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ABSTRACT

Using the lenses of collective memory and medievalism, this study examines the rise and fall of crusader medievalism in Britain over one hundred and twenty years from the publication of Sir Walter Scott’s famous novel set in the Third Crusade, *The Talisman* (1825), to the end of the Second World War. Emphasising the use of the past to a given present it asks why, how and by whom the crusades and ideas of crusading were employed in the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries.

Tyerman has traced the development of crusade historiography into the twentieth century while the foundational work of Siberry, Knobler and Phillips has established the popularity and utility of the crusades in Britain and Europe. The political developments of the nineteenth century, and the increased exposure of the British to the Holy Land, led to an explosion of interest in the crusades. With its depiction in a plethora of forms, from literature and art to plays and opera, crusader medievalism became common currency. The crusades were potent because they could encompass the prevalent cultural strands of late Victorian Britain (Romantic medievalism; imperial militarism; ‘muscular’ Christianity; and chivalry) singly or in combination. Crusader medievalism, therefore, enjoyed a symbiotic relationship with this late Victorian culture which provided it with a fertile ground to grow in; it, in turn, strengthened and propagated it.

It has been suggested that this cultural system was destroyed by exposure to the realities of modern, mechanical warfare experienced during the First World War. However, the examples of crusader medievalism considered here – from the 1914-18 conflict, the interwar years and the Second World War – illustrate both the continuing versatility of a prewar symbol, and its demise by 1945. Ultimately, crusader medievalism could not bridge the cultural shifts of 1914-45 and remain coherently resonant for the British.
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THE LASTING CRUSADE: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

For a quintessentially medieval phenomenon, crusading and the crusades have enjoyed a remarkably lengthy resonance. From White House prayer breakfasts to the propaganda of fundamentalist Islamic terrorists and from blockbuster films to penitential western Christian ‘anti-crusaders’, perceptions of the crusades shape (and are shaped by) international policies and modern media representations of billions of Christians and Muslims across the world.¹ As Adam Knobler has observed of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: ‘The trans-national ubiquity of crusading images is striking. How and why did an 850-year-old series of conflicts become such an effective language in communicating ideas between classes and societies?’² It is my intention to contribute an answer to this question as regards Britain in this period.

This thesis will explore how ‘crusader medievalism’, a term derived from concepts of medievalism articulated by the journal *Studies in Medievalism* and applied to the memory of the crusades, was employed in Britain between c.1825 and 1945. By this is understood the memory and perceptions of crusading, the crusades and the crusaders in their particular contexts. I intend to examine the memory of the crusades in the nineteenth century, how these perceptions related to the culture of imperial Britain, and how the crucible of the Great War altered, but did not end, their usage. The timescale identified ranges from the publication of Sir Walter Scott’s *The Talisman* in 1825 and the development of the popular medievalism of the 1800s down to the Second World War. Although British crusader medievalism must be situated in both European and Anglophone medievalism, the scale of that

---


task prohibits more than limited glances towards continental engagement with the crusades or the use of crusading in the English-speaking world. A focus on Britain will build on existing groundwork and suggest ways to take this emerging field forward though a detailed analysis of the distinctly British historical context. This study will produce original analytical insight into the use of crusading rhetoric and imagery; it will also draw together crusade historiography, thinking on memory and medievalism, and foundational work on how the crusades have been used.

Current work on the ‘post-history’ of the crusades falls into two camps: there is a large historiography of the crusades, which has constituted a field of study in itself. There have also been initial attempts to discern the ways in which the crusades have been depicted and remembered beyond conventional historical accounts. This study intends to build on the foundations laid in the second area, particularly Elizabeth Siberry’s book *The New Crusaders* (2000), and to extend the focus into the twentieth century. In doing so it will place examples of crusader medievalism in their contemporary context and within the wider memory of the crusades.

Drawing on ideas of collective memory and medievalism which emphasise the presentist aspects of perceptions of the past, I will examine particular constructions of crusader medievalism in order to evaluate how and why they invoked the crusades or ideas of crusading. Instead of beginning with a definition of crusading and hunting for evidence of the persistence of the crusades or a crusading mentality, this study will seek to examine perceptions of crusading and the crusades where they are mentioned explicitly. By adopting a cultural-historical approach that endeavours to discover what is meant by crusading in a particular context I will allow the research to be shaped by those who have used crusading rhetoric and imagery – rather than the inquirer. In the choice of establishing a connection with,

---


or a difference from, the crusading past and the nature of that expression, the particularities of a perception of the crusades is revealed. Because a plethora of material would qualify for inclusion, I will concentrate on ‘deep’ engagement with crusading and the crusades; namely, where there is a level of sustained reflection or focus on crusading or the crusades, and/or an adoption and internalisation of a crusading identity.

After establishing a theoretical toolkit and methodology for this study and briefly surveying the relevant historiography I will focus on integrating crusader medievalism into its Victorian and Edwardian context and considering literary case studies of how the crusades were employed to foster the dominant strands of British culture. The later chapters will analyse the use of crusader medievalism in Britain between 1914 and 1945, extending the range of existing work and demonstrating its continued utility despite the upheaval of the world wars. Later uses of crusading in English-speaking contexts have tended to be looser: during the Cold War Anglophone examples of ‘deep’ engagement were slim, at least until the crusades were employed symbolically in the ‘clash of civilisations’ narrative which has often structured international relations. These post-1945 uses of the crusades are unfortunately beyond the scope of this investigation; memories of the crusades, however, continue to be potent to the present day.

**Collective Memories**

One recent approach to the history of the crusades and the posthistory of the movement has been to engage with thinking on the subject of memory and ask ‘how have the crusades (and the idea of crusading) been remembered?’ Although employing concepts of memory to talk about the crusades may seem

---


counterintuitive – memory is commonly considered an individual function of recall regarding events experienced – there is a significant body of work which uses ideas of a societal, collective or cultural memory. This application was pioneered by French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs (1877-1945) who coined the term ‘collective memory’ to refer to events which were remembered by particular communities where none of the members had actually experienced the events themselves. Memory, he argued, was transmitted and mediated by social institutions external to the individual and thus could extend beyond the experience of individuals. Reciprocally, memory served a social function and could not exist independently of a society which narrated, structured and interpreted a collective memory of particular events; ‘Recall’ in an individualist and positivist sense, one commentator declared, ‘is a siren call.’

_Memory: Embodied, Fragmented, Received_

Halbwachs’ thinking has several key points of interest for this study. He proposed that memory must be embodied, that it could not exist separately from individual people or communities. Memory also served the needs of the present – it had to be useful to a group of people. These two principles suggested to Halbwachs that collective memory of any given event could be heterogeneous across a society as there would be the potential for as many different uses or needs as there were subgroups within that society. ‘[T]he remembered past,’ Geoffrey Cubitt concluded, ‘is in practice, always multiple and contestable, mutable and elusive.’ The above aspects of memory encourage a sensitivity to the social context of any expression of remembrance: ‘It is important’, Peter Burke has written when

---

10 Halbwachs, _On Collective Memory_, p. 188. See also Amos Funkenstein, ‘Collective Memory and Historical Consciousness’, _History and Memory_ 1 (1989), p. 9.
considering the functions of memory in society, ‘to ask the question, who wants whom to remember what, and why? Whose version of the past is recorded and preserved?’ Pertinent here is Alon Confino’s warning that recognising the diversity, and competition, of memories is essential to avoid oversimplifying and overemphasising the importance of any particular memory. This takes seriously alternative collective memories of the past and locates specific examples within their discursive contexts – otherwise, ‘The result is a cultural history in a social and political void; the construction of memory here is a story bereft of its sociology and its politics.’

The ‘multiplicity of memory’, Confino concluded, was useful because, ‘in terms of method, it enables us to write the history of memory as the commingling of reception, representation, and contestation’. Wulf Kansteiner has summarised the dynamics involved as follows:

For this purpose we should conceptualize collective memory as the result of the interaction among three types of historical factors: the intellectual and cultural traditions that frame all our representations of the past, the memory makers who selectively adopt and manipulate these traditions, and the memory consumers who use, ignore, or transform such artifacts according to their own interests.

Collective memory, then, must be contextualised in the groups for whom the memory is resonant, whilst recognising that the ‘multiplicity of memory’ prevents too-quick assertions of the importance of particular memories. This study will be grounded in the context of nineteenth- and twentieth-century historiography in order to avoid the dangers of fixation on one collective memory, and to not assume

15 Ibid., p. 1399. For the importance of the reception of the past see below.
a homogeneity of interpretation of memories of the crusades but rather recognise diversity.\textsuperscript{17}

\textit{Formative Social Remembering}

Building on his insight about the embodied nature of collective memory, Halbwachs saw collective memory as influencing social frameworks. In Halbwachs’ thinking, collective memory had the potential both to preserve perceptions of the past and to shape the present; collective memories were a site of dialogue between ‘tradition’ and contemporary needs.\textsuperscript{18} Lewis Coser, Halbwachs’ translator and editor, wrote:

\begin{quote}
\textit{collective historical memory has both cumulative and presentist aspects. It shows at least partial continuity as well as new readings of the past in terms of the present. A society’s current perceived needs may impel it to refashion the past, but successive epochs are being kept alive through a common code and a common symbolic canon even amidst contemporary revisions.}\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}

Halbwachs thought that collective memories were hard to change because of the utility they had in the present; they formed part of society’s traditions and had significant inertia as they were continually produced and reinforced.\textsuperscript{20}

Jan Assmann observed that, ‘The binding character of the knowledge preserved in cultural memory has two aspects: the \textit{formative} one in its educative, civilizing, and humanizing functions and the \textit{normative} one in its function of providing rules of conduct’, while recent commentators have added that, ‘Identities, individual and collective, are formed and re-formed through narrative, in history, and through

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{17}] See also Aleida Assmann’s \textit{mnemohistory}, in ‘Transformations Between History and Memory’, \textit{Social Research} 75 (2008), p. 62.
\item[\textsuperscript{18}] Halbwachs, \textit{On Collective Memory}, p. 188.
\end{itemize}
adversity. [...] Memory is active, forging its pasts to serve present interests.’

Its transmission was an educative process which conveyed by definition something useful to members of a given community. The interpretative aspect of remembering can also be seen as a historical one: ‘Because memory imparts narrative coherence to events in the past, it is also an historical act.’ And, as Paul Connerton has asserted, a political act; ‘our images of the past commonly serve to legitimate a present social order.’ In this view, the collective memories of the past useful to a society also shape it; whether through its role in educating members of a community, defining norms, offering interpretative lenses for events or reinforcing the present social order. Collective memory, then, is particularly eloquent in the realm of socio-cultural identity-formation.

In this vein Confino has proposed that memory is in fact fundamentally a discourse of identity: ‘collective memory is an exploration of a shared identity that unites a social group’. Social frameworks of memory actively constitute society around them. Cubitt has elaborated:

*the past is always the past of something – a group, a community, a state, a nation, a race, a society, a civilization. It is in relation to such an entity that the significance of events is determined, that narrative coherence is established, that the possible lessons of legacies of the past are perceived. For there to be a past worth worrying about, there must always be the imaginative supposition of a continuity in social existence, and such a continuity is generally envisaged from the standpoint of identification: the past in question is our past, the past that gives meaning and value to our continuing existence as a collectivity, the past that belongs to us as a constitutive element in our common identity.*

---


22 Cassidy-Welch and Lester, ‘Memory and Interpretation’, p. 231.


24 Confino, ‘Collective Memory and Cultural History’, p. 1390.
Representations of the collective past hinge, in other words, on backward projections of current perceptions of identity.\textsuperscript{25}

This identity-forming function of collective memory suggests that some of the most productive areas in which to investigate perceptions of the crusades are amongst people for whom the crusades, or perceptions thereof, have most clearly shaped their identity.

\textit{Memory and Crusading}

Considerations of memory have already had some traction in crusade scholarship, not least as Halbwachs’ attention was drawn to the way in which Jerusalem has been a palimpsest for historical narratives, including those of the crusaders’ kingdom.\textsuperscript{26} A recent volume of the \textit{Journal of Medieval History} has sought to use the idea of memory to bring new perspectives to examining the crusades and their medieval reception and remembrance.\textsuperscript{27} This approach foregrounds the social processes of ‘refining and narrating’, of forming and transmitting memory and of subsequent remembrance and commemoration, recognising both the material processes and the presentist value of collective memory.\textsuperscript{28} Perceptions of the crusades function as collective memory: they contain previous perceptions in continuity and present differences by reason of their context. They are both a product of the present and shape it because of their embodied nature.

Indeed, the functioning of the collective memory of the crusades can be seen to have been operating in the ways described above from the earliest historiography of the crusades. Ernest Blake has summarised the importance of the experience of the first expedition in response to Pope Urban II’s call in forming a crusading movement:

\begin{quote}
the expedition of 1095-99, anarchic and formless in the act, but impressing on some of its participants a group experience which was
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{25} Cubitt, \textit{History and Memory}, pp. 199–200.
\textsuperscript{27} Cassidy-Welch and Lester, ‘Memory and Interpretation’.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., p. 234.
filtered back to their homelands by reports and histories and which received further shape and gloss in terms of Christian tradition at the hands of commentators. This growing view of a distinctive religious exercise was taken up in the planning of a repeat performance, deliberately based on precedent, thus sharpening the outline of the model into what was from then the First Crusade.29

Subsequent expeditions were always in the shadow of the remembered miraculous success of the First Crusade and the presumption of divine favour invoked in its interpretation, almost exclusively by its clerical chroniclers.30 Part of the function of these works was as an act of comprehension; ‘the crusade had to be integrated into a coherent vision of the past provided by salvation history.’31 The memory of the first expedition proved formative, shaping an 1101 expedition and the Second Crusade (1145–49) called in response to the Fall of Edessa in 1144. This venture was announced by Pope Eugenius III’s bull, *Quantum Praedecessores*, which deliberately emphasised the continuity of the new venture with First Crusade, tapping into the perception of its divine triumph and sanctity.32 Recruitment for the crusades followed patterns of memory-transmission – for example, through kinship groups, across districts, and following preaching tours.33


30 For the ‘theological refinement’ of the crusade at the hands of Robert of Rheims, Baldric of Bourgueil and Guibert of Nogent especially, see Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and Idea of Crusading*, pp. 135-52.


33 For example, Jonathan Riley-Smith has observed that, ‘it is clear that by the 1140s the crusading experiences of previous generations, and pride in them, had been locked deeply into the collective memory of some cousinhoods.’ Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusaders, 1095-1131* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 102; for ‘burned-over’ recruiting districts, see Gary Dickson, *The Children’s Crusade: Medieval History, Modern Mythistory* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 42.
Furthermore, Nicholas Paul and Suzanne Yeager have acknowledged how the memory of the crusades ‘became a central element in the discourses of identity for individuals, institutions, and communities’:

“If one considers memory as the medium of identity formation, then scholarly explorations of crusade as ‘identity machine’ become productive for many reasons. With their potent admixture of violence, suffering, distance, sacred ritual, and cross-cultural encounters, the crusades created a dynamic framework for the development and performance of medieval identity, emphasizing its constructed nature and its close relationship with culturally specific, collective, medieval recollections of the past.”

The memory of the crusades, though constantly in flux as its history was being written and rewritten, was useful to generations of western European Christians from 1095 onwards. Memory studies, then, has much to contribute to both understandings of the medieval crusading movement and modern perceptions of crusading.

While tools of both historical and historiographical analysis have been expertly applied to the crusades, crusaders and crusading, there is a distinct lack of theoretical engagement with the presentist aspects of crusade memory in recent centuries. In the sections below, I will examine the architecture of medievalism studies, which have drawn on some of the insights of scholars of memory, before applying its precepts to the memory of the crusades. This will necessitate an overview and engagement with both academic crusade historiography and existing examinations of wider perceptions of crusading. In so doing I will develop a methodology for this study for ‘crusader medievalism’.

---

Medievalism: The Presence of the Middle Ages

This discussion of memory has suggested that it is a productive concept for examining the use of the past in a modern context because of the embodied nature of collective memory. Recent work on medievalism, both conceptual and practical, has illuminated how those studies could proceed. As medievalism takes for its focus the use of the Middle Ages rather than any aspect of the past, it is freer to concentrate on how that past is used. Indeed, due to difficulties in defining the medieval period medievalism studies have majored on the question of how and why particular aspects of the past have been received as being medieval and what purpose they serve in the context studied.

The use of recognisably medieval tropes has long been rife in Western culture and is broader than the Romantic or Gothic movements of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Umberto Eco memorably characterised Western preoccupation with the medieval period as a collective ‘dreaming of the Middle Ages’, highlighting a continuing imaginative investment in the idea of a distinctive and premodern medieval society. The discussions around how to understand and use ‘medievalism’ have raised important definitional questions and provide an analytical toolkit for my work, as I will elucidate in the following section. This will then be applied to the crusades to create a specifically crusader medievalism – medievalism which concentrates on the use of the crusades and ideas of crusading – to give a methodological framework for this study.

Defining Medievalism

Attempts to articulate the nature of medievalism can be found in articles in volumes of the journal Studies in Medievalism (SiM). These centre around a definition proposed by Leslie Workman, heralded as the ‘father and founder’ of studies in medievalism, which has served as the mission statement of the journal: medievalism is, ‘the post-medieval idea and study of the Middle Ages and the

---

influence, both scholarly and popular, of this study on Western society after 1500.” This can be expanded to include: ‘Any post-medieval attempt to re-imagine the Middle Ages, or some aspect of the Middle Ages, for the modern world, in any of many different media; especially in academic usage, the study of the development and significance of such attempts.’ Analyses of examples of medievalism, then, cover a broad variety of sources and settings.

There are two potential weaknesses with the definition of medievalism above: firstly, ‘the problem in defining medievalism lies with how we define “medieval”, an artificial and contested term; secondly, and consequently, there is little consensus as to when the “Middle Ages” ended, rendering problematic a study of retrospectives to the medieval era from an ill-defined and undelineated post-medieval period. These weaknesses stem from epistemic arguments about the possibility of coherently defining such an unwieldy and diverse period of time and of the artificiality inherent in attempts at periodization. They do not, however, necessarily stifle its utility.

The Artificial Middle Ages

As traditionally conceived the period covers a millennium of history between 500 AD and 1500 AD. Marcus Bull, in his introduction to the study of the medieval past, Thinking Medieval, has argued that the Middle Ages, and therefore the adjective

39 Elizabeth Emery, ‘Medievalism and the Middle Ages’, SiM XVII, Defining Medievalism(s) I (2009), p. 79.
medieval, are ‘entirely artificial’.\(^{41}\) The choice of dates to begin and end the period are symbolic, revealing the historian’s perception of what the important features of the Middle Ages were and what made it coherent – a point also made by John Arnold: ‘We could attempt to periodize differently – or not at all. The notional boundaries between “late antiquity”, “medieval”, and “early modern” (or indeed “Renaissance”) are all deeply problematic, and can obscure as much as they reveal.’\(^{42}\) Imposing a unity on the Middle Ages by insisting on a uniform character or characteristic feature privileges that feature as the defining aspect, which thus determines the ‘beginning’ and ‘end’ of the period. Moreover, conceptions of medieval and the Middle Ages are likely to be Western Eurocentric. Bull concluded: ‘the value of the word “medieval” can only stand or fall on the basis of its applicability to a certain expanse of time in western European history: the time and place, that is to say, for which it was invented in the first place.’\(^{43}\)

But to acknowledge a term’s artificiality is not to discount its utility. Creating a ‘Middle Ages’, a medium aevum, served to emphasise for those who used it that a medieval past separated the present from classical antiquity. David Matthews has traced the origins of concepts associated with a ‘Middle Ages’ and ‘medieval’ to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries before the first English usage of medieval in 1817, and medievalism in the 1840s.\(^{44}\) A middle, or more primitive, period served as an ‘other’ against which modernity could be contrasted, and thus created:

As constructed by Renaissance humanists, the Middle Ages comprised the West’s shadowy ‘other,’ against which the Renaissance and modernity itself were defined, a modernity delineated above all by its difference from the premodern Middle Ages.\(^{45}\)

---

\(^{41}\) Bull, Thinking Medieval, p. 51.


\(^{43}\) Bull, Thinking Medieval, p. 53.

\(^{44}\) David Matthews, ‘Middle’, in Medievalism, eds. Emery and Utz, pp. 141–48; Matthews, Medievalism, p. x.

If medievalism depends on the Middle Ages both for content and for when it begins then the above instability is problematic, suggesting that consequently medievalism has no objectively defined focus, or necessary beginning (when is ‘post-medieval’?). Both of these aspects have been addressed by theorists who consider the relativity of the definition to be a strength. Nils Petersen has contended that medievalism should focus on elements of the past and cultural artefacts received as being medieval – regardless of their links to a particular medieval past. Elsewhere he argued that, ‘in Workman’s interpretation, the Middle Ages as a notion is fundamentally a reception historical phenomenon’. Scholars of medievalism have thus recognised and accepted this artificiality as a matter of interest rather than an obstacle. Medievalism studies thus begins whenever the Middle Ages are perceived to have ended.

Instead of having to locate an end to the medieval past, allowing there to be ambiguity and investigating how beginnings and endings are perceived facilitates further investigation. Renée Trilling has suggested that, the ‘refusal to decide once and for all the question of whether the medieval is truly past or always present – creates space for considerable creativity, originality and energy in scholarship’: ‘Ultimately, then, medievalism is a constantly evolving and self-referential process of defining an always [‘fictionalized’] Middle Ages.’

_A Very Present Middle Ages_

Medievalism refers to attempts to use the past for particular purposes in the present: any study of medievalism seeks to understand why and how depictions of the past are constructed and employed, to ‘draw out the rationale’ behind or in

---


48 ‘The inauthenticity of medievalism begins, then, at whatever point the Middle Ages is said to have ended.’ Pam Clements, ‘Authenticity’, in _Medievalism_, eds. Emery and Utz, p. 20.

front of such attempts. Furthermore, it is a ‘Janus-faced’ discipline which keeps one eye on the perception of the past being employed and the other on the contemporary context in order to remain sensitive to the relationship between the two – it has a ‘twofold temporal mobility’. Commentators such as Elizabeth Emery have identified that understanding medievalism in this way brings to the fore the method of engagement with the past that sees medievalism as discursive. Medievalism takes for its focus the ‘continuing process of creating the Middle Ages’, highlighting the dynamics of the use and reuse of the past in dialogue with the present. Tison Pugh and Angela Weisl have commented that, ‘Understanding medievalisms, thus, becomes a methodology for understanding the production of cultural and historical fantasies out of the fragments of real material.

This recognises that our access to the past is mediated, and takes those mediations seriously. The lenses through which the past is seen are considered objects of study themselves – the ‘double or triple lens of the study of medievalism’ involves recognising and engaging with the complex ways in which the past is studied and presented. So:

*a medievalist trope is perceived first through the sceptical modern eye of the twenty-first century scholar, second (through not invariably) through the romanticizing eye of nineteenth-century medievalist scholarship and study that is the foundation of the medievalizing*

---

50 Emery, ‘Medievalism and the Middle Ages’, p. 81.
impulse in the contemporary world; and third through the variable (reaching toward ‘authentic’) eye of the creator(s) of the text.\textsuperscript{55}

In addition to this multi-layered approach is a further recognition that ‘medievalism is itself a plural concept’.\textsuperscript{56} This, Pugh and Weisl added, ‘stresses the necessity of looking at the various intersections of medievalisms uniting in a given work.’\textsuperscript{57} Different perceptions of the past interact, competing or coexisting according to the purposes they serve with varying degrees of coherence. They often take the form of appeals for authority grounded in the past, whether for change or to maintain the status quo, or are nostalgic – expressing discontent with the present and critique by comparison with the past.\textsuperscript{58} Together, the plurality of aspects of any given uses of the medieval past ‘contributes another layer to the palimpsest we now call the Middle Ages.’\textsuperscript{59} These observations, and the sensitivity to fragmented and layered perceptions of the past, echo Kansteiner’s comments on collective memory above.

This approach illuminates the artificial elements of the past under consideration and allows the foregrounding of the purposes of the present – recognising that:

\begin{quote}
As many studies of history and historiography proclaim, the past is the present, for the past never dies but is continually reborn in the present moment of consideration and consumption. [...] In making the past, we make the present, and thus remake the meanings of both.\textsuperscript{60}
\end{quote}

Rather than being tautological, this presentist sensitivity allows the voices of those employing supposedly medieval artefacts and ideas to be heard and contextualised as they construct perceptions of the past for their own ends. Furthermore, the presentist nature of medievalism resists a linear progressivist approach to

\textsuperscript{56} Emery, ‘Medievalism and the Middle Ages’, p. 81; Shippey, ‘Medievalisms’, p. 48.
\textsuperscript{57} Pugh and Weisl, Medievalisms, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{59} Emery, ‘Medievalism and the Middle Ages’, p. 81.
\textsuperscript{60} Pugh and Weisl, Medievalisms, p. 10.
temporality by emphasising the ways in which societies employ perceptions of the past in the present; these ‘enfolded temporalities’ form the content of medievalism studies.  

*Medievalism in Action*

Medievalism, as a mode of analysis, seeks to understand perceptions of the past in their socio-cultural setting, asking ‘how and why various individuals and institutions have chosen to engage with the Middle Ages.’ In this sense it takes a cultural-historical approach, as outlined by Miri Rubin:

> for what it highlights and treats as fundamental to human interaction are the conditions of communication, the terms of representation, the interaction between structures of meaning – narratives, discourses – and the ways in which individuals and groups use them and thus express themselves. Like all good ideas the basic point is simple. The cultural turn asks not only ‘How it really was’ but rather ‘How was it for him, or her, or them?’

This focus on the reception of the past also emphasises that medievalism must be grounded in ‘communities of understanding’, groups for whom the past has meaning. Here is a similar charge to that of Halbwachs, namely that ‘collective memory’ must be embodied in particular individuals or communities; it also chimes with Confino’s warnings about neglecting study of the reception of collective memory above. In consequence, it is the definition of ‘medieval’ of the community within which something is received as being medieval which enables and defines the contours of the study of medievalism.

In interrogating the relationship between past and present as situated in particular contexts and communities, Nickolas Haydock has highlighted that the perceptions

---

61 The term is from Heng, ‘Holy War Redux’, p. 423.
62 Emery, ‘Medievalism and the Middle Ages’, p. 78.
64 Petersen, ‘Medievalism and Medieval Reception’, p. 37.
65 Confino, ‘Collective Memory’, p. 1399.
of *continuity* and *alterity* (or ‘otherness’) reveal these dynamics and the nature of the historical distance created.66 The assertion of continuity with the past (or pasts) can illuminate what is perceived to be being preserved, or recovered. Alterity represents the difference, or ‘other’-ness of the past; even its unknowable aspects.67 Both may be figured explicitly or through silence and omission – the continuity or difference may stand centrally or peripherally to any particular example of medievalism but their arrangement structures the perception of the past created. Haydock asserted that, ‘Continuity can never pin down the protean otherness of the Middle Ages; alterity can never stifle the desire for connection.’68 Within any medievalism, an evaluation of these opposing forces, of continuity and alterity, will expose something of the nature of the medievalism itself and its function in its context. This is especially so where medievalism is employed by comparison with the present for conservative or progressive purposes.

David Marshall has concluded that any investigation of medievalism needs to articulate:

> on what does the type tend to be contingent and how does its use of the Middle Ages tend to define the alterities and continuities imagined between the medieval and the modern? We might add to that guide another potential component: the sort of identification with the medieval past to which the type tends.69

To elaborate Marshall’s last comment, the mode of engagement needs to be considered in evaluating a particular medieval reference – does it consider the medieval a teaching exemplar (either positively or negatively), something to be recreated, something to be experienced or merely background colour? Matthews’ discussion of dual aspects of medievalism as Romantic-attractive and Gothic-repulsive Middle Ages missed that this is a two-step question: what is the nature of

the medievalism (Romantic/Gothic), and how is it being used (attractive/repulsive).70

To this we can add the criteria of depth of engagement with the past. Pugh and Weisl wrote, ‘Blended with other more contemporary fictions, medieval language and metaphor often function both as surface dressing and as more penetrating modes of construction.’71 Depth of engagement can be considered in terms of how sustained or developed the engagement with the past is: passing or shallow engagement would reference the medieval past without developing or sustaining that interaction where deeper engagement shapes identities. Echoing earlier observations about collective memory’s role in identity-formation, Gwendolyn Morgan has argued that, ‘medievalism has played a predominant role in learned attempts to define social practices and national identities.’72 She preceded this quote with ‘Since the early twentieth century...’ but the link between medievalism and identity-formation is a more consistent feature of the use of medievalism. Indeed, it goes beyond national identity too, though this is a well-studied connection.73

In summary, the above discussion of memory and medievalism provides an analytical language with which to examine perceptions of the past as they are embedded into their particular contexts. It overemphasises their presentist aspects and is less concerned, therefore, with how they preserve or transmit collective memories than with the communities and contexts within which they are articulated. Methodologically medievalism presents several helpful tools as it seeks to understand the nature of the relationship between past and present. Most relevantly, these include asking how continuity and alterity are constructed; the type and depth of engagement and identification with the past; and, drawing from the insights of memory and cultural history articulated above, how is the perception

70 Matthews, Medievalism, pp. 15-41.
71 Pugh and Weisl, Medievalisms, p. 141.
72 Gwendolyn A. Morgan, ‘Authority’, in Medievalism, eds. Emery and Utz, p. 28.
embodied and received? These concepts now require integration with crusade scholarship in order to facilitate a study of crusader medievalism.

**Crusader Medievalism**

The crusades can and have been deployed as ‘semiotic shorthand’ – ‘icons’ of significance. The focus of this project is to examine the use of the crusades and crusading in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries within the analytical framework outlined above and unpack their semiotic meaning and contextual importance. Helpfully, the discussion about the nature of medievalism can be directly mapped onto a study of perceptions of the crusades, both because the crusades were ‘medieval’ events and because crusading has shared many of the same theoretical structures and definitional troubles as the idea of the ‘Middle Ages’. Indeed, a recent trend in medieval scholarship has been to recognise the crusades as being intrinsically bound up with medieval European society rather than a peripheral sideshow. And conversely, the crusades are often a marker of what popularly defines ‘medieval’, existing prominently in what one commentator has labelled the ‘permanent anachronistic stew’ of the ‘medieval imaginary’. To apply Shippey’s definition of medievalism from above to the crusades produces a description of crusader medievalism as ‘any post-crusade attempt to re-imagine the crusades for the modern world’. The two definitional questions from the discussion of medievalism must therefore be addressed as applied to the crusades – ‘what were the crusades?’ and, in order that a Workmanian medievalism might begin, ‘when did they end?’

The second question – alternatively phrased as ‘when was the last crusade?’ – can be shown to be a byproduct of the first. How the crusades and crusading are defined determines when, and whether, they ended: ‘In determining when crusading

---

76 Shippey, ‘Modernity’, p. 149.
77 ‘Any post-medieval attempt to re-imagine the Middle Ages, or some aspect of the Middle Ages, for the modern world, in any of many different media; especially in academic usage, the study of the development and significance of such attempts.’ Shippey, ‘Medievalisms’, p. 45.
ended, one defines what a crusade was, and what must remain outside that
definition.78 A quick survey of recent historical titles referencing the ‘Last Crusade’
provides wildly different suggestions which illustrate the problem: the last crusade
is proposed as the fifteenth-century campaigns of Castile against Spain; the voyages
of Columbus or Vasco da Gama; the clash between the ‘East and West’ at the battle
of Lepanto in 1571; the Crimean War in the 1850s; and the British capture of
Jerusalem in 1917.79 As with the ‘Middle Ages’, the dates chosen by historians
reveal what they understood the crusades to have been – though often the use of
the idea of ‘crusading’ is loosely applied.

Crusader studies are largely built around the idea that Urban’s speech at Clermont
in 1095 brought something new to his hearers which, even if it was composed of
many familiar elements, inaugurated both the First Crusade and what became
known as the crusading movement.80 Two categories of understanding the crusades
are important for this study – the traditional and the theoretical. The former is a
nebulous sense of what the crusades were which has been handed down in the
form of general impressions and sedimented labels of numbered expeditions, while
the latter consists of the work of recent historians who have attempted to define
the crusades with more rigour and consistency. The weaknesses of both will suggest
that neither can be adopted entirely, and that the reception-historical approach of
medievalism is more appropriate for consideration of modern material.

79 W.B. Bartlett, The Last Crusade: The Seventh Crusade and the Final Battle for the Holy Land
(Sroud: Tempus, 2007); Joseph F. O’Callaghan, The Last Crusade in the West: Castle and the
Conquest of Granada (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Press, 2014); Delano C. West, ‘Christopher
519–41; Nigel Cliff, The Last Crusade: The Epic Voyages of Vasco Da Gama (London: Atlantic
Books, 2012); Barnaby Rogerson, The Last Crusaders: East, West and the Battle for the Centre of
the World (Abacus, 2010); Orlando Figes, Crimea: The Last Crusade (London: Penguin, 2011);
Anthony Bruce, The Last Crusade: The Palestine Campaign in the First World War (London: John
Murray, 2002). For the perspective of a medieval crusade historian, see Norman Housley, The
80 For the exception to this view, see Paul E. Chevedden, ‘The Islamic View and the Christian View
Traditionally, crusading has been understood to be the numbered expeditions to the Holy Land between 1095 (the initiation of the First Crusade) and 1291 (the loss of Acre to Muslim forces, the last outpost out the Latin Crusader Kingdoms); the crusaders were supposed to have fought for the recovery of the Holy Land, and specifically Jerusalem, against Muslim enemies. This understanding of what the crusades were can be seen in a cadre of influential writers on the crusades before the nineteenth century: Jonathan Riley-Smith has identified this view in the writings of Thomas Fuller (1639), Denis Diderot (1751-52), François de Voltaire (1756), David Hume (1762), William Robertson (1769), and Edward Gibbon (1776). That is not to imply a homogeneity of interpretation among these authors, rather that they shared a basic perception of what the crusades were. The first edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in 1771 defined the crusades as ‘the expeditions of the Christians against the infidels, for the conquest of Palestine;’ this formulation was repeated at the head of each article until at least the eleventh edition in 1910. The numbering of the crusades after the Fourth Crusade could vary significantly, though there was little controversy about which were the first four. This ‘traditional’ understanding formed the background for subsequent academic debates and for popular perceptions of what the crusades consisted of through to the present day.

In light of more recent scholarly attention the traditional perception of crusading and canon of numbered expeditions has come to appear inconsistent and artificial. The Fourth Crusade (1202-4) was largely invested in fighting (Orthodox) Christians and most crusaders did not travel to the Holy Land. The Latin crusaders sacked

---

83 ‘Croisade, Crusade, or Cruzado’, *Encyclopaedia Britannica; Or, A Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, Compiled upon a New Plan* (Edinburgh: A. Bell and C. Macfarquhar, 1771), p. 293. ‘Infidels’ became variously ‘Saracens and Turks’ or ‘Mahommedans’ and Palestine the ‘Holy Land’.
Constantinople, the seat of Eastern Christianity, overthrew the Byzantine Emperor and were at one point excommunicated by the Pope – violating almost all supposed criteria of crusading over its duration. Yet the Fourth Crusade has widely continued to be received as a numbered expedition. There were numbered expeditions which never arrived in the Holy Land while, conversely, newer histories have designated unnumbered expeditions as crusades, recognising the artificiality of the numbering.\footnote{For example, Riley-Smith’s most recent edition of The Crusades: A History contains a chronology which includes the crusade of Bohemond of Antioch-Taranto (1107-8), the German crusade to the East of 1197-98, the Barons’ crusade of 1239-40, and Lord Edward’s English crusade (1271-72); Riley-Smith, The Crusades, pp. 369–76. On numbering, see Murray, ‘Names and Numbers’.} The ‘Children’s Crusade’ of 1212, lacked any official ecclesiastical sanction or origination and also failed to reach the Holy Land. Over the subsequent centuries it has acquired so many mythical accretions and distortions that its most recent historian has called it ‘mythhistorical’ – it too is rarely omitted from histories of the crusades.\footnote{Dickson, Children’s Crusade, p. xiii.}

Unlike the medieval period the crusades were conceptualised as discrete entities. In this view they could be considered to be semiotically different to the ‘Middle Ages’, and purport to be neater to date and define. However, this perspective has also facilitated their continuation: rather than having a lifecycle of ‘early’, ‘high’ and ‘late’ medieval, the crusades can theoretically continue to be numbered indefinitely and new crusades can be ‘proclaimed’. It is comparatively easy, therefore, to declare another crusade and label it with a sufficiently high number to indicate continuity and progression, or to claim that the crusades have never ended.\footnote{For a modern example of continued numbering, see Alexander Cockburn, ‘The Tenth Crusade’, CounterPunch, 7 September 2002, <http://www.counterpunch.org/2002/09/07/the-tenth-crusade/> [accessed 13 March 2015].} The idea that the crusades persist continuously into the present is a central tenet of the ‘clash of civilisations’ theory of international relations wherein Judeo-Christian and Islamic cultural-civilisations are inherently incompatible and inevitably, eternally and violently opposed.\footnote{Articulated by both American policy advisers such as Bernard Lewis and Islamic terrorists such as Osama bin Laden; Heng, ‘Holy War Redux’, pp. 422–31; Buttigieg, ‘Clash of Civilizations’, pp. 203–19; Osama bin Laden, Messages to the World: The Statements of Osama Bin Laden, ed. Bruce Lawrence, trans. James Howarth (London: Verso, 2005), p. 124. See also, Emran Qureshi and}
expeditions which were centred on the Holy Land and a binary conflict between Christians and Muslims have strongly, but diffusely, influenced how the crusades have been perceived in the last two and a half centuries.

**Definitional Difficulties**

Recent scholarship, particularly that of the later twentieth and early twenty-first century, has attempted to build a robust definition of the crusades which would clearly delineate the subject and its material. The drive to define the crusades and sharpen the focus of crusade historians was prompted in part by a recognition of the theoretical inadequacies of the received corpus of events traditionally included as crusades – demonstrated by the inconsistencies detailed above.\(^89\)

Much has been written about the historiography of the crusades and especially the definitional debate.\(^90\) Four positions were articulated by Giles Constable: the *traditionalist* view, which understood the place of Jerusalem and the Holy Land to be central to any true crusade; the *pluralist* view, which focussed on the organisation and inspiration of any crusade; the *popularist* view, which considered crusading a mass, popular movement; and the *generalist* view, which emphasised the wider context of sanctified warfare and how crusading was an integrated and central feature of medieval Western Europe.\(^91\) Peter Lock has summarised, ‘The

---


\(^89\) The humanists Jean Carion and Henri Bullinger both listed 12 expeditions, counting the third crusade as three. Thomas Fuller, though he called the crusades “the Holy War” in the singular, listed in his chronological table 13 voyages (or pilgrimages, as he called them in his text) between 1095 and 1269, including in addition to the presently numbered crusades the expeditions of 1101, Henry of Saxony in 1197, the king of Hungary in 1216, Theobald of Navare in 1239, and Richard of Cornwall in 1241. Louis Maimbourg in the late seventeenth century counted seven crusades, as did Edward Gibbon in the eighteenth century. Georg Christoph Müller in his Nürnberg dissertation of 1769, however, counted only five, in 1096, 1147, 1190, 1217-29, and 1246. Friedrich Wilken in the early nineteenth century used no system of numbering.’ Constable, *Crusaders and Crusading in the Twelfth Century*, pp. 355–56.


first approach privileges place – that is, the Holy Land – as the destination that made a true crusade. The second approach emphasises the procedural and organisational nature of crusading expeditions regardless of their destination.’ Much of the debate as to what the crusades were has been firmly grounded in the historical record and sought to do justice to a complex and evolving reality whilst accommodating events traditionally understood to be connected in some way by an idea of ‘crusading’.

The involved nature of the definitional debate is in part because medieval crusading can (and could) be understood to be composite, dynamic, and to evolve with each iteration and transposition. Crusading could be considered a movement, part of, and inseparable from, life in medieval Europe and the Middle East: ‘each definition’, wrote Ernst-Dieter Hehl arguing against narrowing the understanding of crusading, ‘runs the risk of detaching it as a specific war of the Church from the general development of medieval society, of making it an event [which occurred] on the borders of Christendom, as opposed to locating its deep-rootedness in Christendom’s central structures.’ Kingdoms, institutions and military orders could be included in this movement as expressions of crusading and the crusades. Similarly, the definitional enterprise was forced to engage with the fact that over the centuries following Clermont, ‘Crusading evolved, and its evolution was shaped by the interaction of a myriad of forces: social and religious change, the development of military techniques and organization, advances in the economy, the growth of governmental ambitions, all these and many more exerted an impact on the crusades.’ Crusading mutated in response to the times and attempts to bring clarification and order to crusade practices:

*The notion of crusade changed during the twelfth century because of the practical and ideological experiences of crusading, which contributed to forming and developing the more institutionalised features recognisable in the writings of the theologians and canon*

---

93 Quoted in Housley, *Contesting the Crusades*, pp. 6–7.
Perceptions of what it meant to be signed with the cross and undertaking a crusade built on and elaborated some existing concepts whilst others were discarded. Expeditions, experiences, aims, ideals, visions, geography, legal and ecclesiastical frameworks all varied, even over the two centuries of Latin presence in the Levant. The late development of vernacular words for a ‘crusade’ further added to the complexity. Crusading was always a flexible concept – interwoven with medieval European society and its structures of power, faith and intellectual preoccupation – and subject to their varieties and vagaries. It was from the beginning a composite concept because at various times it involved an amalgam of ideas which could vary from preacher to hearer and from pope to king.

‘Constable’s definitions’, Christopher Tyerman observed, ‘have in fact served usefully to expose their own limitations.’ They are somewhat artificial characterisations of the approaches taken by modern historians; all views have greater nuance, depth and overlap. As Trilling noted above for medieval studies, so also for crusade scholarship: the ambiguity of definition has provided much energy for the field of crusade historiography. The attempts were important because they i) significantly extended the horizons of crusade scholarship, ii) highlighted the complex nature of medieval Europe, and iii) demonstrated the limits of the imposition of theoretical definitions. It is important to clarify that the aim of this study is neither to resolve these definitional questions nor to extend the history of the crusades by adopting as broad a definition of the crusades as possible. Rather, in highlighting that there is ambiguity and flexibility in how the crusades are understood and used in the medieval period, by both contemporaries and medieval

96 Housley, Contesting the Crusades, pp. 15–18.
97 Tyerman, Invention, p. 2; Housley, Contesting the Crusades, p. 7.
98 Tyerman, Debate, p. 233.
99 Ibid., p. 224; Riley-Smith, The Crusades, p. 10.
historians, we can appreciate that many difficulties in examining modern memories of the crusades stem from this epistemological uncertainty.

The Tyranny of the Theoretical

The final point to make in this section is that the lack of agreement about how to define crusading suggests that to provide clarity for this study either one perspective should be adopted or that a new approach is needed. In order to examine examples of the use of the crusades in recent centuries the adoption of a definition would provide clarity of focus – of what could ‘count’ as crusader medievalism to be looked for in later centuries. Riley-Smith, as an eminent crusade scholar of the last half century whose work has directly influenced the shape and scope of crusader studies, has advocated a pluralist definition of crusading based on the conjunction of pilgrimage, penance and theories of just war: ‘Crusades were penitential war-pilgrimages.’\(^{100}\) He has emphasised the centrality of the pope in this formulation as the only one who had the authority to call a crusade and to grant a crusade indulgence: ‘The crusades were papal instruments, the most spectacular expressions of the Papal Monarchy, the armies of the Christian Republic marching in response to calls from the men who on earth represented its monarch.’\(^{101}\) This could not entirely define crusading, as the response to calls for crusade were beyond papal control, but it broadened the field from merely including expeditions to Jerusalem. Riley-Smith recognised the need for flexibility: ‘The movement took a century to achieve coherence and thereafter it adapted to circumstances.’\(^{102}\) His work has pioneered new considerations and arenas of crusade scholarship and has been grounded in medieval charters, letters and chronicle accounts of the crusades over a broad period of several centuries.\(^{103}\)

However appropriate it has been for the protean entity of medieval crusading, the limitations of that methodology for this study became apparent when Riley-Smith

---

\(^{100}\) Ibid., p. 13.


\(^{102}\) Ibid., p. 2.

\(^{103}\) Tyerman, *Debate*, p. 233.
sought to identify the end point for the crusades. He proposed that the last crusaders were those who joined the French Cardinal Lavigerie’s *Institut des frères armés* in 1890-92 – an armed, Christian brotherhood based in North Africa and tasked with protecting freed slaves.\(^{104}\) Riley-Smith was able to conclude this because they were the latest example he found of a group who fulfilled his criteria for crusading:

\[
\text{there can be no doubt that he ‘[Lavigerie] had been engaged in an authentic crusade project, or rather a series of them. His frères armés, professed fighting religious wearing crosses, engaged in holy and penitential combat and subject to the papacy, conformed to the old criteria for crusading.}^{105}
\]

Later potential crusades and crusaders could be evaluated for fidelity to this framework and classified accordingly: ‘Para-crusading had within it some authentic elements, although chosen selectively and distorted. Pseudo-crusading had no correspondence to the old reality, but borrowed its rhetoric and imagery to describe ventures that had nothing at all to do with it’.\(^{106}\) Riley-Smith has called for more research to fill out the picture of the end of the crusades, ‘Until it is done, the story of the demise of an extraordinary and durable movement cannot be satisfactorily told.’\(^{107}\) The desire to find the end of the story was because, as Riley-Smith wrote, ‘[we are] approaching the nineteenth century from the direction of the Middle Ages,’ looking to ‘see crusading casting a long shadow’.\(^{108}\)

Riley-Smith’s methodology highlighted events and groups in the modern period which by his standard could be considered conceptually congruent with the medieval crusades. The difficulty with this approach is that it will not allow a more sensitive and nuanced investigation of the use of crusader medievalism on its own
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\(^{106}\) Ibid., p. 334.

\(^{107}\) Riley-Smith, *What Were the Crusades?*, p. 91.

\(^{108}\) Ibid., p. 91.
terms which foregrounds its presentist aspects – i.e. of what use the particular memory of the crusades is to a group of people in their context, or how and why they construct continuity with, and alterity from, the crusades and crusaders. Studies based on seeking later examples which meet Riley-Smith’s criteria are limited to being able to describe how much ‘a’ is like ‘b’ rather than more deeply investigating and contextualising occasions where crusader medievalism is employed.109

Both Janus Møller Jensen and Tyerman have cautioned against this possibility in the application of theoretical definitions of crusading to medieval material and their comments have relevance here. Jensen has warned of the potential for theoretical commitments to overdetermine source material with regard to medieval crusading:

To apply a modern definition of crusade based on these later texts as a stereotype for the sources of the twelfth century wanting this and that criteria to be fulfilled in order to speak of ‘crusade’ would deprive us of an understanding of the dynamics and true nature of the ideas that formed the background for what for want of a clear-cut, congruous contemporary term we call crusade.110

His observation can be inverted – to apply a definition derived from medieval crusading to modern materials means any study would miss the ‘dynamics and true nature’ of how crusading was being understood and employed in later contexts. This runs the strong risk of the theoretical framework, based on medieval crusading, overdetermining modern invocations of the crusades, and flattening difference and context. Pertinently, Tyerman has added, ‘Definition that implies exclusion may seem, a priori, a peculiar place from which to proceed.’111

109 For an example of this approach, see Barry Cooper, The Concept of Crusade in the Long Twentieth Century (CreativeSpace, 2013).
111 Tyerman, Debate, p. 227.
Receiving the Crusades

If the quest for a definition of crusading which encompasses the subject as traditionally understood (numbered expeditions, plus other ventures known as 'crusades') and remains theoretically consistent is a mirage then what constitutes the subject of crusader medievalism? The approach suggested instead is that in light of the emphasis on reception in both memory and medievalism studies the criteria of inclusion should be whether an expedition or aspect of history has been received as a crusade or related to crusading. A key aspect of identifying crusader medievalism which also protects the study from circularity – presupposing what the crusades were and finding examples of that memory – is that this can helpfully be pinned to declarations of crusading. If the focus is on explicit claims of crusading and direct engagement with the crusades, the study becomes more manageable in scope and concentrated on clearer and deeper examples of crusader medievalism.

On these grounds the memory of the Children’s Crusade, the Albigensian Crusade, the Baltic crusades, the Fourth Crusade, and other events problematic for many definitions but traditionally included, are of interest where invoked as being linked to crusading. Similarly, for modern invocations of the crusades, or use of crusader rhetoric or imagery, the key criterion for inclusion is whether they have been explicitly received as relating to the crusades. From this point, further questions as to the nature and ‘dynamics’ of the instance of crusader medievalism can be explored in their own context with a recognition of their embodied and contextualised nature which the discussion of memory suggested. The product will not be a history of the later crusades or their survival, but an investigation of the use and nature of the memory of the crusades.

This proposal, however, leaves open the question that if either the crusades didn’t end or if people have consistently thought they continued such that they considered themselves to actually be crusading, is that Workmanian medievalism or should it be included in late crusade historiography? More helpful perhaps for

---

112 See Confino and Petersen especially above.
this study would be to omit the ‘post-crusade’ clause from Shippey’s adapted definition and instead retain the (usefully ambiguous) term ‘modern’. Crusader medievalism can thus be considered: ‘any attempt to re-imagine the crusades for the modern world’, which are received as being related to crusading or invoke the crusades.

_Crusader Medievalism: A Methodology_

In light of the above discussions of memory, medievalism and the crusades, there are four key analytical questions which will shape this study:

1) **What is understood by the crusades and crusading?** In asking this question of instances which purport to relate to the crusades or crusading, opportunity will be created to understand what is meant instead of presuming and overlaying a pre-existent definition. In this way the intention is to make room to hear the definitions and understandings of those who have received or articulated something as relating to the crusades, and thereby gain insight into the nature of their perceptions.

For example, Islamic fundamentalists in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have used crusading to stand symbolically for Western aggression in the Middle East and have included within this bracket colonial ventures by Western imperial powers in the nineteenth century as well as the US-led invasions of Iraq. Understanding that crusading can here signify more than the medieval expeditions is crucial to appreciating their deployment in the modern rhetoric of Daesh/Islamic State (IS/ISIS/ISIL).

2) **To what use is crusader medievalism put?** Recognising that crusader medievalism refers to the ongoing process of constructing perceptions of the past in the present, this question will draw out the socio-culturally embedded nature of the perception of the crusades by examining the contemporary context and the repurposing of the past. What cultural work does the reference to the crusades do? What does it allow, or deny? How is a crusading identity enacted or embodied? The answers to these
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questions should permit an appreciation of the wider context and patterns of medievalism into which specific examples fit, and respond to the provocation of Halbwachs et al that collective memory serves a purpose in its context as it is always embodied in groups of people.

This can be seen in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when the ideal of the British chivalric gentlemen was promoted in part through the use of crusading rhetoric and imagery. Linked to knighthood and seen as expressions of pure Christian piety the crusaders could be heralded as exemplary models to follow: they were used as such by authors including Kenelm Digby.\footnote{Kenelm Digby, The Broad Stone of Honour, or Rules for the Gentlemen of England, 4 vols (London: F.C. & J. Rivington, 1822) quoted in Siberry, New Crusaders, pp. 32-34.}

3) \textit{What is the nature of the continuity established with the crusades, and/or the alterity used to maintain difference?} Investigating Haydock’s terms will illuminate the nature of the historical distance being established and the relationship between the past and present being constructed, which is at the heart of the perception of the crusader medievalism. Furthermore, and in conjunction with the second question, is the continuity or alterity used positively or negatively?

As will be examined in a section below, the work of Christian missionary agencies throughout the nineteenth century and in the first half of the twentieth century could be referred to as ‘a new missionary crusade’, or their agents as ‘Gospel Crusaders’.\footnote{For example, see K., ‘Art. V: Histoire Des Croisades, Par M. Michaud, de l’Académie Française, et de Celle Des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Sixième Edition, 1841’, \textit{North British Review} 1 (1844), p. 145; George E. Sargent, \textit{Sketches of the Crusades} (London: Henry James Tresidder, 1860), p. 203.} In this analogy, care was taken to be clear about how the missionaries were in continuity with the zeal of the crusaders, but rejected their violence. Alterity was established in the different methods of the new crusaders to the old, even while supposedly standing in their heritage.

4) \textit{How deep is the engagement with crusading?} Following on from the previous question, evaluating the depth of the engagement with crusading will serve to focus the investigation on examples of deeper engagement. The myriad and diffuse uses
of the word crusade, particularly in general use to signify a moral campaign, often
demonstrate little more than passing reflection on the historical use, context or
continuity of the term. These diffuse uses of crusading rhetoric can show the extent
of the penetration of crusading vocabulary, but will not sustain a greater analysis
interested in the identity-formation aspects of memory. A reception-historical
approach which accepted anything which called itself a crusade as a crusade would
be forced to accept endless accretions into the field of crusader medievalism. By
focussing on deeper engagement with crusading the scope will be limited and the
examples richer.

As discussed above, discourses of memory are a powerful tool in the formation of
identities and the memory of the crusades has often functioned in this way in the
last millennia. Deep engagement with crusader medievalism can be characterised
by an explicit drawing on aspects of crusading for self-expression or identification.
Attention will therefore be paid to deeper engagement with crusading rhetoric,
imagery and identities; instances where perceptions of crusading have driven the
identity or purpose of an organisation or cultural artefact. These will have
presented some development of a crusading theme, or imagery that demonstrates
a greater appreciation of the historical phenomenon of the crusades. Finally,
examples of deep engagement are where a developed perception of crusading has
framed the behaviour and self-understanding of a person or group, and motivated
a response.

The memoir of Josephine Butler, a campaigner for social reform and particularly the
repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts in Britain, was entitled Personal
Reminiscences of a Great Crusade. However, though the efforts for reform were
repeatedly termed a crusade, there was no further engagement with the historical
crusades or the idea of crusading as other than a campaign requiring strenuous
effort.117 By contrast, the Most Noble Order of Crusaders was a pseudo-secret

Marshall & Son, 1910). For Butler, see Judith R. Walkowitz, ‘Butler, Josephine Elizabeth (1828-
society created to deal with the social troubles of the aftermath of the First World War in Britain. They developed an identity based around a deep engagement with crusading which suffused their titles, robes, and their mission – labelled the Tenth Crusade – to re-inspire the country with chivalric values which had been lost. They called themselves crusaders and imagined that they were picking up the mantle of their chivalrous forbearers in the military orders and therefore can be seen as an example of deep engagement with the crusades and crusading and will consequently be examined in Chapter Five.

These ideas and questions, then, form the analytical framework and toolkit I will employ to investigate and evaluate crusader medievalism in Britain from c.1825-1945.

**Historiography**

As mentioned above, the medieval crusades have had, and continue to have, many historians. Their works themselves have been evaluated under the remit of the historiography of the crusades and represent a subject of historical writing in themselves.\(^{118}\) The wider, more diffuse, subject of how the crusades have been remembered remains to be written. There are pioneering works in this field however, as well as studies which contribute to the subject – many of these will be found in the footnotes of this work as it attempts to bring them together in one place for the first time.

In this way I intend to build upon the foundations that Knobler and Siberry especially have laid in discovering and presenting numerous (but not all) examples of references to the crusades in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Britain. Knobler’s important article, ‘Holy Wars, Empires, and the Portability of the Past: The Modern Uses of Medieval Crusades’ (2006), took an impressively broad view of the memory of the crusades in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries across Europe and beyond.\(^{119}\) It examined the memory of the crusades as they have been
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\(^{118}\) See Tyerman, *Debate*.

\(^{119}\) Knobler, ‘Holy Wars’.
used in three ways: their use in constructions of national identity, particularly in France, Spain, Russia and Ethiopia; their use in symbols of romanticism, namely the appropriation of crusading heroes and celebration of modern heroes in crusading terms; and their use by Islamic nationalists particularly in the Middle East. Knobler’s *tour de force* concluded that the crusades were useful because they reconciled piety and patriotism which, in Britain, were seen to be domestic and military virtues respectively.\(^{120}\) The crusades, Knobler argued, could (for some) represent fervent zeal in an unambiguous conflict: ‘The crusades have been seen as the epitome of the moral absolute: good and evil, without hint of confusion.’ They were accessible for those who sought to romanticise warfare and provided chivalric, historic, heroes, in part because they could represent ‘the ultimate victory of character over mechanization and industrial warfare.’\(^{121}\) The wide scope and range of examples Knobler deployed helpfully provides an international context for this study, demonstrating the flexibility and cultural range of the crusades beyond Britain and suggesting elements of a common European, or Christian, interest in a crusading heritage. While Britain is examined, Siberry’s work has demonstrated that there is a greater depth and wider range of material to be included which can support further investigation.

Siberry’s works in this field have included her article (1993) on the legacy of Torquato Tasso’s epic poem *Gerusalemme Liberata* which appeared in 1581 after his death and influenced subsequent portrayals of the First Crusade; a chapter on the images of the crusades in Britain in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the *Oxford Illustrated History of the Crusades* (1995); her book on the same topic, *The New Crusaders* (2000); and a further chapter examining the image of the returning crusader in the nineteenth century (2001).\(^{122}\) These works detail a

\(^{120}\) Ibid., p. 323.
\(^{121}\) Ibid., p. 324.
plethora of uses of the crusades and crusaders which had previously fallen outside
the remit of crusade historiography as they included plays, operas, musicals,
paintings, sculptures, stained glass windows, literary works, and travellers’
accounts as well as historical writings. Siberry has demonstrated that the crusades
were widely known and variously used, even though she qualified her study with
the observation that ‘the crusades and crusaders were but one of a menu of options
available to nineteenth and early twentieth century image makers.’ Siberry also
pointed out that they were not exclusively interpreted or used romantically, rather
their use was more varied. However, she did recognise the ‘pervasive influence of
Scott and Tasso.’ Her summary suggested that their use was not directly
proportional to the British presence in the Middle East.

Siberry’s work represents a significant collection of crusader medievalism which has
established that the crusades were a common reference point for people in Britain
in the period up to the end of the First World War. At this point her studies ended
as she saw this as a natural terminus – in this she followed other historians
discussed below. Consequently, this investigation will seek to determine whether
1918 was an endpoint and what happened to crusader rhetoric and imagery in the
interwar years and during the Second World War. This will necessitate discovery
and collation of examples of crusader medievalism for the later period as no
comparable work to Siberry’s exists. The second way in which I will build on the
groundwork done by Siberry is to critically integrate nineteenth- and early
twentieth-century historiography and cultural context with the picture Siberry has
painted of the use of crusader medievalism. While Siberry was sensitive to the
context of her material, her work collected examples thematically rather than
attempting to piece together a larger framework of cultural trends over this
period. The subsequent chapter will identify major cultural strands of the

123 Siberry, New Crusaders, p. xi.
124 Ibid., pp. 188–89.
nineteenth century and demonstrate how they created a context which facilitated the use and propagation of crusader medievalism – and how this was affected by the First World War and its aftermath.

Further chapters will attempt to evaluate what happened to crusading rhetoric and imagery amongst the debate about the extent to which the First World War was a cultural rupture, and whether that rupture could better be located in the interwar years or the Second World War. Michael Alexander has suggested that after 1918 writers and artists limited ‘medieval styles for medieval subjects’, and Albert Marrin saw the war as transforming the use of medievalism in the context of the Church of England.126 Others whose work contributes to this study include Siberry, Stefan Goebel, Eitan Bar-Yosef, James Kitchen and Justin Fantauzzo who have demonstrated that crusader medievalism persisted throughout the First World War; the work of Michael Snape and Edward Madigan has also brought forward uses of crusader rhetoric and imagery by the armed forces and chaplains in both wars.127

Despite these efforts, and the work on crusading historiography of Tyerman and Norman Housley, there has been little coherent investigation of crusader medievalism – neither a cataloguing of examples post-1918 nor examination of key


expressions in their contemporary context. Riley-Smith, Tyerman and Phillips have all considered aspects of this memory as part of other studies, which has limited their engagement – Phillips’ concluding chapters of Holy Warriors represent the most developed engagement with the topic. Most considerations of crusader rhetoric and imagery in the modern period are sidelong; for example, Snape’s God and the British Soldier focussed on the Christianity of soldiers and chaplains rather than their use of crusader medievalism per se. Mark Girouard’s work on the nineteenth-century revival of chivalry saw the use of the crusades as an aspect of this code. Other pieces have concentrated on one aspect of the memory of the crusades: Felix Hinz and Susan Edgington have both looked at novels which took crusading as their subject while Matthias Determann, Ines Anna Guhe and Fiona Kisby Littleton have analysed the depictions of the crusades in Arabic; French and German; and British textbooks respectively. Similarly, the crusades on film have also been considered by Haydock, John Aberth and Edward L. Risden as well as other evaluations of specific films invoking the crusades, such as Anthony Mann’s El Cid (1961), Youssef Chahine’s Al-Naser Salah Ad-Din (1963) and Ridley Scott’s The Kingdom of Heaven (2005).

Whilst extremely valuable, these works have limited their focus to a single type of subject material and have not sought to take a wider view of crusader medievalism or integrate its theoretical dimensions. This study, by contrast, will construct a picture of crusader medievalism in Britain over the nineteenth and twentieth

128 Tyerman, Invention; Housley, Contesting the Crusades.
130 Snape, God and the British Soldier.
centuries which will be grounded in the wider cultural context articulated in the following chapter. The engagement with existing studies of examples of crusader medievalism, crusade historiography, and contemporary context will build on current scholarship in all of these areas, as well as the conceptual framework laid in this section, in order to offer a broad analysis of the rise and fall of crusader medievalism in Britain between c.1825 and 1945.

The above observations suggest the following pathways for investigation. The first chapter will consider the foundations of British crusader medievalism in the Victorian and Edwardian eras in order to contextualise its use. Significant cultural strands identified by historians of the period included a Romantic revival of interest in the medieval past; an increasingly imperial militarism; and a ‘muscular’ Christianity – which together promoted the cult of chivalry. These strands came together and coherently provided a rich environment for crusader medievalism to thrive in as the crusades could embody to the British all of these strands and reinforce them in turn.

If the crusades were fostered by the chivalric cultural amalgam described in Chapter One, an examination of crusader medievalism in the places and systems of enculturation would reveal if, and how, the crusades were being used at the centre of this society. To this end, Chapter Two will consider juvenile literature as a site of memory and education of British youth. Novels, aimed at the young, sought to educate and inspire as well as entertain and popular authors such as Charlotte M. Yonge, George A. Henty and Sir Henry Newbolt all included crusading works for youth in their catalogue. These specific examples of crusader medievalism present an opportunity, therefore, to see the inculcation of chivalric or other values at work through particular depictions of the crusades and crusaders.

The opposite approach will be taken with Chapter Three, in which the focus of study will be Christian mission agencies and missionaries. Historians have shifted from seeing missionaries as simply unofficial agents of British imperialism to recognising that they had a more complex and ‘ambiguous’ relationship with the metropole. They operated both in harmony with imperial expansion – often taking ‘civilisation’ and commerce as well as their British Christianity with them around the globe – and
outside official imperial structures. Most British ethnography and anthropology came from missionaries writing back to Britain through their agencies and they were frequently in tension with colonial administrators in the further reaches of the empire and beyond its borders. To evaluate missionary use of crusading rhetoric and imagery, therefore, is to gain an understanding of the spread of particular perceptions of the crusades and to examine them at work in the context of the endeavour to expand the reach of Christianity, and the empire. This view-from-the-periphery will complement the view-from-the-centre explored in the previous chapter.

The nineteenth-century cultural synthesis was supposed to have come apart with the mechanised, total warfare of the First World War. Girouard and Siberry both ended their works with the war, seeing it as a natural terminus while some historians have suggested that the war severed the connection with the culture of the late nineteenth century which took Britain to war in 1914. As it will be argued that the popularity of crusader medievalism depended on the mutually reinforcing effect of the cultural strands outlined in the first chapter, this study will examine the use of the crusades during the Great War, the interwar years and the Second World War in Chapters Four, Five and Six respectively. This will allow a picture to emerge of whether the memory, perceptions and use of the crusades changed, and their relationship to the experiences of the First World War.

Chapter Four will bring together new and existing examples of crusader medievalism employed during the war by senior political figures and clergy as well as demonstrating the range of use of crusading rhetoric and imagery. Subsequently, Chapter Five will examine the breadth of British crusader medievalism in the interwar years and show how it could be used in traditional and new ways and be modified for the challenges of the 1920s and 1930s. Chapter Six will take a broad view of wartime crusader medievalism in 1939-45 to show that it was applied to the war by some but contested by others. It will focus on two deep engagements with crusader medievalism from 1940 – the pamphlet The Last Crusade by Cyril Alington, Dean of Durham Cathedral, and a Mass Observation (MO) report into how the public understood the term ‘crusade’ – to argue that crusading had become a
diffuse concept which could not evoke the same meaning for the British as it had done. Each of these chapters will highlight examples of crusader medievalism, particularly after 1918 as these have been less well documented or studied, and attempt to integrate them into an analytical framework for crusader medievalism from the mid-nineteenth century to 1945. It will be seen that crusader medievalism did not die out with the First World War but had lost its coherence and resonance for the British by 1945.
In his classic book on nineteenth-century chivalry, *Return to Camelot*, Girouard argued that the nineteenth century saw the creation in Britain of a cultural system of chivalry which extended across society. Girouard and others have seen this as part of a programme to create a generation of young men primed for loyal service to Britain. Whilst aimed at the upper classes, the ideals of this code permeated British society, culminating in thousands volunteering for service in the British army upon the outbreak of the First World War. This system was an amalgam of several overlapping and interlocking strands which developed in nineteenth-century Britain: Romantic medievalism; popular imperial militarism; and ‘muscular’ Christianity. Each has been studied distinctly, but together these cultural strands created the conditions in which the pseudo-medieval code of chivalry was supposedly rediscovered and repurposed for the contemporary education of Victorian men. The ideals of this system were inculcated through art, literature and public schools, producing generations of ruling elites who held a romanticised view of warfare within an imperial, Christianised worldview. John M. MacKenzie summarised, ‘The new traditions of Christian militarism, militarist athleticism in the
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public schools, and a recreated and perverted “medieval” chivalry contributed readily to the national rituals and political progresses which were part of the British imperial cult."\textsuperscript{5} This set the tone for perceptions of British identity and empire which persisted until, historians have suggested, the Great War of 1914-18.\textsuperscript{6} Together, they propelled the ideals of chivalry to prominence which, in combination with these strands, provided conditions favourable for the growth of crusading rhetoric and imagery, and the use of crusader medievalism.

This chapter will examine the major features of the historical and cultural terrain of Victorian and Edwardian Britain mentioned above with the intention of providing a basis for understanding the popularity of crusader medievalism in Britain in the nineteenth century. Starting with the broad context of the nineteenth-century European appropriation of the crusades, it will highlight four complementary cultural strands which historians have seen as prominent features of nineteenth-century British life and demonstrate how they encouraged the use of crusader medievalism and shaped its form. Finally, it will consider the suggestion that the First World War represented a cultural caesura, after which the culture of the Victorian and Edwardian eras was discarded, and outline how the study of crusader medievalism is related to the historiographical debates surrounding the memory of the war. Subsequent chapters will build on this evaluation of the nineteenth-century cultural synthesis and explore how crusading was employed in the inculcation of this system, whether it was influential at its periphery, and whether, or in what form, it survived the turmoil wrought by the First World War.

\textit{Historical Context: Britain 1815-1914}

Historians have often used 1815 and 1914 as bookends for considerations of Britain in the nineteenth century because they represented the period between two major


European wars which potentially threatened the existence of the nation. Britain began the century hardened by war at land and sea against Revolutionary and Napoleonic France, a phase which ended on the fields of Waterloo in 1815. Wellington and Blücher’s victory broke the power of Napoleon and ended the cycle of warfare driven by French imperial ambition. While some have argued that 1815 was of ‘no more than military significance’, it represented a refocusing of national priorities from the war mobilisation required for twenty years of conflict with France.

In many ways the British experienced seismic change through the nineteenth century. Technological innovation and its application irrevocably restructured British industry and saw the urbanisation of the landscape. The transformation of Britain into the world’s first global economic power came on the back of scientific innovation which introduced the mechanisation of production into industries such as textiles, agriculture and manufacturing. New railways criss-crossed the countryside while steam power revolutionised transport and Britain’s ability to project naval power across the globe. The population trebled between 1750 and 1850 before growing steadily up to 1914. Reform acts through the century substantially extended the electorate and reconfigured the networks of power in British politics; philanthropic endeavour and state legislation attempted to grapple with poverty, disease and unsafe working conditions. This reform was ‘undertaken in part by the elites to stave off revolution or more drastic reform, and in this it was successful, allowing them to survive as ruling elites in a largely intact system.’
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9 Ibid., p. 76.
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If Britain kept her distance from European affairs militarily, diplomatically her ministers had been concerned with maintaining the ‘balance of power’ on the continent between the major players, namely France, Russia, Prussia (after 1870 Germany), Austria-Hungary, the Ottoman Empire and to a lesser extent Italy, Spain and Portugal.\footnote{William D. Rubinstein, *Britain’s Century: A Political and Social History, 1815-1905* (London: Arnold, 1998), p. 335.} However, British troops did join the French in a stodgy and squalid invasion of the Crimean Peninsula (1853-56) in defence of the Ottoman Empire which ended with a peace treaty with Russia two years later. Alongside the successful unification drives of Garibaldi in Italy (1859-70) and Bismarck in Germany (1866-71), Belgium and Greece were both formed in 1830. The growth of the empire brought new markets and new commitments and imperial conflicts marked the century – wars of colonisation, expansion and repression designed to serve the interests of Britain.\footnote{Byron Farwell, *Queen Victoria’s Little Wars* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military, 2009), p. 1; ‘It was in the Victorian era that continual warfare became an accepted way of life – and in the process the size of the British Empire quadrupled.’ See also Cook, *Routledge Companion*, pp. 225–30.} Ambitious European powers drove imperial competition abroad and militarism at home, eventually contributing to the outbreak of the First World War.

**National Crusading: European Crusader Medievalism**

Europe in the nineteenth century witnessed a ‘reawakening’ of interest in the crusades, partly sparked by Napoleon Bonaparte’s Egyptian expedition of 1798 and increased exposure to the Near and Middle East:

>This interest emerged when the territories once conquered by Crusaders and their successors ‘again’ came under the rule of the expanding European powers during the modern colonization of the Mediterranean. The French conquered Malta in 1798, followed by British rule over the island after 1814. A second chapter began in 1879 with the British purchase of Cyprus and the Italian colonization of Rhodes in 1912, before the heartland of the Crusades came under European domination.
at the end of the First World War with the British Mandate in Palestine and the French Mandate in Syria and Lebanon.\textsuperscript{15}

The decline of the Ottoman Empire was the ‘Eastern Question’ which absorbed much British attention; especially since it entailed the opening up of the Near East to Westerners. Napoleon’s Egyptian adventures, and the British responses of Lord Nelson and Sir Sidney Smith, stimulated interest in the Near East and the evolution of steam ships made the region increasingly accessible for tourists, imperial officials, archaeologists and missionaries.\textsuperscript{16} The British were allowed to station a Consul with judicial power in Jerusalem from 1838 and, as other Western European nations followed suit, connections with a crusading past became a live diplomatic issue.\textsuperscript{17} Imperial competition and the interpenetration of literary and cultural works created a trans-European community of interest in, and use of, crusader medievalism. Not that attention to the crusades, or how to interpret them, had died out, as Housley and Tyerman have demonstrated.\textsuperscript{18} Rather, the nineteenth century saw a particularly rich and varied engagement with the crusades; this was a pan-European trend into which British expressions need to be placed.

From its initiation the crusading movement had the potential to serve as a ‘usable past’ for ethnic or national purposes.\textsuperscript{19} Siberry wrote that the crusades, ‘served the cause of nationalism, since most countries could find a royal or noble hero who had gone on crusade and performed great deeds.’\textsuperscript{20} While the heroes of the First


\textsuperscript{18} Housley, Later Crusades; Tyerman, Debate.


\textsuperscript{20} Siberry, New Crusaders, p. 188.
Crusade (especially Godfrey de Bouillon) were susceptible to later national appropriation, it was monarchs who went on crusade who best illustrate this phenomenon. In Britain, Richard the Lionheart was memorialised in 1860 with a statue adjacent to the House of Commons at the heart of British government in Westminster, where he ‘vividly conveys the nineteenth-century devotion to chivalry and pride in British achievements overseas’. Indeed, an 1853 letter to the editor of The Times suggested that it was only appropriate for his body to be repatriated from France. The crusades, argued Bar-Yosef, ‘with an Anglicized Richard Lionheart storming the Holy Land—were depicted as a defining episode in the forging of English nationalism.’ While the use of crusader medievalism in Britain and English-language discourses is the subject of this project, the British were not alone in their appropriation of the crusading past for national or imperial ends. Indeed, when the original version of Richard’s statue was on display at the Great Exhibition in 1851 Queen Victoria and Prince Albert took King Leopold to see it to, one historian has conjectured, compare it with the statue of Godfrey de Bouillon which he had commissioned.

It was Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt and siege of Acre which drew most comparison with French crusading past and imperial present. In his wake, both academic and popular interest in ‘the Orient’ revived. Key French figures in, and exemplars of, this nineteenth-century revival were François-René Chateaubriand (1768-1848) and Joseph-François Michaud (1767-1839) who saw the French participation in the medieval crusades as a precedent for French colonial interest in the Eastern Mediterranean. They also shared a perception of the primacy of the French in crusading: Chateaubriand commented on the French-ness of Godfrey de Bouillon

22 Viator, ‘Coeur De Lion’, The Times, 10 June 1853, p. 5.
23 Bar-Yosef, Holy Land, p. 255.
and Michaud saw France as leading by example throughout the crusades. Kim Munholland saw in Michaud’s version of history the roots of a French imperial policy founded on an understanding of crusading; the expeditions to Algeria at the time Michaud was writing his history were presented as a ‘colonial crusade’. Michaud’s long-time collaborator and travelling companion Poujoulat explicitly collapsed the distance between the medieval and modern French to draw parallels with his own day when he declared that, ‘The conquest of Algiers in 1830 and our recent campaigns in Africa are nothing other than crusades.’

Post-Revolutionary France of the nineteenth century saw a carousel of governments which each endeavoured to establish their legitimacy. One of the ways this was attempted was to create continuity with aspects of the pre-Revolutionary past which could be seen as French, rather than necessarily of the ancien regime – thus crusading was reinterpreted as a French national endeavour. The turbulence of the attempts of successive regimes (‘Empire, Bourbon Restoration, Orleanist Monarchy, Second Republic; Second Empire; Third Republic’) to unify the country were the context for Michaud’s articulation of a French nationalist, imperial identity rooted in a glorious past. Even St. Louis IX’s ‘hagiographic cult’ made a comeback in the royalist cause. Expressions of this linkage between medieval and modern crusading included the re-edition of crusade accounts in the Recueil des historiens des croisades (1844-1906) and the displays on crusader art in the Museum of French Monuments in Paris in the 1930s. Several rooms of the Palace of Versailles, the Salle des croisades, were decorated by Louis-Philippe to celebrate a French crusading past: they served to condense and

26 In Tyerman, Debate, pp. 103 and 111; Munholland, ‘Michaud’s History’, p. 150. Godfrey was also appropriated by German, as well as French, textbooks as a national hero; see Guhe, ‘Crusade Narratives’, pp. 374–75.
27 Munholland, ‘Michaud’s History’, p. 165.
28 Quoted in Munholland, ‘Michaud’s History’, p. 154.
memorialise a ‘national consciousness.’ The late nineteenth century saw this association shape French attitudes and behaviour in the Mediterranean. There were French expeditions to Algeria in the 1830s, Lebanon in the 1860s, and Tunisia in the 1880s, while in the negotiations at the end of the First World War (held at Versailles) the French cited crusading precedent to justify a Mandate territory in Syria, which they were subsequently given.\textsuperscript{34}

Where England adopted Richard I and France St. Louis, the late nineteenth century saw a newly unified Germany call on Frederick Barbarossa as ‘a strong Hegelian ruler of vision with “ideas... beyond his time”’.\textsuperscript{35} Kaiser Wilhelm II’s 1898 visit to Damascus and Jerusalem, where he rode into the city dressed in pseudo-crusading garb, deliberately invoked a crusading heritage which included Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II.\textsuperscript{36} Belgium drafted Godfrey de Bouillon as a national hero; Norway had King Sigurd the ‘Jerusalem-farer’; and Spain recreated El Cid as a Christian warrior.\textsuperscript{37} Spanish appropriation of crusading had form: while fighting against Napoleon and the French armies of occupation Spanish resistance was often phrased in terms of Holy War and echoed the \textit{Reconquista}. Succession crises later in the century also attracted evocations of crusading heritage and ancestry from the Carlist faction, and an attempted invasion of Morocco in 1859–60 was clothed in crusading language.\textsuperscript{38} Associating modern nations with medieval figures asserted some form of continuity between medieval and modern ages. Moreover, ‘The virtues these crusaders represented’, Tyerman observed, ‘were of generalised national spirit not precise political arrangements. Nonetheless, such reimagining

\textsuperscript{33} Phillips, \textit{Holy Warriors}, p. 319; see also Munholland, ‘Michaud’s History’, p. 160; Siberry, \textit{New Crusaders}, p. 51; Knobler, ‘Holy Wars’, p. 296. For French, British and Italian competition over the preservation of Mediterranean crusader heritage sites, see Swenson, ‘Crusader Heritages’.

\textsuperscript{34} Tyerman, \textit{Debate}, p. 147.


\textsuperscript{38} Knobler, ‘Holy Wars’, pp. 297–301.
securely incorporated the crusades into national histories and public consciousness.’

Crusading pasts, real or imagined, continued to occupy central places in European national self-imaginings in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Further afield, Knobler has identified the use of crusading in Russia, Bulgaria and Ethiopia through the auspices of significant individuals. Russian plans to retake Constantinople, spearheaded by Peter the Great and then Catherine the Great, were based on the idea that Moscow had inherited the imperial, Byzantine and Orthodox identity of Constantinople; they were also a useful point of commonality in negotiations with western nations. King Ferdinand I of Bulgaria (r. 1887-1918) attempted to build from nothing a crusading heritage in his country by envisioning the Byzantine Empire as Slavic instead of Greek. The utility of the crusading image in the nineteenth century was such that for the Ethiopian ruler, Tewodros II (r. 1855-68):

*the dream of Jerusalem, the claim of being a holy warrior, and the adoption of the persona of a crusader, were merely means of bolstering his claim to legitimacy at home, and gaining respectability as an equal among the ‘Christian’ nations in Europe.*

Crusading proved extremely flexible in accommodating the requirements of the nation-builders of Europe, and beyond, over the centuries; whether legitimising particular monarchs, serving as a ‘golden age’ to hark back to, or as the background and landscape for the creation of national heroes.

i) Romantic Medievalism

The nineteenth-century turn to the medieval past, or a version of that past, has been documented as a resurgence of interest – both scholarly and popular – in the
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culture and ideals of the bygone era. Described as a ‘complex and yet coherent movement’, this medieval revival was located in the wider cultural phenomenon of Romanticism, which encompassed a variety of responses to the rationality of the Enlightenment and the industrialisation of Britain between roughly 1760 and 1850.\textsuperscript{44} The ‘Industrial Revolution’ had a seismic effect on the country; while there was significant regional variation depending on the nature of local industries and the circumstances of industrialisation, Britain shifted from being predominantly rural to being ‘an overwhelmingly urban place’ as the population increased and became centred on towns and cities.\textsuperscript{45} Where the previous century had looked back to the classical Greco-Roman past, Romanticism sought alternative models which emphasised individual experience, imagination and the natural world in reaction to the mechanisation of many workplaces and expansion of industry across the countryside.\textsuperscript{46} It was to the Middle Ages that some in the nineteenth century looked, in part due to the association of Greek and Roman models of the past with the French Revolution.\textsuperscript{47} However, rather than an ‘authentic past’, this was an ‘authentic fantasy’: ‘No period’, wrote Robin Gilmour, ‘was used so promiscuously and unhistorically in the nineteenth century as the Middle Ages.’\textsuperscript{48}

Matthews has argued that the 1840s saw the cultural predominance of medievalism.\textsuperscript{49} The decade bequeathed to the Victorians a discourse of medievalesque symbols which had already been flexibly used for social critique, conservatism, entertainment and decoration. These symbols persisted, especially when translated into prose and verse, painted into medieval scenes, carved into sculpture and built into neo-Gothic architecture. Their meaning might have changed with the context but medievalism left to later Victorians an inheritance of

\textsuperscript{44} Chandler, \textit{Dream of Order}, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{45} Black and MacRaild, \textit{Nineteenth-Century Britain}, p. 76.
\textsuperscript{49} Matthews, \textit{Medievalism}, pp. x–xi.
a tangible medievalised past: 'Whatever else medievalism accomplished, it changed the face of England and, to a lesser degree, of America and the Continent, too, leaving to this day in churches and colleges, public buildings and railroad stations, a visual record of its predominance.'

The content of this medieval heritage varied. The Middle Ages were considered sufficiently amorphous to fulfil almost any demands of it. There were, however, discernible trends and preferences in the types of medievalism; legends of King Arthur and the Round Table were consistently employed, as demonstrated by the enduring popularity and diffusion of Alfred Tennyson’s *Idylls of the King* (1859-85). Robin Hood and the Outlaws, King Alfred and the Anglo-Saxons, Vikings and the Scandinavian ‘Old North’, British kings and queens, and not least King Richard I and the crusades were among the medieval themes which populated the Victorian medievalist imaginary.

Medievalism was a multi-media cultural phenomenon. It spanned literature (e.g. Scott), the arts and crafts movement (e.g. William Morris), architecture (e.g. Augustus Pugin, neo-Gothic buildings), poetry (e.g. Tennyson) and painting (e.g. the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood of John Millais, Edward Burne Jones, Holman Hunt and Dante Gabriel Rossetti). Alice Chandler has seen the influence of this medievalism as pervasive — ‘At the height of the revival scarcely an aspect of life remained untouched’, it ‘changed the face of England’. History was used in political circles as a reference point to reveal universal lessons and timeless truths, and there were

---
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identifiable exponents of this tactic. By use of contrast and comparison, the malleable medieval past could provide a commentary on the present:

*for early Victorian writers, medievalism was an answer to a series of social crises – secularism, industrialization, explosive urban growth, political reform, or the Condition-of-England question – which often intersected with personal crisis. The Middle Ages became whatever a critic perceived most lacking or imperfect in the present or most needed emphasis.*

The appeal to the medieval past for inspiration and social critique was not necessarily critical or radical – it could be thoroughly conservative too, locating tradition in a medieval English past in order to claim the authority of ancient precedent and practice to refute calls for change. ‘The past’, wrote Rosemary Fay, presented ‘a reservoir of possibilities for the future.’

Near universally cited as of foundational importance to this fascination with the medieval past were Scott and his historical novels. Often credited with the invention of the genre of the historical novel itself, Scott was widely read, imitated and re-read. As the ‘most successful writer of his day’, the phenomenally popular Scott set into motion a cultural cascade whereby his novels, characters and scenes
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were endlessly repeated for the rest of the nineteenth century in all forms of visual and written media.  

Chandler, Siberry and Girouard all dedicated entire chapters to Scott’s influence: Siberry has asserted that it is ‘difficult to underestimate the influence and popularity of Scott’s works in creating and perpetuating an image.’ Scott drew on genuine sources for his historical depictions and has been considered a distillation of contemporary work on the past: ‘Scott’s reading and experiences were almost a capsule summary of all preceding medievalism’. This did not prevent him, however, from embellishing the account or taking advantage of the gaps in the record. His genius was in creating a ‘credible’ medieval past which resonated with nineteenth-century society in Britain, Europe and North America. In part, Scott achieved this by creating characters who were recognisable to his audience and with whom they could empathise, reflecting his conviction that the human heart beat with the same passions in each age. Here, then, was one of the reasons for Scott’s success – he was in step with, and contributed to, the temper of early nineteenth-century Romantic medievalism.

‘One of the most revealing indications of Scott’s hold on people’s imaginations’, Marcus Bull observed, ‘was the Eglinton Tournament.’ Held in 1839 in the grounds of the Earl of Eglinton’s castle the mock medieval tournament was scheduled to include jousting, a mêlée and a banquet. Despite torrential rain, the event supposedly attracted a hundred thousand visitors and worldwide applications for attendance. Though reaction to the tournament was mixed – Albert D. Pionke has argued it was ‘a practical and an ideological failure’ and has highlighted how the tournament entered popular culture as a farcical joke – the Earl of Eglinton’s

---

61 Ibid., p. 121.
65 Chandler, Dream of Order, p. 51.
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medievalism clearly resonated with some.\textsuperscript{68} And Pionke too has acknowledged that the later decades of the nineteenth century remembered the tournament, wistfully reinscribing it but, importantly, not forgetting it.\textsuperscript{69} Indeed, the tournament was re-enacted a decade later at the Cremorne Gardens in Chelsea, and jousting featured in the 1912 celebration of ‘Shakespeare’s England’ at Earl’s Court.\textsuperscript{70} Organised to showcase British ‘economic, industrial, and manufacturing prowess and supremacy, to itself and to the world’, the Great Exhibition of 1851 took place in a specially constructed ‘Crystal Palace’ erected in Hyde Park. Overseen by Prince Albert, the exhibition displayed raw materials (including a 24-tonne block of coal), machinery, and the products of British industry, both those mass-produced and of artisan construction; and it was viewed by over six million people.\textsuperscript{71} Pertinently for this study, it featured a ‘Medieval Court’ composed of artisan-crafted ‘medieval’ artefacts.\textsuperscript{72} The exhibition also boasted a statue of King Richard I, known for his participation in the Third Crusade, which with royal sponsorship was later recast and located outside the Houses of Parliament.\textsuperscript{73} Bull has concluded that, ‘Scott’s celebrity, the enormous sums invested in large Gothic buildings, and the artistic influence of the Pre-Raphaelites, to cite just three indicators, are hardly the signs of a minor fad.’\textsuperscript{74}

Siberry has extensively discovered and documented images of crusaders in Britain in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, demonstrating that crusading was part of the cultural milieu and would have been familiar to significant proportions of the population.\textsuperscript{75} Her examples ranged widely: from the use of the crusades in the arts to politics and international relations; from children’s literature to

\textsuperscript{69} Pionke, ‘Ritual Failure’, pp. 37–38.
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academic crusade historiography; and from early Gothic novels at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to the First World War. The popularity and wide diffusion of Victorian Romantic medievalism, then, made Richard I, ‘the Lionheart’, a household name and propelled the crusades (as medieval expeditions) to public prominence.

**ii) Popular Militarism and Imperialism**

Lamented as the ‘re-barbarization’ of society in 1902 by philosopher Herbert Spencer (1820-1903), the Victorian period saw British culture increasingly embrace both militarism and imperialism – the contingencies, both material and ideological, of the British Empire. Olive Anderson and Anne Summers have traced the processes whereby the British Army became a national institution, military matters became public concerns, and how a huge variety of groups adopted, or were modelled on, military organisation: ‘late nineteenth-century British militarism was not only an affair of unprecedentedly adulatory attitudes towards Britain’s professional soldiers, but also of civilian imitation of military organization, discipline and paraphernalia, and the diffusion of military sentiments and rhetoric in general.’ These trends contributed to the favourable reception and repetition of crusader medievalism.

Despite the almost continuous nature of imperial warfare, conflicts were fought at arms-length across the globe and European military entanglements largely avoided. In theory, then, it might have been possible for the British public to remain ignorant of their nation’s involvement in colonial warfare, especially with a tradition of a

---


small land army not stationed on the mainland. But the public were heavily invested in two mid-century conflicts: the Crimean War and the Indian Revolt. The Crimean War (1853-56) has been called the first ‘media war’ as it featured journalists embedded with the troops, whose reports were wired back to London and included in national newspapers. The campaign, therefore, was conducted under the public gaze in a way no previous conflict had been. The military failings and death from disease of much of the expeditionary force gave the British public an insight into soldiering but also into the state of its army.

The Indian Mutiny, or Revolt, (1856-58) came hard on the heels of the Crimean War as a chastening reverse which shattered British complacency regarding the rule of the East India Company over vast swathes of the subcontinent and exposed Victorian anxieties as to the fragility of British imperial supremacy. The uprising of a people seen as inferior and the actual threat to British rule in India presented a challenge to the ideological assumptions of empire and therefore to the empire itself. Moreover, out of the rebellious provinces came rumours of atrocities committed against white women and children which outraged and scandalised the public at home. This prompted one reader of The Morning Post under the title ‘Peter the Hermit’ to propose raising up ‘a new army of crusaders’ to send to India. The exposure of the frailties of Britain’s armed forces and imperial rule led to a public re-appropriation of the military and to the establishment of direct rule over India, rather than by proxy through the East India Company. Debates about military

78 This is suggested to have been a deliberate policy by Commander-in-Chief Duke of Wellington’s reply to a note from Prince Albert in 1847 which argued that keeping the army scattered to disguise its size was important in maintaining its support; Hew Strachan, Wellington’s Legacy: The Reform of the British Army, 1830-54 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), pp. 164–65.
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reform became public concerns, although actual reforms had been underway since Wellington’s death in September 1852 had cleared a major obstacle.83

Furthermore, as the nineteenth century turned into the twentieth, the British government’s spending on the armed forces boomed. From £25 million in 1880, spending reached £70 million in 1900 and stood at £292 billion by 1921. The army and navy too reached unprecedented sizes: the army in 1880 was 131,859 strong, which had increased to 430,000 by 1900, and 733,514 by January 1914. Similarly, the increase in naval personnel went from 58,800 in 1880, to 114,880 in 1900, and to 147,667 by the beginning of 1914.84 While wartime increases were to be expected, the substantial increase in expenditure and manpower by 1900 suggest that the armed forces were high on the British agenda and a key response to imperial competition. Their increased size and cost meant a more visible presence in the eye of the British public and its collective imagination.

The authorisation of the formation of Volunteer Rifle Clubs in 1859 and the ‘invasion panic’ of that year to a certain extent democratised the initiative and access to military training and organisation. Summers has notably called this voluntary militarism of the middle of the nineteenth century a ‘mass movement representing almost every region and section of British society.’85 Antagonistic to regimental organisation and both the idea and reality of professional soldiers, Summers argued that a transformation of British attitudes had taken place by the end of the century as the army had become Christianised through the establishment of chaplaincies and missions to soldiers. Later, technological advances and a cheap press meant that the British public could follow the progress of the Anglo-Boer War of 1899-1902 even more closely than the mid-nineteenth century conflicts, collectively lamenting military ineptitude and the state of British

83 Susan Walton, *Imagining Soldiers and Fathers in the Mid-Victorian Era: Charlotte Yonge’s Models of Manliness* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), p. 36. Walton noted that this had allowed Wellington’s successor, Lord Hardinge, to conduct military exercises at Chobham in Surrey with around seven thousand soldiers – an event for which tickets were sold and the public were exposed to the full pomp of the British army. See also Strachan, *Wellington’s Legacy*.
recruits, whilst savouring the relief of Mafeking. The British army in the nineteenth century, then, became increasingly visible to the British public and militarism – military styles, attitudes and organisation – was progressively incorporated into the social imaginary. To a large extent this was tied up with the nature and role of the British Empire in British life.

**Imperial Militarism**

The famous quote of the historian John Seeley (1834-95), that the British seemed, ‘to have conquered and peopled half the world in a fit of absence of mind’, evoked the ‘creeping colonialism’ which saw Britain acquire a piecemeal and patchwork empire over the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Indeed, *The Guardian* wrote in 1884 that ‘The conquests we make are forced upon us.’ While the construction of the British Empire was neither inevitable nor coherent it was the product of the determined exercise of British diplomatic, military, naval and economic power. Ideologically and materially, the empire was ‘a key factor in shaping British identity’ during the period; ‘the traffic in goods, images, ideas, and people between Britain and its empire was so heavy that, whether they realized it or not, people’s lives were imperial.’ Andrew Thompson’s careful *The Empire Strikes Back?* has argued for a nuanced understanding of imperialism which recognises the many strands of interaction with, and awareness of, the British Empire as a complex network of relations which produced (and was produced by) a host of different attitudes towards the empire.
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Closely tied to militarism through the necessity of military maintenance of the British Empire and the perpetual warfare therein, imperialism was the celebration of empire which became a national preoccupation with its wellbeing. Late nineteenth-century concerns at economic and imperial competition from France, Russia, Germany, and later the United States and Japan, heightened these anxieties as to the health of the nation, colonies and Britain’s ability to defend itself. Robert Gildea has suggested that this reached religious intensity by the end of the nineteenth century and Summers could write of “conversion” to the imperialist and militarist cause’ from evangelicalism and nonconformity. ⁹¹ ‘Both within the government, and at a popular level,’ wrote Summers of the post-Boer War reaction, ‘a search commenced for military panaceas to arrest and reverse the evident process of national decline.’ ⁹²

This was expressed through the foundation of militarised groups, such as the Boys’ Brigade, Lad’s Drill Association, Boy Scouts as well as those advocating military service such as the National Service League and Navy League. ⁹³ This was a popular movement not limited by class; ‘Cadet corps proliferated in both types of school [public and state] from the 1880s. Drilling was adopted as a crucial source of discipline in working-class State schools. Military activities became an important source of recreation for the working classes’. ⁹⁴ Moreover, they were concerned with character as well as physical health. One commissioner for Scotland in the 1920s reflected that:

I was chiefly concerned with putting into them what we call the Scout spirit, something of what we call the public school spirit, which makes a boy play up and play the game for his side: something of what we call
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esprit de corps, which makes men do great deeds for their Regiment, forgetting themselves – and very much of what we call patriotism.95

What these groups had in common was a militarised response to anxieties over British fitness in a context where spiritual, physical, moral and national health were not clearly demarcated from one another.

A subsequent strand of Victorian and Edwardian Britain overlaps with these observations significantly: the rise of a militaristic brand of Christianity which was strongly identified with British national identity. Together these strands paved the way for the application of crusading rhetoric and imagery as a way to frame British militarism and empire.

iii) ‘Muscular’ Christian Britain

A third important cultural strand of Victorian Britain was its Christian faith. In conjunction with the increasingly prominent place of the army and the empire in British public consciousness, late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Britain saw the Christianisation of patriotic and imperialist rhetoric. Despite the perceived challenge of Darwinian evolution and scientific rationalism to established religious institutions and churchgoing, ‘neither statistical nor qualitative evidence supports the notion that Victorian Britain was becoming a secular nation’.96 John Wolfe’s evaluation of religion in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries emphasised the diversity of religious feeling and practice, largely within the bounds of Christianity. He has recognised that significant differences existed amongst...

96 Steinbach, Understanding the Victorians, p. 213. ‘Christian organizations and assumptions dominated the landscape and most people felt themselves to be believing Christians in some basic way. Whereas a small number of intellectuals experienced what has been termed the “Victorian crisis of faith” (triggered in part by developments in the sciences), for most people in 1914, as in 1820, religion permeated life.’
British people; notably along denominational (Catholic-Protestant; Anglican-Nonconformist) and national (English-Scottish-Welsh-Irish) lines.  

Christianised discourses and practices predominated in British life in the period, both within the churches and Christian communities and without. Despite its limitations as evidence for belief or practice, the census which attempted to record the attendance at places of worship across Britain one Sunday in March 1851 did suggest that between a third and a half of the population attended Christian worship. Indeed, the recorded peak of Anglican communicants was at Easter 1927 – thereafter the general relative decline was coupled to an absolute decline in numbers. However, Wolfe concluded that: ‘The readiness of such substantial sections of the population to identify with organized religion implies that it remained a significant focus for their sense of identity.’

British national identity was invested in its Protestantism and at the start of the nineteenth century the country was effectively an Anglican confessional state; Nonconformists and Catholics were unable to obtain degrees, run for parliament, or even vote. However, the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828 granted Nonconformists the vote while Catholic emancipation was passed in 1829. Though the defection of the prominent Anglican John Henry Newman (1801-1890) to the Catholic Church in 1845 caused controversy and reflected a strand of Anglo-Catholic sympathy within the Church of England, Anglicanism remained at the centre of religious life in Britain into the twentieth century. The forms of this association between Christianity and nationalism fluctuated. In the mid-nineteenth century the Crimean War saw the government proclaim a general fast in 1854 while clergy declared the war just. Charles Kingsley could conflate the British cause in
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Crimea with God’s: ‘He who fights for Queen and country in a just cause’, he wrote in a book sent to soldiers in 1855, ‘is fighting not only in the Queen’s army, but in Christ’s army.’103 These, then, were fertile grounds for crusader medievalism.

‘Muscular’ Christian Manliness

Christian militarism was also fostered by the cult of ‘muscular’ Christianity. In response to mid-century perceptions of Christianity and its adherents – particularly ministers and missionaries – as effeminate, various attempts were made to associate Christianity with ‘manly’ virtues.104 As these were often seen to be martial, this tendency reinforced the militarism examined above. Novelists Charles Kingsley (1819-75) and Thomas Hughes (1822-96) became most closely associated with the phrase “‘muscular’ Christianity” with their advocacy of a practical, physical faith which welded older conceptions of chivalrous conduct with a martial Christianity.105 The first to coin the label which became attached to this movement was T.C. Sandars in the Saturday Review in 1857; its central feature was, he wrote, ‘an association between physical strength, religious certainty, and the ability to shape and control the world around oneself.’106

The influence of Kingsley and Hughes was particularly felt through the Public Schools, as Girouard has detailed, which towards the end of the nineteenth century bred middle- and upper-class boys thoroughly soaked in a combination of Christianity and masculinity which fitted harmoniously with cultural expectations of chivalrous behaviour and patriotic duty.107 Leaders of youth movements, such as William Alexander Smith of the Boys’ Brigade and Robert Baden-Powell of the Scouts, saw their work as partially one of providing the formational benefits of a public school education to working-class boys.108 ‘By the turn of the century,
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moreover,’ Wolfe has suggested, ‘there were signs that “muscular Christianity” was developing further into “imperial Christianity”.’

The Church Militant

The mid-century Crimean War was triggered by imperial competition in the Holy Land where the French claimed to be protectors of the region’s Roman Catholics while Russia argued similarly for the Orthodox population. Jerusalem, ruled by the Ottoman Empire and perceived as weak and ripe for exploitation, had grown in the imagination of the Christian nations with its increased accessibility to western travellers. Disputes between the various consuls, populations and religions resounded in the imperial echo-chambers of European governments. ‘For the British and the French,’ Orlando Figes has written, ‘this was a crusade for the defence of liberty and European civilization against the barbaric and despotic menace of Russia, whose aggressive expansionism represented a real threat, not just to the West but to the whole of Christendom.’ Similarly, the Russian Tsar entered into war against the Ottoman Empire and its British and French allies in an effort to reclaim Constantinople and Jerusalem for the Orthodox faith.

Crusader parallelism was employed to characterise the war by both its supporters and detractors. Benjamin Disraeli compared it to ‘those famous deeds of the Crusades’, while a critic in the House of Commons suggested that, ‘They were entering upon a crusade for the tomb of Geoffrey de Bouillon, which was already so broken that it was scarcely discernible, and into this crusade they were to be led by that author of all mischief, the Pope.’ Crusading inflected public debate about whether the war was a ‘crusade of civilisation and public law’, or ‘a preposterous
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crusade for the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire.' The war, then, was riddled with Christianised rhetoric and holy war imagery.

Anderson has identified the Crimean War as a watershed moment for the British public’s attitude towards the army and its soldiers in eliciting sympathy and pride in their vocation. In part this was due to the (largely Evangelical Christian) presentation of soldier-heroes which brought the army within the bounds of the church’s mission and allowed for the possibility of the marriage of martial skill and Christian piety. The army became a mission-field for the church, but was simultaneously owned as a place for acts of Christian heroism by soldier-saints. A significant part was played by the widespread popularity of Catherine Marsh’s *Memorials of Captain Hedley Vicars, 97th Regiment* (1855) which sold 70,000 copies in its first year of publication. It also spawned, or at least catalysed, the production of similar Christian panegyrics of heroes of the Indian Revolt, most notably Henry Havelock. His rise to the summit of a column in Trafalgar Square was occasioned by his death in the relief of Lucknow by British forces and the perception that he embodied the ‘moral militarism’ which resonated with a religious British public seeking reassurance of their national character and role. Havelock’s relief expedition was followed by unprecedentedly swift newspaper reports which narrated his campaign as that of bringing British vengeance, imbuing Havelock with a mythologised role as a national avatar.

Public interest in heroes of the Christian-military type persisted through the century. Pre-eminent among them, Jeffrey Richards has argued, was General Charles Gordon ‘of Khartoum’ (1833-85), a devout (if eccentric) evangelical Christian who was killed in the Sudanese city after refusing to leave it to the approaching troops of the hostile Mahdi. Gordon’s death sparked public ire against Gladstone, Prime Minister at the time, who had delayed sending a relief force and

115 Ibid., pp. 49–50.
116 Ibid., pp. 51.
led to eulogies for Gordon as a modern (imperial) Christian martyr; ‘a British warrior, the supreme example of chivalry, courage and sacrifice.’

MacKenzie concluded:

*Figures like Henry Havelock and Charles Gordon were the subject of scores of biographies, myth-making through repetition; they appeared in music hall song, in painting, engraving and statuary; they sometimes featured in juvenile literature (though they often seem too grand for fictional treatment) but more commonly in books of heroes; they became the verbal icons of any number of memoirs, of propaganda and political controversy, the mascots of pressure groups and sometimes the personification of colonies.*

These, and other military heroes, played a significant part in not only popularising and perpetuating militarism and imperialism amongst Victorian society, but also in marrying Christianity and militarism in the mind of the British public. The Christian soldier-heroes were more than martyred saints; they were also imperial knights.

‘By the middle of the 1860s’, Anderson wrote, ‘the phrase “Christian Soldiers” was no longer either obviously a metaphor, or a term of abuse of blasphemy’, it was in common parlance.

From the mid-century conflicts and the churches’ involvement with the army through the establishment of missions and chaplaincies and celebration of soldier-saints, the relationship between militancy and Christianity grew close: ‘The christianisation of the army was paralleled by the militarisation of Christianity.’ This second development has been observed by Anderson, Wolffe and Richards:

---


The 1870s and 1880s saw the foundation of the Salvation Army, the Church Army and the Boys’ Brigade, complete with uniforms, titles and military ranks, and there was a great vogue for military imagery in hymns: ‘Onward, Christian soldiers’, ‘Fight the good fight’ and ‘Stand up, stand up for Jesus, ye soldiers of the cross’, for instance.¹²¹

The Boys’ Brigade, for example, was founded in the 1880s in Edinburgh by Smith, a member of the Free Church of Scotland, on the ‘twin pillars of weekly drill parades and Bible-classes.’¹²² In addition to the Boys’ Brigade, the Anglican equivalent, the Church Lads’ Brigade, was formed in 1891, and a short-lived Catholic Boys’ Brigade came into being soon afterwards. These groups can be seen to be in conjunction with other examples of organisations adopting military style and substance, such as the Salvation Army, Church Army and even the Jewish Lads’ Brigade, as well as the popular organisations such as the National Service League mentioned in the previous section.¹²³ Wolfe concluded that, ‘What is undeniable, moreover, is that these youth organizations served in effect, if not always in intent, to blend religious, patriotic and military inspiration.’¹²⁴

As the nineteenth century waned, the willingness of the churches to uncritically accept British militarism, and even sanctify it, increased.¹²⁵ This linkage between Christianity and militarism was at its strongest during the First World War, during which Anglican clergy largely, and vocally, endorsed the war and participated in efforts to mobilise the populace for the war effort.¹²⁶ While exempt from military conscription, many clergy volunteered to serve as chaplains while older ministers employed their pulpits to frame the war in Christian terms of reference.¹²⁷

¹²² Vance, Sinews of the Spirit, p. 172; Springhall, Youth, Empire and Society, p. 37.
¹²⁴ Wolfe, God and Greater Britain, p. 230.
¹²⁵ MacKenzie, ‘Introduction: Popular Imperialism and the Military’, p. 1; Summers, ‘Militarism in Britain’, p. 120.
¹²⁶ Wolfe, God and Greater Britain, p. 19.
Second World War, the clergy were in general more cautious in their rhetoric, and of uncritically associating British military action with the work of God.\footnote{Introduction: British Army Chaplaincy in Context, Clergy in Khaki, pp. 3–5. For specifically crusading rhetoric and imagery in the First World War, see Chapter Four.}

*Imperial Destiny*

The British Empire had long held an uneasy relationship with British Christianity. Encompassing myriad connections, including those of clergy and flock, politicians and lobbyists, missionaries and colonial officers, diplomatic relations between nations and people of differing faiths, as well as competing pulls within individuals, it is difficult to characterise the interactions between Christianity and imperialism over the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Christianity, however, did infuse the rhetoric of imperialism through this period – as we have seen with the celebration of soldier-saints above.

Although it was a relationship which could blow hot and cold, historians have identified an increased tendency among both politicians and churchmen to justify the empire’s existence in Christian terms towards the end of the nineteenth century; particularly in the assertion that British dominion was a providential trust to be used to civilise the world: ‘The perception of Britain’s imperial destiny as having both a Providential purpose and Providential endorsement was a central plank in the Church of England’s public theology.’\footnote{Marrin, Last Crusade, p. 253. See also Chapter Six.} In 1887 the Anglican Evangelical journal *The Churchman* declared exactly these sentiments:

> And if this view be true, it follows not only that we hold our empire as the gift of God, but that it should be conferred upon us, not through any merit of our own, but because it pleased Him to choose us as the instrument for spreading His glory among the nations. It was for this that, during the ages, His Providence moulded our composite race, and

\footnote{Black and MacRaild, Nineteenth-Century Britain, p. 213; Brian Stanley, The Bible and the Flag (Leicester: Apollos, 1990), pp. 68–69; Wolfe, God and Greater Britain, p. 222.}
endowed it with the characteristics of enterprise, love of commerce, national persistency, capacity for rule and religious earnestness.\textsuperscript{130}

This could be a double-edged sword as British colonial policy could equally be criticised for hindering the progress and access of missionaries, and thus the spread of the Christian message, or for policies perceived as inhumane, such as permitting the slave trade.\textsuperscript{131} Gildea has summarised: ‘the religious content of imperialism was very marked. In the 1880s it had been opposed in many quarters as conquest, plunder, profit, exploitation, and brutalization. Now [in the 1890s] imperialism was defended as sanctioned by high moral principle, as a vehicle of peace, Christianity, and civilization’.\textsuperscript{132}

Christianity formed an important aspect of Victorian British culture, inextricable from the other strands examined. As we have seen, discourses of national and imperial identity in the late nineteenth century were Christianised, in form if not in substance. These perceptions of identity interlocked and were mutually supportive. A popular militarism and increasing imperialism benefited from, and contributed to, ecclesiastical appropriation of militant Christian rhetoric. The hagiographic celebration of soldier-saints by both secular and religious presses helped to bring a martial, masculine and Christian framing of Britain’s role abroad and of the role of British men (and by implication women) into focus. Along with the rise of romantic medievalism and an increasingly imperial militarism, a ‘muscular’, or militarised, Christianity formed a crucial part of the late Victorian cultural synthesis and is a key lens through which to understand Britain in the period under scrutiny. The subsequent sections will elaborate how these strands together facilitated the rise of crusading rhetoric and imagery and shaped perceptions of the crusades in the same period.

\textbf{iv) Knights of the Empire: Imperial Chivalry}

\textsuperscript{130} Quoted in ibid., p. 222.
\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., pp. 216–17.
\textsuperscript{132} Gildea, \textit{Barricades and Borders}, p. 348.
Famously studied by Girouard, the ‘revival’ of chivalry was ostensibly a recovery of, or a return to, a medieval code of conduct for knights which was employed as a guide for nineteenth-century gentlemen. It (variously) involved loyalty, integrity, bravery, courtesy, generosity and mercy as well as respect for women and one’s enemies. This reconstruction arose, in Girouard’s influential account, in tandem with the medieval revival and increasingly positive attitudes towards the medieval age as it emerged from the shadow of the Greco-Roman classical past. Often found in the contact zones of the three strands of late Victorian culture discussed above, chivalry played an important role in the self-perception and self-expression of the Victorian elite. It could embody all three of the previous strands: it was itself a medievalism; it was an important part of British martial and imperial self-perception; and was often considered a practical outworking of Christianity. And, as will be discussed below, it encouraged the use of crusading rhetoric and imagery.

A Medieval Retrieval?

Just as he played a key role in the rehabilitation and promotion of the medieval ages, Scott also served to popularise ideas of chivalry through both his novels and his own behaviour. While Scott conceived of chivalry as a distinctive feature of the past he also thought it gone: ‘a beautiful and fantastic piece of frostwork, which has dissolved in the beams of the sun’ he wrote in his *Encyclopædia Britannica* article on chivalry in 1818. However, Scott’s own medievalism and perception of what it meant for him to be a gentleman was influenced by his research into the past. Scott amalgamated a ‘medieval knight-errant with a modern gentleman’, wrote Girouard: ‘One of Scott’s greatest achievements was to bring chivalry up to date, and popularise a type of character which could reasonably be called chivalrous, but was acceptable as a model both by himself and his

________________________

133 Girouard, *Return to Camelot*, pp. 16, 19–28. Girouard clarified that, ‘the blanket term of chivalry has always been applied both to the code and to its mediaeval trappings.’ p. 16.

134 Ibid., pp. 30–38.

contemporaries.’ This image was then expressed in the medievalesque decoration of his home, Abbotsford, in his own behaviour (such as taking on the debts of his bankrupt publisher) and in his novels. He also stage-managed the visit of King George IV to Edinburgh in 1822 which has been credited with reviving (or creating) the popularity of tartan as a traditional Scottish dress. The hugely popular author, ‘helped to make the old chivalry a valuable imaginative resource in the midst of the social and economic dislocations of the industrial revolution.’

Chivalry was seen as quintessentially medieval – and understood to have been central to medieval life. ‘Chivalry itself was regarded,’ Matthews has observed of nineteenth-century enthusiasts, ‘less as a literary convention than as an actual principle of order which had maintained civilisation in feudal society.’ It was Kenelm Digby (1795-1880), among others, who turned the showcasing of chivalry into a contemporary ideal. Digby’s *Broad Stone of Honour* was first printed in 1822, but was revised, expanded into four volumes and reprinted in 1828-29, and again in 1877 with a fifth. He advocated chivalry as timeless and practical and his books struck a chord; they were beloved by such figures as William Wordsworth, John Ruskin, William Morris and Edward Burne-Jones – all men reciprocally influential in the nineteenth-century Romantic revival of interest in the medieval past. By the First World War, Newbolt’s *The Book of the Happy Warrior* (1917) could pick a series of medieval episodes to educate British youth in the ways of chivalry without any sense of anachronism. Chivalry was linked to national character and could be brought out in trials such as the war: ‘But the imperishable part of chivalry, that which belongs to character, has survived, and we have only to look at the history of our latest war to see this.’ Here was a wartime call to a neo-medieval chivalry as an answer to both ‘barbarians’ and ‘pacifists’.

136 Girouard, *Return to Camelot*, pp. 37, 34.
137 Ibid., p. 28.
140 See Girouard, *Return to Camelot*, p. 56.
141 Ibid., pp. 60–63.
Imperial Chivalry

Chivalry was more than a marginal aristocratic fad; it underpinned conceptions of British imperial identity. Joseph Bristow has argued that post-Crimea, ‘Appealing to a romanticized tradition of medieval knights in shining armour, aristocratic masculinity became the major shaping force in British imperialism. Such an ideal would feed down to the middle classes as they entered the newly-founded public schools opened in the 1860s and 1870s in increasing numbers.’\textsuperscript{143} Similarly, Richards has observed that by the turn of the nineteenth century it had been made a key component of British imperialism:

\textit{The chivalric ideal was deliberately promoted by key figures of the age in order to produce a ruling elite for the nation and for the expanding empire who would be inspired by noble and selfless values. Dedicated imperialists invested their empire with chivalry, and chivalric imagery was regularly associated with the empire.}\textsuperscript{144}

There was a clear seam of chivalrous discourse which ran from its inculcation in young men in juvenile literature and their education in public schools, to service in colonial administration and its expression in the context of imperial conflicts.\textsuperscript{145} At the peak of this system sat imperial-chivalric heroes, the soldier-saints examined above, who embodied – and reinforced – the ideals of chivalric self-sacrifice: Vicars, Havelock, Gordon, Livingstone. For an empire invested in a multitude of socio-political contexts across the globe which invariably involved armed confrontations, chivalry ‘softened and romanticised the imagining of war’.\textsuperscript{146} MacKenzie has suggested that, ‘The officers of the imperial forces certainly saw these wars as chivalric, virtually sporting events, brief and intense bouts of dragon-slaying. […] Regiments in India held mock tournaments, sometimes with a young subaltern

---


\textsuperscript{144} Richards, ‘Image of the Army’, p. 87.


\textsuperscript{146} Paris, \textit{Over the Top}, p. xvii.
made up as the Queen of Beauty.’\textsuperscript{147} Officers could retain the code of chivalry to the death, as in the sinking of the \textit{Birkenhead} in 1852 in which the men were reported to have chivalrously facilitated the evacuation of all the ship’s women and children to the boats at the cost of their own lives; the episode became a practical demonstration of the ultimate claims of chivalry.\textsuperscript{148} This incident was supposedly repeated in 1912 by civilians in the sinking of the \textit{Titanic}.\textsuperscript{149} ‘References to an idealized medieval past, and the rigorous religious and socio-cultural values of knights,’ Berny Sève has argued, ‘could offer a potent symbolic justification to the expansion of the British Empire, in a Victorian society which grew increasingly fascinated with pre-Enlightenment values, beliefs and tastes.’\textsuperscript{150}

\textit{Chivalrous Christianity}

In the face of anxieties as to the perceived feminisation of Christianity, the Christian militarism described above provided alternate avenues for men to access Christianity – notably through chivalrous military service and emulation of soldier-martyrs. If being a Christian meant self-sacrificially taking up one’s cross for others this could easily be mapped onto a chivalrous service of one’s nation, especially with the blurring of the lines between Christianity and imperial patriotism described above.

Hughes and Kingsley, the expositors of ‘muscular Christianity’, made precisely this connection between chivalry and Christianity. Hughes wrote in 1861 that:

\textit{the least of the muscular Christians has hold of the old chivalrous and Christian belief, that a man’s body is given him to be trained and brought}


\textsuperscript{148} Girouard, \textit{Return to Camelot}, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{149} Ibid., pp. 4-6. With thanks to Alex Windscheffel for the observation.

into subjection and then used for the protection of the weak, the advancement of all righteous causes, and the subduing of the earth which God has given to the children of men.¹⁵¹

Responding to the characterisation of his philosophy as ‘muscular Christianity’ in a lecture in 1865 at Cambridge, Kingsley argued that his vision of Christian manliness was based in the medieval code of chivalry which arose in opposition to a feminised, monastic faith which suppressed masculine virtues and activities which could be consecrated to God.¹⁵² Both saw chivalry as coterminous with the expression of their Christian manliness; this was in contrast to the earlier and influential reforming Christian headmaster of Rugby between 1827 and 1842, Thomas Arnold.¹⁵³ Girouard has linked the function of an officer-gentleman in the empire with this chivalrous Christian ideal:

*By the end of the nineteenth century a gentleman had to be chivalrous, or at least if he were not he was not fully a gentleman. [...] The concept of a Christian soldier was an ancient one, but being a Christian knight was not quite the same thing; it was more like being a Christian officer. And officers were of course gentlemen.*¹⁵⁴

By 1915, the Rev. Charles Allan of Greenock could present chivalry and Christianity as interchangeable in his collection of published sermons and addresses. ‘The age of chivalry, in all its finer elements, was a direct result of the working of the Christian spirit’, Allan explained, before continuing, ‘And Christ Himself was the very pattern of chivalrous action. [...] Our Lord died doing His duty “like the officer and gentleman He was.”’¹⁵⁵ Indeed, the decision to enter the war was widely portrayed as a chivalrous defence of ‘little Belgium’ against the bullying aggression of

¹⁵³ Ibid., p. 164.
¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 260.
Germany. Victorian and Edwardian chivalry, then, encompassed all three of the above cultural strands – medievalism, imperial militarism and Christianity.

This chivalrous code was not universally accepted or unchallenged. As Sandra Martina Schwab has emphasised, critiques of both the ideals and trappings of chivalry were present in popular culture in the 1890s. A line of rejection and ridicule of chivalry can be traced back through, for example, the mocking of the Eglinton Tournament in the popular press, Byron’s dismissal in 1813 of the ‘monstrous mummeries of the Middle Ages’, and, of course, to Cervantes’ character Don Quixote. The late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century parodies Schwab described, while standing in this tradition, presumed a knowledge of chivalrous expectations which gave them bite and did not represent the curtailing of the imaginative power of chivalry. Schwab herself presented Baden-Powell’s Scouting for Boys as the epitome of an imperial, chivalrous culture in 1908 and considered that the First World War marked its demise.

Chivalry, then, was an important feature of nineteenth-century British social discourse – especially, but not exclusively – amongst the elite. It incorporated, complemented and reinforced the cultural strands examined above: the revival of interest in the medieval past; the increased militarisation of British imperial society; and the fashion of ‘muscular Christianity’ and Christian militarism. In tying these strands together and creating a culture that the elite of imperial Victorian Britain shared, chivalry created fertile ground for the growth of crusading rhetoric and imagery and inflected perceptions of the crusades themselves as chivalrous deeds done in the service of God.

**Back to the Crusades: Chivalrous and Imperial Knight-Crusaders**

---

158 For Byron’s comment, see ‘Addition to the Preface’, *Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage* (1813) quoted in Girouard, *Return to Camelot*, p. 33.
159 Schwab, ‘Refuting of the Chivalric Ideal’, p. 220.
‘Chivalry’, Girouard asserted in his study of the nineteenth-century version of the subject, ‘had no more typical or famous expression than the Crusades’. Crusading and chivalry came to prominence in Western Europe around the same time; the late twelfth century saw both the Third Crusade and the Arthurian romances of Chrétien de Troyes. The contemporary adherents of chivalry and crusading were the same men: ‘The knights who were most admired in chivalric society were often enthusiastic crusaders.’ The early twelfth-century authors and composers who took the First Crusade for their topic were writing in an emerging genre of epic romance for an aristocratic audience steeped in tales of martial heroes. ‘The language and images of epic and romance are rarely far from the elbows of the clerical authors; [crusade] histories and chansons shared common sources and common milieu’, wrote Tyerman.

The distinguished historian of chivalry, Maurice Keen, argued that, ‘Through most of the heyday of chivalry the crusade had been regarded as the formal epitome of chivalrous activity’. He was clear, however, that the two were different: chivalry was a martial and aristocratic tradition, ‘the secular code of honour of a martially oriented aristocracy’, while the crusades evolved a host of theological doctrine and canon law (centred around the crusade indulgence) which chivalry did not. Nevertheless, the two continued to be associated with one another even as crusade chroniclers and troubadours sought to bridge the divide between church and aristocracy by presenting the crusade as a divinely inspired ‘new way’ to salvation by literally fighting for Christ. By the end of the twelfth century, ‘the image of the crusader pilgrim had joined itself to the developing conventions of an estate of knighthood, supplying it with a top-tier of ideal standards.’

---
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Later historians of crusading investigated the relationship between the two. Tyerman identified Jean-Baptiste de la Curne de Sainte-Palaye’s (1697-1781) *Mémoires sur l’ancienne chevalerie*, published in 1759, as influential in crusade historiography and in placing chivalry centrally in interpretations of the motives and behaviour of the crusaders; both Edward Gibbon (1737-94) and David Hume (1711-76) possessed a copy, while William Robertson (1721-93) drew on its ideas.¹⁶⁷ Nineteenth-century British historians of the crusades and writers on chivalry were often the same people. Charles Mills’ history of the crusades was first published in 1820 while his subsequent *The History of Chivalry, or Knighthood and its Times* came out in 1825. G.P.R. James wrote on chivalry (1830) and Richard I (1842-49), while in 1830 Henry Stebbing published his *History of Chivalry and the Crusades*.¹⁶⁸ Proponents of chivalry were also crusade enthusiasts. The first two books of Digby’s popular *The Broad Stone of Honour* were named for heroes of the First Crusade, Godfrey and Tancred, and it was from the crusaders, ‘whose learning and patriotism were guided by eternal truth that we should derive our models of chivalry’.¹⁶⁹ Scott, in his article on chivalry for the *Encyclopædia Britannica* in 1818, also gave consideration to the crusades. He saw them as having been animated by chivalry, which ‘blazed forth with high vigour during the Crusades,’ although for Scott the zenith of chivalry was the Hundred Years War between England and France:¹⁷⁰

*The real history of the crusades, founded upon the spirit of chivalry, and on the restless and intolerant zeal which was blended by the churchmen with this military establishment, are an authentic and fatal proof of the same facts. The harebrained and adventurous character of these enterprises, not less than the promised pardons, indulgences and remissions of the church, rendered them dear to the warriors of the middle ages; the idea of re-establishing the Christian religion in the Holy Land, and wresting the tomb of Christ from the infidels, made kings,

¹⁶⁷ Tyerman, *Debate*, pp. 73–77, 82.
¹⁶⁹ Quoted in Siberry, *New Crusaders*, p. 33; see also Girouard, *Return to Camelot*, p. 60.
¹⁷⁰ Scott, ‘Chivalry’ (1815).
princes and nobles blind to its hazards; and they rushed, army after army, to Palestine, in the true spirit of chivalry, whose faithful professors felt themselves the rather called upon to undertake an adventure from peculiar dangers which surrounded it, and the numbers who had fallen in previous attempts.171

Chivalry may have relentlessly propelled the crusaders, but their lack of prudence meant that the uncurbed passion was ultimately destructive. Key figures in the Third Crusade, King Richard I of England and Saladin, were portrayed in Scott’s novel The Talisman as chivalric; Richard ‘the Lionhearted’ was ‘a pattern of chivalry’ while Saladin was ‘an exemplar of chivalry’, a characterisation which would have a persistent echo.172 For Scott, religion was superseded by chivalry as a motivating factor for the crusaders; it both characterised the medieval actors and motivated them. In ‘romantic celebrations of chivalry and the crusades’ (such as those espoused by Ivanhoe in praise of the ennobling effects of chivalry), Patrick Brantlinger has argued, ‘lie the roots of the later Victorian and Edwardian insistence on the relation between the Empire and gentlemanly valor, the public school ethos of “useless” games, pluck, and war.’173

Chivalry also featured in several of the Encyclopædia Britannica’s articles on the crusades. The seventh edition (1842) was the first to refer to chivalry, while G.W. Cox’ 1877 revision in the ninth edition celebrated Tancred as the paragon of chivalrous knighthood along with the French king, St. Louis IX ‘the Pious’.174 By 1910, Ernest Barker could articulate a close relationship between chivalry and the crusades: ‘The crusades are the offensive side of chivalry: chivalry is their parent –

as it is also their child.'\textsuperscript{175} It was not just nineteenth-century historians (as Robert Irwin concluded), but many in Britain in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries who ‘saw crusading and chivalry as intimately intertwined.’\textsuperscript{176} Crusading, as with chivalry, could combine the threads of nineteenth-century culture discussed above: the crusades were quintessentially medieval; they were military expeditions; and they were inescapably Christian. Moreover, they were considered popular mass expressions of Christian zeal and dedication, which heightened their association with the latter. The cultural synthesis which promoted chivalry, then, almost inevitably cultivated the growth of crusading rhetoric and imagery, as well as chivalric interpretations of the crusades.

As well as seeing the crusaders as Christian heroes, crusade histories displayed both chivalric and nationalist educational aims.\textsuperscript{177} For an example of the former, George Davys (previously Bishop of Peterborough) wrote of the crusaders in his \textit{History of England} (1870): ‘I can never help admiring the zeal and devotion of those warriors, who went forth in the cause of the Christian religion.’\textsuperscript{178} Hammond Hall cited Godfrey de Bouillon and Tancred as ‘stars of chivalry’ while John G. Edgar noted in his \textit{The Crusades and the Crusaders} (1860) that his aim was to portray heroes ‘animated by religion and heroism’, amongst whom were the Englishmen ‘Richard Coeur de Lion, the feudal king par excellence, William Longsword, the flower of Anglo Norman nobles and our first Edward, the greatest of those mighty monarchs’.\textsuperscript{179} Henry Frith, in his \textit{In the Brave Days of Old} (1886), summarised the way in which the crusaders could be considered inspirational figures:

\begin{quote}
\textit{In the deeds of the leaders of the chivalrous hosts who left home to gain the Holy City there is much to admire. The self-devotion which many exhibited, the piety of others, and the gallant bearing of all, may still}
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{176} Irwin, ‘Historical Novel’, p. 141.
\textsuperscript{177} For discussion of the following examples, see Siberry, \textit{New Crusaders}, pp. 150–53.
\textsuperscript{179} John G. Edgar, \textit{The Crusades and the Crusaders} (Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1860), pp. iii-iv.
\end{flushright}
now teach us something, and exercise an ennobling influence on our minds even now.¹⁸⁰

Whilst nurturing crusading rhetoric and imagery, chivalry did not have a monopoly on its usage or on interpretations of the crusades. Crusading could be seen in the light of any of the above strands, or none. Furthermore, Siberry has identified at least one proposal to actually conquer the Holy Land – that of Sir William Hillary in the 1840s.¹⁸¹ Conversely, crusading slipped its historical moorings and could be used as ‘a metaphor for fighting a just cause, be it missionary work, suffragism, or temperance. One could speak of a “civilising Crusade” without any sense [of] an oxymoron.’¹⁸² Contemporary perceptions of the crusades provided a vivid, and broad, palette for nineteenth-, and early twentieth-century authors, moralists and empire builders to paint with. In addition to the diffuse, shallow, penumbra of use of crusader medievalism, and in harmony with the strand of British imperialism explored above, it is important to highlight how the crusades were used for the promotion of national ends and the creation of national identities as this was a key strand of nineteenth-century nation-building – one which extended beyond the British Empire. For the British, crusading came to be a foundational part of a national perception of chivalric virtue, which carried imperial expansionist overtones. Baden-Powell, founder of the popular Boy Scouts and handicraft movement, could easily elide chivalry, crusading and British imperialism in 1908 when he wrote in Scouting for Boys that, ‘The Knights of King Arthur, Richard Coeur de Lion, and the Crusaders, carried British chivalry into distant parts of the earth.’¹⁸³

The Death of Chivalry? The Nineteenth-Century Cultural Consensus Unbound

Historians such as Michael Paris and Peter Parker have identified early twentieth-century British conceptions of chivalry as an important factor in both bringing the

¹⁸¹ Ibid., pp. 76-82.
¹⁸² Bar-Yosef, Holy Land, p. 258. For example, see Josephine Butler’s Personal Reminiscences of a Great Crusade.
country into the First World War and in effectively promoting the war to the British public. Paris has argued that the mass of volunteers who flocked to the army in the autumn of 1914 demonstrated the success of the inculcation of a militarist and nationalist agenda; ‘The class of 1914 had been well prepared for the eventuality of war.’\footnote{Paris, Over the Top, p. xx.} Even if the main surges of volunteerism came not on the outbreak of the war but, Adrian Gregory has suggested, as the war ‘turned serious’, the thousands of young men applying to fight for Britain demonstrated that prewar British culture had primed segments of the population for such a response.\footnote{Adrian Gregory, The Last Great War: British Society and the First World War (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 32.}

Though chivalry might have been a propellant for many into the war, Girouard considered the experience of the war fatal for the popularity and cultural pre-eminence of chivalric perceptions of warfare. It provided a ‘death-wound’ for chivalry: ‘Chivalry, along with patriotism, playing the game, and similar concepts, became not so much devalued as simply irrelevant. It belonged to another world, which seemed infinitely remote from the real world of mud, blood, boredom, fear, endurance, carnage and mutilation in which they now existed.’\footnote{Girouard, Return to Camelot, p. 290.} In this argument, chivalric and romanticised notions of warfare were bankrupted by the realities of mechanised, modern warfare in which individual prowess, devotion and even agency mattered little. The death of chivalry has been evocatively painted. Girouard suggested that the war could ‘seem like a nightmare parody of the Eglinton Tournament’, while Allen Frantzen wrote: ‘When young men filled with illusions of chivalry were ordered to walk into machine-gun fire, an ancient brotherhood fell before the weapons of a new age.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 289; Frantzen, Bloody Good, pp. 1–2.}

This powerful image summarises the idea of an outdated symbol of prewar idealism meeting the hard reality of scientific, technological warfare which required little skill to operate but was devastatingly effective at killing.

This argument, though imaginatively compelling, obscures a wider debate. Others, both contemporaries and later historians, have seen the First World War as a
transitory time – a moment of modernity and a rupture with the past in which the world emerged irrevocably changed. Beyond chivalry the war could be seen as precipitating the death of a society’s whole worldview. This perspective was famously taken by Paul Fussell in his book, *The Great War and Modern Memory*, first published in 1975.  

Fussell argued that the traditional ways of understanding war and expressing grief were made redundant by the scale of the horror of the Great War: mechanisation and national mobilisation created a total war, the war ‘to end all wars’, which required new methods of representation to convey meaning adequately. These, Fussell saw as being essentially ironic and fragmentary – they heralded a fundamental shift of mentalité in which the war was central and which he labelled *modernity*: ‘I am saying that there seems to be one dominating form of modern understanding; that it is essentially ironic; and that it originates largely in the application of mind and memory to the events of the Great War.’

This correlates with Peter Fritzsche’s view of traumatic events, ‘an event is traumatic not because it is horrible, although it may well be, but because it cannot be assimilated by the individual’s view of the world. Trauma is therefore taken to be an affront to understanding.’ The First World War was seen to explode traditional, nineteenth-century perceptions of warfare as its scale and horror was beyond the ability of the British to depict or comprehend.

Fussell’s argument has been criticised for its dependence on a small cadre of British elite literary sources, an unproblematic understanding of memory and his privileging of individual experience (including his own); yet the narrative of the war as futile, tragic and presenting an essential break with the past has gained traction. In this vein, Samuel Hynes has written:
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189 Ibid., p. 35.
191 I will leave aside here considerations of the applicability of the nature of individual trauma to understanding societal trauma; Fritzsche’s argument assumes a compatibility of concepts.
Even as it was being fought the war was perceived as a force of radical change in society and in consciousness. It brought to an end the life and values of Victorian and Edwardian England; but it did something more fundamental than that: it added a new scale of violence and destruction to what was possible – it changed reality. That change was so vast and so abrupt as to make the years after the war seem discontinuous from the years before, and that discontinuity became a part of English imaginations. Men and women after the war looked back at their own pasts as one might look across a great chasm to a remote, peaceable place on the other side.¹⁹³

‘A historical caesura’, Aleida Assmann has suggested in her reflections on collective memory, ‘always introduces the chance to narrate the past in different ways.’¹⁹⁴ Here the traumatic experiences of the Great War are presented as a cultural caesura which exposed the inadequacies of ‘traditional’, chivalric Victorian and Edwardian values to make sense of the war and therefore necessitated a clean start.

The argument for the ‘radical discontinuity’ of the First World War has been challenged. Alexander Watson and Patrick Porter have claimed that ‘combatants may have found [prewar sacrificial ideology] not only relevant but actually useful in the trenches’, suggesting that even in the midst of the horrors of frontline experience aspects of ‘traditional’ culture could survive.¹⁹⁵ Rosa Bracco has demonstrated that authors of ‘middlebrow’ literature in Britain after the war sought to preserve continuity with the past in both form and content, while Paris has identified the persistence of traditional values in juvenile literature through to the Second World War.¹⁹⁶ Similarly, Goebel’s work has highlighted the strands of prewar medievalism used to commemorate the war in both Britain and Germany

¹⁹³ Hynes, A War Imagined, p. ix.
¹⁹⁴ Assmann, ‘History and Memory’, p. 61.
after 1918. Girouard himself has recognised that chivalric rhetoric and imagery did not die out overnight, or even with the start, or end, of the war:

*For it is in fact easy enough to find chivalry at work in the years after the war. [...] But the use of chivalry to provide escapes into fantasy, or portray comic figures, as in Wodehouse, or figures out of gear with their times, as in Waugh, is significant of chivalry’s fading powers. As a dominant code of conduct it never recovered from the Great War partly because the war itself was such a shatterer of illusions, partly because it helped produce a world in which the necessary conditions for chivalry were increasingly absent.*

Furthermore, historians, including Hynes himself, have recognized that the interwar years in Britain saw the war remembered differently by different people. For Hynes, though, this was a binary contest between two cultures: ‘a conservative culture that clung to and asserted traditional values, and a counter-culture, rooted in rejection of the war and its principles. Each culture had its art, its literature, and its monuments; and each denied the other.’ These examples paint a more complicated picture of the (admittedly uneven) survival of aspects of prewar cultural ideas.

**Disillusionment with the Peace**

All of which is not to say that there was no disillusionment or disenchantment with prewar ideologies or cultural forms which existed in Britain before, during and after the war. Hynes has suggested that the ‘Myth of the War’ – that it was a futile war fought ineptly – took hold in the late 1920s and early 1930s, rather than due to the
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197 Though they were used differently; Goebel, *Medieval Memory*; Goebel, ‘Britain’s “Last Crusade”’.
experience of the conflict as Fussell argued. 201 During the Twenties, he argued, there was a cultural schism between a traditionalism which sought continuity and a disillusionment which emphasised a break with the past. 202 Despite Hynes’ polarisation of the conflict into two distinct sides, he was right to nuance Fussell’s assertion of cultural fracture, and acknowledge the continuation of certain cultural forms.

In accounting for the success of the narrative of disillusionment, Janet Watson has suggested a generational rupture rather than a chronological break at 1914-18:

_For many of the British men and women who were active participants in the First World War, the languages of honor, patriotism, and self-sacrifice for a greater good never lost their currency (as their later written memories attest). Though some famous authors eloquently articulated a powerful story of disillusionment, this became the dominant historical view of the war because it was embraced by those who came after, not because it entirely changes the perceptions of many people who had fought and worked in the war itself._ 203

This fits with Connerton’s theoretical mapping of memories onto generations and prediction of fractures between them: ‘Across generations, different sets of memories, frequently in the shape of implicit background narratives, will encounter each other; so that, although physically present to one another in a particular setting, the different generations may remain mentally and emotionally insulated’. 204 As well as its nature, the location of the fracture itself has been challenged. Gregory has concluded that while the memory of the war was
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201 He explained the ‘Myth of the War’ as: ‘a generation of innocent young men, their heads full of high abstractions like Honour, Glory, and England, went off to war to make the world safe for democracy. They were slaughtered in stupid battles planned by stupid generals. Those who survived were shocked, disillusioned and embittered by their war experiences, and saw that their real enemies were not the Germans, but the old men at home who had lied to them. They rejected the values of the society that had sent them to war, and in doing so separated their own generation from the past and from their cultural inheritance.’ Hynes, _A War Imagined_, p. x.
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‘continually contested and developing,’ the interwar years saw the growth of disillusionment with the war – specifically, as it became more likely that another war would follow. He concluded that:

*Most people, for one reason or another, came to doubt the value of the victory to a greater or lesser extent between 1919 and 1939. This should not be seen as simply a pacifist turn in opinion. Nor was it simply or even mostly a reflection on the experience of the war as such. [...] The two meanings of the war, victory and warning, were both dependent on the peace. No peace meant no meaning.*

For Gregory, then, the unravelling of traditional ways of understanding warfare came in tandem with the economic depression and the increasing disillusionment with the peace as it became apparent that the war had produced neither a new world nor the end of war. The turn from the traditional grew out of a disenchantment with the past born in the late 1920s and early 1930s, though aspects were present in the writings of the authors Fussell depended on as early as the war itself.

Finally, historians such as Jay Winter have compellingly posited a greater break with traditional ways of understanding and assigning meaning to the Second World War; specifically the twin horrors of the Holocaust and Hiroshima. ‘Both of these catastrophes,’ Winter argued, ‘raised the possibility that the limits of language had been reached; perhaps there was no way to express adequately the hideousness and scale of the cruelties of the 1939-45 war.’ In the light of the Second World War, efforts to commemorate, and thereby understand and remember appropriately, the First World War seemed traditional: the continuity of language and symbols from 1914 to 1918 could be seen more clearly from a post-1945 vantage point.

\[205\] Gregory, *The Last Great War*, pp. 271 and 275. See also Todman, *Great War*, p. 129.

By reason of its entanglement with the late Victorian ‘traditional’ culture of prewar Britain, subsequent chapters will attempt to evaluate what happened to crusader medievalism amongst the debate about the extent to which the First World War was a cultural rupture, or whether that rupture could better be located in the interwar years or the Second World War. The demise, or the nature of the survival, of crusading rhetoric and imagery will shed light on this narrative and serve, in turn, to contextualise particular instances of crusader medievalism.

Conclusion

The use of crusading can be seen to have been fostered by a coherent cultural system designed to train officer-gentlemen for colonial service, but which pervaded British society – the code of chivalry. Chivalry itself was the product of the combination of nineteenth-century fascination with (a version of) the medieval past in contrast with the industrialisation of British industry and society; an increased militarism driven by public awareness of, and engagement with, the demands of British imperial expansion and predominance; and of the rise of a moral militarism and ‘muscular’ Christianity. These interlocking and mutually reinforcing strands provided fertile ground for the cultivation of crusader medievalism, which could embody all three strands or combinations thereof, and then be put to a plethora of uses. As Siberry has demonstrated, the crusades and crusading were widely employed, with varying levels of engagement with the historical crusades. And these too were susceptible to reinterpretation depending on the needs of particular communities.207

Crusading was not the only, or even the most popular, form of medievalism which could combine the strands mentioned above. The Arthurian legends of Camelot and the Grail quest featured prominently. They could provide archetypal heroes unencumbered by historical specificities such as Arthur, Lancelot, Percival, Galahad and Guinevere. Their mythical status meant they were more semiotically flexible than the crusades; though the professionalisation of academic history in the

207 Tyerman, *Debate*, p. 6.
nineteenth century may have meant this ultimately worked against the legends of Arthur. They were also more individualistic: the knights, whilst bound by the Round Table, undertook individual trials and adventures and were susceptible to romantic embroidery. In terms of the aspects of nineteenth-century culture examined above, legends of Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table were medievalesque, they celebrated individual military prowess, and the centrality of the search for the Holy Grail also introduced a veneer of Christian piety – although, as with the other aspects, this was mutable.208

The crusades, by contrast, were more historically specific – expeditions grounded in specific times and places – and this increased their applicability to a large variety of circumstances which imperial Britain found itself in, particularly in the late nineteenth century. The ‘Eastern Question’, contact with the Ottoman Turks and greater exposure to the Holy Land as tourism opened up Jerusalem and ex-crusader sites all meant greater actual and imaginative engagement with sites linked to the crusading past.209 Similarly, crusading benefited from the rise of history as an academic discipline and became a focus for sustained historical study. If Arthuriana was popularly diffused, the crusades can be seen to have more specific applications. They could be more easily associated with Christian piety; however, this left them open to criticism as a Catholic form of devotion by Protestants. Crusading was also perceived to have been a mass movement in response to a call, but which had individual heroic exemplars who could symbolise the movement and represent knightly virtue in their own right. The word entered common parlance as a metaphor for a campaign which required mobilisation, rather than an individual’s quest, though this was possible too.

Clearly, as Siberry’s quantity of references has shown, the use of crusader medievalism was a pervasive cultural phenomenon which covered a broad range of

208 On Victorian Arthuriana, see Inga Bryden, Reinventing King Arthur: The Arthurian Legends in Victorian Culture (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005); Girouard, Return to Camelot, esp. pp. 177-96; and Barczewski, Myth and National Identity.
209 Brantlinger, Rule of Darkness, pp. 135–71; Siberry, New Crusaders, p. 64; Goldhill, ‘Jerusalem’. 
needs; for Knobler the crusades were seen as, ‘the most obvious historic unification of religious piety and manly, martial virtues.’

Moreover:

The crusader was not merely a medieval figure of romance – he brought a level of common understanding to the people of Britain, both rich and poor, and allowed the imperial and military enterprises of the modern age to be communicated to a mass audience and a single community.

Through its ability to encapsulate and hold together important strands of Victorian and Edwardian culture, crusader medievalism was useful to the British, particularly in chivalric form. The crusades, crusading and individual crusaders could build on the medievalism of the Romantic revival whilst at the same time remain shorthand for Christian zeal and militarism. They were incorporated into Britain’s continuing national and imperial story through heroes who acted as exemplars of chivalric ideals. These aspects can all be seen at play, as the next chapter will observe, in stories of the crusades for the formation of British youth.

\[\text{210 Knobler, ‘Holy Wars’, p. 313.}\]
\[\text{211 Ibid., p. 325.}\]
2) ‘WE HOPE EVERY CRUSADER WILL GROW UP AN ACCOMPLISHED CHRISTIAN GENTLEMAN’: YOUNG CRUSADERS

As seen above, the nineteenth century saw the rise in Britain of a cultural system that combined muscular Christianity and imperial militarism with romantic medievalism explicitly to create ‘Christian gentlemen’ who would serve the British empire loyally. Similarly, it has been proposed that this culture enjoyed a symbiotic relationship with crusader medievalism: it provided a fertile environment for the appropriation of crusading rhetoric and imagery (particularly in a chivalric context) and in return the crusades and crusading could be used to reinforce chivalric, imperial and ‘muscular’ Christian ideals. The process of transmission of this cultural amalgam and relationship with crusader medievalism provide the focus of this chapter.

Children’s literature was a key component of enculturisation, or ‘socialisation’, whereby authors sought to inform, inculcate and shape youth (particularly young men) according to the principles thought necessary for maintaining the British Empire and its heritage. Richards wrote, ‘juvenile literature was one of the ways in which society instructed its members in accepted mores and ideas, dominant role models and legitimate aspirations. It both reflected popular attitudes, ideas and preconceptions and generated support for them.’ Jacqueline Bratton, in her study of the ways in which British imperialism was engendered, has explained how fiction was used as a vehicle for ideological education:

Many educators consciously turned to fiction to solve problems of the transmission of the ideology. Fiction had the advantage of a much more nearly universal availability: anyone educated to the level of basic

1 The title quote is from The Crusaders’ Union Annual Report (1934), p. 7. Bod.
literacy was accessible through a story. It was also private, enabling the direct messages inculcating imperial ambitions, and national, familial and racial pride, to be received without a blush; and apparently optional, so that no one need feel repelled by being forced to undergo indoctrination. [...] Perhaps the most compelling virtue of fiction as a vehicle for ideology was (and is) that it appeals to and employs the readers’ imagination, the viral element that Newbolt felt was repressed and excluded by the processing of the boy through public school.⁴

The formative potential of literature was seized upon by Evangelical Christians who produced lessons in morality and stories of exemplary characters.⁵ James Mangan has suggested that adventure fiction ‘celebrated evangelical decency, the work ethic and imperial expansion’ and that the middle class Victorian boy was the primary (but not only) target for these values.⁶ As the century progressed, the moralists writing adventure stories for young people were joined by imperialists seeking to promote the idea of the British Empire. Imperialist authors in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries:

implicitly believed they were performing an important social function, doing their duty to Crown and Empire by preparing the youth of the nation to play their part in the inevitable struggles that would arise from Britain’s imperial status and the jealousy of her rivals. Their attempts to instill the martial spirit and patriotism in British boys were powerfully reinforced by the public school ethos of duty, honour, and sacrifice, by the training received through cadet forces and, for the vast majority of

---


boys unable to attend public school, through the popular youth organisations that emerged in the last decades before the Great War.⁷

Importantly, selected parts of novels were introduced into the growing number of schools through anthologies and school readers (or primers) – textbooks used by generations of children. These became a staple in the Board Schools established in the wake of Forster’s Education Act of 1870 and the Act of 1880 which made school attendance compulsory for those aged between five and ten (increased to fourteen in 1918).⁸ This legislation and corresponding expansion of educational institutions across Britain created demand for readers and textbooks for schools and marked both the growing role of the state and general interest in education. ‘Victorian literary preferences, ensconced within a comprehensive ideologically didactic package,’ Anna Vaninskaya has argued, ‘continued to structure primary educational provision well into the interwar period.’⁹

Fiction, therefore, was an ideal vehicle for the education of young people for several reasons. Ideologically loaded, juvenile fiction sought to inculcate certain values and form character in the impressionable young. For most of the nineteenth century the lines demarcating education and entertainment were blurred, as demonstrated by the educational role authors envisaged themselves playing and the use of literature (or parts of it) in schools.¹⁰ Popular juvenile literature could be widely distributed with the onset of cheap printing, the passing around of journals and the advent of circulating libraries and could therefore reach a large audience; potentially spanning class divides, as MacKenzie has suggested.¹¹ While the context and intertextual relationships of literary artefacts remain far from self-evident, novels have had both a social and material presence. The persistence of the text
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⁷ Paris, Over the Top, p. xviii.
presents an accessible source for the consideration of the educative process described above where the crusades or crusading is employed by authors.

Juvenile literature featuring the crusades is worthy of study because, by reason of their historical setting and length, they reflected deep engagement with crusader medievalism. Authors had time to develop a detailed image of crusading and the crusades through both description and the actions of the characters. Historical novels were written for an audience which may or may not have been familiar with the crusades and so readers were led through the main details of the particular aspects or characters depicted. This required some explanation, which could be incorporated into the speech or actions of characters or inserted as authorial comment. For the purposes of this study both are instructive for understanding how crusader medievalism was conceived of and employed. This chapter will, then, observe the inculcation of the Victorian cultural system described in Chapter One by examining the crusading tales of popular authors of (and educators in) juvenile fiction. In these works the chivalric and imperial nature of the crusader medievalism employed will be seen through the nineteenth century and into the twentieth.

**Crusading Fictions**

As Siberry has demonstrated, crusading had a significant cultural presence in the nineteenth century in poetry, art, music and plays (not least inspired by the popularity of Tasso’s *Gerusalemme liberate* of 1581). The presence of crusading in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century literature was reflected in juvenile literature; every major crusade was represented up to that of Edward I in the 1270s. Indeed, an ‘almost obligatory crusade ancestor’ was a staple of fictional aristocracy throughout the century.

Although the present study begins with the publication in 1825 of Scott’s *Tales of the Crusaders*, crusader novels in English appear to have originated with Sophie
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Cottin’s *Matilda and Malek Adhel, the Saracen*, translated from French and published in London in 1809. The author was acquainted with the French crusade historian Michaud who wrote the historical preface for the first edition of her novel. Two other crusading novels also predated Scott’s *The Betrothed* and *The Talisman*: Louisa Sidney Stanhope’s *The Crusaders* (1820) and Barbara Hofland’s *Theodore, or The Crusaders* (1821). Without including Scott’s novels, Hinz has counted thirty-seven crusading novels published in English before the First World War. Scott’s works, however, dominated the landscape and popularised both medievalism and the historical novel as a genre; his depiction of crusading will be considered below.

Megan L. Morris, in her detailed evaluation of a selection of Victorian crusader novels, has suggested that writing about the crusades was a way for authors to implicitly engage with imperialism at home and abroad: ‘Re-imagining the crusades, [...] allowed nineteenth-century writers and thinkers to re-contextualize their concerns about the impact of imperialism and the British Empire on their own culture.’ The structure of the crusade narrative facilitated ‘representations of alterity’ in the form of the Islamic-Turkish Other, as well as allowing a distancing from British (English) society for the characters through their travel in Eastern settings. In fact, dual ‘Othering’ could be employed as crusading heroes were medieval figures and therefore distant to the nineteenth-century reader.

---

In his evaluation of juvenile literature written about the Holy Land between 1785 and 1940 Joseph Shadur has identified the crusades as a distinct topic of interest. Books for children on the Holy Land largely began appearing with Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt but their numbers increased in the 1820s and represented a ‘steady stream’ thereafter.\(^{21}\) Of the books specifically dealing with the crusades, Shadur has summarised that:

> Notwithstanding the inherent anti-Catholicism of most of the writers, in all these works the old Catholic view of devout, heroic, chivalrous Christian dedication to the ‘liberation’ of the Holy Sepulcher and other Christian holy sites from Muslim desecration is resuscitated and held up as an absolute, overriding ideal – right throughout World War I and thereafter. The British troops fighting the Turks in Palestine in 1917-18, were commonly seen as modern Crusaders battling the Saracens.\(^{22}\)

In her study of chivalric stories for children published in Edwardian-era anthologies in Britain, Velma Bourgeois Richmond has found many examples of crusading tales, in which Richard the Lionheart featured prominently.\(^{23}\) Siberry concluded her survey of crusade imagery in literature with the observation that: ‘The standard formulae seem to have been employed, from the absent and returning crusader to the romanticized crusade hero, fictional or historically based, in particular Richard I and, as ever, Tasso and Scott were the key sources of imagery and influence.’\(^{24}\)

Littleton’s work on selected British history textbooks between 1799 and 2002 has demonstrated that similar ideas and methods were used. Often evaluated within the context of the reigns of monarchs, the crusades were the stories of ‘great men’
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\(^{21}\) Shadur, *Young Travelers to Jerusalem*, p. xviii.

\(^{22}\) Ibid., p. 84.


\(^{24}\) Siberry, *New Crusaders*, p. 149.
who were national heroes, such as the kings Richard I and Edward I. While the French textbooks lauded Saint Louis and competed with Belgian and German books for Godfrey de Bouillon’s nationality, British accounts celebrated Richard’s qualities as a crusading king. ‘A hero’, Guhe observed in her survey of nineteenth-century French and German textbooks, ‘acts as a collective ideal, yet at the same time offers an individual perspective on the nation’s history that he represents.’ These figures could embody national character or represent national interests, though depictions could easily incorporate literary imaginings.

The following sections will consider in further depth the ways in which three authors of juvenile fiction combined their strong educational interests with tales set in and around various crusades. These authors, chosen for their position as both educators and entertainers of the young and for their wider influence and contemporary popularity, all set at least one of their novels in the crusades, thereby enabling us to examine their perceptions and representation of crusading. They also span the era under consideration, overlapping with one another through the Victorian and Edwardian periods to the First World War. Charlotte M. Yonge, a lifelong fan of Scott, wrote moralistic stories of individual sacrifice for young people in the mid-nineteenth century while the phenomenally popular George A. Henty wrote imperialist adventure fiction in the boom years for juvenile literature at the turn of the century. A generation later, Sir Henry Newbolt’s version of a glorious and chivalric thread of national history was expressed in his fiction and the patriotic verse he was better known for – and in his vision for an English curriculum. But first consideration must be made of Scott’s influential twist on the crusades.

*The Talisman* (1825) by Sir Walter Scott

Standing behind many of the nineteenth-century depictions of the crusades in British culture was the ‘ubiquitous’ Scott whose crusading novels were widely read and imitated and whose vision of the crusades and their participants hugely
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influenced subsequent generations.27 Indeed, his work was being read by school children in English textbooks and readers at the start of the twentieth century.28 The scope of Scott’s impact in popularising both medievalism and chivalry in the nineteenth century have been examined in Chapter One; similarly, Siberry has investigated Scott’s engagement with the crusades in detail.29 This section will focus on the nature of his literary constructions of the crusaders and crusading, especially in *The Talisman*, with a view to what was being transmitted to his readers, imitators and illustrators.

Scott published several works set in and around the crusades. *Ivanhoe* (1820) and *The Betrothed* (1825) both concerned those left behind by crusaders, while *Count Robert of Paris* (1831) took a minor incident from the First Crusade recorded in Anna Comnena’s *Alexiad* for inspiration. His unpublished novel, *The Siege of Malta*, concerned the 1565 defence of the island by the Hospitaller knights against invading Turks.30 Scott’s engagement with the crusades was scholarly as well as imaginative: he had read the First Crusade chronicler Raymond of Aguilers, the *Alexiad*, the accounts by William of Tyre and John of Joinville; the works of historians James and Mills; and had copies of Tasso and Thomas Fuller’s *History of the Holy Warre* in his library at Abbotsford.31

Of his ‘crusader’ novels, *The Talisman* most directly engaged the crusades as it was set at the end of the twelfth century during the Third Crusade. The story related the adventure of an (ostensibly) lowly Scottish knight, Kenneth, in the service of the English King, Richard ‘the Lionheart’. Two of the novel’s dominant characters were
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27 Ibid., pp. 122–30. See Chapter One for Scott’s wider influence and chivalry.
31 Siberry, *New Crusaders*, p. 113. It is likely, Andrew Lincoln has suggested, that given the repetition of tropes that Scott was aware of the preceding crusader novels; Lincoln, *Walter Scott and Modernity*, p. 108.
taken from history: King Richard was depicted as a man of passion, bravery and martial skill, well matched by the wise and chivalrous Muslim leader Saladin. Scott famously wrote:

*the warlike character of Richard I., wild and generous, a pattern of chivalry, with all its extravagant virtues, and its no less absurd errors, was opposed to that of Saladin, in which the Christian and English monarch showed all the cruelty and violence of an Eastern sultan, and Saladin, on the other hand, displayed the deep policy and prudence of a European sovereign, whilst each contended which should excel the other in the knightly qualities of bravery and generosity.*\(^{32}\)

He repeatedly heralded the chivalrous Saladin while it was the Christian lords who provided intractable antagonism to Kenneth and Richard. Scott seemed ‘much more interested in the dynamics of contact and encounter between East and West’ than any actual Christian-Muslim conflict.\(^{33}\) The author commented that cross-cultural contact had changed the Muslims as well as the Christians, and had eroded the difference between the followers of the two religions:

*The distinction of religions, nay, the fanatical zeal which animated the followers of the Cross and of the Crescent against each other, was much softened by a feeling so natural to generous combatants, and especially cherished by the spirit of chivalry. This last strong impulse had extended itself gradually from the Christians to their mortal enemies the Saracens, both of Spain and of Palestine. The latter were, indeed, no longer the fanatical savages who had burst from the centre of Arabian deserts, with the sabre in one hand and the Koran in the other, to inflict death or the faith of Mohammed, or, at the best, slavery and tribute, upon all who dared to oppose the belief of the prophet of Mecca. [...] in*
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contending with the Western Christians, animated by a zeal as fiery as
their own, and possessed of as unconquerable courage, address, and
success in arms, the Saracens gradually caught a part of their manners,
and especially of those chivalrous observances which were so well
calculated to charm the minds of a proud and conquering people. They
had their tournaments and games of chivalry; they had even their
knights, or some rank analogous; and above all, the Saracens observed
their plighted faith with an accuracy which might sometimes put to
shame those who owned a better religion.34

Commentators have found in the transfer of chivalry to the east assumed by The
Talisman a victory for the crusade lacking from history and a model for the imperial
project; authors such as Cottin had used conversion to Christianity to bring
triumpant closure.35 In further rejecting a religiously oriented narrative, Scott had
Saladin make it clear conversion was not on the table.36

The above passage suggested that chivalry had ‘superimposed its structures upon
the Muslim knights’; in lieu of a religious war, or even an East-West cultural conflict,
the Third Crusade was overwritten by the demands of Scott’s narrative of chivalric
encounter.37 Morris has therefore concluded that:

*Crusading thus plays a curious role within the text. While it motivates
the ideological zeal that precipitates conflicts between Christian and
Muslim knights, the physical act of chivalric battle simultaneously erases
these ideological distinctions. [...] If virtuous Muslim and Christian

34 Ibid., pp. 35–36; Lincoln, Walter Scott and Modernity, p. 111.
35 Megan L. Morris, ‘Sir Walter Scott’s The Betrothed (1825) and The Talisman (1825)’, The
Crusades Project, University of Rochester, US, <http://d.lib.rochester.edu/camelot/text/sir-
walter-scott-betrothed-talisman>, [accessed 14 May 2014]; Megan L. Morris, ‘Madame Cottin’s
The Saracen, or Matilda and Malek Adhel’, The Crusades Project, University of Rochester, US,
<http://d.lib.rochester.edu/crusades/text/saracen-or-matlda>, [accessed 10 May 2016].
the Jew?”: Friends and Enemies in Walter Scott’s Crusader Novels’, Studies in Romanticism 47
37 Morris, ‘Scott’s The Betrothed and The Talisman’.
knights are essentially the same, there is no need for them to battle one another.  

The Talisman, then, functioned as a discussion of chivalry set in the Third Crusade and featured historical crusaders, in which Scott, though the trials of Kenneth, played out the incompatibilities and tensions of chivalric loyalty and duty to sovereign, faith and lady which provided the drama of the tale. The crusade was a fitting backdrop for an exploration of chivalric virtue.

For Scott, as his essay on chivalry in the Encyclopædia Britannica related, the crusade endeavour was essentially ‘founded on the spirit of chivalry’.  

The defence of Malta by the Hospitallers attracted Scott because it could be considered the final act of chivalry; there he found ‘the Spirit of Chivalry blazing in its ashes’.  

Whilst considering chivalry something of the past, Scott clearly found it compelling. ‘Sharply critical of chivalry in practice,’ Chandler wrote, ‘he could nonetheless praise the ideal.’  

The huge popularity of Scott’s historical fiction ensured that his characterisations of historical personages and of the crusades as a chivalrous folly, were appropriated and rearticulated in countless forms. Morris has observed that, ‘chivalry and the crusades became all but synonymous in the nineteenth-century British and American popular consciousness.’  

Scott discovered chivalrous uses for the crusades, demonstrating their dramatic potential. It was their inbuilt flexibility and Scott’s association between chivalry and crusading which contributed to their later utility.

Duty Unto Death: Charlotte M. Yonge (1823-1901)

Noted for her involvement in the Anglo-Catholic Tractarian movement, Yonge was a Victorian novelist, textbook writer, critic and editor best known for The Heir of Redclyffe (1853). Educated by her father and concerned throughout her life with

38 Ibid.  
39 Scott, ‘Chivalry’ (1815). See also Chapter One.  
40 Quoted in Cavallero, Ottomania, p. 170.  
42 Morris, ‘Introduction’.
teaching in the village Sunday school, Yonge edited a magazine for girls, *The Monthly Packet*, between 1851-94 and produced influential readers for schools in literature and history. Yonge wrote over two hundred works and was ‘one of the best-selling woman writers of the Victorian period’; her historical fiction included a crusading tale, *The Prince and the Page* (1866). Despite being considered a minor author, her influence was ‘pervasive’, especially through the wide distribution of the various textbooks she authored, and she was hailed as the ‘mother of historical fiction for children’ by one historian.

Yonge, like other mid-Victorian writers, took seriously the potential for her work to form her readers. While her fiction was characterised by ‘scrupulously moral agonizing’, her novels have also been described as ‘the rehearsal rooms for productions of patriotic English men.’ History was seen to address all three of these concerns – for morality, nationalism and masculinity – because of the didactic potential of the exposure of young readers to societies of the past. Furthermore, the idealised medieval past in vogue in Victorian Britain provided unique opportunities which authors were not slow to realise:

> *Throughout her life, Yonge continued to sift through history searching for ‘true knights’ and finding them wherever she detected unselfish behaviour beyond the call of duty. She exploited her considerable knowledge of chronicles and legendary tales in order to weave stories into which Victorian readers could imaginatively place themselves as heroes.*

---

Yonge was in many ways an heir of Scott; as a child she had enjoyed Scott’s novels and retained an attachment to his work thereafter. As Rosemary Mitchell has demonstrated, Yonge made complex intertextual use of Scott.48 She was sufficiently well-educated to research and translate the medieval sources which underpinned both her historical fiction and history textbooks; Sarah Wakefield has written of Yonge’s love of Scott and Shakespeare that ‘From these sources, we might argue, she gleaned her method of historical writing: lively, colourful, but frequently inventive and inattentive to exact details. Scott’s lasting legacy to nineteenth-century imitators is that when records are sparse or unclear, one simply invents.’49 Yonge’s career demonstrated the tension that was increasingly felt in the late nineteenth century between the need for ‘factual history’ and ‘anecdotal tradition’. Where Scott could happily invent historical scenes and be lauded for his ability to bring the past to life, Yonge’s involvement in writing history school books and her contact with historians such as Edward A. Freeman, who had aspirations of a drier, more scientific discipline, sensitised her to Ranke’s emphasis that history should describe things as they actually were – wie es eigentlich gewesen.50 In response, Yonge gradually repositioned her fiction into the margins of the historical record – though this should not be understood as a retreat from her educational goals.51 Rather, as the genres of historical and literature writing became more distinct, so did their educational purposes. This proved no barrier, as shall be seen, to Yonge’s purpose of moral education.

Yonge’s attachment to Scott included direct engagement with his crusading legacy. Notably for this study, Yonge wrote an historical introduction to Scott’s \textit{The Talisman} in 1886 in which she discussed Scott’s historicity as well as providing her view of the Third Crusade. The edition of \textit{The Talisman} was designed for school

49 Sarah R. Wakefield, ‘Charlotte Yonge’s Victorian Normans in \textit{The Little Duke}', in Beyond Arthurian Romances, p. 54.
50 For Yonge’s encounters, and disagreements, with Edward Freeman, see Walton, ‘Historic Harem’.
51 Mitchell, Picturing the Past, p. 251.
children and issued when Yonge already possessed a reputation for accessible history writing.\textsuperscript{52} In it she expressed the view that the Third Crusade was ‘one of the ideal conflicts of chivalry’, characterised by the battle between ‘Saladin, gallant, able, wary, and resolute, but with a native generosity able to appreciate a noble foe; [and] Richard, high-minded and chivalrous, brave to rashness, and with the eye and talent of a general, but failing in his aims through his violent temper’.\textsuperscript{53} Saladin, too, earned the epithet ‘chivalrous’ from Yonge; conversely King Philip of France was ‘cunning, bent solely on his own advantage’. Revealingly, the second generation of residents of the Holy Land had been ‘corrupted by their surroundings,’ had taken up many of the Eastern vices and ‘lost their courage and hardihood’.\textsuperscript{54} Yonge was aware that Scott’s vision of the crusade was painted in primary colours and that there was much that was ‘unhistorical’:

\begin{quote}
Scott has made the ‘Talisman’ a kind of epitome of its most romantic moments, throwing many incidents together which happened at different intervals. Yet the brilliant fabric he has woven impresses the characters of the chief personages and the spirit of the Crusade on our minds better than many a more exact chronicle of facts.\textsuperscript{55}
\end{quote}

Despite demonstrating her sensitivity to questions of historicity, Yonge still endorsed Scott’s colourful version of events as being educationally effective.\textsuperscript{56}

In her earlier school history book, \textit{Kings of England: A History for the Young} (1848, nine editions by 1872), Yonge expanded her presentation of the crusades.\textsuperscript{57} Crusading was explicitly kept in the background: though it was a ‘most glorious’ story, it did ‘not belong to the History of England’. The motivation for the First

\textsuperscript{53} Yonge, ‘Preface’, \textit{The Talisman} (1886), p. x.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., pp. vi and x.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., p. v.
\textsuperscript{56} On Yonge’s sensitivity to approaches to writing history, see Walton, ‘Historic Harem’, pp. 232-33.
\textsuperscript{57} ‘Publication History’, \textit{The Charlotte M Yonge Fellowship},<http://community.dur.ac.uk/c.e.schultze/works/kings_of_england.html>, [accessed 2 May 2014].
Crusade was seen to be freeing Jerusalem from ‘bondage’ as well as protecting pilgrims from abuse at the hands of the ‘unbelieving Turks’. Peter the Hermit, having brought a report of these scandals to Pope Urban, worked in tandem with the pope who organised the crusade which Peter preached. The venture was skipped over and only the successful outcome was noted with the refusal of the ‘saint-like’ Godfrey de Bouillon to take the title of king. The Third Crusade, involving King Richard, was accorded more attention; however, it was a depiction which owed much to Scott. Richard was ‘high and noble [...] full of truth and honour; but his pride was very great, and his anger was furious, though it was soon over.’ He was not long without his nemesis – Saladin, ‘the bravest enemy [the crusaders] had yet encountered’ – who provided the counterpoint. These figures dominated the narrative and the English King took on mythical proportions: ‘Only half armed, he fought the whole day, and for a long time without his horse; and such was the terror of his name, that thousands of Turks fled at the sight of him when almost alone.’

Prince Edward’s crusade was given some attention as the prelude to his reign in England. His motivation was to ‘deliver Jerusalem from the Turks’ but he failed to reach the Holy City. Instead Yonge recorded that he survived an assassination attempt through the actions of his wife, Eleanor, who sucked the poison from his wound. He was then attended by a doctor who ordered the flesh around the wound removed. Edward refused to order the Muslim prisoners killed in retaliation as he was afraid of reprisals against pilgrims held by Muslim lords. Yonge’s account was brief and straightforward; although most history books until the 1950s related Eleanor’s role in Edward’s recovery after being attacked, contemporary chronicles did not.

59 Yonge, Kings of England, p. 58.
60 Ibid., p. 61.
61 Ibid., pp. 77-79.
In these examples we can see how Yonge developed a perception of the crusades which was centred on the recovery of Jerusalem and heavily influenced by both the ‘succession of monarchs’ approach to history writing and by Scott’s historical novels. Indeed, in focussing on the reigns and persons of the Kings of England, and considering history to be morally educational, the depiction of chivalrous, larger-than-life characters (especially royals) is unsurprising, as is the focus on what was understood to be national history. The Third Crusade was often overshadowed by Richard the Lionheart and his conflict with Saladin in Victorian literature, poems and plays, and Yonge similarly demonstrated that tendency.63

*The Prince and the Page*

Yonge’s own crusading novel, *The Prince and the Page*, was published in 1866 and set in the thirteenth century with the crusade of Prince (later King) Edward of England. Although the *Prince and the Page* is a fictional story, Yonge carefully acknowledged her sources in the preface and showed an historical awareness throughout; ‘Yonge did not sacrifice history to the demands of her fictional plot; instead, she fitted the plot round the given historical facts.’64

The story followed Richard de Montfort as he was discovered hiding in the forest by Prince Edward (later King Edward I of England), recruited to be his page, and accompanied Edward on his crusade to the Holy Land (1270-72). The novel was a crusading story as the events of Edward’s crusade formed the middle section of the narrative. The characters travelled to Tunis and the Holy Land and mention was made of unsuccessful previous crusades; however, no explanation was given as to why Edward had vowed to fight in the Holy Land, only that he had and was determined to arrive there.65 In conversation with his errant brother Simon, Richard refused to join his independent holding in Galilee because he was ‘a sworn crusader’; his renegade brother retorted, ‘what are we but crusaders too, boy? ‘Tis all service against the Moslem!’66 Crusading, was understood to have been a

---

65 Yonge, *The Prince and the Page*, p. 120.
66 Ibid., p. 163.
vaguely ‘sacred’ endeavour against Muslim enemies with Jerusalem an off-stage aim.

As with other of Yonge’s tales, *The Prince and the Page* had at its heart family dynamics: before the start of the story Richard’s father and brothers had led a failed rebellion against Edward’s father. His oldest brother Henry, presumed dead, was discovered living as a beggar with Hospitaller Knights in London, whilst the antagonist of the novel is another brother, Simon de Montfort, whose actions repeatedly placed Richard under suspicion from the royal court. At the climax of the tale Simon attempted to kill Prince Edward when he stayed with the Hospitallers in Acre, but by mistake fatally stabbed Richard instead. Richard’s dying wish was the reconciliation of the Prince and his brother, which his shocked brother agreed to.

The preface to the book stated Yonge’s educational hope of promoting ‘sympathy and appreciation’ of the ‘great characters of our early annals’. The great character of the book was Edward, whom Yonge called ‘the English Justinian.’ After the first couple of chapters Richard devotedly followed him as his page and the text repeatedly eulogised Edward as a chivalrous leader ahead of his time. Edward consistently sought reconciliation with Richard’s family despite provocation and exercised justice impartially when Richard’s honour was in doubt. Richard’s sacrifice for Edward saved his life and signified the preservation of the future of the nation (in the form of the Prince’s person), as well as the resolution of the baronial civil war, which Richard’s fractured family embodied.

As Morris has identified, Yonge attempted to ‘redefine both chivalry and crusade in accordance with nineteenth-century domestic virtues’; including a Christian moral
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While the external events of the crusade caused Richard little trouble, the novel dwelt on his three opportunities for escaping from the uncertain outcomes of due process when he was accused (falsely) of wrongdoing. This conformed with her aim of history writing: ‘as feebly tracing the dealings of God with mankind; and at the same time, as a religious lesson, a course of examples and warnings, calculated, alike by greatness and reality, to impress the mind.’ The crusade of Edward served as the historical setting for the exemplary tale of heroism and courage which culminated in the Christlike ‘martyrdom’ of Richard. Taken with the exhortation that every person in England do their duty to God and their neighbour at the conclusion of Yonge’s Kings of England, Richard’s death for Edward – the ultimate act of national service – illustrated Yonge’s ideal of chivalric heroism being both a Christian act of self-sacrifice for others and a patriotic duty unto death.

We see, then, in the historical and fictional writings of Yonge regarding the crusades how the influence of Scott and the ‘great man’ view of history could come together to produce narratives centred on heroes which served as ideal moral teaching aids. The crusades themselves provided ‘glorious’ but underdeveloped background scenery for the national figures and the domestic morality with which Yonge was primarily concerned. A complex mix of chivalrous morality and nationalism shaped both the perception of historical personages and of events through The Prince and the Page. Where Edward embodied the nation of England (upon which readers would have understood their Britain to stand in continuity), Richard represented a character for the young audience to identify with and emulate in his moral dilemmas and ultimate self-sacrifice. Yonge’s history books and historical fiction reveal the amalgam of national, moral, and Christian concerns of the author being transmitted to her audience using a crusading setting and narrative. As suggested above, later nineteenth-century juvenile literature moved away from its evangelical...

didacticism and instead mobilised the potential of adventure fiction for imperial purposes.\textsuperscript{74}

\textit{‘War in its most picturesque form’: G.A. Henty (1832–1902)}\textsuperscript{75}

George Alfred Henty was known on both sides of the Atlantic for his adventure stories for boys: his prodigious output consisted almost entirely of war stories, roughly half of which were set in the past.\textsuperscript{76} Before he took up novel-writing Henty had served in the British army and travelled widely as a war correspondent, notably in the Crimean War. As well as contributing to newspapers he had been involved with two magazines for boys; the \textit{Union Jack} (1880–83) and \textit{Beeton’s Boys’ Own Magazine} (1888–90). He was estimated to have sold three-and-a-half-million books in the UK alone through his publisher, Blackie, with many more across the English-speaking world; one estimate suggested he had sold twenty-five million books worldwide.\textsuperscript{77} The goals of education and entertainment were not assumed by Henty to be mutually exclusive: ‘it being my object now, as always,’ he wrote, ‘to amuse, as well as to give instruction in the facts of history.’\textsuperscript{78} Henty’s biographer G.M. Fenn claimed that he ‘taught more lasting history to boys than all the schoolmasters of his generation.’\textsuperscript{79} He was explicit about the type of education he aimed to give; ‘my object has been to teach history and still more to encourage manly and straight

\textsuperscript{74} Richards, ‘Image of the Army’, p. 87.
living and feeling amongst boys." Henty, therefore, consulted works of history to inform his novels and was, in turn, widely used in classrooms across Europe.

In evaluating the impact of juvenile literature leading up to the First World War, Paris has argued that Henty played a key role in painting a picture of war that socialised British youth: ‘Henty romanticised war and turned it into an attractive adventure that boys found enormously appealing in order to inculcate a sense of duty in his readers and the commitment to defend the empire.’ This picture was ‘an idealised portrait of the imperial warrior’ which combined aspects of imperial representation (stereotypical racial characteristics, colonial settings, British superiority) and ‘chivalric manliness’ with fast-paced adventure stories; unlike a painting these images were in exciting motion, enacting Henty’s vision of vigorous boyhood. He was, one contemporary remarked, ‘the most Imperialist of all the Imperialists I have encountered.’ Of Henty, ‘an apologist for empire’, Jerome de Groot has written that he ‘had intended his works to be educational, and they are additionally moralistic, heroic, conservative and nationalistic.’ Henty’s broad dissemination and educational application, as well as his ongoing influence through his many imitators, mean that his work of crusading fiction provides an excellent place to examine whether and how he can be seen to be using the crusades to shape late Victorian British youth.

Henty’s *Winning His Spurs* (1882) was a novel involving the events of the Third Crusade. The hero, a young English noble called Cuthbert, followed King Richard I through the course of the crusade. The repertoire of Cuthbert’s escapades was unrelenting: Cuthbert fought alongside outlawed archers from the forest, won distinction and his knighthood fighting alongside Richard in Palestine, was captured

---
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and taken to Jerusalem, was nearly hanged, rescued his promised bride Margaret, found the imprisoned Richard and finally married Margaret and settled in his estate in Evesham. The Third Crusade provided Henty with plentiful occasions to explore the twelfth-century world and its potential for action. The crusader locations were extensive, forming a non-stop account of historical adventure tourism which took in the breadth of the medieval crusading landscape: the greenwoods of England, mustering in France and Sicily, forays on the North African coast and in Cyprus, the Holy Land – Acre, Jerusalem, the Palestinian desert, Jaffa – and back via an Austrian mountain pass. Similarly, crusade-specific adventures were fully exploited. Cuthbert met a mysterious hermit in the desert during one adventure; as in Scott’s *The Talisman*, the hermit turned out to be an ex-French knight with a hidden room in his cave. Very few staples of imperial adventure novels were absent: Cuthbert was captured and escaped (twice) disguised as an Arab, was instrumental in the successes of the crusade by both might and ingenuity, and served as a valiant and loyal retainer to Richard who rewarded him for his efforts by social advancement.

The figure of Richard I loomed large in Henty’s story. The English King bore a great deal of resemblance to his depiction as man of passion in Scott’s *The Talisman*. Henty’s Richard was a more sympathetic, if less complex, character – a man of action, inspirational leader and phenomenal fighter, with no hint of fear or hesitation when it came to fighting Saracens. Many pages were filled with descriptions of his exploits in battle, including the requisite Turk-slicing feat.

Although Henty seemed to suggest that Richard’s attitude might have been responsible for undermining the crusade, the character argued that he would have taken Jerusalem but for the ‘apathy, folly, and the weakness of the leaders’ with him.

---
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Analytical lenses of gender, class and race distinctly reveal the structure of Henty’s medieval world. The passivity of the female characters was notable; Cuthbert rescued his mother and future bride Margaret from captivity and Richard’s fiancée Berengaria from an attempted kidnap by the French.91 The earthy outlaws of Evesham forest recognised Cuthbert’s natural superiority as a noble and followed him loyally through his travels; Cuthbert, in turn, served his lord, Sir Walter of Evesham, and King Richard faithfully and unquestioningly. His chief retainer, Cnut, was of Saxon stock and entirely subject to his emotions, which at one point nearly cost Cuthbert his life. The young lord compared Cnut to an unrestrained animal: ‘Cnut had something of the nature of a bull in him. There are certain things which he cannot stomach, and when he seeth them he rageth like a wild beast, regardless altogether of safety or convenience.’92 Furthermore, the racial composition of England echoed Scott’s division of Saxon serfs and Norman overlords in Ivanhoe, except that the hope was expressed by one character that the crusade would bring the two together:

*methinks that when the Saxon and the Norman stand side by side on the soil of the Holy Land, and shout together for England, it must needs bind them together, and lead them to feel that they are no longer Normans and Saxons, but Englishmen.*93

As in Yonge’s work, the events of the crusade potentially provide a site for national healing and strengthening of a united British identity. ‘In Henty, then,’ Robert Irwin concluded, ‘going on crusades is not merely character-forming, but nation-forming.’94

Henty’s medievalism was one of an ordered society disrupted: female characters were passive and needed rescuing, the outlaws and lower classes respected the

unbridled passion which went far to wreck the success of the enterprise upon which he was embarked.’
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‘natural authority’ of nobility and the English were at the top of the racial hierarchy. Though there was significant potential within the crusade for social disruption and re-ordering – glimpsed in the quote regarding the possibility of the forging of a new national identity above – this was enacted only for Cuthbert, who took his opportunities for glory to earn knighthood from the hands of King Richard. Cuthbert began the story in the forest with the outlaws and ended it married and securely installed as the Earl of Evesham. These aspects of female passivity, assignment of racial traits and class harmony (when rightly ordered) provided the fabric of Henty’s conservative medievalism, which in Winning His Spurs was mixed with Cuthbert’s coming-of-age tale. The crusade was a personal adventure of transition into maturity which ended when right order (of gender, race and class) was restored; there was no mention of Richard’s death – instead he was last seen presiding over Cuthbert’s wedding.

Unlike Yonge, Henty did address the causes and purpose of the crusade, although in a double manner. In a dialogue between Cuthbert and Father Francis, a local priest who preached the crusade in Evesham, the religious justification and dynamics of the crusade were articulated. The First Crusade was presented as a response to Muslim persecution of Christian pilgrims; the expedition, Francis related, was encouraged by Pope Urban.95 Through Francis, Henty detailed at length the first two crusades and expressed the opinion that subsequent expeditions were justified to ‘avenge our brethren who have been murdered by the infidels’, and participation, therefore, was ‘the duty of every man who can bear arms’. Their success was in God’s hands, though their motives needed to be pure: ‘Those who desire to fight the battle of the Lord must cleanse their hearts, and go forth in the spirit of pilgrims rather than knights [...] they should lay aside all thoughts of worldly glory and rivalry one against another.’96 Francis declined to comment on whether the European princes gathering for the Third Crusade met

95 Henty, Winning His Spurs, p. 38.
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this standard and the rest of the narrative saw cleansing of hearts take a back seat to worldly glory in the form of Cuthbert’s heroism.

The religious reasons given for the crusade, however, were contradicted by Henty’s own authorial interjection at the point when Cuthbert set off:

*It must not be supposed that the whole of those present were animated by any strong religious feeling. No doubt there existed a desire, which was carefully fanned by the preaching of the priests and monks, to rescue the holy sepulcher from the hands of the Saracens; but a far stronger feeling was to be found in the warlike nature of the people in those days. Knights, men-at-arms, and indeed men of all ranks, were full of a combative spirit. Life in the castle and hut was alike dull and monotonous, and the excitement of war and adventure was greatly looked for both as a means of obtaining glory and booty; and for the change they afforded to the dreary monotony of life.*

For Henty, then, the crusades were really, despite the religious rhetoric, an opportunity for adventure and escape from the monotony of everyday life. Indeed, medieval war was ‘picturesque’: ‘This was indeed war in its most picturesque form, a form which, as far as beauty is concerned, has been altogether altered, and indeed destroyed, by modern arms.’ Unlike modern warfare, Henty asserted, ‘prowess and bravery went for everything’ and ‘battles were decided as much by the prowess and bravery of the leader and his immediate following as by that of the great mass of the army.’

Cuthbert’s adventures in fact neatly fit Henty’s formula for heroic adventure. Dennis Butts has argued that readers of Henty’s books could recognise a ‘type’ in the protagonists of all the stories who overcame difficult circumstances to prosper. He has identified the ingredients of Henty’s adventure novel which were replicated through his catalogue; Cuthbert encountered nearly all of them. As his books dealt
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with British and proto-British heroes and heroines through the ages, Henty created a continuum of recognisable national heroism which stretched from Roman times to the imperial present.

Henty’s view of the Third Crusade, and crusading, can therefore be seen to be ‘picturesque’: a form of warfare in which deeds of heroism stood out and in which individuals could make their fortune. Both Yonge and Henty’s heroes had fictional adventures amongst real historical personages for whom crusading provided a background for adventure. The hero of Winning His Spurs modelled the characteristics of action, ingenuity and chivalric comportment as part of an ordered society. Henty’s massive popularity and educational inclination, coupled with his unabashed imperialism, drove his version of a coming-of-age crusading tale in the context of a continuity of British heroism and manly pluck. As Cuthbert’s extensive travels showed, Henty exercised the potential for escapist imperial tourism to the fullest extent he could, making sure he left the world intact behind him. The less secure years of the First World War brought a clearer articulation of the continuity of British chivalric history with the work of Sir Henry Newbolt.

‘A past which can never be truly spoken of as dead’: Sir Henry Newbolt (1862-1938)

Most famous now for his ellipsis of battle and cricket in the poem ‘Vitae Lampada’, Newbolt was a prominent imperial poet, critic, editor, educationalist and author of historical fiction at the turn of the century. The line ‘Play up! Play up and play the game!’ from the above work came to represent the imperial ethos which considered public school games as the training ground for service in colonial fields. Indeed, Newbolt’s ‘The Vigil’ was printed on the front page of The Times the day war with Germany was declared in 1914; such was the positive reception

101 Paris, Over the Top, p. xix.
that Newbolt was knighted.\textsuperscript{102} Though Newbolt later had an ambiguous relationship with the famous line and its symbolic use, he himself became identified with the linkage of education and (inter)national service.\textsuperscript{103} Newbolt’s career was a practical outworking of these concerns: having achieved fame for his patriotic poems he worked during the First World War for the Admiralty, Foreign Office and the Ministry of Information attached to Wellington House. Following the war he was made Educational Editor for Nelson publishers by John Buchan and subsequently chaired the Board of Education committee which produced the influential 1921 Newbolt Report that lobbied for the place of English in a national curriculum.\textsuperscript{104} Newbolt can be seen as an educator with the ear of the government in the early twentieth century whose views were influential in forming national education for young people. At the same time, one commentator dubbed him an ‘emotional refugee’ from the Victorian era – despite being heavily invested in the tumultuous events of the war and its aftermath it was the past Newbolt turned to for secure foundations.\textsuperscript{105}

During the early part of the twentieth century Newbolt took up novel writing. Aiming his fiction at boys, he wrote adventure stories with the intention to inspire his readers to emulate their heroes’ deeds. For the purposes of this study it is noteworthy that Newbolt’s fiction included several novels which were set in the Middle Ages, and one which engaged directly with crusading and the crusades. \textit{The Book of the Happy Warrior} was published towards the end of the First World War in 1917 and was an attempt to bring chivalric heroes to the attention of boys in Britain.\textsuperscript{106} The book consisted of chapters relating to various medieval heroes, which Newbolt had either written himself or translated, and concluded with two chapters explaining how the public schools of his day were the torch-bearers of the
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traditions of medieval knights. In fact, Newbolt claimed, they were directly
descended from forms of training by which squires became knights which had been
preserved through the previous four centuries by the ‘gentle class’:

[The public school] has derived the housemaster from the knight to
whose castle boys were sent as pages; fagging, from the services of all
kinds which they there performed; prefects, from the senior squires, or
‘masters of the henchmen’; athletics, from the habit of out-door life; and
the love of games, the ‘sporting’ or ‘amateur’ view of them, from
tournaments and the chivalric rules of war.\(^\text{107}\)

The didactic aims of the book were twofold. Newbolt explicitly held up models of
chivalry worthy of imitation whilst demonstrating that chivalry was an essential
component of modern life and warfare. Secondly, he implicitly asserted that
chivalry could be located in the training given to young men by the public schools
of Britain. *The Book of the Happy Warrior* can be understood as a textbook – by
presenting classic examples of chivalric heroes to students Newbolt’s book
functioned as a ‘reader’ in chivalry.\(^\text{108}\) It also bore the marks of its wartime
construction as all the examples of heroism presented were British or French –
Germanic chivalry had been expunged.\(^\text{109}\)

It is within this framework that Newbolt presented his heroes. After a chapter which
dealt with the *Chanson de Roland*, the second chapter focussed on King Richard the
Lionheart who was depicted as being motivated by ‘desire for war and pilgrimage’.
Richard was shown to be a terrifying opponent for the Turks, many of whom he
slaughtered, and an inspiring leader of troops who encouraged his men in a dire
situation that ‘there is nothing that cannot be borne by a manly heart [...] ; it is a
man’s choice, to win bravely or die with honour.’\(^\text{110}\) Richard’s decidedly
unchivalrous decision to execute the garrison of Acre after its surrender to him in

August 1191 was omitted; instead the English King was heralded for his prowess in battle and seen slicing through enemies with impunity:

That day he played the man against the horde of yelling Turks, and with his lightning sword cut down countless numbers of them. Some he cleft from helm to teeth; from others he slashed off heads, arms, and other members; such was his sword-play that his right hand was galled and blistered with continual smiting.\textsuperscript{111}

It is likely that the chapter was Newbolt’s own selected translation from Latin of the chronicle \textit{Itinerarium Regis Ricardi}, which threw into relief his use of the phrase ‘played the man’ above and indicated his attempt to construct a particular form of masculinity.\textsuperscript{112} Crusading, as embodied by Richard, was seen to be an uncomplicated exercise in ‘manly’ Turk-bashing. The cause was given only passing reference at the beginning of the chapter as being grief at the overthrow of the Kingdom of Jerusalem and ‘defilement’ of the Holy Sepulchre by ‘infidels’ under Saladin.\textsuperscript{113}

The next chapter which directly related to the crusades was another translation, this time from John of Joinville’s account of St. Louis’ expedition to Egypt in 1248. Louis successfully took the city of Damietta before his army was destroyed and he was himself taken captive. His chivalric character was witnessed in his scrupulous honesty – even in defeat he corrected the Saracens when they miscounted the amount paid in one instalment for his ransom in his favour.\textsuperscript{114} Again, there was no mention of Louis’ later expedition to Tunis where he died of illness in 1270. Subsequent chapters offered further insight into Newbolt’s perception of the past. His account of Robin Hood was that of the natural bonds of loyalty and affection between yeoman and king being disrupted by grasping lords and the king’s attempt
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to have Robin live at court. Chapters on an England versus France jousting tournament (in which the English knights sportingly recognised the superiority of the French), the deeds of Edward the Black Prince, Bertrand du Guesclin and Bayard, all contributed knightly examples of chivalric behaviour. Indeed, Bayard was notable for being almost entirely overdetermined by his designation as a paragon of chivalry. He died after being shot whilst leading the rearguard of the French king in retreat from Spain (*à la* Roland) and was lamented by friend and foe alike. Newbolt spent five pages recounting his qualities – he loved God and his neighbour, was generous to a fault, brave, skilled at arms, entirely loyal to his king and honourable in all his conduct.115

Newbolt’s understanding of the past was most clearly revealed in a chapter taken from his book *The Old Country* (1906), in which an early twentieth-century youth named Stephen Bulmer accidentally travelled back in time to the fourteenth century.116 There his modern ideas of progress and free thought were brought into dialogue with medieval characters who taught Stephen the nature and value of chivalry. Chivalry was presented as the practical solution to the tension between Christian ideals and the trials of the real world: ‘You make Christianity, in short, a counsel of perfection, to be postponed indefinitely?’ asked Bulmer of the medieval Lord Bryan who replied, ‘We should do so but for Chivalry.’117 As Newbolt’s preface to the chapter related, Stephen was ‘more struck by the similarity between the thought of the fourteenth and twentieth centuries than by the external and trivial differences which counted for so much in the books from which his knowledge of the past was derived.’118

It was this continuity that was the key component of Newbolt’s patriotism, also expressed in his poetry: ‘the essential similarity of past and present’ enabled the construction of a continuing heroic tradition which was distinctively English, and

117 Newbolt, *Happy Warrior*, p. 170. Stephen’s acceptance of the value of chivalry resolves a temporal tension between a ‘medieval’ and contemporary perspective; and is presented as a conversion experience; p. 173.
118 Ibid., p. 145.
essentially chivalric.\textsuperscript{119} ‘A past’, Newbolt wrote in his dedication at the beginning of \textit{The Old Country}, ‘which can never be truly spoken of as dead.’\textsuperscript{120} This perception of continuity informed Newbolt’s educational ethos and explained his inclusion in \textit{The Book of the Happy Warrior} of the history of the public school system through the centuries as a demonstration and defence of this continuing tradition. Newbolt’s patriotism and value of this tradition both stemmed from seeing the past as a living continuum to learn from and be inspired by. \textit{The Book of the Happy Warrior} could, therefore, congruously identify it in both the British Army during the First World War and in Richard I during the Third Crusade.\textsuperscript{121} Furthermore, this enabled Newbolt to proclaim in 1916 that British airmen were like chivalrous knights whose combat was the modern equivalent of jousting.\textsuperscript{122}

Newbolt’s perception of the crusades and crusaders can be seen within this context. The crusades provided sites – ‘tournament fields’ almost – for acts of chivalry, serving as the backdrop for exemplary, inspirational heroes such as Richard I who were part of an accessible past in conversation with the present. Unlike Yonge, Newbolt saw the crusades as figuring centrally in the continuing story of Britain; his ‘great men’ were defined by their chivalry which in turn was a practical expression of Christianity. In \textit{The Book of the Happy Warrior} (the title itself a reference to a poem by William Wordsworth) Newbolt created a corpus of chivalric exemplar which was placed in the context of a national tradition which animated patriotism and demanded its continuation in wartime Britain.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Significant authors for a century included medieval – and often crusading – novels in their oeuvre after Scott. The careers of the three writers considered above spanned the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. Their concern to educate and edify their young audiences, typical of authors in this

\textsuperscript{119} Bright, ‘Newbolt’, p. 160.
\textsuperscript{120} Newbolt, \textit{Old Country}, p. x.
\textsuperscript{121} Newbolt, \textit{Happy Warrior}, p. 257.
period, was expressed in both the content of their writings and in their direct participation in setting the educational agenda for schools; whether through writing or editing textbooks or in Newbolt’s case chairing a government committee. And all three saw in the crusades a rich and potent resource through which to do so:

*Because chivalry and the crusades play a key role in the nineteenth-century social and moral imagination, nineteenth-century representations of the crusades are central to understanding nineteenth-century medievalism and its broader social impact. [...] These works, whether romantic or satirical, employ the motif of crusading to engage with a wide range of issues that are of central concern to students of nineteenth-century medievalism: nationalism, imperialism, domesticity, race, gender, and chivalry.*

The threads observed in Chapter One, and by Siberry in her wider survey of the use of the crusade image in juvenile literature in this period, are visible here: medievalist, nationalist, Christian and chivalric. Yonge’s hero died a Christlike sacrificial death for national healing. Henty’s heroic adventure-tourism modelled the active, ingenious and chivalric life befitting an imperial youth’s passage to settled maturity and the potential for warfare to facilitate this. Newbolt advocated a continuing national, chivalric tradition which best represented a practical Christianity and had been preserved in the public school system – the crusades were a link in the chain of chivalric national character. We can, therefore, see at work the cultural system described in the previous chapter as its advocates sought to inculcate its values in the next generations through the use and creation of particular memories of the crusades.

As well as providing specific opportunities to express these ideals, crusading also possessed the potential to disrupt the order of the medievalist vision. These opportunities were rarely realised, however, and crusading was instead used to reinforce ideas of heroism and nationalism in line with historical assessments, and
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imperial requirements, of the day. Yonge’s titular page, Richard, died to preserve
the royal embodiment of the nation and enact restoration of national unity through
the reconciliation of his rebellious family. Henty’s Cuthbert, by contrast, moved
from the periphery of the social order to become a pillar of its establishment.
Newbolt, writing during the upheaval of the First World War, strove to create a
continuity of national character which would preserve the nation through the war.

The authors’ perceptions and use of crusading examined here, therefore,
conformed to and actively helped to inculcate and perpetuate the cultural system
Girouard argued came to dominate the British upper classes in the late nineteenth
century. Their crusades were the backdrop for the ways they sought to educate
British youth; they flexibly functioned as the medium for late Victorian and
Edwardian educators because they were perceived to have combined Christian
piety and militarism with individual prowess and heroism, lending themselves to
the cult of chivalry which had moved Britain’s elite. In the context of an increasingly
militarised British culture, perceptions of crusading could stand centrally for the
cultural amalgam of Christianity, imperial militarism and a romantic medievalism
which produced nineteenth-century chivalry. Continuity with the crusaders was
established on the grounds of this pseudo-median chivalry which shaped the
authors’ historical imaginations and animated their contemporary educational
goals. All saw the medieval past in general, and the crusades in particular, as an
appropriate setting for didactic enterprise, whether Christian, imperial or chivalric,
and ‘reinvented’ the crusades as they redeployed them.
**3) GOSPEL CRUSADERS**

If the education of youth, especially young men, can be seen as a site central to the concerns of Victorian Britain, then Christian missionaries can be understood to have occupied a peripheral place, with an ‘ambiguous’ relationship to imperial power, ideology and practice.\(^1\) Where the previous chapter demonstrated the symbiotic relationship between crusader medievalism and the late Victorian amalgamation of imperialism, a militant Christianity and resurgent romanticism visibly in operation with the enculturation of the young, this section will examine a liminal space for evidence of the same. The presence or absence of crusader medievalism from Christian missionary discourse will enable the extent of the above system to be gauged: did missionaries employ crusader medievalism to frame their self-perceptions and communications? And if so, how?

Missionaries provide an excellent opportunity for this study for a variety of reasons. James Greenlee and Charles Johnston have suggested that, ‘missionaries typified all that was quintessentially British’.\(^2\) They were often drawn from the educated ranks of British society and were (largely) committed to their faith. They were involved in an inherently educative and communicative endeavour: ‘Their activities were more fully and purely directed towards cultural and psychological change than any other actors on colonial stages. They were, on the whole, seeking explicitly to transform the consciousness of colonized subjects’.\(^3\) And inevitably they were compelled to engage with the realities of British imperial power and ideology at home and abroad. These features, then, positioned them both on the edge of British imperial culture and power and in places of education and cultural diffusion; they could oppose and critique the culture of the metropole, or act as vehicles of its transmission.

---

One important work falls outside the detailed scope of this study but is related to it by reason of its concerns. John Tolan’s *Saint Francis and the Sultan* (2009) has considered the different ways in which the alleged meeting in September 1219 between Saint Francis of Assisi and the sultan of Egypt, al-Malik al-Kâmil, has been presented and interpreted through the subsequent centuries. Tolan has provided a complementary case study which took an incident related to the crusades (Francis’ visit was conducted in the midst of the Fifth Crusade as the crusader army was encamped around the city of Damietta) and examined its echoes in detail over 800 years; his work has opened up some of the contexts in which crusader medievalism could be deployed.4

In contrast, this chapter will take a broader approach in seeking out examples of crusading rhetoric and imagery in Christian missionary circles in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries in order to evaluate their engagement with crusader medievalism. After some consideration of the dynamics of missionaries and missionary agencies with respect to the British Empire and the insights of missionary historians, the chapter will survey a broad selection of passing and shallow references to the crusades in missionary contexts. Subsequently, two non-British examples of deeper engagement already identified by historians will be examined to demonstrate how it was possible for crusading to shape missionary identities and provide a reference point for British missions. Finally, the chapter will conclude with a specific case study into the Church Mission (or Missionary) Society (CMS), whose archive of publications has been appraised for crusader medievalism.

**Christian Missions and the British Empire: History and Historiography**

The last three hundred years have seen the development and expansion of Christian mission agencies across the globe. These organisations, formed to take Christianity to parts of the world where it was unknown, had to navigate the particular challenges of crossing multiple cultural boundaries in the context of rising Western influence. Initially, Protestant missionary bodies were arms of the established
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churches in Britain; the Society for the Promoting of Christian Knowledge (SPCK, 1698) and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG, 1701). A wave of new, mostly lay, missionary organisations were formed at the end of the eighteenth century: the Baptist Missionary Society (BMS, 1792), the London Missionary Society (LMS, 1795), the Church Mission Society (CMS, 1799), and the British and Foreign Bible Society (1804) being the most significant. British Catholic missionary activity was limited but did, notably, include the Irish Maynooth Seminary which was controversially funded by the British government between 1809 and 1865.⁵

Not only did a variety of approaches to missions coexist at any one point, the missionary enterprise as a whole went through remarkable changes over time. Missions at the dawn of the nineteenth century differed markedly from missions at the turn of the twentieth century.⁶

Andrew Porter has sketched the history of missions, from eighteenth-century amateur incoherence, through the establishment and initial flourishing of voluntary missionary societies, their retrenchment and reinvention in the second half of the nineteenth century, to the age of aggressive imperial expansion and a general distancing of missions from the official structures of empire.⁷ There were significant differences between denominational missions, ‘colonial’ (white settler) and ‘foreign’ (non-white aboriginal) missions, and with the simplicity of the later nineteenth-century ‘faith’ missions.⁸ British missionary endeavour, therefore, grew in tandem – though not necessarily in harmony – with the expansion of British influence across the globe.

---

The identification of missionaries with British imperialism was complex, but intimate. They stood with feet in both imperial and Christian camps – wedded to a universal faith with an expansionist ideal which in many cases was perceived to be compatible with, and indeed complementary to, the expansion of the British Empire. The churches had an important role in ‘imagining the empire’ as a spiritual realm – ‘God’s empire’ held in trust by the British. Most considered the rise of the British Empire the work of the hand of Providence fulfilling the Divine Plan (though that did not guarantee the eternal security of the empire). Mission stations and institutions could be easily confused with the technology of the empire by missionaries, locals and commentators alike. Furthermore, missionaries could easily adopt both imperial discourses and military terminology. The British Empire provided British Christians with an opportunity to realise the universal claims of their faith; one that the history of missions suggests they worked hard to take.

However, missionaries’ experience of, and contact with, non-British peoples could also lead to conflict with imperial administrators or policies, giving them the potential to recognise and reject assumptions of British cultural supremacy which passed unchallenged at home. Historians have largely moved away from defending or implicating missionaries and missions en masse from the charge of exclusively furthering empire. More nuanced accounts have seen a greater complexity in the relationships between missionary agents, metropolitan Britain, colonists and indigenous peoples: ‘British missionary enterprise [...] sometimes provided channels through which imperial controls followed; at other times it delayed annexation and colonization, or even subverted imperial authority.’ Attention has been paid to the agency of missionaries themselves in how they constructed and
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negotiated ‘ambiguous’ positions for themselves with regard to colonial societies; ‘in different places they were in collusion, conflict, or strategic co-operation with various colonial structures.’ Obviously not all missionaries operated within the formal limits of the British Empire, nor were they British citizens themselves. Moreover, colonial missions were concerned with colonists and settlers, reforming the very representatives of the empire. Nevertheless, the question remained potent for any particular missionary of their relationship with, and understanding of, empire.

Throughout the history of missions, it is notable that the relationship between the far-flung missionaries and the British metropole continued; indeed, this represented a ‘mutually constitutive dynamic’. Through the arteries of the imperial postal service missionaries could, and were expected to, write back to Britain describing the progress of the mission as well as feeding a hunger for ethnographic information about those encountered. This outpouring of literature, once distributed through churches and agencies, had a great effect in shaping perceptions of the ‘other’ peoples encountered and contributed to the creation of a ‘biblical vernacular culture’ in Britain. The mission agencies through whom these reports were often communicated had a vested interest in painting missionary activity in a positive and progressive light and in promoting missionary examples who would inspire emulation. These publications could serve as propaganda for the agencies by crafting images of missions designed to suit their needs; future missionaries were drawn from congregations influenced by these accounts and would go on to write their own. In short, the relationship between the idea and the
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reality of missions was a continuing dialogue which structured both perceptions at home and encounters abroad.

The formation of a missionary discourse did not, therefore, occur in isolation. The missionary as a model of Christian masculinity – ‘vigorous but pious’ – was held up in contrast to native ‘depravity’ and was ‘intrinsically tied to the development of muscular Christianity’. The distinction between Christian identity and the ideal chivalric gentleman blurred: ‘Christian’ could become ‘sportsmanlike, righteous, just, not losing one's ethics even in the flush of victory—in a word: chivalrous.’ Cultural blending has been observed in the tales of missionary exploits which, by the beginning of the twentieth century, demonstrated all the attributes of popular adventure stories. This ellipsis was useful for churchmen and missionary societies as well as empire builders in promoting an attractive masculine avenue for the expression of piety. As well as contemporary heroes who exemplified these characteristics, such as David Livingstone, the crusades provided a rich source of imagery; they could be considered the, ‘most obvious historic unification of religious piety and manly, martial virtues.’

Examining whether and how missionary literature used crusading imagery offers a way to examine the extent of imperial discourses of chivalry as well as missionary self-perception. Crusading imagery put to use in missionary literature stands at a crux between the historiographical accounts of the British Empire and the Christian missionary movement. Despite the prominent place of crusading within discourses on the history of cross-cultural mission, and the attraction of the crusades to the nineteenth-century imagination for the reasons discussed in Chapter One, there is no mention of crusading imagery in the existing studies of missionary literature.
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In the preliminary survey below it will become apparent that there is indeed sufficient missionary engagement with the crusades to sustain further investigation.

**Passing and Shallow Engagement with the Crusades and Crusading**

A survey of crusading imagery in Christian mission agencies and among Christian missionaries in the last two hundred years provides examples of passing or shallow engagement with the crusades and crusading. These range from single mentions of the word ‘crusade’ to shallow reflection on the application of crusading or the relevance of the crusades to missionary workers. This section will by necessity consist of a broad selection of examples drawn from a variety of contexts but will establish that the crusades could form some part of the social imaginary for missionaries in the period under scrutiny.

A *North British Review* article of 1844 concerning the nineteenth-century French historian Joseph-François Michaud’s *Histoire des Croisades* could write of mission: ‘This is the pilgrimage, full of noble piety and tender mercy, which cruelty cannot infuriate, nor superstition cloud. This is the true Crusade. [...] It is the Missionary whom we follow thither with peculiar delight.’\(^{26}\) A pamphlet published in 1851 by ‘A British Hermit’ called Christians to a nineteenth-century evangelistic crusade in Britain.\(^{27}\) The author recounted that Peter the Hermit ignited crusading fervour in the country and inspired six million to take the cross – he called for similar sacrifice and zeal for a contemporary effort, for a ‘holy Crusade’.\(^{28}\) There was also a felt need to address the differences between the proposal at hand and the medieval expeditions:

> The Crusade, in which I invite you to join, is not designed to recover by physical force the locality on which the Cross of our Redeemer was once
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fixed, but to aid (As I believe) in a far nobler effort, – more promotive of God’s glory, more conducive to man’s welfare; viz., in conveying the doctrines of the Cross, the saving knowledge of Christ crucified, to those who need it. Gladly would I enlist every high and noble, aye, and chivalrous sentiment too, in so glorious a cause, the cause, it is reverently believed, of God.\textsuperscript{29}

Christian missionaries could be explicitly called crusaders on the understanding that contemporary missions were the embodiment of true crusading; a letter to the editor of The Times in 1853 referred to Christian missions as a ‘merciful crusade’.\textsuperscript{30} American missionaries in Syria and Mount Lebanon in the mid-nineteenth century drew upon crusading imagery when violence broke out between the Marionite Christian and the Druze populations at the end of the 1850s. Sent by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), it was only under pressure that they articulated a crusading parallel in calling for aid:

\begin{quote}
Seven hundred years ago, a worn and weary band of warriors, the remnant of those who came to redeem the Holy Sepulcher, and who built those castles whose ruins crown so many mountain summits around us, sent back to Europe a cry for help, which, ringing through the thousand homes of prince and serf, called forth an impetuous army to their relief, bristling with swords and spears, ready to endure toil and brave death. And now, from the very same battlefields, a cry for help is raised again, by those too few and too weak to sustain the conflict successfully with the powers of darkness and sin.\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

Ussama Makdisi has suggested that it was in the light of the failure of their previous paradigms to satisfactorily interpret their plight that they turned to crusading imagery. The association with crusading was especially resonant given their location
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in the Near East and the violence of their context; and which took an extra twist as they sought refuge in the ability of the British and French imperial warships to protect them as they sheltered from the conflict in Beirut in 1860.

George Sargent coined the memorable phrase ‘Gospel Crusader[s]’ in 1860 to describe Christian missionaries setting out overseas from Britain, calling them ‘Crusaders of the nineteenth century.’

His book, Sketches of the Crusades (1860) was scathing about the spiritual merit of the crusades and the crusaders, in contrast to many positive readings of the crusades in the nineteenth century. He decried their missionary endeavours to the extent that, ‘So far as the histories of men tell, the Mahometans were better missionaries by far than the crusading Christians’. This critical lens, shaped by a conception of the crusades as defective missionary expeditions, was also evident in the Religious Tract Society’s book for children on the crusades:

_In the Crusades, we see, once more, the spirit of Christianity totally reversed – the form of godliness without the power – superstition for devotion – vice and debauchery for self-denial and purity – avarice for benevolence – the pride of a warrior for the meekness and gentleness of Christ – the prowess of arms for the boldness of faith – hatred for love – resentment for forbearance and forgiveness – a vindictiveness, which satiated itself in scenes of cruelty and blood, for the mercy which triumphs over wrath! Such, in a religious point of view, were the holy wars._

Eugene Stock was a senior figure in the CMS whose history of the society was published in 1899 on the occasion of the society’s centenary. It surveyed Christian missionary history before the society’s foundation and included Stock’s reflections on the crusades and the medieval missionary Raymond Lull who was taken as an
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inspiration for contemporary missionaries. Stock saw the crusades again as misguided, ‘the weapons of this warfare were carnal, and the purpose of the Crusades was not the evangelisation of the Mohammedans, but their expulsion from the Holy Land.’ Of Lull, Stock wrote that, ‘He soon saw what a true crusade ought to be. “The Holy Land,” he said, “can be won in no other way than as Thou, O Lord Christ, and Thy Apostles won it, by love, by prayer, by shedding of tears and blood.”’

The early twentieth-century saw several passing or shallow engagements with the crusades. The Rev. Samuel Zwemer, a noted American missionary to the Arabian Peninsula, also wrote about Lull. His book, printed in Britain as well as in the US, echoed Stock’s comments above. For Zwemer, the massacres after the capture of Jerusalem in 1099 illustrated the crusaders’ lack of morality: ‘They took up the sword and perished by the sword.’ He also connected them to missionary history, suggesting that, ‘The only missionary spirit of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was that of the Crusaders.’ Lull, however, modelled a different way, one of non-violence which led him to consider founding ‘an order of spiritual knights who should be ready to preach to the Saracens and so recover the tomb of Christ by a crusade of love.’ In 1906, four years after Zwemer’s biography of Lull was published, he spoke at a conference for the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions in Nashville, Tennessee, and called for a new missionary crusade: ‘we here and now call upon the Holy Church throughout the world to rise to a new crusade and win back the Mohammedan world to Christ in this generation. God wills it.’

37 Ibid., p. 13.
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Several American books aimed at Christians were published in this period which referenced the crusades in the context of missions. In 1898, Job Mills’ description of work in Sierra Leone included his hope that Peter the Hermit would reappear to:

*stir to the depths our dull spirits till again the crusades should be gathered, not, indeed, to carry votive offerings to the sepulchre of a dead Christ but to carry knowledge of that Christ resurrected to the sepulchres of those dead in trespasses and in sin. Nothing less than the preaching of a new crusade can settle the present problems of the foreign field – a crusade that shall enlist not a mission board, but the church; [...] a crusade that floods the church with knowledge of actual heathenism, of deeds darker than the Saracens ever practiced at the Holy Sepulcher.*

*Crusaders of the Twentieth Century*, by Reverend Walter Rice, was a 1910 handbook for Christians in dialogue with Muslims within which the imagery of a knight of Christ was employed: Rice’s object was to train the ‘recruit [...] to enter the lists’ for ‘the better equipment of every future soldier of the Cross.’ Similarly, passing references can be found in Charles Watson’s *Egypt and the Christian Crusade* (1907) and Florence Fensham *et al*s *A Modern Crusade in the Turkish Empire* (1908).

In *The Supreme Crusade* (1920) the British author, Constance Morison, wrote to call the church to overseas mission, primarily using the mobilisation of the nation for the First World War as an illustration of the scale and co-ordination needed to be effective. Morison also engaged with the crusades as a secondary illustration of mission:
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many organised attacks against some particular evil have been called Crusades in a popular way, without any special reference to the real meaning of the word, which implies a cross somewhere in the proceedings. But if ever an undertaking deserved the name Crusade, surely it is the home and foreign missionary enterprise of the Churches – the war of the Cross of Jesus Christ on the rampant evils abroad in the world.\textsuperscript{44}

These examples establish that crusader rhetoric and imagery could be part of missionary discourses: whether to create continuity with the crusaders with the call for the zeal of the crusaders and their ‘true’ purposes or to demarcate difference between violent expeditions of conquest and peaceful attempts at conversion. However, these examples only represent a passing or shallow engagement with crusader medievalism – there is little evidence of a sustained or developed engagement with the medieval crusades or ideas of crusading which were used to structure the identity of individuals or a group. Attention will now be given to examples of deep engagement with crusader medievalism which, though not British, demonstrate that crusader medievalism could form a central nexus for Christian missionary organisations.

**Deep Engagement: Embracing the Crusades**

**Lavigerie’s Military Order**

Riley-Smith recorded the efforts of the French Catholic Archbishop of Algiers, Charles-Martial Allemand-Lavigerie (1825-92), to found a new military order to provide safe houses for freed slaves in Africa and protection for missionaries and French imperial agents in the 1890s.\textsuperscript{45} Born out of his vigorous championing of the anti-slavery cause in 1888, Lavigerie’s solution combined religious, romantic and military aspects. His project included vows, poverty and a Rule and deliberately echoed medieval fraternities that came into existence as a result of the crusader
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kingdoms: the armed brothers were to wear white robes with red crosses on the front.46

In his first speech on slavery in July 1888 in Paris, Lavigerie described his new order of knighthood and appealed to his audience, ‘Why, Christian youth of Europe, should you not revive in the interior of Africa the noble crusades of your forefathers?’47 Similarly in Belgium, he drew on national crusading heroes to inspire his listeners.48 Lavigerie described his anti-slavery work as a crusade to the Secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society but denied his intentions were designed to combat Islam.49 Although evangelism was apparently a secondary purpose, Lavigerie’s proposal for a chain of self-contained communities strung across the Sahara would have looked to contemporaries very much like the mission stations that had penetrated much of the continent, if more militaristic.

One British observer reported in May 1891 that the order, recently dedicated by Lavigerie, was headed up by the Vicomte de Brissac, and:

With him there are, we believe, twelve others associated, none of them more than thirty-five years of age, who devote themselves to the work and to celibacy, we are informed, for five years. These Templars, as they may be called, are, partly like the Trappists, devoted to industry.50

British Protestants looked on with scepticism, drawing parallels with, ‘the injudicious methods of crusaders’ and concluded disparagingly: ‘it has been made apparent to them [the British public] with how much facility the Jesuit melts into the Crusader – the Zouave. [...] “Booted missionaries” are not to our mind.’51

Facing a lack of support from a French Government concerned with imperial manoeuvring and the establishment of an independent militia, Lavigerie was
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ultimately forced to disband his order. The *Frères Armés du Sahara* was short-lived, but it provided a glimpse of ‘what might have been’ had further support been forthcoming or had Lavigerie lived longer. It also exposed a divide between a deep French, Catholic, engagement with the crusades (here in the form of the military orders) and British Protestant onlookers.

*Catholic Missionary Crusade*

Another Catholic organisation concerned with foreign missions in the 1920s was the Catholic Students’ Mission Crusade (CSMC) based at ‘Crusade Castle’ in Ohio in

---

the United States. From 1922-29 Daniel Lord was influential in bringing a medieval theme to the organisation’s self-understanding and expression, often invoking crusading imagery. The organisation’s headquarters from 1923 was:

transformed to fit the Crusade’s neo-medieval name and emphasis. The basement of the home, the former wine cellar, was transformed into a chapel and dedicated as the ‘Oratory of the True Cross’ in 1928 after the movement received a large relic of the True Cross from Jerusalem. The chapel was fitted with choir stalls and the walls were adorned with medieval-style banners.

David Endres has traced aspects of the CSMC’s crusader medievalism which were inspired by Lord, including two pageants, The Dreamer Awakes (1922) and The Giantkiller (1926), as well as a ‘Ritual of Initiation’ (1924). The pageants featured crusader knights as key characters who called American youth to fight the prevailing paganism across the world. They were popular performances that tapped into the desire for the ‘golden age of Catholic influence and power’ that the crusades represented for Lord’s audiences and the CSMC’s members.

But the use of crusading imagery was deeper than for popular appeal alone. Lord’s ‘Ritual of Initiation’ for new members of the organisation was the enactment of an identity. Upon its first appearance in 1924 it featured, ‘more than 250 youthful knights dressed in long white robes with crosses emblazoned on their chests and ladies wearing medieval garb lining Crusade Castle’s hillside.’ Applicants were questioned by two medievalesque figures, ‘Major Domo’ and ‘Suzerain’, before a ceremony of flag raising (‘the American flag was raised, followed by the CSMC flag and the mission cross’) and in later incarnations the appearance of Peter the
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Hermit, come to plea for freedom for pagan nations. The final act, ‘An Audience with the King’, took part in the chapel and concluded with an oath-taking in the presence of the Eucharist.

Lord’s pageants and ritual of initiation showed a sustained engagement with crusader medievalism which framed the organisation’s understanding of its purpose and work. Furthermore, Endres identified this as connecting with a nationalistic theme that Lord took up in his pamphlet Forward, America! (1929):

Medieval imagery in the Crusade was appropriated to articulate an American-inspired fervor for spiritual conquest and combined with nationalism to evidence the continuity of the Catholic faith and the American ideal. The merging of the missionary ethos with dominant religious and nationalist rhetoric produced a synthesis that appealed to the idealistic and youthful Catholics of the interwar years.

Endres has elsewhere highlighted the international aspects of this Catholic missionary movement. He noted that early literature from the founders of the CSMC – ‘crusade bulletins’ – were sent to institutions in Canada, England, Ireland, Spain and Italy. Most significantly, the mission found papal approval. A visit to Rome by two of the CSMC’s key figures, Francis Beckman and Francis A. Thill, in the mid-1920s involved the blessing of Pope Pius XI on the CSMC; he was reported to have said:

As our predecessors, the Popes of old, blessed the arms of Crusade warriors who defended the sacred places against the impious infidel, so

---

58 Ibid., pp. 49–50.
60 Ibid., p. 43.
do We bless the prayers, the works, the sacrifices of the new student crusaders in their spiritual warfare to win the world for Christ.\textsuperscript{62}

‘Accordingly,’ Endres continued, ‘indulgences were granted to those who took part in the Crusade Ritual of Initiation, those who visited the Oratory of the True Cross in Crusade Castle, and those attending CSMC conventions.’\textsuperscript{63} If accurate, we see here the Pope himself explicitly drawing connections between both the medieval crusaders and members of a modern, Catholic, mission organisation and offering a similar endorsement of their work.

Crusading and the image of a crusader could hold together ‘medieval nostalgia’, the ‘martial ideal’, ‘physical prowess’ and ‘manliness’ while ‘[m]asculinity and the crusading ideal were translated into expression of patriotism, strength, and chivalry throughout the movement’s early history, especially during the days immediately following the Great War.’\textsuperscript{64} Endres concluded that for the founding generation of the CSMC, ‘the image of the crusader was not only the most prominent and mythically accessible image of Christian bravery, sacrifice, and adventure, it was also the most compelling for young men considering life-long commitments as missionaries.’\textsuperscript{65} As the historian of the CSMC, Endres followed William Halsey in assigning the survival of American Catholic medievalism to the separated nature of the Catholic subculture. When there was a shift amongst Catholics of the next generation towards new horizons involving social justice, medievalism seemed less relevant.\textsuperscript{66}

In the CSMC’s medievalism there was a full and uncritical embrace of crusading. The greater willingness to see continuity with the crusades also came in part due to the Catholic context, where continuity could be assumed in the institutions of the Church and Papacy. Unlike Protestants, as Endres alluded to above, Catholics could

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., p. 82. Quoted from Francis Beckman, ‘To Rome and Back’, The Shield 23 (1944), pp. 17-20.
\item Endres, American Crusade, p. 82.
\item Ibid., p. 43.
\item Ibid., p. 44.
\item Ibid., p. 89; Halsey, Survival of American Innocence, p. 57.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
envision the medieval church as a golden age of cultural and religious unity, and therefore relate more easily to a crusading past.

These examples of deep engagement with crusader medievalism by Christian missionary organisations were notably not found in the British context – although they influenced it. They do illustrate that crusader medievalism could be a viable option for missionaries as a lens of self-perception and expression, especially in the decades between 1890 and 1930. They also suggest that, as might be expected, there was an attraction for Catholic mission agencies to engage more deeply with crusader medievalism; and that their counterexample and embrace of crusading could perhaps have lessened the appeal for British Protestant missionaries as the reported comments on Lavigerie’s order suggest. The remainder of this chapter will, therefore, examine the archive of publications of a prominent British and Protestant missionary organisation, the CMS.

**The CMS Archive**

As one of the most significant and active missionary agencies in Britain in the last two centuries, the Church Mission (or Missionary) Society (CMS) was founded in 1799 as the Society for Missions to Africa and the East. Anglican in commitment, it was initially associated with figures from the ‘Clapham Sect’ including William Wilberforce who was its first Vice President.\(^67\) By 1906 it had a thousand missionaries in the field and was the largest of the British foreign mission societies.\(^68\) The CMS continues to function as a missionary agency to the present day having merged with the South American Missionary Society (SAMS) in 2010.

The journals and newssheets contained in the publications archive of the CMS do not necessarily provide a coherent perspective on the crusades or attitude to crusading because they represent a vast chronological span, a variety of authors and publications with a range of purposes and audiences. However, this breadth

\(^68\) Maughan, ‘Stock’.
allows investigation of perspectives and attitudes over time. Of interest is what can be found in the publications, particularly where the context or repetition suggests importance.

**The ‘Misguided Zeal’ of the Medieval Crusaders**

The articles and comments which referred to the crusades in the CMS archive were markedly uniform in their understanding of the medieval crusades and crusaders. The crusaders were praised for their enthusiastic and passionate response to the call of Pope Urban II; indeed, they were held up as exemplars of wholehearted response to a plea for aid or call to action.\(^69\) For example, W.F.A. Archibald commented in the *Church Missionary Intelligencer (CMI)* in June 1900, ‘Would that we had a little more of the fire and enthusiasm and enterprise of the Crusaders!’\(^70\) Reporting on the CMS’ centenary celebrations in 1899, ‘JDM’ wrote:

> Think of the crusades. Was there any holding back then; was there any feeling of giving tenpence or a shilling in the pound, or whatever might be needed then? No; those who could go, went, and those who could not go impoverished themselves to send others. An uncivilized Christendom cried, ‘Slay the infidel.’ A civilized Christendom cries, ‘Educate them.’ But a Spirit-taught, Christianized Christendom is crying, and, thank God, will cry, ‘Save the infidel.’\(^71\)

Nevertheless, as can be seen in this example, the crusaders were almost universally criticised for their employment of violence and armed warfare. In 1896 the ‘swords of the Crusaders’ were directly compared (unfavourably) with, ‘the Word of God, the Sword of the Spirit’, while as late as 1978 in the society’s *Yes* magazine the contrast was reiterated.\(^72\)

---


\(^70\) W.F.A. Archibald, *CMI* 25 (June 1900), p. 438.


The author of an 1871 article titled ‘Missionary Efforts among the Mohammedans on the Shores of the Mediterranean’ combined the above sentiments:

If, in looking back to the efforts made by the Crusaders, some eight centuries ago, to wrest the Holy Land from the Mohammedans, we have to regret that the Christians of that day had not a zeal according to knowledge, we cannot repress the wish that the enthusiasm which then inspired thousands and hundreds of thousands of Christians to take part in an enterprise which they regarded as sacred might animate the Church of Christ in these days to take part in the modern crusade against Mohammedanism and heathenism. We may rightly sit in judgement upon the Crusaders, because they failed to understand that the weapons of the Christian warfare are not carnal; and because they failed to see the import of our Lord’s words, when He declared, ‘My kingdom is not of this world’; still it must be admitted that the sacrifices they so willingly made put to shame our own lukewarmness.73

If the historical crusaders were zealous but violent, how were they understood to have been motivated? There was significant variety in the assertions which are almost entirely contained in passing comments about the crusades rather than more thoughtful attempts to explain them. They could be seen as ‘political or commercial ventures’ dressed up in religious rhetoric or as motivated by a desire to recapture the Holy Sepulchre or ‘sacred shrines’.74 A pre-1900 partisan characterisation was of the crusades as Roman Catholic missions: one reviewer remarked that, ‘the Crusades were the true type upon which Romish Missions were conducted.’75 More colourfully one commentator wrote that: ‘The “Dark Ages” of Europe were lit up towards their end by the lurid fire of the Crusades, those

73 ‘Missionary Efforts Among the Mohammedans on the Shores of the Mediterranean’, CMI 7 (September 1871), pp. 152–53.
diabolical mistakes of so-called religious enthusiasts, seeking not the conversion, but the extermination of the Moslem.”76 The most oft-repeated observation was simply that the crusaders were errant – they displayed ‘misguided zeal’, ‘strange, erratic enthusiasms’, and ‘irrational motives’.77 The crusades, the Archbishop of Canterbury was reported to have said in 1885, were ‘redeemed only by the blessing of their failure.’78

Neither were their consequences portrayed positively. Rev. F. Baylis argued that the crusades weakened the Byzantine Empire, while C.T. Wilson saw the crusades as retarding the work of Christian missionaries: ‘No inconsiderable difficulties in the path of missionary endeavour among Moslems have been caused, in many cases, by the action and inaction of Christians. The result of the Crusades was to put back the hands of the clock for centuries.’79 The largely negative views of the motivations and consequences of the crusades appear to have outlasted the positive perceptions of the crusaders’ enthusiasm and piety (even if seen as misguided). This may indicate why there was a distinct lack of evidence of deeper engagement with crusading rhetoric and imagery in the archive.

*Continuity and Alterity: The ‘New Missionary Crusade’*

A notable feature of engagement with crusading in the CMS’ periodical archive were the many and sustained references to missions as *crusades*. This suggests that the criticisms or failures identified with the medieval crusades were insufficient to prevent a continuity of some form being constructed that allowed missionaries to talk about their work as ‘new’ or ‘modern’ crusades in both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

---

76 ‘Prayer in the History of Missions’, *CMR* 60 (December 1909), pp. 707.
The centenary anniversary of the CMS’ foundation saw celebrations in the years around 1899 which prominently and repeatedly called for ‘a new missionary crusade’, or a ‘great crusade of Foreign Missions’.\(^{80}\) ‘The missionary followers of Jesus’, one writer for the *Church Missionary Gleaner (CMG)* wrote in June 1897, ‘must be “crusaders”, each must go forth “bearing His cross”’.\(^{81}\) The key difference was that missionary work was a purer crusade than the medieval expeditions; it was often described as ‘nobler’, ‘great’, ‘holy’, ‘spiritual’ or ‘true crusade’ to indicate its higher nature.\(^{82}\) An essayist in the *CMI* in January 1864 elaborated on the nature of the true crusade:

> Are there none to step forward and take upon them the cross of Missionary service, and consecrate themselves to the true crusade – not the rescue of the holy sepulchre, but the rescue of our fellow-men from the grasp of Satan, and the advancement of his kingdom who so soon left the gloomy sepulchre that He might ascend and take possession of the glory prepared for Him.\(^{83}\)

Similarly, Archdeacon Farrar in 1886 was reported to have said to a gathering of 2,500 at Glasgow University: ‘Your old crusading fathers took the Red Cross to rescue a sepulchre! Will you be recreants from the nobler crusade of this our century to rescue, not one material sepulchre of Christ, but millions of His Living Temples for your Living and Risen Lord?’\(^{84}\) In 1919 Albert Cock explicitly drew the connection with the crusades: ‘Missions continue the story of the Crusades in a less bloody and guilty form. Wars on behalf of holy places are one thing, the missionary story of making places holy is another, and more noble.’\(^{85}\) As late as February 1955 the analogy was applied by the President of the University of Alberta in Canada in

\(^{80}\) ‘Ninety-Sixth Anniversary of the C.M.S.’, *CMI* 20 (June 1895), p. 413; *CMG* 287 (Nov. 1897), p. 163. See also, *CMI* 20 (Feb. 1895), p. 149.

\(^{81}\) *CMG* 282 (June 1897), p. 95.


\(^{83}\) Ibid.

\(^{84}\) ‘Foreign Missions’, p. 762.

\(^{85}\) Albert A. Cock, ‘Missions, School, and the Child’, *CMR* 70 (September 1919), p. 201.
a speech conferring honorary degrees on two CMS missionaries: ‘As “new crusaders” their weapons are books and antibiotics rather than battle axes; their enemies ignorance, illiteracy and ill health rather than infidels; their objective the liberation of the spirit of men and women rather than the capture of a city.’

There are two important windows provided by the archive into active distancing from the crusades, which, though quite different, are suggestive of a broader trend. The first is from an address given at a missionary conference by Director Axenfeld of the Berlin Missionary Society in February 1914:

> while Christianity claims to be [a] religion of love, [Muslims] point to the Crusades as a colossal contradiction of it, and find in the recent wars and in the action of the Powers only a justification of their distrust of Christian assurances of friendship; [...] In America as well as in Germany the feeling is gaining ground that the use of military terms in connexion with Islam – speaking of such missions as ‘attack,’ ‘fight,’ ‘campaign,’ – should be discontinued, for while the proclamation of the Gospel is rightly spoken of as an attack upon the strongholds of Satan, in the case of Islam the employment of warlike phrases is apt to lead to misunderstanding and to association with the baleful history of the Crusades. We shall gain by substituting ‘service’ for ‘contest.’

Secondly, in August 1927 after eleven issues under the title Crusade Report, one CMS newssheet was renamed Northern Nigeria as it described the missionary work in that area. Prior to this issue crusading references had been occasional; members of the society who had received the news sheet were referred to as ‘Crusaders of Nigeria’ without elaboration. The reasons for the name change echoed Axenfeld’s earlier warning about the associations with the crusades:

88 For instances of address being made to ‘Crusaders’, see 1 (Nov. 1924), pp. 1 and 3; 2 (Feb. 1925), p. 1; 5 (Nov. 1925), p. 3; 6 (Feb. 1926), p. 8; 9 (Nov. 1926), p. 10.
The reason for this [name change] is that for a long time some of us have felt that the titles ‘Crusade Report’ and ‘Crusaders of Nigeria’ have been rather unfortunate. [...] The word ‘Crusade’ is associated with a militant Christianity which focussed its attention on the material, and fought with carnal weapons for the conquest of Islam. Raymond Lull, the great 13th century missionary to Moslems, saw that this method was not only hopeless, but also un-Christian. [...] It is the fear that our real aim, the taking of the knowledge of Jesus Christ, might be obscured and misinterpreted which has prompted our change.89

The new missionary crusades appeared to stand sufficiently in continuity with the crusades to bear the name and to draw inspiration from them. But the continuation was presumably also built on cross-cultural travel, pious zeal (even if misguided) and perhaps even an assumption about the intentions of the crusaders being ultimately the conversion of the ‘heathen’; however, these latter connections were never spelled out. The crucial difference between the medieval and missionary crusades was the transposition of the imagery from a physical Holy Sepulchre and literal fight to the contest for the salvation of souls (‘living temples’) for Christianity. This freed the crusades to serve as an accessible image to inspire missionaries and ensured its flexibility. However, this was not an unlimited application as the final two quotes demonstrate. It appeared that in both cases there was a sensitivity to the associations of the crusades in different contexts or discourses which provoked hesitancy over the use of crusading allusions.

The Crusading Metaphor

Further application can be seen in the occasional metaphorical use of the crusades and crusaders in the CMS publications. The society itself was envisioned as an ‘old crusader [...] far away in Oriental lands, he has borne the cross, and endured hardness.’90 And in 1883 missionaries themselves were, ‘like the doughty knights of

old, these modern crusaders had been called to brace themselves for their life of conflict by keeping lonely vigil beside the sword of the Spirit.91 Similarly, Cardinal Lavigerie’s Frères Armés du Sahara were compared to modern Templars and the cardinal called a crusader.92 The metaphor was able generate its own momentum, with the annual report of the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa quoted as speculating that:

> Probably it will be found in the future that a religious order will be the best agent for the work, and that as knights templars were founded in the days of the crusaders to check the military advance of Islam in Europe, so in Africa there will arise a new order to resist the spiritual advance of the same enemy.93

Indeed, one writer in 1913 ambiguously called for ‘a great crusade, a great assault all along the Moslem line’.94 This was taken to its furthest extent in 1924 by an author who claimed that, ‘Christianity is not primarily a philosophy, but a crusade’.95

However, the distinction was also made between military terminology and missions:

> The military simile is a good one merely as an analogy. Let him who uses it make sure that it does not mislead his thought. We are not fighting Islam, much less are we fighting Moslems. There has been only too much of the crusading spirit transferred from the physical attack to the moral. We are in Egypt to love Moslems; and any one who cannot honestly love them has no place in the field as a Christian missionary.96

---

93 CMR 73 (Dec. 1922), p. 315.
94 CMR 64 (June 1913), p. 331.
95 CMR 75 (Sep. 1924), p. 214.
Over the span of the CMS archive, from the mid-nineteenth century to 2009, there is a peak of references to the crusades between roughly 1890 and 1930 and a later set in the mid-twentieth century. The latter generally refer to evangelistic meetings known as crusades – especially in the wake of American Billy Graham’s meetings in London in 1954. What is noticeable is that as the twentieth century continued, the engagement with the crusades diminished in depth and the historical expeditions were much more rarely referred to as an inspiration for mission. Rather than emphasising a missionary crusade, the names of organisations account for most of the references to the crusades in the latter half of the archive; for example, the Crusaders’ Union (a Bible study class movement), the South American Missionary Crusaders (a support and fundraising group for the SAMS), and the Layman’s Christian Crusade.\(^{97}\)

In addition to the specifically missionary applications of crusading rhetoric and imagery, there were various other campaigns which are referred to in the archives as crusades. Prominently among these was the ‘crusade against slavery’ and against the opium trade, both which use the term as a way to describe the movement to oppose or to abolish those trades.\(^{98}\) Similar use was applied to the temperance campaign which sought to constrain, or even eradicate, alcohol consumption. One final reference of interest was the description of the First World War as a crusade: Canon R. Sterling in the CMG in 1915 wrote, ‘The eyes of Christendom are once again turned towards the Holy Land. A new crusade is being waged and the Cross will assuredly triumph over the Crescent.’\(^{99}\) This idea, of the war as a crusade, had a wider resonance which will be discussed in Chapter Four.

_CMS Crusaders_?

The CMS missionaries and associates who wrote in the various journals of the society over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries clearly at times

\(^{97}\) For example, see CMO (March 1961), p. 12; South American Missionary Magazine 32 (Nov. 1898), pp. 203-204; and CMR 67 (Feb. 1916), p. 128.


felt able to describe their missionary endeavours as a crusade. Though this seems not to have engendered much deeper reflection or engagement with the crusades and crusading the phrase and imagery appear sufficiently often to sustain general analysis. We have seen that the medieval crusades were understood to have been expressions of zeal – mass responses to preaching which inspired wholehearted commitment to a costly cause. However, CMS authors were unanimous that the crusaders were misguided in their enthusiasm, whether misled, unenlightened or merely in error.

For the missionary raison d’être to be able to be described not only as a crusade but in continuity with the crusades required an understanding of the connection with the medieval crusaders in terms of a similar commitment to the missionary cause and willingness to leave homes, families and comforts and to endure hardship and even death in foreign countries. Again, this was on the proviso that their methods were understood to be nonviolent, in contrast to the medieval crusaders.

The chronological span of the archive has enabled a long view of the use of crusading rhetoric and imagery by the CMS. This demonstrated a marked decline in the interwar years of the idea of a missionary crusade, even though the use of the names of British Christian organisations such as the Crusaders’ Union continued. This could have been in part because of an increasing sensitivity to the associations and meanings that the crusades and crusading rhetoric had for others (i.e. non-Christians) or in response to a trend for Christian pacifism.¹⁰⁰ Equally, it is apparent that although discontinuity with the crusades overtook assertions of continuity, there was significant and sustained investment in the idea of a ‘new missionary crusade’ in the decades either side of 1900.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined examples of passing, shallow and deep engagement with crusader medievalism by missionaries and Christian missionary organisations as

---

well as surveying the publications of one society, the CMS, in greater depth. There clearly was investment in using crusading rhetoric and imagery to describe the missionary endeavour between the mid-nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries – though the British Protestant examples are mostly metaphorical and at deepest demonstrate only shallow engagement with crusading and the historical crusades. There is some suggestion that the years between roughly 1890 and 1930 saw the greatest use of crusading as a way of framing missionary activity, particularly with calls for a ‘new missionary crusade’ from the turn of the century seen in the CMS archive and publications of the first decade of the twentieth century.

This investigation has not found examples of deep engagement in British Protestant missionary circles, in contrast to the two organisations profiled above which demonstrated a fertile Catholic discourse of crusading and mission. Whether this proved a factor in Protestant reluctance in order to maintain contradistinction is hard to establish, but hinted at by responses to Cardinal Lavigerie’s actions reported above. The absence of more developed crusader medievalism in the sources considered does suggest directions for further research beyond the scope of this study: other British missionary organisations, such as the ones listed in the introduction; the publications of agencies or missionary correspondence from areas which had historic connection with the crusades, particularly in the Middle East; and Catholic missionary societies in Britain and beyond.

In framing this investigation with the relationship between missionaries and the British Empire, the intention was to evaluate how far the Victorian culture described in the previous two chapters had penetrated – were Christian missionaries, whose relationship with British imperialism and its agents was ‘ambiguous’ but ‘close’, also invested in crusader medievalism as part of their commitment to the expansion of Christianity? From the sources examined above it seems that British Christian missionary activity was rarely framed by crusading in a deep way, providing a limit to the scope of the chivalric culture present in the education of Victorian youth. However, the marks of this cultural discourse can be seen – missionaries could be thought of as ‘new crusaders’ in continuity with the
medieval crusaders; the association, though, was seemingly never sustained or developed.
4) ‘MY DREAM COMES TRUE’: CRUSADING IN THE GREAT WAR

Crusading rhetoric and imagery were close to the surface in the First World War: the nineteenth-century cultural system ensured that a significant proportion of the population considered the war an opportunity for both individuals and the nation to prove themselves on the international stage. War was considered a chivalric endeavour and the state could rely on spontaneous propaganda from the church and private individuals, with encouragement from politicians, to promote the British cause and bolster morale. This often tapped into prewar ideas of honour, duty and glory in the context of a nation which had secured divine favour and anticipated war to be a proving ground of national character. As the Great War escalated, the rhetoric of the clergy intensified these lines of thought. The Bishop of London was perhaps the most extreme example in his fiery rhetoric of holy war but his sentiments were echoed from other pulps – though not universally. Chaplains, by their dual positioning as Christians and as those whose profession required an acceptance of violence, could draw on the justice and morality of the conflict to encourage the troops they served with. Across the fronts – home and abroad, on the ground and in the air – crusader medievalism was employed for a variety of reasons which were knotted together. They were the product of new experiences and old mentalities and this chapter seeks to unravel the range of references to the crusades and crusaders as well as examine how and why crusading was evoked.

In part this is a subset of a wider question of the onset of what has been called ‘modernity’, which asks at what point (and how) was there a transition between Victorian ways of perceiving the world, explored above, and those more recognisably ‘modern’. Clearly definitions of these cultures, as well as their universal applicability and homogeneity, form a significant part of the discussion but for this chapter it is important to note that the historiographical context of the First World War has asked whether, and to what extent, the war provided a cultural
break-point between ‘traditional’ and ‘modern’ cultural perspectives. The use of crusader medievalism as part of the romanticisation of warfare and as a way to hold together concepts of Christian militarism, I suggest, formed a key strand of British culture before the war. Tracing its use and identifying changes or varieties in its deployment will provide information relevant to the question of the existence or nature of a cultural caesura.

Although many of these aspects of crusading imagery and rhetoric in the First World War have been observed and examined, they have nowhere been brought together coherently. Siberry’s pioneering work brought many examples to the fore and will be supplemented here with work in different areas by Marrin, Snape, Goebel, Paris, Bar-Yosef and others as well as adding several unexamined examples to the discussion.¹ This chapter aims to survey the above examples of crusader medievalism with a consistent focus on their evocation and employment of the crusades – seeking to understand the nature of their perception and use of the crusades.

**The Great War and the ‘Last Crusade’**

*St. George is once more struggling in Syria with the Dragon, glutted with the blood of his Armenian victims. Our armies in France, as in Palestine, are on pilgrimage: they are fighting for the Cross; they are engaged in the same Holy War in which Richard Coeur de Lion and his crusaders pitted themselves against the Saracens in days of yore. For all of which Jerusalem is the symbol, for truth, for honour, for justice, for righteousness, for freedom - these are the things for which England is giving her all to-day.*

- *The Church Times, 21 December 1917²*

---


As the above quote illustrates, there were some who were able to employ crusading rhetoric to frame an understanding of the war even towards its conclusion. This suggests that understanding the war as a crusade could still hold together a number of traditional resonances for the British. The mythic symbol of St. George defeating the dragon, the romantic chivalry of King Richard the Lionheart, and the particular ambiguity of a heavenly Jerusalem on earth were all bound together with myriad threads by a Christian form of holy war both historic and idealised – the crusade.

Siberry’s collection of crusading rhetoric and imagery in the First World War has demonstrated that the First World War was a conflict laced with images of the crusade both on the home front and in the foreign arenas in which the British fought.3 While she has acknowledged that crusading was not the ‘predominant image’ and attracted some criticism, it was, she found, employed by all sides. One historian has argued that by the same criteria that we understand the medieval crusades to have been ‘holly wars’ we should designate 1914-18 similarly, such was the prevalence of religious discourse in comprehending, justifying and prosecuting the war.4 However, examining specifically crusader medievalism from the war demonstrates that it was used by a variety of people in markedly different contexts: from politicians, clergy and the lay religious in Britain, to chaplains and soldiers on the Western Front and in Gallipoli and Palestine. Furthermore, as seen in previous chapters, crusading had been used in conjunction with the late nineteenth-century cultural system of understanding war as romantic, virtuous and chivalrous; and that system was vulnerable to the supposed disillusionment and abandonment of traditional cultural forms the war was supposed to have unleashed.

In August 1914 the British Government found itself in a unique position among the warring powers. Neither invaded nor possessing a system of conscription until 1916, the British public had to be persuaded to participate in the tectonic move to a total war footing.5 This heightened the importance of the portrayal of the war to

---

3 Siberry, New Crusaders, pp. 87–103.
5 Paris, Over the Top, p. 8.
the British people: it had to be sufficiently compelling for young men to volunteer for the armed services, especially as the attrition of the Western Front took its toll on the British Expeditionary Force and armies in Belgium and France. A chain reaction of ‘cultural mobilisation’ saw British institutions and private individuals declare their support for the war including, importantly, the churches.6

At the outbreak of war in 1914 Christianity was still highly influential in Western Europe despite diminishing church membership and attendance: ‘Christianity still framed the public and personal morality of most of Europe, at a popular level the Christian rites of passage still exercised a wide appeal’.7 This influence ensured that the national discourse about the nature of the war remained grounded in Christian notions of sacrifice, coupled harmoniously with nineteenth-century concepts of chivalry, nation and duty. In this atmosphere, clergy played an interpretative role especially in the first years of the war.8 Crusading imagery offered an attractive way of combining these elements, mobilising the British Empire for war on a hitherto unseen scale. In return, pre-existent militant tendencies and activities in the churches were moved ‘into a higher gear’.9

From Just War to Crusade: ‘Moral Mobilisation’ on the Home Front

The perception within the Church of England was of its own declining influence and the increasing secularisation of society; the war presented an opportunity for realigning the Church as central to national life.10 To a large extent all the churches, whether Nonconformist, Anglican or Roman Catholic, supported the war effort

---

6 With thanks to Edward Madigan for the characterisation.
8 Madigan and Snape, ‘Introduction’, p. 3.
9 Snape, God and the British Soldier, p. 95. On sacrifice, see Gregory, The Last Great War, pp. 152–86.
once begun, but it was the established church with its semi-official role which took centre stage.

Considered emblematic of the churches’ role in endorsing the conflict and mobilising popular support by later commentators was the outspoken Anglican Bishop of London, Arthur Winnington-Ingram (1858-1946); an Oxford-educated clergyman who had successfully worked in the East End of London before his appointment to the bishopric.\textsuperscript{11} His sermons have been repeatedly quoted as an example of the uncritical co-option of the church for the purposes of state propaganda. Winnington-Ingram’s Advent sermon, preached at Westminster Abbey on 28 November 1915 and later recorded in \textit{The Christian World Pulpit}, included the following assertion: ‘every one who loves freedom and honour, everyone who puts principle before ease and life itself before mere living, is banded in a great crusade – we cannot deny it – to kill Germans, to kill them not for the sake of killing, but to save the world’.\textsuperscript{12} However, Stuart Bell has contended that the bishop’s comments, often truncated in subsequent quotation, came in the context of a more nuanced view of the war which was positive about British participation, in keeping with Winnington-Ingram’s role as a military chaplain and war recruiter.\textsuperscript{13} Furthermore, Gregory has suggested that while these sentiments did not represent the majority of Anglican clergy, who largely exercised rhetorical restraint, the Bishop of London ‘had his finger on the popular pulse’ when it came to his full-bloodied patriotism.\textsuperscript{14}

Marrin has argued that Winnington-Ingram was a catalyst for the escalation of the vocabulary of Christian warfare from just war to crusade in 1915. Indeed, he was not alone in proclaiming the war a crusade. An article in \textit{The Church Times} in November 1914 argued that ‘neither Church nor nation has completely seen that

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
the conflict in which we are engaged is a spiritual conflict. The war is a Crusade and a Holy War.¹⁵ In July 1915 Bishop Diggle of Carlisle pronounced that, ‘On both sides this war has more the nature and attributes of a crusade than of an ordinary war.’¹⁶ The Dean of Norwich preached in 1914 ‘It is a holy war in which we have taken our part; a war of Christ against anti-Christ. Our young men [...] must come in the spirit of crusaders.’¹⁷ Similarly, the Reverend P.B. Bull declared the war, ‘a holy war, a real crusade.’¹⁸ As early as September 1914, Cyril Hepher, a Canon at Winchester Cathedral wrote that the British were fighting ‘a noble crusade, more glorious than the crusades of old, warring valiantly enough, yet warring with pity and mercy; [...] this is a divine crusade.’¹⁹ These and other examples indicated, Marrin concluded, that ‘a numerous and articulate group of zealots heeded the extraordinary call to preach a crusade.’²⁰

In tracking the attitude of the Church of England to the war, Marrin observed a conceptual radicalisation: ‘the conflict that began as a necessary, if somewhat idealized, campaign to safeguard national interests and rid the world of a military despotism was transformed under the pressure of events into a holy war, ending as a frenzied crusade against the Devil incarnate.’²¹ He located this shift in rhetoric as being from May to December 1915, which directly followed the period identified by Gregory as when a series of events brought home the reality and nature of the war to the British public:

*The climax of British indignation came between the middle of April 1915 and the middle of May. In fast succession, the use by the German Army of chlorine gas at the battle of Ypres, the sinking of the Lusitania, air*

---

¹⁶ ‘The Bishop’s Address on the War’, *Carlisle Diocesan Magazine* (July 1915), pp. 100 and 105; quoted in Marrin, *Last Crusade*, p. 141. For subsequent reiteration see ‘Whitehall Comb’, *Daily Mail*, 3 May 1918, p. 3.
²⁰ Marrin, *Last Crusade*, p. 142.
²¹ Ibid., p. 125.
raids by Zeppelins on British towns and the publication of the Bryce Report into German atrocities in Belgium, established the image of Germany as having thrown aside civilised norms entirely. The most widespread outbreaks of anti-German rioting in British cities occurred at this time.\(^\text{22}\)

This lends weight to Marrin’s argument that the idea of the war-as-crusade was an escalation of previous perceptions of the war; crusading could serve a purpose that other ideas of ‘just’ or ‘holy’ warfare could not:

\begin{quote}
We are, therefore, actually dealing with the process by which a traditional concept, the just war, with its emphasis on legality, on proportionality, and on peace coming about through the restoration of rights, broke down under the pressure of modern machine warfare, being replaced by the crusade, an older, more dangerous, but emotionally more satisfying concept.\(^\text{23}\)
\end{quote}

It should be noted that this conceptualisation was not without challenge; Henry Scott Holland, Regius Professor of Divinity at the University of Oxford, decried clergy behaving like ‘Mad Mullahs preaching a Jehad’, while Bishop Gore of Oxford similarly spoke out against the use of crusading language.\(^\text{24}\) Historians have yet to turn up crusading allusions from either of the Archbishops of Canterbury or York during the war, though condemnation of the practice is also unrecorded.

The ‘moral mobilisation’ on the Home Front in Britain was encouraged by connections between the clergy and the Department of Information, even if it took on a life of its own.\(^\text{25}\) Senior politicians too were prone to reaching for crusading rhetoric during the war. David Lloyd George, who ended the war as British Prime Minister and previously occupied the positions of both Chancellor of the Exchequer
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and Minister for Munitions, referred to the war as a ‘great crusade’ in a speech to his constituents in May 1916 and titled his published collection of wartime speeches *The Great Crusade*. He was also heralded in a parliamentary debate in June 1915 as Peter the Hermit, preaching ‘a crusade against the modern Hun’. Siberry noted Austen Chamberlain’s use of the crusade image in a speech given in Birmingham in April 1915 where he referred to the war as ‘a chivalrous crusade [...] a crusade for right and for law’. Winston Churchill in a speech to constituents in Dundee called the war the ‘last and finest crusade’. Finally, King George V in his thanks to the forces at the end of the war wrote, ‘I pray that God, Who has been pleased to grant a victorious end to this great crusade for justice and right, will prosper and bless our efforts in the immediate future to secure for generations to come the hard-won blessings of freedom and peace.’

Furthermore, articles and letters published in national newspapers during the war referred unproblematically to the war as being a crusade. A letter from Victor Giraud responded to the alliance between Britain and France in enthusiastic tones, and described the war as ‘essentially the war of justice and right; [...] it is not a war, it is a crusade.’ Similarly, the British troops at Ypres were described as having been ‘caught up from narrow interests into one mighty crusade.’ A correspondent wrote in the *Daily Mail* in February 1915, ‘The civilised nations of Europe have gone out on a new and greater Crusade. [...] The spiritual call of their Crusade is greater than the call of the mediæval Crusade, for the Teuton has defiled the Cross more


27 Sir Robert Houston in ‘Munitions of War Bill’, *Hansard*, 28 June 1915, vol. 72, <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1915/jun/28/munitions-of-war-bill#S5CV0072P0_19150628_HOC_244>, [accessed 31/10/2014]. In the same exchange, Mr. Carlyon Bellairs (Maidstone) said, ‘for if ever there was a war which deserved to be called a religious war, it is the present one.’
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than ever the Saracen defiled it.’

Further explicit parallels with the medieval crusades were made by another columnist who explained how the crusaders had been fighting for an ideal, just as Britain and her allies were in the same spirit.

These allusions, then, were not confined to the church.

Towards the end of the war in a discussion in The Times regarding the kind of peace settlement to be established, Lord Hugh Cecil (a member of the Privy Council and youngest son of former Prime Minister Lord Salisbury) advocated punishing Germany, because the war had intensified into a conflict of principles:

*From the time of the burning of Louvain it began to be seen that we were not merely fighting in redemption of a promise not to bring a conflict of national interests to the decision of the ordeal by battle, but to preserve the well-being of the civilized world from a monstrous evil. This character of the war became plainer and plainer as time went on until, with the unlimited submarine attack and the intervention of America, it has become so dominant as to obscure all merely national controversies. That the citizens of a nation can know no higher object than to advance the interests of that nation, and for that object may commit any cruelty and any perfidy, is a doctrine which civilization must either destroy or else itself perish. The war is now a crusade. We fight to overthrow a principle, to stamp out a moral disease, to extirpate an abomination.*

This is an articulation of Marrin’s argument, but extended beyond the Church of England; here there is a rhetorical and conceptual intensification of the war to its identification as a crusade.

---

Chivalrous Crusading on the Home Front

The ties of chivalry, Christianity and crusading remained strong, and proved powerful in interpreting the war. A correspondent in The Times on St. George’s Day, 1918, wrote an imaginative, romanticised article about the persistence of the spirit, or ‘strain’, of St. George through history which inspired British victories in the past and continued to do so in the war. He wrote:

Nor did the strain fail, when the war broke upon the world. The youth of this land would never have taken the sword as they did if it had not been for them a crusade. They saw a dragon across the path, and they had to go. [...] They in the memory of the world will be held with the hosts of Christian chivalry.

Lord Northcliffe, influential owner of the Daily Mail, called doctors at the front a ‘veritable body of Knights Templar in the Great Crusade.’ In celebrating the success of the British navy, Newbolt (whose Book of the Happy Warrior was considered in Chapter Two) could write of the sea as, ‘the main battlefield of our spiritual crusade’, and of the war as a conflict between ‘the old chivalry and the new savagery’; Newbolt’s writings clearly indicated the persistence and centrality of a chivalric perception of warfare through the First World War.

Another example of the survival of a chivalric understanding of crusading during the war is recorded in Olive Katherine Parr’s Completed Tales of My Knights and Ladies (1919). The author, a third order Dominican who was also known as Beatrice Chase, established a network of contacts from her Dartmoor home under the auspices of an ‘Order of Chivalry’. This ‘Crusade’, as she referred to it, enrolled members as knights and ‘White Ladies’ through the taking of a vow of purity. Heavily Arthurian, Parr’s book contained letters from her correspondents, her

36 ‘The Strain of St. George: A Persistent Type’, The Times, 23 April 1918, p. 9.
personal reflections, quotes from *The Idylls of the King* and records of wartime keepsakes and prayers in the chapel adjoining her house. Parr claimed to have around 3,450 knights and 800 ‘Nuns, White Ladies and Guardian Ladies’ in her Order from a spectrum of backgrounds and denominations – though largely Roman Catholic. Parr was clearly exposed second-hand to a wide variety of wartime experiences from those at the front in the navy and the army, as well as those wounded, invalided and who served at home. She was also in contact with wives of soldiers and many who did not fight. In reflecting on the survival of her Order after the war, Parr wrote: ‘One cannot help feeling that modern chivalry is a robust plant, indeed an evergreen and an immortelle, and I think the record of the Knights and White Ladies is an extraordinary example of triumphant victory against overwhelming odds.’

The impression given is of a network of those concerned with sacramental purity and survival in the storm of world conflict. Despite a pietistic focus on personal sanctity, it suggests that chivalric interpretations of the crusades could continue to exercise significance for some involved in the conflict, particularly when, with hindsight, it is easy to forget that the conclusion was uncertain. Parr’s use of the form of an Order of Chivalry, associated with the crusades through the medieval military orders, was not unique – the ‘Knights of the Crucifix’ were an Anglican wartime association which centred on a Brother Michael based at St Edward’s House in Westminster. He kept up with those enrolled through writing letters, posting booklets and sending crucifixes. Both provide a window on the survival of traditional, chivalric, ways of conceptualising the war in Britain through the use of crusading associations.

---
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Combatants and Chaplains on the Western Front

Recent historiography of the war has emphasised the connections between home and Western fronts; and indeed other theatres of war further afield. These suggest that the transmission of attitudes and perceptions of the war were possible – though communication was disrupted, and censored. Do we see those involved in combat, or supporting combatants, advocating the war as a crusade or considering themselves to be crusaders? Or, as Girouard has suggested, did the reality of modern mechanised warfare explode any consideration of the war as chivalrous or a crusade? Snape has observed that it was the officers most affected by nineteenth-century Romanticism who were receptive to a ‘neo-crusading’ view of the war. Considering that the cultural system of chivalric masculinity was strongly inculcated by public schools, and these had a proportionally high rate of volunteering for the army, this is unsurprising. The young Harold Macmillan acknowledged the horrors of trench warfare but in the same letter referred to the war as a crusade and a dead soldier as a martyr.

While Rev. Bull could write of seeing soldiers kneeling ‘to receive the crucifix’ in France, and at least one Catholic officer arranged for papally-blessed crucifixes to be given to his soldiers, others felt differently. ‘[T]he novelty of crusading wore off’, a Wesleyan chaplain wrote in 1917, ‘the Holy Crusade spirit has practically evaporated.’ Madigan has identified some ‘indignation’ at the continuing romanticisation of the war on the home front from those who had experienced combat. But the ‘high diction’ didn’t necessarily lose value and notions of

---
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meaningful sacrifice could continue to provide motivation and significance for the realities of modern warfare.\textsuperscript{50}

If the experience of soldiers and officers was varied, chaplains occupied a space at the intersection of commitment to British military force and to Christianity; their role was (variously) interpreted to include inspiring the soldiers in their work and providing spiritual succour to the troops. They were, therefore, ‘naturally inclined to view world events through a religious or theological prism’, and often those events were immediate military ones.\textsuperscript{51} Furthermore, a recent study has placed chaplains at the crossroads of communication between those fighting and those at home: chaplains were overwhelmingly trained as clergymen rather than career chaplains and so ‘provided an important channel of communication between the army and a civilian population that suffered unprecedented levels of bereavement.’\textsuperscript{52} Chaplains, then, stood at the leading edge of ecclesiastical engagement with brutal modern conflict and the men who had to endure it.

What is more, Madigan has suggested, their very presence was an ‘obvious reminder and reinforcement’ of the Christian identity of the British nation.\textsuperscript{53} Aside from the Jewish chaplains, this is true in both the sense of the chaplains’ symbolic presence, and that they were drawn from the ranks of the clergy in Britain – they represented both Christianity in general, and the particular flavours to be found in Britain.\textsuperscript{54} There was a connection, then, between the churches’ rhetoric at home and the men in the varied theatres of war provided by their chaplains. The Rev. Basil Bourchier, for example, was an army chaplain in 1915-16 and described the war as ‘the holiest war that has ever been waged’; when it came to the Gallipoli campaign he wrote:

\textit{It is, in a very real sense, the latest of the crusades. Should Constantinople fall it will be the greatest Christian victory that has}

\textsuperscript{50} Watson and Porter, ‘Bereaved and Aggrieved’, pp. 156 and 159.
\textsuperscript{51} Madigan, \textit{Faith Under Fire}, p. 166.
\textsuperscript{52} Madigan and Snape, ‘Introduction’, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{53} Madigan, \textit{Faith Under Fire}, p. 168.
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occurred for hundreds of years. Surely this is something to captivate the imagination and to make us see that perhaps even greater things are at stake than the future of England [...] who knows, once again the Holy Land rescued from the defiling grip of the infidel.55

Snape has cited examples of the chaplains being positively encouraged to interpret the war as a crusade: ‘one major-general informed a chaplains’ conference on the Western Front that “we were engaged in a Crusade, not now to snatch the tomb of Christ from infidel hands, but to rescue the life & the Spirit of Christ from the dark forces that would seek to overwhelm it”.56 Similarly, a pamphlet approved by Bishop Gwynne was published in 1917 and called Anglican chaplains to ‘inspire our people and send them forward in this NEW CRUSADE.’57

The New Crusaders: Pilots and Tankmen

The prewar conceptions of warfare as ennobling and a place where men would come of age depended on battle being a place where men could exercise agency – where they could perform deeds of individual heroism and prowess. If trench warfare seemed to reduce soldiers’ agency to a minimum, and produce a form of courage that valued endurance, determination and humour, other forms and arenas of warfare could provide more fertile ground for the persistence of chivalric images of warfare.58 The search for alternatives to the deadlocked Western Front was an imaginative pursuit as well as a strategic one which spawned both the campaign to seize the Dardanelles and the opening up of another front in Palestine and Syria.59 Similarly, those who fought the war in the air and, to a lesser extent
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due to its later invention, those who manned tanks, could be configured as heroic and chivalric.

Paris’ study of juvenile literature charted the description of pilots as chivalric heroes – knights of the air.⁶⁰ During the war, the influential Newbolt was associated with Wellington House, the government’s collection of authors enlisted to raise support for the war amongst the British populace. His 1916 *Tales of the Great War* compared pilots with knights explicitly:

> Our airmen are singularly like the knights of the old romances, they go out day after day, singly or in twos and threes, to hold the field against all comers, and to do battle in defence of those who cannot defend themselves. There is something especially chivalrous about these champions of the air; even the Huns, whose military principles are against chivalry, have shown themselves affected by it.⁶¹

Paris saw the ‘myth of the chivalry of the air war’ as originating with Newbolt, but it affected even the official historian of the Royal Air Force (RAF) and pilots’ memoirs.⁶²

In 1917, presumably to aid recruitment into the RAF, R. Wherry Anderson wrote a short book glorifying, and romanticising, the air war and life of a pilot. Fighting in the air was ‘one of the noblest enterprises’ and pilots were ‘the world’s supermen.’⁶³ The crusading connection was chivalric, a continuity of spirit made possible by the personal nature of air combat, and is worth quoting at length:

> Here we touch upon the one thing that distinguishes battles in the air from all the other fighting in this War. It is the revival of the honourable courtesies of the duel – nay, more, the revival of the ancient chivalry of the Knight Templars. As he soars aloft, the airman has at the back of his

---

mind the idea that he is out to meet a champion belonging to the same knightly order as himself, one possessing qualities resembling his own – trained skill, daring, the power of swift decision. In most of the land fighting the enemy’s personality is indistinct, perhaps entirely invisible. [...] Even in the bayonet charge, where the combatants do at least face one another, the gallant deed is to a great extent merged in the rough-and-tumble of the crowd.

It is quite otherwise in the air. From their respective hangars Ivanhoe and Sir Brian de Bois-Guilbert sally forth to personal combat. Each has his machine-gun couched along the upper ridge of the fuselage of his mount and pointed at his antagonist. Each knows that on the quick manœuvring for position and on the ingenious anticipation of the other’s movements the issue of the fight mainly depends. Now consider the feelings of the victor as he sees his adversary hurtling down to the ground. Did any tournament of old provide encounter more picturesque or more sublime?  

Notably, the type of crusading envisioned here references Scott’s characters from Ivanhoe and takes the form of a duel where the aircraft are compared to medieval chargers and mounted machine-guns to lances. Without considering it incongruous, Anderson concluded with the assessment that, ‘The finest sport to-day is to ascend to the upper atmosphere and assist there in the supreme task of defeating the world’s tyrants.’ In some arenas at least, it appeared that a chivalric presentation of the war could thrive; the descriptions could include crusading and nineteenth-century staples of honour, nobility and sportsmanship.

These models of heroism and individualism shifted with the increasingly technological nature of warfare; rather than rejecting any form of mechanised warfare mastery of machine by the individual was celebrated, such that:

---
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[T]he new knights of war were the tankmen and pilots, the submarine crews and the highly trained, well-equipped troops of the assault battalions.... the impersonality of [modern] war consequently appeared to have been done away with; or at least, men could once more be persuaded that war would give them the opportunity to demonstrate personal heroism.⁶⁶

**Crusading Sideshows**

There appears to have been greater temptation to employ crusading imagery in describing the failed Allied attempt to invade the Dardanelles in 1915 and the more successful Palestine Campaign under General Sir Edmund Allenby in 1917. These ‘sideshows’ lent themselves to crusading allusions as the enemy in both cases was the Turkish Ottoman Empire and the ground covered suggestive of historical connections. The Gallipoli campaign aimed to capture Constantinople, with echoes of both the Fourth Crusade of 1204 and the many crusade proposals tabled in the west to retake the city after its fall in 1453 to Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II.⁶⁷ Allenby’s campaign, with Egypt as its starting point, traversed the Holy Land and in December 1917 took Jerusalem, which triggered a spate of comparisons between the British Egyptian Expeditionary Force (EEF) and the medieval crusaders.

_Gallipoli: ‘in a very real sense, the latest of the crusades’_

Widely quoted examples of crusading imagery in the Gallipoli campaign included the poet Rupert Brooke who saw continuity in the expedition with those of the Trojan War and the crusades. He wrote to a friend that ‘this is probably the first letter you ever got from a crusader.’⁶⁸ Similarly, Major Bryan Cooper reflected in 1918 of troops preparing to fight, ‘In a few hours they were to plunge into a hand-to-hand struggle with the old enemy of Christendom, and their pulses throbbed

---


⁶⁷ On crusade proposals, see A. Leopold, _How to Recover the Holy Land: The Crusade Proposals of the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries_ (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000); Housley, _Later Crusades._
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with the spirit of Tancred and Godfrey de Bouillon, as they fitted themselves to take
their places in the last of the Crusades. In the popular novel *Tell England*, written
by a chaplain who had been at Gallipoli, the fictional commanding officer reminds
the soldiers of the historical connections of their current fight:

> [Y]our hands should fly to your swords when I say the Gallipoli campaign
> is a New Crusade. [...] Thus Christendom United fights for
> Constantinople, under the leadership of the British, whose flag is made
> up of the crosses of the saints. The army opposing the Christians fights
> under the crescent of Islam.

Most famously, John Masefield’s best-selling *Gallipoli* framed the disaster in terms
of *The Song of Roland*: each section was headed by a quotation and the repeated
victories against overwhelming odds with no reinforcement made the final defeat
heroic. Moreover, Masefield’s composition was an ‘official’ commission, designed
with a sceptical American audience in mind, which figured widely in later accounts
of the campaign. For Masefield, ‘the reality of what occurred at Gallipoli is
invisible, and its significance derives from an historical uncanny pushed to the point
of supernatural coincidence: martyrdom in a holy crusade against the infidel and
the assurance of salvation’.

Units from Australia and New Zealand (‘ANZAC’ soldiers) were a key part of the
Gallipoli landings. Wounded ANZAC troops at a service in Westminster Abbey were
compared with medieval crusaders by one of their number in *The Times*. In a piece
titled ‘Knights of a New Crusade’, he wrote that ‘the Templars of old were not

---

inspired with any finer spirit than the knights of this latter-day crusade. Both had upheld the Cross against the Crescent.\textsuperscript{74} In the same vein, the Australian Prime Minister was reported a few days later describing the Australasian troops as being engaged on a ‘new crusade’.\textsuperscript{75}

These examples suggest that some at least were drawing historical connections between the crusades and the campaign. Without overstating the use of the allusion, it can be seen that the above quotes were from both the home front and those who witnessed battle; and included both popular (\textit{Tell England}) and propaganda (Masefield’s \textit{Gallipoli}) pieces. Examples of these latter aspects were much more substantial when it came to the activities and representation of the EEF as crusaders, and have accordingly been the subject of much greater scrutiny.

\textit{‘Haunted by an older age’: The EEF – Crusaders in Khaki?}

The historical parallelism of English soldiers fighting in the Holy Land was not missed by contemporary participants or British propagandists in London, although the nature of the relationship with the past has been contested by historians. It is also important to distinguish between wartime references to the crusades and postwar examples of crusading, especially when considering whether members of the EEF saw themselves as participating in a modern crusade. The capture of Jerusalem on 11 December 1917 and Allenby’s entry into the city provided a compelling image which stirred imaginative associations with the crusades and suggested the epitaph ‘The Last Crusade’ for the EEF’s campaign; in fact, Jerusalem could be considered a powerfully symbolic target.\textsuperscript{76}

There seems to have been indecision in the British propaganda portrayals of the capture of Jerusalem and Allenby’s expedition. On one hand, notionally sensitive to the religiously composite make-up of Allenby’s force and international (particularly
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in British Indian) Muslim opinion, the British Government issued a ‘D-Notice’ to the press on 15 November 1917:

The attention of the Press is again drawn to the undesirability of publishing any article paragraph or picture suggesting that military operations against Turkey are in any sense a Holy War, a modern Crusade, or have anything whatever to do with religious questions. The British Empire is said to contain a hundred million Mohammedan subjects of the King and it is obviously mischievous to suggest that our quarrel with Turkey is one between Christianity and Islam.  

The capture of Jerusalem and its reportage a few weeks later was squarely in view. Contrary to the notice, the iconic representation of the conquest was Punch’s cartoon of 19 December 1917 titled ‘The Last Crusade’ which depicted Richard I overlooking Jerusalem with the caption ‘My dream comes true.’ Richard, it had been suggested in the mythistory of the Third Crusade, had refused to look on the Holy City until he had captured it despite twice bringing his forces within striking distance. The historical parallelism clear, the D-notice was ineffective in suppressing a spate of articles which referred to the crusades, often written by British government officials or sponsored by the Department (later Ministry) of Information. Most contradictory was the Department’s own propaganda film of March 1918, titled The New Crusaders: With the British Forces on the Palestine Front. Local newspapers from regions connected by military units to the campaign, such as the Northampton Independent, could present their soldiers as

79 See Joinville’s account of Richard’s actions being recounted to Louis IX in Smith, Joinville and Villehardouin, pp. 283–84.
crusaders before the capture of Jerusalem; a picture printed in April 1917 shows a member of the EEF shaking hands with a medieval crusader in a desert setting.82

The D-notice was not alone in demonstrating that the crusades lay in the shadows of the EEF’s campaign in Palestine as a ‘known secret’, particularly for those in charge of British propaganda in 1917-18.83 Bar-Yosef has identified Mark Sykes, John Buchan and Stephen Gaslee as being both influential in the presentation of the campaign, and as having tendencies towards medievalism. After his death in 1919 Sykes was presented as a knight in armour with Jerusalem behind him on the Eleanor Cross in Sledmere, while Buchan’s novel Greenmantle (1916) had demonstrated his sensitivity to the prospects of worldwide holy war.84 In fleshing out suggestions for propaganda themes for the Palestine campaign, Gaslee had
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proposed the title ‘The Holy Land: A New Crusade’, encouraging scholars who would write articles for the propaganda that:

[I]t is particularly on the sentimental, romantic and religious side of the Palestine campaign that the Prime Minister and Buchan wish emphasis to be laid, especially in the ecclesiastical press, and if you will keep the crusading idea in mind as you write the article, I feel certain that the results will be what they want. 85

This has several striking aspects: here was an official encouragement in the direction of using ‘the crusading idea’; it predated by several months both the D-notice and the capture of Jerusalem; and lastly it represented propaganda aimed at the home front where there was clearly some expectation that crusading would resonate. Lloyd George, sensitive to this resonance, had asked Allenby for ‘Jerusalem by Christmas’ in a meeting before he took command in Egypt. 86

Allenby’s entry into Jerusalem was a key moment in the representation of the campaign, both at home and abroad. Bar-Yosef has contested that the Palestine campaign was ‘consciously staged by the British government as an exercise in propaganda’, one designed to distract attention from the Western Front and capture the public imagination. 87 The staging of this event, then, was a highly charged matter as ‘the Crusading image was so instinctive, so immediate’, as the Punch cartoon suggested. 88 Bar-Yosef argued that when it came to the entry into the city, triumphant British symbolism was kept to a minimum out of a sensitivity to local, and imperial, religious sensitivities, but also in conscious contrast with the ostentatious visit of German Kaiser Wilhelm II in 1898, who had arrived dressed as a medieval crusader. Allenby dismounted and entered on foot – a fact not missed
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by the newspapers.\textsuperscript{89} The Church Times engaged directly with the potential of drawing crusader parallels:

\begin{quote}
We are not to be thinking of a definite crusade. We are not to picture to ourselves a Christian conquest of Jerusalem. General Allenby’s modest entry into the city may be compared with the pious refusal of Baldwin of Flanders to wear a crown of gold in the place where his Saviour had been crowned with thorns, but his careful regard for the rights and susceptibilities of the Moslem inhabitants may yet more profitably be contrasted with the massacre perpetrated by the Crusaders in their hour of victory. It may legitimately be contrasted also with the histrionic entry made by the German Emperor some years ago through a breach in the walls made for his greater glory.\textsuperscript{90}
\end{quote}

At least one writer to The Guardian was also prompted to recall the crusades: ‘There are in Christendom’, wrote James Welldon, ex-headmaster of Harrow and then Dean of Manchester Cathedral, ‘not a few ardent souls which will regard General Allenby, when he rides at the head of his troops into Jerusalem today, as accomplishing the work abandoned by the last of the Crusaders more than six centuries ago.’\textsuperscript{91} The former Bishop of Calcutta went on to associate the victory with the names of Godfrey de Bouillon, Tancred, Raymond of Toulouse, Richard I and St. Louis.\textsuperscript{92}

If the British propaganda and newspaper reports examined above deal with the representation of the campaign to those in Britain, how did the members of the EEF relate to the idea of themselves as modern crusaders? Kitchen has highlighted several contemporary examples of members of the EEF referring to the crusades at
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the time. These demonstrated that at least some of the men of the EEF had an awareness of the history of the land which they traversed which included crusader castles and routes taken by Richard I. Kitchen found that ‘A wider focus across the army that served in Egypt and Palestine reveals that all ranks were capable of indulging in romantic notions of a medieval crusading past.’93 However, his main argument was that although crusading rhetoric and imagery was present across the EEF it was not the predominant form of self-representation.

The army newspaper produced by the EEF from Cairo from March 1918 to autumn 1919 was called The Palestine News. Available in canteens it contained articles as well as letters, comments and adverts of interest to members of the EEF. There was a strong awareness of history in the paper: regular panels on ‘Echoes and Anniversaries’ listed historical events of importance relating to the date of the paper while the ‘Beersheba to Beeroth’ column often mentioned medieval gossip and stories. There were also articles on both biblical geography and crusading figures in the paper, including Richard I of England, Bohemond VI of Antioch and Amaury de Lusignan. Crusading parallels were rare, but not absent. The town of Ramleh was described as Richard’s GHQ, while the EEF were supposedly ‘every whit as keen on sport as were King Richard’s men, the last time our people were here.’94 Again, Allenby’s entry into Jerusalem was compared with the Kaiser’s, especially his entrance on foot.95

The longest piece with a sustained engagement with the crusaders during the war, other than the historical articles, described the religious activities of the soldiers in Jerusalem: ‘As it was in the days of the Crusaders, so today the soldiers of the West are visiting the Churches of Jerusalem and Bethlehem for prayer and thanksgiving. [...] with the Anglo-Celts are their old Crusading Allies [...] heirs of the Crusading tradition’.96 The nature of the connection was not just cultural as two allied
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commanders were held to be descendants of crusader knights, whilst ‘the English knight Sir Philip D’Aubigny has lain undisturbed for nearly seven centuries waiting till the English came again.’ Analysis of the paper suggests that, although not ubiquitous, connections with the crusades and the crusaders could be made.

The Times included several instances of the EEF campaign being referred to as a ‘New Crusade’: an article on an early victory for Sir Archibald Murray was subtitled ‘The New Crusade’ while Allenby’s approach to Jerusalem was noted as the ‘new Crusade’ taking form. A debate in the House of Commons heard a letter from a cavalry officer of the EEF who, upon recalling his view of the Holy Sepulchre commented that their travels in the Judean hill country constituted ‘a real Crusade, if you will.’ His description of combat included many biblical references and a semi-romanticised account of battle which would not have been out of place in a crusade chronicle: a ‘long series of brilliant charges, real cavalry charges every one of them, whole brigades in line, till our swords dripped red. [...] The Turks fired with fuses set at zero at 50 yards range, splitting the nearest horses literally in half.’

Troops during the campaign were discouraged from expressing the idea that the campaign was a crusade; Edward Thompson wrote in 1929 that, ‘We were forbidden to call ourselves Crusaders, but many of us were haunted by an older age.’ Kitchen has identified active resistance to the identification of the soldiers as crusaders, noting that the Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem, Rennie MacInnes, was criticised in October 1917 for appearing to ‘regard our invasion of Palestine somewhat in the light of a Crusade’ in a report commissioned by the British administration in Egypt. T.G. Edgerton asserted that, ‘the spirit of the Crusaders was conspicuous by its absence’, while Major H.O. Lock went further:

> Will our campaign be passed down to history as ‘The Last Crusade’?
> Presumably not. [...] To speak of this as a campaign of The Cross against

---

99 Bar-Yosef, Holy Land, p. 269.
The Crescent is untrue. The Turkish high command was controlled by Germans, so-called Christians. The British soldier fought with no less zest than when opposed to Turks. At the final battle, the Moslems, serving in our armies, by far outnumbered the Christians.¹⁰¹

Allenby, too, later flatly denied the connotation of crusading: ‘Our campaign has been called “The Last Crusade”’, he said at a lecture in Jerusalem in 1933, ‘It was not a crusade.’¹⁰² His reasoning, like Lock’s, was that the combatants were not divided on religious lines and he added that the capture of Jerusalem was strategic, rather than symbolic, because it needed to be liberated from Muslim control.

However, the idea that the EEF had created a bookend for the medieval crusades by successfully restoring Jerusalem to Christian control had traction. In September 1919 Punch printed a cartoon depicting Allenby on horseback in medieval knightly dress titled ‘The Return from the Crusade’, while in parliamentary discussions of financial rewards for British generals, Prime Minister David Lloyd George eulogised Allenby as a victorious crusader:

_The name of General Allenby will be ever remembered as that of the brilliant commander who fought and won the last and most triumphant of the crusades. It was his good fortune, aided by his skill, to be able to bring to a glorious end an enterprise which absorbed the chivalry of Europe for centuries. We forget now that the military strength of Europe was concentrated for generations upon this purpose, and concentrated in vain. A British Army under the command of General Allenby achieved it and achieved it finally._¹⁰³


A letter to the *Daily Mail* in November 1918 from a ‘Crusader’s Father’ suggested that soldiers of the campaign be given a ‘Palestine Cross’ for participation; ‘Surely this 20th-century Crusade deserves special recognition, and what more appropriate than the symbol of Christianity?’\(^{104}\) Lastly, an article in *The Times* relating the campaign of Richard I concluded with the observation that although Richard never saw Jerusalem, Allenby had ‘undone the fatal mistake of the Third Crusade.’\(^{105}\)

These examples are mostly from wartime or in the immediate aftermath of the war and suggest that regardless of whether the EEF was mostly described as, or technically, on a crusade, parallels with the crusaders did arise frequently to the extent that while some felt moved to denounce the association, others, including the Prime Minister, felt they could legitimately be endorsed as crusaders.\(^{106}\)

**The EEF as the ‘Last Crusade’ in Postwar Memory**

These portrayals bring us to consideration of the postwar presentation of the Palestine campaign by participants in the campaign. The number of allusions in the titles of published accounts of the EEF, from both combatants and commentators, suggest that crusading was a significant feature of the postwar representation of the campaign.\(^ {107}\) Captain John More referred to the campaign as ‘the great crusade’; Lt. Col. Parry the ‘greatest of crusades’.\(^ {108}\) Though many accounts made
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\(^{104}\) ‘Letters in Little’, *Daily Mail*, 7 November 1918, p. 2.

\(^{105}\) C.W.C. Oman, ‘Historic Ground’, *The Times*, 26 September 1918, p. 5.

\(^{106}\) Compare with Kitchen, ‘Khaki Crusaders’, p. 152, who argues that because this was not the universal, or predominant image, it could not be applied. I suggest, with Fantauzzo, that a more productive line of questioning is to ask why many, both combatants and observers, during and after the war did see it fitting to describe the EEF as crusaders.


\(^{108}\) Siberry, *New Crusaders*, p. 95.
no further references to the crusades than their title, there were examples of
deeper engagement with the crusades. Some authors connected the geography of
wartime Palestine with the medieval crusades, through recognising that they re-
trod routes crusaders would have taken. For at least one member of the EEF,
physical engagement with the historical journey from Egypt to Syria suggested the
adoption of a crusading identity: ‘we began to feel that we, too, were Crusaders
engaged upon a task similar to that held so sacred by our gallant predecessors of
the Middle Ages.’

The continuity with the medieval crusades was often elaborated to be more than
following in the physical footsteps of crusaders. Vivian Gilbert’s account
romanticised the motivation of the troops, ‘the spirit of the crusaders was in all
these men of mine [...] was not their courage just as great, their idealism just as
fine, as that of knights of old who set out with such dauntless faith under the
leadership of Richard the Lionhearted to free the Holy Land.’ Furthermore, he
wrote, ‘were we not descendants of those same Crusaders’? For Gilbert, and for
others, the fact of Allenby’s capture of Jerusalem overshadowed their accounts of
the man and the campaign. Gilbert wrote: ‘In all the ten crusades organised and
equipped to free the Holy City, only two were really successful, – the first led by
Godfrey de Bouillon, and the last under Edmund Allenby.’ In this schema, the
capture of Jerusalem in 1099 and in 1917 formed the bookend of over 800 years of
crusading endeavour.

Regardless of how troops saw themselves during the campaign, crusading was a
prominent and deliberate lens through which the campaign was retroactively
framed. Fantauzzo has shown that rather than dismissing the crusading allusions as

109 Including Allenby himself in a letter to his wife; see Kitchen, ‘Khaki Crusaders’, p. 148. Also
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112 Quoted in Bar-Yosef, Holy Land, p. 270.
114 Gilbert, Romance of the Last Crusade, p. 171.
a publicity-driven trope, or asking whether they were actually crusading, it is more revealing to consider why the campaign was depicted as a crusade and the combatants as crusaders in postwar accounts; in memoirs and fiction alike. Fantauzzo and Bar-Yosef have both suggested that this ennobled the Palestine campaign and allowed those making historical connections to draw on associations with historical events. Further, Fantauzzo argued that, ‘presenting the Egypt and Palestine campaign, retrospectively, as a crusade, enabled EEF soldiers to compete with the moral value of the war in France and its centrality to the national war narrative.’

These associations capitalised on the imaginative resonance of the crusades present in Britain during the war as employed by clergy and politicians. The use of crusader medievalism was, in part, creating a niche for their wartime experiences which might otherwise be considered marginal to the memory of the war. The appropriation of crusading metaphors and imagery by veterans of the EEF, then, can be seen to be ‘part of the interwar debate on wartime service and national belonging’; namely, as to what counted as sacrifice and of what value – to the individual or the empire – their experiences were.

Interestingly, several of the books mentioned above were by authors from the white dominions and detailed their contributions to the EEF, perhaps suggesting a colonial echo of prewar traditional discourse.

Written in the context of postwar Britain the fact that the authors of these accounts were drawn to associate their memoirs (however superficially) with the crusades is intriguing, because in doing so veterans located the Palestine campaign within a traditional framework of chivalric meritorious warfare which was simultaneously being rejected by authors of ‘war books’ about the experiences on the Western Front.

If the Palestine campaign could be ennobled and given significance through its association with the crusades, were similar dynamics at play on a

116 Ibid., p. 241.
117 Namely, Silas, Crusading at ANZAC; Cooper, Khaki Crusaders; Moore, Riflemen in Sinai; Bowes, Aussie Crusaders.
118 For the debate carried out in the late 1920s about ‘war books’, see Watson, Fighting Different Wars, pp. 212–14; Hynes, A War Imagined, p. 455.
national level about the war as whole in postwar Britain? The nature and place of crusader medievalism in Britain in the interwar years will occupy the focus of the next chapter.

**Conclusion: The Last War - a Great Crusade?**

Using the discourse of crusading to frame and interpret the war was a technique employed variously by clerical figures, politicians, soldiers, chaplains and observers alike. Whilst never being the dominant image of the war, this study has demonstrated that crusader medievalism was threaded throughout the British participation in, and perception of, the conflict. Where there were direct historical parallels, such as the fight against the Ottoman Turks in Gallipoli and Palestine, crusading rhetoric could be persistent, lurking in the peripheral vision of official propaganda and newspaper reports. As expected, those invested in Christian theological interpretations of the war were more likely to consider the war in crusading terms, especially as the war intensified on the Home Front. Notably, this investigation has demonstrated that using crusader medievalism to describe the conflict as a crusade cannot be seen to have died out during the war. Instead a more varied picture has emerged.

Marrin’s conclusion for the Church of England – of a conceptual intensification of rhetoric from framing the war as just and holy to declaring it a crusade – appears to correlate with one of the periods of intensification of the war on the home front proposed by Gregory. Crusading was already both a vernacular and an historical term and was versatile in its application; this definitional imprecision accounts for most of the examples related above. The clerical discourse of crusading was linked to both political propaganda (official and unofficial) and a wider, diffuse, understanding of crusading as a good moral cause worthy of sacrifice.

Though they did not fully strangle traditional ways of viewing the war as a glorious national struggle until the late 1920s, the rise of the narratives of disillusionment and disenchantment meant that crusading imagery was deemed less appropriate to describe trench warfare *in hindsight* and was squeezed to peripheral theatres of combat. The Gallipoli and Palestine campaigns’ geographical connections to the
locations of medieval crusades ensured that despite vacillations of the War Office about the dangers of employing crusading rhetoric, allusions to the crusades permeated both campaigns and postwar published accounts of them. Crusader medievalism, it seems, survived the war in some arenas and found space for significance in remembering the dead. If, as some have argued, the cultural system of the late nineteenth century suffered a potentially fatal blow, rather than sudden death, with the experiences of the First World War – did crusader medievalism coherently survive the peace?
5) INTERWAR CRUSADING

As Britain emerged from its introduction to the scale and crushing realities of twentieth-century mechanical warfare in the Great War of 1914-18 into the uncertainties and economic fragility of the 1920s and 1930s, crusader medievalism could have been expected to die out. Crusading had been closely allied to the values of the traditional prewar culture which had, according to Fussell, been eliminated by the war. However, its persistence and even utility during the war, as seen in the last chapter, suggests that an investigation of interwar crusader medievalism may reveal its survival – we have already seen uses of crusader medievalism by those writing of their experiences of the British campaign in Palestine.¹

This chapter will seek to understand what, if any, uses the memory of the crusades had in Britain in the years between the wars. It will consider the crusading rhetoric of the Spanish Civil War and its echoes in Britain in the 1930s before examining instances of crusader medievalism in Britain and British imperial discourses between 1918 and 1939. Focus will then turn to a potent and deep engagement with crusading: the creation in 1921 of the Most Noble Order of Crusaders, its career and subsequent decline. As an example of deep engagement with crusading indigenous to Britain in the interwar years the Order speaks to the wider theoretical debates about how the war was remembered and the survival (or not) of the ‘traditional’ Victorian cultural synthesis.

The Spanish Civil War and its Echoes, 1936-39

Though the fighting was largely contained within the Iberian Peninsula, the Spanish Civil War was played out in front of the watching nations of Europe, who all felt they had some stake in the outcome. Whether this was because the war was perceived as a fight between international communism and rising fascism, or a government and rebels, or democracy and authoritarianism, Franco and the Nationalists made

¹ See Fantauzzo, ‘Buried Alive’.
headway in promoting their cause as Christian and therefore a conflict between civilization and atheistic communism. The endorsement by the majority of the Spanish Catholic hierarchy of the Nationalist cause as a crusade bolstered the cause both in Spain and across the world, bringing the rhetoric of a crusading holy war to the attention of, among others, the British public. For this reason, it is appropriate to outline the form and nature of this rhetoric. This section will briefly survey the crusader medievalism of the war before considering some of its echoes in Britain in the second half of the 1930s.

Though Ben Edwards and James Fountain have examined British responses to the idea of a crusade as promoted by Franco’s Nationalists, both use the term in a loose way to mean a religiously motivated and justified war. This means that their analyses encompass a broad range of understandings of the conflict beyond its explicit declaration as a crusade and thus that the controversy and complexity of how crusader medievalism is constructed and functioned in British contexts can be lost sight of amongst considerations of responses to Franco’s construction of his cause as a holy war.²

Cruzada Medievalism in Spain

The Spanish relationship with the crusades was long and deep. From the recognition of the spiritual value of participation in the Reconquista as being similar to that of crusading, if not analogous, and the explicit connections between success in Spain leading to the opening of the North African land route to Jerusalem, Christians fighting in Spain had adopted many of the institutions of crusading.³ These included military orders – both international and indigenous – as well as crusading taxes and indulgence-style rewards. As the conflict intensified it became religiously polarised and to be seen as part of a Mediterranean-wide (if not pan-European) struggle between Christianity and Islam. Spanish elites, clergy and populace in the

nineteenth and twentieth centuries could all draw on the crusades for a variety of purposes. Knobler has suggested that after the French Revolution and subsequent invasion of the Iberian Peninsula, ‘crusading came to be an almost constant theme in Spanish traditionalist polemic during the nineteenth century.’

While the press linked the war against Napoleonic forces at the beginning of the century to a holy war, in part because of the French opposition to the culturally central Catholic Church, supporters of the Spanish monarchy drew on perceptions of a glorious crusading heritage in an attempt to legitimise their candidates, a tactic which would persist through the century particularly with the Carlist faction. Clergy, reporters and poets could, and did, proclaim crusades for conflicts later in the century including the attempted Spanish invasion of Morocco (1859-60); the clergy did so regarding Morocco again in 1921 in a pastoral letter. Despite the crushing naval defeat of the Spanish in 1898 by the US which left them without colonies or international influence and with ideas of imperial restoration in tatters, crusading as a largely conservative and traditionalist way of expressing political and theological legitimacy and encouraging military action survived into the twentieth century.

The civil war of 1936-39 was fought between the Republican forces of the government, supported by left-leaning brigades of international volunteers which included communists, and on the other side those who followed General Franco’s Nationalists. Franco welded together the army (the navy supported the Republicans), monarchists and the Catholic Church in Spain whilst also receiving direct assistance from the German Luftwaffe and Italy’s fascist leader Mussolini. Drawing on the traditional strand of crusading rhetoric, Franco explicitly and repeatedly declared the war a cruzada and made this a central plank of his ideological legitimisation. In a speech given on the 25th of July 1936, Franco
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6 In 1955 at the dedication of a statue of El Cid in Burgos, Franco was quoted as having said: ‘The great service of our crusade, the virtue of our movimiento is to have awakened an awareness of what we were, of what we are, and what we can be.’ Aberth, Knight at the Movies, p. 137.
pronounced that: ‘We are in a war that is resembling more and more the character of a crusade, of a great historical campaign, and of a transcendental struggle of people and civilizations.’ He was reported two years later as saying, ‘Our fight is therefore a crusade in which Europe’s fate is at stake.’ Franco had a mural of himself in knightly armour painted and placed in the Servicio Historico Militar (Military Historical Service), visually declaring his appropriation of El Cid as a model and unifying national figure. The version of El Cid which resonated with Franco was heavily inspired by the scholar Ramon Menéndez Pidal; ‘The Catholic, Castilian, crusading – but not loyalist! – Cid of Menéndez Pidal was irresistible to Franco’s propagandists.’ Regardless of the reality of the mercenary warlord, as El Cid was transmuted into a Spanish nationalist hero he had also become a Christian crusader in the Reconquista which suited Franco’s purposes. José Sánchez has argued that:

The legitimation of Franco, both as a rebel general in the Civil War and as the founder of a new state, rested ultimately on this notion of crusade. As a latter-day crusader, dedicated to extirpating all that was unCatholic, Franco could command moral authority as well as military might. His victory subsequently ensured that the values of the crusade would be institutionalized in post-war Spain, hymned as the ideological foundations of a new age in national history.

Clerics such as Bishop Plá y Deniel could assert in September 1936 that: ‘It is true that it has taken on the external form of a civil war but in reality it is a crusade. [...] This is not a civil war, but a crusade for religion and for the fatherland and for
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7 Ibid., p. 145. See also Our Special Correspondent, ‘Fascist State for Spain’, The Times, 22 April 1937, p. 16.
9 Aberth, Knight at the Movies, p. 137. The mural is at the Archivo Historico Militar, Madrid.
One of the most publicised articulations of Franco’s cause being a crusade was an article by a Dominican priest, Ignacia G. Menéndez-Reigada, who argued that Spain’s inherent Christianity justified the conflict’s holy status. Most other bishops too, Sánchez has observed, used the term crusade between 1936 and 1937, thus sealing the ‘blood pact’ between the Spanish Catholic Church and Franco’s regime.

**British Responses**

The above propaganda, and the idea of a conflict for (Catholic) Christianity, brought the war to wider attention – as it was designed to. There were already Spanish exiles and refugees in other western European countries including Britain, while volunteers from western nations travelled to fight on both sides of the conflict. The response of British Catholics was, largely, supportive of Franco and accepted the narrative of the war as a conflict between Christianity and communism; this included the Catholic primate in Britain, Arthur Hinsley the Archbishop of Westminster. More broadly, while some Catholics did question the applicability of holy war and crusading rhetoric to the Nationalist cause, the opposition to Franco amongst Christians was predominantly Protestant and spanned the sectarian spectrum; ‘Protestants in Britain overwhelmingly rejected the idea that Franco was fighting for Christianity.’

In opposition to Catholic publishing companies, such as the Catholic Truth Society and Burns, Oates & Washbourne, who had produced pamphlets promoting Franco’s cruzada, the Republican Spanish embassy in London published a pamphlet by José
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17 Edwards, *With God on Our Side*, pp. 31–37. For Hinsley’s position, see pp. 31-33.
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Manuel Gallegos Rocafull, a canon of Córdoba cathedral, in English in defence of the Republican cause in 1937. Rocafull denied the legitimacy of the claim of the Nationalists to the title of crusade on the grounds that their rebellion against legitimate authority was unwarranted and that the war could not be considered a holy one: ‘A Holy War? A Crusade? No, clearly no. Religion is too sacred and too divine to be mixed in this chaos of reasons which are certainly just, but also of interests which are too human.’

The non-interventionist response of Britain to the Spanish Civil War was debated in Parliament, with acknowledgement of the crusading claims of Franco and the Catholic Church. Both Josiah Wedgwood and Clement Attlee made reference to the conflict’s crusading overtones; the former saw it as a ‘crusade carried on by Moors’ and legionaries, while Attlee remarked: ‘I wonder what Isabella of Castile would have thought if she had seen General Franco at the head of his Moors leading a crusade.’ Similarly, the Bishop of Chelmsford observed in his introduction to the pamphlet ‘Religion in Spain’ produced by the Parliamentary Committee for Spain that, ‘A religious adventure in which the Crescent is employed to establish the Cross, and in which are co-operating Germans, whose new religion of Nationalism has recently and bravely been denounced by the Pope, can only be described as a crusade of a comic-opera variety.’ This seeming paradox was addressed in a letter to the editor of The Times which pointed out that Franco’s use of Moorish allies was entirely consistent with Christian powers in the Reconquista and with the mercenary career of El Cid who served both Christian and Muslim lords. An English nurse, Gabriel Herbert, who had gone to support Franco’s troops related that they were ‘imbued with the spirit of the old Crusaders’.
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19 Ibid., p. 28; José Manuel Gallegos Rocafull, Crusade or Class War? (London: Press Department of the Spanish Embassy, 1937).
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Crusader medievalism employed by Franco and the Spanish Catholic bishops, then, not only shaped the conflict in Spain but its presentation and reception in Britain too. In particular, it was received and accepted on the whole by Catholics as a crusade for Christianity and civilisation against communism and chaos but rejected as incongruous in other quarters. Regardless of whether the claim of crusading was accepted, however, the Spanish Civil War exercised a powerful influence on the rhetoric of crusading as it was adopted, in attenuated fashion, to describe the Nazis’ anti-Bolshevik campaign of the 1930s and 1940s.

**British Crusader Medievalism**

*Britain Between the Wars*

A million servicemen returned to Britain from the Armed Forces after the war, often to find their jobs occupied by someone else or redundant. In a country reeling from the economic requirements of total warfare and grappling with the implications of peace, seemingly intractable problems came thick and fast: the challenge of demobilisation and back pay for soldiers; unemployment, which reached two million in 1921; inflation; and a General Strike in 1926.25 The global Great Depression, triggered by the Wall St Crash, hit in the years after 1929 and caused further unemployment (which reached three million in 1933).26 Britain, however, had a milder experience than the United States or Germany and saw signs of recovery between 1934-37 linked to wages falling more slowly than prices; the middle classes, therefore, could often afford a greater standard of living.27 As discussed in the first chapter, these domestic troubles served to undermine aspects of the British understanding of victory in the war as it had not bought ‘homes fit for heroes’ but had suspended or even exacerbated existing problems which returned in the following decades. Similarly, with the destabilising European situation and

failures of the League of Nations, international diplomacy and the peace and disarmament movements the prospect of another world war became increasingly likely as the 1930s waned. Disillusionment with the outcome of the 1914-18 war took hold of some and the outbreak of the Second World War was greeted with a more muted acceptance than the First.28

While measurements of British churchgoing and membership require careful handling, they do appear to show a proportional decline across the United Kingdom between the wars, followed by an absolute decline in numbers after the Second World War.29 The perception of religious decline and the gains of ‘modernist-secularist-materialist forces’ in Europe, including communism, were prevalent in Britain and motivated the ‘Recall to Religion’ of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cosmo Lang, in December 1936.30 Christianity, though, ‘continued to play a prevalent role in British society, but it did so in a more diffusive and therefore less dogmatic way’, due to its historic influence and the established place of the churches and churchmen within the institutional fabric of the nation.31 The tenor of interwar Christianity inclined both towards ecumenicalism and fracture – common ground could be found in peace movements but differences over support for, or condemnation of, Franco’s Nationalists could harden sectarian divisions.32 Wolffe has suggested that, ‘although the furnace of European conflict was to melt away many of the easy assumptions of the past, bonds between patriotism, imperialism and religion still continued strong in the mid-twentieth century.’33

The ties of the British Empire, united in wartime, loosened somewhat in the decades thereafter. While Britain sought to strengthen trade relationships within the empire, and white dominions particularly, the general trend was ‘fissiparous’.34 Where the empire had survived up to the war by avoiding having to deal with multiple crises at once, 1919-20 saw nationalist uprisings in India, Ireland, Egypt and

28 Gregory, The Last Great War, pp. 271–75.
29 Wolffe, God and Greater Britain, pp. 70–72.
30 Edwards, With God on Our Side, p. 89.
31 Ibid., p. 10.
32 Ibid., p. 6.
33 Wolffe, God and Greater Britain, p. 214.
34 Porter, The Lion’s Share, p. 273.
Iraq, war with Afghanistan, and clashes between Jews and Arabs in Palestine.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 257–58.} This last territory was a new addition to the empire and occupied an iconic place in British imagination; Britain oversaw a mandate for Palestine and France for Syria, extending contact and influence of the western nations in both historically resonant areas. Its governance ‘in trust’ from the League of Nations for the native and Zionist populations, increased the sense of imperial responsibility which was expressed, in part, through a programme of archaeological discovery and architectural ‘restoration’. The concern for the preservation of historic sites was not limited to Palestine but included Cyprus and Rhodes and came in the context of awareness of (and competition with) the other imperial powers of France and Italy; ‘the protection of monuments explicitly became a symbol of a nation’s ability to rule overseas – a measurement of civilization.’\footnote{Astrid Swenson, ‘The Heritage of Empire’, in \textit{From Plunder to Preservation: Britain and the Heritage of Empire, c.1800-1940}, eds. Astrid Swenson and Peter Mandler, Proceedings of the British Academy 187 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 10.} Imperial and European concerns remained a feature of British focus, entangled as they were with domestic issues and British involvement with the new League of Nations.

\textit{Campaigning Crusader Medievalism}

against opium and cocaine and the correspondence of Major Van Der Byl whose ‘Fur Crusade’ spanned several decades. Various movements with a campaigning purpose designated themselves crusades. Several were clearly Christian: the Bible Crusade sought to give ‘publicity to the Bible’; the Catholic Crusade was founded by the Anglican socialist and vicar of Thaxted Conrad Noel to promote Christian socialism, as was the Christian Socialist Crusade by members of the Labour Party in January 1931; while the Christian Counter-Bolshevist Crusade was launched with the Bishop of Birmingham as its president in February 1920 to oppose the perceived spread of communism. Church Army Crusaders – men and women marching across the country each year to conduct Christian missions – were also recorded through the interwar years.

Somewhat incongruously, but demonstrating how the word had drifted to describe a morally good campaign, the cause of world peace was described as ‘the greatest crusade of all’ by the Prince of Wales speaking to the League of Nations Union in October 1930. Similarly, the Womens’ Peace Crusade was active in the interwar years and the Christian Pacifist Crusade was reactivated in 1933 by Leyton Richards.

More politically, Lord Beaverbook, owner of the Daily Express


41 ‘Empire and Peace’, The Times, 31 October 1930, p. 16.

newspaper, started the Empire Crusade for trade protectionism for imperial goods in 1929 which spawned the United Empire Free Trade Party, whose members were labelled crusaders in the press. Consequently, from 1933 the Express carried an image of a crusader in its header. The Jarrow Crusade, or March, of 1936 saw two hundred unemployed men from the northern town walk to London to present a petition to the Houses of Parliament; according to one contemporary they had ‘no less high motives than the crusaders of old.’
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Figure 5.1: ‘Empire Free Trade’, Daily Mail, 24 October 1929, p. 19.

---


The association between crusading and the First World War, seen in the previous chapter, continued after the war. The most striking war memorial from the First World War to engage with crusading in Britain was in Paisley, Scotland, entitled ‘The Spirit of the Crusaders’. It featured a large, mail-clad knight on horseback holding an upright pennant, flanked on both sides by British Tommies who, with eyes downcast, stepped resolutely forward in the same direction. In the juxtaposition of the medieval and the modern, the memorial evoked a continuity of purpose and cause – the British soldiers, it suggested, were embarked on the same venture as the knight. Goebel has observed that the employment of crusading imagery was a trend within the remembrance of the war, and that the war in its entirety could be memorialised as a crusade. He has compared British and German memorialisation of the war and concluded that, ‘in the British discourse of remembrance the concept of a new crusade prevailed, whereas German commemorations put an emphasis on aspects of national defence.

![Figure 5.2: Model of ‘Spirit of the Crusaders’, Paisley, 1922.](image-url)
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46 Alice Meredith Williams, *Spirit of the Crusaders*, Paisley, 1922. For images of the model used for the sculpture, see Figure 5.2 below, from ‘Spirit of the Crusades’, *The Victorian Web*, <http://www.victorianweb.org/sculpture/warmonuments/24.html>, [accessed 28 November 2014]; and Goebel, ‘Britain’s “Last Crusade”’, p. 159.
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This deliberate rendering of the conflict in collective memory as a crusade was neither uniform in application nor acceptance. Gregory concluded his recent study with the caution that ‘there was a great deal of subtle nuance and variation over both time and space. The broad discursive parameters for talking about the war were being appropriated for specific purposes, leading to a memory that was continually contested and developing.’ Belinda Davies too concluded that ‘the war was received and remembered in radically different ways, even by the same people: as tragic, heroic, the source of intense national pride and of insuperable familial grief.’ This heterogeneity extended to the forms of memorialisation of the war – monuments and memorials included halls and gates as well as town centre crosses and plaques. Writing about the war could be in the form of official histories, personal memoirs, novels or juvenile literature such as comics. In these expressions of memorialisation, and as part of a traditional vocabulary of remembrance, crusader medievalism could have currency.

Soldiers could be remembered as crusaders in passing: a widow discussing appropriate grave markers wrote, ‘I think most of us would be content with something as near as can be to the little wooden crosses our Crusaders have won.’ The ‘great crusading spirit’ of the war was referred to in the House of Commons in 1919 by Sir Wilfrid Sugden while Captain William Benn, later Viscount Stansgate, compared the ‘great moral wave’ that had taken the country to war in 1914 to ‘the time of the Great Crusade’. The Bishop of Durham could remember the war in
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1923 as having had ‘the character of a crusade’.\(^{54}\) Most pertinently for the question of the persistence of traditional understandings of war, as opposed to ones privileging the experience of the trenches, one letter to the editor of The Times in November 1933 wrote of Armistice Day addresses since the war: ‘Too many of them dwelt on the horrors of war and too few on the noble comradeship and heroism displayed by the ordinary man and woman. The Great War was a crusade more noble and greater than any crusade in history.’\(^{55}\)

As during the war itself, and in addition to the writings of its veterans examined in the previous chapter, the Palestine campaign of the EEF attracted crusading rhetoric, particularly the epithet of ‘the last crusade’. The New Zealand High Commissioner in London, Sir James Parr, in 1927 called it the ‘great crusade’, and, as mentioned above, in August 1919 then British Prime Minister David Lloyd George hailed General Allenby’s campaign as the ‘last and most triumphant of the crusades.’\(^{56}\) This proclamation, in the House of Commons no less, drew criticism from Muslims in London, a meeting of whom rejected the characterisation on the basis that it was ‘an insult to our Moslem soldiers who assisted in that conquest and the Moslem allies whose adherence made it possible.’\(^{57}\) It should be noted that Allenby himself played down the association on similar grounds in 1933.\(^{58}\) Lloyd George, however, repeated the assertion at a dinner in Allenby’s honour in 1928: ‘He was a worthy successor in prowess and chivalry to the knights of the Middle Ages who fought to rescue the shrines of Christendom from the Saracens’.\(^{59}\)

What, then, did a harking back to nineteenth-century medievalism offer people in the years after the war? It was able to articulate ways in which sacrifice and loss were meaningful and so comfort the bereaved: ‘In contrast to acid irony, a

---

\(^{54}\) Herbert Dunelm, ‘The League and the Bishops’, The Times, 6 November 1923, p. 15.


\(^{58}\) Our Special Correspondent, ‘Lord Allenby’s Tour’, p. 9.

\(^{59}\) ‘Welcome to Lord Allenby’, p. 15.
traditional vocabulary of remembrance offered some consolation and allowed the bereaved to cope with their grief.\textsuperscript{60} It provided ‘a language and an ethical interpretation’ through which the losses could be understood and asserted that ‘sacrifices were redemptive, that they prepared the ground for a better world, one in which such staggering loss of life would not recur.’\textsuperscript{61} Goebel has explained how crusader medievalism operated within this discourse:

\begin{quote}
Such imaginings originated in a desire to find meaning in war and, in particular, to give death on the battlefield a greater historical significance than a purely personal loss. In Paisley and elsewhere in Britain during the inter-war years, the First World War was represented as the ‘Last Crusade’ in an effort to justify the human toll of the conflict. The crusading narrative attributed positive meanings to physical sacrifice. It asserted that fallen soldiers had not died in vain: they had, in the imagined footsteps of the historic crusaders, struggled to achieve not only a military, but also a moral victory based on British liberal principles.\textsuperscript{62}
\end{quote}

Evoking the crusades reassured people of both historical continuity, as opposed to rupture, and of higher moral and spiritual significance for the conflict and their losses.

\textit{Interwar Imperial Crusader Medievalism}

If Allenby in 1933 refused to be cast as a crusading hero, others were. The hundredth anniversary of General Gordon’s birth in 1930 was commemorated with a service in St Paul’s where he was celebrated as ‘a national hero and a Christian crusader.’\textsuperscript{63} Richard I’s role as a national hero persisted in the mid-1930s: ‘King Richard lacks no honour. Through the romance of crusading, his prowess against

\textsuperscript{60} Goebel, \textit{Medieval Memory}, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{62} Goebel, ‘Britain’s “Last Crusade”’, p. 159.
\textsuperscript{63} ‘In Memory of Gordon’, \textit{The Times}, 30 January 1930, p. 15.
the Paynim, his huge strength, his adventures, his love of song, and the pen of Sir Walter Scott, he is a great national hero.” And to complete the set of medieval, nineteenth- and twentieth-century heroes, T.E. Lawrence (‘of Arabia’) was heralded as a ‘crusader of the twentieth century’ by Lord Halifax at a memorial service for his life in 1936. Crusading could still, then, be seen by some in interwar Britain in its prewar place when it came to heroism. This was perhaps not the case with ancestry.

The nineteenth-century practice which Siberry highlighted of trumpeting a crusading ancestor, for both real and literary genealogies, was ripe for comedy in the interwar years. The author P.G. Wodehouse poked fun at the practice of creating crusading ancestors for the nobility by responding to a letter in The Times with details of the crusading credentials of Bertie Wooster’s ancestry: ‘Froissart, speaking of the Sieur de Wooster who did so well in the Crusades – his record of 11 Paynim with 12 whacks of the battleaxe still stands, I believe’. A hoax letter to The Guardian in October 1923 by an American comedian sought to buy a crusading ancestor: ‘I should like some ancestors […] I will pay Mr. Squire any sum within reason for a Crusader, so that he be Norman and Warranted Entire. I should reinter him with appropriate ceremonies on the part of the Ku Klux Klan on my oil lands near Oklahoma City.’ ‘It is easier’, wrote a contributor to the Daily Mail, ‘for the College of Arms to find a Crusading ancestor for William Boggs of war-contracts fame, than it is to fabricate a history for a wonderful piece of Chippendale which appears suddenly from nowhere.’

Nevertheless, greater exposure to Palestine and Jerusalem provoked further interest in the history of these lands, including crusader history. This form of crusader medievalism saw reports published in newspapers of the history of the Holy Land as it was uncovered and calls for the preservation of crusader sites such

---

65 ‘Lawrence of Arabia’, The Times, 30 January 1936, p. 16. Lawrence’s gravestone showed a crusader, Goebel, Medieval Memory, p. 118.
as the Templar castle at Athlit. Crusader sites were also among those cited as in need of protection and preservation in Cyprus and Rhodes by such notables as Steven Runciman and the Archbishop of Canterbury. The crusades were cited in a debate in the House of Lords in 1922 as justification for Christian (here understood as British) involvement in the running of Palestine as a territory: ‘We do not forget that some of the best blood of Christendom was shed in the Crusades for the Holy Land, and the claim of the whole Christian world to have a voice in the settlement of Palestine is a claim that cannot be denied.’ Similarly, William Ormsby-Gore, later Secretary of State for the Colonies, argued:

*England has a unique and great responsibility and opportunity. Are we going to hand that over to anybody else? Is there anybody else who can take it? The Crusaders may have been impetuous, and have wanted to thrust their idea on somebody else, but is there not some moral idea behind the Crusades? Is there not the idea that in the land which we all regard as holy there should be such conditions of government that for the pilgrims and representatives of all nations and races Jerusalem shall be regarded as a house of prayer for all men?*

However it was motivated or justified, in practice the mandate of Palestine threw the British into the centre of the escalating Arab-Jewish tensions of the interwar years which ultimately made their position untenable. Intriguingly, there were examples of both sides employing crusader parallels in this period to bolster their causes. A book by the son of Zionist leader Menachem Ussishkin evaluated the fall

---


of the crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem in order to assess threats to the Zionist cause in Palestine, seeing both as attempts to establish Westernised communities in an Eastern context. In 1932 The Times reported celebrations in the Arab Press of the anniversary of the Battle of Hattin and observed that: ‘Most of the speakers drew a parallel between the Crusaders’ invasion and the present Western efforts to colonize Moslem lands. A speaker at Nablus observed that the site of Hattin, drenched with the blood of victorious Moslem martyrs, was now a Zionist colony.'

Two other examples demonstrate the reach of crusader medievalism. When David Lloyd George as British PM in March 1920 met the Indian Caliphate Delegation he was told that ‘An effort to drive the Turks out “bag and baggage” from the seat of the Caliphate was bound to be regarded by Moslems as a challenge of the modern Crusaders to Islam.’ In response he assured the delegate that, ‘I do not want any Mahomedan in India to imagine that we entered into this war against Turkey as a crusade against Islam.’ Finally, a monument to Afghan success against Britain in Kabul in 1922 featured a chained ‘British Lion’ flanked by two ‘European warriors in medieval armour [who] look outwards on opposite sides, presumably representing the vanquished in a crusade against the Crescent.’

Crusader medievalism in the interwar years exhibited impressive flexibility in imperial contexts; it could be found, unsurprisingly, in scholarly use regarding the British mandate in Palestine but also to justify British rule. It was seemingly also being appropriated in different ways on both sides of the Arab-Jewish conflict in the 1930s as well as being reflected back at the British from such distant contexts as India and Afghanistan.

**Fascist Crusading**

With the rise of continental fascist movements Britain too saw attempts to establish groups on fascist principles in the interwar years. These often displayed an affinity

---

75 ‘Prime Minister on Caliphate’, The Times, 22 March 1920, p. 10.
76 ‘An Englishman in Kabul’, The Times, 2 June 1922, p. 15.
for perceived aspects of medieval life such as a powerful monarchy and an ordered society and saw in these an essence of British cultural life. Crusading and the crusades could become emblematic of these medievalisms and could also embody a militarism which appealed to fascists. In this vein, the British Fascists called for ‘a new crusade’ in Manchester in October 1924, ‘in defence of our religion, civilization, and all that makes life worth living.’ Similarly, in 1936 the Anglican Reverend Nye could evoke the crusades as an example of how violence could suppress heresy.

The Religious Order of Crusaders (ROC) was an Anglican organisation aiming to unite and invigorate bodies within the Church of England while displaying a predilection for fascism. The Crusader’s Journal of the ROC began in 1931 and applied a crusading veneer to the organisation’s purposes; ‘Every Churchman is by baptism a Crusader. Every Crusader is a Soldier of the Cross.’ ‘The Crusaders’ Song’ included the following lines: ‘Come all Christian soldiers / Join the great Crusade / Under Christ your Captain / Be the conquest made.’ While there was little other crusader medievalism in the journal it was notable for the frequent articles between 1931 and 1937 written by E.G. Mandeville Roe, a senior member of first the British Fascists, editor of their journal British Fascism, and later Oswald Mosley’s British Union of Fascists. The first of these was entitled, ‘Fascism: The Modern Crusade’ and the series constituted a platform for Mandeville’s Roe’s political views; the ninth issue in July 1932 featured an anti-Semitic article blaming the Jews for the Great War. While the ROC’s medievalism was more limited than its

---

fascism, the above examples do suggest the periodic interwar adaptation of crusader medievalism for distinctly fascist purposes.

Further Crusading Ephemera

The above cases do not represent the complete spectrum of use in Britain of crusader medievalism between the wars, as the further examples in this section will illustrate. Hinz has counted thirteen crusader novels published in English between the wars while there was at least one attempt to render the First Crusade in verse – that of Evarts Scudder in 1925. The 1935 Hollywood epic film, *The Crusades*, by Cecil B. DeMille was shown in Britain and one writer for *The Observer* suggested that it had been in danger of needing its name changed in order to highlight that it actually was about the historical expeditions rather than contemporary campaigning.

The medieval crusades, or at least the adventures of Richard I, were deemed worthy of adorning both a new tapestry in the chapel at Eton and formed a scene in a series of paintings of ‘The Building of Britain’ commissioned for St. Stephen’s Hall, Westminster. The latter was opened by then Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin and depicted Richard setting off on the Third Crusade. Lest it be doubted that the crusaders could haunt the interwar present, Aubrey Herbert remarked in a House of Commons debate on the Turkish problem in 1920: ‘I feel even in this House a sort of anaemic ghost—the ghost of the Crusaders—urging us on. The Crusaders fought for great ideals. They were for Christianity, but Christianity is one thing, Byzantine superstition is another.’

The Aldershot Tattoo of 1928 featured a crusading set piece which, ‘symbolizes the entire spirit of the Tattoo - duty, service, self-abnegation, and sacrifice.’

It was this section, one observer commented, rather than ones of Marlborough’s troops or the capture of Badajoz during the Peninsula War which would most greatly move the spectators. Finally, as part of a series which reported historical events as though they were contemporary, the Daily Mail in 1931 included an article on the 1099 fall of Jerusalem to the First Crusade. The correspondent emphasised the English contingent throughout, noting that fighting in the Holy War had ‘reconciled’ Anglo-Saxons and Normans, as Henty had suggested. The assault on the city was successful when St. George appeared to spur the crusaders to the conclusion of their ‘holy enterprise’.

We can see, then, that crusader medievalism persisted through the interwar period for a variety of uses and a range of contexts within Britain and British public life. The above examples represent passing, or at most shallow, engagements with crusader medievalism; often the word crusade was used in the sense of moral campaign and even where the historic crusades were considered it was without much reflection. This chapter will move on to consider an interwar example of deep engagement with the crusades, where an organisation placed a perception of crusading centrally to its identity and purpose and undertook sustained reflection on the nature of crusading.

Deep Engagement: The Most Noble Order of Crusaders

A black and white newsreel clip from 1925 captured the public procession through a crowded London street of hundreds of men dressed as medieval crusaders. They wore dark habits with white surcoats which prominently displayed crosses on the breast, whilst several of the men carried pennants with medieval insignia. The scene changed to show the robed men gathered around a large rectangular foundation.

---

stone upon each corner of which the hilt of a sword was ceremoniously tapped (see Figure 5.3). The occasion, though self-consciously medievalesque, was not even a decade after the First World War and was the dedication of the foundation stone of the National Heart Hospital in London by the Most Noble Order of Crusaders. The Order, established in 1921, was a secret society mostly made up of ex-servicemen who aimed to do works of charity for society in line with their understanding of themselves as an order of Chivalry based on medieval precedent.

Figure 5.3: Most Noble Order of Crusaders’ Stone Laying Ceremony, The Tenth Crusade 10 (July 1925), pp. 218-9.

The Order was conceived as an antidote to the changed nature of British society in the postwar years. Many ex-servicemen had been injured, many returned to find themselves unemployed and the demobilisation process was fraught with mismanagement. Furthermore, organisations representing ex-servicemen were divided over party affiliation and other matters, only uniting with the formation of the British Legion in 1921.93 Senior members of what would become the Order had

direct experience of these troubles; Lieut.-General Edward Bethune and Rear-Admiral Francis Caulfeild were both involved in ex-services organisations: Bethune in trying to avert conflict between the government and returning soldiers in 1918 and Caulfeild in establishing a group for ex-naval officers. 94

In recounting its own history, the journal of the Order, *The Tenth Crusade*, described the foundation of the Order:

> Nearly four years ago two men went to a friend who was interested in public affairs and suggested that he should form a society which should try and cope with certain evils peculiarly rampant at the present day, and handle them in a manner entirely different from the way in which anyone had ever attempted to counteract them before.

> This third man turned the matter over in his mind for some weeks, and then the inspiration came to him to revive the Crusades, to appeal yet again to the innate chivalry, the sense of self-sacrifice, the love of fellowship, in short to all that which we call the ‘Spirit of 1914’, and make once more a Crusade, but this time against all the powers of evil which are threatening England. 95

The inauguration of the Order took the form of a ceremony in which the Order’s continuity with a chivalric medieval past was asserted, the participants elected a Provisional Grand Master, took vows and were elevated in rank in turn. 96 Subsequently, an annual commemoration service was instituted which became an opportunity for the Order to gain public exposure as well as to rededicate themselves to their cause.

---


95 R.M. and A.P., ‘The Origin and Growth of the Order’, *The Tenth Crusade* 1 (October 1924), p. 7. The authors of this article were most likely the Grand Marshal, Roderick Macleod, and author Arthur Paterson. See ‘List of High Offices’, *The Tenth Crusade* 2 (October 1926), p. iii.

96 See ‘The Rites and Ceremonies to Be Observed at the Inauguration of the Tenth Crusade’ (The Most Noble Order of Crusaders, c.1921), HO 144/17618, TNA.
Following the publicity generated by a service at St Bartholomew the Great, London, in 1922 and the recruiting efforts of members of the Order, conclaves were founded across London and in towns and cities in Britain where there were sufficient numbers to form a group. Often, The Tenth Crusade recounted, groups of sympathetic and similarly minded men were discovered and welcomed en masse into the Order.97 Milestones in the growth of the Order were recounted in The Tenth Crusade: the writing of the Constitution (later the Rule) of the Order; the adoption of the Unknown Warrior as the Order’s ‘Knight Principal’; and the second commemoration service of the Order in Westminster Abbey in November 1923.98 Newspaper estimates suggested that membership peaked at over 5,000 men after the Westminster ceremony, declining to 2,000 reported in 1928.99

Great emphasis was placed on the representative composition of the Order:

_The Order now contains Members drawn from every section of the community. But workmen in shop and factory; tradesmen in a modest way of business; ex-officers and service men who have the greatest difficulty in making ends meet, still form the large majority of Crusaders. It is therefore in the fullest sense of the term the people’s movement, democratic to the core._100

It is, however, difficult to evaluate this claim. The Tenth Crusade did include articles from an ex-soldier, a railwayman and a teacher to illustrate the breadth of the Order’s appeal, as well as adverts for Crusaders seeking work as a clerk, upholsterer, salesman and a watchmaker.101 Nevertheless, of the sixteen members of the Grand

---

97 ‘Crusaders in All But Name’, _The Tenth Crusade_ 1 (November 1924), pp. 30–31; see also the simultaneous, but separate, foundation of the Canadian jurisdiction of the Order, _The Tenth Crusade_, 1 (October 1924), p. 4.
98 _The Tenth Crusade_ 1 (October 1924), p. 9; see also ‘Crusaders at the Abbey: Duke of York Present’, _The Times_, 29 November 1923, p. 10.
100 _The Tenth Crusade_ 1 (March 1925), p. 126.
Conclave in 1925, four were, or had been, MPs; ten had the military rank of Captain or higher (one of whom was a Rear-Admiral in the navy); two held ecclesiastical rank; one, Henry Lygon, was the son of an Earl; and one was a prominent industrialist (an ex-Lord Mayor of London) who would become a Viscount in 1934 (see Table 5.4 below).102 Arthur Paterson was a member of the Reform Club and friend of Labour leaders, while Guy Kindersley, Archibald Boyd-Carpenter and Robert Gee (VC) were well connected within the Conservative party.103 Despite the prominence of these men, one paper still estimated in December 1923 that membership of the Order was eighty percent working class; the above quote suggests that the Order was also predominantly made up of ex-servicemen.104 If the leadership was not representative of the breadth of occupations within the Order, it does appear that the Order possessed social variety; an inheritance, perhaps, of wartime conscription and the Order’s appeal to ex-servicemen.

---


103 On Paterson see, ‘Crusaders “Rescue”: Moral Pressure in Case of Young Men’s High Play’, Evening Standard, 5 December 1923, HO 144/17618, ref. 426560, TNA.

104 “Crusaders” War on Scandals: Evils Stamped Out by Secret Order’. For the desirability of ex-servicemen as initiates, see ‘A Concise Statement of the Aims and Ideals of the Order of Crusaders’, c.1933, p. 4, HO 144/17618, TNA.
Table 5.4: The Grand Conclave in October 1925

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Rank:</th>
<th>Born:</th>
<th>Died:</th>
<th>Age in 1921:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Walter Faber, MP</td>
<td>Grand Master</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieut.-General Sir Edward Bethune</td>
<td>Pro-Grand Master</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick Macleod</td>
<td>Grand Marshal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major the Hon. Henry Lygon</td>
<td>Grand Seneschal</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieut.-Colonel Arthur Bellamy</td>
<td>Grand Scribe</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon J.C. Morris</td>
<td>Grand Abbot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel John Josselyn</td>
<td>Grand Keeper of the Chest</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Sir Charles C. Wakefield</td>
<td>Grand Hospitaller</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major the Right Hon. Archibald Boyd-Carpenter, MP</td>
<td>Grand Keeper of the Record</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. F. Murray Tapply</td>
<td>Grand Keeper of the Door</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Paterson</td>
<td>Grand Custodian</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

110 Corley, ‘Wakefield’.
The Order had attracted significant international publicity with the service in Westminster Abbey as it had been attended by the future King George VI – a major coup for the organisation.\textsuperscript{117} A second, smaller, peak of attention for the Order was their robed procession for the laying of the foundation stone for the new wing of the National Heart Hospital in Marylebone. About two-hundred and fifty members of the Order processed from the parish church to the hospital wearing their robes.\textsuperscript{118} \textit{The Tenth Crusade} observed that: ‘The National Heart Hospital has a special claim to the support of the crusaders, inasmuch as its Chairman, Secretary, and many members of the staff are crusaders of the Marylebone Conclave, which meets at the Hospital.’\textsuperscript{119} By January 1925 there were thirty-four conclaves in

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Name & Position & Years & \#\
\hline
Captain Robert Gee, VC, MP & Grand Sword Bearer & 1876 & 1960 & 45\
\hline
Captain R.G.E. Whitney & Deputy Grand Marshall & 1876 & 1956 & 45\
\hline
Major Guy Kindersley, MP & Deputy Keeper of the Chest & 1876 & 1956 & 45\
\hline
Rear-Admiral Francis Wade Caulfeild & Deputy Grand Hospitaller & 1872 & 1947 & 49\
\hline
Marchant Warrell (a trade unionist) & Deputy Grand Keeper of the Record & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Britain, with another fourteen by June 1926; they totalled fifty-two in 1928.¹²⁰ These conclaves spanned the country from Edinburgh to Eastbourne and from Liverpool and Gloucester to King’s Lynn (see Figure 5.5). The Order also boasted a Canadian branch which in 1928 had reached 35 conclaves.

Figure 5.5: Conclaves of the Most Noble Order of Crusaders

Subsequent years were punctuated by the deaths of senior figures. The first leader, Colonel Walter Faber, died in April 1928 a few months after Paterson.¹²¹ The second Grand Master and founder member Bethune died in November 1930 and four members of the Grand Conclave died over the course of the next thirteen years. The Order purchased two rest homes in the Cotswolds in the 1930s for providing holidays for underprivileged inner city families who would not be able to afford a holiday.¹²² In December 1936 the Order became affiliated to the Royal Society of St. George (RSStG), an English patriotic organisation whose first Patron was Queen

¹²⁰ For a list of conclaves in 1925 see The Tenth Crusade 1 (January 1925), pp. ii-iii; The Tenth Crusade 2 (June 1926), pp. ii-iii; for membership estimates in 1928 and numbers of conclaves, including Canadian ones, see ‘Order of Crusaders: Cultivation of Citizenship’, p. 11.
¹²¹ ‘Faber’; ‘Paterson, Arthur’.
Victoria and which still exists.\textsuperscript{123} The Order appears to have subsequently become a charitable organization that faded from national, and then local, record.\textsuperscript{124} The last mention was of members of the Eastbourne conclave in 1949 attempting to take Christmas dinner to the offshore lighthouse keepers.\textsuperscript{125}

Members held various ranks in the Order which it was possible to progress upwards through, though all began at the bottom. Habits were worn at conclave meetings over the top of everyday clothes in order to erase class distinctions within the context of the meeting. A sign and password were used to ‘ensure privacy’ at gatherings; the ‘secret society’ nature of the Order was limited to their conclave meetings and for the ‘confidential character’ of much of the Order’s business.\textsuperscript{126} Each member had to pay a ‘Guinea for habit and surcoat, belt, badge, manual and precepts and rule of the Order.’\textsuperscript{127} The robes were specially made by injured ex-servicemen and were worn at conclave meetings and public ceremonies.\textsuperscript{128}

Early on in its existence the Order of Crusaders attracted the attention of the Home Office, not least because several senior members were, or had been, Members of Parliament. The Order sent several examples of its literature to the Home Office to explain its purpose and character including a copy of the inauguration liturgy.\textsuperscript{129} In a similar exchange in June 1923, Bethune attached issues of several publications of the Order for official examination: two pamphlets, part of Crusader Series, and the first two issues of a journal called Crusadery.\textsuperscript{130} Together these documents offer a window on the ideals and aspirations of the Order in its formative stages; Crusadery, in particular, had a more strident tone than was found elsewhere, perhaps reflecting its early genesis. ‘A Concise Statement of the Aims and Ideals of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[122] See The Royal Society of St George, [http://www.royalsocietyofstgeorge.com/], [accessed 3 May 2016].
\item[123] ‘The Order of Crusaders’, The English Race, December 1936.
\item[124] ‘In Brief’, The Daily Mirror, 24 December 1949, p. 3.
\item[125] The Tenth Crusade 2 (June 1926), p. iii.
\item[126] ‘Concise Statement’, p. 3.
\item[129] Walter Faber, ‘The Most Noble Order of Crusaders: “For GOD, KING, and COUNTRY”’, Crusader Series 1 (n.d.); ‘Revival of Mediæval Chivalry’; Crusadery, no.s 1-2, (November 1922 to February 1923), HO 144/17618, TNA.
\end{footnotes}
the Order of Crusaders’ was sent to the Home Office by H.N. Munro in July 1933.\textsuperscript{131}

This was another formal statement of the purpose of the Order, but one used in the early 1930s; even if not written then it allows a glimpse at the settled aims and ideals of the Order.

Later journals provide access into the world of the Order once it is better established. The Tenth Crusade was a monthly bulletin sent out to Crusaders in Britain between October 1924 and July 1926, and possibly afterwards.\textsuperscript{132} The Tenth Crusade contained the news of the Order, reports from various conclaves across the country, adverts for work, communications from the Grand Conclave regarding business of the Order and articles of interest. The journal is a key source for understanding the Order in its maturity as it was the primary means of communication, and therefore education, of members. As the Order grew, the founders had to inculcate the Order’s values into new initiates and instil a common understanding and appreciation of crusading across the organisation. The Tenth Crusade was a significant organ of this task, with members being encouraged to subscribe to the monthly bulletins and buy spare copies for distribution within the conclave.\textsuperscript{133} Subscribers were encouraged that the journal was a ‘most excellent instrument for propaganda’, and to give copies to non-members too.\textsuperscript{134}

The novel Crusaders, by Paterson, was a tale of social reform, adventure and romance. It presented a group of men from a cross-section of society who banded together to form an Order for the purpose of reforming a run-down and iniquitous set of flats.\textsuperscript{135} Given Paterson’s heavy involvement in the Order of Crusaders (Paterson was Grand Scribe, then Grand Custodian for the Order until his death in 1928), the novel’s publication in 1925, and its depiction of meetings of a conclave at work, it provides a window into the inner workings of the Order; though a fictional version from Paterson’s perspective.\textsuperscript{136}

\textsuperscript{131} ‘Concise Statement’.
\textsuperscript{132} The Tenth Crusade: The Journal of the Order of Crusaders, vols. 1-2, (1924-26), Bod. and BL.
\textsuperscript{133} ‘The Journal and Recruiting’, The Tenth Crusade 1 (January 1925), p. 76.
\textsuperscript{134} ‘The Journal and Recruiting’, The Tenth Crusade 2 (June 1926), p. 165.
As it was established in 1921 by ex-servicemen, the Order represented an attempt to grapple directly with the challenges of interwar Britain. Though small, it had genuine claim to national reach and to a cross-section of the (male) population. And, pertinently for this study, the aims and identity of the Order were framed in crusading terms.

*Aims of the Order: ‘A Revival of Mediæval Chivalry’*

The First World War had left a profoundly formative mark on those who formed and joined the Order. Ex-servicemen often remembered the war as a time of camaraderie and common purpose and, although the reality of this perception has been contested, it could remain powerful.137 To the Order’s founders, and to many ex-servicemen, this comradeship offered a solution to the problems of postwar Britain.138 Jessica Meyer has argued that this collective feeling could justify the experiences of the war and provide hope for the future.139 For the Order, the comradeship that marked the experience of the men in the ‘Ninth Crusade’ would be a defining aim of the Tenth.140 This aim, to revive the collective ‘Spirit of 1914’, was reinforced by the attempt to revive a complementary set of values; those of the ancient code of chivalry.

Defending the Order in the *Daily Mail*, Bethune wrote that, ‘The basis of it is Chivalry.’141 The *Tenth Crusade* included what could have served as a summary of the Order’s understanding of, and perceived need for, chivalry in a quote from none less than Charles Kingsley:

> Some say that the age of chivalry is past, that the spirit of romance is dead. The age of chivalry is never past, so long as there is a wrong left

---

137 ‘The egalitarian camaraderie of the trenches was almost entirely mythical, and class distinctions were as clearly delineated as ever. The class struggle, at least in the form of strikes, had also been energetically waged during the war years.’ Kitchen, *Europe Between the Wars*, p. 281.


Conceived of as a medieval Order of Chivalry, the Most Noble Order of Crusaders sought to take up the mantle Kingsley described and maintain the traditions of chivalry perceived to have been held to by the first crusaders. The 1923 pamphlet entitled ‘A Revival of Mediæval Chivalry: The Most Noble Order of Crusaders’, made this explicit, distilling the Order’s aim of chivalric renaissance into four ideals - ‘Service, Self-sacrifice, Loyalty, Brotherhood’:

In these four words are summarised the ideas that inspired the old Warriors of the cross. On this point an utterance of the present Order may be quoted: ‘The Order of Crusaders was founded well-nigh a thousand years ago, when men, fired with a desire to render Service in what they considered to be a Just and True Cause, banded themselves together in a great Brotherhood – an Order of Chivalry – such as the world had never before seen.’

This continuity was reinforced by emphasising that it was the same chivalric code that bound both medieval crusaders and members of the Order: ‘True Chivalry knows neither time nor place, measure nor quality.’ The revival of chivalry was a continuing theme. The Dean of Westminster Abbey was recorded by The Times in 1923 as summarising the Order’s aim as: ‘To recover for this century the spirit of the age of chivalry whose keynote was brotherhood, and whose talisman was

---

142 The Tenth Crusade 2 (October 1925), p. 3. Kingsley was preaching before Queen Victoria at Windsor in 1865; Girouard, Return to Camelot, p. 130.
143 ‘Rites and Ceremonies’, pp. 1–2.
144 ‘Revival of Mediæval Chivalry’, p. 4. Articles on the four ‘Cardinal Points’ for the education of new members were included in the first four issues of The Tenth Crusade and were written by prominent Crusaders: A.P., ‘The Cardinal Points. I. – Service’, The Tenth Crusade 1 (October 1924), pp. 10–12; J.C.M., ‘The Cardinal Points. II. – Self-Sacrifice’, The Tenth Crusade 1 (November 1924), pp. 33–36; C.W.G., ‘The Cardinal Points. III. – Loyalty’, The Tenth Crusade 1 (December 1924), pp. 54–58; C.W.G., ‘The Cardinal Points. IV. – Brotherhood’, The Tenth Crusade 1 (January 1925), pp. 79–82. Though the convention of The Tenth Crusade was to only include initials, the authors of these articles were most likely Arthur Paterson, Grand Scribe; Canon J.C. Morris, then Grand Abbot; and Charles Wilfrid Giles (later Scott-Giles), Deputy Grand Scribe from March 1926, respectively.
service.’ A year later the Mayor of Worcester at a tea party for members of the Order repeated the same phrase and it was subsequently employed at the annual service of the Robert Arbuthnot Conclave in Eastbourne.

Despite the claims of ancient foundation, the Order’s understanding of chivalry included ideals that were distinctively nineteenth-century in origin. Faber wrote that a Crusader knew how to ‘“play the game” - whether it be in the Board-room, the office, the workshop, or on the playing fields’; they were the epitome of a ‘Christian gentleman.’ It is notable that the version of the medieval past being accessed was heavily influenced by a nineteenth-century perception of chivalry, mapped onto the crusaders. The Order, then, from its inauguration was rooted in chivalric perceptions of both the medieval past and recent history which framed its social mission. There was from the outset a dual attempt to revive the past: the crusades themselves, serving as shorthand for an exemplary chivalric past; and the wartime ‘spirit of 1914’ of camaraderie and high purpose. Both were re-imagined as they were revived, blurring together into a set of nostalgically missed values that stood at the core of the Order of the Crusaders’ mission.

The Order and the Crusades: The Ghost of Crusading Past

[I]t was resolved to initiate a movement which, by reason of its unrelenting battle for an ideal, could be called a crusade in the most literal sense of the word. So the Most Noble Order of Crusaders – the Tenth Crusade – was born.

Crusading was quite clearly foundational to the identity of the Order of Crusaders. But how did the Order understand crusading and the crusades, and how were these perceptions translated into action? How was a sense of connection constructed and

146 ‘Crusaders at the Abbey’, p. 10.
147 The Tenth Crusade 1 (January 1925), p. 85; The Tenth Crusade 1 (May 1925), p. 182.
149 For explicit mentions of the revival of wartime camaraderie, see The Tenth Crusade, 1 (April 1925), p. 159; The Tenth Crusade, 1 (May 1925), pp. 172-73; and The Tenth Crusade 1 (August 1925), p. 225.
150 The Tenth Crusade 1 (August 1925), p. 225.
maintained? These two areas, the Order’s engagement with crusading history, and the performance of their crusading identity, will be considered below.

Continuity with the historic crusades was explicit and fundamental to the way the Order of Crusaders understood themselves: *The Tenth Crusade* was more than a title for the journal, or even the mission, of the Order – it located their activities as being in sequence with previous crusades. In this schema the Ninth Crusade was seen to have been the First World War, in which the ‘indomitable Spirit of the British’ won the war and was equated with that of the crusaders.¹⁵¹ The medieval crusaders were the ‘direct precursors’ of the Tenth Crusade who exemplified the ideals of service, self-sacrifice, loyalty and brotherhood which the Order prized.¹⁵² The Order’s founders were compared to Peter the Hermit and his monks, preaching the First Crusade.¹⁵³ Historical distance was collapsed with the adoption of the Unknown Warrior as ‘Principal Knight and Supreme Head of the Order’ who, according to *The Tenth Crusade*, served as an ‘Inspiration and true foundation’ of the Order. Being a participant in, and memorial of, the Great War the Unknown Warrior provided the Order with a connection to the recent past. He was also, of course, a good crusader.¹⁵⁴

Naming a conclave was an act charged with significance. A guide to choosing a suitable name for a conclave in the journal encouraged members to emphasise the continuity of the Order with the medieval past and was sensitive to the need to firmly establish the perception of ancient connection:

> Through the medium of local history [the name] links the conclave with its mediæval counterpart, preserving the memory of the days of chivalry to be an inspiration to twentieth-century crusaders, and imperceptibly instilling in the public mind the fact that the Order is not an organisation

¹⁵¹ Faber, ‘Order of Crusaders’, p. 5. See also *The Tenth Crusade* 1 (March 1925), p. 126; *The Tenth Crusade* 1 (December 1924), p. 49; ‘Rites and Ceremonies’, p. 2.; ‘it was a holy war, if by that term we can understand that we fought to vindicate our principles’, Grand Seneschal, ‘What’s It All About?’, *Crusadery* 2 (February 1923), p. 5.


¹⁵⁴ J.C.M., ‘Self-Sacrifice’, p. 34.
of mushroom growth, but an institution well founded upon ideals which are inherent in our race, and as valuable to-day as they were eight centuries ago.\textsuperscript{155}

While some conclaves honoured senior members of the Order (Faber, Bethune, Paterson) or reflected their military origins (Sphinx, Commander Brock), by mid-1926 there were conclaves named after Peter the Hermit, local crusaders Pain Peverel and Peter Le Marchael, and two named after Richard I.\textsuperscript{156} There were conclaves named for King Arthur, Excalibur and Sir Galahad, while nineteenth-century heroes David Livingstone and General Gordon were also honoured. A conclave in Epsom was named Neil Primrose, presumably for the son of Earl Rosebury who was killed in Palestine in November 1917.\textsuperscript{157} In the Canadian branch of the Order was a Lord Allenby Conclave in North Vancouver, to whom the British General of the 1917-18 Palestine campaign gave permission to use his crest.\textsuperscript{158} In fact, the names of the conclaves demonstrated clearly the relationship of the Order to the past: as well as medieval crusaders they encompassed mythical chivalric figures; late nineteenth-century imperial heroes, and elements drawn from the recent war. Similar symbolic resonance with the past existed in the titles of the senior members of the Order which evoked medieval Military Orders.

Examples of the assumed continuities of the Order can be seen in the series of historical articles published in The Tenth Crusade which described the crusades. The articles, most written by ‘CWG’ (Charles Wilfrid Giles), were largely descriptive accounts of the crusades for the purpose of educating the members of the Order about the crusading past, ‘that we may possess the substance as well as the mere name.’\textsuperscript{159} Tellingly, the first article concerned King Arthur, a ‘legendary forerunner’

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{155} C.W.G., ‘Conclave Names’, The Tenth Crusade 1 (May 1925), p. 171.
\item \textsuperscript{156} Canada also included Valenciennes, Lens and two Richard Cour-De-Lion conclaves.
\item \textsuperscript{158} For conclave names, see The Tenth Crusade 2 (June 1926), pp. ii-iii; ‘To Use Allenby’s Crest’, The Montreal Gazette, 19 July 1928, p. 3.
\item \textsuperscript{159} ‘The Old Crusades’, The Tenth Crusade 1 (November 1924), p. 26.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
of the crusaders. Giles made a distinction between the ‘Arthur of history’ and the ‘Arthur of romance’ and acknowledged that it was the latter, created by Geoffrey of Monmouth, who would have inspired the twelfth-century crusaders with his supposed feats and ideals. It was the Arthur of medieval myth who was evoked as an ancestor for the Order: ‘the ancient prophecy [of Arthur’s return] may find some measure of fulfilment in the dedication to King Arthur of a conclave of the Tenth Crusade.’ The reader was directed for further reading to Mallory and Tennyson, staples of nineteenth-century Arthurian romanticism, to learn about the spiritual ancestor they shared with medieval crusaders.

In retelling the battle for Antioch, in which the chroniclers recorded supernatural help from white-clad warrior saints, Giles connected the incident with the ‘interesting modern parallel in the accounts of the “Angels of Mons.”’ Furthermore, of particular resonance for his audience were the words of Pope Urban II when initiating the First Crusade at Clermont in 1095:

‘It is the will of God,’ repeated the Pope, ‘and let this memorable word, surely the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, be for ever [sic] adopted as your battle cry to animate the devotion and courage of the champions of Christ. His Cross is the symbol of your salvation; wear it, a red, a bloody cross, on your breasts or shoulders, as a token that His help will never fail you; as a pledge of a vow which can never be recalled.’

For members of the Order – whose motto was Sic Deus Vult, who wore badges and robes which featured a red cross, and who had made a vow upon initiation into the Order – the Pope could have been speaking across the ages directly to them.

The attitude of The Tenth Crusade to the crusades was consistent. The crusades symbolised chivalric ideals; even though some medieval crusaders had not lived up

to those heights. A comment between articles in the first issue of *The Tenth Crusade* acknowledged the ‘mixed company’ of the First Crusaders but concluded that: ‘it is an indisputable fact that the pilgrimage to the Holy Land, to fight for the Christian population enslaved by Saladin and to recover the Holy Sepulchre, remains the greatest classic example of pure self-sacrifice and idealistic service for others in history.’\(^{164}\) In his description of the fall of Jerusalem in 1095, Giles confronted head-on the contradiction of the massacre of the Muslim and Jewish inhabitants of the city by the crusaders and their subsequent worship in the Holy Sepulchre. His solution was to maintain the distinction he had established earlier between the ‘true crusaders’ and the ‘baser element’: ‘nor shall I believe that the most ardent in slaughter and rapine were the foremost in the procession to the Holy Sepulchre.’\(^{165}\) Here, then, there was seen to be a ‘pure’ crusading ideal which was imperfectly enacted; an ideal that, freed from the grounding of medieval events, could serve to inspire and connect ‘true crusaders’ across the ages.

In the same way the Dean of Worcester in his address at the Commemoration Service in Worcester Cathedral in December 1925, made a distinction between the ‘ideals of chivalry and the ideal of the Crusades [which] were truly noble’, and their outcome, deemed ‘the most tragic failure ever recorded in history.’\(^{166}\) Fortunately, he continued, the Order of the Crusaders had eschewed the violent methods of the crusaders in taking up ‘the sword of the Spirit of Christ, which is the spirit of love.’ This enabled him to endorse unhesitatingly the Order as modern crusaders, indeed, as *more truly* crusading than the medieval crusaders. In a similar vein the Abbot of the King Arthur Conclave translated crusading for his audience: ‘The crusaders of an earlier age fought to free the sepulchre of Christ from profanation. We of a later age fight against anything that defiles and profanes that human nature which Christ

---

\(^{164}\) *The Tenth Crusade* 1 (October 1924), p. 9.


came to save.'\(^{167}\) The Order’s attitude to the crusades was summarised in a pamphlet from 1924:

*The Order owes its title to the belief of its founders that the only historical parallel to such a Movement, and the awakening and quickening of the public conscience to the service of self-sacrifice required to achieve the end in view is the ‘taking of the Cross’ by the multitudes of men of all classes in this country and in Europe at the call of Peter the Hermit and his successors in the Middle Ages. The Crusades, though marred by acts of brutal self-seeking and corruption among leaders, were undeniably the greatest manifestation of self-sacrifice and devotion to an ideal in olden times. Individuals plotted for gain, but the mass sacrificed everything; toiled and died; or returned home maimed for life and ruined. There were eight Crusades in those days: in 1914 came another, the greatest of all – our own War.*\(^{168}\)

This confidence in the continuity of the Order with the true purposes of the medieval crusaders was a constant theme and foundation for the Order’s self-understanding that allowed the crusades and significant crusaders to function as ideal exemplars. Occupying this re-imagined past it was easy for the fringes to blur and time collapse – King Arthur could comfortably sit with Richard the Lionheart, David Livingstone and Bethune.

Two final images demonstrate the ease with which a re-imagined past and the present could impinge on one another. In a piece for an early publication of the Order, a participant in the 1922 ceremony reflected on the connection between the medieval crusaders and the twentieth-century Order. This was prompted by being in the last surviving church in Britain where men were thought to have taken

\(^{167}\) ‘Address Delivered by the Abbot of the King Arthur Conclave at a Crusader Service Held at the Balham Congregational Church, March 15th’, *The Tenth Crusade* 1 (April 1925), p. 158.

\(^{168}\) ‘Order of Crusaders’, February 1924, p. 6. My thanks to Alan Maddison for this document from his father’s collection.
crusading vows, where ‘the very stones speak to me of the chivalry of bygone days’.\footnote{“Barts” December 17th, 1922: An Impression’, Crusadery 2 (February 1923), pp. 10–12. Paterson includes St Bartholomews’ connection with medieval crusaders, which can be heard in various of the comments in the Crusadery article, in Paterson, Crusaders, p. 56.}

As a Crusader of modern times I am to take my humble part in the Service of the Order here in the very sanctuary where the Crusaders of old were wont to worship. The spirit of the old is transfused into the spirit of the new. [...] The gulf of six or seven hundred years is bridged. I feel I have come ‘home’ to mingle with Crusaders of all ages in the warm atmosphere of Brotherhood.\footnote{‘An Impression’, p. 10.}

The author equated the rituals, the spirit and the vows of the service with those of the Order’s medieval ancestors, imagining them physically present:

\begin{quote}
I feel at this moment the unseen hosts are very near to hear the familiar words. Do they even now join with us in our response? Are the Crusaders of the First, Second or Third Crusade to take their place shoulder to shoulder with the Crusaders of the Tenth of their line? [...] Yes, the Crusaders of yester-year and the Crusaders of to-day are here. This is no idle dream – it is a stern reality.\footnote{‘An Impression’, p. 11.}
\end{quote}

In a second example, the hero of Paterson’s novel Crusaders was a Major Richard d’Acre, a direct descendant and spitting image of King Richard I of England.\footnote{Paterson, Crusaders, p. 105.} His sporting, public school background, adventurous army career, willingness to physically fight the enemies of the tale, and romance with the villain’s daughter Eleanor (!), cast him as a typical action-hero from the turn of the century. He was the most obvious, indeed only, candidate for leadership of the Order of the Tenth Crusade, and was twice heralded by other characters as the medieval king actually returned: ‘It’s not Richard d’Acre that’s before me. It’s the reincarnation and the living image of Richard the Angevin. Cœur-de-Lion has come into the world again.
to lead the Tenth Crusade!'\textsuperscript{173} Who better to lead the fictional Order than the British embodiment of crusading zeal come back in the hour of need, and thereby elided with the nineteenth-century epitome of chivalry – King Arthur.

‘An Amazing Piece of Mediæval Revivalism’: The Reception of the Order

The high profile nature of the Order’s 1923 ceremony in Westminster Abbey and the attendance of the Duke of York drew the attention of the national press. Their reaction to the Order, and that of the Home Office, enable some conclusions to be drawn about how the Order was received beyond those who were sufficiently attracted to join. The embodied medievalism of the Order of Crusaders was an expression of the Order’s identity and self-understanding. It seemed to contemporaries, however, a curiosity. The sight of hundreds of men robed in different coloured habits with white surcoats and red crosses was consistently commented on in newspaper reports. \textit{The Times} report of the Westminster Abbey ceremony observed that the procession was ‘an impressive spectacle’ (to which \textit{TIME} magazine added ‘weird’), while an author in \textit{The Guardian} was quoted as writing, ‘One does not remember a more deliberately mediæval spectacle in Westminster Abbey […] The whole pageant made up an amazing piece of mediæval revivalism.’\textsuperscript{174}

Newsreel footage shot by British Pathé at the time gives some feel for these processions. Though only in black and white, the films convey the striking impression of hundreds of men walking in an orderly fashion through the grounds and interior of a church.\textsuperscript{175} Added to this was the music of these ceremonies, where the ‘The Crusader’s March’ from Scott’s \textit{Ivanhoe} was a favourite.\textsuperscript{176} \textit{The Tenth}

\textsuperscript{173} Ibid., p. 109; see also pp. 339-40.
\textsuperscript{176} ‘Crusaders at the Abbey’, p. 10; Goebel, \textit{Medieval Memory}, p. 87.
Crusade was well aware of the value of these performances in recruiting new members, especially when showcased by Pathé.177 ‘The mystery and mediaevalism are the trimmings, or perhaps one should say the lure’, wrote a reporter in The Guardian of the service, attempting to weigh up the effect of the pageantry of the ceremony on the wider public.178

The Order were happy to make the most of publicity opportunities, such as the filming of their public ceremonies, but were often presented in a negative light. Many of these newspaper articles are found in the Home Office files on the Order alongside other, more positive accounts, submitted by Bethune.179 The files revealed a complicated relationship between the Order, Home Office and the Duke of York, which presents another perspective on how the Order was officially perceived. Ultimately, these reports marked a hardening of attitude of the Home Office to the Order and the closing of the door to official patronage.

In the lead up to the Westminster Abbey service in the summer of 1923 the Order attempted to gather support by lining up prominent people to attend – the most notable being the Duke of York. The Duke, it appears, was far from unwilling. A Home Office report, commissioned in response to the Duke’s enquiries as to the nature and respectability of the Order, noted that the Duke had been asked to become the Order’s first Grand Master, and that, ‘though His Royal Highness will not countenance the Order in any way without Home Office advice he is rather disposed to at any rate support it by a subscription.’ The Order was fully aware of the consequences of patronage of this stature and the report noted that, ‘Apparently, Sir Charles Wakefield has told the Duke that if H.R.H. gives a subscription and will let Sir Charles make use of the fact, it will be possible to raise quite a large sum for the Order in the City of London.’180 The same report also

177 ‘Recruiting’, The Tenth Crusade 1 (December 1924), p. 49.
178 Our London Correspondence, ‘Crusaders and the Critics’, The Guardian, 6 December 1923, p. 8. This article is also found in the Home Office’s file at HO 144/17618, TNA.
179 See ‘Bethune to Sir John Anderson’, 21 December 1923, HO 144/17618, TNA.
180 ‘Home Office Report’, HO 144/17618, 426560/2, TNA.
recorded a comment from Boyd-Carpenter in a meeting with Home Office officials that the Home Secretary, William Bridgeman, was ‘sympathetic’ to the Order. However, the report recommended that a further inquiry be made and that the Duke not endorse the Order, even with a subscription, until it was ‘very well established’. It observed the similarity of the Order with Freemasonry and the lack of information about actual membership, and that they would be well advised to drop ‘Most Noble’ from their ‘ridiculous’ title. Letters were then sent to Bethune and to Louis Greig, the Duke’s Comptroller, to this effect. Not to be deterred, Bethune continued to try to persuade Bridgeman and other senior political figures such as Stanley Baldwin and Leo Amery to attend the Westminster Abbey service. Bethune’s correspondence with Bridgeman over the months preceding the service indicated that the Duke had committed to attending, but apparently on the proviso that Bridgeman did so also; Bethune repeated the claim in two other letters and asked for an official Home Office representative if Bridgeman could not attend. It was only on 16 November, twelve days before the service, that Bridgeman responded to decline the invitation and explain that as he would have been attending in a personal capacity he could not send an official representative from the Home Office.

This exchange reveals the Order’s determination to use the Westminster Abbey service as a public legitimisation of the Order and to earn credibility in the public eye. Members were aware of the financial and social rewards from maximising their connections with the political elite and the royal family. Present at the service, as well as a collection of Lords and Ladies, were the Mayor and Mayoress of Westminster, ecclesiastical figures such as the Dean of Windsor, a representative from the American Embassy and three prominent trade union figures – illustrating

---

181 ‘Home Office Report’, HO 144/17618, 426560/2, TNA.
182 ‘Home Office to Bethune’, 16 July 1923, HO 144/17618, TNA. Greig replied to a similar letter informing the Home Office that as a result the Duke would not take a subscription after all.
183 ‘Bethune to Bridgeman’, 14 August 1923, HO 144/17618, TNA.
184 See letters ‘Bethune to Bridgeman’, 14 August 1923, 16 October 1923, and 15 November 1923, HO 144/17618, TNA.
185 ‘Bridgeman to Bethune’, 16 November 1923, HO 144/17618, TNA.

the cross-section of British society the Order wanted to bridge. In the event, the Duke did attend despite Bridgeman’s (or any other senior political figures’) absence and the Order received the coverage they had sought.

The public image of the Order as benign and benevolent did not go unchallenged, however. The Tenth Crusade reported, with a marked lack of concern, that after the 1922 service at St. Bartholomew’s one paper compared them to fascists, another labelled them ‘a double-distilled Ku Klux Klan’, while one later dubbed the Crusaders, ‘the gentlemen in the nighties’. These suspicions stuck: the Daily Express, Daily News, Evening Standard and Saturday Review all carried critical articles in the weeks following the Westminster Abbey service comparing the Order to the Ku Klux Klan and the ‘Fascisti’. After this barrage of negative press, the tone of the Order’s dealings with the Home Office changed. Sir John Anderson (permanent under-secretary at the Home Office, 1922-32) summoned Bethune for a meeting during which the latter denied a quote attributed to him about the Order’s methods being outside the law. Bethune also confirmed that the oath in the inauguration ceremony, now used for initiations, had been changed into a ‘solemn promise’: the Home Office was clearly taking a less indulgent line with the Order. The press reaction forced others to clarify their involvement with the Order. Bishop Ryle, the Dean of the Abbey, had to defend his decision to allow the service in the Abbey. The Duke distanced himself from proceedings: Greig denied any connection between the Duke and the Order, saying that the Duke, ‘attended

---

186 The latter were: Arthur Pugh of the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation; Thomas Chambers of the National Seamen and Firemen’s Union; and Julia Varley of the Women’s Workers’ Union; ‘Crusaders at the Abbey’, p. 10.  
189 ‘Sir John Anderson to Bethune’, 14 December 1923; notes from the meeting with Bethune at HO 144/17618, 426560/3, TNA. He supposedly said: ‘Our methods may be sometimes a little outside the law, but I do not care a jot if they are’; a quote he strenuously denied to the Home Office.  
190 See ‘Bethune to Anderson’, 21 December 1923; ‘Anderson to Bethune’, 22 December 1923; and ‘Bethune to Bridgeman’, 31 December 1923, HO 144/17618, TNA.  
191 Our London Correspondence, ‘Crusaders and the Critics’, p. 8.
the Abbey ceremony as an act of courtesy to the Dean of Westminster. Naturally, too, he was interested in a new thing. ¹⁹²

The Westminster Abbey service of 1923 was unique – the Order never held another service at the Abbey or received as much publicity as the ceremony generated. It was the zenith of the Order’s public profile and influence. There was no further royal patronage and no implication that national political figures were moved by the Order’s aims or ideals. That it could, even once, command sufficient influence to fill Westminster Abbey and conduct a neo-medieval ceremony in a national cathedral suggested that although the Order may not have anticipated the hostility and suspicion of the press and public, they were attempting to express something that resonated with sections of British society. The initially warm reception of the Order by both the Duke of York and Home Secretary indicated approval for the aims of the Order. A revealing letter in the Home Office file remarked:

_I should say that the elaborate pretence of being a secret society and the extraordinary ritual adopted in imitation of Masonry gives a rather fantastic façade to a Society of which, as far as I can understand, the object is to cultivate a general spirit of brotherhood and goodwill directed to no specific purpose._ ¹⁹³

The aims of the Order, then, were perhaps not clearly enough translated into tangible action for British society to fully understand and endorse, other than the pageantry of medieval revivalism and the opaque rites of a secret society. From the way in which the records of the Order dried up over the 1930s, and its affiliation with the RSStG, it seems that the Order failed to attract substantial numbers of new recruits and faded from record. This, then, is the final verdict on its reception – some initial success and societal resonance, with the 1923 ceremony providing an opportunity for national exposure, but ultimate failure to inspire the next

¹⁹² ‘Duke and Crusaders’, _The Daily News_, 11 December 1923, HO 144/17618, TNA.
¹⁹³ ‘Letter to Waterhouse’, 10 August 1923, HO 144/17618, TNA.
generation with either its diagnosis or solution for the problems of the interwar years.

Understanding and Locating the Order: Fascist? Christian? Chivalric?

How, then, should the Order be understood? Its own claims of continuity with medieval crusaders as an order of chivalry were filtered through a nineteenth-century lens of romantic medievalism which found initial resonance with sections of British society, but which tailed off in the 1930s. There are other potential paradigms by which to evaluate the Order than fidelity or otherwise to an actual medieval order of chivalry, some of which stem from the context of interwar Britain. The focus of historians on interwar fascism, and the fascist uses of crusader medievalism considered above, suggest that the Order could be thought of as ‘protofascist’, to use Dan Stone’s term. Although members of the Order explicitly denied the similarities between the Order and Fascist groups, there were comparable emphases on medievalism, service and national loyalty which featured in many groups who were, if not explicitly fascist, then within the orbit of fascists and fascist theories. Early literature was very clear on the requirement for only men ‘of British birth’ to be admitted: the Concise Statement perfunctorily asserted that, ‘the Order is entirely British’, while the ‘Instructions to Candidates’ insisted that ‘All candidates must be of British birth and parentage [...] we shall face and deal with our national difficulties in a manner that is in accordance with the great traditions of our race.’ Conversely, and in comparison with the ROC and the British Fascists mentioned above, the Order had little in the way of overt racism or anti-Semitism, did not refer to the overthrow of society and lacked a eugenics policy — other markers of these later groups. Members of the Order also publicly denied being a ‘strike-breaking’ organisation.

spectrum, and despite having a prominent trade unionist in a senior post, the Order also denied communist leanings, claiming instead to be ‘anti-nothing’ except class-antagonism.

A fundamental aspect of the medieval crusaders’ identity that shaped their purpose and provided the lens through which their experiences were interpreted was their Christianity. Due to the role of ‘muscular’ Christianity in nineteenth-century Britain described above, the question of how the Order of Crusaders positioned itself with regard to Christianity is part of understanding the Order’s relationship both to the past and to interwar Britain.

The opening section of the Order’s ‘mission statement’ made it clear that while the Order was non-denominational, it placed some elements of Christianity centrally:

The Order is a Brotherhood of British men, drawn from every class, political party and religious denomination, who are bound by vow to honour God, to follow the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, to be true to the King, and to serve their Country and their fellow men.

That these elements were compatible was self-evident to the Order, reflecting the established place, perhaps, of contemporary Christianity in society. In a comment on the ‘Ritual’ of the Order in the first edition of The Tenth Crusade, the ‘religious’ dimension of the Order was described:

[Members have taken part] in the name of God: they have pledged their faith in the Teachings of the Sermon on the Mount. No doctrinal test is imposed of any kind, nor is it incumbent on any Crusader to belong to a Church or to be a member of any religious community. Nevertheless, in

---

199 The Tenth Crusade 2 (June 1926), p. iii.
the truest, if the broadest sense, the Tenth Crusade is a Religious movement.200

Exemplifying the sympathy of the Order for aspects of Christianity was the article ‘A North London Crusade’ in The Tenth Crusade which detailed the social work of the ‘Crusade of the Warm Heart’.201 This was a project of the North London Mission, which involved seaside visits, the dispensing of winter clothing and, prominently, preaching amongst the poor. It was, the author, argued, completely appropriate to understand mission and crusade as being synonymous because, ‘the Mission stands for Service’, and the ‘Missioner’ was a member of the Order. Thus, he was referred to as the ‘Crusader-Missioner’.202 Though the article could equate crusade and mission with a similar result to Christian missionary agencies of the time, the identification here goes through the connection of ‘service’ rather than by seeing the medieval crusades as progenitors of Christian missions. Most impressively, and capturing the interpretative lens of crusading in action, an article entitled ‘The Great Crusader’ described Jesus Christ as ‘the greatest Crusader the world has ever known’.203 Christian language came easily to those in the Order and permeated The Tenth Crusade.

There are some indications that the Order, again perhaps reflecting its appeal across classes, sought a civic Christianity or ceremonial religion. In an address to the London Chapter in September 1925 Bethune observed that:

[W]e in the higher ranks have certainly to keep always before us the true religious side, which is to uphold God, King and Country. All believers in the right are truly religious at heart, and they want to uphold the existing Constitution.204
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Here was a national, civic faith that equated true religion with loyalty to the nation. In this schema, churches were both religious and national sites.

A final example of the re-interpretation of Christian and crusading themes that also demonstrates continuity with wartime crusader medievalism was the treatment of the Holy Land. Unsurprisingly, Faber saw the British capture of Palestine in 1917 as providential and an imitation of the medieval crusaders:

*It was the privilege of the British Nation, under the Hand of God, to restore to the Holy Land the Freedom and Justice that for so many years had given place to tyranny and oppression. It was the Ninth Crusade, and, consciously or unconsciously, each man was following in the steps of the Crusaders of old.*

Giles, the author of the historical articles on the crusades, observed that although the parallelism with modern crusaders was extensive, discussion of the Holy Land within the Order was limited. A key component of medieval crusades was liberating the Holy Land from the ungodly, Giles wrote, and argued that this should define the mission of the Order also: ‘Like its precursors, the Tenth Crusade aims at the security of a Holy Land – for what land shall we deem holy if it not be England?’ The translocation was thereby complete; patriotism and the promotion of England were put at the heart of the Order’s understanding of religion, as well as crusading. The Order of Crusaders were largely happy with a version of Christianity that was practical, removed from the theological debates that demarked denominations, and was tied to loyalty to King and country. In short, this was a pragmatic, civic Christianity that would have sat very well alongside nineteenth-century imperial Christianity and chivalry.

‘It will be one of the incidental duties of our Order to restore this fine word [crusade] to its original noble significance.’ So commented an author in *The Tenth Crusade* reporting on G.K. Chesterton’s observation that the ‘term Crusader or
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Crusade [...] has sunk deep into the language of the English people and spread outwards to the widest possible applications. Crusading, as we have seen, framed the language, activities and identity of the Order of Crusaders, reinforcing and reminding members of their medieval past. However, this was always a negotiated identity. Accessed through a late nineteenth-century perception of a romantic and chivalric past, the Order’s foundation was neo-medieval; the past they were trying to return to was a pastiche of the twelfth and nineteenth centuries. The names of the conclaves of the Order illustrated precisely the range of the romantic chivalric culture that existed at the turn of the century, and is supposed to have been mortally wounded in the trenches of the First World War. Does this, and the explicitly chivalric aim of the Order, indicate a revival of chivalric concern – especially as the Order attracted members from across the class spectrum?

Because the Order of Crusaders was determined to reinvigorate lost values in society they inherently recognised that those values were of the past. Furthermore, those values were conflated from an idealised medieval scene, a pre-war romantic milieu, and from nostalgia for a supposed wartime camaraderie. This collective ‘spirit of 1914’ may have represented the wartime experience of some, but as Davies has demonstrated, the First World War was not remembered homogenously. Taking a common experience of wartime camaraderie as a starting point could only ever have a limited appeal.

Emphasising the past nature of the chivalric values served to create distance between the Order and contemporary society, even as the Order was attempting to revive those values. This ran the risk of the Order sinking into irrelevance and obscurity should its mission be unsuccessful. Unfortunately for the Crusaders, time was against them. Ten of the sixteen members of the Grand Conclave in October 1925 were born between 1855 and 1876 and would have been educated in the cultural system of the late nineteenth century; of those ten, four were still alive in 1941. They would have been strongly influenced by the chivalric cultural system
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and this, coupled with (a different) ten having served in the armed forces before or during the war, created a cultural homogeneity amongst the higher echelons of the Order and some sympathy in high society. The survival of the Order, though, depended in the long term on the ability of the initial leaders to pass their cultural outlook on to others and for their worldview to take hold beyond those who shared their experiences.

It appears that the holding together of chivalric ideals of behaviour, crusading imagery and a sense of wartime camaraderie, did not survive the first generation of leaders. They had reacted to the cultural unbinding that Girouard described as having been inflicted by the scale and nature of the First World War, and their remedy for postwar Britain was a revival of an imagined past. Ultimately the Order of Crusaders was an outpost of the past. It was, however, the late nineteenth-century’s imagined past; a neo-medieval revival of chivalric behaviour that, like the crusading memorials of the Great War, evoked a bygone era. An imagined past still provided meaning – what meaning needed to be negotiated and had to prove its utility in a new cultural context. Tellingly, in attempting to grasp its mission and methods critics of the Order saw it as comic, misguided or threatening – echoing Girouard’s evaluation of the postwar ineffectuality of chivalry.211 The later reflection of Viscount Lymington on the failure of his ‘protofascist’ interwar group, the English Mistery, echoed for the Order: ‘It failed because the times were out of joint for such a movement. It failed because, no matter how we tried to live to our values, the inner world of the Mistery and the outer world surrounding us [were] far too disparate.’212
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Fictive Kin: The Order as a Site of Memory

The Order best fits the model of Jay Winter’s ‘fictive kin’; associational groupings who came together to remember and memorialise the war. Winter argued that ‘sites of memory’ should be understood as being created primarily by small groups:

They are the ‘social agents’ of remembrance; without their work, collective memory would not exist. I want to argue that these ‘memory activists’, in Carol Gluck’s phrase, frequently constitute powerfully unified groups, bonded not by blood ties but by experience. They share the imprint of history on their lives, and act as kin do in other contexts.

The Order was constituted in the aftermath of the war to preserve a particular memory of the war; in this case the experience of camaraderie – the ‘spirit of 1914’ – and a traditional understanding of the First World War as a crusade. Similarly, they sought to honour the sacrifices of the dead and make those deaths mean a better postwar Britain.

Their association was filial, founded on brotherhood and built from people who shared an experience of it. Winter has also offered insight into understanding the decline of these ‘fictional kinship groups’ which also fit the experience of the Order. As they grew the associations ‘lost their power – and perhaps their identity’ due to the relationships ‘thinning’, whether through distance, attrition of key members or the increasing irrelevance of the initial impulse:

This form of small-scale collective memory – the thought-process of kinship, both fictive and filial – was both powerful and brittle. At the time, it gave men and women a way to live on after the horrors of the war. But as those agents of remembrance grew tired or old, developed other lives, moved away, or died, then the activity – the glue – which
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held together these cells of remembrance, atrophied and lost its hold on them.\textsuperscript{215}

It is unsurprising that as memories of the First World War faded they were rewritten and replaced by the practicalities of the interwar years, especially the bite of the depression and the increasing likelihood of another war. The Order over this period became a localised charitable institution comparable to the British Legion or Rotary Club rather than a national call to take up the chivalry of the prewar years. Watson’s suggestion that the cultural shift should be ‘analyzed generationally rather than chronologically’ bears merit here: a new generation with a significantly different memory (collective memory rather than individual experience that is) of the war found it much more difficult to relate to that preserved, promoted and embodied by the Order.\textsuperscript{216}

Conclusion

As we have seen above, crusader medievalism in various forms persisted into the interwar years demonstrating that continuities of form, at least, spanned the ‘chasm’ of the Great War. Goebel has argued that, ‘The Crusades, chivalry and medieval spirituality and mythology provided rich, protean sources of images, tropes and narrative motifs for people to give meaning to the legacy of the Great War.’\textsuperscript{217} But the above study demonstrates that it is too simplistic to see crusader medievalism as merely as a ‘discourse of mourning’, though it was often employed as such. Interwar crusader medievalism had significant flexibility, as demonstrated by its use in ‘traditional’, adapted and new ways. Nineteenth-century associations of chivalry and crusading still provided meaning for sections of the British population after the war through the medium of a medievalist discourse of remembrance. The Order preserved ‘traditional’, prewar, chivalric meanings of crusading, while many, including David Lloyd George, continued to refer to the First World War as a crusade and some could complain that the war wasn’t being
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honoured as a glorious crusade in Armistice speeches. Discourses around the Holy Land and the British mandate of Palestine displayed the adaptation of crusader medievalism of various forms; whether echoing the war, engaging with historical preservation of crusader sites or in the context of the increasing tension between Arabs, Jews and the British. Finally, fascist uses represented new deployments of crusading rhetoric and imagery specific to the interwar context.

Most commentators now agree that any rupture or ‘moment of modernity’ cannot be conceptualised, as Fussell attempted, as simply a cultural caesura, even if it was presented as such. Winter has argued that the complexities of the period need to be appreciated:

_The rupture of 1914-18 was much less complete than previous scholars have suggested. The overlap of languages and approaches between the old and the new, the ‘traditional’ and the ‘modern’, the conservative and the iconoclastic, was apparent both during and after the war. The ongoing dialogue and exchange among artists and their public, between those who self-consciously returned to the nineteenth-century forms and themes and those who sought to supersede them, makes the history of modernism much more complicated than a simple, linear divide between ‘old’ and ‘new’ might suggest._

This characterisation of the cultural trends of the time as shifting and in dialogue with each other seeks to take into account the diversity of memory of the war and builds on Gregory’s insight that it was the experience of the interwar years that undermined the meaning of the war; the war had brought neither a better Britain nor the end to war. Mapping crusader medievalism onto this narrative of ‘disillusionment with the peace’ (rather than the war) emphasises the continuities and survivals of its use as well as allowing for the advent of new and adapted uses. It helps to explain the existence and decline of the Order in terms of the attempt by a group of ‘fictive kin’ to create a traditional memory of the war which would
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provide meaning for the scale of bereavement and that group’s inability to bridge the generational fracture Watson has described.

The Order sheds light on to the complex entanglements of interwar Britain because it was both traditional and new: whilst wholeheartedly embracing prewar romantic-chivalric-civic versions of crusader medievalism the Order was formed in 1921 to engage with postwar Britain. Initially the Order can be seen to defy Fussell’s assertion that the First World War represented a total cultural rupture and consequently the onset of modernity. The Order applied aspects of nineteenth-century culture, such as chivalrous crusader medievalism, to postwar Britain; looking to the past for solutions to and meaning for the present. The Order’s multi-layered, palimpsestic medievalism (itself a nineteenth-century version of the medieval past) and revivalism in the face of changing contemporary circumstances present a more complex tale than merely locating a moment of modernity. The recent historiographical emphasis on the diversity of experience of the First World War and ways in which it was remembered is a helpful caution for metanarratives of modernity that could overdetermine the aims and actions of groups such as the Order, whose postwar founding complicates the simplicity of the premodernity-war-modernity schema. Ironically, however, the Order’s revivalism implied the very change in society they lamented; it presupposed that the world had changed and that their values needed restoring. There had been, if not a total rupture, then significant societal trauma – though not necessarily heralding Fussell’s ironic brand of modernity.

The Most Noble Order of Crusaders, then, can be understood as an attempt to make sense of the war – to give the conflict, their experiences and postwar Britain meaning. The Order’s exploration of an alternative way of interpreting the war for the changed postwar context was, however, ultimately abortive. The timing of the failure of their medievalism to gain traction suggests that the hard realities of the interwar years had bred a disillusionment with traditional, nineteenth-century values that celebrated the war as another heroic engagement of the British
people. Their romantic re-membering of the war as the ‘Ninth Crusade’ lacked wider cultural resonance despite initial opportunity and success, and suggests some form of change had occurred without them. The Order, with its emphasis on the continuity of prewar chivalric values and its crusade to revive them, was increasingly out of step with 1930s Britain, marching out of one war and grimly into the next. That war would, crushingly, render the ‘Great War to End All Wars’ the ‘First World War.’
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6) ‘A CRUSADE WHICH LACKS A CROSS’?: CRUSADER MEDIEVALISM AND THE SECOND WORLD WAR

As we have seen, crusader medievalism survived the Great War and continued to exert some relevance for sections of British society in the years between the First and Second World Wars, despite the onset of disillusionment with the consequences of the 1914-18 war. Girouard argued that Victorian chivalry received a ‘death-wound’ in the First World War, but saw its death as lingering.1 Siberry’s study of crusader medievalism ended with the culmination of the First World War while Goebel’s work on war memorials, as considered above, posited the change in use of medievalism into a ‘discourse of mourning’.2 In the context of the Church of England, whose clergy had largely bought into the rhetoric of crusading for the first war, Marrin concluded that by 1939 the church refused to paint the conflict as a crusade because crusading had ‘lost its emotive power’.3 However, the previous chapters have demonstrated the persistence and diffusion of crusader medievalism, even if it can be considered to have been unevenly distributed. The career of the Order and the generational shifting of attitudes to war in general, and the Great War in particular, through the 1920s and 1930s suggested that crusader medievalism’s coherence and place in British cultural life was decaying.

The Second World War provides an opportunity to examine whether crusader medievalism resonated for the British in the same ways as it had during the First World War. It was another European war which required total mobilisation and careful presentation to the British public; a public who were less naïve regarding modern warfare and more sceptical about official presentations of the cause. To facilitate comparison, similar source material will be consulted: politicians’ speeches, wartime propaganda, national newspapers as well as other examples of crusader medievalism. Moreover, as Siberry’s work does not cover this period, this
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chapter will introduce new examples of crusader medievalism as well as bringing together partial evaluations where they do already exist – most notably Snape’s consideration of religion and British soldiers in his book *God and the British Soldier*.\(^4\)

In the second half of this chapter two sources from 1940 which are particularly illuminating and pertinent for this study will be considered in detail – Cyril Alington’s pamphlet entitled *The Last Crusade* and the Mass Observation (MO) report FR363 into the public reception of the word ‘crusade’.\(^5\) They suggest that whilst there were attempts to paint the war as a crusade, these failed to adequately encapsulate or communicate the nature of the war to the public except in a diffuse and nebulous manner.

The year 1939 again found Britain opposing German aggression on mainland Europe. While Britain, in tandem with France, had ostensibly entered the war to protect Belgian neutrality from the Wilhelmine invasion in 1914, the declaration of war on 3 September 1939 was in response to the invasion of Poland by Nazi Germany. The domestic context was consumed by the war. The threat of invasion and destruction were brought home to the British public by the devastation of Luftwaffe bombing raids, the aerial Battle of Britain, rationing, conscription and the demands of the wartime economy. Newspapers, radio reports and newsreels exposed the population to the progress of the war at home and abroad as did the official government communications of information and propaganda.\(^6\) The war had a profound effect on the nature of the country itself, creating and confirming national myths,\(^7\) accelerating the metamorphosis of the British Empire into the Commonwealth, and galvanising calls for social reform: ‘Social security for all, family allowances, major reform in education, a National Health Service, Keynesian budgetary technique, full employment policies, town and country planning, closer

---

\(^4\) Snape, *God and the British Soldier*.


relations between the state and industry – all these had been set on foot by the spring of 1943.¹⁸

**Official Sanction?**

While the conventional historiographical wisdom suggests that official figures fought shy of describing the war as a crusade, especially in light of the experience of the First World War, there were in fact plenty of occasions when officials termed the war a crusade. What is more, these references spanned the duration of the war and the breadth of the British government, suggesting that it was a persistent association in some circles. This section will highlight examples which can be considered together to create an official suggestion that the war could be described as a crusade, before moving on to examine broader assertions that this was the case and various rebuttals.

At the head of the British Government both wartime Prime Ministers, Neville Chamberlain and Winston Churchill, used the term crusade to describe the war whilst in office. Chamberlain, in a speech which was reported in *The Times* at the end of February 1940 in Birmingham Town Hall said: ‘I do not think that there can be doubt in the mind of any reasonable man or woman as to the purpose of our crusade, for it is a crusade.’⁹ Churchill several times in passing referred to the war as a crusade: once in Clydeside in January 1940, as ‘this great crusade to keep the liberties of mankind free’; in December 1944 in a debate in the House of Commons on the future of Poland; and to the ‘world crusade’ in June 1945.¹⁰ He did, however, relegate the crusaders to the ‘prosaic past’ in comparison with the heroism of the
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RAF pilots in the evacuation at Dunkirk.\textsuperscript{11} King George VI was reported in June 1944 as having called on the country to ‘renew that crusading impulse on which we entered the war’.\textsuperscript{12}

Beyond the premiers, the pattern repeated among ministers and senior figures. The first Minister of the Ministry of Information, resurrected upon the outbreak of war, was Lord Hugh Macmillan. In a debate in the House of Lords a month after the declaration of war he observed that, ‘This war is in a very special sense a war of ideas. It is accepted by our people and by our Allies as a crusade for great principles.’\textsuperscript{13} Reflecting on the first few months of the war Neville Henderson, the British Ambassador to Germany in 1938, argued in \textit{The Guardian} that, ‘We are crusaders, and we have to prove we are and that we are worthy of victory.’\textsuperscript{14} In July 1940 Lord Halifax, as British Foreign Secretary, responded in a public broadcast to demands by Hitler for Britain to surrender. His speech painted the war in terms of right and wrong and called the war ‘this crusade for Christianity’; \textit{The Times} reporter chose ‘crusade’ as the characterisation of the message of the speech.\textsuperscript{15} Lord Caldecote, the Lord Chief Justice, at a united prayer meeting in London in September 1941 commented that, ‘the war seemed to him to deserve more truly the name of crusade than any of the adventures of medieval times. Heroism unsurpassed in the history of mankind had been displayed by our defenders.’\textsuperscript{16} In 1942 there were publicly reported injunctions from Deputy Prime Minister Clement Attlee and the later Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden respectively to ‘come to this
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fight in the spirit of crusaders dedicated to a divine purpose’, and to each soldier to consider themselves ‘a crusader for the faith’.  

Similar comments were made by Lord Gort, commander of the British Expeditionary Force in France at the beginning of the war (August 1940); Lord Beaverbrook, then Minister of Aircraft Production (February 1941); the Lord Mayor of London (September 1941); Colonel Llewellin, Minister of Aircraft Production (February 1942); Sir William Beveridge, author of the Beveridge Report (March 1942); Sir Samuel Hoare, the British Ambassador to Spain (September 1942); Lord Croft, the Under Secretary for War (May 1944); and the war could be described as a ‘crusade for the liberation of Europe and mankind from the German plague’ by the First Lord of the Admiralty, A.V. Alexander (March 1945). Although none of these passing quotes enable us to evaluate the depth of engagement with the idea of crusading or the historical crusades, they do represent a considerable body of official endorsement that the war could, at least superficially, be couched in crusading rhetoric.

The common language of the Anglo-American alliance facilitated a shared discourse of the war and the Allied cause. US President Theodore Roosevelt allowed that there were similarities between the Allied invasion of Italy and a crusade in October 1943, while his prayer for the Normandy landings in June 1944 referred to them as a ‘united crusade’. Similarly, General Eisenhower’s communications to the Allied troops involved in the invasion of France, which were widely repeated, described the campaign as a ‘great crusade’ in July 1944 and was quoted by King George VI in

---

17 ‘Scales Tilting In Our Favour’, The Times, 23 March 1942, p. 2; Our Special Correspondent, ‘City Welcome To U.S. Troops’, The Times, 3 September 1942, p. 2.
his ‘Prayer for the Crusaders’. Eisenhower went on to repeat the description in his messages at the surrender of Germany and the end of the war in the West, which both *The Times* and *The Guardian* reported under the headlines of the end of the ‘crusade’. Famously, his memoir of the war in 1948 was titled *Crusade in Europe*. There were other ways in which the war, or aspects of the war, were presented to the public as a crusade. 1940 saw two national campaigns which employed crusading rhetoric and imagery: a poster campaign for savings and to encourage people to buy war bonds; and adverts in newspapers which displayed the unity of the British Empire and the role of imperial forces. The former was a campaign by the National Savings Committee which produced posters of a British flag topped by a burning cross with the slogan, ‘Join the Crusade’, followed by ‘Buy Defence Bonds’, ‘Buy National Savings Certificates’, or ‘Save and Lend through the Post Office Savings Bank’. In some instances the advert was printed in newspapers with text which read: ‘It is now clear that while this struggle is to the Nazis a war of conquest, to us it is a Crusade to preserve our freedom and everything that makes life worth living.’
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The second campaign was a series of adverts under the banner of ‘Empire Crusade’. The poster, ‘The Greatest Crusade’, featured Allied servicemen and women from a variety of nations and representing different branches of the forces marching forward together with planes flying overhead. Newspaper adverts had linked flags
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of the imperial nations or were profiles of several of the nations’ contributions to the war effort. In this vein, British Pathé could portray the Australian Imperial Force in Jerusalem as crusaders in a short film from June 1940. Over a scene of troops and civilians in Jerusalem, the narrator declared that, ‘in the procession [along the Via Dolorosa] hundreds of young men from Australia in the uniform of their country. They too are taking part in a crusade – the cause of freedom, the extermination of tyranny. May victory be theirs.’

Finally, it is noticeable that the wartime heads of Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand were all recorded as having employed crusader rhetoric when describing the war. Canadian Prime Minister Mackenzie King was reported in October 1939 as saying:

_The present war was for the Allied Forces a crusade, and the young men now enlisting were first and foremost the defenders of Christian civilization. It was a crusade for the preservation, for our own and future generations, of freedom begotten of persecutions, martyrdoms, and centuries of struggle._

And in a speech to departing Canadian troops in August 1940 he developed the metaphor: ‘As crusaders you journey across the seas to defend the innermost shrine of freedom in the ancient land of Britain, which by its example taught the world what freedom means.’ The Canadian High Commissioner in Britain, Vincent Massey, also engaged with crusading imagery when the sword of the statue of Richard the Lionheart outside the Houses of Parliament was bent in a German bombing raid in the same year. He reflected that:
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Five peoples may bend under attack, but they will never break. In their flexibility lies their strength. There is a symbol of this truth in the statue of King Richard, the hero of the Third Crusade, which stands outside the Palace of Westminster. He fought to free the Holy Sepulchre as we now fight to save human life itself from degradation. In his upraised hand is his crusader’s sword. Not long ago a German bomb bent but could not break that avenging sword. O hope that it will never be straightened.

“So let it stand, a people’s sign and token,
Figured in bronze, for all free men to see.
The sword of Lionheart, though bent, not broken,
In this new warfare of God’s chivalry.”

The statue took on further symbolic resonance when it featured in the last scene of the popular and widely-distributed propaganda film London Can Take It!. With Richard’s bent sword and the broken windows of Westminster Hall behind, Mark Connelly has suggested that ‘the film ends with a vision of the medieval past and one that symbolises the unity of monarchy and people’ who are steadfast in the face of destruction.

Here the statue of King Richard I had become a palimpsest of memory: from a chivalrous Victorian crusading hero representing national pride in the Great Exhibition of 1851, to a sign of imperial strength and common determination almost a century later – at least in the eyes of one official.

The South African premier, and veteran of the First World War, General Jan Smuts was also fond of referring to the war as crusade. In July 1940 he told troops leaving to fight in Kenya that, ‘We now go forth as crusaders, as children of the Cross, to
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fight for freedom itself, freedom of human spirit, of the free choice of the human individual to shape his own life according to the light God has given him.' He expressed similar sentiments when invited to address both the House of Commons and the House of Lords in October 1942: ‘At bottom therefore this war is a new Crusade, a new fight to the death for man's rights and liberties, and for the personal ideals of man's ethical and spiritual life.’ Australian PM Robert Menzies described pilots as, ‘the most magnificent band of young crusaders of the sky’ in June 1941, while later in the war the Australian High Commissioner termed the war, ‘the greatest crusade in history’. The Northern Irish PM also proclaimed that the empire was at war, in the ‘spirit of a great crusade against evil systems’. These comments suggest that on the level of government leaders at least there was a tendency to declare the war a crusade of a united British Empire; they also echoed the ‘Greatest Crusade’ newspaper campaign described above. The Australian and New Zealand officials, whether consciously or unconsciously, paralleled crusading rhetoric employed by their counterparts in the previous war. This fits well with Mark Sheftall’s findings that Canada, Australia and New Zealand proved much less susceptible during the years between the wars to the narrative of disillusionment discussed above. Instead, the memory of the war was focused on the achievements of each nation despite the fact that in terms of the human costs of the war they had suffered ‘proportionally comparable’ losses to Britain.

More broadly, the statements identifying the war as a crusade made by British officials do indicate the presence of crusading rhetoric at the highest levels of the government, as does the use of crusader rhetoric and imagery in the poster campaigns. However, there are few indications that this was more than a surface level of engagement with crusading or the medieval crusades that used ‘crusade’ in
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a diffuse and often metaphorical manner; from these examples it is not possible to
know how this language was received or understood. Crusader medievalism was,
though, still an option by which to understand the nature of British involvement in
the conflict and, it is reasonable to infer, contained strands of interpretation which
were useful to some in wartime Britain. The following section will turn to a broad
contemporary discussion of whether the war could be understood as a crusade, and
what the implications of that definition would be.

**Understanding the War as a Crusade**

The British public were largely distant from the early stages of the war which have
been dubbed the ‘Phoney War’ due to the inactivity of armies on the western front;
these months saw a range of proposals as to how the war should be understood.
Though Britain had gone to war over the violated neutrality of Poland, the reasons
for the war were often painted in broader, moral terms. Here, the application of
crusading rhetoric to describe the war became part of this debate and a spectrum
of opinion was visible. Some clearly saw it as describing the nature of the war while
others argued that the war needed to be made into a crusade, or at least presented
as such, in order for it to be won. On the other hand, there were those who, for a
variety of reasons, could not accept that the crusades or crusading provided a
helpful or accurate model with which to understand the modern war.

In the first camp were those who assumed that the war was a crusade. Journalist
Collie Knox explicitly compared the war with the medieval crusades: ‘Long ago our
forebears went forth to battle against tyranny and all that could tend to make life
hideous and of no account. They called it “The Crusades.” [...] We fight a Crusade
once more against the powers of Darkness.’38 Parliamentary Secretary Sir Edward
Grigg (later Minister of State and Minister of War) in October 1939 suggested in the
House of Commons that the war was widely understood to be a crusade: ‘I believe
that 99 per cent. of the people of this country believe in their hearts that we are
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engaged in the greatest crusade in history’. A month later Viscountess Davidson argued similarly, bringing together several strands of justification for the war:

Most of us feel that in this war we are fighting a crusade. We are fighting for right against wrong; the forces of good against the forces of evil. We are fighting for the freedom of small and helpless States against the bullying large State. We are fighting for Christianity, and all that Christianity means, against those who do not believe in Christianity.

General Henri Gouraud, commander of the French Fourth Army at the end of the First World War (who supposedly commented on the ultimate success of the crusades when entering Saladin’s tomb in Damascus as part of the French Mandate in Syria), was quoted in November 1939 as endorsing the word crusade as ‘well chosen’ to describe the war. In an article in The Church Times a contributor wrote, ‘People debate now whether the present war may be called a crusade. Surely the answer is Yes, if by a crusade is meant an adventure of fallible men, giving all they have in defence of that they believe in.’ Rev. C.B. Mortlock asserted in June 1940 that most people, ‘feel themselves enlisted in a crusade.’

Throughout the conflict the war could be termed ‘our great crusade’ or a ‘spiritual crusade’ and continuity built with the historical crusades on the basis that both were fought ‘on an exclusively moral issue’. This principle was enacted by a
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pageant in Manchester in June 1942 which began with representations of the crusades and continued up to the contemporary conflict; the theme was the enduring battle for ‘the essentials of human liberty’. The war could be seen as a ‘crusade against the forces of evil’, and a ‘terrific crusade’; ‘Never before’, pronounced Major Vyvyan Adams in February 1942, ‘have Christian communities been summoned to a finer crusade than this war’. In January 1943 at the conclusion of a review of the war situation in the House of Lords, Viscount Cranborne (the Lord Privy Seal) declared, ‘If anyone ever had any doubts that we were fighting a crusade, he can have no such doubts now.’

Not all took it for granted that the war was a crusade – for some the pressing need was to make the war into a crusade in order to mobilise the moral resources of the nation. One MP argued that: ‘We should make this war a crusade, and the more we make it a crusade the quicker we shall win it. [...] This war must be a crusade, and not just a scramble for material wealth.’ For others, this meant that a ‘crusading spirit’ was required, or that the churches needed to mobilise the people more effectively: ‘The country needs a new fervour, a new faith, a new outlook upon religion. Our churches and chapels must preach a new crusade.’

The author A.A. Milne argued that the war should be presented as a moral crusade to the US in
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order to persuade the American public to enter the war.\textsuperscript{50} Alternatively, as one letter to the editor of \textit{The Guardian} suggested in January 1941, it meant an acceptance of sacrifice:

\begin{quote}
Now we entered the war, we were told, as Crusaders, to rid the world of the Nazi menace. But can the war be continued in such a spirit if we lower ourselves to the level of Nazi morality? It is not possible that, as Crusaders in such a noble cause, it may be our duty to suffer the brunt of this evil? Sacrifice is surely an essential part of a crusade, and we are making that sacrifice. If, however, we inflict a similar sacrifice on our enemy then the value of our own is lost.\textsuperscript{51}
\end{quote}

Objections to the presentation of the war-as-crusade varied. Some remembered that the medieval crusades could largely be considered failures:

\begin{quote}
Government spokesmen talk of this war being a moral crusade. Where are the leaders of this moral crusade? Do they look nice when they paint a big red cross on their shirts and go out crusading? It seems to me that this crusade will fail for exactly the same reasons as the Crusades of the Middle Ages failed, because the crusade leaders, these prominent Christians of ours, these self-sacrificing men who set such an example to the nation, are going to conduct this crusade as their predecessors, in a similar sort of war, fought the Crusades of the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{52}
\end{quote}

In a debate in the House of Commons, Earl Winterton expressed concerns about the suitability of describing the war as a crusade on the grounds that it might undermine the British war effort by alienating Muslims across the British Empire: ‘We shall not defeat [Hitler] by talking of Christian crusades or even of Christian

\textsuperscript{50} A.A. Milne, ‘Americans and the War’, \textit{The Times}, 5 September 1941, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{51} G. Emerson Barritt, ‘Modern Warfare and “Reprisals”’, \textit{The Guardian}, 8 January 1941.
\textsuperscript{52} Austin Hopkinson, ‘Debate on the Address’ (Hansard, 13 November 1941), vol. 376, cc91, <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1941/nov/13/debate-on-the-address#column_91>, [accessed 10 March 2016].
civilisation; it must be a much more broad-based appeal. In response, the MP Tom Driberg argued that:

Those of us who are Christians within the United Nations can perfectly well regard our war effort as a crusade, because, undoubtedly, the Axis, Nazi-ism and Fascism stand for something totally opposed to Christianity at its best. But I suggest we should not attempt to impose that idea or that word upon our comrades in the United Nations who are not Christians, whether they be Moslems or atheists or anything else.

This exchange demonstrated an awareness that presenting the war as a crusade had implications beyond Britain and Christian opinion, as Allenby had appreciated in 1917; and that it was therefore a term of limited utility.

At the furthest end of the spectrum there were objections to declaring the war a crusade on the grounds of inaccuracy rather than efficacy of presentation. The Rev. Stuart Morris, speaking at a Peace Pledge Union rally at Stockport in December 1939, claimed that proclaiming the war a crusade was a contradiction: ‘For the spiritual leaders of the nation to try to persuade them that this was a spiritual war and a holy crusade was a betrayal of the Gospel committed to them, and if it were a spiritual war it could only be fought with spiritual weapons.’ Indeed, one MP considered the repeated suggestion that the war was a crusade to be misleading: ‘I am afraid that many of our people, for instance, have fallen victims to our own propaganda, and think that this is a crusade for freedom and democracy, whatever those terms may mean—and they mean different things to different people.’

Notably, these examples illustrate that crusading rhetoric was a part of the conversation about how to understand the war. Presumably generated by the official usage seen above, coupled with a lingering memory of propaganda from the First World War, the idea that the war could be thought of as a crusade was one possible way for politicians and the public to conceptualise their involvement in the conflict. However, while the range and depth of views about the war in Britain is beyond the scope of this survey, the spectrum of opinions expressed above reveals the flexibility of a crusading discourse and its perceived limitations. Crusading could encapsulate the moral nature of Britain’s cause and the need for mass mobilisation and effort – it could easily, as in Viscountess Davidson’s speech, also slip into suggesting that the war was a war for Christianity. As morality was defined for many by their Christian faith, these elements were indistinguishable, and therefore inevitably interlinked in an understanding of the war as a crusade. However, for others this formulation of the war as a Christian crusade was problematic, and the slippage from a just moral cause to fighting for Christian morality, or even Christianity, was not a necessary, or desirable, move. We can see sensitivity in the above sentiments to the presentation of the war as a crusade, particularly to Muslims fighting for the Allies, and outright rejection of the compatibility of crusading with the contemporary war on grounds of both legitimacy (war could not be holy) and precision (the causes of the war were too vaguely understood to constitute a crusade).

For the most part these references were again of passing or shallow engagement with the crusades only and demonstrated very little further development of the implications of the war being presented as a crusade or comparison with medieval expeditions. ‘Crusade’ was largely being used in the sense of a righteous campaign needing strenuous effort – the metaphorical use of crusading for a good cause. Where there was further development of the idea it was expressed in one of several directions: in the need to stir up the ‘crusading’ spirit among people; as being an ideological war rather than a materialistic or nationalist war; or as being in some way a Christian conflict. This could be seen in both the different uses described
above but also in the objections to its use as being too Christian, inappropriate or inaccurate.

*On Crusade: Soldiers, Chaplains and the British Army*

The First World War saw the use of crusader rhetoric in regard to the war on both the Home Front and amongst troops abroad. The role of religion in both wars as it pertained to the armed forces has been studied by Snape, whose work has identified examples of crusader medievalism used by soldiers and chaplains. As well as these, several official uses of ‘crusader’ as a designation for an operation in North Africa, as the name for a cruiser tank and in the iconography of various army units will be briefly discussed below.

British soldiers could be described as ‘modern crusaders’ and linked to their medieval counterparts without incongruity: 'Along the roads where the English crusaders of Coeur de Lion once trod, there now march British and Australian troops, and where English archers once caused havoc, modern troops hope to prove themselves equally valiant.'\(^57\) And airmen too could be referred to as ‘our modern crusaders of the air’, as in the First World War.\(^58\) The MP Austin Hopkinson observed in November 1942 that the soldiers were ‘told again and again by Government spokesmen that the war is a crusade.’\(^59\) At the end of 1943, Hugh Dormer, an officer of the Irish Guards, member of the Special Operations Executive and once pupil of Ampleforth’s Benedictine-run college, reflected on the war:

> the ideas of Nazi philosophy are infinitely more far-reaching than those of the French Revolution, and more diabolic than anything yet known in the history of the West [...] God knows we in this country are far from
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perfect, but this war is far more of a Crusade than the Crusades themselves ever were.\textsuperscript{60}

The British First Army, in action in North Africa in 1942-43, had as its emblem a shield-shaped patch with a red cross on a white background, with a ‘crusader’s sword’ on the cross; the British Second Army’s insignia was similar, with the cross being blue rather than red.\textsuperscript{61} Travelling with the First Army to its deployment in November 1942, E.A. Montague, a reporter for \textit{The Guardian}, was taken with the crusading parallels he perceived:

\textit{There is no question that the members of the First Army landed with a deep conviction that they are crusaders of a New Jerusalem. Several officers hinted to me that something of the sort was in their minds, and as I looked around at the vast convoy sailing steadily onward my mind often translated the steamers into galleys with the Cross on their sails. The First Army’s shoulder-flash consisting of a shield with a red cross and sword, is something more than a mere military emblem. A soldier with imagination must have devised it, for it represents the heart of the Army.}\textsuperscript{62}

The insignia of the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Force (SHEAF), commanded by General Eisenhower and tasked with the invasion of


Europe from the west, was described officially as: ‘The shield-shaped cloth patch, with a black background representing the darkness of Nazi oppression, bears the Crusader’s sword of liberation with the red flames of avenging justice leaping from its hilt’ (see Figure 6.2). Appropriately, then, General Sir Miles Dempsey of the British Second Army presented the city of Caen with a ‘Crusaders’ Shield’ on its liberation in August 1944.

More commonly associated with a crusading theme was the British Eighth Army, which first participated in ‘Operation Crusader’ in Libya in November 1941. One of the main tanks of the campaign was the A15 cruiser tank, which saw service in North Africa and was named ‘Crusader’ by Lord Beaverbrook; a name which drew favourable comment. The army’s newspaper was also called ‘Crusader’ and their
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patch featured another ‘Crusaders’ Cross’ (Figure 6.3). Pride in this ‘tradition of the Crusaders’ Cross’ was remarked on – approvingly – in Parliament.

The Christian chaplains of the British armed forces in Second World War, just as in the first, occupied a position which required endorsement and promotion of the army’s task within a Christian framework. They were seen to be essential to the reinforcement and maintenance of the soldiers’ morale, which was understood to be a critical commodity. Snape has seen traces of a ‘quasi-crusading’ ideology among some chaplains and identified Frederick Llewelyn Hughes as a key influence in this regard on both the Eighth Army, and later the 21st Army Group, where he worked under British General Bernard Montgomery as assistant chaplain-general and then chaplain-general. Hughes had been to Jesus College at Oxford and served in the British Army in the First World War and would become Chaplain to the king. Upon assuming his position with the Eighth Army, Hughes wrote to all the Protestant chaplains asserting that the British cause was a crusade. Influential due to his patronage by the successful Montgomery, Hughes not only saw the war in terms of the church militant but drew on Arthurian chivalry too. He wrote to his subordinate chaplains: ‘We have full commission to match the men of this great enterprise, on the eve of battle, with King Arthur’s Knights of Chivalry.’

Crusader medievalism again provided a set of rhetoric and imagery useful to those in the armed forces influenced by Christianity and involved in the fighting of the war. However, the comparative lack of material compared to the First World War and the limited examples of deeper engagement with crusading suggest that
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crusader medievalism was a less significant part of the social imaginary of those in the British armed forces. This could have been due to the war involving fewer historically resonant battlefields, in contrast to the Gallipoli and Palestine campaigns of 1916-18, and because of the ‘salutary experiences of the First World War and by the pacifism of the inter-war years’.73

Overview

The description of the war as a crusade was both frequent and from a sufficiently broad range of official figures that it can be said to have gained common parlance in these circles. It also formed a part of the conversation about the nature of the war, as seen above. This was an imprecise contribution to the debate, however, for two reasons. Firstly, most uses of crusader rhetoric were only of passing engagement with the crusades or crusading and did not develop to any great extent the implications of identifying the war as a crusade. Secondly, and subsequently, there does not appear to have been a coherent, agreed understanding of what the crusades were or what crusading was. This is apparent in the uses of ‘crusade’ to mean a difficult campaign, a morally just cause, a Christian holy war, a war which mirrored medieval expeditions – or a vague, overlapping combination of some or all of the above. This diffusion of understanding promoted its general use but mitigated its more specific employment or deeper engagement with the crusades and crusading.

Three of the newspaper archives examined here, those of The Times, The Guardian and the Daily Mail, revealed a drop-off in use of ‘crusade’ to refer to the war over its duration. In part, this can be seen to be due to Nazi propaganda which attempted to portray the Axis offensive against Soviet Russia, which began in June 1941, as an ‘anti-Bolshevik crusade’. The Nazi propagandists tried to claim German leadership of a pan-European movement in defence of Christianity and civilisation against the threat of communism; their failures both to recruit widely for the offensive and to

73 Snape, God and the British Soldier, pp. 182–85, at p. 184.
defeat the Red Army were heralded by the papers.\textsuperscript{74} Whether accurate or not, as early as November 1940 \textit{The Times} had reported Hitler referring to conflict in the east as a crusade: ‘We shall re-create the splendid tradition of the Crusades, we shall carry out our mission to bring civilization to the east of Europe.’\textsuperscript{75} This served to create an association for the paper’s readers between the Nazi enemy and crusading, providing further confusion in public perceptions of the crusades and contributing perhaps to the increasing unwillingness of the British to call the war a crusade, even in passing.

**A Christian Crusade?**

One interpretation of references to the war as a crusade was to understand the war as a campaign requiring mass mobilisation and endurance. Another connection made by many was to understand a crusade as being a specifically Christian endeavour – whether in an ecclesiastical (endorsed by, or to do with, the church) or a moral sense (being righteous according to Christian morality or approved of by God). Across both world wars ‘Christianity’, Snape has argued, ‘continued to exert a powerful and even defining influence on national and individual life.’\textsuperscript{76} Was the Second World War, as one prospective MP was quoted as having said in 1944, a ‘crusade which lacks a cross’?\textsuperscript{77} The Christian community in Britain debated how to understand the war, especially with the memory of the belligerence of the clergy in the First World War and the embrace of pacifism in the interwar years within recent experience. More recently, Franco’s Nationalists in the Spanish Civil War had deliberately embraced crusading rhetoric in order to generate international support, as seen in Chapter Five. Although this had limited success in Britain, it had brought a particularly Catholic crusading association to the attention of the British

\textsuperscript{74} Joseph Saxe, ‘The “Anti-Bolshevik Crusade”: Real Purpose of the Nazi Recruiting’, \textit{The Guardian}, 5 August 1941, p. 4; Our Special Correspondent, ‘Strain of the New War’, \textit{The Times}, 8 July 1941, p. 3.
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\textsuperscript{76} Snape, \textit{God and the British Soldier}, p. 242.

public and largely the ire of non-Catholic Christians.  

Ultimately, it appears that these and other factors softened the approach of the churches and clergy in comparison with 1914-18; Tom Lawson and Stephen Parker have concluded that, ‘Still embarrassed by its bellicosity, and awake to latent popular pacifism, the Church for the most part avoided the crusading indulgences that Winnington-Ingram had given voice to during the Great War.’ However, the term crusade was a complex one for Christians in the Second World War and was used to describe the war – though not without debate.

‘This Great Spiritual Crusade’

The tone was set less than a fortnight into the war with a letter to The Times by Bishop H. Hensley Henson, who argued that the war was, ‘a crusade for the rescue of the ultimate factors of Christian civilization, and we need the faith and fervour of crusaders if we are to achieve victory.’ A similar letter from Arthur Page printed the day after appealed to clergy to preach the British cause as ‘Holy War, and that those who fight in defence of it are crusaders against the forces of evil.’ John Patten of the British and Foreign Bible Society also saw the war as a specifically Christian: ‘It may sound old-fashioned to call the war a Christian crusade, but, in the last analysis, it is an attempt to keep alive what is precious in the Christian heritage.’ The conflict between Finland and Soviet Russia in the early stages of the war, one letter suggested, was, ‘a fight which is in truth part of a great crusade in defence of the principles of that Christian faith which for seven centuries they [the Finns] have held with us.’ A letter to The Times was praised as revealing the nature of the conflict accurately: ‘Lord Elton’s splendid letter in the Times [...] puts this terrible war in its true light, a crusade, a fight to the death for Christianity against
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paganism’. The war could, then, be perceived by some as a crusade for Christianity; whether as a defensive war or by attacking evil.

Senior churchmen too advocated seeing the war as a crusade. Arthur Winnington-Ingram, the Bishop of London during the First World War, had preached the previous war as a holy war and was quoted as referring to the 1939-45 conflict as a crusade in a speech to the Territorial Army in his (uniformed) capacity as an honorary chaplain in October 1939. The most senior Catholic clergyman in Britain during the war was Cardinal Arthur Hinsley, Archbishop of Westminster. He was quoted in The Times characterising the war against Nazi Germany as a crusade:

_In the name of reason and of faith, in the cause of humanity and of religion, the creed of Nazism must be denounced as the arch-enemy of mankind. To save the world a new crusade – ‘God wills it’ – is necessary unless the fair lands of the earth are to be turned into wastes of blood._

Hinsley set up the ecumenical Sword of the Spirit movement to inspire loyalty and commitment to the war effort. With clear echoes of the crusading practice of taking the cross, he had 50,000 bakelite crosses with ‘The pledge of Victory’ made, blessed and given to troops through the chaplains.

In response to revelations about Nazi treatment of Jews in December 1942, the Archbishop of York, Cyril Garbett, described the Allied cause as a crusade, which he had held back from doing beforehand:

_But in view of the fiendish cruelties which are now being committed I feel we may now look upon our people and our allies as united in a
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Whereas for the Archbishop the war had escalated to the level of a crusade, other senior ecclesiastics had been willing to employ crusading rhetoric from the start. In October 1939 the Bishop of Coventry called for people to fight ‘as Christians and in the spirit of Crusaders’; the Bishop of Liverpool declared the war, ‘the greatest Christian crusade in the history of the world’. The President of the Methodist churches in July 1942 also referred to the war as a crusade ‘for the life of the world’. Clearly, just as in the First World War, there were senior clergy who were prepared to both label the war as a crusade, and to see the war as a Christian conflict in the ways described above.

Dissent: ‘The Battle is not for Christianity’

But there were also those who rejected the connections made above between the war, Christianity and crusading; demonstrating again that there were a variety of opinions about how the war should be understood. Three criticisms were particularly forthcoming. Anticipating the wider conflict, a pamphlet produced by the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge (SPCK) in August 1939 argued in a pacifist vein that Christians should remember that war itself was evil, and that ‘they should never, for propaganda purposes, represent it as a holy crusade.’ In this view, no war could be holy as it was intrinsically opposed to Christianity. A modified view saw crusading as antithetical to Christianity but did not necessarily condemn warfare. The distinguished Swiss theologian Karl Barth wrote an open letter to Great Britain in August 1941 in which he suggested that,
‘this struggle must not be thought of as a crusade or a holy war: “we may safely leave all such things to the modern Mohammed and his deceived hordes.”’ Bishop Bell of Chester argued that the war was not a crusade because it was not fought in the name of the cross. A correspondent in *The Times*, however, could decry crusading because they understood the crusades to have been wars of conversion whilst having little doubt that God blessed the Allied cause.

Secondly, a contradiction was seen between the Christian claims for the conflict and the moral state of the country. ‘Are we of the stuff crusaders should be? Do we deserve victory?’ asked Athelstan Riley while echoing calls for penitence. This argument assumed that crusading was a righteous activity and as such required a level of purity from the crusaders. It could be used to bolster efforts for social reformation and for the promotion of Christian morality during and after the war – both of which were taken up with some enthusiasm. The third strand of criticism was represented by a letter to *The Times* contributing to the debate about war aims in which the author sought to disassociate the British cause necessarily from Christianity: ‘we ought not to say we are engaged upon a Christian crusade. We are surely fighting for liberty and justice for all.’ This was in fact the stance taken by the editors of *The Church Times* in April 1942 when they finally weighed in on the debate:
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Some of the least Christian elements in the country are the loudest in their proclamation of the alleged fact that the allies are conducting a religious crusade against the forces of anti-Christ. The Church Times has always been very careful to avoid making any such claim, which it believes to have no justification in fact. [...] The battle is not for Christianity, but for a world in which Christianity is possible.100

Cyril Alington’s Last Crusade

Into the context of the debate about how the war should be understood in its first ‘Phoney’ phase came one of the most direct engagements with the concept of crusading as applied to the war. Published in early 1940 under the premiership of Neville Chamberlain, Cyril Alington’s thirty-eight-page pamphlet The Last Crusade was an attempt to claim the substance of the crusades, as well as the title, for the conflict with Nazi Germany.101 Alington argued that the war was a new crusade by anticipating and answering objections to the application of the historical label, including those articulated above. In so doing, he drew on a particular understanding of the historic crusades and developed a rationale that both saw the war as holy and called the nation to take up the cause. Alington’s vision of the war was fundamentally shaped by, and grounded in, his Christian faith which not only recommended the parallel with the crusades but underpinned his reasoning for fighting. The Last Crusade, written in 1940 to mobilise Britain, represented an attempt (perhaps the last) to appeal to the country to engage in a conflict on the grounds that it really was a crusade, and therefore a worthy cause.

Alington had been the headmaster of Eton school from 1917 until 1933 when he became Dean of Durham; between 1921 and leaving Eton he was also chaplain to the king.102 His pamphlet had a foreword from Viscount Halifax, then Foreign
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Secretary under Chamberlain, advocating Alington’s argument. Halifax was at the
time one of the most prominent men in the British Government, having spent time
as Viceroy of India (1926-31) and succeeded Anthony Eden as Foreign Secretary in
February 1938. In May 1940 he was considered the favourite to replace
Chamberlain as Prime Minister but demurred in favour of Churchill. As noted
above, his key speech in response to Hitler’s invitation for Britain to surrender was
reported across the country and encouraged the nation that it was in the spirit of
prayer and trusting in God that, ‘we must march together in this crusade for
Christianity.’ By December of 1940 Churchill had sent Halifax to Washington as
British Ambassador and he was never so intimately involved in the wartime leading
of the country as in the first months of that year.

Halifax’s endorsement of Alington’s pamphlet should be seen in this light – as an
indication of its orthodoxy. His foreword cannot be simply taken to demonstrate
that crusading rhetoric or parallelism was official policy, nor necessarily, as Alington
claimed, that: ‘The Prime Minister may not use language as definite as that of Lord
Halifax, but they are at one in thinking of us as crusaders defending what is holy
against the forces of evil’. Rather, Halifax’s commendation authorised Alington
to convince his audience of the rightness of the government’s cause. Halifax’s
introduction revealed who the pamphlet was aimed at:

*I hope that this book may prove helpful to all those who are in any doubt
about the essential justice of our cause. Its clear and convincing
message should be of particular assistance to those Christian people*

105 ‘Lord Halifax Replies to Hitler’, p. 5.
whose horror of all war may make it difficult for them to grasp the true nature of the present struggle.\textsuperscript{107}

This purpose, then, framed the pamphlet; the ‘true nature’ of the conflict clearly being a crusade. It was designed to ease Christian consciences and encourage participation in the war effort, coming as it did from an influential establishment communicator and promoted by the ‘Holy Fox’.\textsuperscript{108}

Why choose the crusades as the vehicle for this purpose? Alington clearly saw equating the war with a crusade as a compelling concept which would, once any objections were put to rest, encourage his readers to participate fully in the war effort as a Christian imperative. This then raises two further questions which will shed light onto the original: how did Alington perceive the historical crusades; and how did he use them in attempting to convince his audience that the Second World War was actually a crusade?

\textit{Alington’s Vision and Use of the Crusades}

On the first page of his pamphlet Alington presented his understanding of the Crusades:

\begin{quote}
The origin of the historical Crusades was not a desire to ‘convert’ the world, but a desire [...] to save the Holy Places of Palestine from an infidel who not only dominated them himself but denied access to Christian pilgrims.\textsuperscript{109}
\end{quote}

Indeed, for Alington, ‘The simplest definition of a Crusade is a “holy war”;’ one whose objectives God could bless.\textsuperscript{110} These included fighting for justice (for Christian pilgrims), liberty (to access the Holy Places) and, in so doing, freedom to hear the Christian message. Alington addressed the objection that these aims would have been alien to some of those who took part in the historic crusades by
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asking ‘Who ever taunted an honest Crusader for not being a perfect example of all Christian virtue?’ This meant that his definition of crusading could be applied to the aims of the crusades, whilst not requiring those motivations to be present in all the crusaders themselves; thus side-stepping the morality objection.

For the war to be considered truly a crusade by Alington it needed to fit the criteria he had established – ‘to call a war a Crusade involves the assumption that its purposes are such as God can bless’. The reasons that the British were fighting, Alington proposed, were for justice and liberty. Germany had abandoned all hope of a just system when she had denounced God whilst the British (chivalrously) fought for the justice of the smaller European nations who could not speak for themselves. Liberty for those who were oppressed by the Nazi state was also a cause ‘dear to God’; therefore, ‘to fight for Freedom is to fight for the cause of God.’ Furthermore, the war was presupposed to be conducted without hatred for the enemy. Finally, Alington addressed the objection that the British people were insufficiently Christian to qualify as crusaders. For the Dean of Durham, the Christian heritage of Britain had formed the nation such that it was, ‘the Christian spirit latent in the nation which has taken us into this war’; the holy cause had been recognised and responded to by the British in a way that demonstrated that latent spirit. Besides, Alington reasoned, just like the crusaders not all the participants needed to be pure for the cause to qualify.

If the historic crusades were about securing access to the Holy Places on behalf of others, Alington saw the contemporary war as being the same, ‘our cause is one which God must bless: He must desire that there should be free access to the “Holy Places”, whether they are envisaged as an earthly shrine or as the dwelling place of Freedom and Justice and Good Faith’. The connection was not simply metaphorical: ‘so far as we are fighting to secure for others rights which heathenism
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denies, whether that heathenism is confessed or unavowed, we have a clear claim to the title.’ In this way the British were crusaders in a holy war. The crusades provided Alington with a historical precedent of a holy war; even if the crusaders or the outcomes of their conflicts did not measure up to the ideal in practice, the aim was worthy. Similarly, then, he considered the British cause against Nazi Germany a worthy cause, which meant it qualified as a holy war, and could be called a crusade.

For Alington, the Christian nature of Britain and the spiritual aspect of their cause were crucial to understanding the war. Crusading provided a vocabulary and set of ideas through which his Christianity and the British involvement in the war could be understood together. Alington saw Christianity as foundational to the ideals of justice and liberty he saw as justifying British involvement in the war. He argued both that, a ‘nation which has rejected God rejects with Him that conception of justice on which European society is founded’, and that true liberty was ‘only found in the willing acceptance of a law recognized as divine.’ It was a most Christian war which his intended audience were called upon to recognise and respond to regardless of the actual level of explicit Christian expression or feeling in the country.

While Alington’s pamphlet demonstrated that there was at least one, high profile, attempt to not only link, but to justify, British involvement in the Second World War as a crusade, it is harder to gauge how much traction this view gained. Five thousand copies of the pamphlet were initially printed, with a further three thousand ordered a month after its publication on 5 February 1940. Of these, 5,834 were sold in the UK in 1940 and 90 in America – 160 were sent to Alington in Durham. It is impossible to tell whether eager clergy distributed the pamphlets enthusiastically or whether they never made it to their parishioners. These figures from the publisher suggest, however, that there was sufficient interest in Alington’s
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pamphlet to have it published and distributed and it is likely that it was at least read by those in the hierarchy of the Church of England; they do not, however, indicate that it was a hugely popular best-seller, though it was mentioned in the MO report examined below. In summary, these observations fit with Parker’s wider analysis that:

To a lesser extent than in the First World War, the language of crusading was utilised to describe the character of the second conflict, perhaps because of the nervousness of appearing as belligerent as clerics had apparently done previously. [...] Nevertheless the term ‘crusade’ did on occasion emerge, this time, however, in less jingoistic and in more morally purposive tones.¹²¹

Mass Observation and the Reception of the Crusades

An indicator of the wider response to crusading rhetoric was a series of MO reports in 1940, one of which specifically considered how the word ‘crusade’ was used and understood.¹²² MO was an organisation founded by Tom Harrisson and Charles Madge in 1937 with social scientific aims to observe and understand everyday life in Britain; ‘to enable the masses to speak for themselves’.¹²³ By the Second World War the organisation was split between London and Bolton and produced reports on attitudes based on observations in both contexts. The MO report FR363 was dated 20 August 1940 and stated that its purpose was to investigate, ‘what people think of the word “crusade” and how it makes them feel.’ This was not simply a random study: the report fell under the work commissioned by the Ministry of Information between April 1940 and October 1941 and was required because ‘the Ministry of Information are proposing to use this word extensively in a forthcoming campaign.’¹²⁴ Linking the report to the official British government body for

¹²¹ Parker, Faith on the Home Front; Alington, The Last Crusade, p. 172.
propaganda, then, suggested that the question of what associations and emotional resonance the word crusade carried was a serious political concern. In other words, the Ministry of Information wanted to know what work crusader medievalism could do for the war – could it effect anything like the ‘cultural mobilisation’ of the previous war? Though limited in scope, and therefore in its ability to represent the country as a whole, the report can be considered a snapshot of some contemporary responses to the concept of crusade, especially as a selection of responses are ostensibly recorded verbatim, and therefore of considerable value when evaluating the reception of wartime crusader medievalism.

Aimed at the ‘artisan and working-classes’ the report included fragments of individual responses to the word ‘crusade’ which led to often contradictory conclusions. While many respondents found the concept out of date, old-fashioned or relating to the past, others understood a crusade to be ‘progressive’ and about the future – fighting for, or towards, something.\textsuperscript{125} There was seen to be a strong association with fighting, but less so with religion; indeed, one respondent was quoted as having said, ‘Hitler thinks he’s on a crusade’, presumably with regard to the Nazi anti-Bolshevik crusade.\textsuperscript{126} The report concluded that the word was generally vague and obscure:

\begin{quote}
It would seem, therefore, that the word has no unpleasant associations for the artisan and working classes, but on the other hand, few definite pleasant associations. It is apparently a rather vague and impersonal word for them and does not give any particular feeling of identification or personification. Its moral association is positive, [...] There is a vague religious association of the same nature.\textsuperscript{127}
\end{quote}

In this vein the report observed that while provincial industrial areas showed less interest in the word ‘crusade’, interest was higher in Nonconformist areas. Finally, the report commented on Alington’s pamphlet, noting that, ‘its reception is not
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believed to have been conspicuously favourable. It is unclear, however, how this reception was established; presumably Alington’s pamphlet made little impact, if they had even heard of it, with those questioned in the survey. Interestingly, the surveyors clearly had.

Another, more detailed, MO report into the effectiveness of propaganda on the home front from December 1940 argued against the appropriateness of crusading rhetoric in a review of the Empire Campaign mentioned above. It concluded:

*as earlier tests and reports showed, the campaign started off in an unpopular key, the key of Crusade. While the word has been largely dropped, the rather old-fashioned crusade atmosphere prevails – many phrases from the copy illustrate this. This is out of line with the way the majority of people are thinking in this country at the moment, and the campaign has not been sufficiently strong to alter that situation.*

Two further reports from the MO archive, both from 1940, provide perspective. FR23 examined the church in wartime and claimed that as the realities of war had sunk in, attitudes to the war amongst clergy had crystallised. In categorising these attitudes, the author identified one group as ‘The Crusaders’; they were the ‘official leaders of organized religion’ who saw the war as a ‘crusade against evil things.’ Like Alington (who may have been included in the study) these prominent churchmen interpreted the war as being of a Christian nature, which left them open to seeing the war as a real crusade as well as employing the language of crusading.

Lastly, a report on the meeting of a group called Parliament Christian, part of the United Christian Petition Movement was attended by an observer. An issue of the organisation’s journal was attached to the report which included a call to, ‘make this war a Crusade inspired by the flaming ideal of a high moral purpose.’ Furthermore, the article continued, ‘Hitler has his Fifth Columns. Let us have
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Columns of God acting as His Crusaders in every country, proclaiming our mission to the world.'\textsuperscript{131} Though the meeting was small, and the journal obscure, it presented another example of the war being engaged with through the rhetoric of crusading.

These MO reports, though not representative of the whole of British society, do provide glimpses of crusading rhetoric being employed to describe the Second World War as a crusade. They also offer the opinions of contemporary observers of British society in 1940 who were interested in the utility and resonance of crusading rhetoric. Their conclusions, that amongst broad sections of the population the word ‘crusade’ had little definite meaning other than referring to conflict, and that it was more relevant to readers of The Times than the general populace, are pertinent. This is especially so as MO negatively assessed the use of crusading rhetoric during the war itself and fed back its conclusions to the Ministry of Information.\textsuperscript{132} The reports also seem to suggest that the story might have been different for Christians: many unproblematically saw the war as a crusade, as seen above. Coupled with Alington’s pamphlet, we can see that crusading rhetoric in the context of the Second World War could still resonate for a small minority – carrying a sense of righteous cause and conflict that ‘God must bless’.\textsuperscript{133}

**Conclusion**

Evidently efforts were made to employ crusader medievalism in the context of Britain’s involvement in the Second World War. These largely centred on the nature of the cause and whether it could appropriately be termed a crusade. Attempts to call the war a crusade drew on its metaphorical use as meaning a just cause which would require strenuous effort and mass mobilisation. This often bled into a Christian understanding and justification of the war as being righteous, and indeed holy. It was to the latter associations which there were objections – notably as to whether the country was sufficiently Christian and whether ‘crusade’ in the sense

\textsuperscript{131} MO, ‘Parliament Christian’, 19 September 1940, FR 411, BL, quoting vol. 1, no. 6, 1940, p. 42.

\textsuperscript{132} MO, *Home Propaganda*.

\textsuperscript{133} Alington, *The Last Crusade*, p. 38.
of Christian holy war missed the wider involvement of people of many faiths and of none for whom the cause was equally just. Similarly, the question of the aims of the war could be confused if it was understood as a Christian war and clarity was sought that the war was being waged neither on behalf of Christianity nor for its propagation. Those for whom a just war and a holy war were synonymous, or for whom Great Britain and ‘civilisation’ were inextricably Christian, often could not appreciate the need to distinguish between secular and sacred justifications for the war.

It seems that as the war progressed, this usage of crusade too died down partly in response to the Nazi attempt to appropriate the idea of a Christian crusade against Russian communism. Even this, though, did not deter the king or General Eisenhower (who perhaps represented a distinct American rhetorical tradition) from characterising the Normandy Invasions as a ‘great crusade’. The MO report provides an excellent opportunity to glimpse other responses to crusading rhetoric. Though the report’s conclusion suggested that ‘crusade’ was a vague concept with, ‘slight impact value’, it included references to a morally righteous campaign as well as to Hitler. The fact that such a specific report was commissioned in conjunction with the use of crusading rhetoric in wartime propaganda revealed that there were, still, some in the Second World War who considered it might have some traction with the British public. As we have seen above, two posters, as well as the ‘Empire Crusade’ newspaper campaign, used crusading language and imagery.

While the First World War had seen the clergy enter enthusiastically (for the most part) into the ‘cultural mobilisation’ of Britain using crusading allusions to do so; 1939-45 saw a more cautious engagement. Crusading could still be enlisted by clergy as by politicians, but it seems that its impact was lessened by a more diffuse understanding of what a crusade was and the wider use of crusading as a metaphor. This is reflected in both the contradictory responses contained in the MO report and the lack of examples of deeper engagement with crusader medievalism. It

appears, therefore, that by the end of the Second World War crusader medievalism in Britain had receded into the cultural background. It was present in a diffuse manner and retained resonance for many senior figures, and some Christian communities, where it could still embody the potent combination of divinely approved warfare but it was perhaps superseded by the apocalyptic Churchillian rhetoric of right against wrong which could resonate more broadly.
CONCLUSIONS: RISE AND FALL

Victorian Crusader Medievalism

The exploration of memory and medievalism in the introduction to this study suggested that the memory of an event, or movement, in a particular society depended on its utility to members of that society. In the evaluation of nineteenth-century Britain in Chapter One we saw that strands of romantic medievalism – a backlash to the increasing awareness of the costs of industrialising the nation – and militant imperialism combined by the end of the century with a ‘muscular’ Christianity to promote a chivalric set of ideals. These were inseparable from contemporary understandings of Britishness, manliness and Christianity and were ‘remembered’ in prevalent perceptions of the past. They overlapped and interlocked, reinforcing one another and combining to produce the emphasis on chivalry as a code of conduct appropriate for an aspiring, imperial Briton.

Crusading and the crusades could embody any and all of these strands: the expeditions could be seen to have been a chivalric endeavour; part of an Anglo-British narrative of heroism; an expression of zealous Christian devotion; and quintessentially medieval. Crusader medievalism, therefore, enjoyed a symbiotic relationship with this late Victorian culture which imbued crusading with various meanings and spread images of the crusades and crusaders (especially King Richard the Lionheart) liberally. Following the chivalrous portrayal of crusading in the popular works of Scott, key author-educators included the crusades in their oeuvre: Yonge’s crusading hero was martyred in the line of duty for the national cause; Henty’s Cuthbert toured the Middle East before earning his place in an ordered British society – crusading was ‘nation-forming’ as well as ‘character-forming’; Newbolt’s line up of heroes created a chivalric continuum of national character to be emulated. Crusading proved useful to pre-1914 Britain, able to be used to tell

\[1\] Irwin, ‘Historical Novel’, p. 143.
stories which imparted and reinforced the values of that society. This, then, was the social value and cultural currency of crusading – its semiotic significance.

This research has demonstrated that the late Victorian cultural system fostered crusading rhetoric and imagery by providing a fertile field for its use; crusading could hold together each of the different cultural strands and signify both the whole and each of the parts, thereby reinforcing the cultural ideals by dint of its mutually constitutive relationship to this culture. With regard to Britain, this is part of the answer to the question posed by Knobler at the outset of this study, who asked ‘How and why did an 850-year-old series of conflicts become such an effective language in communicating ideas between classes and societies?’

Two caveats should be made here. Firstly, the chivalric perception of crusader medievalism never possessed a monopoly on the interpretation of the crusades. As the variety of examples quoted in Siberry’s *New Crusaders* and the study of British Christian missionary agencies above has illustrated, the crusading image could be interpreted differently. The latter’s use of continuity between the passion and zeal of the crusaders and missionaries, but consistent disavowal of violence, was a more critical engagement than the examples of Catholic mission agencies quoted. Once it achieved familiarity, crusader medievalism could be used to subvert and criticise a particular mentality or section of the populace. This extended the use of the image whilst broadening its utility. The second caveat is that taken quantitatively or qualitatively Victorian Britain considered Arthuriana more resonant than crusading. An in-depth comparison is beyond the scope of this study but in the same way that the knights of the crusades could embody chivalry and national continuity, Arthur’s Knights of the Round Table were more adequately equipped, and less encumbered with historical factuality, to do so. Tennyson’s wildly popular blank verse epic *Idylls of the King* encapsulated this Victorian appropriation of a medieval myth remade.

British memories of the crusades have to be seen in the context of a Western Europe which increasingly reimagined the crusading past; this interest was
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expressed both through academic attention and popular engagement. While again outside the scope of this study (but surveyed by Knobler and Tyerman), increased foreign attention to the crusades can be seen to have overlapped with British interests.³ France, Belgium, Russia and Spain, for example, all harked back to a crusading past with regard to nineteenth-century (if not earlier) nation-building; and, as the Crimean War demonstrated, all flexed ideological muscles in the context of imperial competition and vying for power.⁴ Britain’s expansion into the eastern Mediterranean, directly and indirectly, led to a greater fascination with the lands and history of the crusades and material involvement in the form of consular presence, interwar mandate, archaeology and heritage preservation.⁵ This came during the development and emergence of the distinct, professional disciplines of history and archaeology, which fed off and fuelled this increased contact. The crusades were part of a pan-European history which was often annexed for the needs of individual nations; in this the British were following the trend by celebrating a heroic, chivalrous Richard I with a statue iconically located outside the Houses of Parliament.

The First World War, The Death of Crusader Medievalism?

Posited as the great break between modernity and pre-modernity by critics such as Fussell and Hynes, did the prewar ‘traditional’ nineteenth-century culture break in the First World War or merely bend, as Richard’s sword did under German bombing in the Second World War?⁶ As the examples discussed in Chapters Four, Five and Six demonstrate, crusader medievalism could still be employed between 1914 and 1945 for a wide variety of purposes. Scholars had already pointed to the survival of crusading rhetoric and imagery throughout the war, especially in reference to the Gallipoli and Palestine campaigns, and its use in memorials of the war such as the one at Paisley.⁷ However, this has never before been integrated into broader

³ Ibid.; Tyerman, Debate.
⁵ Swenson, ‘Crusader Heritages’.
⁶ See Vincent Massey’s comments on the statue; ‘Canada’s Part in the War’, p. 2.
⁷ Siberry, New Crusaders, pp. 87–103.
discussions of the onset of modernity and understood in relation to the use of crusader medievalism in the late nineteenth century. Where Goebel’s comparative study on postwar memorialisation in Britain and Germany has suggested that ‘medievalism was transmuted into a discourse of mourning’ rather than the ‘discourse of identity’ it had been previously, I suggest that the example of the Most Noble Order of Crusaders and other uses of crusading rhetoric in the interwar years, demonstrate that crusader medievalism could still operate as a discourse of identity.\(^8\) This is the case even whilst Goebel’s evaluation of medievalism in memorials holds true: crusader medievalism could ennoble the sacrifices of the fallen and operate in those examples as a discourse of mourning without necessarily excluding other uses. Halbwachs’ thinking about memory suggested such splintering as he argued memories needed to be embodied in a community – by his logic there could be as many different memories of the past as there were communities.

But a significant finding of this research, enacted by the career of the Order and the MO report of 1940, was that crusader medievalism had lost traction and coherence by the time officials sought to enlist its aid in the Second World War. The Order’s 1921 foundation and social purpose situated it as being directly engaged with the troubles of the interwar years – its zenith, the service in Westminster Abbey in October 1923, suggested royal approval and national (if not international) appeal could follow. And this from an organisation explicitly revivalist in intention and based on a nineteenth-century perception of a crusading military order. The subsequent fading of the vitality of the Order in the late 1930s and 1940s support a narrative of cultural change that was less sharp and more fractured than Fussell allowed for. Where Gregory has identified this as being a disillusionment with the peace, Watson has pointed to a generational fracture which took time to emerge. Both of these suggestions fit the pattern of crusader medievalism’s fall better than seeing the First World War as creating an unbridgeable cultural chasm. As observed in Chapter Five, the interwar years saw the persistence of chivalric, ‘traditional’

ways of remembering the war and Britain’s role in it, adaptation of crusader rhetoric (particularly in the context of the British Mandate in Palestine), and new, fascist, uses. This diversity represents a more complex picture than simple before-after chronological binaries allow.

While the above research in Chapter Six has pointed to the continuing survival and diversity of crusader medievalism in the Second World War, the examples of deep engagement mentioned above suggest the lack of resonance of crusader medievalism amongst the wider public. Despite Alington’s appeal to the clergy to see the war as a crusade, and thus support it, his sales figures and the MO reports paint a picture of a rhetoric too confused and diffuse to be useful for official propaganda purposes; and potentially contaminated by the association with the Nazi Anti-Bolshevik crusade reported in the papers. This was notably in contrast to the prior war in which British propaganda, both official and cultural, made use of crusading despite fears of Muslim sensibilities.

What has stood in continuity has often been overlooked by a tight focus on one war or the other or the intervening years: many of the senior figures in British politics and public life between 1914 and 1945 were the same, and were educated in the late nineteenth century. Schooled in the currents of chivalry, imperialism and militant Christianity described above, men such as David Lloyd George, Arthur Winnington-Ingram, Lord Halifax, Neville Chamberlain, Winston Churchill, Clement Attlee, Harold Macmillan and Anthony Eden all drew on crusading rhetoric in the period to describe Britain’s wars, as did kings George V and George VI. Similarly, significant Anglophone figures such as Lord Beaverbrook, General Smuts, General Eisenhower and President Roosevelt prominently called the war a crusade, as did heads of the white dominions. Utterances of this kind can be found in national newspapers and the records of the Houses of Parliament and suggest that crusading rhetoric had an instinctive relevance, even where undeveloped, for a particular section of people.

The generation which grew up in the late nineteenth century, especially those who went through the public schools, were educated with the values and expectations of the Victorian cultural system explored above. A significant proportion of Britain’s
ruling elite through both wars and the years between was made up of men from this generation for whom crusader medievalism carried the associations of a pre-1914 culture. As Britain headed for an increasingly likely second global conflict at the end of the 1930s, the voices of disillusionment with the First World War were amplified and influenced both those who had lived through the war and those who lived in the shadow of its consequences. Increasingly they came to identify with the idea of rupture and cultural difference to the prewar values of their parents and grandparents – for them crusader medievalism seemed more appropriate to denote a bygone world.9

Just as there is scope for further work on the European nations’ use of crusader medievalism, an integration of these findings with both the European and wider Anglophone worlds is suggested by the hints of entanglement provided above. The work of Astrid Swenson on imperial heritage and preservation and the work of Goebel on the memorialisation of the First World War in Britain and Germany present models for ways in which different contemporary uses of crusader medievalism were employed and in dialogue across national borders. For example, Scott’s works were widely distributed, translated and copied throughout the nineteenth century and carried his medievalism beyond the British Isles.10 We have seen glimpses of how the statue of Richard created by royal commission for the Great Exhibition of 1851 and eventually placed outside the seat of British Government might have been involved in imperial competition and a discourse of national rivalry. Similarly, the use of crusading rhetoric by prominent figures in the white dominions in the wars and the continuing significance of the Gallipoli campaign for the national identities of Australia and New Zealand suggest that crusader medievalism may have echoed differently in other parts of the British Empire and subsequent Commonwealth.11

9 For the generational break in practice and theory, see Watson, Fighting Different Wars, pp. 307–8; Connerton, How Societies Remember, p. 3.
10 See Manning, ‘Walter Scott’.
What is illuminated by the plethora of new examples of crusader medievalism which this study has added to Siberry’s research and brought together from other existing work, is both the breadth and variety of use of crusading rhetoric and imagery. The shallow use as a metaphor for a morally virtuous campaign was ever-present and persisted although, as stated at the outset, this has not permitted further evaluation due to the generally limited nature of the engagement with crusading in these examples. Deeper engagements of varying nature have been found throughout and have sustained the analysis above, namely that crusader medievalism survived both the Great War and the disillusionment with the peace of the interwar years. While the assumption of its utility on a national level persisted until well after the start of the 1939-45 war, it appears that the cultural changes and social upheaval of 1914-45 did lead to the transformation of crusader medievalism such that it lacked coherence and resonance for official British propaganda purposes by 1940. But, just as its flexibility assisted its wide use for a variety of contemporary messages before the wars, it continued to operate in some contexts – usually in diffuse, metaphorical, or shallow ways rather than in expressions of deep engagement with crusading. Where the devaluation of the ‘traditional’ strands of pre-1914 culture freed crusader medievalism from the chivalric interpretation it also deflated its cultural currency.

**Crusader Medievalism into the Twenty-First Century**

It may be argued with some accuracy that in choosing 1945 as a terminus for this study I am also overwriting the ongoing nature of crusader medievalism by assigning an arbitrary endpoint. However, I do not claim 1945 to be the end of crusader medievalism, just of this study. Further work on crusader medievalism in the Cold War is needed, whilst crusader medievalism in the twenty-first century in general, and in the context of the war on terror and ‘clash of civilizations’ in particular, is already attracting significant attention.\(^\text{12}\) As the opening references in

the introduction indicate, the crusades still resonate today, whether in the rhetoric of Islamic terrorists or Christian reconciliation walkers.\(^\text{13}\) They exercise an iconic significance sufficiently flexible to draw references from Presidents and global terrorists seeking to describe, explain and interpret the relationship between the present and the past, current geopolitical entities and world religions.\(^\text{14}\) Their relevance to the pragmatics of geopolitics is in part due to their utility: they can be employed to signify religiously sanctified violence; to create or sustain monolithic religious or cultural (and therefore pan-ethnic and international) identities; to construct temporal fractures, as in ‘medieval brutality’ or ‘backwardness’; and to frame a historical parallelism that purports to explain or predict present conflicts. As Tyerman has summarised: ‘It is clear that the crusades, or, to be precise, perceptions of the crusades, now matter beyond the shades of academe.’\(^\text{15}\)

The modern era keeps returning to the crusades; they continue to fascinate. Out of the vast swathe of medieval (and indeed all other) history, this study has shown that the crusades have endured as a repository of resources useful to British people between 1825 and 1945. There is some truth in Haydock’s suggestion of ‘an enduring and widespread imaginative investment by the West in this imperial, quasi-religious form of medievalism.’\(^\text{16}\) The crusades have been remembered for their (supposedly) chivalric nature, as a model of devotion and as the cradle for both the national identity of several western European nation states and as a key episode (or episodes) in an intractable enmity between the ‘Judeo-Christian’ west


\(^{14}\) For example, see comments by President Obama, Daesh/ISIS, and Andreas Breivik; Office of the Press Secretary, ‘Remarks by the President’; Official Spokesman for Islamic State, ‘Indeed Your Lord Is Ever Watchful’; Mattias Gardell, ‘Crusader Dreams: Oslo 22/7, Islamophobia, and the Quest for a Monocultural Europe’, Terrorism and Political Violence 26 (2014), pp. 129–55.

\(^{15}\) Tyerman, Debate, p. 247.

and ‘Islamic East’. This continuing resonance has been due to aspects of their dual function as a history to be (re)constructed for its own sake and as *figurae*. This second feature of elements of the past enables history to be read in a symbolic sense. Questions of ‘what does this mean?’ and ‘what is the significance?’ presume the function of history as a series of signs pointing somewhere; it is this second function that this study has addressed. We have seen that crusades-as-*figurae* are presentist, can emphasise, create or hide both continuities and discontinuities with the past, and can encompass spheres often held apart (such as academic crusade historiography and popular perceptions of the crusades; official presentations of crusading and personal or private networks of meaning). Recognising that the memory of the crusades contains both aspects – material-factual traces and memories with semiotic significance – has opened up the field of crusader medievalism, the modern memory of the crusades, for exploration.

This study has demonstrated the need for careful and nuanced examination of the way in which crusader medievalism is used in any given context. The slippage between metaphorical and historical use is easy but, as for then US President George W. Bush in September 2001, can cause major trouble if confused.\textsuperscript{17} Gary Dickson’s phrase ‘mythistory’, used of the accretions of legend of the 1212 Children’s Crusade, reminds us of the bleed between fact and fiction.\textsuperscript{18} His coda to the 2015 article on the crusades in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* highlighting ‘Crusade as Metaphor’ argued that both aspects are powerful:

> Metaphors empower language and thought; they also risk oversimplifying and distorting historical truth and trivializing their subject through repetition. Moreover, metaphors are culturally specific and often convey value judgments. While modern historians attempt to understand the Crusades by placing them in the context of medieval religion, culture, and society, popular metaphoric usage dehistoricizes


\textsuperscript{18} Dickson, *Children’s Crusade*, p. xiii.
the Crusades into ongoing, eternal, yet contemporary conflicts of good versus evil—against AIDS, drugs, poverty, terrorism, and so on. [...] In other words, the ultimate power, significance, and meaning of Crusade and its usefulness as a metaphor depend, in the end, on one’s cultural heritage and point of view.\textsuperscript{19}

Many of the works referenced in this study reflect the definitional arguments of crusade historians by loosely and inconsistently referring to crusading – sometimes meaning the historical expeditions, sometimes ecclesiastically endorsed violence and at other times generically and vaguely referring to holy war. This study has shown that by interrogating what is meant by crusading in any given deployment insight can be gained into the memory and perceptions of the crusades and crusading as well as that particular context.

This investigation into British crusader medievalism suggests that ‘rise and fall’ is an accurate description of its use and popularity in Britain between 1825 and 1945, though this study has also demonstrated the variety and diffusion of the phenomena. As the changes wrought to Britain by the experience of two world wars were felt, understanding the wars as glorious, chivalric enterprises seemed to express inadequately both their scale and ferocity. Nineteenth-century cultural strands came apart and no longer provided a fertile field for crusading rhetoric and imagery as they had; crusading became more available and able to be more flexibly interpreted once divorced from this context, but less resonant and less coherently chivalric. It was with the rise of Arab nationalism, Islamic terrorism and the ‘war on terror’ in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries that crusader medievalism once again became widely culturally potent.
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