PACIFIST COMMUNITIES IN
BRITAIN IN THE SECOND WORLD WAR

by Andrew Rigby

If we got, say, a million voters actively insisting that they'll never take part in any war, the Government would have to begin to take notice.[1]

Such was the optimistic hope and political strategy of Dick Sheppard, the founder and moving spirit of the Peace Pledge Union (PPU), writing in 1936. His faith in the possibility of creating a pacifist movement of such a scale that no government could afford to ignore its influence was not totally unfounded at that time. The PPU had a membership of over 118,000, with some 300 local groups in existence, and a weekly newspaper (*Peace News*) with sales of approximately 6,000. The origins of the PPU date back to October 1934 when Sheppard published his Peace Letter requesting people to contact him who shared his pacifist determination to renounce war and never support or sanction another one. The burgeoning growth of the PPU in those prewar days, as the *New Statesman* observed, lay in its appeal "not only to the convinced absolutist pacifist but to the large number of people with only slight political knowledge but with a recent realization of the fearful imminence of war, who are fascinated by the direct simplicity of the crusade."[2]

As it was, the PPU failed in its basic aim of preventing war, with the formal declaration coming on September 3, 1939. Given that the PPU had turned its back on becoming an active campaigning movement of war resisters prepared to resist the implementation of war preparations, it now had no practical proposals to offer pacifists as to their appropriate role in wartime. As Sybil Morrison has recorded:

> There was nothing pacifists could do in 1939 but stand still and say,
> if they were allowed to say anything at all, that Hitler might be a
> worse evil than war, but that to try to overcome one evil with another
> evil was not only morally intolerable but could well lead to even
> greater evil.[3]

In the absence of any immediately practical pacifist policy, quite a number of PPU members abandoned their absolutist stance as it became clear that the simplicity of the pledge belied the complex dilemmas of conscience and action that confronted the pacifist in wartime. The dilemma of discovering the appropriate role for the pacifist in wartime reached a new intensity in the spring of 1940 when the Germans achieved their military breakthrough in Europe: how to reconcile the promptings of the pacifist conscience with the sense of duty owed to one's fellow citizens and neighbors? In ideal-typical terms one can identify three different responses to this dilemma that were adopted by different tendencies within the broad pacifist movement — for the sake of alliteration if nothing else, I have labeled these *relief, resistance,* and *reconstruction.*

Advocating *relief* were those who urged that pacifists should refrain from directly impeding the state's war effort with regard to issues such as civil defense and conscription and should confine their activities to humanitarian relief work. They should seek to soften the blows of war by helping to alleviate the suffering of its victims: helping dig people from the rubble, serving refreshments in air raid shelters, and the like. Few in the pacifist movement would criticize an individual for engaging in such relief work; what some did criticize was the apparent claim that such work was a specifically *pacifist* response to war, rather than a general *humanitarian* one. As a correspondent to *Peace News* put it:

> There is no harm in anyone doing humanitarian work. I think all
> people who profess humanitarian principles would by their very
> nature be compelled toward it; but much harm is done by suggesting
> that this is pacifism in action, firstly because it implies that only
> pacifists can do such work, and, secondly, because it is a misstate-
> ment of fact. Such work is merely the work that any decent person
> would do — that and nothing more.[4]

For those that I have termed *resisters,* the prime duty of pacifists was to do all in their power to bring the war to an end, rather than accept it and devote oneself to ambulance work. It was this element, centered around what was known as the Foreward Group within the PPU, that concentrated on political developments during the war, campaigning for "Peace by Negotiation" and, later in the war, launching an "Armistice Campaign" against the imposition of a vindictive peace settlement. For people of this persuasion, the pacifist renunciation of war also involved a duty to provide positive policy proposals with regard to issues of immediate concern, even if this meant, in the words of one of their number, that "in the relative sphere of human politics we have, now as always, to choose the lesser of two evils, and honourably to support the bad against the worse. . . . We cannot philosophise out of the obligation to demand the lesser evil of peace negotiation rather than the greater evil of war."[5]

By contrast, the third grouping or tendency, the *reconstructionists,* were those who eschewed engagement in such protest campaigns. Instead they emphasized the traditional role of pacifists as a redemptive minority, bearing witness to a higher order of morality and pointing the way toward a new order of communal life. Thus John Middleton Murry, the leading intellectual force within the PPU during the war years, likened pacifists to "the raw material of a new Christian Church," urging people to establish socialist communities that might act as "the nucleus of a new Christian society, much as the monasteries were during the dark ages."[6] In other words the true role of the pacifist in wartime was that of planting the seeds of a new civilization within the barbarism and insanity of a world bent on destruction. It was this notion of their redemptive, reconstructionist role that came to the fore among pacifists in Britain during the Second World War. The concrete result on the ground was the formation of a substantial number of agricultural communities and related communal ventures. It is the purpose of this article to provide some indication of the nature of this series of experiments in community.

In emphasizing the exemplary and prophetic role of the pacifist project of creating "anti-war islands in a martial sea,"[7] people such as Middleton Murry, Wilfred Wellock, Max Plowman, Eric Gill, and others drew upon a long tradition that stressed the essential continuity between the processes of individual and social change. In Britain at the turn of the century the influence of Tolstoy's ideas was particularly significant — especially his emphasis on the duty of individuals to observe a higher moral code than that of the state, to refuse to cooperate with evil, and to seek to exemplify goodness and abstain from participating in any form of violence. In his turn Tolstoy was influenced by the example of such world-rejecting Anabaptist groups as the Doukhobours and the Hutterites, who could trace back to the sixteenth century their attempts to pursue a divinely ordained way of life by means of communities of believers withdrawn from the profane world.

While it would appear that Tolstoy disapproved of attempts to establish what he depicted as "communities of saints among sinners," [8] this did not prevent pacifists in Britain and elsewhere from attempting to form cooperative colonies where they sought to lead simple lives of ethical purity, untainted by the evils of capitalism. Thus, in May 1894, John Coleman Kenworthy established the Brotherhood Church in Croydon, and in 1896 a group of men and women from the church formed a Tolstoyan community at Purleigh.[9] A year later a related experiment was launched in Leeds with the formation of the Brotherhood Workshop. In 1898 the Whiteway Colony was established along Tolstoyan lines in Gloucestershire, while early in the following year an offshoot of the Leeds community was founded at Blackburn in Lancashire.[10] Although many of these enjoyed only a short life, a number of them were still in existence at the outbreak of the Second World War, including the Whiteway Colony and the Brotherhood Church at Stapleton in South Yorkshire.[11] In London there was Kingsley Hall, founded by Muriel and Dorothy Lester, where Gandhi had stayed during the Round Table Conference of 1931. It was run as a social, educational, and cultural center, with communal living accommodation for those working there.

Of particular significance were the two Bruderhof of the Society of Brothers. Originally founded by Eberhard Arnold in Germany in the early 1920s, life for this Christian communitarian group had become increasingly difficult following Hitler's rise to power in 1933. A group traveled over to England in 1936 and purchased Ashton Fields farm, near Ashton Keynes in Wiltshire. By 1938 its numbers had swelled to over 230, following the closure of the Society's last remaining German colony, and a new Bruderhof was established on a 300-acre farm at Oaksey in the Cotswolds. The Bruderhof attracted quite a number of British pacifists, who shared the Germans' commitment to the Christian faith as a basis for community living and their conviction that "if patriotism is not enough, neither is pacifism unless and until it becomes a whole way of life."[12]

One of the key figures behind the revival of the tradition of community living and working during the Second World War was Max Plowman. As early as 1935 he had written that the problem facing pacifists was not so much how to stop war but rather "how to live like a human individual in order that you might live socially and communally."[13] By 1941 Plowman was reaffirming the role of the pacifist as a witness to peace:

> It is with us now as it was with the disciples after the dispersion. Their disruption blew the seeds of Christianity all over Europe. Their job became that of creating centres of Christian living. That we should be trying to make similar centres of pacifism, for the purpose of social radiation, seems to me good today.[14]

Wilfred Wellock, another key figure in the movement at the time, argued that the key role of the pacifist was "to envisage the future and to seek ways and means of saving and introducing those values without which human existence ceases to have any meaning."[15] For Wellock the fulfillment of this prophetic role required the adoption of an "integrated pacifism," a "politics of creative living." As the origins of war lay in our whole way of life and the materialistic values upon which it was based, the long-term goal of pacifists must be to transform society from the bottom upward, beginning with their own lives. Whereas the PPU had been predicated on the

assumption that wars would cease when men refused to fight, Wellock and others had begun to argue that this could be achieved only when people had learned how to live.

One of the projects with which Plowman was closely associated was the Adelphi Centre at Langham, near Colchester in Essex. The PPU had taken over the house and its 35-acre estate originally as a home for refugee Basque children during the Spanish Civil War. In October 1939, when all the children had returned to Spain, Max Plowman launched a "voluntary service scheme," calling on pacifists to help him renovate the property. He talked of creating a "pacifist university — a centre of pacifist activity, a nucleus of life which will actually demonstrate that pacifists are willing to give up their personal liberty and comfortable home living . . . and so begin that way of life which has so often been talked about as 'each for all and all for each.' " [16] A conference was held at the Adelphi Centre in November 1940, to discuss the thesis that "the way to the restoration of a healthy national life, and a truly peace-minded society, lies through the establishment of agricultural subsistence communities." The participants explored the possibility of purchasing land that could be used to train in farming techniques those conscientious objectors who had been directed toward alternative service by the tribunals. The hope was that they might acquire the necessary practical skills to complement their social idealism and thereby be better equipped as agents of social regeneration. There was, in fact, already in existence a scheme known as the Christian Pacifist Forestry and Land Units, organized by Henry Carter. Many COs, conditionally registered by the tribunals, who were ordered to do alternative service on the land encountered problems insofar as many farmers were unwilling to employ "conchies." Carter's scheme was established to facilitate the communal living of groups of religious pacifists while they worked on the land.

A second conference was held at Langham in December 1940, when it was resolved to form a society called the Community Land Training Association for the purpose of acquiring and working a farm where pacifists could be trained in agricultural techniques. The Brocklesbury brothers, two pacifist farmers, were asked to look for a suitable farm in Lincolnshire while an appeal was launched to

raise the necessary funds. By the spring of 1941 a 300-acre farm at Holton Beckering had been bought for £8,500. The later acquisition of adjacent farmland eventually brought the acreage under cultivation to 1,000 acres. For people like Wilfred Wellock these were exciting times, as he recorded in his autobiography:

> In the midst of the biggest and most devastating war in history, steps were being taken to build a more stable and enduring civilization on new foundations. By 1941 I was devoting all my time to this purpose. Every month I spent several days at Holton Beckering to help in its work, and strengthen the faith of the men working there. In addition I visited as many of the new communities spread about the country as I could, and in the meantime wrote articles for Peace News, in whose pages Middleton Murry and I were perpetually expounding the wider aims and implications of the community concept.[17]

In March 1941, *Peace News* began publishing a monthly supplement devoted to the coverage of community projects and the discussion of the ideas behind them. Those pacifists who felt unable to commit themselves to the communal life within an agriculturally based community were urged to develop the community spirit with friends through the establishment of income-sharing networks. One such income-sharing group was centered around the Community Service Committee and its leading spirit, Leslie Stubbings. The members each drew from their pooled incomes sufficient to meet their immediate needs. The surplus was devoted to spreading the principles and practice of communal living by means of a regular Community Broadsheet and by organizing conferences. Two conferences had been held as early as 1937 in Bath and London, on the basis of which a book titled *Community in Britain* had been published. A revised edition of this was issued in 1940, and in 1942 a second volume, *Community in a Changing World,* was published. Alongside the largely theoretical contributions of people like Plowman, Middleton Murry, and Wellock, there were in these volumes heady accounts from the many community projects that were in existence. They thought of themselves as pioneers, working to save humanity through developing a cooperative and nonexploitative alternative to capitalism. As Leslie Stubbings depicted them:

> These groups, so pitifully small and feeble-seeming against the background of international rivalries, stand for things that are greater than themselves and greater too than the embattled forces of nations in arms. The values they are seeking, imperfectly and unregarded by the world, to witness are those values by which at the last the world must live.[18]

The Gloucester Land Scheme was just one of these small-scale experiments in laying the foundations of a new order. It consisted of about half a dozen pacifists housed in a converted sports pavilion near Hempsted on the outskirts of Gloucester. A local Quaker had loaned the group the land upon which they grew vegetables and aspired to self-sufficiency. One of their number in 1941 was Tom Carlile, who was "on the trot": avoiding the "call-up" by moving around the country from one community to another and keeping one address ahead of the registration authorities who were attempting to serve him with a summons. He has recorded how

> after the first year the Land Scheme working members were self-supporting and self-governing. Weekly meetings of the working members would decide domestic matters regarding the communal accommodation, catering, house-keeping and budgeting, and with one or two coopted advisers the work to be done, the crops to be grown, marketing and overall finances. All work and responsibility for individual or special tasks were performed communally or by rota and some emphasis was placed on communal social activity, contacts, visits and exchange of produce, ideas and personnel with the wider community movement, and outside activities.[19]

A similar small-scale experiment was the Kingston Community Farm, founded by a group of pacifists from Kingston-upon-Thames, who purchased three acres of land at Charney Bassett in Berkshire in 1940. Rectory Farm housed two families and their children.[20] Moore Place, near Stanford-le-Hope in Essex, was on a slightly larger scale: twelve members, fifteen acres, and two cows! Perhaps not untypically, the predominantly middle-class members of this community had no agricultural experience prior to joining. However, they seemed to believe that what they lacked in practical experience could be compensated for by their social idealism.

> Moore Place has no rules and regulations. . . . Its inhabitants postulate 'do what thou wilt', believing . . . that a high sense of honour

is sufficient virtue and forms true foundations for welfare of their social unit.[21]

Despite this libertarian faith, it would appear that the conventional sexual division of labor at Moore Place remained unquestioned, for as one visitor recorded (without comment), on entering the house there were to be found the "women of the community preparing supper, ironing, washing, darning."[22] Matters seem to have been organized somewhat differently at the Elmsett Community, a forty-one-acre farm near Ipswich. There it would appear that all the tasks were shared by the dozen or so members, regardless of sex. Founded in 1939, the original statement of the aims and the basis of the community is fairly typical of the kind of philosophy that underpinned these attempts at social transformation.

> We realize that it is useless to try to re-design the superstructure of the old system while the foundations are at fault, and have decided that we must help to lay the foundations of a new order based on the principles of brotherhood and cooperation of all mankind. We therefore renounce the selfishness of the old order, and this can only be done by sharing our life together in a true community, working not for personal reward, but for the benefit of the whole, and holding all our material goods in common. Thus personal ambition will be relinquished for the higher ideal, and the individual personality freed from the warping effects of commercialism, will be able to express itself more fully in furthering that ideal.[23]

Unfortunately, the lived experience of those seeking to establish the seedbeds of a qualitatively new civilization was to prove rather more problematic than theory had led them to expect. It would seem that too many pacifists living in community during the Second World War suffered from the illusion that people have only to resolve on perfection in order to achieve it. The saga of Ronald Duncan's community in North Devon serves to illustrate some of the problems and tensions encountered by these pioneers of a new way of living. Duncan's account is replete with examples of what he portrayed as "the depths of stupid childishness to which so many moderately intelligent people are brought when they are involved in any sort of communal activity."[24] During the first year of the venture the "hotch-potch of intellectual nitwits" (Duncan's descrip-

tion) revealed themselves to be strong on rhetoric and theory but rather weak when it came to the implementation of ideals into practice. Furthermore, although they were exploring a new way of life, it seemed to Duncan that they carried with them quite a few of the faults of the old civilization upon which they had turned their backs. After a year the novelty of the new life began to wane. Much of the work took on the character of routine chores that members sought to avoid — with the result that pigsties went uncleaned, tools unsharpened, and milking delayed. When Duncan attempted to supervise the others to ensure that tasks were performed, he was charged with spying and behavior contrary to the true spirit of community. This was just one of the interpersonal tensions that permeated the life of what was becoming something of a farming disaster. Idealistic young pacifists who tended to reject any exter-nally imposed discipline on ideological grounds, who believed that there was something bourgeois in being tidy and punctual, who were convinced that good manners were a sign of self-repression, and who were prepared to *discuss* such issues at every opportu-nity — this was not the most appropriate form of human capital with which to fashion an economically sound community farm. There was also the problem of the "free-riders," who left little evidence of any work they had performed during their stay in the community except that achieved with their knives and forks. Toward the end of his salutary experience Duncan was forced to conclude that "as a community the experiment looked like a failure; but so were the social patterns around us failures too. At least we were not dropping bombs on each other."[25]

John Middleton Murry's experience was not totally dissimilar from Ronald Duncan's. He decided to practice what he was preach-ing and establish his own advance post of the new Christendom on a 183-acre farm in Suffolk that he purchased in 1942. He too noticed "a strange carelessness amounting to a resentment of order" among the membership.[26] This was particularly the case with regard to farm tools: in a situation in which they were considered to belong to the community as a whole, too often no one took responsibility for caring for them. For Murry this was symptomatic of "a rank con-fusion of thought which sees no difference between non-attachment

to possessions and carelessness towards them."[27] As in the case of so many community projects, interpersonal stresses and divisions caused by emotional jealousy and all the other small yet significant aspects of communal living were compounded by the development of factions formed around other issues to do with how the farm should be managed, how the finances should be organized, how the tasks should be allocated. Murry was subjected to much criticism as he insisted upon retaining financial control of the farm, having invested all his capital in the project. For his part, he charged the dozen or so individualists who made up the membership with being "like most zealots for 'community,' they did not really think about finances at all. They were fascinated by their own Utopian vision of self-governing community — a vision uncontaminated by mundane realities."[28] He was to complain:

> I have had to deal with many who regarded economic realism as a sign of moral inferiority. They talked with lofty contempt of money as an unclean thing. But the contempt for money of these exalted spirits always manifested itself as a readiness to live off other people's, and to reckon it a virtue.[29]

As with communities before and since, the farm seemed to attract more than its fair share of oddballs and eccentrics — people who seemed to be motivated more by the desire to escape the constraints and responsibilities of the mundane world than by a positive vision of how to remake that world. As Murry was later to recall:

> When I look back over those trying years, I seem to see a procession of social misfits entering and departing from the farm. We found it hard to resist an appeal to our charity. From the nature of our efforts we felt obliged to maintain a higher standard of generosity than the outside world. We were trying to achieve "community" whatever that might mean, and that, we felt, committed us to give at least temporary shelter and a trial to people whom a strictly practical enterprise would never have considered.[30]

As with so many Utopian communities, the idealism of the truly committed made them easy prey for the parasitism of those seeking refuge from the demands of conventional existence.

In his history of conscientious objection during the Second World War, Dennis Hayes identified three types of people who were

attracted to the agricultural colonies: those with a definite calling
to work on the land with others; those who were seeking an escape;
and those who needed a job during wartime. Murry's experience
with all three types led him to the conclusion that the majority were
primarily of the third category — those for whom, however much they
might profess devotion to the idea and practice of community, farm
life was a convenient way to spend one's time during a difficult pe-
riod. He expressed his view of the human resources upon which the
pacifist communities had to draw with characteristic forthrightness.

> Young pacifists are suspect. Unless by their works they definitely
> prove the contrary it may be assumed that the majority of them are
> seeking to escape social responsibility, though they may be uncon-
> scious of it. They made poor material for a long term effort. Half of
> them, as soon as the war was over, went back eagerly to their
> pre-war jobs: the vocation for cooperative agriculture which they
> had professed was merely an alibi.[31]

Dennis Hayes was a little more charitable in his overall assessment
when he admitted that "the best thinkers (and talkers) were not
always the best workers. . . . The pattern of community life imposed
a strain that many were untrained to bear: the fundamental need was
for self-discipline, and though the 'communiteers' had often seen
the Promised Land from afar, their provision for the journey was
often sketchy in the extreme."[32]

What are we to make of this period of community building and
its demise? In part the death of many of the ventures has to be
located within the general decline in the vitality of the British peace
movement in the immediate postwar period. It was not just a case
of pacifists deserting the valiant venture in order to pick up the
threads of their interrupted careers and lives. The end of the war
brought severe divisions and disputes within the pacifist movement.
The disclosure of the full extent of the Holocaust, the growing
awareness of the terrible power that could be wielded by totalitarian
states over civil society, and the revelation of the awesome destruc-
tive violence of atomic weapons, caused a number of influential
pacifists to reevaluate their positions. Was nonviolence a feasible
stance against totalitarianism and all the forces of repression avail-
able to the modern state? How relevant was the individual's refusal

to participate in war making in a nuclear age? Could it not be argued that some form of collective security centered around an "international police force" equipped with atomic weapons was the most realistic pathway toward world peace? These were the kinds of questions that exercised pacifists in Britain in the immediate postwar period. Planting the seeds of a new civilization through the practice of exemplary nonviolent, cooperative lifestyles had little place in the discourse. Indeed, at the 1945 annual general meeting of the PPU, a resolution proposing help for such communities was defeated by an overwhelming majority.[33]

And yet the old tradition of self-reliance and mutual aid within a localized, cooperative community refused to disappear completely. While some pacifists, influenced by the example of the Indian liberation struggle led by Gandhi, began to explore the implications of nonviolent direct action in the nuclear age, others began to explore the lessons to be learned from that other dimension of Gandhi's struggle — the constructive program and the attempt to regenerate Indian society from the grass-roots upward. Wilfred Wellock, for whom the collapse of so many of the pacifist communities constituted one of the major disappointments of his life, continued to advocate and practice a simple, nonacquisitive lifestyle: emphasizing the themes of self-reliance, voluntary poverty, bread labor, decentralization, cooperation, and mutual aid; urging people to develop the art of "localizing, nationalizing, and internationalizing neighbourliness."[34] It has to be said, however, that his voice, along with that of people like Ralph Borsodi in the United States, were isolated ones during the immediate postwar period.

However, by the time Wilfred Wellock died in 1972, Britain was witnessing a resurgence of the community-building tradition, with a new generation of advocates of simpler, nonacquisitive, cooperative lifestyles. Although the majority of the participants in what became known as the alternative society movement were largely unaware of the experimentation that had preceded them during the Second World War, they were clearly part of the same utopian tradition — seeking to remake the world through the nonviolent power of exemplary living and the creation of alternative institutions and structures.[35] The new generation shared with its prede-

cessors the emphasis on the continuity between means and ends in the process of social change, stressing the inseparability of individual and social transformation. Like the generation of the 1940s, the more recent wave of community builders sought to live their lives as close to their ideals as possible. Rejecting the murky compromises of the profane world of party politics, there was a sustained attempt to examine the totality of their lifestyles, in the effort to establish nonexploitative social relationships, seen as the necessary basis for the creation of a nonviolent social order within which war would have no place.

There were, of course, differences in style and substance. The more recent generation was more hedonistic than that of the Second World War. The experimentation with drugs and other stimuli in the pursuit of "expanded consciousness" was new. The interest in Eastern religions and variants of the mystic tradition was also more pronounced in the recent generation. The communitarians of the 1940s were predominantly inspired by the Christian vision of the New Testament, and the Sermon on the Mount in particular. The generation of the 1970s also paid greater lip service to the ideal of transcending the traditional sexual division of labor than did their forebears.

In the harsher economic climate of Britain in recent years, it has become almost fashionable to deny the significance of the alternative society movement of the 1970s. Just as people like Middleton Murry bemoaned their naive faith in the capacity of young idealists to sow the seeds of a new civilization in the midst of the barbarism of war, so critics now dismiss the more recent attempts to create a new age as little more than the symbolic posturing of disaffected middle-class youth. To many it now appears that the commune dwellers of the 1970s were more concerned with individualistic solutions to the angst of contemporary existence than with confronting the economic and material issues that remain the predominant concern of the mass of folk. Their communes have been likened to "cultural ghettos" where "the traditional pacifist emphasis on the means of change rather than the ends was devalued into a narcissistic focusing on the self," and where "the idealistic emphasis on consciousness as the critical variable too often degener-

ated into an apparent assumption that oppression and domination could be overcome simply and solely by thinking differently."[36]

It is perhaps inevitable that those who set themselves up to transform the world through the medium of their own exemplary lifestyle will fall prey to charges of inconsistency and irrelevancy. The gap between principle and practice is not so easy to bridge. The attempt to live the life of the future in the here-and-now is bound to appear self-indulgent to those whose lives are dominated by immediate concerns of material survival. Yet, it is apparent that the issues that concern the new social movements of the present age are the same as those addressed by the "communitarian cranks." Decentralization, "small is beautiful," the limitation of material wants, cooperative production, ecologically sound economic systems, and non-exploitative modes of life — all these ideas have started to encroach into the mainstream of debate from the margins. Such notions have been sustained and nurtured on the margins by those with the moral courage to question the fundamental values and taken-for-granted premises that have traditionally underpinned the dominant order. Such has been the historical role of those who, like the communitarians of the Second World War, have insisted that pacifism should entail more than saying no to war, it should inform every aspect of one's life.

NOTES

1. A. Huxley and H.R.L. Sheppard, *10,000 Say No* (London: PPU, 1936), p. 6.
2. *The New Statesman,* July 28, 1936.
3. Sybil Morrison, *The Pacifist* 10, no. 11 (September 1971): 12.
4. Alex Thompson, *Peace News,* 22 November 1941.
5. Bill Grindlay, *Peace News,* 30 May 1941.
6. John Middleton Murry, *Peace News,* 15 May 1940.
7. Dennis Hayes, *Challenge of Conscience* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1949), p. 210.
8. In 1908 Tolstoy wrote to an aspiring colonist, "Why in a community? One ought not to separate oneself from other people. If there is anything good in a man, let that light be spread about him wherever he lives" (quoted in M. J. De K. Holman, "The Purleigh Colony: Tolstoyan Togetherness in the Late 1890s" in M. Jones, ed., *New Essays on Tolstoy* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978]).
9. See De K. Holman, "The Purleigh Colony."

10. See D. Hardy, *Alternative Communities in Nineteenth Century England* (London: Longmans, 1979). See also, N. Shaw, *Whiteway: A Colony in the Cotswolds* (London: Daniels, 1935).

11. For details of the Brotherhood Church, see A. G. Higgins, *A History of the Brotherhood Church* (Stapleton: Brotherhood Church, 1982).

12. Leslie Stubbings, *The Plough* 2, no. 1 (Spring 1939): 24. Following the outbreak of war the Bruderhof began to suffer from local hostility stemming from anti-German sentiment. When the British government threatened to intern the Bruderhof members of German descent, it was decided that they should emigrate as a group. In 1941 about 350 traveled to Paraguay, the only country willing to admit them. Three members remained in England, and in 1942 they bought a farm in the Cotswolds that became known as the Wheathill Bruderhof. See B. Zablocki, *The Joyful Community* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1971), especially chap. 2.

13. Max Plowman, letter to Jack Common, in D. L. P., ed., *Bridge into the Future* (London: Andrew Dakers, 1944), p. 547.

14. Max Plowman, *Peace News*, 13 June 1941.

15. Wilfred Wellock, *Peace News*, 14 June 1940.

16. Max Plowman, *Peace News*, 1 March 1940.

17. Wilfred Wellock, *Off the Beaten Track* (Tanjore: Sarvodaya Prachurala, 1961), p. 70.

18. Leslie Stubbings, in *Community in Britain* (London: Community Service Committee, 1940), p. 10.

19. Personal communication. Eventually Tom surrendered to the authorities, was imprisoned, and then did alternative service in the coal mines.

20. See "Kingston Community" in *Community in a Changing World* (London: Community Service Committee, 1942), pp. 72-73.

21. *Peace News*, 16 May 1941, p. 3.

22. Ibid.

23. "The Elmsett Community," *The Plough* 2, no. 2 (Summer 1939): 45.

24. Ronald Duncan, *All Men Are Islands* (London: Hart Davis, 1964), p. 230.

25. Ibid., p. 249.

26. J. Middleton Murry, *Community Farm* (London: Peter Nevill, 1952), p. 52.

27. Ibid., p. 53.

28. Ibid., p. 85.

29. J. Middleton Murry, "What I Have Learned from Community," *Peace News*, 16 August 1947, p. 2.

30. Murry, *Community Farm*, p. 98.

31. Ibid., pp. 110-111.

32. Hayes, *Challenge of Conscience*, p. 217.

33. For a fuller examination of the divisions within the pacifist movement in Britain at this time, see A. Rigby, "Peace News, 1936-1986" in G. Chester and A. Rigby, eds., *Articles of Peace* (Bridport: Prism Press, 1986).

34. Wilfred Wellock, *Peace News*, 18 May 1945, quoted in A. Rigby, *A Life in Peace: A Biography of Wilfred Wellock* (Bridport: Prism Press, 1988).

35. The following comments are based on earlier research into the commune movement in Britain during the early 1970s. See A. Rigby, *Alternative Realities: A Study of Communes and Their Members* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974).

36. A. Rigby, "Be Practical, Do the Impossible: The Politics of Everyday Life" in Chester and Rigby, eds., *Articles of Peace*, p. 99.