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INTRODUCTION

This publication results from continuing research into who the British Radicals were in the
early years of the 20th century. Whereas previous writings have identified such people in political
life and the Press, this work aims to do the same for those in academia; those with ecclesiastical
connections; and those acting in an independent capacity, such as literary figures, and travellers.
The common denominator of this category of persons was that such individuals were well-
educated and had sufficient income to pursue their own ambitions.

As with the previous output relating to this author’s writings about British Radicals, there is
particular attention with regard to their opinions about central and eastern Europe. However, as
this work is primarily an exercise in initially identifying individuals, more will be written at a later
date about their detailed feelings towards that geographical area. Then, any references by them,
inferring attitudes to imperialism, autocracy, and nationalism in the German, Austro-Hungarian,
Russian, and Ottoman Empires, along with the much smaller fledgeling Balkan States, will be
analyzed and synthesized.

As a help to the reader, once again it is pointed out that for an initial definition of the word
‘Radicals’, there should be reference to previous publications in this Review. There, one can
appreciate the familial background, the educational standing, the attitudes, and the interests, etc.,
of others holding similar opinions. Thereby, it is possible to begin to come to a greater understand-
ing of the type of people of this frame of mind.1

(I)

In Edwardian Britain no section of society equated to what in Russia could be described as the

---
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Nevertheless, the term can be usefully adopted here to describe a section of the British Radicals who consisted of academics, writers, clergymen, and travellers. Such Radicals are easier to identify than their peers in politics or in the Press. Academics aspiring to intellectual honesty could claim a certain freedom from pressure to conform, though if they wished to achieve Chairs and more senior posts in the gift of the Establishment, they would have to be watchful of criticizing the government. With clergymen, those who belonged to the Church of England had a similar difficulty, but the Nonconformists need not be so cautious. Additionally, clergymen were expected by society to pronounce on humanitarian concerns, and to appear to be unrestricted by political considerations. Writers need only be mindful of what sales their writings might bring; so that along with those who travelled abroad and who wrote about their observations, these last two-mentioned groups were the most free to express their views. They were simply not answerable to an employer. Throughout all these groups, there was a natural tendency to identify with one’s employment or chief preoccupation in life, so that this also has to be taken into consideration in analyzing the attitudes of these Radicals.


One can confirm the Radicalism of those people in a variety of ways. Firstly, some of them chose to contribute to known Radical newspapers and journals. Such were the cases of Brailsford, Dickinson, Hammond, Hobhouse, Nevinson and Stead. They often used pseudonyms.

Another indication of Radical tendency, can be discerned by the titles and topics that they chose to write about. The subjects covered, ranged from pro-Boer and pro-German writings, to sympathy for small nations. Anti-armament and anti-autocracy convictions featured as well as books and pamphlets calling for increased democracy, and an end to secret diplomacy. Humanitarian concerns were commonly written about, especially the massacres of the Armenians and Macedonians. Cultural interests involved poetic and literary output.

There was a natural tendency to identify with one’s occupation, so that they wrote mostly about topics which related to their individual fields of enquiry. For example, clergymen wrote

---

1 Defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as ‘The part of a nation, orig. in pre-revolutionary Russia, that aspires to intellectual activity; the class of society regarded as possessing culture and political initiative.’ The first reference that the dictionary gives to the use of the term is to Maurice Baring’s *Year in Russia* (1907), p. 77.

2 See APPENDIX for a list of some Radicals in the intelligentsia.

about theological matters, academics about their field of specialization, and writers on a single type of output, such as science fiction by H.G. Wells. Those who chose to travel, wrote on what they observed. Those who had a close interest in a foreign race backed by appropriate linguistic ability, translated material into English. Edith Durham wrote extensively of her travels in south-east Europe, and E.G. Browne translated many Persian works.

Probably the most striking feature of the Radical intelligentsia, is that so many of them were so interested in the past. The historians included J. Bryce, H.A.L. Fisher, G.P. Gooch, R. Muir, A.J. Toynbee and G.M. Trevelyan. Those interested in archaeology, included Sir Arthur Evans. E.V. Arnold, R.S. Conway, and Gilbert Murray were classicists. Apart from those, other Radicals who had occupations other than studying the past, also had an active interest in it. Such were the cases with the Rev. Malcolm MacColl and the writer Hilaire Belloc.

One notices a notable lack of Radicals interested in topics of scientific, engineering, and business orientations. Despite the fact that we cannot discount from the latter the study of economics, as for example in the writings of J.A. Hobson, nevertheless, it is true to say that their works fall overwhelmingly into what we would regard nowadays to be the arts and humanities.

There were occasions when the author actually referred to himself and others as Radicals. Such was the case with Gilbert Murray in his pamphlet *The Foreign Policy Of Sir Edward Grey 1906-1915*:

> I said something of this sort to a Radical friend. ‘Yes,’ he said, ‘for the last twelve days Grey has been working for peace, but for the last eight years he has been making peace impossible.’

> Is this a true criticism? Or is it that we Radicals judged foreign policy in part wrong. ...\(^5\)

Also, Gilbert Murray named Toynbee as a Radical in writing to Bertrand Russell of his (i.e. Murray’s) daughter’s matrimonial plans:

> You have heard, of course, of Rosalind’s engagement to Arnold Toynbee? He is not the man we should have guessed, though we like and admire him greatly. Fellow of Balliol, radical, and, as far as I can make out, a quite satisfactory freethinker with no nonsense about the Absolute; tremendous strength of character. ...\(^6\)

Likewise, H.A.L. Fisher in writing to Gilbert Murray about who should be approached to write

---


\(^6\) Murray to Russell, 29 July 1913, Gilbert Murray Papers 165. Reel 54. F. 137-138, Bodleian Library, Oxford University. (Hereafter referenced as ‘Murray Papers.’)
the contribution on the ‘Elements of Political Economy’ for the Home University Library referred to Lees Smith as: ‘... Also a good radical. ...’

One can also discern who were not Radicals by similar examination. For example, in H.A.L. Fisher’s letter of 18 July 1913 to Gilbert Murray about allocating the work on a Russian topic to the Home University Library the former wrote:

Maurice Baring whom I met the other day is very anxious to write a book for us on Russian Literature or on Russian party. I fancy that this has already been assigned to Hagberg Wright, but if H.W. is too busy to go on, should we consider M.B.?

Of course he knows a lot about the subject and is enthusiastic but I seem to remember that you dislike his views. ...  

Maurice Baring was not a Radical, which is probably why he was not favoured by Fisher, whereas Hagberg Wright was considered to be ‘... hand and glove with all Russian conspirators.’

Those are the indicators as to whether individuals belonged to the Radical intelligentsia or not. However, it must be pointed out, that in looking at topics and attempting to identify Radicals, there are some pitfalls to beware. For example, it cannot be presumed that everyone who wrote on a matter of humanitarian concern was a Radical. Secondly, the same can be stated of those who wrote criticizing or condemning Tsarist autocracy. Non-Radicals recognized the apparent trends towards democratic government in Britain and France and duly condemned the arbitrary nature of the Russian regime. Thirdly, literary output about nationalism, supporting the nationalistic aspirations of subordinate ethnic groups in central and eastern Europe was not the sole prerogative of Radicals. R.W. Seton-Watson wrote about the minorities in Austria-Hungary, but by the autumn of 1914 he was not a Radical. By then, he saw the dissolution of the Habsburg monarchy as a necessary weakening of German influence in Mitteleuropa.

(II)

In examining connections between Radicals, one has to bear in mind that some changed employment between the political life, the Press, and academia. The common factor was that most of them were very highly-educated and could consequently express themselves articulately. Just as C.P. Scott, who had been M.P. for the Leigh division of Lancashire during 1895–January 1906,
was also engrossed in journalism; likewise, there were journalists who were involved or transferred into the intelligentsia. For example, R.C.K. Ensor later became an academic at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. L.T. Hobhouse, who worked for Scott’s paper the *Manchester Guardian* during 1897–1902 and for the ill-fated *Tribune*, was appointed in 1907 to the newly-created Martin White Chair in Sociology at the London School of Economics. He had previously lectured there, and besides contributing still to journalism, including the *Nation*, he retained his post there until his death in 1929. In 1911, he wrote *Liberalism*, which was considered to be the clearest explanation of the theory of the New Liberalism.11

Of those who dabbled in political life and belonged to the intelligentsia, one could name the historian G.P. Gooch, who was M.P. for Bath during 1906–January 1910. He contributed several chapters in *The Cambridge Modern History*. The author Hilaire Belloc, was M.P. for S. Salford 1906–December 1910. The Congregational minister, the Rev. Charles Silvester Horne, was M.P. for Ipswich from January 1910 until his death in May 1914, and he wrote widely.12 Rudolph Lehmann, who was M.P. for the Harborough division of Leicestershire during 1906–December 1910, was an author, and was involved in journalism. He was a member of the staff of *Punch*, as well as being editor of the *Daily News* from 1901. Indeed, one could continue with such ascriptions, for their literary output was truly prodigious.

Connections between Radicals working in the political life and the intelligentsia existed in a direct way. For example, the Rev. John Clifford, writing to E.D. Morel, concerning the issue of reform in the Congo, soon after the General Election of 1906, claimed that Meyer as President of the Baptist Union could ‘get anything done’ that Morel wished. Clifford not only offered his [i.e. Clifford’s] help, but also maintained that: ‘We ought to have no difficulty with the Government now since our friend, Mr. Herbert Samuel is in the Government.’13 And again, as evidence of such aspirations in 1909, when Morel writing to John Clifford stated succinctly: ‘Since writing you yesterday I see there is to be a Meeting of the National Liberal Federation in Southport. Could not the Baptist machinery be put in action to place pressure upon the Members of Parliament attending it?’14

Additionally, Nonconformist clergymen did become involved in politics with the other members

---

of the Radical intelligentsia. In 1907, for example, the Rev. John Clifford, when writing to E.D. Morel, referred to an interview that Morel and he had had with the Foreign Secretary about the Congo. Clifford expressed his anxiety to Morel, that England might simply acquiesce in the transfer of the Congo from King Leopold to the Belgian government, and yet still keep the same system in existence. And in 1909, clergymen’s on-going involvement was evident in relation to the Congo situation. Morel wrote to John Clifford that

I have just come back from an hour with the Archbishop who left me to go to the House of Commons to seek out Grey, with whom he would like to speak first, but he agrees to going with you to Grey.

I enclose you a press copy of my letter to him. I have suggested the Archbishop, yourself, the Bishop of Southwark and the Rev. Scott Lidgett, as forming this small Deputation to Grey ON THE ARBITRATION SCHEME.

Clifford felt the same frustration as other Radicals, in not being able to effect immediate results for their causes:

Our powerlessness is distressing beyond expression.
Your protest must be circulated far and wide. Our Committee ought surely to dissociate itself entirely from the policy of silent acquiescence in the continuance of the present diabolical slave system of the Congo.

And again five months later: ‘... Our country is in imminent danger of being cheated again by “words, words.” ... What can be done?’

（Ⅲ）

As with their contemporaries in political life and in the Press, those who are included under the term ‘intelligentsia’ consisted of a minority of opinion. Consequently, they tended to mix together not just to exchange ideas but also for companionship. Many were subsequently linked by marriage or close bonds of friendship. Besides the marriage of A.J. Toynbee to Gilbert Murray’s daughter, Rosalind, mentioned above, there were many other examples. A.E. Evans who contri-

buted as a correspondent to the *Manchester Guardian*, married Margaret, daughter of E.A. Freeman, Regius Professor of History at Oxford, who had also written for the same Radical newspaper.\(^{20}\) C.P. Scott’s youngest son Edward, married Mabel, the eighteen years old daughter of J.A. Hobson.\(^{21}\) The writer G.K. Chesterton, was godfather to Gilbert, the youngest child of A.G. Gardiner.\(^{22}\)

As friends, the Radicals chose to help one another, either to advance their career prospects or in times of trouble. For example in April 1894, H.A.L. Fisher received the news from Gilbert Murray of a vacant Professorship in History at Glasgow.\(^{23}\) Subsequently, Fisher decided to try for the Chair of History with Murray as one of his referees. Much correspondence flowed between them that summer. Fisher was one of four unsuccessful candidates. Fisher wrote to Murray in July 1894, on hearing the news of his failure, naturally expressing disappointment, but actually going so far as to write that: ‘... I should certainly never have stood for the Glasgow chair if you had not been at Glasgow, and assuredly I should never have been thought of seriously as a candidate if it had not been for your exertions. ’\(^{24}\)

And, as an example of Radicals helping one another in times of trouble, one can cite a letter from H.N. Brailsford to Gilbert Murray in June 1905 relating to the forthcoming Passport trial. In the letter, Brailsford informed Murray, that the character witnesses in his defence, would be severely restricted in the amount they could say, possibly to as little as five or six sentences. Brailsford wrote that ‘... if that is so the fact of your knowing me intimately would hardly count at all, & I can get on with Courtney & perhaps Bradley or Arthur Evans or Bryce. ’\(^{25}\) That comment implies the possibility of considerable Radical sympathy and help to Brailsford, as Murray, Courtney, Evans and Bryce were all renowned Radicals.\(^{26}\) Bertrand Russell also lent his support, as expressed in a letter to Gilbert Murray in May 1905:

> ... I am very sorry about Brailsford. You don’t say what is the penalty he may naturally expect; I hope it is not very severe. I can’t feel that he ought to have done otherwise. It seems to me odd that it should injure his prospects as a writer; I should have expected it to improve them ... \(^{27}\)


\(^{21}\) ibid, p. 431.


\(^{24}\) Fisher to Murray, 7 July 1894. Fisher Papers, 54. F. 42.

\(^{25}\) Brailsford to Murray, 14 June 1905. Murray Papers 124. Reel 42.

\(^{26}\) A.C. Bradley M.A. was Professor of English Literature at Glasgow, and editor of T.H. Green’s *Prologomena to Ethics* (1883), etc. Additionally, it must be remembered that Brailsford was an ex-student of Gilbert Murray’s when the latter was teaching Greek at Glasgow.

\(^{27}\) Russell to Murray, 16 May 1905, Murray Papers 124. Reel 42. F. 120.
The last sentence of the extract from Russell’s letter, is also very interesting from another point of view. Could it be interpreted as meaning, that because Brailsford was to receive such increased publicity, albeit of an adverse kind, that therefore he was simply better known to prospective employing editors and to a wider readership? In other words, was Brailsford an example of Radicals deliberately doing, writing, or saying something merely to become noticed? Or was Russell’s last sentence just an innocent observation, that because Brailsford’s name had been seen in wider publicity than before, that people would be more interested in knowing more about him and reading his literary output in the future? On balance, one cannot accept the interpretation that Radicals behaved in the way they did merely to distinguish themselves from the majority in order to be noticed, and therefore be more likely to gain recognition and promotion from their contemporaries. Undoubtedly, there were a mix of motives.

In the instance given above, the trial did not do Brailsford’s immediate journalistic career any good, despite Russell’s comment, for C.P. Scott temporarily suspended the decision to appoint Brailsford to his newspaper because of the Passport trial.28 It was as if Scott wanted to keep his distance from the implications of the case. However, one must realize that Brailsford was one of the minority who could be classed as thoroughly-determined Radicals, who would stand by their convictions, apparently irrespective of the problems in which they would subsequently be involved in. The majority of Radicals however, had a wide range of motives for being nominal Radicals. Some of the latter, may indeed have called themselves or appeared to be Radicals, in order to be noticed as being different, or apart, or above their contemporaries, thereby putting their personalities to the fore for those who already held power to consider them for advancement. Others of the nominal Radical grouping, may have wanted to appear to have some Radical tendencies that could easily be quickly forgotten, if expediency demanded. They ‘hedged their bets’ to take advantage of any successes that a Radical approach might bring, but be ready to retreat to a more conventional and traditional attitude, if need be, if the ideas of Radicalism foundered.

The high-water mark of Radicalism, would seem to have been reached during the premiership of the Radical, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman 1905–1908, when there seemed so much politically to work for. As the government had such an overwhelming majority, it seemed as if they might meet Radical aspirations. However, the death of Sir Henry came as a serious blow to the Radicals, as the Liberal Imperialists strengthened their grip on power with the succession of H.H. Asquith as Prime Minister. The successful passage of so much of the domestic programme dear to the Radicals, defused their onslaught, and the setbacks to the Liberal Party in the two General Elections of 1910, meant that their influence had diminished, never to return to its 1905 vigour.

The political retreat of the Radicals is interesting, in that those who were nominal Radicals shifted rightwards accordingly, towards the centre of the Liberal Party. That accounts for why

such figures as Winston Churchill and David Lloyd George, who had once been known as Radicals, now appeared to betray their previous allegiance and lose their Radicalism. They were in fact protecting their own career prospects, and were prepared to conveniently forget or put aside their Radical convictions.

Just as in political life nominal Radicals felt it to be necessary to ditch their beliefs for their self-interests, so in the Radical intelligentsia some found it similarly convenient. This showed itself in those who chose to side with the Establishment. H.A.L. Fisher, Gilbert Murray and G.M. Trevelyan fell into that category. All of them kept their distance from the Union of Democratic Control in the 1914–1918 war. Murray’s trenchant defence of the Foreign Secretary’s policy leading up to the Great War, in *The Foreign Policy Of Sir Edward Grey 1906–1915*, is evidence for this view. Those who supported him in his opinion, as expressed in that work, tended to be like-minded, nominal Radicals. Those who criticized it, like Bertrand Russell, were real, true Radicals. While the latter type of Radical joined the UDC or had strong pacifist convictions; the nominal Radicals often ended up helping the government by aiding various departments, such as the Foreign Office with their ‘expert knowledge.’ A.J. Toynbee, for example, spent most of the 1914–1918 war in the Political Intelligence Department of the Foreign Office.29

(IV)

Undoubtedly, the literary abilities of the Radicals, rested on the fine education that most received; and that in turn reflected the financially comfortable world in which they lived. Wealth and snobbery existed amongst the Radicals. Gilbert Murray, for example, having married into the aristocracy, Lady Mary Howard of the family of the Earls of Carlisle, gave up his Chair of Greek at Glasgow University (nominally on grounds of poor health), to devote himself to six years as a gentleman of leisure, to become a translator of Greek poetry. It was only in 1905, that he felt the need to have a regular post again, this time as a Fellow of New College, Oxford.30 H.A.L. Fisher wrote to Lady Mary Murray, of Murray’s intended resignation at Glasgow in the following vein:

...I am truly thankful to think that this is the last year of Glasgow, and I only wish that the resignation could be at Xmas. Anyhow I am sure that it will make all the difference to your lives, when it comes, and that however much Gilbert may face the step at the time, he will never afterwards regret it. It is not as if he required the stimulus of an exacting post to keep him up to the mark, and as soon as his health returns, he will be able to get as much teaching work as he desires....31

And the air of wealth and snobbery, is clearly discernable in a further letter of Fisher to Murray, of 1904:

... We want both of you to come here on that afternoon. The next day Wednesday we go in a Motor to South Wales; stay a few days there — say till Saturday — and then come back by train. What do you say? One can hire a very good motor here for £3 a day, and a day will take us to the borders of Wales. The chauffeur is thrown in. The point of a Motor, I understand is

1. To make a demonstration of wealth and insolence.
2. To obtain fresh air without fatigue.

It will be a capital thing for us all, and not very expensive. Do come. ... 32

But then the Edwardian Age was well-known for the flaunting of its wealth, and the subsequent corruption that ensued from it. In 1907, Hilaire Belloc in writing to Fisher, commented on the fact that the Chief Whip bought his office for £10,000 from the Prime Minister and, according to rumour, had yet to pay it back. 33 The fact that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was considered by many to be a Radical, only goes to show that Radicals were not above such dealings.

Another indication of the wealth of Radicals in the intelligentsia could be observed in that they travelled abroad a great deal. Additionally, their educational achievements were reflected in their ability to understand many foreign languages.

For example, Miss Edith M. Durham, travelled extensively in the Balkans from the beginnings of the twentieth century into the 1920s, ostensibly to help alleviate the suffering of the peoples under Ottoman rule. She developed a strong liking for the Albanians, and a hostility to the Serbs and Montenegrins. She was a correspondent of the Manchester Guardian, Nation, and the Times. 34 According to A.J.P. Taylor, she was one of the people whom: ‘... A man with an intelligent interest in foreign affairs ...’ 35 would read.

H.N. Brailsford also visited the Balkans, and though he has already been referred to in a study of Radicals in the Press, 36 nevertheless it must not be forgotten that he also had a reputation as an independent writer of considerable standing. His Macedonia: Its Races And Their Future (1906), was the recognized authoritative account of that region in the pre–1914 period.

---

32 Fisher to Murray, 14 April 1904, Fisher Papers 54, F. 157–158.
33 Belloc to Fisher, 6 May 1907, Fisher Papers 53, F. 31–32.
34 Her books about the region included Through The Lands Of The Serb (1904); The Burden Of The Balkans (1905); High Albania (1909); The Struggle For Scutari (1914); Twenty Years Of Balkan Tangle (1920); etc.
H.W. Nevinson also accompanied Brailsford, in being both a journalist,\textsuperscript{37} as well as an independent writer of distinction. He had also travelled a great deal. He was in Greece in 1897 for the Greco-Turkish war; in Spain during the U.S.-Spanish war of 1898; in South Africa for the Boer war where he was involved in the 118 days long siege of Ladysmith; in the Balkans in 1903; in the Portuguese west African colonies during 1904-1905 investigating the slave trade; in Russia 1905–1906 to include covering the massacre events of Christmas Week, and twice more in 1906 involving overseeing the opening proceedings of the new Duma. Based on these Russian exploits, he produced the book \textit{The Dawn in Russia} (1906). He went to India in October 1907 for six months to study British rule there; Spain 1908 where he covered the Barcelona rebellion, and then North Africa to witness Spanish military efforts against the Moroccans; to Northern Ireland twice in 1912; followed directly by nine months in the Balkans covering the conflict there. In the earlier half of 1914 he was in Ireland again; and then in Berlin to report on the deteriorating European political situation, on the outbreak of war escaping from the city in the British ambassador’s train on 6 August. These were some, not all, of Nevinson’s travels before the Great War. Whether he was sent by a newspaper to a location for information, or whether he went of his own free-will, he seemed to have the uncanny knack of being in the right place at the right time.

Though E.G. Browne only visited Persia once in his life, in 1887–1888, he was regarded as the leading Persian scholar and Orientalist of his day. In 1893, he published \textit{A Year amongst the Persians} which, with some other works, narrated his experiences in Persia. He turned his attention to Persian literature, and produced a series of volumes on the \textit{Literary History of Persia until the time of Firdausi}, in 1902, 1906, 1920 and 1924. His linguistic abilities in Persian, Arabic and Turkish gave him access to primary source materials, that were until his time simply unused by Western scholars.

Noel Buxton, who first travelled to the Balkans in 1899, founded the Balkan Committee in 1902. His many journeys there, resulted in \textit{Europe and the Turks} (1907), and \textit{With the Bulgarian Staff} (1913). A visit in the Autumn of 1914, underlined the dangers of such trips, for a Turk shot at both Noel and his brother Charles in Bucharest.

---

\textsuperscript{(V)}

In identifying common characteristics amongst the Radicals, one can observe a strong sympathy towards Germany. This theme is explored, because sympathy for Germanic culture helps explain why the Radicals were more sympathetic towards the Austro-Hungarian Empire than towards the Russian and Ottoman States of eastern Europe. Austria-Hungary was regarded as the greater force for civilization.

The Radicals, who so greatly admired the German contributions to European civilization, found

\textsuperscript{37} ibid, pp. 1–32.
it immensely difficult to square those achievements with the militaristic State portrayed by, and emphasized by, non-Radicals. Indeed, the feeling amongst some Radicals, was that if an entente was possible with France in 1904 and with despotic Russia in 1907, then why could there not be one with Germany as well?

In keeping with their admiration for German civilization, many Radicals had either been educated in Germany, or had German relatives. For example, E.V. Arnold, Professor of Latin at the University College of North Wales 1884–1924, had been an undergraduate at Trinity College, Cambridge and studied also at the University of Tübingen. Sir Arthur Evans, the archaeologist, had been educated at Brasenose College, Oxford and at the University of Göttingen, and eventually received an Hon. Ph.D. from Berlin in 1910. H.A.L. Fisher, the historian, was educated at New College, Oxford and Paris, but also at the University of Göttingen. G.P. Gooch, having studied at King’s College, London and Trinity College, Cambridge also did so in Paris and Berlin. Furthermore, of those with German relations, one could cite Gooch, for he married in 1903 a Saxon art student, Else Sophie, daughter of Julius Schoon of Berlin.38

Perhaps the most outspoken apologist for Germany among those who belonged to the Radical intelligentsia, was E.D. Morel. In 1909, he wrote to Lady Frederick Cavendish complaining that:

... The attitude of the *Times*, is, I think, wholly inspired by hatred of Germany, in which it is followed by the *Spectator*; and I cannot but believe there is Foreign Office influence at work, knowing as I do the history of how that article in the *Times* was written and by whom. You will have noticed, of course, the two very significant sentences in it against Germany. ...39

Morel’s views about Germany were well-known, and therefore it is of interest to know whom he felt able to communicate with, in regard to spreading his ideas. In November 1911 he wrote, for example, to G.P. Gooch co-editor of the *Contemporary Review* and fellow Radical, that he was ‘... speaking on Anglo-German relations on Sunday at the request of ... Dr. Clifford – in his chapel ...’40 and asking Gooch for a back-number of the journal. (October 1900)

Morel’s zeal for seeking better Anglo-German relations led him to accept membership of the executive committee of the Anglo-German Friendship Society41 and also to be involved in the Foreign Policy Committee, the latter founded by Philip Morrell. Both organizations were extra-
parliamentary pressure groups, aimed to effect greater parliamentary control over foreign affairs vis-à-vis the Foreign Office, and to stop any policy which ‘... might seem to oppose the legitimate aspirations of Germany.’

He proceeded to publish *Morocco in Diplomacy* in 1912, which argued that Germany’s stance in the two Moroccan crises of 1905 and 1911 had been correct, while the Anglo-French position ‘... had been unjustified in purpose and Machiavellian in execution.’ In preference, he opposed any British alliance with either France or Germany, and preferred to look back to the idealistic state of affairs when Britain maintained a policy of ‘splendid isolation’:

> Let us ... keep our hands free, unfettered by alliances or understandings of a compromising character ... and let us come back to the only sound ideal of policy for Great Britain at the opening of the twentieth century, i.e. to play our own part in the Concert of Europe when necessity arises; ...

Once war with Germany had begun, Morel served as Executive Secretary to the Union of Democratic Control (UDC). It cost him dearly. He was compelled in October 1914 to resign his parliamentary candidacy in Birkenhead; and lost the admiration of non-Radicals which he had won during the Congo campaign.

Many accused Morel of pro-Germanic tendencies, for he held that ‘My object is to assist in destroying the legend that Germany was the sole responsible author of this war, undertaken by her to “subjugate Europe.”’ Morel was aware of those accusations against him, for in a letter to Arthur Ponsonby he enclosed an open statement of G.K. Chesterton’s to Buxton, in which Chesterton was reputed to have called Morel ‘... an agent of the German Government’!

E.D. Morel was not the only Radical who took such a stance. However, he was almost certainly, the least cautious publicly of them. Bertrand Russell warned him not to be so carefree in his statements. In Germany, even the Social Democrats were holding up his words for comment in the *Reichstag* during the war. So it was not surprising, that the British governmental authorities in the autumn of 1917, sentenced him to six months imprisonment for his views, when he violated the Defence of the Realm Act, by encouraging Miss Ethel Sidgwick to convey his pamphlet *Tsardom’s Part in the War* (1917) to a French pacifist, then resident in the neutral State of Switzerland.

C.P. Trevelyan sympathized with him. In 1913, he wrote from Berlin to Morel, claiming that he

---

[i.e. Trevelyan] had seen one of Morel's letters referring to a Liverpool jingo speech claiming that Britain would send an army to help France. Trevelyan wrote:

I am over here in Berlin and am profoundly convinced that it is that belief, and absolutely that alone, which keeps the Germans from the best relations with us. I intend to enter upon a vigorous private campaign on the subject when I get home. ... 47

Once war had begun, Trevelyan felt compelled to resign his position in the Liberal Government. In his letter of resignation to his constituents in the Elland Division of the West Riding of Yorkshire, he stated that ‘... for some years now past many of us have been anxiously combatting the spirit which has been declaring Germany, our ancient friend, to be our present enemy.’ 48

Along with other members of the UDC, Trevelyan was considered to be pro-German. This was very evident from a letter he drafted to John Simon, in which he claimed that the UDC, was ‘... being constantly attacked by the Morning Post and Daily Express and other papers on the ground that it is supported by German funds.’ 49 He maintained that the charge was repeated, despite regular denial. The purpose of writing to Simon, was to ask him to inspect the subscribers list, so that if the government made enquiries in the future, it would receive a statement from Simon, to re-assure it, that money was not being obtained from enemy aliens.

Miss Edith Durham also had strong German sympathies. As a philo-Albanian, she was anti-Serb and anti-Montenegrin, which in turn led her to support Austria-Hungary’s plight. This is shown in her strong condemnation of Servia 50 for its duplicity in the Sarajevo murders, and consequent reduction of blame placed on the Dual Monarchy for the outbreak of war in 1914. In 1919, she wrote to Morel of the ‘... awful letters about the state of Vienna and Innsbruck. There the Italian army of occ. [upation] eats everything and the owners of flats houses etc are made to live in one or two rooms and have soldiers quartered on them.’ In the same letter, her feelings for Germany itself became clear, when she wrote that: ‘... I hear now from friends in Frankfort they are terrified of a French occupation and Senegalese troops.’ 51

Edith Durham, in writing to Morel in the post-war years, maintained that ‘... Loreburn still puts to my mind far too much blame on Germany, ...’ 52 And Loreburn had himself written to Morel that ‘... I am convinced that the country will soon see through the interested delusion that Germany was

48 C.P. Trevelyan Papers. CPT 59, Newcastle University.
50 The spelling of Servia is used here for the period preceding the Great War. Thereafter, Serbia will be adopted as in accordance with the practice of the times.
alone to blame in regard to this war."

Indeed, only nine months before Morel’s death in November 1924, yet another fellow Radical, G.L. Dickinson, wrote to him outlining the contents of a book of memoirs by Baron Eckhardstein. The publication referred to the British suggestion as early as 1901, of the commercial penetration and eventual partition of Morocco by Britain and Germany.

Other intellectual Radicals of particular note, who also indicated strong sympathies for Germany, were H.N. Brailsford and Noel Buxton. Brailsford believed that Germany was being denied her ‘place in the sun’, by being denied expansion overseas. Germany’s subsequent protests endangered the peace of Europe and increasingly so, as she felt hemmed in by the encirclement of the Triple Entente. Brailsford believed, that if Britain and France offered colonial concessions they ‘... could assuage German feelings of victimization and remove the ostensible motive for massive armaments.’ He was in favour of Britain’s supporting the German-funded Baghdad Railway scheme. He sincerely believed that the German menace was exaggerated. Once the Great War had begun, he refused, like Morel, to blame Germany as its sole originator, and thereby faced similar charges of being pro-German. Such accusations were made against him, for example, at the Nation lunches by Hobhouse and Hammond, who joined in ‘... attacking Brailsford with unfair & scandalous abuse as a pro-German.’

Noel Buxton, too, tended to recommend meeting German claims rather than resisting them. He joined the Anglo-German Friendship Committee, and it was he who nominated E.D. Morel also for membership. He believed that Germany ‘... as a heavily populated industrial state’ ought to have due consideration in the interests of both peace and justice. A second and economic reason, was that British protectionism gave Germany an added claim to have colonies of her own, as well as ports on the open seas. A third reason, independent of economic considerations, was the justifiable fear of the Triple Entente, and in particular, the impulse of France to re-possess Alsace-Lorraine. Germany feared encirclement, which led to a perilous increase in her naval armament. Buxton, in order to channel German resentment into peaceful outlets, saw no objection to her being

... given openings under the Congo Basin Convention, in the French Congo, the Portuguese Colonies, Zanzibar and elsewhere. Moreover, she should be given strategic bases in Morocco, Persia and China, and recognition of her special interests in trade with areas such as South America.
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He disliked Sir Eyre Crowe, the Permanent Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who resisted any such concessions to Germany, for he ‘... would admit nothing good of the Germans, ... He almost always attributed an ulterior design to any supposed change for the better in the German attitude.’

Buxton felt that the attitude adopted by Grey towards Germany during the crisis surrounding the Austro-Hungarian annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908 had brought war closer. He felt that the Mansion House speech of David Lloyd George heightened the tension between the two countries, and that the Agadir crisis of 1911 showed that Grey and the Foreign Office were not to be trusted. In fact, he was not reassured by the Foreign Secretary’s statement in the House of Commons of 27 November 1911, that ‘We have laid before the House the secret articles of the Agreement with France of 1904. There are no other secret agreements.’

In an article in the *Contemporary Review* of November 1911, Buxton denied that Britain would commercially gain by Germany’s military defeat. Likewise, he maintained that Britain had no need to fear German colonial competition, and quite correctly pointed out that in Germany there were strong political elements against the possession of colonies. Further, he questioned the attitude that Germany was the main international troublemaker.

In December 1911, the Liberal Foreign Affairs Group was founded in the House of Commons of which he became chairman, and his Radical friend, Arthur Ponsonby, became vice-chairman. This Group was concerned about Britain’s increasing commitments to the other Entente partners, and sought to make foreign affairs more answerable to parliament. At the very first meeting, the Group passed a resolution requesting an understanding to be reached with Germany and disapproving any policy that sought to block Germany’s legitimate aspirations. Later, in another memorandum in describing the Group’s attitude, he wrote

... that the attitude of the public towards Germany is not represented by the Foreign Office ...[and]... Liberals of all classes, and not Liberals alone, are bound to protest against a policy of ‘hemming Germany in’ from a share in the colonial world. This policy accords neither with justice nor with expediency. It is an attitude obnoxious to those who desire to see peace in the future; it must lead to permanent friction; ...

Once the First World War had begun, Noel Buxton chose to uphold the Entente position. He went to Bulgaria in the autumn of 1914 with his brother, in order to induce that country to join the Allied cause, for he felt that there would thereby be ‘... a final and permanent solution of the Balkan

---

question...’ and that ‘... the entry of Bulgaria would have the most marked effect in shortening the
war.’

However, his sympathies for the Germans still existed though. For example, the French claims
to regain Alsace-Lorraine he dismissed, as merely a means to have access to its mineral wealth.
Additionally, he opposed the dissolution of Germany’s chief ally, Austria-Hungary.

Though initially he became a member of the UDC and gave it substantial financial help, he did
not take an active role in it, unlike his brother Charles. He agreed with the UDC’s aims but not
their methods, for he preferred to work through the traditional diplomatic system in order to
achieve peace.

Of course, Radicals were not the only people who had sympathies for Germany and its civiliza-
tion, but these preceeding observations show it to be one of the more common feelings amongst
them. A special mention of Richard Burdon Haldane has to be made in relation to this matter. He
was Secretary of State for War during December 1905–June 1912, and Lord High Chancellor
1912–1915. In matters of foreign affairs he was a Liberal Imperialist and not a Radical, despite his
strong sympathies for German culture.

Haldane showed many of the characteristics of a Radical. For example, he was brought up in a
particularly strong religious atmosphere, in which both his father and grandfather had given up
naval careers for evangelical work. Indeed, his mother began her letters to him with Biblical
quotations. He proceeded to study at the University of Göttingen in 1874, and thereafter held a
life-long fascination for the German Idealist philosophers. In the pre–1914 war period, he published
or contributed to many scholarly works, amongst which were the following relating to German
civilization: a translation of Schopenhauer’s *The World as Will and Idea* (1883); and *Germany in
the Nineteenth Century* (1912). After the 1914–1918 conflict, he produced or contributed to works
on Goethe (1920); Hegel (1929); and Schopenhauer yet again in 1939.

The width of his intellectual pursuits, and his emphasis on the German contribution to know-
ledge, led him to be a friend of Albert Einstein. Haldane was nicknamed ‘Schopenhauer’ and ‘Herr
Professor’ by his fellow Liberals and the opposition party respectively. Indeed, Alfred Lyttelton
wrote on an envelope to Lewis Harcourt, just before Haldane was due to give a speech about the
army on 25 February 1907, complaining about ‘... the prospect of 3 hours from Schopenhauer.’
Haldane seemed to make no effort to moderate his displays of admiration for German civilization.
In fact, his most famous ‘indiscretion’, held against him for years by his opponents, was his remark

---
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to a visiting German academic, that Germany was his ‘spiritual home.’ John Morley, complained to H.A.L. Fisher, that Haldane ‘wear[ied] his Cabinet colleagues by long harangues on the contribution of Germany to civilisation.’

Haldane’s constant references to German culture irritated people, at a time when Germany was being blamed for heightening the international tension. His annual German holidays, added further evidence to his personal predisposition towards that country. Indeed, in June 1913, the University of Göttingen conferred on him an honorary doctorate, on the 25th anniversary of the Kaiser’s accession to the throne. So by the time war broke out in 1914, he had acquired a reputation as a pro-German, and consequently suffered from that repute once the conflict actually began. In May 1915, it was suggested that his notable absence from Asquith’s new Cabinet was due to his German sympathies, and therefore he had been made a scapegoat for the Government’s wartime failures.

A further suggestion for Haldane’s demise in the Liberal Party in 1915, was indeed the very dichotomy of his having Radical attributes and yet being a Liberal Imperialist. Was he a Radical or was he not? Beatrice Webb’s observation of him was that ‘She recognized in Haldane one of the Liberal politicians with “collectivist” tendencies, not quite a socialist, but something more than a Radical reformer.’ However, probably the closest answer to the question, comes from the historian Stephen Koss, when he maintains that:

Although he appeared right-wing – particularly on matters of imperialism, foreign policy, and defense – in the eyes of many back-bench Liberals, Haldane was decidedly left-wing in his response to social issues ...

Therefore, despite his liking and admiration for German culture, he was nevertheless able to separate those ideas from the necessity of advancing his political career.

(Ⅵ)

Radicals were not simply deeply interested in humanitarian causes, but had a reverence for the sacredness of life in general. That showed itself in their distaste for the arms race preceding the First World War, and also that so many of them were pacifists and conscientious objectors when war began. They were often Quakers, or had strong sympathies with them. Furthermore, their respect for and sensitivity to life, extended to many of them becoming vegetarians, such as
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Brailsford, Ensor, and Murray. That belief was based, not on health grounds, but on the desire to avoid cruelty to animals. For example, Hobhouse’s son, later reported how his father ‘hated all forms of sport which involved taking life.’ Brailsford, wrote against blood sports, and made pleas on behalf of the welfare of pit ponies. He also wrote several essays about his supposed relationships with cats. Likewise, the Radical M.P. for Peterborough 1906–1918, Sir Granville George Greenwood, who was the author of several works on Shakespeare, also showed a strong tendency to alleviate the sufferings of animals, as well as humans. In parliament, he spoke for the better treatment of animals in every year during 1906–1914, the following being some cases: against the cruelties practised in deer-hunting in the name of sport; for legislative proposals for improving the methods of cattle slaughtering; against cruelties caused during stag-hunting; to draw peoples attention to cruelties perpetrated during the export of worn-out horses; mention of cats, horses and rabbits, deer, pit ponies, foxes, poultry, larks and swallows. He also spoke on matters relating to vivisection, in every year during 1906–1914, with the exception of 1907. Additionally, his interest for humanitarian concerns, moved him to speak on the situation in Macedonia.

78 Besides *Tracts on Vivisection* (London 1906) and *Sport. A paper read before the Animals’ Protection Congress at the Caxton Hall, London, on July 9, 1909* and issued in 1910 as a pamphlet by the Animals’ Friends Society, he also produced *The Law of the ‘Steel Trap’* published by the Humanitarian League (London 1908).
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1906–1908; on the Chinese employed in South Africa 1906 and 1907; on the natives in Natal in 1908 and 1910; the situation in Persia in 1909; vagrancy laws in 1911 and 1912; and executions in Nigeria in 1912, just to name some examples before the First World War.

(Ⅶ)

If one examines the religious backgrounds of the Radical intelligentsia and their subsequent beliefs, it can be discerned that a large percentage of them were of a clerical background, and in particular, of the Nonconformist tradition. H.N. Brailsford, for example, was the eldest child and only son of the Rev. Edward John Brailsford, 1841–1921, a Wesleyan Methodist preacher. E.D. Morel’s mother, Emmeline de Horne, was a Quaker. H.W. Nevinson, though brought up by Anglicans, was in fact subject to ‘a rigidly evangelical environment.’ John Hammond, was the second son of the Rev. Vavasor Fitzhammond Hammond. In 1901 he [John] married Lucy Barbara Bradby, the daughter of the Rev. Dr. Edward Henry Bradby. L.T. Hobhouse’s father, Reginald, was Rector of St. Ive in Cornwall from 1848 for the remaining 51 years of his life, and also Archdeacon of Bodmin during 1877–1892. H.W. Massingham’s father, Joseph, was a Methodist
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preacher.\textsuperscript{104} In Joseph O. Baylen and Norbert J. Gossman’s dictionary of Radicals, the first words in the biographical entry for W.T. Stead are ‘Nonconformist, Radical, ...’\textsuperscript{105} He was the son of the Rev. William Stead, a Congregational minister.\textsuperscript{106} C.F. Andrews, began his professional life as a High Church Anglican minister. His paternal great-grandparents were Baptists, and his grandfather a Methodist minister who later joined the millennialist sect known as the Catholic Apostolic Church. Charles’s father held ministerial office in the church, in the Irvingite sect, named after Edward Irving, considered by outsiders (incorrectly) to be the founder of the Catholic Apostolic Church.\textsuperscript{107} Thomas E. Harvey, was ‘One of the three or four most influential British Quakers of the twentieth century, and a respected back-bench Radical voice in the House of Commons, ...’\textsuperscript{108} Hilaire Belloc, who wrote many novels and historical biographies, was a ‘vigorous Roman Catholic apologist.’\textsuperscript{109}

**CONCLUSION**

In summary, British Radicals exhibited a great sensitivity and respect for high moral values, quite naturally based on Christian teachings. That was a major reason for their admiration for Mr. W.E. Gladstone, the great 19\textsuperscript{th} century moralist Prime Minister. The Radicals espoused anti-war, anti-armaments race policies, believing that the money could better be spent on diminishing the socio-economic problems of the age. The Radicals often had strong personal religious convictions, as quite a number of them were either clergymen or came from familial backgrounds heavily influenced in that direction. Their pacifistic tendencies extended to supporting humanitarian causes, and notably to aim to speak for life where there was little or no chance of defending itself. This naturally encompassed a fondness for animals.

Because of their high level of educational attainment, Radicals could express themselves well in written and spoken forms. They had an abiding fascination with the past, even some of them being professional historians. Others chose to write in a literary vein. They had strong cultural interests. This led them quite understandably to have an attraction for German culture – the main source of 19\textsuperscript{th} century European intellectual curiousity. In turn, this infused the Radicals with the notion that Germans were not bent on warlike aims. Instead, many Radicals pointed the finger of blame for heightened international diplomatic tensions on to their own government. The charge was that the British Foreign Office was far too secretive in its dealings with the European Powers.
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The Radicals believed that a more open system of dealing with foreign policy issues, would result in more parliamentary discussion, leading to greater political accountability, thereby progressing the advancement of democracy. Very importantly, the Radicals wanted political change to occur in a gradual, controlled manner; not a sudden, violent way. Hence, it must be emphasized, that they were not revolutionaries. If anything, their political restraint harmed their efforts – after all was said and done, with the exception of a very small number of females, they were considered in the sphere of manners to be at the pinnacle of society as Edwardian Gentlemen. Additionally damaging, was that an absence of a common course of action resulted from the lack of unity amongst them, as they tended to be highly individualistic people. They wanted what they considered to be the intellectual and political shackles of their day to be removed from their minds and their paths, so as to experience the righting of injustices, and what they believed to be the advancement of greater personal freedom.

These are some of the characteristics that the Radical intelligentsia possessed. Though those factors and ideas were by no means exclusive to them, the strength of their convictions was greater than others held, or cared to express.

Undoubtedly, a major reason why Radicals were such a minority voice in society, was that open admission of their feelings caused problems in their day-to-day dealings with other people. They were considered idealists, resting their points of view on grounds of high moral principles. To non-Radicals, they appeared to base their case on emotional feelings rather than pragmatic considerations. Consequently, they were thought to be unreasonably stubborn in their behaviour and writings, and often came across as prickly in their conversations. This cost them dearly, for they were disliked in employment, and normally stunted in progressing to, and in attaining, their ambitions. Theirs was the voice of protest that was usually ignored. With very few exceptions, they failed to reach the heights of their careers and to win key positions in influential society.
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## SOME SIGNIFICANT RADICALS IN THE BRITISH INTELLIGENTSIA, 1900–1914

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Notable Information</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Clifford</td>
<td>1st. Baron Allen of Hurtwood</td>
<td>1889–1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, Charles</td>
<td>Freer</td>
<td>1871–1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angell, Sir Ralph</td>
<td>Norman (Original surname: Lane)</td>
<td>1872–1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch, Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td>1826–1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, Edward</td>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>1857–1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt, Wilfrid</td>
<td>Scawen</td>
<td>1840–1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brailsford, Henry</td>
<td>Noel</td>
<td>1873–1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Edward</td>
<td>Granville</td>
<td>1862–1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterton, Gilbert</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>1874–1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney, Rt. Hon.</td>
<td>Leonard Henry (1st. Baron C. of Penwith 1906)</td>
<td>1832–1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham, Miss Mary</td>
<td>Edith</td>
<td>1863–1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensor, Sir Robert</td>
<td>Charles Kirkwood</td>
<td>1877–1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond, Lucy</td>
<td>Barbara Bradby</td>
<td>1873–1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, Frederic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1831–1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobhouse, Leonard</td>
<td>Trelawney</td>
<td>1864–1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobson, John</td>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td>1858–1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyndman, Henry</td>
<td>Mayers</td>
<td>1842–1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morel, Edmund Dene</td>
<td></td>
<td>1873–1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, George</td>
<td>Gilbert Aimé</td>
<td>1866–1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevinson, Henry</td>
<td>Woodd</td>
<td>1856–1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pease, Edward</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>1857–1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratcliffe, Samuel</td>
<td>Kerkham</td>
<td>1868–1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton-Watson, Robert</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1879–1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw-Lefevre, Rt.</td>
<td>Hon. George John (Baron Eversley 1906)</td>
<td>1831–1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanhope, Hon.</td>
<td>Philip James (Baron Weardale 1906)</td>
<td>1847–1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toynbee, Arnold</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>1889–1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevelyan, George</td>
<td>Macaulay</td>
<td>1876–1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallas, Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td>1858–1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedderburn, Sir</td>
<td>William, Bart.</td>
<td>1838–1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells, Herbert</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>1866–1947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>