



Durham E-Theses

Churches attitudes to education at the end of the nineteenth century

Smythe, B. H.

How to cite:

Smythe, B. H. (1969) *Churches attitudes to education at the end of the nineteenth century*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/9587/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

"Church Attitudes to Education at the End
of the Nineteenth Century."

Thesis for Part ii of
M.Ed Degree by
B.H.Smythe
St Chad's College
Durham.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

Part I : Historical Background

Chapter 1	Scope and Limitations of the Thesis	1
2	The Situation before the Education Act 1870	13
3	The First Education Act 1870	37
4	Educational Law 1870-1901	43
	Appendix i, ii and iii	
5	The Education Act 1902	52

Part II : Church Attitudes

Chapter 6	<u>Church of England Attitudes</u>	57
	Part i : Emergent Denominationalism within the Church of England	61
	Part ii : The High Church Attitude (W.E. Gladstone)	70
	Part iii : The Attitude of Militant High Churchmen	77
	Part iv : The Attitudes of Moderate Anglicans	84
	Part v : Anglican Attitudes and the Law	92
Chapter 7	<u>Free Church Attitudes</u>	
	Part i : The Churches' Attitudes and the Nonconformist Ideal	129
	Part ii : W. Dale's Answer to the Church-State Question	135
	Part iii : Congregationalist Spokesmen for the Free Churches	142
	Part iv : The Attitudes of the Methodists	157
	Part v : The Contribution of the Baptists	165
	Part vi : The Attitude of the Society of Friends	169
	Part vii : Roman Catholic Attitudes	176
Chapter 8	Part i : General Disagreement at the End of the Century	197
	Part ii : The Climax at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century	218
Chapter 9	Contrasts in Church Attitudes	231

Book List i

The number given to each book is quoted when the book is referred to in the text. The list is in alphabetical order of authors.

1. J.W. Adamson : English Education 1789-1902 : C.U.P. 1930
2. W.G. Addison : Religious Equality in Modern England 1714-1914 : S.P.C.K. 1944
3. W.H.G. Armytage : Four Hundred Years of English Education : C.U.P. 1964
4. E. Barker : Church State and Study: Methuen, London 1930
5. H.C. Barnard : History of English Education from 1760 : (2nd Ed.) London U.P. 1961
6. G.A. Beck (Ed.) : The English Catholics 1850-1950 : Burns Oates 1950
7. A.C. Benson : Life of Archbishop Benson : Macmillan, London, 1899
8. C.K.F. Brown : The Church's Part in Education : W.S. & S.F.C.K. 1942
9. H.J. Burgess : Enterprise in Education : W.S. & S.F.C.K. 1958
10. H.J. Burgess and P.A. Telsby : A Short History of the National Society : W.S. London 1961
11. O. Chadwick : The Victorian Church Part 1 : A. & C. Black, London 1966
12. Mary Church : Life and Letters of Dean Church : Macmillan, London 1894
13. R.W. Church : The Oxford Movement : Macmillan, London 1904
14. H.M. Clark : History of English Nonconformity 2 Vols. : Chapman & Hall, London 1913
15. S.C. Coleridge : On the Constitution of Church and State : Hurst Chance, London 1839
16. Mandell Creighton: The Church and the Nation : Longman, London 1901
17. M. Cruickshank : Church and State in English Education, 1870 to the Present Day : Macmillan, London 1963
18. G.H. Curteis : Dissent in its Relation to the Church of England : (Bampton Lectures 1871) : Macmillan, London 1899
19. S.J. Curtis : History of Education in Great Britain : (1950 Edit.) University Tutorial Press

Book List ii

20. S.J. Curtis and H.E. Boulwood : History of English Education since 1800 : 3rd Ed. University Tutorial Press, London 1964
21. A.V.V. Dale : Life of P.V. Dale : Hodder & Stoughton, London 1898
22. R.E. Davies : Methodism : Pelican 1963
23. J.F.W. Drury : Manual of Education : Heywood, Manchester 1903
24. B.E.C. Dugdale : Arthur James Balfour : Hutchinson 1936 (2 Vols.)
25. E.J.R. Eaglesham : From School Board to Local Authority : Routledge & Kegan Paul 1956
26. Maldwyn Edwards : Methodism and England : Epworth Press London 1943
27. T.S. Eliot : The Idea of a Christian Society : Faber & Faber, London 1939
28. L.T. Elliott-Birns : (a) English Thought 1860-1900 : Fetterworth 1936
(b) Religion in the Victorian Era : (2nd Edit.) Fetterworth 1946
29. J.M. Figgis : Churches in the Modern State : Longmans, London 1913
30. J.A. Froude : The Earl of Beaconsfield : Everyman Ed., London 1890
31. A.G.G. Gardiner : Life of Sir W. Harcourt : (2 Vols.) Constable London 1923
32. N. Gash : Reaction and Reconstruction in English Politics : O.U.P. 1964
33. W.E. Gladstone : (a) The State in its Relation with the Church (2 Vols.) : 1834
(b) Church Principles : 1840
(c) Gleanings of Past Years (7 Vols.) 1879
(d) Later Gleanings 1898
all published by Murray, London
34. H.H. Henson : The Church of England : C.U.P. 1939
35. Richard Hooker : Ecclesiastical Polity :
36. A.M. Hutton : Cardinal Newman : Burns Oates, London 1892
37. T.H. Huxley : Science and Education : Macmillan, London 1893

38. K.S. Inglis : Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England : University of Toronto Press (and Routledge & Kegan Paul) 1963
39. F.A. Iremonger : William Temple : O.U.P. 1946
40. G. Kitson Clark : (a) An Expanding Society : C.U.P. 1967
(b) The Making of Victorian England : (2nd Ed.) Methuen, Edinburgh 1962
(c) The English Inheritance : F.C.M. Press 1950
41. E.A. Knox : Reminiscences of an Octogenarian : Hutchinson, London 1934
42. W.C. Lester Smith : Education in Great Britain : Blackwell, Oxford (3rd Ed.)
43. S. Maccoy : English Radicalism 1886-1914 : Allen & Unwin, London 1955
44. T.B. Macaulay : Critical and Historical Essays : Longmans, London 1843
45. J. Stuart Maclure : Educational Documents, England and Wales 1816-1963 : Chapman & Hall, London 1965
46. Guy Mayfield : The Church of England : C.U.P. 1958
47. V.A. McClelland : Cardinal Manning : O.U.P. 1960
48. F.D. Maurice : Learning and Working : Macmillan, London 1855
49. J. Morley : (a) Life of Gladstone (2 Vols.) : Macmillan, London 1905
(b) National Education : Chapman & Hall, London 1873
50. H. Nuttall and O. Chadwick (Ed.) : From Uniformity to Unity 1662-1962 : S.P.C.K., London 1962
51. J.H. Overton : The English Church in the 19th Century : Longman, London 1894
52. J.H. Overton and F. Selton : The English Church : Longman, London 1924
53. F. Owen : Tempestuous Journey - Lloyd George and His Times : Hutchinson, London 1954
54. E.A. Payne : The Free Church Tradition in the Life of England : S.C.M. 1944
55. A. Peel : These Hundred Years : London 1931

56. H. Pelling : Social Geography of British Elections 1885-1910 : Macmillan, London 1967
57. H.B. Philpott : London at School : Fisher & Urwin, London 1904
58. A.M. Ransey : From Gore to Temple : Longman, London 1960
59. H.B. Reckitt : Maurice to Temple : Faber & Faber London 1947
60. T. Rees : History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales : Snow, London 1883
61. Royston Pike : Human Documents of the Industrial Revolution in Britain : Allen & Urwin, London 1966
62. B. Sacks : The Religious Issue in the State Schools of England and Wales : University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque 1961
63. C.R. Sanders : Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement : Duke University Pub., London 1952
64. E.G. Sandford : Life of Frederick Temple (2 Vols.) : Macmillan, London 1906
65. Scott Lidgett : My Guided Life : Methuen, London 1936
66. Scott James (Ed.) : Education in Britain : Muller, London 1948
67. B.A. Smith : Dean Church : O.U.P. 1958
68. F. Smith : A History of English Elementary Education : University London Press 1931
69. C. Smyth : The Church and the Nation : Hodder and Stoughton 1962
70. W.R.M. Stephens : Life of W.F. Hook : Bentley, London 1861
71. R.H. Tawney : The Radical Tradition : Pelican Ed. 1966
72. D. Thomson : England in the 19th Century : Pelican 1950
73. R.G. Torbet : A History of the Baptists : Carey Kingsgate Press 1956
74. H. Townsend : The Claims of the Free Churches : Hodder & Stoughton London 1949
75. W.J. Townsend : New History of Methodism (2 Vols) : H.P. Workman and G. Mayrs Hodder & Stoughton London 1909
76. A.R. Vidler : The Orb and the Cross : F.P.C.K. 1945
- 76(a) G.M. Trevelyan : English Social History : 1942
(b) British History in the Nineteenth Century

77. E.I. Watkin : Roman Catholicism in England:
O.U.P. 1957
78. H. Wheeler Robinson : The Life and Faith of the Baptists :
Methuen 1927
79. M.W. Wells and : The New Law of Education (5th Ed.) :
P.S. Taylor Butterworth 1961.
80. W. T. Whitley : A History of the British Baptists :
Chas. Griffin, London 1932. (2nd Ed.)
81. B. Yeaxlee : Religion in the Nation's Schools:
Fisbett, London 1958

Pamphlets etc.

A large number of references to newspaper articles appears in the text.

82. Pamphlet : Revd. J. J. Dingle Elementary Education 1885
83. Pamphlet : R. Calvert B.C. A Plea for Voluntary Schools
84. Pamphlet : A.J. Balfour Criticism of an Opponent of the Education Bill 1902
85. Pamphlet : Dr. J. Clifford The Fight Against the Bill 1902
86. Pamphlet : Revd. Burns An Argument Addressed to Thoughtful Nonconformists 1904
87. Collection of Pamphlets Catholics and Education C.T.S. 1908
88. The Journal of Victorian Studies : various volumes
89. 'Theology' Vol. LXXI August 1968
90. Church Quarterly Review 1902-3 and 1903-4

Sources etc.

91. Census of Great Britain 1851 : Gyre & Spottiswoode, London 1854
92. The National Society (a) Annual Report 1834
(b) Annual Report 1844
(c) Standing Committee Minutes 1849-50
(d) Standing Committee Minutes 1850-1900
(e) Finance Committee Minutes 1871
93. Report of the Education Department 1871-2
94. Ministry of Education Papers 1902 Appendix 6
95. Parliamentary Papers Vol. xiii

96. Hansard 1843, 1870, 1876 and 1902
97. Reports on Elementary Schools 1852-1882 : HHO 1908
98. National Free Church Council, Official Year Books 1896-1940
99. Wesleyan Education Reports 1890-1891
100. Report of Proceedings, 1st, 2nd and 3rd Ecumenical Methodist Conferences 1881-1901
101. Chronicle of Convocation 1866
102. Chronicle of Convocation 1870
103. Minutes of Lower House of Convocation (Canterbury) : Report on Education Section E : 16 July 1880
104. The Religious Society of Friends; London Yearly Meetings of Sufferings, Proceedings 1869-1903 : and Minutes of the Parliamentary Committee.

Other references are given in the text.

Chapter 1

Scope and Limitations of the Thesis

The complexity of affairs during the Victorian era is the subject of G.M. Trevleyan's comment.

"Anyone who has attempted to wrestle with the immensity of the Victorian age in literature must sooner or later come to feel that Lytton Strachey was wise in his decision 'to row out over that great ocean of material, and lower down into it, here and there, a little bucket which will bring up to the light of day some characteristic specimen from those far depths to be examined with a careful curiosity!" (1)

The comment is also true of educational matters. So involved is the matter that historians now feel compelled to extend the period beyond the century; indeed, 1914 has been suggested as a more logical date on which to end the 'Victorian' era (2). To confine attention to a particular date, even to a special decade, within the 19th century, would be to impose serious restriction on the scope which is necessary for examining cause and effect. Despite the title, therefore, this examination will stretch deep into the century for causes, and beyond the end for effects and signs of changes. It is the account of a long series of disagreements and misunderstandings in the course of which many events are not linked in sequential order. The absence of sequence is often due to political and sociological issues which were by no means necessarily educational issues, but, by affecting educational legislation, they became so.

Once the educational factor appears there is tension arising from combinations of some five interested groups. The groups are as follows.

- (i) The National Education League (formed in 1869) which was openly 'secular'. That is, its members were opposed to voluntary (Church) schools.

(1) G.M. Trevleyan English Social History (78(a)) p.263.

(2) See for example L.P. Curtis' article in Journal of Victorian Studies Vol.9/Nö.3 March 1966, p.269: "...an aristocratic age which fell apart after 1914".

- (ii) The National Education Union which supported Church efforts and wanted to retain voluntary schools. They wanted these schools supplemented in number by independent Government action, and, in any case, given financial support from the rates. The Union was predominantly Anglican.
- (iii) The Roman Catholics and Jews who insisted unequivocally on a voluntary system with full support paid out of the rates.
- (iv) A number of moderate nonconformists who agreed with the National Educational Union. These were a minority, however. Their leader and spokesman was Dr. Henry Allon who spoke, however, "...for an age in ecclesiastical politics that was already passing" (in 1866). (1)
- (v) The majority of nonconformists siding with the National Educational League and opposed to voluntary schools. The reason for their opposition underwent change, though not for 'secularist' reasons; and it is fair to add that Anglican motives changed also.

Each of these groups had to influence the country at large and, in particular, the two equally influential Houses of Parliament. Parliament and the growing civil service in turn had to produce results which were both acceptable to the nation and workable. Such, in loose outline, is the context within which early English educational legislation was planned and executed. Obviously, there was a huge amount of flux; and relief may not be had within the narrower limits imposed by a study of specifically Church attitudes.

Church attitudes presuppose acceptance of some theory of Church and State. This is vital to full understanding. It presents problems which are not resolved to this day. Of course,

(1) Addison Religious Equality in Modern England (2) p.130

in our time very few people are aware of any problem; but this was not the case a hundred years ago. The theory of Church and State affected thousands of influential and articulate Victorians. It is unfortunate from our point of view that this theory varied between churches and even within churches; so, as it created firm attitudes, it requires detailed and separate treatment below.

In the same way Church attitudes varied as the century progressed, and variations are not always either logical or predictable. Hence, the ecclesiastical and political attitudes found at the end of the century cannot be understood without studying and reporting on earlier periods. The early attitudes are high-lighted at the Education Act 1870, and they persisted for many years after. They reappear between 1870 and 1902 when interested parties show disagreement often much affected by their own allies who supported the theory of an older regime. All such issues leading up to the end of the century require the fullest treatment. Again, the 1902 Education Act, while it is outside our period, is so much a part of that period that it must be included. It represents a final compromise, if not solution, which gave shape to a system that survives in some respects to our own day.

The issues in the 19th century are most clearly marked in responses made to the growing demand for 'the education of the poor'. This meant elementary, that is Primary, education. The call for secondary and higher education was later and was inspired by different motives. Secondary schools, with the endowed grammar and 'public' schools, therefore, are outside the scope of this thesis. The provision of elementary education displays the heart of the matter. Motives, and changes of motive; are most clearly seen at the Primary level; because vocational education, (i.e.) technical subjects in the broadest

sense, ~~does~~ not arise at this level; and also because the Primary school always touches the largest number of children.

On June 30th 1858 a Royal Commission was appointed under the presidency of the Duke of Newcastle. Its terms of reference were set out as follows.

"..to enquire into the state of popular education in England, and to consider and report what measures, if any, were required for the extension of sound and cheap elementary instruction to all classes of the people."

The phrase 'sound and cheap' applied to education is not attractive to the modern eye. It should be remembered that this, like the system of 'payment by results', was a limitation imposed by the State. It was a parsimonious ambition. It is to the credit of the voluntaryists in the 19th century that they had not entered the field, nor did they remain in it, with any such motives except when rising costs compelled them to attend to expense. Their motives were worthier than those of the politicians; but they receive ungracious treatment sometimes. For example, R.W. Rich has written thus.

"Only gradually did the State take any part..and it was not until 1870 that any degree of compulsion was introduced. The schools were unambitious in their programme, and were for the most part content to devote themselves to teaching the 'elements' - reading, writing and arithmetic. As the social conscience was aroused in the matter of education, so the original idea of the 'education of the poor' as a form of charity gave way to the conception that every human being has the right to an education that will make the most of his potentialities, and that it is the duty of the State to secure, and to provide where necessary, facilities to make this possible". (1)

The passage seems to accuse voluntary effort as if it was the result of insufferable condescension to 'the poor'. In fact, the churches led the State in this matter. What education there was had been provided by the churches until 1870. The offensive undertones connected with cheapness and "payment by results" were

(1) R.W. Rich, Essay 'English Elementary Schools' in "Education in Britain" ed. Scott-James: Muller (London) 1944.

ideas from Whitehall not Lambeth. Certainly the "social conscience" was showing signs of unrest and it is quite false to suppose that such a collective conscience was something separate from organised church life. The 19th century was loyal to its churches. Articulate and thoughtful Victorians, influenced a little - who knows? - by Shaftesbury, Kingsley and Booth - recognised the need for action. They would no doubt have agreed with parents that education, including elementary education, meant personal improvement; and for the churchmen, including the laity, improvement had theological and ethical undertones relating to salvation, and they were never afraid to talk in such terms. Some, probably many, parents interpreted improvement in terms of private ambition, yet they still demanded that there should be religious education: their children should study to better their lot in life, but in a devout environment. Neither viewpoint has superior moral quality; for behind the controversy lies the shadow not of frustrated 'potentiality' in sensitive children but of appalling poverty and destitution. Anxious parents below the middle class could never be sure how their offspring might end their careers.

"Stark poverty lay behind the brutalised conditions of the times. In Shaftesbury's words 'the children were in a filthy and miserable state. We washed and fed and civilised them'.

..frequently poverty was a result of trade depression which struck the deserving and undeserving alike. In such conditions parents were frequently too ignorant..to avail themselves of education even when it was offered free of charge. There were many thousands of children who had never been to school at all. In the rural districts they provided a fund of juvenile labour, but in the cities they were urchins in the streets. At best they might profitably occupy themselves running errands or selling newspapers at the worst they degenerated into thieves and gamblers". (1)

(1) Marjorie Cruickshank Church and State in English Education (17) p.20.

Of course there were those who took a reactionary line, but it is unfair to hint that this was the principal failing of church members. If anything they were so enthusiastic about providing education that they were unwilling to share the task (although they were glad to share the cost)! However, Chadwick quotes examples of the 'old school' of thought.

"The axiom that education was good for everybody was not accepted universally. Lord Melbourne was reported to have said that he did not believe in education 'because the Pagets got on so damned well without it'..

According to the Reverend Stephen Cassan the church should educate the poor because otherwise the dissenters would. 'The people at large', wrote this fierce clergyman 'have no business with minds'. Even Cobbett asked why you should teach a ploughboy to read and write when these accomplishments would be useless for mounting a cart horse". (1)

However, as Chadwick goes on to say, this old-fashioned opinion had faded by the middle of the century, at least among the educated middle and upper classes. Cruickshank does not go all the way with Chadwick about that. She lists the pressures which were making themselves felt.

- (1) Social and industrial developments had driven out many old prejudices about the children of the poor; yet there were still some to whom the chief appeal lay in the supposition that an education rate would save the costs of prisons and paupers' institutions.
- (2) Others were worried by the challenge presented to the nation's commerce by competitive foreign industries. Education provided the only way to raise the efficiency of the labouring class.
- (3) Of the competitors Prussia was the most formidable, and Prussia was the nation of schoolmasters!

(1) O. Chadwick The Victorian Church (1965) p.337.

"The need for elementary education was generally admitted; the real clash of opinion was the religious issue..

Nevertheless, it would be delusive to dismiss the (religious) dispute as a 'clerical difficulty'. In an age of spiritual and intellectual concern the supreme questions .. exercised the minds and imaginations of thoughtful men and women. Many reflecting and serious-minded Victorians were intimately involved in the fundamental differences of interpretation, and deeply stirred by the religious conflicts of the time. To them, education was not for this world; it was for the salvation of souls, a preparation for immortality, and, therefore, education which was bereft of religion, or suspect in its form of religious teaching, was fraught with the peril of eternal damnation." (1)

Thus, Cruickshank sees the difference between the admitted motives of the churches, on the one hand, and the growing unease throughout the nation as a whole about the utilitarian advantages of popular education, on the other hand. It was not until the 19th century was well under way that the unease began to grow, however. In its earlier decades "... as the great matrix of Christendom, the church founded and nourished educational institutions of all kinds", and, as part of this activity built on a desire to save souls, large numbers of elementary schools were built. In the desire to save souls the Free Churches were at one with the established church and the rest of the nation. There was disagreement about content. It was often noisy and undignified disagreement and this has led many to regard the era as one of unprecedented quarrelling (2). In fact, odd though the assertion may be to modern eyes, the 19th century was a time for settling down. Sects were friendlier than ever before. After all, a long period of mutual persecution, which included the Commonwealth period as fully as the Restoration, had closed only in the previous century. In the 19th century tolerance was for the first time de jure, and it was but a matter of time before

- (1) M. Cruickshank Church and State in English Education (19) p.21-22.
 (2) M. Cruickshank says 'It was an age of fierce sectarian rivalry'.
Church and State in English Education (19) p.14; and thus G.M. Trevelyan in British History in the 19th century (98 (b)) p.353
 '...any proposal (on education)..must involve its authors in the fiercest sectarian controversy'.

it became de facto. However, it must be admitted that the spread of tolerance was slow and the effects were not always predictable: for example, tolerant attitudes extended to ideas originating in Geneva did not always stretch to contrary ideas originating in Rome!

In the course of our period the attitudes of the interested parties undergo change. The desire to save souls is no longer noticeable to any great extent, and there is a subtle but undeniable swing towards emphasis on the practical value of education by means of 'useful' subjects. The vast majority of Englishmen, then as now, wanted religious education for their children (albeit not zealous practitioners themselves) but it was not all they wanted. Protagonists within church and parliament continued to argue about church principles; but the eidos, the spirit of the age, was undergoing change, and more utilitarian criteria were being applied. This desire for tangible, even commercial, results would affect secondary education more than primary education: yet, as always, pressure for results higher up affects 'feeder' schools, and there was little talk, even in the elementary schools, of releasing 'potentiality' in any sense that would be intended nowadays (1). It is not true that the acquisition of mere facts is the proper fruit of genuine concern for education; and its appearance during the 19th century is not to be hailed as enlightenment. Certainly it was not given an unqualified welcome when it appeared.

It was not the desire to vie with the Prussians that motivated churchmen to spend some £21 million (by Anglicans alone) and to open 6,429 new schools, "besides paying their share towards 4,900 board schools" (2); so remarked Bishop E.A. Knox. Knox, the father of 'Evoc' of Punch and of R.A. Knox, was, in his day, an elected

(1) See the quotation from Rich's essay, p. 4 above.

(2) E.A. Knox Reminiscences of an Octogenarian (2^d) p.187.

member of the Birmingham School Board and, just outside our period, as Bishop of Manchester headed a protest procession to Hyde Park (against Birrell's Bill) with some 10,000 working men from his diocese in 30 special trains. Knox remarks (1) that, in the early days, the demand for 'secular' education was not "irreligious" but "a corollary of Liberation of Religion from State control" and defines his own approach, which reflects that of many prominent and conscientious men of his day.

"A secular education is no true education because it divorces the spiritual from the intellectual development of the child, and, further, if it is carried to its logical consequences it may place children under the disastrous influence of irreligious, or even anti-religious, teachers." (1)

This point of view was to be heard many times during the course of the 19th century. Knox goes on to quote Mandell Creighton "When old school-fellows meet in after life they discuss not their lessons but their old teachers".

Here is a common attitude which prevails to our own times. It is the 'common sense' approach of the ordinary citizen who is not a professional educationist. It was and is widespread, but those who hold to such attitudes are not organised on that account. Lack of organisation can distort the findings of the historian because his attention is understandably attracted to well-publicised policies. Statements of policy provide a certain way to discovering and identifying attitudes. Unfortunately, in our period, the majority groups - Free Churches and Anglicans - did not sustain consistent policies (2). Within denominational churches 'party' policies did indeed exist, but sometimes the 'party' cut across denominational boundaries; so that a complete picture of official attitudes at no time emerges. The temptation is to concentrate on the utterances of extremists, but it is

(1) E.A. Knox op.cit. (21) p.182.

(2) As distinct from Roman Catholics and Quakers, whose policies are outlined later.

essential to keep the ideas of the moderates in mind the while.

As has been remarked, here is the reason for confining attention to the elementary schools. By 'education' the churches meant something other than what educationists desired for secondary and higher schools; for, outside the Primary stage, the basic religious principles of which Cruickshank speaks (p.7 above) naturally become overshadowed by the genuine need for some vocational bias in curricula. Having thus noted the difficulties of positive identification of 'parties' and the value of concentrating on elementary education there remains the question of what is an attitude and how it is to be uncovered.

The way to discovering an attitude may be found by studying three approaches. First, there may be clear policy statements from an organised body relating to a specific matter. Thus, the Roman Catholic hierarchy were able to speak authoritatively for members of their church about education. Secondly, the views of those who held extreme opinions call for examination although it is a precarious activity to sense what moderate views have been stretched to make a coherent but extreme approach. Thus, Dennison represented the relatively few Puseyites who feared usurpation of the church's role by the State; and Clifford opposed Puseyites with equal energy. Clifford no more represented the nonconformity of Allon, Dale or Hughes than Dennison represented the Anglicanism of Temple, Tait or the high church layman Gladstone. Their views are set out below. Thirdly, it is possible to recognise the 'party' line from time to time. Thus, the political influence of secularists increased among state officials, and appeared also among some nonconformists late in the century.

Yet given a detailed account of each of these approaches, separate or connected, the final picture is inadequate. The Victorians were very complex people. Their approach to social

problems - and solutions - is difficult to comprehend in a short study. It should be recalled that this utilitarian age also contrived an immense amount of reforming legislation as well as a great deal of philanthropic concern. Writing on another subject M.J. Jackson (1) introduces an interesting distinction.

"We may begin.. by importing the concept of social eidos, a more neutral way of speaking of the spirit of the age. By social eidos is meant the underlying and assumed ways of thinking in a particular culture. (The social ethos would be the underlying pattern of emotional attitudes.) The social ethos of our industrial society is utilitarian. Institutions should serve social purposes. Their efficiency is to be measured by technical-rational criteria."

He continues with some questions about our own day, but they might have been put to secularists in the 19th century. He questions the value of "the language of the business school" testing the best advantages to which "resources" may be put in terms of materials, time and men; and he asks if the "Glacier Institute, Lord Beeching and the public relations officer set forward the right kind of thinking for the Church's consideration of its divine calling?" This is precisely the question which a keen voluntaryist would put about the use of church schools in the 19th century; and we have seen what Knox's answer would have been. (Page 9).

At first glance the social eidos of the 20th century is every bit as utilitarian, in Jackson's sense, as was that of the 19th century (but the ethos, the pattern of emotional attitudes, is different). However, our culture at least gives the appearance of being more homogeneous. The body of articulate thinkers is relatively larger, certainly noisier and impressively international. In the socially disturbed England of a hundred years ago there were many more 'nations' than the two acknowledged by Disraeli.

(1) M.J. Jackson, article The Spirit of the Age in Church Reform: 'Theology' Vol.LXXI August 1969 No.578 p.358.

Educated and uneducated men might be secularist or religious; they might be rich Liberals or poor Tories; country folk might hold opposite views to town dwellers; and a vast multitude in the industrial areas could not afford the luxury of any socio-political outlook except one of the most primitive kind. For such reasons the social attitudes of those days are most difficult to outline in a simple way. Yet it is true that something distinctive of the age persisted up to 1914 when the whole of Europe was transformed. What was distinctive was the ethos which was, according to Jackson, the underlying pattern of emotional attitudes. Hence, Victorians could at the same time be both utilitarian and demand a cheap form of national education on one hand, and, on the other hand, they could and did display admirable concern when they were confronted by inescapable facts about contemporary destitution. There were therefore at least two forces at work. And, in the course of the century, as they tried out new ways of using and supplementing educational supply, they were liable to the influence of one or other force, though unfortunately, not unanimously.

So, in investigating Church attitudes, it is insufficient to accept a dictionary definition of attitudes as settled behaviour indicating mere opinion, or a settled mode of thinking. This was true only of some subjects, and it was less true of all subjects as the century progressed. With some Victorians the force of eidos monitored thought more than ethos; with others the reverse was true. In all cases both eidos and ethos were present in some degree. Hence it will appear that all the churches took their stand firmly on the traditions their particular ethos required, but, being children of their time, they had to learn to give way to practical considerations. Only after that do they pick up the original ideas and relate them to changed circumstances.

Chapter 2

The situation before the Education Act 1870

Education came to these islands with Christianity long before England was a nation; and for centuries the church was the patron and sole provider of learning. The church's monopoly continued through the Middle Ages until the 19th century with the single interruption caused by state control during the Commonwealth period. It was at the Restoration that Dissenters, naturally unwilling to accept church-controlled teaching for their children, founded academies; and with the spread of toleration their numbers increased. Yet there was little provision for the children of the poor, and philanthropic churchmen set up 'charity schools', owing much to the S.P.C.K. for exciting interest and support. Unfortunately, the charity school movement declined as the industrial revolution gathered momentum and for the worst economic reasons. The Sunday Schools set out to meet the need and did in fact make a significant contribution towards solving a scandalous problem. What the nation needed was a wide-spread network of day schools providing free, or almost free, instruction. The state was neither willing nor ready to provide such a system and the church had to face the task.

The famous Joseph Lancaster inspired the foundation of the British and Foreign School Society in 1807, and four years later, Andrew Bell provided a structure on which was established the National Society under the support of Archbishop Charles Manners-Sutton. Lancaster and the British Society followed an undenominational pattern of education. Bell and the National Society provided similar instruction as to secular subjects (using the monitorial system) but joined this to a dogmatic and disciplinary religious education which remained without qualification for the next twenty years. During those twenty years voluntary schools had appeared in over 6,000 areas.

1833 is an important year in the history of English Education since it is the year of the first state subsidy to assist school building, still done, it should be remembered, by voluntary bodies. The state building grant was renewed year by year but it was merely a welcome addition to the churches' respective incomes. That being so, there were no strings attached to the grant.

Suspensions were aroused early, however, that taxes might be used to maintain church property, and particularly Anglican property. It was clear that the educational need was outrunning the resources of denominations and the question of how much the state should provide appeared. Only a minority contemplated education outside the churches, but in 1836 they formed the Central Society of Education to urge governments to provide a national system of secular education. No proposal to exclude religious education was likely to win much support. The important division of opinion was not between religious education and secular education at this stage. It concerned two different notions of religious education and its content; and the two main Societies organised establishment men on the one hand and dissenters on the other.

The Treasury stipulated that half the cost of a school building must come from private resources. The National Society had the best resources. The result was it obtained £70,000 out of a possible £100,000 granted by Parliament in five years. Non-Anglicans were not slow to note that what should have been neutral money was going to the already favoured established church. At the same time, by 1838, it was clear that the state would have to take a more active part in the field of education particularly in the training of teachers. The National Society pledged itself, at a public meeting, to promote its own programme for teacher training. The government immediately resolved to

form a Committee of Council on Education and to establish a training college, thus indicating that government too was alarmed by the growing strength of the National Society. The Committee was extra-parliamentary and Kay-Shuttleworth was the paid secretary. It was evident that government was abandoning the role of paymaster and was invading the province hitherto governed exclusively by the churches, and that it intended to have its own agent for education.

However, the state had to proceed with caution. There were still no schools outside the network provided by the denominations. The official account of the number and distribution of schools throughout the denominations was given to Palmerston in 1851 by the Registrar General (1). The number of schools receiving support 'to any amount' from religious bodies is given as 12,708 and they catered for 1,188,786 scholars. The list consists of two groups; denominational and undenominational.

"From this it will be manifest that not only has popular education in this country been promoted mainly by a religious influence, but that it is now rapidly becoming a matter of denominational activity. This tendency, so far as the Dissenters are concerned, has only recently been evidenced; for schools upon the British system (which discourages sectarian teaching) satisfied their wants till about ten years ago. The controversies of that period, however, when it seemed to the Dissenters that the Government designed to place too much of the education of the poor in the hands of the established church, produced very great exertions on the part of the various bodies to counteract this supposed design... How far this denominational action is henceforth to proceed is a very important question. It is clear, however, that the Dissenting Bodies are not likely to be represented in proportion to their numbers by the day schools which their small comparative wealth will enable them to raise and carry on - exposed too as many of them must be to the competition of schools aided by the public funds. An interesting problem therefore is before us - "How is the education of dissenting parents to be provided for, in order to secure religious liberty?"

(1) The figures are from Census of Great Britain 1851: Eyre and Spottiswoode London 1854; p. liii (91)

The commentator goes on to make further extremely shrewd observations on the whole matter, and displays a remarkable grasp of the situation. He notes that if his prophecy is correct the mass of the people will have to be sent to Anglican schools - a situation not likely to cause satisfaction outside the Church of England. However, he adds some comfort for the nonconformist! It seems that for years at least four fifths of the children in elementary schools must have received their education from the Church of England; but concurrently with this "a very considerable augmentation has (according to the tables of Religious Worship) been proceeding in the number of Dissenters." (1) The result was that the number of Dissenters approached half the total population.

"This appears to prove that either the education given by the Church has been administered on very tolerant and liberal principles, or the sectarian and doctrinal instruction of the day school is extremely ineffective in comparison with those religious influences which the scholar meets elsewhere." (1)

This tactful reference to influences outside the school was perhaps as far as a senior civil servant might go in referring to the close connexion between nonconformity and radical liberalism. This connexion is important to the understanding of nonconformist attitudes and is examined later.

(1) Census: op.cit. p.liv (91)

Census 1851: Report on Education.

Table 17

Denominational Schools.

Church of England (National Society)	10,555
Church of Scotland	5
United Presbyterian Church	3
Presbyterian Church in England	28
Scottish Presbyterians (in England and Wales)	1
Presbyterians	13
Independents	453
Baptists	131
Society of Friends	33
Unitarians	39
Moravians	7
Wesleyan Methodists	381
Methodist New Connexion	14
Primitive Methodists	26
Bible Christians	8
Wesleyan Association	11
Calvinist Methodists	44
Lady Huntingdon's Connexion	10
New Church	9
Dissenters	49
Isolated Protestant Congregations	14
Lutherans	2
French Protestants	1
German Mission	2
Roman Catholics	339
Jews	12

Undenominational Schools.

British and Foreign	514
Others	4

Total 12,708 (1)

There is one ambiguity in this list, and it concerns the British schools. Some of those schools are included in figures allocated to denominations. This becomes obvious on p.lvii of the Report where it is pointed out that the Congregationalist church (Independents) lead the field outside the Church of England with 453 schools; but of the 453 there were 185 'British' schools.

"This however will not completely represent the efforts of the Congregationalists; as doubtless no inconsiderable part of the contributions which support the purely undenominational British Schools proceeds from members of this community". (1)

The position of the Free Churches had changed 1840-1843. It was in 1840 that the Committee of Council offered satisfactory terms for a compromise on the question of the state's right to inspect schools for which public funds were used. Lord John Russell had naturally expected this right when he proposed the increase of government spending on school from £20,000 to £30,000 the previous year. The inspectors were to be controlled by the Committee of Council. Russell also proposed a 'normal' school for training teachers which would give 'general' religious instruction and denominational teaching would be supplied by visiting ministers. This was the first attempt at a system which could be religious but not denominational. Unfortunately, it coincided with an Anglican movement which was moving to a climax. The Oxford Movement stressed the doctrine of the Church and of its unique catholic nature with attendant duties to the nation. Tractarians therefore rose up in indignation at Russell's proposal. The government gave way about the 'normal' school, but stood firm over the control of inspectors. In this, government strengthened its power, and this should not be overlooked on account of simultaneous denominational reaction. The right to promote the improvement of elementary education and the right to inspect its secular efficiency was established. Dissenters welcomed this.

It was natural that Dissenters welcomed the whole principle of state action more than Anglicans, and, given the traditional association between the Liberal party and nonconformity their welcome in this instance cannot have escaped the influence of political events. They had looked to the Whigs for the abolition

(1) Census 1851: p.lvii (91)

of Church rates and, perhaps, a national and non-sectarian educational system. But the Tories were returned in the 1841 election and nonconformists became anxious. Their suspicion was confirmed in 1843 when Graham's Factory Bill was introduced containing the proposal that factory schools should be controlled by representatives of the Church of England. All this helped to build up an attitude to the Established Church which influenced Dissenters until after the end of the 19th century. Even the Wesleyans, the largest nonconformist body and the one most friendly to Anglicans, were horrified. After 1843, therefore, nonconformists looked less to the state for support and adopted the principle and practice of 'voluntaryism', that is, of non-interference of the state in education. There is evidence of vacillation here. Earlier the 18th century idea that any state interference was an infringement of liberty had settled men's minds about education. Then, when the state seemed to offer relief from Anglican monopoly, free churchmen tended to want education supplied by the state and of a non-sectarian kind. Further evidence of plans to send more state money into Anglican coffers now, in 1843, compelled free churchmen to start their own schools. Later, when they were unable to compete with rising costs, they switched back to supporting the cry for state control. What did not vacillate was their determination not to be dominated by the Church of England!

Prior to the resolutions of 1843 Free Church support had gone for the most part to British system schools which seemed to secure for them both religious liberty and religious education. In the distress of 1843 they began in earnest to establish day schools. In this, as has been noted, the Congregationalists were leading the others, at least by 1851; and this was the result of a strongly worded resolution passed at the Leeds

Meeting of the Congregational Union and subsequently adopted by the meeting in London on 13/14 December 1843.

"Resolved, that this Meeting, utterly repudiating on the strongest grounds of Scripture and Conscience, the receipt of money raised by taxation, and granted by the Government, for sustaining the Christian religion, feels bound to apply this principle no less to the work of religious education."

A Congregational Board of Education was set up to coordinate the efforts of the Connexion. Among other things it was responsible for organising their several training ventures at Homerton College (which had previously been used for training ministers).

Congregationalists were able to distinguish between a denominational course of action and a system of sectarian teaching. Acting independently would, they thought, create efficient and harmonious action. It would also provide opportunities to enlist the sympathies of various churches; for united action is more difficult to achieve in the context of avowedly independent congregations. Nevertheless, admission to their schools was unrestricted and education was based on evangelical principles without taint of catechism.

"The education given in schools connected with this Board shall be conducted on evangelical views of religion: neither the learning of any denominational formulary nor attendance at any particular place of worship shall be a condition of admittance to them..." (1)

These details are given to show the ecclesiological background to their thinking; for it might be obscured when their attachment to particular political programmes later in the century is described.

The Wesleyan Methodists' figures are also lower than would be the case if the Census took account of their support for British schools. No formal action by Conference appears to have been taken before 1833; but in 1837 an Educational Committee was

(1) Quoted Census 1851 footnote p.lix (91)

formed, and, by 1840 the number of Wesleyan schools had risen to 101. Like most free churchmen Wesleyans were alarmed by the 1843 proposals and actually resolved to build as many as 700 new schools in a decade! Although the scheme was not fully realised, it got well under way. However, the Wesleyans were not of the same mind as Congregationalists about accepting assistance from the Parliamentary grant. Indeed, they at no time objected to the principle of state support for religious education.

Their elementary schools were managed by local committees of which two-thirds of the members were always Wesleyan Methodists and on which circuit ministers were included. The schools were distinctive in that they were fully committed to education of a religious character. The Wesleyan catechism was used daily and no doctrines contrary to Wesley's "Notes on the New Testament" were to be taught. On Sundays the pupils were to attend Wesleyan chapels. None of these regulations applied to children whose parents objected, and in this respect they set an example to the National Society!

The Roman Catholics came fourth in the list of non-Anglican providers of schools in 1851. The Associated Catholic Charities and the Catholic Institute had been set up in 1815 becoming the Catholic Poor School Committee in 1847, and, in turn the present Catholic Education Council in 1905. The recognition of the Catholic Poor Schools Committee as the channel of communication between themselves and the committee of council was a landmark. (1) Its secretary T.W. Allies was to be a tower of strength for the next 30 years. Catholics received great intellectual stimulus from the (Anglican) Oxford Movement, indeed Allies himself was a convert. This stimulus was perhaps the more necessary as their numbers swelled by the arrival of half a million Irish between 1841 and 1851: the potato famine was in 1846. Areas of

(1) W.H.G. Armytage Four Hundred Years of English Education

concentrated Irish settlements like Manchester, where Kay-Shuttleworth had obtained his early insights into the problems of poverty, were to see "some interesting further experiments, like the Irish Community of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary" (1). The Roman Church stood aside from alignment with any political party in educational matters (except when it affected Ireland), but, as the century progressed, they became increasingly worried about the 'leakage' of Catholics educated outside their control. The same problem attracted the attention of the Registrar General, and his comment is recorded above in connexion with the Church of England; but Anglican divines seemed to have remained blissfully unaware of their plight! Catholic 'leakage' may be traced to two contributory factors. The first was the serious deterioration in social conditions in the growing towns. The second was the arrival by the middle of the century of open secularism in intellectual and therefore in educational circles. In practice these factors must have affected all denominations. Catholics had the additional problem of dealing with Boards of Guardians who were anti-Catholic.

A.C.F. Beales (2) gives the numbers of schools in 1850 as 236 day schools and 60 Sunday Schools with 25 in London alone. This is below the figure given in the 1851 Census Report by the Registrar General (3). The schools had been erected by voluntary subscription from a Catholic population of nearly one million. Although the schools held 38,207 pupils, there remained 101,930 Catholic children without places. By further remarkable efforts 101,556 of these children were catered for by 1870. Beales gives some of the difficulties.

".. insofar as education is, to the Catholic, a unity of religious and secular formation in a theological atmosphere, religious instruction is vital. And, by the concordat with the Privy Council in 1847, religious instruction was outside the H.M.I.'s purview. There was

(1) W.H.G. Armytage Four Hundred Years of English Education

(3) p.116

(2) A.C.F. Beales in The English Catholics 1850-1950 (6) p.371

(3) Census Report 1851 p.lxi (91)

no organised means of assessing or improving it;
and the unaided Catholic schools were of course, not
inspected at all." (1)

In 1856 the Hierarchy set up their own inspectorate to examine religious instruction on a diocesan basis. This was financed by the Catholic Poor School Committee; but, in view of the expanding educational demand over the country, this was not a very satisfactory situation in the long-term.

An additional source of worry arrived with the Revised Code of 1861. Beales remarks that by relating grants to the "3 R's" the Code advised against straining after higher classes (since the grants would not depend on higher work). This deterred pupils from enrolling as pupil-teachers, and was a cause of leakage. At the same time, we shall see that, later on, when more senior studies were encouraged this in turn caused trouble for Catholic schools, because 'specific' and scientific subjects were expensive to provide. All this was noted by Cardinal Manning in his Pastoral Letter of 1866 which was described by The Times as 'free from exaggeration'.

Thus, the danger to the cause of Catholic education was seen early. As one Chairman of the Poor Schools Committee (T.W. Allies) had remarked.

"There can be no sound religion without education: as
is the teacher, so is the child: as is the trainer,
so is the teacher." (2)

Allies saw the size of the problems ahead; for his comment was made when, according to Beales, only one Catholic child in three attended a school of his Church, and, of these, only a third attended for more than one year. It may be added that most of these children would be under 8 years of age.

The Roman Catholic thinkers had the advantage of belonging to a large and well-informed international organisation. This advantage was, unfortunately, shared by neither the Church of

(1) A.C.F. Beales in The English Catholics 1850-1950 (6) p.371
(2) Beales op. cit. p.372

England, nor, as will be apparent, by the Free Churches. Catholics were able to draw on the experience of their co-religionists outside Britain, as Manning was to show. This accounts for a refreshing absence of parochialism in their educational thinking which ought not to be overlooked on account of their acceptance of aid on Government's terms - which were the only terms they could get. However, the passage of time made it evident that the Government would have to face up to creating a national system. Given Gladstone's expressed desire, the question was bound to be about the kind of religious teaching to be given in schools which were financed out of public funds; therefore, Catholic opinion would have to adjust if State schools were to take Catholic children.

The Baptists had 131 schools in 1851 containing 9,390 scholars. However, the Baptists were generally adverse to denominational action in the matter of day schools and they therefore contributed much of their resources to the maintenance of British Schools. "It will therefore be apparent that the Baptists are opposed to State-interposition in the work of education" wrote the Registrar General (1).

Other religious bodies than those mentioned above made comparatively small provision; that is, 331 schools containing 33,551 pupils between them. Yet this list has left unmentioned the schools of the British and Foreign School Society of which the Census reports there were 514 (see p.17 above). The Census compilers had difficulty (2).

".. to obtain a view of the total number of British schools (3) there must be a certain number added of the schools which are connected with particular bodies, and which yet retain the distinctive features, and some of them the name, of British schools. The effect of an addition of all such .. will be to raise the number of such schools to 857.. But even this would be an insufficient statement; for no doubt a certain number,

(1) Census 1851 p.lxii (91)

(2) do. p.lxiii

(3) That is, Schools conducted on the principles of the British and Foreign School Society

not described as British schools, are really such. Mr. Dunn, the Secretary of the Society, is stated to estimate the number of scholars at upwards of 200 (see Public Education by Sir J.K. Shuttleworth p. 11)

The Registrar General's difficulty was that the Society advocated what Cruickshank calls "simple Bible teaching" (2). The Society's principles were declared to be as follows.

1. That in all schools established in connection with or assisted by the British and Foreign School Society the Holy Scriptures in the authorised version or extracts therefrom shall be read and taught daily.
2. That no catechism or other formulary peculiar to any religious denomination shall be introduced or taught during the usual hours of school instruction.
3. That every child attending the day school shall be expected to attend the particular place of worship or Sunday School which its parents prefer.

If every school conforming with these principles was considered to be a British School, then, in the Census compiler's opinion, the Society's Secretary had underestimated the number of pupils affected. For example, Congregational schools were of this character, as were those of the Baptists. The Wesleyans employed a Catechism, but the same principles were otherwise embodied since no conditions about attending places of worship were imposed on parents. So the increased denominational energy of the Free Churches had the effect of diminishing only the apparent strength of the British and Foreign School Society, because they no doubt started calling their schools by their own names.

The Radicals and secularists naturally stood apart from all this activity. At this time there was no common ground between them and any church body.

(1) Census 1851, p. lxxiii (91)

(2) M. Cruickshank op.cit. (17) p.2

"Despite their differences, denominationalists were united in their belief that religious and secular education were inseparable, united also in their faith in the philanthropic and personal value of voluntary work and in their distrust of the bureaucratic powers of the State." (1)

Secularists therefore seemed to have bided their time until the overwhelming opposition to them might subside and until they could gain a hearing for their advocacy on behalf of secular education controlled and directed by the government. Their numbers were growing, as was their influence, not least in Parliament where, for instance, J.A. Roebuck, M.P. for Sheffield, had long championed their cause.

However dissatisfied minority opinion may have been there was, as Armytage has observed, a very great deal to be proud of.

"To thinking men, however, the great educational landmark of 1851 was not so much the exhibition in Hyde Park as the Census. This showed that the population was now 17,927,609: an increase of 101.6% since 1801... Special educational questions had been inserted in the Census. These showed that the 2,144,378 children at 46,142 day schools in England and Wales represented a proportion of 1 to 8.36% of the population. This was a great advance from 1818 when the proportion was 1 to 17.25%..." (2)

Gratifying though these statistics were, discontent was in the air. The discontent is notable in the growth of voluntarism within Dissenting circles where there was a fixed determination to diminish the favoured position of the Church of England in the state, in the parish and therefore in the schools. The year of Graham's Factory Bill saw the preliminary flotation of the British Anti-State-Church Association (1844) which gave impetus and focus to an organised and sustained attack on Establishment, as such; and this was closely linked to attitudes to political parties and their fortunes rather than to the needs of children in elementary schools. Yet unfortunately for education, Anglican ascendancy in providing schools was attacked as if it was a source

(1) M. Cruickshank op.cit. (17) p.7

(2) W.H.G. Armytage Four Hundred Years of English Education

of grievance similar to the compulsory Church rate, incumbents' control of churchyards or the exclusion of Dissenters from universities. Ten years after the Association re-styled itself The Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Patronage (1854), and, as such, it flourished under the influence of the most eminent disestablishmentarians for a generation to come. It is mentioned here because the effect of disestablishmentarianism was to colour the outlook of many fine champions of the underprivileged. Its greatest leader perhaps was Edward Mill (1809-81) and later Dale of Birmingham, his follower and friend. The question is why nonconformists should seem to have been unhelpful, not to say obstructive, to the cause of education simply because the Church of England held the largest number of schools, and did so at a time when it is very questionable whether the electorate would have returned any party which proposed to pay for mass education out of public funds. The answer is important to any understanding of nonconformist attitudes to educational legislation right up to 1902, so to avoid repetition it is stated here. Men like Mill were convinced from the bottom of their hearts that in attacking the established church they were waging war against a false idea which had had disastrous effects upon the morale of the nation, and, indeed, the church.

".. to men like Mill and Dale - and their followers were numerous and generous and energetic - the union of Church and State was a superstition, a blasphemy, an offence against God and man.

Mystics and politicians, fired with moral passion, they cried *Ecrasez l'infâme* and embarked upon the business of its destruction". (1)

There was more to it than that. The Anglican church was already divided by the Oxford Movement into those who stressed its catholic heritage (and often defected to Roman Catholicism) and those who did not. Those who did not were not always enthusiastic

(1) W.G. Addison Religious Equality in Modern England (2) p.91-2

churchmen in practice; but the suspicion of Romanism which was at the time almost synonymous with Puseyitism could create an astonishing alarm in the most luke-warm. Sometimes this had unpleasant results. Thus, James Frazer wrote to Thomas Mozley in 1855 (1) "In half the constituencies of England a man has to pander to an ignorant and fanatical Protestantism (as it calls itself) of the narrowest and most intolerant kind to have a chance of getting elected." The Liberation Society attracted the support of men who were not of Miall's stamp.

Nonconformists pinned their hopes on the government of the country being in the hands of first Whigs then Liberals. The 1851 Census, made public in 1854, encouraged them by displaying their great numerical strength. Addison says it is possible for us, like them, to make too much of the statistics.

".. though we need not accept the exaggerated estimate of the Nonconformist historian that 'the Religious Census of 1851 stands out as one of the landmarks in the ecclesiastical history of England', it is true that the enquiry evoked great excitement and that its results afforded strong stimulus to the propaganda of the Liberation Society. Statistics, official and accurate, were now available to buttress the Dissenting thesis that the Church (of England) could no longer maintain her claim to represent the nation on its religious side...

To all this there were from various quarters ample and elaborate rejoinders, notably by Gladstone in the Commons and by Bishop Wilberforce in the Lords...

In 1881 the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation expressed its opinion that the (misleading) results of the Census of 1851 had been the ground of subsequent legislation injurious to the Church and too favourable to Dissent." (2)

Nevertheless, the statistics brought home to the church and the politicians the existence of a powerful and rapidly increasing Dissenting community now approaching numerical parity with the Established Church. The view of establishment - of Church and State - which came under attack is described below. Here the

(1) W.G. Addison Religious Equality in Modern England (2) p.99
 (2) W.G. Addison op.cit. (2) p.99

beginnings of bitter disagreement is noted among the non-conformists and their misgivings were not allayed by educational legislation which they perceived as much too favourable to the establishment.

Yet within the much maligned established church much was being accomplished at least in the field of elementary education. As early as 1843 the National Society had called for 'extraordinary efforts to raise manufacturing and mining districts from the alarming state of ignorance and demoralization recently disclosed to public view'. The disclosure had been by means of riots! For an explanation of the frame of mind which gave rise to rioting reference may be made to Royston Pike Human Documents of the Industrial Revolution (61) pp.156-175 and 245-277 for accounts of the conditions of life and employment. As a result the Society received donations totalling £114,000 in the first six months alone and rising to £150,000 by the end of the year (1).

The National Society was openly dedicated to the education of children in the credal principles of the established church. That was its Charter, and that was how it attracted support. An uncompromising account of its aims appeared as early as 1834 (2).

"Indeed, under circumstances of every kind, it is a religious impression on the minds of the young which the Society desires to produce - and whatever knowledge and intellectual powers it may cherish, and whatever habits of useful industry and manual skill it may impart, it is the reasonable service of the creature in the worship of Almighty God which it principally desires to secure, by promoting the habitual observance of the Lord's Day, by training the infant mind to contemplate the mercy of God in redeeming and sanctifying His People, and thus laying the foundation of those higher acts of Church membership which He will expect at their hands as they advance in years."

Now doctrinal pronouncement were by no means a matter of form in the nineteenth century. And, if this statement by the National Society shows something less than insight into the

(1) The figures are quoted in Elliott-Binns English Thought 1860-1900

(28a) p.2.

(2) The National Society Annual Report 1834 (92a)

activity of the 'infant mind', it is not lacking in the best sort of charity and concern. This must be borne in mind in assessing denominational attitudes and their trends, however patchy and however violent the outward expression of attitudes may be.

The trouble arose in areas where the only school available was owned and run by the Society or the incumbent, because that meant that the local parson had total control of the religious education of the children there. This might not have been so serious if the Oxford Movement and the Disestablishment movement had not occurred; in nonconformist minds the one linked to Rome, and the other linked to many grievances outside the field of education. As it was, the fear of "Romanizing", the pursuit of religious liberty combined with the sheer size of the National Society to alarm nonconformity. Indeed, attitudes hardened all round, and it may be that here is one example of eidos forcing ethos into an eclipse.

Together with the problems arising in 'one-school areas' was the unpalatable fact that the National Society received very large grants of public money. This was interpreted as state support for the property of the Church of England and the indignation which this caused is amply evidenced in reactions and attitudes, not only at the middle of the century, but also when the great Education Acts 1870 and 1902 were under discussion. For their part, Anglicans admitted that they received the lion's share of grant money; but they pointed out that as they owned most of the schools this was inevitable.

Yet there were moderate men of sense even within the Church of England who sought for a fair solution and who tried to make their voices heard. One such W.F. Hook (Vicar of Leeds and later Dean of Chichester) had offered some suggestions as early as 1844. He examined the whole problem brilliantly.

"The State could not consistently undertake to educate the whole people on a religious basis which was not common to the whole. And if it sought for this common basis, where was it to be found? Not in the Church (of England), not in any of the countless variety of sects, not in the Bible since all disagreed respecting the interpretation of the Bible." (1)

And, if this were so, how could the State be blamed for not doing what it could not do even if it had a mandate? Hook then produced a plan so remarkable in its foresight that it deserves to be better known than it is. He suggested schools established and supported by the State in which "that secular instruction only should be given which all denominations could agree about": and that would settle the problem of curriculum. However, the children were to produce every week a certificate that they had attended at Sunday School, Church or "some legally licensed place of worship". Every school would have special classrooms and "on Fridays and Wednesdays the Parish Clergy and Dissenting Ministers should give religious instruction separately to the children of their respective flocks." This is an anticipation of the "withdrawal Class". Indeed, excepting the matter of obligatory attendance at worship which, written in 1844, offends modern eyes, Hook's scheme is excellent and ought to have been adopted. As he pointed out, nobody's principles were violated by the scheme.

Hook had a further plan about school management which included local control of a different kind from that envisaged by the British and Foreign Schools Society. He asked for a County rate to be levied. Each district within a County should have a Board to which County Magistrates should appoint members irrespective of their religious affiliations. Hook chose magistrates because he thought they would know the area well and would be removed from 'parochial or municipal cabals'.

(1) W.R.V. Stephens Life of W.F. Hook (7C) p.404

Hook earned the approval of the Liberal party and was even praised in the 'Quarterly Review'. Churchmen, however, did not like his scheme and they said so.

Meanwhile the number of children was increasing faster than the number of schools. Hook recognised this and demanded more schools (and teachers) on a non-denominational basis. He consulted with Kay Shuttleworth before writing his 'Letter to the Bishop of S.David's on the Means of Rendering more Efficient the Education of the People'. (1)

With the next Whig Government Kay Shuttleworth moved quietly to get more money for schools, and therefore more State control of the schools owned by particular denominations. In 1846 he reached agreement with the National Society about 'Management Clauses' for schools receiving State aid (reported in 'The Schools Guardian' 1847 p.587). They agreed that the members of Management Committees must be Church of England; some lawyers objected that this could include Dissenters, because Dissenters had never been officially ex-communicated. The country clergy were alarmed at the prospect of 'their' schools falling into unusual hands! Controversy arose and became both heated and confused.

Kay Shuttleworth's popularity waned in spite of granting some concessions ('The Schools Guardian' 1849 p.355), although The National Society and the Archbishop were content. Then Kay Shuttleworth made matters worse by founding a normal school at Kneller Hall in 1849. He appointed Frederick Temple to superintend it. This provoked discontent among the supporters of the National Society. Although Broad Churchmen and Evangelicals would have liked peace, because they disliked quarrelling with the Government, the High Churchmen were powerful in their indignation. However, High Churchmen suffered an eclipse of influence in 1850 (due to feelings roused by Papal aggression),

(1) This was in 1846.

See W.R.W. Stephens Life of Hook (70) p.403 ff

and it became a matter for debate whether the clergy should be allowed to control anything, including schools. Even High Churchmen must have realised by now that the National Society could not repudiate State aid (because the people could not be educated without State money); but if so, men like Denison did not admit it. The Annual General Meeting of the National Society in 1851 ended in uproar and deadlock. Then, also in 1851, the moderates formed a break-away Society on Protestant principles, the Church Education Society.

However he may have offended some Churchmen, Kay Shuttleworth had at least succeeded in making more education available for the 'labouring poor'. Then, after his resignation, there were administrative changes of a very significant kind. In 1856 the status of the Committee of the Privy Council was raised to that of a Department of Education. This was done by Order in Council, not by Parliament. The President remained the chief of the Department, and he was represented in the House of Commons by his Vice President. The Vice President was chosen by the Prime Minister as he formed his Cabinet. Thus education was linked with party politics.

The significance of the link with politics did not appear at once. The ideal system of education, to most Englishmen, continued to be a chain of schools in the hands of the leading denominations; although it was realised that help from taxes would be needed. As late as 1859 the Church of England received two-thirds of the total State grants. The conscience of Free Churchmen began to stir over the problem created for them by the Anglican monopoly in some parishes. Yet, according to Chadwick, by the middle of the nineteenth century half of the incumbents allowed dissenters' children to absent themselves from religious instruction and acts of worship. Such parish clergy would be Broad Churchmen, of course. Sticklers, such as

High Churchmen, would do nothing of the sort, on the grounds that the Rubric in the Baptism Service required them to see that the catechism was taught. Kay Shuttleworth and his supporters had worked to get acceptance for a Conscience Clause. It was still too early to insist, until, in 1860, it was enforced in Wales. The Revised Code (1862) required a Conscience Clause in all State-aided schools, and this was the subject of renewed controversy even after 1870 when it was required by Act of Parliament.

This reference to Wales, where controversy followed different courses, reminds the historian that political schedules are planned and executed within a larger context than the relatively simple task of providing elementary education. The beginning of the second half of the 19th century was a time when thoughtful people were aware of immense changes. Even abroad there was much to report which stirred the conscience and altered social mores for good. For example, 1865 saw both the death of Lincoln and the 13th Amendment banishing slavery and involuntary servitude from the United States of America. In Europe France and Germany moved towards war (which broke out in 1870) while the Roman Catholic world prepared for the forthcoming Vatican Council. In Britain the universities came under attack from reformers with the important effect of removing the bar to entry applying to non-Anglicans. Church rates came under serious fire in a series of Bills beginning in 1858. These had the important effect of pressing Gladstone further towards political Liberalism in spite of his churchmanship; and he introduced the Bill which successfully ended this source of genuine discontent in 1868. Another real grievance, the right to nonconformist use of burial grounds, was hotly debated until it was finally removed in 1880.

These matters indicate the feeling that was in the air. Outside Parliament, Convocation, on one hand, and the Liberation

Society on the other, organised every sort of protest, while fear of the unknown and indignation took hold of the country clergy and many of their parishioners. Politicians knew well that an attack on the citadel of the established church was well on its way; and, indeed, the Liberation Society made no secret of its intentions in this respect. When Gladstone returned to head the great Liberal government 1868-74 - which was to initiate the first Education Act (1870) - the really paramount issues were ecclesiastical. And the eager reformers on the Prime Minister's left caused him great anxiety; and there was little comfort from the right!

"(Gladstone).. who happened to be the most eminent and devout layman of the Tractarian School received rather less courtesy and understanding from Archdeacon Denison's The Church and State Review than from Mr. Miall's Nonconformist. It was not only on the Home Rule issue that Gladstone might have complained that he had received his worst wounds in the house of his friends." (1)

Needless to say, Mr. Miall's supporters in Gladstone's party were highly suspicious of his high church attitude about the church's role; and, much encouraged by his disestablishment plan for Ireland, it is not surprising that they looked for something of the sort in England in their own time. This was the atmosphere in which the country approached the date of Forster's Education Act (1870) and the ecclesiastical issue can no more be ignored than the spirit of radical change and expectancy that was everywhere.

"The great Liberal Ministry of 1868-74 did not altogether belie the hopeful vigour of its inauguration. It has to its credit legislative achievements of solid and permanent worth. But it was essentially a conjunction of incompatible minds; it rested on a majority embracing two antagonistic philosophies and traditions; and the underlying antipathy on occasion flared into open animosity.

Whenever religious or ecclesiastical issues were in debate the atmosphere grew more electric, tempers rose and brotherly concord declined. Unfortunately the early sessions of this Parliament were filled to overflowing with precisely that kind of issue." (2)

- (1) W.G. Addison Religious Equality in Modern England (2) p.127
 (2) W.G. Addison Religious Equality in Modern England (2) p.127

Addison continues with the observation that in 1870 the House of Commons discussed at great length seven measures of a purely ecclesiastical character, in addition to the sectarian clauses of the Education Bill. The same thing happened in 1871. There were three discernible effects which touched even the lowly affairs of children in schools, albeit indirectly. The first effect was that the Non-conformist and radical element revolted against the moderate centre of the Liberal party. The second was that this impelled a progressive decline in party morale and loyalty. The third was that as tempers rose the natural compassion of those who would have provided the children of the nation with a system of education was more than once overcome by indignation about the rights and privileges of organised church bodies.

Chapter 3

The First Education Act 1870

It is hard to tell how much the difficulties, not to say bitterness, which accompanied the first attempts to supply a national system of education were due to political frustration. We have seen in the previous chapter, that the political atmosphere was tense and that this was bound to affect the workings of Parliament: Education Bills were not excepted. W.G. Addison (1) remarks, for example, that "... the vast body of nonconformist Liberals cherished the most avid expectations and consequently suffered the bitterest disappointment". Anglicans, on the other hand, either sided with radical Liberal thought or with the party, such as that headed by Denison, which reflected a new self-consciousness about the nature of the church: they thus tended to use the same approach as was brilliantly outlined by the (more consistent) Roman Catholic church. This in turn alarmed Free Churchmen who feared Puseyiteism for just this reason - that it aligned a reformed church with Roman Catholic policies. These attitudes are examined below.

Frustrated or not, according to M. Cruickshank, it was the radical element which set the machinery of government in motion.

"It was the Radicals of Birmingham who provided in 1869 the powerful organisation for a national agitation, the National Education League, which immediately launched a widespread campaign for a universal system of education, free, compulsory and unsectarian, supported by rate aid and subject to public management. Politically the League was frankly partisan." (2)

The most prominent members of the League included George Dixon M.P. for the borough, Archdeacon John Sandford of Coventry, George Dawson who called himself a 'Latitudinarian avowedly'. Then there was Joseph Chamberlain who was to find himself in some difficulty later when he joined a coalition government. Finally, there was the great Robert William Dale, a Congregationalist minister of note.

(1) W.G. Addison Religious Equality in Modern England (2) p.125

(2) M. Cruickshank Church and State in English Education
(17) p.16

The group formed a National Education League as early as February 1869. Within eight months it had recruited 2,500 'influential members', including forty Members of Parliament and over 300 ministers of religion. There were branches in London and seventeen other towns as well as Birmingham.

The League published a circular declaring its object to be "the establishment of a system which shall secure the education of every child in England and Wales." Although they disagreed about some things, the membership was united in the belief that this object could not be attained by means of a voluntary system. So, to achieve the League's object, local authorities must be compelled to ensure that there was adequate school accommodation within their areas. This would mean local State schools; and these were to be founded and maintained by local rates and Government grants. They were to be inspected by Government officers; but they were to be managed by the local authority - that is, by town councils or boards of guardians. The instruction in these schools would be "unsectarian, free", compulsory and universal. The League set out to disseminate relevant information to increase support for new legislation. They were obviously preparing to influence the shape of Forster's Bill.

At a meeting of the League in October 1869 it became clear that there was disagreement, or at least ambiguity, about the meaning of the word 'unsectarian'.

"Archdeacon Sandford did not like the word, but preferred to say 'undenominational'. Professor Fawcett explained that unsectarian did not mean secular; that it left the managers free to follow the British and Foreign School Society's plan for Bible-reading without note or comment. The less politic George Dawson bluntly declared that they meant instruction to be 'purely secular. Disguise it as you may, to that complexion you must come at last.'

A.J. Mundella, M.P. for Sheffield and a future Vice President of the Committee of Council, contributed the

following novelty to this discussion: 'the word secular is scandalously abused. All truth is holy. The order, system and cleanliness of a school are the most religious influences, I think, that can be brought to bear'.... Finally, George Dixon, the Chairman, ruled that 'unsectarian' meant the exclusion of all dogmatic, theological teaching, creeds and catechisms, but not the exclusion of Bible-reading.." (1)

Dixon announced their intention to bring strong pressure to bear upon both Forster and the Prime Minister. Although the League suggested only that it should supplement the voluntary-ists' efforts, the meeting at Birmingham showed that the voluntary system was in serious danger. Soon the friends of denominationalism in education united in defence. This took the form of the National Education Union.

The National Education Union included members of all churches. It reflects the voluntaryist, not the Anglican, point of view. Since it was a reaction to the Birmingham League it is included here with the account of the League instead of being set within the account of the Church of England's attitudes. Similarly, the account of the League belongs here and not with the story of the attitudes of Non-Conformists, because it was not a specifically Christian, let alone Non-Conformist, body.

The Union was formed on October 1st 1869 and planned a conference in Manchester in November. It was joined by a large number of peers, politicians and churchmen of all denominations. Their object was to 'secure the primary education of every child by judiciously supplementing the present denominational system of national education.' Nothing was said about how new schools were to be founded; but it was made clear that religious teaching should continue to be denominational. The Union was in opposition to the League; and this became very clear after February 1870 when the Bill was introduced.

(1) J.N. Adamson English Education (1) p.350

The Bill was the work of W.E. Forster and contained the germ of controversy and argument which persisted until after the turn of the nineteenth century. Forster was Thomas Arnold's son-in-law. He understood about the lack of school places in the country and about the uneven distribution of the schools: for, in 1870, there was only one school place for every 3 or 5 children (it is difficult to give exact figures for the nineteenth century populations). The large voluntary system was already there and Forster's Bill was intended to "fill in the gaps". It was a compromise Bill only; and, although an important piece of legislation, it did not create a national system, a completely compulsory system or a free system. The Bill left room for more voluntary effort, for school fees and for private endowments to continue. The effect was as follows.

First, School Boards were to be set up in places where the voluntary bodies could not or would not cope with the task (by applying for a Government grant). This stimulated the voluntary bodies by alarming them; and, by 1876, some 1,500,000 new places were provided, of which two-thirds were supplied by the National Society.

Secondly, School Boards were to consist of members elected ad hoc by the rate-payers in the locality. One admirable innovation was that women were eligible for election. This according to the following comment by the Quakers some years afterwards, seem not to have worked well in practice.

".. another unfortunate feature of the Bill (i.e. of 1902) is its effect on the election and position of women on the Education Authority. A woman might be placed on either the central committee or the school committee by the nominating Authority, but, if past experience is any guide, very few women would in future be allowed to take any part in the educational work of the country." (From the Report of the Committee on the Education Bill for the Meeting of Sufferings 16 May 1902).

Thirdly, School Boards were to establish and maintain elementary schools out of the rates which would be added to government grants as well as fees.

Fourthly, the School Board was to ensure the attendance of children aged between 5 and 12 years. This had been one of Kay-Shuttleworth's problems. Schooling was not welcomed by those industrialists and parents who wished to see quite small children at work.

Fifthly, the School Boards were to have powers of decision about religious education in their schools. A Conscience Clause was to be applied (Clause 7). This was a cause of contention; and so was Clause 14 (2). Clause 14 (2) forbade the teaching of any "catechism or formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination"; and this is the famous Cowper-Temple clause. Here was a law which forbade the teaching of the established Church in the schools owned by the State.

"The Elementary Education Act 1870 established elective school boards for the purpose of providing and maintaining from public funds schools which became known as board schools. The Act established the principle, by the provision known as the Cowper-Temple Clause that tenets distinctive of particular religious denominations should not be taught in publicly provided schools." (1)

Sixthly, only secular teaching was to be inspected or made the condition of a grant.

The Bill did not establish a national system. The Grants to voluntary schools were doubled and thus Anglican and Roman Catholic schools were permanently established. That is, the Act established a 'Dual System' which is in existence to this day. This event does not merit unqualified applause, and it did not get it at the time.

"The Act of 1870 is a landmark in the history of religious education in England. Before that date the State had insisted on the union of religious and

(1) Wells and Taylor The New Law of Education (79) p.119 footnote

secular instruction and had made this union a condition of all grants. No school had been entitled to support unless it was connected with one of the religious societies... After 1870 State responsibility was confined to the secular sphere.. In the Act itself all references to religious instruction were restrictive, board schools were to exclude catechisms and formularies from their teaching, denominational schools were to confine their religious instruction to the beginning and/or end of the school session, and where parents objected no attendance at religious worship or instruction was required...

Before that date (1870) the central Government had had a positive regard for the teaching of religion and had in fact insisted that there was no education without religion; now, and for three-quarters of a century it assumed a negative attitude and confined its interests to the sphere of secular instruction." (1)

Cruickshank is right to make the point that the 1870 Education Act was one of the most important landmarks in the history of England. It was, moreover, a decidedly educational measure, which was, at the time, often overlooked. The oversight is understandable, since the problem of the schools in the modern state inevitably raises those fundamental ethical issues which have been debated throughout the centuries, and which we are presently examining as they appeared in the 19th century.

"The English orators, reformers, parliamentarians and pamphleteers of 1870 were certainly not unaware of the far-reaching issues at stake, and rival partisans were therefore more eager to secure the preservation or the entry of their own fundamental ideas in the educational system of the future." (2)

(1) M. Cruickshank Church and State in English Education (17)
p.36-7

(2) W.G. Addison Religious Equality in Modern England (2) p.129

Chapter 4

Educational Law 1870-1901

Elections to the new School Boards were fought in many places with great bitterness. There were extremists who denounced the Act because it interfered with the voluntary system. Intolerance, fear of increased rates, hatred of compulsion and the unfair taunt that Board School education was 'godless' were among the accusations flung about. On the other side, radicals complained most of Clause 25 in the Act which empowered school boards to pay the fees of necessitous children at whatever school, denominational or not, the parents had selected. Forster was accused of betraying the Liberal cause by allowing this. John Bright denounced him publicly. John Morley wrote a passionate and reasoned statement of the opposition's case. However, a close reading of Morley's National Education (1) shows that he is not only concerned with Clause 25 - which meant that in 1872 school boards paid a mere £5,000 to the voluntary schools - but also with the continuance of voluntary schools. Yet his indictment of church schools was partly an indictment of the system of 'payment by results'. This system was no part of the plan of any church. It was a state system. Yet Morley's book is important to show the impatience for progress; for, by the Reform Act 1867, the English people were franchised, though still only half-literate. Morley had great faith in democracy and he sorely desired to educate the nation for its political tasks and to do so quickly.(2) Forster's opponents were not appeased by his suggestion in 1873 that fees for needy children might be paid by Boards of Guardians: they were angry about the destination of the fees - the church schools - not the source.

(1) No. 49 (b) in the book list.

(2) John Morley National Education (49(b) p.8.

Meanwhile, school boards were set up; and 300 were established by the end of 1871. A few boards decided for secular schools but the majority followed the lead of the London School Board. London resolved that board schools should give explanations and instruction about readings from the Bible "in the principles of morality and religion" provided that it was done in the spirit of the Cowper-Temple amendment. This resolution was followed by a noteworthy declaration by T.H. Huxley, who was a member of the London school board.

"When the great mass of the English people declare that they want to have the children in the elementary schools taught the Bible, and when it is plain from the terms of the Act, the debates in and out of Parliament, and especially in the emphatic declarations of the Vice-President of the Council, that it was intended that such Bible reading should be permitted, unless good cause for prohibiting it could be shown, I do not see what reason there is for opposing that wish.

Certainly, I, individually, could with no shadow of consistency oppose the teaching of the children of other people to do that which my own children are taught to do. And even if the teaching of the Bible were not, as I think it is, consonant with political reason and justice, and with a desire to act in the spirit of the education measure, I am disposed to think it might still be well to read that book in the elementary schools." (1)

Thus, however discontented the radicals were, the 1873 Act required school fees to be paid by guardians if this was necessary, and, in any case, children whose parents received parish relief were compelled to send them to school. Regulations were also made to limit expenditure connected with school board elections, and the Education Department had fiscal powers in this connexion. Of this, the compulsory element was the most important: not surprisingly, compulsion spread more rapidly in towns than in rural districts. By 1873 forty per cent of the population were under bye-laws enforcing attendance, and by 1876 this had risen to fifty per cent.

(1) T.H. Huxley Science and Education (37) p.396

There were inefficient school boards, and there were areas which had no school board. The existing Act (1870) had its scope considerably enlarged by Sandon's Act 1876, in consequence. This was a marked advance. In particular a new departure was entered on the Statute Book that "it shall be the duty of every parent to educate his child". In 1870 the school boards had been empowered to make bye-laws to compel attendance, as we have seen. The power was permissive, however; and, although Sandon's Act did not insist on direct compulsion, it forced attendance in an indirect way by placing restrictions on the employment of children. Moreover, areas not using a school board were now to be covered by School Attendance Committees appointed to ensure attendance.

In 1880 Mundella's Act secured universal and direct compulsion and all school boards and School Attendance Committees which had not so far made bye-laws had to do so now.

The years 1870-1880 were, clearly, very important in the development of a national system, but the conditions of the schools gave rise to alarm. This was disclosed by the reports of inspectors. Again, this is no cause for surprise. The school population had doubled by the absorption of vast numbers of children of all ages with understandable effects on the efficiency of both schools and teachers. At the same time the Education Department did not help when it gave advice to inspectors such as "if satisfactory 'results' be obtained, no adverse criticism should be made on the method" (1). Here was the application of the 'payment by results' system at its worst. The Department recovered its sense of balance six years later, however, and declared the object to be "to promote the development of the general intelligence of the scholars rather than to seek to burden their memories with subjects" (2).

(1) Report of Education Department 1871-2 p.cxx (93)

(2) Ibid., 1877-8 p.335

From 1882 to 1902 no fewer than fourteen Acts were passed having direct reference to elementary education. Some of these were Amending Acts arising out of new insights into method and curricula. Others were of major social significance. The 1891 Act and the 1897 Act (Voluntary Schools) were introduced with a view to relieving some of the strain of maintenance charges upon voluntary schools under pressure from the school boards' competition as well as the improved but more exacting requirements of the Education Department.

Two other important Acts were the Elementary Education Act 1893 by which provision was made for the care and education of blind and deaf children; and in 1899 a further Act provided for 'defective' and epileptic children. Both these Acts were to be quoted later by the Anglican and Roman Catholic churches, because, for some reason, provision was included for denominational teaching and no protest was heard.

Thus the rapid extension of the means of education continued throughout the remaining years of the nineteenth century. The 18,000 schools of 1881 increased to 19,500 in 1891, and to over 20,000 in 1900. This expansion is an impressive one, and particularly so in its speed. Furthermore, by 1880 the provision of new voluntary schools was nearly at an end. Church of England and Roman Catholic schools increased only slightly in the remaining years of the century, while Wesleyan and British schools decreased. This meant that the burden of a national system was passing more and more to the board schools, which, by 1900 contained over 46 per cent of the total number of scholars. Since no system of national education could have survived without popular support, these years after 1870 show a marked change in attitudes in favour of education. Hitherto there had been isolated enthusiasm in the midst of lethargy; but this was changing. It was not changed entirely, as we shall observe from Balfour's proposals in 1902; but the acceptance of compulsion

in education as a worth-while social service and not as an interference with freedom indicates change in public opinion without which progress would have been much slower.

It was probably the Report of the Cross Commissioners in 1888 that set off the new educational vigour of the last decade of the nineteenth century. Although the differences between the Commissioners were sufficiently pronounced as to produce a majority and a minority Report, there were many points of agreement. The majority were friendly to the voluntary schools; the minority were critical of their shortcomings, and were impatient to complete a unified national system. Yet all of the Commissioners were not unmindful of the work the voluntary schools had done and of the still important service which they were rendering.

The existence of a dual system of schools had inevitably raised questions of superiority and of priority of right which were to remain live issues until beyond the end of the century. The majority of the Commissioners claimed for voluntary effort a right to supply deficiencies equal to that of school boards. This seemed particularly urgent in an area where there was little enthusiasm for expensive educational provision. Less easily substantiated was the further claim that voluntary schools were better managed than the board schools because of the closer personal relations between managers and teachers. On the other hand, the minority claimed the prior right of school boards to supply deficiencies, and also the superiority of the board schools. They believed board schools had better buildings, and that the better staffing ratio produced superior examination results out of a more extensive curriculum than church schools offered. The minority also complained that in some areas where only one school existed it was usually a voluntary school; so they recommended that undenominational

schools ought to be within reach of the whole population. They did not believe in the efficacy of the conscience clause.

The issues which became clarified during the last ten years of the century were, first, the relationship of the voluntary schools to the national system, and, secondly, the question of local and national educational administration. The burden placed on church schools grew heavier. They received no aid from the rates, and they earned a slightly smaller grant from the Education Department than the board schools. Hence, they were obliged to employ more unqualified teachers, to pay smaller salaries, and to buy less equipment than their rivals. They also had to keep their buildings in repair, to add classrooms and cloakrooms and to bring sanitation up to more modern standards. As the country still relied on the church schools, for the system would have broken down without them at this stage, churchmen protested that they were unfairly treated. Demands for further financial assistance were put forward more insistently throughout the nineties.

No doubt many defenders of the voluntary schools were partly inspired by jealousy of the school boards and their superior resources. Yet school boards had not risen high in public esteem. They were too small and sometimes allowed local considerations to restrict their outlook. Larger boards were accused of extravagance and of hostility to denominational schools. They could levy a rate which other authorities had to collect, and there was a feeling that a complete change of educational administration would engender a new sense of responsibility. Counties and County Borough Councils already had educational duties, and public opinion was turning in their favour at the expense of school boards. Balfour acted on that when he prepared his Bill of 1902. Indeed, the existence of a Conservative Government from 1895 to 1906 was a threat to the boards. The Government was markedly sympathetic to voluntary

schools which, indeed, still educated more than half of the nation's children. Yet even such a prominent champion of the school boards as Lyulph Stanley, a member of the London School Board who complained of restrictions by and hostility from the Education Department, admitted in 1899 that administrative reform was over due.

"We are constantly brought face to face with the same problems: that education is one, and must be dealt with as a whole; and that it is with the increasing civilisation of the whole nation that our systematic and collective recognition of what is worthy intellectual training for life will grow and develop." (1)

Stanley advocated one authority for primary, secondary and technical education working in suitable areas not smaller than the County or County Borough. He suggested that subordinate authorities for primary education in rural areas would be a useful addition.

School boards were advancing their 'elementary' educational work well outside the limits anticipated by the legislature. This was understandable but it was also illegal. Strangely enough Whitehall was encouraging this lift in standards well beyond the scope of elementary education. The fact was that nobody had ever defined 'elementary education'; and the lack of definition caused administrative muddle. The crisis came in 1899 when the London auditor Cockerton surcharged the School Board with expenditure on the teaching of science and art in day schools and evening continuation schools. The complaint was that the school board was acting ultra vires by this teaching and especially by teaching to adults. Litigation followed, and in 1900, the Court of Queen's Bench ruled that no money might be spent outside the limits of the Education Department's Code, or in teaching adults. There was an appeal but the ruling was upheld in 1901.

(1) Quoted in Frank Smith History of Elementary Education 1760-1902: University of London Press 1931: p.344 (68)

A short Education Act was hurried through to legalize the illegality into which the Government's servants had fallen, but it was now obvious that from everybody's point of view the time for a new Act had come. Meanwhile (after the Bryce Report) a new Board of Education had been created (in 1899) by amalgamating the Education Department with the Science and Art Department. The new Board was not a Committee of Council. It was an independent body of ministers of the Crown under their own President. Under the leadership of Balfour himself it worked hard at framing the new Bill.

The Bill was in for a stormy passage. It contained the principles upon which the Radicals had insisted for years even though it met the objections of many voluntaryists. The voluntary schools, it will be recalled, had received grants since 1833 and, since 1870, they had competed with the board schools. Now, by 1900, they were in financial straits. Yet moral and political support for them was strong. The Government was said to be pro-Church, indeed, it was dubbed the 'Hotel Cecil'; and the Liberals, thinking the Church had got a good bargain, called the new Measure the 'Bishops' Bill'. The Bill was to create a truly national system of education for the first time. Local education authorities were to be the supreme authority in the area controlling secular curricula and time tables. The new local education authorities were the County Councils and County Boroughs. The board school became 'provided schools' and the old voluntary schools were now 'non-provided schools'. What was provided, however, was the origin and the buildings of the school - not its maintenance: both classes of school were to be maintained by the local education authority. That is, voluntary schools were put on the rates; and it was this extension of rate aid to them which caused the opposition to the Bill. All who represented the radical position, non-Conformists and secularists, regarded this as a gross injustice to members of communions other than the

Roman Catholic or Anglican; and it was resented on the further ground that it involved State intrusion within the religious domain.

An Appendix to Chapter 4

Appendix to Chapter 4

The Cross Commission

Several references are to be found in the text of this thesis to the Cross Commission. This Appendix gives the main features of the Commissioners' findings. As the findings were not law the information is placed separately here.

The Commission was called into existence because of the strain upon the voluntary schools caused by the rising cost of education. The matter became more pressing in the last decade of the century when this pressure was felt by the smaller necessitous board schools also. The financial resources of both classes of elementary school were not equal to the competition caused by the policy of the great school boards. Large school boards interpreted their educational function very widely indeed; and the extent of the senior work in their 'elementary' curriculum was often absurd. In this they were interrupted by the Cockerton Case in 1901. Then it appeared that Whitehall had encouraged them to force up extended standards without any express statutory authority for doing so.

".. it was not merely a matter of relaxation of controls. School boards had been incited to adventure in areas of doubtful legality." (1)

The Education Department was interested in higher standards and not in the plight of small schools - even boards' schools - who suffered in competition with their grander rivals.

Yet the supporters of voluntary schools had worked hard to hold their own and even to improve their position. Approximately 36% of the cost of public elementary education was borne by taxes, 34% by rates and the remaining 30% roughly in equal parts by subscriptions, endowments and fees. In 1880, moreover, the voluntary schools contained over 70% of the nation's pupils, and in 1890 it was still as much as 60% (?).

(1) E.J.R. Eaglesham From School Board to Local Authority (25) p.104
 (2) Figures given by F. Smith History of English Education (68)

The Cross Commission sat for many months to receive evidence germane to the problems set by progressive and wealthy school boards; "... there were some lively moments when Commissioners and witnesses engaged in spirited exchanges" (1).

Cruikshank considers that, to Liberal eyes, the Commission was 'packed'. Certainly a list containing the names of Cardinal Manning, Canon Gregory, the Bishop of London, Dr. Pigg and the Earl of Harrowby looked suspicious until it was seen that the list also named F.W. Dale, Henry Richard and Lyulph Stanley, none of whom were likely to allow themselves to be bullied.

There was general agreement about the high quality of religious education in voluntary schools, the hardship caused by reducing the grant to small schools and about the drawbacks of the system of 'payment by results'. The Commission also agreed over the recommendations about retaining Standards VII, encouraging technology and introducing a system of classification in schools by ability and not by age. There was, on the other hand, disagreement about the best way of training teachers. And the greatest disagreement was over the religious issue. This resulted in a split report (2).

The Report of the Majority of the Cross Commission. (15 signatures)

1. The grievances hampering voluntary schools should be abolished.
2. Government grants should not be limited.
3. The system of rating schools should be changed.
4. They did not approve the necessity of an appeal by indigent parents to the Guardians.
5. They objected to the prior right of school boards to provide new accommodation.
6. As the voluntary system was the foundation of the national programme, not merely a part of it, it was entitled to claim support on equal terms with the public system.
7. They recommended a local rate for their schools - but not so large a one as would discourage their contributors from subscribing in future.

(1) M. Cruikshank Church and State in English Education (17) pp.56-7
 (2) J. Stuart Maclure Educational Documents (45) pp.128-140

One member who had reservations was Cardinal Manning (see below); and, although he signed, he was dissatisfied with the financial proposals. He was anxious for more rate aid. The Anglicans were concerned to soft-pedal that part of the appeal.

The Report of the Minority of the Cross Commission (8 signatures)

1. While they did not agree with the majority about the essential place of religion in the education of a child, they certainly favoured moral education (so did the Code).
2. If the denominational school had difficulties about religious education it could not matter overmuch since the Sunday School figures were soaring.
3. They denied that there was undue strain on the voluntary schools. The majority seemed "too often to approach proposals for the improvement of education from the point of view of considering how such improvements may affect the interests of certain classes of schools rather than how far they were desirable" (1).
4. Rate aid was entirely impracticable.
5. The country should establish 'schools of an undenominational character and under popular representative management'.

The last item is a great distance from the problems of the early part of the century. Since only one-third of the upkeep of schools came from voluntary sources, the rest was from taxes or rates. Hence, it was only just that representatives of taxpayers and rate-payers should have a say in how their money was spent; therefore they should send representatives to join the managing bodies of church schools. The Church attitude was that whatever the source of maintenance the schools were theirs and nobody had any rights over their property.

Further references will be made to the Cross Commission's work and Report in the text below when we come to examine the attitudes of churches in detail.

(1)M. Cruickshank Church and State in English Education (17) p.59

The Education Act 1902

The 1902 Act is, very strictly speaking, outside the period, but there could be no justification for excluding it. The educational situation which demanded new legislation had been growing increasingly more unsatisfactory, and the Act is the culmination of the problems at the end of the nineteenth century. Balfour explained this when the Bill was first read. The proposals caused a great outcry from both secularists and denominationalists, and the quarrel was prolonged. It exposed attitudes which had clearly been building up for some time; and that aspect of the matter will be examined below. For the moment attention will be directed to the parliamentary significance of the Act.

In his introduction Balfour gave a short historical sketch of the situation before and at 1870. Forster's Act was, he thought, successful only to a certain extent. In Balfour's view there were two unforeseen circumstances and 'considerable omissions' which subsequently appeared. The first was the difficulty into which the voluntary schools were thrown by the rivalry of the board schools. Forster had thought that a three-penny rate would provide what was needed; and he did not anticipate the expensive competition to which the board schools' ~~...~~ subjected the voluntary schools. The second result was the burden on local finance in school board areas caused by "a body, responsible only as far as education to the community, but having no connexion with the general local expenditure which is, of course, in the hands of local authorities". So much for Balfour's unforeseen circumstances. He next listed the important omissions.

(1) The 1870 Act provided no organisation for voluntary schools, and, though this defect was remedied to some extent by the Voluntary Schools Act 1897, they still remained isolated and unconnected.

(2) There was not sufficient provision for the education of the large numbers of teachers for national schools.

(3) The Primary system was put in no kind of national or organic connexion with the Secondary system. Neither Forster nor anybody else had ever defined 'elementary education'.

Balfour then showed how he wanted to deal with the situation. He summarized the main provisions of his Bill under five headings.

(a) His Bill must establish one authority for education - technical, primary and secondary - and the authority would try help the 'welding on' of higher technical and higher secondary education to the university.

(b) This one authority should be the rating authority of the district, because it was responsible for heavy costs on the rates.

(c) The voluntary schools 'must be placed in a position where they can bear their necessary and inevitable part in the scheme of national education.' This item was to cause trouble from those who never really faced the fact that it was by no means probable that an Act which placed the purchase, rent, compensation for confiscation, or maintenance of all the voluntary schools on the rates would not have been passed in the House of Commons then.

(d) Balfour then expressed the hope that the new system will not encourage, for the future, the 'perpetual dragging' of these denominational squabbles into local and municipal life.

(e) The educational authority, which was also to be the rating authority, was to have at its disposal 'all the educational skill which the district over which it works could supply'.

The first reading of the Bill was carried by 176 to 23, which means about two hundred Members were present. The second reading, carried by 402 to 165, shows that interest was waking up. The House went into Committee (2 June) and it was soon obvious that an Autumn Session was needed if the Bill was ever to become law. Accordingly, Parliament adjourned 7 August, reassembled 16 October and gave the Bill the third reading late in November. Altogether it had been discussed for fifty-seven days (forty-seven in Committee). Forster's 1870 Bill had only occupied the Commons

for twenty-two days! During its progress through Committee there were several important modifications which must now be noted.

There were new financial proposals. On 23 June Balfour indicated that the Government proposed a new clause for the Bill dealing with parliamentary grants to elementary schools. He explained as follows (1).

"Since 1895 there have been two separate classes of grant made out of the Public Exchequer in order to aid elementary education. There is a grant for voluntary schools, and there is the necessitous school board's grant. The one was intended to assist the Managers of voluntary schools who have had difficulty in carrying on their educational work; the other to assist those districts which, by reason of the great burden of the rates, were in a difficulty in dealing with the obligations laid upon them by Parliament. These two grants together amount to £860,000. The voluntary school aid grant last year amounted to £640,000 and the necessitous school boards grant to £220,000.. As regards the voluntary school grant it loses its original purpose as soon as the voluntary school in regard to maintenance is supported out of the general rates. That may be a good or a bad plan, but evidently it does away with the ground on which the 5s. grant was given; and moreover, the Bill as it stands would have the effect, certainly not desired by the framers of that Bill, of giving a direct bribe to local authorities to use the voluntary machinery rather than any other machinery, if these schools had to be made to meet the growth of population.

Moreover, if these grants were stereotyped to the county authority this great anomaly would be produced - that those districts in which there were an immense number of voluntary schools would get a disproportionate amount of public money, and other districts which were school board areas would get proportionately less without there being any rational ground for distinguishing between the two cases. That is pretty conclusive as regards the voluntary schools grant, and it is no less conclusive why the necessitous school grant should be altered also...

Under this Bill, as the House is aware, the local authority will be responsible for all the children in its district, the school board being abolished, and what were

(1) Quoted in J.F.W. Drury Manual of Education: Heywood, Manchester, 1903; p.163 (23)

formerly board schools will become schools under the new educational authority. Therefore that grant.. must, I think, be abolished. We propose to abolish them both and to substitute a new grant in aid of elementary education."

Without pausing to remark on the reactions of those who disliked the idea of rate-aid going to voluntary schools in any circumstances, and to which reference is made below, it is worth observing Balfour's awareness of the danger of 'a direct bribe' to authorities which might prefer to use existing voluntary schools in their area. To do that would be cheaper! Here is an indication that disagreement was not entirely confined to denominational issues. There were, evidently, localities where no great enthusiasm for founding an expensive system of schools ^{that} had to be reckoned with in Parliament.

Further provision was made affecting the composition of boards of Managers of schools. This caused protest. So did the 'Kenyon-Slaney' clause to the effect that "religious instruction shall be given in a school not provided by the local educational authority in accordance with the tenor of the provisions of the trust deed," and it was to be under the control of the Managers. This seemed to many churchmen to be barring the influence of incumbents from their parish schools. Again, additional assistance to denominational schools was permitted by allowing managers to continue to charge fees (with the consent of the local authority), and authorities were compelled to pay a certain proportion of them towards the cost of maintenance of the school.

When the Bill reached the House of Lords four further important amendments were carried. First, a modification of the Couper-Temple clause was inserted to apply to provided secondary schools. Strictly, this is outside our scope; but it is interesting to note that under certain circumstances arrangement could be made for denominational teaching. Secondly, the local authority was required to make adequate provision for religious instruction in non-provided elementary schools. A third amendment which provoked

much hostility was carried to the 'Kenyon-Slaney' clause. The object was to make it clear that, where the trust deeds required it, an appeal should lie to diocesan bishops regarding the character of religious instruction, so that the provision of the trust should be maintained. This was put forward by the Lord Chancellor and went far to convincing non-churchmen that the government were bent on supporting church schools out of public funds. Fourthly, in opposition to Government wishes, one of the bishops moved and carried an amendment making the local authority responsible for making good any ordinary wear and tear in schools used by the authority but not provided by it.

The amendments made in the House of Lords were substantially adopted by the Commons. The Bill became law on 18 December 1902. There was a great outcry and long argument. Much of the indignation on all sides had been building up for years, for attitudes form slowly and are maintained for a long time. It is interesting to note that Sir Robert Morant, at the time chief of the Education Department described the measure as "the greatest incursion on Church property since the Reformation" (1).

(1) See E.A. Knox Reminiscences of an Octogenarian (41) p.212; but Knox comments that this was an exaggeration.

Part 2

Chapter 6

Church of England Attitudes.

Attitudes were not held consistently throughout the 19th century (see Chapter 1) but it would be impossible to appreciate the situation by the end of the century without a close look at the reaction to the first Education Act. 1870 was a most important year for the nation's schools. Once again we are looking at the provision of elementary schools for it is in that sphere that the fundamental issues are most clearly marked when the search is for church principles. In identifying adherents to a set of church principles the difficulty often is that supporters can be found in more than one denomination. It may therefore be convenient to treat the matter along the lines of left-wing and right-wing in politics. The usual equivalent to this method of labelling is to make low church or evangelical Christian correspond to the left wing, and high churchmen correspond to the right wing. This method would not be helpful unless it is remarked that nowadays the left-wing represents a form of 'new theology' not known a hundred years ago. Left-wing or right-wing notwithstanding, the arrangement below will start with the monarchical high view of the church and work to the low church and radical viewpoint.

"Some hold that education without theology is worse than none. Others maintain, quite as strongly, that education with theology is in the same predicament. But this is certain, that those who hold the first opinion can by no means agree what theology should be taught; and that those who maintain the second are in a small minority." (1)

Huxley thus puts the matter in a nutshell. Yet radical agnosticism was a more powerful factor than many believed at the time - so, at least, history has since shown. Fabian tactics seem to have been their choice. Thus, Harcourt who is described by his

(1) T.H. Huxley Science and Education (37) p.80. This quotation is from an essay A Liberal Education and Where to Find it.

biographer (1) as an Erastian low churchman, cautioned the secularist Sir Charles Dilke (2).

"We are fighting a great cause with inferior forces and everything must depend on husbanding our strength using it to the best advantage and not exposing ourselves to needless defeats. We must always seem to win even though we do not get all we want...

I am quite satisfied that neither in the House of Commons nor in the country can we beat denominationalism by secularism. If we attempt to meet the flood by the direct dyke it will simply be over our heads, and we shall go to the bottom. We must break the force of the wave by a side slope...

There remains that which to my mind is the only practicable means of defence. I mean the acceptance of the simple Bible reading in the time set apart for religious instruction - exclude everything else. Behind such a line of defence as this we shall rally a great party - I believe the most powerful party in the country...

We shall drive our opponents to contend that the Bible is not enough to satisfy them and that they must and will have sectarianism and in that position we can punch their heads instead of their punching ours."

This is the language of an astute parliamentarian who lent his support to the secularists in Birmingham. He hoped to topple the position of the Established Church in education, and yet was a convinced Erastian - believing that the church was the creature of Parliament, yet not prepared to see it teach support for itself as such. Was not this inconsistent, and does it not suggest inconsistency similar to the attitude of nonconformists later in the century who found themselves supporting secularists who, by normal rules, should have been their sworn enemies? It was inconsistent! And this seems to have been due to the indignation, almost obsessional in force, which operated in the minds of the opponents of denominationalism.

The problem for those who opposed establishment was that a country prepared to return Gladstone's Liberal party to power on almost ~~an~~ nothing but a firm promise to disestablish the Church of

(1) A.G. Gardiner Life of Sir Wm. Harcourt 2 Vol. Constable London 1923. Vol.ii, p.481 (31)

(2) A.G. Gardiner op.cit. Vol.i p.215-6

Ireland was not so enthusiastic to apply the same treatment within her own borders; and indeed, Gladstone himself warned his more extreme followers that the two issues were not the same. It may be said, despite reform and despite the heavy nonconformist contingent in the House of Commons, that England was in certain ways, certainly in ethos, quite unchanged right through the 19th century and perhaps up to 1914. One permanency was the prominent position of the Church of England. To be 'fully English' still meant being a member of the Church of England (among other things). This was taken for granted. Since it was taken for granted it was nowhere written down, but it can be seen 'between the lines' in Victorian literature. Again, it was taken for granted, by a very large number of people, that education was the business of organised Christianity. The official organ of Christianity was the Church of England, so it naturally followed that schooling was a function of the parson in his parish (see the controversy about this in connexion with the Kenyon-Slaney amendment, p123f). Certainly, for most of the nineteenth century, the Anglican Church held what was virtually a monopoly in education in many areas. This at once raises the whole question of her right to do so. What was the Church's role in society? In Britain that is to ask what is the proper relationship between Church and State?

Differences of interpretation about this role affected the attitudes of churchmen of all denominations throughout the whole of the 19th century. It is necessary, therefore, to examine in detail what these differences were. This is not a diversion nor is it in any sense irrelevant to the Churches' attitudes to education. Education was to change the character of England. Some took the view that this meant restoring the Christian character of England; and they did not have to look far for evidence that restoration was needed. Others saw the reconstruction of society as a matter of paramount importance and they wished to

use education as one means of accomplishing social change. Again it should be noted that elementary education was the sector likely to affect the majority of the nation's children.

Chapter 6 : part i

Emergent Denominationalism within the Church of England

In the Church of England a legacy of the medieval (and therefore Romanist) view still exists today. It had been modified after the Reformation because it cannot stand without modification once the role of the papacy is unfilled. In the lives of a huge number of ordinary Englishmen the exclusive position of the Anglican church was accepted without question. This acceptance followed naturally from the presupposition that the church was the nation itself, no less, 'on its spiritual side'. Thus, the nation had two 'sides' - like a coin perhaps - and one 'side' was the established church. Logically, if a particular church does not fill this role then those who disagree will fill it instead; so that a 'dissenting' church or a combination of several churches would constitute a new and different 'establishment'; but this escaped the notice of 19th century churchmen although there are signs that they felt it almost unconsciously, in their bones, so to say. Thus the effect of the two-sided and medieval structure does not change in fact so much as in content, and will always do so as society itself undergoes change. As society rarely changes abruptly the older view remained into the 20th century. It is this view which may be explained first.

Christian political theorists have always had to work with the same stock-in-trade of ideas as can be found in the New Testament and the early Church. In the first century a synthesis had to be worked out between the doctrine of the State as understood by the Greeks and the Romans on one hand, and, on the other hand, the teaching of Scripture. In the event Scripture has never offered much help. It spoke rather to a sect living in a pagan state. It seemed not in the least probable that Christianity would become the religion of the Roman Empire. There is

nothing in Scripture to help a church which saw itself as the nation 'on its spiritual side' although many churchmen, including Gladstone would not have accepted that, as we shall see.

Oddly enough the Church of England has never been declared to be 'established', except that the phrase 'as by law established' appears in Elizabethan declarations. The Church's constitutional position, with any ancillary rights and duties, has never been defined to this day. Yet in the 19th century a change had come about which appeared to put the church's position in jeopardy. On the surface this was manifest in the agitation to 'disestablish' the national church and this seems remote from the problems connected with the supply of elementary education. Yet it is not remote; for national education is, in the precise sense, as much a political matter as the relationship of Church to State. Not only was there the matter of ownership of the vast majority of schools which gave a monopoly position so offensive to non-Anglicans: there were legal and moral aspects of importance also. One quite mundane illustration will support the assertion. There might be a question about the use of a school building which is Church property. If it is Church property in the sense that it belongs to a monastery then it is owned by a corporation (as distinct from an individual) and is subject to ordinary law. If, on the other hand, it is the property of a church which thinks of itself as an integral part of the community, then the situation is different. Is the true owner the community or the organised Church? This is a question of moral right rather than a question of law. Needless to say, the problem increases when the distinction is about ownership and the attendant duty to maintain the property; and this was a live issue especially after 1900. Now, if questions of ownership and use of buildings (in an undisputedly good cause) gave rise to confusion, then it requires little imagination to appreciate the amount of disagreement which could arise, not out of laws of property, but about principles of education.

Members of the organised 'established' Church did in fact see themselves as an integral part of their own national society. They also considered that it was the Church's function to educate the young. They had, so far, provided what education there was. They owned the buildings which were used for education. Unfortunately, if this sense of ownership went too far it could look like arrogance.

The classic exponent of English theories of Church and State has always been the sixteenth century divine Richard Hooker. Yet even he only attempts to comment on a relationship which had grown and was in operation before definition could begin. He gives his conclusions in "The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity":

"I conclude, first, that under the dominions of infidels, the Church of Christ, and their commonwealth, were two societies independent. Secondly, that in those commonwealths where the Bishop of Rome beareth sway, one society is both Church and Commonwealth: but the Bishop of Rome doth divide the body into two diverse bodies, and doth not suffer the Church to depend upon the power of any civil prince or potentate. Thirdly, that within this realm of England the case is neither as in the one nor as in the other... : but from the pagans we differ, in that with us one society is both Church and commonwealth, which with them it was not: and also from the state of those nations which subject themselves to the Bishop of Rome, in that our Church hath dependency upon the chief of our commonwealth, which it hath not under him (the Bishop of Rome)."

Hooker reflects the conditions of his own time, naturally; but these are essentially the ideas which became modified and finally rejected during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Modification and rejection of itself is never proposed by the establishment, ecclesiastical or political. The establishment itself changes because of socio-political factors outside it. However, the change was not fully accomplished in our period. Many influential theorists supported the traditional view, or something like it. Hence, the law which affected the property and the influence of the Church - and therefore education in England -

developed in the way it did. It is useful to pause in this account of the Church of England's belief in its raison d'être to glance briefly at Figgis's comment on Hooker's passage (1). He observes that, in England, both the Laudian and the Puritan party were basically mediaevalist. That is, they believed in, and looked for, a State which was also a Church - a theocratic and theocentric State. So they had much more in common with one another (and with the Middle Ages) than with moderns. This applies to political concepts in general, so it applies to educational matters. It is sometimes overlooked that on such issues no modern educational or social reformer would feel at one with the great pioneers of education almost down to our own time. In a footnote, A.R. Vidler quotes Carlyle (2)

"It is at first sight a curious thing to find a Scottish Protestant like George Buchanan expressing almost the same judgments in political theory as the Spanish Jesuit Mariana; but the fact is that the difference of religious belief, as such, had little or no relation to political conceptions."

It may well be that there was just as little relation between the "fierce sectarian rivalry" on the one hand, and the educational aims (which are a branch of political practice) which distinguished the protagonists in the controversy through which the secular national schools system actually developed, on the other hand. It is fair to speculate whether nineteenth century dissenters did not suspect the 'established' Church of political motives which she did not have. It was difficult for them to understand her innocence in this matter. Political control was perhaps the logical end of the sort of theological system supported by dissenters; and perhaps they projected this on to Anglicans. If so, they were mistaken. The most ardent defenders of Anglican establishment may not describe it as a system. The ecclesiastical establishment of England (not Scotland) is, in practice, shapeless. It had no defined end or purpose beyond the reign of

(1) J.N. Figgis Churches in the Modern State (29) p.217
 (2) A.R. Vidler The Orb and the Cross (76) p.17

Elizabeth I. No doubt it was used by governments from time to time. It was too well-knit into the fabric of national life to avoid political abuse; but the structure has come about piece-meal and has no defined national function. This causes no small confusion outside its ranks. Organised sects do not suffer from incoherence about their function and appear not to understand it. They are actively engaged on accomplishing a declared goal; and this might even be the disestablishment of the Church of England (as in Wales and Ireland) so that Anglican attitudes appear as political reaction.

On the other hand, Churchmen must have infuriated their opponents by seeming to be "out-of-date", and never more so than when they quoted an authority which belonged to an earlier political context than their own. The continuance of the traditional mediaeval theory is an example of this. It was a response to a recognisable set of political circumstances which had disappeared and was never to be repeated. This view is developed in G.H. Sabine's A History of Political Theory p.354, and also in R. & A.J. Carlyles' A History of Mediaeval Theory in the West Vol.III. p.5ff.

In the nineteenth century there was no time for a leisurely and careful readjustment of personal views. Social change was by then too rapid. The surprising thing is that mature opinion was so late in coming. As the century progressed the Church-State relationship was changing and even within the Church itself this had its effect. A new self-awareness is discernible. The Church of England begins to emerge as a separate denomination; and it had never thought of itself in such terms before. Hitherto Church and Nation had been thought of as one. The older theory lingered well into the next century, so it is important to describe it fully below. Meanwhile, the new process had begun. More Churchmen saw themselves in a more activist role, setting out with a message, which is a very different concept from that of

the Church sitting still, so to say, simply being the Nation. A note of caution is needed, however. The interaction of sub-groups with society, and vice versa, is always difficult to define. If there was an enlightened avant garde in both Church and Nation, there was also a considerable body of opinion which lagged behind. Again, it is wrong to give an impression of eager reformers battling in the teeth of reactionary obscurantists. The reforms that were proposed were modest by modern standards, but conservative thinkers did not have the advantage of modern hindsight. They simply were not sure to what end they were invited to proceed; and, let it be admitted, they were sure that it was passing comfortable where they were already. What was their position? If they thought that the Church still represented the Nation 'on its spiritual side' what, in fact, did they think was the Church's true function?

The answer would have been a two-fold one. First, the Church had a spiritual function: and by this was meant matters of sacramental living and salvation. Without diminishing the significance of these theological factors either in their own right, or as motivating agents in the minds of nineteenth century Christians, we are not much concerned with them here. Secondly, the Church had a cultural function. It somehow governed or monitored the nation's culture. Certainly some Churchmen interpreted this as imposing a duty to create centres for the improvement of the masses, but the general view of the Church's function was a wider one. There was no hint of the modern dichotomy between what is 'sacred' and what is 'secular'. Church influence was closely interwoven in the fabric of English social life. It is difficult to make this clear in modern terms. Perhaps the nearest parallel is, oddly enough, the influence of the Communist Party in the U.S.S.R. today.

This two-fold concept of the Church's role underwent a gradual change during our period. This was due, not to re-

thinking, but to changes within society. Since later Anglo-Saxon times the basic unit of the Church of England had been the parish; but the parochial system was rendered ineffectual by the developments arising as a result of the Industrial Revolution. The towns were growing in importance, and they represented cultural units vastly different from country parishes. Church educational provision was inadequate, and the state had to step in. Parliamentarians were affected by all this, and so in turn, legislation imposed by Parliament was affected also.

Moreover, new thought about man's relation to the natural order (and vice versa) was gradually displacing the older pre-occupation with man's relation to the next world. It is true that this would be found among educated people and not among the populace at large. Nevertheless, new style thinking did in time encourage the growth of a secular conception of the state as something to be independent of church influence and theocratic considerations. None of this was planned, but it was in the air. Understandably, churchmen were affected by it also, and they were startled by the implications. The following is an account of secular thinking of just the kind that alarmed church supporters. It outlines exactly what the more thoughtful were afraid of in schools.

"The theory of the secular state, as in principle it was expounded by Locke and was maintained and developed by the Whigs and Liberals, depended on the view that the State was properly concerned with temporal welfare and material interests only. Religion was concerned with spiritual and other-worldly interests, and Churches were voluntary societies for the promotion of those interests. It might or might not be expedient for the State to enter relations with the Church; that depended on the circumstances and on the State's convenience. According to this theory, whatever connexion there is between Church and State in any particular country, they are, in principle, separate." (1)

(1) A.R. Vidler op.cit. (76) p.21

This is an excellent statement of the whole problem and it can be seen that the broad issue of Church-State relations easily includes the national system of education. Bentham had already indicated his view that the function of education was to teach the alternatives to the 'pleasures' of crime and immorality.

Against the secularist view Gladstone stressed the moral 'character' of the State. Again, Manning was to attack the secularist's standpoint late in the century.

The modern critic might point out that the first part of the statement entirely justifies the treatment of the church in Nazi Germany before 1939; and this has special interest because of the educational policy of the Nazis. Also of special interest is the last part of the statement which would allow a country to choose to be governed along lines dictated by a local Church. This is of importance in Britain. If a country chooses to operate on theocratic principles, for example, it must decide upon what those principles rest. If it does not so choose, then there must be a series of ad hoc decisions: there would be no general guidance about the basis of educational legislation. Broadly speaking, the last and undecided state was preferred by most Englishmen in the nineteenth century, and astonishingly, it was acquiesced in by large numbers of clergymen. It proved a good enough working arrangement only until some specifically dogmatic (i.e. principled) issue arose. In that case to what was the ordinary citizen to appeal - even in small matters like the payment of Church rate or (later) the School Board rate? Thus, all citizens could find themselves involved in difficulties which arose out of the new morality of that time. There was no campaign, no manifesto or programme of change. There was, of course, interaction between sub-groups, groups and society, and ordinary citizens had to come to terms with the results.

Two other complications are discernible. First, individuals are rarely aware of the process of interaction. Secondly, since the principles affected were fundamental, the suggestion of changes such as secularists proposed were regarded by many with intense suspicion. This suspicion was aggravated by new movements within the Church itself which increased its sense of exclusive mission. Outside the Church, interests, not much concerned with Christian principles, urged forward legislation which, despite good lobbying in the House of Commons, was tainted with the marginal legality which the Cockerton judgment was to disclose in 1901.

It is not surprising that country clergy, their squires and, indeed, most ordinary citizens got confused. They read the protestations of each of the five interested parties identified on page 1 of this thesis; and this may even have confused them further because of the lack of strict denominational demarcation within the five parties.

Chapter 6 : part ii

The High Church Attitude (W.E. Gladstone)

Gladstone was a devout Tractarian churchman who had worked out the issues involved in establishment with more care than most. As a politician he had difficulties about reconciling his principles with 'the art of the possible'. He was head of a new and radical Liberal party and subject to agitation inspired by the zeal of would-be reformers on the parliamentary benches behind him.

"It is not surprising that there was misunderstanding: Mr. Gladstone's views on Church and State, on religious establishments, on nonconformity, were scarcely susceptible of reduction to the simplicity and brevity of an election manifesto. Those views had a long history. They had been formed in and through much reading, meditation and experience. Both as a philosopher and a parliamentarian Gladstone was aware of wide reaches of the controversy not apparent to enthusiastic followers in a hurry to see their solution applied forthwith." (1)

To follow Gladstone's position we must go outside the political arena to study his earlier thought in his Church Principles in their Results (1840), then his Gleanings of Past Years (1879) leading to his mature reflections in Later Gleanings (1898). His views and conclusions not only reflect an almost classical view of church and state but reinterpreted them in an intellectual context of liberal ideas; and they were popular well into the 20th century.

Before Gladstone the medieval monarchical ideas prevailed, although adapted by divines such as Richard Hooker, within the Anglican church. By Gladstone's day democratic principles were fast displacing monarchical structures in society and new situations were arising in consequence. Attendant upon these new situations was the changing attitude of the state itself to the church and the dissenters. A 'liberal' state became individualistic in politics and economics; and it grew first

(1) W.G. Addison Religious Equality in Modern England (2) p.126

'tolerant' and finally indifferent about religion, at least so far as public opinion allowed.

Such was the atmosphere within which a national system of schooling had to emerge. It is tempting to reflect on what might have happened had the state been generous enough to supply its own system from the start. When would it have started? How secular would it have been in content? Despite the traditional connexion between the Liberal party and social reform it is unlikely that they or anyone else would have got a mandate for universal education before 1870. Certainly they would not have won support for an elementary curriculum which ignored religion as a strong educative force. They might have adopted Hook's suggestions which anticipated much of what is incorporated in the compromises of 1944. Or they might have worked on an 'agreed' syllabus to overcome denominational objections; and if they had, the results would probably have been different from what is found in schools today - for Victorians were not so easily pleased as are our contemporaries. However, none of these things happened. It was taken for granted before and after 1870 that the church would continue to shoulder the major part of educating the nation. This is important to any appreciation of the attitudes of the time: for at any point it was open to an all-powerful parliament to vote money for a complete state system.

As it was taken for granted that the Church would fulfil her traditional educative role, it must have depended on a general and wide acceptance of the church and state relationship already referred to. So Gladstone was not quite right to describe himself as 'the last man on the sinking ship' (1) by which he meant the old view of church and state; on the contrary, his view was greatly respected and widely held, although his ability to argue the case was neither the one nor the other. He acknowledged that political liberalism was interlocked with religious

(1) W.E. Gladstone Gleanings Vol.vii (33 (c)) p.115

sectarianism and that these forces were likely to increase. He had to accept these conditions in politics, so they applied immediately when education became a party political issue.

The extent of the interest aroused by the problem of church and state relations at the time may be seen by the fact that Gladstone's rather forbidding work The State and its Relations to the Church published in 1838 ran into four editions.

In his introduction, Gladstone follows Hooker's definition and so rules out the extremist views of, say, Hobbes on one hand, and Bellarmine on the other. According to Hobbes, the Church is the mere creature of the State. According to the opposite view, the Romanist, the State is wholly dependent upon and subordinate to the Church. Cardinal Manning, a good friend of Gladstone, was to explain his interpretation of this at length some 50 years afterwards.

Gladstone attacks both extremes for not even discussing the matter of relations; but rather, one party is seen as derived from the other. Thus, the Church is the off-spring of the State, or vice versa. Gladstone is statesman enough to prefer to treat of equals.

The third view that Gladstone is anxious to demolish is that "the magistrate (i.e. the State) has no concern with religion". In this Gladstone is nearly at one with Bentham who certainly wants the "magistrate" to be concerned with conduct and morals. Writing in 1802, Bentham had declared "... education is only government acting by means of a domestic magistrate... as an indirect mode of preventing offences." Bentham and Gladstone were opposed to one another about the nature of the Church, of course; but it is interesting to see how differing views begin to resemble each other at class-room level. Gladstone's treatment of this third view has relevance to the attitude adopted by some of the Non-Conformists to religious teaching in schools.

Gladstone's overall comment on the three points of view was that the first was the peculiar danger of Lutheranism (chiefly found in Germany). The second scheme reminded him of the Romanist view; and the third of Calvinism. We are able to see that if the Lutheran interpretation could be abused in Germany later on, so could the Romanist view be misused in modern Spain. The Calvinist view did not have to wait so long; for it will appear later with particular relevance to the position adopted by some Non-Conformists about teaching religion in schools.

Gladstone saw education as an inseparable component of national culture, like religion. So it is difficult to isolate specifically educational views from his general treatment of the culture. It is necessary to follow the whole of his reasoning. He distinguished four ways of looking at the Church and State problem - which included the provision of education, as we have seen.

"It is written (in Scripture); it is natural; it is expedient; it is customary." (1)

He chiefly follows the second of his four views, that the relation between Church and State is 'natural'. He analyses the nature of the State itself.

"There remains the examination of the law of nature. The most authentic, the most conclusive, the most philosophical, and, in the absence of literal and undisputed precept from Scripture, also the most direct method of handling this important investigation, is that which examines the moral character and capacities of nations and rulers, and thus founds the whole idea of their duty upon that Will which gave them their existence." (1)

Gladstone indeed begins his investigation at the beginning - with chaos itself! Chaos he attributes to the Fall of Man. Thereafter, God disallowed chaotic progression (which should have been the natural consequence) but arranged first the

(1) Gladstone The State in its Relation with the Church (33 a)
Vol.1 p.44

redemption of the race, and secondly an intermediate "system of discipline". The instruments of "discipline" included the common structure of corporate life, such as the family, the nation or, presumably, the school. However, he notes that collective life produces evil as much as good, especially since it enlarges the scope of men's power. This is a subtle process because "where many unite to do wrong, the conscience is staggered as by an appearance of authority, and we are tempted to believe it right, or to insist less upon its wrongfulness" (1). Few educationalists would disagree with this!

Some remedy is required for the dangers of collective life. The remedy is supplied under the guise of collective religion. Gladstone is anxious to make it clear that this is not just another institution like the family or nation. He calls it a 'consecrating principle' to all forms of moral agency either individual or collective. Thus, the national church is not merely a sub-group within society as the secularists would like to say. It has the quality of giving society a special flavour, so to say, like sugar in tea.

Macaulay commented that, if this was so, then gas companies, banks, book societies and clubs among others should profess a religion, coming, as they do, under the consecrating principle with which the entire culture is interfused. In fact, modern theology would seriously agree with Macaulay's jibe. Gladstone, however, corrected his fourth edition.

The "combinations" to which Gladstone would apply his condition after this correction were those

".. that require in a high degree moral motives and restraints for the right discharge of the obligations subsisting under them; that... distinctly contemplate moral ends; that... exercise manifold pervasive, subtle, potent moral influences". (2)

This list of the features which matter in a "combination" applies well to schools.

(1) Gladstone op.cit. (33 a) Vol.i p.62

(2) Gladstone op.cit. (33 a) Vol.i p.94

The State must have a religion and Gladstone does not believe it can survive without one. He gives his reasons for thinking so.

"(it is of)... universal, or at least, general application. Its agency is permanent and annexed to the whole of our life.. There is no limit of quantity to the obligations of the individual towards it. It is moral, and not merely economical, inasmuch as its laws and institutions, and the acts done under them, are intimately connected with the formation of our moral habits..." (1)

When views of this sort were so deeply held it is small wonder that strong emotions were aroused by the implications of nineteenth century educational legislation. Here is no mere "sectarian rivalry". Gladstone is attacking the secular theory that the State was concerned only with material needs and not directly with truth and morality. He agrees with Cardinal Manning that the State had a conscience - indeed the State is almost a person (2).

Modern sociologists would wish to separate Gladstone's "state" from the society for which it legislates; but they would be hard put to it to establish their own view as a superior account of the reality. Of course, Gladstone could only speak about the State's duties and responsibilities because, for him, it supported only one religion (there cannot be two 'truths') while it has the duty to tolerate other religions.

On such grounds alone the Church's recognition by the State would stand; but the bond is even closer. Gladstone now declares what was for him and a great number of his contemporaries the crux of the matter. The "ends" of both State and Church are "reciprocally inclusive" and coordinate. They were different "ends" and there were differences about the way they were pursued.

"The State and the Church have both of them moral agencies. But the State aims at character through conduct; the Church at conduct through character". (3)

(1) Gladstone op.cit. (33a) Vol.i p.86

(2) Gladstone op.cit. (33a) Vol.i p.86 Dale disagreed: see p.137 below

(3) Gladstone op.cit. (33a) Vol.i p.115

The last sentence no doubt begs some questions, but it is easily remembered and thus displays Gladstone's rhetorical skill. It represents the basic worry in the minds of many people both at the time and since. It anticipates the theme of thousands of letters and articles in the press as educational controversy grew. Churchmen found it hard to see how a secularised State could provide education for 'character'.

Gladstone continued "... the State forbids more than it enjoins, the Church enjoins more than it forbids." If the State aspires to 'enjoin' rather than to 'forbid' then its first task would be to find a way of doing so without using its customary powers of coercion. This is an important problem raised when principle is put into practice. There have been modern attempts to resolve the difficulty in totalitarian states, and in particular, in their educational policies. Even in democratic countries the problem is not unknown.

Such issues created distrust as the tide of secular control advanced in the educational world and Churchmen were much affected by it. The terms they used to explain their own aims (e.g. "the education of the poor") like their use of the word 'charity' now carry undertones of condescension which they did not do at the time. Modern emotions are sensitive to such undertones, however, and the Victorians lose our sympathy undeservedly in consequence. It was not a case of the pursuit of crude power by patronizing ecclesiastics who were finally ousted from their monopolist position by free-thinking reformers of a tolerably modern stamp. The whole matter is far more complicated. Perhaps the pre-suppositions of many Churchmen were not subjected to frequent enough reappraisal: but self-examination and an objective evaluation of aims and motives were never popular activities then or now. It is much too easy a diagnosis to depict a nineteenth century educational reforming movement as aiming a one-directional attack on the legal privileges of a landed interest so as to shift wealth and power into worthier hands.

Chapter 6 : part iii

The Attitude of Militant High Churchmen

The most conspicuous defender of the Anglican supremacy was Archdeacon Denison, who, in his Church and State Review voiced the most uncompromising attitudes of High Church Anglicans. It is not completely accurate to say that they stood for exclusive clerical control over the schools (1).

"They were the 'medieval party' of the Church, denying to the State any role in education save that of pay-master and, as the dominant group in the National Society, they were prepared to resist any attempt by the State to restrict their independence. Yet though the Tractarians were deeply resentful of State interference they were not unwilling to accept State aid. Their objection was to the conditions attached to such aid, particularly to the right of inspection." (1)

Denison never shrank from expressing his views or from explaining why he held them; and an echo of his approach will be found in the attitude of those who supported Gladstone's ideal as well as the structured attitude of Roman Catholics. To describe them as 'medieval' is to suggest that they were hopelessly out-of-date - which is just what Denison believed was not the case.

As will appear in this chapter, Denison gathered considerable support. He was indeed suspicious of bureaucracy, but he did not equate bureaucracy with the state. He would have said that Parliament represented the bulk of the nation, and that the church was the nation 'on its spiritual side'. The church's function within the nation, and her duty to it, was educative. It would be falsehood, to him, to suggest that the State paid money to some external body when it helped the church over educational matters. However, he seems to have been quite convinced that there existed a powerful lobby under the direct influence of both agnostic intellectuals and committed disestablishmentarians. Accordingly, he set out to arouse his fellow

(1) M. Cruickshank Church and State in English Education (17)

churchmen to the danger. It is easy to say that he was fighting a losing battle and that he ought to have accepted compromise because he could not win. Presumably, however, he did not accept the view that the role of the old establishment was superseded.

"(He).. had never accented the conditions of State aid, but had continued for almost half a century to run his own village school efficiently, without a grant, without a conscience clause and without interference of Her Majesty's Inspectors" (1)

Denison was extremely active both as a supporter of the National Society and as a member of Convocation. However, it is not necessary to follow all his speeches in either place. He published a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1883 entitled The School in England, Century XIX (2) setting out the history of his long campaign. As it gives his fully consistent position it can be described here separately.

The occasion was a proposal to found a company for building schools 'for the middle classes' rather like the Woodard Corporation's plan except that the proposed schools were to operate a "conscience clause". It was the possibility of a "conscience clause" which incensed Denison; for he had fought against just this for years.

"The first formal proposal of Conscience Clause is found in the Manchester and Salford scheme of Mr. Entwistle 1850-1. The scheme was opposed by me.. It made no apparent progress then in or out of Parliament. The adoption of it as a condition of parliamentary grant dates from 1858." (Appendix A of 'Letter')

He made a speech in the Lower House of Convocation on February 6th 1866 (3). As he saw it there were two causes of the Clause. The first was the growing secularism of the Committee of Council. The second was the need to find a way to reduce the size of parliamentary grants as M.P.s and others grew anxious about the

(1) M. Cruickshank op.cit. (17) p.52

(2) The only copy easily available was obtained from the Presbyterian Historical Society of England, 86 Tavistock Place, W.C.1.

(3) Chronicle of Convocation 1866 pp.54-55 (IOI)

rising cost of education; and Denison notes that the anxiety had disappeared by 1866. His speech to Convocation did not mince matters.

"How came the Committee of Council to introduce such a thing at all? They were told they must cut down the Education grant. How was it to be done? It might be done, as it has been done, in two ways:

1. by a revised Code.
2. by a Conscience Clause.

The second.. was no doubt welcomed by the Council office.. being a great step forward towards the establishment of a comprehensive and undogmatic, that is, in the end, a Secular system.

As respects the saving of money.. Conscience Clause has answered very well. The building grants fell off to the extent of £60,349.15.11 in 1862-3, principally because church people will not have a building grant coupled to a conscience clause. I believe there has been a like falling-off in 1864-5. Now men can get over the Revised Code - though it was not altogether a very clean proceeding - because first there was a good deal to be said for it, and second because it infringed no religious principle and did no violence to conscience.. Now, how did the Committee of Council set about it? They introduced - for the first time, for there is no trace of it from 1839 to 1858 - the practice of asking what were the relative numbers of Church and Dissenting families in a place. Then they set down all doubtful cases to the credit of the sects, and made the answer to the application accordingly."

Denison was extremely vocal during Convocation sessions in 1870, and writing 18 years later he described 1870 as a turning point at which strong Churchmen deserted principle for expediency.

"Thus, after 18 years of contention in the House (of Convocation) against the Committee of Council, and only 4 years after the vote of 1866, having had then and previously some three-fourths of the House at my back, I was deserted by my oldest supporters under the delusions of the Bill of 1870; and Committee of Council, chief expositor of the secular system, triumphed finally over Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, over the House of Lords, and over the National Society."

He believed strongly that the Church had gradually come to accept money in the place of principle. Quoting Rom.xvi 26

'the obedience of faith only' he asks "whether the day will come.. when churchmen will stand fast upon principles of the church, as against the supreme Indifferentism of the Civil Power and as against their own temptation to follow in its train." This kind of remark was not likely to convert churchmen who did not agree with Denison. Those who did agree with him suspected not perhaps a plot against the Church but certainly a plan (p.8 'Letter'). Denison had already written an open letter to Gladstone in 1847 "when our minds were very much nearer the one to the other upon this matter than they have been at any time since". He had pointed out that while it was true that churchmen were not entirely agreed among themselves these "on the other side, were and are of one mind" (1)

"They took care, 40 years ago (i.e. in 1843), have taken it since, and take it now, that nothing distract their attention and effort; and indeed, 'the school secular' is a simple thing enough to those who recognise and insist upon its paramount claim. They saw that the new conditions of parliament were favourable enough to warrant them in saying that the time had come for public action. And they applied themselves.. to turn the great net-work of the Church School into the great net-work of the School Secular." (p.8 'Letter')

Denison accused them - it is not clear if he still means the Committee of Council - of being set on the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England. Within that intention was included 'their' policy towards Church Schools. The 1870 Act was no compromise at all: it was a stage towards the end. He complains of lack of resistance from churchmen. They should have demanded, with him, neither compromise nor special treatment, but equity.

The general position was that the schools of England had been religious and had now become secular. (p.14 'Letter') One instrument for making them secular was the Conscience Clause, and churchmen's acquiescence in it was a sign of their failing

(1) He finally abandoned appeals to Gladstone, and described him as a promoter of 'Red Radical' policy! See Supplement to Notes of my Life G.A.Denison: Jas.Parker Oxford & London 1893: pp.17-19

sense of the principles involved. First, the original Conscience Clause (1858-70) had provided for admission into church schools of children of parents who were not churchmen so that they had power to withdraw the children from the religious teaching of the school. The second step was to limit the religious teaching to one hour a day. He interprets the time table clause as an inevitable consequence of the original clause, and he hints that this was part of a plan also. Without the time table provision the original clause would not work. With it, the priest's office and commission in relation to the church school was formally abrogated.

The real vice, as he saw it, was the demarcation between religious and secular teaching in church schools where all the teaching should be religious. The Clause stood for something worse. It made religion merely an item of the Christian life and not the sum of it. He would have none of the argument that 'as you have Free Churches so you should have Free Schools'. There was no analogy between churches and schools for two reasons. One was that education was now compulsory. The other was that the freedom only worked one way, if the school was "free" to priests then it is not 'free' to non-Church children, and, if it is 'free' to them, then it is not 'free' to Church children".

Finally, Denison states four reasons why the trend in educational reform constituted a danger to the Church. This, like his whole position, is a good summary of the misgivings of a great number who agreed with him in the Church (and amongst the Roman Catholics). Echoes of this statement can be noticed in all of the periodicals of the Church during the last decade of the century. The dangers were these.

- "1. In the theoretical and practical separation between religious and secular.
2. In the brief time allotted each day to the religious.
3. In the invasion and disparagement of the commission and office of the parish priest, and his representative, the Church's schoolmaster.

4. In the impression unavoidably created in the mind of the children of the church that the secular teaching in which only all the children of the school join, is, after all, the one thing of primary importance." (p.23 'Letter')

Denison's third point, describing the schoolmaster as the incumbent's representative would cause alarm today. It has to be interpreted not only in its historical context but also within the context of an anxious parish priest deeply moved by Tractarian theology to a vivid awareness of his responsibility. This is surely instanced in Denison's fourth paragraph above. If the incumbent was not to educate "the church's children", and if the teacher was to ignore this aspect of the work, then who would do ~~it~~? Denison always refused to allow that any church but his own was commissioned to the work; and he was convinced that forces were at work to prevent the execution of this commission. Not even the Prime Minister was above suspicion of sinister intentions.

"The fact remains that he (Mr. Gladstone) is identified with and is the leader of men whose object is to revolutionize the home empire of England, and to dethrone the Church of England from its constitutional position in church and state." (1)

He encouraged his followers to uncommon doubts about the reliability of Gladstone's ecclesiastical loyalty.

"Mr. Gladstone has very lately issued his conclusion following. These things keep dribbling out to keep one section or other of his supporters alive. His conclusion is that Religious Equality is the thing to be contended for. It is difficult to adjust to Mr. Gladstone's own churchmanship what he means by Religious Equality." (2)

Denison gives his own interpretation, and it cannot but have struck a chord in the hearts of many of his fellow churchmen who, no doubt, pondered the same question. In their view Gladstone sanctioned the dispossession of the Church of England

(1) G.A. Denison Supplement to Notes of my Life (see) p.22
 (2) G.A. Denison Supplement to Notes of my Life (p 80) p.19
 (fn above

in favour of nonconformist Englishmen. They wished that all schools including nonconformist and Roman Catholic schools should be assisted in the way they wanted Anglican schools assisted. What they feared was the usurpation of church schools 'by way of invasion' in order to turn them into schools for secular education. Denison maintained this was just what the government was doing 'on the strength of holding the purse of which all grants come'.

The problems which came to light by 1870 were not new. They were to appear again at the end of the century - substantially unchanged so far as High Churchmen were concerned.

Chapter 6 : Part iv

The Attitudes of Moderate Anglicans

Gladstone and Denison exhibited the views of a great number of traditionalists within the Church of England. There were, however, many other Anglicans who did not associate themselves with the arguments of a definite party. These were churchmen who lived, in a pragmatical way, with presuppositions about the established church which were like those of Gladstone, the National Society and even Denison, but which had not been reasoned out so carefully. It has always been difficult to label middle-of-the-way Anglicans; yet it is important to identify them for they have usually been in the majority. Never very extreme, but often conscientious, they may perhaps be described as those who belonged to the established church simply because it was there!

Having recognised the distinction between High churchmen and Low churchmen, it is tempting - even convenient - to call the rest Broad churchmen; it seems to fit them. This Cruickshank appears to have done (1). Yet Broad churchmen are a different category; but confusingly they were not a party within the church. As they are not a party they are confused with the others who are not a party either. These others are dubbed Latitudinarian by Sanders, as he warns readers against this mistake.

"Some significance should also be attached to an article by A.P. Stanley.. 1850 which asserted that the English Church was 'by the very conditions of its being not High or Low, but Broad'..

(Another article) considered the characteristic tendencies of Broad churchism with those of the other parties of the Anglican Church, said that this party had been called 'Moderate, Catholic or Broad Church, by its friends; Latitudinarian or Indifferent by its enemies.'" (2)

The use of party labels, such as High or Low, can be particularly dangerous when they are used of periods before the twentieth

(1) H. Cruickshank Church and State in English Education (17) p.52.
 (2) C.R. Sanders Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement (63) p.7-8

century. The party members rarely met together; and Latitudinarians, like Broad Churchmen, never did so. Individual members of each group might share some views and disagree about others. One distinction may be that Latitudinarian churchmen accepted the status quo while Broad churchmen, such as Thomas Arnold or Coleridge, certainly did not. All of them had a strong sense of duty although Broad Churchmen were probably more sensitive to the effects of interaction between church and society. Both types of churchmen were suspected of lacking a sense of ecclesiastical *raison d'être* which would have stiffened them against compromise. A tendency to accept what was merely expedient distressed more definite churchmen. Yet the Broad churchmen accepted their social responsibilities, at least more energetically than most Latitudinarians. Many of the great public school Headmasters were Broad Churchmen; and so it may be said that their contribution to education is to be found outside the political arena. Their gifts to the state system were not to be realised until controversies had been settled. Then, when the need for a structured pattern of corporate conduct was felt, the need for some kind of code permeating the life of a school, then it was to the church's public schools that head teachers looked for suggestions. This points to a curious limitation in human conduct during all periods of social change. Even the most rebellious members of a society are rooted in the norms and presuppositions of their environment; and very few are willing or able to make a truly objective criticism of the basic principles on which their personal code of behaviour is, albeit unconsciously, based.

Broad churchmen have had a great influence on the intellectual life of England. The enormous influence of Coleridge for example, derives from his ideas on intellectual, social and religious unity. These ideas in turn influenced Arnold of Rugby, his son Matthew, J.C. Hare, Carlyle, R.M. Dale and F.D. Maurice as well as

Kingsley, Tennyson and Browning. Sanders suggests that they typified religious liberalism but "the main difficulty lies in distinguishing between it and other types of liberalism with which it can by no means be identified" (1). A negative means of identification is not helpful, yet there is little alternative. The group had no official association, no organised propaganda and no press except the ordinary newspapers: and it did not need such things because it did not exist in any party sense. It was simply that there was a tendency of opinion held by subordinate groups of men who agreed about moral sanctions and obligations. However admirable, this was not helpful when definite churchmen wished to present a strong case, perhaps about education, to the nation: but then, Broad churchmen were among those who regarded themselves as the nation.

There was another extremely large group of churchmen outside the High church and Broad church Movements and about whom confusion can arise. This group may be called Low church: but a very important distinction must be made. Low churchmen might be either Evangelicals or the sort Sanders calls Latitudinarian. David Thomson finds it difficult to identify Low churchmen.

"The most generally accepted and practiced form of Christianity at the time was that which may be broadly called evangelical with its emphasis upon moral conduct as the test of a good Christian." (2)

This is to confuse Broad churchmanship with Evangelicalism. It was Coleridge who claimed moral conduct as the test (3): that is, it is a Broad church idea. Evangelicals welcomed moral conduct, naturally; but they would consider other things of primary importance. The Evangelical placed great value upon the literal acceptance of the truth of Scripture, and upon an inner assurance of Salvation. This inner assurance created an intense awareness of living in the Presence of a personal Saviour. Neither Broad churchmen nor Latitudinarians had any

(1) C.R. Sanders Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement (63) p.8

(2) David Thomson England in the 19th Century (72) p.107

(3) C.R. Sanders Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement (63) p.67

such doctrinal hall-mark; indeed, the more urbane among them found Evangelical expressions of piety embarrassing. Evangelicals found friends elsewhere, however. They have always been conscious of a great affinity with others who sincerely agreed with them; and they paid no attention to denominational connexions. Salvation, and the means to salvation, monitored life and thought; and sometimes the monitoring was too strict.

".. we are so constituted with a body and with fleshly appetities that we must be in the world; but we must be separate from it, and its controversies, which are so unimportant compared with our eternal welfare."

These words are put into the mouth of a character in Mark Pattinson's novel The Revolution in Tanner's Lane (4th Ed. 1887 p.336). The passage exaggerates the case, no doubt, for the Evangelicals lent great impetus to the whole idea of social reform in the nineteenth century. Yet the danger of detachment was certainly there as the following quotation illustrates.

"It was the defect of the honoured leaders of the Evangelical Revival, as it has remained the defect of that great Movement, that it disparaged and belittled the life on earth, except insofar as it was a preparation for the life above..

It was not sufficiently considered that the life which Christ gives.. being a Divine Power.. is to truly transform every relation in which its possessor stands to his fellow men.

When this sacred leaven is boldly and thoroughly mixed with the whole mass, it will not be said that religion is on the outside of practical life." Congregational Year book 1891 p.33

The great majority of Anglicans would have agreed with the Congregationalist viewpoint. Broad churchmen and High churchmen were always uneasy about the Evangelicals' position. Broad churchmen felt that Evangelicals diminished the significance of the intellect on one hand, and on the other hand under-valued service to humanity as a truly religious act. High churchmen deplored the Evangelicals' denigration of priesthood, and disagreed about humanitarian service because, they felt, sacramental

faith knew no gulf between spirit and matter. For both Broad churchmen and High churchmen the education of the nation was a service to humanity.

As it happens even the Nonconformist churches were placed in a difficult position by Evangelical views. Within their churches Evangelicalism had become a term almost synonymous with orthodoxy.

"Nobody could honestly call himself a follower of Wesley who disavowed the doctrines of the Evangelical Revival: neither could any Congregationalist or Baptist reject them either, unless he was prepared to associate himself theologically with the Unitarians.

Any apparent denigration of Evangelicalism could appear as a lethal threat; for where else were the Nonconformists to find inspiration?" (1)

Apart from these fairly definite groups there existed the mass of parish clergy and the laity. Many of these looked to London very little, but lived sheltered, even narrow, lives in the country or in their town parishes fulfilling their pastoral duties according to their lights and offering little welcome to innovation of any sort. These are the so-called Latitudinarians of the nineteenth century; but the term strictly belongs to the eighteenth century when it commanded intellectual respect. Such Anglicans ought not to attract criticism simply because they were unobtrusive. Many of them were very conscientious indeed - not least in the field of local elementary education.

Grounded, as they were, in ideas of Church and State which belonged to a past age and living fairly remote lives, ordinary churchmen were first astonished, then outraged, by growing Government influence in the work of education. It seemed perfectly natural that the nation should support its 'spiritual side' with payments for education when the church could no longer afford to do^{so} without aid. Moreover, however inactive theologically, they were very sensitive about the role of the parson in his parish; and among the best of them this

(1) K.S. Inglis Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England (38) p.306

sensitivity was based on sound pastoral experience. The church elementary schools - that is, the majority of the nation's primary schools - were supported to a great extent by voluntary subscriptions as well as parliamentary grants. Even remote parishes became aware that the central government seemed set on sweeping away their schools in favour of a secular education supported out of the rates. Realisation was not unanimous, naturally. Moreover, this was the admitted programme of the secular Birmingham League and its supporters. Ordinary churchmen were aghast that nonconformists should support the League or any plan for a secular system. No doubt they wondered if anyone who professed Christianity and also supported secular schools could do so for any but unworthy motives; and this kind of suspicion does not make for local good-fellowship. Even better-informed Anglicans were puzzled. They would have agreed with Lord Salisbury's remarks, as early as 1865.

"Christian morality is a blessing which can only be enjoyed by the world as a consequence of the Christian faith.. This rule is true of a community, but it is not necessarily true of an individual. Some of the brightest examples of what a Christian life should be, have been and still are men who have renounced all but the mere pretence of Christian faith.

The fact, in their case, is that their morality was formed before their intellect went astray. Virtue had become easy for them before faith had become difficult. Thus it has come to pass that Christianity is reproached with her own success, and the morality which her preaching has produced has been employed to discredit its truth.. Men will not be moral without a motive, and a motive can only be furnished by religious belief." (1)

It may be true that many churchmen, including laymen, lived in areas which suggest an intellectual backwater, but they were men of the world in their day. And that day was remarkable for that force, very real in people's lives, which David Thomson calls the Victorian Moral Conscience.

(1) quoted in C.K.F. Brown The Church's Part in Education (8) p.130

".. it transcended all barriers of religious sect, and marked the religious outlook of a Quaker like Bright and of a High Churchman like Gladstone, a low church Tory like Shaftesbury and an Independent like Livingstone. It even coloured the outlook of an agnostic like T.H. Huxley and a man like Disraeli who, though Jewish by birth, was a practicing Christian. Its basis was Biblical.

Bible reading in the home was as popular as sermonizing in church. Its highest virtue was self-improvement. Its emphasis lay not on sacraments or ritual, but on organised prayer and preaching and the strict observance of Sunday. Until the 1870's this form of religion and of religious worship remained the normal form for the great mass of Englishmen." (1)

It is worth noting that Thomson uses the phrase 'normal form', but this need not be taken to mean that all Victorians held to the same high standard. Yet the 'normal form' helped to create the ethos of their time, and public opinion doubtless enforced the standard. This leads to hypocritical conformity, but on the credit side it forces up the standard of public behaviour. This was badly needed in times of commercial cut-and-thrust. Reformers in those days could appeal to religion and conscience. It is questionable if so much reform could have been accomplished in that age without such appeals. There is, furthermore, no reason to suppose that churchmen were unaware of the strength of this position, or that reformers did not know that if the appeal to conscience lost its validity their contemporaries might have supported even more brutal social conditions than was the case. And it is in the context of this self-awareness that the attitude of churchmen to the need to educate children in Christian principles must be seen. They also saw, however, that the type of religious education apparently favoured at Whitehall amounted to very little as an influential directive in people's lives. It might justly be retorted that their own system left a good deal to be desired, in spite of Lord Salisbury's prose, and that

(1) David Thomson England in the 19th Century (72) p.107

local loyalty to the parish church depended more on economics than piety. So it may be. People close their eyes to some facts in every age. Yet this does not put their sincerity in doubt. Even Dean Hook had not been impressed by new proposals for religious education; and he had declared himself as early as 1844.

"The State could not undertake consistently to educate the whole people on a religious basis which was not common to the whole. And, if it sought for this common basis, where was it to be found? Not in the Church (of England), not in any of the countless variety of sects, not in the Bible - since all disagreed respecting the interpretation of the Bible." (1)

(1) W.R.W. Stephens Life of W.F. Hook (70) p.404

such activities to the assumptions and operations of a secularized society was, however, implicit rather than explicit. I have interpreted my subject as confined to movements which were seeking.. the reconstruction of society on Christian principles.

The Church is seen as at issue with the world, in Westcott's sense of the term, 'society organised apart from the thought of God.'⁽¹⁾

Churchmen believed that it was their business and responsibility to provide education. They also believed that the State was taking advantage of them. They feared that their society was indeed to be organised "apart from God" both nationally and parochially. Yet, by the end of the century the constitutional position of the Church of England, insofar as it had one, had changed. Increasingly, it could no longer be taken for granted that there was a privileged position to be maintained. The 'established' church was beginning to think of itself as one more denomination. Churchmen deplored this state of affairs; and they may have thought that their foes were more interested in disestablishment than the children in the parish schools. Resentment grew among Anglicans; but once again, this did not happen to every Anglican at once, and in any case some were more hot-headed than others, as we have seen. As resentment grew so every new educational law was greeted with suspicion which was matched only by the suspicion of the Nonconformists.

The first bone of contention was the Conscience Clause - the Cowper-Temple Amendment - and then the time-table regulation within which the Clause was to operate. The full text of the relevant Section is as follows.

"S.14

Every school provided by a school board shall be conducted under the control and management of such board in accordance with the following regulations:

- (1) The school shall be a public elementary school within the meaning of the Act.

(1) M.B. Reckitt Maurice to Temple (59) p.11

- (2) No religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the school." (1)

This seems reasonable enough to the modern eye. To the nineteenth century churchmen it meant that the State was banning the 'established' religion in schools; and, moreover, if church schools were to qualify for State aid, it must be banned in them also. Furthermore, the time-table clause created a difficulty which was in the sphere of genuine educational principles. Removing religious instruction to specific times robbed the curriculum, in churchmen's eyes, of its master purpose which was religious education. Apart from the Anglican Denison the best exponents of this principle of education were the Roman Catholics whose views will be explained in another chapter below. The wording of the time-table clause was as follows.

"The time or times during which any religious observance is practised or instruction in religious subjects is given at any meeting of the school shall be either at the beginning or at the end of such meeting, and shall be inserted in a time-table to be approved by the Education Department... (and) any scholar may be withdrawn by his parent from such observance or instruction without forfeiting any of the other benefits of the school." (2)

The National Society, as spokesmen for the majority of Anglicans, framed its policy cautiously (too cautiously for Denison) because, while the Society wished to secure the existing denominational system, rising costs were already making it difficult for them. That acceptance of the clauses was a qualification for grants worried churchmen, for they feared this to be a precedent to be followed by more unpleasant conditions at a future date. Worry about money must not obscure the attitudes which were high-lighted at the time and which prevailed to the end of the century. From now on the

(1) Elementary Education Act 1870; 33 & 34 Vict., C.75; S.14
 (2) Elementary Education Act; 33 & 34 Vict., C.75; S.74

conflicting ideals of two opposing factions are clear. On one hand, the Birmingham League set out to work for compulsory attention in State schools where instruction would be secular and where, if there was any religious instruction at all, it would be unrecognisable. Tension within the League finally caused its dissolution and re-emergence as the frankly secular National Education Association in 1876. The Manchester Union, on the other hand, pointed out that the League were openly calling for the abolition of religious education and that the Act was intended to supplement, not supplant, voluntary schools. A large meeting under Lord Shaftesbury was organised to show a united front against attack on the denominational system. Thus, the question was, should schools be secular or not; but there was the further question that if they were not to be secular then should they be denominational or not?

The Government had its way over the conscience clauses. An Amendment to make Bible reading compulsory was refused; but another, which reduced the proposed period of grace from 12 to 6 months, was accepted. Then against Tory opposition lasting throughout an all-night sitting, a proposal was carried to make the election of school boards by ballot; the proposal was cut out by the House of Lords. An 'ad hoc' Board was accepted instead - directly elected by ratepayers.

On the whole the Anglican Church came out of it very well, but the wrangling itself is a strong indication of the changing role of the 'established' church. This change put the Anglicans in a dilemma. They could not simply shrug off what they fervently believed to be their moral commitment; and, to their mind, acceptance of conscience clauses amounted to just that. In 1870 Dean Church gave his version of the changing situation.

"The difficulty is beginning to be more visible every day of reconciling a Church with great privileges with the general set of modern society; of combining a national Church with a Church having the raison d'être

of a religious society believing in a definite religion and teaching it...

One of these days I expect we shall find ourselves put into the position of having to choose between making the Church co-extensive with what can be called the religion of the whole nation, or giving up our present position." (1)

As the new controversies loom up, it is important to recall how much Churchmen, High, Broad or Low, were being asked to give up. It was not a matter of ceasing to give mere Church instruction in schools. They saw school work very differently. They were being asked to accept a form of secularism in place of the Christian tradition, with all its mythology and symbolism which appealed to the imagination and emotions as much as it might captivate the mind and intelligence. It had been handed on through generations of the national community as a whole; and it was an integral part of England's culture.

"There is no need to idealize the past, nor to pretend that the Christian system of education was ever perfectly effective; it always stood in need of much improvement and extension.. (but) .. Can Christians fail to object to a plan of religious education which is abstracted from the Ministry of the Word and Sacrament in the visible Church? It is evident that.. they have weighty grounds for objection. On the other hand ... there is no Church in England at present which can reasonably expect to receive that recognition from the State." (2)

The 1870 Act established elementary education as a public service, whatever its critics said. Not only so, the public were now better involved because the representative nature of the school boards made all electors (rate-payers) of equal significance. Moreover, the school boards were a good way of finding out the deficiencies in the existing system; and this had its effect on the national attitude generally so that the need for more secondary education was more easily accented when the time came. One historical effect of the boards was to

(1) Mary Church Life and Letters of Dean Church (12) p.226

(2) A.R. Vidler The Orb and the Cross (76) p.114

create a practical interest in planning and building schools, thus creating a standard in the public mind.

In 1882 when the Code was revised the approach to the curriculum became more liberal (especially at the level of Standard VII). Three types of subjects were recognised. The first was to be 'obligatory' (i.e. elementary); the second type was to be 'class' subjects (i.e. compulsory English and some simple science); the third was to be 'specific' subjects requiring some specialisation. Both 'class' and 'specific' subjects were new, and created financial difficulties for the voluntary schools. That was not the only cause of concern.

There is evidence of growing discontent when the schools settled down to work under the new Act. It took time for complaints to appear; but by 1880 there is no doubt about the new problems which had been created.

The Report to the Convocation of Canterbury on Education (1880) gave an account of the view of H.M. Inspector Landon of the London School Board. Landon was dissatisfied with what he had found during his inspections, and what he said cannot have reconciled the members of Convocation. There was evidence of a reduction in the 'status' of religious instruction. This was caused by the time-table Conscience Clause in many people's opinion. It was not helped by the introduction of 'specific' subjects either. Both things will have reduced the standing of the subject in the eyes of teachers and children. The H.M.I. also complains of finding "the craving for a religion without a theology (which) is well known".

The Report continues with the customary praise for the National Society and its supporters. Then a significant item is inserted, perhaps accidentally, for the Agenda of the Lower House. This was a Report from a Canon Norris calling attention to the ignorance of candidates entering (the Church's) Training Colleges. This would cause concern, since both the Colleges and probably the 'feeder' schools were Church property.

Finally, Convocation endorsed the common complaint that churchmen had to pay for education twice; once by subscription if they wished to use Church schools, and once by paying their rates.

Convocation pointed to a need for 'vigilant and loving supervision' to prevent what they called 'stagnating confidence' placed in the preservative effects of (i) Trust Deeds, (ii) Teachers and (iii) Managers of Schools. Although couched in the placid language of Convocation this is a clear warning that the National Society schools must not depend on Trust Deeds or local loyalty to save them. Complacency would be disastrous. Convocation was hinting that legal foundations afforded no safety, as they already knew after the Charitable Trusts Act 1853 (which affected several public schools). The Government could alter what it wanted at any time. As for teachers and managers, the latter held a precarious position and, like the Deeds, were at the mercy of Whitehall, while teachers were the victims of local pressures against which the Church could not protect them. In fact, the way things were going, being a loyal churchman did not promise to be to the advantage of any teacher.

Outside the official proceedings of Convocation an enormous quantity of literature was circulated but it did not reflect the honeyed tones of the Upper House. Churchmen were still indignant, but, by 1885 new ideas were being suggested for a reasonable settlement of the matter of control in the schools. One example is a pamphlet entitled 'Gratuitous Education' by J.W. Diggle, Chairman of the London School Board, who read his work to the Liverpool Diocesan Conference. The writer remarked that the clergy could be proud of the number of schools and the multitudes of children who wished to attend them. In fact, by 1885 the Church of England had 11,794 schools, Roman Catholics had 850, Wesleyans 554 and British and Foreign School Society had 1,387. Diggle said all this shows the extent of the support

for the voluntary principle in the country. He ignored the effect which local monopoly would have on attendance in voluntary schools; but he was concerned to congratulate the subscribers who continued to donate money for Church Schools. He quoted Mr. Gladstone (and failed to notice that the Prime Minister's remarks admit of more than one interpretation).

"The nation does not appear to be disposed to confine the public teaching in primary schools to matters purely secular.. a large mass of opinion has grown up which is totally adverse to the use by the State of any prescribing or limiting authority at all in religious matters."

Another pamphlet appeared in 1885, this time by a layman.

"A plea for Voluntary Schools" was by F. Calvert, J.C. His first complaint was a popular one and Convocation had mentioned it. It was that the working of the 1870 Act was unfair because Church subscribers had to pay rates for State educational services as well. His pamphlet reads like very special pleading for the National Society, but his opinion that the Church has a right to be heard is uncommon in our day, so his grounds for holding it may be of interest. Here is a clue of historical value because it points to the difference between the approach of his time and that of ours, and it may be that the latter takes just as much for granted (and on as slender grounds) as the former.

First, Calvert quotes three passages from the New Testament. His choice of texts show that he is in no mood to bandy words. The first quotation was Matthew xxvii 17 and was presumably meant to set a choice before his readers: "When therefore they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ?" Next, Calvert suggested they read Luke xxiv 19: "And they said unto him, The things concerning Jesus of Nazareth which was a prophet mighty in word and in deed before God and all the people." Finally, from the Epistle to the Ephesians vi 4

"And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but nurture them in the chastening and admonition of the Lord."

It is quite impossible to guess what effect this approach may have had; certainly a greater effect than would be the case now. People were less given to separating the New Testament from moral precept in Victorian times; and, as has been noted, nobody was prepared to plan for education without its moral aspect. There were, on the other hand, those who positively expected Biblical support in matters of principle and who were entirely without self-consciousness about giving it or accepting it. Calvert had satisfied himself that Scripture testified to the rectitude of the stand taken by the National Society about making their religion the basis of education, and, by so doing, making their educational service superior to the State's.

Next, the pamphlet deals with the National Society's record since 1870. He praises the Society's energy and gives statistics about the school accommodation in 1870. In the following abstract from the pamphlet a second set of figures (underlined) is given for comparison. The underlined figures are Marjorie Cruickshank's (1)

Church of England	1,365,000	<u>844,334</u>
British and Wesleyan	411,948	<u>241,989</u>
Roman Catholic	101,556	<u>66,066</u>

The discrepancy is commented upon below.

Thirdly, Calvert notes three further important items by 1874.

- (i) There were 2,715,062 children in voluntary schools. 1,981,664 in 1880
- (ii) The Government was contributing £2 million to a system which actually cost £27 million.
- (iii) Voluntary schools supplied four-fifths of the entire accommodation available to the number of children desiring it - which probably accounted for the intensity of Churchmen's indignation.

(1) M. Cruickshank Church and State in English Education (17)
Appendix C

Finally, the pamphlet reminds the reader that in 1884 Voluntary schools had borne a double rating. The children attending them had as good an academic record as could be found in the State schools. The last point was much disputed at the time.

The last point is not the only disputable part of the pamphlet, for the discrepancy between the pamphleteer's figures and those of Cruickshank calls for explanation. Cruickshank obtained her figures from the Reports of the Department of Education. The pamphlet's figures are much closer to those given for the year ending 31st August 1878 as 'average attendance' (as distinct from accommodation) in school by H.M. Inspector's Report in "The Report of the Committee of Council 1876-77" page 397 (1). The Report of the Newcastle Commission (1861) Vol.1 p.592 claimed 1,187,086 pupils in Church of England schools. This is in excess of the figure from Cruickshank's source for all voluntary schools 9 years later. It is not at all likely that the numbers of children would decrease in the period. A possible cause of the discrepancy is that places were computed on the basis of the cubic capacity for Board Schools only, so it may be that more voluntary school children were squeezed into less space than a Board would allow.

The problem of supplying more space and better facilities was by now becoming serious. The following quotation refers to the end of our period and thus illustrates to what end conditions were heading.

"By the turn of the century, the voluntary schools, though still considerably in the majority, were experiencing grave difficulty due to the rise and cost of higher educational, staffing and hygienic standards, and of providing education over a lengthened school life." (2)

The Report of the Cross Commission (3) bore fruit immediately in the 1890 Code which abolished grants in respect of the 'three R's', thus dealing a heavy blow to the system of "payment

(1) Quoted in C.K.F. Brown The Church's part in Education (8)p.171

(2) Wells and Taylor The New Law of Education (79)p.119 footnote

(3) The Commission's Report is summarized in the Appendix to Ch.4

by results." This was welcome; but not so welcome was the proposed retention of the system in the case of 'class' and special subjects, for these were expensive.

The 1891 Act giving the right to free education made the majority of schools free. The National Society, as major Anglican spokesmen, had always opposed free education.

".. because it would inflict a severe and unnecessary burden on public funds, because the whole country would be taxed to provide education for a section of the population of which the greatest number could well provide for themselves, and because it considered that the requirement to pay enhanced the value of school attendance in the parents' estimation.

In 1890, however, the Committee acknowledged that 'they cannot disguise from themselves that the movement in direction of free education has now advanced to a stage when discussion of the question on its merits is no longer in place'.

To compensate the voluntary schools, which had been dependent upon fees to meet their commitments, a Fee Grant was substituted for a certain portion of the fee."⁽¹⁾

The Cross Commission had also criticised the system of pupil-teaching which directly affected elementary schools. The National Society were wary about new suggestions, and particularly about the setting up of Pupil Teacher Centres (after 1881). The Society were concerned about the effects of pupil teachers' attendance at Centres when their work was in rural areas, for they were often essential to the running of small country schools. The Education Department made an enquiry into the whole system (1896-1898) and the Society appointed a Committee of their own which recommended caution on behalf of small country schools. The Education Department Committee, however, recommended the reduction of the number of pupil teachers. Colleges for the training of teachers had, of course, been developing since the middle of the century. However, the Colleges have a separate history of their own in connexion with the churches; and, although

(1) H.J. Burgess and P.A. Welsby A Short History of the National Society National Society London 1961: p.43 (IC)

a supply of teachers is always essential to elementary education, the history of teacher training is outside the scope of this thesis.

On November 22nd 1893, a meeting was held at the National Society's Office of Representatives for various dioceses of England and Wales at which it was agreed to ask the archbishop to appoint a committee to consider the condition of the voluntary schools. The archbishop set up this committee and in its report we find the usual expression of discontent over costs; e.g. the rating of school buildings. Also among its recommendations it stated that if the government were to maintain the staff in both board schools and voluntary schools then, not only would the working of grants be simplified, but also the voluntary schools would be delivered from unfair competition in obtaining teachers. At the same time it was important to churchmen that they did not relinquish powers to appoint and control teachers. This was a new and important departure and Archbishop Benson set to work.

First, the National Society Standing Committee were to draft a Bill embodying the Committee's suggestions. Next, the draft received the support of the whole Standing Committee, representatives of dioceses, the Upper House of Convocation (Canterbury) and the Annual Congress of Church school managers and teachers. What objections there were went before another meeting - independent of the National Society this time - for expert consideration. All the evidence had come as a result of the Society's recommendation for investigation 4 April 1894 on a motion by the Bishop of Gloucester.

"The secretary was to send a circular to the secretaries of diocesan boards inviting them to communicate particulars of church schools upon which, during the past two years, undue pressure in respect of improvements, and time allowed for carrying them out, had been brought to bear by the Education Department; also of church schools upon which unreasonable demands in the matter of improvements had been made." (1)

It is clear that all was not well and that a sense of grievance had appeared, not only among extremist churchmen but among the usually cautious episcopate. On 20 November 1895 a unanimous report was presented to the Government.

"It prayed that in the framing of a new Education Bill the religious character of education should be preserved by retaining voluntary schools. Parents should have the right to determine the religious instruction given to their children, and no school should be penalized because of the religious views held by the teachers or the pupils. The memorial emphasized the value of variety in the type and management of schools, and asked for the abolition of the limits on the grants to schools, and that the grants should be rearranged so as to assist the poorer schools. They asked for increased exchequer rates, the provision of facilities for separate religious instruction in both voluntary and board schools, and power to establish denominational schools where parents demanded them." (1)

The idea that more public funds should be allocated to voluntary schools alerted the nonconformists at once. The Guardian noted that the Prime Minister had received a Roman Catholic and a Wesleyan deputation following the Archbishop's, and the editorial observes the beginnings of an embittered correspondence in The Times. The leading article, 4 December 1895, seems not to anticipate the storm which the Anglican proposals were to cause when their influence on Gorst's measure was exposed in the Commons in the following year. The leader reminded readers of its own viewpoint, and first lists the complaints of both the Anglican and the Roman Catholic churches.

".. they find that in fact the state throws by far the greater part of its influence into the support of schools in which the religious instruction is satisfactory neither to members of the Church of England nor to those of the Church of Rome.

They say that this is unfair as a matter of principle, and that in practice it forces them in a large number of cases either to withdraw children under the conscience clause, or to give consent to the kind of religious instruction which from their point of view is inadequate and misleading."

(1) S.J. Curtis History of Education in Great Britain (1950 Edit.)
University Tutorial Press: p.312 (19)

The Guardian's leader argues for as large a share of 'aid and favour' for church schools as was enjoyed by board schools, pointing out that church schools still educated more than half of the children and so performed a great service. The article hits at nonconformist objections.

".. it is often said to the members of the Church of England, as, for instance by Mr. Price Hughes.. that they at least have no grievance, because the religious instruction given in board schools, is, as far as it goes, the same as is given in Church Schools; to which the sufficient answer is, as the Prime Minister admirably suggested to the Wesleyan deputation, that Anglicans don't think so. Members of the Church of England must be supposed to understand their own religion better than those who dissent from them, and they emphatically do not regard the disiecta membra of Christianity which it is usual to serve up to children in board schools as any equivalent at all for their own ordered and complete presentation of the catholic faith." (1)

In this extract a distinct difference of attitude is disclosed which is worth pausing over. The Wesleyans had traditionally been more closely attached to Anglicanism than any other dissenting church. Yet, if this is a fair account of Hugh Price Hughes' attitude, it indicates a presupposition as deeply bedded as any Latitudinarian sub-belief. It starts out from the premise that the Church of England, being reformed, as nonconformist churches are reformed, was of the same Protestant persuasion as nonconformists. This would have been the view of Evangelical Low churchmen only, at the end of the nineteenth century. R.W. Dale knew this, as apparently Hugh Price Hughes did not. Similarly, those who lived in an exaggerated fear of popery - men of very different calibre from Dale - also knew it, but, of course, they regarded Puseyitism as treachery to the Protestant cause. If this was truly a nonconformist interpretation of the situation, then Anglican attitudes about establishment, her social role and her duty in education must, of course, have struck them as an affectation. In this they

(1) The Guardian 4.12.1895; p.1872

were mistaken; but the sharp language of ecclesiastical journalists on all sides at the time cannot have helped the cause of mutual understanding.

The Guardian freely admitted the difficulty for nonconformist children in rural 'one-school areas', but protested that it was no solution to water down the doctrinal teaching of the majority in order to accommodate the minority. The editor claimed that an Anglican delegation to the Prime Minister had in fact proposed a solution.

"All we ask, all we have ever asked, is that the State shall make it possible for every parent who is compelled to send his child to an elementary school, whether voluntary or board, to have that child taught the Christian religion - if he desires it to be taught the Christian religion at all - in the way that he himself thinks right." (1)

That seems fair to the modern eye; but was it true to say that permissive choice was what the Church of England had always asked for? This is not the earlier attitude of Anglicans who saw themselves as the nation 'on its spiritual side'. At one time any denominational teaching outside Anglicanism would have been regarded as heretical at worst, and unBritish at best: Denison and his followers had not changed to this new position, and never did so.

If the new permissive approach was a peace-offering it was disregarded. Not only did Dr. Fairbairn and Hugh Price Hughes follow the Anglican Archbishop's delegation to the Prime Minister, but so did the secularists. Lyulph Stanley anticipated the Archbishop's intentions and moved into the attack by "Reopening the Education Settlement of 1870" in an article in The Nineteenth Century.

"Above all, the friends of the denominational schools, and those who resent the growing cost of our elementary school system, desired to find relief for voluntary schools, which are slowly yielding to the rival Board system, under public taxation.

(1) The Guardian 4 December 1895; p.1872

This last question of further aid to denominational schools is now the one which seems likely to be raised first of all in the new Parliament...

It may be noticed that the movement is entirely one of the Established Church and of the Roman Catholics.

The Wesleyans, though they have denominational schools and training colleges, and though their educational policy has long been directed by the clerical and conservative section of that body have... emphatically reaffirmed their demand for universal school boards of sufficient area, and have asked for an undenominational school within reach of all.

The friends of the British schools are also strongly in favour of the extension of the school board system." (1)

Stanley goes into detail about the financial consequences of the new proposals and examines the attitudes behind them with severity. He notes, in passing, that the position of the established church had changed essentially even though distabishment had not been accomplished.

"The teaching usually given (in board schools) is a general Christian teaching, based on the Bible, from which all reference to sacraments and church doctrine is generally left out. But the Anglicans say that this teaching errs by defect, and therefore, even if true as far as it goes, it is in effect false teaching.. because it gives as apparently sufficient that which is not sufficient; and they further say that it is a wrong done to their conscience to make them pay rates for such religious teaching.

It is rather refreshing, and even amusing, to see how readily the advocates of an established church can feel its injustice when the church established is not their church. School boards are in their religious teaching a permissive established church, the doctrine of which may vary with the local majority." (2)

Stanley's paragraph about a new (secular) establishment was not wise, and the reply is reported below. Nevertheless he does not hesitate to hint that there is a church conspiracy to which both Lord Salisbury and his nephew Balfour were parties. The archbishop's proposals he dismisses as "avowedly intended not merely to aid the voluntary schools, but to cripple the progress of

(1) Article in The Nineteenth Century: No.226 Dec. 1895; p.916

(2) Lyulph Stanley's Article in The Nineteenth Century: No.216 Dec. 1895: p.918

schools boards" and in this he is less than just if only because the churches could not possibly have faced a situation in which board schools shrank so much in significance that the old burden of national provision would again have to be shouldered by churches: those days were quite gone.

Lastly, Stanley says he fears some return to the idea of Tests, not by law but by abuse of patronage in appointments in schools. He thinks teachers will have to "make a parade for professional purposes of their presence at the most solemn rite of the Church of England". He cannot have believed that parsons would encourage any such thing, or that they would be deceived by hypocrisy any more than politicians are. This matter needs to be faced, however. Yet reformers who wish to reduce religious influence sometimes forget that the removal of ethos never leaves a vacuum; another influence replaces the first. And it may be thought, probably many churchmen then did think, that discovering if a teacher was religious was as important as discovering which political party he supported: and, from the children's point of view, it was (and still is) more important. These things affect choices at local level. Churchmen knew that as well as Lyulph Stanley.

Stanley's shafts went home, and both J.R. Diggle and Athelstan Riley replied in the next issue of The Nineteenth Century. Diggle complained of the departure from the intentions of the 1870 Act and, in particular, of Mr. Acland's use of H.M.I.s as 'taskmasters' asking for higher standards in voluntary schools where there was no money to provide them; we may note that the Cockerton judgment would soon bring the whole question of spending - in board schools - to light. As to religious teaching in board schools, Diggle does not spare his opponent.

"Mr. Stanley is a prominent member of the Liberation Society. His policy is two-fold: to disestablish the National Church with its recognised and settled creeds;

and to establish everywhere 'permissive established churches, the doctrine of which may vary with the local majority'. These are strange proposals to proceed from a nonconformist leader.

The 'stern nonconformist' is an extinct species. In his stead there has arisen a spurious nonconformist whose political creed dominates his religious principles. That fact accounts for Mr. Stanley's leadership, and the rehabilitation of the Birmingham League." (1)

Diggle remarks that on Stanley's showing religious instruction in board schools could amount to anything or nothing at all.

Athelstan Riley was if anything less kind to Stanley's ideas than Diggle: but his positive contribution to the exchange lies in his disclosure of Church of England attitudes which lie at a deep level. In effect, Stanley had asked churchmen what they wanted in schools more than the Bible? Riley replied.

"No religion in the world is founded upon the Bible, but many forms of religion, some Christian some not, are founded upon particular interpretations of the Bible... Religion is a matter of the individual conscience (and) we decline to allow it to be settled for our children by 'local majorities'." (2)

Riley then revives a point made by the Prime Minister to the Wesleyan deputation to him (3).

"The Bible is our religion, let it speak for itself, says the Protestant; but on enquiry you will find that it is to speak for itself through a teacher of his own faith: he (the nonconformist) will not allow his child to receive Bible instruction from a Papist.

Now the gulf between the Churchman and the Unitarian is far more profound than that between the Protestant and the Roman Catholic." (4)

There is a further interesting passage in which recent pronouncements of leading nonconformists are quoted. This is of value at this point in the thesis because such views contributed to the formation of much stiffer Anglican attitudes than had been necessary or desirable hitherto.

(1) J.R. Diggle, Article in The Nineteenth Century; No.227 Jan. 1896; p.49

(2) Athelstan Riley in do. p. 52-3

(3) do. p.53 footnote

(4) do. p.53

"Mr. Stanley is not alone; the whole school board party are equally determined to exclude as far as possible the fundamentals of Christianity from board schools.

Dr. Guinness Rogers tells us, as the spokesman of the London Nonconformist Council, that the Divinity of Christ is not to be taught in the board schools because they 'are supported by the money of believers and unbelievers alike'. If only that can be taught which is agreeable to believers and unbelievers alike, what is left of the Christian faith?

Dr. Clifford, the most prominent and militant of the nonconformist leaders, is equally emphatic. 'The money of the state' is not to be used for teaching the deity of our Lord, the Atonement, the fundamental truths of Christianity, and he ridicules the ideas of 'agitators' that the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Holy Trinity, the Atonement shall be taught the children of Board schools and at the public expense." (1)

Guinness Rogers had supplied Riley with this ammunition in a letter to The Times 9 June 1894; and Clifford had his say in Review of the Churches January 1894. To be called 'agitators' by Dr. Clifford would be regarded by churchmen at the time as praise indeed! On the other hand, Riley cites two prominent nonconformists who repudiated such views: Parker, who preferred a totally secular education, and Hugh Price Hughes who went so far as to support the inclusion of the Apostle's Creed in the Curriculum.

Pointing out that morality cannot be taught to children without religious dogma (and vice versa) Riley ends by giving a good account of the principles of State education for which churchmen were now contending.

- (1) As all Englishmen are taxed to provide national education then all must be equally considered in the expenditure.
- (2) Neither denominational nor undenominational teaching should be endowed by the state; and no particular form should be established in schools to the prejudice of the rest.
- (3) Religious education in elementary schools should not be the religion of the majority of rate-payers, or of a particular teacher, but that of the parent.

(1) Athelstan Riley, Article in the Nineteenth Century; No. 227, Jan 1896 p. 54

Seventy-three years later the truth of Riley's three points are still a matter for doubt.

We have seen that a number of the Archbishop's delegation's proposals were embodied in an Education Bill which the government presented in 1896. The Bill's main purpose was to give effect to the recommendation of the Bryce Commission on Secondary Education, but there were clauses dealing with the difficulty of voluntary schools. A larger grant for distribution to voluntary schools by local authorities was suggested. The Comper-Temple Clause was to go, and denominational teaching allowed in board schools if a sufficient number of parents wished it. Naturally the National Society and churchmen generally welcomed all this. However, the opposition was building up and was so great that the Bill was abandoned in June.

The Church of England now adopted a more aggressive attitude, and went on the offensive. A large and representative conference was held on 30 October 1896 with a view to securing more united action. The conference resolved to ask for three things.

- (a) An Exchequer grant should be made at the rate of 6s. per child in all elementary schools; and, in the case of voluntary schools this should only be made to 'federations of schools'.
- (b) Rate-aid should be available to voluntary schools which were in school board districts.
- (c) Where (b) was implemented, the church must retain control of the appointment of teachers, and the provision of religious education.

Thus, the National Society surrendered its opposition to rate-aid. This had been a matter of disagreement with the Roman Catholic church which, in other respects, had supported Anglican moves in the long debate.

The outcome was the Voluntary Schools Act 1897. This Act did not, in fact, touch the question of rate-aid for voluntary schools, but it abolished the 17/6 limitation and provided an

aid-grant (not exceeding in total 5s. per child). It also freed the schools from the payment of rates. Moreover, where an association of church schools existed, the government was prepared to make a block grant for disbursement as the association saw fit. This was most valuable for poor schools, and the Diocesan Boards of Education were alerted. Unfortunately, rising costs diminished its effect.

It was clear that the time had come for a new attempt at an Education Bill of major proportions. Balfour, alarmed at the storm which arose over the Bill in 1896, was forewarned when he turned his mind to the new legislation.

In the meantime an article on how matters stood in 1900 appeared in The Guardian on 14 April 1900 entitled "The Position Explained to Churchmen". It outlines one cause of disagreement within their ranks, that of whether or not to accept money from the rates. The suspicion was that if a controlling authority was local then petty jealousies would cause more trouble than if control was exercised from Whitehall. On April 1st, a new Board of Education had been formed.

"How (its) powers are to be exercised is not yet clear, but the government have announced the intention of setting up local authorities to assist in the work.

It is here that the immediate danger lies... If the local authority of the future is to be.. merely a school board under another name.. a very serious state of things will have arisen. There is no reason to think that the school board of the future will be more friendly towards denominational schools than the school boards of today."

The article anticipates that the new local authority will be the County or County Borough area, perhaps an even smaller area. It asks how the same area can produce two popularly elected educational bodies, "the one hostile and the other fair towards denominational schools"?

"But there is another danger of quite a different kind. In some quarters churchmen have persuaded themselves that they can no longer carry on their

schools because of lack of funds. They used to charge fees, now they charge none, and the loss has not been made up in other ways. They are consequently in despair. In other districts, where fees were lower, voluntary subscriptions have always been obtained and the same difficulty does not arise. This division of churchmen has brought about the other danger. It has created a wide-spread belief in the instability of the present situation, and has diverted the attention of many of our leaders from the effort to secure an impartial local authority to an effort to obtain financial relief through Parliament."

The Archbishop of Canterbury was to bring up the matter of payment when he addressed the Annual Meeting of the Canterbury Diocesan Education Society at Ashford (reported in The Guardian 14 January 1901). Speaking about the whole question of religious education in elementary schools he urged churchmen not to abandon what he considered was a powerful agency for advancing both Church education and, generally, religion in the country. To make sure that religious education was taken seriously the Archbishop recommended that the instruction should be given by ordinary, that is qualified, teachers who were also sincere believers.

He acknowledged the difficulties of churchmen who suffered from 'double rating' to support schools in which they could not be sure that any religious instruction was given, not to speak of schools where doctrines which churchmen repudiated might be taught.

"But there was a perpetual temptation to churchmen to withdraw from their duty and say, 'If the State takes it up, let the State do it all!' The State said, 'You are divided in opinion.. (and) it is not for us to say what is the right system and what is wrong'. So the State set up school boards in which it was left to the managers to give such religious instruction as they saw fit...

They (the Church) neither declared that (i) they would never join in a general national system if one could be devised to meet their needs; nor (ii) pledged themselves to extend the present system of church schools so completely as they would wish to do and really cover the country." (Guardian 14.1.01)

The previous year the Archbishop, addressing the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, had voiced some other worries. He said he did not despair of maintaining church schools provided that two conditions were complied with. One was that subscriptions must continue to flow in from the laity, even when a particular school received a special aid grant. The other condition was that "the clergy should work in the schools as much as they do now, and in most cases, even more". Apparently, some parsons were losing interest. They had not been in the controversy, as had the Archbishop, for nearly half a century, and his comment was "the schools were then established by the clergy who had charge of them and those who have come in since are not stirred by the same zeal". Both the Archbishop and the Editor of The Guardian (10.3.00) recommended as much contact as possible between parish priests and the schools.

One "Rate-payer" writing to the Morning Post in 1900 had asked why the Primate continued to use optimistic and conciliatory language; Denison would have applauded this letter. Church schools were in a bad way because of finance; and this was particularly true of towns and school board areas. The Archbishop ought to have pressed for a system by which educational rates could be apportioned either to the school board or to voluntary sources. Otherwise both churchmen and church schools were subsidizing non-denominational religious education to which they objected strongly. The Roman Catholics felt strongly about this double rating also.

Why did not the Anglican bishops agitate? It would have strengthened the Church schools' position and it would have helped them financially. The answer must be that they feared local control. The Roman Catholics were in a happier position because the Hierarchy could be sure of unanimity beneath them - a sensation well outside the experience of any Anglican bishop. Yet they did nothing to organise the enormous support which was available. On one occasion before 1899 Balfour had presented a

petition in Parliament which consisted of 250,000 signatures asking for the right to assign rates to voluntary schools. One would have thought that everyone would have been content, apart from local squabbles. Of course, it would have perpetuated a strong voluntary system; so perhaps Denison's fears were well-founded and there was a plan to which the bishops were party.

The matter was examined in an article in The Guardian, (13 October, 1900) reporting the proceedings of the Church Congress about the maintenance of voluntary schools. Congress recorded its satisfaction that its London, Leeds and Manchester representatives were unanimous in their demand that Church schools should obtain a share in the rates which churchmen, like everybody else, had to pay. They were irritated by the Archbishop's repeated requests for increased subscriptions to help the schools. This was all very well where the subscriptions were high enough to make the school independent of rate aid. But, even apart from the wrong done by "twice-rating" the church, there was the remaining problem of a parish which was poor and where the school population was likely to be heavy.

"Why have not the church schools shared in the rates from the first? Forster would have given them rate-aid, but Mr. Gladstone, under the influence of the Birmingham League, took it away, and substituted for it an addition to the government grant. In like manner, the present government, under the influence of Mr. Chamberlain, the representative of the spirit of the League, when rate-aid was demanded by both Houses of Convocation, substituted for it a meagre dole from the Imperial purse."
(Guardian 13.10.00)

The article continued with some detailed suggestions about an entirely new system of rating, and went on to point to an important regional difficulty.

"There would still be the additional difficulty created by the Assisted Education Act of 1891. In 1870, though the parents' contribution in school fees was taken, for argument's sake, at 10/- per child, as a

matter of fact in the South it was less, and in the North it was much more." (Guardian, 13.10.00)

This was due to the larger sources of subscriptions in the South. The Act of 1891 was said to have destroyed the Northern schools by telling them they must supply education "for the sum of 10/-, paid as a fee-grant in lieu of the larger fees formerly paid by parents".

This reference to regional differences supplies one clue to the lack of consistency in churchmen's attitudes. At a previous session of the same Church Congress to discuss elementary education, the Bishop of Newcastle, in his inaugural address had pointed this out: ".. but readers of these debates will form a mistaken opinion if they think that because proposals differ the Church of England has no educational policy. The truth is that the circumstances vary so greatly in different parts of the country."

The atmosphere had undergone two enormous alterations. Up to 1870 the Church had demonstrated a calm self-confidence which showed that the change in her constitutional and social role had not been widely appreciated in her ranks. After 1870 the outlook changed and so did the tone of public statements. There was a strong sense of injustice not only at having lost control of her property and at the scanty thanks received for the service to education rendered before Forster's Bill and for many years afterwards. There was a deep feeling of grievance; and the discontent and disillusionment was not only voiced by extremists like Denison. Flower, a member of the London School Board, is reported as making some interesting and perhaps typical observations to the Church Congress on September 29, 1900.

"Up to 1870 the Church of England had with some exceptions provided elementary education. The Act of 1870, passed in a Parliament largely Liberal and Non-Conformist, was an attempt by Mr. Forster to supplement, not supplant, the voluntary system. The wonder

was that the schools of the Church of England had held their own so well in this unequal fight.. a million pounds a year of voluntary subscriptions, the heroic exertions of the National Society.. had even caused increased attendances at Church Schools. The Church claimed that such service to the State deserved equal recompense. Of course there must be public control. There already was. In the case of voluntary schools the owners or managers paid, from their own resources, for the buildings and 'plant' and took the risk of advancing money for maintenance. If the government examiner was satisfied at the end of the year then payment by results was made. If there were no results, then the managers lost their money. "Here rate-aid", said Mr. Flower, "to be added to the Government grant in payment for the education given, then the rate-payer would rank with the Government as joint purchasers of the education provided. Unless they became joint-partners.. They could not justly claim, any more than the Government claimed, to be joint managers. Common sense at once pointed out that it was far more economical for such rate-payers to become purchasers of education, at a small sum from the voluntary schools.. than to build new schools of their own." (Article The Guardian, 'The Church and Elementary Education' 29.9.00).

Flower used what was a favourite argument of the Roman Catholic authorities when arguing the same cause. As a matter of fact and law, rates had been paid regularly to industrial, reformatory and poor-law schools (all voluntary) for 30 years. The law decreed that specifically denominational instruction should be given. Flower's picture is incomplete, however; his case was stronger than he thought. The Reformatory and Industrial Schools Act to which he refers was passed in 1866. Since then, there had been the Deaf and Dumb Schools Act of 1893, the Defective and Epileptic Children Act of 1899, and, of course, denominational chaplains were authorised to work and teach in Prisons and in the Forces.

Flower went on to show how rates were being used at the time.

".. Under the more recent Technical Instruction Act, County Councils and other local authorities contribute rate-payers' money to schools and institutions on the

conditions laid down in the Act itself... But, although rate-aid did not carry rate-payers' management (under any of these Acts) yet they (the churchmen) were ready to admit representatives (of the rate-payers) to the voluntary schools Associations formed under the Act of 1896, and to administer all aid from the rates through those Associations." (Article by Flower, The Guardian 29.9.00).

On the other hand, things were sometimes so unpleasant at the level of the local authority that one can understand a certain reluctance to provide new opportunities for friction. In this, The Guardian is not entirely consistent. A leading article (September 22, 1900) frankly demands release from religious persecution. It remarks bitterly that it ought not to be necessary at the beginning of the twentieth century to ask that the principle of religious freedom should be acted upon. However, it was necessary.

".. we find that the old love of oppressing those from whose faith we differ is really as alive among us as ever it was, only with this difference, that whereas in old times men persecuted to compel others to accept doctrines which they disliked, the object now is to compel children to attend schools in which the faith of their parents cannot be taught.." (The Guardian 22.9.00)

Certainly this was hard on parents who held to a definite religious faith. The tables were turned, in a way; for now the church could complain of the plight of those who lived in areas where the State school had a monopoly. This was precisely the complaint brought by secularists against the position of the Anglican church early in the century.

What was wrong with the religious education provided in the State schools? The Guardian would have no truck with a religious education by which no truth that was "sufficiently definite to be expressed in creed or catechism" was allowed. The complaint was that only the objections of unbelievers were listened to when religious education was arranged. Moreover, the teachers were in a very difficult position.

".. precluded as they are from using any Creed or catechism, and watched, as some of them are, by zealous anti-Church members of the school board, they are obliged to limit their religious instruction to bare and barren facts, such as the history of the Kings of Israel and Judah." (The Guardian 22.9.00)

How far this concern for the difficult position of teachers was justified can be seen from two law cases which admittedly occurred outside our period. Yet they serve to show how feelings must have been building up. In one case the managers of a school represented, by their action, Anglican attitudes of the narrowest and least intelligent kind.

"In *Smith v. Macnally* (1912) 1.Ch.816 .. a teacher was dismissed by the managers who alleged dissatisfaction with the religious instruction given by her, though in fact the ground was that she had ceased to be a member of the Church of England and had become a Wesleyan.

It was held that the true ground of dismissal was not connected with the giving of religious instruction in the school.." (1)

A similar attitude could be found in non-Church circles.

Another dispute reached the Courts because a local authority paid higher salaries to teachers in the State school than it paid to those in the voluntary school which consequently did not attract the best teachers. This was *Rice et al. versus the Board of Education*, Ed Act 1902 S.7 Sub-S.3 and S.16.

As we shall see below the Church of England received no encouragement from the Free Churches, and this increased the sense of grievance over loss of educational control. Church members had really done very well. What of the others?

"What the Church of England had done for education was greater than anything accomplished by the Dissenters. The Commission of 1858 and 1861 found that at the time of their report the Church of England possessed about nine-tenths of the elementary schools in the country with three-quarters of the children, the Roman Catholics about 5½%, the Wesleyans 4% and the Congregationalists 2%. This difference is sometimes explained by the fact that the Church of England contained the wealthier

(1) Wells & Taylor New Law of Education (79) p.140 para 'h'

classes, and so it is said, its members were in a better position to subscribe money to earn grants which were available to all. There is probably some truth in this but it is unlikely to be the whole truth... by 1858 the Industrial Revolution had been going on for some time and so had the increase in the numbers of Dissenters, an increase which had by no means only been among the poorest in the land...

A good many Dissenters were clearly comfortably off while some Dissenters had made considerable fortunes.. Moreover, in fact a great deal of the money which had been used to build and staff elementary schools had not come from the superfluity of landowners but from the pockets of the clergy, often at the cost of severe self-sacrifice. It would be difficult to deny that a good many dissenting shopkeepers and manufacturers could have subscribed the same amounts more easily." (1)

How can the disagreement be accounted for? The danger from secularists was as obvious to nonconformists as it was to Anglicans. In fact, beneath the educational developments of these years there was both a religious and a political controversy which may not be ignored. It reached the height of its bitterness at the end of the century; and this conditioned the progress and the form of educational development. The issue was not the same as before. In the early days the state did not dispute the role of the church in education: but the question before the nation at the turn of the century was, what part should the state allow denominational schools to play in a national system of education? The connecting link was the several philosophies of church and state.

The Church of England had come to recognise the impracticability of assuming responsibility for the education of a whole nation. Even if the church could have afforded to do it, the nation would not have it. Yet churchmen did not propose to sacrifice distinctively Anglican religious teaching and worship; but they were prepared to accept state aid as an act of justice. Yet state aid brought certain dangers which were not lessened by the compromise solutions for which politicians earnestly wished. The Archbishop of Canterbury pointed out the most

(1) G. Kitson Clark The Making of Victorian England (40b) p.175

serious as he spoke in the House of Lords 23 July 1900.

"Those who are anxious that religious education should be given mean not only that the learners should be taught particular doctrines, but that they should be trained to apply all religious doctrines to their ordinary life, and you do not get that training from any teacher who is not very much in earnest about the religious instruction which he gives." (1)

This was the usual church attitude; but there were signs of fatigue in the church's attitude. There were those who saw that a fully satisfactory solution for the "definite" churchmen was impossible. One such was the Bishop of Hereford who had suffered at the hands of The Guardian's editorial staff because of his moderate views. Speaking in the same debate he not only applauded the suggestion that, when public funds went to church schools, then the public should be represented on the Governing Body; he also expressed some impatience with prolonged religious argument.

"The only other clause to which I would refer is.. an attempt to solve what is known as the religious difficulty, but I am bound to acknowledge that I do not think it is an attempt which is likely to be successful. I have the deepest desire to see this religious difficulty got out of the arena of public discussion. I have felt for many years that it has been one of the greatest obstacles to our real educational progress..." (2)

The bishop was right to suggest that Anglicans must yield to greater public control, but he overlooked the social and political influences which rendered it unlikely that the religious difficulty be dropped from public discussion for some time to come. The almost traditional nonconformist objection to their children being obliged to attend church schools in certain areas and to the expenditure of public money for schools which taught doctrine of which they disapproved remained unabated throughout the nineteenth century.

(1) Parl. Debates 1900, 4th Series, Vol.LXXXVI Col.809

(2) Parl. Debates 1900, 4th Series, Vol.LXXXVI Col.818

The division was translated into political terms. The Conservatives favoured the financing of church schools from public money and allowing them to retain religious independence. The Liberals still had a strong nonconformist following and not only supported undenominational teaching but were prepared to finance voluntary schools only on condition that they forfeited their denominational character.

In 1902 the Conservatives decided to bring the voluntary schools completely within the national system. School boards were to be replaced by Local Education Authorities. Board schools became 'provided schools' and voluntary schools were to be known as 'non-provided schools'. Voluntary, non-provided, schools were at last to receive rate-aid, but the cost of capital expenditure on buildings and structural repairs was to be borne by the denomination. In return for this aid, two of the six managers were to be appointed by the L.E.A. Managers retained the right to appoint and dismiss teachers (subject to the L.E.A.'s approval) on educational grounds. Religious instruction was to be in accordance with the Trust Deed, subject to a conscience clause and the right of withdrawal. The Church of England - or at least the National Society - welcomed the Bill. Their welcome was premature, however. After the First Reading the agitation which broke out was sufficient to put the government's security of tenure in jeopardy. Balfour was thoroughly alarmed and perhaps uncertain about what to do for the best. He was anxious to find a compromise between extreme views, and so he was doomed to please few people in the end. The two protagonists were the Nonconformists, on one hand, led by the Baptist Dr. John Clifford who described the Bill as 'blind and bigoted'. Nonconformists' opposition was to rate-aid being paid out of their pockets for Anglican religious instruction. On the other hand the Anglicans replied that they already paid rates for undenominational teaching in state

schools - thus supporting teaching of which nonconformists approved; this argument was to be heard many times into the first years of the twentieth century. Anglicans also pleaded that the rent-value of church schools would exceed the total cost of the rate-aided religious teaching. The Committee of the National Society pointed out that it would cost the country £42 million to provide the school places which the church was then supplying (1). This concept of rate-aid as "rent" was quite new in the church's thinking. It reflects churchmen's belated awareness of their altered role in society (2).

When Parliament re-assembled after the summer recess concessions were offered to nonconformists. Colonel Kenyon-Slaney moved an amendment that religious instruction in non-provided schools, while remaining in accordance with the Trust Deeds, should be under the direction of the managers. The significance of this was that the direction was taken out of the hands of the clergy and transferred to managers, two of whom were to be appointed by the L.E.A. and might well be non-churchmen. This amendment raised a storm of protest. Cruickshank remarks "even Morant was perturbed at the Anglican fury and warned Balfour in some alarm that it was 'horribly dangerous' to alter Trust Deeds" (3). Protests poured into and out of newspaper offices.

The Bishop of Coventry wrote to The Times asking how managers might be controlled should they be unfaithful to the purposes of the trust? He accepted access to the Courts, but deplored the notion that religious education should be the subject of litigation. Yet he felt sure that managers were bound to 'err' just as 'General Councils have erred', (4) and one likely error would be to 'whittle down' religious teaching in their anxiety to avoid conflict.

-
- (1) H.J. Burgess & P.A. Welsby Short History of the National Society:
(IC) p.48 1961.
- (2) See Report of Archbishop of Canterbury's speech (at Maidstone) in The Guardian 22.10.02 p.1523 for an example of this.
- (3) H. Cruickshank Church and State in English Education (17) p.84
- (4) A reference to Article XIX of Religion, Book of Common Prayer.

".. the very subjects the founders have valued are placed at the hazard of a vote in committee.

.. irresponsible power is placed in the hands of a committee after it has been removed from the incumbents."

The bishop knew that nonconformists were worried about their children coming under the influence of High Church clergy who were 'ritualists'. He had little patience with them himself, and he approved therefore of some control upon the clergy. He reported a resolution of the Executive of the Church party at Birmingham, for, at this time, many meetings were being organised; but the Birmingham resolution puts the matter well.

".. this committee regrets that in giving the managers control of religious instruction, Her Majesty's Government appears to have taken no precaution to secure that the managers shall carry out faithfully the denominational purposes of the Trust, and suggests that some further amendment is necessary, either by way of granting appeal to the bishop or other authorised representative of the denomination from a minority of the managers, or by way of insisting on religious instruction conducted (directly) by the denomination.."

Presumably, to make any such further amendment effective, the bishop concerned would have had power to replace disloyal managers.

The Bishop of Worcester also objected to the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment, and he, too, wrote to The Times (quoted in The Guardian 8 November 1902). For it to be possible for a board of managers to oust a clergyman from religious teaching in his own parish, and in a church school at that, and for the same board of managers to determine the character of the teaching, was "flat contrary to the principle of an episcopal church". Such a school was not managed on the principles of the Church of England. He noted that Kenyon-Slaney had in mind the restraint of "certain unreasonable and extravagant incumbents" (that is, ritualists).

Lord Hugh Cecil wrote to The Times (8 December 1902) to explain the dilemma for churchmen. Supposing that a vicar was

excluded by the managers from his own school, and without agreement of the bishop, Cecil would suggest such a school should be closed at once. Otherwise he "conceived it possible that children would hear one thing in Church and another contrary religious teaching at school". This would be in a Church of England school. Things had come to a pretty pass if churchmen had to send their children to a provided school in preference to the Church school, on the grounds that although the non-denominational school might be 'alien' it was not obviously and publicly anti-clerical.

The Bishop of Southwark complained that Church leaders had cooperated with the government because they had believed that the time had come to abandon criticism and to cultivate unity. The leaders had the support of many churchmen out of loyalty only; and a serious degree of opposition could easily be roused. The objection, from the point of view of the parish priest, to the Kenyon-Slaney Amendment was not simply petty pride. The spiritual welfare of the parish was the priest's responsibility, and this had been violated. This violation was a betrayal of the principle of grant conditions. He advised legislators not to be rushed into making unfair law because of a few extravagant high-churchmen with ritualistic leanings. There was more to it. The parish clergyman in the parish situation was not a petty matter. For example, there might be a danger of a powerful squire carrying 'lesser men' with him on a board of managers and between them imposing a religious knowledge syllabus of which no parish priest could approve; and this could happen in a Church school. (Reported in The School Guardian 8.11.02).

The School Guardian was equally indignant (20 December 1902 Article "What is to be done now?"). Incumbents had been deprived of a position which had been secured legally by the Trust Deeds. Clergymen, who had both worked to raise money for

the schools, and taught in them, were now to receive a "commission" to teach the faith: the "commission" would be granted by five laymen of whom three would be churchmen. The article admitted that some of the clergy had been neglectful, but so were army generals sometimes. And nobody suggested that every general officer should be controlled by a committee of himself, three other military men and two civilians! Yet the Church must make a positive and not a negative approach. The case was not one for abandoning the schools. There were four things to be done. First, parishes must find three really good laymen for the Committee. Secondly, a new attempt must be made to make religious instruction efficient. Thirdly, parishes should confer regularly with Diocesan Inspectors to encourage frank and helpful criticism. Fourthly, supporters must keep up their subscriptions.

The Church Times frankly described the Kenyon-Slaney Clause as "a wanton insult" (7.11.02) and Lord Halifax concurred with his description of it as "an intolerable insult to the clergy". Halifax also spoke up for Roman Catholics. He wrote to The Guardian 8 November 1902.

"Grievous injustice (is done).. to the Roman Catholic body in England as it is to any other religious body that possesses schools of its own, which believes that its members or clergy have any special responsibility in regard to the religious education of children..

It is directly interfering with the religious instruction given in denominational schools contrary to the principle professedly maintained by the Bill... Ought we to close our schools?"

This was The School Guardian's attitude just after the Bill had been passed on 18 December 1902.

".. but the conflict had been unbelievably bitter.. and amid all the turmoil.. the educational aspects of reform had been largely overlooked...

Behind the unedifying spectacle of religious conflict at election times and at school board meetings, there

had been a very real conflict of principle. Undoubtedly the more extreme supporters of the board schools had endeavoured to drive the voluntary schools out of existence, for in their enthusiasm for direct control they had tended to assume that a local authority, elected by popular vote, held the monopoly of educational wisdom. Nevertheless, in their devotion to public representation they stood for a principle which was firmly rooted in English life. On the other hand, there was the principle steadfastly maintained by denominationalists, that education was too closely linked with private conviction to be brought wholly under the direct control of public authority....

Anglicans and Roman Catholics were on the whole well satisfied.."
(1)

This satisfaction was based on what Archdeacon Denison called 'delusion' (in his Letter to the Archbishop); that is, it depended upon a failure to realise the extent of the loss to the Church which the Law would impose. By now, however, even the High Churchmen appear to have become weary of argument, for, in spite of the uproar occasioned by the 1902 Bill, it is striking that no churchmen seems to have taken the long view. What really was the position of the voluntary system under the new Act? Every non-provided school was to have representatives of the L.E.A. on its managing committee, and though they were to be in the minority, these men represented the 'power of the purse'. The L.E.A. was to pay for the upkeep of the school and for the teachers' salaries. The teachers, however, were to be appointed without reference to the religious body to which the school was ostensibly supposed to belong. The Managers, for their part, had to maintain the buildings (apart from reasonable 'wear and tear') and alter them if the L.E.A. so recommended. That was very well, but no one asked where would the voluntary system be when these buildings wore out or became obsolete?

The future of the buildings was not all, however. In spite of protests from the Non-Conformists, the balance of the 1902 Act proved eventually to be on the side of the Undenominationalists and radicals; for, in the end, the schools tended to

have less and less religious teaching. Religious teaching became a matter for the individual with which the State was not concerned. A hundred years earlier the almost unanimous opinion had been that all education was, by its very nature, religious. This ideal had slipped away. Its regression was gradual, irregular and the course of it is difficult to plot. In the end, it simply appears that what was once never questioned even outside the Church became a matter of opinion for unusual people even inside the same Church.

Chapter VII : Part i

The Nonconformist Churches' Attitudes and the Nonconformist Ideal

If Anglican attitudes appear most clearly when some principle is at stake the same is true of the attitudes of Free Churchmen. Similarly, it is in studying views on the developing system of universal elementary education that we can see how the role of the churches in society, that is the church and state relationship, was interpreted. If strong views were held by the Anglicans, equally strong and equally principled attitudes were maintained by nonconformists. 'Dissenters' were proud of their dissent. Yet simply to dissent is not a productive attitude, and no such negative attitude was to be found, in the nature of things, in a non-established church which needed to demonstrate its life to survive.

What were the positive signs of dissent? There were some four kinds. Yet before outlining these it should be observed that in many cases the line between nonconformists and their Anglican brethren could be a very faint one: much depended on personalities, localities and 'churchmanship'. It is at the high level of the first kind of nonconformity that this inner unity between Christians has been explained by H.M. Clark. He speaks of "the Spirit of Nonconformity", and throughout the two volumes of his book he traces its appearance and sometimes its disappearance in England.

"Nonconformity must recover the true nonconformist ideal - the church ideal which insists that all church order and system, all church activities, all church programmes of doctrine and discipline, must be nothing else than the living Christ, working Himself out through the church..

It is a high church-ideal, of course (it is the true High Churchism) - yet not one beyond the common man's power either of understanding or of striving for it.

It is a comprehensive church ideal; for by embracing it the member of no single denomination need shift his

material ground, if only he be satisfied that the denomination to which he belongs is, in all its organisation, created and sustained by an energising inward life having its dwelling-place in the individual members' hearts." (1)

Clark declares that his conditions includes episcopalians "and so on, the whole list through". His interpretation is subtle, but it bears on the question of the church's role in education and in society generally. He calls for a change in "direction of the life-movement". It cannot be from "outward to inward" but the other way round; and there lay the objection to rigidly structured churches (such as the Roman Catholic church) and established churches also - an objection stated in spiritual terms. As Clark observes this is a very high ideal. Both individuals and denominations fell short of it from time to time. Those who did not, among the individuals, stand out through the nineteenth century; and their attitudes and work in connexion with education is explained below.

The second outstanding feature of nonconformity was, and is, evangelical zeal; and in this Anglican evangelicals maintained close fellowship with their free church friends. The inspiration positively altering what Clark called the "direction of the life-movement" in the callous nineteenth century laissez faire economy is well-known wherever the names of men like Shaftesbury, General Booth and Dr. Barnardo are recognised. It is true that great evangelicals had to break out of the theology of detachment which is associated with "other-worldly" evangelicalism; but the fact is that they did break out, and, paradoxically, this was due to that same theology. Clark is, in his gentle way, slightly critical of nineteenth century evangelical nonconformity (2), but he overlooks the great social work that was done in his own search for deep holiness.

(1) H.W. Clark History of English Nonconformity (14) Vol.ii; p.427

(2) H.W. Clark History of English Nonconformity (14) Vol.ii; p.355

Less attractive, as Clark remarks, was the use of anti-establishmentarianism and anti-popery as a binding force. This regrettably constitutes a third type of dissent. It was open to misuse, as we shall see below. And, connected with this negative appeal went a genuine concern for improving the state of society which found expression in the fourth kind of nonconformity. This was nonconformity with a strong political bent, and, traditionally it was attached to the Liberal party. As the Liberal party was in its turn connected with the movement of reform the link was sometimes too close for the health of the religious spirit of nonconformity. It is interesting to speculate on what might have been the state of things if the political aspect had not been there. Would affairs have been very different if Anglicans had eschewed Conservative politics and Free Churchmen their Liberal connexion? Had they done so a great opportunity to unite in the work of national education would not have been lost. Yet the spirit of unity was not entirely absent, and this is sometimes overlooked.

Of course there was much argument and not a little bitterness, but the picture was not entirely bleak, as has been occasionally suggested (1), and there is good evidence that the nineteenth century experienced a good deal of the spirit of drawing together.

Even the Church of England did something! As early as 1870, when educational argument was growing louder, the Convocation of Canterbury set up a Committee for "More Reunion of the Divided Members of Christ's Body" which presented its Report, albeit in guarded tones, on 3 May (2). A debate was initiated in Convocation 7-8 July 1870.

"The debate did not measure up to the challenge implicit in the practical proposals which the Report contained.

Both Dean Stanley of Westminster and Bishop Mackenzie drew attention to the great social gulf which made many

(1) See p. 7 above, footnote (2)

(2) Nuttall and Chadwick From Uniformity to Unity (50) p.335

nonconformists think of the Church of England as the preserve of the gentry and their dependants..

The words of another speaker in the debate are perhaps worth quoting: 'There is no one system of Christianity, no one system of religion, except absolute atheism, which does not contain in it some germ of truth; and it is by taking the truth that people hold and enlarging upon that, not shocking their prejudices wantonly, that you may hope to regain them by treating them with tenderness and Christian love.' (1)

A modern discussion would be more vigorous, but it shows that some men hoped for a better state of things: and if little came of it, it was at least a beginning.

Of more lasting importance was the 1870 decision to prepare a Revised Version of the Bible. Nonconformist and Anglican scholars worked together on this supremely important project. Three Scottish Presbyterians, two Baptists and a Congregationalist worked on the Old Testament, and three Presbyterians, a Baptist, a Congregationalist and a Unitarian worked on the New Testament.

Nonconformists were themselves drawing closer together and finding new ways to unity. After one failure, the Congregationalists formed a Union in 1832; and the Baptists also united in that year. The Methodists had suffered a number of secessions, but, from 1836 onwards the spirit of unity was at work. In 1836 the Wesleyan Methodist Association was formed, and the Protestant Methodists joined, followed the next year by the Arminian Methodists. The Association lived through internal troubles to become the United Methodist Free Church. Just outside our period, in 1907, this body joined with the Bible Christians and the Methodist New Connexion to form the United Methodist Church.

In 1892 a Free Church Congress was held in Manchester; hence the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches was constituted in 1896. This was a great step towards a united Free Church. E.A. Payne has the following comment.

(1) Nuttall and Chadwick op.cit. p.337 (Essay by Edward Carpenter)

"To some it heralded the long-delayed triumph of nonconformists over the Establishment. In the minds of Charles Berry, a Congregationalist, and Hugh Price Hughes, a Methodist, the movement had deeper significance. They not only summoned nonconformists to take a fuller part in the religious life of the land and to be active in united evangelism; they also pleaded for a more considered and consistent churchmanship." (1)

Payne goes on to quote a passage written by Elliott-Binns which is apposite.

"This discovery by nonconformity of the catholic church.. saved it from lapsing into a barren individuality. Had it been content to face the twentieth century with the merely negative policy of the Liberation Society, disendowment and disestablishment, its fate might well have been that of the Liberal Party with which it was so closely involved. The vision and power of a number of statesmen and prophets .. enabled them to rise above the limitations of their heritage into a clearer air." (2)

Yet it was not the 'limitations of their heritage' which chiefly contributed to the loudest protests over education. Mention has been made of the danger of association between churchmen and a political party. In this, nonconformists were perhaps less experienced than senior 'established' clergy; and many dissenting spokesmen over-stepped the mark in their political activity. They allowed their social conscience, which prodded them to destroy what they believed ought to be destroyed, to dull their sensitivity to what was in fact possible. This is certainly true in the field of education, and it is occasionally hard to escape the feeling that disestablishment meant more to some of them as a panacea for the nation's ecclesiastical ills, than the practical problems connected with educating the nation's children. This at once draws attention to the question of church and state as it affected elementary education. The core of any account of church attitudes is the interpretation of the church's role. How then did nonconformists interpret their own

(1) Essay 'Toleration and Establishment 1' in Nuttall and Chadwick From Uniformity to Unity (50) p.284.

(2) L.E. Elliott-Binns Religion in the Victorian Era (28b) p.468

role, and what was their estimate of the role of an established church? To answer these questions we need to look at the views of several great spokesmen for Dissent. At the same time, as in Anglicanism, there were clergymen and laymen up and down the country whose views were not so well-reasoned. Moreover, although unity was in the air, it was some time before it was accomplished to any significant extent between the several non-conformist churches; and this makes any account of "Free Church Attitudes" inevitably artificial. E.M. Dale realised this and saw the dangers. The following passage anticipates events, but it shows what these dangers actually were.

"The Nation Free Church Council had hardly been formed, with a network of local councils, before renewed controversy in the field of national education diverted its energies into public agitation, as E.M. Dale of Birmingham, one of the greatest of Victorian Nonconformists, had feared might happen. The struggle over the Balfour Education Act with the Passive Resistance Movement which followed its passing did no credit to any of the parties concerned. In Parliament and in the constituencies it appeared as a conflict not only between Conservative and Liberal but also between Church and Chapel. Wild men on both sides made reasonable compromise very difficult." (1)

(1) E.A. Payne Essay in From Uniformity to Unity Ed. Nuttall and Chadwick (50) p.285

Chapter VII : Part ii

R.W. Dale's Answer to the Church-State Question

Nonconformists naturally disagreed with Anglicans who saw their church's role as being the nation 'on its spiritual side' carrying the exclusive duty of educating the nation's children. It is not easy to discover a definitive statement of the reason behind nonconformist disagreement without going back through hundreds of years of dissent and persecution. The reasons were historical. They constitute the distinctive ethos of nonconformity which is recognisable in its effects. Yet it is important to search, because their different attitudes affected their approach to the problems of elementary education. One brilliant account of the dissenter's view of the church in the nation was given by R.W. Dale. In his biography A.W.W. Dale explains his father's thoughts, but he is careful to add that "the materials are comparatively slight" (1).

Dale begins with the treatment of Church and State as Hooker had originally propounded it. Church and State, on this view, were not to be thought of as being in alliance - and this is just what nonconformists did think - in fact, Church and State were identical. The state represented the commonwealth in relation to secular affairs, and the church represented the commonwealth in spiritual affairs. This would throw the question of whether education was to be secular or spiritual into sharp relief!

The will of the church, according to Hooker's view, acted through the same government as the will of the nation. All laws express the will of the nation in its two functions. And it is just here that nonconformists would have questioned Mr. Forster's Bill! The nation, needless to say, exercised its paramount legislative authority through its representatives.

Dale objected that this was inconsistent with the ideas of the New Testament; but he did not face the problem raised by

(1) A.W.W. Dale Life of R.W. Dale (21) p.370 ff

the New Testament writers' peculiar political predicament. He accuses Hooker of replacing Christian churches by "nominally Christian nations" and here he uncovers a fundamental difference of outlook between establishment churchmen and evangelicals of any denomination. It is a question of from which direction to move, and to what end. Evangelicals will rightly maintain that the effective spread of Christianity is done personally and individually. Churchmen, pleading that politics (in the correct sense) is the art of the possible, will come to terms with the facts of society, as they interpret them. 'Nominally Christian' the nation may be, but laws must be made and society can often best be influenced for good by an unobtrusive restraining presence. In any case, churchmen would add that by no means all Christians are consistent in their patterns of conduct, and that there is a general tendency easily discerned. It is easily discerned because the group, as modern sociologists would say, can have a character which may be Christian or not: so, at least, Gladstone thought. Dale emphatically disagreed with both Hooker and Gladstone.

"The churches founded by the apostles were societies constituted of persons who by their free and voluntary act entered into religious fellowship with each other; a nation is a society constituted of persons who, only by a fiction constructed for the sake of a theory, can be said to have entered into it, or to remain in it of their own free will." (1)

If this was so the case for an established church and, still more, the case for church schools dissolves. But is it true? The Pilgrim Fathers would not have agreed with Dale. They both left 'a nation' and founded another 'by their free and voluntary act'.

Dale continues by constructing a dichotomy between the functions of the church and the state which would win him very little applause from the proposes of 'secular Christianity' today.

(1) A.M.W. Dale Life of R.W. Dale (21) p.371

"The churches founded by the Apostles were established for strictly spiritual purposes; a nation has a thousand inferior objects to secure... a nation cannot divest its acts of a secular and political character." (1)

Such fundamental differences are not adaptations of New Testament principle nor are they merely developments of 'polity'. What is involved, for Dale, is the transfer of power and prerogatives from one community to another. The differences in the characteristics of the two communities involve membership, the purposes of activity, and the sanctions and methods upon which support relies. Even if it is argued that such changes are inevitable because of the lack of scriptural guidance Dale remarks that here is no security for the right administration of ecclesiastical government.

"By Hooker's theory you first corrupt the communion of the church and you then place the government of the church in the hands of men who are almost sure to be unfit for the task...

.. and you place the control of a society which is intended to purify and to regenerate the human race in the hands of men who may have no desire that these great spiritual objects should be accomplished." (2)

According to A.W.W. Dale his father next turned his attention to the theory of church and state as expounded by Gladstone. It is of special interest in view of the positions taken up by both men with respect to the work of the church in supplying schools. It is a little doubtful if the difference between the view of Hooker and that of Gladstone is quite so marked as Dale thinks. In any case, Gladstone is declared to believe that "duties which bind men individually bind them also collectively", and, as has been shown in Chapter 4 part ii, this led to the suggestion that the state can have a character, Christian or non-Christian. Dale will have none of this, on the ground that while the idea of a state-personality can go so far, it cannot go the whole way to being a Christian, and, therefore, the concept is inadmissible.

(1) A.W.W. Dale Life of R.W. Dale (21) p.371

(2) A.W.W. Dale Life of R.W. Dale (21) p.373

"There are some particulars in which a nation, in the unity of its action and responsibilities, resembles a person; there are many other particulars in which it does not. A nation corresponds to a person in the unity of its outward acts, but not in the unity of its inward life. The acts of a nation are like the acts of an individual, but there the analogy ceases." (1)

Dale does not rule out the possibility Gladstone suggested.

"I believe in the possibility of a nation becoming Christian, as I believe in the possibility of railway companies becoming Christian" presumably means that Dale does not think it likely. Here he uncovers an important attitude in the traditional attitude of the long and famous line of English dissent. While Anglicans (and Roman Catholics) knew that no state did in fact live up to Christian standards, they also knew that individuals did not do so either; and they have always preferred to move in and with society, thus reaping some advantage to Christian institutions of course, but also ensuring that principles cannot be ignored in society. This approach was and is unacceptable to traditional dissent which reaches out for standards which are almost perfectionist. To the dissenter individual response to the demands of Christ is all of what matters. To the establishment there seems to be a need for more flexibility. One appreciation of the mind of dissent was offered in the Bampton Lectures 1871.

"The leading theory of the Independents is this: once grant the Calvinistic hypothesis - that the church is, in its highest sense, no organised visible thing at all, but a mere spiritual body consisting of God's elect scattered throughout the world - and it seems logically to follow that high organisation is a mischief rather than an advantage.

To make the church a strong and well-ordered power in the world appears .. to be at variance with the will of Christ; and to necessitate sacrifices .. such as no worldly advantages (even were they permissible) could possibly counterbalance.

(1) A.W.H. Dale Life of R.H. Dale (21) p.375

Upon this axiom are built three main tenets which characterize the Independent body, viz:

- (1) That in point of organisation the line must be drawn at 'the congregation'...
- (2) That while repudiating every sort of ecclesiastical control a congregation is under still more stringent obligation to reject every relic of secular control, and - above all things - to liberate both itself and others from the bondage of a national establishment and National Endowments...
- (3) ..It (the Independents' congregationalism) is a divine and not a human system... " (1)

Curteis notes that it is on these three points that congregationalism takes its stand. He considers that the viewpoint is out-of-date; but he is at variance with nonconformists, and, as he remarks the Independents were proud to be 'Dissenters, not by stress of circumstances, but of principles'.

It would seem that Dale was not wholly convinced about the matter. His son reports that he avoided the platforms of the Liberation Society for several years beginning 1862; but this may have been due to his involvement in the growing educational dispute. Even ten years after he was still uneasy.

"But the platform of the Liberation Society was not to his mind. He sometimes found himself in uncongenial company - associated with men who had neither his confidence nor his esteem." (2)

Dale and Guinness Rogers were of one mind about the Liberation Society at this stage and they set off to hold lectures and meetings of their own at which Dale outlined his approach to establishment, and therefore to church control in schools, a little further.

He was as contemptuous of Anglican snobbery as of the counter-snobbery of anyone who minded it; but he was extremely concerned about the division which he felt inevitably followed when an establishment existed side-by-side with dissent. Statements such as that of Bishop Wilberforce brought out all the feelings of protest that Dale was capable of.

(1) G.H. Curteis Dissent in its Relation to the Church of England

(18) p.92 ff

(2) A.W.W. Dale Life of R.W. Dale (21) p.378

"By the providence of God this much is certain, and must be admitted by everyone, that the Church of England, as treated at present by the state and the nation, is the religious teacher of the people. Mark you that this is so. There has been given, and I think very properly given, perfect liberty to all other religious bodies - and I for one would not see that liberty infringed upon by prerogative or other legislation in the least degree.

But that is not in the least degree giving up the claim that the Church of England is the teacher of the people. It is saying: we provide what we believe to be the properly constituted system of teaching, but if others think differently, we do not enforce upon their consciences that which they condemn, but leave them to provide another for themselves if their conscience dictate to them to do so". (1)

Thus, although the country was openly not in agreement about its ecclesiastical loyalties the state favoured one community - the established church. The result was harmful to the established church itself. The state made laws which affected its very worship; and the only result was to stereotype both thought and religious life. Moreover, there was no liberty for the 'working of the Spirit'. This very point can be made of organisations and movements outside the establishment, however, and Dale knew it and withdrew from the noisier elements in the Liberation Society in consequence. Not all his fellow-dissenters had his insight, as Clark sadly remarks.

".. it has to be stated that by degrees.. there grew a fear in some nonconformist minds that nonconformity was taking on a too distinctly political colour, and was allowing itself to be used too readily as a political tool...

The instinctive feeling with some was that in doing thus nonconformity was devoting itself to sins which - however right in themselves they might be - had no direct connexion with the nonconformist Ideal, and was accordingly misdirecting and misappropriating its own collective strength." (2)

(1) Quoted in A.S.W. Dale Life of R.W. Dale (21) p.380

(2) H.W. Clark History of English Nonconformity (14) Vol.ii pp 422-423

It was one such thing which compelled Dale to feel he must withdraw from the Congregational Union in 1888. The Union had passed a resolution criticising the Tories over the Home Rule controversy (but not in official session). Although Dale was, in Clark's words 'an ardent politician' he objected strongly to the corporate action of nonconformity in the political field. It was unfortunately true that by 1877 foreign affairs had displaced national issues like education in the public mind. Nonconformists had aligned themselves perhaps too completely with liberal politics.

Chapter VII : Part iii

Congregationalist Spokesmen for the Free Churches

Although the 1851 Census had disclosed the number of non-conformists as large, it must be remembered that they had not yet united. The several churches expressed their attitudes at annual meetings, but it is of the essence of their tradition that authoritative statements are not appropriate. It is consequently difficult to outline the different views in a short survey. At the same time, nonconformists were active both in the League and in Parliament. Whatever their particular denomination there were certain factors which made the majority of them unite on the education question. First, they were determined to withstand any attempt on religious liberty. Secondly, they were equally determined on religious equality; and, in the context of education, this motivated their opposition to measures which threatened to extend or even maintain Anglican ascendancy in this field. There is a volte face in their attitudes during the nineteenth century, however. Early on, nonconformists opposed state interference of any kind.

"Since all classes of society had already pledged themselves to the necessity of enlarged and more strenuous efforts for the religious education of the poorer classes and since it was generally admitted that.. there is little or no reason to expect the establishment of any adequate or satisfactory national plan for religious education the denominations were under the necessity of acting distinctly from each other." (The Watchman 5 Jan. 1844)

Once it became clear that there was a way to create a non-denominational system of elementary schools, and once the fear of Anglicanism (and Roman Catholicism) had grown, the non-conformist attitude changed completely.

It was natural that nonconformist interest should be aroused, if only because of the traditional concern for the destitute associated with the Free Churches. There was plenty

of evidence (1) to concern everybody. Sadler had made an impressive speech in the House Of Commons, 16 March 1838; and this was followed by The Second Report of the Commissioners on the Employment of Children (Trades and Manufacturers) in 1843. In view of such evidence it is surprising that partisanship and prejudice were not suppressed by all the churches.

A Committee of the Privy Council had been set up as a result of a motion by J.A. Roebuck in the House of Commons "to devise a means for the universal and national education of the whole people"(2). The 1843 meeting of the Congregational Union of England and Wales were far from sure that they welcomed suggestions of "compulsory interference".

"Without pronouncing a decided opinion on the propriety of government interference in the education of the people.. (we) entertain the gravest doubts whether any compulsory interference can take place without establishing principles and precedents dangerous to civil and religious liberty, inconsistent with the rights of industry, and superseding the duties of parents and churches: while all plans of national education by the agency of the government suggested of late years have been very objectionable whether to friends of the established church or to the Dissenting Bodies. This Meeting, therefore, concludes without despondency or regret that both the general and the religious education of the people of England must be chiefly provided and conducted by the voluntary efforts of the various denominations of Christians." (3)

It is noticeable that the reason given for discouraging state help was that education was the business of parents and churches. Forty years later Cardinal Manning was to put the same point of view. However, once the dangers of financial aid from the state had been realised, and once the danger of swelling the influence of the established church had been identified, there was a change of tone.

"The analogies of the past were all in favour of a change. What had happened in the case of education was no new

(1) See, for example, the case histories in Royston Pike Human Documents of the Industrial Revolution in Britain (61)

(2) Hansard 3rd Series, Vol.xx, Col.139

(3) Quoted in A. Peel These Hundred Years (55) p.177

experience. When a great moral duty incumbent upon all men was recognised only by the church, she had no choice but to discharge it herself, that the community might learn from her example...

The church had established schools for secular as well as for religious instruction; but when the nation had learned to care for education, secular teaching might be left to the care of the nation". (1)

There are two points worth noting in this passage. The first is that there was far too much awareness of England's place in the race for places in the technological economics for it to be true that the nation "learned to care" for education in the sense that the church did. Secondly, the passage is an interesting example of one aspect of nonconformist thinking with regard to establishment. Even A.W.F. Dale has not appreciated that the Church of England, the pioneer in national education in England, did not think of itself as a church doing something for the nation, but it thought of itself as the nation on its spiritual side. This was a presupposition, perhaps mistaken, and Dale displays the counter-presupposition in nonconformist thinking. It is the kind of misunderstanding which seems never to be cleared.

The change of attitude among Congregationalists continued. Soon the Union suggested that all schools "for the poorer classes" ought to receive government grants whether they were secular or denominational. At this time, as we have seen, the Congregational Church in fact owned a number of schools; but they did not serve their needs, for they were a scattered membership. Hence, they suffered with other nonconformists in areas where the only elementary school was an Anglican foundation. So by 1868, the Christian Witness was calling for the universal imposition of a conscience clause. Dale did not agree about government grants as he feared that state aid leading to free education meant "freedom to give nothin." (2). In this, however, Dale's opinion was a fairly isolated one (3).

(1) A.W.F. Dale Life of R.W. Dale (21) p.268

(2) A.W.F. Dale Life of R.W. Dale (21) p.269

(3) Shared by the National Society, however; see p. 102 above

When Forster introduced his 1870 Bill he did so under the watchful eyes of John Bright (President of the Board of Trade) and Edward Miall in a House of Commons containing "nineteen Unitarians, fourteen Independents, eleven Presbyterians, ten Quakers, twenty-six Roman Catholics, who, with a few Baptists, Methodists and Jews, constituted a total of nearly one hundred members hostile or indifferent to the maintenance of the connection of Church and State" (1). Of these the most remarkable for energetic moderation was Edward Miall. Miall was a good example of the conscientious nonconformist, able to see clearly the link between his religion and his politics.

Edward Miall was the first parliamentarian to take his place in history as champion of nonconformist rights in connexion with education; and this is due to the active part he played when Forster's Bill was under discussion. He was a nonconformist minister who gave up his pastorate to devote his energies to the removal of grievances. To this end he concentrated on working for the disestablishment of the Anglican Church. He was no mere agitator. In the first issue of his newspaper, The Nonconformist (14 April 1841), he declared that he was concerned, not with injustice to nonconformity which the existence of a state church involved, but he exhorted Dissenters to "make the basis of their operations national rather than sectarian - (and) aim not so much to right themselves as right Christianity." He became a Member of Parliament in 1852 and was an active speaker throughout the country. He was of course a supporter of the Liberation Society already mentioned. Until his retirement in 1874 disestablishment was his single-minded aim; and for him this meant little less than the victory of true religion. Hence, it was never his intention that children should be educated without religion; but he was dedicated to obtaining true religion for them.

(1) W.G. Addison Religious Equality in Modern Britain (2) p.124

Miall had enormous influence on another great nonconformist minister, Dale of Birmingham. The difference between the two has been described by H.W. Clark.

"And Dale, though in the very nature of the case he could not become the man of one idea as Miall practically was, knew full well that the nonconformist ideal meant unending hostility to the establishment idea. One may say of him, as contrasted with Miall, that while Miall looked back from the disestablishment idea to the ultimate ground of it in the nonconformist conception, Dale, starting from the nonconformist conception, came naturally to the disestablishment idea". (1)

While he was Chairman of the Congregational Union Dale found himself in the forefront of the conflict raging around the Education Act 1870.

"In his mind there was a clear distinction between the voluntary principle in religion and the voluntary principle in education; the one did not necessarily involve the other." (2)

It would be well to identify the sources of discontent about the schools which created friction and which were still important issues at the end of the 19th century. This will make repetition less necessary.

- (a) The ascendancy of the Anglican church in education caused problems for areas in which there was no other school. At first, the powerful National Society grew richer because early state grants favoured those already in possession; and this suggested further extensions to the influence and control of the Church of England over the nation's schools.
- (b) There was deep distrust after 1870 about the adequacy of the conscience clauses. The important thing for the nonconformist was to ensure that no pressure of either a social or a proselytising kind was bearing upon their children.
- (c) Since state money inevitably became necessary, nonconformists were anxious that rates or taxes, paid by all citizens, should not go to the support of Anglicanism. This would

(1) Henry W. Clark History of English Nonconformity Vol.ii (14) p.416
 (2) A.W.W. Dale Life of R.W. Dale (21) p.267

have been a disguised return to the Church Rates from which freedom had so recently been won.

Such were the main issues; but H.M. Clark notes that besides some uncertainty about attitudes from time to time, reformers had to contend with another problem.

".. two or three men labouring to arouse a nonconformist public which could be only temporarily and sporadically aroused, and which would at other times do no more than turn and mutter a feeble 'Yes' in its sleep...

There were certainly other occasions.. on which the whole question of disestablishment came up - sometimes in not very desirable ways. But we must fairly say of them that they were created out of a feeling that if the general liberal tendency did not go far enough to embody disestablishment on its programme, it ought to do so, and out of something like irritation because it did not. They marked attempts to push that tendency beyond limits to which it kept, rather than consecrations to the call of the nonconformist ideal." (1)

By 1866 Dale had made up his mind that the time had come for the state to take up the task of educating the nation. He made this position clear in a series of letters published in the English Independent (February 14th and 21st; March 7th, 1867) in which he asked for a compulsory national system paid for out of fees sided from public funds. His insistence on fees is strange, but he felt strongly about admitting any financial differential; and his views prevented him joining the National Education League in 1869, although of course he did not join the Manchester-based Union either.

The situation at 1870 had aroused all thoughtful nonconformists. They had already been alarmed by Brougham's Bill threatening to put local education virtually into the hands of parish incumbents; they were concerned at various extensions of grants; and, above all perhaps, they were alarmed by instructions of the Committee of Council as to inserting, in trust deeds, clauses which seemed to make the clergymen supreme authorities

(1) H.M. Clark History of English Nonconformity (14) Vol.ii p.416

with the bishop as arbiter in disputed cases. Many nonconformists concluded that education ought not to be a government matter at all; but by accepting that view they cut themselves off from Liberal policy on which, in other matters, they were ready to rely.

"Probably for a time the majority took that view; and although it did not long keep its attraction, and by the time the great conflict of 1870 arrived had been almost everywhere dropped, nonconformity had lost its way." (1)

Clark comments so because in his view "the general deliverance of nonconformity" was not to be looked for in the assertion that while the state should provide a national system of education, it was not its business to teach religion in any shape or form; that is, to propose a secular system of education as the only solution of a problem, which it should be noted, at least appeared to be created by the scandal of establishment rather than the scandal of illiterate and destitute children. Dale had already told his fellow Congregationalists that he was not anxious to preserve the denominational system and that 'nine Congregationalists out of ten' agreed with him (2). Yet there was the difficulty that Free Church bodies had in fact founded their own schools, and, in 1870 they still had them. The next complication was that they had supported the British and Foreign Schools Society which accepted state aid. Many nonconformists were therefore on the horns of a dilemma. A further passage of Clark's illustrates this.

"But the willingness to accept grants for the schools of the British Society on many of whose governing bodies nonconformists served, must have tended to make nonconformist voices husky as they attempted to declare the nonconformist principle which had been violated so long; and the fact that it had been so violated made a handy weapon for those on the 'dogmatic teaching' side." (3)

- (1) H.W. Clark History of English Nonconformity (14) Vol.ii p.419
 (2) A.W.W. Dale Life of R.W. Dale (21) p.271
 (3) H.W. Clark History of English Nonconformity (14) Vol.ii p.419

To the three usual objections of dissent to existing state policy Dale added others and he stated his demands in the English Independent 24 February 1870.

"I object to the unnecessary delay which its provisions will occasion in the creation of school boards in districts where the school accommodation has been proved inadequate. I object to it because it evades the greatest difficulties that lie in the way of educational legislation instead of solving them. I object to it because it leaves compulsory attendance to the discretion of the school board: 'permissive compulsion' is but another phrase for permissive ignorance..

What we ask for is education - the best education possible, and at any cost, for every child in England. But not even at the bidding of a Liberal Ministry will we consent to any proposition which, under cover of an educational measure, empowers one religious denomination to levy a rate for teaching its creed and maintaining its worship. On this point compromise or concession is impossible." (1)

A.W.W. Dale adds that the questions at issue were not merely political or even educational, so, 'to represent nonconformist opinion' the Central Nonconformist Committee set up headquarters at Birmingham. The Committee's first step was to organise a protesting petition. This document outlines an attitude common to over 5,000 ministers among whom were Wesleyan Methodists (traditionally unfriendly to the League), other branches of Methodism, Congregationalists, Baptists and Unitarians.

"The Protest was directed:

- (1) against the power given to local boards to levy a rate for the support of schools in which they may determine that the religious teaching shall be denominational, under whatever conditions the denominational teaching may be given
- (2) against the conscience clause, which requires a nonconformist citizen to claim religious toleration in schools supported by national money
- (3) against the permissive arrangement for religious inspection."

There was little in this to help the government out of their predicament, exposed, as they were, to attack from Anglicans as

(1) Quoted in A.W.W. Dale Life of R.W. Dale (21) p.275

well as nonconformists. In fact, the government went a long way to try to satisfy all its critics and the final alterations to the original bill are described by one nonconformist historian as 'considerable' (1). And, in spite of the disappointment of the League the 1870 Act was in fact a notable achievement. There was no general liking for secular schools; compulsory education could not be enforced until there were enough schools; and if education had been made free the resulting pressure on existing schools would have thrown them upon rate-payers or taxpayers - for which the time was certainly not ripe. By the Act an adequate supply of schools was promised. School Boards were set up where a deficiency existed; and they had power, as we have seen, to raise a school fund from rates, government grants and fees. Moreover, thanks to the help of Mundella (later a Vice President of the Committee of Council) boards had the power to compel the attendance of children between the ages of five and thirteen, subject to certain conditions.

Elections to school boards were fought with great intensity and many eminent nonconformists were attracted to their service: Birmingham had Chamberlain, George Dixon and McCarthy; Manchester had H. Birley; Bradford had James Hanson; and London included Lyulph Stanley and the secularist T.H. Huxley among its talented members. The boards set out to cover a great deal of ground with London in the lead, so that new ideas on buildings and on organisation (Nottingham set up the first 'organised science school') were coupled to an impressive building programme. It is true that some of this activity attracted the attention of the Public Auditor later on, but the country had good reason to be grateful in the long run. Morley outlines part of the difficulty.

"It is impossible to imagine a question on which in a free government it was more essential to carry public opinion with the law. To force parents to send children to school was an enterprise that must break down if

(1) Skeats and Hall History of the Free Churches p.628

opinion would not help to work it. Yet probably on no other question in Mr. Gladstone's career, was common opinion so hard to weigh, to test, to focus and adjust." (1)

Morley notes earlier that Gladstone cared most for the 'integrity of religious instruction'. What he disliked and dreaded was, in Gladstone's own words, the invasion of that integrity 'under cover of protecting exceptional consciences'. This was the standard High Churchman's point of view and Gladstone seems to have had Forster's support in it (Forster had been a member of the Society of Friends). Morley has some reservations. Writing of Forster's account of the government's and his own intention to see that the State should not 'decree against' religion he is a little hard on the politicians.

"Insist, forsooth, that religion was not a thing of no account against men like Dale, one of the most ardent and instructed believers that ever fought the fight and kept the faith; against Bright, then whom no devouter spirit breathed, and who thought the Education Act (1870) 'the worst Act passed by any Liberal parliament since 1832'." (2)

Thus, there was disappointment growing amongst non-conformists even as the Act of 1870 passed. They had won some concessions, but they felt strongly that they must be very vigilant in future about how the new law was administered. Their chief concern was that a Dual System was now established and would perpetuate denominational schools. In spite of owning some such schools themselves their opposition to the voluntary system was now to grow. It is reasonable to ask why. If they were against the principle then they had no business owning any. If they were simply antagonistic to the Roman Catholic and Church of England schools they were being very hard-hearted, for the national need was great. Morley attempts an answer (3).

"At bottom the battle of the school was not educational, it was social. It was not religious but ecclesiastical, and that is often the very contrary of religious... So

- (1) J. Morley Life of Gladstone (49a) Vol. i p. 940
 (2) J. Morley Life of Gladstone (49a) Vol. i p. 939
 (3) " " " " (49a) Vol. i p. 941

now quarrels about education and catechism and conscience masked the standing jealousy between church and chapel - the unwholesome fruit of the historic mishaps of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that separated the nation into two camps, and invested one of them with all the pomp and privilege of social ascendancy. The parent and the child, in whose name the struggle raged, stood indifferent.. The Church of England was quickened into active antagonism by Irish disestablishment, by the extinction of sectarian tests at Oxford and Cambridge, and by the treatment of endowed schools. This might have been balanced by the zeal of nonconformists. Instead of zeal, the Education Act produced refrigeration and estrangement."

In an atmosphere of keen desire for disestablishment, however, it is not surprising that many nonconformist hopes were dashed as they saw, or thought they saw, a Liberal government selling the pass. For example, the Cowper-Temple clause - not much liked by any Anglican and positively hated by those of Denison's stamp - caused no pleasure at all in Dale's mind.

"(the clause) excluded the Church Catechism, but left the Board absolutely free to teach every one of its characteristic doctrines. There was nothing in it to prevent the schools of the nation from being used for the same purpose for which denominational schools had been established - to propagate a denominational creed. The 'formulary' was forbidden, but the dogma of the formulary was permitted". (1)

Dale's antagonism to denominational schools, based as we have seen on his clear views on the proper place of the church within the state, remained unabated; and it is time to mention some of his activities in this field. First, he attacked the use of Clause 25 of Forster's Act (Clause 24 in the Bill) by means of which some school boards hoped to pay fees out of rates, as the Clause proposed, but to denominational schools. Dale headed indignant deputations and worked hard to get the Clause repealed at last by Lord Sandon's Act 1876. At the same time he and Miall had noticed how many incumbents had been appointed governors ex officio in the newly constituted endowed

schools. This was put to rights. He found a great deal to criticise in the new legislation and in the government's behaviour. In his Manchester lecture on 'Politics of Nonconformity' he outlined his list of complaints. His biographer lists them as follows.

- (1) The sectarian partiality of the endowed schools commission.
- (2) The efforts of the Department to force school boards to pay fees in denominational schools.
- (3) The increased grant to denominational schools, coupled with a refusal to provide that a fixed proportion of the cost of maintenance should come from voluntary contributions.
- (4) What he saw as a deliberate attempt to extend and enlarge the sectarian system at public cost.

Dale was alarmed also at the activity of Roman Catholic bishops in attempts to shape an Education Bill for Ireland. Again, he insisted on a visit to Scotland which was not much encouraged by the clergy of the established church there - as his biographer frankly records on page 290.

This long statement of Dale's activity is of special value as he was an outstanding leader among anti-sectarian nonconformists; and much of what is here reported of him met with their full support. He was an obvious candidate for a place on the Cross Commission where he sat with the Bishop of London, Cardinal Manning, Canon Gregory and Dr. Rigg. Here his earlier interest in elementary education soon revived. There was an exchange with Stewart, one of H.M. Chief Inspectors on the question of the efficacy of the conscience clause; and, by his questions, it is clear that Dale was not convinced that all was well. Again, he crossed swords with T.W. Allies, a Roman Catholic spokesman, who had described voluntary schools as the shelter of religious liberty and had added his opinion that the 1870 Act amounted to an endowment of nonconformist principles. Needless to say Dale did not agree.

His son tells us that Dale attached little value to religious teaching that was not 'definite' and in which the truths of the Christian faith were diluted or ignored. He did not believe in the efficacy of 'undenominationalism' as either a mode of belief or as a basis of conduct. In this he was perhaps a little unrealistic; for the elementary schools were dealing with children at a stage when doctrinal subtleties were not likely to be understood. One would have expected him to use 'undenominationalism' as a weapon in the defence of the causes he supported. He preferred the solution of a secular education, and, in a letter to Lord Norton, he explained why in 1887.

"In the first place - no concordat between Evangelical Christians and Unitarians on the subject of religious teaching can possibly be satisfactory. Unless our Lord is spoken of with the reverence, awe and wonder which His Divinity should inspire, I think that to talk to children about His earthly history must discourage faith rather than contribute to it.

In the second place - no concordat is possible with the Roman Catholics: they are obliged, with their views of the church, to meet the proposal with an unconditional refusal...

In the third place - no concordat is possible between nonconformists and that party in the English church which is at present most vigorous and powerful, and is showing the most earnest religious life - I mean the High Church party.

... there remain only the evangelical nonconformists and those members of the English church who appear to me to explain away the clear teaching of her formularies...

My conclusion is - let the school be secular..." (1)

It would be interesting to know what would have been Dale's reaction to the successful 'concordat' of 1944.

Oddly enough he found that it was difficult to get strong evidence of discontent with items, such as the conscience clause, which would have supported his own views. This may or may not be of significance: but it surely worried Dale. He was active

(1) see A.W.W. Dale Life of W.E. Dale (21) pp.557-8

in the questioning of the five representatives of nonconformity who came to explain the grounds of their dissatisfaction with the existing system of elementary schools. His letter to Henry Richard written 20 July 1886, and quoted by his biographer (p.560) explained the difficulty.

"The question of evidence on our side is exercising me a great deal, I have had letters written to the Secretaries of County Associations all over England, inquiring for persons who could give evidence on the grounds of nonconformist dissatisfaction with the present system. There is abundance of vague discontent, but as soon as people are pressed for definite facts there is nothing to be had - at least nothing available as evidence. This is inevitable, I suppose, from the nature of the case."
(1)

It is extraordinary that Dale had this difficulty! He was not searching for evidence among his own denomination alone; indeed he regarded himself, not as the representative of a sect, but as a representative nonconformist, and as such he had been nominated as a Commissioner. Moreover, his interest was by no means confined to religious issues. Dale was keen for a more flexible system of education than the 1870 Act had provided. His biographer records his dislike of stereotyped 'standards' and the principle of 'payment by results' both of which encouraged mechanical drill of the worst sort (2). Dale proposed the abolition of standards and a revision of the pupil teacher system. He failed in this and was saddened by the lack of support from other Commissioners for his suggestions. Thus, Dale's interests were by no means exclusively sectarian or political. They extended to the whole field of the educational welfare of the children. He had developed a singular gift for seeing where the principles inspired by nonconformity might be overtaken by enthusiasm for reform - or for reaction - which was merely political. This insight was frequently absent from the ranks of his Anglican contemporaries as well as his fellow dissenters. It has been

(1) A.W.W. Dale Life of R.W. Dale (21) p.560

(2) A.W.W. Dale op.cit. p.576

observed above that Dale demonstrated the best of nonconformist vigilance and he expressed objections effectively. It is time to examine the extent to which other nonconformists agreed with his presentation of the case.

Chapter VII : Part iv

The Attitudes of the Methodists

It was remarked in the early parts of this chapter that no unanimity can reasonably be expected from official Free Church authorities until the last years of the nineteenth century when an appropriate Council was formed. For earlier periods we must investigate the thought of leading Nonconformists: thus we follow Strachey's decision to "row out over that great ocean of material, and lower into it, here and there, a little bucket which will bring up to the light of day some characteristic specimen.." (1). This has its dangers and disadvantages of which the most persistent is the difficulty of producing a cohesive and chronological account of events. Avoiding such difficulties by generalisation has proved sometimes a temptation, as the following passage by E.A. Payne demonstrates.

"Nonconformists continued to take a deep interest in education and were in the forefront of the movement for a national system under public control, in the provision of which England lagged sadly behind other nations largely because of the opposition of the National Church...

(In 1870) an Education Act was passed by Gladstone's first government, setting up a national system, but of a kind which gravely affronted nonconformists and has been the cause of continued strife ever since. The scheme was the work of W.E. Forster. It made the existing voluntary schools, almost all of them the property of the Church of England, an integral part of the national system, doubled the existing grants to them, and put publicly controlled schools only in the places then unprovided for." (2)

It is surely better to investigate the conscientious individual leader, misleading though he may be on account of his special gifts.

Indeed, although concerted action and general statements were not possible, especially from the Methodists, until their

(1) See Trevelyan's comment on page 1 of this thesis.

(2) E.A. Payne The Free Church Tradition in the Life of England

schemes for unity had got under way, yet their attitudes were shared with all who were loyal to the cause of dissent. These attitudes have been fully stated in the account of R.M. Dale's enormous contribution to the education question. On this question Dale dominates the nonconformist scene, so to say. Nevertheless the policy of both Methodists and Baptists is discernible; and their leaders, men like Hugh Frice Hughes on the Methodist side and John Clifford on the Baptist side, in their turn, wielded huge influence. It is true that their interest in education was, perhaps, a side-effect of a more general concern for reform; and they lacked the detailed study of the practical and political problem which Dale had made.

In the early part of the nineteenth century the attitude of the Conference to the question of elementary education was consistent. The idea of a national secular system was rejected. Equally unacceptable was the notion of a curriculum from which the religious element was excluded. By 1833 formal approval had been given for establishing Wesleyan day schools, and by 1837 there were nine infant schools and twenty-two day schools. That year a Report was presented to the Conference stressing the great need for denominational education, and in 1838 an Education Committee was created to supervise both day and Sunday schools. In 1843 an educationalist named John Scott proposed a scheme, which was adopted, for seven hundred new day schools in seven years. The scheme was not quite completed, but as the 1851 Census figures show, a large number of schools were working by the middle of the century. And in 1844, the Conference had sanctioned raising some £20,000 as the basis for an educational fund. In 1856 the Wesleyan's Education Committee received high praise from Matthew Arnold, in his capacity as H.M.I., "so long as the present denominational system of schools remains in force, there is no school system to which I wish success more than theirs". By the time Forster's Act was passed

there were about seven hundred schools under the control of the Conference, and, by 1899 the number had risen to 750 with 160,787 pupils (1).

During this time there were two main schools of thought in Methodist circles,

".. a majority who cordially supported the policy of co-operation with the state, and a minority, including some distinguished and influential men, who regarded such a policy as wrong in theory, but tolerated it in the absence of any practicable scheme of their own..

The opposition to grants-in-aid shrank first into silence as the conditions came to light, and was slowly transmuted into a disposition to welcome those grants as the magnitude of the task was realised." (2)

R. Waddy Moss goes on to explain in his essay that Methodists faced up to the consequences of state aid more frankly than Anglicans ever did. In his view, receiving grants carries an obligation to submit to "the interference or control of the state". He records that the Conference repeatedly committed itself to three essentials in its attitude to national education.

- (1) There must be an unsectarian school within reasonable distance of every family; but it must be Christian. Managers would be elected from the surrounding area.
- (2) There must be adequate "representative public management" over any denominational school which received public funds.
- (3) There must be "no national system of education, which shall exclude from the day schools the Bible, and religious instruction therefrom by the teachers, suited to the capacities of children, will meet the necessities of the country".

This is not quite the universal attitude of nonconformists. In the main, the Free Churches objected to the Dual System and adopted the view that it was the state's business to establish a universal structure of education in the course of which each child received undenominational religious instruction. They denied that any particular church was entitled to receive state

(1) Minutes of the Conference 1900 p.458

(2) Townsend, Workman and Bayrs New History of Methodism Vol.i (75) p.471

aid for the teaching of its own tenets. So nonconformist schools, which the 1851 Census had disclosed to be a large number, gradually closed in the course of the century. The Methodists did not follow the pattern closely, however, though neither Payne nor Waddy Moss make this clear. Rupert Davies outlines the difference.

"The position of Methodism in the controversy was equivocal. It had gradually reduced the number of its schools during the closing years of the nineteenth century but not to anything like vanishing point.

Some of its leaders (still) could see merits in the Dual System, others could see nothing but faults, and especially the fact that thousands of Free Church children had no chance of education except in Anglican schools." (1)

One reason why a substantial minority continued to oppose state intervention was the fear that money handed to the Anglican church was inevitably supporting that body when it was growing denominationally self-conscious, in which growth it was internally encouraged by the popularity of Fusedism. In the minds of many Free Churchmen this meant Roman Catholic practices and in the established Church of England; and they were not prepared to help make this possible. Moreover, the Roman Catholics themselves were increasing in number and were building many schools, and, at the same time, crying out for government aid to assist their endeavours.

"A minority ... feared that the state would ultimately countenance Romanism and other beliefs to which they were opposed and they would have no right to protest." (2)

It is difficult to assess how potent the prejudice of anti-papery can have been. It is certain that Dr. Clifford was to make capital from this underlying fear after the 1902 Act. Meanwhile, the three items of the Conference's declarations were Methodism's platform and monitored attitudes at the end of the century.

(1) Rupert E. Davies Methodism (22) p.181-2

(2) Maldwyn Edwards Methodism and England (26) p.123

Anti-popery was by no means the main motivating force among thoughtful Methodists. Throughout our period two names particularly stand out. One was Scott Lidgett and the other was Hugh Price Hughes, both of whom saw the value of the 1902 Education Bill - though they were not happy at the abolition of school boards and the continuation of church schools. Yet they played no small part in keeping apart, at least officially, from Clifford's Passive Resistance Movement. This was the more surprising as Dr. Fairbairn had announced that no quarter would be given when he led a deputation to protest to the government about the Bill. By then the nonconformists were able to act in unity. For that reason their reaction to new proposals at the turn of the century is postponed until a later chapter after their different contributions have been evaluated and their different attitudes distinguished. Once concerted action appears it becomes realistic to speak of the attitudes of the Free Churches as a whole - or nearly so. Both the Quakers and the Methodists had reservations about the political undertones of Clifford's movement. Yet they had never shrank from trying to apply Christian principles to political and social life. Indeed, Lidgett continued to influence educational affairs on behalf of Methodism beyond the death of Hugh Price Hughes (shortly after 1902) and helped draft the Liberal Bill 1906 which, unfortunately, failed.

Hugh Price Hughes was as great a spokesman as Scott Lidgett though not perhaps so "official" in that capacity. There was a natural explanation for this which Maldwyn Edwards discloses.

"If Hughes was not a great preacher (by choice) he was certainly not a great thinker. He touched life at so many points that he could not make himself master of any one subject...

If he was not essentially great as a preacher, politician or reformer, he was truly great as a prophet. It is never the function of a prophet to lay down a detailed policy.. It is his task to warn, to threaten, to challenge and to inspire." (1)

(1) Maldwyn Edwards Methodism and England (26) pp.147 and 151

Hughes had no sympathy, however, with laxity in doctrine: he opposed the entry of Unitarians to the Free Church Council, and, in the educational field, he earned some criticism by his expressed willingness to accept the Apostle's Creed as a basis of religious education. Many of his nonconformist contemporaries felt that the Apostle's Creed would be contrary to the requirements of the Comper-Temple Clause. Anything contrary to that Clause was greeted with deep suspicion as probably indicative of proselytizing by the established clergy with Romanist tendencies. Hughes' election as President of the Wesleyan Conference enabled him to bring conscientious influence to bear in 1898 as the century closed.

As remarked above, although "Methodism was still split up into seven separate though not hostile camps" (1) considerable activity proceeded to bring all Methodists together. There had been the First Ecumenical Methodist Conference at which the question of education was discussed. As the Conference had representatives of Methodist churches throughout the world the subject was treated broadly; but English representatives explained their case. The British Wesleyan Methodist G. M. Olver read a paper directly concerned with religious education in schools. These were his conclusions.

"..there seems to be no other conclusion but that schools must be under Christian control as well as under Christian teachers. And if any one lesson more than another is to be learnt from the experience of modern times that lesson is that if this control is to be truly Christian it must be more or less definitely denominational." (2)

In the same debate T. Snape, representing the United Methodist Free Churches took a different line. He placed his trust in the ability of Sunday Schools to do all that was needed.

"The duty of the Church is to take hold in the province where the Church has power and influence, and there to see that religious schools, her Sunday schools, are well provided..."

(1) Report of Proceedings First Ecumenical Methodist Conference 1891
 (2) Report of Proceedings 1901 p.195 ff

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee. The names are listed in alphabetical order, and the addresses are given in full. The list includes the names of the members of the committee, the names of the members of the sub-committee, and the names of the members of the advisory committee. The addresses are given in full, including the street name, the city, the state, and the zip code.

.. the only religious education I think we can secure, and it must be secured, not through national assistance, not through asking the state to help the Church, but through our own personal and persevering effort." (1)

Speaking again in the Ecumenical Conference 1901 both men found that they disagreed about providing denominational schools (2). The position of Wesleyan Methodists had been explained to delegates at the Second Conference in 1891 by D.J. Miller.

"In order that there may be no mistake as to the attitude of the Wesleyan Methodist Church on this important matter, I ask attention to the following resolutions which were unanimously adopted:

1. That the primary object of Methodist policy in the matter of elementary education should be the establishment of school boards everywhere, acting in districts of sufficient area, and the placing of a Christian unsectarian school within distance of every family, especially in rural areas.
2. That no national system of education will meet the necessities of the country which shall exclude from the day schools the Bible, and religious instruction therefrom by the teachers, suited to the capacities of the children.
3. That all modifications of the national policy in respect of elementary education should be made in view of the ultimate establishment of a complete national system of schools under adequate and representative public management.
4. That so long as denominational schools form part of the national system of education our connectional day schools and training colleges should be maintained in full vigour and efficiency." (3)

It will be observed that in this passage a fourth paragraph has been added to the three "essentials" (4) with respect to the Conference's attitude to national education. The Wesleyans' fourth paragraph stresses the importance of keeping their own schools - as long as voluntary schools remained in the national system.

- (1) Report of Proceedings First Ecumenical Methodist Conference 1861
- (2) Report of Proceedings 1901 p.195 ff (ICO) p.329
- (3) Report of Proceedings 1891 p.334
- (4) See page 159 above

The time for more united action among all Free Churches was beginning and as we shall see Methodist leaders played a significant part in events.

Chapter 7 : Part v

The Contribution of the Baptists

British Baptists, like members of all the Free Churches, developed within a state-church environment of which they were very conscious. We have already seen that they possessed a good number of schools reported in the Census of 1851. As the compilers of the Census remarked, they did not care to use money from state sources.

"When the National government began in 1833 to issue an annual grant of twenty thousand pounds to religious bodies to build new schools, Baptists viewed it for what it was - a concession to win support of nonconformists." (1)

Baptists were quite certain that to accept their share of state assistance would violate their commitment to the principle of the separation of church and state (2). They felt entirely justified in their fears when arrangements were made in 1839 for government inspection in schools which were receiving grants. This was seen as a direct threat to the independence of church schools, and an educational conference was called in 1844 at the instigation of the Baptist George Foster. Then churches were called upon to establish day schools under distinctly denominational auspices (1). Churches were to refuse government aid which would, so it was thought, inevitably bring government control. A committee of the Association was set up to arrange for the collection of subscriptions and to supervise the establishment of schools.

In this attitude the Baptists were at one with other denominations, for, as we have seen, a great many voluntary schools had been created by the Free Churches and were running independently of the Anglican church by the middle of the century. At the same time, the Baptists, with others, took a keen interest in the further attainment of political and religious liberty

(1) R.G. Torbet A History of the Baptists (73) p.123

(2) W.T. Whitley A History of British Baptists (80) p.289

throughout the whole century. This naturally affected their attitude to the question of voluntary schools in the long run, because it was attached to their dislike of the established church - that is, of the idea of establishment - and, naturally, they did not favour schemes which were designed to prolong Anglican influence in education or anything else.

"A keen interest was taken by many Baptists in the movement for the disestablishment of the Anglican Church, promoted especially by the Liberation Society from 1844.."⁽¹⁾

This hostility to the established church, based as it was on a deeply held and principled conviction, was equalled, according to Addison, only by that of the Congregationalists (2). At the end of the nineteenth century, as we shall see, it was a Baptist leader who marshalled all the forces of nonconformity against Balfour's proposed Bill of 1902.

However, back in the middle of the century the various Baptist churches maintained numerous schools. They had further ambitious plans, many of which affected the elementary sector, but these met with internal opposition from "strict Calvinists"⁽³⁾ and they foundered because of lack of funds. The absence of sufficient money was inevitable and the effects struck all the denominations. The growing conviction in the country that every child should have an education brought about a new challenge to any church which wished to maintain its own net-work of schools. The special difficulty of the Baptists was the large numbers of separate Associations of churches. Thus, when the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland appeared at last in 1898, it "represented the concerted efforts of twenty-seven Baptist Associations in the British Isles to give forth a united witness"⁽⁴⁾.

In the meantime, in 1870, when Forster proposed to "fill in the gaps" in the denominational system of elementary schools over the country, Baptists found themselves conscientiously unable to adopt a positive position. They certainly favoured the

- (1) H. Wheeler Robinson Life and Faith of the Baptists (78) p.163
 (2) See R.G. Addison Religious Equality in Modern Britain (2) p.84
 (3) R.G. Torbet A History of the Baptists (73) p.124
 (4) R.G. Torbet op.cit. p.128

provision of public education, but they were adamant that it should be non-sectarian.

"To be sure, they themselves had not set up their own parochial schools to help meet the need, but their failure to do so was only partly due to an insufficient concern on their part for general education. It was due also to lack of funds, and to a too ready reliance upon the Sunday schools to provide a basic instruction for their children. Many other dissenters likewise had failed to respond to the voluntary principle of public education under church auspices." (1)

Torbet goes on to criticise the Baptist churches for failing to do more than oppose Anglican opposition "when they might have been constructive by creating a system of elementary and secondary schools under their own guidance and supervision". This he regards as a deplorable loss of a unique opportunity. Yet many of them, as he says, (quoting H. Wheeler Robinson) were sure that the education of the people was not within the province of the government. This seems a strange idea in our day, but it was not strange, neither was it indefensible, throughout the nineteenth century. Yet, while such a view set many Baptists against the idea of state interference, it by no means reconciled them to the idea of an Anglican network of schools growing richer at the expense of the tax payer or rate payer. And their opposition to state interference extended to interference by what they regarded as a state church. No doubt the tension caused by their views - both that the state must not interfere and yet that the existing system was wrong - might have been resolved if the resolution had not been rendered so difficult by their passion for independence. Had there been denominational machinery of a democratic kind they might have constructed an effective educational programme of their own.

Torbet is less than fair, however, when he does not immediately stress Baptist enthusiasm for liberty which, they felt, was badly hindered by the apparent ascendancy of the Church of

(1) R.G. Torbet op.cit. p.124

England. It was this, more than anything, which gave strength to the effort on the part of Evangelical Free Churches to launch the Passive Resistance Movement against the Education Bill of 1902. Here we again notice that this was not a movement of a particular denomination despite the indisputable leadership of Dr. John Clifford. Torbet remarks that initially Dale was responsible.

"The Passive Resistance Movement really began in Birmingham where Dr. Dale, a Liberal member of the Birmingham School Board, and four associates refused to honour the power of the board to pay fees of poor children at the denominational schools of the town."

Torbet is right. The opposition was spread throughout the ranks of all nonconformists. They were able to take united action as the century drew to a close and, certainly in the agitation of educational controversy denominational lines of demarcation are not easily discernible.

Chapter 7 : Part vi

The Attitude of the Society of Friends

The Quakers have a standing representative committee of the Yearly Meeting of Friends in Great Britain. The committee is known as the Meeting for Sufferings. All the Reports quoted in this chapter are taken from the Proceedings of the Yearly Meeting. The Meetings for Sufferings set up a Parliamentary Committee to keep a watchful eye on developments in the field of education generally and over the interests of Friends as they were affected by national education; and, at the end of the century it advised Friends who had conscientious scruples about the Education Rate. Apart from this, the main stream of Quaker thinking has always stood apart, so to say, from both the Church of England and Free Church activities in this field. This enables us to get a more detached view, perhaps: for the Friends are the only body, apart from the Roman Catholics, with one central organisation to act as official spokesman.

Originally, the British and Foreign Schools Society (founded 1807) had enjoyed much Quaker support; but by the latter part of the century the interest seems to have disappeared. It may be that the religious issue in state schools did not touch Quakers in the personal way that it affected Free Churchmen because the Friends already had boarding schools "for children not in affluence" - as well as one founded specifically to discourage Quaker parents from sending their sons to Winchester and Rugby.

The Parliamentary Committee had taken note of an impending Bill in 1870 "on the sixth day of the fifth month". A deputation was sent to see both Forster and Gladstone; and a document was prepared to circulate the views of the Committee among the whole body of the Society. The Committee welcomed any plan to educate the children of the nation, but they regretted that the proposed Bill would impose rates for the support of religious teaching "of a denominational, even of a controversial character" (1).

(1) London Yearly Meetings Proceedings. Minutes of the Parliamentary Committee 1870 p.55 f

There was no question about their support for moral and religious training in general elementary education, but they were anxious to ensure that rights of conscience were safeguarded.

"The distinction is plain and important, between the establishment and support of a state church, and the support by state grants or by local rates, of elementary schools, in which the education is grounded on a basis upon which all professing Christians are practically agreed. We believe that the great body of the people would unite with us in objecting to education in which all reference to the Bible is prohibited by Act of Parliament. .. Experience has amply proved that Bible lessons can be given without sectarian bias.." (1)

To the Quakers all the fuss about creeds and formularies - the position of High churchmen and Roman Catholics - must have been incomprehensible. They knew that feelings were roused by such matters, however, and the report of the Proceedings laid down three points.

1. The Bible ought not to be excluded from any school.
2. The Cowper-Temple clause must apply in all board schools, because the public support of denominational teaching involves 'a direct infringement of religious liberty'.
3. The Act should provide that in all districts in which there are no board schools, adequate provision should be made for public elementary education of an undenominational character.

"We foresee great and we fear insurmountable difficulty in the application of local rates to existing denominational schools; but if the proposal to that effect continues to form part of the Bill, it will be in our opinion absolutely necessary that, at the least, effectual provision be made to secure that such funds shall not be applied in support of sectarian teaching." (2)

Then, when rumours of Gorst's Bill were in the air, the matter came up again in a Minute to the London Yearly Proceedings 1896

- (1) London Yearly Meetings Proceedings. Minutes of the Parliamentary Committee 1870 p.55 f
- (2) London Yearly Meetings Proceedings. Minutes of the Parliamentary Committee 1870 p.56 f

coming, perhaps significantly, from the Westminster and Longford Monthly Meeting in 1895. It deplored any suggestion that more aid should go to church schools and thus hamper the development of the board schools. An 'Amendment' was prepared which was to be sent to the Duke of Devonshire. The Amendment expressed their pleasure that denominational and other efforts had made such good progress in the past; but board schools were believed to give more efficient instruction in secular subjects, and parents would seem to be content with the non-denominational religious instruction of board schools.

"As members of the Society of Friends which has long taken a deep interest in the cause of national education we view with extreme regret the proposals which have recently been put forward to re-open the educational compromise of 1870.

The arrangement come to in 1870 was of the nature of a compromise which non-conformists reluctantly accepted. There are thousands of parishes where non-conformists have no choice but to send their children to schools established in the interests of a religious body to which they do not belong. Yet, about four-fifths of the cost of maintaining these church schools is drawn from public taxation." (1)

Mild though this language is, no Anglican or Roman Catholic engaged in raising 'subscriptions' for voluntary schools would have sympathised with it. They would have asked why, after 1870, the number of schools built by other denominations fell off. They would have asked why this was so, and they would conclude that other denominations did not care to build. They overlooked the changing tenor of the times. There was a new awareness of education as a right. Certainly, many Anglicans were slow to realize that. Free Churchmen and Quakers were anxious to assert it. They therefore did not deal with the problem which was troubling Anglicans and Roman Catholics. The proprietors of the voluntary schools did not admit that Society, in pursuit of a right, could morally confiscate and use equipment and buildings belonging to the Churches, or anybody else. If there was an

(1) Minutes of the Parliamentary Committee 1896 p.95 f

emergency, then there was no alternative; but in that case rent must be paid. By this time Anglicans and Roman Catholics had come to regard rates and taxes made over to them for educational work as rent.

At any rate the Friends thought that the solution was being attempted in entirely the wrong way.

"The reality of this grievance in the parishes has been recognised by the Prime Minister, who, however, has suggested no remedy except the multiplication of small denominational schools - a policy mainly destructive of efficient education.

The usual Trust Deeds of church schools debar non-conformists from any share in their management or teaching. The violation of religious liberty that this entails throughout almost the whole of rural England is well brought out by the Bishop of Hereford in his letter of November 20th:

'In thousands of parishes where there are no board schools, this prohibition, if I am correctly informed, actually closes the door of the teaching profession to the children of conscientious non-conformist parents, and constitutes an injustice and a hardship against which the churchmen would rebel as intolerable if the case were reversed.'

So long as steady progress was being made in national education non-conformists bore with less impatience the serious limitations of religious liberty. But now proposals are being pressed upon the government, the effect of which would be both to check educational progress and to intensify existing grievances."

(1896 p.96)

The Committee pointed out that allowing more money to Church schools simply levelled the board schools down to the point at which they were no longer rivals. They demanded unsectarian schools within reasonable distance of every family - thus echoing the Wesleyans. The problem might have been the reaction of rate-payers if this had been granted, for it would have been expensive. The Quakers were disgusted with the Church's attitude to expense. The Bishop of London had expressed the opinion that 'Board schools had spent a great deal too much on buildings, and,

in many cases, had spent a great deal too much on salaries'. This provoked the retort from the Friends' Committee that "no educational expert will hold that even the best board schools were too well equipped, or that teachers are too well paid for the important work they perform".

The deputation did not succeed in gaining an interview with the Duke of Devonshire, and, in any case, the Bill failed. However, when the 1902 Bill came up there was another meeting and another Memorandum was prepared on 27 May 1902, (1902 p.57). This time the Committee felt that an even stronger protest was required. In particular they were annoyed about the proposal to abolish school boards and put the denominational schools on the rates, while, at the same time leaving the management of the schools and the appointment of teachers in the hands of sectarian managers.

"To compel the whole community to pay the cost of schools placed under sectarian management seems to us even more objectionable than was the enforcement of church rates. By the church rates, Dissenters were made to pay the cost of Church of England services they did not attend; by this Bill they will be compelled to pay the cost of bringing their own children under the influence of teaching of which they entirely disapprove." (1902 p.57)

There is a flaw in the reasoning in this passage. It was quite wrong to make dissenters pay rates for maintaining a church building whose services they did not attend or wish to support. It was not the same case when they did wish to use the schools of the church.

The Memorandum continues with criticism of the problem still existing in rural areas and in particular how hardly this bore on intelligent children of conscientious Non-Conformist parents living in such an area. Such a child might not enter the teaching profession; indeed the whole matter of excluding Non-Conformists from teaching was deplored. Then follows an interesting side-comment on the attitudes of Local Councils when confronted with educational expenditure.

"It is true that there may be some levelling up of the, at present poorly equipped and poorly taught, denominational schools, but it is to be feared that the desire to save the rates on the part of the Councils will lead to a more than equivalent levelling down of the better equipped and better staffed board schools..

Nearly all progress in the past has come from the effective pressure of a powerful Board of Education above, or from the effective pressure of a powerful electorate below. The first of these will be distinctly weakened, and the second abandoned, under the proposed Act."

(1902 p.59f)

By 29 May 1902 the Bill had had its Second Reading but, on the whole, the Friends' Committee were no happier; and they indicated four special points which concerned them.

1. Popular representative control of all schools supported out of the rates or public funds should be made real and effective.
2. Differences of religious belief should not be allowed to stand in the way of teachers' employment and promotion in schools supported out of public funds. Therefore, "no school should participate in aid from such public funds which contain the provision in their Trust Deeds that membership of a specific religious body is a necessary condition of employment".
3. All training colleges (of Education) should be freely opened.
4. The Bill should contain provision for an effective conscience clause in regard to boarding schools and colleges for secondary and higher education.

When the Bill passed into Law a number of Friends had strong conscientious objections to paying the education rate and became interested in the Passive Resistance Movement. Such supporters were to be found in 120 towns (see 'Proceedings' 1904 p.200f) and the Committee was able to give them advice. Officially, however, the Society of Friends was not connected with the Passive Resistance Movement.

Their detachment makes their commentary on events the more valuable. Although the Friends supply this kind of insight, it ought to be added that they remained aloof only until the matter (educational or not) touched their social conscience. Perhaps it may then be said their interest was not entirely educational; but neither was Dr. Clifford's. To some extent their detachment was because they had little experiential knowledge of the situation in relation to their own children. There had been discussions at the Yearly Meetings of 1891 and 1892 "respecting children of the wage-earning class". Although enquiries seem to have been made between the two Meetings about how many Quaker children were actually attending board schools, there is no record of extant replies (1). The general trend of their discussions was that Friends must certainly make sure that the children of artisan and wage-earning classes, who are Quakers, should be able to go to Quaker boarding schools, and a fund was proposed to enable local Friends to present this opportunity to their children.

(1) Enquiry was made of the official Librarian of the Religious Society of Friends.

Chapter 7 : Part vii

Roman Catholic Attitudes

The Roman Catholic Church in England is, strictly speaking, part of English Dissent. That does not mean that the Roman Church often found itself in agreement with the Free Churches. In the nineteenth century, in fact, the prejudice against Roman Catholics was probably stronger among nonconformists than anywhere else. Still, the Catholic contribution to the voluntary sector in nineteenth century elementary education was enormous and did not abate. For that reason it is possible to bring the history of Catholic attitudes through the turn of the century without a pause. This has not been done in the foregoing accounts of the several Free Churches, because at the end of the century they found it possible to take a common stand. That stand was against the established church's position (and against Roman Catholic growth), and, since attitudes other than Roman Catholic tend to be taken relative to the Church of England, Anglican history has been held back also.

The other advantage of keeping the account of Catholic attitudes separate is that it is consistent. It is true that Roman spokesmen returned the nonconformist attacks over the 1902 Act, and where this is relevant it is given in the appropriate chapter. Up to that time, however, there was great agreement in any view of Catholic attitudes for simple organisational reasons. It is only necessary to record the official attitude of the Hierarchy, and how this was expressed at the several crucial stages of development through which national education passed. To an outsider, the key-note of Catholic policy until 1850 might be described as the simple attempt to secure an equitable share of funds from the Exchequer for building schools. Thereafter, until 1902, this interest was shared with an interest in getting money from the rates. That is how it looks; but it is a very incomplete picture unless it is set within the context of

Catholic thought. Important principles lay behind Catholic attitudes. These principles were concerned with the freedom of the individual, his religion and his politics: the same things indeed that both Anglicans and Free Churchmen believed lay behind their several attitudes. This is to the credit of the Churches. The Government, for its part, had no coherent policy at all until after 1870, so vigilance was essential.

Officially, Catholic policy reflects similar ideas to those adopted by Gladstone in the early part of our period. Unlike Gladstone, Catholics did not modify their basic doctrine, and, although they had to accept compromises, there was no talk of 'sinking ships'. Their steady loyalty to principle made them feel isolated. The Church of England wavered a good deal and was an uncertain ally, and Catholic relations with Non-Conformists were never easy. Their aims were different; and, besides, in spite of 'toleration' laws, "popery" gave rise to suspicion amongst all protestants throughout the nineteenth century.

The Catholic Institute and the Associated Catholic Charities were set up in 1815. Grants were received from the Committee of the Privy Council in 1839: the National Society and the British and Foreign Society had received grants since 1833. From the 1815 organisation came the Catholic Poor School Committee in 1847; this in turn became the present Catholic Education Council in 1905.

Forster had made it clear that he did not wish to destroy anything which was already in existence. He rejected the secularist solution in his first Memorandum (October 1869). However, he also rejected the completely denominational plan proposed by the Church of England and strongly supported by Roman Catholics. Forster's reason was quite simply that he did not believe the churches could administer a fully national system, even with financial aid from the State. And he was troubled about the rights of the tax-payers who supplied what aid there was. He described his dilemma.

"It would not be fair to tax a Roman Catholic to teach Methodism.. (but) it would not be unfair to levy a rate on a Roman Catholic for the secular education of a Methodist." (1)

Gladstone's comment was as follows.

"Why not frankly adopt the principle that the state, or the local community should provide secular teaching, and either leave the option to the rate-payers to go beyond the sine qua non, if they think fit, within the limits of the conscience clause, or else simply leave the parties themselves to find Bible and other religious education from voluntary sources?" (1)

This was in 1869 when Cardinal Manning was in close contact with the Prime Minister, and he was to comment on the suggestions in his Pastoral in 1872. Meanwhile, the Catholic presentation of their case was hampered by an unexpected reason: all the bishops were out of England attending the Vatican Council while the debate proceeded at home.

As we have seen, the Bill was introduced 17 February 1870. It did not exclude rate-aid for voluntary schools, and it offered the famous 'period of grace' in which voluntary authorities might set their houses in order. After that, Board schools would try to absorb children who were still without places. For Catholics, this meant that out of 178,000 children in need of places, some 44% might be lost by being compelled to attend Board schools; because there were only 100,000 places available in their own schools.

Manning set to work to organise an interdenominational stand on the ground that 'Christian education is the genus, and denomination is the species'. From Rome he wrote to head Gladstone off the solution of 'Common Schools', that is, un-denominational schools. Catholics already had experience of this solution in U.S.A., and while Manning wanted a national system, he did not want it modelled on the American example. The Cardinal visualized the country virtually paying the denominations to provide education to the population; and he wrote to Gladstone on March 20th.

(1) A.C.F. Beales in The English Catholics (6) p.373

"I do not see why the school rate should not be granted in proportion to private efforts by enactment of Parliament. In the last three years we have opened in London 30 new schools and have gathered out of the streets 3,000 children. Give me time, and just proportionate help, and there will not be one of our children without a school." (1)

Anticipating a little, Manning was to be disappointed. He wrote again to the Prime Minister after the Act was passed.

"The real crisis is in the formation of men. They are as we make them and they make society. The formation of men is the work you have given to the board schools. God gave it to the parents. Neither you nor Mr. Forster meant this; you, least of all, on your side of the House. Glad to see you lay down the broad and intelligible line that state grants go to secular education, and voluntary efforts must do the rest. Let us all start fair in this race. Let every sect, even the Huxleyites, have their grant if they fulfil the conditions." (2)

Gladstone cannot have enjoyed reading the first part of this letter. He would have agreed that the responsibility for children was primarily the parents'. The letter shows an awareness of the danger of active secularism which is missing in the writings of other denominationalists, especially the Free Churchmen; and this danger was what prompted T.W. Allies to compose the motto "Catholic Schools for Catholic Children" (3). Allies also asked for compulsory education, set, of course, within a denominational system which he regarded as an absolute right of British parents.

To return to the passage of the Bill, Catholic opinion took shape under five main headings.

1. There must be support from public funds for parents who wanted a denominational school and where the number of children warranted it.
2. The Churches must have larger grants to build more schools.
3. The Churches must have powers to lease, hire and mortgage property.

(1) A.C.F. Beales in The English Catholics (6) p.373

(2) J. Morley Life of Gladstone Vol.i; (49a) p.942

(3) A.C.F. Beales in The English Catholics (6) p.374

4. A longer period of grace was highly desirable because of the size of the task.
5. There must be care over the definition of the term 'parent' so as to afford the child the utmost protection.

On June 13th a 'Crisis Fund' was set up on the basis of these five points. The Fund raised £390,000 which promised an extra 71,000 places in schools. Although he was backed by the Anglicans, Manning's request for pro rata aid was violently opposed by secularists who could not bear the idea of the Church of England gaining a very large sum as a result of the new legislation. Not only so, a further political consideration was that such a precedent might spread to Ireland, which, of course, Catholics dearly hoped it would. The pressure built up, and, on June 16th the Prime Minister told the House of Commons that the new school boards would not, after all, give money to the voluntary schools, but that the Government was prepared to offer an increase in the amount of the Privy Council grants. The plan was, to Catholic eyes, quite wrecked by the adoption of the Cowper-Temple Clause which, by declaring for undenominational religious education, rendered relations between board schooling and the voluntary system impossible.

The Clause raised a storm. Cowper-Temple himself is quoted by Beales (1) "the exclusion of catechisms and formularies left the opinions and faith of the teacher untouched, and dealt only with the lesson books which bore upon the title-page indications of their origin". Beales remarks that, if Cowper-Temple believed that at the time, we know better nowadays.

Gladstone still showed signs of an uneasy conscience which, while it lasted, gave some hope to denominationalists. He spoke of 'the popular imposture of undenominationalism'. During the Third Reading of the Bill he spoke in the House of Commons (July 22nd).

(1) A.C.F. Beales in The English Catholics (6) p.375-6

"It is impossible for us to join in the language, or to adopt the tone, which was conscientiously and consistently taken by some members of the House, who look upon these voluntary schools, having generally a denominational character, as admirable passing expedients, fit to be tolerated for a time... but wholly unsatisfactory as to their main purpose, and therefore to be supplanted by something they think better. That... has never been the theory of the Government." (1)

This was the kind of statement to which all the denominations, including the Roman Catholics, would dearly have wished the Prime Minister to adhere to. It was still the period when it was generally agreed that there is an unviolable unity in religious and secular education. Apart from the minority opinion of secularists, the only question was how this unity could best be preserved by legislation. The legislation might preserve the unity by keeping a balance between denominations. This was certainly a requirement, for, as we shall see, the single common aim of most sects was to attack the establishment of the Church of England and the position it occupied in the field of education. Yet the Anglicans themselves were not of one mind. Only Roman Catholics were fully united, or so it seemed to them (in fact, the Jews had a single aim also).

Roman Catholics (and Jews) were committed to oppose attempts to prevent denominational teaching in schools. They had precedent for this. Denominational religious instruction had already been authorised by Government in prisons and the Forces as well as in Reformatory and Industrial schools. This authorisation was to be reinforced in 1893 (Deaf and Dumb Schools Act) and in the Defective and Epileptic Children Act 1899. It certainly seemed that a child needed to be handicapped in some way if it was to be educated in the faith of its parents. This was a fair point. It is odd that such specific requirements should reach the Statute Book almost at the time when the same subject matter was causing such heated controversy about normal education.

(1) Hansard 1870 Vol.ccciii Col. 746

Roman Catholic thinking always followed a pattern very similar to that outlined by Gladstone on Church and State relations. It was a somewhat medieval outlook, and the Prime Minister had to shift his position. Catholic thinkers were less flexible than a politician needs to be. They argued strongly that it was not the State's business to educate, indeed that the State cannot educate, because it cannot control or even reach 'inward thought and will'. Hence, as Manning explained, 'Natural Law' awards the duty to educate to parents. If they are Catholics the parents delegate this to their Church; because the Church has a divine mandate to educate. Non-Catholic parents also have the duty and the right to educate their children according to conscience. And, whatever his denomination, a citizen ought not to be penalised financially for following his conscience.

It was acknowledged that by 1870 the need for help from the State was inescapable; but, writing in 1904, Cardinal Bourne outlined causes of discontent about the way the State had given help.

"But, in carrying out this urgently needed reform, a very great injustice was committed, and a privileged position was conferred upon those who had done little or nothing in the cause of education, while those who had made sacrifices of every kind were placed in a position of inferiority."

("The Injustice of 1870" C.T.S. Pamphlet 1908)

Bourne, like Manning, thought little of religious education free of dogma. He noted that, in practice, board schools went well outside the field of secular instruction and were as concerned as anyone about moral and religious training.

"Be it so, then the inequality is all the greater, for it gives a privileged position to one form of religious teaching which is repugnant to vast numbers of people..."

Unwittingly.. the framers of the Act of 1870 introduced a system of unfair treatment of definite religious belief against which we have protested for more than 30 years." ("The Injustice of 1870" C.T.S. p.9)

This protest was indeed a continuation of the attitude of Catholics from the start. Manning (in 1870) had already regretted what he regarded as a breach with a long British tradition: the nation was divided, in that now only one-third of the children would be educated as Christians, and two-thirds would be educated 'indefinitely'.

As it was passed the 1870 Act affected Roman Catholics as follows.

1. The Time Table Conscience Clause provided for the withdrawal of children from religious instruction at their parents' request.
2. But the special position of religious education in the school day meant that children who were Catholics but who attended board schools would find no unity of secular and doctrinal instruction. This affected children in other denominations also.
3. This unity within the curriculum was essential to Catholic educational principles. This will be apparent from Manning's writings quoted below.
4. The Year of Grace was reduced to six months.
5. Rate aid was withheld altogether.
6. They were saddled with an unequal dual system in which new non-denominational schools, entirely provided and maintained out of public funds would rival and probably out-strip the older voluntary schools provided by subscription and helped only by Privy Council grants.

It is time to examine the principles upon which Roman Catholic attitudes (referred to in para.3 above) rested; and to do this we must follow the development of Manning's interpretation of his position, because, after 1870 that position stiffened and remained consistent. Manning abandoned diplomatic restraint once he perceived the secularist ideas of T. Huxley and others were being declared openly. He issued a Pastoral "National Education and Parental Rights" in 1872.

Contrary to the opinions of secularists Manning declared that the Christian world was the highest condition to which mankind had ever attained: moreover the world had accomplished this promotion because of Christianity.

"Christianity in itself is civilisation and more than civilisation. Without Christianity, civilisation is deformed.. (which was why).. the Catholic Church has always inflexibly held that the education of its children is a sacred trust of the Divine Founder of Christianity, and that for Christian people, education without religion is impossible."

With most of this important statement the majority of his contemporaries would not have quarrelled. The question was, rather, about the way in which a Christian education was to be imparted.

For Manning, Natural and Revealed Law bind us to educate children in the knowledge and love of Christ, and this is to be found only in Christianity. This true knowledge and true love of Christ is what actually had developed the reason and will of the human race. All government, law, civilisation and morality are founded on an understanding of this knowledge and love together with the perfect human example, and perfect law of duty towards God and man. Seen as a moral force alone, Christianity has achieved what neither Hebraism nor paganism could achieve. Therefore, it is Christianity alone which preserves the reason and will of mankind from lapsing 'into corruption'. Neither philosophy nor legislation can shape or 'form' the inward life of a man.

Manning has no time for the secularists' assumption that innate goodness in men and women will mechanically purify society. He disagreed with the fashionable Victorian trust in progress as something inevitably good. Only the Catholic Church had a mandate as educator of mankind (his explanation of the position of other churches is implied in the account of his 'systems' below). The Church shares the Commission with parents to 'shape and mould the reason, conscience, heart and will of children'.

Since education without Christianity is impossible, it follows that the secular and religious content of education are not separable. Here Roman Catholics stood firm in the nineteenth century. Education was essentially religious, and where religion was excluded, there was no education. There could, of course, be instruction without Christianity; but secular instruction was not the same thing as education. Manning was anxious to keep this before the eyes of his contemporaries. He attacked "a handful of doctrinaires who urged national instruction without religion". He was sure they were not representative, but he was afraid that they might get their way because people grew weary of argument.

The Cardinal set out four "supposable systems of national education".

1. There might be a one-denominational State with all its children attending schools which belong to Church and State alike because they are at one.
2. There was the present system. That is, "... from 1839 a vast multitude of schools had been formed so as to provide for two-thirds of the children of England and Wales". Clearly, he here means all voluntary schools, not only those of his own church. The wise distribution of Government aid would extend this system efficiently. Then, denominational schools, founded by voluntary effort and run with State support, would freely teach their own doctrine and belief.
3. There was the Irish national system, which Manning deplored. Four-fifths of the children were 'deprived': many were taught by Protestant teachers, and no Catholic books were allowed. Here Manning speaks of a situation in Ireland in terms which recall the Free Churchmen's attitude to Anglican monopoly school areas in England. It may be that Catholic attitudes to voluntary schools run by other bodies would have changed if their own circumstances in England had been different.

4. The worst system would be one in which religion was excluded entirely, as in the American Common School System and in France.

"The state of Paris (Commune blazing that year, Tuileries and Hotel de Ville in ashes, and the Prussian spiked helmets at the gates) was traceable to a godless education - so the archbishop argued." (1)

Manning is not afraid of the tone of Morley's comment. He continues his case in the tone typical of Victorian moralists, and he is impatient with the suggestion that religious instruction was superfluous.

"Instruction without religion is instruction without morality - which is the law of duty to God and neighbour (and) which cannot be known unless knowledge of the Person concerned be taught."

He foresaw that the only alternative to dogmatic Christianity would be some form of deism in schools.

He also foresaw the objection that religious education is best left to parents and pastors. He claims the objection itself as an acknowledgement of the validity of his point that the State has neither power nor commission to educate children. Then, in terms strongly reminiscent of Gladstone, he argues closely and well.

".. but how then has it (the State) the right to compel parents to send their children to schools to which they object? It has truly been said by a writer of no small discernment that the State has a moral character; and that until (this) .. is recognised 'sacerdotalism' will never be got rid of. This is most true. The commission and authority of the Church will never be got rid of until the State usurps it. But the State cannot usurp it in virtue of its moral character, for in usurping it, the State will violate its highest moral duty. The moral character of the State consists in this, that it is bound to protect the moral rights and moral duties of all its members. It derives its moral character from its members. It has no moral rights nor moral duties independent of them, still less against them."

Manning would not compromise on the important point that the nation was in danger if the State usurped the rights of parents.

(1) J. Morley Life of Gladstone Vol: i (49a) p.942

The power which exercises its discretion to exclude religion altogether claims thereby the power to admit religion if it wants to; and then in what form and to what degree would it be admitted? This was not an academic matter, because Manning could look to Ireland and France for warning. In our own day the dangers arising from State power applied in education and religion, or some combination of the two, has been demonstrated in totalitarian regimes. Manning pointed to the risk that the State might become supreme over the religion of its people; and he might have added that it is part of the genius of the English 'establishment' to overcome exactly this situation.

Manning also appeals to Victorian concern for public morality. This can easily become the object of modern scorn, but that is to overlook the dreadful condition of many thousands of people in the nineteenth century. "No immorality," says the Cardinal, "is so profound as that which springs from education without Christianity". He was not optimistic about the effect of relying on parental influence; and he elaborated on this in the second Pastoral (below). He pointed out that by no means all parents were equipped to give a sound moral education. The rich employed governesses and tutors to see to this. The poor could not do that; and in any case they were hard-pressed to feed and clothe their families without having to supply a difficult and subtle educational need. It would therefore be the poor who would suffer; and they had a right to Christian schools in a Christian State. "That is called denominationalism is no more than Christian education protected and guarded by the ministers of religion to whom fathers and mothers of the people confide the care of children".

The situation was serious. There were $3\frac{1}{2}$ million children who ought to be under education. In 1869 there were, in all schools, no more than 2,165,000. Therefore, 1,335,000 children were still to be provided for. He argued that the voluntary

system had supplied this vast need since 1839, although it had been a strictly denominational system. There was the sense in interfering with it in 1870?

He ends by making proposals which suggest that he left himself some loopholes. He wished for State aid on a basis of quid pro quo. This was what everyone wanted, and only parsimony (on the State's part) could prevent the expansion of the popular voluntary system. Then follows a suggestion of compromise which calls to mind the characteristics of the Butler Act 1944.

".. between a denominational school and a secular school there are gradations of religious education which could reconcile nearly all divisions, and yet preserve the Christian character of the school".

Does not this suggest an undenominational compromise such as he deplored earlier in his Letter (see p184 above)? That is not the only surprise in his Letter. Having castigated the system which was imposed in Ireland he hints that some modification of it might be acceptable in England. This certainly left him some room for negotiation. However he re-states his case.

".. but what wisdom or justice is there in robbing those who desire, and will deny themselves to attain, a Christian system of denominational schools because, in a few residual cases, such schools would not content a small number of sectaries?"

Yet this last line of argument would have little appeal for the rank and file of the Liberal Party who depended too much on the support of 'a small number of sectaries' in their constituencies.

When the Act was passed Manning saw that his worst fears were realised and issued another Pastoral Letter.

"A school of politicians has arisen among us.. in whose political creed the three following articles hold high place. First, that the Church ought to be separate from the State. Secondly, that the school ought to be separate from the Church. Thirdly, that the education of the people belongs to the jurisdiction of the civil power." (Pastoral 1872: Burns Oates.)

This description of a situation that he and others feared can hardly be improved upon. The modern inquirer might ask if the Cardinal seriously wanted the State to keep aloof and neutral in what is now a public service. Manning's reply would be that the State does have the duty to intervene when parents neglect the welfare of their children, but only then: and in any case, it must never deprive the parents of their right to select the kind of education they think fit. For Catholics this meant that the children must be educated in faith and morals by the Church and nobody else. To interfere with the Church's authority in this was tyranny of the most dangerous kind.

"A people educated by a Government without faith - and what Government pretends to have faith - a people formed to the likeness of an atheistic commune, or a Voltarian civil power, can only grow up to scourge itself with intestine feuds..

The attempt to set up a universal, uniform, compulsory and secular education.. would be to inaugurate an age of the worst despotism over the consciences of a Christian people. But there are men who have conceived the thought and desire its execution.. (The people).. will not allow the rights of fathers and mothers over the training and formation of their off-spring to be taken from them by a Platonic republic or by a Parisian Commune".

Cardinal Manning knew that in France the secularisation of the State was fully faced and its implications were accepted. In this he was at one with Archdeacon Denison and the Anglican High Churchmen. Others were inclined to assume that such a state of affairs could never come about in England. Roman Catholics and High Church Anglicans were alarmed at the growth of secularist thought in Britain. Those Christians who did not share a very definite belief in the nature of the organised Church, or who were not sensitive to the subtle value of establishment were slow to grasp the full implications of secularism.

It was not necessary to look abroad to account for the hardening of Catholic attitudes. Between 1870 and 1902 there

were signs of trouble over the working of education law. The most depressing portents were detected in relations between school boards and churches - and in this the Catholics were not suffering alone. In Manchester, for example, the school board and the Anglicans worked to achieve a compromise. The result was that the board eventually consisted of 4 Catholics ranged against 11 other members including the Anglican representatives. Naturally, the Roman Catholics felt themselves deserted. A more serious result of the compromise was that, on the strength of it, Protestant churches began to surrender their schools. By 1883 no fewer than 478 voluntary schools had been transferred willingly to Boards; and, by 1895, the figure had risen to 1,200.

Moreover, Manchester was a city with special significance in education. As in Birmingham, where Joseph Chamberlain had organised the Education League, Manchester was not enthusiastic about having religion in its schools. Now, after 1870, local opinion, which was sometimes illiberal, could make itself increasingly influential. Roman Catholics were concerned about inequitable financial aid from the rates, and they were depressed by news of compromise at a time when they urgently needed the cooperation of other denominations. In their view the rate was given to only one class of school representing but one form of opinion, and which was therefore 'sectarian'. Catholics were surprised to find that Non-Conformists failed to denounce this state of affairs so soon after they had fought against Church rates.

T.W. Allies stressed the principle of the Catholic case rather than the need for special treatment when he appeared before the Cross Commission in 1886. The Commissioners expressed agreement with his point of view.

183. "That there should be no reason why the principle of voluntary schools receiving annual aid from the rates should not be extended, and rate aid, in respect of their secular efficiency, should not be given to voluntary schools, as it is now given to Industrial

and Reformatory Schools (without the imposition of the Cowper-Temple Clause) which, under the 1870 Act, affects those schools only which are provided and supported entirely out of rates.

We should regard any separation of the teacher from religion as injurious to the morals and secular training of the scholars."

In the 50 years before the Cross Commission the Roman Catholics had created 680 elementary schools and 3 Training Colleges. The grant-aided schools had risen in number from 28 (in 1850) to 328 (containing 1,862 'departments'). The school population was now at 173,000 and the annual grant amounted to £194,000. Although the maximum building grant had risen from one-third to one-half (in 1870), as a consolation for lack of rate aid, yet rising costs had off-set this. The 'payment by results' system had affected the recruitment of Catholic teachers. The outlook was bleak. Yet they were determined not to hand over schools to the boards.

In 1891 education was made free. There is some disagreement about how this affected the Roman Catholics. Elliott Binns takes a different view from A.C.F. Beales.

"The obvious sequel to compulsory education is free education, and this was introduced by the Act of 1891 which made a new grant of 10/- per head. Incidentally, this grant was a great boon to Roman Catholic schools and the passing of the Act was regarded by Hutton as a triumph for 'clerically controlled education'." (1)

If it was thought to be a boon by Hutton, Beales does not see it in this way. Speaking of free education:

"This the Catholics had hitherto feared, believing that an abolition of fees would apply only to Board Schools and perhaps kill their own." (2)

After 1892 the Hierarchy concentrated on getting a fair share of the rates. Nothing so concise as Manning's utterances emerged, but the tone of Catholic statements becomes sharper. Gorst's Bill (1896) had failed. It had asked for 'reasonable

(1) L.E. Elliot-Binns English Thought 1860-1900 (28a) p.314

(2) A.C.F. Beales in The English Catholics (6) p.381

arrangements' for rate-aided religious instruction in board schools at the request of parents. This would have eliminated the effects of the Cowper-Temple clause. An Act was, however, passed in 1897 abolishing the 17/6 grant-limit as well as the rates to be paid by voluntary schools and the system of payment by results. Cardinal Vaughan said he "took it on account". He can perhaps be forgiven if he felt impatient at the continuing lack of security for the schools of his church. In 1895 The Westminster Gazette remarked that only 30% of the cost of voluntary schools came from subscriptions; The Tablet retorted that it was time the term 'voluntary' disappeared. The State, it was felt, was still getting a good bargain out of church efforts, and, "... the single thing we want is equality of educational opportunity for all parents, whether they value definite religious education or not."

In 1891 the Hierarchy had made two positive suggestions. The first was that the powers of schools boards should be transferred to County Councils. This was done in 1902. It is interesting to find how the plan appealed to Catholics, as it did to Anglicans, because the more localized the control, the more difficult it was to keep the atmosphere free of bias. Hence, Central Government control is best, and County control is the next best thing. Hook had proposed something similar to this in 1844. It was elaborated in The School Guardian in January 1895. Certainly, it seems to have appealed to Balfour in 1902.

The second suggestion of the Hierarchy was that England should have an arrangement like that of Scotland. The Scottish scheme worked well (S.72 Scottish Education Act 1872) and Scottish school boards gave different kinds of religious education as the parents wished. This was usually arranged by having denominational teachers in proportion to the kinds of children on roll. The plan was good, but the bishops overlooked the fact that Scotland is more conveniently placed than England. Areas

tend to reflect a definite religious hue; for example, areas of the Western Isles are overwhelmingly Roman Catholic, and other parts of Scotland are predominantly Presbyterian.

In spite of the care which Balfour took his Bill took nine months to pass. He undertook to meet the objections of Non-Conformists, like Dr. John Clifford.

".. our duty, as far as we can see, (is) to see that every parent gets the kind of denominational teaching he desires."

Thus Balfour is able to appeal, on the one hand, to Non-Conformists who opposed voluntary schools, and, on the other hand, to Roman Catholic opinion, by using the same argument. What did not appeal to Non-Conformists was the way in which the Act was secured. The Government depended on the support of John Redmond's Irish Party who were known to do pretty well what the Hierarchy suggested to them. More respectable support came from J.H. Haldane who commented that the voluntary schools had better be mended since apparently they could not be ended. Lord Hugh Cecil, another (Anglican) ally of the Roman Catholics, explained his agreement which was to prevent giving a child "a clear field to the negative movement which, we say, is the real peril of the future". As Beales remarks the Non-Conformists were outraged by the Bill, for it "put Rome on the Rates" (1). Vaughan retorted that both schools and teachers "were ours, we paid for them", that Catholic teachers had to teach somewhere so why not where they were wanted, and that even Catholic managers could do nothing except appoint teachers. On the whole, then, Catholics were pleased at the time.

"This Act, as finally passed, put the voluntary schools on the rates. Provided by the denominations as to sites and buildings and structural repairs, they were henceforth to be maintained financially by the new local educational authorities. Their teachers were to be appointed by the school managers, subject to a veto on

(1) A.C.F. Beales The English Catholics (6) p.383

educational grounds by the L.E.A.: The secular education was to be controlled by the L.E.A., and the religious education by the managers." (1)

The Tablet spoke for many Catholics when it said that "... the assertion of this great principle of the fundamental equality of all elementary schools in this country is a matter of far-reaching consequences and it dwarfs all the details of the Bill". Cardinal Vaughan agreed that they were not likely to get a more satisfactory settlement.

Writing in 1904 Cardinal Bourne praised the Act but with qualifications. There had been a great advance in the educational prospects of the country with a new spirit of method and cooperation. The complicated control of the Education Department, the Department of Science and Art, the Charity Commissioners and of the school boards were now unified and simplified. Teacher training was getting attention, too; and there were increasing chances for able children to win scholarships. The Cardinal was addressing the Annual Meeting of the Catholic Truth Society and his address was published by the Society in 1906, (No.87 in the book list).

"But more important still is the spirit which is animating these reforms, a spirit very different from that which we were once accustomed to associate with the department. A glance at the Introduction prefixed to the Education Code 1904, or at the Regulations for Secondary Schools will be sufficient indication of what I mean. It is now clearly recognised that the main object of education is not to give instruction in certain subjects.. but to train character and develop intelligence in children and to fit them for the work of life.. They (the promoters of the 1902 Act) have shown themselves to be keenly alive to the educational necessities of the country, and they have proved themselves to be men who know what education is."

It soon becomes clear that the Cardinal's compliments are for the spirit only and not the letter of the law. Although he admits that some of the 'inequalities' of the 1870 Act are resolved, he is careful to say "the inequality existing between

provided and non-provided schools of today is not so great as that which existed between board schools and voluntary schools which they have supplanted." But the inequalities still existed! He called the 1902 Act "only an instalment of justice": reform was still needed. In particular, those who wanted definite dogma as part of their children's education were still discriminated against although they paid rates and taxes like everybody else. On page 10 of the C.T.S. Pamphlet he continues this.

"The people of England are divided into two camps. Those who prefer that their children shall receive at school only secular instruction or some colourless moral instruction are placed in a position of privilege.. at the public cost. Those, however, who regard definite religious teaching as an all-important and fundamental part of education, are called upon to provide at their own expense.. the education which, as a matter of conscience, they require..

We have recently heard a great deal about the non-conformist conscience and of the injury done to non-conformist children because they are obliged to frequent Anglican schools. I confess that I am astonished to find so little appreciation on the part of our non-conformist friends that other people have consciences too." (1)

His solution was to have more and better schools and equipment out of the public purse. Voluntary organisations could not afford to provide such things any more.

The Cardinal was right to comment that they had recently been hearing a lot about non-conformists' consciences. This was the time of Dr. Clifford and the movement for 'Passive Resistance' (see below). To those who believed that there was some plot between Anglicans and Roman Catholics to 'put Rome on the Rates', Bourne gave a flat denial at the Blackburn Conference on 25 September 1905. There were more comments by Roman Catholics on the subject of Passive Resistance and these are outlined below.

(1) The pamphlet is one of a bound collection. No.87 in the book list.

In conclusion, there were three basic principles of which Catholics were more acutely aware than other church at the time. They are inherent in any dual system of educational control. One is curricular: is religion the core of education, or only 'a subject'? The second is an administrative matter: is there to be national control or local autonomy? The third is political and theological: is the duty to educate the parent's or the State's? Beales gives a good account of the Catholics' replies. The State had certain duties in respect of education, but teaching was not one of them. A teacher's authority came from God to him through the parents. Thus, the teacher is always in loco parentis. The teacher is never in loco civitatis. With the arrival of compulsory education this is an enormously important principle.

These principles monitored the attitudes and approach of the Roman Catholics during our period. It would be a mistake to concentrate on their tactics with reference to allocations of rates and taxes, important though money is. It is a great pity that all the churches did not share their ideas and ideals. There was a wonderful opportunity to unite. Yet there seems to have been no realisation among many non-Catholic churchmen that compulsory education gives the State, in the long run, the opportunity to control the minds of its members (1). Perhaps it was too soon to say so; not even Cardinal Manning went so far.

(1) Cf. L.E. Elliot-Binns Religion in the Victorian Era (28b)
p.313 fn.

Chapter 8 : Part i

General Disagreement at the End of the Century

At the end of the nineteenth century it seemed that from the government downwards almost everyone who could disagree about the proposals for education did so. The need for a revised Education Act was apparent to all. The trouble began as local tensions built up, but those at the top of both church and state set out to mend other matters. Local politicians and national politicians in church and state seemed not to be aware of one another's problems. From the point of view of reformers the existing Dual system had two main dangers. The first was that there might be a natural drift among nonconformist children who were obliged to attend Church of England schools, so that they would forget their ties to their own chapel. The second danger was that, at local level, there was deliberate proselytising by Anglicans. The letter from the Lincoln Diocesan Director of Education to The Manchester Guardian 4.8.97 was not calculated to allay suspicions.

"Our syllabus is so arranged that it gives distinctive denominational instruction. I always saw that it was given.. and I always asked children, chiefly the children of nonconformists, questions about it. This is the case throughout Lincolnshire. Thus, in fact, we are training children of nonconformists to be children of the Church".

At the same time, in other areas stories got exaggerated. One example is probably typical. The Kidderminster News reported (in November 1902) that a Pastor Bainbridge of Baxter Congregationalist Church had made a complaint against an Anglican school. A girl was said to have been persecuted by the second teacher for not being baptised. The newspaper accused the pastor of trying to inflame the minds of his congregation, and he was asked to substantiate his statement. He said he had "received it from a Mr. Fisk, Pastor of a Baptist Chapel, and that Fisk now disclaimed all knowledge of it". Such is local politics then and now; and many such stories must have circulated.

Yet there was substance in some of the complaints. The Wesleyan Education Report 1890-91 records the speech of the Principal of Westminster College. While he said he approved of the progress made since 1870 he regretted "the numerous and painfully impressive testimonies as to the intolerant use of day-school influence with not a few schools belonging to the Church of England. He suspected a 'leakage' of Wesleyan children because of Anglican proselytising which in turn he attributed to "increasing Romish intolerance and bigotry in doctrine and spirit among Church of England clergymen as a result of Tractarianism". It should be remembered that the Wesleyans were, traditionally, closer to friendship with Anglicans than any other nonconformist body.

The same year the Wesleyan Special Representative Education Committee produced its famous statement "in anticipation of a measure as to free and assisted education being introduced into Parliament" and which urged that more school boards should be set up providing a Christian unsectarian school within reasonable distance of every family. As we have seen in Chapter 7 part iv and elsewhere, the main nonconformist design, which was well expressed by the Wesleyans, was to see that nonconformists were not at a disadvantage by comparison with Anglicans and Roman Catholics; and they suspected that further aid to voluntary schools only postponed the appearance of a unified and adequate system. The conscience clause was regarded as quite ineffectual against any intolerance in church schools. And nonconformists felt helpless because it was too difficult to appeal to the Education Department: so they would have preferred local authorities to have power to deal with complaints.

When Gorst's abortive Bill was introduced in 1895 the worst fears of the nonconformists were realised. The Bill was intended to relieve the financial burden on denominational schools, indeed it was meant to prevent their collapse under that burden.

However well-meant, it confirmed the suspicions of thousands of Free Churchmen. Yet these problems were on any estimate ecclesiastical problems. The political advantages of a scheme to disestablish the Church of England had long diminished to the point where the issue was no longer a live one in secular circles. Many nonconformists did not move with the political times in this respect, however. So their motives for unsettling both the Church of England position and that of Roman Catholics could no longer be entirely due to a concern to reform society. And it is not accurate to think of a nonconformist "front" leading the classes who could not speak for themselves and were thus the victims of entrenched sectarianism. If Anglican ascendancy had been, in principle, the important factor for a minority church, one would have expected the Roman Catholics to take the lead in complaining. And if a concern for the working classes had been the principal motivation, then again the Roman Catholics had an enormous influence among the poor. Not too much may properly be made of the traditional picture of widespread social concern in the churches. There were notable and brilliant exceptions of which Booth and the Salvation Army is the long-standing example; but Inglis appears to have demonstrated that no church may claim to have represented the working classes in Victorian England. The reason was that the towns had grown too fast and the situation got beyond control almost as soon as it was recognised.

"The very phrase 'spiritual destitution' seemed to imply a hunger and thirst after righteousness that the church had only to satisfy. Thomas Chalmers, for one, was doubtful (in 'The Christian and Civic Economy of Large towns' 1821): 'The less we have of it,' he said of religious instruction, 'the less we desire of it. It is not with the aliment of the soul as it is with the aliment of the body'..

There was little working class demand for the tons of evangelistic pamphlets put out by such bodies as the Religious Tract Society... The most clear-sighted

students of the matter were forced to realise that non-worshippers among the working classes were not just physically inaccessible to the Christian ministry, but were declining to accept it. The old approaches continued; but they were accompanied.. by a growing number of enterprises whose authors saw that evangelism involved an encounter between ways of life". (1)

It is quite true that this does not tell the whole story. The Free Churches did not have the same machinery for starting internal organisations with specific goals. In this Anglicans had an advantage, and bodies like the Christian Social Union and the Guild of S. Matthew were able to appear with semi-official status (2). Many younger nonconformist ministers were equally active in fact, but the official status of their ventures was hindered by organisational complexities in their churches. That they did not lack was leaders. Besides the energetic Dr. Clifford there was Hugh Price Hughes urging the Methodist church to look to its working class allegiance.

"Methodism has reached the parting of the ways.. We must either go back to the obscurity of a class religion and the impotence of a moribund sect; or we must go forward into the blessed opportunities and far-reaching beneficence of a national religion which preaches the Gospel to the poor." (The Methodist Times 19 March 1885.)

The enthusiasm of men like Hughes is the more praiseworthy when it is remembered that by the end of the century a great many nonconformists came not from the working classes but from the new and often wealthy middle class created by commercial success. Not all of these were sure that they wanted to champion the people and be in the vanguard of progress. Inglis explains with a kindly wit.

"Ordinary Non-Conformist worshippers, belonging to those middle classes who had every reason to believe in self-help, were perhaps unlikely to attend to their pastor as closely as he would wish when he talked about the duty of Christians to support efforts to remove social inequalities. Among ministers, zealous for reform,

(1) K.S. Inglis Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England (38) p.18

(2) K.S. Inglis op.cit. p.293

there must have been many who could say, 'the people are.. hard to enthuse, luke-warm, discontented and reactionary. They have no care for social Christianity'.

The pulpit's law the pulpit's patrons give,
And men who live to preach must preach to live." (1)

It may be that the absence of social concern at home may have helped to drive men like Clifford to seek fellowship outside the ranks of Christian reformers. Anglican radicals were more fortunate than their Free Church contemporaries. If they were incumbents they certainly came each Sunday under the eagle eye of their local squire. Yet they were protected by their freehold (one of the few genuine advantages of an established church), and they could defy local tyrants if they wished. In the case of overwhelming opposition in a locality it was not impossible for an innocent man to find a patron to present him to a living elsewhere.

So the nonconformist minister was at a disadvantage in more ways than one! This brought additional problems including the need to be constantly aware of the dividing-line at which concern ceases to be religious and is crudely political. Some confusion can arise out of this. Men like Clifford turned to the large question of reforming society and the jargon they used resembled that of the early Socialists of, say, Wales. Since Clifford was a nonconformist sharing the idealism of Welsh liberal socialism it may easily be assumed that English nonconformity was the powerful social instrument which it was in the Principality. This was not the case. So, if the Anglicans and Roman Catholics are open to criticism for protecting their interests - which were, viewed in one way, reactionary interests - it is equally true that Free Church reformers desired to protect radical interests, viewed in the same way. None of them appears to have kept the problem of uneducated children in the forefront of his attention for long. Even Roman Catholics had an ulterior motive, in a sense, since they were chiefly anxious about

(1) K.S. Inglis Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England (38) p.299

'leakage'; and it is interesting to note that their policy of retaining control of their schools has not solved their problem (see J. Britten 'The work of the Laity' article in the Dublin Review July 1887). They were all mistaken. 'Leakage' of Catholics or Protestants is not to be solved through the schools.

So it was that nonconformist attitudes to education towards the end of the nineteenth century became decidedly social and political. The concern for reform lent the attitude a bias, and in some cases the bias was pronounced. Against the attitude of the establishment and the Roman Catholics reforming Free Churchmen posed the challenge of radicalism. It must be admitted however that they presented the challenge with an extra vigour because of their distrust of High Churchmen and Catholics who were, they suspected, in some way leading the country towards 'papist practices'.

As the 1902 Bill was discussed and prepared the protagonists took up position.

As the voluntary schools, so unpopular with radicals, found themselves in an impossible financial position at the end of the period, the Tory Government set out to mend their affairs. Balfour had already declared that he would not consent "in the name of religious freedom to banish religion from education, or, in the name of religious equality, to plunder the church". That was an election address (Manchester 1885); and he had since learned caution from the welcome which Gorst's Bill had received. His biographer says that he was determined that the fiasco should not be repeated (1). From his own point of view the disclosure of his determination was not wise.

In March 1902 Balfour consulted with Morant and Davidson (then Bishop of Winchester, Archbishop of Canterbury the following year).

(1) B.E.C. Dugdale Arthur James Balfour (24) p.319

"Balfour's determination and Morant's skill overcame the resistance of the Prime Minister (Salisbury) and Joseph Chamberlain to the idea of rate aid for church schools. Morant was determined on administrative order at all costs, and Balfour wanted to secure for every parent the kind of denominational teaching he desired".

(1)

The nonconformists made their case as clearly as could be wished. Perhaps the most balanced and careful statement is to be found in the Address on behalf of the National Free Church Council 1902-3 which was presented to Balfour by Principal Fairbairn of Mansfield College representing Baptists, Congregationalists, all Methodists, Presbyterians and the Society of Friends. They objected, not to details, but to the principle and purpose of the Bill as a whole. They had borne with the drawbacks of the 1870 Act, such as State support of voluntary schools and religious teaching in them, but they had done so under protest. Now the compromise was to be jettisoned in 'legislation which the State is invited to enact and enforce as if we had no standing ground in the matter, no children to educate, no liberties to conserve, no rights which Parliament is bound to consider and to guard'.

Free Churchmen were sure the new Bill would consolidate the Church of England's monopoly in some areas; not only so, Anglican control of other people's education was maintained together with the power to exclude non-Anglicans from the teaching profession. Fairbairn saw the Bill as increasing 'the range and force of ecclesiastical tests; and it endows out of public rates and taxes, and establishes in the schools, a class that may be termed the minor clergy of an already endowed and established church.' Neither of these points against the Bill is an educational one. The second, against the 'minor clergy' echoes the resentment of establishment. The first point is elaborated further.

(1) B.E.C. Dugdale op.cit. p.319-320

".. The reason against tests in the universities apply with greater force to their retention in elementary schools. For they can be retained there only with the help of public money.. raised from persons who conscientiously object both to the tests, and to the formularies they are intended to guard... (and) what is far more germane to the question, the effect of this Bill will be to create or perpetuate an atmosphere, a dignity and an influence - which shall do more than any attempt at systematic inculcation to commend special forms and dogmas."

It is worth pausing to consider what atmosphere Fairbairn is describing. It does not sound like the atmosphere of a primary school. One wants to know what effect the atmosphere will have on children - whether a good effect or a bad effect; and why nonconformists would not desire the effect since the alternative would be a secularist atmosphere. The answers to these questions might indeed be of more relevance to the university situation than to the junior school at a time of appalling ignorance and deprivation among children.

Fairbairn's remarks about atmosphere are strangely reminiscent of Cardinal Manning's reasons for desiring Catholic schools for Catholic children. They would, of course, be in disagreement only about the form that religious teaching should take. Manning's would be dogmatic, and Fairbairn would opt for undenominational approaches. Fairbairn considered the matter of Catholic education at Higher level; a little strangely, in an Address about primary schools.

"One of the arguments for a Catholic university, endowed out of taxes, is that a Catholic atmosphere will be created in the schools where Catholic youth is educated; and how is this atmosphere created save by the people who manage and the people who teach? But here, the proposal is.. to create an Anglican atmosphere in schools where pupils may be Anglican or Methodist or neither.." (op.cit.)

And, if it be granted that by now the State owned the schools entirely, then Fairbairn had a very strong point in this segment of his address. The claim that the State (or 'society')

did own the schools of Roman Catholic or Anglican foundation was, needless to say, much disputed by members of those churches. They preferred to say that the State purchased the education given in voluntary schools; or, sometimes, that the grants or rate-aid money was to be thought of as rent.

Fairbairn now exposed a different argument which was to be debated a good deal. He objected that the Bill was unconstitutional. The reason he thought so was that the Government had no mandate to alter educational law.

"This, Sir, is not to us a question between rival churches, but between citizens and the State.. The religious differences between the Church of England and ourselves are not differences which legislation can decide.. It has been said by more than one prelate of the established church that they will deal fairly with the nonconformists. But we do not acknowledge any right on the part of that church to deal with us fairly or otherwise. Our appeal is to the State.. (and) to the legislation which creates an ecclesiastical monopoly on the schools of the people we will not submit." (op.cit.)

Statesmen were concerned with relaxing tension if they could; and in this they were not always successful. Balfour was no exception.

In his reply to Fairbairn's Address, Balfour argued that the accounts of school managers refusing to appoint nonconformist teachers were exaggerated. He seemed to suggest that the Bill actually reduced their grievances, if only free Churchmen could understand it! The deputation, bearing the Address, was led by Townsend, who commented "He (Balfour) showed indeed the entire failure, if not incapacity, of his mind to appreciate the Free Church standpoint, and spoke to a group of men, many of national reputation, as though they were schoolboys" (1). Scott Lidgett also suggested that both Fairbairn and Clifford were sure that the declaration of conscientious but determined opposition would secure the dropping of the Bill.

(1) Scott Lidgett My Guided Life (65) p.185

The controversy became heated. The central items of disagreement were the appointment of non-Anglican teachers, the value of a Dual system, the ethics of payment for voluntary schools from public money, and, lastly the Government's right to legislate on such a matter for which it had no mandate. The 1903 Official Year Book of the National Free Church Council (76) records that two days after the Bill was introduced the combined Education and Organising Committee passed the following resolution.

"This committee having considered the Education Bill introduced by the Government strongly condemns its provisions, among other grave reasons:-

1. Because it proposes an education authority which, so far as its constitution is concerned, is in no way representative, is not responsible to the public, and will be largely controlled by sectional interests: and which is particularly unsuited to take the place of school boards as an authority for elementary education.
2. Because it provides for the maintenance of the voluntary schools out of rates unaccompanied by any real and effective public control.
3. Because, while it confirms the ecclesiastical ascendancy in thousands of schools, from which the nonconformists have suffered in the past, the proposals as to the erection of new schools which are offered as mitigating this injustice, will, in practice, prove to be inoperative, would generally be educationally mischievous, and would lead to the multiplication of sectarian schools at public cost."

This reaction arose because of the proposal to create local educational authorities to assume responsibility and control from the school boards. And, although the school boards were to be abolished, the voluntary school managers were to remain, strengthened by a minority chosen by the local authority; but, the authority's nominees represented 'the power of the purse'. The whole cost of maintaining schools would come from State funds except that the managers were to see to repairs and make alterations and improvements when these appeared necessary.

The National Free Church Council was indignant that Free Churchmen now had to pay for schools where abhorrent doctrines were taught. They also protested at the exclusion of Free Churchmen from training colleges and from teaching posts in many places because of denominational discrimination against them.

Next, on April 15, a Conference was held in St. James's Hall, London, for (local) Free Church and Federations Representatives from all over Great Britain. The Daily News, reporting next day, spoke of the Conference as 'full of fire and fight'. The Conference, predictably, deplored "an entire reversal of the leading principles of the settlement of 1870 and a violation of public justice." They all objected to a Bill which would "still further hinder education, greatly increase the rates, inflict injustice and create religious bitterness". The Times, also reporting on April 16th, said the Conference was "characterized by the greatest unanimity and enthusiasm".

The enthusiasm of which The Times spoke spread round the country. The National Council provided a great number of pamphlets, the titles of which sum up the nonconformists attitude well. Some examples are:-

"How to defeat the Bill."

"The duty of the Nation."

"An unwarranted attack on Free Churchmen."

"Endowing the Parsons' Schools."

Local Free Church Councils were advised to write to their Members of Parliament, and ministers were urged to suggest to the congregations ways of 'putting forth every effort to defeat the disastrous proposals of the Government'.

Some have thought that the enthusiasm was not universally strong. Thus, Frank Owen points to the eagerness of extremists to discover a causa belli.

"The objects of the Bill were simple and necessary. It was a genuine and overdue attempt to bring under one hat the two separate and frequently conflicting educational systems and to the benefit of both."

Yet this was not how nonconformists saw the matter; but it may be that they were indeed too preoccupied with the sort of general reform that would affect the structure of society overall, and they forgot about the children. Most of their schools had been transferred to the State system after 1870: and they strongly objected, not to Church schools as such, but to Church schools getting State money. They did not have the support of the majority of the nation; for, as Owen observes, most of the grants were buried in general taxation, and few citizens were aware of them. On the whole it seemed that the public were content with an untidy compromise. Only "the fanatics on either side" wanted strife. If so, their opportunity had come in 1902.

"Briefly, the Education Bill of 1902 proposed that the County Councils should take over all primary schools recognised by the Board of Education and levy a local rate to run them. This set up the requisite single control. The stern Manchester Guardian applauded the reform, and the National Union of Teachers unanimously endorsed it.

.. For Free Churchmen, it (Balfour's concessions to Anglicans) represented the ultimate in Anglican arrogance." (1)

Within the ranks of the Government there was concern about Free Church unrest. Salisbury was worried lest Balfour's concession might alienate the Unitarian Chamberlain and drive him back into the arms of the Liberals. As for the Liberals themselves, Haldane thought it a good Bill.

"He was one who watched with anxiety the rising commercial challenge of Germany.. and was already mesmerised by the legend of thoroughness. He believed it was based upon a superior popular education, and this opinion was shared by men of progressive mind in

(1) F. Owen Lloyd George and his Times (53) n.123-4.

all parties including Sydney Webb and the Fabians, G.B. Shaw and H.G. Wells. They hoped this Bill would put it right". (1)

In fact, Webb was to write to the Daily Mail later, stating his opinion. He recognised three fundamentally good points. The first was that all education in each great town was to be administered by "one spending body and one only". Secondly, Webb applauded the removal of restrictions on secondary education 'which gave Mr. Cockerton his opportunity'. Thirdly, he welcomed recognition of education as a public function, for the first time. On the other hand, he regretted the exclusion of London; and he was concerned because 'women have no place in the Town and County Councils which are to be the new educational authorities'. He criticised the decision to allow some areas to opt out (Urban Districts of 20,000 inhabitants and Boroughs of 10,000) as a 'concession to local home rule.. which I do not think will work out beneficially to themselves'. He also thought denominational schools ought not to remain in Church control because secular instruction within them was at public expense. The local council, subject to audit, were much to be preferred to managers as spenders of public funds: but he saw a grave inconsistency in allowing the same managers power to employ teachers, not as their own servants but as servants of the authority.

"This is a solution no one likes, not even the Roman Catholics and Anglicans; but it is very forcibly argued that though the details might be varied, some such solution is the only one practicable here and now.. if we are to get any educational reform at all.. From the standpoint of the man who thinks it is positively wrong for the State to support any form of religious education at all it is a serious matter. From the standpoint of the man who is concerned for education it is by no means so serious. The managers proposed.. represent a decided advance on the present system. While there is no public representation, no audit, generally no real committee of managers, and

(1) F. Owen op.cit. p.124

where the clergyman is practically uncontrolled in his handling of four or five millions a year of public money.. The Bill is a great advance.. It is more democratic, radical and even socialist, proving that public opinion has moved far. No Cabinet that ever sat under Mr. Gladstone ever thought of giving unrestricted power to elected local authorities to provide out of the rates without limits..."

(School Guardian 25 October 1902 from article in the Daily Mail.)

Churchmen might have pointed out that it was not they, but local authorities, that had been under judgment for uncontrolled handling of public money not long before (during the Cockerton Judgment crisis). All the same, Webb's account of the Bill and its effects is moderate and practical. Not all secularists took so wild a view. Two months previously Picton had objected strongly to the Bill's conditions because they put teachers under a strain of conscience.

"It is a direct temptation to hypocrisy.. It is not the nonconformist conscience that is most cruelly wronged by such reactionary legislation, it is rather the gifted and devoted teacher, in full sympathy with the national ideal of citizenship, but unable to pronounce the shibboleth of any prevalent theology."

(Literary Guide and Rationalist Review 1 August 1902)

Secularists also objected that teachers had to be recruited from the ranks of candidates already available to voluntary schools. Keir Hardie contrasted the Measure's conception of the teacher as the 'vicar's assistant' with the ever-widening view of State supported activities as a civil service open to all without reference to religion. In the Labour Leader (7 June 1902) he said, "It is absurd that the Right Hon. John Morley who claims to be an agnostic, and spells god with a small 'g', is eligible to become a Cabinet Minister, but under this Bill would not be eligible to serve as an ex-pupil teacher in a school wholly supported by public money."

The question of the appointment of teachers was a difficult matter. Cardinal Vaughan had already asked for good reasons for

not using denominational teachers in schools where they were wanted; and Anglicans (and Jews) could say the same. Yet Anglicans were as likely as anybody to be petty, especially at the local level. Moreover, the majority of training college places were available only to Anglicans, which meant that even the undenominational teaching prescribed for State schools would be given by teachers who were Anglicans. The secularist The New Age noted what this could lead to when it published an article quoting 130 advertisements from one issue of The Schoolmaster in which applicants were asked to apply to vicars! There was a real danger that teachers would succumb to proselytising pressures, particularly in High Church parishes, and they were not reassured by Balfour's announcement that foundation managers could appoint assistant and pupil teachers of other faiths. Guinness Rogers, a prominent Congregationalist minister, declared in The Daily Chronicle (November 10th 1902) that such an assurance merely formalised the denominational status of the Head Teacher, and it was an insulting reminder that nonconformist teachers might not aspire to senior posts. They had a powerful ally in an unexpected quarter. Archbishop Davidson wrote to The Times to urge full status for Free Churchmen teachers (15th December 1902). The justice of the case was thus fully recognised.

The existence of the Dual System was the second point of disagreement. This took a two-fold form. The first factor was the danger of more proselytising. The second factor involved argument about finance and so overlapped with argument about the morality of using public funds in voluntary schools.

Of course, Anglicans were in a dilemma. They were bound by the Charter of the National Society. Teachers had to be Anglicans, and the Church of England did not apologise for this. They did deny proselytising, however. They further denied that, in a country area, Free Church parents (who would certainly be

known to be such in the country) were in a worsened position if they invoked the Conscience Clause. What were the facts? On July 29th 1902, a Member of Parliament (Richards) asked Balfour for figures relating to children 'withdrawn' from religious instruction in both voluntary and State schools. Balfour replied that it was unwise to seek an accurate canvas, but, so far as he could ascertain, the number was small. The official figures were, in fact, as follows:

1,748,772 attending
 5,147 wholly withdrawn
 7,596 partly withdrawn (1)

Further evidence was available from Lincolnshire, this time from the Diocesan Director's Assistant (Curtoys quoted in The Pilot on April 26th 1902). He claimed that out of 39,444 children, 219 were withdrawn, and of these 50 were Jews and 10 were Roman Catholics. Davidson's comment on all this may have a good deal of truth in it. He remarked that the reason why so few nonconformist parents invoked the Conscience Clause was that although they may object to some credal teaching, they objected even more to no teaching at all.

The Church of England was being unrealistic, notwithstanding the Charter of the National Society. Years of practice in the board schools had made the Bible the basis of a type of religion we know as undenominational. This was no more the religion of nonconformists than it was of Anglicans. Yet it was a substitute that nonconformists could tolerate. Because of it nonconformists had been able to transfer many of their schools to the State. According to some Anglicans this simply meant that nonconformity was being paid for by the rates.

Some Free Churchmen were growing tired of Anglican claims about the State's debt to the Church's schools. Blomfield, Baptist Principal of Rawdon College Leeds complained that the

situation was now changed, and Anglicans had not recognised the fact. In the Baptist Times (September 19 1902) he remarked that in 1870 contributions had been 29%, and school fees 30%, of the total cost: but by 1900 contributions were down to 13% and fees to 9%. Munro Gibson frankly said that the Church schools had over-extended themselves, were desperate for money and anxious for State funds. In his opinion they should have counted the cost. He could not see why the public should be asked to pay for their schools (see his pamphlet 'An Appeal to British Justice on the Educational Question' page 21).

Anglicans might claim that the State had urged them to lay out more and more money on schools. Free Churchmen thought that this consisted in frightening reluctant citizens into contributing by threatening extra burdens on the rates if the church school closed and the board school opened. To this the Church Quarterly Review made the tart reply that the public in general, and nonconformists also, were equally guilty with those 'relatively few parishioners who had been influenced by such base motives'. James Hollowell, Secretary of the Northern Counties Education League, attacked the Anglican allegation that the State would not stand the expense if they closed church schools. He, too, doubted whether the original subscriptions had come from devoted denominationalists - though this seems not to support his case, if it is true! Then, in The Breaker (May 24 1902) the disestablishmentarian Edgar Woodhead made an interesting comment on published Anglican figures about the extent of the Church's contribution to Education. He suggested that the number of places claimed was swollen, because the number of square feet allowed per child in board schools was larger than the accepted number in voluntary schools; so Church schools could take more pupils than board schools of the same size were allowed. He also thought that in thinly populated areas accommodation was often in excess of local needs.

The argument over principle was degenerating in tone. Complaints flowed in every newspaper and periodical; each complaint was followed by a reply in publications of the Church. The following is a sample of newspapers concerned not already quoted.

1902 The British Weekly April 13, November 6, 27.

The Daily Chronicle November 4.

The Daily News November 5 and 13.

The Manchester Guardian July 16 and November 6.

The Baptist Times May 2 and September 19.

The last item of disagreement leads to the specifically political actions of Lloyd George and Clifford. It concerned, not an educational but a constitutional matter; and it first appeared before the introduction of the Bill - after the election of 1900 in fact.

"It is well to remember that the Government now to be in power has very distinct and definite instructions. The nation has said 'since you began the war you are to carry it through and arrange the ultimate settlement'. It has also said 'You are to see the Army is thoroughly reformed'. Beyond that it has no instructions. The Chief electioneer did not ask for votes in order to.. interfere with the education of the country."

(The British Weekly 18 October 1900)

Thus, from the start, nonconformists felt that the Government had no mandate for the 1902 Education Bill. Yet it is a naive understanding which expects a Government to go to the country every time a Measure is proposed which displeases a minority. Parliament is not elected on a single issue, and the country must be governed in all respects by the elected Party. Non-conformist extremists alarmed some observers and attempts were made to inject common sense into the debate.

The Standard reminded nonconformists that they had rejoiced at the dis-establishment of the Irish Church in 1869 despite the fact that Gladstone had no mandate for it (November 1).

On November 14 the same paper pointed out that there had been no special mandate for school boards which Free Churchmen were now anxious to retain. The Times (10 April) had already pointed out that Balfour's Bill was bound to please the majority whatever nonconformists might say, because most Englishmen were Anglicans.

Then, as the opponents of the 1902 Bill began to organise themselves for their Passive Resistance Movement even secularists were alarmed. This was not strange; because independent and lawless plans have no place in the kind of society secularists desired. The Journal of Education launched an attack in 1903.

"Did they (the nonconformists) not accept complacently their 'unsectarian' religion taught in council schools at the expense of all citizens? Did they show any solicitude for the plight of non-Christian elements like atheists and Jews who were compelled to support Corper-Templeism?"

From the vantage point of politics, Frederick Ryan.. asked nonconformists how they could reconcile their silence in 1899, upon the outbreak of the Boer War, with their protestations of No Mandate for an Education Measure in 1902? The nonconformist conscience had not been outraged by the fact that the declaration of war against the Boers was not the subject of a previous election.

From the vantage point of constitutionalism, Chapman Cohen (later Editor of The Free Thinker and President of the National Secular Party) asked what would be the fate of education if Anglicans refused to pay rates for the teaching of unsectarianism in the Council schools?"

(1)

These points were raised within the ranks of nonconformists also. The Secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance, Dawson Burns (a Baptist Minister) pointed out in his pamphlet that it was inconsistent for nonconformists to take this strong line about paying school rates when they had not refused to pay taxes for the unpopular Boer War. "... the Quaker did not allow his aversion

(1) See B. Sacks The Religious Issue in the State Schools
(62) p.52 fn.

to the military establishment to induce him not to pay taxes" (1). He suggested that the proper way to register protest was to change the Party in power.

The Manchester Guardian also disapproved strongly. The editor was not impressed by reference to John Hampden and Ship Money cited by 'Passive Resisters' as their precedent for refusing to pay rates. In fact, Ship Money had not been approved by Parliament like the 1902 Bill; if it had been, Hampden would have paid it cheerfully. On September 19, the editorial sternly accused the rebels of wilful defiance of parliamentary government.

It is strange that nonconformists found it objectionable to pay rates towards denominational schools after having paid taxes for the same cause over the years. Hugh Price Hughes replied that the taxes were not specially ear-marked for education: the rates were. That put it 'beyond bearing' (Westminster Gazette 31 May 1902). This may have seemed a tame reply, but in fact Hughes, like most Methodists, was in an embarrassing position. As one Methodist honestly pointed out, by retaining voluntary schools of their own Methodists played into their opponents hands. Why did they need schools if they had no interest in proselytising? ("Ought nonconformists to uphold the Education Act?" 1903 Pamphlet p.7-10). There were still 452 Methodist schools.

Again, James Hirst Hollowell wrote to The Times (January 9 1903) to ask why Wesleyan school managers represented the public any more than Anglican managers did? Then the famous Scott Lidgett suggested the transfer of Wesleyan schools to become council schools, provided that there was sound unsectarian teaching in them. He seconded a proposal at the Annual Methodist Conference (July 21 1903) to this effect (excepting Anglican monopoly areas). The Motion failed. The Conference

(1) "An Argument addressed to Thoughtful Nonconformists" 1904

preferred the resolution "... that it is the duty of managers of Wesleyan Day Schools to retain schools.. until such time as the Education Act was repealed or amended" (The Methodist Recorder 1903 July 23., 30., August 6.). For this attitude Wesleyans had already been criticised by the Pall Mall Gazette (9 December 1902), but apparently to no effect.

All this may seem to have been the same mixture of accusation and retort which had gone on continuously since 1870; but there was an important difference in tone. The style of journalism in the editorial columns of both secular and church papers at the end of the nineteenth century was sharper than is the fashion now. Allowing for that, however, there is no doubt that feelings were getting out of hand. Even the usually sedate Church Quarterly Review, which dealt with the subject of elementary education twice and at length between 1902 and 1904 (1) grew impatient of opposition to the Church of England and unsympathetic to the secular authorities.

"Churchmen have been too tolerant of this undenominationalism in board schools. It has come to pose as if it were universally acceptable... (but) The determination of Dissenters to capture all the schools may clear the air and reveal the mistake which has been made." (1)

As to the question of supplying money to schools the Review summed up by remarking that the undenominationalist seemed to want his schools provided - while the churchmen must build his own (2).

It may be that the prolonged debate would have subsided in time in the same way that the political issue of disestablishment disappeared from the arena; but this was not to be. Politicians and leading churchmen seem to have overlooked the power of the attachment of some nonconformists to radical politics. It only needed the right leader to bring matters to a head.

(1) Church Quarterly Review Vol.LVII 1903-4 p.113

(2) Church Quarterly Review Vol.IV 1902-3 p.193

Chapter 8 : Part ii

The Climax at the turn of the Nineteenth Century

The climax came when leaders of reform were backed by the support of Lloyd George. Lloyd George had many qualities, but a strong attachment to a church would not be reckoned among them. He saw that a leader was needed in the fight over education. The new Bill offered him a chance to distinguish himself, and he took it.

He did not commit himself at once. "I am not favourably impressed by the Bill.. There may be points which I cannot agree with, and until I have seen it in print I must reserve further opinion" (1). However, he spoke during the Second Reading (8 May 1902) and his speech had a great effect. The Daily News (9 May) commented on his skill.

"Until Lloyd George spoke tonight, nonconformity, its intellectual attitude to education, its historical associations with the settlement of 1870, now being torn up, and its contribution to the religious problem, had gone without a recorder and a champion. Mr. Lloyd George took that vacant place tonight."

Lloyd George voiced all the fears in the minds of ordinary Free Church rate-payers, as distinct from prominent ministers of religion. He complained of the special terms for the Church of England, for now the law would compel children to Church monopoly area schools. The speech was calculated to appeal strongly to nonconformist opponents of the Bill's provisions. Coming almost at once after the struggle over corn-tax Lloyd George must have caused considerable embarrassment to the Government. His language was brilliantly chosen to excite all the old resentments against the privileges and revenues which the established church was believed to enjoy. Not only so, his remarks uncovered the specifically social jealousies between Church and Chapel - felt so bitterly at local level. The following is an extract from the speech.

(1) F. Owen Tempestuous Journey (53) p.124

"The church had over 12,000 schools in the country which were the mission rooms to educate the children of the poor in the principles of the church. In 8,000 parishes there were no other schools, and the whole machinery of the law was therefore utilised to force nonconformist children into them.

Another advantage of the Church was the patronage of 60,000 excellent appointments in the civil service (presumably, teachers' and caretakers' posts).

There were about two million children in Anglican schools, and one million of them were nonconformists, and yet nonconformists were not allowed to enter the teaching profession except on the condition of becoming members of the Church of England, attending the services of that Church". (1)

He attacked Anglican control of "the most important communal institution" in five thousand parishes, and, he demanded to be told what Church people gave for these advantages. He does not ask to whom they "gave" whatever it was. Of course he meant money. His reasoning smacks a little of the experienced orator.

"They gave £650,000 a year, as against 34 million which came from the State. Taking their own claim as to the number of adherents of their church, their contribution was exactly a farthing a head per week per adult (cheers). They complained that they would have to maintain the repairs of the school buildings. The cost of that would come to about £60,000 a year, at the very outside, or one-tenth of a farthing a week for every adult member of the Church of England; one-fifth of the Widow's Pite, and dukes grumbled at it (cheers and laughter).

There was no coin of the realm insignificant enough to mark the maximum of sacrifices these fearless religious zealots were prepared to make for their faith (renewed cheers)..". (1)

Lloyd George then rounded on the Irish Party who were supporting the Government. He accused them of deserting his Party when they were most needed. He reminded them that the Liberals had supported the Irish and lost office because of that support.

Thus, one point which stands out from the speech was that the Irish M.P.s took the advice of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy about how they would vote. The advice was influenced by the financial straits into which Catholic schools had fallen by 1902.

It is clear from the tone of the speech that some non-conformists were open to an appeal aimed at provoking bitterness. Dr. Clifford had already resolved to follow the policy of Passive Resistance. The opposition was such that by 8th August when the Commons adjourned, only seven clauses had gone through the Committee stage. This opposition was loudly encouraged "... outside Parliament, by nonconformity and friends of the school boards (who) appeared to grow more obstinate rather than less" (1). Maccoby makes an interesting comment about the Government benches whom Lloyd George addressed.

"If some of the Government's clerical friends had seen reason for anxiety in the Minister's tendency to make dangerous concessions to the Opposition's demands for larger representation of the public in the managements of schools, another class of Government's friends had to submit to a different type of disappointment. There were those on the Government Benches who had regarded the Bill as a means of transferring to the public charge, Church School expenses that incomes, depleted by the fall of agricultural rents, could no longer carry. They regarded even much of the board school education as an extravagance, and now they found the Government, in the effort to render County Education Committees more attractive to the Opposition, consenting to make the exercise of the Committees' Higher Education Powers not optional but compulsory..." (1)

No squire likes to see the rates going up; and here was something the die-hard Tories could share with the Cliffordites!

Lloyd George was alive to the impossibility of a voluntary system supplying the nation's needs, and he stressed the urgency of these needs. At a packed meeting of the Liberal Party in the Queens Hall he asked "How should we get on if we

(1) S. Maccoby English Radicalism 1886-1914 (43) p.339

run the Royal Navy the way we proposed to run National Education?" (1). He suggested a Catholic battleship and Methodist torpedo boats; all of which was excellent debating material. Then he turned on Chamberlain for "... his advocacy of the Bill (which) is the last act of treachery in the career of one who has sold many of his convictions". Owen remarks that this was quite untrue, for Chamberlain had opposed the Bill inside the Tory Cabinet. Indeed, Chamberlain's position in the coalition was unenviable. He foresaw the extent of the difficulties and he wrote to the Duke of Devonshire.

"The worst of the business is that, after the Bill has passed, the agitation will continue in its most serious form. What are you going to do with the town councils who refuse to act? And rate-payers who refuse to pay? Some will! Damn the Bill!" (1)

Chamberlain was right! The unpopularity of the proposals and the success of the Government's opponents began to tell in by-election results. Things got worse! In particular the attitudes of churchmen had hardened, and in the case of opponents of the Bill a genuine spirit of aggressive revolt was growing to alarming proportion. While Lloyd George was at work in the House of Commons, Dr. John Clifford, the Baptist leader, was in Wales continuing his efforts towards organising the Passive Resistance Movement. Strictly, the Movement, like the Education Bill 1902 which provoked it, lies outside our period. Yet it is at this point that the attitudes which had persisted throughout the nineteenth century built up. It is in the response which Clifford won which shows how deeply the lessons of the years since 1870 had been learnt and how bitterly denominational attitudes still opposed each other, in spite of a separate growing awareness of the need for unity and federation on all sides.

Lloyd George's appeal was to a discontent which he identified exactly in all its aspects. His approach was skilful but his

(1) F. Owen Terrestrial Journey (53) p.126

words did not often contain a reference to the needs of school children. Dr. John Clifford must have welcomed such powerful support as much as Anglicans and Roman Catholics dreaded it. Indeed, it is about this point that Roman Catholic clergymen were stung to reply. On the whole they had previously left it to their bishops to announce their policy; but now that one of the slogans was a protest against "Come on the Rates" they took advantage of their own minority position to issue some telling replies to their opponents.

To say that Dr. Clifford had political leanings does not diminish his integrity in the context of the late nineteenth century in the way that it might do if he was alive today. The association with political action for social reform was an established part of the nonconformist tradition in England, as we have seen. Clifford had joined with Hugh Price Hughes 'Forward Movement' dedicated to encourage nonconformists to the duty of thinking out the faith in the light of new knowledge so as to grapple with the needs of a changing society. Then, when the Christian Socialist League was formed, Clifford was the first President. It was open to all who agreed that "... the principles of Christ are directly applicable to all social and economic questions, and that such application to the conditions of our time demands the reconstruction of society upon a basis of association and fraternity" (Clifford's article in Christian Socialist May 1886). His Presidential address (1895) was printed as a Fabian Tract (Socialism and the Teaching of Christ 1897).

Clifford's antagonism to the 1902 Bill was implacable. He not only saw the struggle in terms of maintaining the principles of the English Reformation but in terms of wide-spread revolution also. The first was unfortunately due to his genuine distrust of Roman Catholicism and the echoes of it he detected in Tractarianism. The second seems to have been due to his revolutionary

spirit which would have emerged in support of whatever cause he may have sponsored. In February 1903 he declared himself in no doubt about the morality of his actions (Liberal Review pp.17-19, 23-25). According to his view, the 'purest patriotism' sometimes required the practice of the 'sacred duty of insurrection'. The only subject for debate was 'what act of the executive Government is of such a character as to make it absolutely necessary and right.' In the Baptist Times (December 1904) he gave his reasons.

"This fight is only one in a much wider context.. proceeding in France, United States, Germany and in our Colonies, and all over the world.

It is the battle with clericalism in politics.. with the extreme section of the Anglican Church and its drift towards Rome. For the moment, Clericalism wields its sceptre.

The battle is set between a Free Church in a Free State and a despotic Church in an enslaved State."

From his conviction that the Church of England was heading for Rome he probably arrived at the slogan "Rome on the Rates" which became the battle-cry of the Passive Resistance Movement.

While he was campaigning against the Bill on its journey to the Statute Book he had the support of men like Hugh Price Hughes, Scott Lidgett, Parker and Hollowell. When it was seen to what end matters were proceeding the ranks of his supporters thinned a little: Scott Lidgett's influence prevailed at a decisive meeting of the National Free Church Council when Passive Resistance was actually denounced (1). More outspoken expressions of disapproval were to come from the exasperated Roman Catholics who were not impressed by appeals to democratic idealism from Clifford.

"There is a fundamental assumption that efficiency goes hand in hand with popular control, that the more popularly representative an authority is the more efficient it is.

(1) F. Cruickshank Church and State in English Education

'Popular control'! I have often asked myself.. what does popular control mean, and where do the people live who are to exercise it? .. Do they not possess it and exercise it already?

We have been labouring under the impression that denominationalists form the greater part of 'the people'. I fear that.. by 'the people' is meant merely an aggressive minority".

(Pamphlet by H.F. Glancey, Birmingham School Board (1))

Clifford was perturbed by the support given to the 1902 proposals by High Churchmen. Denison had now retired from the fray; but the Tractarian cause was represented by men like Lord Halifax (President of the Church Union), both Lord Huch and Robert Cecil and Athelstan Riley (a member of the Lower House of Convocation). Clifford seems to have been convinced of the danger of putting the clock back to before the Reformation as The School Guardian (8 November 1902) noted. The Guardian commented that 'Clifford is at it again!' and accused him of 'gigantic mis-statements'. Clifford had declared that "the Bill places the elementary education of the country in the hands of the clergy of two churches, the Romanist and the Anglican". To this the School Guardian retorted that more than half of the children in the country were in schools over which neither Catholic nor Anglican minister had the slightest control. "Nor has Dr. Clifford foresworn his pretty art of misquotation. 'Everything is subordinated', he says, 'according to Mr. Balfour, to the one object of making the schools of the nation truly denominational.' There has been shouting and shrieking enough in the domain of party politics during the past few months."

Clifford had the support of those who feared that Churchmen would stamp out the voice of Dissent. He suggested that the crisis was "more fearsome than England has known since the days of James II". These views are to be found in his pamphlet "The Fight against the Education Bill" (2). This pamphlet stands out,

(1) Pamphlet in Catholics and Education C.T.S. 1908

(2) J. Clifford The Fight Against the Bill National Reform Union 1902 p.52

even in an age which delighted in polemic, because Balfour took the trouble to reply. Mrs. Dugdale in her 'Life of Balfour' commented (in 1939) that "It (Balfour's reply) is unfortunately as unsuitable for quotation as the exuberant rhetoric to which it was a reply, though for entirely opposite reasons" (1). However, The Times was not so squeamish and on 4 December 1902, published the letter. Balfour was writing to Middleton, a Conservative Party agent.

"You long ago called my attention to a Pamphlet (Clifford's) as representing, in their most typical form, the controversial methods employed by the opponents of the Education Bill in their Autumn campaign. Their methods.. have found no imitators in the House of Commons. But I concur with you.. that they are not on that account without their importance.. The author is an acknowledged leader among the militant section of political nonconformists. His intervention in this controversy has received enthusiastic approval from eminent authorities on his own side of the question..

The first thing that strikes one in glancing through the closely worded pages of Dr. Clifford's pamphlet is that the author seems preoccupied more with politics than with either religion or education. The keen eyes of the divine have penetrated a conspiracy so far hidden from mere lay politicians. 'The State' (he tells us) is in danger; our primary and elementary rights are threatened.. and so on.

If religion is concerned in the matter at all, it is religion in relation to politics." (2)

Balfour noted that Clifford based his case on "two presuppositions, both demonstrably false". The first was that in future the whole cost of the denominational schools was to be paid from the rates. The second was that, in future, the whole control of education is to be left to the clergy. Balfour maintained that the propositions contained in the Bill itself were enough to refute these suggestions. In fact the Bill was intended to remedy just the things Clifford complained of. It would remove clerical control over secular education; and

-
- (1) A.J. Balfour A Letter on the Criticisms of an Opponent of the Education Bill Eyre and Spottiswoode 1902
 (2) B.E.C. Dugdale Life of Balfour (24) p.248

it justified their control of religious education. Balfour was as outraged as Clifford. He accused Clifford of trying to win him over by down-at-heel political methods. First, by irritating sectarian susceptibilities. Secondly, by inflaming theological animosities.

It certainly seems true that Clifford did not concern himself with principles of education in the same way that, say, Manning did. Nor did he reflect the tolerant attitude of Archbishop Davidson or the Bishop of Hereford. It almost appears that Clifford was committed to so ambiguous a theological view of affairs that he became confused; and it will be recalled that in this period recourse to a theological approach was respected, particularly from clergymen, so Balfour does not spare Clifford for his shortcomings in this. Dugdale remarks that Balfour's comment is "a commentary on Dr. Clifford's doctrine of the type of religious teaching proper to be given by the State". That being so, it is valuable to have the commentary in full.

"Dr. Clifford would, it is true, admit the teaching of the Bible, but only if it be used as an instrument of 'purely literary and ethical education', and because the study of it may enable us the better to understand Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth and Burns, and is therefore 'necessary for a full secular education'. It is apparently to be treated as a collection of elegant extracts and edifying maxims. The With Commandment may be taught, for taken by itself, this is merely a moral pronouncement. The 1st Commandment, on the other hand, must be treated only as literature; for manifestly it has theological implications.

Of the two precepts which contain 'all the Law and the Prophets', the second may be taught but not the first. The Lord's prayer may be used as an introduction to Burns, but not as the outpouring of the Spirit of Man to his Maker.

According to Dr. Clifford, Parliament would be going beyond its function in teaching at the cost of the public funds that man has a Maker." (1)

If Balfour is being fair to Clifford which we need not accept without question then it is an outright condemnation of a religious attitude which is something less than Christian, in any accepted sense of that term. It happens that Cardinal Bourne turned his attention to the whole matter of 'undenominational' religious teaching in 1907, when, presumably, Catholics were watching developments outside their own schools in case the day came when they had to surrender their children to State schools.

"We now have to have a very different system which, in its own nature, is singularly arrogant, aggressive and unjust". The "system" wanted to retain religious education, but it set itself up, not only to hate dogma, but also to arrogate "to itself the right of declaring that there is a form of teaching, so vague, so colourless, so simple that it may be taught in every school without wounding the conscience of any learner; and that.. such teaching will be enough to maintain the religious character of the nation.. And, so enamoured are they of their own invention, that they propose to arm it with all the power of the public purse, and to deny this tremendous assistance to any teaching but that of which they themselves approve." Bourne acknowledged the high character of those who meant well; but he asked them if they realised the nature of the blow they were striking at the religious life of the nation. He declared that he pleaded not for Catholic schools but for the nation generally. If State aid was withdrawn, as Clifford and the Passive Resistance Movement wanted, then not only would Catholic schools disappear but also the schools of the Church of England.

"I cannot believe that this is what the bulk of well-meaning nonconformists really want. Some few there are, no doubt, who, in their fanatic hatred would rejoice at the overthrow of Catholic influence, even though it should culminate in disbelief and anarchy.

But I feel I should be wronging the great majority were I to impute any such sinister motives to them..

I declare that if the forces of religion are gradually sapped in the hearts of English children, the blame must lie with those who are pursuing the course to which the great nonconformist leaders have given their constant and loud-spoken support."

(Inaugural Address to Catholic Conference) (1)

By that time the Passive Resistance Movement was well under way and many brave and conscientious nonconformists (including Clifford himself) had demonstrated the strength of their indignation by submitting to prosecution rather than pay rates for educational services of the kind they disliked. The problem was larger and more sincere in Wales, where, as has been noted the Chapel played a very significant part in the culture of the country, which it did not generally do in England. But English nonconformists were inspired by their Welsh co-religionists perhaps, and they were certainly encouraged by their own politically minded nonconformist leaders. Obviously there would be little support for them from the Church of England. Anglicans are always timid about interfering in State matters, and in this case they were with the Roman Catholics cast in the role of enemy. Not only so, but they gave the impression that they were hopelessly divided within their own ranks. Roman Catholics were on the look-out for allies: but Sir Bertram Windle took a gloomy view in his address to the Catholic Conference 26 September 1904. Among other things, his remarks point to a changing position amongst Wesleyans also.

"Hitherto we (Catholics) have made common cause with the Anglicans and Wesleyans but.. it seems doubtful whether this policy will be open to us for any very great length of time.

As far as the Wesleyans are concerned, it would appear that a large number at least of that body are prepared

to give up the policy of separate schools, so that if this should turn out to be the case we can no longer count on their support or assistance.

Then we come to the Anglican position.. It is extremely difficult to know what the Church of England does want, if indeed it has any clear idea itself.. far too large a proportion of the Anglican laity has no strong convictions on the subject of religious education."

(1)

The Roman Catholic sense of grievance was understandable. Glancey had already complained that nonconformists seemed selective in the causes they were prepared to support. He clearly thinks that support should be due to a cause for theological and not political reasons: but even so he demanded consistency.

"Nonconformists have a conscientious objection, we are told, to the allocation of rates to schools which teach any special creed.. All these years they have had provided for them, out of the rates, in board schools a religious teaching that was just the thing they wanted, and was just the thing we did not want.

Udenominational teaching is as much against our conscience as denominational teaching is against theirs. In answer to this, Mr. Hugh Price Hughes tells us that undenominational teaching puts us all on a footing of absolute equality...

When therefore nonconformists threaten to refuse to pay rates, I would remind them that there is no possible argument by which they justify refusing to pay that would not have justified us Catholics in refusing to pay rates for board schools". (1)

Later the Jesuit Joseph Hicksby continued the attack. Remarking that the Catholic conscience was "surely as reputable an organ as the nonconformist conscience" was outraged to see Catholic children driven into schools where their religion was treated with anything but respect.

"The nonconformists fill all England with their outcries at the iniquity of having to send their children to Church of England schools in places where they have failed to build schools of their own.

If they had built schools of their own, and a majority of voters, being strong Church of England men, had refused all aid to these nonconformist schools unless they came under Church of England management and were taught by Church of England teachers, one may imagine how the temple of nonconformity.. would have rung with indignant complaint, and how Passive Resisters would have multiplied in the land.

Yet that is the exact counterpart of the situation.. (they) are trying to create for us. We are threatened with an endowment of nonconformity "the nonconformity on the rates" and not a mere endowment, but a monopoly". (1)

Rickaby had more to say, touching now on the political and sociological implications of the argument. He pointed out that, of all denominations, the Catholic church had the largest number of poor people and poor children. He hints, indeed, that throwing the education of all Catholic children on to the local authorities would cost a large sum of money: "There would be, in some towns, a pretty bill to pay". Payment of salaries and grants by no means covered total costs.

"There remains a large amount. That sum represents the gain hitherto made by the public purse from the educational charity of Catholics - from the charity of the poorest class in the country. One would like to know, in this matter of elementary schooling, how much the public purse is indebted to the voluntary contributions of prosperous nonconformist tradesmen, the Wesleyan and Jewish communities always excepted".

("The Rights of Minorities" 27 September 1905) (1)

It would seem that the nonconformist spokesmen were more likely to meet their match amongst Roman Catholics than Anglicans. An account of fully Anglican attitudes is not to be extracted even in such a heated debate when issues were clear. The great majority of Anglicans still held indefinite views. To the Roman Catholic attitude is specially valuable. Moreover, as they were themselves a minority church it is particularly interesting to see them set out views opposed to those of another minority which considered that it had been unjustly treated.

Chapter 9

Contrasts in Church Attitudes

The 1902 Act was as concerned about the provision of secondary education as it was about the elementary or primary sector; but it is in their attitudes to elementary education provided during the formative years that the churches displayed what educational principles monitored the presuppositions behind their different views of church and state. The identification of attitudes, as distinct from party policies, is rarely to be found in official documents. It must be discovered from the newspapers and journals of the time. Attitudes affected policy - if the politicians were wise; but policy did not affect attitudes to anything like the same extent. Attitudes are affected by more nebulous factors. Of these factors the most important was the apparent stability of the times. We have seen that society was not stable at all; much reform was accomplished and many changes made. Yet, to the middle classes at least, social structures seemed very firm, and continued to seem so until 1914. So the most important influence on attitudes was the spirit of the age the "common sentiment of the time"; although we have seen that even this was not uniform. S.E. Finer (1) describes Dicey's notion on "the spirit of the age or the common sentiment" as "fuzzy"; and recommends a study of men instead, for "it is men that legislate and administer, not ideas". Yet to ignore the influence and pressure of ideas and attitudes on the same men would surely lead to an incomplete picture of the Victorians.

Certainly it is essential to appreciate the various attitudes and their undertones in the field of education; such things excite fear and courage. Generally speaking, then, all churchmen - which means most Victorians - were most uneasy about the fate of the nation's elementary schools. Their first

(1) S.E. Finer, Review in J. Vict. Studies Vol. iv, 1960-61, p. 261

concern was that these schools should not be secular; education, without religious education, was unthinkable. However, if there was to be religious education, was it to be sectarian or non-sectarian? At that point there was disagreement; and over the century no satisfactory compromise was reached which was sufficiently comprehensive to prevent the unpleasant polemic which led to the Passive Resistance Movement. At the same time, the spirit of any age, the common sentiment, does not suddenly appear: it is always an evolutionary process. That is what made Finer describe it as a "fuzzy notion" perhaps. If "fuzzy" means complicated and elusive, then he is right. Because attitudes were evolving all the time it was found best to begin this examination well inside the nineteenth century; otherwise the attitudes at the end of the century would be incomprehensible.

Church attitudes to education evolved, not only within the political context of the age, but also side-by-side with theological development and the church's changing role in society. An examination beginning at 1900 would overlook the ground covered by those who set out to extend the early ideas of toleration to become a dynamic unity; for the spirit of unity was growing as surely in one part of the whole church as discontent over education persisted in another part. In fact, Anglicans had discussed the problem in 1870 albeit without result. The Free Churchmen, John Angell James and Guthrie, worked at the same idea at much the same time. In 1873 a conference of Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists and Congregationalists was held to consider common ground. In 1878 there was an adventurous attempt to hold a Free Church Conference. In 1890 Dr. Guinness Rogers wrote to The Methodist Times and inspired the circulation of a letter to all nonconformist ministers signed by such prominent leaders as Paton, Leeson,

Hugh Price Hughes, Clifford and Scott Lidgett. This led to the first Congress at Manchester in November 1892. Free Church Councils were created up and down the country. In 1894 the Congress was held at Leeds, and there was a plan to change it from a voluntary to an elected gathering. The 1895 Congress at Birmingham elected secretaries.

The underlying idea in Guinness Roger's letter was "The Church" as distinct from the churches. Supported by Hugh Price Hughes the deeper meaning was everywhere gaining sympathy. We are not concerned with the theological implications, but their effects concern us, for soon nonconformity was able to speak with the voice of a body corporate. In turn, this could turn positive statements rather than negative protests against Roman and Anglican claims; but this took some time. The negative attitude is very important to this study, and it was not confined to nonconformity. In Anglicanism it was attached to reaction. With nonconformists it was joined with a radical political outlook of a kind not inspired by a pure desire for educational reform. H. J. Clark points to this particular contrast in nonconformist attitudes with regret (1) but he also underlines the important positive element.

"The 'general liberal tendency' came to mean, not merely a tendency on the part of the governing classes for the people's good, but a tendency to more and more completely worked out self-government on the people's part - a very different thing." (1)

Thus nonconformists played their historical role in training the nation towards responsible and sensitive government. And, if Clark is right in deploring the loyalty given to political goals to an extent that the nonconformist ideal was obscured, yet this confusion of vision was never universal; for there were always men like R.M. Dale and Scott Lidgett to offer correction. Naturally, different parts of the liberal nonconformist tradition headed in different directions from time to time.

(1) H. J. Clark History of English Nonconformity (14) p.401

It should be noted that dissent is a respectable ingredient of nonconformity. Even the federation accomplished by setting up Congress and the Free Church Council did not mean, and was not intended to mean, uniformity of opinion.

By the end of the century two contrasting schools of thought are easily identifiable among nonconformists. One held decidedly political views on reform and it owed much to the influence of the Liberal Party - though that was a two-way traffic. This sector would claim the allegiance of Hugh Price Hughes as well as the less moderate John Clifford. On elementary education their fixed conviction was that no state money should go to voluntary schools. They were convinced disestablishmentarians; this was their interpretation of the church and state problem. They therefore worked hard to free the national educational system from church influence.

On the other hand the more moderate, less political faction earned the support of most Wesleyans with leaders of the calibre of Fairbairn and influenced by the wisdom of F. J. Dale and Scott Lidgett. They too were anxious for reform, but were discerning and realistic about how far this should lead to outright political action. They were cautious about abandoning the voluntary system entirely, because totally secular influences were presented in Whitehall though they were still an unknown factor in the country at large. Moreover, even if secularists were to prove impotent, relinquishing nonconformist schools might leave the field clear for Anglicans to consolidate their earlier ascendancy. Certainly, no nonconformist, however moderate, wished to support schemes which would enrich the established church by means of grants or rate-aid.

The fact is that all the parties concerned had lost their earlier sense of direction. Traditionally, nonconformity had opposed any form of state interference, not only in education, for Peel's proposals for a police force had been resisted as an

encroachment on liberty. This early attitude underwent a subtle revision leading to positive support for state interference, provided that it diminished the monopoly exercised by the Church of England. However, when the state began to interfere on a grand scale in 1902 the result was violent resistance; but the resistance had little to do with educational principles except insofar as those principles were contained in the more political, not to say sectarian ambition to exclude "Romish" practices and Anglican influence. The curious thing is that both Edward Hiall and, later, Hugh Price Hughes, disliked the position of the Church of England just because they disliked the principle of a state church or a state religion. By the end of the century, as the opponents of Passive Resistance pointed out, militant nonconformists were in the position of demanding a particular form of religion (in schools) under state protection.

There was quite as much confusion among Anglicans, though not among Roman Catholics. Again, Anglican attitudes had undergone revision, and again, the revision depends for understanding upon earlier ideas. In early days a parish person was likely to have been the only educated man in his area. The result of this was that the clergy were identified with the teaching profession in Englishmen's minds. Hence, the established church had a monopoly of elementary education, but persons would have called ^{it} a duty to educate. That time passed, and if the clergy were not to do the work, who was? Coleridge had suggested a "clerisy" within the nation to fulfil a cultural function educating a changing society; but the clerisy would include not just theologians and clergymen but "the learned of all denominations". This was an essential "estate" in "a rightly constituted nation" (1). This attractive idea carries certain dangers outside the safety of an apparently secure social structure such as Coleridge knew. Such an "estate" may well be

(1) C.R. Sanders Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement (63)
p.86 and elsewhere.

in danger of losing professional integrity. The "clerical" could move in and out of influence like a political party; and its members, including teachers, would be at the mercy of temporary fashions about their duty and might be driven to solicit support from new patrons of influence - say, the electorate or officers of State. The problem is not unknown in the twentieth century.

No doubt some such notion was abroad in Whitehall though not expressed in Coleridge's style. And the dangers implied were realised more quickly within the Church of England than among her opponents (1).

Anglicans showed less insight in clinging to an outmoded version of their church's role in society which many of them were able to do well into the twentieth century. This was not arrogance; and they considered it unfair when they were accused of consolidating their position by a misuse of the benefits and wealth consequent upon establishment. To some extent they were right. They had their reformers too. Prelates worked hard in the "corridors of power" and by no means always for sectarian ends. At the other end of the scale, Anglicans would have pointed out that the humblest person who created a school in a parish which did not have one before was a reformer in his own right (2). They resented the construction which their opponents put on their motives for Anglican contributions to national education; and this resentment was provoked by growing self-awareness and denominational self-consciousness until it exploded in combat with the charges of John Clifford and his followers.

Yet Anglican attitudes at the end of the century were not as reasonable as all that! No explosion would have taken place if the old self-confidence of being the nation 'on its spiritual side' had remained. In fact, events had overtaken the Church of England. Its role was changed; not voluntarily, but as the

(1) See for example the concern expressed at Convocation in 1840, page 236 above.

(2) As for example in the parish of Esh in Co. Durham.

inevitable consequence of social change throughout the country. For example, the greatest possible contrast is disclosed by Anglican appeals for financial aid from the state. At the end of the century they no longer expected help as a matter of right. By then the demand was for "rent". And this carries the implication that the role of educator had indeed passed to the State as something separate from the church. No church which is "the nation on its spiritual side" would ask for rent in return for the use of schools. This contrasting attitude was neither spontaneous nor universal, of course. It arose as one effect of social change; and the effects of change can harden attitudes more surely than the change itself, but in this the Anglicans and nonconformists are as one. Unfortunately, as attitudes harden, there is less room for adaptation and less willingness to accept a workable compromise.

So it was that evolving attitudes did not enjoy a tolerant atmosphere at any important stage in the development of a national educational system. What was consolidated by the 1870 Act outraged those who looked for great changes; and what changes there were outraged those who looked for none. From one point of view, after 1870, the status quo was being constantly reinforced; and from another point of view, radical alterations were becoming as permanent as they were unwelcome. At the end of the century more Englishmen had adopted definite positions with respect to these two points of view, and the number who held no views was greatly reduced, though it at no time disappeared. This was still true in 1902 when an attempt to provide for the large quantity of church schools infuriated those who wished to see none in existence. Both sides demanded state assistance for their point of view; but the demands were incompatible. The presuppositions behind the demands were incompatible with earlier attitudes also, although paradoxically they had evolved from those earlier attitudes.

No one can tell how far their failure to unite for concerted action against secularism of the worst sort depended on earlier attitudes from the effects of which they could not be entirely rid. F.H. Freemantle, in the 1863 Bampton Lectures had seen the need in a wider social context, and called for the restoration "of the idea of the Christian Church as a moral and social power.. accepting the whole life of mankind and destined to accomplish the transformation of it" (1). It is tragic that the churches did not unite, at least far enough to offer a combined programme for the religious education of the nation. We have seen that, on both sides, attitudes were monitored at the end of the century by views of church and state which were out-of-date. A more positive approach would have been to accept that establishment did still exist, for it is bound to exist in a Christian nation, but its boundaries were now capable of expansion to include the Free Churches and the Roman Catholics. This had indeed become a fact by 1900. In this it resembled the original Anglican establishment - never defined in law, but simply accepted because it was there!

On the other hand, it would not be suitable to criticise Victorians for refusing a compromise which outraged their principles. The Anglican attitudes to secular education, like the nonconformist attitudes to High Churchmen, were based on deep convictions about these matters. And, if in our day, we think the compromise they accepted was a bad one, yet it was the only compromise that they would accept. And, as a matter of fact, the voluntary schools did fit into the national network, and this incorporation was a considerable achievement. And it should not be forgotten that the incorporation of church schools and the quietening of the nonconformist conscience were but a small part of the intention of the 1902 Education Act. Its real purpose, as Cruickshank remarks, was "to secure greater

(1) Quoted in Elliott-Binns English Thought 1860-1900 (1962) p.216

unity in educational administration" (1) which is to say that it was, in the end, concerned about the children of the nation. In appearance at least by the end of the nineteenth century, the teachers and the administrators displayed a more practical charity towards those who are the real end in education than did the protagonists in the churches.

(1) H. Cruickshank Church and State in English Education
(17) p.108