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‘FRIENDLY PATRIOTS: BRITISH QUAKERISM AND THE IMPERIAL NATION, 1890-1910’

This thesis examines the public image and dominant attitudes of British Friends between 1890 and 1910 through the Quaker press – *The Friend*, *The British Friend*, *Friends’ Quarterly Examiner* and *Peace and Goodwill* – as well as reports from Yearly Meeting and *British Weekly*, a Nonconformist newspaper. In essence, the author argues that this generation of Friends were the first entrenched within British society and politics, and were part of an ‘Alternative Establishment’; something which, despite commitment to their seventeenth-century tenets and nineteenth-century evangelicalism, they were unwilling to leave. By 1900, it is asserted, Quakers believed that they alone were the rightful leaders of Nonconformist denominations and the only people who could spiritually guide, educate and minister to those in power. Quakerism was considered by some to be on the verge of inspiring mass conversion.

Injected with religious zeal, a modernising and worldly approach, self-confidence, and the patriotism which abounded in Imperial Britain, Quakers set out to defend their faith and promote their ideals in the corridors of power. For the author, the key areas in which this ‘Friendly patriotism’ was expressed were the 1902 Education Act, the European Peace Movement and Anglo-German friendship. Yet at every turn, it is argued, Quakers were flattered by external compliments, blinkered by their own heritage and self-importance, and failed in their ideals. Their central tenet of pacifism was undermined by their: unwillingness to break the law under passive resistance against the 1902 legislation; inability to recognise the hypocrisy and hollowness of participating in a European Peace Movement, which manifested in ‘peace jamborees’ and lavish banquets with the glitterati; and their hubris and conviction that they would lead heads of state – namely Tsar Nicholas II of Russia and Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany, two undemocratic and militaristic rulers – to become grand peacemakers.

**Keywords:** *The Friend; The British Friend; Friends’ Quarterly Examiner; Peace and Goodwill; Cadbury; Rowntree; 1902 Education Act; School Boards; Cowper-Temple Clause; sacerdotalism; jingoism; peace movement; Hague Peace Conference; International Peace Congress; Priscilla Peckover; Tsar Nicholas II; 1898 Rescript; Kaiser Wilhelm II; Anglo-German relations.*
**Useful for:** those looking at different manifestations of the peace movement, the *fin de siècle* press and British imperialism, changes in Quakerism and the political impact of evangelicism; historians of war, religion, Nonconformity, education, passive resistance, and international and Anglo-German relations.
This section is part of the overall introduction to the thesis. The author argues that, while a considerable amount of research has taken place on the early periods of Quakerism, and some substantial work has been done on the nineteenth century, Quakerism at the cusp of the twentieth century has been largely overlooked, despite the 1895 conference at Manchester, in which members essentially espoused the values of what has come to be called the Quaker Renaissance: the embracing of science and philosophy towards a modern, liberal and socially-engaged pacifist Society, which helped shed the image of a ‘peculiar people’. The author argues that the years 1890-1910 held an ambivalent nervousness, and it is here that he identified something he has termed ‘Friendly patriotism’ - a complex set of attitudes by which publicly spirited Quakers attempted to straddle multiple identities; a ‘blend of Evangelical theology and Imperial mission’. Similarly, in wider scholarship, which has examined the connections between faith and imperialism, Quakers (a group of 15-18,000 in Britain between 1890 and 1910) have been overlooked.

Using the Quaker press – The Friend, The British Friend and the Friends’ Quarterly Examiner – as well as published reports from Quarterly, Monthly, and Yearly Meetings, the thesis assesses what happened when the ‘Friendly patriots’ sought, not to ‘speak truth to power’, a traditional Quaker tenet, but sought ‘instead to help shape public policy and opinion through the direct exercise of power’. To do this, the author examines three of the most vivid expressions of Friendly patriotism: the reaction to the 1902 Education Act and its milieu, the involvement in the European peace movement and the promotion of Anglo-German friendship.

“The Hallowing of Politics:” An Introduction

Overview: This section rests on opinions present in the Quaker press, evidencing the sentiment upon which the thesis is built. The author argues that late-nineteenth-century Friends forged a mythologised and clear corporate identity, aided by a new engagement with an increasingly democratic political system and by prominent public Quaker figures, such as the Cadburys and the Rowntrees (other key Quaker names are peppered throughout the chapter and thesis). However, the making of ‘Christian citizenship’ by Friendly patriots was complicated by the Boer War.
Recasting Quaker History: The segment opens with further reflections on the history and historiography of Quakerism, touching briefly upon the 1850s/60s ‘malaise’, through to the emergence of business dynasties, and on, past the 1871 repeal of the Universities Tests Act that increased Nonconformist access to higher education. Moreover, the author argues, in the late 1800s, founder George Fox and other seventeenth-century Quakers were increasingly considered role-models for Gospel dissemination and national conversion, rather than ‘theological revolutionaries of an apocalyptic bent; the emphasis of the presence of the inner light of Christ in all people shifted from a great leveller to individual salvation’. With a new-found ‘unity before Scriptural truth’, early ‘extremists like the messianic James Nayler, who had proclaimed himself Christ while riding into Bristol on a donkey’ were carefully shunned. ‘Christian Citizenship’ instead channelled individualism towards a clear corporate image in the press, which was accepted by other denominations; plaudits from whom, the author argues, were especially sweet for Friendly patriots. The ‘new Quaker historiography’ generated a ‘tradition of near-hagiography’ and a ‘wilful blindness’ towards the ‘apocalyptic and disruptive mentality of early Friends’. The most prominent historian of the Quaker Renaissance, William Braithwaite, it is argued, would also highlight or gloss over elements of early converts to fit in with the esprit de corps.

Quaker Public Life: As was true for other evangelical sects, Christian mission dominated nineteenth-century Quaker life. What set Friends apart was their notion of ‘speaking truth to power’. The Society had always been inadvertently and hesitatingly involved in politics, or else their organisational abilities were deployed in single-issue lobbying (e.g. anti-slavery). Through evangelicalism, Friends’ outlook shifted profoundly. Individual political activity flowered, but, the author argues, it was only between 1890 and 1910 that ‘a corporate Quaker public culture’ was fashioned. Bolstered by their social stability, it was the ‘sons and daughters’ of ‘prosperous Evangelical families’ that (with the aid of Quaker publishing) adopted the notion of an historically and theologically-informed public identity. Yet it would take more than the 1895 Conference to consolidate ideas which developed through evangelicalism; an influence that did not dissipate, but directly informed early-twentieth-century Friends.

Quaker Politics: The spirit of salvation was instilled in fin de siècle Friends. The sentiment, but not the manifestation, of socialism was recognised as inherently Christian. This atmosphere, connecting modernity and faith, was seen as an opportunity to propel the Society to the forefront of British life. Throughout the remainder of this section, the author draws on extracts from the Quaker press to illustrate the internal discussions of how the Society could achieve this, the expression of ‘Christian
Citizenship’. John Stephenson Rowntree is singled out as an advocate, a crusader and a ‘bridge between two generations’, who drew on Quaker history to express modern Quaker identity. The faith became a means to nourish the nation and the Empire, which was in turn cast as a duty. Political Friends were needed in a modern democracy and could inform policy – a subject expounded eloquently by Edward Grubb at the influential 1889 York Conference on Poverty. The House of Commons called. Friendly patriotism helped elect nine Quakers to Parliament in 1906. In 1910, Joseph Albert Pease entered Cabinet; the first Friend appointed since John Bright’s 1882 departure. Municipal politics, the powerhouse of regeneration, became ‘one of the most fruitful areas of ... Quaker civic service’.

Social welfare became a focus, articulated most clearly through the work of Seebohm Rowntree. Friends could assuage injustice, if not through direct social work, then, in the words of a 1907 Friend editorial, by being a ‘social servant’. Modernising Quakers – uniting ‘head and heart’, and individual action with corporate public identity – veritably swaggered through the years straddling 1900. External affirmations of Quakerism’s spiritual and moral equipment for statecraft, public education, and the supervision of social welfare were circulated in the Quaker Press.

Yet challenges came. The outbreak of the Boer War in 1899 wrought a lacklustre Quaker opposition: the peace testimony sat uneasily with widespread jingoism; Friendly patriots struggled to balance public life with ‘passive resistance’, not least because many denominations were equating ‘the struggle against the Boer’ with the struggle of Christian mission. A Friend editorial worried that instead of civilising, the Empire was creating a spectacle of warmongering. Conversely, some Quakers, especially John Bellows, outwardly challenged the Society’s traditional pacifist stance on the unacceptability of all military action, supporting Government imperialism in South Africa. This was damaging to the public image of Quakers in Britain, as John Wilhelm Rowntree argued. Christian Citizenship was no simple task.

Section One – British Quakerism and the Politics of Education: Balfour’s 1902 Act and the Passive Resistance Movement

Overview: This section examines the strident militancy and ultimate crumpling of Quakerism as the natural leading faith amongst the Nonconformist family of denominations. The crux upon which Friendly patriots pivoted was the 1902 Education Act, which threatened enforced Anglicanism in all schools.
**The 1870 Education Act:** Quoting historian D. W. Bebbington, the author asserts that ‘education was the issue that brought Nonconformity more prominently into the political arena in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century’. The 1870 Education Act introduced compulsory elementary education and permitted the creation of local School Boards, which could institute Board Schools: fee-paying sites, supported by local government grants. The Act, and the existing multiplicity of schooling, encouraged a patchwork of administration and curriculum. Initially Nonconformists had been opposed to legislation which permitted funding for denominational schools, believing that Anglicanism would therefore dominate education. However, the Act enshrined non-sectarian religious education through the Cowper-Temple Clause and elected School Boards enabled greater Nonconformist political participation. The exponential growth of democratic, successful and locally-accountable Board Schools meant that late-Victorian Nonconformity ‘had in fact become a sort of “Alternative Establishment”’.

**Quaker Education:** Education had always been central to Quakerism. In the late-nineteenth century, ‘[t]here was a generally shared exalted sense of what the [ideal] schools – like the factories before them – could do for an Empire preparing to enter a new century’. The strength of inherited belief was such that Friends, and Friendly patriots, considered the Society of Friends as the natural educator of the new Christian citizenship; the citizens who commanded the Empire. The Adult Schools Movement in particular was emblematic of dedication, organisation and Friendly patriotism. One of its most famous proponents was George Cadbury, instigator of the Woodbrooke Settlement in Birmingham, who ‘had acquired formidable powers’ within the Alternative Establishment.

The well-to-do Society were concurrently able to operate and support their own schools, thereby able to avoid post-1870 state support. Quaker schools such as Ackworth, Bootham and Saffron Walden also enabled social mobility, producing businessmen and industrialists. Yet the success of the Board Schools had led Friends to question their own system of education, which had failed to produce great men of faith or even nourish the faith of pupils; worse still, in adult alumni the faith was moribund. Cadbury roundly chastised the isolation of Quaker boarding schools. What was needed, he argued, was evangelical fervour; the type of zeal exhibited in his ideal for mass municipal conversion in Birmingham, fed by the Adult Schools Movement, itself supplied by the working classes, with whom elite schooling did not sit well. Cadbury’s opinion was rejected by numerous Quakers. Nevertheless, membership numbers did little to refute such notions.
The Battle for the Souls of the Nation: The supreme danger, however, came from the 1902 Education Act. The first threat was the failed and nationally contentious 1894 Riley Circular in London, which insisted on Trinitarian instruction. Issued by a High Anglican, Nonconformists saw priestly trappings stalk schools. For Quakers, the result was not only a firmer belief in their primacy, but also the injection of evangelicalism that Cadbury and other Quakers sought.

A new education bill crystallised matters. Under the proposed legislation, more public money was to be allocated to denominational schools, but unelected Local Education Authorities oversaw the process. Worse still, seemingly violating the Cowper-Temple Clause, sectarian instruction was permitted. Indignation grew. Confidence snowballed. Militancy swelled. Friends were drawn even further into worldly politics from the pinnacle of the Nonconformist base. Quakers therefore invested generously in the Congress of Evangelical Free Churches (CEFC), established in 1896. Whilst the bill foundered in the face of opposition, another replaced it, giving (often Anglican) voluntary schools exemption from local rates and increased state aid.

In this atmosphere, teaching became expounded as true missionary work and had elicited a shift in Cadbury’s ideology. He now envisaged the power of a single Quaker teacher in a Quakerless community, stemming militarism and ministers. With evangelicalism coupled to and confirmed by outside affirmation of Quaker tenets and ‘simple Gospel teaching’ (p. 110), Friends’ education was once more lauded. Friendly patriotism found a new vigour in schooling.

Although promising greater administrative harmony, the 1902 Act threatened and then enacted the suspension of School Boards. Control was handed over to local councils. Baptists, Methodists and Friends were together incensed. Yet Quakers, as prominent educationalists, thought their position to be heading the fight. However, whereas Friends were able to negotiate the Boer War as either ‘radical or … patriot’, as friends of Government and those in need in South Africa, the 1902 Act required a definitive position. Initially, Quaker response was muted. Then the Congress of Evangelical Free Churches (CEFC) met to formulate a united response: the legislation was branded ‘an Anglican declaration of Holy War on Evangelical Nonconformity’. Carried by the fervour, and afraid of losing ground within the movement, Quakers and London Yearly Meeting coalesced around opposition to the Act, despite the questioning voices of Bevan Lean, Headmaster of Sidcot and government education inspector, and John S. Rowntree ‘one of the principal framers of the notion of the Quaker as “Christian patriot”’. Within months, Friends and other Dissenters across the country were moving towards passive resistance: refusing to pay the anticipated ‘education rate’. This was depicted as an exceptional case, and a fight in which Quakers were meant to lead Nonconformists. Yet almost as soon as the Bill was passed into law – and though
there were fewer activists than anticipated in a coherent passive resistance movement – Quakers wavered. Having fought for so long and so hard to be respectable, ‘few Friends seemed prepared to break the law ... By March of 1903, *The Friend* was already returning to the conciliatory tone of respect and even admiration for the Government. ... The velocity and intensity of the Society’s reversal clearly did not go unnoticed either within Quakerism or without”; with the exception of a few individuals, Friends slipped away from their Nonconformist brethren, and retreated from evangelical fervour.

**Section Two – “Gentlemen Among Gentlemen:” The Late Victorian and Edwardian Quaker Approach to International Relations**

**Overview:** This substantial section considers the hubris of fin de siècle Quakers (the author’s Friendly patriots), within the European peace movement; ‘a movement positively drunk with its own sense of amity and virtue’. The author emphasises, not only the lack of any palpable success to emerge from the international congresses and conferences which he terms ‘peace jamborees’, but Quaker hypocrisy through their enjoyment of the trappings of wealth and privilege.

**Princes and Peace:** By 1900, the peace movement had rather transcended its roots, gathering pace in the 1870s and 1880s from events such as the American Civil War. From a largely British and French popular base, it had become, in the words of Prince Scipione Borghese to Baroness Bertha von Suttner, ‘un groupe du high-life pacifique’, although occasionally the working classes – such as British labour activist Randal Cremer – could rise to enter what the author has termed ‘the professionalisation of peace’. The peace movement became formalised and bureaucratised, with ‘aristocratic statesmen and dignitaries’ at its helm, steering through the 1889 establishment of annual Universal Peace Congresses and Inter-Parliamentary Bureau, and similar events in 1892. A ‘peace aristocracy’ hosted a continual round of ‘lavish receptions and banquets’, crowned by the First Hague Conference in 1899.

**Queens and Quakers:** Peace witness had been part of the Society of Friends since its formative years. In 1816, artisans Joseph Tregelles Price and William Allen established the London Peace Society. The essays of Friend Jonathan Dymond articulated and inspired pacifism. Quakers such as these, Joseph Sturge and Richard Cobden, whilst ‘speaking truth to power’, were firmly rooted in democracy and did not ‘cloak themselves in ... establishment authority’. In fact, for these Friends, and others, like politician John
Bright, the removal of the management of foreign affairs from entrenched establishment interests was essential for international peace. Such figures were more typical of the British wing of the peace movement than the glitterati of the European arena. Yet the doors to conservative power and the *beau monde* proved irresistible to Friendly patriots, and their peace pedigree proved useful currency to the peace aristocracy. More than this, Quaker diplomacy had a lineage of access to the throne, going back as far as Charles II in 1672. In an age of self-assured importance, Friends considered it their rightful place to build on their past and walk amongst, minister to, tutor and convert to peacemakers the European heads of state. Not only were Quakers singularly placed at the ear of the British monarch, their interventions at European courts had already proven effective in securing peace: the 1850 Schleswig-Holstein War. The ‘Society’s fundamentally egalitarian values … its innate distrust of hierarchy in world authority and organisation’ and its rejection of ritual ‘seemed to recede … into the background of its approach to international relations’.

In fact, seeded by Elizabeth Fry and the Gurneys (a reforming, philanthropic and banking family) in the mid-nineteenth century, and reaching its zenith in the figure of Priscilla Peckover – editor and dominant author of the journal *Peace and Goodwill*, reinvigorator of Local Peace Associations and sister of the first Quaker to be given a peerage – Friends revelled in the whirlwind of wealth and privilege accorded them. Alongside Joseph Gundry Alexander, T. P. Newman, William C. Braithwaite, S. J. Capper, Robert Spence Watson and Sir Joseph Pease, Peckover was at the heart of the permanent European peace bureaucracy and their ‘jamborees’ from 1889, and it was she who was considered ‘the international peace celebrity among British Quakers’. Such Friendly patriots were seen as assets to the cause and formed a large contingent amongst the British delegates.

**British ‘Jamborees’**: In 1890 two of the key international peace congresses were held in London. However, the author argues, the first attempt to produce a genuinely British variant on the international peace jamboree was at Glasgow in 1901. A confluence of events ensured a more sober, even disappointing, affair; not least the British Imperialist Boer War. Here, a more familiar Quaker emerged: reflective and penitent, Friends Watson and Pease broke the taboo and spoke about South Africa. A ‘British triumph as host to the “high life pacifique”’ would only occur in London, 1908. In the interim, the National Peace Congress was instituted. By the third such Congress, at Birmingham in 1906, not only was ‘Quaker supremacy’ within this new forum clearly established and now fixed by the pre-eminent Cadbury family, but the wealth of the ‘King of Cocoa’ also ensured that the Birmingham event was on an equal level of luxury and to the continental jamborees. The swelling pride of the national movement was
enhanced by its access to the British upper echelons, including Prime Minister Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, alongside the appearance of Watson and Cremer on the King’s 1906 honours list; something which also highlighted the centrality of Radical Liberal politicians to the movement. In the House of Commons, Campbell-Bannerman had been joined by the election of eight Quaker MPs.

The 1908 London conference glittered with the national and European stars of the movement. The Government held a banquet, ‘but nothing could equal the honour’ of a reception at Buckingham Palace. *The Friend* and Meeting for Sufferings were enthusiastic. Barrow Cadbury featured prominently at the reception, manoeuvring ‘to the fore of the Quaker section of the British pacifist elite’. Barrow was one of the self-assured, and now-establishment, second-generation Friendly patriots.

**Converting the Tsar:** Whilst the realities of government mitigated the peace credentials of Campbell-Bannerman, for Friendly patriots any inkling of ‘Royal enlightenment’ from Quakers’ ‘imperial instruction’ was seized upon. Yet there was negligible ‘genuine political impact’ resulting from the peace jamborees, as exemplified by the 1890s attendance of Belgium’s King Leopold II, who visited the very worst of colonialism on Congo. Nonetheless, ‘nothing excited the Congresses more than … royal or military authority’ involvement. With the increasing ease of Friendly patriots’ access to the corridors of power, they even discussed Belgian rule and atrocities in Congo with the Pope.

Ironically, the Quaker peace establishment’s greatest enthusiasms and hopes for ‘Peace through Princes’ were targeted at the distinctly anti-democratic rulers, Tsar Nicholas II and Kaiser Wilhelm II. The Tsar’s 1898 Rescript was therefore surprising, and taken as evidence of the sway exerted by the European peace movement generally, and Quakers in particular. Inferring the principal of gradual disarmament, the Tsar mooted the idea of establishing conferences at The Hague. Instantly, British Quakers established what became known as the ‘Peace Crusade’; aflutter with pamphlets, petitions and celebrities, public meetings pressed for national support of the measures. The Tsar was evidencing conversion. The Society was convinced that their traditional associations with the Tsars – Peter the Great, Alexander I, Nicholas I – accorded them a special place which would enable them to lift spiritually the Russian leaders. Friendly patriots (amongst them Francis William Fox) also held a privileged position at the first Hague Peace Conference in 1899 and revelled in their diplomacy, rank, ‘dignity, and even holiness’. That ‘the Society had become publicly identified with the near-canonisation of the Tsar was ... a source of embarrassment to ... sceptical Friends’: Nicholas was proving tyrannical in Russia and Finland. Indeed, despite Finn’s passive resistance and the potential starvation of millions of Russians,
there was no corporate support for those in distress. Instead, Friends promoted the avoidance of conflict with Russia, and continued in their ‘perception of the Tsar as a sort of Quaker prince’.

Even before the 1899 conference, the Russian Government had declared that ‘the humanisation and moderation of modern warfare’ would dominate discussions, rather than disarmament. Some Friends overlooked this, instead exalting the establishment of an international court of arbitration. Until the 1907 Hague Conference, they also largely disregarded the Russo-Japanese War, the shooting of unarmed Russian demonstrators and the dissolution of the Duma parliament. Whilst Radical Liberals were incensed, Quakers clutched at Nicholas’ innate goodness. The author argues that the British Government cynically sold disarmament to Friendly patriots; Germans refusal to entertain the idea. The Quaker ideal for the 1907 conference shifted towards diplomacy and arbitration, something that elderly law-man Sir Edward Fry was able to influence, though not the British refusal to consider naval restrictions. The only incident on which to cling was the jamboree surrounding Andrew Carnegie’s laying of the foundation stone of the Palace of Peace in The Hague.

Section Three – British Quakerism and the Anglo-German Friendship Industry

Overview: This section describes the determination of Kaiser Wilhelm II and his government to pursue militarism, and, more pointedly, the determination of Quakers to support the Kaiser’s pathway to peacemaker. However, as was the case in the previous chapter, the author argues that Friendly Patriots were profoundly deluded in their efforts, their support, the relationships promoted between British and German churches, and their pacifism, especially at the outbreak of the First World War.

German Domestic Politics: Although swift industrialisation in the late-nineteenth century was a success for Germany, the associated social and political upheavals threatened stability. To provide a unifying focus, the Kaiser and his junta emphasised the ideals of imperialism and military supremacy, with the British naval fleet a firm target; in many ways, this worked – certainly German notions of international relations were based more on conflict than peace. The author argues that it was the intensive programme of soliciting love for the Emperor and the Reich that achieved a kind of propaganda coup within the ranks of the Quaker leadership, who, with a discourse of a shared Protestant Teutonic heritage, moved to dampen ‘sabre-rattling’ in the British and German press. The Anglo-German
Friendship Committee was formed and met across the tables of a tea party at the Universal Peace Congress in Lucerne, 1905; the perfect forum for Friendly patriots.

**Quakering the Kaiser:** The ‘Quaker peace elite’ were heartened by support from the German Chancellor, Prince von Bülow on behalf of the Kaiser for the first public meeting of the Friendship Committee, in London. Von Bülow continually praised the (unrealistic) efforts of Quaker Francis W. Fox and other important peace meetings and initiatives to generate German public support because it hid the true intent of Imperial Germany. Friends often portrayed the Kaiser’s ‘passion for armaments’ as ‘a misguided expression of an otherwise sincere desire for peace’. Part of Quaker courtship was therefore to praise any action of the Kaiser which suggested change, despite occasional dissenting voices. Quakering the Kaiser through ‘spiritual and moral instruction’ was the calling of J. Allen Baker, ‘a leading ... industrialist, Adult School educationalist, and Radical Liberal’ MP. The interest of German members of the ‘groupe du high-life pacifique’, helped stir his peace initiative to link British and German Churches. The result was similar to other peace jamborees and attracted important Friends like Rendel Harris and Barrow Cadbury. Relations were expanded through the founding of an Associated Council of Anglo-German churches and by the promotion of exchange visits by working-class male attendees of Quaker-run Adult Schools. Allen Baker gained a personal audience with Wilhelm four times before 1914, believing all the time that the Kaiser was on the verge of becoming a ‘bold peacemaker’. Quakers failed to recognise the overall position of the Church in the Kaiser’s Germany: the patriotic German clergy often ranked amongst the most stalwart critics of the European peace movement; and German involvement in the Associated Council was nothing more than propaganda – a matter confirmed by their rejection of affiliation with the German Peace Society.

**Reality Surfaces:** Other Nonconformists had always been involved in peace initiatives, but were more realistic about Anglo-German friendship and the Kaiser. They considered that in some cases moral or ‘just’ warfare was preferable to pacifism, especially after the 1890s Ottoman persecution of Christian Armenia and Crete. This opinion was palpable in Robertson Nicoll’s powerful Nonconformist journal, the *British Weekly*, as was widespread support for the Boer War. Moreover, Baptists and Primitive Methodists – the ‘denominations which matched Quaker peace aspirations’ most closely – abandoned pacifism at the outbreak of World War One. They were not alone: almost a third of eligible young Quakers enlisted.
Challenges were also coming from people and press closely connected to the peace movement. Radical Liberals in particular articulated the blinkered double-standards of the Society. Arthur Ponsonby, J. Guinness Rogers, George Trevelyan, L. T. Hobhouse and H. N. Brailsford all displayed degrees of disapproval for the naivety of Friendly patriots. The new generation of Friends, who would go on to enlist, found themselves attracted to Brailford’s thesis that democracy should be used to control foreign policy and not the ‘sentimental pacifism’ of the European peace establishment. English lawyer Norman Angell, through his study *The Great Illusion*, argued that peace should be pursued because war was just too expensive. This coupling of materialism to the spiritual basis for the Quaker’s historic Peace testimony by younger Friends – such as Philip Noel-Baker and Horace Alexander, sons of peace acolytes Allen Baker and Joseph Gundry Alexander – moved the Society’s pacifism back to its democratic roots and away from the glitterati. The 1913 Northern Meetings’ Joint Conference for Peace embraced ‘the new pacifism’, which ensured once more that Quakers were at the vanguard of twentieth-century expressions of peace.

“Prophets of the Ideal Nation:” A Conclusion

**Overview:** Quoting extensively from the Quaker press and the historiography, the conclusion clarifies the meaning of ‘Friendly patriotism’ and how this connects the 1902 Education Act, the European peace movement, and the ‘Anglo-German friendship industry’. The author then discusses the confusion with which Friendly patriotism was met in the twentieth century and in mourning King Edward.

**Friendly Patriotism:** At the first annual Swarthmore Lecture (Birmingham, 1908), Rufus Jones stated that modern Quakerism sought to ‘enlarge the scope of freedom’ and to ‘promote peace through the heightening of national honour and the expansion of national justice’. Evangelicalism ensured that Quakers often considered themselves, to use Jones’ words, ‘prophets of the ideal nation’. Their belief in their own superior spiritual education amongst Nonconformist denominations and beyond permeated all three areas of the thesis; its outcome varied, from public service to a conceited fantasy. The prevailing conviction, though, from 1890 to 1910, was that true Friends were also true patriots.

**Quaker Heritage and Hubris:** For Friendly patriots, ‘Prime Ministers and preachers, Kaisers and councillors appeared ripe for conversion, and the opportunities for Quaker ministry at the national,
international, and local levels were thought to be limitless’. Why should the Society not believe in their ‘spiritual superiority’? They were lauded by outsiders and other Nonconformist groups. This was their inheritance, ‘the authentic Dissenting religious inheritance’ from George Fox, passing down 250 years, to the twentieth century and the Imperial nation; something which the historiography of Renaissance Quakerism reflected – and for both Friend and detractor, John Bright had become a foundation upon which the Society built.

**Reality Bites:** That Quakers were at the lead of the Nonconformist denominations was ‘largely illusory’. In Britain, their numbers never expanded past c.20,000, despite the idealised impact of Adult Education or anything else. Their ‘radical costume proved to be a rather thin disguise for what was an essentially conservative, respectability-conscious community with no real appetite for risky political struggle’. The evangelical fervour against the 1902 Education Act, in international relations and foreign politics evaporated in the glitter and glare of the Establishment. Such deference continued as the First World War commenced; *The Friend* merely stating that “the method of force is no solution to any question [but] we hold that the present time is not one for criticism, but for devoted service to our nation” (p. 337). As exemplified by Horace Alexander, Young Quakers were confused. Alexander described how, on the battlefields of France and in his killing a German soldier, World War One effectively punctured Quaker heritage and Friendly patriotism. The author concludes that ‘Friendly patriotism’ and its fantasy vision of international relations and the meaning of Christian pacifism had proved ‘a hollow construct upon which to make a commitment to either peace or war’.

**Summary prepared by Rebecca Wynter (2012)**