'I still remain one of the old Settlement boys': Cross-class Friendship in the First World War Letters of Cardiff University Settlement Lads’ Club

‘I still remain one of the old Settlement boys’ was how Guardsman Dai Luker chose to sign off one of his first letters home after enlisting for active war service in 1915. Written to husband and wife Edward and Amy Lewis, organizers of the Cardiff University Settlement Lads’ Club, the letter is among a number sent between working-class former settlement attendees and the Lewises, middle-class settlement workers, during the war. Letters have long been important sources for historians of the First World War, offering first-hand accounts of military experience. But war letters are also cultural products that enable us to analyse emotion, gender and selfhood.¹ This article explores one as yet under-researched element of First World War letters: the way in which cross-class friendships formed in philanthropic organizations before the war were sustained after 1914. Letters sent by former members of Cardiff University Settlement Lads’ Club, I will argue, not only offer a glimpse of how one group of soldiers experienced the Great War, but also allow invaluable insight into the nature of the relationships formed in organizations such as university settlements. The article shows how letters written by former members of the Lads’ Club incorporated Cardiff University Settlement into their imagination of home and community.

The university settlement movement, so-called because it involved university graduates settling in poor urban areas for the purposes of social work, was established in 1883. Settlement houses acted as centres of cultural, social and economic philanthropy for the local area. The first to be established were Toynbee Hall and Oxford House in East London. The movement spread to Glasgow (1889), Manchester (1895), Cardiff (1901), Edinburgh (1905), Liverpool (1907), and Bristol (1911), where universities and university colleges sought to address the social and economic needs of their own cities.² The histories of London settlements in general and of Toynbee Hall in particular have dominated much of the historiography on the university settlement movement.³ This article expands the scholarly terrain by focusing on the lesser-known case of Cardiff University Settlement. Plans for a Welsh university settlement were first discussed in 1899. Initially, Thomas Ellis, the Liberal MP for Merioneth, proposed that Old Aberystwythians based in London should open a settlement house in East London for the Welsh poor residing there. Ellis died in 1899, prompting others to take up his project, but instead of London, they decided to
open a university settlement in Cardiff. This reflected the growing recognition at this time that the social problems of poverty, class separation and class antagonism were not exclusively tied to London. The 1898 coal strike in South Wales was perhaps the key catalyst in convincing Ellis’s followers to open a settlement in Cardiff rather than London. They argued that the University of Wales had a social and civic duty toward the industrial working class of Wales, even if ‘there was not the submerged tenth of slums in Wales’ as there were in London. Within eighteen months of Ellis’s death, Cardiff graduates and academics, led by Reginald Burrows, Professor of Greek at the University College in Cardiff, had established University House in Splott. In 1908 the settlement moved to a purpose built building on University Place called Settlement House where the settlers continued to run social and educational clubs for the people of East Moors. During the First World War the settlement was commandeered as a military hospital. It closed altogether in 1922.

This article moves beyond the usual chronology of settlement historiography. Most histories of the movement do not consider the First World War period, since the war caused a significant contraction and reorientation of settlement activity. However, letters written from the trenches demonstrate that in order to fully understand the university settlement movement’s ideology of cross-class friendship, it is necessary to look beyond the Victorian period, and indeed beyond the institutional life of the settlement house. This article also extends the usual source base of settlement historiography. Almost all of the surviving source material relating to university settlements was produced by middle-class settlers rather than by working-class attendees. Working-class voices are rarely heard in this official material, and when they are present, they are often mediated through settlement discourse in support of arguments made by wardens or settlers about class and community. Histories of the settlement movement have by necessity had to rely on this material and have had little choice but to present the dominant view. Attending to the letters written in the trenches of the First World War by those who had once attended Cardiff University Settlement Lads’ Club can go some way toward redressing the balance, suggesting ways forward for wider work in settlement history.

The notion of cross-class friendship was central to the settlement movement. The correspondence examined here demonstrates that personal relationships developed in the settlement before the war continued to flourish beyond the institutional walls of the
settlement house and became an important source of emotional support for soldiers in the trenches. Rather than focus just on the ideological construction of cross-class friendship in settlement discourse, however, this article takes as its starting point the words written by former Lads’ Club members themselves. Their letters from the trenches reveal the affective relationships that evolved between middle-class settlers and working-class settlement attendees. The experience of fighting in the First World War encouraged comradeship and friendships between soldiers but also strong emotional ties to an imagined ‘home’. As Jay Winter has noted, wartime drew people into ‘fictive kinships’: while away from home, soldiers relied upon formal and informal networks of friendship, face-to-face and via letter, that replaced or supplemented the bonds of family life. Winter’s notion of fictive kinship can be extended to the settlement movement during the war to reveal how established philanthropic bodies were utilised by soldiers as part of their network of emotional support. The use of familial language in philanthropic organisations, including the settlement movement’s development of the language of ‘brotherhood’, found its full significance during the war. More importantly, Marc Brodie and Barbara Caine nineteenth and early twentieth-century philanthropic institutions were intent on ‘befriending’ the poor.

Cross-class friendship was nevertheless a part of wider a cultural and social context. During the First World War, Sarah Cole has argued that ‘friendship might function as a bridging structure between individuals and institutions’. But we need to remember that the interaction between people and philanthropic organisations would have been hierarchical and asymmetrical which was articulated, and echoed through the letters forwaver writers of the Lads’ Club. Their decision to write to the Lewises reveals not only the strength of philanthropic agencies in this period but also the networks of friendliness played out in working-class communities. According to Joanne Bourke, the working classes were reliant on notions of neighbourliness that could provide emotional and material assistance when needed. Ideas of neighbourliness were extended to also include settlement workers who resided in these working-class districts. The argument presented in this article is that, for rank-and-file soldiers, kinship was not straightforwardly tied solely to immediate family, but could include bonds formed in organisations such as the settlement. The emotional connection that former Lads’ Club members had to the Lewises is palpable in the letters examined here. To borrow Michael Roper’s phrase, these
working-class letter writers extended their wartime ‘webs of care’ to include philanthropic personnel. Home, family and fellow soldiers were used in First World War letters, according to Roper, in order to indicate the emotional support needed to survive active warfare. Building on Roper’s approach, I argue in this article that we should include university settlements in our understanding of home and community in this context. Kate Hunter has argued that ‘Under the stress of war men clung to aspects of their past lives and idealized peacetime lives and relationships’, while Joanna Bourke also notes that First World War soldiers continually reaffirmed their connections with pre-war civilian lives. Cardiff University Settlement was undoubtedly part of the wartime letter writers’ imagination of home and community.

Cardiff University Settlement and Friendship

Cardiff University Settlement opened its doors in 1901. University House was located on Portmanmoor Road in the district of Splott. The decision of University of Wales students to turn their attention to Cardiff’s poor reflected a growing awareness at this time that British towns and cities faced similar social problems centred on poverty, class antagonism and social separation. Following the advice of the Chief Constable of Cardiff, it was decided that graduate settlers would work in the East Moors of Splott. East Moors had only recently experienced rapid industrialization. The area had been transformed by a steel and iron works together with the development of a wagon works and railway lines over the last thirty years of the nineteenth century. East Moors had been turned from a small village on the outskirts of Cardiff into an industrial working-class district on the fringes of the city centre. Its transformation was reflected by the demographic of the boys who attended the Cardiff University Settlement Lads’ Club for boys between the ages of 11 and 17. Several of the boys who attended the Club were working at the time of the 1911 census. Ivor Reece, for instance, was an errand boy. Others were employed in Splott’s main industries. Fredrick Spiller and James Hawkey, for example, both worked as copper apprentices, while John Childs laboured in the iron foundry. William Dunn was an apprentice fitter. Many of these boys had fathers who worked as dock labourers and who appear to have moved into Cardiff from other parts of South Wales or from Dorset and Gloucestershire.
East Moors’ social and economic transformation had been profound. According to Ronald Burrows, Cardiff University Settlement’s first warden, one needed only to

Look at the Moors; at the misery and the drunkenness of dozens of homes. Look at the streets surrounding the club. Think of the poor, uncared for, dirty little children, the over-worked mother with too much to worry over for her temper to keep good, and too little money given her by a drunken husband or selfish sons to give the children good food or clothes, or to keep the house clean and tidy. Look at the worst case of all, when it is the mother herself who drinks, and the home is in total ruin.  

Burrows’s description of the working-class home and family was not unusual in settlement discourse. Throughout this period, a number of philanthropic agencies had entered working-class urban districts emphasising the moral and social disintegration of those living there. Commentators on Cardiff’s social life generally agreed that the city did not suffer from the same levels of deprivation as in the slums of London, but were resolute in their belief that the gap between rich and poor was too great.  

As the author of an article on ‘University Settlements’ in Wales noted in 1901, a settlement was needed in order to bring Cardiff students into closer connect with Sprott’s industrial working class.  

Neil Evans has noted that many in Cardiff’s social elite believed at the time that it was easier to give money than provide personal assistance to the poor.  

The founders of Cardiff University Settlement took the opposite view, establishing educational and recreational clubs for boys, girls, women and men, which would be staffed by University of Wales graduates and students.

The Lads’ Club was a busy, lively affair, according to Burrows, writing in The Dragon, the student magazine of Aberystwyth University College, in 1905. He noted that lads would arrive in pairs or in threes from 7pm until 7.45, during which time they would pay their subscription and there would be ‘a great deal of talking and joking round the fires, Ping-Pong starts in one room, quieter games in another’. At 7.45 educational classes started. Boys were notified that they were about to start by the sound of the bell. Manual classes included bent iron work and woodwork. Boys could also take classes in history, geography, reading, citizenship, writing, arithmetic, drama and Glee singing, while sports clubs were formed for boxing, baseball and football. A condition of membership was that the boys must attend two educational classes. If they had attended these classes then they could read in the library, play billiards, Ping-Pong, or draughts. Classes lasted 50 minutes. They would then have a 20 minute refreshment break before their next class started. At 9.45 classes
ended, with the National Anthem sung 15 minutes later. This demanding timetable does not necessarily give an insight into the interpersonal relationships that would have formed during these classes or social activities. Yet, as the warden of the settlement Edward Denny noted in 1908, ‘the organisation came in touch with hundreds of growing lads at the most crucial time of their lives.’

Cardiff University Settlement was always more than a series of buildings and activities. The movement was imbued with a spirit that emphasized cross-class friendship and the ‘personal touch’. The letters discussed in this article will reveal the affective relationships that Amy Lewis and her husband Edward, the settlement’s arithmetic tutor, developed with former members of the Lads’ Club. Amy Lewis started working with the Lad’s Club in 1910. Prior to this the Lads’ Club had suffered from a shortage of settlement workers able to commit themselves to assisting with the club’s leisure, social and educational programme on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Saturdays. The running of the club had often been left to the warden, who could be forced to supervise 85 boys on his own. The behaviour of these boys was ‘exceptionally difficult’. At times, Denny was dependent on older club members intervening to ‘neutralize’ bad behaviour and bring order to the club’s activities. Similar complaints had been made only three years earlier when it was noted that the boys were ‘quick to take advantage’ when any irregularity in the management of the club came about. Much of the disorder at the club was explained, by settlement workers, in relation to the social class of the club members, who were apparently drawn ‘from the very poorest section of the district’. These were just the group of lads that the settlement sought to attract. As the first annual report declared: ‘our efforts should be directed...to the production of more efficient workman’, a point reinforced when the 1906-7 annual report proudly declared of their new intake that they were ‘ideally rough, and we mean to be firm on this point, so that our club may not become aristocratic and “collared”’. As a consequence, the settlement’s programme was concerned primarily with moral training. Classes and annual lectures focused on character, public service and citizenship.

The active involvement of Amy Lewis and her co-worker Bertha Lewis in the Lads’ Club was needed not only to bring order, but to truly effect Cardiff University Settlement’s commitment to working with local boys on a personal level. It was not enough to simply supervise these boys, as Denny had done. The settlement’s founders wanted cross-class
friendships to be built between workers and lads. As Burrows acknowledged in 1904 in a speech to the Lads’ Club: ‘it is the loyalty and love you feel to your friends as equals you must feel also when they are above you...Whether the friend is one of your teachers who has come down to for love to help you...you must learn to obey him, and help to get others to obey him, not from fear but from loyalty and love.’

Cardiff University settlement built, in this respect, on a central component of university settlement ideology, namely the commitment to developing interpersonal relationships with the poor. From the university settlement movement’s inception, the Rev. Samuel Barnett, founder of Toynbee Hall, had argued that social and philanthropic work needed to ‘bind classes by friendship, and pass, through the medium of friendship, the spirit which inspires righteousness and devotion.’ Friendship was central to Barnett’s view of philanthropy. He believed that modern philanthropy was too concerned with ‘officalism’ and the cultivation of impersonal relations, judging the poor and handing out material gifts. In contrast, the university settlement movement was devised to counteract the coldness of modern philanthropy by bringing rich and poor together in intimate friendships. According to Barnett, this would create and fashion new kinds of class relations enabling in turn greater understanding and knowledge of one another, removing prejudice and ignorance.

The ideology of cross-class friendship was actively promoted by the founders of Cardiff University Settlement from the beginning. Lilian Howell, a Cardiff student and later prominent Welsh feminist, together with Mrs Burrows, the wife of the first warden Ronald Burrows, continually framed the work of the Lads’ Club around the notion of friendship, leading Howell to boldly declare in the settlement’s Annual Report of 1903-1904 that ‘We really are friends with our boys’. Both Howell and Burrows believed that this could not be achieved without personal connection. They felt that settlement work should be voluntary, which in turn meant that the friendships developed at the settlement were more likely to be genuine. Club activities should not simply be about ‘bodies and minds’ but also about ‘these boys’ hearts’. To fully adhere to this commitment, it was decided that Cardiff settlement workers would not be paid, the only exceptions being Denny when he was appointed in 1908 along with one other paid employee, a drill sergeant. As the Lads’ Club arithmetic tutor, Edward Lewis supported himself as a solicitor. Census records show that in 1911 Bertha Lewis supported her settlement work by teaching. She also described herself as an ‘artist’ on the census. Interestingly, Amy Lewis (née Hughes) listed her occupation as a
‘settlement worker’, suggesting not only that she was supporting herself through independent means, but that she placed a high value on her settlement work. The language of friendship was also used by Cardiff University Settlement for pragmatic reasons. Unlike Barnett, who felt that friendships would bring about greater religiosity in the poor and was in general motivated by the need to return religion to working-class life, Cardiff’s settlement workers and wardens were aware that religion had the potential to be divisive in South Wales. It was hoped that their emphasis on friendship, rather than religion, would avert Nonconformist suspicions that the Settlement was either a religious mission or tied to the Church of England. Although Cardiff Settlement’s leaders were forced to adapt and expand Barnett’s religiously-inspired ideas about friendship, they were determined to make meaningful relationships with local inhabitants and this also extended to their living arrangements. Unlike many other settlement houses in this period (including Toynbee Hall), Cardiff Settlement University was not a residential institution. No living quarters were offered for settlement workers. Rather, they were encouraged to live in East Moors by renting their own houses. Before Amy Hughes married Edward Lewis, she lived with Bertha Lewis at 160a Habershon Street. Amy continued to live in Splott even when she got married. Matrimony brought Edward Lewis to Splott from the more prosperous north Cardiff, where he had lived with his parents. It was here that Amy and Edward would bring up their first-born daughter, Alicia. The Lewises’ decision to begin their married life in Splott illustrates the commitment and passion they must have had for the area and for settlement work. They placed themselves at the heart of the settlement as well as the boys’ lives. Envelopes in the collection of letters sent to them from the front reveal that mail was initially sent to ‘2 University Place’, the street next door to Settlement Hall. Residing here really would have broken down class barriers. According to Mrs Burrows, living in the district meant that the boys were ‘no longer afraid of us or shy of us; and if one lives in the district never a day passes without one or more of them dropping in to see us for advice about their work or games, or to discuss some questions with us that they are in difficulties about’. This was further strengthened by the settlement’s visiting committee, which encouraged settlement workers and Cardiff students to build cross-class friendship with the boys by visiting them and their families at home.

Letters of Friendship and War
Letters are cultural products. According to Martyn Lyons, ‘soldiers’ correspondence invites an analysis of the nature and purpose of letter-writing, the rules and expectations that guided it, and the implicit social grammar that letter-writing obeyed’. The collection of letters sent to Edward and Amy Lewis by former members of the Cardiff University Settlement Lads’ Club enables us to consider the affective relationships that were created between settlement movement workers and working-class lads. Fifteen correspondents in the collection sent to the Lewises from the front are known by their full name, with David ‘Dai’ Luker and Enos Skrine being the most prolific correspondents, sending 40 letters and postcards between them over the course of the war. Soldiers’ understanding of settlement friendship was framed by the social and professional conventions of the time. Correspondence sent to the Lewises followed a conventional mode of address by formally referring to the receipt either as ‘Dear Sir’, ‘Dear Mr and Mrs Lewis’, or individually with their title and surname. Several correspondents did address the Lewises as ‘Dear Friend’ or ‘Dear Friends’ but these letters were usually part of a series rather than individual letters. Correspondents usually signed off affectionately, but still in a reserved manner, ‘With kindest regards’, ‘From yours truly’, ‘Yours sincerely’, sometimes adapted to have the prefix ‘Best wishes’ and ‘I remain’. Only Dai Luker signed off ‘Good night’, although James Hawkey ended one letter ‘Bonne Nuit’ before adding in the formal French ‘Comment allez-vous?’ showing the Lewises the French he had learnt in the trenches.

The letters reveal that the writers were well educated and that this group of working-class boys had benefitted from improved schooling. This could have been enhanced by their attendance at the settlement’s educational classes, which included writing. Similarly, letter writing would not have been unfamiliar to settlement boys. They appear to have been encouraged to write letters to settlement workers before the war, when the settlement was closed for the summer or when they were at summer camp. Their handwriting bears the mark of sustained tuition. Harry Hawkins, Enos Skrine, W. Miller and Babs all write in a cursive style, joining up their words with specific flourishes and loops to the letters ‘f’, ‘h’ ‘l’ and ‘w’.

Despite this, many correspondents were conscious
of their handwriting and spelling, perhaps acknowledging the different educational backgrounds they had with the Lewises. W. J. Dunn was typical of soldiers asking that the Lewises 'Please excuse the writing and mistakes in words in a hurry.' Meanwhile, James Hawkey felt that his handwriting suffered from having to write with a lead pencil rather than with ink which, he noted, was difficult to carry in the trenches. On a few occasions, the quality of the paper was objected to. Much of the correspondence is heart-warming and always friendly in tone. On the whole, handwriting is clear and highly readable, but some correspondents did struggle with spelling.

Many of the letters confirm Roper's assertion that trench letters were primarily written about the everyday, mundane aspects of life in the trenches. The letters are usually devoid of any detailed information and are short. They largely follow a specific template and series of topics, with many asking after the health of the Lewises and occasionally their daughter Alicia, often referred to as 'Babs' or 'Baby' by correspondents, signifying their familiarity with the family's domestic arrangements. Soldiers were always keen to let the Lewises know that they were well, and several used the phrase 'in the pink', confirming Jessica Meyer's argument that soldiers' letters were initially written to reassure those at home. The weather was a popular topic. Letters were usually closed with a plea to be remembered by all those at the Settlement Lads' Club. Letter writers were keen to hear what the Lewises were up to, if they had any news about the settlement or news from their friends on the front. The latter two topics suggest that the Lewises acted as intermediaries between specific social groups at home and on the front. In this, they facilitated the dissemination of information when soldiers would not have had the time or opportunity to sustain complex social networks. Occasionally, the lads offered guidance to former club members, such as when Luker used his letter of 26 January 1915 as a chance to offer advice to lads on whether they should join the King's Guard as their regiment. Meanwhile, the Lewises could provide emotional support for those left behind. James Cummingham was particularly grateful to Amy Lewis for 'visiting & consoling the wife' and hoped in his letter that Edward Lewis would convey his thanks for 'her kindness'. Similarly, it was assumed that the friendship between the writer and the Lewises could extend beyond the club's walls, such as when Enos Skrine asked them to write to his friend Private Hall who 'haven't got anybody in the world to write to him/ I so sorry for him and the shells as effected [sic] him/ his is quite silly'.
Direct references to warfare were minimal. Those soldiers on active service would have been aware that they could not relay specific information about the war effort. As Duncan McDonald noted at the beginning of the war, ‘Well I can’t tell you much about the war only it is going on’. Here McDonald acknowledged the role the censor played in intercepting letters sent from France during the war, but also the pressures of writing letters to those at home. Surviving envelopes bear the stamp of the censor. Only one letter in the collection has had specific sentences blocked out, suggesting that this particular group of soldiers were either good at self-censoring or that their friendship with the Lewises dictated what was said in their letters. Battles were not discussed, locations not revealed. Direct references to combat were instead confined to soldiers who were away from the front. In 1915, Luker watched for Zeppelin in Essex, while towards the end of the war Skrine guarded a German camp in Wales. W. Miller, as a member of the merchant navy, reported how his ship was stopped for inspection. Meanwhile, C. H. S. Hook regretted his lack of participation in the war. Writing from Ireland in February 1915, he reported that he was ‘just fed up’ with not being on the front. Having enlisted in the Navy he felt that ‘we are doing no good where we are now...I think our navy are going to sleep to let them come so far around’. Instead he wished that he was stationed on the front like Luker. The drama of war was not necessarily absent from these letters. By appropriating the image of the Tommy, Skrine noted that ‘I have been in action with our Regt and have seen many exciting times but I am none the worse for it at present’. Yet, later in his letter, he also wrote, ‘I wish I was there I would be delighted to call Peter [the Lewises’ dog]...I will write later...I am on my way to the firing line so good bye’. His ‘good bye’ not only stood for the end of the letter, but also the realisation that these ‘exciting times’ could lead to his death.

Unsurprisingly, the realities of war were brought to the fore when soldiers discussed the death of friends from the settlement club. The decision to write to the Lewises about the loss of fellow settlement lads indicates how networks were employed at specific moments and how letters could be used in the grieving processes. One letter from Luker is worth quoting in full:

Dear Mr and Mrs Lewis,

Many thanks for the letter was so glad to hear from you I am hope you will soon [be] well again Well we are having some nice weather now and are out for the next charge and going on just the same I shall be going back for a few months again soon I
would like to come home on leave but it is no use I have not much to write Today B. Bunkham was killed on May 11\textsuperscript{th} in action with us Glad to hear that the baby is getting on quite well

Good night Dai.\textsuperscript{57}

It was not unusual for Luker to write without full stops. This was one of the shortest letters Luker sent to the Lewises but also one of the most descriptive. He wanted to come home but he could not. Instead he wrote a quick note before going into battle. The letter’s significance rests in the act of commemoration he made to B. Bunkham, killed on the day he wrote the note. Yet, Luker felt the need to record the date, breaking the flow of the sentence. This shows that Luker was aware of the contingency of the letter’s different temporal currencies for writer and reader. According to Liz Stanley, ‘letters are strongly marked by their quotidian present’, which differs for the receiver who is removed from the writer’s present.\textsuperscript{58} Letters are therefore removed from the moment for the recipient, something Luker seems to have recognised; today for him is yesterday for the Lewises. It is to the Lewises that Luker records the death, suggesting not only that they might have had a connection with Bunkham, but also that Luker needed their emotional support.

Meanwhile, James Hawkey wrote to his ‘Dear Friend’ of the shock of hearing that ‘Poor Old Fred Spiller’ had been killed in action. Hawkey was one of only two correspondents to use the term ‘Friend’ to address Edward Lewis. This letter also differed from other correspondence in the collection in its candid reaction to Spiller’s death (said to have been ‘knocked down’). Hawkey’s relationship with Spiller was close. Not only were they work colleagues, but they were also the ‘best of chums. He was the Best chum a chap could ever wish for and will be sadly missed by all at the club.’ Hawkey’s use of the term ‘chum’ to refer to Spiller and ‘Friend’ to refer to Edward Lewis is suggestive of the different modes of friendship on display in Hawkey’s letter. It is evident that the term ‘chum’ was being used to refer to a friendship between class equals, whereas the later use of ‘Comment allez-vous?’ in the letter is suggestive of the hierarchy that remained between Hawkey and Lewis, despite their friendship.

Forgetting and Remembering Friendship
Letters provided a vital source of information about family and friends for soldiers fighting in the First World War. They also provided a platform for the negotiation of emotions and emotional relations. Letters were the primary means for sustaining and reinforcing networks and relationships that would usually have been conducted face-to-face. Letters were also physical reminders to soldiers that those at home remembered them and appreciated their sacrifice. The significance placed by former members of Cardiff University Settlement Lads’ Club on their friendship with the Lewises can be seen when letter writers commented that they had not received a letter for a while. Lyons has noted that, during the war, there was a ‘fear of silence’ because it isolated soldiers from their homes. Many letters in the collection sent to Edward and Amy Lewis began with sentences noting that the Lewises had not replied to earlier correspondece. As Luker wrote curtly in March 1917, ‘Received your letter and thought you had forgotten [sic] me’. There were several occasions when correspondents wrote to ask for a ‘line from you’. They often relied on the field postcard on which correspondents crossed out specific sentences structured around health, such as ‘I am quite well’ or ‘admitted to hospital’, or to say that a ‘letter follows at first opportunity’. Many of the field postcards used by former Lads’ Club members stated that they were well but awaiting a message. Hawkey on one occasion blackened out every sentence on the field postcard suggesting that a letter was much needed and desired.

The Lewises probably had a number of reasons why they did not reply to letters as quickly as soldiers would have liked. Amy Lewis had only just had her first child when war was declared. Her attention must have been diverted. In the summer of 1916, Edward Lewis was conscripted into non-combatant service. This saw the Lewises move from Splott to Rhiwbina on the city’s edge, for forestry work. Prior to this move, it appears that both were still playing an active role in Cardiff University Settlement. They might not have had the time or opportunity to respond to letters. Being friends with so many soldiers would have placed enormous pressure on the couple when the mode of communication shifted to the written word and a more formal tone was needed. At the same time, some letters might not even have reached the Lewises. Many envelopes in the collection were re-directed to the Lewises in Rhiwbina, an action dependent on the good will of others to forward their post. These explanations appear not to have occurred to former Lads’ Club members, though. Their tendency to seek regular reply is suggestive not only of their strong need for contact with home, but also of an anxiety about the nature of their friendship with the Lewises. Letters
are gifts that construct, in the words of Margaret Jolly, ‘fantasies of identity and relationships’. The failure to receive a reply put the intimacy of friendship with the Lewises in doubt, perhaps accentuating pre-existing fears about the unequal social nature of the relationship. The Lewises, for their part, would probably have viewed their correspondence with former settlement lads quite differently, having to maintain contact with a large number of them all at the same time.

Forgetting could also happen the other way around. Several former club members would directly name people that they wanted the Lewises to remember them to. On one occasion, Luker failed to remember the name of the settlement worker he especially wanted to be remembered to, revealing, perhaps, how cross-class friendship, though not unnoticed, was sometime nameless. Nevertheless, the need to be remembered by those at home was a strong motive in the letters written to the Lewises. James Cummingham wanted Edward Lewis to ‘tell them [the boys at the club] that I have not forgotten them’. The majority of the letters, in fact, express a desire to be remembered in one form or another. The letters interweave the writer into a community, rendering them visible. Soldiers were keen to position themselves in the organisations where they were ‘at home’ and part of a group. Soldiers might have temporarily relocated to the front, but their desire to be remembered located them once again with their friends and social networks at home.

For some soldiers the Lewises played a more significant role than simple friends. It is hard to know if the collection of letters that survives is complete, but it is notable that Luker and Skrine, the two most regular correspondents, had non-traditional family backgrounds. This might have meant that they developed a different relationship to the Lewises than other club members. From these letters we cannot ascertain whether Burrows’s image of the working-class family was correct for any or even some of the soldiers who corresponded. Luker lived with a widowed mother and eight siblings. The lack of a father figure might have meant that Edward Lewis took on this role for Luker. His letters certainly seek approval from the Lewises and aim to make them proud of him. Unlike letters from other correspondents, Luker goes into detail about what he is doing and wants the Lewises to know that he has won his swimming badge, is clean and that he is about to take his rifle certificate.

Yet it is Enos Skrine who really stands out from the other letter writers in this respect. It appears that of all the correspondents, Skrine developed the most profound
relationship with the Lewises, especially Amy. The 1901 census shows him to be living apart from his mother and father, with many of his siblings residing with other family members. In the 1911 census he had been reunited with his father and some of his brothers and sisters but his mother had moved to Gloucester. This might explain why Skrine’s letters are more personal and emotional. It is to the Lewises that Skrine turned when he needed help. Skrine’s eyes were injured in combat. He was sent to Summer Down Convalescent Camp in Eastbourne to recuperate in 1915 but his letter from that period is distressed. He needed financial assistance and it is evident that the decision to ask the Lewises for help had not been taken lightly. Skrine reveals a certain level of discomposure to the reader in these letters. His usually chirpy tone was downbeat. It is ‘breaking my heart’, he wrote, that he could not get paper, stamps or ‘a few things’, because he has no money. He knows that, as his friends, the Lewises will give him a ‘copper’ but he is frustrated that he did not ‘come that Sunday to tell you about [my] adventures’. His distress over this matter implies that he had undermined their relationship by not visiting them when he had promised to. He hoped that he had been ‘forgiven’ but his need for assistance meant that he must reveal the instability in their relationship: the fact that they can provide him with the money he desperately needed but which they could hold onto despite his promises to one day pay them back. This request was placed in the middle of the letter which he sent stamp-less, with the phrase ‘letter from a wounded solider’ written on the envelope. He concluded his request with the statement, ‘Well I am the most unfortunate of all the club boys and I am so glad that I have got friends like you as I have no others’, concluding ‘I remain your broken hearted servant’. 67

Amy Lewis did send Skrine a money order, leading Skrine to proudly declare in his next letter that ‘I am so glad that I have such a good friend’. As well as noting the gift of money, Skrine also placed significant value on the power of the Lewises’ letters, which he felt would ‘keep his heart up’, something he needed to do if he was to survive a camp that he and his fellow soldiers found depressing and nothing more than an internment camp for ‘German prisoners’. 68 In his next letter, he noted that he was ‘a lot better’ and ‘feeling more at home’, but still resented the fact that he could not leave the camp. He was also frustrated not to have made any friends there. Nonetheless, he was fully aware that the camp was better than the front. He informed the Lewises that he had just had a letter from a fellow solider to say that the war in France was currently ‘Hell’, a crude expression that he felt the
need to apologize for, but one that must for him have brought home the news that his
friend Jack Fisher ‘was killed, was murdered’ in battle. This is not the first time that Skrine
mentioned his ‘mate Jack Fisher’, whose death ‘is on my mind all the time’. He ended his
letter asking if the Lewises had seen Fisher’s name in the newspaper. In drawing their
attention to this detail, Skrine suggested that he needed material acknowledgement of his
friend’s death, or at least Amy Lewis’s words to confirm it, a point reinforced in his direct
plea to Amy: ‘I wish to heavens it was not true don’t you Mrs Lewis.’ In drawing Amy into
his grief, Skrine reinforced the idea that club friendship was not straightforwardly individual,
but interweaved groups or pairings of lads together.

It would be wrong to assume that Skrine created a friendship with the Lewises built
solely on financial support. Rather, his letters reveal more than any other in the collection
the extent to which settlement lads were involved in the Lewises domestic lives. The
Lewsies’ home provides an emotional anchor in Skrine’s letters. The Lewises might not have
been part of Skrine’s biological family, but they are framed as being part of his mental
landscape of home. Here Peter, the Lewises dog, and Amelia, ‘Babs’, played a highly
significant role. The only direct expressions of affection for the Lewises are conveyed by
Skrine to the Lewises’ daughter. Half way through his correspondence, he started leaving
kisses (little crosses) on the page which he always indicates are ‘for baby’. This was
coupled with his desire to find a cure for their dog’s bad toes. His expressions of love
illustrate the importance placed on caring and nurturing. These not only offset the
brutality of war, but also suggest that Skrine was positioning himself within the intimacy of
their domestic lives. This was never more obvious than when he heard that the Lewises’
daughter was ill with a cold which he knew to be ‘very dangerous this time [of year] and for
children’. The strength of feeling he must have had for the Lewises was conveyed in one
letter when he declared before his leave ‘I must stop hoping to see you’. He was
devastated when the Lewises failed to see him off from Cardiff when he left for the front.
Having asked his ‘people in Cardiff’ to let the Lewises know of his time of departure, he later
wrote to ask them if they were told too late to come to the station. On a later occasion,
Skrine was sad that, because he had been fined by the army for the loss of his coat on duty
he could not afford to visit the Lewises, or his mother in Gloucester.

Parcels, as well as letters, played an important role in the relationship between
former Lads’ Club members and the Lewises. Rank and file soldiers would not have received
the volume of parcels that middle-class soldiers received from their family, although many did benefit from appeals at home to send Christmas treats to the front line. Settlemements and other philanthropic organisations were able to step in to provide material support. John Child reported his ‘pleasure [sic] in hearing from you’ and his delight at receiving his Christmas parcel sent jointly from the Lewises and from fellow club members that have stayed behind. He was not the only settlement lad to appreciate the settlement Christmas parcel. Hawkey replied almost immediately upon receiving his Christmas parcel. He began his letter by thanking the Lewises and the ‘men at the club’ informing them that he has broken in the writing pad that they have sent him. Hawkey also seemed to have been fortunate to have been given presents when he was on leave. Yet an undated letter from Hawkey also indicted the obligations felt when parcels were sent. During a bout of leave, Hawkey did not visit the Lewises. Rather than travelling back to Cardiff on the earlier train as he had intended, he had decided to travel on the late train with ‘my mates’ which did not arrive until after midnight. In choosing his ‘mates’ over the Lewises, Hawkey indirectly implied a hierarchy of friendship in which settlement workers came below fellow soldiers. The need to write this letter at all, on the other hand, suggests Hawkey’s discomfort at not having seen the Lewises. He felt the need to tell them that he had been required to return early back to barracks on Sunday for the horses.

Parcels were not only confined to Christmas. Luker was especially appreciative of his March 1917 parcel, finding the cakes ‘lovely’ and the Woodburn cigarettes necessary having gone ‘without a smoke for 3 days’. The parcel arrived at an opportune moment as he reported that his dog Gee Gee had just been shot in the leg. For some settlement lads, the parcels were much needed, welcomed gifts. C. Upcott wrote that his parcel brightened up what was for him a depressing couple of months of rain and ‘one thing or another’. Skrine, in particular, expressed his need but ‘surprise’ at receiving a parcel. Like Luker, Skrine was especially grateful to have been sent cigarettes. Furthermore, the goods Skrine received from the settlement enabled him to cement and reinforce trench relationships. He used his Bovril to make a stew with his fellow soldiers who also enjoyed his chocolate and cake which were ‘quite a change for us indeed’. He repaid the Lewises’ gift by offering tips on how to look after their dog’s paws which appear once again to have become infected and blistered after a spate of bad weather in Cardiff. The sending of parcels also encouraged some lads to write to the Lewises for the first time. A. Morgan had not written before he
received his parcel but was compelled to send the Lewises a note as thanks, which also explained that he did not have any news. Morgan might have seen the Lewises as his friends and the settlement as a part of his mental landscape of home, but some soldiers clearly felt the need to have something to say before sending a letter. Some lads, like Morgan, may have preferred to see the Lewises face to face and not conduct a relationship through letters, which, after all, might expose educational and social differences. It is also possible that Morgan, and others, wrote to the Lewises only in order to secure future parcels.

In general, however, the surviving letter collection indicates that there was a reciprocal relationship between correspondents and the Lewises. Sending letters offset the hierarchies created by parcels. Friendship, especially when conducted between two classes, needed to at least appear equal and not reliant on the generosity of the Lewises’ parcels. Photographs are also part of the surviving archive. At least four soldiers sent photographs to the Lewises. Three of these are unknown but one of the photographs was signed ‘Yours Sincerely Babs’, who was also a regular correspondent but not identified in the collection by any other name. In sending this photograph, Babs was indicating the value he placed on his friendship with the Lewises and the affection he must have felt for them. The fact that the Lewises kept this photograph likewise reveals the intimate relationship between Babs and the Lewises. Babs, like Luker and Skrine, wrote with knowledge of the Lewises’ domestic life and evidently considered himself a close friend of the family. Duncan McDonald sent the Lewises a beautiful embroidered Christmas card from the front which contained a small piece of card printed with the words ‘I’m thinking of you’. McDonald might not have written these words himself, but in sending this Christmas card he demonstrated the significance of his friendship with the Lewises. Christmas was a time for family and friends. Soldiers at the front were removed from their homes but Christmas cards, like MacDonald’s, wove these men into the lives of those they cared about, and those they hoped also cared for them.

Conclusion

Letters from the front reveal the nature of affective relationships between writers and recipients. The First World War soldiers’ letters discussed in this article have brought the personal relationships which middle-class settlement workers developed with working-class settlement attendees to the fore. Institutional papers of settlement houses do not do justice
to these affective relationships. Cardiff University Settlement annual reports repeatedly illustrated difficulties in running the Lads’ Club and the settlement itself. The reports tell a story of decline, of the coming to pass of a Victorian culture of cross-class contact. When the war ended, the settlement appears to have struggled to find settlement workers or the money needed to re-open.\textsuperscript{88} Such an institutional story can be read to suggest that the settlement movement in Cardiff was a failure. Yet, the trench letters examined here reveal that Cardiff University Settlement’s attempt to create cross-class friendships was a success. Soldiers such as Luker and Skrine evidently placed great significance on the friendship and personal interaction they had with Amy and Edward Lewis. These soldiers may well have been corresponding with other settlement workers, too. Emotional connections that had initially developed in the Lads’ Club were further cemented by post during the war. This article has shown that historians of the university settlement movement should re-assess the afterlives of the Victorian university settlement movement and has demonstrated the importance of analysing settlement relationships from the point of view not only of middle-class settlers, but also from the point of view of those they befriended.

Settlement houses, like Cardiff’s, created additional survival networks for those who fought in the First World War by extending ideas of home beyond the familial sphere and out into the community. Philanthropic institutions were pivotal in the lives of many working-class soldiers both prior to and during the war. Institutional papers of settlements, the usual sources for settlement history, present working-class lives within the specific codes of the middle-class social imagination. Understanding the complex and dynamic relationships which philanthropic institutions had with their users means turning to alternative sources, such as letters. The working-class settlement attendee did not always adhere to the sensational image projected on them by philanthropic agencies, nor were they docile actors who took rather than gave. The friendships which developed between settlement workers and settlement attendees were, of course, not free from the confines of class and social status, as numerous examples in this article have shown. As Seth Koven has recently argued, friendship between the classes was ‘dynamic’ and ‘reciprocal’ but also ‘unequal, and asymmetrical’ in this period.\textsuperscript{89} Trench warfare destroyed, erased and broke friendships.\textsuperscript{90} In this context, the ‘web of care’ offered by the Lewises was much needed, providing soldiers with a vital connection to home, which, for them, included the social networks that had been built up in the settlement house.
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