House of Commons a month later and simultaneously by Lloyd at the UN General Assembly.

Our proposal for a commission to handle the re-screening and release of POWs contained two alternatives: 'a commission either representing a few Asian Governments in which both sides have confidence, or a mixed commission of two appointed by each side.' In the event, these options were merged in a commission of two states designated by each side, with an Indian chairman. This placed India in an awkward situation, sometimes siding with one side, sometimes with the other, abused by the prisoners they had come to help, and criticized in the most virulent language by the South Korean Government (the Indian Custodial Force had to be airlifted by helicopter from a ship in Inchon harbour to the demilitarized zone because South Korea refused transit rights). In any case, committees composed of states are never suitable

instruments for mediation: they spend more time negotiating with each other than with the contending parties.

One wonders, in retrospect, why it was necessary to issue the Meeting for Sufferings statement to the media a week *before* our meeting with Selwyn Lloyd. That must have had the effect of reducing flexibility on both our part and on Lloyd's. There was, I recall, pressure from the meetings that Sufferings should "say something" about the armistice deadlock, but my own inclination is to go public *after* a piece of delicate Quaker diplomacy rather than before, taking appropriate account of what one has learned during the process.

This episode draws attention to a difficulty that often arises in Quaker mediation. Lloyd gave us some information "in confidence" and some other information for our own "most confidential information only". I confess that I am still often uncertain what "confidential" is supposed to mean. Was the delegation entitled to pass on any of the information that Lloyd asked us to treat as confidential to the bodies that had mandated us: Meeting for Sufferings, the Peace Committee, and the EWRG? If we had told them what Lloyd had said "in confidence", were the members of those bodies entitled to pass on any of the information "in confidence" to Quaker meetings? And if we respected to the letter Lloyd's request for confidentiality and simply gave Meeting for Sufferings "an encouraging account of this confidential interview", as the minute has it, how could Sufferings judge whether it had acted wisely in endorsing the EWRG's statement? May any part of the Quaker machine ask for authority to act, and then simply report later that the outcome was confidential? How can Friends give pastoral and moral support, and administrative and financial backing, to colleagues who cannot disclose what (if anything) they have done?

This was not a typical piece of Quaker mediation: it was simply one phase of an ongoing peace effect in which our own country was involved. It thus had affinities with later Quaker work regarding Southern Rhodesia in the 1970s in which Britain was a direct party, and the Gulf war in the 1990s in which, as in Korea, Britain was part of a collective action under some kind of UN authority. I have long wished for more case-studies of Quaker mediation so that we can learn from past experience: I hope that this article will provide a factual basis, along with other case-studies, for Friends in the future to draw general conclusions about what to do and what not to do when performing a mediating role.

Sydney D Bailey

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1]*Manchester Guardian,* 23 June 1952, p.6.

[1b]I am grateful to Roger C. Wilson for advice and help in preparing this article.

[2]Roger C. Wilson, *Quaker Relief,* Allen and Unwin, 1952, 235-6, also A Tegla Davies *Friends Ambulance Unit,* 1947, 448-9.

[3]*Foreign Relations of the United States,* 1952-4, vol.XV pt.1, 476-8, 485-9, 492-4.

[4]UN General Assembly Official Records, 7th session, Annexes, Agenda item 16, pp.30-1, A/C.1/730; 1st Committee, 535th meeting (1 Dec. 1952), para.89.

[5]Public Record Office, file FO371 99585/FK1071/510.
There are 55 pages of documents relating to this episode in the Public Record Office in files FO371 99584/FK1071/493 - 99587/FK1071/596.

[6]Dean Acheson, *Present at the Creation,* Norton, New York, 1969, 656-7.

[7]*Quakers visit China* East West Relations and Peace Committees, 1956.

[8]House of Commons *Hansard,* 29 Oct. 1952.

[9]Dean Acheson, *Present at the Creation,* Norton, New York, 1969, 697-700.

[10]Lester Pearson, *Memoirs, 1948-1957,* London, Gollancz, 1974, 316; *Foreign Relations of the United States,* 1952-4, vol.XV, p.564; Public Record Office file FO371 99589/FK1071/626.

[11]UN General Assembly resolution 804(VIII).

[12]Department of State memorandum, 31 Aug. 1950, in *Foreign Relations of the United States,* 1950, vol.VII, 678.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

The Quaker Peace Testimony, 1660-1914. By Peter Brock. Sessions Book Trust, York, 1990. Hardback £25, laminated card £14.95 + £1.25 p&p.

The subject matter of this important book was originally called the Quaker testimony against bearing arms, then the testimony against all war, and now the peace testimony. The change from "bearing arms" to "all war" was necessary when it was realized that simple refusal to bear arms left open the possibility that some Friends might engage in other activities in support of war, such as the manufacture or sale of weapons. The change from a negative to a positive testimony reflected the growing belief among Friends that pacifism must include efforts to build a warless world.

Peter Brock's new study updates and complements Margaret Hirst's classic *The Quakers in Peace and War,* first published nearly 70 years ago. Brock is much briefer than Hirst, but his style is drab. The book is fact-packed and provided with full notes, but it has a rather inadequate Bibliography and a meagre Index. Both Brock and Hirst stop at the first world war.

The outstanding impression of Brock's study is how varied have been the circumstances in which the peace testimony has had to be applied. Friends have in general refused to hire substitutes or pay special fees in lieu of military service but have usually been willing to undertake humanitarian service under civilian control. Friends in nineteenth-century Prussia, while unwilling to pay commutation fees, made a payment to the exchequer, not as a contribution to the war, 'but as a token of gratitude for the toleration they had of late enjoyed' (p. 231). The greatest moral predicaments for Friends arose in Rhode Island and Pennsylvania where, for nearly two generations, they dominated political life, being repeatedly elected to the provincial assemblies even when not constituting a majority of the population. Was it morally admissible to ask others to undertake tasks regarding which Friends themselves had conscientious scruples? In the end, with encouragement from this side of the Atlantic, American Friends withdrew from government, finding it impossible to reconcile the obligations of a Christian magistrate and the refusal to take military action (p. 93).

Peter Brock stresses the tension between peace and justice (p. 17). For the 1948 assembly of the World Council of Churches, the Historic Peace Churches produced a pamphlet, *Peace is the Will of God.* The mainstream churches responded with *God Wills Both Peace and Justice.* The mainstream churches chose a good title, but the fact is that war negates both peace and justice. The American Civil War posed acute problems for those Quakers (no doubt the majority) who wished to get rid of slavery, but without violence (p. 166). Friends who support the United Nations have faced similar difficulties over UN-sponsored wars to combat aggression in Korea (1950-53) and the Gulf (1991).

Pacifists of my generation are grateful that the faithful witness of earlier generations has saved us from much of the pain of refusing to bear arms. When military conscription

has been in force, there has been legal provision for conscientious objection, including absolute exemption or exemption on condition of performing alternative service under civilian control. When I appeared before the CO tribunal in Leeds in 1940, the chairman (Judge William Stewart) pointed out that 99 men out of a 100 had obeyed the law, to which I was able to give the cheeky reply 'So have I, sir, the law makes provision for conscientious objectors.'

Brock points out how reluctant the secular authorities have been to exempt Quakers from war service, for if it should lead to mass conversion to Quakerism of the lazy and the cowardly (pp. 53, 156, 175, 231). On the other hand, the secular authorities have come to realize that it is profitless trying to compel unwilling objectors to undertake military service. There are more pressing tasks in time of war, and pacifists would be worse than useless in the armed forces.

Peter Brock has rendered us a useful service: perhaps one day he will bring the story up to more recent times, for an unchangeable principle has to be constantly adapted to new circumstances.

Sydney D. Bailey

Quakers in Gildersome. By Jean A. Mortimer, published by the Author, 60 Gledhow Wood Grove, Leeds LS9 1PA, 1990. £5.

Frequently local histories do not acknowledge the presence of Quakerism in the area studied and if it is mentioned it is inadequately covered. Publications, such as *Quakers in Gildersome*, therefore, make a very valuable and additional contribution to local history.

Gildersome, like so many meetings of that period, was an offshoot of a larger Meeting. Leeds P.M. agreed to a request from Gildersome Friends to hold a weekday meeting once or twice a month and from that they progressed to holding first day meetings on the first and third Sundays and eventually became a P.M. This lasted until 1835 when it relinquished its P.M. status back to Leeds, but worship at the meeting house continued.

The book consists of short comments on the usual aspects of a Friends' Meeting - premises, subscribers, trustees, discipline, marriages, care of the poor, sufferings, burials and burial ground etc. One interesting aspect of this Meeting during the eighteenth century was the establishment of a Workhouse School for poor Friends' children, which opened in September 1772. Quite a detailed account is given of the development of the school, which during its 40 years existence educated some 312 boys and girls, not only from this country but also from abroad.

The local records have been well used and in this short book Jean Mortimer has managed to cover the usual areas of Quaker development in the area. It must have been quite difficult to condense so much available information into an affordable publication. There are areas which could warrant further development, in say articles for the *F.H.S. Journal.*

Joan Goodwin

Ambrose Rigge: Soldier in the Lamb's War. By Charles Kohler. William Sessions Ltd, The Ebor Press, York, 1990. £2.50 + 50p p&p.

The seemingly simple style of this biography of Ambrose Rigge carries the reader easily along from 1648 to 1705, from the intelligent schoolboy, the restless adolescent and the eager young publisher of truth to the travelling preacher and the settled teacher. Charles Kohler's imaginative portrayal of characters and occasions invites us to a deeper understanding of the seventeenth century. We see the lame and disillusioned soldier in Kendal market, the comfort of fellowship at the Bull and Mouth, a voyage to Gravesend, the trial before Justice Rivers, and the school at Gratton Place. His anecdotes are firmly based on careful research. Although there is no heavy emphasis on points of civil and social history, there is much of interest within this slim volume. Ambrose Rigge's life is the epitome of the response of sensitive and courageous youth to spiritual awakening. Charles Kohler has set it out for us in an eminently readable form.

Kathleen L. Cottrell

Lending a Hand in Holland, 1945 - 1946. By Joan Hewitt. William Sessions, York, 1990. Pp. iv + 28, Illus. £2 + 50p p&p.

Joan Hewitt's booklet recalls her six months work as part of a Quaker relief team, mainly at Zetten, between November 1945 and May 1946. The text is well produced and illustrated with photographs and drawings of the period. The humour, sadness and the comradeship of working at such a time in an unfamiliar environment are placed within the broader context of the tremendous difficulties, both material and psychological, occupation and war had left the Dutch people to face. Their courage as well as their problems, are evident in these pages. All of this is presented through Joan's vivid impressions and memories of what is clearly an important moment in her life. The Quaker search for reconciliation in a hostile post-war Europe is movingly reflected in Joan's later work in the Ruhr and the gifts of fruit and vegetables she and her fellow workers were able to bring there from those they had helped in Holland. This is, as Joan points out in her Introduction, an account of one individual's experience of, and part in, a major Quaker relief initiative. The detailed history can be found elsewhere but personal records like this, with its warm humanity, careful observation and practical Quakerism, illumine that wider Quaker effort and give it life, particularly for those of us too young in 1946 to be aware of it.

Howard F. Gregg

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.

ISSN No. 0071 9587

E & E Plumridge Ltd, Linton, Cambridge