TALES OF THE UNEXPECTED: GLIMPSES OF FRIENDS IN THE ARCHIVES OF LAMBETH PALACE LIBRARY

By the very nature of the collections in Lambeth Palace Library [1] which reflect the views of establishment figures, Archbishops, Bishops, and to a lesser extent local clergy, it is inevitable that Friends are not always portrayed in a particularly sympathetic light, especially in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.[2] The collections as a whole illustrate the full breadth of change in society's and the Church of England's attitudes to Friends over the years. These range from virulent attack and total incomprehension of Quaker testimonies in the late seventeenth century to mutual accommodation in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when the Society of Friends was in general conceived less as a threat to the establishment; then finally in a more ecumenical age to an acceptance that Friends had a recognisable contribution to make as both individuals and a Society – at a time when a Quaker, Douglas Steere, was among the official observers present at a Lambeth Conference, in 1968,[3] and when an Archbishop of Canterbury, Robert Runcie, used his privilege under Peter's Pence Act of 1534 to grant a Lambeth doctorate of civil law to Sydney Bailey in 1985 in recognition of his services to international justice and peace, the first Quaker to receive a Lambeth degree.[4]

It is not my purpose to provide a lengthy catalogue of records or a guide to references to Friends in the manuscripts and archives at Lambeth, but rather to home in on a couple of different and contrasting collections dating variously from the eighteenth and the twentieth centuries which show Friends in less expected lights. The first set of records, which developed out of the long-established episcopal practice of visitation, illustrates the attitude of local clergy to their non-conforming neighbours, whereas the twentieth century's less formal collections of archiepiscopal and episcopal correspondence provide examples of the Archbishops' relations with a few individual Friends, but concentrating on one particular Friend, Edith M. Ellis (1878-1963), who relentlessly pursued the episcopal bench in her remorseless mission for a united Christian stand for international peace and reconciliation based on sound Christian principles.

Quakers viewed through Visitation Returns in the eighteenth Century

From the Middle Ages onwards, Bishops used the practice of visitation as a means of controlling and informing themselves of the state of religious and moral observance within the parishes in their dioceses. By the early eighteenth century, and no doubt affected by the introduction of a limited toleration of Nonconformists, some of the inherited formal methods of relying on the local churchwardens to present misdemeanours became increasingly less reliable and informative, unless perhaps the miscreants were withholding payment.of various dues, or tithes from the local incumbent.[5]

With the gradual decrease in the reliability of churchwardens' presentments for giving a true indication of the problems within a parish (many reporting omnia bene, or all is well), and the need for Bishops to gain a better understanding of what was happening among the clergy and parishes locally, there developed a practice, first initiated by William Wake as Bishop of Lincoln in 1706, and subsequently used by him as Archbishop of Canterbury from 1716, of circulating to his clergy just before his visitation a series of printed questions, with space beneath each question for their answers.[6] Unlike churchwardens' presentments, the answers or returns had no legal status and could not be used as a preliminary to prosecution in the church courts. The questions and answers, known as visitation articles and returns, were broader in scope and the answers by the clergy were more informal. The articles covered a variety of subjects about the extent and composition of the parish, the state of ministry, the times and number of religious services, the provision for catechising the children, the residence of the incumbent, local charities and schools, and use of the offertory money. Archbishop Wake's visitation articles of 1716 began with the following two sections of questions:

> What Number of Families have you in your Parish? Of these, how many are Dissenters? And of what Sort are they?
>
> Have you any Licensed or other Meeting House in your Parish? How many? Of what Sort? How often do they assemble? In what Numbers? Who teaches in them?[7]

These articles formed the basis of all visitation articles drawn up by the Bishops and Archbishops in both England and Wales, but often a Bishop or Archbishop would add his own individual emphasis depending on his own specific interests. This was particularly the case with Thomas Secker, first as Bishop of Oxford (1737-58), and subsequently as Archbishop of Canterbury (1758-68).[8] In general

Secker was more tolerant of Nonconformists than some of his fellow bishops, but he had a particular suspicion of Quakers, viewing them 'as extremely apt to be perverse in every thing'.[9] He had encountered them as Bishop of Bristol during their campaigns in support of the Quakers Tithe Bill of 1736, observing in his speech on the latter in the House of lords that the Quakers 'plead a Scruple of Conscience against paying the Clergy what is due to them by the Law of the land'....'they meet every year in very large Numbers, & write circular Letters to all their Congregations stirring up & exciting all their Friends in the strongest manner that words can express to disobey the Laws of the Land that require that AntiChristian Payment of Tithes',[10] a reference to Friends' testimony to be mindful of the AntiChristian yoke of tithes. As Bishop of Oxford, he paid particular attention to them in his visitation charge of 1750, advising clergy to take care especially in dealing with them over tithes: 'For they are a Generation, loud in their Complaints, unfair in their Representations, and peculiarly bitter in their Reflections, where we are concerned: unwearied in labouring to render us odious and surprisingly artful in recommending themselves to the Great'.[11]

Given this antipathy towards Friends, it is perhaps not surprising to find that Secker as Bishop of Oxford, and then as Archbishop of Canterbury, amplified and expanded the set of visitation articles he circulated to his diocesan clergy. In addition to questions about the extent of the parish, numbers of families, and people of note, the residence of the incumbents, local charities and schools, he asked the following very searching questions about all those who did not conform, starting perhaps understandably with detailed questions about Papists, continuing through Dissenters (excluding Quakers), and concluding with the following series of questions on Quakers.

> 'Are there any Quakers in your Parish, and how many? Is their Number decreased or increased of late Years, and by what number. Have they a meeting House in your Parish duly licensed, and how often do they meet there? Do any of them and how many in Proportion, pay your legal Dues without Compulsion. If not, do you lose such Dues, Or how do you recover them? And what Facts do you know, which may help to set their Behaviour towards the Clergy, or that of the Clergy towards them in a true Light?'[12]

The Secker visitation returns of 1758-9 consist of six volumes covering some 350 parishes, not only of the diocese of Canterbury, but of the Archbishop's far-flung exempt or peculiar jurisdictions in other dioceses, mainly in North Kent, the city of London, Middlesex,

Surrey, Sussex, and Buckinghamshire. As regards the diocese of Canterbury, which covered most of Kent south of the Medway, 32 out of the 265 returned record information on local Quakers, and for the Peculiars, 17 of the 90 returns provide such details. These figures were significantly less than those in 1716. Friends represented a small minority of all dissenting sects, with the exception of the rare instance of a Muggletonian.[13] Incidentally fewer of the returns recorded Papists, another group that periodically aroused even more public alarm and suspicion, though they were probably more numerous and were clustered around noble families, such as Sir Edward Hales, bart, in Hackington, and Lord Teynham in Lynsted.[14]

As a general observation. Quakers were not seen to be increasing in these areas covered by the 1758 returns – the only dissenting group perceived to be increasing in certain places was that of the Methodists. Most of the returns that referred specifically to Quakers suggest that the sect was thought to have decreased in numbers of late, a similar decline being attributed to some other Nonconformists, especially the Baptists (and this is borne out by comparing the returns to Archbishop Wake over forty years previously with those of 1758).[15] Some Quaker families had died out, or the children had been converted to the Church of England as at Wellesborough, where the four children of the wealthy Quaker farmer had been baptised, with his consent, the eldest in 1739, and the others in 1740.[16] At St. Mary Cray, the curate reported how the only Quakers there, a substantial miller and his sister, had been baptised by him in 1757, and had subsequently been confirmed, and had since been very constant in their attendance at the parish church.[17] At Bishopsbourne and Ruckinge there were instances of Quaker women married to Anglicans whose children had all been baptised by the local incumbent.[18] Some licensed Quaker meeting houses in Kent, such as those at Loose and at Birchington, were either being resorted to less than in the past, or had not been frequented for several years.[19] At Monk's Risborough in Buckinghamshire, it was reported that Quakers had formerly been very numerous and had a meeting house and a burial place.[20] On the other hand, very occasionally, Quaker families had moved to the parish from elsewhere as happened at Mersham in Kent and Putney in Surrey.[21] And in one of the city of London parishes in the Archbishop's deanery of the Arches, the numbers of Quakers had increased, partly as the parish was well situated for trade, and there were other Quakers in adjoining parishes, and it was near to 'their grand Meeting House in White Hart Court Lane, Lombard Street', namely Gracechurch Street

Meeting House.[22]

Folkestone had the largest number of Quakers. In a parish consisting of some 550 houses, there were twenty four families of Quakers. But even so their number was thought to have lessened, chiefly as a result of intermarriages with Anglicans – an effect noted as being very different from what intermarriage with other sectaries produced. Indeed Quakers were 'not so industrious to make Proselytes, as others are'.[23]

At Benenden in Kent, in a parish with 150 families, there were only three Quakers, one was a widower of 80 and upwards; the other two, a married couple, were described as 'very near as ancient'. Their children and grandchildren belonged to the Established Church, most of them having been baptised by the current incumbent, John Williams, who had been appointed in 1744. As regards payments, he noted 'As their Dues to me are but small, being only Sixpence a year from the three, one of them commonly works it out in my Garden. They are respected for their Honesty & upright dealing by all the Parish'.[24]

At Ashford where there were 314 houses, four or five families were Quakers. Their number had rather lessened that increased. They had a meeting house, said to be duly licensed, and they met every Sunday. Occasionally they met at other times, notably at Whitsuntide when they had 'a General Meeting, Assembly, or Visitation'.[25]

At Croydon in Surrey, where there was a meeting house, their meetings were more numerous in summer than in winter – 'Londoners of this Persuasion having Lodgings at this time of year at Croydon', clearly the wealthier Friends.[26] But Quakers were not the only ones who moved out of London to Croydon during the summer months. There was a similar increase in the numbers who frequented both the Baptist and Presbyterian Churches.[27]

As to the payment of various dues owing to the local incumbent, there was a general impression given of some accommodation, reporting either that the Quakers paid their dues or that the incumbent had no difficulty in levying church rates or tithes from them. The three Quaker families living in the city of London parish of St. Michael, Crooked Lane, wisely avoided 'the necessary expense of compulsion, which they know will come upon them' and therefore 'sometimes submit upon frequent threatening; and at other times they suffer themselves to be defrauded, as they call it, by the old Artifice of stopping the money in the hands of those, who have dealings with them in trade'.[28] At Monk's Risborough, it was

reported that since the Restoration there had been no dispute over the tithes of one Quaker family who had long occupied an estate valued at about £80 per annum. 'The person who rented the Parsonage usually went first with his Cart & took out the Tenth Cock and Shock, being for the most part allow'd a reasonable time to do so; and in lieu of Privy Tithes amounting annually to about twenty shillings, he took up a Load of Beans, which was judg'd an equivalent, from some part of the Quakers Lands.' This Friend's compliance was attributed to the fact that in the time of the Commonwealth ('Usurpation'), when 'the legal Incumbent had been ejected' and replaced by Nathaniel Anderson, his great grandfather had been prosecuted for withholding tithes. The Quaker 'was obstinate and lay in Goal for a considerable time'.[29]

There were however a number of Friends who still maintained the Society's testimony against payment of tithes and church rates, refusing to pay until compelled or distrained to do so. But perhaps surprisingly not all Quakers in a particular parish, who would presumably have attended the same meeting, followed the same policy. At Mersham, of the two Friends assessed for tithes, one paid by composition as other parishioners did, but the other 'will not yield to this, but he very civilly allous me to take all great Tithes in kind', and for the small tithes, the cleric had to apply to the local justice of the peace 'after first trying in vain to persuade him to pay such dues without compulsion'.[30] Similar differences were reported in other parishes. This is particularly interesting as one might have expected some pressure to conform within a meeting.

It took one outsider to observe that one solitary Quaker, a man of good disposition, was 'held to his profession more by the constraint of his Friends than by his own inclination'.[31]

Some clergy thought that their dues were too small to be worth pursuing, preferring to lose them than have the trouble and expense of a law suit. In one of the Canterbury parishes, St Andrew's the incumbent reported that none paid without compulsion. 'Of two of them, who are in good Circumstances, I recover them by Course of Law. The other being indigent, them I lose'.[32] Failure to pay was at times seen to be more the result of poverty than obstinacy. Indeed there were references to the low status of some of the Quakers, particularly in Canterbury.[33]

Unfortunately the returns rarely give the names of local Quaker families. One exception was at Cranbrook in Kent where Sherlock Thorp occupied land as a farmer, and also kept an ale house about

two miles out of town. He was, apparently, rather dilatory about paying his tithes, like some other parishioners, though he did not apparently 'declare against Payment of it'.[34]

Occasionally details are given about the nature of the meeting for worship itself. At Cranbrook, there was no ministry ('speaking') unless' some Person (which happens now & then) who pretends to that Gift comes from a Distance', a reference to Friends who travelled in the ministry. The incumbent reported that one of 'these Speakers (a Woman)' had visited the previous week, and had given 'an Exhortation to the Soldiers at the Barracks on Horseback behind a Man'.[35] At Dover, a silent meeting was held twice a week, there being 'no Speaker among them'.[36] At Margate, in the meeting held in Drapers Almshouses, there was very seldom any ministry ('Preaching'), perhaps only three to four times a year, and then chiefly at funerals.[37]

On the whole Quakers were viewed as inoffensive, quiet, an honest sort, or even respected, and in one parish, Charlwood, they joined their Anglican neighbours in public worship.[38] On the other hand, one Kent cleric observed: 'they seem extremely bigotted to their own Opinions and hold their Neighbours in great contempt as if for want of their light, everybody else was in the dark'.[39]

The same set of visitation articles was circulated by Archbishop Moore in 1786 to his diocesan clergy, followed shortly afterwards to the parishes within his exempt jurisdictions.[40] To a large extent, the returns reinforce the trends identified in 1758. But where the earlier answers indicated the presence of an elderly Friend or two, the later returns show that the Quaker presence in the parish had died out with them, as happened at both Ash-next-Sandwich and Benenden in Kent.[41] At Ashford, the meeting house had not been used for eight to ten years, leaving the three or four families of the 'lowest sort' to go to a distant meeting.[42] At Cranbrook, there were no longer any Quakers, though there was a meeting house and a burial ground, the former where meetings had previously been held annually, had not been resorted to during the past two to three years.[43] There were other parishes too where previously there had been a couple of Quaker families, but now there were none. However one of the Canterbury parishes showed an actual increase, no doubt reflecting changing patterns of population and work within the surroundings areas, and the shift towards the towns.[44]

Certain conclusions can be drawn by looking at these replies to the Archbishop: the comparatively small numbers of Quaker families in

the areas concerned, and relatively small number of parishes involved. Indeed the diocese of Canterbury was not one of the well populated areas for Quakers, certainly not by comparison with some of the northern dioceses.[45] There was generally a level of accommodation or adoption of some sort of compromise or acceptance of going through the motions as regards payment of tithes and other church dues, and in general good relations prevailed between Quakers and their neighbours, clerical or otherwise, especially in small rural parishes. Even where compulsion or distraint was resorted to, there seems to have been no apparent ill will on the part of the Quakers to the officials concerned. The picture contrasts with the Society's complaints, at times vocal, about their sufferings,[46] and the local picture as portrayed in these returns submitted by the clergy may well have misled some Archbishops and Bishops into dismissing the claims of Quakers, especially in those dioceses where Friends were thin on the ground. I suspect that Quakers and Bishops were sometimes relying on different evidence – the latter more concerned with actual prosecutions, rather than cases of distraint or the other ways of raising the dues, and indeed it may not have been in the interests of those making the returns to draw attention to the difficulties of their dealings with their Quaker neighbours.[47]

Twentieth century Friends

A different perspective on Friends and their relations with the Church of England can be seen in the extensive twentieth-century papers of the Archbishops of Canterbury, Randall Davidson to William Temple, and of George Bell, Bishop of Chichester. These collections are so interrelated even though the individuals ecclesiastics were very different personalities.[48] Friends feature in some of these as officials of organisations with which they were involved, such as Percy Bartlett, secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Gerald Bailey of the National Peace Council, and Lucy Gardner, honorary secretary of COPEC (the Conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship) held in 1924. In addition there are subjects, mainly humanitarian in the broadest sense, where Friends' testimonies prompted the Society in general or individual Friends to consort with Church leaders, over such subjects as South Africa, apartheid, the death penalty, refugees, race relations and emigration, conscientious objection, to name but a few. However I am primarily concerned with Friends where they express their own views as distinct from those of the organisation for which they worked.

One not infrequent, but much respected correspondent, of both Archbishop Temple and Bishop Bell during the Second World War was the very sensitive and thoughtful Friend, Stephen Hobhouse (1881-1961), who had suffered imprisonment, solitary confinement, and hard labour for his stand against conscription during the First World War. He felt called to resume his active membership of the Church of England, whilst remaining a Friend, for the sake of Christian unity and out of a feeling of affection and unity for the local vicar, David Parry Williams, who had helped to get together an inter-church prayer fellowship group at Broxbourne and Hoddesdon in Hertfordshire.[49] He shared his anguish with Bishop Bell, himself an outspoken opponent of the Allies' obliteration bombing of Germany: 'I expect your heart aches, as mine does, especially over these utterly devastating bombing raids. Worse to me, indeed, is the apparent blindness of most of our Church leaders and spokesmen to the fact that the deliberate, most carefully organised use of such systematic destruction is setting in train currents of anti-social soul force, tremendous hates and fears which are going to make the work of a "good" peace and national and international harmony so much more difficult, even than after 1918'.[50]

Given these views, it is perhaps surprising to find that Stephen Hobhouse asked Archbishop Temple, one of those Church leaders who refused to condemn these bombing raids, to write an introduction to the revised edition of his pamphlet, *Christ and our enemies*, first published by the Fellowship of Reconciliation in 1941. The original pamphlet itself had been born out 'of a long time of concern, of mental labour & pain, especially due to the pitiless way both newspapers & the BBC treated the Nazis (natural enough in war-time) as if they were quite irredeemable, quite apart from the highly monstrous attempt, encouraged by high quarters, to equate all Germans with them'.[51] Stephen Hobhouse's unexpected request was prompted by the knowledge that the original edition had received the Archbishop's blessing, but more importantly he was aware of the latter's desire to remain in friendship with Christian pacifists, even though he was not one himself.[52]

Archbishop Temple's immediate response was to refuse on the principle that he did not write introductions for others. However on reflection he felt impelled to do so 'Exactly because he was not only non-pacifist, but ant-pacifist', and yet he valued every means of expressing unity with pacifists for that very reason.[53] Stephen Hobhouse was delighted with Temple's draft. But what pleased him most was the evidence that the Archbishop appeared to have

changed his mind, now asserting that 'any thoughts of "punishing Germany" more than the course of the war is punishing her, must henceforth be excluded from the minds of those who are under obligation to find and to follow the way of Christ', a very welcome change of attitude which he gleefully shared with the Bishop of Chichester.[54]

This pamphlet was designed to be used for private meditation, reflection or for group discussion, and with the archiepiscopal imprimatur, it carried considerably more weight in Church circles. Copies were circulated to the Bishops with a covering letter of recommendation from Bishop Bell noting: 'Within the pages of this pamphlet you have a very striking exposition of something on which, in the Archbishop's words, all Christians should be agreed. It is the fact that the Archbishop says that which I think gives the book its particular interest.'[55] Copies were circulated to numerous clergy with a covering letter from Dame Sybil Thorndike, and in 1946, copies were sent via the Chaplain General to chaplains working in Germany.

Another Friend who shared a common concern with Bishop Bell was Bertha Bracey (1893-1989). She championed the cause of refugees, working first for the Germany Emergency Committee of Friends and then more generally for the Inter-Aid Committee of the Save the Children Fund, which later worked in close association with the Church of England Committee for Non-Aryan Christians, based at Bloomsbury House, of which Bell was the founder and chairman.[56] In writing to Henrietta Bell after the Bishop's death she counted it 'an honour and a joy' to have been allowed to work with the Bishop whom she regarded as 'so great a champion of righteousness, and so generous and magnanimous a person, that the glow of humble yet exalted satisfaction' she had in looking back to those years was 'difficult to relate though vivid to remember'. She particularly valued the fortitude he showed in the tragic situations which developed both in Germany, among German Christians, and in the world because of the Nazis.[57]

On his part, the Bishop had a considerable regard for her and her work. Called upon to write references on her behalf, he referred to her as 'a woman of quite outstanding character and capacity and balance, with a remarkable gift for working with people of all sorts. She had a very genuine sympathy and concern for those in any kind of need; extremely practical, with excellent judgement, and a fine understanding of human character – a woman of very high ideals.'[58] In consulting him about the advisability of working with the

Womens Affairs Branch for Scheleswig-Holstein, she shared her doubts: 'Women's Affairs Branch has a somewhat "Feminist" sound, but that is not a camp I want to join in principle or in practice.... Please help me to see more of the Way and to walk therein. I do long to worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness, but all the time I fall back into what Peguy calls "the ingratitude of sin"'.[59] This position gave her the opening to enable women to take a positive part in post-war social reconstruction in Germany.

Edith M. Ellis – a partial appraisal

There are other examples of Friends who can be briefly glimpsed in the modern collections of archiepiscopal and episcopal correspondence, but for the rest of the lecture, I propose to concentrate on one individual Friend whose activities can be traced through a number of Lambeth Palace Library's collections and whose ceaseless work for reconciliation between the Churches and nations has gone largely unrecognised even within the Society, namely: Edith Maud Ellis of Wrea Head, Scalby, Scarborough, who died aged 85 on 27 March 1963.[60]

Edith and her identical twin sister, Marian, were born on 6 January 1878, daughters of John Edward Ellis, first and foremost a paternalistic and socially responsible Nottinghamshire colliery owner, who subsequently entered parliament as a Liberal Member of Parliament for Rushcliffe in Nottinghamshire in 1885, a position he held until shortly before his death in 1910.[61] Second perhaps only to John Bright in Quaker political influence, he campaigned for Irish home rule and the alleviation of injustices there and in South Africa. He opposed both the arms and opium trades, and supported the temperance movement.

The twins continued their father's philanthropic and political activities, and shared a common concern for international peace and reconciliation.[62] Marian's contribution has been well documented,[63] partly perhaps as her marriage to Charles Alfred Cripps, Lord Parmoor, in 1919 inevitably elevated her to a different position in society with new opportunities, especially following his official involvement with the League of Nations.[64] By contrast Edith Ellis's life and work have been largely overlooked, with the exception of her imprisonment in 1918. In that year, as secretary of the Friends Service Committee, together with two other officials, Edith Ellis was put on trial at the London Guildhall, under the Defence of the Realm Act, for publishing an uncensored pamphlet, *A Challenge to Militarism*, and

after an unsuccessful appeal she was sentenced to three months in prison, rather than pay the alternative fine. Whilst in Holloway prison, she found herself in a cell next to Sinn Feiners, imprisoned following the 1916 Easter Rising: this shared experience of imprisonment was to give her an entrée into the hearts of some of those in Ireland who would otherwise have been unapproachable to her in her work there.[65]

In February 1923, when the newly established Irish Free State was threatened by renewed fighting and insurrection, she published *An Appeal to the Women of Ireland*, 'for the violence to cease', in which, as a postscript she listed her credentials, and it is perhaps interesting to see how she described herself at that date.[66] First and foremost she was a member of the Society of Friends, the daughter of the Rt. Hon. John E. Ellis, who for twenty five years as a Member of Parliament had worked for Irish self-government. She was 'a Pacifist imprisoned for three months in Holloway Goal on account of the Society of Friends protest against conscription', as she herself explained her imprisonment, and she was a member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

She had visited Ireland, each year between 1919 and 1923, to gain first hand knowledge of conditions there. She had worked hard for the release of Terence MacSwiney, the Lord Mayor of Cork, who had died in Brixton prison 74 days into his hunger strike in October 1920, and for the withdrawal of English armed forces from Ireland, and for a settlement of the political differences by Conference, or negotiation, rather than by force.

She had also administered relief on behalf of English Quakers 'in devastated places in Ireland' January to May 1921, and was a member of the White Cross Committee, a committee which took over responsibility for distributing aid, especially in Southern Ireland. She was also a member of the Peace with Ireland Council.[67]

It was in connection with her work for reconciliation in Ireland, and especially with the Peace with Ireland Council, that Edith Ellis had interviewed Eamon de Valera, the sole surviving leader of the 1916 Easter rebellion, and leader of the Dail, the independent Irish Parliament, together with other political leaders in both Ireland and England. She had also corresponded with George Bell, then chaplain to Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury. In June 1921 she forwarded a statement drawn up jointly by her brother-in-law, Lord Parmoor, Lady Aberdeen, and herself, which she hoped might prompt the Archbishop and other Church leaders (in whom she was

in contact) to sign to express their profound thankfulness to the British Prime Minister, Lloyd George, for his recent appeal to Irish leaders to attend a conference to settle the differences between the two countries, and stressing the belief that a settlement in Ireland must be based on fundamental Christian principles.[68]

In early July 1921, together with George Llewellyn Davies of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Edith Ellis was given an interview with Archbishop Davidson who in his diary described her as 'fanatical in her Sinn Fein sympathies'.[69] In view of the critical political situation in Ireland and the prevailing atmosphere of distrust and fear, their purpose was to ask the Archbishop to call for both prayers in support of the forthcoming conference between De Valera and the British Prime Minister, and for a general display, particularly on the English side, of a generous spirit of trust and reconciliation. Following the meeting and after due consultation with others, including Lord Stamfordham, private secretary to George V, the Archbishop wrote a letter to *The Times*, 8 July 1921, calling for prayers to uphold the participants, and appealing to each side to look 'with eyes of new and generous trust upon those with whom they are conferring'.[70] For some time afterwards Edith Ellis continued to correspond with the Archbishop passing on responses from de Valera or his wife that she thought might be helpful to the Archbishop, and thanking him for his letter to *The Times* following the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 6 December 1921, which ended a terrible chapter in Irish history; the Irish Free State came finally into existence a year later and the British troops left Ireland.[71] These encounters between Edith Ellis and Archbishop Davidson show the importance she already attached to published appeals and to the need for co-operation among the Churches to offer the spiritual guidance and support necessary for solving national or international conflicts.

So far as I can judge, the next occasion on which she features in the archiepiscopal correspondence dates to the 1930's. She was certainly in correspondence with the Archbishop of York, William Temple, from at least 1936, but it is not until 1939 that her work for international peace and reconciliation and a united Christian call for peace comes clearly into focus. In March 1939, Edith Ellis, then in her early sixties, made a three pronged approach to the Anglican hierarchy in an endeavour to enlist their support for a proposal to get the League of Nations to call a conference to consider the economic problems facing the world which were thought to be undermining any chance of a lasting peace.

Following an interview with Edith Ellis, Alan Don, chaplain to the

Archbishop of Canterbury. Cosmo Gordon Lang, and accustomed as he once put it to shielding the Archbishop 'from the attention of the feminists'.[72] wrote to the Archbishop of York, asking for enlightenment as to the nature of his support for her proposals:

'I have just had a visit from Miss Ellis whose activities are, I have no doubt, as well meaning as they are mysterious. She appears to flit between de Valera, Lord Halifax, Cardinal Hinsley and the Archbishop of York without being able to state definitely what her business really is'. She had, Don thought, convinced herself that de Valera as President of the League of Nations Assembly had a unique opportunity during his forthcoming visit to Rome for the coronation of the new Pope, Pius XII, on 12 March, of securing the support of the Roman authorities in an endeavour to summon a special meeting of the League to consider the economic problems afflicting the world. She had also informed him of her idea that Temple as chairman of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches should raise the proposal that the national committees should encourage their respective governments to pay more attention to these economic problems at the recent meeting in Paris. In conclusion, Don observed: 'As to Miss Ellis, I confess that she causes me considerable irritation, but that is doubtless owing to the large dose of original sin in my own composition'.[73]

Archbishop Temple's response to this enquiry began somewhat ominously: 'Miss Ellis is a problem – I have only once actually seen her and it will be my endeavour to avoid doing so again, but whether I can succeed in that, as she actually lives in my diocese, I don't know'. He supposed that it was through her connection with Lord Parmoor, when the latter was very prominent with the League, that she gained access to so many people. 'Anyhow she is constantly concerned with trying to secure the organisation of spiritual energy in the backing of schemes which seem to her and her friends likely to tend towards peace'.

He felt that 'along with a distinctly genuine devotion to the cause, she derives great enjoyment from the process of flitting about from one distinguished person to another'. He did not know how much she counted for with de Valera, which by her own account was a good deal. However Temple did think that one of the best hopes for peace would be for governments and nations to switch their attention to a joint enterprise to raise the standard of living of common folk, something that could only be achieved by international co-operation. His own position, he concluded, was 'Miss Ellis bores me stiff – but I think her idea is good one!'[74]

Edith Ellis had also written to George Bell, now Bishop of Chichester, to elicit his support. He in his turn had passed her letter on the Revd. Alan Don with the comment 'I think it tells its own story'.[75] Armed with Temple's reply, Don put the Bishop in the picture, advising him that she had come to see him and was 'as illusive as ever'. So far as he could make out, she proposed that de Valera would like to be fortified with the backing not only of the Pope, but of the Archbishop of Canterbury and other Bishops to summon a special meeting of the League of Nations. Don could not think that she was de Valera's accredited emissary, entrusted with the task of gathering the spiritual forces which would enable him to carry out his propose. 'Is she not', he queried, 'rather an exceedingly well-meaning woman and enjoys her self-appointed mission of flitting from one distinguished person to another and giving the impression that she is in the fullest confidence of them all?' Repeating the Archbishop of York's aphorism about her, he suspected that 'if all the other people whom she approaches were asked their opinion their answers would be somewhat similar'. And as to her precise proposal, the Archbishop of Canterbury could not but feel that the summoning of a special meeting of the League of Nations for the purpose of discussing world economics was unlikely to ease the international situation so long as Germany and Italy refused to take part in the proceedings and regarded anything that the League did 'with the greatest suspicion'.[76]

This correspondence, quoted or paraphrased at some length, illustrates the attitude of these Churchmen to her at this stage, and shows what she was up against. But clearly this was not an auspicious beginning, and nothing came of this particular proposal even though she was by no means the only person calling for such a course of action. Undaunted she continued to make suggestions and even to draft appeals for the Archbishop and other leading Churchmen to sign. She was fired by the belief that they 'had a unique opportunity for getting ahead of the Dictators and giving the Church a mission to help Humanity & Peace'.[77] In addition, with the new Pope, Pius XII's initial appeal for peace combined with the deterioration of the international situation, she changed tack and concentrated her efforts on trying to get support for the Pope's appeal and for a united stand under the leadership of the Pope, backed by leading Churchmen. That she was not alone in this desire for united action is evidenced by the Archbishop's Call to Prayer at Whitsuntide 1939, signed by Archbishop Lang, Germanos, Archbishop of Thyateira, the Archbishop of Uppsala, the Moderator

of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and the Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches. This Call to Prayer was accompanied by Archbishop Lang's letter of explanation to *The Times* 17 May which referred to his original hope for a joint appeal of Christian leaders headed by the Pope, and continued: 'my experience in arranging even this measure of common action is sufficient to show how great the obstacles are. It is one thing to cry somewhat irresponsibly "Let something be done". It is a very different thing for responsible persons to try to do it'.[78] Archbishop Lang had found the entire negotiations over this appeal both frustrating and disillusioning: he in fact dismissed it in private as 'the damp squib'[79] and to some extent this feeling of having been heavily let down, especially on the Papal and French sides, would undoubtedly influence his response to any subsequent joint appeals, from whatever quarter, even from Bishop Bell, let alone Edith Ellis.

The declaration of war on 3 September 1939 gave considerably more urgency to Edith Ellis 's various crusades, though apart from a proposal for a truce at Christmas,[80] the focus of her attention shifted once again and this time to the need to set out the Christian principles which should form the basis for a future peace and to have these agreed and promoted jointly by the Church leaders here and overseas. She assured Lang that she believed she had 'a real call from God to do His Work at this time', and had been charged by Cardinal Pizzardo 'to work for the Kingdom of God', and even proposed going to Rome to see the Irish Minister to the Vatican, William J. Babington Macaulay, who was a friend of the Pope.[81] She continued writing to both the Bishop of Chichester and to the Archbishop of York. Her network of significant contacts also included the Apostolic Delegate to England, Archbishop William Godfrey. Apparently the Papal Nuncio in Dublin, Archbishop Paschal Robinson, to whom she was known from her work for reconciliation there, had telephoned Archbishop Godfrey telling him that his services were to be put at her disposal 'if anything more were required'.[82] He in his turn gave her an introduction to David Mathew, Auxiliary Bishop of Westminster, and to Cardinal Hinsley, Archbishop of Westminster. Another possibly unexpected contact was the Spanish diplomat, writer and pacifist, Salvador de Madariaga, then in exile in England, a vocal opponent of General Franco, who had spent some time as a permanent delegate to the League of Nations, and would probably have been well known to her brother-in-law, Lord Parmoor, and was much admired by Archbishop Temple.[83] Fortified by a private assurance that the Roman Catholic hierarchy would be willing to join in some joint statement with other

Church leaders, she seems to have arranged for de Madariaga to draw up a memorandum embodying the Pope's Five Peace Points for regulating international life (to which she was very firmly wedded) with a counterbalancing statement taken from the Report of the Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State held in 1937 entitled *The Churches Survey their Task.*[84]

After much correspondence with Edith Ellis, Archbishop Temple wrote to Archbishop Lang in October 1940 on a note of triumphant relief: 'Miss Ellis has at last produced something which I think might really be of value'. As a result of her conversations with others, she had reason to think that the draft statement would have a wide measure of support among Church leaders, including the Roman Catholic and the Free Churches. The putting together of the Pope's Five Peace Points with the five standards for economic and social life agreed at the Oxford Conference was, he thought 'a real gain, and the appearance of the various names in joint utterance would be worth something'.[85]

Lang, ever cautious, was rather less enthusiastic: 'I presume it emanates from the worthy Miss Ellis, but I am bound to say that a long experience makes me very sceptical about the real results of her many conversations. I know myself when I have expressed interest, sympathy, goodwill, etc., this is taken to mean complete approval of what she may have said'. Nevertheless, he agreed there was some value in the proposed document. But he was not prepared to sign the appeal unless Cardinal Hinsley or the Apostolic Delegate, and the representatives of the Free Churches did. He was doubtful about the reaction of some of the representatives of the Free Churches to the prominent part given to the Pope. The whole matter, he thought, required a good deal of careful consideration.[86]

Temple fortified him. To his mind 'the whole value of the thing is as a presentation of some measure of Christian unity. The political effect of the document itself and its publication cannot be great, but what there is will tell in the right direction'.[87] Temple queried the advisability of both Archbishops signing offering to drop out himself, but Lang insisted on his inclusion as he had promoted the document secured by Edith Ellis. Much negotiation went on behind the scenes, and a lot of consultation, with some editing to meet both the views of Archbishop Lang and Cardinal Hinsley, and in some of these Edith Ellis seems to have played a part. But undoubtedly her principal contribution had been the initiating and securing of an acceptable draft and the preparation of some of the ground via the Apostolic Delegate, and possibly Bishop Mathew, for the participation of Cardinal Hinsley.[88]

The final joint letter was published on 21 December 1940 on the middle page of *The Times* headed 'Foundations of Peace – A Christian Basis – Agreement among the Churches', with the signatures of the two Archbishops (Canterbury and York), the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council (The Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland had refused to sign on this occasion, a decision later regretted by subsequent Moderators).[89] It was accompanied by a lengthy editorial commending it. The letter made a very significant impact, much wider than the Archbishops had anticipated, and heralded an interlude of ecumenical activities and meetings previously unheard of in the country. It also prompted a deputation of Members of Parliament to see the Archbishop of Canterbury in support of the statement.[90] The editorial in *The Friend* welcomed it as' the foundation of hope at a time when hope was dim', and recommended that if Friends believed that an enduring new order must have a Christian foundation, they must not hesitate to co-operate with their fellow Christians who may differ from them in the matter of war.[91] As a member of Meeting for Sufferings. Edith Ellis drew the attention of the January meeting to both the important letter signed by Christian leaders and to the Pope's Christmas Eve statement. There were, she felt, clear signs of a more effective unity among the churches working for peace, of which Friends should be aware and by which they should be encouraged.[92]

The success of this joint publication, which came to be known as the Ten Point Letter, spurred Edith Ellis on even further and brought her into close contact with the Sword of the Spirit Movement, founded by Cardinal Hinsley soon after the Fall of France in 1940.[93] The movement took the opportunity afforded by this joint publication to promote ecumenical study groups and meetings on the subject of the Ten Point Letter. She frequently consulted A.C.F. Beales, and to a lesser extent Barbara Ward, both officials of the movement, and was later seen speaking at interdenominational meetings promoting the Ten Point Letter. She also went off to Dublin for a month (Jan-Feb 1941), apparently with the approval of Lord Cranborne, and the Ministry of Information, to promote its circulation through her various contacts there, including the Papal Nuncio in Dublin, who she hoped would get copies circulated to the Vatican and to the Roman Catholic hierarchy elsewhere. She was introduced to the newly appointed Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, John McQuaid, whom she described as most anxious to co-operate.[94] She also had 'much talk' with de Valera, now Prime

Minster of Eire. (Southern Ireland) The latter she reported to Archbishop Lang was reading *The Churches Survey their Task*, which apparently interested him 'very greatly'; she had lent him a copy but he wanted to possess it! He had also asked her to send him information of continental Protestant opinion published in the *Christian Newsletter*. 'All this', she observed, 'makes for the Unity of Christendom'.[95]

In Edith Ellis's mind, the Stoll Theatre meetings in May 1941, organised by the Sword of the Spirit around the Ten Point Letter, were the real pinnacle of success of this joint ecumenical venture.[96] Cardinal Hinsley and Archbishop Lang presided separately on consecutive days and the Archbishop's address was broadcast. On both days, a resolution was passed by a representative inter-denominational gathering (both the speakers and the audience) calling on the governments of the British Commonwealth and allies to adopt the Ten Point Letter as the basis of future statements of war and peace aims.

Not wishing the momentum to be lost, she sent Archbishop Lang a draft of another joint letter to be sent to *The Times* in November 1941. This she reported embodied ideas given to her by Archbishop Godfrey, had been drafted with assistance from her sister, Lady Parmoor, and had the approval of Professor Christopher Dawson (Vice-President and Chairman of the Sword of the Spirit) and Father Simon O'Hea of the Catholic Social Guild. She also mentioned that her proposal was welcomed by Dr. William Paton of the Peace Aims Group. It was thought that Cardinal Hinsley would be willing to sign something of the sort; and Archbishop Godfrey, she claimed, was very anxious that the letter should be got out as quickly as possible so that the Pope could refer to it in his Christmas Eve allocution.[97] This appeal reaffirmed the Pope's Five Peace Points in a slightly different form, together with the Ten Point Letter, but added references to a couple of basic human freedoms, recently defined by President F.D. Roosevelt in the Atlantic Charter.

The subsequent correspondence between the two Archbishops reveals a certain frisson of annoyance.[98] Lang did not see that there was any particular reason to issue another joint letter – there was nothing new except some needless reference to the so called Atlantic Charter. Such letters should be reserved for special occasions when they had something quite definite to say. He had 'a great esteem for this good lady's intentions and persistence', 'but', he observed 'there must be some limits to our giving way to her activities!'[99] Temple was equally dismayed and had written to tell her he felt she was

stampeding them. He also thought the Cardinal was a good deal annoyed at being confronted with a draft before he had been specifically consulted on the question. And, Temple observed, if they went on 'pushing this leadership of the Pope we shall lose the English Free Churches which are already very restive'.[100] However, and here was probably the real rub, her draft (discussed and possible approved by a number of other Churchmen and others of significance), prompted Temple to go and see the Apostolic Delegate and to redraft the letter. But this was all to no avail on this occasion. As Lang advised her, not even Archbishop Temple could give point and shape to a joint letter.[101] Unbeknown to her, others had been pressing the Archbishops to issue a joint statement elucidating the much needed distinction between retribution and vengeance, following the Prime Minister's statement that retribution must be one of the Allies war aims, and Temple had drafted an alternative joint letter, which the Cardinal had declined to sign, much to both Archbishops' dismay.

Not daunted she looked for other allies and one of these was Harold Buxton, Bishop of Gibraltar, whom she saw as a channel to the Churches overseas. She even arranged for him to see the Apostolic Delegate. It was thought that a joint statement signed by British Church leaders would be useful indicating to foreign countries the kind of guidance being given to Christians here; it would provide some assurance of the sincerity of Great Britain's peace aims, that these were quite different from those embodied in the Versailles Treaty following the First World War. Although Edith Ellis had corresponded with Archbishop Temple about this joint statement, it was arranged for the draft to be forwarded by Bishop Buxton to Archbishop Lang – a shrewd tactical move. This letter combined references to the Pope's last Christmas Eve Allocution and his Five Peace Points, with the four essentially humanitarian freedoms propounded by President F.D. Roosevelt in 6 January 1941 as freedoms of speech and worship, and freedoms from want and fear. The letter was duly signed in March 1942 by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and the Moderators of the Free Church Federal Council and of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland on the understanding that it was **not** to be published.[102] But the Bishop of Gibraltar was authorised to show it to the Cardinal Archbishop of Lisbon and other ecclesiastics in both Portugal and Spain during his visit to these countries. As Archbishop Temple later explained at some length to Edith Ellis 'the issue of a series of messages made up of quotations

partly indeed from the Pope and partly from a secular statesman is really unworthy of the Church. To do it once in our first letter was thoroughly sound and made a great impression. But if we are going on issuing joint messages we must have something quite specifically our own to say; otherwise... we shall undermine the influences of the Church by presenting it as an echo of a statesman and in the end we shall have done much more harm than good. On the other hand, to distribute privately... a statement that the religious leaders stand behind these particular points that have been put forward by others and so gather increasing support for [them]....is immensely to the good.... this is a case where the whole difference between doing good and doing harm turns on the avoidance of publication; but on the other hand the wide if discriminating use of the document through private channels is all to the good.'[103]

Yet even this measure of co-operation over what amounted to a statement for private circulation was not achieved without considerable cost of time and energy. She later recalled how she personally had persuaded Cardinal Hinsley to sign the Lisbon Letter. He had initially refused because the opening sentence included the word 'unity', to which he took exception, because 'the Catholic Church provided that unity'. She apparently told him there could be an alteration and he proposed instead 'all those who love and owe allegiance to our Lord Jesus Christ' which she accepted, and she described the incident to Bishop Bell some years later, 'with a smile he took up his pen & signed saying "We ought to love Him more, should not we?" – I said "yes"and we got our unity, a deeper one'.[104]

In the spring of 1943, another draft statement, couched in a rather different form, with no quotations from the Pope, but with a lengthy list of over twenty possible signatories including foreign pastors (all already consulted), landed on the desk of William Temple, now Archbishop of Canterbury. Once again this prompted him to compose his own draft, indicating to her that she might include a couple of sentences from her own text if she wanted (which of course she did): 'I think a call to the remembrance of God is really worth making. I do not think an exhortation to shew a loving spirit ourselves worth making. Everyone knows we are supposed to stand for that, and everyone knows that these exhortations have been given and passed unheeded for generations. I really think we rather betray our trust as Christians if we give the human side without the divine side in a call of this sort'.[105] This was rather harsh, as she was always anxious to emphasize the spiritual or Christian elements, but her terminology or expressions of faith were different from those of an

Anglican Archbishop.[106] In fact Bishop Bell had previously advised her that her draft might be better suited for private meditation, published anonymously.

On 19 April 1943, a letter headed 'The Church Leaders Appeal, Foundation of Peace' was published in *The Times*. This appeal 'to return to God, set his will before you as the guiding rule of life', was signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool (the see of Westminster was vacant following the death of Cardinal Hinsley), the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council, the Moderator of the Church of Scotland, with 15 other signatories, including Scandinavian and Swiss pastors, two Russian Orthodox priests, an Armenian priest, and two French politicians (including Andre Philip, Free French National Commissioner).

Edith Ellis, who was the prime mover, in getting all these signatories, was highly delighted with the publication, observing that 'it was something new to have got these different nationalities & Christian communions to put their hand to the same document concerning their faith'.[107] She had been left by the Archbishop with the responsibility of collecting these, and dealing with the niceties of the order of signatures, even though the final text was sent from Lambeth Palace.

Her prominence in ecumenical circles led to her appointment in 1943 as a member of the IX Commission of the London International Assembly with the task of looking at the role of religion in the post-war world, which was chaired by the Dean of Chichester, Arthur Stuart Duncan-Jones.[108] This gave her a new purpose: to draw in other religious faiths. She saw this as a means of providing a unity of spiritual forces and an opportunity for some united action. She was appointed to a sub-committee to collect authoritative documents and statements of Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, Moslem beliefs. She wanted 'to get at the heart of these different people who also thought that religion mattered'.[109] The Commission, which totalled some thirty-six members representative of different nationalities and religions, included some of her friends, such as A.C.F. Beales of the Sword of the Spirit and the Revd. William Paton, but it also opened up new friendships and acquaintances, and her work here brought her into contact with the World Congress of Faiths. Alive to the value of broader co-operation, she started off on her own track of proposing the issuing of inter-faith statements and the calling of a large public meeting similar to the successful Stoll Theatre Meetings in 1941. However much Bishop Bell tried to warn her off to leave public inter-

faith meetings to the World Congress of Faiths, she carried on regardless, or as Bell would have put it 'ceaselessly'[110] – 'firing letters' at him and when he failed to reply getting into 'telephonic communication' with him![111]

Prompted by the receipt of her letter advising him that following conversations with Bishop of Chichester, Archbishop Godfrey and Lord Cecil, there was a project for a public meeting 'representing all religions which believe in a divine Creator', the idea being to give support to the notions that the Bishop of Chichester had expressed in April on the need for religion behind any new world authority, Archbishop Temple immediately wrote to Bishop Bell for his candid opinion. The Archbishop indicated that he would be glad of anything that would enable them 'to give some joint witness with the Jews on the supremacy of God and His Law, but does she mean to go beyond that and bring in the Moslems? That I think begins to make difficulties, because Allah is a different person from the God of either the Old or the New Testaments – and do you think such a meeting can avoid banality?'[112]

The Archbishop was also wary of inter-faith meetings and statements because 'they so easily suggest that those who take part in them assent to the view that all religions are varieties of some one thing called Religion: which is the really important matter; whereas of course Christians are committed to the view that Christianity itself rightly understood, is already the universal religion containing in itself all that is valuable in every other'.[113]

Bishop Bell was at considerable pains to explain to the Archbishop the differences between his own work through the World Congress of Faiths and her own proposals, needless to say raised with some of the Congress's officials, for both a large public meeting in the summer and subsequently a joint Christmas message in which Buddhists and Hindus collaborated with various Christian leaders. He was, he assured the Archbishop, 'rather shy of the multi-lateral pronouncements suggested by Edith Ellis.'[114]

The proposal of Edith Ellis for a joint inter-faith Appeal, which would not seem so radical now, was not the only occasion on which she allowed her ideas or enthusiasms to run away with her, only to discover at the eleventh hour that the joint enterprises, meetings, or even broadcasts she had planned foundered. She certainly had a large number of friends or acquaintances, Churchmen, politicians and organisations on whom she relied for support, and they backed her schemes with varying degrees of approval. She was supremely

confident in her self-appointed mission, and was not always aware of, or sensitive to others' reluctance. In August 1944 she was trying to persuade the Foreign Office to give her a visa to go to Rome with the Methodist ecumenist, Henry Carter, to see the Pope to establish contact for the future building of a new world order based firmly on Christian principles.[115]

Edith Ellis was just as committed in the post-war period. The autumn of 1947 saw her in Rome working on a scheme for Christian co-operation, though now she was aware of the changes in the political atmosphere, and was increasingly conscious of the dangers of Communism and its strong appeal for the dispossessed and underfed.[116] The following year she was back in Rome with a commission from Canon John Collins to gain support for his newly formed Christian Action.[117] This time she had an interview with the Pope.[118] Following each annual visit to Rome she reported back immediately to her various 'backers'. In January 1951, she saw Canon Collins, various United Nations Association officials, the Labour politician, Philip Noel-Baker, and the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Godfrey, all before going home to Scarborough for a rest – life in Rome had been very strenuous – she admitted to Bishop Bell in her letter hastily written from her bed.[119] She was by this date in her late seventies.

In late 1952 she drafted an 'Appeal to the Women of the World' which she wanted taken up at the forthcoming meeting of the Commonwealth Ministers. Did she perhaps see this as the 50th anniversary of *The Appeal to Women of Ireland* published by her in early 1923? Although the world had changed, it was still beset by fear, conflict, hunger, poverty, disease, and racial and social antagonisms. Science, which had opened up possibilities of a fuller, richer life for the whole human race, threatened to become 'a monster of destruction because of our lack of moral purpose'. She appealed to women, as 'custodians of life....with creative powers not fully utilized which are God given, to unite to combat the real evils which beset mankind...If we really care,... we shall be the instruments in the Hands of God for carrying out His Divine Purpose for mankind' 'In a world of shortages with potential wealth for all there is work for all women to discover the part they can play'.[120] The appeal included a quotation from the French philosopher, Jacques Maritain, whom she had met in Rome when he was the French ambassador to the Vatican. Bishop Bell, on whom she could rely for a considered judgement advised her that 'it contained important truths and had a very wide basis of a moral and philosophical kind – the kind of

appeal which should be signed by eminent women, or if thought appropriate, by philosophers and writers'.[121]

The last major proposal of Edith Ellis for which there is evidence in the papers in Lambeth Palace Library was that inspired by the forthcoming coronation and the self-evident dedication of the new young Queen, Elizabeth II. Looking back to the inspiration and success of the Stoll Theatre Meetings of 1941, she drew up proposals for a large public meeting to be supported by the Council of Christians and Jews, the Sword of the Spirit, the World Council of Churches, the World Congress of Faiths, Christian Action, and United Nations Association, to be chaired by an eminent layman – her first choice was the distinguished philosopher and diplomat, Sir Oliver Franks, just retiring as British Ambassador to the United States of America.[122] She even guaranteed the cost of the hire of the Stoll Theatre, some £202. She envisaged the meeting as a way of raising awareness among the religious consciousness to the fact that there could be no true peace while half the world's people were underfed and living in poverty, and also as the visible means of showing a sense of dedication to public service in solidarity with the Queen on the eve of her coronation. But as Bishop Bell remarked to Canon Collins: 'There is no Ten Point Letter to proclaim. If there were a sudden change in the international situation for good or for evil, then there might well be a case for reviving the idea'.[123] Once again she had gone her own way, and the proposal foundered as she failed to gain the leading figures required for such a meeting or the support of an organisation to take responsibility for arranging the event.

From this rather lengthy trawl through some of the correspondence,[124] one can perhaps share the irritations of some of the ecclesiastics she dealt with, all very busy men preoccupied with more important issues, especially in wartime. But one has to admire her persistence and tenacity, and her achievements, especially the publication of the Ten Point Letter in 1940, set against the background of the considerable prejudices then existing between the Churches, on all sides. She might have been irritating, but she continued to get interviews and replies to her barrage of letters, and her more influential contacts could have refused to see her. Surprisingly, perhaps, she went on visiting Archbishop Lang, not her greatest champion, even in his retirement. But of all her ecclesiastical contacts, and the ecclesiastic she visited more than any other was Archbishop Godfrey, the Apostolic Delegate, who was incidentally far less ecumenically minded than either Cardinal Hinsley or Bishop David Mathew, and indeed had less of a regard for the Church of

England.[125] He recommended her to other members of the Catholic hierarchy in England and to Monsignor Montini (later Paul VI) of the Papal Curia. The predominance of Roman Catholic contacts is certainly surprising, as indeed was the weight she gave to Papal pronouncements especially in her dealings with the Anglican hierarchy, and this would not always have endeared her to them.[126]

However it was her experience of working in Ireland in the 1920's that laid the foundations of her later work for international reconciliation. This showed her the need for co-operation among the Churches: that many of the problems were really deeply-rooted spiritual issues that needed the Churches' co-operation to overcome. Her standing there, as a Quaker concerned with peace and reconciliation, gave her access to Irish ministers, even to Eamon de Valera, and to the Roman Catholic hierarchy. They in their turn gave her introductions to various officials in Rome, and it was to the Irish Minister to the Vatican that she turned for support and advice, rather than to the British. She knew how to work the system and to use people, or name-drop to her advantage, or rather to her cause. Lord Parmoor, and Sir Stafford Cripps, his youngest son (by his first marriage), all counted for something in the circles in which she moved, both in England and overseas, as did the fact that her mission had received the blessings of so many – Cardinals, Archbishops, as well as the Bishop of Chichester.[127]

She was also prepared to do the ground work – smoothing paths and opening up channels of communications between differing Church leaders and politicians, and exchanging literature. The Papal Nuncio in Dublin sent a copy of the Pope's Five Peace Points; she circulated *The Churches Survey their Task*, and writings of William Temple.[128] She concentrated on joint statements as she saw them as a visible expression of unity, but she was aware that statements were no good in themselves unless came from understanding and sympathy, and for that reason she went on collecting 'friendships'.[129] But the value of such activities is difficult to assess even at the time, and even more so over sixty years later.

She was very much an individualist. She had served her apprenticeship working in an official capacity for the Friends Service Committee during the 1914-18 War and for the various committees involved in her service in Ireland. During the 1930's, with the deterioration in the international situation, she seems to have preferred to go her own way, though she still served on a variety of Quaker and non-Quaker organisations.[130] She shed the absolutist

approach which had led her to jail in 1918, and by the time of the Second World War she wished to ensure that pacifism did not split the Churches.[131] Secure in her Quaker heritage, both Ellis and Rowntree,[132] and in her financial independence she did not apparently seek any support of the Society for her mission, nor perhaps did she take many Friends into her confidence as to its precise nature.

Her ecumenical undertakings for the sake of international peace and reconciliation and a sound Christian foundation for society were clearly those of her own initiative, which developed, changed and matured depending very much on the international situation, and on the responses she received from her various contacts, both friends and acquaintances.[133] Marian was her staunchest supporter and critic until she predeceased her in 1952. Although the twins had different strengths, the tribute to Marian given in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* could equally apply to Edith: 'At every depressing turn of world politics, she would follow the direction of her idealistic conscience and struggle for the implementation of those ideals in international relations'.[134] But in this inevitably partial account (based as it is principally on the records in Lambeth Palace Library), the penultimate word should perhaps be left to Archbishop Temple, a not inconsiderable critic: 'She has done some immensely good service, but I also think she starts a great number of pretty futile hares!'[135] Yet given a longer perspective, those 'hares' may not have been so futile; they provide evidence of her courage and perspicacity, and a sound understanding of her principles needed for the foundation of international peace and a just society.

Not all of this lecture can be described as 'Tales of the Unexpected', but Lambeth Palace Library's collections certainly provide unusual glimpses of Friends, showing them in slightly different perspectives both in Kent in the eighteenth century and in an usually productive encounter between an indefatigable Friend and the Anglican hierarchy in the twentieth century.

Melanie Barber

Presidential Address given at Britain Yearly Meeting, 6 May 2007

FOOTNOTES

1 Lambeth Palace Library (hereafter LPL) is the historic public library of the Archbishops of Canterbury, dating back to its foundation under the will of Richard Bancroft in 1610. It is now the principal research library and record office for the history of the Church of England, but its substantial collections of manuscripts, archives and printed books range over a much wider spectrum of both subjects and countries. For admission details, see the Library's website: www.lambethpalacelibrary.org. I am grateful to the Lambeth Librarian for permission to use and quote from the collections, especially the letters of William Temple and George Bell whose copyright is vested in the Library.

2 See for instance letter from Henry Prideaux, Archdeacon of Suffolk, to Archbishop Tenison. 13 July 1698, in which he described Quakers as 'the dangerousest Sect among us they being regulated under a very formidable order & discipline which all the other Sectorys want, & for want of which must all in a short while come to nothing if we have but patience to wait for it' (LPL MS 930/57).

3 Douglas Steere, 'A Quaker Observer looks at the Lambeth Conference', *The Friend*, 126 (1968), pp.1081-3. He reported to the October Meeting for Sufferings, having been appointed their representative to attend the Conference (pp.923, 1270). Douglas Steere was chairman of the Friends World Committee for Consultation.

4 Wolf Mendle, 'A doctorate for Sydney Bailey', *The Friend*, 143 (1985), pp.821-2. See also *Festschrift* for the latter, *Explorations in Ethics and International Relations*, ed. Nicholas Sims, 1981, and obituary, *The Friend*, 154/3 (1996), pp.18-19.

5 For the practice of visitation in the early 17th century, see *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the early Stuart Church*, 2 vols. Ed. Kenneth Fincham, Church of England Record Society, 1 (1994), 5 (1998).

6 Norman Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1657-1737* (Cambridge, 1957), chap. 3.

7 Archbishop Wake's visitation returns for the diocese of Canterbury, 1716-28, are in the Library of Christ Church, Oxford (MS 284-7); a microfilm of these is available in LPL; the returns for the Archbishop's Peculiars, 1717, are in LPL (MS 1115).

8 *Articles of Enquiry addressed to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford at the Primary Visitation of Dr. Thomas Secker, 1738*, ed. H.A. Lloyd Jukes, Oxford Record Society, 38 (1957). The 1758 visitation articles are given in full in *The Speculum of Archbishop Secker*, ed. Jeremy Gregory, Church of England Record Society, 2 (1995), pp.xli-xlii.

9 LPL Secker Papers 4, ff.252-3; Archbishop Secker to the Master of Faculties, Dr. Francis Topham, 8 March 1760, in connection with the application of Joseph Sherwood for admission as a public notary. 'Joseph Sherwood, Quaker Attorney and Notary, c.1734-73', *A Quaker Miscellany for Edward H. Milligan*, ed. David Blamires, Jeremy greenwood and Alex Kerr (Manchester, 1985), pp.7-16.

10 Secker Papers, 7, ff.326-35. Cf. S.J.C. Taylor, 'Sir Robert Walpole, the Church of England and the Quakers Tithe Bill of 1736', *Historical Journal*, XXVIII (1985), 51-77

11 Thomas Secker, *Eight Charges delivered to the Clergy of the Dioceses of Oxford and Canterbury*, published by Beilby Porteus, London, 1769, p.131.

12 Secker visitation returns: LPL MS 1134/1-4 (diocese of Canterbury, 1758): 5, 6 (Archbishop's Peculiars, 1759). Secker's abstracts of all the returns are given in *The Speculum of Archbishop Secker*. The returns for the Archbishop's exempt parishes in Surrey are printed in *Parson and Parish in Eighteenth-Century Surrey: Replies to Bishops' Visitations*, ed. W.R. Ward, Surrey Record Society, XXXIV (1994).

13 MS 1134/5, f.39v (Little Brickhill, Bucks).

14 There are various returns which give overall figures for Papists (unlike Quakers): in 1767, there were 271 Papists in the diocese of Canterbury: *The Return of Papists*, 1767, ed. E.S. Worrall, Catholic Record Society, 1989, Occasional Publications 2, pp.142-3; by 1780, this figure had increased to 458, whereas the numbers of Quakers had further decreased. See also *The Speculum of Archbishop Secker*.

15 About 40 returns for the diocese of Canterbury in 1716 referred to the presence of Quakers within their parish, whereas in 1758 only 32 noted Quakers, and the numbers in specific parishes appeared to be more numerous.

16 MS 1134/4, f.221. The children had been baptised, 'with licence' from Archbishop Potter: by 1758 the father was dead.

17 MS 1134/6, f.42.

18 MS 1134/1, f.96 (Bishopsbourne); 3, f.258 (Ruckinge).

19 MS 1134/3, f.42 (Loose): two small families of 6 persons, occupied in husbandry; 1, f.88 (Birchington): there were no longer any Quakers in the parish.

20 MS 1134/6, f.74.

21 MS 1134/3, f.82 (Mersham): one Quaker from Sussex marrying and settling with his wife in the parish, and another coming from East Kent. 6, f.125 (Putney). There had also been fluctuations in numbers at Cliffe, nr. Lewes in Sussex (5, f.73).

22 MS 1134/5, f.86 (St. Dionis Backchurch, city of London).

23 MS 1134/2, ff.100-1.

24 MS 1134/1. ff.61-2.

25 Ibid., ff.29-30.

26 MS 1134/5, f.82.

27 *Ibid.*, f.81v.

28 MS 1134/6, f.62.

29 *Ibid.*, f.74. This probably refers to the White family. Library of the Society of Friends, Friends' House, Euston Road., London (FHL) Great Book of Sufferings, 1756-1761, 23, pp.4, 131, 286-7 bears out this practice of taking some of the crops of Joseph White of Meadle, Monks Risborough, at harvest time in lieu of tithes, and without any legal proceedings. However the 18th incumbent probably predates the imprisonment for non-payment of tithes to the Commonwealth, which probably occurred in the 1660's. According to Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers*, 1753, 1, pp.77, 78, John White of Monks Risborough was prosecuted by 'Timothy Hall, priest of Monks Risborough', and not only endured twenty-eight weeks imprisonment,

but had his goods seized to the value of £92 in 1667, and he also appears to have been imprisoned in 1665. But Hall was never the incumbent of Monks Risborough, though he held other benefices in Buckinghamshire, including Princes Risborough from 1669.

30 MS 1134/3, f.82. Only two of the 10 Quakers, including children, noted as living there were assessed for paying tithes. They generally went to Ashford meeting.

31 Kennington, Kent: Ms 1134/2, f.257.

32 MS 1134/1, f.176. See also Cliffe (5, f.73), and Deal (2, f.6). In the latter parish the only demand was for Easter Offerings which they refused to pay and 'as they are of so little consequence, I think it prudent rather to connive at it, than force them to pay'. In Secker's *Speculum*, this was rendered as 'Only Easter Offerings due from them: which R[ector] Connives at their not paying' (p.144).

33 Especially in the parishes of St. George (MS. 1134/1, f.188), St. Mildred (f.216), and St. Paul (f.220).

34 MS 1134/1, f.284.

35 *Ibid.*

36 MS 1134/2, f.27.

37 *Ibid.*, f.241. Parish known then as St. John's in Thanet. See also reference to Drapers Almshouses, which had been founded by a Quaker, Michael Yoakley, for ten people, both men and women, in 1708 (f.242).

38 MS 1134/5, f.54. These Quakers all paid their dues without compulsion.

39 Thomas Edwards, Vicar of St. Mary's, Dover (MS 1134/2, f.31).

40 VG 3/1a-d (Canterbury diocesan returns, 1786); VH 55/1 Archbishop's Peculiars returns, 1788). LPL has other visitation returns for both the dioceses of Canterbury and London, 18th-20th century, and although they do not include a separate question on Quakers, they often ask about the presence of Nonconformists in general.

41 VG 3/1a, p.19 (Ash); p. 435 (Benenden).

42 *Ibid.*, p.427 Only two in these families were assessed for payment of tithes: one paid willingly; the other suffered himself to be distrained 'cooly & quietly' every two years.

43 *Ibid.*, p.499.

44 Return of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, where there were five families consisting of 20 to 30 persons; one family had recently moved into the parish (VG 3/1a, p.259). Two out of the five paid without compulsion. Folkestone still had perhaps the largest number of Quakers (1b, p.67).

45 Gillian Draper, 'The first hundred years of Quakerism in Kent', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, CXII (1993), pp.317-40; CXV (1995), pp.1-22; Karl Showler, *A review of the history of the Society of Friends in Kent, 1655-1966*, (Canterbury, 1970). Neither of these used the visitation returns.

46 *The Later Periods of Quakerism*, Rufus M. Jones, (London, 1921), 1, pp.146-57. Joseph Besse published his *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers* in 1753.

47 FHL, Great Book of Sufferings, 1756-1761, 23, records the amounts claimed by Friends in Kent to have been taken mainly for tithes and, to a much lesser extent, for church rates. Relatively few families and even fewer places were

involved, the brunt being borne regularly by Thomas Finch of Bishopsbourne, in some years totalling over £30. But according to the visitation return for the latter parish, all dues were paid without compulsion (MS 1134/1, f.96).

48 There is a considerable overlap between the papers of George Bell and those of the Archbishops. Bell had been chaplain to Archbishop Davidson from the outbreak of the First World War until his appointment as Dean of Canterbury in 1924, and as Bishop of Chichester in 1929 until just before his death in 1958. The Davidson Papers run to 803 volumes; the Lang Papers to 322, William Temple Papers to 111 and the Bell Papers to 368 volumes.

49 W. Temple Papers 51, ff.114-15 (Hobhouse to Temple, 26 Dec. 1943). For local ecumenical invitation to prayer, study and meditation in fellowship, 1943 (Bell Papers, 69, ff.156-7).

50 Bell Papers 69, f.155 (Hobhouse to Bell, 5 Sept. 1943).

51 *Ibid.*, ff.114-15 (Hobhouse to Bell, 16 Aug. 1941).

52 W. Temple Papers 51, ff.114-15 Hobhouse, to Temple, 8 March 1944.

53 *Ibid.*, f.116 (Temple to Hobhouse, 26 March 1944).

54 *Christ and our enemies*, (SPCK 1944), p.4. See also review in *The Friend*, 102, (1944), p.497. W. Temple Papers 51, f.131 (Hobhouse to Temple, Good Friday 1944); Bell Papers 69, f.165 (Hobhouse to Bell, 5 April 1944).

55 Bell Papers 69, f.174 (Aug. 1944). See also draft 15 July (f.69). With annotation, prompted by a request from Temple, 'I ought to make it plain that the Archbishop has nothing to do with the sending of this to you'.

56 Bertha Bracey is remembered particularly for her role in the *Kindertransport* rescue of children, 1938-40. See: Sybil Oldfield, *Women Humanitarians. A biographical dictionary of British Women active between 1900 and 1959*, London, 2001, pp.27-8. Testimony from Banbury and Evesham Monthly Meeting, *Yearly Meeting Proceedings*, 199 (1990), pp.162-5.

57 Bell Papers 367, ff.29-30 (Bracey to Henrietta Bell, 7 July 1959).

58 Bell Papers 32, ff.323, 383v (10 May 1946, 16 March 1948).

59 *Ibid.*, ff.407-8 (Bracey to Bell, 12 Aug. 1948).

60 The principal LPL collections in which Edith Ellis features are: Davidson Papers, 392, ff.79-233 *passim* (June-Dec. 1921); W. Temple Papers 13, ff.214-308 (June 1936-May 1944); Lang Papers 56, ff.51-9 (March 1939); 84, ff.111-283 *passim* (Sept. 1939-Dec. 1941); 185, ff.123-37, (March 1942); Bell Papers 70, ff.335-8 (Feb. 1944); 73, ff.95-227 (May 1941-Sept.1945); 207, ff.71-161 (April 1946-Jan.1957).

61 John Edward Ellis (1841-1910), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (ODNB), 18, pp.241-2, where he is described as 'A highly principled man, as befits a Quaker'.

62 For instance, during the First World War the twins were very generous in their support of families of conscientious objectors, and initially contributed substantial funds to the non-denominational No-Conscription Fellowship, though the more obsolutist stand of the Friends Service Committee, on which they both served, caused them to reduce their contributions to the Fellowship: Thomas C. Kennedy, *The Hound of Conscience: a History of the Non-Conscription Fellowship, 1914-19*, (Arkansas Press, 1981). See especially Edith Ellis's letter of 5 June 1917, pp.211-12.

[63] ODNB 18, pp.242-3 (Ellis, Marian Emily, Lady Parmoor, 1878-1952)1; *Women Humanitarians*, pp.66-7. There were obituaries in *The Times*, 7 July 1952, and *The Manchester Guardian*, 8 July 1952, and a testimony from Hampstead Monthly Meeting printed in *Yearly Meeting Proceedings*, 1953.

[64] ODNB 14, pp.196-8 (Cripps, Charles Alfred, 1852-1941). Marian was his second wife, his first wife having died in 1893. Stafford Cripps, the distinguished Labour minister, was his youngest son, from his first marriage. Lord Parmoor was opposed to conscription during the First World War, campaigned for the establishment of the League of Nations, was President of the Peace Society, and in 1924 as Lord President of the Council in the first Labour government was charged with special responsibility for the League of Nations affairs.

[65] *The Friends*, 63 (1923), p.103, a reference she made to her imprisonment in her concluding report to Meeting for Sufferings on the laying down of the Committee set up in 1921 in connection with the Irish crisis. See also John William Graham, *Conscription and conscience: a history* (London, 1922).

[66] Copy in FHL, pamphlet 264. I have expanded some of her statements to give some background of the events in Ireland which would have been well known to her reader in 1923.

[67] *The Friend*, 61 (1921) includes a number of references to Edith Ellis's work in connection with Ireland. She also reported on the situation to Meeting for Sufferings, noting 'this was much more a spiritual question than a political one', p.22. See also Maurice J. Wigham, *The Irish Quakers. A short history of the Society of Friends in Ireland*, (Dublin, 1992).

[68] Davidson Papers 392, ff.79-83 (Ellis to Bell, 28 June 1921).

[69] Davidson Papers 14, f.121 (6 July 1921).

[70] Ibid., ff.122-3 (interview with Lord Stamfordham 7 July, and follow-up).

[71] Davidson Papers 392, ff.135, 144, 213, 224, 233 (Aug.-Dec. 1921).

[72] Don's diary, 13 June 1940, referring to his interviews with Dorothea Belfield of the Anglican Group for the Ordination of Women, and to Christobel Pankhurst (LPL MS 2868, f.63).

[73] Lang Papers 56, f.51 (Don to Temple 6 March 1939). Don, later Dean of Westminster, never changed his view of Edith Ellis, writing even after the Ten Point Letter in 1941 'Here is Miss E., still flitting about among the leaders of thought and drafting, for the signature of such leaders, platitudinous Epistles adorned with admirable sentiments culled for the most part from Papal pronouncements' (Don to Archbishop's secretariy, 12 Nov. 1941: Lang Papers, 84, f.259).

[74] Lang Papers, 56, f.57 Temple to Don, 8 March 1939).

[75] *Ibid.*, f.52 (Bell to Don, 6 March, enclosing letter from Ellis, 3 March, ff.53-4).

[76] *Ibid.*, ff.58-9 (Don to Bell, 19 March 1939).

[77] *Ibid.*, ff.53-54 (Ellis to Bell, 3 March 1939).

[78] *The Times*, 17 May 1939, pp.9 (Call to prayer), 15 (Archbishop's letter). See also Lang Papers 56, ff.60-303 (March-May 1939); and Don's diary, March to May (MS 2867, ff.34, 37, 49-56 *passim*). Marc Boegner, president of the Protestant Federation of France refused to sign. The Pope had already issued an appeal for peace, and a call for prayer at Whitsuntide. In addition Archbishop Lang was viewed in Germany at the time as a 'politically-minded prelate', whose impartiality was compromised.

79 MS 2867, ff.54, 56.

80 She left her appeal for a truce with Don, 7 Dec. 1939 (Lang Papers 84, ff.133-4), Don;s reply, 8 Dec. (f.135).

81 Lang Papers 84, ff.111-12 (Ellis to Lang, 24 Sept. 1939); f.165 (Ellis to Lang, 8 Aug. 1940). cf. Ellis to Don, 3 Jan. 1940. 'All I Know is the God is calling us as Christians to do something'. & 'I can't believe that Cardinal Pizzardo's charge to me was given for nothing' (*Ibid.*, ff.150-1).

82 Lang Papers 84, ff.143 (Ellis to Don, 11 Dec. 1939).

83 W. Temple Papers, 13, f.241 (Temple to Ellis, 4 Sept.1940): He is, of course, a really great person'.

84 Lang Papers 84, f.165 (Ellis to Lang, 8 Aug. 1940). Assurance from Bishop Mathew that the Roman Catholics would be prepared to come in provided she understood the initiative was not theirs. 'I replied I was carrying out the charge given to me by Cardinal Pizzardo to work for the Kingdom of God & I took full responsibility'.

85 *Ibid.*, ff.177-8 (Lang to Temple, 1 Oct. 1940). The draft appeal at this stage was headed 'Principles accepted by Christian Leaders in England – with government support'. See also W. Temple Papers 13, ff.241-52 (Sept. 1940-Jan. 1941).

86 Lang Papers 84, f.179 (Lang to Temple, 5 Oct. 1940).

87 *Ibid.*, ff.181-2 (Temple to Lang, 30 Nov. 1940, with appeal (ff.183-4).

88 Her assessment of the cardinal's contribution prompted by Bell's appreciation of the Cardinal in *Blackfriars* (Bell Papers 73, ff.153-4: Ellis to Bell, 11 May 1943). She thought Bell gave the Cardinal too prominent a role as regards the Ten Point Letter.' The impetus for collaboration came from the Apostolic Delegate...I only mention these tiny points because I gather there is a feeling in some quarters that the Cardinal's friendly nature was the mainspring of action at the time'.

89 The Ten Point Letter asserted there could be no permanent peace in Europe unless the principles of the Christian religion were made the foundation of national policy and social life. They accepted the Pope's Five Peace Points for regulating international order, namely the right of every nation to life and independence, a reduction in armaments, an international body to maintain international order, recognition of the rights of minorities, and the submission of human law to 'the sacred and inviolable standards of the laws of God'. To this were added the five standards for economic and social life from the Oxford Conference report: abolition of extreme inequalities of wealth, equal opportunities of education for every child regardless of race or colour, the safeguarding of the family as a social unit, the restoration of the sense of the divine to daily work, and the use of the earth's resources as God's gift for the whole human race, both current and future. The Letter concluded on the confident note that these principles would be accepted by rulers and statesmen throughout the British Commonwealth as the true basis for a lasting peace.

90 Lang's account of the deputation, 12 Feb. 1941 (Lang Papers 84, f.203). Although wanting the Ten Point Letter to be widely circulated, the Archbishop made it clear that he did not wish it to be used 'as a mere piece of British propaganda'.

[91] *The Friend*, 99 (1941), p.4.

[92] *Ibid.*, p.20.

[93] Stuart Mews, 'The Sword of the Spirit', *The Church and War*, Studies in Church History, 20 (1983), ed. W.J. Sheils, pp.409-30. Originally designed to unify Catholic social efforts, with a view to promoting justice in war on the basis of Pius XII's Five Peace Points, the movement was initially open to non-Roman Catholics, but by the end of 1941, full membership was restricted to Roman Catholics. Religion and Life developed as a equivalent non-Catholic movement.

[94] 'with whom I have formed a friendship' Lang Papers, 84, ff.208-9 (Ellis to Lang, 23 Feb. 1941).

[95] *Ibid.*, In her letter to Lang, she referred to her intention to see Lord Cranborne to report on her visit to Rome, which prompted the Archbishop to write him a somewhat cautionary letter, 27 Feb. 1941 (f.224). She subsequently had an interview with Lang, in which he noted 'she fully realised it would not do for the British government to express any official opinion about the letter lest it should be regarded as a bit of British propaganda', 7 March 1941 (f.224). However on 28 May 1941, Convocation passed a resolution that the Ten Point Letter embodied principles on which lasting peace and social order could be established, and asked for it to be sent to the Prime Minister. Churchill's reply to Lang, 2 July 1941 read. 'I noted at the time this striking sign of the unity of purpose between the Christian religious bodies towards the issues of the war. I feel confident that this unity will not only be a strength to our stern endeavour in war, but will also prove an earnest of success in the difficult time of reorganization afterwards.' Lang Papers 84, f.258. *The Chronicle of Convocation*, 1941, pp.110-11, 146-51.

[96] She looked back to the Stoll Theatre meetings 'as a land-mark in Christian co-operation' Ellis to Bell, 31 May. 1945: Bell Papers 73, ff.220-1).

[97] Lang Papers 84, ff.260-4 (Ellis to Don 12 Nov 1941, with draft of appeal), forwarded on by Don (f.259).

[98] *Ibid.*, ff.265-83 *passim* (Nov-Dec. 1941); W. Temple Papers, 13, ff.263-6 (Nov-Dec. 1941).

[99] Lang Papers 84, f.265 (Lang to Temple, 18 Nov. 1941).

[100] W. Temple Papers 13, f.264 (Temple to Ellis, 14 Nov. 1941).

[101] Lang Papers 84, f279 (Lang to Ellis, 16 Dec. 1941).

[102] Lang Papers 185, ff.123-37 (March 1942); W. Temple Papers 13 ff.270-8 (March-May 1942). Includes (f.276) report of the Bishop of Gibraltar's interview with the Cardinal Archbishop of Lisbon in which the latter thanked God 'that the religious leaders in your country are giving this guidance, and reveal such unanimity, with regard to the Christian Principles which alone can form the basis of a true peace'.

[103] W. Temple Papers 13, f.278 (Temple to Ellis, 22 May 1942).

[104] Bell Papers 207, ff.75-6 (Ellis to Bell, 2 Feb. 1947). The original draft began with 'We, who are religious leaders in Great Britain, recognise our fundamental unity in allegiance to Christ Our Lord, and see in the tragedy of the world situation a call to reconsider the obligations of our faith to meet the challenge.' (Lang 185, ff.126-7). The final copy stated 'We, who are religious leaders in

Great Britain, recognising our love and allegiance to Christ Our Lord, see...' (Bell Papers 73, ff.216-17; Temple 13, ff.274-5).

105 Bell Papers 73, ff.120-51 (Feb- April 1943); W. Temple Papers 13 ff.280-93 (March-April 1943).

106 She wanted 'doctrinal phrases avoided' as these caused difficulties for the Roman Catholics (W. Temple Papers 13, ff.282-3: Ellis to Temple, 21 March 1943). After minor changes, her two sentences included in the final version read: 'We need a vision, in the hearts of men and women who are freed from selfishness and greed, of a world ordered according to God's purpose and law. We need the spirit of love and repentance, humbly beseeching God to forgive us our past sins, and to give us the spirit of forgiveness for wrongs done to ourselves'. Bell had advised her to reproduce Temple's draft without her additions as they spoilt the flow of the Archbishop's writing.

107 Bell Papers 73, f.151 (Ellis to Bell, Saturday in Holy Week, 1943). But for Temple's view of this letter, see W. Temple Papers, 13, ff.294-5 (Temple to Bell, 18 May 1943). The Archbishop felt under pressure to rewrite the letter because so many signatures had already been promised, and 'put in some sentences which by extreme compliment might be called points, though I am afraid they were very round at the tip even so'. The Archbishop of York, Cyril Garbett, refused to sign, questioning whether it was 'really worth while for the leaders of religion to sign this kind of document? It only tends to cheapen their signatures to really important declarations.' Frederick Iremonger, *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury. His life and Letters* (Oxford, 1948), pp.561-2).

108 The Commission published their report in 1945: *The place of religion in post-war reconstruction: the report of a commission of the London International Assembly*, with an introduction by A.S. Duncan-Jones. This included a list of members. For correspondence on her membership of the commission and its sub-committee, see Bell Papers 73, ff.151-96, passim, 210-211, 214-15 *passim* (April 1943-Oct.1944).

109 Bell Papers 73, ff.177-8 (Ellis to Bell, 14 July 1943).

110 *Ibid.*, f.157 (Bell to Temple, 21 May 1943) – 'It is extremely difficult to know about Miss Ellis. There is usually a grain of goodness in what she proposes: but she is ceaseless in operations'.

111 *Ibid.*, f.203 (Bell to Temple 1 Dec. 1943).

112 W. Temple Papers 13, ff.294-5 (Temple to Bell, 18 May 1943).

113 *Ibid.*, f.299 (Temple to Ellis, 12 July 1943).

114 Ibid., f.305 (Bell to Temple, 1 Dec. 1943); also Bell Papers 73, f.203.

115 Bell Papers 73, f.212 (Ellis to Bell, 16 Aug. 1944).

116 Bell Papers 207, ff.81-5 (Oct-Nov 1947).

117 *Ibid.*, f.103 Collins to Ellis, 14 Sept. 1948).

118 Papers of Canon Collins – minutes of Christian Action, Caxton Hall, 14 Feb. 1949 (LPL MS 3290, ff.62, 71). Canon Collins thanked her for her 'immense amount of work' in Rome. She was a member of Christian Action from 1949 until her death, and was a co-opted member of Council in 1951 (MSS 3312, ff.14-20 *passim*; 3318).

119 Bell Papers 207, ff.108-9 (Ellis to Bell, 17 Jan. 1951).

120 *Ibid.*, ff.115-16 (appeal), with covering letter to Bell, 23 Nov. 1952 (ff.113-14).

[121] *Ibid.*, f.117 (Bell to Ellis, 27 Nov. 1952).

[122] *Ibid.*, ff.121-41 (March-June 1953).

[123] *Ibid.*, f.137 (Bell to Collins, 8 May 1953).

[124] Her correspondence with Bishop Bell continues until January 1957 (*Ibid.*, f.161).

[125] Of Archbishop Godfrey, she wrote 'I am thankful that the door is always open for me to go to Wimbledon [his residence] to seek advice before I take any action' (Ellis to Bell, 11 May 1943; Bell Papers 73, ff.153-4). She had high hopes of his appointment as Archbishop of Westminster in December 1956, writing 'I shall be much nearer to [the] position we had at the time of the 10 Point Letter when the Archbishop of Westminster is back in London early in February, giving a much needed leadership' (Ellis to Bell, 14 Jan. 1957: Bell Papers 207, f.157). Cf. assessment in ODNB 22, pp.273-4. Cardinal Hinsley 'opened a door for me on Christian co-operation (Ellis to Bell, 2 Feb. 1947, Bell Papers 207, ff.75-6). See also ODNB 27, pp.291-2 In another context, Bishop Mathew's informal comment to Bell is of relevance here, 'Among the Free Churches, I am drawn to the prayer and spirit of the Society of Friends' (Mathew to Bell, 3 Sept. 1941: Bell 71, ff.200-1). The same letter showed his understanding and appreciation of the 'great moulding force of the whole ethos of the Church of England'. See also ODNB 37, pp.286-8.

[126] 'The Pope is the greatest spiritual personality which we have & it is spiritual power that is needed to overcome the evil principles as well as the power to restrain' (Ellis to Lang, 24 April 1940: Lang Papers 84, f.159). 'I am much amused by your referring to the Pope as the head of Christendom; I regard him as one especially influential Bishop.' (Temple to Ellis, 4 Sept. 1940: W. Temple Papers 13, f.241). The Anglican hierarchy did not wish to be limited to the Popes' Five Peace Points, or to be sponsoring statements that were not as inclusive as those of secular statesmen, who included other freedoms, such as freedom of worship.

[127] Bell Papers 73, ff.96-7; 207, ff.75-6, & 108-9, 146-7. These included Cardinal Pizzardo (Rome), Cardinal Hinsley, and Cardinal MacRory, Archbishop of Armagh; Archbishops Lang and Temple; and Bishop Bell, the latter being the first to have taken her into his chapel and asked for God's blessing on her work. In December 1953 during a papal audience, she received a blessing from Pius XII, both for herself and for Dame Isobel Cripps.

[128] Lang Papers 84, ff.157, 159 (April 1940). Later on she circulated speeches of Strafford Cripps, especially to Jacques Maritain in Rome (Ellis to Bell, 22 June 1948; Bell Papers 207, f.97).

[129] Bell Papers 73, ff.161-2 (Ellis to Bell, 29 May 1943).

[130] Her membership of Quaker committees included the Continental Committee, 1916-19; Friends Service Committee, 1917-20; War Victims Relief Committee, 1919-21; War and Social Order Committee, 1919-28; Penal Reform Committee, 1920-32; Council for International Service, 1921-7; Friends Service Council, 1927-30; Industrial and Social Order Committee, 1928-36. She was appointed a representative on Meeting for Sufferings from 1920 until 1949, but as an elder of Scarborough meeting she could have attended meetings thereafter. She was a founder member of the Committee on Christian Relationships from 1942 until 1960. As to non-Quaker Committees, these included the Women's International

League for Peace and Freedom, The League of Nations/United Nations Association, of which she served on their regional committee, and Christian Action.

131 'I am greatly concerned that people who stand for true & righteous peace should not be divided on the matter of pacifism' (Ellis to Don, Easter Tuesday 1940: Lang Papers 84, f.157).

132 Her mother, Maria (1845-1941), was the 5th child of John and Jane Rowntree of Scarborough. Her great uncle, James Ellis, had undertaken relief work in Connemara following the Irish famine, setting up a model farm at Letterfrack (1849-57).

133 By 1953, her interest shifted to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation, and she gave as her motto 'Faith, Food and Friendship'. Bell Papers 207, f.144 (Ellis to Bell, 28 Sept. 1953).

134 ODNB 18, p.243.

135 W. Temple Papers 13, ff.294-5 (Temple to Bell, 18 May 1943). Further research, particularly in other archives, would help to produce a more rounded account of Edith Ellis's activities.