IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 10, Issue 3 (Mar. - Apr. 2013), PP 14-19
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.Iosrjournals.Org

A Pacifist's Allegory: Margaret McNamara's *In Safety (1923)*

Dr. Saed Jamil Shahwan
Hail University KSA

Abstract: *McNamara, like many pacifist writers, believed that a peaceful world could only be realized by exposing the underlying social causes of violence and conflict. In her plays in general, she does not only demonstrate the methods by which tension can be alleviated but also shows the actions leading to escalating conflicts. Thus, her plays provide conceptual representations of her ideology and thereby open the pathway for the message to apply to the varied experiences of her audience. She aspires to show that her characters' ability to triumph over seemingly irreconcilable differences could serve as an indicator that the same good results could be achieved in larger scale of political conflicts if they were handled in a similar fashion. Tracing the historical thread of pacifist ideology will assist in illuminating McNamara's avowed design. The paper intends to do so through the analysis of In Safety (1923) which is set in colonial America and addresses pacifist issues very directly. In this play, the Quakers' peace-loving manner of responding to an aggressor's siege in the New World is contrasted with the defensive posture that another group of colonists takes toward the Native American population.*

Keywords*: pacifist, conflict, Irreconcilable differences, Quaker, defensive posture.*

Pacifism has an eclectic history (Chatfield, 1971) since its principles are rooted in both Eastern and Western thought. From their inception, such eastern religions as Taoism, Hinduism, and Buddhism have urged followers to strive for detachment from the kinds of passionate desires that lead to aggression. During the Warring States period of Chinese history (475-221 B.C.), Confucius observed pervasive conflict and, therefore, resolved to find a way in which people could coexist more amicably. After many years of careful reflection, he concluded that the establishment of peaceful civilization only becomes tenable as citizens develop the capacity to maintain sound interpersonal relationships in the family and community. Along the same lines, McNamara bases her play upon the premise that an observation and analysis of interpersonal relationships serve as the beginning of a more productive society.

Greek Stoicism also illuminates traditions of pacifism with its manner of advocating the cultivation of individual virtue in order that one may best meet an obligation to society. Furthermore, Stoics believed that the soul exercised control over a person's being in direct correspondence to the way that *Logos* (Word, God) exerted mastery over the universe. In this cosmology, the human soul was thought to be a fragmented aspect of the Divine Being. In order to create the best self, Stoics asserted that human beings should allow their soul, or conscience, to govern their actions.

Thus, they were encouraged to privilege the use of reason over desire or emotion. Extending their ethical sensibility to a view of the *polis* as a representation of the divine order, Greek and Roman Stoics believed that it was the responsibility of each citizen to place the good of the community above the gratification of the self. Participation in friendship, family life, and civic activities came to be regarded as a vital means for each citizen to strengthen the development of personal virtue.

The Christian Gospels, of course, advocate a non-retaliatory stance toward aggression. The message of the *Beatitudes* upholds harmonious relationships as a means of evidencing a relationship with the Divine in the same manner that Christ exhorted his followers to adopt a spirit of meekness and humility in dealings with others. Likewise, the *Hebrew Essences* placed prominence upon the cultivation of integrity and delay of self-gratification and, therefore, showed many commonalities with other philosophical doctrines with regard to relationships among fellow human beings. All of these principles emphasize the importance of assimilating spiritual or moral principles into daily interactions with others. Scholars (Aston 2000) of succeeding generations have shown the tendency to revise or expand upon ancient philosophies and world religions in order to enhance their applicability to contemporary problems and, thus, pacifist ideology has been adapted to many different referential frameworks throughout the centuries.

During the nineteenth century, Pacifism became more formally adjoined to the political sphere as it moved away from its exclusivity of association with religion or philosophy. Newly formed pacifist organizations in Europe and America made their presence known in civic and social arenas. In 1815, the Society for the Promotion of Permanent and Universal Peace was established in London. By 1843, pacifist societies began organizing a series of international conventions to facilitate the practice of peaceful arbitration as viable means of avoiding conflict. As part of their basic precepts, most prominent pacifist organizations in Europe

formally declared their intention to counteract the nationalism that had been stirred by sensationalist propaganda. They also spoke out against overly romanticizing acts of heroism instead of conveying the harsh realities of the battlefield (Colloms, 1982).

To be a pacifist during an era of the two World Wars often required supporters of the cause to take an unpopular stand at a time when the majority of people believed that a show of force was the only means of resolving the ever-expanding conflict in Europe. Correspondingly, most British people voiced an ardent resolve to subdue German aggression, and patriotic sentiment surged as a spirit of nationalism spread rapidly through England just prior to its entry into the First World War. In this milieu, pacifists maintained a low profile since they risked becoming either a target of ridicule or being regarded as treasonous. During such emotionally charged intervals, outspoken critics (Jo Vellucolt 1981,41) of the pacifists referred to them as the "dead weight" of society- as those who benefited from political freedom yet, remained unwilling to defend it.

The conscientious objectors in England were often reviled and punished for refusing conscription to military service in part because so many people had loved ones risking their lives on the battlefield. England's entry into the expanding conflict had been promoted to the public idealistically as "the war to end all wars."(Aston 1995,42) Ironically, pacifist ideology had been incorporated into the war slogan. Since the slogan corresponded well with the liberal sensibility of many British people, the nation virtually united under the commitment to offer assistance to the Allied forces of Europe and the atmosphere was charged with emotion.

A few selected groups and individuals withheld their sanction of war in Britain. They refused to believe that warfare was the only possible means of resolving the conflict on the continent." "In Safety", some select members of the Fabian Society, and a few courageous individuals were among those that took a noteworthy stand for pacifism in the midst of the battle cry"(Bacon 1986). Towards the end of World War I, as sentimentalism died and the atrocities of war were brought to public awareness, a group of women met to advance the hopes of peace in a world ravaged by conflict. Since the tenets of Socialism had been based upon their philosophies of social justice and community life, socialists saw pacifist principles as an inherent aspect of their cause. Correspondingly, members of the International Socialists' League had pledged to lead civil strikes in their respective countries if rumors of war were to surface. However, more powerful loyalties surfaced when the conflicts between north-eastern European countries erupted into battle. At this point, the international coalitions disbanded as their leaders rallied to the support of their own countries, betraying their commitment to pacifist ideals when their own countries were threatened.

Controversy developed in feminist groups of the time period regarding the association between pacifism and women's issues. In the gathering of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS), women debated the necessity of England's involvement in the war. A conflict in the group over the war eventually erupted into a decisive split among the leaders of the organization (Vellacott 1981, 121) (Ibid). Yet, Millicent Garrett Fawcett, the group's leader, reluctantly agreed to sponsor a meeting that promoted the conservation of peace just as was had been declared in 1914. Several of the women's labour organizations such as the Women's Cooperative Guild sent large numbers of representatives to the meeting (Vellacott 1981, 121). The news of the Parliament's decision to enter the war earlier that day had not yet reached the women as they proceeded with their agenda, and many of these women expressed hopes that the country might retain its status of neutrality. Yet, most of the women realized that Britain's entry into the war was inevitable. Therefore, a large part of the discussion consisted of speculation about the impact that the war might have upon their lives. If nothing else, the meeting allowed the women to come together to share their anxieties regarding the mounting crisis (Vellacott 1981, 121).

Margaret McNamara's play *In Safety* (1923) establishes authorial faith in the possibility of fostering amicable relations between disparate cultures by indicating how peaceable associations may be created and sustained. Set in colonial America, the play contrasts the reactions of two groups of European colonists to the rumoured attacks by a Native American tribe of Algonquin Indians. As the play opens, a small group of colonists hasten towards an armed fortress anticipating and Indian attack. Moving rapidly across the terrain as they discuss the situation earnestly, the colonists pause at a Quaker meetinghouse to ascertain if the inhabitants have been justly warned of the imminent danger. With the fearful posture of the first set of colonists newly established, McNamara shifts our focus to a small congregation colonial Quakers. Just informed of prospective danger, the Quakers engage in solemn deliberation amongst themselves concerning the crisis. As a gesture of peace, the Elders announce that their congregation plans to reconvene in the clearing outside of the meetinghouse to await the Indians' approach. The first colonists are astounded and dismayed by the Quakers' ideas and beg to reconsider the plans. Hoping to divert them from a seemingly fatal course of action, one of the colonists conveys graphic details about the Indians' reputed acts of savagery. Despite various protests, the Quakers remain resolved to continue with their plans. Although objections have been raised about the inclusion of children in this dangerous mission, The Quakers inevitably concur and remain as one coalition. Hence, the children are required to face possible acts of brutality in the same manner as the adults.

Each character's group affiliation becomes an integral part of their identity. Therefore, the manner in which the playwright develops the distinctiveness of each community holds a strong bearing upon the play's overall impact. Although the nobility of the Quaker proceedings was likely to command the audience's highest regard, the fearful deportment of the first set of colonists could hardly warrant full condemnation under such threatening circumstances. McNamara depicts the Quakers' commitment toward their spiritual ideals as an exceptional act of gallantry, she requests the readers to have compassion for those that remain consumed by fear or intolerance. McNamara shows how misapprehension and distancing furthers discord. The Quakers attain a favourable outcome in their entreaty for peace as they extend empathy and inclusion to others. In contrast, the haughty and exclusionary deportment of the first set of colonists meets with the Indians' wrath. Rather than glorifying or vilifying either enclave, Macnamara demonstrates the correlation between actions/attitudes and reactions/strife. She underscores the strife created by contention and violence without denouncing any of the three coalitions represented.

McNamara utilizes ritual to heighten the encounter of three disparate entities. In the play *In Safety*, rituals inhabit the space and time of the play's previous action become part of the contemporaneous action. The performative gestures of each faction indicate their distinctiveness as well as association with the social and semiotic matrix of colonial America. For example, the established prayer meetings of the Quakers exemplify their adherence to the group facilitation of prayer and worship as an integral part of their daily lives. The Quakers acquire collective strength through spiritual devotion as they contend together amidst the rugged wilderness of the terrain. Their regular worship services serve to enhance their sense of mutual responsibility and, thus, establish a greater likelihood for survival in such strenuous circumstances.

With allusions to popular conceptions, the playwright incorporates such prototypical motifs as the Quakers' convocation of meetings, the White colonists' tendencies toward reclusion, and the Native Americans' desperate strikes against ever encroaching intruders upon their land. Ritualized orders had established the basis for each community's self-identification in foreign surroundings that sustained the groups' unity and sense of relatedness to each other. The spiritual integrity of the characters becomes manifested through their participation in such ritual practices. While the two groups come to an understanding, expected rivals explore new realms of possibilities , they get to know each others' rituals, customs, and beliefs.

In her play *In Safety*, McNamara focuses on the Quakers struggling with the brutality of the wilderness in colonial America. Removed in place and time from the aftermath of World War I, the play allows the audience to have a greater objectivity of response. McNamara effectively contrasts the Quakers' inclusive and compassionate approach to conflict with the Settlers' manner of creating distance or furthering hostility among opposing forces. McNamara draws a distinction between the stereotypical gender roles exhibited by the Settlers with the more flexible functions of the men and women of the Quaker community. Even more profoundly, McNamara correlates gender roles among the Quakers to their extension of greater tolerance and appreciation of all human beings.

The play opens with an American army officer named General Stapley hurriedly accompanies young James Weir and his wife through the wilderness to an armed fortress as they anticipate an Indian attack. The varied responses to aggression begin to surface while the White settlers stop to take respite from their travels at a Quaker meetinghouse. Instead of making efforts to move to the fortification, Stapley observes that the Quakers are continuing with their meeting to the impending danger. Presuming that the Quakers must not be aware of the circumstances, Stapley consults with his friends to discuss the best way to break the news to the Quakers without causing mass hysteria. Although Stapley's character is complex, he represents the patriarchal status of the conventional male that the playwright describes him a "stalwart colonial in the prime of life" (10).

Since Stapley presumes his judgment and way of life to be superior, he is condescending to whoever represents differences. His reference to the Quakers ridicules their alleged cowardliness. Mrs. Weir urges the general to warn the Quakers without delay, he responds, "Softly dear lady! You forget. There is no immediate danger from the Indians. And these Quakers are timid folk. With their men kind professed cowards, the women are likely to be in a pretty panic" (11). Not only does Stapley show condescension to the Quakers for their commitment to non aggression, but also reveals his views on women in general with his prediction that the Quaker women will panic.

It is soon ascertained that Stapley is in control of the small threesome of travelers . He downplays input from others, especially Mrs. Weir, since she is a woman. In accordance with his character, he prides himself for his great wisdom and integrity as he requests two elder Quakers to step outside of the meetinghouse in order that they might speak with him. Not only does he speak reproachfully to them for their apparent lack of awareness of the extenuating circumstances, he also refers to the other Quakers "your people" (11) and thus shows his tendency to designate their "otherness" (10). He orders the young Quaker who greets him to, "Stay! Bring a second elder. Just as well for your people to get an inkling of the gravity of the matter" (12), Stapley characteristically supposes that his way is the "right" way (22), and he must therefore correct the course of those in error. His egotism and sense of superiority comes through in his every word and action are revealed.

The patriarchal dynamics of the small group is confirmed by young James Weir's apparent desire to acquire the same kind of authoritarian male identity like the General. Though he submits to his forceful leadership, Weir emulates the older man when he ridicules the Quakers, "A pair of fine broad shoulders and a chicken heart! The sight of such a fellow makes me sick!" (12). The young James Weir has evidently begun to acquire the same inclination for position of superiority like the General. When the officer is confronted by the realization that one of the Quaker elders is a woman, he demonstrates his utter contempt the way the young Weir reiterates, "What's this…a woman?" (12) and Stapley replies condescendingly, "Don't laugh, I beg" (12). Perhaps realizing that he could easily become the next object of ridicule, Weir hastens to participate in Stapley's patronizing appraisal of the Quakers and their practices.

As Stapley becomes fully aware of the fact that he is talking with a woman in a position of authority, he assumes a patronizing tone revealing his preconception. He states to her, "Your servant, Madam! I expected two men elders – I can but entreat you to be calm" (12). Though Mrs. Copeland displays no effort to retain composure, the Settlers reveal a hidden state of fear after Zebulon Hoxie communicates the news that the raid may come sooner than originally expected. The time that young James Weir unwittingly displays a dread of the attack by slightly quivering, Mrs. Copeland offers him some water to calm the tremors. Defensively, his wife rushes to assert that her husband is "as brave as a lion" (15). The General also hastens to compensate for him by adding, "Braver, Mrs. Weir! But even lions may be thirsty. I am, I confess" (15). Though fleeting, James Weir's disclosure of fear was inconsistent with patriarchal notions of ideal manhood and ,therefore, was immediately obscured by both his wife and older colleague. Rather than accepting fear as a normal response to such a threat, it becomes subverted and disgraceful. The patriarchal structure that the settlers represent within their relationships to each other is shown as harsh and unyielding prohibited and of their growth as individuals.

McNamara illustrates the difficulties that characters, as representatives of human beings, find themselves in a strive to fit into preordained roles. Her representation of women within a patriarchal structure demonstrates her perception of a world of confining roles. McNamara dresses Gertrude Weir as someone who has defined herself fully within a traditional configuration : *"Mrs. Weir wears a large shawl of bright green sild and a "gipsy" hat with green ribbons*" (10). Gertrude seems to accept her world unquestioningly, and even joins in the male's conviction that traditional modes remain superlative to the manners and means of the Quaker or Indians. It is obvious that Mrs. Weir considers these worlds to be inferior to the one she is accustomed to.

Her mode of interaction with the other characters causes us to question the satisfaction of her existence. In accordance with this argument, the question of expression versus repression arises within an analysis of Mrs. Weir's character. Mrs. Copeland's apparent ease in the articulation of thoughts and feelings could be compared with the communication skills of Mrs. Weir who shows evidence of being overly censured in patterns of communication. Mrs. Copeland seems more at ease with efforts to express herself , since she has long enjoyed the freedom to do so within the Quaker community. In contrast, Mrs. Weir's tendency to have periodic outbursts perhaps stems from the customary repression of personal expression. Conceivably, Mrs. Weir dreads being disregarded so much that she experiences surges of anxiety in her attempts at self-expression. Consequently, she seems to have unconsciously developed a habit of frequently or expressing minor dissatisfactions to the men in her life as a means of retaliation for their suppression of her thoughts and feelings. Besides continual complaints, her other means of expression is to have a sudden outburst. Her penchant for overreaction and hysteria soon becomes evident as she realizes the danger that the Quakers are in: "Oh! God knows! Warn them now quick!" (11). Both men respond by attempting to soothe her. Mrs. Weir does not only deem herself a secondary personage in the company of her husband and his male friend, but also conducts herself rather like a child in the company of adults.

McNamara juxtaposes Mrs. Weir's portrayal of lady's role by Mrs. Copeland's embodiment of womanhood, their contrasting functions proffering distinctive prototypes for audience members. The following conduct between Mrs. Copeland and Mrs. Weir places them in bold relief, "We Quaking women as ye call us – we walk by our own inward light and stay our courage upon God alone" (17). Just as Gertrude Weir continually demonstrates her weakness and dependence upon men, Mrs. Copeland displays a proportionate amount of autonomy and self-possession. As characters upon the stage, we can imagine Mrs. Weir's shallow and anxious breathing as well as her sporadic displays of emotion while Mrs. Copeland presents herself in a more moderate and dignified manner. To further delineate the contrast between Mrs. Copeland and Mrs. Weir, McNamara writes: "The stiff straight lines of her Muslim wrist bands, large collar and close cap are in marked contrast to Mrs. Weir's graceful frills and fichu" (12).

Mrs. Copeland and Mrs. Weir's differences do not end with physical representation upon the stage but also become even more pronounced as their inner conflicts emerge. While Mrs. Weir sometimes realizes the ineffectual nature of her role, Mrs. Copeland often struggles with the burden of responsibility to the community. While Mrs. Weir operates in a survival mode, Mrs. Copeland copes with the various intellectual and spiritual concerns of the people of her community. Both characters deem themselves ideologically cantered, Mrs. Weir's acceptance of her world has fostered such long-term habits of self-repression that her essential nature has

perhaps been removed from her awareness. Mrs. Copeland struggles with self-doubt and experiences inner conflict, she has generally obtained a sense of self-actualization and inner strength that has evaded the young Mrs. Weir.

Loveday Smith also represents the role of women in McNamara's play. Described by the playwright as youthful and pretty, her character is marked by the willingness to persevere in the face of fear. Just like how young James Weir paralleled the elder Stapley, Loveday presents us with a younger version of Mrs. Copeland. In many ways, she emulates the characteristics of the older woman by demonstrating a capacity for self-direction and reliance upon inner guidance to make decisions. Through past struggles with making difficult decisions and taking responsibility for outcomes, she shows a capacity for independence and maturity despite her youth. After the Quaker community has been reminded of the pending danger of attack, Loveday remains resolved to abide by the collective decision of her congregation to be inclusive towards the Indians. Though Loveday stands by the side of her husband during the intensive moments before the Indian's arrival, she shows an independence of spirit and maintains her courage to face the outcome of the group's commitment to their gesture of peace.

The characteristics of Zebulon Hoxie, the Quaker elder, are contrasted with the aforementioned demeanour of General Stapley. Hoxie calls upon his associates to apply reasoning to the situation at hand. He cites historical evidence against utilizing force to resolve conflict, he appeals to their intellect and sense of ideals. Thus, Hoxie explains the Quaker's rationale for pacifism in the following address to his people as he exclaims:

Hark thee friends! When we withdrew into this wilderness, our purpose, as we did openly declare, was to rid ourselves of military protection no less than of persecution. In the old country we were protected willy-nilly, now by the Parliament against Charles Stuart the younger against the Dutch, then by Dutch William against the French, and so on for another half-century. We were forcibly encaged by protection, and heartily spat upon and beaten for ingratitude to our gallant defenders. Repeat to the governor our former answer, he is clear of us in that he hath warned us (17).

Since the defeated in a war are dishonored, he remarks that a display of aggression usually creates a spirit of retaliation rather than resolution. Hoxie also conveys the Quaker's belief in the equality of all people as he indicates by his actions that such "others" as "women" and "Indians"(10) are regarded as valuable and self-governing. Giving further evidence of the women's autonomy and equality of stance within the group, the elder Quaker responds to the query of James Weir about subjecting the women to the Indians' horrific scalping methods. Hoxie replies that the women do not 'stand at their [the men's] bestowal" (17). Hoxie reiterates that the Quaker women remain free to follow their own consciences just as the Quaker men do.

Following another period of intense silence, Zebulon Hoxie responds after careful thought that fellow Quakers should keep the quest for the spiritual realm above the vain fulfillment that can be found in this world. Though the audience members may remain decidedly unconvinced of the Quakers' course of action regarding their decision to risk such danger, the resolution of the community seems to be strengthened by Hoxie's reminder of their pre-eminent purpose. After he quotes the Scriptural warning about placing their faith in God above all other things, the group makes a collective decision to place their selves in the spiritual realm as a means of transcendence over the worldly domain.

Many might believe that the Quakers' course of action is extremist in placing innocent children under such risk. McNamara succeeds in building the tension further as young innocents are placed as potential victims of violence. In this manner, the playwright creates heightened concern and sympathy the way how audience members recalling Gertrude Weir's agonized words of warning to the Quakers, "But the children! The children! Tomahawked before your eyes! The poor pretty curls" (18). Though the Quakers remain resolved, the tension in the play escalates as they also express their fears and doubts. Even the elder Hoxie divulges a susceptibility to fear as he exasperatedly proclaims, "Anguish for the women and children was ever the test of our faith" (18). Although the Quakers express acute concern for the little ones, their decision to remain on course indicates a higher placement of their spirituality over the will or intellect.

The plays tension rises once again as five Indians move silently towards the vulnerable group of Quakers from behind. The friends' quiet meditation is interrupted "only as one of the women calmly indicates" interrupted by one of the women who calmly her awareness of this threatening presence of their enemy: "Wait on the Lord: be of good courage and he shall strengthen thine heart" (21). As Zebulon Hoxie rises to face them, he conveys a gentle receptiveness to them. The Indians gaze at the Quakers with suspicion and bewilderment. After several friendly gestures, the Quaker Elder motions to one of the children to bring some water to the Indians.

After several more communicative gestures between them, the Indians eventually relinquish their hostility as they place a hatchet above the door of the Quaker meetinghouse to indicate their intention to protect their new friends in the future. Yet, the Quaker Elder pushes it further as he still feels moved to convey his beliefs against violence to the Indians. After Hoxie gives him a pipe as a token of peace, he also removes their

hatchet from its place above the meetinghouse door. After reverently removing the Mohawk emblem from the hatchet, he places the seal in his breast pocket over his heart as a sign of their new friendship. When he proceeds to breaks up the hatchet however, the Mohawk leader becomes angered until he begins to realize that the Elder Hoxie's action symbolizes his nonviolent approach.

The time when another Indian suddenly enters the clearing after his return from battle, he heightens the drama's tension once again when he approaches his chief wearing Mrs. Weir's bright green shawl and carrying several rifles. When he lays the rifles at the chief's feet, the innocent voice of a Quaker child is heard to inquire about what the Indian holds under his cloak. In response to young Nathaniel's question, the Quakers can only attempt to catch their breath as they consider what is hidden under the cloak. The child's curiosity compels him to move closer to the Indians as he presumes the Indian warrior to be as amiable as the ones that the chief has just dismissed from their midst. As the Quakers hold their breath once again, the Chief harshly warns the Indian not to harm the child. As the Indian reveals evidence of his recent accomplishments in battle, little Nathaniel's cry of anguish represents the emotional anguish of the entire Quaker clan. The little boy runs to his grandfather's arms for protection, after seeing a set of bloodied scalps.

Besides creating a drama of crisis in which the tension progressively builds, McNamara demonstrates her skill as a playwright and theatre practitioner by providing remarkable details of character and setting that contribute to the play's authenticity. The playwright incorporates Indian dialect for her Native American characters while she also includes descriptions and illustrations of tribal clothing. For the colonial Quakers, McNamara apparently studied their lifestyle and prevalent mode of interaction with other colonists and Native American tribes. As for the three colonists, her subtle depictions of the traditional male and female roles are bitingly satirical.

Though she creates characters of great dimensionality, her play is essentially an allegory for pacifist tenets as exemplified by her reification of the Quaker's ideology of social justice and equality for all people. As Mrs. Copeland's reminds fellow Quakers that a glimmer of light can be found in all human beings, she refers to the foundation of their beliefs in equality for all people. The playwright asserts the crux of her blended ideologies in the following speech by Mrs. Copeland to fellow friends:

"Our seeking hath not followed safety, but peace-which is a shining thing, of delectable beauty. And peace hath been given us, not as the world giveth and snatcheth away in the hurly-burly of war, but by continuous gift from the Prince of Peace…daily renewed unto life Everlasting" (22).

Though McNamara places pacifist ideals within a particular religious setting, her play honours the creation of peace for all people as she honours higher ideals of social equality and justice. Contemporary perspectives and historicized theories have been juxtaposed to form the dialectics in McNamara's plays and she conveys the possibility of allowing disparate influences to co-exist. In this paradigm, characters are shown as capable of modifying their initial stance as they consider broader ramifications and find ways to manifest peace. Demonstrating the means of reaching a compromise that satisfies all, the character's actions exemplify how the pacifist hermeneutic can serve mankind.

References

[1]. Aston, Elain. *An Introduction to Feminism and Theatre*. London:Routledge.1995.
[2]. --------, and Janelle Reinelt. Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Modern British Women Playwrights*. Campridge: Cambridge University Press. 2000.
[3]. Bacon, Margaret Hope: *The Story of Quaker Women in America*. San Francisco: Harper and Row. 1986
[4]. Chatfield, Charles. *For Peace and Justice: Pacifism in America, 1914-1941*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1971.
[5]. Colloms, Brenda. *Victorian Visionaries*. London: Constable, 1982
[6]. McNamara. Margaret. In Safety . Joseph William Ltd. 1923
[7]. Raven, Charles E. *Is War Obsolete? A Study of the Conflicting Claims of Religion and Citizenship*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1935
[8]. Vellacott, Jo, *Bertrand Russell and the Pacifists in the First World War*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981
[9]. -----. "Feminist Consciousness and the First World War" *Women and Peace: Theoretical, Historical, and Critical Perspectives*. London: Croon Helm, 1987