The life of Dr W. F. Hook with special reference to and assessment of his educational work

Tate, J. R.

J.R. TATE.

THE LIFE OF DR W.F. HOOK WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO AND ASSESSMENT OF HIS EDUCATIONAL WORK.

M.A. THESIS.

FEBRUARY 1971.

Abstract of M.A. Thesis.

The Life of Dr W.F. Hook with Special Reference to and Assessment of his Educational Work.

Chapter 1. Outlines his life commencing with his education and also his curacy at Whippingham, during which he studied theology intensively and began his pastoral work. His work at Moseley and Birmingham when his educational interest and close contact with the working classes first came to the fore. This work was continued on a larger scale at Coventry and then at Leeds. His relationship to The Tractarians is outlined and also his work of Church and School extension. Finally his literary and other work at Chichester is mentioned together with a brief assessment of his life.

Chapter 2. Educational progress during Dr Hook's lifetime. The Monitorial system, the rise of the Voluntary Societies and the beginnings of State aid for education. The rise of Training Colleges, School inspection and the Pupil-Teacher system. Increased State provision, management and conscience clause controversies, the Revised Code and events leading up to the Education Act of 1870. The 1870 Act with its sequel and other Educational developments 1800-1875.

Chapter 3. A survey of the practical and theoretical educational work of Dr Hook throughout his Ministry with special reference to his letter to the Bishop of St David's on the means of rendering more efficient the education of the people (1846). Dr Hook's practical educational work is shown to be very

comprehensive while his educational theory is shown to have changed considerably over the years.

Chapter 4. The impact of Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's (1846) on contemporaries as revealed in biographical material and Reviews. A critique of the Reviews and also an assessment of Dr Hook's educational proposals both in the light of the possible alternatives to his suggestions and also in view of what in fact did happen in educational practice after 1846 both before and after the Education Act of 1870.

CONTENTS.

The life of Dr W.F. Hook with special reference to and assessment of his Educational work.

Chapter 1.

The Life of Dr W.F. Hook.

(a) Childhood and Education 1798-1821.

Walter Farquhar Hook was born in London on March 13th 1798 at a time when the French Revolutionary War was at its height, and in the year before the repressive Combination laws against Trade Unions were passed. Walter's father, James Hook, eventually became a wealthy pluralist, partly because of the fact that his father-in-law, Sir Walter Farquhar, who started life as a Naval surgeon, became the Prince Regent's personal physician. Thus, in addition to being Rector of Saddington in Leicestershire, James Hook became Chaplain to the Prince in 1801 and subsequently acquired Epworth, Hertingfordbury and a parish in Hertford, all before the year 1806. As Archdeacon Stranks says, James Hook was 'more remarkable for the number of his benefices than for the work that he did in any of them'.[1] It must be remembered that he was typical of the age in which he lived, being neither much better nor much worse than the great majority of his clerical colleagues.

In 1804 the family moved to Hertingfordbury, which became James Hook's favourite abode, and during this period Walter was taught at home by his mother. In her description of his character which she wrote down, we can see even then the traits in his personality which frequently come to the surface

[1]Archdeacon Stranks: Dean Hook. (Mowbrays 1954), p.14.

in the annals of his adult life. 'He was fond of reading, shy, and not very quick at picking things up, but he was also a hard slogger whose perseverence got him there in the end. His temper flamed up easily and was repented of as quickly. The simplicity and depth of his religious feeling was already remarkable. Add to all this an exuberent sense of humour'.[1] From the age of nine to eleven Walter was taught by Dr Luscombe at Hertford - a gentleman with whom he was to have further dealings when he was Curate at Whippingham - then he went to the more austere Blundell's School at Tiverton for a further three years.

In 1812 Walter went to Winchester College which, like other public schools at the time, was harsh and brutal, it still being fifteen years before Dr Arnold's appointment to the headship at Rugby, an event which was an augur of better things. He hated the mechanics of Latin and Greek Grammar which took up an undue proportion of the timetable, and loved literature, Shakespeare and Milton in particular. In order to satisfy this love he frequently cut other things and retired to a quiet place to read, but on his return from these withdrawals he was often 'severely beaten for missing cricket or whatever else it happened to be'. The most important result of his going to Winchester was the commencement of his lifelong friendship with William Page Wood (1801-81). Politically the two families were in opposite camps, James Hook being a Tory and prospering because of his connection with the Prince Regent, Wood's father being a Whig, a wealthy clothier and a supporter of Princess Caroline. The friendship prospered despite this difference and although

[1] Ibid, p.14.

in 1820 after the accession of George IV and his attempt to divorce Queen Caroline, James Hook forbade any contact between the two friends, after a temporary enforced silence the friendship went from strength to strength. The friends wrote to one another at approximately fortnightly intervals until Hook's death in 1875. These letters, several of which are recorded by Dean Stephens in his biography, reveal both Walter Hook's warm, affectionate nature, and also his views on many subjects which would otherwise be either partially or completely hidden from us. Wood, who became a Queen's Counsel (1845), Solicitor General (1851) and Lord Chancellor (1869)[1] was a staunch High Churchman and advanced Liberal and thus his views closely approximated those of Hook who, despite a Tory background, became a social reformer of an advanced type, especially after living for many years among the working classes.

It is interesting to note here that Walter Hook, humanly speaking, would never have acquired the post of Vicar of Leeds in 1837 if it hadn't been for his friendship with Wood. Mr Henry Hall, the senior trustee for the living of Leeds, at a dinner sat next to Mrs Wood and listened to her praise of her husband's friend.[2] Then the trustees went to Coventry and heard Hook for themselves. In 1872 we read that Wood resigned his Lord Chancellorship owing to failing eyesight, and yet in 1876, out of loyalty for his deceased friend, he travelled to Leeds to lay the foundation stone of the Hook Memorial Church, All Souls, Blackman Lane. The stone reads as follows:- 'This foundation stone is laid to the Glory of God and the Memory of

[1]Dictionary of National Biography: William Page Wood.

[2]Archdeacon Stranks: Dean Hook, p.46.

Walter Farquhar Hook D.D., Vicar of this town (1837-1859) by his lifelong friend William Page, Baron Hatherley, late Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, Sept. 2nd. A.D. 1876. Walter's general scholarship at Winchester was only fair, but with his melodious voice he won a silver medal for a speech day presentation of Mark Antony's funeral oration over Julius Caesar. His voice was one of his greatest assets and we are later told that he unfortunately preached his first sermon at Leeds with a bad sore throat, which concealed his powers of oratory.[1] The Guardian tells us that even in the last sermon he ever preached his beautiful voice came forth with its old power.[2] In 1817 Walter's Grandfather got the Prince Regent to nominate him to Christ Church, Oxford. There he was more lonely than at Winchester as he made no friendship comparable with the one he had made with Wood. He continued reading Shakespeare and Milton and added to them some Anglican Divines, especially Hooker and Taylor. Hook ignored most lectures and apart from a slight contact with Pusey he made no acquaintance with the later leaders of the Oxford Movement even though some of them were then gaining prominence. He described with glee, in letters, the rebellion at Winchester College in 1818 and his friend Wood, who was slightly implicated in the affair, went away to Geneva University for a couple of years before going up to Cambridge. Then in the summer of 1819 he went to Stratford-on-Avon, the birthplace of his hero Shakespeare, and although it rained all the time his excitement wasn't much reduced. Later in his career at Oxford, much to his joy, he

[1]Archdeacon Stranks: Dean Hook, p.48.

[2]The Guardian: Obituary of Dr Hook, Wednesday October 27th 1875.

won 'Boydell's Illustrations of Shakespeare' in a lottery. Then he scraped through his B.A in 1821 and left Oxford without much sadness in his heart.

(b) Whippingham 1821-1826.

In 1821 Walter Hook decided to be ordained, and he prepared himself for this at Whippingham on the Isle of Wight, which was his father's most recent acquisition. The preparation for Ordination and the Ordination itself were conducted in what seems to us an almost casual manner although it was the norm for the age. Walter was examined by his father, privately ordained by the Bishop of Hereford in Winchester College Chapel, and was back in Whippingham to commence his duties on the following Sunday. During his diaconate he spent some time in a visit to Oxford to listen to a few theology lectures, then he was made a priest by the Bishop of Oxford (1822). He spent five years as his father's curate at Whippingham and as his father was very rarely present he in reality ran the parish himself. His basic daily routine at Whippingham was study in the morning, visiting his flock in the afternoon and spare time in the evening spent either with friends, reading for leisure or walking in the countryside. Whippingham gave him both the leisure time to lay a deep foundation of theological learning which he had sadly lacked in his University days, and also a deep pastoral care and concern for his people. He later wrote in reference to his life at Whippingham, 'The strong pastoral feeling is generated in the country, and I attribute what little success I have had entirely to my country breeding'.[1]

[1]W.R.W. Stephens: Dean Hook, Vol. 1, p.61.

The parish included East Cowes, two miles away from the rectory. There was no Church in East Cowes, but Hook held a service in a sail loft there every Sunday evening after two full services with sermons in the parish church. Many of his letters of the Whippingham period show the great power of sympathy, as Dean Stephens said rightly, the most indispensable qualification of a successful pastor, how he rejoiced with those who rejoiced and wept with those who wept. Thus he describes the departure of one of the families of his parish to another part of the country; 'The Tassels are going to Bideford; they start tonight. You cannot think how sorry I feel at parting with them, for I had trained both of them for Holy Communion, and he took it for the first time on Christmas Day and she on Whitsunday: and she was a convert of mine from the Dissenters. Poor Tassel: he cried like a child at parting with me, and so to keep him company I cried too'.[1] At Whippingham Hook undertook an extensive study of theology, with great stress on the early Fathers and the Reformers, but little on the Medievals, and from this study he formed his views, from which he never much diverged for the rest of his life. He did this study in a little wooden hut which he set up near the corner of the churchyard - called Walter's cot by his punster Uncle Theodore - and he worked there from an early hour in the morning to 2.0 or 3.0 in the afternoon. His course was a very extensive one including patristic texts and post-Reformation theological works among which Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church was probably the most important. Bingham's huge ten volume work was "a complete survey, under systematically ordered headings, of the ancient

[1] Ibid, p.62.

customs, usages and practices of the Church. He did his work so thoroughly that it has never had to be done again; and though in some respects inevitably out of date, after more than two centuries 'Bingham' is still a reputable authority.[1] The conclusion that he reached as a result of his studies and which his subsequent study and work strengthened, was that the Reformed Anglican Church was a pure Apostolical branch of the Church Catholic: that she was essentially Catholic as being on all vital points of constitution, doctrine and practice in harmony with the primitive Church, and on the other hand essentially protestant, as opposed to the pretensions of the papal power and to the corruption in teaching and practice of the Middle Ages.[2]

In 1822, while still a Deacon, Walter preached a sermon at the Bishop of Winchester's visitation at Newport in place of his father, who now was Archdeacon of Winchester but also in poor health. This sermon was so well reasoned and skilfully written that Walter had it published at the request of the Bishop, and we note in Crockford's Clerical Directory of 1876 that it is listed as the first of his very numerous published works. The title of the sermon is 'The Peculiar Character of the Church of England Independently of Its Connection with the State', in which, as J. Overton states, he advocated the very same views which were insisted upon so strongly by the tract writers eleven years later.[3] In the sermon he confidently argued that it is the duty of Englishmen

[1]S. Neil: Anglicanism, Chapter 15, p.421.

[2]W.R.W. Stephens: Dean Hook, Vol. 1, p.66.

[3]J.H. Overton: The Anglican Revival, p.148.

to belong to the Church, not because it is established, but because it is a pure branch of the Church Catholic, which can exist in purity and vigour under any form of Government, either severed from the State or connected with it. It is interesting to see that he held these views in 1822 - before he began his reading course - views which he maintained throughout his life. This sermon also detects his interest in other pure, Episcopal Churches outside of England. Dr Luscombe, Walter's old headmaster at Hertford, who had been teaching in France between 1820-25, proposed that a Church of England Bishop should be appointed to serve the 50,000 English in that country. A suffragan to the Bishop of London was suggested but the whole idea was rejected by the Government on political grounds. Walter, having a solution to the impasse, suggested that the Scottish Bishops, who in 1785 had consecrated Bishop Seabury for the American Church, should consecrate a Bishop to minister to the English on the European continent. This suggestion was adopted, the Scottish Bishops elected Dr Luscombe and he was consecrated at Stirling, the sermon being preached by Walter Hook. This sermon was also published and its title characteristically was 'An Attempt to Demonstrate the Catholicism of the Church of England and other branches of the Episcopal Church'.

(c) Moseley and Coventry 1826-1837.

In October 1826 Walter Hook went to Moseley near Birmingham as perpetual Curate and thus began his work in the great towns which was to prove the most important work of his life. As at Coventry and Leeds he found the Evangelicals and Dissenters strong. Thus as a result of his youthful enthusiasm

and High Church principles he sold S.P.C.K. Bibles and other Christian literature through a local shop at 5% below the price of Bible Society publications. We now notice for the first time his interest in schools and education generally, an interest primarily engendered as a result of his pastoral concern for his people. In 1827 he was determined to found a village school, so he worked hard persuading the people to support the venture and then in finding a site, building and obtaining scholars. He wrote to his mother 'I write a few lines lest you should be anxious, but I have not time for much. I have been on my legs since 7.0 this morning all over Birmingham and its vicinity to persuade some landowner to sell us the eighth of an acre of land for building upon; but I have not yet succeeded'.[1] In the work of setting up a school he was successful and more educational work came his way when he accepted the lectureship at St. Philip's, Birmingham. This more than doubled his income so he was able to appoint a curate to help him with his work in Moseley. He now regularly inspected schools for poor children in Birmingham as part of his work. A pupil at one of these schools wrote to Dean Stephens about the visits of Walter Hook to his school. 'Once a month he came down to our school, and after going through it and looking into everything, he examined the first class. I was in that class and we always did our best, because we knew the man and loved him. His examinations were thorough and searching. He warmed to his work and so did we. When he had finished, he would say, 'Well done, my boys, you are a credit to the school'.[2]

[1] W.R.W. Stephens: Dean Hook, Vol. 1, page 118.

[2] Ibid, p.124.

After many years of ill health, in February 1828, Walter Hook's father died. His mother wanted to get Walter a living, as did Lord Lyndhurst, the Chancellor, who had been a friend of his father's. He turned down a country living in Herefordshire but himself took the initiative of applying to the Chancellor for the challenging living of Holy Trinity, Coventry, which he obtained in the autumn of 1828. In June 1829 he married seventeen year old Delicia Johnson, the daughter of a well-known physician. The marriage was a very happy one and Mrs Hook complemented her husband in many ways, especially in her tact and common sense in money matters. As well as being a good wife and mother she greatly involved herself in parish work and wrote several fine books of devotion, publishing them in her husband's name. So when she died in 1871 at the age of fifty-nine her elderly husband was heartbroken.

Both the state of the Church and the conditions of life generally were poor in the year 1829. Unemployment was severe and the population was rising steadily. Dissenters, mainly of the middle and lower middle classes, were a large group in Coventry and the Church services on the whole were dull, and the Church had hardly begun to face up to the challenging problems created by the Industrial Revolution. Hook tidied up the Church building and made it more suitable as a place for worship, then he increased the number of services and encouraged the congregation to be more responsive in the worship. He had frequent celebrations of Holy Communion and services on Saints days, something which was then very rare, it still being three or four years before the commencement of the Oxford Movement. As many of his parishioners were only loosely Anglicans, going to church on Sunday morning and to a

Dissenting Chapel later in the day, he began evening services in the summer of 1830. These were so successful that he promptly had gas lighting fitted so that the services could be continued in the winter.

In the spring of 1831 he began his popular lenten lectures on Wednesday mornings, and many people obtained permission to leave their offices to attend them. His Passion week lectures (1832) entitled 'The Last Days of Our Lord's Ministry' were published and acclaimed by many, including the poet William Wordsworth. His Sunday evening sermons were usually in a series and consisted of an exposition upon a subject or a book of the Bible. One of his sermons from the series on St. Matthew, in a slightly modified form, became his sermon 'Hear the Church'which was preached before the Queen and became quite famous. Owing to overwork he had alarming fainting fits between 1831 and 1834 and had to go away for quite long spells to recover his health. After 1834, for the rest of his life, despite incredible hours of work, especially in Leeds, his health remained generally good and only broke down after intense pressure as in 1848.

Hook's educational interest already noted at Moseley and in Birmingham continued in Coventry. In 1829 there were only 120 children in his Sunday school, whereas when he left Coventry in 1837 the number well exceeded 1,200. He founded an infants school in 1831, a category of school in which the National Society at that time had little interest. He had a real gift with children and was able to win their sympathy by mingling fun with his reproofs. At Coventry he started a dispensary, a savings bank and a Religious and Useful Knowledge Society. Full members of the dispensary paid 1d. a week and

thus the services of doctors were obtained. The Religious and Useful Knowledge Society showed his interest in adult education which he further developed in Leeds. This Society gave people access to a library with many books and magazines, a quiet place in which to read and also the opportunity to hear lectures on various subjects. He became more well-known during this period as a result of his work in Coventry, his published sermons and lectures, his sermons delivered before his old University and also in the Chapel Royal. Then in 1837 the important living of Leeds fell vacant upon the death of the incumbent Dr Fawcett. The Rector of Brightstone, Samuel Wilberforce, was offered the Vicarage of Leeds on February 4th of that year through Sir Robert Inglis. He weighed it most anxiously in his mind and only turned it down upon the advice of his physicians, who, although they passed his delicate wife and children as fit, considered him personally to be too delicate for such a demanding post. I cannot help musing upon the words of Ashwell at this point 'and thus S. Wilberforce was reserved for a long and extensive career of usefulness in the south, while W.F. Hook was removed to eclipse the work he had already done at Coventry, by doing it again on a far larger scale, and by bringing it to far larger issues at Leeds. Idle as all such conjectures are, the fact of there being so can never quite prevent a momentary speculation as to the modifications it might have effected in the history of the Church of England, had Samuel Wilberforce become Vicar of Leeds at the age of thirty-one, and had Walter Farquhar Hook remained at Coventry. Differing widely in their gifts, in their training, and in the spheres of duty which they were called to fill, no two men did more to bring the Church revival of the nineteenth

century to bear upon the Church at large.[1]

Then through the chance conversation between the senior trustee for Leeds and Mrs Wood already referred to, the trustees went to Coventry, and after their visit there, they wanted Walter Hook to be their Vicar. However, because Walter Hook's High Church principles were both known by and alarming to many of the Evangelicals in Leeds, much wrangling went on before the election took place. In the election he was elected by sixteen votes out of twenty-three and thus sadly he left his friends at Coventry for what was to be the most important part of his life's work. The Guardian neatly sums up his work at Coventry, 'This lesser work has naturally been obscured by the greater work at Leeds. But it must have been real and deep; for, twenty years after he had left them, his old parishioners declared, in an address to him as Dean of Chichester, that they still retained a grateful sense of his services, and felt their influence working among them for good'.[2]

(d) The relationship between Dr Hook and the Oxford Movement.

It has been thought necessary to have a section on this subject both because of its inherent importance and also because of the confusion sometimes found surrounding it. This is the most appropriate place for this section, being between the account of Dr Hook's work at Coventry, where he was first able to put his principles into practice on a big scale, and his work at Leeds where we reach the focal point of his life's work. Dr Hook formulated his principles, from which he was

[1] A. Ashwell: Life of Samuel Wilberforce, Vo. 1, p.106.

[2] The Guardian: Obituary of Dr Hook, Wednesday October 29th 1875.

to waver little later in life, during his curacy at Whippingham in the early eighteen-twenties. In fact, even before his extensive study at Whippingham, he was able to preach a sermon before the Bishop of Winchester in 1822 about the Character of the Church of England independently of its connection with the State. Overton rightly observes that in this sermon he advocated the very same views which were insisted upon so strongly by the Tract Writers eleven years later. Walter Hook then was firmly established in his theological position, which was, in the main, the same as that of the early Tractarians, long before and quite independently of the Oxford Movement.[1]

Walter Hook, fighting against apathy, the view that the Church was merely a State department, and the power of Dissent and the Evangelicals, naturally welcomed the early Tracts as containing views which he was trying to put into practice in the parochial ministry. The Tract writers for their part regarded Hook as a solitary, practical exponent of their principles. Dessain comments, 'In 1834 Newman remarked that W.F. Hook at Coventry was the only High Church Vicar in any large town, and he found himself exposed to considerable opposition from the Evangelicals there'.[2] Newman wrote to Hook in 1838, 'You are in the thickest fire of the enemy; and I often think how easy it is for us to sit quietly here, sheltered from bullets, while you often get what is meant to hit us'. The Tract writers recognized that Hook had formed his views independently of them and in most cases prior to them. Thus Pusey wrote to Hook in 1838, 'Thanks for your defence of us; as for your being our

[1] J.H. Overton: The Anglican Revival, p.148.

[2] C.S. Dessain: Life of J.H. Newman, p.IX.

disciple the thing is absurd. Newman said in the "Christian Observer" that you had formed or received your views long before many of the writers in the Tracts (long before myself on many points). We were led by different paths to the same end, and from our early separation had little to do with forming each other's opinions; and you have held them earlier than Newman probably, and far longer and consistently than ourselves'.[1] However, on many issues he differed from some of the Tract writers, eg., the Hampden case; the case for disestablishment of the Church; the question of imparting religious knowledge; the formation of the Protestant Bishopric in Jerusalem and several more. He was unhappy about 'Froude's Remains' in part, and also with some of the Tracts themselves including the notorious number 90. But the attitude and behaviour of the enemies of the Tractarians made him loyal to them despite his private misgivings. Hook wrote a letter to the Bishop of Ripon on the State of Parties in the Church in 1841, on the occasion of four tutors and the Hebdomadal Board condemning Tract 90. Hook had, in fact, been about to write a pamphlet showing the errors of Tract 90, but when he heard that the writer was to be silenced, not by argument but by usurped authority, he renounced his intention and resolved to stand with the author.[2] In his letter Walter Hook had, in the heat of the moment, (with local troubles as well as Tract 90), spoken rather rashly that the time had come for High Churchmen to act together as a party. In a letter to his close friend C. Anderson, Samuel Wilberforce acknowledged that Hook's letter had pained him deeply. 'It is

[1]H.P. Liddon: Life of E.B. Pusey, ii 40.

[2]Fairweather (Ed.): The Oxford Movement, p.158.

the very opposite of his own 'Call to Union', and it seems to me really quite dreadful that he should avow that he thinks it a duty to split into a part'.[1] Dr Hook's letter was the occasion of Dr F.D. Maurice's 'reasons for not joining a party in the Church'. We read in the biography of F.D. Maurice, 'Dr Hook, who never sympathised with any of my opinions and knew little of me personally, yet wrote to me afterwards with characteristic generosity, that in this instance I had been right and he had been wrong. The confession was far more honourable to him than to me, but no praise bestowed on me personally could have pleased me so much'.[2] Walter Hook's reaction to Tract 90 brings out two of his characteristics which recur again and again in his life; his impulsive, sometimes dogmatic nature, and above all his kind, generous, humble and forgiving spirit.

After other blows which befell him, John Henry Newman left the Anglican Church in October 1845, and he was followed by many lesser spirits. These included nine out of the first fifteen Clergy,who laboured at St Saviour's, Leeds, a church founded by Pusey himself in an area which was once part of Dr Hook's parish before the passing of the Leeds Vicarage Act in 1844. The story of St Saviour's will be told in the next Chapter, it being sufficient to note here that the whole incident estranged Dr Hook from Dr Pusey and other leading Tractarians, weakened Dr Hook's position with the Evangelicals and caused him thereafter to regard Rome as the primary enemy and not the Evangelicals or Dissenters. Then many of Samuel Wilberforce's

[1]A. Ashwell: Life of S. Wilberforce, I, p.196.

[2]F. Maurice: Life of F.D. Maurice, I, p.238.

relatives seceded and after the Gorham judgement Henry Manning and many others also joined Rome. The influx of large numbers of Irish Roman Catholic immigrants and the creation of a Roman Catholic hierarchy in Britain (1850) also tended to make Dr Hook 'Rome conscious' more than 'Protestant conscious' in his sermons and lectures after the late 1840's. Dr Hook was well compared by Samuel Wilberforce to a ship at anchor, which, though stationary, swings round to present its breast to the tide. As Carpenter says 'At this time he swung back strongly in the anti-Roman direction, but it didn't prevent him from being suspected. He became for a time estranged from Pusey, and he described his own difficult position by quoting, with much justice, a sentence of Alexander Knox, "You can easily conceive that, when anyone stands at a middle point between two others who are in respect to him strictly equidistant, he must, from the inevitable laws of perspective, appear to both, not to be in the middle, but comparatively near the opposite party"'.[1]

Dr Hook's views didn't change substantially from his Whippingham days to the time of his death. As the Guardian sums up the position 'While he thus acted with the great Tractarian leaders, his theological position was undoubtedly somewhat different from theirs. He took it up from the first, and in all substantial points he held it unchanged to the last, while other minds were passing through various phases of belief around him. His sermon, preached the year after his appointment to Leeds at the primary visitation of the first Bishop of Ripon, was "a call to Union on the Principles of the English Reformation". It was then but the fuller and bolder enunciation of principles

[1]S.C. Carpenter: Church and People (part 2, Chapter 8, p.204).

before advanced; it is still (we believe) absolutely identical with the principles again and again maintained in the last pages which he wrote'.[1]

(e) Leeds 1837-1859.

Leeds with 123,393 people at the 1831 census, was growing rapidly, and as in the case of other great towns, Church provision was wholly inadequate. In the township of Leeds (excluding the surrounding villages which were rapidly being absorbed into the town) there were 88,000 people, with Church accomodation for only 13,000 people, of which as a result of the pew rent system only 5,500 seats were free. Dissent was very strong in Leeds and the Church of England was mainly Evangelical. Side by side with the wealth of the new rich were squalid slums, where most of the people lived; poverty, ignorance, disease and unemployment were all rampant. A Leeds Mercury writer years later commented, 'In some respects Dr Hook might have been thought unsuited to Leeds, and Leeds unsuited to him. A man of literary tastes, he might have preferred a sphere in which there would have been more opportunities for their cultivation; a decided Churchman, he might have inclined to a place where the Church was predominant and nonconformity less powerful. But the very difficulties of the town must have had a fascination for him. He was resolute, energetic, daring, and he found occasion enough for the exercise of all these qualities'.[2] Soon after his appointment to Leeds he took his degree of D.D. at Oxford and preached twice at St Mary's Church;

[1] The Guardian: Obituary of Dr Hook, Wednesday October 27th 1875.
[2] Leeds Mercury: Obituary of Dr Hook, October 21st 1875.

then in June 1837 he began in earnest his great work which lasted for nearly twenty-two years. He soon made an impression by his powerful preaching, enthusiasm for solid hard work and his straightforward, genial manner, all of which had an effect on the Yorkshire folk. 'When Dr Hook came to Leeds, the established Church was at an extremely low ebb in the town, there being very few Churches, and these but scantily attended. He had also to contend on his arrival with a considerable degree of unpopularity and prejudice. These unfortunate prepossessions were, however, overcome on both sides by better acquaintance, and the new Vicar soon gained "golden opinions from all sorts of people", eventually becoming in fact one of the most popular and influential men in Leeds. His powers as an able and eloquent preacher attracted crowded congregations to the old Parish Church, whilst the energy and zeal with which he threw himself into the general work in Leeds, gave the Church a much needed and lasting impulse'.[1] He skilfully handled the Church Rate controversy and in reply to a speech by Giles, a Baptist preacher, which contained personal abuse, Dr Hook said that the most brilliant eloquence without charity is only a sounding brass, but that he would act upon a High Church principle, namely, forgiveness, and with that he shook the astonished Mr Giles by the hand.[2] Most of the Churchwardens were Dissenters or men otherwise indifferent to the interests of the Church. But by firm but fair methods Dr Hook got on with them and was able to make changes beneficial to the dignity of the Church. Soon after his arrival in Leeds he prevented them from putting their hats

[1] Ibid.

[2] W.R.W. Stephens: Dean Hook, Vol. 1, p.377.

and coats on the Holy Table when they came together for a vestry meeting. When the Wardens, anxious to keep down the Church Rate, refused to replace old surplices and service books, Dr Hook promptly called in Archdeacon Musgrave, who had legal power to compel them to act. When Dr Hook arrived in Leeds in 1837 there were only two curates at the Parish Church and thus the staff spent most of their time in baptizing, marrying, churching and burying large numbers of people. Thus in 1843 alone there were 1,810 baptisms at the Parish Church! He wanted the load of this work to be reduced so that the clergy had more time for other parts of their ministry. This was done at first by appointing more curates and also later (in 1844) by the passing of the Leeds Vicarage Act, whereby the huge parish of Leeds was sub-divided into many smaller parishes. The curates in 1837 were not keen on saying the daily offices in the Church and hoped to discourage any would-be congregation so that they might omit this part of their duty. Dr Hook did the curates duty himself for a whole week to show how he wanted it to be done. He chose new curates carefully, wanting men with views similar to his own and with a like willingness to spend and be spent in the service of their divine Master. The number of communicants went up tenfold during his first few years at Leeds. This is because he taught his people well, had more frequent celebrations of Holy Communion and encouraged his people to be confirmed. Since the refounding of the See of Ripon in 1836, which was carved out of the former huge diocese of York, the Bishop could get round more frequently than previously. With the completion of the new Parish Church (1841), two daily choral services were introduced, with a large surpliced choir and first rate music, Samuel Sebastian Wesley

being made organist. The musical tradition of Leeds Parish Church has been maintained to this day and the Church closely resembles a modern Cathedral, being much more a focal point to the diocese than the ancient Cathedral Church of Ripon. Canon E Jackson, Vicar of St James', Leeds, formerly a curate at Leeds Parish Church under Dr Hook, describes the occupation of an ordinary day there in his work 'A Pastor's Recollections'. 'We rose at 6 a.m. and within a few minutes were assembled for a short service, wherein we blessed God for our preservation through the night, and dedicated ourselves afresh to His service for that day. At 7.30 a.m. two of us were at Church, beginning the early morning service which was regularly attended by a few earnest souls, both young and old, rich and poor, some of whom came from a considerable distance. Before breakfast we had our own family worship. At 9 a.m. the day schools had to be opened with prayers, and afterwards religious instruction given to the elder scholars. From school the transition was naturally to the district, where the anxiously expected visits were made until 10.30, at which hour those of us who had not been to Morning Prayers had to hasten to Church to take the ordinary forenoon service, preceded by marriages and followed by Baptisms and Churchings; while the others continued to visit in their districts. In the afternoon at 3 p.m. came Baptisms again, with Churchings and Burials, and a full choral service; the latter to be repeated at 7.30 p.m. but now only read for the convenience of working people and others, who could not attend earlier. At the last service in Church only one curate was usually present, the rest being otherwise fully occupied: some with classes of candidates for Confirmation, or of communicants; others at evening schools, but all in one way or another.

It was usually 10 p.m. before we had wearily reached home, to eat our simple supper, have our night devotions, and go gladly to rest. Every day, as it has been shown, had its full share of work and Sunday, however sacred, was no sabbath, being the day the least of all the seven a day of rest'.[1] This hard work was even more than shared by Dr Hook, who was usually working in his study by 5.30 a.m. He recommended this practice of early rising in a course of sermons at Oxford in 1858 on the duties of the young pastor. Dr Hook, as I have said, carefully chose his curates and rarely made a wrong choice. A curate in 1846 (Rev. E Jackson) on seeing a new curate for the first time, felt the man to be too much of a dandy and totally unsuitable for working among the slums of Leeds. However, this particular curate, the Rev. W.S. Monck, laboured unceasingly on the Bank, the very worst district of Leeds, between York Road and the river, and died of the Irish fever in 1847 after ministering to the fever-ridden Irish immigrants day by day.[2] Dr Hook once said to a Curate of his 'Oh! God grant for his dear ~~sonn's~~ Son's sake that we, my dear good friend, may meet in his everlasting kingdom, and there be able to look back on past trials and dangers with that delight with which those who have been saved from shipwreck look back upon the stormy ocean'.[3]

In June 1838 Dr Hook preached at the Chapel Royal, before the young Queen the famous sermon 'Hear the Church'. This sermon caused much excitement and ran through twenty-eight

[1]The New Curate: E Jackson (1890) in a volume 'Pastor's Recollections' in Leeds Reference Library.

[2]Ibid.

[3]W.R.W. Stephens: Dean Hook, Vol. 2, p.123.

editions, in which a hundred thousand copies were sold! It was an old sermon from his country days reused with slight modifications to show the young sovereign the claims, the character and the privileges of the Church of which, in the providence of God, she had been called to be the Temporal head. He selected the sermon because, being aware that the Queen was surrounded by the Whig Government, many of whose members had misconceptions about the Church, he felt it his duty to do his best to show her the truth about the Church. He showed that the Church was above and beyond the establishment. The dissolution of the tie between Church and State, while it would harm the State and Monarchy, could not vitally impair the energies of the Church. The Bishop of Exeter told Dr Hook that he greatly enjoyed the sermon but that the Queen had first been displeased with it, but that another source said that it had greatly interested her as being something both new and momentous.[1] The idea that the sermon had offended the Queen stuck, thus we read in something written nearly forty years later 'At the same time, he was as far as possible from being an Establishmentarian. His denunciation of merely Establishmentarian principles, illustrated by a marked contrast between the English and Scottish Establishments, and his carefulness to ignore the secular power of the Crown in his description of the work of the English Reformation, were probably the chief grounds of offence in his celebrated sermon 'Hear the Church', preached in the Chapel Royal as early as 1838'.[2] The old Parish Church of Leeds was not only in urgent need of repair

[1] W.R.W. Stephens: Dean Hook, Vol. 1, p.430.

[2] The Guardian: Obituary of Dr Hook, 27th October 1875.

but also it was unsuitable for worship, for during the celebration of Holy Communion the congregation was quite cut off from the sight of the altar.[1] Late in 1837 after a public meeting it was decided to renovate the Church, but upon inspection it was found to be so unsafe that there was no alternative but to pull it down and build an entirely new Church. Dr Hook had much influence on the type of new Church to be built; he wanted a very large Church with a fairly central pulpit and a wide altar and altar steps which could be seen from most points. In 1841 the Church was consecrated by Dr Longley of Ripon in the presence of the aged Metreopolitan Vernon Harcourt of York and a Scottish and American Bishop. Dr Hook, right from the days of his first curacy, had always had a deep interest in these two comparatively small and non-established Episcopal Churches - Churches which were a living proof that Anglicanism was above and beyond being merely the established religion of England. As the Guardian said, 'The Parish Church was rebuilt with a splendour often since surpassed, but then unexampled, and its opening festival of services, with a great gathering of Bishops and Clergy, and amidst the rejoicing of the whole town, marked a new Church era'.[2] Dr Hook wanted to divide Leeds into many parishes and himself only to be the Vicar of St. Peter's. For of twenty-One Churches in the parish of Leeds in 1844, eighteen were curacies without cure of souls. Dr Hook wanted to relieve the great extra burden on the Clergy of the Parish Church that this situation imposed by making these clergy responsible for the cure of souls and enabling them to reside

[1]Archdeacon Stranks: Dean Hook, p.54.

[2]The Guardian: Obituary of Dr Hook, 27th October 1875.

near their Churches. The Church Commissioners supported him in the main but Dr Hook had to threaten to abandon the whole scheme if they wouldn't assent to his proposal that 'no Church should be constituted a Parish Church unless the floor was declared absolutely free'. This Act was passed in August 1844 and the whole scheme was instigated by Dr Hook despite the fact that his income, patronage and power diminished.

Dr Hook's educational interest, which has already been noted in his work at Moseley, Birmingham and Coventry, was continued on a larger scale at Leeds, both in his practical parochial work, and also in speeches, letters and pamphlets. This work will only be briefly outlined at this point as a whole chapter - and, indeed, the longest in this work - will be devoted entirely to it. In 1838 Dr Hook made a speech at a Conservative banquet held in Leeds, on behalf of Sir Robert Peel's Government which had just been defeated. He was alarmed at a small but able body of Secularists who disliked all religion in education. He also opposed those politicians who wanted to finance schools by robbing the Church, ably showing that all that the Church possessed had been given her by pious benefactors in the past and not by some parliamentary transfer of property at the Reformation. Being a realist Dr Hook believed that one day the State would have to undertake the education of the people. Because of the many denominations found in England, the State being fair to its subjects, would either have to give a secular kind of education, or some form of diluted religious education which would make people 'Nothingarians' and probably unchistianize the country. Of these two possibilities Dr Hook favoured the former and proposed to supplement it by the Church and Sects undertaking the religious side of education within

the State school. Thus even as early as 1838 he had conceived of the plan which he propounded in full in his letter to the Bishop of St David's in 1846. He also wanted a new Board of Education for Leeds, including the clergy and a committee of laymen appointed by the Bishop. He hoped that this Board would raise more money for education, form a training school for Masters, and also institute a commercial school.

Dr Hook loved teaching, and of the 1,000 candidates presented for Confirmation in 1840, he had taught 256 in his own classes. He once said in a letter, 'of all the happiest employments of a pastor's life, the happiest is that of preparing young people for Confirmation. I do love to be in communion with youthful minds. I can thoroughly enter into their feelings and difficulties'.[1] He spent much time raising money and doing other things in order to build schools and churches. 'We must never rest', he wrote in 1844, 'until we have provided for every poor man a pastor, and for every poor child a school'. His enthusiasm for catechizing is shown in a letter declining to pay a visit which included a Sunday, to Archbishop Vernon Harcourt. 'I catechize upwards of 1,000 children every Sunday afternoon, and I have succeeded in making this duty interesting to a large congregation. I am pursuing a course of catechetical instruction, so that I could not delegate the duty to another, and any interruption of the course, until the custom is fully established, would be injurious'.[2]

In 1843 Lord Ashley told the House of Commons that above 1 million children in England and Wales had no education

[1] W.R.W. Stephens: Dean Hook, Vol. 2, p.13.

[2] Ibid. Vol. 2, p.116.

at all and he advocated that the State should spend far more than the mere £30,000 a year which she was at that time spending on National Education. As a result of Lord Ashley's speech the Government prepared a Bill, aiming at the compulsory education of pauper children and those who were employed in factories. Despite modifications made by the Government, the Dissenters still condemned the proposed Bill, with the result that its Educational clauses had to be dropped. Dr Hook, in 1843, wrote letters both to Mr Gladstone and Archdeacon Wilberforce suggesting that the best thing for the Church to do was to take the education of nearly all the people into her own hands. Only a very few people would object on conscientious grounds and these would support schools for themselves. All that was needed was money, but if Bishops in particular and also clergy and laity made real sacrifices, it could be done. Dr Hook gradually realized that the Church wasn't willing to make such a momentous sacrifice, so he fell back with renewed vigour on the view he had already propounded in 1838, namely that the State should provide a secular education and give access at stated times to Clergy of the Church and Dissenting Ministers in order to give doctrinal teaching. Dr Hook supported Lord Ashley's proposed ten hours Factory Bill (1844) on moral, medical and educational grounds despite the risk of losing the favour of wealthy manufacturers. He said 'It is impossible to train children in the way they ought to go unless we have more time to train them'. In his famous pamphlet 'How to render more efficient the education of the People', addressed to the Bishop of St David's in 1846, Dr Hook tried to convince Churchmen and Dissenters that it was beyond the power of voluntary efforts to provide an education adequate in quantity and quality

to the needs of the population. Therefore the State should provide schools in which secular instruction should be given. Every child should bring weekly a certificate to show attendance at the Sunday school of his denomination, and on Wednesday and Friday afternoons the Clergy and Ministers should give religious instruction to the children of their respective flocks. While Kay-Shuttleworth, the Secretary of the Board of Education, welcomed this pamphlet coming from such a source, despite personal misgivings, its general reception was negative both among the leaders of the Church and of Dissent. Kay-Shuttleworth then wrote to Dr Hook saying that his pamphlet had 'overwhelmed in disgrace and shame the advocates of antiquated nonsense.' In that age of laissez-faire many Churchmen and Dissenters opposed Dr Hook's assertion of the necessity of interference by the State. On top of this many Churchmen were dismayed at his assertion that the Church of England didn't have an exclusive claim as the establishment to financial support from the Government. Many opposed his proposal to sever Education into two parts - Secular and Religious, believing that the religious element would lose all its efficacy if it was relegated to certain days instead of pervading the teaching of the whole school daily. However, despite the statements of Baines, the Editor of the Leeds Mercury, and others, it was an objective fact that the voluntary bodies had by a long way fallen short of universal Education and that the standard of Education was low. It was also correct to recognize the just rights of non-Anglicans, who now formed a large part of the total population, as Mann's religious census of 1851 was to show. In answer to the criticism that Dr Hook's scheme would departmentalize Education into Secular and Religious elements it should be noted that he expected

all the Masters, being religious men, to exercise a religious influence as much as anyone could be justly expected to do when teaching secular subjects.

Dr Hook welcomed the new system of Pupil Teachers (1846), working under trained and certified teachers, replacing the old system of monitors and unskilled teachers. In a speech delivered at a Leeds meeting in 1847, Dr Hook supported the Government's intention of increasing the Grant for popular Education to the sum of £100,000 a year. Edward Baines M.P, being the leader of the Voluntaryists, was of course against this proposal, and in the Leeds meeting he won the resolution against the Government's proposals, as was to be expected, but Dr Hook used great eloquence saying 'In a word I call upon you to assist the Government to empty gaols by building schools'. The Secularists became stronger by 1850 and founded the 'National Public Schools Association'. They tried but failed to get legislation through Parliament setting up Secular schools while at the same time giving no help to Church schools. Dr Hook wrote to Wood in 1850 informing him of the Lancashire school scheme and a similar newer one in Yorkshire. He gave a prophetic word of warning 'The evil I wished to avert will come to pass. If we don't look about us we shall have secular schools established by the Government and controlled by ratepayers, to which we shall be denied access. If we had moved first, our offer might have been liberal but we should have gained control of the schools'.[1] Among the proposals of a committee of Leeds Clergy with Dr Hook as Chairman (1851), was one to promote popular Education among adults, including the establishment of

[1]W.R.W. Stephens: Dean Hook, Vol.2, p.343.

scientific institutions, reading rooms and libraries. Dr Hook spent much of his time trying to improve by every possible means in his power the moral and intellectual condition of the working classes. He was also very enthusiastic about middle class Education and it was largely through his efforts that Leeds Grammar School was remodelled in 1854. When Dr Hook left Leeds in 1859 the number of Schools and Churches had gone up enormously since his arrival there in 1837, and especially the former. Instead of fifteen Churches there were thirty-six and instead of three Schools there were no less than thirty.

As already briefly mentioned, Dr Hook supported the ten hour movement. He held this view for moral, medical and Educational reasons, for after living among the working classes for a very long time he had both a profound understanding and sympathy for their lot, 'Hook himself gave his complete support, in spite of doubts he seems to have had about the accuracy of some of the evidence given before the Sadler Committee'.[1] 'Hook took a deputation to see Longley, the first Bishop of Ripon. He expressed his sympathy with the movement and promised to give it his support'.[2] The working men of Yorkshire liked Dr Hook's straightforward, genial manner, his blunt speech, hard work and deep sympathy. As a token of their regard for him he became the key arbiter in a Colliers dispute near Leeds in 1858. He opposed the Militia using Woodhouse Moor, a large open space a mile to the north-west of the town centre, and proposed that it should be made a place for recreation. To Dr Hook 'being a friend was never forgotten in the priest, the

[1] J. Gill: The 10 Hours Parson, (SPCK 1959), p.181.

[2] Ibid: p.189.

priest was never forgotten in the friend'. The 'Congregationalist' described Dr Hook as one "who can uphold the authority of the Church and yet show breadth, geniality and tact: who is not afraid of the people, and knows enough of them to get near their hearts, in whom the priest has not extinguished the man, and has sufficient 'savoir faire' to preserve him from the fatal blunder into which strong Evangelicals and extreme Sacerdotalists are alike apt to fall".[1] At the end of the article the 'Congregationalist' admits "The Congegational Ministers of the day were men of eminence and power, honoured in the town and esteemed throughout the kingdom, well able to cope with the Vicar on all points of controversy, but deficient of that skill of dealing with people which he so largely possessed".[2] Dr Hook also gave very sound pastoral advice to any who were in need of help. Owing to lack of space only two examples will be given to illustrate this. In August 1858 he wrote to an introspective invalid a long letter of comfort and advice, a summary of which will be given: 'Look out from yourself to Jesus. Have no thought about yourself, think of your God, and how you can serve him by submission to his will. His will is that you should now serve him without any pleasure in his service, with coldness, almost deadness of heart. Was not our Lord so tried? Shut your eyes and say, "If it be possible, O Father, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, let not my will but thine be done". Holy Communion will help you most in getting out of yourself and thinking of your Heavenly Father, but don't self-examine yourself before Holy

[1]The Congregationalist quoted in Leeds Mercury, Oct. 21st 1875. (obituary of Dr Hook).

[2]Ibid.

Communion as usual but meditate on our Lord's sufferings.'[1] In a letter to a friend (1841) on the theme 'obedience is better than opinions' he said, "If in their endeavours to become more holy, some shall be led into absurdities (as you think them), whether methodistic or popish absurdities, condemn them not, until you hope that you have become as holy as they".[2]

Dr Pusey, after his wife's death in 1839, decided to build a Church both in her memory and as an act of penitence. He chose Leeds for the place for this Church because he wanted to help Dr Hook in his efforts to capture that rapidly growing great town for the Church. In 1844 Dr Hook and Dr Pusey again co-operated in a scheme of Lord John Manners to found the first Community of Sisters at Park Village West in London. Bishop Blomfield, after consulting Archbishop Howley, allowed the scheme to go ahead and soon there were Sisters teaching, running an orphanage and visiting labourers houses. However, it should be noted that the Bishop's caution was justified because the first Superior and some of the Sisters seceded to Rome.[3] Dr Pusey's scheme for the new Church in the worst area of Leeds had even more alarming consequences. The name of the Church 'St Cross' was changed to 'St Saviour's' because of the objections of Bishop Longley of Ripon. The consecration occurred ominously in October 1845, just a fortnight after Newman's secession, and just before this service the Bishop objected to an inscription over the West door 'Ye who enter this holy place, pray for the sinner who built it'. Dr Longley

[1] W.R.W. Stephens: Dean Hook, Vol. 2. p.372.

[2] Ibid. Vol. 2. p.125.

[3] O. Chadwick: The Victorian Church, Part 1, p.505.

made this objection because when the founder died it implied the acceptance of the notion of prayers for the dead. However, the Bishop gave way and the inscription remained. The Rev. R. Ward, the first Vicar of St Saviour's, a former curate under Dr Hook at the Parish Church, now began to move much more in a Romeward direction. Dr Pusey sent R. MacMullen from Oxford to be Ward's curate but he was more extreme still and almost at once preached that the Virgin Mary and all the Saints are making perpetual intercession for us. Dr Hook wrote a bitter letter to Dr Pusey (December 1846), 'I complain of your building a Church, and getting a foot in my parish to propagate principles which I detest, having come under the plea of assisting me in propagating principles which I uphold'.[1] Then on New Year's Day 1847 MacMullen and four others from St Saviour's seceded to Rome, Pusey apologized to Hook and the latter replied in a conciliatory tone, but pointed out that the damage done would be hard to repair. In 1847 Ward resigned and later went over to Rome, in 1848 a curate at the Parish Church went over to Rome, and by 1851 nine out of the first fifteen clergy to serve at St Saviour's had seceded. In the height of the troubles Dr Hook had written to Archdeacon Manning warning him that if he, Pusey, Keble and others preached at St Saviour's then he would have to say publicly what he had only said very privately before, that he disagreed with them.[2] To be fair to Dr Hook he was only angry because he felt that all his work of inculcating High Church principles would be ruined because of the

[1]Quoted in 'The Anglican Revival' by J.H. Overton, Ch. 7.

[2]Purcell: Life of Cardinal Manning, Vol. 1, pp.326-8.

secessions. After the expected reaction to the secessions by the Evangelicals, Dr Hook warned his people that, by the malignant, the events at St Saviour's would be represented as the results of principles inculcated from the pulpit of the Parish Church. It is good to know that in 1873 Dr Hook sent an affectionate message through Liddon to Dr Pusey and got a similar reply.

In 1848, as a result of all his troubles, his health failed and he had a rest for a few months. The Gorham case, with all its intricacies, went on from 1847 to 1850, and because a secular court favoured Gorham in the final judgement, many went over to Rome. While the particular views held by Gorham and the Bishop of Exeter might have had something to do with this, the primary factor was that to some the Church appeared to subside into a mere department of State. Among those who seceded at this time was Henry Manning. Dr Hook commented about those who thus joined Rome, 'they look with a magnifying glass at every gnat which annoys them in the Church of England and shut their eyes to the many camels they will have to swallow if they join Rome'. During these years Dr Hook faced Rome rather than the Protestant sects as the main foe of the Church of England. A list of his published works in Crockford (1876) reveals this to us. Thus he had published a sermon on the Mother of our Lord and Mariolatry (1847); The Invocation of Saints a Romish Sin (1847), and the Nonentity of Romish Saints and the Inanity of Romish Ordinances (1849). In 1859 Dr Hook resigned at Leeds and became Dean of Chichester. He was very depressed about leaving Leeds but at the same time he felt too old to keep up with such an exacting position. The headmaster of Leeds Grammar School (Dr Barry) made a speech and then Dr and

Mrs Hook were given very generous presents by the people. He left the great town which had previously been a stronghold of dissent, now after twenty-two years of hard labour, as a stronghold of the Church, having fulfilled what he said in a letter to W.P. Wood in 1837, 'I know that many better persons may be obtained for Leeds than I am, but certainly there can be none more desirous of doing his duty to his God, his Saviour, and his Church'.

(f) Chichester 1859-1875.

It took Dr Hook some time to adjust to his new work at Chichester which was very different in most respects from his work at Leeds. Extensions and a rearrangement of the Cathedral was in progress when he arrived there. Dr Hook wished to fill the Cathedral first and get a desire for extension from the congregation afterwards; thus he wrote to Prebendary Swainson, 'Our first object should be to win souls to the Lord Jesus Christ'.[1] However, as this work of extension began before he came, he allowed it to continue. He examined the Acts of Chapter to find out all that his job as Dean entailed, and after only a fortnight at Chichester he insisted on two sermons on Sunday (instead of the previous one) and he made himself responsible for the afternoon one. His literary work was his dominating activity during the last years of his life and in September 1859 he began his 'Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury from Augustine to Howley'. He had always had a literary interest and he had many published works, mainly sermons, the first one being the sermon before the Bishop of Winchester, at Newport

[1] W.R.W. Stephens: Dean Hook, Vol. 2, p.394.

in 1822. His longest work (before his Lives of the Archbishops) was a huge Ecclesiastical Biography compiled in eight volumes between 1845 and 1852 in the midst of his very busy ministry at Leeds. His first two volumes on the Archbishops were rather unfavourably judged, but he got on with volumes three and four on the thirteenth and fourteenth century Archbishops and when they came out in 1865 they were more favourably acclaimed. He failed to finish his mammoth task, but he did get as far as the life of Juxon by the summer of 1875. About his writing the Guardian said, 'The noblest part of his life is undoubtedly the wonderful pastoral work of his great parish at Leeds. But few men who have done so much practical duty have found leisure and thought for literary work of a high degree of excellence - work which certainly fills an important niche in ecclesiastical literature, and will speak of him, when the fresh remembrance of his active life has passed away. He felt, in fact, no separation between the two kinds of work; they reacted upon and aided each other. The Church may be well thankful for both'.[1]

On February 22nd 1861 Chichester Cathedral spire fell and this unfortunate event involved him for a time in begging, attending committees, and making speeches, which he had hoped to escape from when he retired from Leeds. He gave a year's income for restoration work and his finances were for a time at quite a low ebb. The Guardian said about the falling of the Cathedral spire, 'It seemed as if the tower waited to fall till there was a Dean to whom the rebuilding of it was by comparison an easy task'.[2] He made a few visits to Leeds

[1] The Guardian: Obituary of Dr Hook, Wednesday October 27th 1875.
[2] Ibid.

during the eighteen-sixties, visits which moved him greatly but which also left him exhausted. His radical and liberal views came out clearly in his opinions on many of the issues of the day. He favoured the extension of the franchise to the working classes, the right of Jews to be members of Parliament, and the disestablishment of the Irish Church. He criticised those who wanted to withold the salary of F.D. Maurice at Oxford Chapel in St Marylebone, and, while he disliked extreme ritualism, he objected to repressive legislation against ritualists. In 1845 Dr Hook had, after much deliberating, supported the Grant to Maynooth and by the time of Mr Gladstone's Bill for the disestablishment of the Irish Church, he had long been amenable to the idea. He felt that an Established Church which didn't contain more than one-seventh of the whole population had no right to be kept in its present position and he even would have welcomed a proposal to make the Roman Catholic Church the Established Church of Ireland. All his life Dr Hook saw the advantages and disadvantages of the Church of England being Established. Thus when he favoured opening up Parliament to Jews and Heretics, he moved again towards disestablishment because of the incongruity of such a Parliament legislating for the Church. The alternative was for the Church to be able to make more of her own decisions outside Parliament. Mr Gladstone offered Dr Hook other Deaneries including Canterbury (January 1871) but because of the illness of his wife and his own age he turned them down. In May 1871 Mrs Hook died, and during his last few years he was cared for by his youngest son and daughter-in-law, while continuing preaching once a week in his Cathedral and continuing his Lives of the Archbishops until the very end (October 1875).

One might fairly ask why it was that a man with Dr Hook's ability, industry, faith and geniality in personal relationships, was never raised to the Episcopal Bench. One reason was his belief in plain, straightforward speaking, even when it might be to his detriment in influential circles. He said in a letter to W.P. Wood in 1857, 'If I had made high preferment my object, I have that mediocrity of talent which might have enabled me to obtain my end. I deliberately preferred another course: I determined from my youth to support my own opinions, and without restraint I, with my eyes wide open, made myself what all Governments would regard as an unsafe man'. His sermon 'Hear the Church' exalted the Church over the State and the Monarchy, and some said that it displeased the Queen. 'This was the time of the Famous sermon 'Hear the Church', which nowadays would hardly provoke question, but which then spread like wildfire through the country, raised a storm of controversy, and was said (we know not with what truth) to have been the reason why he was never placed in the position which he seemed, of all men in England, fittest to occupy'.[1] Although the Guardian also says 'That he should have been excluded from the Episcopate was an injustice, which others felt deeply for him, and which he must have felt sometimes for himself',[2] I feel that he made his choice with his eyes open and was happy with his lot. Archbishop Vernon Harcourt chided him for speaking out too freely; 'If you don't mind your tongue and pen' he said 'you'll never get on'. His answer was, 'I am in the place that exactly suits me: I don't want to get on, and I would rather

[1] The Guardian: Obituary of Dr Hook, October 27th 1875.
[2] Ibid.

speak out my mind'.[1] Dr Hook's famous pamphlet on Education (1846) probably prevented him from being translated to the Episcopal Bench. He annoyed many Churchmen in separating secular from religious education, in stressing the shortcomings of Church Education and, above all, in asserting that the Church didn't have an exclusive claim as the Establishment, to financial support from the State.

Thus on October 20th 1875, after a few days illness, during which he said to his son, 'I cannot pray much, but I can trust implicitly in my Saviour', he died, and was buried beside his wife at Mid-Lavant near Chichester. In its tribute the Guardian said, 'With a faith in Christ simple, deep and vivid, manifested alike in the outer life of labour and the inner life of devotion - he did a great work, for God first, and then for the Church of England, which, in our generation has certainly never been surpassed, if it has been equalled'. And at the end - 'But even thus, 'being dead he yet speaketh'. We thank God for such men. We pray that he will raise them up to us again and again'.[2]

The Yorkshire Post finished its eulogy with special reference to the work of Dr Hook in Leeds, 'The name of Hook will ever be treasured by the Church he adorned; in this town it will always be a watchword of encouragement for the present and hope for the future'.[3]

The writer of this short work remembers as a child in the Second World War, the great statue of "t'owd Doctor" as

[1]W.R.W. Stephens: Dean Hook, Vol. 2, p.476.

[2]The Guardian, October 27th 1875.

[3]Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer, Obituary of Dr Hook, October 21st 1875.

it then stood in the City Square, with his hand outstretched blessing the people, and remembers the security that sight gave. An appropriate ending is to quote the words of Dean Stephens at the end of his preface to the Life of Dr Hook. 'The life which it has fallen to my lot to portray was a singularly noble life. I would fain hope that not a few of those who shall read the record may be stirred up by the perusal to emulate the life'.

Chapter 2.

Educational progress during Dr Hook's lifetime.

(a) The state of elementary Education before 1800.

Before the Reformation, and indeed afterwards, until as late as the reign of Charles II, the Church was the only provider of Education. During this period it was universally believed that Education is a unity centred on religion, allowing for no distinction between the religious and the secular. This concept was still accepted by an influential portion of the Church of England in the nineteenth century, and it figures largely in the educational wrangling and disputes of that period. During Charles II reign Dissenting academics grew up and eventually the Episcopal licence was no longer essential for schools and teachers. The Church's grasp on Education became weaker still during the eighteenth century because of the Act of Toleration (1689), and the ascendancy of the Whigs, who depended on the political support of the Dissenters, after 1714. During the last two decades of the eighteenth century both the number and the proportion of the Dissenters in the population began to grow rapidly, and as these were mainly of the middle classes, the Church of England became primarily the Church of the Aristocracy and the poor. N. Hans said that because of this situation 'the leaders of the Church were unable to conceive a national system of Education; for them the Education of the two classes had to be separate and of different content. For the ruling classes Grammar School and University; for the poor Charity

schools of an elementary nature'.[1] In the late seventeenth century there had been a big rise in the number of Charity schools for the poor, hence in 1698, the year the S.P.C.K was founded, which supported and encouraged the work, there were 460 of them. These schools, which provided a basic elementary education, and were unevenly distributed, there being more in the London area than elsewhere, numbered 1400 by the year 1729. The Pupil-Teacher method of recruitment of teachers was sometimes used by these schools. Unfortunately these schools declined in the latter part of the eighteenth century, mainly because of the increased use of child labour at a very early age, in the rapidly growing number of factories resulting from the Industrial Revolution. The Sunday School movement began about 1780, one of its pioneers being Robert Raikes of Gloucester. The Evangelical Revival was behind this movement both within and outside the Church of England. These schools had the double advantage that they didn't hinder factory work and that many middle class, voluntary teachers were found for them. There were 844,728 Sunday School children in 1803, but while these schools made a very valuable contribution to Education, obviously not enough could be done on one day a week.

(b) Elementary Education 1800-1833.

State intervention in Education began with Sir Robert Peel, the Elder's, very limited Health and Morals of Apprentices Bill (1802). This Bill, which was carried, applied only to Apprentices sent from Workhouses by Public Authorities. They should be taught the three R's during part of the working day,

[1] H.J. Burgess: Enterprise in Education, Ch. 1, Origins of the Enterprise.

Religious Instruction for one hour on Sunday, and to Church at least once a month. As well as being limited in scope there was no machinery for enforcing this Bill, but at least it was a beginning. In 1804 Sir T Bernard made proposals to stretch the benefits of endowed schools over a greater number of children. He aimed to do this by investigating endowments and hoped to extend the poor law to provide rate support for parish schools. In 1807 Whitbread brought forward his Bill allowing for the establishment of rate aided schools, under the supervision of the Clergy in every parish. The Commons accepted this Bill but the Lords rejected it partly because they thought it didn't safeguard the interests of the Established Church. Whitbread had aimed at the free education of all poor children, but he alienated many who, while supporting popular education, disliked any state legislation. Others, it must be admitted, were hostile to the very idea of education for the masses. Some thought that the education of the poor was a danger to the State, while others under Lord Brougham thought that lack of education for the poor was dangerous. Many disagreed with Thomas Carlyle when he said 'Who would suppose that Education were a thing which had to be advocated on the ground of local expediency; or indeed in any ground? As if it stood not on the basis of everlasting duty, as a prime necessity of man'.[1] Many agreed with Cobbett who once asked why you should teach a ploughboy to read and write when these accomplishments would be useless for mounting a carthorse. Even in the Church, early in the nineteenth century, there was some feeling against popular education. The portrayal of the squire saying to his clerical

[1]Sir L. Woodward: The Age of Reform, Book 4, Ch.2, p474. (from T Carlyle: Chartism).

crony 'you keep 'em ignorant, and I'll keep 'em poor'[1] was in some places unfortunately not far from the truth. The Archdeacon of Stowe was by no means alone among clerics when he saw a danger in any attempt being made to take the minds of the poor from manual employment which went with their occupation in life. The State then was not yet ready as it was in some continental countries to undertake even partially the education of the poor. Education by voluntary means was an expensive business and it probably wouldn't have extended very far without the widespread use of the Monitorial system. Dr Andrew Bell (1753-1832), an Anglican Clergyman, and Joseph Lancaster (1778-1838), a Quaker, both seemed to stumble upon an educational plan independently of each other in the latter years of the nineteenth century. In 1789 Bell became superintendent of the Madras Male Orphan Asylum, where he began the Madras system, which was a system of using the elder children to teach the juniors. He published an account of his system in 1797, became Rector of Swanage in 1801, and spent most of his time in spreading his methods of teaching.

Although Lancaster began his monitorial system about a decade after the work of Bell, his fame spread more rapidly because his work was done in London. The two men were very confident about the value of their systems, Lancaster describing his as 'a new mechanical system for the use of schools', while Bell went further, boastfully saying, 'Give me twenty-four pupils today, and I will give you twenty-four teachers tomorrow'. Despite all its drawbacks, the monitorial system was the only possible system of education in those early years, having the

[1]Desmond Bowen: The Idea of the Victorian Church, Ch. 5, Section 2, p.196.

two vital requirements of being cheap and also, in large measure, being able to combat the acute shortage of teachers. The two men clashed on their approach to Religious Instruction, Lancaster wanting undenominational teaching excluding all distinctive religious formularies, whereas Bell believed that unsectarian religious teaching wasn't religion at all. Most Anglicans agreed with Bell that religious instruction was useless unless it included training in membership of the Church, which meant that the liturgy and catechism of the Church of England must be an integral part of the schools teaching. There was much rivalry and bitterness between Bell and Lancaster, caused partly by the denominational tensions of the day and also by their characters; Woodward describing the former as 'domineering and conceited' and the latter as 'vain and unbalanced'.[1]

In 1808 the Royal Lancasterian Society was founded on general Christian principles, while in 1811 the National Society was founded on a specifically Anglican basis. The Established Church had many enemies in those days and one of these, the famous London tailor Francis Place, who later was instrumental in the repeal of the Combination Laws, said that the Clergy did nothing to found schools until Lancaster's success forced their hand. In fact, many parochial schools existed long before Lancaster's work began but, while his work did not cause the formation of the National Society, it is probable that it hastened an inevitable development. Archbishop Manners Sutton and the High Church Hackney Phalanx, including J Watson and H. Norris, were very active in the foundation and running of the National Society. The aim of the Society was that

[1]Sir L Woodward: The Age of Reform, Book 4, Ch. 2, p.475.

'The National Religion should be made the foundation of National Education and should be the first and chief thing taught to the poor'. This and limited secular instruction, all based on the monitorial system, was the object of the Society at least until the death of Dr Bell and the beginning of State aid in 1833.

In 1814 the Royal Lancasterian Society became the British and Foreign School Society, and this Society, with the National Society grew rapidly, but the latter was always much the larger of the two and the disparity between them became greater as the years went by. But with the rapid rise in population, the stupendous size of the task and the limitation of voluntary funds, the Churches were unable to give an education to every child. Their efforts were made more difficult by the fact that school attendance was voluntary and fees had to be charged to make the schools viable. Added to this was the widespread use of child labour in the factories. In 1816 Lord Brougham urged that a Parliamentary Committee should be set up to inquire into the Education of the lower orders in London. This Committee revealed that there were few Educational facilities, and that where they existed attendance was very irregular. Brougham estimated that 1/8th of the population should be at school whereas in fact overall he found 1/16th of the population at school. The numbers at school varied greatly in different parts of the country, the worst areas being Middlesex with 1/26th of the population at school and Lancashire with 1/24th. As a result of these findings, in 1820 Lord Brougham proposed that schools should be built by manufacturers and maintained by the rates, and by parents who could afford the fees. He wanted all teachers to be members of the Church of England but at the same time no distinctive catechism to be taught in

schools. By this compromise he alienated both Dissenters and Churchmen, and thus his Bill failed. In his Bill Brougham had praised the Church of England for her efforts in Education in recent years, and a Roman Catholic, Walter Murphy said that any stigma attached to the Church of England for its neglect of Education up to 1800 was removed by the efforts of the following years.[1] The aim of the National Society was to plant a school in every parish in England and Wales, even though voluntary subscriptions were its only revenue. In its Grant policy the Society would only give a percentage of the sum needed to build a school. The aim of trying to stimulate local effort rather than to suspend it, arose partly out of the comparatively small sums at the Societies disposal and partly because it was considered to be intrinsically good for a locality to have a large part in financing its own school. Then the locality concerned would be more likely to maintain its school, for the Society made no provision towards a school's running expenses. Grants were also only made on condition that schools were opened free of debt and that the land on which they were built was either freehold or had a long lease. On top of this, before getting aid, schools must teach the catechism of the Church and only use books contained in the S.P.C.K. Catalogue. Normally to obtain a Grant schools had to be day schools and not just Sunday schools, but in the manufacturing areas this rule was modified. At the same time the Society was opposed to schools which didn't open on Sundays. The National Society was keen that girls should have an equal proportion of school places but at the same time it had, in this period, a negative attitude

[1] E Binns: Religion in the Victorian Era, Ch.4, Education to 1843.

towards infants schools. The only satisfactory infants schools during this period were those of Robert Owen at his New Lanark Mills. His influemce in the Educational sphere would have been more widespread if he hadn't opposed religion, as the religious bodies were then the only large scale educators. Although by our standards the Society's schools were overcrowded, nevertheless they were of a high standard for their age, and strict rules were obeyed about ventilation, and height and size of rooms.

A Central School in Baldwin's Gardens, London, founded in 1812 to train teachers, became a model for other central schools. As early as 1813 the Hampshire Society began inspecting schools and masters trained at Baldwin's Gardens went all over the country organizing schools before finally settling down to teach permanently in one themselves. Various works of industry were performed in the schools after the completion of the limited curriculum. By 1832 there were 6,730 Church Schools of which 6,020 had Sunday schools and day schools. Of these 6,730 Church schools only 3,058 were in union with the National Society. While it is not surprising that some Church schools should have avoided entering into union with the National Society because of the Society's insistence on the use of S.P.C.K books or those in the S.P.C.K Catalogue, or for some other reason; what is surprising is that such a large proportion of Church schools were not in union with the National Society. Burgess puts the alternatives clearly, 'Either the Church of England had far more Sunday and day schools in the early nineteenth century than is generally supposed or the National Society's stimulus to Church Education resulted in the formation of other schools equal in number to those called by its name'.[1]

[1]H.J. Burgess: Enterprise in Education. (End of Ch.3).

(c) Elementary Education 1833-1845.

According to H.C. Barnard in 1833 4/10ths of children of school age went to no school, 3/10ths went to Sunday school only, 2/10ths to Dame schools or private day schools, and only 1/10th received a satisfactory education.[1] Again, according to the British Critic 1838, less than 2½ million children were being taught in all schools irrespective of quality, out of nearly 4 million who needed instruction. This state of affairs and the indifference of the Government to literature and science scandalized the Radicals. France at this time was organizing national education, as indeed was Prussia, and several other continental countries. Hence it is not surprising that in 1833 John Roebuck, a disciple of Bentham, laid before the reformed Parliament the educational programme of his group. This plan proposed compulsory education for all between 7 and 14, infant schools, schools of industry, evening schools and a normal school (from the French écoles normales, meaning a training college for masters and mistresses). Administratively it was proposed to divide the nation into Education districts with local school boards democratically elected. In charge of Education there would be a Minister with a seat in the Cabinet, whose duties would include the allocation of funds granted by the State, the power to construct schools and generally supervise Education. Roebuck was opposed by the whole House of Commons irrespective of party and religious affiliation. As Halévy said, 'He was opposed not only by Peel but by Lord Althorp who expressed his fear that a system of State controlled primary education by discouraging private initiative might do more harm

[1] H.C. Barnard: A History of English Education from 1760, Ch. 11.

than good. And if the proposal was attacked by Sir Robert Inglis, a Tory and an orthodox Protestant, O'Connell, who denounced Prussian drill and French impiety, was no whit more friendly'.[1] In 1833 Lord Althorp, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, allocated £20,000 a year to be divided between the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society for the purpose of elementary education. The former Society obtained £11,000 of this money while the latter obtained £9,000; an additional £10,000 being given for elementary education in Scotland. In 1832 a Board of National Education had already been formed in Dublin for Ireland, allocating Grants to schools on condition that extracts from the Bible should be selected so as to give no offence to Catholics, to be read without comment twice a week in school hours. On other days the Bible was not to be read in school hours; thus we have an attempt at co-education of Catholics and Protestants without either separation for religious teaching or its exclusion from school. The condition for the Education Grant in England was that 'no sum was to be contributed from the Grant, unless an equal amount were raised by voluntary contributions'. This stipulation enabled the wealthier National Society to get the lion's share of the State Grant, so after five years the Church got £70,000 and the Dissenters £30,000 from the State. It wasn't only the greater resources of the Church which acquired for it the major share of the State Grant. Some of the Dissenters who, by the 1840's became a formidable group called the 'Voluntaryists' believed that Education should not be controlled or aided by the Government, so they gave their money to schools which didn't

[1] E. Halévy: History of English People in Nineteenth century, Vol. 3, p.106.

apply for the Education Grant. Other Dissenters with much money and not holding the 'Voluntaryist view' gave little to their schools, while the Clergy of the Church gave much, often at the cost of severe self-sacrifice. Both the Radicals and the Dissenters were resentful at the proportion of the State Grants obtained by the Church of England but they were prevented from coming together because the former were, in the main, Free Thinkers who, faithful to the doctrine of Bentham, demanded a secular system of Education, while the latter were ardent supporters of religious instruction. In 1833 a Factory Act was passed stipulating that children of under thirteen years of age should only work eight hours a day and spend two hours a day at school. The measure was defective in that the provision of schools was left to manufacturers and the State provided no money for the children's education, but it was a start. Robert Saunders, the Yorkshire Factory Inspector, approached local clergy with a view to seeking National Society help for such schools. Four schools were selected by the Society for a pilot scheme, in areas where the people were very poor and the factory owners were Dissenters. Thus, as no subscriptions were possible, the National Society was asked to do everything, to build a school, pay salaries, and all other maintenance costs. They did this for eight schools in Yorkshire and for a few more in other areas. While only a few schools were built in this way because of the great expense involved, it does show a major departure from the National Society's normal conditions to places wanting a school. While these are exceptional cases, The National Society did give more than the usual amount of help to many poor areas in order to enable them to qualify for the State Grant.

At last in 1834 the National Society began its interest in infants schools by giving Grants towards them, provided that such schools were used on Sunday for older children. In 1836 the training of teachers for infant schools was begun by the National Society, but in rather cramped conditions. In the same year the Evangelicals, who had founded many infant schools, combined with the Dissenters to found the 'Home and Colonial School Society' with a school to train infant teachers in London. Despite all the Educational advance at this time, a survey of elementary education in the thirties revealed a profoundly disquieting picture. School buildings and teachers were often unsatisfactory and the average school life was between one and a half and two years. The Society schools were the best but even these often left much to be desired. At Salford, of the 1,800 children nominally at school, less than half were taught to read or write. An investigation of the marriage registers in Manchester shows that there was little improvement in the percentage of writers between 1810 and 1838. 'In 1810, the Signers were 52, the Markers 48; by 1838 the proportion had only moved to 55 and 45'.[1] In 1836 the Central Society of Education was formed, approved of by Mill, Spencer and some moderates. This Society wanted State schools and training colleges with undenominational instruction in religion given by the teachers. The Ministers of the various denominations were to have right of entry at specific times in order to give denominational religious instruction.[2] Churchmen disliked this scheme because it divided education into 'religious' and 'secular' and also

[1]G.M. Young: Portrait of an Age, p.59.

[2]H.C. Barnard: History of English Education from 1760, Ch.11, p.99.

many of them still thought that the Church should have the sole right of State aid. They agreed with the sentiment expressed by Bishop Blomfield in 1838, 'No system of national, compulsory education would be tolerable which isn't in agreement with the principles of the Church of England'. The Dissenters disliked this scheme because they wanted to educate their own children in their own way, while some Radicals were against any form of religious instruction in State schools. Roebuck wasn't returned to Parliament in 1837, his place being taken by the Irish Catholic, Thomas Wyse, who had taken the initiative in setting up the Irish system of National Education mentioned above and who also supported the Central Society for Education. He supported Brougham's proposal put forward in the Lords in December 1837. Brougham wanted a Department of Education to be set up whose function should be to control the allocation of Grants to schools founded by voluntary societies and to found schools where private enterprise was inadequate. Brougham also wanted to take over from the Church the management of the ancient religious foundations, believing that if they were well managed by the State, their revenues might suffice to provide for the entire education of the poor.

There was an erroneous view held by some that the State may at any time take away the property of the Church because it was originally given to her by the State. Dr Hook, in his speech at the Conservative Banquet at Leeds (April 1838), not only doubted the morality of such an action by the State if the premise was correct, but he also denied the premise altogether. 'When did the State give property to the Church? Where is the Act of Parliament by which it was given?' He then demonstrated the origin of ecclesiastical endowments in the

gifts of individual benefactors and then exposed the then common fallacy of supposing that at the time of the Reformation this property was taken from one Church and handed to another.[1] Brougham's Bill passed the first reading for form's sake, but nothing further was heard of it. In 1839 a select committee of the Privy Council for Education was set up by Lord John Russell, whose function was to superintend the application of any sums voted by Parliament for the purpose of promoting public Education. The Government Grant for Education now went up to £30,000 a year and money could now be given to Societies or bodies other than the two who previously had a monopoly of State aid. The first secretary of the committee of the Privy Council for Education was James Kay, later known as Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth. He held this post for nearly ten years until a seizure in 1848 caused his premature retirement. He was born in Rochdale in 1804, the son of a nonconformist cotton manufacturer.

In 1815, long after his family had moved to Salford, he went to work at his uncle's bank in Rochdale in order to learn business, and was also a Sunday school teacher. In 1824 he went to Edinburgh university to train as a Doctor and after the completion of his training he worked both among the poor of Edinburgh and Manchester and also in research, primarily on asphyxia. Then he became Assistant Poor Law Commissioner of East Anglia and then of London, during which time he became interested in workhouse children and their education. It was during this period that he accidentally hit upon the pupil-teacher system. Many charged Dr Kay with not being a member

[1]Dean Stephens: Dean Hook, Vol.1, p.423.

of the Church of England, but in fact he was a communicant Churchman, although his father was a Dissenter and he himself was tolerant to Dissenters in an intolerant age.[1] Dr Kay supported compulsory rates being used to provide local schools and he told Lord John Russell that he was working for the claims of the civil power to control the education of the country. The Church of England, as early as 1833, had a scheme for a Training College, which it was hoped would issue certificates to successful students at the end of their course before they obtained their first teaching post. It was also hoped that the young teacher, after a few years as an assistant master, would then become the master himself, and at the end of his working life would receive a State pension. The Church was slow to implement this scheme because of the heavy maintenance costs involved, and when they approached the Whig Government for aid they received an evasive answer, probably because the Government wanted to get in first with a State normal college.

In 1839 the Government proposed the establishment of an undenominational training college for teachers, including a model school for children from 3 to 14. General religious instruction was to be given to all, while denominational religious instruction was to be given by teachers of the various denominations. The Clergy didn't approve of the equality thus given to Nonconformists, while both Churchmen and Dissenters disliked the undenominational character of the proposed college, which implied indifferentism to religion. So the Government was more or less compelled to give way. The Church had for a long time before 1840 disliked the Madras or Monitorial system, but

[1]Frank Smith: Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth.

owing to lack of money not much had been done practically to change the situation. In 1840 Kay and Tufnell opened a training college at Battersea. This college, which had pupil-teachers and also men aged between 20 and 30, was influenced by Swiss and Dutch models. This college had Church of England religious instruction and a hard programme of physical work and study adding up to 14 hours a day! This college was handed over to the National Society in 1843 for financial reasons. The Church built no less than twenty-two colleges between 1840 and 1845 accomodating 540 students. The Church paid most of the money in order to set up these colleges, thus for example, in the case of St Mark's, Chelsea, the Church paid £33,000 and the State £5,000. The annual maintenance cost of St Mark's was about £2,000, all of which was provided by the Church before 1843, and in that year the State began to give £1,000 a year. The educational level of students entering the Training Colleges was very low and on top of this it was hard to get enough entrants for the colleges as teachers' prospects were so low. The aim of the Training Colleges was to impart knowledge but not to foster ambition by educating future teachers above their station. As Derwent Coleridge, the son of the poet and first principal of St Mark's Chelsea said, 'The object was to produce schoolmasters for the poor; the endeavour must be on the one hand, to raise the students morally and intellectually to a certain standard while on the other hand to train them in lowly service'. Consequently gardening and domestic work were an integral part of the course.

The low educational standard of entrants to Training Colleges remained until after 1846, when Government pupil-teachers provided a nucleus of brighter Freshmen. The curriculum was

dependent upon the quality of students, but many Principals, including Derwent Coleridge were slow to recognize this and only reluctantly lowered their standards.

Conversely, when later standards rose, there was an even greater risk than previously that, at the end of their training the young teacher might be persuaded to enter more lucrative forms of employment. In June 1831 the Committee of Council on Education stated that 'all building Grants given for school carry with them the right of inspection'. Thus began the protracted struggle between Church and State over the right of inspection. The Church was willing to give an annual report to Parliament about its schools but not an inspection by a Government inspector. The Government's claim to inspect was based on the building contribution even though this was only a small percentage of the whole outlay on schools. The Government had already given the National Society £500 and the British and Foreign School Society £500 to help them with their work of inspection. The National Society had for a long time conducted school inspections and while the standard of inspection, although comprehensive, wasn't very high, it was as good as what the State later performed. The Society continued its own inspections and simply refused to apply to the State for further Grants, thus it avoided accepting Government inspections.

In 1840 the National Society appointed its first full time inspector, the Reverend Field, and then the Committee of Council tried to end the impasse. A concordat was arrived at consisting of four points. First of all each Archbishop was to be consulted before an inspector for National Society Schools was chosen for his province. The Archbishop had a veto and could make suggestions. Any inspector's appointment could be

terminated when the Archbishop willed it. Instructions to inspectors about religious instruction could be framed by the Archbishop and the inspector has to give a copy of his reports to the Archbishop and the Bishop of the Diocese. Finally, future Grants were to be in proportion to the number of children educated, so the National Society no longer was to receive Grants proportionately less than those given to the British Society. Of course, schools which hadn't received Government Grants weren't to be inspecfed by the Government, so Church inspectors covered them. In November 1843 the Education Committee gave the British and Foreign School Society the same control over inspectors that had been granted to the National Society four years previously. In March 1841 Ewart, the M.P for Dumfries campaigned for a Minister of Education who should be an M.P, more and better teachers and schools, improved educational methods and several normal schools for the training of teachers. His whole approach was an enlightened one, but he failed to get much support in Parliament. There had been Chartist disturbances in 1839-40 and in 1842, and many people felt that a sound religious and moral education given to the poor would be a safeguard against future disturbances.

Lord Ashley was working hard to protect all, and especially children, from the injustices resulting from the industrial revolution. Thus he got a Mine Act through Parliament in 1842, which improved the lot of children in the mines, and then in February 1843 he urged the Government to consider some scheme of National Education. He painted a terrifying picture of the fearful multitude of untutored savages, industrial poor children would become if they were left untouched by civilisation and Christianity.[1] Then Sir James Graham, the

[1]Best: Shaftesbury, p.99.

Home Secretary, brought in his Factory Bill, including educational clauses, hoping to satisfy Lord Ashley. Graham's Bill was limited to textile factories and stipulated that in them no child under 8 should work, while those between 8 and 13 should not work more than 6½ hours a day. Young people between 13 and 18 should not work more than 12 hours a day, while children between 8 and 13 should spend three hours a day at school after work. The new schools could be built by Government loans and be maintained both by fees of not more than 3d per head per week and also from the local poor rate.

So far there was general agreement but dissension came on the question of management. Graham proposed that the schools should be managed by a committee of seven including the incumbent and his two Churchwardens. The remaining four, two of whom should be mill owners, were to be elected by the magistrates. The headmaster must be a Church of England member and approved by the Bishop. The religious instruction was to be based on the prayer book and attendance at Church was vital, though a conscience clause was given for Nonconformists. Finally the schools were to be inspected both by Clerical trustees and by the Committee of Council. While a few Highchurchmen disliked this measure, feeling that it wasn't entirely behind the Church, the bulk of the opposition to it came from the Dissenters. The leader of this opposition was Edward Baines, the editor of the Leeds Mercury, and his key objection was that while all the inhabitants were required to contribute to the maintenance of the schools through the poor rate, the management would be exclusively in the hands of the Church. Graham, in his proposed amendments, gave many concessions including permission for Nonconformist Ministers to visit the schools for

three hours on one day a week in order to give denominational religious instruction. The Dissenters turned down Graham's amendments and as he felt that he could go no further to meet them, the factory clauses of the Act were passed while the educational clauses of the Act were dropped. Harriet Martineau criticized the Dissenters failure to accept the Government scheme especially in its amended form; 'The opportunity was lost of taking the Church in a genial and liberal mood and of providing for children of various sects being reared as brethren, while instructing each in the doctrine of his own communion'.[1]

On the other hand Lord John Russell said that Graham's Bill was like going back to the Test Act and Owen Chadwick observes that the stipulation that the master must be an Anglican was very foolish. Lord Ashley, who was very disheartened when Graham's Bill was rejected, didn't blame one side more than the other; the Established Church was being asked to make very large concessions, the Dissenters had much Established insolence to repay; he blamed both equally for indulging their mutual hatreds and suspicions at the expense of the vast body of neglected children.[2] Best, Ashley's biographer, considers his verdict fair enough. 'Modern descendants of neither party have much cause to take pride in a dispute which held up the development of a national schools system for nearly thirty years, and helped to keep hundreds of thousands of children in brutish ignorance'.[3] It is fair to say that some Dissenters not only opposed Graham's Bill because it seemed to give undue

[1]F. Warre-Cornish: History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century, pp.209-210.

[2]Best: Life of Shaftesbury: p.100.

[3]Ibid, p.100.

advantage to the Established Church, but also because they were opposed to the idea of State aid for Education in principle. Thus in 1843 in Leeds, Edward Baines, at a meeting of the 'Congregational Union', repudiated State control in Education and wanted a voluntary system on a religious basis. These Voluntaryists, who were mainly Baptists and Congregationalists, opened 364 schools by 1851 without State aid, and a teachers training college at Homerton in 1846. This movement, which at first spread rapidly, diminished as quickly as it had spread, and ended in 1867. It followed the principles of Edward Miall's periodical, the Nonconformist, which preached the need to reduce to a minimum the activities of the State. In 1844 an anti State-Church conference of 700 Dissenters met in London to declare war against every form of alliance between the State and any religious community. The Dissenters here showed two chief fears. Firstly a fear to surrender their schools to Church domination, a fear increased with the growth of ritualism, exemplified by the fact that the Wesleyans, who normally stood aloof from Dissenting attacks on the Church, had actually joined with the rest in 1843 against Graham's Bill. Secondly they feared a secular system of education, which would be separated by the State from any religious influence. Thus they opposed J Hume's Bill (1843) which proposed that schools should be built with public funds in which secular and moral training should be given, but religious instruction should be given outside school. Hume wasn't opposed to religious instruction but when he saw that Graham's Bill had failed on the religious question, he felt that the only way to secure educational advance was by eliminating the religious question from the school, by removing religious teaching. In 1844 the Ragged School Union,

for the waifs of London, was founded by Lord Ashley, who was also a prominent member of the National Society. The aim was to provide day, evening and Sunday schools for the poorest children and adults, and buildings were hired for the work. The National Society was aloof and didn't help Lord Ashley in this work because of the undenominational character of the Union. The only Church support he obtained came from those who were tolerant towards Dissenters. Despite the lack of National Society support and the fact that the State aid, even after 1846, was completely beyond the reach of the Ragged schools, by 1849 Ashley had 82 schools, 124 paid and 929 voluntary teachers and 8,000 children.

(d) Elementary Education 1846-1862.

There was widespread dissatisfaction with the Monitorial system especially after the death of Dr Bell in 1832. The lack of questioning or explaining what was read or learned by rote was condemned, and the Reverend Field said that teachers either cannot or will not teach their monitors how to teach. So it was not surprising to those who knew anything about education, when in 1844 it was revealed that 75% of scholars left school unable to read the scriptures tolerably well, while 50% left school without any instruction in writing. But the Monitorial system remained, not because people in the Church hadn't devised better methods of teaching, but because financially without much increased Government aid, it was the only viable method of running schools with well over a million children in them. In 1837 Kay-Shuttleworth had adopted the pupil-teacher method in workhouse schools and the National Society did the same in some of its schools after 1840. So the Govern-

ment pupil-teacher plan of 1846 was only an elaboration of what the National Society had been doing for six years. Of course, the Government systemized this plan and by giving financial help to those schools which practiced the pupil-teacher system they facilitated its spreading throughout the country. In Kay-Shuttleworth's scheme schools with a satisfactory report from an inspector were recognized as suitable for training pupil-teachers. At 13 the young person began his five year apprenticeship, with a stipend of £10 a year, rising by increments to £20. There was to be a maximum of one pupil-teacher for every twenty-five scholars and the headmaster had to give his pupil-teachers one and a half hours instruction daily. At the end of their apprenticeship they took the Queen's Scholarship examination and those who were successful obtained an exhibition of £20-£25 a year at a Training College where they went for three years. This part of the Government scheme was also found in operation by the National Society before 1846. Those candidates who were not successful in the Queen's Scolarship could apply for minor jobs in the Government revenue department. If successful at the end of their course at Training College, students got a Government certificate which entitled them to proficiency Grants towards their stipends and their retirement pension. Also in 1846 the Government gave Grants for workshops, books and other school equipment, provided that 2/3rds of the cost was met by subscriptions. As the poorest schools were too poor to claim the Grant, the gap between the richer and the poorer schools became wider and thus it became more difficult for these schools to get good staff. During this period the State Grant to education rose rapidly, thus from £30,000 in 1839 it went up to £40,000 in 1842, £75,000 in 1845, £100,000 in 1846,

£125,000 in 1848 and £160,000 in 1851. Owing to the State's conditions of giving money the National Society garnered a bigger proportion of the State Grant as time went on. The large increase in the Grant in 1846, coupled with the pupil-teacher system, and the State's offer of help in the realm of school equipment to those who helped themselves, brought to the fore again the whole issue of State intervention or abstention in education. Most Dissenters took the field against the Committee of Council, partly on the Voluntaryist principle and partly because they feared an increase of the Church's power through its schools. However, the Methodists generally and the British and Foreign School Society still favoured Government Grants to all denominational schools. Most Churchmen favoured State Grants for education but some were reluctant to give up any of their powers in exchange for money; thus they stuck out with Archdeacon Denison at their head against any reasonable conscience clause or management clause proposed by the Government. Some Churchmen favoured even more State intervention in Education because of the lack of sufficient voluntary funds to educate every child properly. Among these were Bishop Blomfield of London and Walter Hook, Vicar of Leeds. Both these men, who were directly acquainted with the lives and needs of the poor, looked at education from a pastoral and not from a political position. Dr Hook favoured schools being run and financed by the State so that every child could have a decent education, while allowing for the Clergy and Ministers of the various sects to come into the schools on two afternoons a week to teach their respective flocks distinctive, denominational, religious instruction. As neither Dr Hook's solution was acceptable to the prejudiced majority, nor was that of the

Secularists who wanted to banish religious instruction from schools, it followed that the voluntary system continued, and thus, owing to limited resources, an education for every child was denied for nearly another thirty years. Despite emotive speeches of Baines and other Voluntaryists, increasingly large financial support from the State to the voluntary bodies for their educational work was there to stay. In 1847 Lord Brougham, in a speech, when referring to the Church and the Dissenters said, 'they loved education much but controversy more'. While, when we look at the self-sacrificing efforts of some men, this seems a harsh statement, when we look at the rigourists in the Church and those Dissenters who treated education as not in itself of primary importance, it appears to be a fair comment. In 1847 Macauley made a famous speech supporting the increased Parliamentary Grant to education, in which he stated his belief that the ignorance of the common people was the key cause of danger to persons and property. G.M. Young considers this to be a turning point, 'Henceforth the education of the people was admitted to be a primary function of the State. From this admission it is not far to the Radical position - education universal, compulsory and secular - and the only question remaining was how slowly and by what devious routes and compromises it would be reached, and how much energy would be squandered by the way on the interminable rancours of Church and Dissent'.[1] In the late eighteen-forties the Management clause and Conscience clause controversies began, in regard to Church schools depending on some State aid. In 1846 Kay-Shuttleworth wanted school managers to be a more permanent body than the incumbent, where

[1]G.M. Young: Portrait of an Age, p.62.

policy might change with every vacancy. A body of school managers would give continuity, secure local interest and involvement and, above all, Kay-Shuttleworth felt that they would usually be more willing to allow Dissenters into the school, with a conscience clause, than would the incumbent if he was the only manager of the school. At the time of his appointment in 1839 Dr Kay had told Lord John Russell that he was going to work for the claims of the civil power to control the education of the country. In 1846 he saw in enforcement of management clauses a valuable means of limiting clerical power. The reaction of the National Society to Kay-Shuttleworth's new measures was mixed. On the one hand most Evangelical and Central Churchmen agreed with Kay-Shuttleworth that there were many advantages in each school having a board of managers rather than being solely under the control of the incumbent. Many other Churchmen supported Archdeacon Denison of East Brent in Somerset, in his two uncompromising principles, namely, that as in his view there should be no interference by the State in the internal affairs of schools, therefore there should be no State management clauses; and secondly, school promoters should be at liberty to give the parish priest absolute control in the running of schools if they wished. The General Committee of the National Society, finding itself in the middle, failed to satisfy both Kay-Shuttleworth and Archdeacon Denison. The Government made some concessions but Denison was successful in persuading the General Committee of the National Society to avoid coming to an agreement with Kay-Shuttleworth. At this time (1849) Kay-Shuttleworth resigned through illness and as Lingen his successor was far less conciliatory the dispute ended with an agreement to differ. The problem of a conscience

clause for children of Dissenters in Church schools became more acute in the eighteen-forties.

While in 1811, at the time of its foundation, National Society policy appeared to be rigorous in demanding that all children of its schools must be instructed in the liturgy and catechism of the Church of England and attend Church on Sunday, in reality it was fairly flexible. The children of Dissenters, Roman Catholics and Jews were to be found in National Society schools and their consciences were respected. The Memorandum of 1818 was correct when it stated that 'liberality occurs in many National Society Schools, the Church catechism and attendance at the Church of England on Sunday is only required of those whose parents belong to the establishment'. Two factors changed the Society's liberal approach in this matter; firstly, the influence of the Oxford movement which brought pressure for a rigorous attitude and, secondly, as towns were mainly supplied with schools, many of the new schools in the eighteen-forties were in rural areas; hence the problem of the single-school area became more acute. As Burgess observes, while the problem of the single-school area had always been a factor, it increased numerically at a time when rigorous tractarian influence was increasing, demanding the universal requirement of catechism learning and Church attendance for all Church school scholars. Curtis bluntly states the attitude of the extreme wing of the Church under Denison, namely that Nonconformist parents who wished their children to attend National Society schools must either allow them to learn the catechism and attend Church or keep away from the Church school altogether.[1] Many people

[1]S.J. Curtis: History of Education in Britain, Ch. 7, p.231.

within the Church of England, including Connop Thirlwall, Bishop of St David's, supported the Privy Council's desire for a conscience clause. They wanted all children to learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the ten commandments but only Church children to learn the catechism. Moderate Churchmen and Evangelicals felt that wherever Dissenters were too few to warrant a separate school, their scruples should always be respected. E. Girdlestone underlined the moral dangers of being so bigoted as to shut the door in the face of Dissenters of working class origin and thus expose them to ignorance and vice just because they wouldn't repeat every word of the Church catechism. This policy would (and in fact sometimes did) drive reasonable people into the arms of the Secularists.

While the controversy was raging, a Government inspector said that at least in half the National Society's schools, consciences of Dissenters were respected. John Keble then demanded of the General Committee of the National Society, a general inquiry to see if this was so. When the results of this inquiry came out, it was found that the terms of union were, with very few exceptions, faithfully observed. In 1852 the Privy Council asked of applicants for building Grants whether they would receive Grants on the following terms, 'that under terms of union, if there be any difference of opinion between parochial clergy and the managers of a school concerning exemption of children of Dissenters from that instruction in the Church catechism which is required by the rules of the School, such difference is to be referred to the final decision of the Bishop'. Lingen felt that an appeal to the Bishop would usually succeed. However, for a time, the National Society tried to evade the issue and the Privy Council stopped trying to insert

conscience clauses in the deeds of National Society schools. Although Denison was eclipsed at the Bath and Wells board meeting of the National Society in 1855, schools asking the National Society for a conscience clause in their trust deeds were refused it. The division in the Church over the conscience and management clause issues caused a considerable fall in the amount of money collected for the National Society in the General Collections in Churches called for that purpose by the Queen in 1847 and 1852.

This division also led in 1853 to the formation of the Church of England Education Society by the Evangelical wing of the Church, and it induced the Government in 1854 to refuse to advise the Queen to issue any further royal letters in support of the National Society. In 1860 the Privy Council demanded a conscience clause for schools in Wales and they followed this up by a similar demand for schools in England. The National Society was evasive in its reply, but the Privy Council continued to insert conscience clauses in what were likely to be single-school areas in England. Lingen was rightly concerned about the children of Dissenters in single-school areas, thus, while he favoured compulsory religious instruction, he wanted voluntary Prayer-book classes in parish schools situated in places where there was no room for a second school. The Committee of the National Society defied Lingen as a result of pressure from Denison's party and the two sides went on uneasily in their separate ways until 1870. H.J. Burgess sums up the position well, 'The unsatisfactory conclusion to these two controversies undermined the partnership of Church and State, /and the Dissenters/ ^who were most affected by the conscience clause question, were driven into the arms of those working for a secular system of

education'.[1] In 1850 the Association for Secular Education of the County of Lancaster was formed, with the aim of paying for education out of the local rate and leaving religious teaching out of the timetable. Although this movement spread to Yorkshire and then to the Midlands, its support was very limited because of the united opposition of the Churches. W. Fox, the M.P for Oldham, then introduced his Bill for secular education in England and Wales, under which local boards were to be created, empowered to apply rates for school purposes. School fees were to be abolished and a Grant was to be given only for secular instruction. Shaftesbury commented about Fox's Bill, which was quickly defeated as a result of Church opposition, 'In this Bill the State was to declare that having undertaken to educate the people, it would withhold the one thing needful, and refuse to give that which alone conferred force and efficacy upon all the rest'. Another abortive Bill was Sir John Russell's Borough Bill of 1853 giving towns with a population of over 5,000 people the power to levy an Education Rate. Three more Education Bills in 1855 were dropped and then in 1856 the Education Department was founded, taking the place of the Committee of Education. Many were alarmed at the increasing cost of Education, which reached the unprecedented figure of £541,233 in 1857. Curtis rightly remarks, however, that this was a mere pittance in comparison with the cost of the Crimean War, which came to some £78,000,000!

But in 1858, because of the rising cost of Education, a Parliamentary Commission was appointed, with the Duke of Newcastle as Chairman, to inquire 'into the present state of

[1] H.J. Burgess: Enterprise in Education. End of Ch.11.

popular education in England, and to consider and report what measures, if any, are required for the extension of sound and cheap elementary instruction to all classes of the people'. The Commission found a few monitorial schools left, and the pupil-teacher system proving a success although it was still in its initial stages. They were glad to note that most children now went to school, thus while in 1800 only 1/21st of the population was at school, that figure had risen to 1/7.83 in 1858. But the early school leaving age, mainly caused by child labour, was still a serious problem. Only 29% of children in inspected schools were over the age of ten, while only 19% were over the age of eleven. The Commissioners believed that in most cases private schools were less efficient than the State aided schools visited by Government inspectors. The Commissioners recommended that private schools should receive aid if inspectors reported favourably on them. The aim here was to weed out the poor private schools by putting them at a disadvantage in comparison with good private schools which would now receive State aid. The Commissioners also didn't want to interfere with religious instruction, and they wanted to admit to the Teachers Certificate Examination people with good characters who had kept a school for at least three years. They aimed at giving two types of Grants, on the one hand from Government taxation, dependent on school attendances and a good report from an inspector, and on the other hand from the local rates, based on the results of an examination in the 3Rs. Robert Lowe, who was the Vice-President of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education from 1859 to 1864, adopted with modifications this method of paying for Education which became known as 'Payment by Results'. Lowe, according to Curtis,

was a man who loved efficiency and was impatient at the shortcomings of others. He was a Free Trader, was greatly influenced by Darwin's theory of the survival of the fittest, and valued competition as a means of selection. Lowe tried to base Education Department Grants not so much on the amount raised by voluntary effort, which had formerly been the chief criterion for the payment of such Grants, but mainly on the attendance of pupils under a teacher and subject to the examination of each child in the 3Rs by an inspector. Some money was saved as a result of the Revised Code, thus the Grant of £813,000 in 1862 was reduced to £636,000 in 1865. Also there was a better school attendance. But there was also a decrease in the quality and number of pupil-teachers and a lower standard in Training Colleges and lower salaries for teachers.

The new system encouraged cramming and as no examination was made of religious instruction, the Churches were united in their opposition to the system and its sponsor. All else other than the 3Rs, which alone were examined, tended to be neglected and Kay-Shuttleworth said critically of the new system 'The Revised Code has constructed nothing; it has only pulled down'.

Matthew Arnold, who was an inspector of schools since 1851, and a member of the Newcastle Commission, was mainly negative in his assessment of the Revised Code. He thought that reading books had improved as a result of it, but at the same time the new examination was worse than the old inspection; he regretted the decline of pupil-teachers and the too great a stress on mechanical processes and too little on intelligence. As a result of the Code a few teachers defrauded registers of attendances and for a long time, even after the repeal of the

Code in 1897 many teachers regarded inspectors as enemies. Curtis describes, as a result of the Code, the tragic scene of children being brought from their sick beds to attend examinations so that the school thereby might not lose a part of its Grant.[1] Woodward, like most historians of the period, describes the drawbacks of the Code but, unlike most of them, he also stressed the merits of the Code, 'There was at the time a good deal to be said for this principle. The Commissioners believed that many children leaving school at the age of eleven were badly taught because the teachers neglected the drill of the 3Rs for work more interesting to themselves. Payment by result would put an end to this neglect; the only way to test results was by examination. The system raised the standards of the worst schools, and gave mediocre teachers and school managing committees an incentive to greater efficiency. Since the majority of schools and teachers were inefficient this way of raising the general level was not entirely against the interests of the children'.[2] A National Society Memorandum, which was a well-worded criticism of the Code, went to the Lord President in December 1861. It criticised the rush with which the Code was introduced, for Lowe had actually brought it in on the day when Parliament was proroged. The fact that religious instruction was made less important, because only poor attainment in the 3Rs would now incur financial loss, was regarded as harmful to the moral development of children. The shorter teacher training and reduced State Grants were considered to be very harmful to the Educational advance of the country. No

[1] S.J. Curtis: History of Education in Britain, Ch.7, p.267.

[2] Sir L. Woodward: The Age of Reform, Book 4, Ch.2, p.482.

answer was given to this Memorandum, so in the next few years the National Society got many allies; the Government made some concessions; while at the same time Lowe limited the Grant earning capacity of schools with endowments. This latter measure was so unpopular that in 1864 Lowe was forced to make a modification, that an endowment was no longer to be deducted in the case of small, rural schools whenever the Grant and the endowment together didn't exceed 15 shillings per scholar. Then in 1865 Lowe resigned and another concession was made, that Grants shouldn't be reduced to any school provided the Grant and endowment together didn't exceed 15 shillings per scholar. So, despite the strong opposition of the Church and the Dissenters, most of Lowe's Code was there to stay, long after even the Education Act of 1870.

(e) Elementary Education from the Revised Code to the Sequel of the 1870 Education Act.

The desire for a National System of Education, which had been quite strong since about 1850, greatly increased in the 1860's. Perhaps as Woodward suggests, the fact that two armies from well-educated regions defeated those of their less well educated neighbours had something to do with it.[1] Certainly the 1867 Reform Bill, which doubled the number of voters, made many echo the words attributed to Robert Lowe, 'we must educate our masters'. By this time, many Dissenters, realizing that they couldn't in any way compete with the Church in voluntary education, and at the same time angered by the reluctance of many Churchmen to allow for a conscience clause in their

[1]Sir L. Woodward: The Age of Reform, Book 4, Ch.2, p.482. Referring to the North beating the South in the U.S.A., Prussia defeating Austria in Europe.

schools, now favoured free, compulsory, undenominational education. While these Dissenters went into the arms of the Secularists, others of their number still clung to the existing system, wanting both its universal application and also a universal conscience clause. Thus by 1868 there were two rival educational associations both clamouring for the support of the new Liberal Government. The National Education League centred on Birmingham, founded by Joseph Chamberlain, R.W. Dale and others, wanted universal education provided by local authorities, by means of local rates and Parliamentary Grants. Members of the league proposed that all rate aided schools should be managed by local authorities and inspected by the Government inspectors, and that the State should have the power to compel attendance.

As far as religious instruction was concerned, dogmatic teaching of any sort was excluded, and if the Bible was read it had to be read without note or comment. Cornish aptly says at this point that the Nonconformists, in opening the door to let out the parson had let in the unbeliever. The Manchester Education Union, which counteracted the League, wanted a primary education for every child, judiciously supplementing the present denominational system of National Education but safeguarded by a conscience clause. A compromise between these two approaches WAS MADE ^ both by the National Public School Association and also by Dunn, the Secretary of the British and Foreign School Society. In 1868 the Liberals had come into power under Gladstone, and William Forster, M.P for Bradford, who was a Radical, Quaker, West Riding Woollen Manufacturer, was put in charge of the Education Department. Gladstone and Forster, unlike many Liberals, didn't wish to supplant but rather to supplement the voluntary schools. Thus Forster's Education Bill which became law in

1870 aimed at filling the gaps, and while it was a compromise between the proposals of the Education League and those of the Education Union, it was probably on the whole closer to the latter than the former. In Forster's Bill the country was divided into school districts and the Education Department was to see how many more school places were required in each district and to fill them. Where there was a deficiency, the denominations were allowed a period of grace of a year in which to supply it, and they could apply for Parliamentary Grants to assist them, but not to the rates. This period of grace was reduced to six months as a result of pressure from Nonconformists and Secularists. No Parliamentary Grant was to be given to any school which didn't accept a conscience clause, but at the same time the old Parliamentary Grant to denomimational schools was to be doubled. Then if the Denominations did not fill all the gaps the State would fill them by School Boards. Board Schools which were secular, non-denominational and provided by local authorities were maintained out of the rates, Government Grants and fees. It was estimated at first that about $\frac{1}{3}$ of the cost of maintenance was met by fees, $\frac{1}{3}$ by the Government Grant and $\frac{1}{3}$ out of the local rates. The voluntary denominational schools were maintained by fees, Government Grants and endowments, but not by the local rates. Voluntary effort increased greatly after 1870, thus of the $1\frac{1}{2}$ million new school places provided between 1870 and 1876, $\frac{2}{3}$ were due to the Churches and only $\frac{1}{3}$ were due to the new school boards. Eventually the voluntary schools couldn't keep up with the board schools financially until the passing of the 1902 Act which gave them greater financial support. The local School Boards were to decide whether their schools should give religious instruction

or not, and if as was usual they decided in the affirmative, no distinctive, denominational teaching was to be given. Cowper-Temple, the M.P for South Hampshire, proposed a clause which was accepted, which struck a balance between denominational religious instruction on the one hand and the straight Bible reading without note or comment as advocated by the Birmingham Education League on the other. His clause 'forbade the use in Board Schools of any catechism or formulary distinctive of any denominational Creed, whilst permitting school teachers to expound as well as to read the Bible'. Cowper-Temple also wanted teachers to teach religious instruction in schools rather than Ministers of Religion. Thus as a result of the Education Act of 1870 the voluntary schools were allowed to survive, increase in number and obtain far more State aid in return for a conscience clause. But they failed in their demand for either rate support for their schools or rate exemption for their subscribers. So while in the short run there was a big spurt forward in voluntary effort resulting from the 1870 Education Act, in the long run the voluntary schools lagged behind in their unequal struggle with the Board Schools, especially as fees were eventually abolished, until their position improved again with the legislation of 1902. The real loss in the Education Act of 1870 was in the realm of religious education. The divorce between religious and secular education which the Church had always opposed had been accomplished. Religious Instruction was no longer inspected by Government inspectors until the Butler Act of 1944, and thus the status of religious teaching was greatly reduced. Burgess comments about the 1870 Education Act, 'The antipathy of Dissenters and Tractarians prevented united Christian action. So the State, pushed by

the Secularists into neutrality between Christian and Secular Education and undermining the religious integrity of the English school system, assisted the isolation of the working classes from organized religion. The Church of England had to learn tolerance, the Dissenters the folly of supporting Secularists. In 1944 the Churches united and restored Government inspection of religious instruction.' The Education Act of 1870 was generally acceptable except to a small group who were mainly nonconformists. Many Dissenters schools collapsed after 1870, either through lack of resources or through a feeling that there wasn't much point in going on with voluntary schools. As Bowen points out, distrust of the Church, and especially Ritualism, had made Nonconformist educational policy very negative, 'to protest and protest, but never to produce any alternative policy for which any sacrifice was made'.[1] The Church of England and the Roman Catholics battled on and even by 1882 $\frac{2}{3}$ of children were still provided for in voluntary schools. It wasn't until 1898 that there were as many children in Board Schools as in voluntary schools. After 1870 school fees were still paid but the fees of poor children were often remitted in part or in full. In 1876 Lord Sandon tried to make school attendance compulsory, but this didn't become the case throughout the whole country until 1882. In 1891 a fee Grant of ten shillings a head was introduced which made elementary education virtually free. The school leaving age was raised from ten in 1870 to eleven in 1893, to twelve in 1899 and thirteen in 1900. Thus the Education Act of 1870 opened up the way for a reasonably good elementary education for every child up to the age of thirteen by the end of the century.

[1]D. Bowen: The Idea of the Victorian Church, p.206.

(f) Education other than Elementary Education during Dr Hook's Lifetime.

It is fitting to end this Chapter with a very brief survey of other educational changes during the period of Dr Hook's lifetime. The Universities, and especially Oxford, were in a bad state around 1800, with college chapel services being both compulsory and badly conducted. The Universities were poor and needed reform, while many of the colleges were rich. However, the reform of studies which had begun in the late eighteenth century was continued and new Departments and buildings were opened up, especially for science subjects. The religious exclusiveness of the Universities was criticized but a Bill to overthrow the religious tests which passed through the House of Commons in 1834 failed to get through the Upper House. In 1850 the Universities Royal Commission was set up, and between 1854 and 1856 the tests were removed. University College, London, was founded amidst much opposition in 1828, free from the outset from any religious test. Fearing that the University might develop on secular lines, King's College was founded and based on Anglican principles. Durham University, which had been contemplated by Cromwell in 1657, was opened in 1832, as a result of a large grant from the Dean and Chapter of Durham Cathedral. Colleges were opened at Sheffield, Birmingham, Leeds, Manchester and in other centres which developed and received University status at the turn of the century. The Public Schools which were almost entirely Anglican institutions, were places where true religion was neglected and life was rough and vicious at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The curriculum was narrowly Classical, poor books and methods of teaching were used and discipline was unsatisfactory. The

riot at Winchester College in 1818, the year after Walter Hook had gone on to Oxford, was a particularly bad example of what was quite a common phenomenon. Thomas Arnold, who became headmaster of Rugby in 1827, was one of the chief reformers of the Public Schools.

However, there were many others besides, of whom Butler of Shrewsbury and Thring of Uppingham are good examples. Eventually these reforms pervaded all the Public Schools and at the same time, after 1840, the number of Public schools went up very sharply. The Clarendon Commission on the Public Schools was set up in 1861 and in its findings some idleness was observed, but the classical education provided was favoured, but new teaching methods were felt to be desirable. Secondary schools for the middle classes were sadly lacking throughout the nineteenth century. In 1838 the National Society had plans for a middle school system to follow on from the elementary school with a very wide curriculum. But this movement for a middle school system faded away, mainly for financial reasons, because it was felt to be a more important priority to give an elementary education to every child first. After 1847 Nathaniel Woodard founded schools in the Woodard Trust which were Anglican public schools for the middle classes. The Taunton Commission, on schools not covered by the work of the Newcastle Commission or the Clarendon Commission, was set up in 1864. In its report this Commission showed the great need for secondary schools and wanted rate aid to be given for such schools. Needless to say this was not put into effect for a very long time. The Endowed Schools Act of 1869 appointed three Commissioners to revise the statutes of the Grammar schools and many of these schools, after reforms were made, became among

the best in the country. Education for girls developed very rapidly after the founding of Queen's College, London, with F.D. Maurice as its first principal. By 1873 Girton and in 1876 Newnham were opened as halls of residence for women taking Cambridge University exams. Soon there were many good schools of all types for girls, and increasing University opportunities. In 1850 the National Society Memorandum referred to the great advance made in the number and importance of evening schools for adults in towns and rural districts. As early as 1827 Brougham founded the Society for Diffusion of Useful Knowledge and during this period cheap and good books began to be produced on a considerable scale. Brougham also planned Mechanics Institutes, including libraries, lectures and discussions, and by 1850 the first public libraries Act had passed through the Houses of Parliament. F.D. Maurice and T. Hughes opened an adult school in a London slum and in 1854 Maurice, with others, established the Working Men's College. Walter Hook took a leading part in the adult education movement both in Coventry and in Leeds, and like Maurice was anxious to teach working men as well as give them access to information, so that their horizons in every sphere of life might be widened.

Chapter 3.

Dr Hook's Educational Work.

(a) Before 1837.

In Dr Hook's educational work we can observe two strands often working together; his practical work of catechizing, founding and running Sunday schools and day schools and societies for adult education, and also his theoretical work in speeches, letters and pamphlets, searching out for the most effective way the State and the Voluntary Societies might work together for the education of the poor in this country. Despite much catechizing, preaching and teaching at Whippingham, his real educational work began at Moseley, near Birmingham, where he began his thirty-three year long Ministry to the growing industrial areas. The practical work which occupied him most during the summer of 1827 was the foundation of a village school. The laity of the neighbourhood were far from enthusiastic in the work, but the energy and determination of the young curate at length broke down all obstacles. Hook searched for an eighth of an acre of land on which to build his school for a long time, and at last he obtained it from his Squire, Mr. Taylor, on a lease of ninety-nine years at a guinea rent, and then the building was soon begun. Some of the extreme Evengelicals whom he called 'saints' opposed him in this work, but he dealt with them skilfully, silencing some and bringing others over to his viewpoint.

In the autumn of 1827 he obtained a lectureship at St Philip's, Birmingham, and by employing a curate to help him at

Moseley he was able to divide his time between the two places. Part of his time in Birmingham was spent in the establishment of a Penitentiary and the superintendence of schools. This latter work, as well as shorter visits, included spending one day a month examining schools for poor children. In a letter written to Dr Hook in 1864, mainly on another subject, A Peers, an old pupil of the Birmingham National School, describes one of Hook's visits to the school over thirty-five years before. 'I can remember when I was a little boy, and you took a great interest in the Birmingham National School, and when you had examined the first class, in which I was a scholar, you used sometimes to show how pleased you were by emptying your pocket of all your loose silver to be divided among us. Oh! those were glorious times. It sometimes came to as much as 2½d. each; and then the consultation as to what we should do with so vast a sum! No Privy Council was ever more solemn in their discussion; nor did the Rothschild family ever feel the weight of their riches more than we did ours'.[1]

At the beginning of 1829 Walter Hook became Vicar of Holy Trinity, Coventry, where he was to remain for over eight years. Evening services in the Church became a permanent feature after the autumn of 1831, when gas lighting was installed, and the Vicar as well as introducing more frequent Holy Communion, also had courses of lectures and series of sermons in order to educate his people more in the matter of their faith. Thus his Lenten lectures of 1831 were so popular that some clerical workers used to get permission from their employers to attend them, while others who were not so fortunate asked the Vicar to

[1]Stephens: Life of Dr Hook, Vol. 1, p.124.

deliver the lectures in the evening instead of the morning. As well as numerous explanations in his sermons of the offices in the Prayer Book, he devoted a complete series of lectures in 1834 to the liturgy. While his Sunday morning sermons came from various themes, his Sunday evening sermons almost always consisted of an expository course upon some subject, or upon some book of the Bible. Walter Hook, with the able assistance of his wife, spent much of his time in Coventry developing the Sunday schools, which grew tenfold frpm 120 members to 1200 members during his Incumbency. As a teacher he was never dull and heavy, and while he was severe in repressing irreverence he often rallied the interests of the children and won their sympathy by mingling fun with his reproofs. In 1836, in a letter to the Rev. T.H. Tragett, he gave much advice on catechizing and began by stressing that to become a good catechist one must frequently catechize, "As to the children, they are certainly the first and grand consideration. You say you are a wretched catechist, but the art of catechizing does not any more than that of reading and writing, come by nature; but to become a good catechist you must catechize, and it is astonishing how rapid is the improvement, both on the part of the catechizer and the catechized'.[1] He then described his work before coming to Coventry, and the value of catechizing in Church, 'You ask what I did at Whippingham and Moseley: I laboured much at my schools, and never missed an attendance there all day on the Fridays, when I examined all the classes; only catechizing in Church in Lent. I was younger then than I am now, and I should now catechize in Church under any circumstances, under the expectation of receiving greater grace, and under the conviction that

[1]Ibid: Vol. 1, p.292.

the fact of their being examined in Church impresses on the minds of the children that it is not knowledge, but religious knowledge, that they come to receive'.[1] In January 1831 Walter Hook opened an infant school, not only without any assistance from the National Society, but with the opposition of Dissenters, because he insisted upon the Master being a member of the Church. He took a major part in the founding of the Religious and Useful Knowledge Society in May 1835. The purpose of this Society was to extend knowledge by means of a library, classes of instruction and periodical lectures. The S.P.C.K. gave a grant of books valued at £25 which started the library, and the Vicar worked hard both in securing lecturers and also giving lectures himself. The Vicar wrote to Sir Robert Peel for support for the Society on the grounds that he owned land in the neighbourhood. In his reply Peel refused to give help on the grounds of his remote local connexion, but he in fact gave generous support on other grounds - out of respect for Hook's character and his unremitting and successful exertions to promote the moral and religious instruction of the people committed to his spiritual charge.[2]

In a letter to the Dean of Hereford (June 1836), Walter Hook showed how it was his Sunday school teachers who asked him to form the Religious and Useful Knowledge Society 'About twelve months ago they came to me, and said that they were much in want of the means of self-improvement, and that young persons who had left school had only the resource of the Mechanics Institute, which, having been started by the Political Union, was managed by Radicals and Dissenters, and where all the good principles imbibed at school

[1] Ibid: Vol. 1, p.293.

[2] Ibid: Vol. 1, p.180.

were destroyed.'[1] Then after a description of the Committee, membership and functions of the Religious and Useful Knowledge Society, he closes his letter by describing the hostility of the local Mechanics Institute and Radical paper to this new Society. 'We have upwards of six hundred members. We have met with most violent and furious opposition from Dissenters of all classes except Wesleyans. I have been abused most fiercely in the Radical paper, and the Mechanics Institute, from a spirit of opposition, has increased from sixty members to two hundred. But this only shows that we are doing good. Such is our history'.[2]

(b) Dr. Hook's Educational Work 1837-1846.

Dr Hook worked very hard, especially during his early years at Leeds, in explaining the principles of the S.P.C.K. and in establishing branches in connexion with it both in Leeds and also in many neighbouring towns. Time and again in speeches he showed that the Society tried to promote Christian Knowledge by the Bible rightly interpreted. First Bibles were freely circulated and then tracts and books which were written to guide people to interpret the Bible correctly. Then Dr Hook showed that it was the Church which guided the Society in its interpretation of Scriptures. As the twentieth Article claims that 'the Church has authority in controversies of faith' Dr Hook asserted that the Church has authority in interpreting scripture. Before the end of 1837 a scheme had been devised for dividing the whole of Leeds into twelve districts each with a branch of

[1] Ibid: Vol. 1, p.181.

[3] Ibid: Vol. 1, p.182.

the S.P.C.K. The Committee of each district was to consist of a Chairman, the local clergyman and two visitors for every thousand inhabitants. A depository was to be established in each district containing specimens of the publications of the Society and notices showing the public the aims of the Society. The Visitors' job was to call upon people in their homes to discover who wanted Bibles and Prayer Books among the poor and who wanted to support the Society among the wealthy. Then progress was reported monthly to the Chairman of the district and quarterly by the Chairmen of the twelve districts to the General Committee. Thus Dr Hook as President addressed the district committees in turn and the General Committee and so was able to reiterate the principles of the Church to those who were going out to visit people in their homes in all parts of the great town of Leeds. In 1837 some Methodist teachers, convinced of the truth of the Church principles by Dr Hook's sermons, wanted to join the Church but were unwilling to abandon class meetings. Dr Hook was happy for them to keep their class meetings, and, although after being to some, he forbade the 'telling of experiences', he decided to use this form of meeting for some weekly instruction in a book of the Bible, or some portion of the liturgy.

In April 1839 Dr Hook made an able speech on the subject of national education at a Conservative banquet in Leeds. He very rarely interfered in politics and only did so on this occasion because he felt that the Church was passing through critical times and that the Tories under Peel were more likely to protect her than the present Whig Government. As he put it himself 'once and only once in my life before this have I attended a political dinner; but I have abstained, not because

I had no right to be present, but because I thought that my attendance might interfere with my ministerial usefulness - a regard for which is my first and primary duty. And, gentlemen, I am present this day at this glorious, this splendid festival, because I verily believe that my absence would have interfered with my ministerial usefulness'.[1] Several events had made Dr Hook depart from his normal practice and speak at this political dinner. In 1835 Peel's Government had been narrowly defeated by a resolution moved by Russell that the Commons should form a Committee to consider the state of the Established Church in Ireland with a view to applying its surplus revenue for the general education of the Irish people, irrespective of religious denomination. Churchmen feared that the Government might take away some of the property of the Church of England for the purpose of introducing national education on secular principles. In 1836 the Central Society of Education was formed, approved of by Mill, Spencer and several others, with the aim of persuading the State to pay for a system of national education which excluded religious instruction from the school syllabus. Dr Hook feared that the Secularists would convert the Political Dissenters to their cause, while at the same time he admitted that the pious Dissenters were united to the pious Churchmen in believing that education must be based on religion. He then stated the policy of the advocates of secular education, namely that there should be secular education not based on religion, and then, after that, the people may send their children for religious instruction where they please. Dr Hook commented on this policy 'I should like to know what time the children of

[1] Ibid: Vol. 1, p.418.

the poor would have to give to this double system of education, as every person who has been at all employed in Education is well aware that two-thirds of the children sent to our schools are sent there not for the sake of religious instruction but for the sake of the general information we give, the price we demand being that they shall also receive religious instruction. So that if this secular system be established two-thirds of the children will be brought up without any religious instruction, without any knowledge of their Saviour and their God'.[1] Dr Hook admitted that many Ministers wouldn't sanction any education that wasn't based on religion, but their meaning of religious instruction was scriptural education. He then showed that scriptural education wouldn't work on an exclusive plan because the term 'scriptural education' meant different things to different people. In Ireland where Catholics and Protestants were educated together the scriptural passages allowed to be used in school excluded those parts of the Bible from which all leading doctrines are formulated, thus 'their system of religious teaching is very much like an orange with the juice squeezed out of it'.[2] Dr Hook finished this part of his speech with a theme which was common in his speeches and writings on education after this time, that the State itself couldn't provide religious teaching, because if it attempted to do so, it would either be partisan in advocating the religious teaching of one denomination thus causing the wrath of the rest, or in an attempt to please everybody it would give a diluted State religious instruction which would unchristianize the country.

[1]Stephens: Life of Dr Hook, Vol. 1, p.420.

[2]Ibid: p.421.

Dr Hook then dealt with another burning topic, the feared appropriation by the State of Church property for the purpose of secular education. Many Secularists felt that the State had the right at any time to take away the property of the Church, because it was originally given to her by the State. Dr Hook questioned the morality of the proposed action of the Secularists even if their premise was correct, but then he denied their premise also. 'Now if I were to meet a man in the street today, and were to give him half-a-crown, am I, if I meet him tomorrow, to take it back and say I have found someone more worthy? But I deny their premises altogether. When did the State give property to the Church? Where is the Act of Parliament in which it was given?'[1] He then outlined the origin of ecclesiastical endowments in the gifts of individual benefactors and exposed the then fairly common fallacy that at the time of the Reformation this property was taken from one Church and handed over to another. Dr Hook ended his long speech with a eulogy of Sir Robert Peel and an assertion of confidence that under his leadership in a new Government the Church and State would be upheld.

Out of his conviction that on the one hand diluted State religious education would make children grow up into 'Nothingarians' and on the other hand that because of the paucity of the funds of the voluntary bodies, the State would one day take over the education of the people, Dr Hook as early as 1838 had conceived in his mind the germ of the bold educational scheme which he propounded in his famous letter to the Bishop of St David's in 1846. A brief outline of this scheme, with

[1]Stephens: Life of Dr Hook, Vol. 1, p.422.

a few slight differences from the later letter of 1846, are to be found in a letter written to his friend William Page Wood in November 1838. Dr Hook said in this letter, 'I propose a measure which is this; that a board of education be formed in every parish; the incumbent Chairman, his curates ex-officio members, and a certain number of ratepayers to complete the board. If pressed I would concede that Dissenting Ministers, resident in the parish three years, should also be members. The board to have power to lay a rate, and to decide on the books to be used; no direct religious instruction to be given; but no child to be admitted who cannot bring a certificate of being a member of some Sunday school, where religious instruction is given. Absence for three Sundays from Sunday school without leave, to be punished by three months expulsion from National School. Each Clergyman or Dissenting Minister to be permitted to attend on Fridays to instruct his own children; a separate room to be provided for the purpose'. Dr Hook then concludes the letter with some suggestions about Normal Schools and a request to his friend not to let anybody know about the proposed scheme for the moment. Dr Hook disclosed his School Board Scheme only to close friends because he knew that if it was made public it would upset those who still believed that the Church of England, being the Established Church, was not only bound to educate the whole people but also was competent to discharge the duty. He hoped that Churchmen would make the most of their opportunities and continue to take the lead in the work of national education. Dr Hook wanted to establish a local board of education in Leeds because he thought it would help to extend the Church's educational work there, and so in March 1839 he addressed a large meeting to that end in the Music Hall.

Dr Longley, the Bishop of Ripon, was in the Chair and Dr Hook made one of his most detailed speeches on the subject of national education. He began by observing that as Churchmen, his hearers would agree that no education could deserve the name which was not based upon religion. Thus he went on, 'we must offer to the country the best possible education, or the State will take the duty of education upon itself, and if the State does this it must eventually adopt a purely secular education - an education not based on religion'.[1] He proved his point by asking the question, suppose the State were at the present time to undertake the education of the people and decide that education must be based on religion - on what religion is it to be based? 'Shall it be the religion of the Church of England? If so, no change is necessary. But a change is demanded to meet the views of those who dissent from the Church. The State, it will be said, is to provide for the education of all the people. Well, then, let us now ask, is the education to be exclusively protestant? No, not if the principle is to be adhered to, for that would exclude the Romanists. Carry on the principle, and we may ask, again, is the education to be Christian? If infidelity prevails (and, alas! it does prevail to a fearful extent), Jews, Turks and Infidels will all demand that the education of the country shall be so conducted as not to exclude them. And then what is the religion on which the State education is based? It certainly looks as much like no religion as possible'.[2]

Dr Hook then went on to show that one of the purposes

[1]Stephens: Life of Dr Hook, Vol.1, p.448.

[2]Ibid: Vol. 1, p.449.

for which the Church was endowed was to educate the people, except those who dissented from her teaching. He sketched the progress of Church schools down the ages and pointed out that for a long time the Church was rowing against the stream, advocating the education of the poor when many were hostile to such a proposal. Then he gave some statistics and proved that especially in the case of day schools the Church had an overwhelming percentage of the scholars in comparison with the Nonconformist Sects and secured two-thirds of the Government's educational Grant. After claiming that there were 112,035 children above the age of seven who were receiving no education whatever, he urged that some plan of compulsory education should be adopted. Compulsory attendance would be enforced in Government schools and in Church schools, if a law was passed empowering magistrates to ~~visit~~ insist on all children being sent to some school. Dr Hook regarded present education to be most deficient in the training of Masters and claimed that as it was the Master and not the system which made the school, priority should be given to the founding of training schools in which Masters might be prepared for their important work. Finally he urged building more infant schools and good middle class schools in connexion with the Church. The resolution which Dr Hook moved at the conclusion of his speech was that a local Board of Education, embracing all the townships of the parish of Leeds, should be established. This board should consist of all the Clergy officiating in the parish of Leeds, a committee of laymen appointed by the Bishop and a Secretary. The Board, once founded, was requested to raise fresh subscriptions for education, to promote the building of new National, Sunday and Infant schools and to ascertain the educational statistics of

the parish.

The Board was also asked to unite with itself all existing schools conducted by members of the Church, to adopt measures for the formation of a Training School for Masters and to institute a commercial school which could serve as a model school. As Dean Stephens comments, 'The Board of Education thus founded was the germ of the Diocesan Board, which has been for nearly forty years the principal instrument of elementary and middle class education throughout the diocese of Ripon'.[1] As well as writing letters and making speeches in aid of education, Dr Hook was as active in Leeds as he had been at Coventry in catechizing children and adults for confirmation and instructing Sunday school teachers. In 1840 he had 256 candidates in his own classes which were about one quarter of the candidates from his parish for that year. Because he regarded catechizing to be very important and also because he knew the work put a considerable strain on the clergy in addition to their other Sunday duties, he was anxious to employ a skilled man as Chief Catechist and overseer of all the Sunday schools in the parish. Thus he wrote to Mr Gladstone, 'What we want in manufacturing towns is the appointment of some well educated, energetic man in each town, to act as catechist-general under the Clergy; and the National Society ought to be in fact what it is in theory, a grand normal school for the education of such persons. This person should be not only able to catechize the higher classes of the different Church schools, but to train the subordinate teachers: and as a good salary would be necessary, I should think that we might safely insist on the catechists being at

[1]Stephens: Life of Dr Hook, Vol.1, pp.456-7.

least in Deacon's orders'.[1] In a letter to Samuel Wilberforce in December 1838, acknowledging his sermon which he had just read, Dr Hook said 'all my thoughts are at present devoted to education', and this comment could well apply to many occasions during his Ministry in Leeds.

In 1843 Sir James Graham proposed a new Factory Act, which included Educational clauses, before the House of Commons. While there was agreement among most members that the working hours of children should be reduced and that those between eight and thirteen should spend three hours a day at school, dissension came on the question of management because the Act gave too much weight to the Church in relation to the Dissenters. Despite Graham's proposed amendments, which went part of the way in meeting the objections of the Dissenters, the Educational clauses of the Bill were dropped. The outcome greatly pleased Edward Baines, Editor of the Leeds Mercury, whose main objection to Graham's measure had been that while all the inhabitants were required to contribute to the maintenance of schools through the poor rate, the management would be exclusively in the hands of the Church. Graham's proposed Factory Act spurred Baines into obtaining statistical returns of the state of Education and of Church and Chapel accomodation in the manufacturing areas of Yorkshire, Lancashire and Cheshire. These statistical returns showed a marked increase in Church accomodation and the number of scholars in the last forty years, and so Baines put them in the Mercury. Thus the editors of the Mercury were converted to Voluntaryism - that the State shouldn't interfere at all in Education. Edward Baines Junior commented, 'The dangerous Bill of Sir James Graham,

[1]Stephens: Life of Dr Hook, Vol. 2, p.17.

and the evidence brought out of the ability and the disposition of the people to supply the means of Education, combined to convince the editors of the Mercury that it is far safer and better for Government not to interfere at all in the work; and from that time forth they distinctly advocated that view'.[1] In March 1843 Dr Hook wrote to Mr Gladstone, at the latter's request, in order to give his opinions on the proposed scheme of factory education. He began by outlining his conviction that the Church could retain the education of nearly the whole population in her hands. All the Church has to do is to open schools and give a good education and such is the general indifference to religion in manufacturing districts, that not one person in a hundred would even think of interfering. 'They would rather say, give a good secular education, cheap or gratis, and you may, as pay, inculcate your own religious doctrines'.[2] Dr Hook then pointed out that there was no popular feeling in favour of Dissent and that while a few conscientious Dissenters would keep their children away and support their own schools and a few Dissenting Ministers might cause a little annoyance, the fact remains that the Church could educate the children of the poor, entirely on Church principles, with very little difficulty. Only one thing is necessary and that is financial support. Dr Hook then urged Bishops and other wealthy Clergy, and others as far as they were able, to make big sacrifices for such a cause. Dr Hook then realistically admitted that sacrifices on the scale he felt necessary were most unlikely to be made. Probably in part, alluding to

[1] E. Baines (Junior): Life of E Baines. pp.270-1.

[2] Stephens: Life of Dr Hook, Vol 2, p.113.

Graham's measure, he condemned the notion favoured by many clergy, that the State is to supply the funds and the Bishops and Clergy can expend those funds as they think fit. 'I call this a monstrous notion in a free State where there is full toleration, and where the taxes are paid by Dissenters as well as by Churchmen'.[1] Then he made a statement which we find time and time again in his educational speeches and writings: 'If the Church supplies the funds, let the education be an exclusively Church education; if the State supplies the funds the State is in duty bound to regard the just claim of Dissenters'.[2]

Dr Hook admitted that in the present measure the State had done everything in its power to give precedence to the Church. He favoured the present measure in general principle, although he disliked a few of its minor details. He probably favoured Graham's measure mainly because it would have secured the education of more poor children rather than leave them in brutish ignorance. To Dr Hook, a pastoral concern for the needs of his people was always uttermost, and he knew that the alternative to Graham's Bill was a continued struggle by the Voluntary bodies to educate the poor, a struggle which would leave many without any education unless voluntary funds greatly increased, and being a realist, he knew this was unlikely. Dr Hook ended his letter by saying that there was only one way of legitimately opposing the present Bill and that was by Church leaders going to the Prime Minister and promising that the Church would provide £100,000 a year for education if the

[1]Stephens: Life of Dr Hook, Vol. 2, p.114.

[2]Ibid, Vol. 2, p.114.

State would leave the education of the poor in Church hands. But Dr Hook, when he wrote this, knew that it was wishful thinking, and therefore didn't add anything to the substance of his letter. In July 1843 Samuel Wilberforce, being asked to speak at a public meeting in London, in support of the scheme then proposed for factory education, applied to his friend Dr Hook for information on the subject in general, and specifically for any facts about the disposition of the labouring classes and as to the means by which the Church might meet existing evils.[1] Dr Hook, in his reply, as in his letter to Mr Gladstone earlier that year, made it clear that he wanted wealthy Clergy and others to make big sacrifices, so that the Church could undertake the education of the people herself. 'If we are to educate the people in Church principles, the Education must be out of Church funds. Let wealthy prelates give most of their stipend for education. Then the Church will live in the hearts of the people who now detest her. Many in the manufacturing districts consider the Church to belong to the party of their oppressors, so they hate it and consider a man of the working classes who is a Churchman to be a traitor to his party or order - he is outlawed in the society in which he moves. Now this being the case, the Church must try for God's sake to win the people by making a great sacrifice. The Church should say "we will educate the people in our own way out of our own funds". Till something like this is done, it is useless to invent schemes of factory improvement, i.e., useless to undertake partial schemes for the education of factory children. I am almost a Radical, for I

[1]Ashwell: Life of S. Wilberforce, Vol. 1, pp.224-6.

do not see why our Bishops should not become poor like Ambrose and Augustine etc, that they may make the people really rich'.[1] In this letter Dr Hook also reiterated his point that the Church couldn't ask money fairly from the State for the purpose of giving a Church education, when money is to be supplied to the State by Dissenters and Infidels as well as Churchmen. 'The State cannot employ public money to give a Church education because of Dissenters, nor a Protestant education because of Papists; and have not Jews, Infidels and Turks as much a right as heretics to demand that the education isn't Christian? In saying this, I don't of course mean to advocate the cause of Infidel education, but I would have the Government see what the difficulty is, and not attempt to educate at all'.[2] In his reply to these suggestions Samuel Wilberforce said, 'I do not believe that the Church ought to strip herself bare as you propose. All who have wealth should give it to their brethren; this is better than selling our Bishops lands.'[3]

In 1844 Dr Hook supported a Bill promoted by Lord Ashley, proposing to limit the working hours of women and children in factories to ten. He earnestly supported this measure, despite the fact that it was opposed not only by many wealthy Leeds manufacturers, who had given much financial support to the parish Church, but also by many members of Sir Robert Peel's Government, the party which he usually supported. All worldly considerations of personal advantage and party favour were cast aside by Dr Hook whenever he thought that the temporal happiness

[1]A. Ashwell: Life of S, Wilberforce, Vol. 1, pp.224-6. Also Archdeacon Stranks: Dean Hook, Ch. 4.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

and moral welfare of the people were at stake. He attended two public meetings in favour of the Bill in March 1844 and said that he supported the Bill on medical, moral and educational grounds. 'It is impossible to train children in the way they should go unless we have more time to train them'. Dr Hook knew that ~~may~~ many children didn't attend school even part-time, because their hours of work were too long to afford them any time other for work and rest. He ended his speech on one of these occasions, amidst cheering, as follows, 'If I thought you working men were in error on this subject I should still sympathize with you, though I should not be here tonight, but, believing you and knowing you to be right, I should be unworthy of the post which I occupy in this parish were I to permit any reluctance on my part to oppose Her Majesty's Government, to prevent my being present. Yes, I will go further, and say that I come here to tell you that I am ready in this righteous cause to press forward with you till the last gasp; and if a collision should occur between your interests and the interests of a higher social class, you may depend on finding me on your side. And I trust that our friends in London, when the question is put to them, whether they will support the cause of the poor or of party, will fling party to the dogs and support humanity. There is much to be said, no doubt, on the manufacturers side, but throw humanity into the scale and their arguments are outweighed. To the present system we are opposed, and in our opposition to this system I trust we shall persevere diligently, ardently, patiently - according to all that fair play which every Englishman loves, and acting with Christian feeling until we have brought the matter to a successful issue'.[1]

[1]Stephens: Life of Dr Hook, Vol. 2, pp.178-9.

(c) On the means of rendering more efficient the Education of the people.

(A letter to the Bishop of St David's, 1846.)

By the year 1846 Dr Hook was in many respects a disillusioned man as far as the education of the poor was concerned. As Bowen observes, 'Like Blomefield, Dr Hook was directly acquainted with the lives and needs of the poor and so, to him, their education was a pastoral, not a political concern.[1] Dr Hook had hoped that the Church, by great sacrifices, would take the education of the people into her own hands, as his letters to Samuel Wilberforce and Mr Gladstone in 1843 show. But by 1846 Dr Hook must have realized that the Church as a whole had no intention of acting in the way he proposed. He also knew, only too well, that the present system of education was unsatisfactory, leaving many children without any schooling and many more with a very poor type of education. The State Grant to Education, although it rose from £20,000 a year in 1833 to £100,000 a year by the April of 1847, was only a drop in the ocean in comparison with the Country's educational needs. The State only paid for the erection of schools, and only then on condition that the sum raised by private contributions came to at least half the total expenditure. This approach of helping those who helped themselves, which was looked on with favour by many Victorians, made the gap between the fairly poor and the very poor wider than before, because the latter were totally unable to qualify for the State Grant. The National Society also had a similar policy of giving only a percentage of the money needed to build

[1] D. Bowen: The Idea of the Victorian Church, Ch.5, Section 2, p.196f.

a school, with the expressed aim of trying to stimulate local effort rather than to supersede it. However, it is fair to observe that the National Society did provide cheap S.P.C.K. books for schools and that in some very poor areas they built a few schools without any local help at all. The Government approach of helping those who helped themselves was even maintained in Dr Kay-Shuttleworth's education minute of December 1846, whereby the State offered to pay for the first time one third of the Master's stipend and one third of the money needed for school equipment. Again the poorest schools were too poor to claim the Grant. Lack of sufficient funds meant not only that some areas had no schools but also that even where there were schools, school equipment was poor, and the monitorial method of teaching was adhered to. There was nothing attractive in being a teacher, even to attract men of quite humble learning. As Dr Kay-Shuttleworth said, 'A teacher's income is little greater than that of an agricultural labourer, very rarely equal to that of a skilled mechanic. A religious motive alone can induce a young man now trained in Normal schools to sacrifice all prospects of personal advancement for the self-denying and arduous duties of a teacher of the children of the poor'.[1] Dr Kay-Shuttleworth also claimed that funds for education fluctuated, there being more money raised in times of controversy than in times of comparative quiet. 'Every new step, however, disclosed the poverty of the resources of the existing system. During the feverish excitement of controversy it was possible, by great exertions, to procure considerable funds for the promotion of education, but with the termination of the conflict,

[1]Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth: Four Periods of Public Education. (3rd. period, Ch. 3, P.471f.)

the tendency to personal sacrifices was exhausted, and the original langour returned'.[1] This gives support to Lord Brougham's quip of 1847, 'The Church and the Sects liked controversy more than they liked education'.[2] Dr Hook, knowing both that the the Church couldn't educate the whole people herself and that the present system of education was unsatisfactory, resorted to the scheme he had already propounded to his friend William Page Wood in 1838, that the State should take over the education of the people.

There were three main ways of viewing the possibility of State education in the eighteen-forties, two of which were completely anathema to Dr Hook, and the third being the method which he himself propounded. The first was for the State to introduce into its schools its own religious instruction, following the Irish pattern, which had been formed under the initiative of Thomas Wyse in the eighteen-thirties. Dr Hook was convinced that this system of religious instruction would skilfully avoid all controversial doctrines and thus the teaching given would become so diluted as to unchristianize the country and make everybody into 'Nothingarians'. The second method of State education was to have secular instruction in schools and no religious teaching of any kind. Two types of people favoured this method; on the one hand secular humanists and atheists who were a small but influential group, and on the other hand a group of sincere Christians. The former disliked religious instruction in principle, the latter being realists, who also earnestly desired the rapid spread of educ-

[1] Ibid, p.473.

[2] Quoted by F. Smith: Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth. Ch. 6.

ation, felt that religious differences would be a permanent stumbling block to educational advance. This latter group also felt that religious bickering was harmful to the Christian cause and that children could learn their faith better in the atmosphere of Church Sunday schools. Dr Hook disliked this method because the absence of religious teaching in school implied that religious teaching was unimportant, and also he was a realist, knowing that as most children were sent to the present Church schools primarily for secular instruction, if secular instruction was to be given in one school and religious teaching elsewhere, then few children would in reality be sent to the school which gave religious teaching. In essence Dr Hook's plan involved schools being established and supported by the State, in which secular instruction would be given. Every child should bring each week a certificate to show his attendance at the Sunday school of his denomination, and on Wednesday and Friday afternoons, the parish Clergy and Ministers of various denominations, or their deputies, should give religious instruction to children of their respective flocks.

In April 1846 Dr Hook asked Dr Kay-Shuttleworth, the Secretary of the Education Committee of Privy Council, for information under the following heads. Firstly, he asked what is necessary to make education in England as efficient as it was in Holland and Prussia? Secondly, what are the existing means of education through the National Society and the British and Foreign Schools Society? Thirdly, he wanted proof showing the impossibility of the voluntary associations educating, except by the Monitorial system, and then the defects of that system. Finally, he wanted to know the number of Masters required to educate the children of England and Wales. Dr Kay-Shuttleworth

gave this information and more besides, and by the end of May Dr Hook, after much correspondence on details, submitted the MSS to him with a characteristic letter. 'If you approve of it, I will write to Mr Murray about the publication of it. If you think that it will not benefit the good cause, I have not the least objection to your committing it to the flames. It will be no pleasant thing to publish it, therefore I almost hope that you will condemn it. For I shall be attacked, I suppose, on all sides'.[1] Kay-Shuttleworth, while not agreeing with the proposals, welcomed such an authoritative attack on the inefficiency of the schools and the exclusive claims of the Ecclesiastical party. 'The pamphlet' he replied, 'is a great experiment worthy of the hardihood which has led you to dare and to accomplish so much; and if the organs of the High Church party will unite with the organs of the State party in its support, the pamphlet would make a great impression on public opinion. It is important for its success that it should bear, as it does, the complete impression of your own mode of thought and expression. On these, therefore, I offer no suggestion. The success of the work would certainly be impaired if it didn't retain its perfect individuality and unqualified originality in these as in other respects'.[2] It was the authorship of the pamphlet even more than its contents which Kay-Shuttleworth regarded to be as most important for its influence in the country. He said elsewhere 'Dr Hook possessed, in a pre-eminent degree, the confidence of Highchurchmen. No-one could suspect him of any unworthy concession of the claims of the Church or of religion.

[1] F. Smith: Life & Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, Ch.6, p.174f.

[2] Ibid.

When, therefore, he earnestly proclaimed his desire to relinquish, on the part of the Church, any desire for predominance; when he sought to place the Church on the same level with the Dissenting Communions with respect to the education of the poor; and to forego his own preference for a system of religious education, rather than leave the poor in ignorance; this plan of providing for education was introduced to the consideration of Churchmen under the most favourable auspices. They placed confidence in the sincerity of his zeal, and if any advocacy short of a concurrence of opinion among distinguished prelates could have reconciled the Established Church of England to such a plan, the vigour and ability with which Dr Hook espoused this cause must have had this effect'.[1] Kay-Shuttleworth did discuss with Dr Hook various difficulties which the proposals raised, for example, difficulties of finance, of school management and of the possible opposition of Dissenters. Then the pamphlet was published with the full backing of Kay-Shuttleworth behind it. The pamphlet, which is seventy-one pages long, follows contemporary convention in being addressed to a distinguished personage, in this case the Bishop of St David's. There are several reasons why Dr Hook selected the Bishop of St David's as the addressee of his pamphlet. Connop-Thirlwall (1797-1875) was a great scholar, being a lawyer before he went into the Ministry in 1827. As well as being a Classicist and debater of eminence, he held liberal views, so that he had to resign a University post at Cambridge in 1834, because he favoured the admission of Dissenters to the University. His liberal views are again reflected in that he supported the

[1]Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth: Four Periods of Public Education. (3rd period, Ch.3, p.505).

Grant to Maynooth (1845), the abolition of civil disabilities to Jews (1848) and the disestablishment of the Irish Church (1864).[1] He accomplished much educational work in his Welsh diocese, an area with a bilingual problem and where the Established Church was in a minority. In the eighteen-forties in Wales, there was a great educational revival, culminating in the formation of the Cambrian Education Society in 1846 by Sir Hugh Owen.[2] Churchmen and Nonconformists worked together in considerable harmony in South Wales, and much of this was due to the liberal views of Connop-Thirlwall. He also often spoke on educational matters in the House of Lords. His scholarship, liberal views, educational interest and influence, especially in the House of Lords, made him the ideal official recipient of Dr Hook's pamphlet.

Dr Hook began his pamphlet with reference to a recent speech by the Bishop of St David's in the House of Lords on education, and noted the Bishop's pessimism in feeling that the Government was unlikely to provide any general measure for the education of the people in Wales. He then expressed his own view that some very general measure for the education of the people must be, before long, adopted by the State. This was a view gaining ground among the Clergy of the manufacturing areas, but at the same time he, and they, were anxious in any suggestions made, to act consistently on Church principles. Dr Hook, after describing the Bishop as a man noted for tolerance, prudence, energy, liberal principles and also firm adherence to the principles of the Church, expressed the hope that he

[1] Dictionary of National Biography: Connop-Thirlwall.

[2] S.J. Curtis: History of Education in Great Britain, Ch.7, p.270.

might devise a measure for the education of the people. He then admitted that the reason why he was addressing his pamphlet to the Bishop was in order to obtain for his views a calmer consideration than they would otherwise receive. He admitted, 'I am aware that proposals made by me will be received with suspicion in some quarters, and it is with a view of obtaining for them a calm consideration from all parties that I desire to address them to your Lordship'.[1]

Dr Hook then thankfully observed that, unlike twenty-five or thirty years previously, the question was not whether, but how, the poor are to be educated, and much of the credit for this changed attitude was due to the work of the Clergy. While some made too great claims on behalf of education, 'anticipating results from it which we know, as Christians, can never through this instrumentality alone be accomplished',[2] nevertheless Dr Hook did recognize its great importance in moral training 'without which religion becomes a mere dogma'.[3]

Dr Hook then acknowledged the educational work done by the National Society and the Dissenting Societies, especially the Methodists. But then he acknowledged that hardly anything had yet been done in comparison with what remained to be done. 'But, my Lord, when I look upon all that has been done, I ask, what is the result? I must contend that, compared with the educational wants of the country, we have done next to nothing; we have lighted a lantern which only makes us more sensible of the surrounding darkness'.[4] Dr Hook then bluntly said that

[1] Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's, p.4.

[2 & 3] Ibid, p.6.

[4] Ibid, p.7.

he counted for nothing the reports of the Societies because failures were judiciously passed over and, because of that fact, the good accomplished was given in an exaggerated form. The Treasurer of the National Society claimed that in 1838 there were 6,778 schools in union with the Society having 587,911 scholars, while in 1846 there were 10,509 schools with 911,834 scholars. These returns were of limited value when it is remembered that many schools were held in hired rooms, many were Dame schools held in rented cottages, and above all, in some cases, there could have been a double enumeration of children in attendance, both on evening schools and Sunday schools, or both on day schools and Sunday schools. He then showed that it was quite easy to determine the number of schools which had been erected with the aid of Government Grants. The Parliamentary Grant for education, for the whole period from 1833 to 1846, amounted to £395,000, and as the Grants to individual schools over this period was on average £120, it follows that 3,291 schools were built, if the whole Grant was applied to this object. These schools would accomodate 493,650 children, according to the average ratio of the number of children to the Grants of money observed in the Minutes. Dr Hook admitted that during this period many schools were built without Government aid, but because of this fact, many of them being private property, could revert to private use unconnected with education. He concluded, at a liberal estimate, that loo private schools had been built annually over the period in question; thus 1,300 private schools had to be added to the 3,291 built with Government aid and a total of 600,000 or 650,000 scholars were in these two types of schools. Dr Hook then looked at the year 1845 by itself, and pointed out that

the 93,750 scholars accomodated in the 625 schools built with the aid of the £75,000 Grant for that year numbered only one quarter of the increase of population, which was 365,000 in that year. However, the disparity between the number of scholars and the rise in population for that year was not as bad as Dr Hook implied, because the increased population was due at least as much to a falling death-rate as to a rising birth-rate. Dr Hook then condemned the very low salaries of schoolmasters, in much the same vein as Kay-Shuttleworth, and went on to lament the total lack of any financial provision for apprenticed pupil-teachers. 'Instead of apprenticed pupils and trained assistants, we commit the education of the people of England to the wisdom, experience, and discretion of unpaid instructors in the shape of monitors, whose average age is ten years'.[1] The fund for the provision of books and school equipment was very low, and probably because of this, the Bible was often used as a class book, because ~~they~~ it could be purchased cheaply.

Dr Hook blamed the National Society and even the S.P.C.K, a society which he had done much to support, for failing to supply a better class of school books, especially on religious subjects. He then went on to examine the quality of education and immediately admitted that there were some very good schools, but these were situated in parishes, like his own, where there were some wealthy inhabitants; active, numerous and influential Clergy; and some laity who had both sufficient leisure and enthusiasm to work gratuitously as teachers or inspectors. Dr Hook then outlined at length, and in vivid colours,

[1] Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's: p.10.

the pathetic situation in manufacturing villages, and stated at the outset that 250,000 people lived in such places, exclusive of the large towns, in his own area. The length of this section and its pathos was designed to inform and probably spur to action many people, including Clergy and devout laymen, who lived in rural areas still almost untouched by the changes of the industrial revolution. A Clergyman, upon arriving at such a place, continued Dr Hook, would try to form a school, and after much exertion he would be able to obtain a pittance sufficient to pay for the hire of a room. He might be able 'to induce some pious young man, for the love of God, to give up a trade and to undertake the school with a trifling salary, and with the hope of obtaining a livelihood by the pence of the children'.[1] The young man, ill-equipped at Westminster training school, would be given sole charge of a hundred or a hundred and fifty 'little, dirty, ragged, ignorant urchins, assembled in the miserable building now dignified by the name of a National School Room, and he is expected, as by miracle, to convert them in as short a space of time as possible into clean, well-bred, intelligent children, capable of passing a creditable examination, if by chance an inspector or organizing master pass that way'.[2] The young master, with no assistance from anybody, apart from a word of encouragement from the Clergyman, who is too busy with other duties to do more, is compelled to use the monitorial system despite its defects of keeping most of the children in their ignorance and making the Monitors themselves vain and conceited. After school the master

[1] Ibid, p.12.

[2] Ibid, p.12.

must teach his monitors, probably hold an evening school, and then with the Clergyman beg from the poor and the few better off people in the parish, in order to raise enough money to build a school. Then at last with the aid of the National Society and the Committee of the Privy Council, the school is built. When the school building is completed the master and the Clergyman have to continue to beg, in order to cover the running expenses of the school. The master's living is always precarious, because even when his family is increasing, he can be reduced to greater want by a falling off, for various reasons, of the school pence of the children, on which his living mainly depends. Owing to the rapid rise of population, as soon as one school is completed, the Clergyman has to commence fund-raising all over again in order to build another school elsewhere in his parish.

Dr Hook then pointed out how much more time the Clergy would have for their other work if the State took over the work of building and maintaining schools. Education, he stressed, is at a minimum where it is wanted most and in those places where there is little education, those few workers who are educated have great power, for good or ill, being leaders of their order. Their power would be reduced by making education universal. Dr Hook quoted Bishop Butler's remark that to keep a poor man uneducated now would make him comparatively worse off than in the Dark Ages, now that education is more common and also necessary for the ordinary affairs of life. He then turned to the question of compulsory education, and while to some extent reflecting the prevailing laissez-faire philosophy in being against direct compulsion, as interfering with the liberty of the subject, nevertheless to some extent

he went against that philosophy in favouring indirect methods of forcing unwilling parents to educate their children. Children caught begging should be sent to the industrial school attached to the workhouse, where they could be fed and clothed as well as educated. He recommended that school inspectors should inspect every child working in a factory and rsceiving education at least once a year. School should be continued for all such children beyond the age of thirteen, irrespective of their form of employment, if they failed to reach a certain educational standard. If more masters were employed and a register of all children living in the district was kept in the school, then after school hours masters could visit parents of absentee children and entreat them to send their children to school.

Dr Hook then reiterated the point that the voluntary bodies could never make education universal because of lack of funds. Even the special fund of the National Society, which was established under favourable circumstances in 1842 only raised £151,985, in one sense a large sum, but paltry if measured by the amount of money that was required to make education universal. He then at length went into the statistics on the number of children there should be at school, the number of masters and assistants, the number of schools, and the amount of school equipment required in England and Wales. Then he estimated the amount of money that could be raised by school pence of the children, and voluntary contributions for running costs, and subtracted this from the total amount of money required for the school running costs, the deficit being made up by local rates or Parliamentary Grants.

In his first calculations Dr Hook considered that one

in six of the population should be at school, while in his final calculations he considered that one in eight of the population should be at school, and as his final estimate on this point was more realistic, we will take his final calculations for our perusal. As the population of England and Wales was about 16 millions in 1846, it followed that two million children should be at school. Dr Hook assumed for his figures that the average school would have 120 scholars and thus the number of schools required in England and Wales was 16,666. For the running costs of schools he had five items, the first of which was one master for each school at an average of £100 each, thus costing £1,666,600 altogether. The annual expenses of each school he put at £20, thus coming to £333,320 in all. One half of the school he assumed would have one apprentice at £15 each, thus coming to £124,995 altogether, while the other half of the schools would have two apprentices at the same rates each, thus coming to £249,990 altogether. Finally he estimated that the annual expenses of the thirty Normal Schools would come to £150,000. The total annual running costs of schools would be £2,541,571. Three sources of income would cover this expenditure, the first of which was the school pence of the children. School pence paid by children varied enormously, but Dr Hook took 1½d. per week as an average, or 6/- a year, thus allowing for school holidays. This sum for two million scholars came to £600,000 a year. Dr Hook assumed that voluntary subscriptions would on average come to one third more than the money raised by school pence. Thus £800,000 a year would be raised in this way. Dr Hook, however, was aware that voluntary subscriptions might decrease drastically if the State took over the education

of the people, but he took no account of this in his figures. The income came to £1,400,000 which left a deficit of £1,141,571 to be covered by endowments, annual Grants of Parliament and/or local taxation. The cost of the initial building and furnishing of thirty Normal Schools and over sixteen thousand schools was estimated by Dr Hook to be £450,000 for the former and over £8,000,000 for the latter. He admitted that in this particular sphere of the work much had already been done, but still nothing like £8,000,000 had been spent and much still needed to be done before every place had adequate school provision. Concerning the number of Masters and apprenticed assistants required, as the basis for statistics of school running costs given above; Dr Hook considered that the headmaster should teach forty scholars and that for every subsequent forty scholars in the school an assistant should be provided.[1] For obtaining the number of Normal Schools required, Dr Hook assumed that the average master would commence his duties at 21 or 22, and work for an average of sixteen years, bearing in mind life expectancy at that period and other factors. Thus 1,000 Masters, or 1,500 Masters and Mistresses would be required annually. If students remained in a Training College or Normal School for two years, and there were a hundred students in each college, then twenty Normal Schools for Masters and ten for Mistresses would be required in all.

After giving statistics to show what was required in manpower, materials and money in order to educate the poor in England and Wales, Dr Hook then gave educational statistics for six European countries, including France and Prussia, which

[1] Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's, p.24.

revealed a very much better situation than in this country. Only after Dr Hook's plan was implemented, or some other one just as comprehensive, would English education bear comparison with these European countries. Therefore State education was essential to put Britain on the same level as these other countries. Dr Hook asked the crucial question, what steps may be taken to this end without violation of religious principle, and if so what steps ought to be taken. He warned that the State must not promise what it cannot give, namely religious instruction. If the State tried to teach religion, which religion would it select for this purpose? In answer to this question Dr Hook reiterated what he had said many times before, namely, that it would be wrong for the State to support any particular religion in its schools when taxes were paid by people of various religions and no religion. Any general religious teaching that was broad enough to be acceptable to almost the entire population of the country would be so diluted as to be almost worthless. He then warned of an erroneous distinction made by some, that religion could be divided into general or special religion, the latter being doctrinal and the former being some system of morals. This general religion if used by the State as the basis of its religious education would unchristianize the country, 'Satan could devise no scheme for the extirpation of Christianity, more crafty or more sure than this, which would substitute a system of morals for religion'.[1] This division of religion into two parts is a false one. 'To separate the morality of the Gospel from the doctrines of the Gospel, everyone who knows what the Gospel is, knows to be

[1]Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's, p.35.

impossible. The doctrines of grace and of good works are so interwoven that they must stand or fall together. Faith and Works, doctrine and morality are like body and soul'.[1]

Dr Hook then claimed that the one way to have State education of the people with religious teaching and without violation of principle, was for the State to give secular instruction and to give opportunities for the Church and Dissenters to complete the education. The Church cannot object to admit Dissenters to an equal opportunity for giving religious teaching, because at the moment the State aids both Church and Dissent and so this will be only another application of a principle already conceded. Dr Hook went on by digressing at length against the notion which once prevailed, and was still supported by some Establishmentarians, that the Church of England has an exclusive claim to financial support on the ground of its being the Establishment. His main argument against the notion was that as taxes are collected from persons of all religions, then State money cannot be fairly expended for the exclusive mainenance of one. Having asserted the principle that in any measure of education the State must admit the co-operation of Dissenters as well as that of the Church, Dr Hook went on to explain his plan in further detail. The State should establish a school in which only literary and scientific instruction should be given by the Master appointed by the Government. On each Monday every child should bring to school a certificate, showing that he attended the Church or Chapel Sunday school of his denomination. Then on Wednesday and Friday afternoons the Clergyman of the parish and Dissenting

[1] Ibid, p.35.

Ministers or their deputies might give religious instruction to their respective pupils, rooms being provided for that purpose. After implying that his scheme violated no principle on either side, Dr Hook appealed for support. 'I ask whether, for the sake of a great national object, there might not be a sacrifice, not of principle, but of prejudice on either side'.[1] Then Dr Hook addressed himself specifically to Churchmen through the Bishop and claimed that there would be greater opportunities for giving religious instruction under his proposed scheme than was the case at present. Two afternoons a week devoted to religious instruction would afford more time for that department than was the case now. It would be a gain to throw upon the Clergy that department of education, which being now regarded as part of the routine business of the school, was usually left to the Master alone. Dr Hook showed the generally unsatisfactory state of religious instruction at that time, by quoting copiously from the Inspector of schools for the Northern District. The Bible was very often used as a class book and scripture lessons often degenerated into mere reading lessons. Monitors often read from anywhere in the Bible, not on a set plan, and the Inspector found one little class struggling through the Epistle to the Galatians. The catechism was often taught badly, the liturgy rarely, and few children were taught any prayers to repeat at home. Inspectors from other parts of the country had equally unsatisfactory reports. Dr Hook emphasized that religious instruction would always be unsatisfactory when taught by one Master and a whole set of ill-educated monitors, aged from ten to thirteen, to a large school. 'For religious

[1] Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's, p.41.

education we require more than the Bible, more than the Prayer Book; we require the living soul of the instructor, sanctified by grace, to come into spiritual contact with the soul of the person taught: the educated and religious mind must be brought to bear upon the mind untrained and uncultivated'.[1] He praised the Sunday schools as being the mainstay of religious education, while the National schools were merely nurseries for the Sunday schools. Sunday school teachers were often young people who only had one day a week off work and yet they gave that time to the training of little children in the Christian faith.

As well as teaching their class of children, these Sunday school teachers visited the children in their homes, guided the Clergy about them before their confirmation, and themselves met together under the Clergy from time to time for instruction and fellowship. If good, State day-schools were universal, the duties of the Sunday school teachers would be lighter. Dr Hook asked a question about his scheme which many Clergy must have asked when they first read about it. How would the Clergy find the time to teach on two half-days a week? He was convinced that if the Clergy had fixed times of attendance they would be no more busy that at the moment, because now many of them went to the schools very often for short periods. However, the Clergyman would need assistants to help him in this teaching, especially where there were more than thirty Anglican children, and this would usually be the case. Dr Hook wanted Church schoolmasters in his scheme - men trained at diocesan Normal Schools, who would help the Clergy in teaching

[1]Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's, p.46.

on Wednesday and Friday afternoons, be superintendents of the Sunday schools, help the clergy in their other work and probably be in Deacons orders. Not only would the Clergy on average be no more busy in the schools than previously by Dr Hook's scheme, but also in other ways their time would be saved, especially from the onerous duty of raising funds for school building and school maintenance. The time saved they could devote to their spiritual duties and the amount of money that they still raised could be devoted to building new Churches, and above all, to supporting a greater number of working clergy.

Dr Hook considered that the main opposition of Churchmen to his proposed scheme would be by those who said that by supporting the National Society, and only co-operating with the State through that Society, we maintain the principles of the Church. But Dr Hook himself felt that Church principles could be maintained quite as powerfully under his proposed system as under the present system. While the National Society was instituted for 'the education of the poor in the principles of the Established Church throughout England and Wales', in reality if one asked 'What are the principles of the Established Church?' one would get a different answer from one party within the Church than from another. Officials of the National Society would be reluctant to answer precisely the question 'What are the principles of the Established Church?' for fear of offending any one section of the Church and thus losing its financial support.[1] Dr Hook referred to recent speeches of the Bishops of Chester and London and the Archbishop of Canterbury in which all concurred that children were not forced to

[1]Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's, p.53.

learn the catechism in National Society Schools. The National Society tried to make children attend their local parish Churches, but if some parents took their children to other places of worship, the children concerned were not henceforth refused admission to the National Society school. Dr Hook was glad that children of varied sects went to the same schools - for that he was contending, but his point was this - 'Why, if Church principles may be dispensed with at the caprice of the Clergy, are we to waste our valuable time in raising subscriptions for the National Society, and in erecting schools to be in union with the Society, when what the National Society designs to do would be done better by the State, if we could only permit the State to have the control?'[1] The answer given to this point Dr Hook knew would be 'by an occasional sacrifice of principle, the clergy would retain what otherwise they could not do, the education of the people in their own hands'. Dr Hook maintained that he wanted to do the opposite, to make every sacrifice except that of principle. The Clergy would be more at liberty to propound the doctrines of the Church under his scheme than they were at present. Dissenters would enjoy the same liberty, but Dr Hook urged Churchmen not to think of Dissenters but simply whether children could receive a Church education as well under the scheme he proposed as they did at present. His own view was clear. 'I have no fear as to the answer unprejudiced minds must give to the question. We shall obtain a great boon for our country without any spiritual loss to ourselves. I believe that Dissenters will return a similar answer to the same question if they will consider it fairly'.[2]

[1] Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's, p.56.

[2] Ibid, p.58.

Dr Hook then went on to two other important points which have to be considered in every education scheme; the system of finance and the local governing body. He agreed with those who disliked parish councils controlling education. because they were often incompetent and were frequently involved in disputes and controversies at election times. Thus he favoured making the locality for educational purposes as extensive as possible. He wanted money for elementary education to be raised from a county rate, granted by the magistrates at the Quarter Sessions. The county Magistrates should define school districts throughout the county, and each district should have a Board of Management with powers to elect and dismiss teachers, to provide for visitation of schools, and to decide which schools should abolish school pence. Their other duties would be to purchase books and apparatus, to make necessary repairs, and to provide for general management in all respects. He considered that the Master's salary should come in part from school pence, except in very poor areas, and a minimum part of the stipend should be secured by law and charged on the county rate. The Master should also receive gratuities from a Government fund for training his apprentices well and for being successful in the management of his school. This same Government fund should pay the wages of apprentices. Dr Hook wanted the Government to erect new schools in places where there were over a thousand inhabitants and where there was no good school already established. The Government might also offer to defray the expenses of an existing school on its being transferred to the magistrates, on condition that the school trustees and their successors should become members of the Board of Management and have the exclusive use of the school-room on

Sundays.

He also advocated that where new schools were built, private contributions might be accepted on similar conditions: a certain sum be subscribed, the subscribers might elect five trustees to become members of the Board of Management, and to occupy the building for a Sunday school. He then listed, with various individual characteristics, the Normal schools of the National Society and the various dioceses, and claimed that in this sphere the National Society had been pre-eminently successful. All that was needed was more of these Normal schools and he felt that this could easily be done by the Voluntary bodies once they were relieved of the support of the Primary schools. The Government, for its part, should establish a Board of Examiners, conferring a diploma necessary for every Master seeking an appointment to a Government school. Before the examination, each candidate should be required to produce a certificate of his having attended for at least two years one of the Normal schools. If the Church and Dissenters failed to maintain their Normal schools, which Dr Hook thought to be most unlikely once they had been relieved of building and maintaining Primary schools, then the Government should take them over. Dr Hook wanted Deacons or Sub-deacons who would later work in the religious schools and help the Clergy generally to train in the Normal schools alongside those who were training to be teachers in the Secular schools. He then recapitulated his whole scheme, adding one or two points, and developing others. The School of religion was to be held on Sundays, Wednesday and Friday afternoons, and was to be supported by the voluntary contributions of congregations. The Master of the Secular school could be superintendent of the Sunday school,

when elected by the trustees of that school. The literary or secular schools were to be taught by Masters who had been trained in Normal Schools and had passed an examination. The object of the literary school was to inculcate strict moral discipline and to exercise the mental faculties. Dr Hook insisted that the Bible should not be used in the literary school; 'Above all things, selections from the Bible, as mere moral lessons should be avoided; for such selections would lead to some of those consequences, from the dread of which, as I have shown, the opposition to a Government system of education is raised. Such a proceeding is calculated to induce children and their parents to suppose that, instead of deferring to the Bible as the great Charter of their religion, they may pick and choose from it whatever may commend itself to their judgement, rejecting the rest'.[1]

Dr Hook admitted that some would object to his desire to place the appointment of the Board of Managers in the hands of the county magistrates instead of by the representative system in elections. But elections in the days before the secret ballot involved both canvassing and controversy, and Dr Hook hated parochial wrangling and wanted education to be under the control of a larger authority which, by the nature of the case, would be more detached from local jealousies.

One of the difficulties in Dr Hook's scheme which Kay-Shuttleworth mentioned to him in correspondence before its publication was om the question of school management. Dr Hook's reply shows his antipathy to local councils having anything to do with the management of education in their locality. 'Let me

[1] Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's, p.69.

conjure you, not to permit town councils to have anything to do with it. I have had twenty years experience of corporations, reformed and unreformed, and I have always found them, no matter what party is in power, so influenced by little, local, party, jobbing, petty, paltry feelings that they do injury to any and every cause they take in hand'.[1] Dr Hook then ended his letter with an appeal to all, to make great sacrifices in every way, except that of principle, so that the poor might receive a good education. 'When the foreign enemy threatens our common country, it is a glorious thing to see how Englishmen cast aside all party feeling, and unite as one man to repel him: so let it be in our warfare against ignorance and immorality: casting aside all minor considerations, not involving principle, may we be united in one common cause, doing not what, abstractedly considered, we should deem to be the best, but the best in these circumstances under which the providence of our God has placed us'.[2]

Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's will be assessed in detail in the next chapter, but it is worth noting here that it caused a great stir at the time and most of the comments on it were unfavourable. The Voluntaryist Dissenters under Edward Baines, one of their spokesmen, while admitting that Dr Hook's pamphlet was fair as far as the relationship between the Church and Dissenters was concerned, were at the same time strongly opposed to State interference in the voluntary efforts to educate the poor. Many Highchurchmen resented the equality Dr Hook meted out to Dissenters in relation to the

[1] F. Smith: The Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth. p.176.

[2] Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's. p.71.

Church and disliked his opposition to the view that the Established Church alone had a right to financial support from the State. In an age when laissez-faire and self-help were put on a pedestal, many felt that Dr Hook's scheme interfered too much with individual liberty and was far too expensive to be put into practice. The most serious criticism of Dr Hook's scheme came mainly from Churchmen, but to a lesser extent from Dissenters in condemning the way in which he divided education into two departments. This departmentalizing of religion was thought to be wrong because it could only be taught properly as a subject which pervaded all others. The great merit of Dr Hook's pamphlet was that it caused a stir and resulted in the publishing of many articles on education in newspapers and periodicals. The fact that Dr Hook, who was a loyal Anglican Clergymen, could condemn the present educational system as very deficient, even though it was mainly organized by the Church, must have convinced many that this was the case, and stirred them into at least thinking about what should be done.

The education minute of Kay-Shuttleworth (December 1846), which among other things brought in a new method of training pupil-teachers, and the increasing of the Education Grant to £100,000 a year early in 1847 by Lord John Russell, while not brought about by Dr Hook's pamphlet directly, nevertheless were in the spirit of his writings and were probably facilitated by the stir which his pamphlet of May 1846 caused.

(d) Dr Hook's Educational Work from 1847.

In 1847 there was much hostility in Leeds and elsewhere to the education minute of December 1846 and there was a fear early in that year that the Government Grant for education

was likely to be increased. Dr Hook attended two large public meetings in Leeds in March 1847 and made it clear that he was pleased with the education minute of December 1846, although in his view it didn't go far enough, and he also hoped that the Government would increase its Education Grant. At the first meeting, which was under the presidency of the Mayor, he expressed approval of the new educational minutes. 'The measure of the Government does not go as far as my plan, but because they will not go with me twenty miles there is no reason why I should refuse to go with then five'.[1] At the end of his speech he made an appeal to his hearers 'working men of Leeds, I may have sometimes given you offence, but I hope that you believe I am your friend, desirous in every possible way to promote your interests. My heart is right, my heart is yours, and I call upon you to prevent the cause of education being retarded in its progress. I call upon you to assist the Government of this country to reward merit, as well as to punish vice. I call upon you to assist them to do what will add to the comfort, respectability and intelligence of the working people. I call upon you to assist in doing what will enable you to educate your children so that they may be able worthily to exercise any constitutional privilege with which they may be entrusted. In a word, I call upon you to assist the Government to empty gaols by building schools'.[2]

At the second meeting which was held in the Cloth Hall Yard, he addressed in particular Voluntaryist Dissenters, who had vehemently denounced the measure: 'If you are satisfied with the quantity and quality of education in this country I will say

[1]Stephens: Life of W.F. Hook, Vol.2, p.213.

[2]Ibid, Vol. 2, p.213.

no more; if you can do without State aid, so can I. The number of children in Church schools at the present time is about a million, and in Dissenting schools about 100,000'.[1]

In April 1847 a Bill easily passed through Parliament enabling the Government to spend £100,000 a year on national education. But the Voluntaryists remained powerful and in the Parliamentary elections later that year, Macaulay, who had eloquently defended the right of the State to provide the means of education, was defeated.

The extract given above from Dr Hook's earlier public speech of March 1847 clearly implies that he considered that the children of his audience might one day exercise further constitutional privileges than their parents enjoyed and that, for the exercise of these privileges, more education was necessary. While coming from a somewhat static Tory background of the old school, Dr Hook, as a result of his close contact with the working classes over a long period, became a bold reformer, and this is especially true of his educational views and policies. He said to his friend William Page Wood in a letter in 1852, 'The present incapable Ministry cannot last. It will terminate Toryism as with the last Ministry the reign of Whigism came to an end. New parties must be formed, and I shall certainly be attached to the party of progress. Immense social improvements must take place. We are bound as Christians to aim at this'.

In 1850 the advocates of a secular system of education founded the National Public Schools Association, and Fox, the M.P for Oldham in Lancashire proposed that compulsory powers

[1] Ibid, Vol. 2, p.214.

[2] Ibid, p.297.

should be given to ratepayers to establish schools where there was a deficiency, and to levy an education rate for the support of such schools for children from seven to thirteen. In this proposed Bill the Grant was only to be given for secular instruction, and mainly for this reason it was easily defeated. Before its defeat, Dr Hook wrote to his friend William Page Wood about the Lancashire and Yorkshire advocates of secular education and described their views of himself and his education scheme, 'The Secretary of the Yorkshire Society said to Mr Jackson, 'Dr Hook was in advance of the age, but the age is now getting in advance of him, though the friends of education feel that deference is due to his opinion'. This was a sop to flattery, but the fact is observable. And what do you think is the great objection to the plan I proposed, omitting the details? The promoters of the Lancashire plan say to me "your plan is a very good one; but then you insist on everyone receiving a religious education; but why might not the Infidel, the man who thinks it wrong to prejudice the mind of his child to any religion, send that child to a Government school?'[1] Dr Hook then commented on these objections to his scheme 'Now you will observe here that infidelity has taken a new shape. It is a sect, demanding to be tolerated. I say a Sect, for it has its regular preachers, teaching morality, especially prudence, temperance, and domestic virtue, apart from, and in bitter hostility to, religion.'[2]

In July 1846 Dr Hook wrote about the reception of his educational letter written to the Bishop of St David's as

[1]Stephens: Life of W.F. Hook, Vol. 2, p.344.

[2]Ibid, Vol. 2, p.344.

follows, 'I hear that I am praised by some papers and abused by others for my pamphlet on education. I am too old to care for praise or blame. But I know I am right, and when it is too late Churchmen will see that I am'.[1] In December 1850 in the letter written to Wood, referred to above, the prophecy of July 1946 seems near to fulfilment. 'In the next place the evil which I wished to avert is coming to pass. And if we do not look about us, depend upon it, we shall have secular schools established by Government and controlled by the ratepayers, to which we shall be denied access. If we had moved first, our offer might have been liberal, but we should have gained control of the schools. Our fight will now be to escape being excluded'.[2] At the end of his letter Dr Hook very accurately foresees that most Dissenters would combine with the rising movement of Secularists against the present system. 'Dissenters have failed miserably in educating. They see that the Church beats them. They will join the rising movement - all but the really religious among them'.[3] This is precisely what happened, for the unreasonable attitude of the Denison Wing of the Church in the conscience clause controversy, coupled with the failing efforts of the Dissenters in educational work, convinced most of the latter that State Education, either with no religious instruction or with a watered down religious teaching, should be implemented throughout the country. School and Church building and pastoral provision barely kept pace with the rapidly rising population in the manufacturing areas, and thus

[1] Ibid, Vol. 2, p.211.

[2] Ibid, Vol. 2, p.344.

[3] Ibid, Vol. 2, p.345.

Dr Hook wrote to William Page Wood in 1851, showing his disquiet at the still prevailing ignorance in many places. 'You at a distance cannot understand the savage ignorance, the embittered barbarism of our manufacturing villages; you can have no notion of the ignorance which prevails, and which, being unchecked by superstition, is ready to break out into terrible acts whenever there is an opportunity'.[1]

In September 1851 a Committee of the Ruri-decanal Chapter of Leeds was set up, with the Vicar as Chairman and six other clergy, to consider the best means of reclaiming the lost portion of the population. Their report contained many suggestions and included one which aimed at promoting popular education, not only be means of schools for the young, but also by the establishment of scientific institutions, reading-rooms, and libraries for adults. Dr Hook spent much time trying to improve the moral and intellectual condition of the working class and the lower middle class and aimed at preparing them for the reception of religious truth by helping to cultivate among them a taste for literature, science, and a spirit of rational enquiry. He obtained speakers on a variety of subjects and lectured himself frequently on historical and theological subjects both to cultivated audiences in Philosophical and Literary Societies, and also to workers in their Mechanics Institutes. His lectures were both numerous and learned, and meticulously prepared, and yet as well as learned, they were also down to earth, on the one hand exciting his audience to mirth and on the other giving them wise, practical advice. He taught them to be contented with their lot, yet animated by a spirit of

[1]Stephens: Life of W.F. Hook, Vol. 2, p.309.

honourable ambition; and above all he impressed upon them the deep, paramount importance of acquiring a knowledge of religious truth, and of discharging all the duties of life upon religious principles.[1]

As well as working hard in the cause of promoting the education of poor children and also night schools for adults, Dr Hook was also active in promoting within the sphere of his influence, the education of the middle classes. He earnestly advocated the Oxford middle-class examination scheme, and it was largely through his efforts that steps were taken to remodel the old Grammar school at Leeds in 1854 on a sound basis. The practical success of this scheme was secured by the appointment of Dr Barry as Headmaster, a distinguished man, who later became Principal of King's College, London. In April 1858 the foundation stone of new buildings for Leeds Grammar School was laid by the Bishop of Ripon, and Dr Hook described that occasion in a vivid and moving letter to his friend William Page Wood. 'Easter Tuesday was a busy day. The Bishop laid the foundation stone of the Grammar School, with a beautiful service and an admirable address. We then gave the boys a dinner, to the high table of which subscribers were admitted. I was, of course, in the Chair. Barry spoke admirably, and of me personally, with such affection that, if I hadn't been in the Chair I should have cried, but I gulped down my maudlin with a glass of wine. Then we went to Church, where the Bishop gave us a beautiful sermon, one of those sermons which remain upon my mind. He offered to go in his robes to open the schools, and to say grace for the children. He spoke of me as 'his valued

[1] Ibid, Vol. 2, p.312.

friend the Vicar' which made my heart, as darling Jim would say, go "pit-a-pat". And then when we were breaking up, my wife was taken by surprise by the presentation to her of a splendid Prayer Book'.[1]

In the following year Dr Hook left Leeds, now with thirty schools and thirty-six Churches as opposed to the three schools and fifteen Churches which he had found when he went there twenty-two years previously.

As noted at the outset of this Chapter on Dr Hook's educational work and also by the Guardian in its obituary of him, Dr Hook kept a fine balance between practical, pastoral work on the one hand and theoretical, academic work on the other. As the Guardian said, 'He felt, in fact, no separation between the two kinds of work; they reacted upon and aided each other. The Church may be well thankful for both'.[2] As this is true of his Ministry in general, so it is true of his educational work in particular. Dr Hook spent much of his time in catechizing large numbers of children, lecturing adult evening classes, going round schools, and teaching and advising Sunday school teachers and catechists. He also spent much time in thinking about education, especially elementary education, considering the views of others on the subject and himself writing letters and pamphlets to friends and the public at large. His pastoral concern, Christian conviction and love of humanity made him desire a full education for every child. Thus he wrote his pamphlet to the Bishop of St David's in 1846 which made sacrifices of everything except principle in the cause of

[1]Stephens: Life of W.F. Hook, Vol. 2, pp.322-3.

[2]The Guardian: Obituary of Dr Hook, Wednesday October 27th 1875.

educational advance. As Lord Hatherley said, 'He foresaw the development that education must receive in a free country, and he was one of the earliest to secure for the Church her true position in forwarding that great work, not by the exclusion of others from the field of labour, but by her own superior activity. He was intolerant only of pretension and indolence, and in the midst of indefatigable labours he had no leisure for petty ambitions'.[1]

[1]Stephens: Life of W.F. Hook, Vol. 1, p.368.

Chapter 4.

An Assessment of Dr Hook's Educational Work.

(a) The impact of Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's (1846) on Contemporaries.

A good summary of how Dr Hook's letter to the Bishop of St David's, on the means of rendering more efficient the education of the people, was received is given by Dean Stephens in his biography.[1] He shows that while the pamphlet was in general supported by the Liberal party, much of the press and the Quarterly Review, the opposition to it was far more widespread, including most sections of the Church and the various branches of Dissent. The advocates of the voluntary system, both Churchmen and Dissenters, were vexed with Dr Hook for positively asserting the necessity of interference by the State. The supporters of the National Society were offended because he had implied that the Society could not act strictly on Church principles for fear of losing subscribers. He also offended Establishmentarians and many Highchurchmen by asserting that the Church of England had no exclusive claim to financial support from the State; and again many Clergy were offended when he spoke of the low quality of religious education given in many Church schools. Stephens correctly observes that the greatest outcry was raised against the proposal to sever education into two parts, secular and religious. As Stranks says, the strongest argument against Dr Hook was from Churchmen, namely, that

[1] Stephens: Life of W.F. Hook, Vol.2, pp.209-11.

if his suggestions were adopted religion would become departmentalized, whereas it could only be properly taught as a subject which pervaded all others.[1] This was a view also held by many Dissenters, thus for example Edward Baines, wrote in his seventh letter to Lord John Russell on State Education in September 1846, 'Systematic exclusion of religion from the ordinary instructions of the schoolmaster would be a fearful evil'.[2] However, as Stephens points out, critics of Dr Hook's scheme assume too readily that the secular master would have no religious influence whatever. Dr Hook expected that the secular masters would be religious men trained in Church Normal schools and thus they would inevitably exercise a religious influence even though their special work was confined to secular instruction.

Frank Smith, in his Life of Dr Kay-Shuttleworth, gives a detailed account of the first effects of Dr Hook's pamphlet. Dr Kay-Shuttleworth got a favourable reply about Dr Hook's pamphlet from the Secretary of the British and Foreign School Society and he replied to this Secretary as follows: 'Your note gives me hopes of the removal of a great impediment to progress, arising from the objections to State interference which had transiently been so generally adopted among the Dissenters. I have seen one of the chief agents and promoters of the Sunday School Union, who tells me that the chief members of the Committee are satisfied with Dr Hook's proposals'.[3]

While the British and Foreign School Society had

[1] C.J. Stranks: Dean Hook, Ch. 4.

[2] Nonconformist: London, Wednesday September 9th 1846, p.609f.

[3] F. Smith: Life & Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, Ch.6. p.177.

always accepted State aid in the present system of education, unlike the Voluntaryists who are alluded to in the first sentence of Dr Kay-Shuttleworth's reply, nevertheless it encouraged the latter to see that they were willing to accept increased State involvement in education. Then Dr Kay-Shuttleworth wrote to the Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, to inform him about the state of public opinion on Dr Hook's pamphlet. 'Among those who have imagined themselves in the National Society to be invested with almost legislative powers, and have abused their influence to retard national education for the sake of the côterie, his knockdown blows have left them either stunned, or enraged with pain and shame....The British and Foreign School Society are full of hope that the Dissenters will abandon their theoretical objections to the interference of the State'.[1] The High Church party rejected Dr Hook's proposals on many grounds and also failed to answer his charges that the present system of national education was deficient both in quantity and in quality. Many still lived in rural England in places as yet almost untouched by the industrial revolution where the educational provision was satisfactory, and where the Clergyman could keep a close watch on the village school. Clergy in these areas rarely wanted drastic changes and were often willing to ignore the very different situation in the Metropolis and the growing cities and towns in the industrial midlands and north. Many agreed with Denison (1805-96), who was Vicar of East Brent and Archdeacon of Taunton, in his contention that education was indivisible and that with or without State aid National Education should come under the control of the Church.

[1] Ibid, Ch.6.

Thus Denison said on one occasion 'I have always set my face as a flint against the mind of the time. I will fight till I die for the Catholic Church of England. I will not move one finger for a Church which negotiates with the House of Commons, or its creatures, about the means of discharging the trust committed to her of God'. The hordes of untutored savages referred to by Dr Hook wouldn't have moved Archdeacon Denison, even if he had lived in proximity to them. As Smith says, the problem of numbers, so dear to the reformers of the nineteenth century, was unimportant to him. As Denison said himself, 'you may teach a hundred children where you taught one before, but it does not follow that the teaching of the hundred is worth so much as the teaching of one'.[1]

W.E. Gladstone wrote to Dr Hook showing his views on the latter's pamphlet, and also how he himself would increase educational provision, 'For the last six months before my resignation I had been a member of the Committee of Privy Council on Education, but during that time we did nothing....Generally, I confess, I should like to try a larger extension of the present system before altering it fundamentally'.[2] This approach of retaining the voluntary principle in Education and with it the unity of Education, not dividing it into secular and religious, parts like Dr Hook, was the line taken by the Liberal Government and was held by Dr Kay-Shuttleworth himself. These people wanted to greatly increase State aid to the Voluntary Societies and at the same time to enforce a conscience clause and a management clause upon them. The hope was that with increased

[1] Ibid: p.78

[2] Ibid: Ch.6, p.174f.

State aid the evils mentioned by Dr Hook would be reduced and eventually eliminated. Many held this educational policy because they thought it was the best one, while others held it because they knew that other approaches such as that of Dr Hook would never get sufficient public support to make them viable. As Barnard observes, Kay-Shuttleworth himself realized that the comprehensive scheme of a denominational school with a conscience clause was the only kind that the nation would accept.[1] Dr Kay-Shuttleworth in his own educational writings shows both a sympathy for Dr Hook's proposals and also his own view and that of the Government, that the educational approach outlined above was preferable. He describes Dr Hook's aim of dividing education into two separate parts, religious and secular, as follows: 'This proposal originated in the conviction that the secular instruction communicated by masters religiously educated, would be pervaded by a religious spirit, and that such instruction so given would form a most useful preparation for the religious teaching the child was to receive on Sunday and on two other days in the week. By such means Dr Hook expected to triumph over the radical defects of the school of purely secular instruction, and felt confident that by concentrating the energies of the country on the establishment and support of combined schools, the spirit of Christianity would inevitably penetrate the whole instruction even of the secular school, while the secular learning energized the instruction given in the school of religion'.[2] A little later Dr Kay-Shuttleworth portrays the position the Government had held ever

[1]H.C. Barnard: History of English Education, Ch.11, p.44.

[2]Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth: Four Periods of Public Education.

since 1839 'The Government had however never wavered in its adherence to the principle adopted in 1839, that religion should be mixed with the entire matter of instruction in the school, and regulate the whole of its discipline; and though the proposal of Dr Hook might be regarded by sagacious politicians, as one of great interest in determining the drift of public opinion, it was, in political circles, regarded as impracticable'.[1]

As Smith says, the uncertain people, with regard to their reaction to Dr Hook's pamphlet, were the voluntaryists, because his proposal to divide secular and religious instruction cut their argument in two. As time was to show, they disliked this division, because they felt it would harm religious instruction and also they were hostile to any extension of the State's activity in educating the people. On the other hand Dr Hook showed a scrupulous fairness to the Dissenters in relation to the Church by his scheme and also the religious department of education was to be run independently of the State, both financially and in every other way. The Leeds Mercury at first gave a careful and accurate analysis of the pamphlet, but reserved its comment, thus gaining time to reconstruct the position. A little later Edward Baines replied to Dr Kay-Shuttleworth that while Dr Hook's pamphlet was the fairest and most liberal proposal to Dissenters he had yet seen, he couldn't go the smallest way towards State Education. 'By perfect freedom of Education, with the wholesome stimulus of competition, we should seek to attain an education as universal and of a higher moral quality and spirit than any stereotyped form that could be

[1]Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth: Four Periods of Public Education. p.506.

established by the State'.[1] Baines followed this statement up by eloquent attacks on State interference in education both in the Leeds Mercury and in letters to Lord John Russell. Here he overreached himself by 'proving' too much, namely that there was no deficiency in school provision and that the quality of existing schools, including even the Dame schools, was satisfactory. A letter of the Rev. R. Burgess, who was Honourable Secretary to the London diocesan Board of Education to the Bishop of London in November 1846, is typical of many and reveals a state of affairs in the capital similar to that portrayed by Dr Hook of the Yorkshire manufacturing area in his pamphlet. 'The humiliating fact must be acknowledged that in this wealthy Metropolis, the centre of mercantile enterprise, the depository of wealth and the seat of luxury, many thousand children are growing up without any instruction, secular, moral, or religious'.[2] He estimated that London needed at least fifty more schools, a special fund of £20,000 and an extra annual income of £2,000.

Smith says that Dr Hook admitted that the criticism of Dissenters, who anticipated an increase in the power of the Church was correct. This is surprising because in his pamphlet Dr Hook seemed to be anxious to give absolute equality in his educational proposals to Dissenters. The only slight inequality might appear to be in that Dr Hook allotted one room for the children of the Established Church and one for the children of Dissenters for religious education on Wednesday and Friday afternoons. While Church children could easily be taught together, it would be much harder to teach a group of children coming

[1] F. Smith: Life & Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, Ch.6.

[2] Ibid, Ch.6.

from various Dissenting sects all in one room. However, it should be noted that very many schools were small, not possessing more than two classrooms, and also that as far as numbers were concerned there were in 1846 more Church children than children of all the Dissenting sects put together. A militant Dissenter like Edward Baines would certainly not have admitted that Dr Hook's pamphlet was fair to Dissenters unless that was the case. Dr Hook became somewhat despondent as Church opposition to his pamphlet grew in bulk and variety, and expressed his disappointment to Dr Kay-Shuttleworth that Churchmen should be so blind as not to see that if they were to control the education of the people, they must seek State aid for secular instruction and fasten on to religious instruction as their own domain. Dr Kay-Shuttleworth was more optimistic about the effects of the pamphlet and he described to Dr Hook the good that had been done. 'It has roused the indifferent, produced extreme consternation among the small pedlars who work the machinery of voluntary coteries against the national interests - it has overwhelmed in disgrace and shame the advocates of antiquated nonsense - it has destroyed the homage paid to the names of things long since effete, such as the monitorial humbug and the makeshift at the sanctuary (the headquarters of the National Society)'.[1] Dr Hook felt less secure and replied 'the opposition is evidently so decided, that it would be presumption of me not to suppose that there are just grounds for it'. This contrasts markedly with a confident letter written about the same time (July 1846), 'I hear that I am praised by some papers

[1] F. Smith: Life & Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, Ch.6. p.174f.

and abused by others for my pamphlet on education. I am too old to care for praise or blame. But I know I am right, and when it is too late Churchmen will see that I am'.[1]

In September 1846 Dr Hook received an unexpected letter from Dr Stanley, the Bishop of Norwich, concerning his pamphlet on education. The Bishop acknowledged having read Dr Hook's pamphlet many times and said that he broadly concurred with its contents, only differing on minor details. He praised the home-thrusts and plain truths given by Dr Hook and felt that they couldn't fail to open eyes and ears hitherto, either from ignorance, timidity, or less pardonable causes, closed. The Bishop ended his letter by admitting that when liberal Churchmen like himself said that reforms were necessary they rarely got a hearing, and then in a final sentence he thanked Dr Hook for putting principle before party in the cause of the common good. 'A dozen or two honest and fearless "High Churchmen" like yourself are entitled to the cordial thanks of all who, regardless, comparatively speaking, of minor differences and distinctions, look to questions not connected with the mere exaltation of this Church or that Church, this or that party, but those of a more enlarged or comprehensive character, involving the best interests and welfare of the whole community'.[2]

In his reply to the Bishop Dr Hook admitted that the general reaction to his educational plan had been unfavourable. Then with characteristic honesty and bluntness Dr Hook showed that there was a marked difference between his position and that

[1]Stephens: Life of W.F. Hook, Vol.2, p.211.

[2]Ibid, Vol.2. p.240.

of the Bishop on education. Dr Hook had maintained that Churchmen and Dissenters could not work together in religion. He wanted both to keep aloof and to ask from the State a fair field on which to work in education. Then Dr Hook outlined the Bishop's position, 'If I may judge of your Lordship's principles by your conduct, I presume that you take the opposite line. You would wish Churchmen and Dissenters having the same object to act together. I think this can only be done by a sacrifice of principles on both sides...and I am quite certain that any dallying with a principle for any object whatever must be injurious to the moral character'.[1] Dr Hook then closed his letter by acknowledging that even if he and the Bishop disagreed on education principles, nevertheless they had the same object in view, namely the extension of education, and both agreed in thinking that it was absurd to suppose that the present system of education was sufficient to meet the wants of the country.

The Quarterly Review (number 78, 1846) gave a very detailed analysis of Dr Hook's pamphlet and also gave some suggestions as to how educational advance should take place. This review began by showing the considerable impact of Dr Hook's pamphlet, causing unexpected reactions and reflecting the widespread interest in the subject. 'In the manifesto of the new Minister, the state of public education has been placed in the front rank as one of the primary considerations which must occupy his Government. The rapidity with which the letter of Dr Hook has circulated through the country; its stunning effect on some, who had supposed that the whole weight of Dr Hook's authority was on their own side, but who retain nevertheless

[1] Ibid, Vol. 2, p.242.

the most profound confidence in his honesty of purpose; the unexpected satisfaction of others, who, like ourselves, had long since arrived, through less experience it may be, and with less sacrifice of opinion, at the same point; the general excitement which this pamphlet has produced in all quarters - announce the inevitable reopening of the whole question in all its momentous bearings'.[1]

The Quarterly then admitted that most people were unanimous in feeling that religious instruction should be given to the people but the stumbling block was how, and in what way this should be done. A warning was given to all parties not to unnecessarily impede any Government in its work of extending national education. Here Dr Hook's position, which he stated in his pamphlet, is clearly echoed, 'Generous self-sacrifice must be made of all which is not Christian principle'.[2] Then the writers of the Quarterly, after acknowledging that they were not Utopians, believing that popular education would solve all problems, went on to admit that there was a danger in education in that it might set the poor above their station, but despite this they were behind Dr Hook when he said that it was an old heresy that God had given man a mind capable of great things, without the intention, with respect to most men that it should be exercised. The Quarterly then condemned with great force one of Dr Hook's opponents who, having read his pamphlet, said 'I think I see in your declaration of principles that your benevolence and commiseration for the uneducated masses around you have overthrown your Churchmanship'. That,

[1] Quarterly Review 1846, No.78, p.377f.

[2] Ibid, p.377f.

said the writers of the Quarterly, would indeed have been but spurious Churchmanship - we might be disposed to give it a harder name.[1] The Quarterly then referred to a speech by Dr Hook on education, given a few years ago in London, in which he asserted the right of the Church to conduct exclusively the education of the people, and claimed that if this speech was put in parallel columns next to his recent pamphlet, it would only add to his arguments. Dr Hook changed his opinions so drastically because of his compassion for all those who had no education and for those large numbers who received a very poor education. While agreeing with Dr Hook that the State must before long take over education, the writers of the Quarterly were anxious not to alarm the new Chancellor of the Exchequer with the huge sum of money suggested by Dr Hook both for the erection of schools and the maintenance of schools. They suggested that State education would probably at first have to be supplementary, only building schools where those of the Church and Dissent were very inadequate. In his pamphlet Dr Hook, although reflecting the Victorian desire of not wishing to interfere with the liberty of the subject and thus being opposed to compulsory education, nevertheless did uphold indirect methods of forcing unwilling parents to allow their children to be educated. For example, he wanted children found begging to be fed, clothed and educated at the industrial school attached to the workhouse.[2] The Quarterly Review, here reflecting the current laissez-faire philosophy, was more reluctant than Dr Hook to use compulsion. 'It may be supposed that some comp-

[1] Ibid, p.383.

[2] Dr Hook: Letter to the Bishop of St David's, p.19.

ulsion will be necessary to bring this class under the discipline of the school; but we will be driven only by compulsion to compulsion; we even repudiate the mild coercion suggested by Dr Hook - that the young pilferer or vagabond should be committed to the school instead of to the jail or treadmill'.[1] Then the writers of the Quarterly showed their true colours in revealing where their real educational aspirations lay. They began by saying that the State being precluded from all partial assignment of its funds for the benefit of one religious community, in framing a plan for popular education, must take one of two courses. 'Either exclude all religion and leave it to Wednesday and Friday afternoons and Sundays as Dr Hook proposes, or find some neutral ground whereby the State teacher may inculcate some religion, without giving rational offence to any. We want this second possibility to be seriously considered. Cannot the State school teach 'religiousness' and does the Church school or Dissenting school normally do more?'[2] This shows that the Quarterly Review was not only against State support for one Church, presumably the Established Church, in its educational work, which we would expect; but also it disliked State support for several denominations in their educational work, which was the case at present. This latter point is correct because the Quarterly didn't allow State support for various denominations in their educational work as a viable alternative to the two it gave. The second alternative which the Quarterly gives is similar to the position of Bishop Stanley, namely to attempt to give religious instruction to Church children and Dissenting

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 78, p.398.

[3] Ibid, p.401.

children together without causing offence to anyone. This diluted religious instruction was much more opposed by Dr Hook who described it as like an orange with the juice squeezed out of it, a sure receipt for turning children into 'Nothingarians', Probably instead of having these two policies as alternatives as the Quarterly puts it, it would be better to work them together. That is to say while specific, denominational, religious instruction should be maintained, to help to link children with a particular church, at the same time general religious teaching, or at least a religious influence bearing on secular subjects, should be encouraged by the secular master. Either of these policies as alternatives have grave drawbacks, the former if it precludes a general religious influence in secular subjects, thus causing a dangerous cleavage between secular and religious in education, and the latter when it fails to have real depth and is unable to link children to the living body of Christ, the Church.

The Quarterly Review then criticized Dr Hook for condemning selections from the Bible in school, which he claimed had given children and parents the idea that they may pick and chose from it what they will and reject the rest.[1] The Quarterly rightly suggested that as the Church selects from the Bible so must the school, but it then agreed with Dr Hook that the perpetual use of the Scriptures as a classbook for reading, writing and spelling as well as for religious teaching is wrong. The Quarterly then agreed with Dr Hook that the mainstay of religious education was in the Sunday schools, the day schools merely being nurseries for them, but the writers expressed

[1] Quarterly Review: No. 78, 1846, p.402.

sympathy with those who objected to Sunday being the hardest School day of the week. 'Sunday school should be for catechism and its Dissenting equivalent, then the children should be free!.'[1] Finally the writers of the Quarterly reiterated the point that while the cost of State education could in the end be as great as Dr Hook suggested, it could be done gradually and not immediately. One way of saving money and also retaining voluntary subscriptions in the cause of education, even after the State made a more direct intervention in education, was to refrain from interfering too much with good, existing schools.[2]

The Guardian, which was actually founded in 1846, the year of Dr Hook's pamphlet, being a newspaper reputedly upholding Tractarian principles, gives a different outlook on educational matters from the Quarterly Review. Like the Quarterly however, the Guardian stressed the prevailing interest in education and pointed out that three of the four quarterly periodicals had an article on education in their last number. The Central Government was at the moment considering the whole question of the education of the poor and the outcome of their deliberations might have a permanent effect. The Guardian then succinctly gave the kernel of the issue confronting the Government. 'Is the main business to be a Government affair, with religious lectures permitted; or is the main business to be in the hands of an independent and definitely religious agency - the secular instruction being raised and improved and extended, the while by Government Grants?'[3] The former alternative posed

[1] Ibid, p.415.
[2] Ibid, pp.418-9.
[3] The Guardian: Article on National Education. Oct. 14th 1846.

by the Guardian was clearly the scheme of Dr Hook while the latter one was probably the existing system but with increased State aid. By its next few sentences this article in the Guardian clearly portrays its antipathy to the scheme of Dr Hook, 'Is the instruction of the poor to be substantially religious in its character, or substantially the reverse? But people say it is not an irreligious system that is being advocated, religion is to be taught, they only separate 'religious' from 'secular' instruction. Now that a religious lecture can make an irreligious education religious, we positively and entirely deny. It is not what the lecturer may be, but the master; not what the scholars may see in a strange visitor, but what they see at home in the school where they live and pass their time, that makes them of this character ot that, and for the assertion that it is unimportant what that character may be, whether religious or not, this we may safely leave to any of our readers to answer'.[1] While sympathizing to some extent with this viewpoint, it is only fair to point out in defence of Dr Hook that, in his scheme, the secular master being trained in a Church or Dissenting Normal school and being a religious man, would have a religious influence in the secular school.

The Guardian then gave two alternative educational policies which were acceptable to itself, namely the one mentioned above, that the State should aid the Voluntary Societies on an increased scale in their educational work, or secondly, that the State should consider endowing the Church alone to educate the people. This second alternative, which was put more forcibly by the English Review, need not surprise us when we remember

[1] Ibid, .

the Tractarian leanings of the Guardian and also that after Waterloo the State had given considerable sums of money to the Established Church for building new Churches. Graham's proposed educational clauses in the Factory Act of 1843, before their modification made in the hope of appeasing Dissenters, were very much in favour of the Established Church. Thus the unity of Church and State, which had been breaking up for many reasons in the decades before 1846, was still a potent force in the minds of many Churchmen. The Guardian resolutely opposed any other method of educating the poor than by the alternatives it proposed. 'There is no third course. To educate in irreligion or non-religion must be the duty of the State on no hypothesis whatever'.[1] In a number of the Guardian for December 1846 we have a surprisingly warm tribute to Mr Baines of the Leeds Mercury for his work in stressing that both the quantity and quality of education were in a better state than many would suggest.[2] Edward Baines and the Guardian differed from one another fundamentally on many points on the education question. For example, the former wanted no State aid whatever for the education of the poor, while the latter wanted increased State aid for the Voluntary bodies in their educational work or even, if possible, State sid for the Established Church alone in its educational work. The former was one of the staunchest upholders of a 'fair field' for Dissenters in their educational work, while the latter would have been happy to see increased State aid for the Established Church in its educational work, with, at the same time aid denied to the Dissenting communions in their

[1] The Guardian: Article on National Education, Oct. 14th 1846.
[2] The Guardian: Article on Education Question, Dec. 30th 1846.

educational work. The Guardian agreed with Edward Baines in his work in the press and in letters to Lord John Russell where he tried to play down the alarming lack of good educational provision portrayed by Dr Hook in his pamphlet. The Guardian did this probably because it feared that if the Government accepted Dr Hook's analysis of the present situation it might accept his remedy also. This is what the editors of the Guardian feared most of all, and thus it is why they came into alliance at this point with Edward Baines. In fact, the Government did accept Dr Hook's analysis of the present situation but for various reasons they did not accept his remedy. In November 1846 the Guardian quoted in full an article on National Education from the Examiner. It began by displaying a similar opposition to compulsory education to that which we found in the Quarterly Review. Then it proposed that each parish should have its own education paid for in the main out of the parish rates. Almost everyone in the parish, including even the agricultural labourers, should make some contribution towards this education on the grounds that all would benefit from it and also that we attach a value only to what we pay for. This latter point which enshrines the Victorian ideal of self-help was summed up well by a quote from Dr Johnson. 'If a book is given us, we seldom look into it; if we buy it, we read it'. The arrangements made for religious education in this article are somewhat ambiguous 'for the purely religious part of instruction, we think it may safely be left to the care and zeal of the different Ministers of religion. We have no fear of a failure in our Sunday schools, no distrust in the zeal of our own Clergy, or of the vigilance of the Ministers in our various forms of Dissent'.[1] This implies that at least the bulk of

[1] The Guardian: National Education. Nov.18th 1846. From the Examiner.

religious teaching should be conducted outside the day school in Sunday schools and under the supervision of the Clergy and Ministers. The lengthy obituary of Dr Hook in the Guardian is interesting because, in two places, one briefly and the other at length, it shows after a period of nearly thirty years, that paper's well considered opinion of the educational pamphlet of 1846. In the first passage the Guardian, while still opposing Dr Hook's advocacy of a secular system of education, recognized that behind his policy was a hatred of Erastian theory and the rejection of the claim of the State to be in any sense a teacher of religion. In the second passage the Guardian went further and claimed that 'Dr Hook's greatest mistake at Leeds was (as we thought and still think) his rash advocacy of the secular system of education'[1] and again 'It is possible that deeper reflection may have led him to see that it was, on the whole, his one serious declension from sound Church principles'.[2] However, in the obituary, but not in 1846, the Guardian did have praise for certain aspects of Dr Hook's pamphlet; 'He was absolutely right in his sense of the urgent need of education, in his discontent with its condition at the time; he was, as events have proved, right in believing that the Voluntary system alone could not meet the whole needs, in holding that the aid of rates and the use of compulsion (although he never thought of direct compulsion) would be necessary; he was right in claiming for the Church, as all that she needed, "a fair field and no favour".[3] The first point in the last quote contrasts

[1] The Guardian: Obituary of Dr Hook. Wed. Oct. 27th 1875.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

sharply with the Guardian's praise in December 1846 for the work of Mr Baines, in claiming that the education of the poor in England was quite satisfactory, both from the point of view of quantity and quality.

The Nonconformist, with its grandiloquent subtitle 'the protestantism of the protestant religion and the dissidence of Dissent' has much material on the subject of national education in its numbers for the latter half of 1846, some of which explicitly deals with Dr Hook's pamphlet, while much of the rest does so obliquely. In an able article on Educational Voluntaryism in August 1846, the Nonconformist at first states the view of those who wanted to overthrow the Voluntary system; 'The Voluntary principle, it is said, whatever may be its merits in regard to spiritual institutions, is clearly incompetent to provide for the whole people a due amount of secular instruction. It has been tried and the result has been a failure. The schools that it has erected are sadly few compared with the wants of the population, and the education given in them sadly defective'.[1] The Nonconformist answers this charge by asking 'What, if in both respects it is doing somewhat more and better now than it did twenty-five years ago, or ten, or even five?'[2] Clearly much more was being done than twenty-five years previously but reformers would answer that much more needed to be done, and especially with the rapid rise in population, drastic remedies were needed in order to ensure that before another generation passed away every child could have a reasonable education. The Nonconformist then described the language

[1] The Nonconformist: Educational Voluntaryism. p.548, August 12th 1846.

[2] Ibid, p.548, August 12th 1846.

of reformers and quite clearly, by what it said, had Dr Hook in mind, 'Language like this, although tinged at times with the humour of sarcasm, springs, we are willing to believe, from sincere benevolence. It is warm with right human feeling - it smacks of a hearty, and to a certain extent, an intelligent good will - and there is little cause for surprise, therefore, that it should reflect itself to kindly but unreflective minds....It is benevolence in a hurry'.[1] The article then gives as a precedent for the slow progress of education, the slow advance of Christianity, which after many ages had still effectually subdued only a small portion of the world; 'yet He, whose benevolence none but the impious will question, does not, to hasten on its universal triumph, deviate a hair's breadth from the fixed laws by which He regulates His moral administrations'.[2] The Nonconformist reminds those who had so little faith in voluntary effort and so much in Government provision that voluntary efforts in education preceded by a very long time State intervention. Here the writer is, of course, correct, but then he unjustly says that the sneers now made on the voluntary principle were made by those who twenty-five years previously had denounced every attempt to enlighten the masses. Certainly Dr Hook, as one of the most prominent of those who now criticized voluntary efforts as alone sufficient for the education of the poor, had always supported education from the earliest days of his Ministry. The Nonconformist then criticized those who had misrepresented the facts by insinuating that next to nothing had been done in educational advance.

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.

This is a fair criticism of Dr Hook who said in his pamphlet 'I must contend that, compared with the educational wants of the country, we have done next to nothing; we have lighted a lanthorn which only makes us more sensible of the surrounding darkness.'[1] To imply that little had been done was as untrue as to imply that everything which was necessary had been done. Dr Hook, however, overstated his case out of pastoral concern for the uneducated in the hope of stirring people to action. This article ends with the just comment that if half those who deplored the inefficiency of the voluntary principle exerted themselves in their own districts, things would be much better. However, this chiding exhortion applied to many people of all educational viewpoints and not just those who opposed the voluntary principle. In several numbers for the latter half of 1846, the Nonconformist gives excerpts from Edward Baines letters to Lord John Russell on State education. In the fifth letter Baines claimed that in England and Wales there were nearly enough school places already, because while ~~1,876,947~~ 1,937,292 children should be at school there was school provision for 1,876,947. Baines does not tell us how he calculated the first figure but simply tells us 'The amount of day school accomodation that could be reasonably expected in England and Wales in the present social and industrial circumstances of the people was for 1,937,292 scholars'.[2] He obtained his latter figure quite simply by adding Lord Kerry's returns, in which he said there were day schools containing 1,276,947 scholars in 1833 to Dr Hook's calculation that schools were provided since 1833

[1]Dr Hook: Letter to the Bishop of St David's, p.7.

[2]The Nonconformist: State Education, p.581f. Aug.26th 1846.

for between 600,000 and 650,000 scholars.[1] Baines then correctly said that while Government aid stimulates some private liberality, it reduces it in some quarters at the same time. The present Government policy of giving aid to those localities which had provided at least as much from private resources was an incentive to private liberality, being only unfair to those areas too poor to qualify for the Government Grant. What concerned Dr Hook and other reformers was, that if the State very largely took over the education of the people, private giving for education might fall off very badly. Baines then claimed that the deficiency of education in England was due not to lack of schools but poverty, whereby many parents were forced to send their children out to work at a very early age. The truth is that both lack of schools and poverty were, together with the poor quality of education and apathy, responsible for the deficiency of Education in England.

Edward Baines is at his most complacent in his sixth letter, where he began by assuming that there was no very serious inefficiency in National Society and British and Foreign School Society Schools. Then after praising the schools for upper and middle classes as quite good, he went on to admit that the cry of inefficiency was especially made against small Dame schools and a few others. After saying that many of these private schools were disappearing, he praised some of the Dame schools naively as follows; 'They are respected by their neighbours. If they were not respected they would not obtain scholars'.[2] In fact, many parents sent children to the Dame school because

[1]Dr Hook: Letter to the Bishop of St David's, p.9.

[2]The Nonconformist: Extract of Mr Baines 6th Letter on Education. September 9th 1846.

it was the only school in the area, and cheap, and because it kept the children off the streets, while the parents were at work. These factors, rather than the inherent quality of Dame School education, kept these schools open. Baines ended this letter with a maxim, then popular, but in fact as a generalisation, untrue, 'Under the influence of freedom and competition, whatever is found worthy to stand, stands; and whatever is deserving to fall, falls'.[1]

In his seventh letter Edward Baines cogently dealt with a subject which became the most controversial question raised by Dr Hook's pamphlet, namely, whether religious and secular education ought to be separated. He began by saying that the State, according to Dr Hook's scheme, was to recognize religious education and to provide two rooms for it, but for this part of the school to work, Dr Hook trusted in the voluntary principle. He went on, 'Now if it be true (as Dr Hook contends) that the voluntary principle cannot be trusted for General Education, is it certain that it can be trusted for Religious Education? I confide in the voluntary principle for both. Dr Hook confides in it for one, but not for the other. On his own principles, his scheme is defective, and that in the most important point'.[2] A hidden danger that Mr Baines saw in Dr Hook's scheme was that in all probability it would lead one day to a takeover by the Government of the religious part of education. If in reality, or in the opinion of Parliament, the religious part of education was not satisfactorily conducted by the voluntary bodies, then, by its own recognition, Parliament

[1] The Nonconformist: Extract of Mr Baines 6th Letter on Education. September 1846.

[2] The Nonconformist: Extract of Mr Baines 7th Letter on Education. Sept. 9th 1846.

would be bound to take the providing of religious education into its own hands. Baines then described what he regarded as the least satisfactory part of Dr Hook's plan; 'No religious or moral instruction is to be given by the schoolmaster. The Bible is not to be used as a classbook, nor selections from the Bible as mere moral lessons. The school must not be opened by prayer. These things must be provided by law and so Dr Hook's plan excludes the teaching of morality'.[1] However, Dr Hook said that the first object of the literary or secular school was to enforce "strict, moral discipline"[2] and this would surely include both the example of the master and precepts pointed out by him at suitable moments in his teaching. While it is true that Dr Hook forbade the use of the Bible in the secular school, nowhere does he explicitly state that the school must not be opened by prayer. However, this is a possible, but by no means certain, interpretation of his pamphlet. Edward Baines then asked the crucial question, 'would it be right, or desirable, to prohibit by law the teaching of religion or morality, the use of the Bible, or the exercise of prayer, by the schoolmaster, in day schools for the children of the poor, and to confine him wholly to literary and scientific instruction, leaving religious instruction to be given by Ministers at stated times?' He answered his own question emphatically in the negative, stating that the exclusion of religion from the ordinary instruction of the schoolmaster would be a fearful evil. After reiterating his point that Dr Hook's method of education would exclude all moral instruction, he went on to

[1] Ibid.

[2] Dr Hook: Letter to the Bishop of St David's. p.67.

show that it would also produce teachers having no religious character. If the Church and Dissenters kept up their Normal Schools as Dr Hook proposed, what motive would there be for teaching religion in those schools, seeing that the persons trained there would themselves be prohibited from giving religious instruction? Mr Baines then went further. 'Moral character would be insisted on for teachers but not religion, in fact there would be a motive for selecting people of a neutral or no religious position'.[1] Religion and morality would be banished from school books and so, by following Dr Hook's scheme, there would be 'a tendency to discountenance a combination of religion with elementary knowledge in science and literature - an evil of immense magnitude'.[2]

The Nonconformist then referred to the September 1846 copy of the 'Ecclectic Review', an Evangelical periodical, which, prompted by the pamphlet of Dr Hook and other recent happenings, gave a powerful article on the subject of State education. The Ecclectic laid bare the dangerous consequences which were likely to result from the Government assuming the office of public instructor and thus took a similar line to that taken by the Nonconformist itself.

Dr Vaughan, a leading Dissenter, who, like Dr Hook, advocated the separation of religious and secular instruction, replied to Edward Baines as follows in a dispute they had on the adequacy of educational provision. 'You may receive as true nearly everything reported to you by the Earl of Kerry's inspection, and may reject everything reported by other inspectors whose returns are not favourable to your views, but it is

[1] The Nonconformist: Extract of Mr Baines 7th Letter on Education, Sept. 6th 1846.

[2] Ibid.

not by any such process that this question may be settled'.[1] This reply reminds us that there were many figures bandied about by educationalists, figures which were not formulated on a scientific basis and which frequently diverged quite markedly from one another. Thus people could come to different conclusions by using different sets of figures, unless the figures were used with caution and reserve. While faulty figures could cut both ways, it is fair to say that on the whole, with double enumerations and other factors, they tended to exaggerate rather than to minimize educational provision.

By far the most powerful attack on Dr Hook's pamphlet was to be found in the English Review for September 1846. It began, like the Quarterly Review, by showing the considerable impact of Dr Hook's pamphlet. 'It is a very important subject and the author's position in the Church gives great weight to what he says, and it is clear that he has spoken to a very attentive audience, from the eight editions of his pamphlet which have been called for within the brief space of three months'.[2] The English Review then admitted that Dr Hook had conclusively shown that it was impossible for voluntary associations to supply both sufficient schools and competent masters, and therefore it was the duty of the State to promote more fully the cause of National Education. The Review then condemned the title of Dr Hook's pamphlet as a misnomer, and said that instead of calling it 'on the means of rendering more efficient the Education of the people', he ought to refer to the education of 'the poor'. 'The poor are a part, a most

[1] The Nonconformist: Dr Vaughan's reply to Mr Baines, Sep. 23rd. 1846.

[2] English Review: No. XI. Sep. 1846. p.127.

important part, of the people, but they are not the people, and it appears to us a serious error to call them so: and in our opinion it is especially incumbent on the Clergy to abstain from all expressions which may give the poor a false notion of their position and render them discontented with it'.[1] The writers of the Review then praised the National Society for having the frankness to describe their Society as one for promoting the education of the poor. To us this criticism of the title of Dr Hook's pamphlet seems to be a trivial one, not worthy of the space the English Review spent on it, but at the time it would carry considerable weight in many influential quarters. The Review then praised Dr Hook for stressing that there can be no education without a doctrinal, religious basis, and that this education cannot be given by the State. Then it outlined Dr Hook's proposals in detail, and made lengthy comments on them. The first point made was that Dr Hook's plan was not original. Mr Simpson, a Scottish gentleman, had a similar plan, and the House of Commons ordered his plan to be printed in an appendix to the Report of the Committee on Irish Education for 1835. Thus Simpson said 'Teachers of Elementary Schools, it is proposed, shall be secular teachers, and no more; they should not be required to teach revealed religion; but, more, they should not be permitted to do so. There shall be other and much better provision for it; it shall be imparted to the young, not by the elementary teacher, but by the proper religious teachers, the Clergy of the different persuasions'.[2]

[1] Ibid, pp.128-9.

[2] Ibid, pp.134-5.

However, while Dean Stephens himself described Dr Hook's letter to William Page Wood in 1838, including the germ of what later became his Letter to the Bishop of St David's, as a 'bold and original scheme'[1], nowhere does Dr Hook himself claim his educational plan to be original. We do not know whether Dr Hook had read Mr Simpson's work, but even if he had, it makes no difference to the value of his pamphlet or views. While Dr Hook's pamphlet was not original, what was original was that a man of Dr Hook's position and Churchmanship should hold such views. As Frank Smith succinctly put it 'the pamphlet attracted much attention, not so much for its novelty as for its authorship'.[2] The writers of the English Review then pointed out that the system proposed by Mr Simpson and Dr Hook had been tried in France and there it had produced a race of youthful infidels. The French Episcopate had been unanimous in condemning this State system of Education, and a shrewd observer, M. le Vicomte de Cormenin wrote in 1845 'Do our schools give any moral education to their pupils?' 'No.' 'Why not?' 'That is the business of the parents' - 'Any religious education?' 'No'. 'Why not?' 'That is the business of the clergy'. 'But we have Chaplains in our schools'. 'You may have what you like, but you have no religion there: your schools are not made for it, and they have none'.[3] French Chaplains were despondent and one said 'When the scholastic career of the pupils is finished, of those who quit a school of about four hundred students, there is only about one pupil a year who believes the doctrines, and

[1]Dean Stephens: Life of W.F. Hook, Vol. 1, p.445.

[2]F. Smith: Life & Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, Ch.6,p.174f.

[3]English Review: No. XI, Sep. 1846, p.136.

discharges the duties of religion'.[1] With great force of satire the Review commented, 'Let Dr Hook add this fact to his statistical tables, in which he calls on us to vote £8,000,000 sterling, and £3,000,000 per annum for the establishment of similar schools in this country, to produce one Christian in four hundred'.[2] The Review suggested that as Masters were independent of Clergy and Bishops in France, the Master might become a rival of the Pastor, and thus Church and State might be in an attitude of antagonism to each other. Many French Clergy had kept aloof from State schools because of the bad conduct and influence of the schoolmaster, and thus the schools had become completely secular and, in the end, hostile to the Church. From this fact the Review asked 'Suppose Dr Hook got his £8,000,000 and £3,000,000 annually for State schools, is he sure the parochial clergy would attend any of them?'[3] The Review it seems, as well as an element of the Clergy, wished to keep the schoolmaster under the sway of the local clergyman, not only in order to safeguard religious truth, but also for less noble reasons. As Burgess observes, a few High Churchmen favoured the Revised Code of Robert Lowe, despite all its drawbacks from a religious point of view, because by it teachers would receive no money from the Council office and thus would be more under the Clergyman's control.[4] After saying that in Education, unlike in Dr Hook's scheme, the secular must be subordinate, dependent on and subsidiary to the sacred, the

[1] Ibid, p.137.

[2] Ibid, p.139.

[3] Ibid, p.144.

[4] H.J. Burgess: Enterprise in Education. Ch. 12.

Review went on to claim that in some respects Dr Hook's plan was worse than the French system. While in 1833 M. Guizot had a clear field to work on, England in 1846 had many schools, including over 10,000 Church schools. Dr Hook's work was destructive in the sense that he supposed that Church schools would become State schools in order to exist at all. Again, while Dr Hook's masters were compelled to teach no religion, French teachers did teach the catechism of the diocese to those who were willing to learn it. The Review warned that it was impossible to tell a master not to teach religion and think that you can stop there. 'No. By not teaching religion, he must teach irreligion. There is atheism in his silence'.[1] Dr Hook's solution of having teachers of various denominations coming to the school twice a week to teach their respective children was condemned as 'showing the children twice a week how much religious strife there was in the parish, and what a variety of opinions in the world on the subject of Christianity, and teach them thereby to debate and quarrel about it, instead of believing and practising it'.[2] However, it is fair to point out that the denominational differences in a parish existed whether the children went to the same school or not, and it could be argued that differences are accentuated rather than eased by children going to separate schools for their entire instruction. The authors of the Review then gave a warning of the alarming consequences of not allowing the ordinary master to appeal to religion when teaching secular subjects. 'If the master is never allowed to appeal to religion, he can't

[1] English Review: No.XI, Sept. 1846, p.147.

[2] Ibid, p.148.

apply religious motives and precepts to the formation of his pupil's habits; he can only offer him worldly maxims and objects, and he must therefore lead him to form the irreligious habit of regulating his actions by the opinions of men, and not by the law of God. This is unchristian education and its bad effects cannot be counteracted by an hour or two of Religious Instruction two days a week'.[1] This comment is correct if the premise is correct, namely that Dr Hook forbade the secular master from appealing to religion in his teaching. Dean Stephens correctly states that Dr Hook both expected the secular masters to be religious men and also to exercise a religious influence in their secular teaching.[2] However, it is fair to say that Dr Hook's pamphlet isn't very explicit on this point, hence the divergent interpretations of it. While on the one hand the secular master was to enforce moral discipline and on the other Bibles were not to be used in the secular school, his precise religious influence is not stated, and this silence is one of the main faults of Dr Hook's pamphlet. The Review condemned Dr Hook for accepting the present position of Dissenters in education and accused him of 'stereotyping heresy and schism forever'. 'We respectfully suggest to him that he has no right to say to the Dissenters, "Be Dissenters, you and your children, until Doomsday", and he is guilty of an act of grievous cruelty to them and their posterity in blocking up the road for their return to the unity of the Church. His approach is very different to that of St Augustine!'[3] The Review ended its long

[1] Ibid, p.149.

[2] Dean Stephens: Life of W.F. Hook, Vol. 2, pp.210-211.

[3] English Review: No.XI, Sept. 1846, p.151.

attack on Dr Hook for his attitude to Dissenters as follows; 'He speaks of this compromise being a sacrifice, not of principle, but of prejudice. Has it then come to this, that it is a prejudice to "magnify the office" which Christ has instituted for the salvation of souls?'[1] Dr Hook was a practical man, a realist and also eminently fair, even if sometimes somewhat blunt, in his dealings. Hence, as the Dissenters existed, and in large numbers, and as they paid their taxes, they had a right to be included in a national scheme of education. The two alternatives to this course of action would have been unpalatable to Dr Hook, for to exclude them altogether would perpetuate ignorance and Dr Hook, with his pastoral concern for the dignity of man could not have countenanced such a proposal. On the other hand, allowing Dissenters into State schools, with ~~no~~ Church religious instruction and no conscience clause would have betrayed their principles. The return to the Established Church by the Dissenters would not be facilitated by keeping them either without State education, or with it only after a surrender of principles; rather such a course of action would have hardened the most religious of them and pushed the rest into the arms of the secularists. Dr Hook's method of approach to Dissenters did in fact induce many of them during his Ministry to return to the Established Church and the rest had a respect for Dr Hook's principles and he for theirs.

The English Review then referred to Dr Hook's pamphlet where he said that to ask Parliament to vote money for the exclusive support of the Church of England was unjust. The Review pointed out that, while having received our taxes the

[1] Ibid. p.151.

State should in return protect us, it had no obligation to endow our opinions. 'Whatever opinions the State may encourage, it does so not because they are ours, but because they are in accordance with the Divine Will, and conducive to the general good....Religious unity strengthens a State, so legislators often endow one religion rather than many'.[1] With considerable rhetoric the Review went on, 'If then it is a persecution of Dissenters to apply taxes partly collected from them to promote Church Education, how much more an act of persecution is it of Churchmen and Dissenters to make them contribute £millions not for the establishment of anything, but for the disestablishment of all things!'[2] Dr Hook had asked in his pamphlet 'Where is the Act of Parliament which established the Church?' The Review answered this by asking 'Where is the Act of Parliament which established the Monarchy, peerage or Commons?' It then pointed to hundreds of Acts of Parliament which recognized and maintained the Church. The Review then criticized Dr Hook for urging the Bishops, in his pamphlet, to sell their estates in order to provide funds for National Education. The Bishops gave much at the moment for various good causes, and if they were unable to do so, little would be given by anyone else; so 'a "pauperized hierarchy" would be one of the most sure recipes for an "uneducated people"'.[3] The Review then agreed with Dr Hook that the State did, in fact, assist both the Church and Dissent in their work of Education, but disagreed with him by saying that this fact had not conceded the principle that there

[1] Ibid. pp.155-6.

[2] Ibid. p.157.

[3] English Review: No.XI, Sept. 1846, p.161.

was no established religion.

Finally the writers of the English Review gave their solution to the present educational problem. 'Most of the poor are Church of England or nothing, thus as the poor should be educated by the State, and as their education must be religious and to be a blessing doctrinal, then as the Church is the branch of Christ's Church in this realm, established by law, so the Church ought to be enabled by the State to educate the poor'.[1]

The Record for July 1846 copies an article from the Morning Chronicle, a Whig Newspaper, on the first impressions of Dr Hook's letter. The editor of the Morning Chronicle, knowing Dr Hook to be both a Highchurchman and also a pastor with a real concern for the poor, expected his letter to combine a desire for the welfare of the poor with a vigorous assertion of the exclusive claims of the Church to control education. 'But nothing could be more wide of the mark than such an anticipation. A concern for the welfare of the poor is indeed stamped upon every page and the claims of a long neglected class to the blessings of education are vindicated with extraordinary power, but all this is united, not merely with the concession, but with the broadest and boldest assertion of the rights of those who dissent from the Established Church'.[2] The Morning Chronicle then, after praising Dr Hook for his fearless frankness in exposing the hard realities of society and for refusing to blunt the edge of any cutting truth to make it bearable, went on to assess his pamphlet as one of inestimable importance and

[1] Ibid. p.166.

[2] The Record: July 13th 1846. Quote from the 'Morning Chronicle'.

ended with the promise to complete the publication of it in the course of the week. A later number of the Record gives lengthy extracts from a letter to Dr Hook on the contents of his educational pamphlet by the Rev. R Burgess, the Rector of Upper Chelsea and Honorary Secretary to the London Diocesan Board of Education. The Rev. R Burgess was a realist about the deficiency of education, as his admission about the state of education in London, quoted near the beginning of this chapter, reveals. The letter opens with praise for Dr Hook's sincerity and frankness and then says, 'In your zeal to make out a crying case for Government interference you have committed two faults; you have sought to depreciate both the number and the efficacy of Church schools and you have very much exaggerated our educational wants'.[1] The Rev. R Burgess then went into statistics to prove his point, and claimed that according to Government returns 1,187,942 children were under daily instruction in 1833. By deducting 47,287 who were in schools of Dissenters, 1,140,655 were left in schools belonging to the Established Church. By deducting from that number children in schools where education was paid to the full by parents and duplicate entries of overseas, which he had worked out in an elaborate pamphlet in 1833, the Rev. Burgess claimed that 387,227 children were left. By adding to that number the 600,000 or 650,000 which Dr Hook himself said were accomodated since 1833, then about 1,000,000 daily scholars were by 1846 in schools connected with the Church. The Rev. R Burgess agreed with Dr Hook that there was much room for improvement in the teaching given in the great majority of National Society Schools, but his solution was a different one to Dr Hook's. 'I think we had better set about effecting that improvement

[1] The Record, Aug. 10th 1846. Letter of Rev Burgess to Dr Hook.

rather than hold up our defects to the ridicule of our neighbours'.[1] However, Dr Hook had painted his case vividly and possibly in some aspects exaggerated it in his pamphlet, because he wanted to stir people to action. He knew that the monitorial system was educationally bad and unless the Government gave very much more aid to the voluntary bodies in their educational work, the only way to improve education reasonably quickly was by the State taking it over. The Rev. R. Burgess was probably correct in saying that one in six or one in eight at school as Dr Hook advocated was too high a number and that the figure for German cities of one in $9^{8}/_{10}$ was nearer the mark. After all, Dr Hook had praised German Education and it should also be remembered that more children in Britain went to private schools than elsewhere in Europe. This 1,600,000 children should be provided for in schools, excluding private schools, and as 1,000,000 children were already in Church day schools and 100,000 in the schools of Dissenters, another 500,000 school places were needed. The Rev. R. Burgess, by looking at the school provision made since 1833 was confident that these extra school places could be provided under the present system.

The Rev. R Burgess, like Edward Baines, felt by following Dr Hook's premise, the incongruity of safeguarding secular education by putting it under the pay of the State and yet, at the same time. leaving the most important part of education to the voluntary efforts and contributions of congregations to supply. If the local Clergyman lacked influence over his flock, or if the parish was poor, what would become of the Religious School? 'Clergymen in our rural parishes

[1] Ibid.

might give, and indeed would give, their personal attendance, but how can a Clergyman or Dissenting Minister in the towns devote his Sundays, or any portion of them, to school teaching? If you say he must have help, you must supply him with funds. The secular master is secure with his £100 a year. The Spiritual instructor must still beg for the Religious Department. The secular knowledge is secured, the Religious knowledge is left to the chance and wills of Ministers of various denominations, who may either attend or let it alone'.[1] Dr Hook had hoped that by relieving the Clergyman of the massive burden of providing and maintaining a parish school, he could easily cope with the Religious Department. While this would often be true, clearly in some parishes for various reasons, the Clergyman would fail to run the Religious Department adequately. Then Religious Instruction would go by default and the Rev R Burgess forecast with Edward Baines that ultimately the State would take over the Religious Department.

Dr Hook in his scheme of Education, demanded that every Monday each child had to bring to school a certificate, proving his attendance at the Sunday School of his parish church, or of some other place of worship, and also of his having attended Religious Instruction lessons at some period set apart during the week. The Rev. R. Burgess claimed that in very many places less than three quarters of daily scholars would be able to get into the Sunday school and in many more under a half would be able to get in. Also the certificates Dr Hook proposed would soon degenerate into mere form and would very often be dropped altogether. Here Dr Hook had probably been somewhat naive for

[1] The Record: Aug. 10th 1846. Letter of Rev. Burgess to Dr Hook.

the Rev. R Burgess continued realistically, 'when we can hardly induce parents to take the trouble to bring their children to school, does anyone suppose that they will be running after the Clergyman or Dissenting minister for a weekly certificate?'[1] The Rev. R Burgess went on to contend that Dr Hook's proposal to put all Dissenting children of whatever variety into one room was impracticable and doomed to failure. 'Let us take a scene at one of those Government schools on a Wednesday afternoon: you have allotted two classrooms for Religious Instruction and you say to Churchmen and Dissenters, divide. The Minister of the Established Church is made comfortable enough, he has a room to himself with Bibles on the shelves and he introduces a few copies of the catechism and prayer book, obtained on subscribers terms from the S.P.C.K; but would you turn the Roman Catholic priest, the Independent Minister, the Wesleyan, the Socinian teacher and maybe the Jewish Rabbi into one room?'[2] The Rev R Burgess then ended his letter with his verdict on Dr Hook's scheme taken as a whole. 'I am persuaded that the Clergy of our Established Church will never co-operate in such a scheme, and such a separation of secular and Religious Instruction will never be tolerated by the orthodox Dissenters'.[3] Dr Hook's suggestion that children should bring a certificate showing Sunday school attendance to the secular school on Monday morning was, as Archdeacon Stranks correctly observed, impracticable.[4] Not only would attendance at Sunday school have been

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Stranks: Dean Hook, Ch.4.

unsatisfactory, as in the case of the Day school, because of the lack of compulsion, but also because of the low premium put by many on the value of Religious knowledge. Whereas the master in the Voluntary school, for example the Church school, would induce his pupils to go to Sunday school, the secular master in Dr Hook's scheme couldn't be expected to do so. Of course the teachers in the Religious school which met on Wednesday and Friday afternoons would encourage their pupils to attend Sunday school, but this might not have been as effective as the promptings of the master in the Voluntary system who was ideally with his children all the time.

Dr Hook was aware that most children who went to school in the existing Voluntary system did so not for the sake of the Religious Instruction they would receive, but for the general education they would obtain.[1] It could be argued that by Dr Hook's scheme the influence in the Day school for attendance at Sunday school was reduced rather than increased. Dr Hook's proposal to put all Dissenters in one room for Religious Instruction was so obviously impracticable that some solution would have had to be found if his scheme had been put into practice. Many schools had more than two rooms and elsewhere rooms could have been hired, while in the case of many villages there would have been few Dissenters, and often of such a limited variety that they could have been taught harmoniously together.

(b) An Assessment of Dr Hook's Educational Work.

The great majority of those who examined Dr Hook's educational pamphlet of 1846 agreed with him that the present

[1]Stephens: Life of W.F. Hook, Vol. 1, p.420.

Voluntary system was inadequate. State aid was very limited and the poorest areas were too poor to qualify for State Grants and usually Voluntary Society Grants also. Consequently the frequently maligned Monitorial system was still very common and as the State before 1847 didn't help to maintain schools, school equipment was generally inadequate. Many areas still had either no school at all or merely a Dame school where the children were often minded rather than educated. Owing to economic factors many children of the poor went to school only for a short time or not even at all. However, even by Dr Hook's scheme of education, many of these children would have been sent to work at an early age instead of to school. Nothing less than compulsory education, which few at that time were willing to advocate, would have secured the education of these children. There were insufficient masters and many of those there were, were badly qualified and trained for their work. Owing to the bad education system there were not enough suitable candidates entering the Training Colleges, and while some of these Colleges were of a high standard, others left much to be desired. Teachers salaries were both low and also precarious and so, apart from a strong vocation, there was little incentive to be a teacher. Again, when the young person had completed his course at Training College, he was now sufficiently educated to consider other forms of employment much more lucrative and secure than school-teaching. By 1846 conscience clauses were officially rare and in practice becoming less common, hence in single school areas, Dissenting children, who were usually the ones in this predicament, had the choice of either a Church education including the catechism or no education at all. The power and influence of the Voluntaryists, which was very considerable in the forties,

tended to put the brake on educational advance. On the ~~other~~ one hand they refused State aid themselves, with the result that their schools were built slowly; while on the other, through the press and public meetings, they strengthened the hands of others who, for less worthy reasons, wanted to discourage State aid for education.

There were five main methods which were mentioned from time to time, in various quarters, for securing educational advance. Some advocated schools supported in entirety by the State in which there should be no Religious Instruction. While this scheme was supported, not only by humanists but also by Christians, who regarded it is the only way to educational progress, it failed to get much support in a country which regarded Christianity as the very basis and foundation of education. Others favoured schools supported in entirety by the State, with Religious Instruction being taught on the Irish pattern, with an agreed syllabus. It was hoped that Christianity could be taught in a decisive way and yet by the avoidance of controversial points denominational harmony could be maintained. Dr Hook probably had the support of most Clergymen when he condemned this comprehensive approach to teaching Religious Instruction as liable to make children grow up into 'Nothingarians'.

Today the agreed syllabus of most areas contains much solid doctrine and yet rarely are denominational antagonisms excited. But a hundred years ago there was much more intolerance, hence a syllabus to avoid antagonisms would have had to have been far more restricted than they are today. Many Churchmen felt that as the bulk of the poor were either members of the Church of England or had no religious affiliation, and

also because the Church of England was the established Church, the State ought to give full aid to schools in which Church Religious Instruction was given, and to no others. Dissenters by this time were far too powerful a group to accept such a measure and they would have had the support of many Churchmen, including Dr Hook, who would have regarded it as a basically unfair and unjust proposal. The two other ways of securing educational advance, both of which were more plausible than those outlined so far, were Dr Hook's scheme and an extension of the present system, in order to make education universal. The present system of education, with increased State aid to ensure an education for every child, and also better school equipment and the abolition of the monitorial system, would have been very satisfactory. The two main obstacles in the way of achieving this were interrelated, namely the lack of management and conscience clauses in Church schools generally, and the large sum of money required to bring it about. The Denison wing of the Church, which had become stronger with the spread of Tractarian views, did all it could to prevent the National Society from accepting a State request that the Society's schools should have a conscience clause. The State became more unwilling as time went on to give Grants to schools without a conscience clause, especially as most new schools now being built were situated in single school areas, - areas more than any other where a conscience clause was felt to be desirable. Many people still disliked the notion of education for the poor, partly because they feared a rise in taxation and also because they feared that the poor might get ideas above their station. The position of these people was strengthened by the conscience clause controversy because they could

say that they disliked increased State aid, or indeed, any State aid for schools which were in some way exclusive. Thus, while Dr Hook would probably have been very glad to see the present system of education both universal and much improved in quality, as a result of a massive increase in State aid, nevertheless, being a realist, he knew that this was most unlikely to happen in practice. The viable alternative to his own scheme was the present educational system developing very slowly, mainly as a result of an intractable element within the Church.

Dr Hook's educational scheme had many good qualities, especially in that it was able both ~~the~~ to secure State aid to pay for education and yet also retain solid, doctrinal, religious instruction, run by the various denominations. Children of the various denominations were to be educated together apart from in religious instruction lessons. Also by Dr Hook's scheme the shortage of educational provision would soon have been rectified and the quality of education would have improved markedly at the same time. Dr Hook's scheme, of course, had its drawbacks, many of which have previously been mentioned, and probably the most serious was his silence about the religious role of the secular master. The secular master should have been specifically allowed to refer to the Bible and to use it in his teaching as he saw fit. He should also have been urged to have a religious influence and not just a moral influence. Dr Hook's silence on the religious influence of the secular master played into the hands of his opponents, who claimed that many of the secular masters would be atheists, and that there would be a cleavage between the two schools. Dr Hook should have provided more than two rooms for religious instruction so that the different types of Dissenters might have had their

lessons separately. Also the whole idea of bringing certificates showing Sunday school attendance to the secular school on Monday morning should have been dropped as impracticable. While attendance at Sunday school might have fallen somewhat as a result of this, it would have had no effect on the attendance at religious instruction lessons on Wednesday and Friday afternoons. This is because the weekday religious instruction lessons formed an integral part of the school timetable, and children going to one part of their form's curriculum would normally automatically go to the rest.

Dr Hook tended to exaggerate the bad state of educational provision thus while, in fact, things were bad, he made them out to be worse than they were. His motive for doing this was a good one, namely that he hoped to stir to action the indifferent and the ignorant. His suggestion that one in six should be at a State school was far too high, and even his alternative suggestion of one in eight was on the high side. While Dr Hook was a very tolerant and broadminded man by the standards of his day, he should have gone a stage further in his educational scheme and catered for infidelity. By this I mean that there should have been a clause allowing children to opt out of religious lessons altogether. The practical effect of this would have been small in that a very small percentage would have done so, but it would have catered for the objections to Dr Hook's scheme made by the promoters of the Lancashire Education Scheme in 1850. The promoters of the Lancashire plan commented about Dr Hook's scheme 'Your plan is a very good one; but then you insist on everyone receiving a religious education; but why might not the infidel, the man who thinks it wrong to prejudice the mind of his child to any

religion, send that child to a Government school?'[1]

Today, when children can opt out of religious lessons with parental backing, less than one in a hundred does so, and this is better than all the stir that would be caused if there was no such power to opt out of religious instruction. While Dr Hook correctly said that the Church of England had no exclusive claim to financial support from the State, he wrongly suggested that the State shouldn't pay for religion. The present policy of the Government giving very large Grants for denominational schools provided that there are sufficient children of that denomination in the area concerned to warrant it seems to be entirely just and reasonable. In fact, as long as the condition is fulfilled, there is a case for the Government paying for such a school in entirety.

While Dr Hook went further than many of his contemporaries in his educational scheme, he could still be criticized for not making education compulsory. Even if Dr Hook provided a school place for every child, and education of an improved quality, it would all be to no avail without compulsory education. Of course, while some parents wilfully refused to send their children to school for no good reason, it is fair to observe that many did so in order to send their children out to work, because they were in real poverty. Thus compulsion in education was bound up with economic factors and the standard of living.

A final criticism of Dr Hook's educational pamphlet and also one of the most serious was around the query that, if his educational scheme had been put into practice, would the

[1]Dean Stephens: Life of W.F. Hook, Vol. 2, p.344.

Churches have managed to cope with the Religious Department of Education, or would it have gone by default, and thus have been taken over by the State. Dr Hook had always maintained with some truth that if the Church had been relieved of the responsibility of looking after the secular department of education she could easily have looked after the Religious department. On the other hand the Rev R. Burgess, Mr Baines and other critics of Dr Hook's educational scheme, by following Dr Hook's premise, saw his inconsistency of safeguarding secular education by putting it under the pay of the State, while leaving the religious part, which he and they both thought to be the most important, to the chance of Voluntary effort. Poor parishes, those with inefficient, sick, or too few Clergy were the sort of places where religious instruction might go by default. If the State had taken over the religious part of education, the result might have been one of the things Dr Hook feared most, a watered down version of Christianity.

As we know, Dr Hook's scheme was rejected, and the Voluntary system of education continued with a very limited increase of State aid. The Crimean War, the lack of importance which many influential people attached to elementary education, coupled with the failure of the State to get satisfactory management and conscience clauses from State aided Church schools, all tended to result in one thing, - only a very gradual extension of State aid for education. The extension of the franchise and two wars, one in Europe and one in America, where in each case the better educated saie defeated its oppon-ents, were among the factors which stirred up public opinion in the sixties to demand the extension of elementary education. Most Dissenters, realizing that they could nowhere near keep

up with the Church in the work of elementary education, and also angered by the lack of conscience clauses in Church schools in single school areas, joined with the Secularists in demanding an abolition of the Voluntary system and universal State education. Although the Education Act of 1870 wasn't very satisfactory from the Church's point of view, nevertheless the Church was lucky that a far more extreme Act wasn't passed. In School Board Schools religious instruction was an optional subject being only taught in some schools, non-denominational and not inspected. Thus, especially before the 1944 Education Act, it was regarded as a very unimportant subject. Dr Hook, as a realist, wanted a big extension of the Voluntary system of education, but in practice knew that this was most unlikely to happen. Thus he propounded his scheme which, with modifications, was far better than a poor working of the Voluntary system which resulted in the Act of 1870. Dr Hook then tried to shake people out of their lethargy into either accepting his pamphlet and putting it into practice, or into making the present educational system fully work. He caused a momentary stir and much discussion by his pamphlet, but them most people went back either to their slumbering indifferentism or to their petty quarrels for another twenty years, while the rest struggled valiantly against great odds to make the Voluntary system work.

In this assessment of Dr Hook's educational work we have confined ourselves to his letter to the Bishop of St David's because this letter is not only the focal point of his work, but also the climax. His earlier educational thought, found in speeches and letters is, in the main, embodied in the letter of 1846. Unlike most theorists Dr Hook's theoretical work was matched by his practical work and nowhere is this more

true than in the realm of education. In some respects Dr Hook's views changed radically over the years, for example, on the question of the Establishment and the appointment of Bishops and their place in the House of Lords. Also he changed in his educational thought from wanting elementary education run by the Church to wanting it to be run by the State. Archdeacon Stranks' assessment is certainly a correct one. 'Hook's greatness as a parish priest has been fully recognized, but the breadth and fertility of his ideas in both education and ecclesiastical reform haven't not always received the notice they deserve'.[1]

[1]Stranks: Dean Hook, End of Ch.4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Dean W.R.W. Stephens. Life and Letters of W.F. Hook D.D. F.R.S. 2 Volumes. London 1878.

W.F. Hook. The Means of Rendering More Efficient the Education of the People. (1846).

W.F. Hook. Miscellaneous Sermons.

H.J. Burgess. Enterprise in Education.

Canon Wood. Four Notable Vicars of Leeds.

Archdeacon Stranks. Dean Hook.

Elliott Binns. Religion in the Victorian Era.

Owen Chadwick. The Victorian Church.

Desmond Bowen. The Idea of the Victorian Church.

F. Warre Cornish. A History of the English Church in the Nineteenth Century.

H.C. Barnard. A History of English Education from 1760.

D. Thomson. England in the Nineteenth Century.

S.J. Curtis. History of Education in Britain.

E. Baines, Jnr. Life of Edward Baines, Senior.

Canon E. Jackson. A Pastor's Recollections.

F. Smith. The Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth.

S. Neill. Anglicanism.

Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth. Four Periods of Public Education.

K.S. Inglis. The Church and the Working Classes in Victorian England.

S.C. Carpenter. Church and People.

J.H. Overton. The Anglican Revival.

G.F.A. Best. Shaftesbury.

F. Maurice. Life of F.D. Maurice.

A. Ashwell. Life of S. Wilberforce.

Purcell. Life of Cardinal Manning.

D. Newsome. The Parting of Friends.

J. Gill. The Ten Hours Parson.

Fairweather. The Oxford Movement.

Sir L. Woodward. The Age of Reform. (Oxford History of England.)

G.M. Young. Portrait of an Age.

E. Halévy. Triumph of Reform 1830-1841. (History of English People, Volume 3.)

A. Briggs. The Age of Improvement.

C.S. Dessain. Life of John Henry Newman.

H.P. Liddon. Life of E.B. Pusey.

Obituary of Dr Hook. Yorkshire Post and Leeds Intelligencer; Oct. 21st. 1875.

Obituary of Dr Hook. Leeds Mercury; October 21st 1875.

Section on W.F. Hook; Crockford 1876.

Dean W.R.W. Stephens. Dictionary of National Biography; Section on W.F. Hook.

Dr Hook's Letter to the Bishop of St David's reviewed; The Quarterly Review: 1846 Number 78.

Obituary of Dr Hook. The Guardian; Wed. Oct. 27th 1875.

Section on W.P. Wood (Lord Hatherley), Connop-Thirlwall and Joseph Bingham. Dictionary of National Biography.

Educational Voluntaryism; The Nonconformist. Aug. 12th 1846.

State Education; The Nonconformist. Aug. 26th 1846.

Mr Baines 6th & 7th Letters on Education reviewed; The Nonconformist. Sept. 9th 1846.

State Education (Body without Soul); The Nonconformist. Sept. 16th 1846.

The Discipline of Voluntaryism & Mr Baines Reply to Dr Vaughan; The Nonconformist. Sept. 23rd. 1846.

State Education-Transfer of responsibility; The Nonconformist. Sept. 30th 1846.

Intentions of Whig Government; The Nonconformist. Dec. 2nd 1846.

Review of Dr Hook's Letter to the Bishop of St David's; The English Review. Sept. 1846, pp.127-175.

Article from the Examiner; The Guardian. Nov. 18th 1846.

National Education; The Guardian. Oct. 14th 1846.

The Education Question; The Guardian. Dec. 30th 1846.

Article from the Morning Chronicle on Dr Hook's Letter. The Record. July 13th 1846.

Extracts of Letter of Rev. R Burgess to Dr Hook; The Record. Aug. 10th 1846.