

"THE CONTRIBUTION OF F.D. MAURICE TO THE
CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST MOVEMENT OF 1848-1854."

A Thesis presented to the
Faculty of Divinity,
Rhodes University.

In Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Divinity.

by

Ronald Luke Steel.

January, 1971.

I would like to express my
thanks to the Rev. M. Nuttall
for his guidance and encouragement,
and to all those who have assisted
me in so many ways.

CONTENTS AND SUMMARY

	<u>Page.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.</u>	1 - 2

Maurice was a man who solicited both keen support and bitter opposition, both during his life time and after. It is only within the last twenty or thirty years that his true worth has begun to be recognised and appreciated. The aim of the thesis is to show that his contribution to the Christian Socialist Movement was an invaluable one. Chapter two describes the working-class conditions and their causes during the first half of the nineteenth century, as well as the role the Church played in social improvement. Chapter three deals with Chartism and the European Revolutions of 1848, and the effect of the Revolutions on Chartism. Chapter four gives an account of the man F.D. Maurice, as well as some of his thoughts and aims. Chapter five is a detailed account of Maurice's contribution to Christian Socialism, showing that he was not the 'practical' leader, and emphasising the importance of his theological beliefs in governing what he did.

<u>CHAPTER 2: THE ENGLISH SCENE.</u>	3 - 9
--------------------------------------	-------

There were a number of reasons for the shocking conditions of the working-classes in England. First, England during the late 18th and early 19th centuries underwent a rapid increase of population. The birth-rate had risen; families moved from the country into the cities due to the over-population and to the effects of bad harvests and enclosures; Irish immigration added to the over-population and to the social and economic problems. Industrialisation was another important force at work which had far-reaching effects on the working-classes. While bringing prosperity to some, it added to the terrible working-conditions. Simultaneously, change in agriculture by means of more modern methods and the enclosure movement, forced many to leave for the new cities that were springing up.

Population increase, Industrialisation and the agricultural revolution led to enormous increases in town populations, and to great misery, which was aggravated by the fact that the people were rural in their background, and because the towns could not cope with the vast numbers. The result was shocking conditions as regards housing, sanitation, health, and work conditions. Parliamentary and municipal reform led to steps in alleviating these conditions, but they were slow and faltering steps.

Apart from some individuals, the Church was inactive in social matters and reform. The Church lost whatever working-class allegiance it had possessed. New churches were built, but few in the slums where they were most needed. The Church failed the lower classes first, because in the minds of the workers it had become fused with the aristocracy. Secondly, because of the state of the Church itself, which was characterised by pluralism, non-residence and nepotism. Peel's Ecclesiastical Commission did much to remedy abuses, but much

reform was still needed. Thirdly, because the Church was not really concerned with reform and social issues. The Evangelicals concentrated more on personal salvation than on physical environment. The Oxford Movement was concerned with the 'internal' life of the Church, and the members remained unaffected by industrial change. Both the Evangelicals and the Oxford Movement were concerned with charity; but what was required was not charity but social reform. The Church lacked a vital Social Theology.

Church leaders were also influenced by the prevailing philosophy of Laissez-Faire and Utilitarianism, which stifled any attempts to alleviate working-class conditions. In this atmosphere, the Church's failure is understandable.

The conditions of the workers could not remain unaltered - something had to happen.

CHAPTER 3: TIME OF UNREST.

10 - 14

Where was relief for the working-classes to come from? Robert Owen sought to bring relief through cooperation and ideal surroundings, but his experiments failed. Chartism was the result of the failure of Owen's experiments, discontent with the Reform Bill of 1832, and economic depression. The Movement took its name from the "People's Charter", and mass meetings were held. Two factors contributed to the failure of the Chartist Movement: the hostility of the ruling classes, and division in the Chartist ranks. They also did not have public support. The petition presented to Parliament in July 1839 was rejected; and Chartism lost many supporters. This was not the end of Chartism.

The European Revolution of 1848 inspired the last Chartist agitation and influenced J.M. Ludlow. The conditions of the working-classes in Europe were largely the same as those in England. But in Europe the workers rose in revolt. Socialism tried to meet the working-class need, and Louis Blanc proposed 'social workshops'. The Revolution broke in Paris in February 1848, and social improvements began to take place.

Measures were taken in England to prevent the occurrences in France from occurring in England and these measures had widespread support. The great Chartist gathering at Kennington Common on April 10th, 1848, ended in a fiasco, and the threatened storm passed over England. But the social conscience of many had been awakened, and April 10th, in a sense, can be seen as the beginning of the Christian Socialist Movement.

CHAPTER 4: F.D. MAURICE : HIS BACKGROUND AND CAREER.

15 - 33

Purpose is to trace Maurice's life-story and to see what sort of a man he was. Born on August 29th, 1805, Maurice was greatly influenced by his family life, especially by his father. The family was strongly united, but became disunited over the question of religion. This division distressed Frederick, and his quest for unity was born.

He entered Cambridge in October, 1823, where he studied mathematics and classics, and then law. He hoped to find at Cambridge the solution to the division that had occurred within his family. Julius Hare exercised a great influence on him, as did Coleridge. From Cambridge Maurice went to London and was active in the literary world. At this stage, his religious views were very different from those of his father.

After three years in London, Maurice entered Cambridge to study for the priesthood in the Church of England. Certain thoughts and ideas which were to characterise his later life are discernable in letters written from Oxford, such as his belief in God as Trinity, his view that judging was an evil, and his consciousness of his own Christian failings. He was ordained on 26th January, 1834, and became curate at Bubbenhall. While there he published his "Eustace Conway", and defended the Thirty Nine Articles. After reading Pusey's tract on baptism, he was convinced that there could be no uniting with the Tractarians. He began work as Chaplain to Guy's Hospital in January 1836. In October of the following year he married Anna Barton. Towards the end of 1838 he published his "The Kingdom of Christ" which embodied his main beliefs, and worked out the consequences of Christ being the Head of every man.

Maurice was also concerned with education, and saw the Church's main role as that of education. He became editor of "The Educational Magazine", and argued for education based on the Christian faith. In 1840 he became professor at King's College. His lectures were not easy to understand. Acutely aware of the needs of the people of London, he considered publishing tracts. In November 1843 Hare urged him to accept candidature for the principalship of King's College, but he refused saying that his work was with those 'outside the fold', and that he could not have a high rank within the Church if he was to be of any use to it. He toyed with the idea of 'Hospital Tracts'. While defending H.G. Ward from attack, he stated his controversial views on eternal life.

His wife died on Easter 1845. In July of the following year he was appointed professor at King's College in the theological faculty, and also chaplain to Lincoln's Inn. This meant his leaving Guy's Hospital. He influenced many at Lincoln's Inn. Opposition to him by the religious newspapers grew continually due to his defending those attacked and his own attack on the very principle of religious newspapers. The opposition to Maurice disturbed Dr. Jelf, the principal of King's College. In 1848 Maurice became involved with Queen's College, and, in a wider sphere, with those who were to form the nucleus of the Christian Socialist Movement. After the Chartist gathering of the 10th April, the group started meeting regularly. The first issue of their "Politics for the People" appeared on the 6th May. At the same time they did practical work in Little Ormond Yard. Maurice held Bible-study meetings weekly

on Fridays. These were very valuable for all concerned.

Maurice married Georgina Hare on July 4th 1849. Through Walter Cooper, meetings with the Chartists were arranged. In the light of opposition to Maurice, Dr. Jelf wrote him expressing his concern.

After some hesitation, Maurice joined the others in their plans for Co-operative Societies. They published "Tracts on Christian Socialism", and started to form Co-operative Associations. Structure was given to their efforts through the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations, and the Central Board. The first issue of the "Christian Socialist" appeared in November 1852, and in 1853 the title was changed to "Journal of Association." The passing of the "Industrial and Provident Partnerships Bill" was a triumph for the Christian Socialists. Maurice once again came under stinging attack, and Dr. Jelf advised him to resign from King's College. But the committee of the College set up to inquire into Maurice's teaching appreciated what he was trying to do, while regretting his bad image. His "Theological Essays" aroused severe criticism, and the two chairs he held at King's College were declared vacant in October 1853. There were two main reasons for this: the opposition to Maurice alarmed Dr. Jelf and the Council of the College; and his views on Eternal Life were unacceptable and seen as dangerous.

In November 1853 he resigned from Queen's College, and the following year became principal of the "Working Men's College." In 1856 he was re-elected to Queen's College. He strongly opposed H. Mansel's Bampton lecture of 1858, and the following year published a detailed criticism of it. In July 1860 he was appointed to St. Peter's, Vere Street, and his appointment received wide support.

His appointment in October 1866 to a professorship at Cambridge meant his leaving the Working Men's College. In October 1869 he resigned from Vere Street on doctor's orders; but in 1870 took on the living of St. Edward's, Cambridge, and the Cambridge Preacher-ship at Whitehall the following year. All this extra work proved fatal, and he died on Easter Monday, 1872.

CHAPTER 5: THE CONTRIBUTION OF MAURICE TO THE CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST MOVEMENT.

34 - 55

The clue to the role that Maurice played is seen in the fact that while being very conscious of the need for action to be taken in combating the social evils of their society, he did not know what that action ought to be. It was Ludlow who prompted Maurice and forced him into action. While Maurice was often the inspiration, he was not the practical driving force of the Movement. Before the actual beginning of the Christian Socialist Movement he had twice turned down practical appeals made to him for helping the working-classes, and he acknowledged that he was not skilful in suggesting improvements in the

physical condition of the poor. Thus it is not surprising that the drive for action, after the Chartist fiasco, did not come from him. It came from Kingsley and Ludlow.

We will first attempt to show that Maurice's role was not an active, practical one, and then to discover exactly what his role was.

The posters addressed to the workmen of England were Kingsley's work. The idea of starting a newspaper was Ludlow's idea, and more than a third of the writing came from Ludlow. Maurice's contribution in this was rather one of guidance. It was Ludlow's idea to improve the condition of Little Ormond Yard; and Ludlow's lead that established contact with the ex-Chartists. When it came to the setting up of Workmen's Associations the practical suggestions and driving force came from Le Chevalier and Ludlow who both had first-hand knowledge of similar attempts. The constitution for the proposed Council of Promoters and Central Board was drawn up by Sully. Most scholars agree with our assessment of Maurice's role not being the practical one.

II

Maurice's contribution was that of being the "Prophet" of the Movement, the spiritual leader. An understanding of his theological convictions is essential in understanding the contribution he made and some of his puzzling actions.

Maurice had a passionate desire for Unity, and he found this Unity in the Trinity. He saw God as the Father of all men, and revealed in Jesus Christ. Christ took on the nature of all men, thus making God the Father of every type and class of people. The unity between God and men has been brought about through Jesus Christ, the head of every man, the King of our Race. It was Maurice's vocation to proclaim this fact. Man's relationship to God and to his fellow-men arises from the very nature of things.

Man is essentially a Social Being and is not to be treated as a 'thing' but an 'I'. Men are morally responsible persons, who can never be without God or each other. Because of Christ's Headship, man can only live a truly human life when he follows Christ's type of life, one of sacrifice and love.

Maurice saw the Divine Order, the Kingdom of Christ, as an existing reality in which man was already living. Family and nations belong to the Divine Order. The most advanced state is that of the Universal Society, the Church, which is the witness to the eternal truth that Christ is the Head of every man, and that all aspects of human life are included in the Divine Order.

Maurice's strong opposition to parties and systems followed from his theological thinking. They were a denial of God's order and unity. His theological convictions also led to a social concern, and the belief that the Church had an immediate responsibility for the

less fortunate. Competition he saw as the denial of the law of love and the law of Christ. Human relations and not property relations lie beneath trade and commerce. Ignorance and unbelief in God lay at the root of all anomalies in society. The great function of the Church was therefore education - revealing to man the foundation of his being in God, and the laws of God's universe. This meant teaching co-operation and not competition.

As regards politics, Maurice was opposed to Democracy. His acknowledgment of the divine sovereignty led to his belief in king's reigning by the grace of God.

III

Maurice was the prophet of the Movement. His influence began before the start of the Movement, and his theological view underwent almost no change. He exerted a very strong influence on the group through his weekly Bible-classes.

Maurice's contribution was also that of acting as a brake on the others. He censored some of the articles in "Politics for the People", the reasons for his doing this being consistent with his beliefs. He refused to endorse the plan for Sanitary reform; gave no support to Ludlow's plan for Home Colonisation, and for a while was hesitant about the plans for practical co-operation, until he reconciled them with his theological thinking. When he could no longer reconcile the aims of the Associations with his theology, he gradually withdrew and became absorbed in the task of education. Maurice opposed the formation of a Central Board, and only consented when it was given the purely practical side of Associative work, and a Council of Promoters also formed to deal with ethical and practical aspects. Maurice also opposed helping the engineers carry out Associative work after the lock-out of 1852.

Maurice continually called the Christian Socialists back to his principles.

He also contributed to their literary activities both by way of his articles and by preventing the others from doing what he considered might oppose God's order.

Maurice's role was a difficult one, for a prophet's task is always difficult. His actions were governed throughout by his theological convictions. He had a deep enough theology to answer the questions of society, and he gave a theological justification for replacing competition by co-operation. He met the challenge of Utilitarianism and Positivism.

CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION.

John Frederick Denison Maurice was a man of whom many divergent opinions have been expressed. Some speak very disparagingly and give a low estimate of his value and contribution even to the religious life of his own day, saying that he had not a clear idea in his head, that he was futile, bewildering, confused, inconclusive, ineffectual and had an impotent mind. (1) There are others (2) who speak very highly of him and rate him amongst the greatest Christian leaders and thinkers, if he himself was not the greatest, of the nineteenth century, saying that his was the greatest mind since Plato, that he was a live man amongst the ghosts, fresh and full of meaning, that it would be difficult to find his superior among living theologians.

During his life-time also Maurice had those who were strongly opposed to him, and those who supported him as one in whom they saw a vital and clear Christian message, the proclaimer of a truth which others had not yet seen. It was only twenty or thirty years ago that Maurice was 're-discovered' and his true significance and contribution really appreciated. In the introduction to his book on Maurice, H.G. Wood, for example, said that "Even now he is probably not estimated at his true worth, and he deserves a higher place in the ranks of the Victorians than he has yet received." (3) This is a much fairer and far truer estimate of Maurice than of those who see him as unimportant.

Our present aim is to show that the contribution Maurice made to the Christian Socialist Movement was a great and invaluable one; that without his involvement in the Movement, and without his particular contribution, it is doubtful whether the Christian Socialists would have made such an impact, and the Movement had the lasting influence that it has had.

In dealing with a subject such as a contribution made by one individual to a particular movement in history, it is essential to understand the circumstances in which that movement arose, and something of the individual himself. It is necessary, therefore, to review the background both of the Christian Socialist Movement and of Maurice as a

(1) Estimates of men like J.B. Mozley, Leslie Stephen, F. Harrison, Matthew Arnold.

(2) e.g., Tennyson, J. Hare, C.E. Raven, Dr. Scott Lidget, J. Martineau.

(3) H.G. Wood : "Frederick Denison Maurice." Pg.3.
Cambridge University Press. 1950.

person. Christian Socialism arose out of and was a response to a particular situation and need, and this we will deal with in chapters two and three.

In chapter two we have endeavoured to draw a realistic picture of the working-class conditions in England during the first half of the nineteenth century, tracing the causes of the terrible slum and working conditions of those who were drawn to the cities. We have also attempted to discover what role the Church was playing in the working-men's lives and what concern it had, if any, about social conditions. The urgency of the situation and the desperate need for something to be done soon becomes clear, as does, also, the enormous task attempted by the Christian Socialists.

What occasioned the beginning of Christian Socialism? In chapter three we seek to show that through the Chartist Movement, the workers tried to secure rights which had been denied them. We also turn our attention to conditions in Europe prevailing at the same time, where the workers rose in revolt, and seek to show the effect of this on the Chartists in Britain, and how this all prepared the way for the Christian Socialist Movement.

In chapter four we have thought it necessary to deal with F.D. Maurice, his life and work, in some detail, because to understand the contribution he made to the Christian Socialist Movement, it is essential to have a general picture of his life as a whole, including something of his thoughts and aims. Only thus can one begin to understand the vital part which he played.

In the fifth and final chapter we look more closely at Maurice's role in relation to the other leaders of the Movement, his theological thinking and convictions which motivated and were the basis of his actions, and then seek to evaluate the particular contribution he made to the Christian Socialist Movement.

It becomes clear that Maurice's was not by any means the practical, and not always positive, role, but that without his sound theology and biblical teaching, and the inspiration he gave to the rest by his thinking and what he was, the Christian Socialist Movement would have been infinitely the poorer in its work and witness.

CHAPTER 2. : THE ENGLISH SCENE

England, especially during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, underwent a rapid increase in population. In 1801 the figures for England and Wales were given as 8,872,980, and in 1851 they had risen to 17,927,609. (1) This increase forced society to change and adapt itself, and it "created a community of a completely different order from what had existed in England and Wales before 1800." (2) England had for long been mainly an agricultural or rural society, and in the period we are now dealing with, it had to face a new phenomenon - that of the enormous increase in the town or city populations, with the problems that accompanied it. Not only had the birth rate of the country as a whole risen, but families were moving from the country districts into the towns and cities. This was mainly due to overpopulation and the effect of bad harvests and enclosures. To the movement of the English people from the country to the towns, we must add the very important fact of Irish immigration. The eight or nine million Irish were kept alive, even if in dire poverty, by their potato crops. In 1845, 6, and 7 the crop was struck with disease, and "the only visible relief was by way of emigration..." (3) Large numbers of poor and low class Irish families found their way into England, to add to the increasing problem of over-population. This sudden inflow came as the climax to the Irish immigration that had been going on since 1815 and before. By 1835 there were already 100,000 Irish in Lancashire alone, and by 1851 there were well over 500,000 Irish immigrants in England. The number continued to rise, and the absorption of Irish immigrants "became one of the social and economic problems of the early nineteenth century," (4) for they were poor, had low standards, and "threatened the wage rates of their neighbours." (5)

There was yet another force at work during this period; that of industrialisation. This 'revolution', that is, "the application of mechanical invention and the methods of mass production to British industry" (6) lasted roughly from 1770 to 1840, and both the changes that occurred and the speed with which they occurred threw society into a turmoil. This 'revolution' cannot be limited to industry alone. It went hand in hand with new ways of transport, progress in agriculture, organization of trade, and a developed system of banking. (7) Another important contributing factor to industrialisation was the increase in population to which we have referred, which provided both a market and a labour force. The appearance in industry of machines which did more work more easily and more quickly than had been possible by hand, coupled with the vast expansion of industry,

(1) G. Kitson Clark : "The Making of Victorian England" Methuen & Co.Ltd. London. 1962. Pg.66.

G. Kitson Clark : "An Expanding Society. Britain 1830-1900" Cambridge. 1967. Pg.4.

L. Woodward : "The Age of Reform 1815-1870". Oxford. 1962. Pg.1, gives the figure for 1851 as "over 21,000,000", but this presumably includes Scotland as well.

(2) Kitson Clark : "The Making of Victorian England". Pg.66.

(3) G.M. Young : "Victorian England. Portrait of an Age." London. Oxford University Press. 1953. Pg.20

(4) Woodward : Op.Cit., Pg.2

(5) Kitson Clark : "The Making of Victorian England," Pg.78

(6) Kitson Clark : "An Expanding Society." Pg.5.

(7) Woodward : Op.Cit., Pg.4.

had far-reaching effects on the working-classes.

One must recognise that the Industrial Revolution had many beneficial effects. It brought wealth to many people. It created opportunity for those who could take it, and paved the way for the future progress of the country. But there is also the other side of the picture, and even though we might try to mitigate it by pointing out, as Kitson Clark does, that there was "the inherited tradition of callousness, brutality, and degraded conditions which went far back into history" (1), and that the rapid growth of population resulted in 'strain' on society, it does not alter the fact that the industrial revolution added to the terrible conditions into which so many men were forced.

Almost simultaneous with the change in industry came the change in agriculture. The big open fields and almost all the other land were "drained, ditched, hedged, and enclosed" (2), and more modern methods of farming techniques came into use. The result, particularly of the enclosure movement, was that more and more land came into the hands of the wealthy, and many of the poorer smallholders were forced out, becoming labourers or drifting into the new towns. Those who remained on the lands as labourers lived a pitiful existence, with a diet more often than not of "bread and cheese for six out of seven days of the week." (3) The price of corn was high and their wage negligible, with no real relief available. Indicative of their plight is the incident in 1830 when "The starving field labourers of the southern countries rioted in support of their demand for a wage of half a crown a day." (4) At the time some of the labourers were receiving five shillings a week. (5)

It was thus population increase, Industrialisation, and the 'agricultural revolution' that led to the enormous increase in town populations. It is here that we come face to face with misery and degradation in their starkest form. Two factors in particular aggravated the situation. First, the people were rural in their background. As Young points out, ... "the traditional culture and morality of England were based on the patriarchal village family..." (6), and their being thrown together in the towns involved the complete uprooting of life as they had known it. Secondly, the towns into which they were drawn were "singularly ill prepared to receive them." (7) They had never had to cope with such numbers before. The result was that the wage-earners were subjected to intolerable conditions as regards both their places of living and their places of work.

Not nearly enough accommodation, if one can call it that, existed. The cellars and attics of houses, no matter how old or dilapidated, were crammed full. Cheap tenements and houses were slapped together in rows, one next to the other, and back to back, using every available inch.

(1) Kitson Clark : "The Making of Victorian England", Pg.90.

(2) David Thomson: "England in the Nineteenth Century." Penguin Books. 1950. Pg.14.

(3) Woodward : Op.Cit., Pg.9.

(4) Thomson : Op.Cit., Pg.16-17. (The only result was that three were hanged and 420 deported to Australia.)

(5) F. Maurice : "The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice." London. Macmillan & Co. 1885. Vol.1. Pg.115.

(6) Young : Op.Cit., Pg.21.

(7) Kitson Clark : "The Making of Victorian England," Pg.79.

People were crammed into "cottages run up hastily in confined spaces with little or no access to light and air - in alleys, in rows placed back to back, in folds and folds within folds, in the backyards of existing houses or what had been their gardens." (1) It is not difficult to picture what went with such housing conditions. Water was often not provided, nor sanitation. Drinking water was discoloured with refuse and sewage. Night soil and refuse were often dumped on street corners. Corpses were left for days unburied. Smog from the coal fires hung over the city. Houses were damp, drab, and dirty. Crime was rife, for there were no recreational facilities. Disease was everywhere - the life expectancy at birth of those in these vast slums varied from 12 years in parts of London, to 15 in Liverpool, 17 in Manchester, and 38 in Rutland. (2)

Working conditions were often characterised by harsh sweated labour and inhuman exploitation. It was not until 1847 that the working hours of women and children were limited to ten hours a day; while in 1819 child labour under nine years of age had been forbidden, and between nine and sixteen limited to not more than 12 hours a day; although this applied only to cotton mills. But there was no way of enforcing this 1819 act which, as a result, was largely evaded. An act of 1833 excluded children under nine from factories, limited to 48 hours a week the work of children under thirteen, and 69 hours a week for those under eighteen years of age. These three acts give a fair indication of the work people were being forced to do. Workhouses were set up to deal with the very poor, and in the long run the reforms of 1834 did "succeed in checking the demoralization and pauperization of the working classes." (3) But meanwhile the workers had to contend with harsh treatment, the tyranny of petty officials as portrayed in *Oliver Twist*, overcrowding, and the indiscriminate mixing of all types of people. In most workhouses, until 1842, parents were not allowed to see their own children in the same workhouse, smoking was forbidden, and there were no books, not even Bibles. (4)

One must not be blind to the fact that steps were being taken to alleviate the conditions we have described. However slow and faltering they might have been, parliamentary and municipal reform was occurring, and this led to acts being passed dealing with parliamentary representation, working conditions, public order, health, and housing conditions. (5)

Where did the Church fit into the working-man's life, and what part did it play in social improvement? This question is important for it was a question that F.D. Maurice was particularly concerned with, and its answer will help us understand the difficulties he continually faced.

(1) Kitson Clark : "The Making of Victorian England," Pg.79.

(2) Young : Op.Cit., Pg.24, Footnote (i)

(3) Thomson : Op.Cit., Pg.70.

(4) Woodward : Op.Cit., Pg.455.

(5) Details of the various acts passed dealing with the working-class conditions do not fall within our scope; but when we deal with the reasons for the Church's slowness to act, mention will be made of the prevailing philosophy and economic theories which were partly responsible for the State's lack of action as well. Details of the State's action can be found in Woodward, and Kitson Clark's "An Expanding Society."

On the whole, the Church was inactive as far as social matters and reform were concerned. There were some individuals who threw themselves into the reform movement, like Oastler, a parson; Lovett, a Methodist; clergymen like Wade, G.S. Bull, and S.G. Osborne; but on the whole the Church remained unmoved.

Whatever working class allegiance the Church had possessed, "they lost that allegiance when the country labourer became a town labourer" (1), with the result that Woodward is able to say, "The poor, at least in the great towns, were largely pagan..." (2) The churches, like the towns themselves, were not able to cope with the new numbers. The Church was aware of the population increase and the resultant need for new churches. Some new chapels and churches were built, following the grant made for Church building, but few in the slums where they were needed most. There were many good pastors in the slums, but there were also many who were bad, incompetent, and idle. (This seemed to be the case in the Church as a whole.) The attitude of the people changed from friendliness to hostility, and the demand was for "food, not churches." (3) Their lack of 'Church-enthusiasm' can be seen in the emptiness of the churches that did exist and of the new ones that were built in the towns. In the religious census of 1851 it was disclosed that out of a population of just under 18,000,000, just over 7,000,000 attended service once or more on census Sunday, the lowest number coming from among the labouring classes. Why did the church fail the lower classes? (4)

First, the Church of England failed because, in the minds of the workers, it had become fused with the aristocracy. "Her bishops were deliberately chosen either for reasons of birth or political service or because they were known to be sound and sleepy. Her clergy were the well-groomed, well-meaning sons of the well-to-do, men in whose eyes all was well in this best of worlds - or if not there was always the hereafter." (5) This, in a sense, was necessarily so, as residence at a university was required for ordination, and only the rich could afford to attend.

Arnold of Rugby hoped that the clergy's "Christian sympathies" would enable them to bridge the gap between the Church and the poor, but it did not work out that way. (6) The clergy were divorced from the sphere of the poor. One incident which illustrates this is the surprise and amazement that the Chartists showed when Maurice met them and took interest in their plans and in them as people. But the gap between the clergy and the poor went further than this, for clearly, as Kitson Clark points out, there was a widespread and bitter "dislike in England of the English nobility" (7), which thus turned to dislike of the church authorities. (8)

Then there was the state of the church itself. As Raven points out,

-
- (1) Owen Chadwick : "The Victorian Church" Part I. Adam & Charles Black. London. 1966. Pg.325.
 (2) Woodward : Op.Cit., Pg.502.
 (3) Chadwick : Op.Cit., Pg.331.
 (4) We will deal with the Church of England. Some of the broad principles apply equally to many of the non-conformists as well.
 (5) C.E. Raven : "Christian Socialism. 1848-1854." Frank Cass & Co.Ltd. 1968. Pg.7
 (6) S.C.Carpenter : "Church and People. 1789-1889" Part I. London. SPCK. 1959. Pg.302.
 (7) Kitson Clark : "An Expanding Society" Pg.17.
 (8) c/f Chadwick : Op.Cit., Pg.26f.

"Organised religion had grown conventional; its vitality and elasticity were at a low level : it was ill-prepared to adapt itself without danger and acute discomfort to the needs of a new time." (1) The picture one gains is one of "pluralism, non-residence, and nepotism." (2) There were some bishops receiving as much as £19,000 per annum - as did the Archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of Durham - while many curates who did nearly all the work received somewhere between £60 and £100 per annum. There were clergy who never came near the parishes under their care; and there were large 'Church' families, the members of which were each given a place within the hierarchy of the church. We must note that much was done to remedy the abuses in the Church, by Peel's Ecclesiastical Commission of 1835. The authorities of the church were slowly becoming aware of its condition. But a great deal of reform was still needed.

There were still deeper reasons for the church's 'sleepiness.' The French Revolution and other disturbances on the Continent left a bad impression on the English mind. They conjured up a picture of terrorism and blood-thirsty crowds, with a resulting fear of the mob; and this "set back social progress in England." (3) Because much of the force behind the Revolution was anti-Christian, reform was linked with atheism and anti-Christian tendencies with which the Church could not associate itself.

The Church was not, however, really concerned with reform and social issues. It is true that the Church was undergoing a religious revival, but it was not of the kind that made it particularly conscious of the condition of society - rather it was 'inward looking.' The revival we refer to is that of the Evangelicals, and the Oxford Movement. The Evangelicals were concerned with the individual person, whom they saw as a soul in need of conversion. Their preaching was individualistic, each person was to see his personal salvation as paramount. Because this was their main emphasis, and because they failed to understand the social significance of the Church, the Evangelicals on the whole "cared little for the physical environment of their converts, and nothing for the causes that produced it." (4) There were individuals like Wilberforce and Shaftesbury who were concerned with social matters, but they were exceptions. This lack of real concern followed also from the Evangelical's belief that it was the spiritual, world-hereafter that really mattered, and that this world was merely something temporary, to be accepted as a test, as something to be endured. Their attitude seems to have been that, if you are poor, then be thankful, for it is a better lot than God should really have given you; and they quite accepted that God made some men poor and that poverty was immutable. Although they were "individualistic"...

(1) Raven : Op.Cit., Pg.2.

(2) Young : Op.Cit., Pg.63.

(3) S.L.Greenslade: "The Church and the Social Order." SCM Press Ltd. 1948. Pg.104.

(4) Raven : Op.Cit., Pg.10.

and ... "actively anti-revolutionary" (1) (reform was not new machinery, but of the heart (2)), we have to recognise that they did offer some help to the poor by way of their founding Sunday Schools, and thus education, and by giving them "an interest in life ... and a moral sobriety" (3). The Evangelicals had a lot to do with the abolition of slavery, and were found in the forefront of nearly every scheme of charity. But this, as we have said, was not their main concern. Their real defect lay in their substituting more charity when what was really required was social reform. Thus Raven is led to say rather strongly, that "at its best such a doctrine" (other-worldly, individualistic) "might be called unpractical and pietistic; at its worst it became a mere device for repressing honest aspiration and obstructing every attempt at progress." (4)

The Oxford Movement's contribution lay in what it did for what might be called the 'internal life' of the Church. Devotion to the ideal of Catholic Churchmanship led its members to work for the improvement of the clergy by higher standards of pastoral responsibility and improved education (5), and as Young points out, "Their object was to brace and fortify the Church against the coming onslaught of Liberalism and infidelity." (6). They did much to enhance worship by "deepening the content of English prayer"... by ... "lifting English eyes...to the treasures of the Catholic centuries..." (7), and by creating an Anglican self-consciousness. However, the Oxford Movement was against any Liberalism and hostile to social reformers. Their refusal to support the reformers and their blindness to the social needs of their time..."becomes almost incredible when we remember that the terrible condition of the poor both in manufacturing and in agricultural districts was not only widespread but well-known." (8) - The reason is that they came from Oxford, and Oxford was relatively untouched by industrial change. They seemed to be lost in a world of their own"... and their subjects of study increased their isolation from the most urgent social problems of the age." (9) Their concern was with ritual, archeology, apostolic succession, and their absorption with the past resulted in their losing faith in progress and the present working of the Holy Spirit; and in their energy being spent in academic interests. It was true of the Oxford Movement, as it was of the Evangelicals, that they were concerned with charity; but again, it was a private charity. The masses of people striving after improved conditions and a better life were confronted once again by paternalistic works of charity, instead of by social reform. One can hardly blame them for concluding that if they were to be freed from their bondage, they would have to look not to the Church, but elsewhere. The theology of the church did not really extend to social issues - there was lacking a vital Social Theology.

-
- (1) Raven : Op.Cit., Pg.11.
 (2) Chadwick : Op.Cit., Pg.442
 (3) Greenslade : Op.Cit., Pg.103.
 (4) Raven : Op.Cit., Pg.12.
 (5) Greenslade : Op.Cit., Pg.114.
 (6) Young : Op.Cit., Pg.68-9
 (7) Owen Chadwick (ed): "The Mind of the Oxford Movement." Adam & Charles Black. London. 1960. Pg.58.
 (8) Raven : Op.Cit., Pg.24.
 (9) Woodward : Op.Cit., Pg.512.

Outside the Church, there were other great forces at work, those of the prevailing philosophy and the economic theories. The period under review was characterised by the policy of Laissez-Faire, and the prevailing philosophy that of Bentham and his Utilitarianism. It was a case of every man fighting for himself; of individual selfishness, which was supposed to lead to the greatest happiness of the community as a whole. It was maintained that the fewer laws the greater happiness, and initially held that the state's functions should be limited to the absolute minimum, leaving all the rest to providence which would ensure the general good and profit through each man seeking his own good and profit. Though, to be fair to Bentham we must recognise that he believed in action through parliament; that he attacked abuses; that he wanted reasonable government; and that in seeking the greatest happiness of the greatest number he was concerned with all sections of the population. But the havoc this type of thinking results in is clear. For if freedom means the right of the individual to follow his own interests with the minimum of restriction, then if we carry it far enough we have the following sort of situation, "Wages must not be fixed - that would be to destroy the freedom of contract : workers must not combine - that would violate freedom to engage labour or to seek other employment :... child-labour must go on unchecked - even infants should enjoy freedom to spend sixteen hours a day in the mills ..." (1) and so on. This sort of theory stifled any attempts to alleviate the burden of the working-classes. In the sphere of economics it led to Ricardo's dictum that "...Wages should be left to the fair and free competition of the market, and should never be controlled by the interference of the legislature." (2) Wages were by nature to remain at subsistence level, and they came under 'natural' and not 'moral' law. This was the atmosphere in which the Church found itself and as Raven says, with public opinion in favour of non-intervention "...we can readily understand, even if we find it hard to pardon, the failure of the Church." (3) Non-intervention could not last. When the hardship of the working classes could no longer be tolerated, something would have to happen. The way was being prepared for Socialism.

(1) Raven : Op.Cit., Pg.31

(2) Raven : Op.Cit., Pg.41

(3) Raven : Op.Cit., Pg.28

CHAPTER 3 : TIME OF UNREST

Where were the working-classes to find relief if none was sufficiently forthcoming either from the Church or the State? They had nowhere else to turn but to themselves and their own resources; and their dissatisfaction with their conditions grew continually.

Robert Owen attempted to uplift the condition of his work-people, and he saw the solution to the problem of their condition in the replacing of competition by co-operation. It was in this sense that he can be called the father of English Socialism, and he was the pioneer in much that the Christian Socialists attempted to do. Owen's ideal was a "voluntary and freely self-governing co-operative community." (1) He believed that character was entirely dependant on environment and education alone, and thus that if workers were placed in ideal surroundings they would respond to them and become reliable and moral members of the community. But the 'ideal communities' he founded were a dismal failure, and he roused great opposition from even those who had supported him in his alternative to Laissez-faire when in 1836 he published his strongly anti-religious "Book of the New Moral World."

Chartism as a movement attempted "to create a sense of class unity" (2) which would bind together the groups within the labour force, and in a real sense was "an agitation for more extensive political reforms in a fully democratic direction." (3) It was the result partly of the failure of Owen's experiments, and partly of discontent with the Reform Bill of 1832 which had benefitted only the middle class. A third, and more immediate and down-to-earth cause, was that of the severe economic depression which the country began to experience towards the end of 1837. The harvest of 1838 failed. In the same year William Lovett, who founded the London Working Men's Association in 1836, and Francis Place drew up the 'People's Charter,' from which Chartism takes its name, which demanded votes for every man, the ballot, and annual parliaments. Lovett and his friends were soon joined by the radical Birmingham Political Union which sponsored the People's Charter and called for a National Petition on its behalf, and then by "a third and still more demagogic movement, led by the hot-headed Irish land-owner Feargus O'Connor." (4) Throughout the year mass meetings were organised, and rousing speeches made depicting the wrongs of the toiling classes and aimed at fanning their passions into a flame. A National Convention was convened in London in the spring of 1839 during which it was planned to present the Charter and petition with hundreds of thousands of signatures to parliament. At this point in the life of the Chartist Movement there are clear signs of what was to

(1) David Thomson : "England in the Nineteenth Century." Pg.45 Penguin Books. 1950

(2) Asa Briggs (Ed) : "Chartist Studies." Pg.4 London. Macmillan & Co. Ltd. 1962.

(3) A.R. Vidler : "The Church in an Age of Revolution. 1789 to the Present Day." Pg.93
Penguin Books. 1961

(4) Thomson : Op. Cit., Pg.85.

contribute to its petering-out. The ruling classes were strongly hostile to the Charter which also did not have the public support and moral sanction needed to have it implemented. It was clear, as Raven points out, that the "Charter could only have been passed by violence and revolution." (1) But the Chartists themselves were not united on the question of violence. "The Charter was a symbol of unity, but it concealed as much as it proclaimed - the diversity of local social pressures, the variety of local leaderships, the relative sense of urgency among different people and different groups." (2) At the London Convention this was illustrated by the differences of opinion that existed about what was to be done if the petition were rejected by Parliament. Lovett and his followers urged a campaign of peaceful agitation and popular education, while O'Connor and the more radical members urged violent reprisals - nothing less than civil war. In May the convention moved to Birmingham and in July the Petition, carrying nearly a million and a quarter signatures, was rejected by the Commons. As a result there were riots in Birmingham, but the general strike and march on London which the Convention had considered did not take place. About four hundred Chartists were imprisoned, "and the revolution ended in a splutter of musketry and a dozen men killed outside the Queen's Hotel, Newport." (3) After 1839 Chartism did not again have the backing that it had previously. The Anti-Corn-Law League, formed in March 1839 after the revival of the demand for the repeal of the corn laws, drew the support of the middle classes away from Chartism, "the artisans reverted to peaceful agitation; and large sections of the working classes began to turn to trade unionism." (4)

But this was not yet the end of the Chartist movement; as Briggs points out, "...Chartism never completely disappeared in the 1840's even in its darkest hours." (5) The National Charter Association kept alive its principles, and a second petition was presented and again rejected in 1842. In 1848 the movement appeared to be reviving once more, and that year saw its last surge, and then its death. This last attempt at demanding and securing their wishes was the result once again of economic depression, and they were "...inspired by the European revolutions..." (6)

(1) C.E. Raven: "Christian Socialism 1848-1854." Pg.53. Frank Cass & Co. Ltd. 1968.

(2) Briggs: Op.Cit., Pg.26.

(3) G.M. Young: "Victorian England. Portrait of an Age." 2nd Edition. Pg.37. London. Oxford University Press. 1953.

(4) Thomson: Op.Cit., Pg.86.

(5) Briggs: Op.Cit., Pg.28.

(6) N.C. Masterman: "John Malcolm Ludlow: The Builder of Christian Socialism." Pg.65. Cambridge University Press. 1963.

The European revolutions of 1848 are important for us not only in that they inspired the last Chartist agitation, but also in that they influenced to a notable degree J.M. Ludlow who was in Paris for a while at the time. It was these revolutions that caused Ludlow when he returned to England to exclaim that action had to be taken if all were not to be lost.

The conditions of the working-classes that we have described, particularly in the last chapter, were not confined to England. Conditions in Europe were largely the same. (1) Following the French election law of 1831 there were never as many as 250,000 qualified voters out of an adult male population of 9,000,000; for only those who paid a direct tax of 200 francs or more were eligible to vote. The large majority of the French population therefore had no say at all in the governing of their country. The Industrial Revolution had spread from England to the Continent, bringing with it distress to the poorer classes. "...France did not become the second industrial power in Europe without at the same time accumulating the second most miserable class of factory workers. England, of course, had the first." (2) Workers in France were subjected to the same conditions as those in England; long hours of work, low wages, atrocious factories, and dreary houses. Attempts had been made by some to alleviate the distress, which was made well known in books and articles, but the only political action taken by Louis Philippe was a single law against daytime labour by children under eight and night labour by those under twelve. This law was not strictly enforced and its effect was negligible. Poverty was accompanied by unemployment. Workers were drawn to the cities, swelling the numbers of workers in them and adding to unemployment. To make matters worse, Europe was thrown into a financial crisis in 1846, and together with this came bad harvests. It is estimated that in 1847 a third of the population of Paris was on relief. (3) In early 1848 people were aware that revolution was 'in the air.' "Political discontent, ranging from demands for a wider suffrage which would undermine middle-class rule (France) to hatred of the autocratic systems restored after 1815 (Central Europe), had been simmering for a considerable time..." (4) In France the discontent went much wider and deeper than a demand for a wider suffrage. Early in 1848 Alexis de Tocqueville prophesied: "...Ideas flow through their" ... (the working classes') ... "breasts that will shake the basis of society: they say that everything above them

(1) We will confine our attention to France, and particularly Paris where the 1848 revolutions started. It is interesting to note that, unlike England, Europe, and France in particular, had what one might call a 'tradition' of revolution. There had already been the Revolutions of 1789 and 1830.
 (2) P. Robertson: "Revolutions of 1848 : A Social History." Harper & Row, Publishers. 1960. Pg.17.
 (3) Robertson: Op.Cit., Pg.18.
 (4) B.E. Schmitt: "1848 - as seen from 1948";
 in M. Kranzberg (Ed) : "1848 - A Turning Point,"
 D.C. Heath and Company. Boston. 1959. Pg. 1-2.

is incapable and unworthy of governing; that the distribution of goods to the profit of some is unjust... When such ideas take root, they lead soon or late, I do not know when, to the most terrible revolutions. We are sleeping on a volcano... Do you not see that the earth trembles anew? A wind of revolution blows, the storm is on the horizon." (1)

Socialism grew up to meet the problem of the industrial working-class. Louis Blanc, a popular Socialist leader, saw competition as the great source of evil and proposed organising 'social workshops' or 'producers' co-operatives' with state money, where employment would be offered to all who wanted it. Through the work of many of the Socialists and also through the secret societies, many of which were strongly revolutionary, the workers were being prepared for the revolution.

The 'volcano' erupted in February 1848 in Paris with bloodshed; the people were armed and barricades set up in the streets; bridges, railways and stations were destroyed, and the cry went up for a republic. The King abdicated and fled to England, and on the 26th February the Provisional Coalition Government proclaimed the Republic. Social reform was demanded, and the government reduced working hours to ten a day in Paris and eleven in the provinces; it also issued a proclamation recognising the right to work. In order to deal with the acute problem of unemployment, the government created National Workshops. What is important for us to notice here is that the mob had secured certain rights and social measures for themselves, and their hopes were high. The people had revolted and long-awaited measures to improve their lot started to be taken. It was a sequence that appeared to be inevitable. The French revolt inspired similar revolts in other parts of Europe, and although England remained relatively unaffected, the revolutions did, as we noted earlier, inspire the Chartists to take action once more.

Of England during this period, Tom Hughes, who became one of the original members of the Christian Socialism Movement while reading for the bar in Lincoln's Inn, and author of "Tom Brown's Schooldays," wrote, "Through the winter of 1847-8, amidst widespread distress, the cloud of discontent of which Chartism was the most violent symptom had been growing darker and more menacing... In March there were riots in London, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Liverpool and other large towns." (2) The success of the Paris revolution had the effect of giving the extremists temporary ascendancy in the Chartist movement. They summoned a great 'convention' to meet at Kennington Common on April 10th, from which they intended to present their monster petition to Parliament.

(1) Robertson : Op.Cit., Pg.14, quoting Barrot : "Memoires Posthumes" 1, Pg.478.

(2) As quoted by Masterman : Op.Cit., Pg.65.

But the whole effort ended in a fiasco. Many of the five million signatures on the petition were false ones. The European revolutions had had the effect of turning the majority of articulate British people against the Chartists, for the news that the February Revolution aimed at introducing Socialism and Communism horrified them. Most Londoners were scared. As Higham puts it, "As April 10th, the fatal date approached, the citizens of London, and not least the prosperous gentlefolk in the suburbs, began to think they might be murdered in their beds and London set on fire." (1) The Whig government, which in the steps it took had the support of the Tories and the middle-classes, determined that the occurrences in Paris should not be repeated in London. Thousands of people were enrolled as special constables, and troops were out in full force under the command of the Duke of Wellington. The storm "which swept away half the Governments of Europe passed harmlessly" (2) over Britain. The Chartist leaders failed to turn up at the meeting, and the pouring rain dampened all spirits. People drifted quietly away from the common, and the petition eventually reached the House of Commons through the back streets of London in a hansom cab. The 'convention' was ill-timed. The European events and the reckless language of the Chartist leaders had had the effect of rousing maximum opposition, and, more seriously, of making people forget that the Chartists had very real grievances and deserved to be heard.

But there were a group of people who had not forgotten, and who were deeply concerned. Christensen makes the point that a change had taken place in the religious world, and editorials in the religious press indicated that "the impending catastrophe was looked upon as a visitation of God on a people that had not lived in accordance with His will and had neglected to care for its poor." (3) Leading articles in the religious press stressed the need to take the Chartists seriously. The social conscience of the religious people was thus being awakened, and they were made to "realise their responsibilities towards the lower classes." (4) April 10th, in a way, marks the beginning of the Christian Socialism movement. It is necessary to qualify our statement by saying 'in a way', because although April 10th saw the formation of a group of people who were to become the core of the Christian Socialists, at this stage "they had but very vague ideas about where and how to set to work." (5) Nevertheless, the formation of this group was of decisive significance.

(1) F. Higham : "Frederick Denison Maurice." Pg.58. S.C.M. Press Ltd. 1947.

(2) Young : Op.Cit., Pg.78

(3) T. Christensen : "Origin and History of Christian Socialism 1848-54." Pg.64. Universitetsforlaget 1. Aarhus. 1962.

(4) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.72.

(5) Christensen : Op.Cit., Pg.108.

CHAPTER 4: F.D. MAURICE: HIS BACKGROUND AND CAREER

The purpose of this section is to see what sort of background Maurice had; to see what sort of a man he was; and briefly to trace his life-story.

Just before F.D. Maurice died, he gathered his strength together as he lay in his bed, and slowly and distinctly said: "The knowledge of the love of God - the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost be amongst YOU - amongst US - and remain with us for ever." (1) These were his last words, but words which, as Florence Higham says, "held the whole meaning of his life." (2) He was a man who knew what it was to rely on, and to be guided by, the living and ever-present God. His love and compassion for men which was so strong, arose from his conviction of God's present reality and His love for all men.

F.D. Maurice, born into a large family on August 29th, 1805, at Normanstone, near Lowestoft, was tremendously influenced by his family life. He was the fifth child of Michael and Priscilla Maurice, who had nine children in all, one of whom died of croup while still a baby.

Michael Maurice was a dedicated Unitarian minister, and Frederick acknowledges in a letter written to one of his sons in 1866 how greatly his father influenced him. "My ends have been shaped for me, rough hew them how I would, and shape has been given to them by my father's function and this name 'Unitarian' more than by any other influences..." (3) He had a very high regard for his father. They would often go for long walks in the country, a few of his father's pupils sometimes joining them, and would discuss the social questions of their time. His father was Whig and Liberal in outlook, and often talked with great feeling of poor men and their conditions. He took Frederick along with him to his projects of social improvement which included national education, Sunday School, anti-slave trade, Clothing Club, and Soup kitchen. His absolute integrity, his strong ethical views concerning religion and politics, and his dislike of violence and intolerance made a deep impression on young Frederick. Michael Maurice's "Unitarian faith was bound up with a keen sense of love and justice as the attributes of the Almighty, and he abhorred the Calvinist trend of thought which coloured most of the Christian teaching of the day because it seemed to him neither loving nor just." (4) His hope, and his wife's, was that his son would also become a Unitarian minister, and Frederick took this for granted.

(1) Frederick Maurice : "The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice chiefly told in his own letters." Vol.11. Pg.643. London. Macmillan & Co. (1885)

(2) Florence Higham : "Frederick Denison Maurice." Pg.121. S.C.M. (1947)

(3) Life of F.D.M.: Vol.1. Pg.13.

(4) Higham: Op.Cit., Pg.14.

The first seven years of Frederick's life spent at Normanstone were happy years which he always remembered. There existed a very strong sense of unity in their family, but this did not last. In an autobiographical letter written by Frederick Maurice in 1866, he says, "...there came a great change over the spirit of our household." (1)

Anne Hurry, a friend of the family, began to feel the need for a personal Saviour, and under her influence Elizabeth, Anne and then Mary Maurice started to feel the same way, becoming dissatisfied with their father's Unitarianism.

In 1812 the family left Normanstone for Clifton where they stayed until 1814 when they moved to Frenchay in Gloucestershire. Edmund Hurry died in October 1814 and this seemed to be a turning-point in the life of the family, for his death brought home to Anne Hurry the need for a personal Christ in a very real way. Elizabeth Maurice paid a distant relative a long visit, and became convinced of the error of her father's religion. On July 25th, 1815, Anne wrote on behalf of herself and Elizabeth to their father, saying that they could no longer take Communion with him and that "We do not think it consistent with the duty we owe to God to attend a Unitarian place of worship." (2) About this same time Mrs. Maurice began to lean away from Unitarianism towards Orthodoxy, and in 1821 she gave her husband a paper that had taken nearly a year to compose, explaining her views. This division of the once strongly united family distressed Frederick, and his deep desire for unity, for reconciliation between the different faiths, which was central to the rest of his life, was born.

In 1821 Frederick decided to enter the Bar, and in 1822 moved to the Hardcastles to be taught by a Mr. Clarkson in preparation for the law. It appears that he had accepted a rigid Calvinistic dogmatism, for in a letter to a person called 'Lucy' he talks of himself as "a being destined to a few short years of misery here, as an earnest of and preparation for that more enduring state of wretchedness and woe." (3) Lucy declared to him that his predestinarian view made God a tyrant, whereas God was Love. On his return to Frenchay he felt the need to enter a university, and in October 1823 he entered Trinity College, Cambridge.

Maurice entered Cambridge as a young man who hoped to find there the answer to his dilemma which had arisen out of the differing faith of the members of his family. He began by studying mathematics and classics.

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol. 1. Pg.20
 (2) Life of F.D.M. Vol. 1. Pg.23
 (3) Life of F.D.M. Vol. 1. Pg.43

Julius Hare was a great influence on him, and later on in life, thinking back on his days at Cambridge, Maurice said of Hare that "...to his lectures on Sophocles and Plato I can trace the most permanent effect on my character, and on all my modes of contemplating subjects, natural, human, and divine." (1) He ascribes to Hare both the setting before his pupils of an ideal which was applicable to all mankind and which was opposed to selfishness as a basis for anything; and teaching them a way out of party opinions to which the party opinions themselves bear witness. (2) It was during his first year at Cambridge that he met and made friends with John Sterling, a friendship which was to be very important to him. During his second year at Cambridge, Maurice and Sterling and other young men like Charles Kemble and Richard Trench, formed what they called the 'Apostles Club', in which they discussed and thought about the problems of the world.

After two years Maurice and Sterling moved to Trinity Hall to specialise in law, although it appears that Maurice was not yet sure that law was in fact to be his vocation. (3) It was during this, his third year, that he and Whitmore, a friend, became joint editors of the "Metropolitan Quarterly Magazine" which was first published in November 1825, and which lasted for three numbers. (4) Although he spent so much time in this venture, he passed his examinations with credit, but did not obtain a degree due to the fact that he had not yet declared himself a member of the Church of England, or accepted all their doctrines.

From Cambridge Maurice went to London. The three years that Maurice spent in London were years of great unrest in England. Reform was in the air, and many questions were being asked about the church and its future; the conditions of the working-classes began to be noticed, and the Church's relation to these people and their plight was one of concern.

Maurice began to put his thoughts into words, and contributed articles to the "Westminster Review" and the "Athenaeum." In 1828 he became editor of the "London Literary Chronicle" and later on in the year became the joint editor of the "Literary Chronicle" and the "Athenaeum" when they amalgamated. His aversion to systems and parties continually comes out in his writing, as well as does his love for man as such.

Although Maurice never actually met Coleridge, he was a fervent disciple of his (5), and Ramsey says that "apart from him" (Coleridge).. "we cannot

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol. 1. Pg.55

(2) Life of F.D.M. Vol. 1. Pg.56

(3) Higham: Op.Cit., Pg.20; Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.59 (bottom)

(4) The number given by his son in Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.61 Higham: Op.Cit., says four. Pg.20

(5) Higham : Op.Cit., Pg.24.

see Maurice in his right perspective." (1) (2) Higham says that it was from Coleridge's firm faith in the existence of something true and eternal which was above the uncertainties and shallowness of the world and time, that Maurice "lit his own torch of faith." (3)

Although Maurice's own thinking must have undergone a development in London, his time there was not a very happy one. In a letter written to his son in 1870, he says of his time in London, "I began to think that I was wasting time, and that if I could ultimately excel, it should be somewhere else than in a newspaper, even if it could have succeeded in my hands." (4) London depressed him. He spent a lot of time alone in his lodgings, worrying about his sister Emma who was ill, about his own future, and about the people of London with their superficiality and unrest.

In the autumn of 1828 the family lost a lot of money when the father's Spanish bonds lost all their value due to a political revolution; and this forced Frederick into some sort of action, and to take his career more seriously than he had done. He, Sterling, and Whitmore each decided to write a novel hoping thereby to raise some money which two of them badly needed. (5) Toward the end of the year he began to toy with the idea of returning to Cambridge, which was what his mother and Emma urged him to do. The idea of entering the Church of England was also in his mind. At this stage his thinking was far removed from that of his father, and in a letter written to his father in February 1829 (6), he explained that he believed God to be absolute and unqualified Love - but because of his own sinfulness and corruption could not approach or understand Him. Hence the necessity of a man embodying God's perfect spirituality, and the Spirit who would remove the evil from his heart and thus enable him to have fellowship with God, to contemplate Him and pray to Him in the correct way. In his thinking Maurice got to the core of the Christian faith.

The Athenaeum was not proving a success either financially or by way of circulation. Emma had become very seriously ill, and in May or June Maurice's mother persuaded him to resign his editorship and to return home, where he continued with his novel as well as writing other articles. This really ended a chapter in his life. His time of turmoil in London was over, and from here he went to Oxford to train for the priesthood - the wish of Emma and his mother.

He nearly did not return to Oxford after the long vacation due to financial difficulties - which were, fortunately solved. He must have been held in

-
- (1) A.M. Ramsey : "F.D. Maurice and the conflicts of Modern Theology." Pg.14. Cambridge. 1951.
 (2) Coleridge asserted that men may achieve real fellowship with God; he saw Christianity as "the crown and perfection of all intelligence, the truth in which all lesser truths find their fulfilment," (Ramsey : Op.Cit., Pg.16); he was not afraid of reading the Bible critically; he saw the national Church as a part of the Church universal and not as identical with the nation. It was the family of Christ to which all men belong, and was above all parties and systems.
 (3) Higham : Op.Cit., Pg.25.
 (4) Life of F.D.M. Vol. I. Pg.178
 (5) Life of F.D.M. Vol. I. Pg.90
 (6) Life of F.D.M. Vol. I. Pg.92f.

high regard by those at Oxford, for people like Dr. W. Jacobson and J.L. Richards almost ordered him to return, even offering him the necessary financial assistance. "So", says Jacobson, "pray don't be perverse." (1)

On March 29th 1831 he was baptised as a member of the Church of England. In his letters written from Oxford during this year, one can discern a few of the thoughts and ideas that were to characterise his later life. Because, largely, of the love that he had experienced within the family, and because of the different ideas about religion that they held dear, he disliked any rejection of what others held sacred, seeing the "spirit of judging" as sinful. He realised that every person had something to contribute and possessed something of positive value. More and more "he came to look upon the order of God as founded on relationships." (2) Maurice was a man who loved people with a very deep and sincere love. With this was coupled a humility which made him say that we must "dwell and delight" in seeing other people as much better and kinder than we ourselves are. He was conscious of how far short he fell of Christian standards and was continually examining himself and his motives in order to get rid of all which he considered evil. His own belief in God as Trinity and his conviction of the necessity for God being Trinity was at this stage fully developed, and in a letter to his father in 1832 he explained his faith to him.

In October J.A. Stevenson, the rector at Lympsham invited him to become his assistant, which he accepted. It is probable that Stevenson was also one who planted, or at least gave force to, certain thoughts in Maurice's mind. (3)

Maurice was ordained at Eccleshall in Staffordshire on 26th January 1834. In a letter written to his father on the day before the ordination (4) he says that his feelings at the time are "a desire for greater self-abasement and a more perfect and universal charity." He was sure of the fact that charity springs from the certainty of God who is Truth and Love, and that God wills all men to know Him. "Now this I feel is my imperfection that I do not love men's persons enough, and hate that which makes them unhappy enough; that I do not more labour to guide them into truth, and use the only means of doing so, kindness and love. This is my desire, this I am bound by my ordination vows to seek after; and, seeking, I trust that I shall find."

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol. I. Pg.113

(2) Life of F.D.M. Vol. I. Pg.127

(3) In his memoir of J.A. Stephenson, written in about 1838 (Life of F.D.M. Vol.I. Pg.147f.), Maurice talks of him with great respect; as a man of great Christian character, who brought 'heavenly' things into the realm of ordinary living, who saw the good that was in the world, who taught the absolute and essential love of God, who saw the centrality of the incarnation for man, and who saw the universality of the Church which was a real body and which would encompass all men.

(4) Life of F.D.M. Vol.I. Pg.158-9.

After ordination he became the curate at Bubbenhall in Warwickshire. Shortly after settling in, his "Eustace Conway" was published, and seems to have been well received with people like Coleridge giving it high praise. While at Bubbenhall he wrote "Subscription No Bondage" which was published in 1835. It was occasioned by a move to have subscription to the Thirty Nine Articles by undergraduates abolished, and Maurice argued that subscription to the articles was not intended as a test but was in fact "a declaration of the terms on which the University proposed to teach its pupils.....not terms which are to bind down the student to certain conclusions beyond which he cannot advance, but are helps to him in pursuing his studies.... not unfit introductions to a general education in humanity and in physics because they are theological, but on that very account are valuable"....(1), and he saw them as contributing to what was positive in all Christian sects.

Maurice's time at Bubbenhall did not last very long. The chaplaincy of Guy's Hospital was expected to fall vacant, and J.C. Hare, Sterling and H.Rose worked to get it offered to Maurice. Maurice went on a quick visit to London at the end of 1835 to have a look at the hospital; and it was during this visit, when reading Pusey's tract on Baptism, that he saw that he could never agree with Pusey and the Oxford school, and that all hope of uniting with the Tractarians was at an end. The tract made Maurice very sad, as it was against all that he believed. He saw Pusey as regarding baptism as effecting a change of nature, and it seemed to him that Pusey's teaching meant that the whole race is given over to the devil "except for those individuals who are rescued out of it by a sacramental change of nature." (2) Maurice, however, regarded baptism as the start of being under the influence of the divine Light that was always in the child; as the acceptance by man of the sonship offered by God to all. He saw all men as being born into a race "of which Christ is the Head and baptism is the sign that they are." (3) Perhaps one of the main differences between Maurice and the Tractarians was, as Higham points out, that the "keynote of Maurice's religion was fellowship; of the Tractarians, personal piety and exclusive Churchmanship." (4)

In spite of this upset, Maurice was excited about the prospects of Guy's Hospital, and began work there in January 1836. He hope to steer clear of rivalling factions and busy himself with work at the hospital. He enjoyed working amongst the patients. "I have great pleasure in collecting the patients in a ward round the bedside of one of the most ill, and reading and explaining the Scriptures to them..." (5) Before going to Guy's, he had

(1) From 'Explanatory Letters' written in 1870 and quoted in Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.181.

(2) Alec Vidler : "The Church in an Age of Revolution." Pg.85. Penguin. 1961.

(3) Vidler: Op.Cit., Pg.85.

(4) Higham: Op.Cit., Pg.38.

(5) Life of F.D.M. Vol. 1. Pg.193, quoted from a letter written to his mother from Guy's.

hoped that he might be of help among the medical students, and it appears that he was successful. During the summer he lectured to them twice a week on moral philosophy. Maurice was very happy working at Guy's. He turned down the tutorship of Downing College, Cambridge, but then allowed himself to be nominated for an Oxford appointment - that of professor of Political Economy, after first refusing it. But when he published his own tract on Baptism, it appears that the Tractarians decided to vote against him, and "his name was withdrawn from a hopeless contest, the very men who had proposed him originally being now the most bitter in opposition." (1)

Shortly before Maurice moved to Guy's, he met Mrs. Sterling's sister, Anna Barton, and John Sterling did all he could to encourage this friendship which had begun between the two. Maurice and Anna were married on October 7th, 1837, at Clifton, with John Sterling himself officiating. Marriage was perhaps one of the best things that could have happened to Maurice. It "calmed him, gave him the courage of his own faith, and made him not afraid to speak out boldly the thing he believed to be true, no matter how different it might be from the opinions of those whom he most respected and loved," (2) because Anna gave him the support and understanding and sympathy that he needed, bringing him out of himself and helping him to extend himself by sharing his life in every way with her. In marriage he once more realised how important unity was; and that one's centre of fellowship with others is Christ who is present in all men.

Towards the end of 1838 Maurice published his book "The Kingdom of Christ." In it he examines the positive principles of a Quaker, a pure Protestant (Lutheran, Calvinist or Zwinglian), a Unitarian and Rational Philosopher, and shows that they serve the Truth while they stand for the positive principle that each enshrines. We might note that because he recognised some truth in all schools of thought, again and again throughout his life he came to the defence of any party that was violently attacked. (3) In "The Kingdom of Christ", then, while seeing that each school served the Truth while standing for their positive principle, he stressed that in each case the positive principle is lost when it is made into a system; and as a result the school becomes "sectional and exclusive and it begins to decay." (4) Or, as Vidler puts it so well, Maurice maintained that "each of the main divisions in Christendom, and each of the parties in the Church of England, and indeed each secular philosophy and movement too, stood at bottom for a true principle or at least a valid quest: their mistake was to assert their own truth exclusively against others!"(5)

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.222.

(2) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.229.

(3) For example, he defended Protestantism when it was attacked by the Oxford men, and in 1843 he defended Dr. Pusey who was barred from the Oxford University pulpit, for he saw it as an attempt to suppress the Tractarians. He did this even though he himself disagreed with Pusey's views, especially on Baptism.

(4) Higham : Op.Cit., Pg.43. c/f Ramsey : Op.Cit., Pg.27.

(5) Vidler : Op. Cit., Pg.84.

"...the principles asserted by the religious societies which have been formed in Europe since the Reformation are solid and imperishable;...the systems in which those principles have been embodied were faulty in their origin, have been found less and less to fulfil their purpose as they have grown older, and are now exhibiting the most manifest indications of approaching dissolution."(1)

Maurice saw the signs of a spiritual Kingdom, a divine society, which lies behind all the different systems, as Baptism, the Creed, forms of worship, the Eucharist, Episcopacy, and the Scriptures. The Church of England is a branch of the Catholic Church, and Maurice denounces all those who try to form parties within it. The aim of the book was "to prove that if Christ be really the head of every man, and if He really have taken human flesh, there is ground for a universal fellowship among men.....it is the business of the Church to assert this ground of universal fellowship.....the denial of a universal head is practically the denial of all communion in society." (2) It followed that people have a responsibility to all in the society, especially to the underdog.

National education had interested Maurice for a long time, and he saw the Church as "a great educational organisation." (3) He was not a man for theory only, and during the year gave a course of lectures on education, which were later published under the title "Has the Church or the State the power to Educate the Nation?" (4) In September he and some friends became joint editors of "The Educational Magazine", and in January of 1840 he became the sole editor. He saw education as a unity - it had to have a 'oneness', for a person was one entity and not two, one religious and the other secular; and so he urged for a not purely secular education, but one based on the Christian faith, for only then would class barriers be broken down and men given a chance for developing fully. (5) The magazine was disbanded in the spring of 1841, mainly, it seems, because the reason for its existence disappeared when the government gave the Church a part to play in education. (see below)

In June 1840 Maurice was unanimously elected to the Professorship of English Literature and Modern History at King's College, London. Shortly after the appointment he and his wife spent two months holiday in Switzerland, and while on holiday, the government in England agreed that the Church be responsible for the inspection of religious education. The Church was now able "to be and to appear the friend and promoter of popular education." (6)

(1) F.D. Maurice : "The Kingdom of Christ." Vol.1. Pg.213. James Clarke & Co. Ltd., London. 1959
 (2) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.258.
 (3) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.269.
 (4) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1, Pg.269.
 (5) Higham : Op.Cit., Pg.46.
 (6) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.285.

On returning from their holiday, he got down to his lecturing, which he enjoyed. The next year or two was a satisfying time, not only from the point of view of his professorship, but also in that his first son was born in May of 1841, and the second edition of the "Kingdom of Christ" was published (1842). From Canon Farrar we learn something about Maurice's lectures.(1) They were different from those of other lecturers in that no questions were asked by Maurice, he did not check to see whether they were doing the work, nor did he require them to take notes during the lectures. Often he was so caught up in what he was lecturing about that he was hardly aware that the class was there at all. But they were very aware of him, and especially his command of the subject and originality of thought. This does not mean that they always understood what he said. As Chadwick says, "Whether his students were better or worse, they could make nothing of the notes which they took from his lips. But a lofty purpose and a reverent mien did better for some of them than information or coherence. They could see and feel the grandeur and mystery of truth." (2)

During this period Maurice was acutely aware of the needs of the people of London, and their dissatisfaction with what the Church had to say to them. He was urged to some sort of action by many people; and just what form this was to take was continually on his mind, with the idea of tracts uppermost at this stage. "If they felt that we did not write to censure and contradict them, but to communicate to them truths with which we are concerned, as a part of their inheritance, some few here and there might at least listen...." (3) The tracts, he thought, were to be written on the principle that the readers were 'reasonable people' who were seeking the truth and who had their own thoughts on the subject.

In November 1843 Hare wrote a letter to Maurice urging him very strongly to put himself forward as a candidate for the principalship of King's College when Lonsdale resigned, as he was expected to do at any time; and also to succeed him at Lincoln's Inn. This was a very important decision for Maurice to make, for it would influence the direction of his future work. He wrote back to Hare urging him not to suggest his name to any members of the Council, saying that if he were to be nominated, "All the professors would at once resign and the number of admissions to the College would be reduced two-thirds or three-fourths." (4) To think of the principalship of King's College and preachship of Lincoln's Inn was ludicrous as he was an insignificant and unknown person! Hare, of course, found these reasons quite unsatisfactory. Maurice replied, this time saying that he was convinced that to be of use in the Church he could not have some high position or rank within it. He saw

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pgs. 312-318.

(2) Owen Chadwick: "The Victorian Church." Vol.1. Pg.349. Adam & Charles Black. London. 1966.

(3) From a letter to Archdeacon Hare in Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.330.

(4) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.355.

his work with those 'outside the fold' of the Church rather than with those inside it - ".....I think that some time or other my vocation will be among them, and generally among all that are in distress and are in debt and are discontented - Quakers, Unitarians, Rationalists, Socialists, and whatever else a Churchman repudiates, and whatever repudiates him." (1) Hare accepted what he said, even though he thought Maurice to be ideal for the principalship, where he could give free reign to his obvious intellectual capabilities. The principalship went to Dr. Jelf.

Meanwhile Maurice was toying with the idea of writing tracts from the hospital, for there he was in contact with all conditions of men, "where may be found nearly every form of false opinion and evil practice." (2) He saw them as badly needing right literature and guidance, and longed to be able to put his thoughts down on paper and bring to them the living God to take the place of their atheism.

In 1844 W.G. Ward wrote "The Ideal of a Christian Church Considered", which dealt with the Articles and expressed contempt for them. And, as was typical of Maurice, he defended Ward against the persecution that resulted from his article, even though he did not in the least bit agree with the views expressed by Ward. In a pamphlet that he wrote during the controversy (3), Maurice defined what he meant by 'eternal life'. He disagreed with the interpretation which makes 'eternal life' the equivalent of some future life, and takes 'eternal life' to mean the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ, saying that it was vital that the revelation of God be the end of the Divine Dispensation and not some idea of rewards and punishments, and secondly that he believed that a 'future state' was not part of the hope of those under the Old Covenant. The import of this view of eternal life was of great significance, and the same view was in 1853 to cause his expulsion from King's College.

Easter of 1845 was one of great sadness for Maurice, for his wife Anna died of a lung infection. The depth of Maurice's faith came out with great force. He was conscious that God's love was beneath all things and that it was His will that she depart this life - "He gave and He has taken away; blessed be His name." (4) His feelings were not so much of self-pity, but rather of his own sin - "I cry to be forgiven for the eight years in which one of the truest and noblest of God's children was trusted to one who could not help or guide her aright, rather than to be comforted in the desolation which is appointed to me." (5) Annie had been a perfect wife, and had always encouraged Maurice in all that he tackled. "...She was certainly the most un-

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.358

(2) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.368

(3) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.396f.

(4) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.405

(5) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.405

selfish person I ever conversed with, and the one who most mourned over our failure in referring every thought and act to Christ as its source and end." (1) Life had changed for him now, and London and Guy's hospital did not fill him with any joy or enthusiasm.

Shortly after his wife's death, Hare tried to persuade Maurice to accept nomination as Master of the Temple. But much as he would have liked the position, his humility which made him deny himself the principalship of King's College two years previously, again made him want a humbler, less spectacular position.

In July he was appointed Boyle Lecturer, and in August the Warburton Lecturer. The Boyle lectures were later published as "The Religions of the World", and the Warburton ones as "The Epistle to the Hebrews." At the beginning of the following year (1846) plans were afoot to establish a theological department at King's College and Maurice, Dr. McCaul and the Rev. Trench were appointed as professors. Maurice was also appointed to the Chaplaincy of Lincoln's Inn; and at last he was in the sort of position that many had wished for him for a long time and which he well deserved. This meant his leaving Guy's hospital. His whole married life had been spent at Guy's, with many happy memories attached to it, but Maurice was glad to leave for this was to be a new life for him and with the new commitments he now had, the extra ones at Guy's would be impossible. Higham says that "the removal to Bloomsbury rings up the curtain on a new chapter, the beginnings of Christian Socialism." (2)

His duties at Lincoln's Inn consisted of taking the daily morning prayers and two services on the Sunday. The power of his message brought a new meaning to those services, and a new sense of fellowship. He spoke with a sincerity and wisdom, and the congregation felt that he was sympathetic to their needs, one who knew what life was all about. From a small congregation of not more than a dozen or so, after a few years the stage was reached when not a seat was left empty, even those under the organ loft were always full. T. Hughes wrote, "For myself... I believe that the daily congregation increased because when a man got up and went to chapel in the morning and heard Mr. Maurice read the prayers, (3) he felt there was somehow a reality about the service which was new to him, and he went again to satisfy a want; and if he overslept himself he found that he had lost something - that his day was not started right." (4) In the Theological department Maurice was kept busy lecturing in Ecclesiastical history, modern history, English literature and English history, while at home he did his best to bring up his two sons and give them as much time as he could.

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.407

(2) Higham : Op.Cit., Pg.53.

(3) His son prefers to say that he "prayed" rather than "read the prayers."

(4) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.428.

At this stage one must say something about the opposition to Maurice that was steadily growing, mainly because of his views and his support of those who were attacked and unpopular. He was very strongly opposed by the religious newspapers of the day, like the 'Record' and the 'Church Times'. It started in 1836 when his 'Letters to a Quaker' were written, or perhaps when they were published in 1838 - for they contained "an open proclamation of war against all the religious newspapers of every party whatsoever." (1) In a way, the opposition that was aroused was natural, for Maurice repeatedly came to the defence of anyone strongly attacked, whatever his views, and opposed those who did the attacking. This was bound to lead to his own views being attacked and misrepresented, and his being accused of all sorts of heresy and partisanship, especially if he had attacked the very principle of religious newspapers in the first place. The attack of the newspapers built up and in 1848, after his defence of Dr. Hampden, Dr. Jelf, the principal of King's College, wrote to him about the whole business. "My excellent principal, Jelf," wrote Maurice, "looks white, and fears I have compromised the college." (2) The opposition of the religious newspapers was to continue for many more years.

Through his sister Mary, Maurice became involved in the education of governesses. In 1848 "Queen's College" was formed, with Maurice as principal and a staff composed mostly of King's College professors, although people like Kingsley and Clark joined at a later stage. At the same time he became involved in a far wider sphere. 1848 was a very important year as we have seen from our previous chapters - it was a year of great unrest throughout England and Europe. Socialism and Chartism had joined forces and J.M. Ludlow, who had just visited Paris, wrote to Maurice saying that Socialism was a very real force and that "it must be Christianised or it would shake Christianity to its foundation..." (3) In the light of the events going on around them, and after the great Chartist gathering of the 10th April, Maurice and Ludlow, together with Kingsley, Hare, and a few others, met to decide on what action to take. The first issue of their newspaper "Politics for the People" appeared on 6th May. They emphasised that politics and religion cannot be separated; politics must become Christianised, and religion must involve itself in the affairs of politics. "Politics for the People" lasted for seventeen numbers and then had to be abandoned, for it was not paying its way.

The group that had gathered round Maurice still continued, however, to meet once a week. During their work on "Politics for the People", their energies were also directed to Little Ormond Yard, an area full of violence and vice and lawlessness, where they set up a night school, and later a girl's school. The effect of their work was that the area became relatively peaceful again.

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol. 1. Pg.241

(2) Life of F.D.M. Vol. 1. Pg.451

(3) Life of F.D.M. Vol. 1. Pg.458

In addition to the weekly Friday meetings, Maurice soon began to hold weekly Bible-study meetings on a Monday evening, the first being on December 7th, 1848. They arose out of the need that some of his friends felt for the privilege of his instruction and discussion with him. At the first meeting there were about a dozen people, from all walks of life, mostly young men, with widely differing points of view, who were all dissatisfied with the world as it was. They gained much from the man who spoke "with the spirit of God." (1), and each "gained a knowledge of the meaning of Holy Writ, which was worth more to him than all he could have won by any number of hours of solitary study, or could have gleaned from a very considerable number of sermons." (2) Maurice himself also gained a lot from these meetings by way of learning of the members' actual "difficulties, doubts and objections" (3).

Early in 1849 Maurice became engaged to Georgina Hare. They were married on July 4th, and once more he had someone to share his burdens and hopes about both society, and the Church which seemed almost dead and which needed "Reformation, Revival, Restoration." (4) His time was spent with lectures at King's and Queen's College, in writing articles and lectures.

New contact was made with the Chartists when Ludlow brought Walter Cooper, a tailor, to some of Maurice's services at Lincoln's Inn, and a meeting with the Chartists was arranged for April 23rd. The meeting went well and Maurice felt that he learnt a lot about and from them, and from then on they held frequent meetings.

Dr. Jelf, in March of that year, felt that he ought to write again to the controversial Maurice who was arousing so much opposition. Maurice replied very efficiently to all the questions that Jelf asked and that seemed to be the end of the matter. The only one to have suffered at all seems to have been Dr. Jelf. "He is ill in bed, and I am afraid I have some of his nervous feelings to answer for." (5)

The need for some sort of action continued to press upon Maurice and his friends. The question was how they were to be of assistance to the working men and to the poor. The idea of co-operative societies for workmen arose. At first, Maurice seemed hesitant, but this was because of his dislike of any parties or societies, and because he saw the need for a Christian basis of living as supreme, rather than economic projects. However, when Ludlow persisted and invited a few friends to dinner to consider co-operative workshops,

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.492
 (2) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.493
 (3) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.494
 (4) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.540
 (5) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.526

(1) & (2) from a letter to Mr. Ludlow
 from Mr. Mansfield.

Maurice turned up uninvited, and they agreed to go ahead with their plans.

These took the shape of a series of tracts and the formation of working men's associations. The tracts were given the title "Tracts on Christian Socialism," which seemed to Maurice "the only title which will define our object, and will commit us at once to the conflict we must engage in sooner or later with the unsocial Christians and the unchristian Socialists." (1) An association of tailors was started, and then a Needlewoman's Association. Soon, other tradesmen wanted to join in the formation of associations, and a "Society for promoting Working-Men's Associations" was organised in order to give the movement some sort of structure, giving assistance and advice to the different associations; and then a "Central Board" which dealt with pure business matters. The need was felt for a journal dealing with co-operation, and the first issue of the "Christian Socialist" with Ludlow as editor, appeared on the 2nd November, 1850, and at the beginning of 1852 came out as the "Journal of Association."

In 1850, R.A. Slaney, who was a member of parliament, with the aid of a committee, began investigations into the issues raised by co-operation, and in June of 1852 the "Industrial and Provident Partnerships Bill" was passed by Parliament, which gave legal status to co-operative societies. This was a great triumph for Maurice and his friends.

Maurice was a humble man, one who sought to show the implications of the Christian faith for all spheres of life. He was doing his best to point to Christianity as the answer to the troubles of the world. Yet once again he came under a barrage of fire, especially from the religious papers, which accused him of teaching Infidelity, Pantheism, Sabellianism, and Universalism; and which denounced Christian Socialism and all who were connected with it. In the September 1851 issue of the "Quarterly Review," J. Wilson Croker penned a stinging attack, called "Revolutionary Literature." Amongst other things he said, "Systems the most destructive of the peace, the happiness, and the virtue of society, are boldly, perseveringly, and without let or hindrance, openly taught and recommended to the acceptance of the people with great zeal.... Cheap publications containing the wildest and most anarchical doctrines are scattered broadcast over the land, in which religion and morality are perverted and scoffed at, and every rule of conduct.....on which the very existence of society depends, openly assailed; while in their place are sought to be established doctrines as outrageous as the maddest ravings of furious insanity'...." (2) Croker continued that amongst others, two clergy of the Church of England, Maurice and Kingsley, have been preaching the same sort

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.35

(2) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.72-73

of "Jacobinism and jacquerie" under the name of Christian Socialism "in a form not the less dangerous for being less honest." (1) He concludes that he finds it most surprising that the editor of "Politics for the People," and the author of other theological and political works even more heterodox, should be the one occupying the professorial chair of Divinity in King's College. This, as we shall see in the next chapter, is a serious misrepresentation of Maurice's views and intentions.

Dr. Jelf felt that he had to act. In his letter to Maurice, he conceded that personally he saw nothing in his writings that was inconsistent with his position at King's, but said that his association with Kingsley, who in turn was associated with 'several notorious infidels,' might put the college in a bad light. Jelf thus suggested that Maurice allay the Council's fears, or if not, "the best advice which your most sincere friend could give you, would be to resign your office without delay." (2) The committee of King's College set up to inquire into his teaching, found nothing unsound in his teachings, saw Christian Socialism as the best antidote to Socialism proper, and recognised Maurice's Christian motive in what he was doing. At the same time they regretted his being connected in the Press with more questionable publications which put him in a bad light.

For the moment the controversy seemed to be over. While his work amongst the co-operative societies went on, Maurice felt the need to "show men where they stood, and why they must not only co-operate but must do so loyally and unselfishly. For nothing.....less than the Kingdom of Christ would save mankind." (3) The working men were desperate "for guidance, and for a God-inspired lesson on Belief and Duty," (4) as were all classes of men. "Theological Essays" were the result, and in the preface to the third edition (1871) (5) he says that the questions he has discussed are "Has this Age any connection with the Permanent and the Eternal? Is there any link between our present, our past, and our future, in One who unites the past, the present, and the future in Himself? Is there an Eternal God? Has He made Himself known to us? Has He given us a right to trust Him now and for ever?" (6) The book roused severe criticism, particularly the chapter on "Eternal Life and Eternal Death," where Maurice's central conviction was that "This is life eternal, to know

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.73

(2) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.80

(3) Higham : Op.Cit., Pg.90.

(4) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.163.

(5) F.D. Maurice : "Theological Essays." Pg.xix. Macmillan & Co. 5th edition. 1891.

(6) Carpenter, in the introduction to "Theological Essays" (James Clarke & Co. Ltd. 1957.) on page 9 says that the Essays "result from the honest and profound outpourings of a dedicated person wrestling in himself with the abiding problems of man's nature and destiny." Ramsey deems the book to be one of the weakest of Maurice's writings, being the result of a man on edge, and a man preoccupied with points where other theologians irritated him. (Ramsey : Op.Cit., pg.48) Another comment on the book is that of Chadwick who says, "The reader is battered and fatigued by the demand to feel indignation on subjects where he did not know himself to feel anything; unable to grasp the author's meaning while seeing that this meaning is life or death to the author." (Owen Chadwick : "The Victorian Church." Part I. Pg.545. Adam & Charles Black. London. 1966.)

Thee the one true God." (1)

The two chairs held by Maurice at King's College were declared vacant in October 1853. There seem to be two main reasons for the decision:

- 1) Maurice had been continually plagued by the religious newspapers, sufficiently so for Dr. Jelf and the Council of King's to be seriously alarmed about the opposition to Maurice that was being built up as a result. When the Essays were published, a spate of condemnatory articles appeared and the Council felt that something had to be done.
- 2) In contemporary theology, the alternatives at the day of judgment were everlasting life or everlasting punishment, both being thought of in terms of endless duration. For Maurice 'eternal' could not and did not have any reference to time, and eternal life and death were possibilities here and now; life in communion with God, or life separated from Him. This was quite shattering to his contemporaries, and they assumed him to be a universalist; no hell and moral laxity as a result.

The Council declared Maurice's beliefs regarding "future punishment of the wicked and the final issues of the day of judgment" to be of "dangerous tendency," calculated to "unsettle the minds of the theological students of King's College; and that his association with the college as a professor would be "seriously detrimental to its usefulness." (2) The motives and thoughts of one who above all wanted to bring before men God's redeeming love, could scarcely have been more misunderstood.

Maurice's dismissal was taken up by newspapers throughout the country, and the fact that so many people from all walks of life spoke out in favour of him and assured him of their support, moved him very deeply. When told that the Daily News had taken up his cause, Maurice, with tears in his eyes, replied, "Indeed! I did not think there was a newspaper in London that would have said a word in my favour." (3)

He resigned from Queen's College in November (1853) because there had been one dissentient in a vote of confidence in him. But his resignation did not mean the end of his role in education. On October 30th, 1854, Maurice gave the inaugural address at the "Working Men's College," of which he was the first principal. He saw the College not as a system or place of education, but as "a community of teachers and pupils, sharing in a joint adventure in search of wisdom and learning in the society of congenial persons,

(1) See Maurice's correspondence with F.J.A. Hart on Eternal punishment in Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. pg.15-23, where he gives a clear statement of his beliefs on the subject. See also the relevant chapter in "Theological Essays."

(2) From the minutes of the Council held on October 27th, 1853, quoted in Life of F.D.M. Vol.11 pp.190-192.

(3) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.210.

not merely how to acquire knowledge but how to live together as good citizens." (1) On the whole the College went well and made progress, but it did have its difficulties. Financially, it was sometimes only kept in existence through generous donations - from Maurice himself included! But the fact that so many of the members were uninterested in the Sunday worship and the daily prayers, was a source of great heart-break for him. Classes for women were also started at the College, and continued until December 1860 when difficulties caused them to be discontinued. (2)

In 1856 the member of the Council of Queen's College who had opposed Maurice's re-election left the College, and Maurice was unanimously invited to return, which he did. His time was spent lecturing at Queen's College and at the Working Men's College, with his Bible classes and personal interviews, with his work at Lincoln's Inn, and with writing his commentary on John's Gospel, and "Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy." Maurice was a man who was always at work where he felt the greatest need to exist, and Higham observes (3) that in the years from 1855 onwards he was at the forefront of the battle of Christian dialectics, in the realm of thought rather than economics; for he felt the urgent need to uphold Christian doctrine against Atheism, Agnosticism, and any other misguided beliefs.

In 1858 H. Mansel delivered the Bampton Lectures. He believed that since our minds are finite, we cannot know anything of the nature of God. All that we can know about Him is what He has revealed to us for the conduct of our lives and our thoughts about Him. Mansel's conclusion was "to assure his young hearers that Christians had in the Scriptures and the pronouncements of the Church a revelation upon which they could rely." (4) Not only was Maurice, as Higham says, "uneasy and dismayed" (5) but he "was stung to a violence unparalleled in the whole of his life of conflict." (6) The issue at stake was that of Revelation. For Maurice, the life of a Christian is "to know God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost." (7) He saw the incarnation as bringing to men in a man "that very knowledge of God which Mr. Mansel declared to be impossible...." (8) The centre of his preaching was Christ who is the very manifestation of the actual righteousness and love of God; Christ is God become man. The following year Maurice preached a series of sermons and published them under the title, "What is Revelation?", as a detailed criticism of Mansel.

(1) Higham : Op.Cit., Pg.96.

(2) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.379. No detail of these "difficulties" are given.

(3) Higham : Op.Cit., Pg.105.

(4) Higham : Op.Cit., Pg.109

(5) Higham : Op.Cit., Pg.109

(6) Ramsey : Op.Cit., Pg.75

(7) Ramsey : Op.Cit., Pg.75

(8) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.328.

In July 1860 he was appointed to the living of St. Peter's, Vere Street. This was a Crown appointment, and the 'Record' made loud protest, calling on the clergy themselves to protest. But the 'Record's' day of power was over, and only about twenty signatures were obtained over against just more than 800 secured by the statement of congratulations and support, of which Ludlow, Davies and Dean Hook had been prime movers. (1) The kind of support that he was now getting was in sharp contrast to earlier years, when support received was hardly worth mentioning. As Higham says, this period of his life onwards was "a time of recognition and fulfilment." (2) Many years of work on his "Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy" came to fruition when it was published at the end of 1861.

At the end of 1862 Maurice and his family moved from Russel Square to a new house in Regent's Park, near to the Vere Street Church. One might have wished for him a quiet and an easy time; but this period was one of theological and Biblical turmoil, with "Essays and Reviews" perhaps embodying the revolution that was occurring; and we find Maurice again in the forefront of the controversies. When he felt that the faith was being undermined, nothing could prevent him from having his say; stressing the unity of mankind in Christ; the Love of God for all men; the need for men to be united with God; and above all, stressing the fact that God is, and that He is in control of all events.

Cambridge had always had a special place in Maurice's heart, and his appointment in October 1866 to the Knightbridge Professorship of "Causistry, Moral Theology and Moral Philosophy" filled him with delight. It gave the university as a whole great delight as well, and letters poured in congratulating him. His appointment meant the end of his work in London at the Working Men's College; but his work among the working classes and his attempt to bring about co-operation between them and the professional classes had not been in vain, and continued to bear fruit in the years that followed. The move to Cambridge signals the last chapter of his life. His health was not good, and although it was a considerable strain on him, he continued to travel up to Vere Street each Sunday to take the Services; until October 1869, when his doctor insisted that he give up either Vere Street or Cambridge. It is sufficient tribute to say that at his farewell sermon on November 7th., the church was absolutely packed with people from all over the country. (3)

His hair was now "silvery white" and his "...movements had like his life become quiet and measured." (4) But even if the pace had slowed down, he was still continually on the go, lecturing to his students and inspiring them with

(1) Among the eight hundred signatures were those of many prominent people - bishops, deans, canons, archdeacons, professors, headmasters; and Maurice was greatly encouraged and delighted.
 (2) Higham : Op.Cit., Pg.111.
 (3) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11 Pg.593
 (4) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11 Pg.554.

the faith that burned within him, writing many letters to friends and to those who sought his advice, writing on the issues of the day, preaching, and visiting. In 1870 he took on the living of St. Edwards, Cambridge, as if he did not have more than enough to do already; and then in July 1871 the Cambridge Preachership at Whitehall.

All the extra work now at his age, and when he was far from well, proved fatal. He became weaker and terribly thin, and near the end was often in great pain. He died on Easter Monday, 1872, profoundly convinced that he was not going to Death, but into Life.

We close the chapter on his life with a tribute by Dr. Montagu Butler: "Wherever rich and poor are brought closer together, wherever men learn to think more worthily of God in Christ, the great work that he has laboured at for nearly fifty years shall be spoken of as a memorial of him." (1)

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.645.

CHAPTER 5: THE CONTRIBUTION OF MAURICE TO THE
CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST MOVEMENT. (1)

The clue to the role that Maurice played in the Christian Socialist Movement is given right at the very beginning of the Movement when we ask how it all started. In a letter which Maurice wrote to Ludlow in March 1848 he says, "I have not time to tell you now what earnest thoughts your letter has awakened in my mind, or how much they conspired with some that had been working there for a long time." (2) It is clear that the condition of the working classes, the condition and role of the Church (3) and the unrest in society had been on Maurice's mind for some time. It is also clear that he was aware of the great need for some action to redress the existing evils, but exactly what action was to be taken he did not know. "I see my way but dimly; this, however, I do see, that there is something to be done, that God Himself is speaking to us and that if we ask Him what He would have us do, we shall be shown." (4) It was Ludlow who brought Maurice's thoughts out into the open, who in a way crystallised the thoughts that had been going on in Maurice's mind, and who brought home to Maurice the need for action. It was Ludlow and not Maurice who urgently wrote that Socialism must be "Christianised" or it would shake Christianity to its foundation. Six years later Maurice wrote to him: "Not only every task in which we have engaged together but every sermon or lecture I have delivered in the exercise of my vocation, almost every thought I have thought, has been shaped and coloured by the conviction you helped to waken in me." (5)

Maurice was thus not the 'instigator' or the driving force behind the movement, though he was often its inspiration. He was not active, in the practical application of what the Christian Socialists believed, in the same way that Ludlow or Kingsley or Neale, for example, were. In fact on more than one occasion he strongly opposed the plans that the others wished to put into practice. (6) Christensen emphasises the point that before the actual beginnings of the Christian Socialist Movement Maurice had in fact

-
- (1) It will not be our intention to trace in great detail all facets and activities as such of the movement during the seven years, nor will we attempt to give a chronological sequence of the events that took place. The detailed history of the movement will rather be assumed, and we will concentrate on the different ways in which Maurice contributed to it.
- (2) Frederick Maurice: "The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice, chiefly told in his own letters." Vol.1. Pg.458. London. Macmillan & Co. (1885)
- (3) See Ch. 2 for details.
- (4) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.458
- (5) F.D. Maurice "Learning and Working" Dedication, quoted by N.C. Masterman in "John Malcolm Ludlow, The Builder of Christian Socialism" Pg.62. Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- (6) We shall discuss this later as one of the roles that Maurice played in the movement.

"turned down an appeal for help to 'the outlying sheep of the fold'"(1) twice. The first time was in 1842 when Daniel Macmillan, distressed by the fact that the working population severely lacked sufficient spiritual guidance, appealed to Julius Hare and Maurice to set up a society of competent men who would insert a few letters every week in newspapers read by the workers. Maurice, however, made it clear that he would not take part in this scheme, and as an alternative suggested "hospital tracts" for the inmates of Guy's Hospital. The second occasion was on Ludlow's return from Paris in 1846. While over there he had been greatly impressed by the work of a Lutheran clergyman, Louis Meyer, who founded the Société des Amis des Pauvres and who further wanted to establish a fraternity of young Christians dedicated entirely to the service of the poor in all possible ways. Ludlow promised Meyer to see what he could do in London along the same sort of lines. On returning to London Ludlow approached J.A. Anderson, the Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, who referred him to Maurice. Maurice, however, dismissed the idea by referring him to the incumbent of one of the poorest neighbouring parishes. It was no wonder then that Ludlow's first impression of Maurice was one of "a good man, but very unpractical." (2) To these two incidents we might add the example of a third. In 1835 Maurice went to have a look at Guy's Hospital, of which he was to become Chaplain the following year, and on his return wrote a letter to R.C. Trench which began, "I was delighted with the establishment (the hospital,) and I think I should prefer it to a parish, because I am not skilful in suggesting improvements in the temporal condition of the poor, a serious deficiency in the country, but one that will not affect me there." (3) (4)

Thus it is not surprising, in the light of what we have said, to find, after the Chartist fiasco of April 10th 1848, that the inspiration for not leaving the workers in their failure, and the drive for some positive action, did not come from Maurice. Prior to the Chartist Mass Meeting at Kennington Common, Charles Kingsley, a young clergyman at Eversley, had felt in himself the panic which many felt at that time, and on the morning of April 10th went to London to see Maurice. He had the idea of distributing handbills in the hope of preventing the Chartists from what he was sure would be revolution, and he discussed the whole situation with Maurice. Maurice, who was confined to the house with a cold, told Kingsley of Ludlow's plans (5) and sent him to Ludlow with a letter of introduction. Ludlow did not believe that the

-
- (1) T. Christensen: "Origin and History of Christian Socialism 1848-54." Pg.57. Universitetsforlaget 1 Aarhus. 1962. For the first incident see pg.33. We will see the reasons for Maurice refusing to join in much of the practical work when we deal with the theological basis for what he did in the movement.
- (2) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.430. One must bear in mind here that Maurice was still utterly disheartened by the recent loss of his wife and had only just taken over at Lincoln's Inn, apart from any theological convictions about such action.
- (3) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.186.
- (4) These three examples we have given are not intended to convey the idea that Maurice was not concerned with the physical condition of the workers. This would be entirely false. He was deeply and sincerely concerned. The point that we are trying to make is that the practical ideas did not spring from Maurice.
- (5) Ludlow and Maurice were by this time firm friends. Ludlow had gone to Paris during the February revolutions and on his return wrote to Maurice. This time he found Maurice willing to listen and discuss, and Ludlow 'unburdened' his heart to him. They discussed all the observations that Ludlow had made while in Paris and Ludlow's plans as he saw them.

mass meeting would lead to revolution - but Kingsley, sure that a clash would take place between the Chartists and the forces of Law and Order, was determined to go and see what he could do. On the way to the Common he and Ludlow, who had decided to accompany him, met some of the demonstrators peacefully returning from the disbanded meeting. As Reckitt says, "In that moment Kingsley and Ludlow saw that the workers' defeat was the Church's opportunity. There was a vacuum to be filled..." (1)

The question was 'How'? In discussing some of their answers we will attempt to show that Maurice's was not an active practical role and that the lead in the main did not come from him. Having shown that, we can then go on to discover exactly what Maurice's role was.

On the way back from the Common Kingsley and Ludlow discussed what was to be done, and that evening went to Maurice with Ludlow's idea of launching a Christian newspaper to deal with social and political problems from a Christian point of view. However, their first move was to put out posters addressed to the "Workmen of England," telling them of friends who were aware of their distress, and informing them that what they were striving for could only be obtained on the basis of the Christian faith. The posters were Kingsley's idea "and he had the drive and the enthusiasm to push such an enterprise through, provided that he was assisted by men willing to act with him and to give sympathetic encouragement. Maurice and Ludlow did this" (2).

On the 12th, Maurice, Kingsley, Julius Hare, and J.A. Scott met to discuss future plans. The Group decided to follow Ludlow's idea of starting a newspaper and also Maurice's idea of tracts by individual people: but when practical details were discussed Maurice's idea was dropped and they decided to go ahead with a paper, with Maurice and Ludlow as joint-editors. The first edition of "Politics for the People" appeared on May 6th, 1848. Chadwick has observed, "Almost all the best came from the pen of Ludlow, who wrote more than a third of the whole," and the most outspoken writing came from Charles Kingsley under the pen name of "Parson Lot" (3) Maurice's role was not so much that of author, but rather of guiding the tone and direction of the paper as a whole. (4)

- (1) M.B. Reckitt: "Maurice to Temple. A century of the Social Movement in the Church of England." Pg.68. Faber and Faber Ltd., London. 1947.
 (2) N.C. Masterman: Op.Cit., Pg.68
 Reckitt: Op.Cit. Pg.70 sees the placard as solely Kingsley's work, Ludlow having no hand in it.
 (3) Owen Chadwick: "The Victorian Church". Vol.1, pg.352. Adam & Charles Black, London. 1966.
 (4) We will come back to this point later.

'Politics for the People' came to an end in July after seventeen numbers had been issued. Inspiration for the next move again came from Ludlow whose "mind turned towards the fulfilment of his old scheme for the betterment of the district around Lincoln's Inn" (1), and it was on his initiative that the brotherhood that had been formed (2) undertook to "moralise and Christianise" the slum district of Little Ormond Yard.

Through his work for "Politics for the People" and at the school in Little Ormond Yard, Ludlow had established contact with a number of ex-Chartists, and following his lead, a meeting was arranged through Walter Cooper, a tailor, at the Cranbourne Coffee Tavern. This step was very significant in the life of the Christian Socialist Movement, for contact was established with the ex-Chartists and workmen thus giving the brotherhood direct access to the strivings and aspirations of the workers, and establishing an understanding between them.

The main practical work tackled by the Christian Socialists was that of setting up Workmen's Associations. Maurice as we shall emphasise later, was convinced of the absolute necessity for co-operation instead of competition, which he saw as anti-Christian. But the practical suggestions for co-operation did not come from him. They came from Jules St. Andre le Chevalier and Ludlow. It was Ludlow who had been in Paris and had studied action being taken there. As Furnivall later said, "Week after week did Mr. Ludlow press these subjects on our consideration and say.....'we must have an Association like the French Working Men's Association that I have known succeed so well'...." (3) "It was he who was the real socialist of the movement" (4), and together with a few others began formulating concrete plans for a Co-operative Association with which they were to go ahead despite protests from Maurice. Le Chavalier, a French Socialist refugee had an important influence on the brotherhood. He considered himself a Socialist and saw the pivot of Socialism as the principle of Association. Christensen (5) emphasises the great influence of Le Chavalier

- (1) C.E. Raven: "Christian Socialism 1848-1854" Pg.128. Frank Cass & Co. Ltd. London. 1968.
 (2) The three original founders had been joined, amongst others by F.J. Furnivall, C.B. Mansfield, and C.B. Walsh.
 (3) Quoted from Raven: Op.Cit., Pg.146.
 (4) A.D. Millard: "The Christian Socialists of 1848: who they were and what they stood for." Pg.212 in "The Modern Churchman": Vol.1. 1957-8.
 (5) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.109 ff.

on Maurice and the rest of the brotherhood, as well as Maurice's influence on him. By introducing his new ideas on the relation between the Church and Socialism, Le Chavalier "opened new vistas of thought to Maurice and his companions." (1) Ludlow, together with Mansfield, Thomas Hughes, Kingsley and other supporters, drew up plans for operative associations, and on the 11th February 1850 the Working Tailor's Association was ready to start work, the driving force having come from Ludlow.

The need was soon seen for a Central Board to assist individual associations and to co-ordinate new activities. Maurice protested against the idea; and in the end a Council of Promoters as well as a Central Board was established. The work of the Central Board, consisting of the Managers of the Associations, was to organise all practical aspects of their work. The constitution was drawn up by C. Sully with Ludlow critically revising it. In fact, then, Maurice had nothing to do with it and again was seen to have no hand in the practical work of the Christian Socialists. (2)

The scholars agree with this assessment of Maurice's role. "...the real impetus of the movement came from Ludlow." (3) "...Ludlow was the real founder and driving force of that 'Christian Socialism'...." (4). Kingsley and Ludlow were the firebrands of the movement...(5), and to these can be added Christensen, N.C. Masterman and Owen Chadwick.

Maurice's contribution was in another sphere, and we can perhaps best describe his contribution by saying that he was the "Prophet of the Movement.

II

By saying Maurice's role in the movement was that of the prophet; we mean that "...he was a man of thought rather than a man of action, made more for uttering prophecies than for framing policies" (6), that he was the spiritual leader giving the Movement a spiritual and theological foundation. It is only as we understand his basic theological convictions in relation to Christian Socialism, that we can understand some of the rather puzzling actions that he took. His concept of the Christian faith and the function of Christians in the world explains the role that he played.

(1) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.117.

(2) The part played by Neale, the further constitutional changes, the formation of the Central Co-operative Agency, and the tension between the Agency and the SPWMA need not detain us at this point, for they fall rather within the scope of a history of Christian Socialism. The point that we have made is that the role played by Maurice was not along these lines.

(3) A.R. Vidler: "The Church is an Age of Revolution, 1789 to the Present Day," Pg.95. Penguin Books. 1961.

(4) T. Dring: "Frederick Denison Maurice," in "The London Quarterly and Holborn Review." January 1948. Pg.39.

(5) C.E. Raven: Op.Cit., Pg.117.

(6) A.R. Vidler: "F.D. Maurice and Company." Pg.177.
S.C.M. Press Ltd. London. 1966.

Maurice had a passionate desire for Unity which, as Wood correctly points out, was engendered by the "...break-up of the religious fellowship of his home circle..." (1) Maurice himself says, "The desire for UNITY has haunted me all my life through; I have never been able to substitute any desire for that, or to accept any of the different schemes for satisfying it which men have devised." (2) His home situation made Maurice critical of his father's faith. Where was he to find the Unity "...which seemed to him the ultimate goal of all human endeavour"? (3) It was in the Trinity, which had been the subject of the family arguments that he found what he was looking for. "I not only believe in the Trinity in Unity, but I find in it the centre of all my beliefs; the rest of my spirit, when I contemplate myself or mankind." (4)

Maurice did not see God as some far-off Being who was unrelated in any way to the world. God is our Father. The human heart cries out for a Father, and this longing for a Father is turned into substance in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. 'He hath sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.' "Now this revelation is grounded upon an act done on behalf of Humanity - an act in which all men have a like interest; for if Christ did not take the nature of every rebel and outcast, he did not take the nature of Paul and John. Therefore the first sign that the Church was established upon earth in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit, was one which showed that it was to consist of men of every tongue and nation; the baptized community was literally to represent mankind." (5) Maurice emphasised that when we pray the Lord's prayer, it is Our Father to whom we are praying. He is the Father of all men, even those whom we think are evil, those above us, those below us, those whom we despise. "...when we pray, we are praying for them and with them; ... we cannot speak for ourselves without speaking for them." He goes on, "How many petty disagreements are there between friends and kinsfolk, people dwelling in the same house - so petty that there is no fear of giving way to them, and yet great enough to cause bitterness and estrangement, great enough to make this 'Our Father' a contradiction." (6)

This unity between God and man has been brought about through Jesus Christ. "To Maurice, Christ was the unacknowledged head of every

(1) H.G. Wood: "Frederick Denison Maurice." Pg.25. Cambridge University Press. 1950.

(2) Life of F.D.M: Vol.1. Pg.41.

(3) C.F.G. Masterman: "Frederick Denison Maurice;" in 'Leaders of the Church 1800-1900.' P.10 A.R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd. 1907.

(4) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.41.

(5) F.D. Maurice: "Sermons on the Prayer-Book and the Lord's Prayer." Pg.286-7. London, Macmillan & Co. 1893.

(6) F.D. Maurice: "Prayer-Book and The Lord's Prayer." Pg.284-5.

man." (1) "The Fall of Man is commonly regarded by both ('Romish and Protestant divines') as the foundation of Theology - the Incarnation and Death of our Lord as provisions against the effects of it. Now St. Paul speaks of the Mystery of Christ as the GROUND of all things in Heaven and Earth, the History as the gradual discovery or revelation of this ground. Such a view, I think, at once presents itself to us as the most reasonable and satisfactory..."(2) Maurice starts from the truth that God has created and redeemed mankind in Christ. "...do not let us surrender the one great witness which we possess, that a nation consists of redeemed men, sons of God, that mankind stands not in Adam but in Christ..." (3) The Gospel tells us that Christ is the Head and King of our race. "The life of man, so the gospel declares, is not vanity, for it is derived from the life of the Son of God. He is the Lord of every man. In Him is life, and His life is the light of men." (4) It follows that "Whatsoever is good in any man is derived from Christ who is the Head of all men, the bond of society, and the root of all righteousness." (5) Maurice saw men as a unity and the whole of life in the light of Christ. It was his vocation to proclaim this fact. "I was sent into the world that I might persuade men to recognise Christ as the centre of their fellowship with each other, that so they might be united in their families, their countries, and as men, not in schools and factions;..." (6) Thus a man's relationship to God and to his fellow-men"... arises from the very nature of things. Real social relations can be PERCEIVED by reasonings and feelings, not CREATED by them," (7) and as Bailey comments, "This cardinal principle of the universal sovereignty and headship of Christ 'in', 'through', and 'unto', whom (Col.1.16) all things have been created, and in whom all things cohere, governed and conditioned all Maurice's thinking." (8) In Maurice's theological thought it follows that man is essentially a Social Being. God has created and redeemed man to sonship to himself and brotherhood to men. "...he is a person whose very being consists in the powers and capacities by which he is interpersonally related to other persons." (9) People are not to be seen and treated as things, but as "I's," who are related to each other and to society as a whole. And because

-
- (1) N.C. Masterman: "The Mental Processes of the Reverend F.D. Maurice" in 'Theology' Vol.68. 1965. Pg.50.
 (2) F.D. Maurice: "Prayer-Book and The Lord's Prayer." Pg.118-119.
 (3) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg. 358.
 (4) F.D. Maurice: "Lincoln's Inn Sermons." Vol.111. Pg.90. London. Macmillan & Co. 1891.
 (5) Vidler: F.D. Maurice and Company. Pg.54.
 (6) Life of F.D.M. Vol. 1. Pg.240.
 (7) C.E. Osborne: "Christian Ideas in Political History." Pg.254. London. John Murray. 1929.
 (8) S. Bailey's review of A.R. Vidler's "The Theology of F.D. Maurice" in the 'Scottish Journal of Theology'. Vol.3. 1950. Pg.327.
 (9) G.H. Ranson: "F.D. Maurice on the Social Nature of Man," in the 'Canadian Journal of Theology.' Vol.X1, No.4. October, 1965. Pg.265.

we are relatives, we are "morally responsible persons with obligations both to self and to others." (1) We become truly men in our relationship with God and with other people. All men have been made brothers through the reconciliation brought about by Christ. Just as man could never be without God, who "...is the root from which all human life, and human society, and ultimately, through man, nature itself, are derived," (2) so he could never be without his fellow-man. Christ had established a community of which all men are members. "Christianity, as a mere system of doctrines or practices, will never make men brothers. By Christianity we must understand the reconciliation of mankind to God in Christ;... No notion, or set of notions, will bind us together; He binds us who has given his Son for us all, that we might not live for ever in separation from Him and from each other." (3) "In Jesus Christ the Son of God, he (St. Paul) proclaimed, there is life for Jew and for Gentile. He is the ground of human fellowship, the ground of righteousness and wisdom and power to each man. He has come into the world to claim us as members of His body, as children of God in Him..." (4) "...it is a sin to hate men; because this brotherhood of men with men is made known...to hate a brother is to walk in darkness. It is to hide ourselves from Him who is our great common brother. It is to live as if the Lord had not appeared." (5) And because Christ is the true man and the Head of the human race, man can only live a truly human life when he follows Christ's type of life, namely, one of sacrifice and love towards his fellow-men. It follows that selfishness and individualism are evil and must be done away with.

The world is God's world because God is the ground of all things. "Assuredly, it is God's world, God's order; assuredly, He did form it and pronounce it good,..." (6). Maurice saw the Divine Order (Kingdom of Christ) as an existing reality in which man was already living. "Our Lord speaks of His Kingdom, or His Father's Kingdom, not as if it were to set aside that constitution of the universe, of which men had seen the tokens in family and national institutions,

(1) Ranson: *Op.Cit.*, Pg.267.

(2) *Life of F.D.M.* Vol.11. Pg.136.

(3) F.D. Maurice: "Prayer-Book and The Lord's Prayer." Pg.329.

(4) F.D. Maurice: "Lincoln's Inn Sermons." Vol.IV Pg.49

(5) F.D. Maurice: "The Epistles of St. John." Pg.98. London. Macmillan and Co. 1893.

(6) F.D. Maurice: "The Epistles of St. John." Pg.121.

of which they had dreamed when they thought of a higher and more general fellowship; but as if it were that very constitution in the fulness of its meaning and power. He who is the ground of the world's order, He in whom all things consist, reveals Himself that we may know what its order and consistency are, how all disorder and inconsistency have arisen from the discontent and rebellion of our wills." (1) God's Kingdom is a reality and present in the world. Christ is the Head of the human race. All men are brothers. But this does not mean to say that human institutions and order in society are not necessary, "...it was not the task of man to create forms of organisation in which true brotherhood of love and fellowship could be expressed, God Himself had already placed man in a 'Human Order' with 'human relationships.' Every individual had here been given a distinct vocation ...and inequality of offices was characteristic of the relationships in the 'Human Order.' Every person was called upon to act according to the law of love, but the various vocations and their field of action differed." (2) Thus, "we need for the establishment and rectification of our Social Morality not to dream ourselves into some imaginary past or some imaginary future, but to use that which we have, to believe our own professions, to live as if all we utter when we seem to be most in earnest were not a lie." (3)

Families and nations belong to the Divine Order. Talking about the family, Maurice says, "We have here some of the indications of a spiritual constitution; that is to say, we have the marks of a state which is designed for a voluntary creature; which IS his, whether he approve it or no;..." (4) He goes on, "(History) seems to say, that as there is a worse state of society than the patriarchal, there is also a better and more advanced one; it declares that the faculties which are given to man never have had their proper development and expansion, except in a NATIONAL community." (5) Maurice traces the Covenant that God made with man first through a family (Abraham, Isaac and Jacob); which became a nation. The final stage is that of a Universal Community, which was founded in Jesus Christ, a "...kingdom

(1) F.D. Maurice: "Prayer-Book and The Lord's Prayer." Pg.310-11.

(2) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.24.

(3) F.D. Maurice: "Social Morality." Pg.413 London. Macmillan and Co. 1872.

(4) F.D. Maurice: "The Kingdom of Christ, or Hints on the Principles of the Catholic Church in letters to a Member of the Society of Friends." Vol.1. Pg.231. James Clarke & Co. Ltd., London. 1959.

(5) F.D. Maurice: "The Kingdom of Christ." Vol.1. Pg.233.

which must prevail because it rests upon a NAME which expresses the perfect Love, the ineffable Unity, the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (1) This Universal Society is the Church, and it "...is just as much a reality as any particular nation is... (it) is the witness for the true constitution of man as man, a child of God, an heir of heaven, and taking up his freedom by baptism;..." (2), and it is the witness to the eternal truth that Christ always has been and always will be the "Head of every man." Maurice would not speak of the world as something alien from which the Church must keep apart, and to which it must be hostile. States, nations, families, and all human order "...become the world in an evil sense...only in so far as they set themselves up to pursue their own ends, in so far as they become organised selfishness, refusing to confess that they have one foundation, one centre, one bond." (3) He saw the task of the Church as bearing witness to men that all sides of human life are included in the Divine Order, in other words, "to tell the world the truth about its own existence." (4)

One can easily see how it followed from Maurice's theological thinking that he was vehemently opposed to parties and systems. The Church is defined by acts of God which create and sustain it, systems are defined by the opinions held by their upholders, and the difference is a radical one. He saw systems as a denial of God's order and unity. "...I feel that I am to be a man of war against all parties, that I may be a peacemaker between all men." (5)

What effect does what we have said so far have on Maurice's social concern? If there is a universal fellowship of the kind described, where men are brothers with Christ as their Head, the inevitable conclusion is that "...Churchmen (have) an immediate responsibility for their less fortunate brethren, the mass of people without roots, thrown up by the industrial revolution and infesting the slums of every large town." (6) It is important to notice that Maurice starts off from theological grounds and a concern for man in himself; not from social and economic grounds. He saw that the "...whole com-

(1) F.D. Maurice: "The Kingdom of Christ." Vol.1. Pg.260.

(2) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.166.

(3) Vidler: "F.D. Maurice and Co." Pg.65.

(4) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.25.

(5) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.506.

(6) F. Higham: "Frederick Denison Maurice." Pg.45. S.C.M. Press Ltd, London. 1947.

petitive principle, with its postulates of selfishness and conflict, is a denial of that law of love, and a repudiation of the law of Christ..." (1) He saw an economy "...which declared that the welfare of the whole could only be maintained through each man feverishly and hungrily seeking his own individual aggrandisement" to be a "proclamation that the devil and not CHRIST" (2) is the king of the universe. The remedy for the state of society was not to be found in setting up some other system. "To set trade and commerce right we must find some ground, not for them, but for those who are concerned in them, for men to stand upon." (3) "...true radical reform and radical conservation must go deeper (than property relations etc.) and say : "'Human relations not only should lie, but do lie beneath all these, and when you substitute - upon one pretext or another - property relations for these, you destroy our English life and English constitution, you introduce hopeless anarchy' ". (4) Maurice thus recoiled from Capitalism and the idea that possessions are the basis of society. People and not things are what matter. Selfishness was the evil that introduced "rottenness and mischief " into society - men must learn to co-operate; justice and fellowship must be applied to trade.

He saw all the evils of society coming "from people's ignorance of God and His Order, or from their attempts to deny it.... Because of this unbelief man considered himself to be a god and went on to regard both God and his fellow-men as a means of satisfying his own selfishness. But, since ignorance and unbelief in God, together with selfishness as its corollary, were at the root of all anomalies in society, only the proclamation of God and His dealings with mankind was able to heal the wounds of a nation." (5) The great function of the Church was therefore education - the revealing to man of the foundation of his being and the laws of God's universe. He considered his vocation to proclaim that "economy and politics.... must have a ground beneath themselves, that society is not to be made anew by arrangements of ours, but is to be regenerated by finding the law and ground of its order and harmony, the only secret of its existence, in God..... to me it" (this order) "is the only one which makes action possible.... The Kingdom of Heaven is to me the great practical existing reality

(1) A.D. Millard: Op.Cit., Pg. 213
 (2) C.F.G. Masterman : Op.Cit.,231
 (3) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.115.
 (4) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.114
 (5) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.26.

which is to renew the earth and make it a habitation for blessed spirits instead of for demons." (1) This meant teaching men to co-operate and associate with one another, the opposite of selfish competition. "The order which secular socialists such as Owen, Fourier and Blanc wanted to INTRODUCE into society, Maurice found existing already, most strongly in the family and the Church - institutions reflecting the fatherhood of God - and more faintly elsewhere. Once this order was SEEN, the spirit of competition would be routed, men would be treated as men and not as members of castes, and the spirit of co-operation, which was the spirit of the Bible and the creeds, would reign. (2)

It remains for us to say something about Maurice's political views. He insisted that the nation was not a secular thing, "...it was one of the forms in which human society was constituted by the will of God." (3) And he was opposed to Democracy, for he believed that "...the monarchy and aristocracy had a rightful place in an organised Christian society and that authority was not derived from the people." (4) "...reconstitute society upon the democratic basis - treat the sovereign and the aristocracy as not intended to rule and guide the land, as only holding their commissions from us - and I anticipate nothing but a most accursed sacerdotal rule or a military despotism, with the great body of the population in either case morally, politically, physically serfs, more than they are at the present or ever have been." (5) Writing to Ludlow in December 1848, Maurice stated, "I begin, where I think you both (Ludlow and Carlyle) end, in the acknowledgment of the divine sovereignty; thence I come to the Tory idea of kings reigning by the grace of God. This I hold to be the first of political truths historically, and the first fundamentally;..." (6) "...I must have Monarchy, Aristocracy and Socialism, or rather Humanity, recognised as necessary elements and conditions of an organic Christian society. If you keep any one out it will avenge itself fearfully...." (7) He saw the need for these different elements as a "...witness to the permanent value of submission and order, as a type of the lordship of Christ over the individual or of the spirit over the flesh,...." (8)

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.137.

(2) K.S. Inglis: "Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England." Pg.264. Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd. London. 1963.

(3) S. Bailey: Op.Cit., Pg.327.

(4) Wood: Op.Cit., Pg.158.

(5) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.129

(6) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.485

(7) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.131

(8) Raven: Op.Cit., Pg.91

III

We are now in a position further to understand the contribution to and the role that Maurice played in the Christian Socialist Movement.

We stated earlier that his main contribution was that of being the prophet, the one who gave a spiritual and theological foundation to the Movement. Actually, his influence started before the Movement really got underway. Walter Cooper and Ludlow were amongst those who heard him preach at Lincoln's Inn, and his sermons made a great impact on them. Higham tells of how Cooper who was present by chance on one occasion, kept coming back until "he had grasped the essential truths constantly reiterated : 'Christ, not the Devil, is the King of the Universe; the Church is the Family of all mankind; we dare not refuse to any member of that family a share in the beauty and riches and responsibilities of the world which God created.'" (1) Ludlow's reaction was to go and see this preacher who had such a great understanding. (2) During the spring of 1848 Maurice preached Man's brotherhood, and condemned the social system that made mockery of that truth.

It is important to note that the views of Maurice we have given were present in his thought all along, and during the period of the Christian Socialist Movement they underwent hardly any change at all. His theological views certainly did not. As Christensen says, "The events of the spring of 1848 had not changed or modified his views. To him, they were a challenge to make men realise the true foundations of human life." (3)

We ought not to under-estimate the influence that Maurice had on the group through his weekly Bible-classes. Raven underlines this when he says, "But after all, much as they owed to men like Hughes or Mansfield, the true centre of their fellowship and source of their strength lay, as they were the first to insist, not in the quality of their members so much as in the spiritual basis of their work. The weekly meetings for the reading of the Bible on Mondays at eight o'clock at Maurice's house were begun in December, and were in a real sense the sacrament, the effective symbol of their unity, the means

(1) Higham: Op.Cit., Pg.54.

(2) Their first meeting.

(3) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.76.

whereby they received their inspiration....the hours spent together in the study of the ancient records...were the richest and most useful of their lives....they began to share his vision of the reality and nearness of God, his certainty of the ultimate triumph of the Christ, his confidence in the message and the meaning of the Kingdom....and as the experience of God came into their lives the bonds which linked them one to another became holy, and the venture upon which they were embarked was transfigured into the splendour of a crusade." (1) Ludlow later described these Bible readings as "the very heart of the (Christian Socialist) movement." (2) Maurice had thus a great part in moulding their Christian beliefs, for they became convinced of the truth he spoke; and as Christensen says, Maurice's thoughts and beliefs "...were imbibed by Maurice's young friends and became to a great extent the religious impulses underlying Christian Socialism - and in this way Maurice may be said to have been "the master-spirit" of the movement" (3). They all looked up to him as their leader, never taking what he said lightly, and it is because they had such a great respect for him and his beliefs, that so often they allowed him to censure what they proposed to do.

Bearing in mind the beliefs and convictions of Maurice as now outlined, it can be appreciated that Maurice's contribution to the Movement also became, of necessity, that of acting as a BRAKE on the enthusiasm and the plans of the others. This contribution was of great value, "...for several of them...were as impetuous as they were resourceful, and without his restraining hand might easily have involved themselves in futile enterprises....(Maurice) would not go forward until he was sure of his principles, and, when once these were clear, neither sneers nor hostility could give him pause." (4) He had no hesitation about withholding his support from any scheme which did not fit in with his convictions. This point can easily be illustrated.

In his second letter to the Chartists, printed in "Politics for the People," Kingsley said, "If you have followed a very different 'Reformer's Guide' from mine, it is mainly the fault of us parsons: we have never told you that the true 'Reformer's Guide', the true poor man's book, the

(1) Raven: Op.Cit., Pg.134-5.

(2) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.92.

(3) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.93. c/f pp. 94-5 for Maurice's influence on Ludlow.

(4) Raven: Op.Cit., Pg.82.

true 'God's Voice against Tyrants, Idlers and Humbugs' was the Bible.... We have used the Bible as....an opium-dose for keeping beasts of burden patient while they were being overloaded....We have told you that the Bible preached the rights of property and the duties of labour, when (God knows!) for once that it does that, it preaches ten times over the DUTIES OF PROPERTY and the RIGHTS OF LABOUR.." (1) Julius Hare protested about this letter, and wrote to Maurice telling him of his objections, and asking him to suppress the article. Maurice defended Kingsley and Ludlow to Hare, but at the same time was impressed by Hare's criticism. "...there was real risk that they might waste themselves by reckless violence and premature agitation. Maurice realised the danger and his own responsibility." (2) When Kingsley wrote "The Nun's Pool", which contained a violent attack on the monarchy and aristocracy and depicted all their misdeeds towards the poor, Maurice refused to allow it to be serialised in "Politics for the People." The reason for this was probably partly because Maurice believed in the legitimate part of the monarchy and aristocracy in society and did not want to cause more tension between classes than already existed. When it became apparent that Maurice also intended to censor one of Ludlow's articles, Ludlow spoke his mind, telling Maurice that he was wrong in this matter. Maurice, however, held that his action in suppressing Kingsley's novel was quite correct. He agreed that there should be different opinions in the paper, and that it should be written for all classes, "But if we write for the people, high as well as low, rich as well as poor, we are to reverence the CONSCIENCE of high as well as low, rich as well as poor...So far as we wound the conscience of any man, we do a positive injury to him and to ourselves: we do that which cannot be undone or neutralised by ever so many articles which will soothe and conciliate him....I hold it therefore a great duty to deny oneself in a number of strong, piquant phrases that one likes, and to get the disgrace of being called milksop or spooney, or via media man.... rather than run counter to those earnest and deliberate convictions of other men, upon the preservation of enlightening of which all our hope of doing them good depends." (3) In the light of there being so much to do, it was a waste of time to upset people needlessly. This was not the way to make people recognise their brotherhood, and would not further

(1) Quoted from Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.76, Ft-note 25.

(2) Raven: Op.Cit., Pg.118.

(3) Life of F.D.M. Vol.1. Pg.478.

reconciliation between men.

During the summer of 1849 Cholera broke out in the slums of London. "...Kingsley found almost intolerable the waste and misery of it all. He was impatient for that sanitary reform which he believed could save so many human lives." (1) The young men felt compelled to go into immediate action, and Ludlow "...conceived the idea of a national Health League which should arouse public opinion to demand sanitary reforms and, by subscriptions, raise funds for helping their practical execution...." All the young friends entered heartily into the plan." (2) But Maurice flatly refused to consent to this plan. The reason for this was his dislike of parties, or societies, or leagues, or clubs. (3) These were a denial of the order of fellowship and co-operation established by God, for they were self-elected human societies. Instead of the League, Maurice suggested renewed and more active work in the neighbourhood of Lincoln's Inn against overcrowding, insanitation, vice and ignorance.

On December 5th 1849 "The Morning Chronicle" printed a letter of Sidney Herbert in which he recommended emigration as the answer to the conditions of the workers, and the over-population in England. Another article in the same edition, while recommending emigration, called on the people to take up the cause of the poor and to do something. This article roused in C.B. Mansfield the urgent need for positive action, and he wrote to Ludlow urging a protest against the proposed scheme of emigration. Ludlow went to Maurice, and further suggested a scheme of Home Colonisation. But no support was forthcoming from Maurice, who did not see emigration as evil. "Colonisation is not transportation; it is a brave, hearty, Saxon, Christian work.... Let us devise a Socialist home Colonisation as soon as you please; provided only we give it a ground to stand upon, the sooner the better. But in the meantime here IS this emigration." (4) The reason for Maurice's opposition to Mansfield and Ludlow's plan was again his dislike of parties. "...I have sometimes thought that I might be of use in warning...against...a tendency to be quick-sighted in detecting all errors in the schemes of other men, and to set up their own in opposition to them....God...will not let me ever be the leader or sub-leader of any school or party in this land." (5)

(1) C.F.G. Masterman: Op. Cit., Pg.75

(2) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.121

(3) c/f Pg. 43.

(4) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.28-9. Letter to Ludlow

(5) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.29-30. Letter to Ludlow

The group yielded to Maurice's wishes regarding the abandoning of a Health League, but not with regard to co-operation amongst the working men. "...the sense that something must be done towards promoting associated labour was strong in almost every one of us who were then grouped round Mr. Maurice...We could no longer remain content either with mere talk on the one hand, or with evening schooling and some individual visiting of the poor on the other." (1) Ludlow therefore went ahead, and in an article on "Labour and the Poor" published in "Frazer's Magazine" for January 1850, he recommended the establishment of Associative workshops, Co-operative Stores and even Labour Bazaars, and gave the Christian basis for such action. Ludlow and his friends expected no support from Maurice in carrying out their ideas, and were "surprised and delighted" when he heartily entered into their plan. Christensen makes the point that Maurice was "...forced into action by the seriousness of the situation and by the zeal and determination of his young friends to assist the slop-workers," (2), but this did not involve any change in his theological convictions. He still held that the "...Divine Order made all human schemes and organisations superfluous.." (3) Associations did not have any absolute value in themselves but they were an immediate remedy and protest against competition. "I do not see my way further than this. Competition is put forth as the law of the universe. That is a lie. The time is come for us to declare that it is a lie by word and deed." (4) He still held the relation between employers and employees to be a true one. Associations were not a denial of this and thus God's order for "...at present it is clear that this relation is destroyed, that the payment of wages is nothing but a deception." (5) He also saw Association as favouring the cause of order by preventing strikes. (6) "Thus it is evident that it was only with great heart-searchings that Maurice had gone in for Associations. He was afraid that they might mean a violence of the Divine Order. He openly admitted that he was not able to foresee clearly the consequences of the step taken in starting Working Associations. On the other hand, the false system of competition was threatening to destroy God's Order - and in this emergency, Associative work represented an efficient weapon of protest. Under this aspect Maurice could accept it..." (7) Maurice was continually to guard against what he thought might be a violation of God's order, and it is important to notice that associations only played a small part in his exposition of Christian Socialism. He made it clear in his Tracts on Christian Socialism that the function of Associations was to "...bear

(1) The words of Ludlow in Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.30-1.

(2) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.132.

(3) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.132.

(4) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.32.

(5) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.32.

(6) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.48.

(7) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.133.

witness to the fact that competition and rivalry were human devices which had been engrafting themselves upon the true order of society..'' (1) Their purpose was not to extinguish the existing relationships of capital and labour, of master and servant, but "...to educate men to brotherhood and fellow-work." (2) But it is clear that the work that Ludlow and his friends were doing in promoting and setting up Workmen's associations was in fact aimed at abolishing the distinction between Capital and labour by making the workers their own capitalists. When Maurice eventually realised this, he gradually withdrew from promoting Co-operation, and threw himself into education. He had always laid great emphasis on the importance of education as the true function of the Church, and he saw the absolute necessity of education if the Associations were to succeed. The workers had to understand themselves as spiritual beings belonging to a Divine Order. When Maurice became the principal of the Working-Men's College, he almost forgot all about Associative work, in his absorption with the idea of a college and education. "As Maurice had expounded the objects of the college, it did not represent a natural development of the work of the Christian Socialists, but a new and quite independent work. In other words: In contrast to Associative work, the college was to be the practical demonstration of Maurice's principles." (3) By throwing himself totally into the work of education and suggesting that the others did the same, Maurice had in fact "aimed the final blow at Christian Socialism." (4) It was only after much hesitation that the others followed him.

But we have gone a little too far ahead. While involved in the Associative work, Maurice continued to act as brake. Shortly after the founding of the Working-Men's Associations, C. Sully saw the need for a Central Board to control the individual associations along proper business lines. Ludlow and the younger members also recognised the need for a definite scheme of management, and approved of Sully's plan. Sully made the mistake of mentioning to Maurice that a Central Board was necessary if the workers were to succeed successfully on the competitive market. Maurice refused to have anything to do with

-
- (1) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.139.
 (2) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.140.
 (3) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.350.
 (4) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.361.



the Board. In a letter to Ludlow he wrote, "God's order seems to me more than ever the antagonist of man's systems; Christian Socialism is in my mind the assertion of God's order.....Every attempt to hide it under a great machinery, call it Organisation of Labour, Central Board, or what you like, I must protest against as hindering the gradual development of what I regard as a divine purpose, as an attempt to create a new constitution of society, when what we want is that the old constitution should exhibit its true functions and energies....if we build churches upon the decrees of councils, or associations upon decrees of central boards, we build upon the sand, and (I do say) that when the rain comes our houses will fall, and that great will be the fall of them." (1)

A break between Maurice and the Promoters was only averted by setting up a Council of Promoters to concentrate on the spiritual and ethical aspects of the Movement, as well as the Central Board which was to deal solely with practical matters. It says a lot for Maurice's influence that Ludlow took up his warning and in the introductory paragraph of the constitution wrote, "In offering this machinery to others we are bound to protest against that idolatry of social mechanism, which imagines society as a mere assemblage of wheels and strings, and not as a partnership of living men; which takes account of the form only, and not of the spirit which animates it." (2)

As our final example of Maurice "acting as a brake," let us take his opposition to the Christian Socialists helping the Amalgamated Society of Engineers to carry out Associative work, which Ludlow and the rest wanted to do after the great lock-out of 1852. Maurice believed that the workers ought to yield to their employers, and he would not take part in anything which tried to undermine the relation between employers and employees by making the workers their own masters and capitalists. "The idea of Association, which should testify to people that they were members of a human fellowship and under obligation to act towards one another as brethren, would thereby be mistaken for a new economic and social system which abolished the existing relationships between men - and this implied a denial of the Divine Order." (3) The result of Maurice's veto was that as a body they did not join in the engineer's dispute.

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.44-45.
 (2) Quoted from Raven: Op.Cit., Pg.187.
 (3) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.260-1.

We see then that Maurice was continually calling the Christian Socialists back to the principles he understood as underlying the Movement - his principles.

There is one final aspect of Maurice's contribution with which we must briefly deal, and that is his contribution to the literary activities of the Christian Socialists.

He did his fair share of contributing articles to the various publications which they issued. His theological convictions came out strongly as he attempted to give answers to the questions of the day, and to explain to the people the validity of the Christian way of life. In his involvement with their literary publications we once again find Maurice trying to keep the others from doing anything which in his opinion might do injury to the order which God had established, and trying to guide them along the lines of his theological thinking. We have already mentioned how Maurice censored some of the articles in "Politics for the People" (1). Charles Kingsley and Ludlow, as early as February 1850 were keen on a Christian newspaper, and after the establishment of the S.P.W.M.A. (2), Ludlow had the idea of a newspaper addressed to the whole nation in which topical questions would be discussed in the light of Christian Socialism. This was to be published along with a penny periodical. Maurice rejected the idea. "To make use of the press to propagate Christian Socialism would in his eyes mean its ruin - it would be similar to taking up with evil powers and bowing to public opinion and its tastes, with the result that the Christian Socialists would become an exclusive party." (3) As a result the idea of a newspaper was dropped, but Ludlow carried out his plan for a penny periodical which was published as "The Christian Socialist: a Journal of Association." It was in every respect Ludlow's own paper.

When Hughes became editor, the title was changed to the "Journal of Association" on Maurice's suggestion, as he believed that some of the political articles had harmed the cause of co-operation. "A newspaper *per se* could but arouse party-feelings and divide men up into sections and parties. It bound them together

(1) c/f Pg. 48.

(2) Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations.

(3) Christensen: Op.Cit., Pg.152.

by human systems and schemes instead of making them alive to the Divine Order as a living reality." (1)

Maurice's role as "Prophet of the Christian Socialist Movement" was by its very nature not an easy one. "...a prophet who speaks smooth things in an incredible anomaly. In proportion to the authenticity of his inspiration will be the vigour of his protest against error : it is his business to expose and pillory evil, to explore its roots in his own soul, learning meekness in the process, to wage war upon it there without truce or compromise, and then to confront it in others with the severity which has first been exercised against it in himself.....Maurice in the agony of his own spiritual experience had fastened upon certain fundamental principles which he believed to be universal and divine : by them he judged his own life and the society around him : by them he tested the words and actions of his contemporaries." (2) It was his theological convictions that governed all that he did. His greatness lay in his being able to show that his theology was deep enough to answer all the questions which his society raised in acute form; his importance, in giving a theological justification for trying to replace the spirit of competition by the spirit of co-operation, in meeting the challenge of Utilitarianism and Positivism when they were at the height of their influence.

That Maurice was the Movement's spiritual leader, its prophet, the one who tried to keep its leaders and its followers not only together but on the path of a true theological foundation cannot be gainsaid or doubted. His name will ever be associated with the contribution which the Christian Socialist Movement undoubtedly made toward applying the Christian faith to all aspects of life, and toward a fuller realisation of the Kingdom of God.

The motive and inspiration of Maurice's own contribution might be summed up in his own words, "Church Reformation therefore, in its highest sense, I conceive involves THEOLOGICALLY the re-

(1) Christensen : Op.Cit., Pg.214.

(2) Raven : Op.Cit., Pg.83-4.

assertion of these truths..." (God's Absolute, Fatherly Love, the Incarnation, the Sacrifice for all) ..."in their fulness apart from their Calvinistical and Tractarian limitations or dilutions; SOCIALLY the assertion on the ground of these truths of an actual living community under Christ in which no man has a right to call anything that he has his own but in which there is spiritual fellowship and practical co-operation; NATIONALLY the assertion of a union, grounded and not on alliances and compromises but on the constitution of things, between this Universal Community and the State of which the principle is Personal Distinction and the symbol Property. For this I desire to labour in all ways, being most careful to choose none by self will or from mere calculations of expediency, and to avoid none, which God points out, because it may seem dangerous to oneself or to mere formal onlookers. I believe whoever enters on this path must lay his account with opposition, active or passive, from all quarters; must eagerly welcome and set down for gain all tokens of sympathy; must have no confidence in himself; must cultivate entire confidence in God and in the certainty of His purposes. It will and must be a long battle, in which many, even standard bearers, will fall. But the issue is not to be doubted; let us work and trust for it." (1)

(1) Life of F.D.M. Vol.11. Pg.9-10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Asa Briggs (Ed.) : "Chartist Studies".
London. Macmillan & Co.Ltd. 1962.
- S.C. Carpenter : "Church and People. 1789-1889." Part II
London. S.P.C.K. 1959.
- Owen Chadwick (Ed.) : "The Mind of the Oxford Movement".
Adam & Charles Black. London. 1960.
- Owen Chadwick : "The Victorian Church". Part I.
Adam & Charles Black. London. 1966.
- T. Christensen : "Origin and History of Christian Socialism
1848-54."
Universitetsforlaget 1. Aarhus. 1962.
- G.S.R. Kitson Clark : "An Expanding Society. Britain 1830-1900."
Cambridge. 1967.
- G. Kitson Clark : "The Making of Victorian England."
Methuen & Co. Ltd. London. 1962.
- S.L. Greenslade : "The Church and the Social Order."
S.C.M. Press Ltd. 1948.
- Florence Higham : "Frederick Denison Maurice."
S.C.M. Press Ltd. 1947.
- K.S. Inglis : "Churches and the Working Classes in
Victorian England."
Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd. London. 1963.
- M. Kranzberg (Ed.) : "1848 - A Turning Point?".
D.C. Heath and Company. Boston. 1959.
- C.F.G. Masterman : "Frederick Denison Maurice." in 'Leaders of
the Church 1800-1900.'
A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd. 1907.
- N.C. Masterman : "John Malcolm Ludlow : The Builder of
Christian Socialism."
Cambridge University Press. 1963.
- Frederick Maurice (Ed.) : "The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice,
Chiefly told in his own Letters."
Vols. 1 & II. London. Macmillan and Co.
1885.
- F.D. Maurice : "Theological Essays"
Fifth Edition. London. Macmillan and Co.
1891.
- F.D. Maurice : "Theological Essays".
James Clarke & Co. Ltd. 1957.
- F.D. Maurice : "Lincoln's Inn Sermons." Vols. III & IV.
London. Macmillan and Co. 1891.
- F.D. Maurice : "Sermons on the Prayer-Book and The Lord's
Prayer."
London. Macmillan and Co. 1893.
- F.D. Maurice : "Social Morality."
London. Macmillan and Co. 1872.
- F.D. Maurice : "The Kingdom of Christ, or Hints on the
Principles, Ordinances and Constitution
of the Catholic Church in letters to a
member of the Society of Friends."
James Clarke & Co. Ltd., London. 1959.

- C.E. Osborne : "Christian Ideas in Political History." London. John Murray. 1929.
- A.M. Ramsey : "F.D. Maurice and the Conflicts of Modern Theology." Cambridge. 1951.
- Charles E. Raven : "Christian Socialism 1848-1854." Frank Cass & Co. Ltd. 1968.
- M.B. Reckitt : "Maurice to Temple. A Century of the Social Movement in the Church of England." Faber and Faber Limited. London. 1947.
- P. Robertson : "Revolutions of 1848. A Social History." Harper & Row, Publishers. 1960.
- David Thomson : "England in the Nineteenth Century." Penguin Books. 1950.
- Alec R. Vidler : "The Church in an Age of Revolution. 1789 to the Present Day." Penguin Books. 1961.
- A.R. Vidler : "F.D. Maurice and Company." S.C.M. Press Ltd. London. 1966.
- H.G. Wood : "Frederick Denison Maurice." Cambridge University Press. 1950.
- Sir Llewellyn Woodward : "The Age of Reform 1815-1870." Second Edition. Oxford. 1962.
- G.M. Young : "Victorian England. Portrait of an Age." Second Edition. London. Oxford University Press. 1953.

JOURNAL ARTICLES.

- S. Bailey : Review of A.R. Vidler's "The Theology of F.D. Maurice", in the "Scottish Journal of Theology." Vol.3. 1950.
- T. Dring : "Frederick Denison Maurice" in "The London Quarterly and Holborn Review." January 1948.
- N.C. Masterman : "The Mental Processes of the Reverend F.D. Maurice", in "Theology". Vol.68. 1965.
- A.D. Millard : "The Christian Socialists of 1848 : who they were and what they stood for," in "The Modern Churchman": Vol.1. 1957-8.
- G.H. Ranson : "F.D. Maurice on the Social Nature of Man", in the "Canadian Journal of Theology", Vol. XI, No.4. October, 1965.