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THE BRITISH PROHIBITIONISTS
1853-1872

A BIOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS

In his famous study of attitudes to the state in nineteenth-century England, Dicey described the period 1825-70 as "the period of Benthamism or Individualism". Evangelicalism and Benthamism, he argued later, "represented the development in widely different spheres of the same fundamental principle, namely, the principle of individualism". Only later did laissez faire fall into eclipse: "somewhere between 1868 and 1900... changes took place which brought into prominence the authoritative side of Benthamite liberalism." 1 Dicey's interpretation has come under sustained attack during the last twenty years, and historians now pay more attention to the continuing momentum of state intervention from the 1830s, and to the collectivist aspect of Bentham's teaching. Yet Dicey's critics have ignored a movement which in some ways lends more support to their case than any other mid-Victorian development, and which draws attention to hitherto unappreciated virtues and defects of Dicey's account.

The United Kingdom Alliance was founded (in Manchester!) in 1853 to promote a "Maine Law" which would outlaw the trade in intoxicating drink, and campaigned after 1857 for the "Permissive Bill" which would enable a two-thirds majority of the ratepayers in any district to ban the trade from their locality. Its reaction against laissez faire doctrines was quite self-conscious: F. W. Newman, its most intelligent advocate, saw in prohibition "the turning-point in the new view of the position of governments in the earth" and described the belief that the state should forsake moral reform as "the cardinal heresy of the Liberal party in both continents". The UKA aimed to "infuse a new morality into state-action", and its secretary Samuel Pope in 1865 insisted that "the Whigs and Radicals, since Bentham, have tried to throw away good principles which had

been either neglected or perverted.” The Alliance clashed directly with J. S. Mill’s libertarianism, and scornfully repudiated the attack on the Maine Law in his *Liberty*. Long before T. H. Green’s ideas became famous, the Alliance was denouncing the policeman theory of government and describing the state as “an individual organism; a collective individual”. Whereas its organ the *Alliance News* gave Mill only the briefest mention when he died in 1873 and denounced his ideas as “in every point of view, defective and misleading” – it honoured Green by publishing in full his lecture on *Liberal Legislation and Freedom of Contract*, and by marking his death in 1882 with a full-column obituary. Here then was a group which resolutely challenged individualism in the middle of Dicey’s “period of . . . individualism” and which owed much to his two “individualist” influences, Benthamism and evangelicalism. Who, then, were the prohibitionists? What inspired them to advocate the most draconic interference with individual liberty at such a time?

The United Kingdom Alliance prospered in response to long-term developments within the British temperance world. The British temperance movement was launched in the late 1820s, when Irish and Scottish evangelicals imported the idea of anti-spirits association from America. With aristocratic and Anglican support, the British and Foreign Temperance Society in the early 1830s formed associations of abstainers from spirits throughout the country. But in the mid-1830s militant teetotalers from the North of England – mostly dissenters and working men – captured the movement, which became more radical in tone. The teetotalers’ zeal soon began to wane: Father Mathew, the Irish Catholic temperance advocate, induced thousands to sign the pledge in the late 1830s and early 1840s, yet by the 1850s Ireland’s drink problem was no nearer solution. Nathaniel Card’s foundation of the United Kingdom Alliance in 1853 must be seen partly as an attempt to recapture for the temperance movement the millenial optimism of the 1830s, and many prominent teetotalers joined it.

Yet the aggressive tactics of the Alliance antagonised some teetotalers. They felt that prohibitionists expected too much from a mere legislative enactment, and that prohibition could be enforced

---

2 Alliance News, 24 May 1873, p. 330; cf. ibid., 17 May 1873, p. 309; for Green, see ibid., 1 Apr. 1882, p. 193. Green’s lecture is reprinted in ibid., 29 Jan. 1881, pp. 66-68.
only when supplemented by energetic teetotal propagandism. Although the Alliance claimed only to be supplementing the existing teetotal (or “moral suasionist”) societies, it furnished political excitements to its supporters which teetotalism had never been able to offer. Significantly, the Alliance was founded in the same year that the disestablishment movement adopted the more aggressive title “Liberation Society”; both organisations urged nonconformists forward from their traditional plea for tolerance towards the repudiation of Anglican and aristocratic culture. In effect, if not avowedly, both movements focused their attention on political activity, and on promoting radical at the expense of Whig influences within the Liberal party. Teetotal societies could offer no such attractions, and in many areas found the prohibitionist movement capturing their members. Still more alarming for teetotalers, the Alliance did not insist on teetotalism as a qualification for membership, and attracted into the temperance movement influential individuals like Lord Brougham who would otherwise have been deterred. Hence the squabbles in the late 1850s and early 1860s between the Alliance and the leading British teetotal organisations, the National and Scottish Temperance Leagues.

The structure and history of the Alliance must be analysed elsewhere; the objective here is to discover what type of person provided prohibitionism with its leadership in the years when it was coming to the forefront of British political life. Six major inquiries have been conducted: into the age-group, regional background, social class, personality, reforming outlook and religious belief of Alliance supporters between 1853 and 1872. The latter year provides a convenient stopping-point because it saw the passage of H. A. Bruce’s famous Licensing Act, partly as a result of temperance pressure. Up to 1872 the Alliance was fighting for recognition at Westminster, and repudiated any formal connexion with a particular political party; thereafter, it gradually aligned itself behind the Liberal party and became a rather different type of movement.

Several recent studies have shown how systematic biographical analysis of a movement’s supporters can illuminate its attitudes and appeal. The investigation which follows is reinforced by an analysis of all those identifiable Alliance subscribers who gave £5 or more to the Alliance in the financial year 1868-69. There is no reason to think that this year was in any way untypical, and as 234 individuals were involved (an additional nine subscribers of £5 or more in that year were anonymous) the sample is small enough to be manageable but large enough to justify firm generalisations. The biographical information is printed as an appendix to this article, and will be frequently employed in the discussion. It is ordered alphabetically.
by county, except for Wales, Ireland and Scotland which appear at the end. The information is ordered into a standardised sequence within each entry. The analysis has three limitations. Firstly, a static analysis of this kind cannot reveal how the leadership of prohibitionism was changing over time. If the time-span were wide, this would be a serious disadvantage: but during the twenty years from 1853 to 1872, the type of person attracted into the prohibitionist movement did not change appreciably. Secondly, the analysis inevitably relies heavily on obituaries and hagiographical biographies, and it may therefore overstress prohibitionists’ virtues. Finally, a survey of prohibitionists alone cannot reveal what was distinctive about the recruitment of their movement. We can guess at its peculiarities, but until we have systematic biographical studies of other contemporary movements, we cannot do more.¹

I

Whereas modern reforming movements owe much to the indignation of young people, in the early Victorian period the existence of social deprivation in all age-groups enabled reforming movements to attract people of all ages. Although Nathaniel Card the founder of the Alliance was 48 in 1853, and although its first president Sir W. C. Trevelyan was 56, three young men – T. H. Barker, F. R. Lees and Samuel Pope – were prominent in the movement from the start. The 1868-69 sample shows support coming from all age-groups; it is probable, though, that an earlier age-group analysis would produce a younger average age, just as a later one would produce an older figure. Reforming movements attract the young at their foundation, but they find it less easy to do so in their maturity; after a few years, the temptation for a movement to rest its strategy on the receipt of legacies is strong.

¹ For interesting recent examples of systematic biographical analysis, see W. F. Mandle, “The Leadership of the British Union of Fascists”, in: Australian Journal of Politics and History XII, No 3 (Dec. 1966); S. Budd, “The Loss of Faith. Reasons for Unbelief among Members of the Secular Movement in England, 1850-1950”, in: Past and Present, No 36 (Apr. 1967). I gratefully acknowledge here the generous help I have received from many British public libraries – especially from the central public libraries in Cardiff, Darlington, Glasgow, Hull, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester and Sheffield. Without their help, this article could not have been written. W. H. Chaloner of Manchester University was kind enough to help me with information on Manchester prohibitionists. The history and structure of the United Kingdom Alliance up to 1872 are fully discussed in my forthcoming book Drink and the Victorians, Chapters 9-11, 16.
Regionally, prohibitionist support was much less uniform; it was strongest in the industrial towns. The birthplaces of 96 of the 1868-69 sample are known, and a high proportion fall in the Northern counties of England:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But prohibitionists often moved away from their birthplaces. For although there were a few static individuals (e.g. No 11), prohibitionists were not normally people whose horizons were limited by any single community. They were adventurous and enterprising – enthusiasts for the geographical and social mobility encouraged by the railway system which they themselves had helped to create. Geographical mobility was essential to success in the manufacturing and commercial world, where so many prohibitionists were to be found; this mobility often began at an early age, when the teenager was apprenticed to a relative in another town. From country to town, from provinces to London, from North to South, from Scotland to England, from England to foreign parts – there are many instances of prohibitionist adventurousness in travel at a time when travel was relatively dangerous, difficult and expensive. ¹

Analysis of subscriptions indicates regional patterns of support in greater detail. Whereas the Anti-Corn Law League moved its headquarters to London in 1843, the Alliance remained in Manchester till 1918. It would be interesting to know whether the Alliance move to London signified a change in its regional basis of support; if so, this shift had not gone very far before 1872. In 1868-69, whereas London’s 277 donors gave only £637, Manchester’s 244 donors gave £1,547. In the 1860s London gave a far smaller total than Manchester,

¹ For successful North-South moves, see Nos 1, 66, 87, 140; for successful South-North moves, see Nos 52, 109, 175, 182, 200-202. For Scotsmen moving South, see Nos 27, 41, 71, 89, 93, 169.
contained far fewer donors per head of population and produced far fewer donors of large sums.

Table 2

Total subscriptions from leading English cities in four selected years (£)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>1859-60</th>
<th>1863-64</th>
<th>1868-69</th>
<th>1873-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Subscription lists in UKA Annual Reports.

Throughout this period the Alliance found London difficult to move: it would “never be fused but by the heat of popular opinion in the country”. As late as 1873 London was receiving a grant of £1,500 from Manchester, and throughout the 1860s the radical law-stationer and Reform Leaguer J. R. Taylor was denouncing the flaccid prohibitionist leadership in London: “the question meets you at every corner of the streets”, he wrote: “what is the London Auxiliary doing? NIL.” For many years Alliance men shared Cobden’s belief that it was very difficult for a man “however clothed in the panoply of principle, to go through the ordeal of a London season, without finding his coat of mail perforated”.¹ No other city approached Manchester or even London in the scale of its donations; even by 1873-74 Birmingham was giving only one-sixth as much as Manchester. The industrial areas also provided a mass following. All but four of the 71 Alliance English auxiliaries noted in the subscription-lists between 1859 and 1869 were situated North-West of the Boston-Gloucester line, and there were high concentrations in South Lancashire, the West Riding and the North-East coast.

Analysis of donations by county (Table 3) shows Lancashire producing by far the largest proportion of Alliance subscribers – nearly a quarter throughout the 1860s. The Alliance was correspondingly

### Table 3

Regional analysis of donations in financial year 1859-60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Amount given (£)</th>
<th>Number of donors</th>
<th>% of total donators in each area</th>
<th>Donors per 10,000 population</th>
<th>Rank order Col.</th>
<th>Rank order Col.</th>
<th>Rank order Col.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beds.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambs.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbd</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbs.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glos.</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hants.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herts.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancs.</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leics.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincs.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middx</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northants.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbd</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notts.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxon.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salop.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soms.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilts.</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks.</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

weak in the South-East; that "sea of political darkness" in the Home Counties of which Ernest Jones complained in 1852, and which separated London from provincial radicals, can also be seen here. When MPs from the English county seats failed to support the Permissive Bill, they were faithfully reflecting prohibitionist weakness in their localities. "Deep under the superficial controversies of English society", wrote Bagehot in 1864, "there is a struggle between what we may call the Northern and business element of English society, and the Southern and aristocratic element."¹ Had the English countryside possessed a peasantry, radical movements like prohibitionism and the Manchester School's attack on feudalism might have been more successful. As it was, prohibitionists – like all temperance reformers – were forced into dependence on towns in the North of England and Scottish lowlands; they enjoyed extensive rural support only in the North and West. The geographical pattern of late-Victorian Liberalism – often loosely called the "Celtic Fringe" – is foreshadowed in the regional patterns of support for several early Victorian radical movements.

Although none of the 1868-69 subscribers whose birthplace is known were born overseas, prohibitionists were seldom parochial in their interests. The "grand tour" by the 1830s was by no means confined to the landed aristocracy, as the early business careers of Bright and Cobden reveal. The search for customers and ideas often sent prohibitionist manufacturers overseas, and several were connected with shipping firms. At least two of the 1868-69 sample (Nos 28, 149) were wealthy enough to live abroad.² Prohibitionists displayed their energy not only in diversity of activity and in energy of opinion, but also in the width of their zeal for travel. In some, enthusiasm for travel as such was openly avowed (e.g. in No 14); in others it was disguised as missionary zeal (Nos 61, 205). Missionary organisations provided many opportunities for vicarious as well as personal enjoyment of travel. Such zeal sent Thomas Barrow (No 61) to Quaker missionary stations overseas, John Cadbury (No 154) to Ireland, F. W. Newman (No 42) to Baghdad, and many more to the "foreign parts" which existed in the slum areas of British nineteenth-century towns. Prohibitionists believed strongly in personal visitation, and in the "personal approach" to influential individuals: Robert Charleton (No 38), for instance, sought to end the Crimean War in 1854 by

² For business trips abroad, see Appendix, Nos 24, 27, 75, 96, 134, 136, 148, 178, 190, 198, 204, 231. For shipping connexions, see Nos 30-34, 98, 150, 200-202, 204, 210, 211, 220, 222.
visiting the Czar. In the course of their travels, many prohibitionists — notably J. S. Buckingham, F. W. Newman and Cardinal Manning — gained a comparative perspective on British drinking habits which nourished their domestic temperance crusade. A passionate involvement in questions of foreign policy was a natural consequence of overseas travel. The peace and anti-opium trade movements and the Anti-Corn Law League attracted prohibitionists strongly, and the 1868-69 sample includes three individuals who later became pro-Boers (Nos 7, 150, 152). Humanitarian movements helped to pioneer internationalism, and in their attitudes to foreign policy prohibitionists display a curious combination of desire to evade complicity in evil, together with a semi-patriotic eagerness for Britain to take the lead in setting international moral standards. The Risorgimento found an eager champion in Alderman Williamson (No 28); the Bulgarian Horrors found enthusiastic opponents in the Pease family (Nos 20, 21). And in supporting the antislavery movement and the cause of the North in the American Civil War — many prohibitionists combined their libertarian with their humanitarian sympathies. Here, in short, were the Gladstonians and the Cobdenites, the provincial rank-and-file upon whom idealistic opponents of a cynical and worldly-wise aristocratic diplomacy could rely for support.

II

Investigation of prohibitionists by social class can best begin with a fund analysis. Between 1853 and 1874 the Alliance drew about a quarter of its funds from donations under £5, and over a third from donations of more than £5 but less than £100. Up to 1869, donations of £100 or more accounted for another third, but by 1873-74 this proportion had risen to almost a half. In 1868-69, three people contributed one-fifth of the total Alliance income, 95% of the total receipts for the year came from donors of £1 or more, and the average of 3,018 annual donations was £2.19.5. During the 1860s one-third of the donors gave less than 10/-, and £5 or more was given by only one-tenth or less. Even the small donations came from quite substantial individuals. The original census returns in the Public Record Office facilitate a brief investigation of all the donors listed under four randomly-selected small towns — Bridgwater, Lewes, Liskeard and Cirencester — during the financial year 1863-64. To take but two examples: Whinfield Robinson of Liskeard, who gave only 10/6, was a grocer with two servants and twelve employees; and Edward Sealy of Bridgwater, who gave only 5/-, was a bookseller/printer/stationer with a staff of six. The parliamentary spokesman of the Alliance
Wilfrid Lawson, Jun. (No 7) often complained that prohibitionists never contributed donations as large as those which had brought success to the Anti-Corn Law League.¹

Table 4

Analysis of donations and donors giving over 4/11d. in four selected years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount (£)</th>
<th>5/- 9/11</th>
<th>10/- 19/11</th>
<th>£1 4/11</th>
<th>£5 99/11</th>
<th>£100 499/11</th>
<th>£500-</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1859-60</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863-64</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>4,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868-69</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>8,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873-74</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>3,083</td>
<td>4,762</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>16,259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>1859-60</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>–</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1863-64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868-69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873-74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>1859-60</th>
<th>390</th>
<th>252</th>
<th>462</th>
<th>110</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>–</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1863-64</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868-69</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873-74</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>1859-60</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>–</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1863-64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868-69</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873-74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UKA Annual Reports.

The Alliance was never widely supported among the aristocracy; within the temperance movement, only the anti-spirits societies achieved this distinction. The Alliance never attracted support from the royal family, and its vice-presidents before 1870 did not include the bishops, admirals and aristocrats who adorned many other contemporary philanthropic movements. Prohibitionism attracted very few great rural landowners or gentry: the few exceptions were usually atypical of their class in other respects too. The first Alliance president Sir W. C. Trevelyan (No 136) was educated at Harrow and Oxford, and between 1853 and 1869 gave the Alliance £6,150. He was an eccentric but distinguished naturalist, a progressive agriculturist, a generous art patron, and an enthusiast for any scheme

¹ G. W. E. Russell, Sir Wilfrid Lawson. A Memoir (1909), p. 74; cf. 3 Hansard 196, c. 645-6 (12 May 1869); 3 Hansard 278, c.1283 (27 Apr. 1883).
which seemed likely to advance knowledge. Another landowner and early supporter was Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Sen., a leading Cumberland Liberal educated at Cambridge, whose baronetcy was of very recent creation. Lawson was a keen railway promoter and a nonconformist who financed the *Christian News*, organ of the Evangelical Union. Lawson had been connected with the temperance movement since 1831, and early tipped the family spirits into his fishpond. Between them he and his son (also named Wilfrid) gave a total of nearly £6,000 to the Alliance from 1853 to 1873. The only other prominent titled Alliance supporter in the 1850s was the Earl of Harrington, brother of the teetotal Lord Stanhope, owner from 1851 of large estates in Cheshire and Derbyshire, Benthamite Liberal, chancery reformer, champion of the Greeks and Poles, and author in 1858 of a booklet on the Maine Law. The 1868-69 sample includes five titled donors: apart from Sir W. C. Trevelyan, only Sir Robert Brisco (No 12) came from an ancient landowning family, and even he had strong commercial connexions. Not until 1880-81 – when Edward Baines, William Collins II (No 219) and Hugh Owen were knighted – were honours conspicuously bestowed on prominent temperance reformers. Until then, teetotal connexions were actually an obstacle to social mobility beyond the middle classes. Only thirteen substantial landowners appear in the sample, and all are in some way unusual in their class. Of the eight farmers, four were Quakers, several took up farming only as a hobby or as a second occupation, and most were distinctly progressive in their agricultural views.\(^1\) The other rural donors were dissenters like Thomas Judge (No 133), W. R. Neave (No 45), James Cadbury (No 138) and the Pattinson family (No 114). The “governing class” professions – landowning, law, church, armed services and brewing – are markedly under-represented.

Westminster was a bogey to an organisation so divorced from the Establishment: “if you go there”, said the radical journalist Washington Wilks to an Alliance meeting in 1862, “you scarce see around you a man animated by his own moral sense and feelings.” Teetotalism had never been popular among politicians, and they were even less sympathetic towards prohibition. The anomalies and corruptions of the existing electoral system convinced the Alliance that parliament’s hostility to the Permissive Bill did not reflect the wishes of the public.\(^2\) Small organised groups of publicans and brewers in the

---

\(^1\) For the thirteen landowners, see Appendix, Nos 6, 7, 11, 12, 35, 37, 47, 136, 140, 162, 229, 230, 234. For the knighthoods, see P. T. Winskill, The Temperance Movement and its Workers (1892), IV, p. 42.

constituencies were distorting constituency opinion: the over-representation of the landed interest was converting the national assembly into a self-interested clique: and MPs' aristocratic environment enabled them to ignore the sufferings of the masses and to feather their own nests through promoting foreign wars and heavy taxation. Despite thirty years of temperance agitation, the total number of teetotal MPs remained – in 1860 as in 1834 – only four.¹ No wonder the Alliance came to regard the process of converting MPs as a tedious preliminary to obtaining a measure which, once enacted, would bring blessings so obvious that all further propagandist effort would be unnecessary. Prohibitionist argument frequently cries out for Lord Beeching's recent rejoinder to agitators equally inexperienced in politics – the revolutionary students at Southampton: "there's an air of unreality about so many of the things you say." The Alliance tried to coerce MPs by squeezing them into giving pledges on the hustings, by forcing them to vote in annual parliamentary Permissive Bill divisions, and by bombarding them with petitions, letters, deputations and literature. Wilfrid Lawson, Jun. often stressed that "parliament only does right through fear": the Alliance, like Richard Cobden, knew that the aristocracy were "afraid of nothing but systematic organization, and step by step progress". During the 1850s and 1860s the Alliance therefore besieged parliament with a nation-wide system of agents and auxiliaries modelled on Anti-Corn Law League precedents of the 1840s.²

In these years, manufacturing and aristocratic leaders were not yet frightened into a firm alliance against the ambitious and articulate working men. Indeed many wealthy men still hoped to profit politically from a radical alliance with the masses. Of the 172 donors of £5 or more in 1868-69 whose livelihood can be discovered, the 39 textile manufacturers constitute by far the largest group. Manufacturers and merchants account for the overwhelming majority of the other donors. Nine donations came from firms rather than from individuals, and at least sixteen from individuals working in the same firm. At least fourteen of the donors were railway promoters, and the lives of at least fifteen fit into the self-help mould.³

¹ There were 36 teetotal MPs in 1885; see A. A. Reade, The House of Commons on Stimulants (1885), p. 8.
³ For railway promoters, see Appendix, Nos 19, 21, 55, 70, 96, 98, 109, 125, 158, 199, 200, 201, 218, 224. For self-help careers, see Nos 25, 46, 48, 57, 76, 77, 93, 101, 109, 111, 122, 125, 130, 134, 210.
Table 5

Occupations of identifiable donors who subscribed £5 or more, financial year 1868-69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textile manufacturer</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipowner</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Merchant&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile merchant</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironfounder</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinster</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals manufacturer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea merchant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn/flour miller</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber merchant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master-dyer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa manufacturer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaslighting equipment manufacturer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipbuilder</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master cutler</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headmaster</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jute manufacturer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway company agent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissenting minister</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Manufacturer&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pin manufacturer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper proprietor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutta percha manufacturer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironmonger</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste merchant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some prohibitionist leaders were well-known and enterprising individuals: Charles Watson (No 169) the Halifax manufacturer of patent ventilators, for instance; Joseph Lingford (No 18) of Bishop Auckland, the manufacturer of baking powder; and George Cadbury (No 152), that skilful exploiter of the cocoa market. Typical of the
early prohibitionist manufacturers is the Baptist Harper Twelvetrees, chairman of the Alliance London auxiliary. His father was a hard-working builder and contractor at Biggleswade, but Harper had grander ambitions. After considerable self-improvement, particularly in chemistry, he began manufacturing soap – an article of central importance in the Victorian cult of respectability! Aided by the repeal of the soap duties, he flourished and moved to London. By 1861 his Bromley soap factory had become one of the largest in the kingdom. Still in his thirties, Harper was an energetic innovator, proud of his humble origins; he displayed all John Cassell’s impatience at the traditional reticence of tradesmen. An enthusiastic opponent of slavery, he edited in 1863 The Story of the Life of John Anderson, an escaped slave. He had no thought of enslaving his employees. In 1861 he opened a lecture-hall in his factory; he also sponsored evening classes, penny savings banks, sick- and clothing-funds, brass bands and a cricket club. Meanwhile Mrs Twelvetrees was instructing female employees in dressmaking and housewifery. The firm was conducted on teetotal principles, and temperance festivals were held in the factory grounds. “It is not eminent talent which is required to ensure success in any pursuit so much as *purpose* – not merely the power to achieve, but the will to labour energetically and persevering-ly.” Harper was lecturing his employees at a dinner they gave him in 1862. “I love energetic, determined, and persevering men”, he went on: “for they are the very salt of the earth.”

Several of the 1868-69 sample were highly respected in their professions for their sound judgment, independence and integrity. Their religious faith was not unconnected with their prosperity; professional integrity was becoming an assured asset in marketing one’s products and services, skilful personnel management an accepted way of improving productivity. *Straightforwardness Essential to the Christian Character* was a book which strongly influenced the conduct of F. J. Thompson (No 143), the Bridgwater ironmonger; no doubt the book also helped him to win grateful customers and faithful employees. John Smedley (No 14) and George Cadbury (No 152) were probably not alone among prohibitionist manufacturers in beginning the day by participating in a small religious service with their employees.

---

2 For men of integrity, see Appendix, Nos 45, 67, 72, 82, 156, 173, 182, 197, 208, 219.
George Cadbury's career is a classic demonstration of the rewards to be reaped by the thrifty. The links between the temperance and the building society movements are strong, and many temperance reformers promoted local savings clubs.

Prohibitionists, where authoritarian, were usually paternalist; at least twelve in the sample showed a benevolence in managing their employees which was markedly progressive for its day. It would be wrong to ignore the bonhomie of Robert Shaw of Colne (No 57), who knew so many of his employees by sight and name, and spoke their dialect; or the popularity of Dr Graham of Over Darwen (No 103), carried to his grave by two of his workmen and escorted by twelve principal workmen as pallbearers. In some prohibitionists, the political and religious justifications for resentment against the aristocracy were reinforced by a personal distaste for mixing in "society". The middle-class leadership so valuable to the temperance movement had always owed much to a positive preference among some manufacturers and tradesmen for the company of the relatively poor. As Joseph Livesey, the founder of the teetotal movement, put it: "I have tried two or three times to be a gentleman; that is, to leave off work and to enjoy myself, but it never answered." Like George Cadbury, Livesey took a positive delight in mixing with people who were socially inferior to himself. While prohibitionists believed firmly in self-help, one cannot but suspect that, like J. S. Mill, they saw this as only a stage towards realising the ideal of a less competitive society; self-help would perhaps create the affluence and rationality which must precede any new social order. Not for them the belief in a conflict of interest between employer and employee! Six of the 1868-69 sample helped to promote co-operative experiments in their own lifetime, and the ideas of George Cadbury and G. T. Livesey (No 122) on co-partnership were really imaginative and fruitful.

What could be gained from subscribing to the Alliance? Relief from guilt-feelings at the monstrous contemporary evil of drunkenness – "how monstrous, it is perhaps difficult for the present generation to realise" – and the normal gains to be made from nineteenth-century philanthropy. Through letting thy left hand know what thy right

1 For benevolent employers, see Appendix, Nos 14, 33, 46, 57, 69, 98, 122, 152, 156, 204, 211, 219.
hand doeth, a place in the public eye could be purchased; in 1871
the Alliance offered a vice-presidency to all who gave £1,000 a year
or more to its guarantee fund. Again, “he that giveth to the poor
lendeth to the Lord”. Such loans might even bear interest in this
world, for the temperance movement might induce working people
to conserve their own resources: hence its claim to give more relief
per £ donation than other charities.¹ A temperate working class
would be able to support itself during unemployment, and ratepayers
would no longer have to pay out poor relief. As one prohibitionist
wrote in 1869, “our workpeople, were they sober, would be able to
put up with short time without inconvenience.”²

In a more class-conscious age, the Alliance could hardly have
publicised such views without losing working-class support: but the
risks were less great in the mid-Victorian period, when the concept
of respectability was so powerful among working people. “Work
discipline” was not yet seen solely as a means of filling the capitalist’s
money-bags. At an Alliance meeting of 1871, James Clark the Street
shoe-manufacturer complained that “he had the misfortune to have
one of the very worst of the liquor-shops opposite his factory, and
it was a perpetual source of nuisance. As he sat in his counting-house
paying the money to the workmen, he saw them spending it in that
noxious place, and he had no power whatever to put it down.” Pro-
hibition might make his task easier as an employer, but he believed
that all classes would profit by it. Prohibitionist mineowners like
Handel Cossham and the Pease family had everything to gain from
organisations which curbed the irregular habits of their employees,
and textile manufacturers expected much from an expanded home
market for consumer-goods. Again, British manufacturers, by re-
ducing their working expenses, could compete more easily with their
foreign rivals. Samuel Pope, when contesting Stoke-on-Trent in 1857,
stressed the need for sobriety if British goods were to rival American
products. If the Permissive Bill were obtained in five years, said
William Hoyle in 1871, Alliance subscribers in trade and commerce
would get their money back “ten times over”.³ But in analysing

¹ Quotation from R. C. K. Ensor, England 1870-1914 (1936), p. 409; see also
² Anon., Inquiry into the Causes of the Present Long-Continued Depression
Movement and its Workers (1892), I, p. 70.
For Pope, see Alliance Weekly News, 4 Apr. 1857 (Supplement). For the
Peases, see Select Committee of the House of Lords on Intemperance [Parl.
Papers, 1877, (418) XI], Q. 8490.
prohibitionist motives, it would be quite wrong to stress only economic factors. Social and religious resentments against those in authority were quite as powerful; and insofar as materialist considerations did operate, prohibitionist employers always saw their own interests as coinciding with the interest of the nation as a whole.

The early Alliance believed that it enjoyed the support of an elite among working men. In 1868-69 it raised £287 from individuals who gave less than 5/-, and it greatly valued the support of its humblest donors. When a 74-year-old Chesterfield domestic servant Jacob Bradley in 1871 wrote (in a very shaky hand) to bequeath the Alliance £200 “for the supression of the licquer trafack [sic]”, the Alliance executive committee took the trouble to paste his letter in its minute-book. Prohibitionists recognised the propagandist value of an income derived from large numbers of people. Samuel Pope at the 1871 annual meeting argued that the guarantee fund “must consist of large and small, must have a wide basis; as £100,000 from a hundred thousand subscribers would have more weight and representative value than the same sum contributed by a few.”¹ The Alliance was probably correct in believing that its numerical strength lay with large sections of the mid-Victorian labour aristocracy, or – in the Economist’s words – with “upper class workmen, the humblest of the middle classes, and, generally speaking, persons below the class of gentlemen”. The two former Scottish Chartists who denounced O’Connor at the Calton Hill meeting in Edinburgh in 1838 – Rev. Patrick Brewster, the Presbyterian minister of Paisley, and John Fraser, formerly editor of the True Scotsman – both supported the Alliance from the first, as did the ex-Chartists William Lovett and Elijah Dixon (No 77) of Manchester. Two of the 1868-69 sample, Elijah Dixon and Henry Steinthal (Nos 77, 94) were pallbearers at Ernest Jones’ funeral. “Let there be any extension of the franchise”, the Alliance claimed in 1859, “that shall make the registration spoon dip low enough to take up the cream of the working classes, and we shall sweep all before us in the House of Commons.”²

Positioned midway between the two predatory social forces of aristocracy and pauperism, respectable members of the middle and

² Economist, 7 July 1855, p. 728; Alliance Weekly News, 7 May 1859, p. 781. For Ernest Jones’ funeral, see Benjamin Wilson, The Struggles of an Old Chartist (Halifax, n.d.), p. 35.
working class were strongly attracted to the Alliance. Its propaganda emphasised that, proportionally speaking, the working classes were no more drunken than any other class; criticised the political parties for their indifference to social reform; praised self-help, and vigorously condemned the styles of life which prevailed among the very rich and the very poor. The *Alliance News* denounced bad behaviour at both social extremes: from the afterdinner scrapes of a youthful Lord Randolph Churchill in 1870 to the squalid miseries of slum life noted in its weekly column entitled “Barrel and Bottle Work”.¹ The conflict between aristocrat and tradesman is more helpful in explaining Alliance attitudes than the conflict between industrial employer and employee. The Alliance conducted its social pathology in terms of aristocratic corruption and oppression; it saw the licensing system as the instrument of an aristocracy eager to avoid taxation by levying indirect taxes, keen to boost the price of the barley grown on its estates by “imposing” public-houses on respectable working men throughout the poorer districts. Thereby the people could be held in subjection, discouraged from self-improvement, and deprived of religious liberty and political instruction. A different diagnosis – which attributed drunkenness to the social disruption, monotony and dreariness accompanying industrialisation – could hardly be expected from an organisation so heavily dependent for support on enterprising industrialists and self-improving working men.

A working man like William Lovett was attracted by such a diagnosis. The magistrates rejected his application for a music licence for his National Hall School in Holborn, yet they granted it to the publican who succeeded him in the premises: “publicans can always have such licences”, Lovett wrote bitterly, “but not so those who would have music apart from the means of intoxication.”² Respectable men placed between the two social extremes felt threatened by the working men at the bottom of society who were the pawns of aristocratic corruption: by the drunken individuals employed by them as “lambs”; by the racegoers spending their time on sport rather than on self-improvement and politics; by the rioters, the wifebeaters and the spongers off the rates. The division between “rough” and “respectable” working men is crucially important in explaining Alliance attitudes. Richard Brazier, a stout Alliance man and a Banbury

whitesmith, frequently tried to get local poor law guardians to allow teetotalers and drinkers each to provide for their own poor — for he knew that the teetotalers would gain by the change. William Lovett denounced parents whose failure to postpone their gratification ensured that society was plagued with neglected children: why indeed should the “industrious and frugal” pay for the consequences of this “ignorant recklessness and improvidence”? According to the prohibitionist William McKerrow (No 89), no man had the right to bring up his family “to be pests and nuisances and burdens to his fellow-men... the industrious and respectable working-people of a neighbourhood have a right to defend themselves against unnecessary rates and against the offensive conduct of those by whom they are surrounded.” ¹ Although O’Connor won applause by flattering the “fustian jackets and unshorn chins”, such tactics were frowned upon by the Chartists who later supported the Alliance.

Two factors convinced the Alliance that it enjoyed the support of an elite among working men — its Manchester Free Trade Hall meetings which its secretary Samuel Pope was so anxious for Brougham to see, and which were always crowded with Lancashire artisans; and its canvasses, conducted in many parts of England in the early 1860s, which seemed to show a greater enthusiasm for temperance restriction the larger the town and the lower the descent in the social scale. These canvasses had the incidental advantage of educating the public in temperance principles, and seemed to show that most areas, including the large towns, would be able to produce the two-thirds majority needed to secure a local veto. Several serious criticisms can be made of them: it was easier to agree than to disagree with the canvasser, nor could a canvass ever indicate the intensity of support for temperance legislation. If immediate enforcement had been likely, far less zeal for the restriction might have been registered. No allowance was made for those pitfalls of the public-opinion poll – biased questions, insufficient alternatives and patchy geographical coverage. Furthermore, the phrasing of prohibitionist canvasses, like that of the League of Nations Union canvass of 1934, aimed to elicit a favourable response. Most important of all, these canvasses went no lower in the social scale than the householder, and ignored the views of drinkers in the “dangerous classes”. Roebuck in 1863 denied that 13,165 Sheffield Sunday Closing petitioners could really represent

local working class opinion, and produced a counter-petition signed by 24,000 Sheffield adult manual labourers.

The Alliance always exaggerated the extent of its support among working men. Even the most educated among them were not united behind the Permissive Bill – as the hostility of the Bee-Hive and of G. J. Holyoake shows. The concept of respectability was less popular among the humbler grades of working men than the Alliance imagined. Prohibitionists chose to regard the William Lovetts and the George Howells as a growing influence with working men, whereas in the second half of the nineteenth-century many technological, recreational and other developments were actually weakening their influence. When prohibitionists like Lovett or T. H. Green observed the use made by late-Victorian working men of their extended leisure hours, they often despaired. The Alliance believed that in their hearts the humbler working men favoured prohibition; that environmental pressures were distorting their true wishes; and that if they continued to drink, they were “really praying that . . . temptation may be removed from them”. “The opinion of the drunkard is with us”, said Pope, overconfidently in 1856, “his habit is the reverse.”

Such arguments could hardly attract politicians who must deal with realities and not with aspirations. Working men could always be found in the nineteenth-century to break up Alliance meetings and to riot against licensing restriction. The Alliance chose to regard such demonstrations merely as proofs of the corrupt self-interest, crude methods and obscurantism of its opponents: they came not from representative working men, but from “rather the unworking classes . . . a crowd of roughs – a congregation of scamps”. In some rural areas, where drink was deliberately employed to stifle new ideas, this view might be justified: but in mid-Victorian cities starved of recreational facilities, the Alliance would have gained by treating its opponents with more respect.

1 For the meetings, see University College, London, Brougham Mss: Pope to Brougham, 14 Oct. 1859. For opinion polls, see H. Cantril, Gauging Public Opinion (Princeton, 1944), p. 3; L. W. Doob, Public Opinion and Propaganda (New York, 1948), p. 151; I am most grateful to Dr D. E. Butler, Nuffield College, Oxford, for help on this point. For Roebuck, see 3 Hansard 171, c. 311 (3 June 1863).
2 Quotation from Card, in Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Houses, Q. 1954; Pope, letter to Stanley, 26 Sept. 1856, printed in The Stanley-Pope Discussion (Manchester, n.d.).
3 Alliance News, 13 June 1863, p. 188.
Support for the Alliance cannot be understood entirely in terms of social class, for class loyalties can never explain why Alliance supporters chose this particular reforming interest and not others; nor did any class unanimously support the movement. If George Howell supported it, Alexander Macdonald did not; if F. W. Newman (No 42) supported it, his brother John did not; Alliance policy appealed to many other influences and interests apart from social class. Alliance leaders were in some ways distinctive in personality. What impresses the mid-twentieth-century eye is their immense energy, self-confidence and optimism. Many of them possessed what Bagehot called "the first great essential of an agitator — the faculty of an easy anger". In five instances, biographers mention a youthful hasty temper which had to be repressed in maturity. Prohibitionists did not always succeed in sublimating the violent passions against which their whole movement constituted a protest. For they saw life as a battle, and their combativeness displayed itself in vehemence of expression — in the uplifted finger, the earnest gaze and the thumping of the table so often noted by observers. Men like Henry Gale (No 144) and Timothy Coop (No 112) were born fighters. Prohibitionists felt that conflict positively developed the character: "I wonder what man was born for", Lawson retorted to opponents who argued that the Permissive Bill would foster bitter local disputes, "excepting to struggle. We live in a world full of sin, of wrong, and of injustice, and if we are not to struggle, the sooner we are out of this world the better." Timothy Coop's biographer might have said the same of many prohibitionists: "very many of his habits of life were formed and consciously practised in direct opposition to the natural promptings of his impulsive and intensely aggressive nature."¹ Men like Hugh Mason (No 46) and John Smedley (No 14) did not suffer fools gladly. Many of the 1868-69 sample were well-known and controversial local personalities. Their forcefulness sometimes merely led to sterile dispute; Rev. Henry Gale — like his more famous prohibitionist contemporary F. R. Lees — merely brought upon himself a reputation for being "difficult". But it often issued in really courageous acts. The 1868-69 sample shows that conscientious refusals of office were common-form among prohibitionists: Richard Hall (No 11) refusing to pay the additional

income tax required by the Abyssinian War; Thomas Barrow (No 61) and Jonathan Priestman refusing the magistracy; Wilfrid Lawson (No 7) – after nearly half-a-century’s consistent Liberalism in parliament – refusing Campbell-Bannerman’s offer of a privy councillorship in 1906 because “if a man did his duty, it brought its own reward with it”; J. R. Wigham (No 210) and J. G. Richardson (No 204) refusing their knighthoods; George Cadbury opposing Boer War fever, just as J. G. Richardson and Jonathan Priestman had opposed Crimean War fever fifty years before.1 Such men were not easily trampled upon. Indeed the careers of Thomas Judge (No 133) and Joseph Pease (No 19) constituted long-drawn-out fights for religious and political liberty.

It is but a short step from individualism to eccentricity. These stalwarts were able to display such independence largely because they moved in circles whose values were quite different from those of conventional society: their friends and relatives scorned the honours which conventional society could bestow. By any standard, at least eight of the 1868-69 sample were eccentrics; some, like F. W. Newman (No 42), almost gloriied in the fact. “No society in which eccentricity is a matter of reproach can be in a wholesome state”, J. S. Mill pronounced in his Political Economy;2 nineteenth-century public life was greatly enriched by the presence of eccentrics. The ebullience of the prohibitionists could be observed even as they walked along the street: James Cadbury (No 138) of Banbury and Benjamin Townson (No 67) of Liverpool were well known locally for walking faster than any of their contemporaries. The contest between the temperance reformer and his opponent was a contest between two attitudes to time, and it is fitting that W. T. Blacklock (No 70), the owner of Bradshaw’s Railway Guide, should appear in the 1868-69 sample. These were men of almost aggressively active temperaments, early risers, cramming their days with a host of miscellaneous activities. “Recreation to Mr. Gladstone was, speaking quite generally, change of occupation”: the same could be said of his many prohibitionist admirers. The cult of athleticism was only beginning to grip the country in the 1860s, and temperance reformers were only beginning to harp upon the link between abstinence and sporting prowess, but two of the 1868-69 sample became famous for their athletic achievements.3

1 For Lawson, see G. W. E. Russell, op.cit., p. 261.
3 Viscount Gladstone, After Thirty Years (1928), p. 56; for athletes, see Appendix, Nos 78, 124.
The puritan personality was of course prominent in the movement – George Cadbury (No 152) with his distaste for gossip and his refusal to put racing information in his Daily News: Hugh Mason (No 46) “carrying all questions in politics, morals, and conduct to the Higher Powers and coming down from Sinai thoroughly prepared to act”. Several prohibitionist leaders displayed a retiring nature. Perhaps they found in Alliance work a channel for energies blocked by religious disabilities or family mishaps. But it would be wrong to convey an impression of universal gloom and austerity; at least five in the sample were noted for their sense of humour. The case of Wilfrid Lawson, Jun. is alone sufficient to dispel modern stereotypes of the Victorian temperance reformer. Clothed in his wit, puritanism for decades enlivened the parliamentary round at Westminster. And though four of the sample were keen sabbatarians, six were more constructive, and advocated the opening of counter-attractions to the pub on Sundays.  

Local politics and philanthropy often provided the arena for life’s battles. Seventy-two of the 218 male donors in the sample are known to have been active in local government – a figure which probably greatly underestimates the total. Many prohibitionist leaders would have echoed George Tatham’s (No 181) dictum that every man should be a good citizen of his own city. Among the auxiliary attractions of the Alliance was the fact that its Permissive Bill, by entrusting licensing to periodic ratepayer votes, would nourish enthusiasm for popular participation in local government. Taking the highest office reached, the sample includes 37 JPs, 15 town and county councillors, 9 mayors – sometimes more than once, four members of school boards, three improvement commissioners, two poor law guardians, one alderman and one member of a local board of health. The careers of Walter Smith (No 109) and Jonathan Hutchinson (No 189) suggest that temperance involvement was one way of attaining prominence in local politics. Several in the sample were major figures locally – the Corys in Glamorgan, the Peases in Durham, and the Darbys in Denbighshire all opened up new sources of local wealth through exploiting mineral deposits. Davies (No 202), Oldroyd (No 167), Shaw (No 57), Mason (No 46) and McCulloch (No 214) were household names locally. “To write an obituary notice of Mr. Walter Smith [No 109] is . . .

1 Quotation from W. H. Mills, The Manchester Reform Club. 1871-1921 (Manchester, 1922), p. 11. For puritans, see Appendix, Nos 38, 77, 152, 161, 204, 219. For retiring natures, see Nos 33, 54, 61, 76, 152, 153, 168, 182. See also Nos 103, 110. For cheerful puritans, see Nos 7, 53, 57, 97, 174.
almost like writing an abbreviated history of Southport”.

The intensity of prohibitionist feeling on local issues sometimes caused them to split their local communities into friends and foes just as Gladstone polarised the national community after 1876. In Ashton-under-Lyne, you could hardly remain neutral about Hugh Mason: you either loved him or loathed him.

One can hardly hope to estimate the intelligence of mid-Victorian prohibitionists merely by studying those who gave £5 or more. For the mid-Victorian educational structure was never meritocratic: many highly intelligent citizens occupied very humble social positions, and many prosperous intellectuals would be unlikely to sympathise with the Alliance – libertarians, clergymen suspicious of a predominantly dissenting cause, sophisticated individuals who shuddered at the crudities of a radical agitation. Professor F. W. Newman (No 42) is the only university figure on the 1868-69 list, though by the 1870s the Alliance was attracting several radical intellectuals: Goldwin Smith, Thorold Rogers, Professor Rolleston, and T. H. Green from Oxford, together with Professor James Stuart from Cambridge. The 1868-69 sample includes 33 individuals who might be described as “intellectuals”, in that they enjoyed higher education, were members of learned societies, or had distinctly academic interests. The sample includes only one schoolmaster – the Quaker Fielden Thorp (No 198); but at least 14 of the donors helped to promote school building. Four – R. S. Newall (No 27), Joel Cadbury (No 153), Peter Spence (No 93) and J. R. Wigham (No 210) patented inventions; several fostered local cultural activity, two were keen promoters of music and four of art. Eight promoted mechanics’ institutes, and several perpetuated the strong connexion between the temperance movement and local Literary and Philosophical Societies. Three became local antiquarians and a few energetic individuals – John Mackenzie (No 229) and Charles Jupe (No 161), for instance – acted as a cultural leaven to the whole surrounding area.

Prohibitionists’ predominantly nonconformist background ensured

---

1 Southport Visiter, 5 July 1887; for key local personalities, see Appendix, Nos 12, 18, 19, 24, 25, 27, 29, 46, 48, 57, 69, 75, 81, 83, 89, 93, 95, 103, 109, 136, 143, 150, 158, 161, 167, 185, 189, 191, 197, 200, 201, 202, 210, 224, 225, 227, 229.

2 For intellectuals, see Appendix, Nos 2, 27, 29, 33, 38, 42, 53, 55, 67, 73, 89, 90, 93, 95, 122, 123, 136, 141, 144, 148, 168, 169, 173, 174, 185, 186, 198, 206, 210, 214, 222, 225, 229. For mechanics’ institutes, see Nos 22, 23, 48, 52, 93, 158, 186, 197. For local antiquarians, see Nos 2, 185, 186. For promoters of music, see Nos 28, 222; for patrons of art, see Nos 2, 29, 136, 224.
that their cultural interests were theological or scientific rather than classical or literary; whereas nonconformists had little time for the purely literary and linguistic aspects of Greek and Latin, they ran specialised institutions for theological and scientific study. At least four of the sample read widely in religious literature; Trevelyan of Tranent (No 234) was an amateur chemist, Nutter (No 53) an amateur geologist and astronomer, Townson (No 67) an amateur botanist and McCulloch (No 214) an amateur electrician. Six qualified doctors appear on the list, and three enthusiasts for hydropathy – John Smedley (No 14), A. E. Eccles (No 78) and Dr John Goodman (No 108).¹ Prohibitionist dissenters in the religious world were often also dissenters in the medical world, sceptical of the doctor’s skills. “Some doctors, if they went down inside you with a lighted candle, could not tell what was the matter with you”, said Basil Wilberforce. Prohibitionists advertised their contempt for doctors in their readiness to oppose compulsory vaccination and the Contagious Diseases Acts. F. W. Newman and Wilfrid Lawson were prominent in both movements, which drew recruits from just those social groups which supported the temperance movement. Many prohibitionists looked on medicines as sourly as they looked on alcohol: indeed, alcohol was at this time frequently prescribed as a medicine by doctors.

Self-help extended even to the medical sphere, for many prohibitionists believed that, given rational dietary habits, disease would wither away. At least six of the sample were vegetarians – a creed which also attracted major figures in the Alliance hierarchy – Lees, Hoyle, Raper and Hargreaves. At least nine in the sample also despised smoking, and at least two campaigned against air pollution. Peter Spence and his son (Nos 92 and 93) were among the founders of the English Anti-Tobacco Society, and William Harvey (No 81) was a vice-president. Far from seeking social and moral progress through increased wages, F. W. Newman sought it through increased abstinence: “for the welfare of the millions, they need 3 abstinences”, he wrote privately to E. Sargant in 1876: “1. from intoxicating drink. 2 from narcotics, 3 from flesh meat. Then we will be well off.”² The pursuit of rationality in diet naturally attracts

¹ For theologians, see Nos 29, 33, 38, 90.
intellectuals who earn their living by exercising their reasoning powers; whereas in twentieth-century Britain many intellectuals in the communist and socialist parties concentrated on creating a rational social order, their nineteenth-century predecessors pursued the same objective by creating rational individuals. The prohibitionist's attack on the materialism of urban society, his pursuit of the simple life, is once more coming into vogue. The prohibitionist world, then, was a world of individualists pursuing truth wherever it might lead them — whether (with F. W. Newman) to theological eccentricity, or (with John Smedley) to medicinal heresy.

IV

In 1902 Robert Blatchford accused temperance reformers of being "men of one idea",¹ but this was certainly not true of the prohibitionists in 1868-69. A richer diversity of reforming activity could hardly be imagined: down alleys they strayed, in search of prostitutes for reclamation; up flues they gazed, in pursuit of air pollution and climbing boys; down sewers they plunged (at least metaphorically) in their quest for public health. While the United Kingdom Alliance may as a body have been sectarian in its relationships with other reforming causes, its individual supporters were catholic in their reforming relationships. Voluntary activity is the neglected concomitant of the Victorian belief in laissez faire: the modern complaint that there are "no good causes left" could be heard only in a welfare state. The modern historian of nineteenth-century local communities, enmeshed in the network of Victorian local voluntary organisations, will fully appreciate the reality which lay behind the Victorian faith in local self-government. Men as eager to join reforming causes as James Cadbury (No 138) or Edward Backhouse (No 29) would now be regarded as busybodies, but the political theory of nineteenth-century Liberalism rested on the assumption that such men existed in every community: indeed that, with the extension of religion and education, they would multiply. Hence the vigour of prohibitionist admiration for American political institutions.

Table 6
Other reforming interests of identifiable donors who gave £5 or more, 1868-69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Donors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teetotalism</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disestablishment</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular education</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday schools</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace movement</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Society</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local hospitals</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas missions</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home missions</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-CD Acts</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-slavery</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-smoking</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing reform</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics’ institutes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-corn law league</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-sabbatarianism</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Home Rule</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetarianism</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary reform</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminism</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory reform</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphan homes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public parks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution reclamation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-animal cruelty</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatarianism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-opium trade</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydropathy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Boer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragged schools</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-compulsory vaccination</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Rule</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Reform</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Association</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSPCC</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-gambling</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-vivisection</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charities for the blind</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-ritualism</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Public Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing boys</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-air pollution</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building societies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform League</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer movement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformatory schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailors’ homes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings banks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamen’s and Boatmen’s</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-capital punishment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-birth control</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for the Protection of Aborigines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Organisation Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Age Pensions League</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Sweating League</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Nurses Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cripples’ homes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Pastoral-Aid Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling reform</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Tract Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teetotalism was of course the most popular of the prohibitionist causes, for the Alliance had grown out of the temperance movement and always regarded the work of “moral suasionists” as essentially complementary to its own. Though there were disputes at the national level between moral suasionist and prohibitionist organisations in the 1850s and 1860s, it is clear that in many localities both wings of the temperance movement were supported by the
same people. Some prohibitionist leaders — Trevelyan (No 136), Tatham (No 181) and Harvey (No 81) — showed real initiative and courage in challenging the drinking customs so venerated at the time. Several in the sample were even prominent in other national temperance organisations — notably the Sunday Closing Association, Church of England Temperance Society and British Temperance League: disputes between the Alliance and moral suasionist organisations concealed an extensive common membership.¹

Anti-slavery and the Anti-Corn Law League are causes less prominent in the 1868-69 sample than they would have been in the 1830s, for these were causes which by the 1860s had been won. But the connexion persisted in the vigour of prohibitionist opposition to slavery during the American Civil War, and in Sir Wilfrid Lawson’s hostility to tariff reform in 1903. To a limited extent the nineteenth-century temperance movement was in itself a feminist movement — defending the interests of women and children against the selfishness of men. At least four in the sample helped to reclaim prostitutes, not to mention the eleven who supported Josephine Butler’s agitation. Sylvia Pankhurst’s list of anti-feminists might almost be a list of those who opposed the Alliance: “from first to last, its opponents were mainly the professional Party politicians who objected to the penetration of women into their particular sphere, the brewing interests, the wealthy unoccupied ‘men about town’, and the naval and military officer class.” Prohibitionism is a noteworthy example of that alliance between feminism and middle class puritanism which Bernard Shaw so detested.²

This is not to say that women were prominent in the Alliance hierarchy. In the late-Victorian period women were to run their own temperance organisation, the British Women’s Temperance Association; but in the Alliance, as in other mid-Victorian temperance organisations, their role was decidedly subordinate. 218 of the 234 leading donors in 1868-69 were male; and many of the women were

¹ For the British Temperance League, see Nos 18, 48, 103, 160, 198. For the Sunday Closing Association, see Nos 21, 75, 99, 160. For the Scottish Temperance League, see Nos 219, 224. For the National Temperance League, see Nos 143, 150. For the Church of England Temperance Society, see Nos 99, 149. For the Band of Hope, see Nos 13, 127, 138, 146, 150, 165, 192.

² Sylvia Pankhurst, The Life of Emmeline Pankhurst (1935), p. 25; cf. G. B. Shaw, Epistle Dedicatory to A. B. Walkley, in his Man and Superman (Constable ed. 1930), p. xv. For the American civil war, see W. Farish, Autobiography (privately printed, 1889), pp. 117-118; cf. Meliora, IV, No 16, p. 384; V, No 18, p. 192; and Appendix, Nos 82, 102; but see also No 211. For prostitute reclaimers, see Nos 24, 29, 38, 96. For Josephine Butler’s supporters, see Nos 7, 24, 29, 38, 42, 93, 95, 123, 164, 181, 206.
widows or spinsters perpetuating the generosity of departed husbands or imitating the generosity of male relatives.¹ Women accounted for only 6% of all donors in 1859, and this proportion fell steadily to 2% in 1873-74, though female influence may have accounted for many more donors; women gave an even smaller proportion of the total Alliance receipts – 2% in 1859-60 and 1% in 1873-74. Women rarely spoke at Alliance meetings, and the permanent organisation at Manchester was entirely in male hands. There was no prominent female prohibitionist advocate at the time, whereas the moral suasionist National Temperance League in the 1860s and 1870s employed several female lecturers for special purposes. Nevertheless the Alliance often appealed to women for help; it was a woman's "duty and ... prerogative to be a Reformer of all that pertains to social morals and manners" it claimed in 1854.² Women were wanted primarily for routine work behind the scenes – for raising funds, organising bazaars, distributing propaganda.

The prohibitionist F. W. Newman once told an amused dinner-party that he was "anti-slavery, anti-alcohol, anti-tobacco, anti-everything". Protest movements naturally attract individuals who lack experience of power; furthermore, in the nineteenth-century situation, protest against privilege was, in a sense, constructive. But many of the 1868-69 sample were also constructive in our sense in that, instead of contenting themselves merely with moral exhortation, they tried (often at their own expense) to create alternative, drink-free, institutions. At least ten in the sample provided counter-attractions in the shape of coffee-taverns, "British Workman" public-houses, temperance hotels and non-intoxicating wine. A prohibitionist family like the Lucas-Shadwells (No 149) of Rye Harbour did not merely exhort sailors to be sober: they provided sailors' homes at their own cost. Any oppressed or neglected group received the prohibitionists' attention: animals, prostitutes, sailors, cripples, the blind, and above all children. Temperance reformers saw themselves as completing the work of the schoolteacher, and at least 22 of the sample helped in some way to extend educational opportunity. Adult education attracted them – particularly the distribution of tracts, which gave opportunities for the personal philan-

¹ See Appendix, Nos 3, 5, 8, 9, 36, 59, 62, 64, 110, 118, 142, 151, 159, 166, 203, 207.² UKA, Address to the Ladies of Great Britain and Ireland (1854), p. 2. In calculating women's donations from the subscription-lists, it has been assumed that the only female donors are those whose names are prefixed by "Mrs." or "Miss".
thropic effort they valued so highly.\(^1\) Sunday schools and ragged schools were especially popular with them, but prohibitionists' interest extended to all aspects of child welfare. The obituarists of three in the sample made a point of mentioning their subjects' love of children. Social reformers have always enjoyed seeing themselves as allies of the younger generation and of posterity. Prohibitionists in the sample can be found supporting orphanages, climbing boys, and the NSPCC.

Irishmen were another neglected group: they must have weighed heavily on the conscience of an Edward Pease (No 20), for he employed an agent to distribute relief among them. John Stuart's (No 96) support for Irish famine relief was generous; Edward Whitwell (No 160) bought an estate in Western Ireland for philanthropic reasons, and lived there for part of each year. With their remarkable spread of commercial and industrial activity in the Waterford area, the Malcolmson family (No 211) were rejuvenating Ireland by methods far more ambitious than mere charity. Likewise J. G. Richardson (No 204) with his temperance and textile manufacturing utopia at Bessbrook, Benjamin Whitworth (No 98) who introduced cotton manufacture into Drogheda, and J. R. Wigham (No 210) with his gaslamps, buoys and beacons. To the consciences of such men, the Hume Rule question, when it came to the political forefront in later years, posed insoluble problems. As with John Bright, their radicalism, libertarianism and humanitarianism tugged them one way – but their concern for thrift, respectability and public order, their strong protestant connexions and their personal demonstration that the British connexion could be benevolent, tugged them in the opposite direction. It is not surprising to discover their lack of unanimity on Home Rule: in the 1880s, three declared for it and six opposed it.\(^2\)

If prohibitionists enjoyed little influence at Westminster in the 1860s, they often made full use of their position on local councils; their activities there at once reveal how mistaken it would be to place them in the Liberal *laissez faire* category, as opposed to Tory/Socialist interventionism. Admittedly a few saw social policy in these polarised terms: two members of the sample – Archbishop Manning (No 123) and the Manchester Conservative W. R. Callender (No 73) – were well known for opposing the Liberal school of political

---

1 Newman, quo. in I. G. Sieveking, Memoir ... of Francis W. Newman (1909), p. 139. For tract distributors, see Nos 34, 52, 78, 118, 121, 150, 160, 169, 204. For counter-attractions to the public-house, see Nos 11, 52, 61, 90, 107, 109, 130, 146, 149, 153.
2 For opponents of Home Rule, see Nos 21, 28, 98, 125, 204, 214; for Home Rulers, see Nos 7, 152, 175; cf. R. C. K. Ensor, "The Evolution of Joseph Chamberlain", in: Spectator, 3 July 1936, p. 7.
economists, and G. T. Livesey (No 122) took up a firm position in the other camp when he clashed with Manning during the gasworkers' strike of 1889. But most prohibitionists did not see the world like this; while they might be generally sympathetic to cheap government, decentralisation, and free trade – they responded pragmatically in the face of contemporary evils. At the local level, many readily used government machinery in eliminating social evils. Nine of the sample were keen housing reformers; four campaigned for public parks, and John Lupton (No 178) was one of the first in Leeds to throw open his garden to the poor in summer. R. W. Winfield (No 156) gave an annual fete on Whit Thursdays, in which his garden was thronged by pupils at his factory school. Benjamin Whitworth (No 98) and Alderman J. Barlow (No 48) did much to improve their local water supplies; at least six of the sample were active sanitary reformers, and thirteen gave generously to local hospitals; at least five of the sample favoured the compulsory restriction of factory hours.\(^1\) Furthermore, the Permissive Bill – although often linked with an enthusiasm for *laissez faire* causes – constituted in itself a breach of conventional political economy. Prohibitionists' attitudes stemmed largely from the situation of their generation: voluntary and local remedies had to be tried before more ambitious and "constructive" policies could be adopted. The example of George Cadbury, a prohibitionist who lived into a later generation, shows how a prohibitionist of the 1860s could, when placed in the new climate of the early twentieth-century, subordinate his temperance remedies to the more interventionist policies which by then had come into vogue.

It hardly needs saying now that the prohibitionists were overwhelmingly Liberal in their politics: of the 75 in the sample whose political views are known, no less than 67 were Liberals. Furthermore, these Liberals were often among the most energetic in the constituencies – men "who would have become keen party workers if there had been a constituency party".\(^2\) Often authoritarian in factory, family or locality, the prohibitionists were ardent democrats in national politics, and were strongly opposed to the Whigs. From them, and from like-minded provincial groups, the Gladstonian Liberal party was created. Many prohibitionists saw the Alliance as a purifying

---

\(^1\) For housing reformers, see Nos 46, 52, 119, 123, 137, 152, 178, 200, 204; for water reformers, see Nos 48, 98; for sanitary reformers, Nos 58, 93, 138, 185, 214, 229; for hospitals, Nos 28, 48, 107, 123, 154, 165, 171, 175, 178, 182, 185, 191; for factory hours, Nos 46, 55, 73, 125, 219.

agent within the Liberal party; its Permissive Bill was, for them, one of those political issues like Home Rule or the attack on Beaconsfieldism – which separated the sheep from the goats. The Conservative prohibitionists were invariably Anglicans, often militantly evangelical. Evangelical not only in religion, if W. R. Callender is representative: for he was also eager to recruit working men into the Tory party. The social views of these Tory prohibitionists were by no means obscurantist: they were drawn away from Liberalism only by their local connexions and religious beliefs. Like R. W. Winfield, the Birmingham brass manufacturer, the Conservative prohibitionists were “truly Liberal in all secular affairs”.1 If one can make such distinctions, their political allegiance followed naturally from their religious experience: it was not a primary determinant of their outlook. For the more closely one investigates prohibitionist beliefs, the clearer it becomes that the most important single influence upon them was their religion.

V

It was essential for any reforming movement at this time to attract religious support, and in 1853 the Alliance wisely launched itself with hymns, prayers and a sermon. Although this was good tactics, it was probably not seen as such, because a deeply held religious faith was itself an inspiration to so many prohibitionists – not least to Nathaniel Card, the founder of the Alliance. The early history of the Alliance constitutes an important, though neglected, phase in the increasing nineteenth-century Christian involvement in social reform. Prohibitionists’ religious faith owed much, of course, to childhood influences – to the pious mothers, Sunday school teachers and family friends whose efforts bore fruit many years later. It was nourished by the family tragedies which in those days were so much more frequent. For at this time the death of a beloved child or relative might well inspire involvement in philanthropic work. “My sole wish”, Josephine Butler declared, after the death of her daughter Eva, “was to plunge into the heart of some human misery, and to say to afflicted people, ‘I understand. I, too, have suffered.’” Her family tragedy led to the mounting of the campaign against the Contagious Diseases Acts; perhaps the prohibitionist zeal of at least

1 E. Edwards, Personal Recollections of Birmingham (Birmingham, 1877), p. 122; for the Conservative prohibitionists, see Nos 24, 54, 73, 75, 151, 156, 185, 234.
five individuals in the 1868-69 prohibitionist sample owed something to the family tragedies they had experienced.¹

So strong were the religious influences acting upon prohibitionists that they were sometimes able to moderate another powerful influence: class-consciousness. A common religious belief helps to explain the close friendship between a gutta percha manufacturer like T. B. Smithies (No 127) and the Earl of Shaftesbury. Benjamin Townson (No 67), too, is interesting in this connexion, for according to his biographer, "the poor clerk or shopman who was trying humbly to serve his God had as much interest in his eyes, and was esteemed as worthy of his friendship as the rich City merchant who could drive his carriage and pair." But the Alliance by no means attracted all Christians, for its leadership was almost exclusively nonconformist; dissenters contributed 108 of the 124 in the sample whose denomination is known. Samuel Pope, the first Alliance secretary, was a son of a

Table 7

Religious adherence of those who gave £5 or more, 1868-69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quaker</th>
<th>Anglican</th>
<th>Wesleyan</th>
<th>Congregationalist</th>
<th>Baptist</th>
<th>Unitarian</th>
<th>United Methodist</th>
<th>&quot;Methodist&quot;</th>
<th>United Presbyterian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evangelical Union</td>
<td>Free Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>Cowherdite</td>
<td>&quot;Nonconformist&quot;</td>
<td>Total unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manchester merchant and came from a radical Baptist family; he was engaged in chemical manufacture, but later took up law. His successor as secretary, the energetic and dedicated cabinetmaker’s son T. H. Barker, was an accountant and commission-agent; he had taken the pledge at the age of 19 from John Cassell in 1837, and left his Wesleyan chapel in Lincoln during the 1840s after a dispute over the use of intoxicating wine. Funds as well as leadership came from nonconformists. The amount given by donors with the prefix “Rev” never amounted to more than 3% of the total received from donors of 5/- or more, though their contribution looks more impressive when expressed as a proportion of total donors. But the

¹ Josephine Butler quo. in my article “Philanthropy and the Victorians”, in: Victorian Studies, June 1966, p. 362. For family tragedies, see Appendix, Nos 5 and 90, 67, 110, 144, 156.
sample includes really prominent laymen in many denominations.¹

In the 1868-69 sample, the Quakers were supreme. They also provided the Alliance with Nathaniel Card, its founder; and with John Hilton, who succeeded J. H. Raper as parliamentary agent. Quakers who were not well-known national figures could often be invaluable in their localities. Without the support of James Cadbury (No 138) at Banbury in the 1850s, for instance, Banbury prohibitionism would have been nowhere. Although in the 1850s the Alliance faced some hostility from Quaker temperance reformers, by 1857 Neal Dow was sitting on Edward Smith’s left hand at the annual gathering of the Friends’ Temperance Union, and prohibitionism was gaining support in The Friend’s editorials and correspondence-columns. Quaker temperance reformers were always more influential than their numbers would suggest, because they were often personally related.²

In its very origins, the Alliance was almost a family concern. Its preliminary meetings were held in the house of Alderman Harvey (No 81); among other prominent Alliance men present were his brother-in-law Joseph Brotherton and his son-in-law James Simpson. Another important Alliance family link in Manchester was that between Samuel Pope and W. R. Callender (No 73), who married Pope’s daughter. Several families gave valuable service to the Alliance – the Whitworths, Peases, Lawsons, Corys and Cadburys. The leading Alliance donors in Cardiff, Darlington and Dublin were almost all related.³ Another religious group was over-represented in Alliance counsels: the Cowherdites, a small Manchester sect. Although Joseph Brotherton, a prominent Cowherdite and pioneer temperance reformer, did not join the Alliance, he attended the discussions which led to its formation, and his Cowherdite brother-in-law William Harvey was at the centre of the prohibitionist world from 1853 to his death in 1870. Brotherton’s friend James Gaskill, also a Cowherdite, was another pioneer prohibitionist, and left £1,000 to the Alliance

² On Cadbury, see B. H. Harrison and B. S. Trinder, op.cit. pp. 37-38. For Quakers, see The Friend, July 1853, p. 112; Nov. 1854, p. 207; Aug. 1855, p. 147; Apr. 1857, p. 70; 1 Oct. 1865, p. 215; 1 Feb. 1866, p. 35; but see ibid., Jan. 1854, p. 12, and July 1855, p. 128.
³ For relationships, see Nos 5 and 90; 7, 8 and 9; 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23; 32, 33 and 34; 35 and 36; 39 and 81; 61, 138, 152, 153 and 154; 88 and 89; 92 and 93; 98, 99 and 100; 142 and 144; 164, 165 and 166; 189 and 190; 200, 201 and 202; 207, 208, 209 and 210.
when he died in 1870. Of other nonconformist groups, Charles Jupe (No 161) the Congregationalist silk manufacturer of Mere, Wiltshire, gave over £4,000 to the Alliance between 1853 and 1873. Unitarians – who contributed 5 of the 124 in the sample – were important intellectually rather than financially. The recorder of Birmingham M. D. Hill helped to draft the Permissive Bill, F. W. Newman (No 42) was the Alliance’s most original and intelligent spokesman in the 1860s, and S. A. Steinthal (No 95) gave powerful aid for many years in Manchester. No Catholic became prominent in the Alliance till Manning joined in 1868. He was a power in himself, but he never succeeded in aligning the whole Catholic hierarchy firmly behind prohibitionism. At least two of the 1868-69 sample returned the hierarchy’s suspicions, but anti-catholicism was distasteful to most prohibitionists, whose obituarists often comment on their unsectarian outlook.1

Significantly, 63 of the 234 donors in the sample supported disestablishment. Like the Liberation Society, the Alliance urged nonconformists forward into public life; it combated sectarian and quietist influences within the temperance movement. Manning was fighting the same battle in the English catholic community. Similar factors may explain the presence in the sample of four Englishmen of foreign extraction. Joseph Sturge, Robert Charleton (No 38) and Joseph Pease (No 19), the first Quaker MP, were all active in assimilating dissenters into the British political community, and George Cadbury (No 152) early abandoned the distinctive dress of the Quakers and worked for freer forms of Quaker worship. John Bright found it so difficult to oppose local option partly because in Quaker politics, prohibitionists were so often fighting by his side in other causes. At least six of the sample left Anglicanism for dissent. Few clergymen contributed to the Alliance before the 1870s, and only 14 Anglicans appear in the sample. But a more dynamic analysis might alter the picture somewhat: for Dean Close’s subscription of two guineas in 1859-60 heralded a change of heart among some Anglican evangelicals. After 1862, with the formation of the Church of England Temperance Society, Anglican teetotalism revived, and the temperance movement became less exclusively dissenting in character and mood. Two Anglicans in the 1868-69 sample – Robert Whitworth (No 99) and the Lucas-Shadwell family (No 149) – were connected with the Church of England Temperance Society. In the early 1870s the support

1 For Manning’s motives, see B. H. Harrison and A. E. Dingle, “Cardinal Manning as Temperance Reformer”, in: Historical Journal, 1969. For anti-Catholics, see Appendix, Nos 24, 75; but see also the unsectarian prohibitionists: Nos 21, 81, 136, 147, 152, 206, 232.
of Bishop Temple helped to get a hearing for local option in Devon, and later in the century the fiery support of Canon Wilberforce was invaluable. Furthermore in the 1860s there were signs of rap-prochement from the other side. As dissenters grew more prosperous, and as their disabilities were steadily removed by the Gladstonian Liberal party – many of them became Anglicans: this applies to at least four of the Anglicans in the sample – to Wilfrid Lawson (No 7), W. R. Callender (No 73), John Greenwood (No 80) and John Guest (No 185). Of the 353 ministers who attended the 1857 Alliance ministerial conference, 33% were Congregationalists, 16% Anglicans and 15% Baptists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UKA 1857 Ministerial Conference: analysis of denominational involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Responded favourably” to letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregationalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive Methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvinistic Methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan New Connexion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Reformer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Episcopal Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It would be wrong to pay too much attention to denominational allegiance: on social questions, the significant divisions often lay within rather than between denominations. The Alliance had been

---

1 For conversions to dissent, see Appendix, Nos 14, 37, 42, 90, 111, 161. For naturalized Englishmen, see Nos 95, 155, 157, 203. The Anglicans in the sample are Nos 7, 24, 27, 31, 73, 75, 80, 99, 124, 136, 149, 156, 185, 192.
founded on a specifically unsectarian basis: "without ignoring the value of intellectual opinions", said the first editorial in its periodical the *Alliance* on 8th July 1854, "we must be content, as fallible beings, to acknowledge that these are less important, because less certain in their guarantees, than those universal aspirations and social interests which bind the races of man together." Prohibitionists in the 1868-69 sample delighted in abandoning theological differences for the sake of co-operating in moral and social reform, and were eager to attract the masses into Christianity through involving the churches in the world. The evangelical clergyman G. T. Fox (No 24) held special evening services for working men in his Durham church – carrying out at a humbler level the policy which A. C. Tait promoted on a larger stage as Bishop of London. Many accompanied these attitudes with a distinctively personal philanthropy. William Gregson in the late 1850s marvelled to see the quantity of food carried away from the Jupe family table for distribution to the poor; clearly this Alliance donor was making a definite effort to model himself on his Saviour.¹

Joseph Lingford (No 18), the Quaker baking-powder manufacturer of Bishop Auckland, and Thomas Emmott (No 102) of Oldham gave a free tea to the aged poor of the town every New Year’s Day. Richard Allen (No 205) risked smallpox to attend the wounded during the Franco-Prussian War; Edward Pearson (No 90) and Gurney Pease (No 22) both ran their own Bible classes, and by the 1880s the banker Charles Gillett (No 139) was giving free breakfasts to the children of the Banbury poor during the winter months.

It might of course be argued that these men could well afford their philanthropy. J. G. Richardson (No 204) with his landscape gardening, James Fildes (No 79) with his orchids and his grapes, William Euing (No 222) with his great collection of music and books, W. R. Callender (No 73) with his noted collection of china, and Alderman Williamson (No 28) with his villa on Lake Como – these were not men who gave their all to the poor. Yet many of them went to considerable personal trouble and danger in their philanthropy. Dr McCulloch’s (No 214) efforts against cholera caused him to catch the disease twice; Edward Backhouse (No 29) and James Cadbury (No 138) toured local drinking places to discover the evils within; Edward Whitwell (No 160) and J. G. Richardson (No 204) were among the many prohibitionists who distributed tracts when out travelling. Some sacrificed business profits for the sake of their moral principles, and others – like William

Matthews (No 37) – retired early to devote their lives to philanthropy. Edward Backhouse was one of several who suffered financially by his lack of interest in the family firm. Many prohibitionists spent far less on themselves than was customary among people with their income: William Hoyle’s architect noted his constant concern to avoid extravagance when designing his new house; Cardinal Manning’s rigorous self-denial emaciated him. This was no cold or kidglove philanthropy, but a warm benevolence requiring real enthusiasm and effort. In analysing the 1868-69 sample we pass in review several of the men who created Britain’s economic prosperity in the nineteenth-century – men who did more than many of their contemporaries to ensure that their wealth benefited others beside themselves. Nor was their business success unconnected with the possession of a certain moral fibre which they tried to inculcate in others. It is difficult to deny that the 234 prohibitionists of 1868-69 were doing their best to relieve the miseries which surrounded them in the only way that they knew.

VI

It is clear, then, that the prohibitionists reinforce the case against Dicey’s crude periodisation of nineteenth-century attitudes to the state; for here is state intervention in its most extreme form emanating from mid-Victorian provincial Liberals and nonconformists – precisely the people from whom one might have expected strict laissez faire views. Biographical analysis of the prohibitionists highlights other defects in Dicey’s argument. He stressed the individualism displayed by evangelicals and Benthamites in the nineteenth-century: “the appeal of the Evangelicals to personal religion corresponds with the appeal of Benthamite Liberals to individual energy.” Yet in the Alliance we find the two groups co-operating, not in promoting laissez faire policies, but in promoting state intervention. Prohibitionists enthusiastically drew out the collectivist aspects of Benthamism. In the Alliance Prize Essay, handbook of prohibitionist advocacy, F. R. Lees took some trouble to show that “the general principles of law laid down by BENTHAM” were “in perfect accordance with the views of the ‘Alliance’”. Several prohibitionist speakers stressed how prohibition followed logically from Bentham’s basic principle – that

1 For personal charity, see Nos 18, 34, 41, 78, 90, 102, 137, 138, 139, 143, 150, 160, 161, 204, 224. For sacrifice of business profits, see Nos 37, 138, 152, 160, 191, 204, 206. See also the many conscientious refusals of office in the sample: Nos 7, 19, 42, 61, 97, 152, 153, 181, 185, 204, 210.
2 A. V. Dicey, Law and Opinion, p. 400.
governments should pursue "the greatest happiness of the greatest number". "I want to know how you reconcile with that principle", said the radical Washington Wilks at an Alliance meeting in 1864, "a system which ruins many for the advantage of only a very few, which makes more orphans and widows than the bloodiest campaign?" Still more valuable to the Alliance was Bentham's reaction against extreme libertarianism in his Principles of the Civil Code: "Liberty, which is one branch of security, ought to yield to general security, since it is not possible to make any laws but at the expense of liberty."1

Some prominent intellectuals influenced by utilitarianism behaved as Dicey leads us to expect: J. S. Mill and Robert Lowe are two whose opposition to prohibition was conspicuous. Nevertheless, several utilitarians were attracted into the Alliance during the 1850s: notably the Earl of Harrington, M. D. Hill, and Lord Brougham. It was natural for manufacturers, utilitarians and evangelical Christians to co-operate in Alliance work; for all wanted to ensure that prosperity promoted rather than retarded further economic growth, and fostered a humane society. Traditionally, increased wages had been spent on drink rather than on expanding the home market for consumer-goods. Benjamin Whitworth at an Alliance conference in autumn 1872 "regarded the annihilation of the liquor traffic as equivalent to an increase in the wages of the working classes of 25 per cent".2 Prohibitionists often cited contemporary criminologists who argued that, under existing conditions, higher wages meant more crime. John Clay, the famous chaplain of Preston gaol, argued in his prison reports that summary offences increased during periods of prosperity and declined during strikes and depressions, when working people were too poor to drink in excess. Much to the disgust of Thomas Hodgskin in the Economist, Clay proceeded to generalise from criminal behaviour about the habits of the working classes as a whole.3 His findings were apparently confirmed during the strike of 1853, when summary offences fell, and when Preston’s weekly expenditure on drink declined by £1,000. Cobden and others were convinced by this strike that principles of political economy must be more widely diffused if the nation was to acquire "the ability to bear a temporary prosperity". Preston strikers who claimed that their class lacked

capital were ridiculed by Samuel Pope: "the working classes have the capital", he said, "but they pour it down their throats."\(^1\) John Clay had long admired Preston teetotalism, and the Alliance attached much value to his reports. It claimed during the cotton famine that the simultaneous fall in alcohol consumption and in the crime rate vindicated Clay against Hodgskin: "why cannot these things be in prosperous times?" it asked; "the right answer is, they can be. If it were not for the liquor-traffic, they would be."\(^2\) The temperance movement had always been preoccupied with the problem of crime, and by attracting the support of M. D. Hill, Mary Carpenter and Henry Brougham, the Alliance tightened the links between the temperance and criminological worlds still further.

Strenuous efforts were made in the Alliance periodical *Meliora* to give an intellectual justification to prohibition and to align it with the contemporary movement for social science. At the 1861 Social Science Congress J. H. Raper was seen spreading the Alliance gospel to all who would listen: "there was not a half-disclosed friend that he did not ply with argument, persuasion, and documents, until he won him over." When Brougham referred at the 1859 Congress to the "Grand Alliance", Samuel Pope expressed delight and claimed that his speech had given the cause "a ten years impetus". Although prohibitionism encountered much initial opposition within the Social Science Association, it made steady progress there, and by the 1880s temperance legislation had become the Association's only remedy for the social evils of the day. Admittedly, Dicey stressed the "socialistic" implications of Benthamite doctrines: but he saw these as being drawn out only by politicians responding to what he calls "the democratic socialism of 1905". The study of prohibitionist propaganda shows individuals from the worlds of industry, criminology, evangelicalism and social science drawing out these implications as early as the 1850s.\(^3\)

Dicey's utilitarians believed in "the supreme value of individual liberty"; yet in the Alliance several of them pursued it through legislation which proposed drastically to *curb* individual liberty.

---

2. UKA, 10th Annual Report 1862, p. 3.
"To socialism of any kind they were thoroughly opposed", Dicey writes: yet several of them joined an organisation whose arguments were decidedly collectivist.1 How far do the prohibitionists between 1853 and 1872 embarrass Dicey's general interpretation of state intervention in nineteenth-century England? They surely modify his generalisation that during the years 1825-70 Benthamism "swept away restraints on individual energy, and . . . exhibited a deliberate hostility to every historical anomaly or survival, which appeared to involve practical inconvenience, or in any way to place a check on individual freedom". Far from wishing to abolish the restraints of the licensing system, prohibitionists campaigned to tighten them up (though at the same time to bring them under popular control). Admittedly in studying the Alliance apologia one finds support for Dicey's belief that, in a democratic age, the principle of utility was "a principle big with revolution": yet the principle was being used in this way by Dicey's arch-individualists — by evangelicals and Benthamites — long before the end of his period of "individualism". Nor were any special changes needed to bring "into prominence the authoritative side of Benthamite Liberalism", for that authoritative aspect was fully apparent in Bentham's own writing, as expounded by F. R. Lees in the Alliance Prize Essay of 1856.2 The Alliance was fully aware that modern urban conditions had created a new role for the state: as one supporter put it — "nothing can be plainer than that, in a well-ordered and vigorous society, general welfare must always override individual interest."3 Individuals could not be perfected in isolation. In its early years the Alliance cited many contemporary precedents for liquor restriction: the quarantine laws, legislation against poisons, adulteration, obscene literature, noxious fumes and explosives.

Dicey failed to emphasise that two aspects of contemporary evangelicalism and Benthamism conflicted with his general interpretation of state intervention in nineteenth-century England. He admitted that utilitarianism had "inherited some of its most valuable ideas from Puritanism", yet he ignored the collectivist strands in the puritan tradition. Society's aim, wrote the Alliance, was "not individuality, but socialism; that is, the maintenance implicitly of the guarantees which have been decided to be common rights".4 There was in the Alliance, and in puritanism in general, a very marked

1 A. V. Dicey, op.cit. pp. 175, 173.
2 Ibid., pp. 64, 304, 309.
sense of community responsibility for social evils. Need society be so arranged, asked the Alliance, that “no feeble one shall stand, no defenceless person be protected, no ailing body supported”? Was there not “a certain amount of care which society should collectively bestow on its weak, its unformed, and its misformed members, so that there shall be amongst them as little necessity of failure, as much freedom from temptation... as shall at any rate secure... to every one of them the possibility of standing?” Nonconformist moral reformers often displayed an almost irresponsible contempt for “property in vice”.¹ Beatrice Webb observed dissenting communities in Lancashire during 1886: “the religious socialism of the dissenting communities is very remarkable”, she wrote, “each circle forming a ‘law unto itself’ to which the individual must submit or be an outcast”. Libertarian principles could hardly stand in the way of the godly community. The Alliance was only applying to the community at large the “socialism” of chapel life. Its Permissive Bill was a sort of mass “conversion experience” by which the national life could be transformed. Mid-Victorian nonconformist temperance reformers, like seventeenth-century Calvinists, displayed two largely contradictory tendencies: a militant individualism, certainly, but also an authoritarian collectivism.²

Secondly, Dicey ignores the direct conflict between individualism and the humanitarianism which (as he himself says) characterised evangelicalism and Benthamism. He knew that “the age of individualism was emphatically the era of humanitarianism”, yet he gave no attention to the fact that early nineteenth-century humanitarians conducted a continuous critique of laissez faire principles.³ Prohibitionists ridiculed the indiscriminate application of free trade dogma; they eagerly publicised the evil results of the 1830 Beer Act, which instituted partial free trade in beer; and they vigorously attacked Gladstone for his free licensing campaign of the 1860s. F. W. Newman “really was astonished to find educated men talking about free-trade as if it were in some sense a panacea, a cure for all evils”. Like the anti-slavery reformers of an earlier generation, Samuel Pope emphasised in 1861 that “everything that looked like

trade, and every bargain, was not trade"; prohibitionists liked to brand the drink trade as the liquor "traffic".1

Yet the Alliance was not as strongly collectivist as it seems at first sight. Indeed, such a standpoint would have been puzzling in a predominantly nonconformist movement, hostile to parliament, suspicious of London, enthusiastic for self-help and voluntary action. The Alliance in fact favoured state intervention only of a peculiar sort, and its activities are less embarrassing to Dicey’s argument than those of some other humanitarian agencies. Whereas the Royal Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals saw itself as "a kind of auxiliary to the legislature", built up a formidable body of legislation, and created a large staff of inspectors to enforce it – prohibitionists never advocated the creation of a staff of inspectors, and showed no marked enthusiasm when H. A. Bruce embraced inspection in his Licensing Bills of 1871 and 1872.2 Biographical analysis shows that prohibitionists at the local level were often tackling the drink problem in very practical ways. But at the national level they desired no more than a symbolic declaration of support for their own voluntary and personal philanthropic activity: they were not advocating an efficient police or administrative machine which would supersede that activity. The Alliance was remarkably uninterested in questions of practical enforcement. Its Permissive Bill would not have increased the administrative authority of government in any way: it would have added nothing to its power and patronage, for by simultaneously depriving governments of drink revenue, by reducing the need for police, and by nourishing local self-government, it would actually minimise the contact between the state and the citizen. And insofar as prohibition superseded the licensing system, it would deprive the aristocracy of a means of distributing rewards to those who had served their class and creed. It would not increase taxation in any way: prohibitionists opposed drink taxes as tainted sources of government revenue which implicated all citizens in an iniquitous trade – a policy which conflicted with their formal objective of combating drunkenness. Drink taxes seemed to them "the price of blood" falling into the exchequer "heavy with the curse of God".3 And prohibitionists

argued that their reform, by promoting individual morality, would so reduce the expenses of government that no new taxes need be imposed to replace the diminished drink revenues. The Alliance’s major concern was to register a protest at the prevailing level of drinking; it was not interested in licensing reforms which assumed that the evil would continue, in however diminished a form. Some prohibitionists did not even see the Permissive Bill as a permanent enactment: for, as M. D. Hill put it, “a break in the custom might, in our present stage of civilisation, be all that the case requires”.¹ The Alliance News on 7th January 1871 considered it “a most dishonouring and dangerous tendency of our age to increase the extension of Government agency”.

Like so many of the Liberals’ early essays in state intervention, the Alliance resorted to the state only to create the type of self-directed, rational, sober citizen who, once created, could ensure the effectiveness of *laissez faire* policies. It defined liberty as “the state of a balanced and rational exercise of power, defined by the constitutional limits of the law”, which it knew could hardly characterise the slumdweller surrounded by drinkshops.² Prohibitionists claimed that many adults were “very much in the condition of children” and that the drunkard was “almost like a paralysed man; you may tell him to move his hands, and it is just what he wants to do, but he cannot do it.”³ Yet these collectivist arguments were not used to justify welfare provision – if only because Alliance supporters were frequently self-made men who believed that voluntary and local action was the best way to obtain housing and sanitary reform, and other environmental improvements. State intervention was far more tolerable to the mid-Victorians if administered locally and imposed as a result of local choice rather than of central command. In supporting Josephine Butler’s crusade against the state regulation of prostitution, many prohibitionists revealed the intensity of their belief in the inviolability of the individual, and in the importance of holding him or her responsible for the consequences of his or her sin. The Alliance aimed only at giving *indirect* aid to the poor – by cultivating their initiative, rationality and thrift, and ultimately by developing their sense of individual moral responsibility. By internalising social discipline in the individual citizen, the Alliance hoped to supersede the government’s order-

² Quotation from Meliora, II, No 8, p. 345 (c.1861).
keeping role. "I'm worth more than ten policemen", said the temperance reformer Revd J. Broadbent: the more Broadbents there were, the cheaper and the less powerful government need be.¹

Liberals first abandoned their hostility to state intervention in the spheres of temperance and education: for if the state could promote these virtues in the citizen, it might eventually be able to wither away altogether. Prohibitionists are therefore not quite as embarrassing to Dicey as they might at first seem. They too, like their opponent Richard Cobden, hoped that "the governing system of this world" might "revert to something like the municipal system"; their Permissive Bill was designed to promote just such a development. They too, like their opponent W. L. Courtney, hoped that posterity might see "the ultimate realisation of a perfect order without coercion, and of the service that shall be perfect freedom".²

**APPENDIX**

Prohibitionists who gave £5 or more to the United Kingdom Alliance in financial year 1868-69³

_Berkshire_

1. **Reading**: A. Waterhouse (£5)

This could have been the Alfred Waterhouse who settled at Reading in the early 1860s and acted as trustee for Reading Savings Bank, 1865-71. He was a Quaker cotton broker who retired at age 47. Alternatively, it could have been his eldest son Alfred Waterhouse (1830-1905), the famous architect, who was living in Reading at the time. Alfred Waterhouse Jun. was born in Liverpool, educated at Tottenham, and began as an architect on his own account in 1853, in Manchester. He soon built up a successful practice in the North of England, married 1860, F.R.I.B.A. 1861. He designed the Manchester town hall opened in 1877, and the Natural History Museum completed in 1880. He was always ready to try out new methods and materials, and was one of the first architects to use constructional ironwork. At the height of his career "was regarded as the chief figure in the profession by a large majority of his fellow architects"

1 Broadbent, quo. in P. T. Winskill, Temperance Movement and its Workers, IV, p. 213.
3 _Abbreviations_: CD Acts = Contagious Diseases Acts; Congr. = Congregationalist; Presb. = Presbyterian.
Anglican, fond of painting. Helped to found the Society for Checking the Abuses of Public Advertising, of which he was president till 1901. He detested the way advertising was spoiling the environment. A lifelong teetotaler, he was prepared to offer intoxicants to his guests. His brother Edwin (1841-1917) was a famous accountant and head of Price, Waterhouse and Co., 1887-1905. Like Alfred Waterhouse Jun. he was brought up as a strict Quaker, but joined the Church of England later in life.

Cambridgeshire

2. Wisbeach: Richard Dawbarn (£20)

Cheshire

3. Alderley Edge: Mrs Mary H. Martindale (£20)
No information.

4. Birkenhead: Geo. Dobson (£5)
No information.

5. Wilmslow: Mrs Charlotte E. Pearson (£5)
Born c. 1802, widow of the Quaker Benjamin Pearson and mother of Edward Pearson the Manchester wool-merchant (No 90). Died 1887.

Cumberland

6. Allonby: Thomas Williamson (£5.5.0)
1815-87. Quaker farmer and a principal landowner in Allonby. Married, 4 sons, all of whom became farmers. His 2nd wife was Norwegian, one daughter. Mannix and Whellan's History, Gazetteer and Directory of Cumberland (1847) says that the Allonby Meeting House was attended by a "numerous and highly respectable portion of the inhabitants".

7. Brayton: Sir W. Lawson (£551)
fully contested Carlisle 1868 as champion of Irish Church disestablishment. Voted for inquiry into Queen's expenditure, 1872. Favoured Sunday opening of museums. Continuously advocated Permissive Bill in parliament during 1870s. Carried local option resolution 1880. Opposed CD Acts, anti-gambling. “I doubt if anyone had a more intense admiration of Mr. Gladstone than I had” (quo. in G. W. E. Russell, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, p. 245). One of the few feminists to hold to the female suffrage amendment to the 1884 Reform Bill. Defeated at 1885 election, despite Home Rule sympathies – largely by the Irish vote. MP for Cockermouth, 1886. 1892, succeeded after long campaign in preventing parliament adjourning for the Derby. Pro-Boer, defeated at 1900 election. MP for Camborne, 1903. Passionately opposed tariff reform. Again MP for Cockermouth 1906. Refused Campbell-Bannerman's offer of privy councillorship 1906 because "if a man did his duty, it brought its own reward with it". Gained notoriety for his sense of humour, his passionate radicalism, his resolute independence.

8. **Brayton**: Miss Lawson and Sisters (£20)

9. **Brayton**: Lady Lawson (£5)

10. **Maryport**: W. Adair (£5)

Born 1830 of teetotal family. Draper, Liberation Society, early UKA supporter.

11. **Waverton**: Richard Hall (£5)

1815-81, pious parents. Educated Wigton school, where his parents were superintendent and housekeeper 1826-29. Then they settled at Waverton, where Richard lived throughout his life. Married, 1838. Active in Quaker work, elder from 1856. Peace Society, and refused to pay the addition to the income tax required by Abyssinian War expenses. Farmer. Died leaving £2,738 gross. His estate was agricultural, with a small amount of property, including the White Horse Temperance Inn, Waverton.

12. **Thurisle**: Sir R. Brisco (£30.10.0)


**Derbyshire**

13. **Belper**: A. Smedley and Bros. (£10)

Alfred, Frederick and James Smedley owned the Eagle ironworks, Belper, founded 1855. The firm manufactured steam-engines and boilers, and heavy construction cast and wrought ironwork of every kind. All three brothers
teetotalers. Alfred Smedley, born 1830, was a public benefactor, United Methodist, subscribed to Liberation Society, and was a leading Belper Liberal, and Band of Hope worker.

14. LEA AND HOLLOWAY: JOHN SMEDLEY (£10.10.0)

Born Wirksworth, 1803. Paternal ancestors local lead miners. Grandfather became a spinner and hosiery manufacturer. His father continued in the firm. His mother of a good Derbyshire family – one of her ancestors had owned Winster Hall, and a large estate. When John inherited the family firm, it was financially unsound. Intolerant and impatient by nature, John was very energetic, and put the firm on a secure footing, manufacturing underclothing. By 1840, he had made enough to leave the firm to be managed by a deputy, and embarked on foreign travel. He caught a fever soon after. Doctors could do nothing, but he recovered and realised that hitherto he had been no more than a mere professing Christian. He had always been angry at the local Anglicans when they rejected his suggestions for reform, and now at age approx. 43 he became a Wesleyan. Preached righteousness, temperance and the judgment to come. Built several chapels in the area. Daily services before work at his factory during the 1850s, combining hymns, lectures on scientific subjects, Bible-reading and prayer – all conducted by himself. By 1872, he was providing meals, adequate washing facilities and medical treatment for his employees. Liberation Society. Began to question current medical practice. Had himself benefited from hydropathy. Founded a small non-profitmaking hospital. By 1867 more than 2,000 patients were being treated there annually. Wrote Practical Hydropathy. Total abstainer. His originality “bordered on eccentricity” (H. Steer, The Smedleys of Matlock Bank, 1897).

15. CHESTERFIELD: JAMES CAMPBELL (£5)

No information.

Devon

16. PLYMOUTH: SAMUEL ELLIOTT (£5)

1818-82. 2nd son of well-known Liskeard temperance reformer and philanthropist, Timber-merchant, Quaker elder and teetotaler from c. 1838. Married 1843, and moved to Plymouth. Town councillor, school board, poor law guardian. Subscribed to Liberation Society, supported Sunday schools.

Dorset

17. PORTLAND: J. BERRESFORD (£10)

No information.

Co. Durham

18. BISHOP AUCKLAND: JOSEPH LINGFORD (£10)

1829-1918. Born Snenton, near Nottingham. Quaker parents. Educated Friends’ School, Ackworth. Trained as grocer, and in 1852 began as retail grocer on own

19. DARLINGTON: JOSEPH PEASE (£75)

1799-1872. Born Darlington, 2nd son of Edward Pease, the Quaker railway promoter and owner of one of the largest woollen manufacturing firms in the North of England. Pious parents. Educated at Leeds Quaker school. As teenager, entered the family woollen mills. 1820, prominent in sponsoring the early Stockton and Darlington railway. A leading promoter of the company formed to develop Middlesbrough estate. Never himself engaged in iron manufacture, but acquired ironstone royalties. Married 1826, the youngest daughter of the teetotal Quaker J. J. Gurney, 8 sons. Liberal, and much interested in the Reform Bill debate. Elected MP for S. Durham 1832-41, but retired because too busy elsewhere. First Quaker MP. "His admission on his affirmation was an era in the history of religious liberty" (Annual Monitor, 1873, p. 106). One of the first elected members of the local board of health, and refused request to become first mayor of Darlington, 1867. Established 3 schools in the town at own expense, and helped found schools throughout County Durham. Presented Market Tower Clock to the town and helped lay out local open spaces. Quaker minister from 1864. Liberation Society; president, Peace Society from 1860. Supported Bible Society, British and Foreign Schools Society, generous to Quaker schools. Vigorously anti-slavery. Helped RSPCA in 1830s in its efforts to root out cruel sports. Supported several temperance missionaries and generous to temperance movement as a whole.

20. DARLINGTON: EDWARD PEASE (£50)


21. DARLINGTON: ARTHUR PEASE (£50)

1837-98. Born Darlington, 3rd son of Joseph Pease. Worked for a time in the family woollen mills. Married 1864, 4 sons, 3 daughters. Prominent in national affairs, director of many local companies, especially the Stockton and Darlington railway. Supported Liberation Society. A Quaker minister, unsectarian in

22. DARLINGTON: GURNEY PEASE (£40)

23. DARLINGTON: CHARLES PEASE (£40)
1843-73, 5th son of Joseph Pease. Active in social reform and in the family business, but not as prominent in local life as his father or brothers. Married 1871, Quaker. Subscribed to Liberation Society. Mechanics' institutes, Sunday schools.

24. DURHAM CITY: REV. G. T. FOX (£5)

25. GATESHEAD: ALD. W. BROWNE (£5)
c. 1798-1884. Partner in the firm of John Abbott, Gateshead ironfounders. Rose from ironmonger's apprentice to become one of Tyneside's most successful businessmen. Married, 2 daughters. Prominent local Wesleyan. Poor law guardian, magistrate, for many years town councillor, mayor of Gateshead 1858 and 1869. Generous to local charities.

Glass and oil merchant with premises in Newcastle, but lived in Gateshead. Quaker, Liberation Society. In charge of the property committee of the Friends' Meeting House, Newcastle, 1860-95.

27. **Gateshead: Robert Stirling Newall (£5)**

1812-89. Born Dundee. In 1840, took out patent for inventing wire ropes and established rope factory in Gateshead. One of the most active members of the River Tyne Commission 1876. Alderman of Gateshead for 25 years, mayor 1867, 1868. JP. Developed the definitive form of submarine cable; personally directed submergence of many cables because of the lack of trained engineers. Probably an Anglican. Interested in astronomy, and his enterprise caused a great increase in the size of refracting telescopes. Elected Fellow, Royal Astronomical Society, 1864. FRS 1875.

28. **South Shields: Alderman J. Williamson (£10)**

1825-87. Son of an original partner in Jarrow Chemical Co. Well educated at Hull. Entered Jarrow Alkali Works c. 1841. This firm eventually became Jarrow Chemical Co., and he died a director. Mayor of South Shields 1858, 1859, 1868. Magistrate 1860. Eventually bought a villa on Lake Como, and spent part of every year there. Generous to South Shields local hospitals, libraries and Anglican churches. Keen on church music. Liberal, but opposed home rule. Keenly supported the United Kingdom of Italy. Interested in volunteer movement.

29. **Sunderland: Edward Backhouse (£50)**

1808-79. Born Darlington. His family were bankers and colliery owners. Conversion experience at approx. age 30. Not active in the family firm. Quaker and minister from 1854. Artist and scholar. Keen Liberal, but kept himself free for philanthropy. Long treasurer to Bible Society and president Sunderland Total Abstinence Society. Anti-slavery. Supported Liberation Society. Prominent Sunderland philanthropist, shrewd but deeply religious. His name "is a household word among us" (Sunderland Daily Echo, 1879). Keen on mission work among sailors. Wrote a book on early church history. Information gained in the early 1860s from his personal visits to Sunderland drinking-places roused such indignation locally that many licences were withheld. The inquiry also led Backhouse to establish a home for prostitutes. He later opposed the CD Acts, and established a mission house at the East end of the town. Active in the anti-spirits, teetotal phases of the temperance movement. Vice-president, UKA.

30. **Sunderland: Thomas Blain (£5)**

1812-89. Accountant and shipowner. For many years connected with Messrs. Joshua Wilson and Bros, as manager of their sailing vessels and other depts. Quaker, subscribed to Liberation Society. Close personal friend of Charles Wilson (No 33).

31. **Sunderland: George Robert Booth, JP (£5)**

1816-1906. Son of a shipowner, educated Germany and later in business as
marine underwriter. Anglican. Magistrate, chairman of gas works, and member of River Wear Commission and other local bodies.

32. SUNDERLAND: CALEB STANSFIELD WILSON (£20)

33. SUNDERLAND: CHARLES WILSON (£20)
1815-86. Partner in Joshua Wilson and Bros. In the days of sailing vessels, looked after crew as well as cargo. Quaker, Liberal. Not active in local politics, being of too quiet a temperament. Helped found the first Sunderland ragged school 1849. Interested in reformatory and industrial schools. Earnestly supported the local British School. Well informed in the ancient languages required for closely studying the Bible. Knowledgeable on botany. "One of the most unostentatious but one of the most useful of our townsmen" (Sunderland Daily Echo obituary).

34. SUNDERLAND: HENRY WILSON (£20)
1808-77. Partner in Joshua Wilson and Bros. Poor law guardian. Quaker, subscribed to Liberation Society. Active philanthropist and especially interested in YMCA, Bible Society, local schools and reformatory institutions. Active in Sunday school work, and distributed tracts when out walking.

Essex

35. CHELMSFORD: JAMES CHRISTY (£5)

36. CHELMSFORD: MISS CAROLINE MARRIAGE (£5)
1802-84. Her family were millers, corn merchants and farmers, and were connected with the Christys by marriage. Quaker, Liberation Society.

37. EARL’S COLNE: WILLIAM MATTHEWS (£5)
Of farming stock. In his youth a private in the grenadier guards, and for a time secretary to Sir Hudson Lowe. Not Quaker by birth, but his parents sympathised with Quaker views and he occasionally attended Westminster Quaker meeting in full military uniform. Ill-health caused his discharge, and he became a prosperous seedfarmer in Earl’s Colne, at least from the time of his marriage in 1861. Reputedly a hard master. Liberal, sabbatarian, and supported Liberation Society. Anti-smoking. Became a Quaker. At the height of his success he sold much of his land in order to leave himself free for religious activity. "Even in public ministry his manners and speech revealed the erstwhile soldier of the Guards: his upright bearing the positive and unmistakable character of his teaching" (J. T. Mills, John Bright, I, p. 346). Died 1904.
38. Bristol: Robert Charleton (£60)


39. Bristol: Herbert Thomas (£60)

Married sister of Mary Carpenter the penal reformer. Prominent Bristol Liberal in the 1860s. Favoured disestablishment.

40. Cirencester: William Brewin (£5)


41. Cirencester: Isaac Pitt (£5)


42. Clifton: F. W. Newman (£21)

1805-97. Born London, 3rd son of John Newman, banker. Mother a Calvinist of Huguenot descent. Brother of J. H. Newman. Educated Ealing private school. Confirmed 1821. BA Oxon. double first classics/mathematics 1826. Fellow of Balliol. Resigned fellowship 1830, unable to subscribe to the articles. Influenced by Plymouth Brethren. Went on mission to Baghdad 1830. Various academic posts till appointed professor of Latin, University Coll. London 1846. Wrote *Phases of Faith*, 1850. Remained a theist, but rejected orthodox Christianity. Joined British and Foreign Unitarian Association 1876. "He was the individualist of theology" (*Inquirer*, 9 Oct. 1897). Dr Martineau felt that in him "Bibliolatry was replaced by Iconoclasm". Not the type of person to attract disciples. Keen political radical, friend of Mazzini and Kossuth. In the 1860s Lords reform, rationalisation of parliamentary procedure, female suffrage, creation of a new heptarchy, direct accountability of MPs to constituents – all these were grist to his mill. Like Cobden and Bright he believed that the aristocracy turned taxes and government posts to their own purposes. He represented all the aspects of contemporary Liberalism which Matthew Arnold abhorred – for he espoused a host of reforming causes designed to break up the traditional society without providing any greater security or grandeur. Opposed vaccination and vivisection. Later in life became a vegetarian. Opposed CD Acts, pioneer feminist, and an ardent Gladstonian later in life. Strongly
opposed birth-control. Eccentric in appearance and dress, anti-smoking. Copious writer. Supported UKA from the late 1850s, largely because he felt it would rejuvenate politics, cut government costs, and promote decentralisation. He felt that moral reform should precede franchise extension. Afraid of the urban mob, he believed that with temperance they might be refined. One of the three most distinguished prohibitionist advocates in the 1860s. His political analyses were sometimes perceptive, often absurdly ill-judged, but always original. Teetotaler 1861.

43. **Stonehouse**: Charles Hooper (£5)

No information.

44. **Woodchester**: Lt. Col. W. C. Statther (£10)

Probably from a local family of clothing manufacturers. Retired from Indian army, 1856. Voted Liberal, 1868.

*Hampshire*

45. **Fordingbridge**: W. R. Neave (£5.5.0)


*Lancashire*

46. **Ashton-under-Lyne**: Hugh Mason (£100)

1883 Manchester by-election candidature. Strongly supported Nine Hours Bill. Anti-tobacco, and City Jackdaw Dec. 1875 maintained that “there is an 'am I not holier than thou' air about Mr. Mason, which is aggravating to the ordinary run of sinners”. W. H. Mills, Manchester Reform Club, 1922, p. 10 says: "either one belonged to that half of society which accounted him as little less than deity or to the other half of society which stoned his carriage windows.” Much hated, much loved. Had the habit of "carrying all questions in politics, morals, and conduct to the Higher Powers and coming down from Sinai thoroughly prepared to act”. Vice-president UKA. Prominent among Lancashire temperance reformers.

47. **ALTCAR: RICHARD MARSHALL (£20)**

Probably from a local family of Methodist farmers, but no precise information.

48. **BOLTON: ALD. J. BARLOW (£20)**

1821-87. Born Tottington, Lanes. Began by helping his father, a small farmer. Then cotton manufacturer on his own account. Initial setbacks, but succeeded and came to Bolton 1846. Applied steampower to weaving fancy quilts and overcame great opposition from handloom weavers who feared unemployment. His firm very versatile in manufacture, and won many exhibition prizes. In 1874, with Thomas Hughes QC, he enabled his workpeople to obtain shares in an industrial partnership scheme. This succeeded, and in 1875 the firm became a limited liability company. **Bolton Daily Chronicle** obituarist wrote: “with the cotton industry in its various branches, Mr. Barlow’s name has long been . . . associated most intimately, for there are few if any gentlemen who have done more to aid in its progress and development”. Enthusiastic Liberal, but in 1885 refused requests to stand as Liberal candidate for Bolton. Town councillor 1853-56, 1862-71. Mayor 1867, re-elected 1868. Prominent in obtaining an excellent water-supply from Bolton corporation; active in campaign for improved lighting. Member of school board for 3 years from 1870. Close friend of the respected local philanthropist Dr Chadwick. Prominent Wesleyan, and founded children’s home. On Bolton special relief committee during cotton famine. Gave £1000 to Bolton Infirmary. A leading founder of workshops for the blind in Bolton. Local missionary and educational movements, mechanics’ institute. A modest but much respected local figure. Very active in local temperance movement, he and William Hoyle being "the leading lights of temperance in Lancashire". President, British Temperance League, strongly supported Blue Ribbon Army.

49. **BOLTON: JAMES BARLOW (£25)**

No information.

50. **BOLTON: JOHN HODGKINSON (£5)**

No information.

51. **BOLTON: ROBERT SMALLY, JP (£40)**

52. Bentham: J. T. Rice (£10)


53. Burnley: Henry Nutter (£5)

1828-97. Born Barrowford. Father a shoemaker, and he himself learnt the trade, but became cotton spinner and manufacturer at Burnley; bad trade closed his mill in 1880 and Nutter was left poor. Methodist. Cheery personality, always able to entertain with recitations and flute. A founder-member of Burnley Literary and Scientific Club, which flourished 1873-97. Devoted to Darwin and Darwinism. President Burnley Literary and Philosophical Society 1893-97. Tender-hearted, candid, "too impulsively generous to be discriminating" (Burnley Gazette, 19 Mar. 1898). Worshipped Robert Burns, whose works he carried about with him. This enthusiasm "merged into monomania". Annual pilgrimage to Burns' haunts and homes. Well informed on astronomy and an enthusiast for geology. Lectured on both.

54. Bury: James Clarkson Kay (£10)


55. Bury: John Robinson Kay (£10)

1806-72. Born Burnley, son of Thomas Kay cotton manufacturer. Millowner, carrying on father's business. Shareholder Bury Banking Co. Director Lancs. and Yorks. Railway Co. One of the earliest presidents of Bury Athenaeum. Favoured the Ten Hours Bill 1844. JP from 1849. Prominent Methodist. Watchman 27 Mar. 1872 claimed "he was the leading promoter of Education among us" and gave 3 full columns to his obituary and funeral. He was among the leading laymen in the 1840s who obtained the formation of an education fund for Wesleyan day schools. Subscribed to Liberation Society. Generous to Methodist missions at home and abroad. Principal pioneer promoter of London Quarterly Review.

56. Bury: Samuel Smith (£5)


57. Colne: Robert Shaw, MP (£12)

1809-85. Born Trawden. Father a steward, and Robert in youth helped him
with farm work. Robert first became clerk to his uncle at Greenfield corn mill. Then partner with his brother-in-law 1839 in a weaving-mill with 300 looms. Hoyle then retired, and Shaw went into partnership with another brother-in-law and built Greenfield Mill. This partnership later dissolved, and Shaw rented a mill where he began spinning with 10,000 spindles. This number he soon doubled. The huge Stanley Mills weaving-shed was built 1862-64. By 1883, the whole building was complete. In 1881 Shaw took his two sons into partnership. Employed 1,200 hands, and at one time paid approx. one tenth of the whole town rates. By 1885 he and his sons had over 60,000 spindles and 2,600 looms between them — one of the biggest private firms in Lancashire. Director of Craven Bank from its foundation. Liberal. Chairman, local board. Magistrate from 1873. Robert knew all his workpeople by sight and most by name. Originally an Inghamite, later Baptist. Enjoyed talking in dialect to his intimates. Good sense of fun. Spotless character. Frugal, non-smoker, teetotaler, free trader.

58. ECCLES AND PATRICROFT: JAMES HODGKINSON (£10)
Born at Dean, Lancs., 1810. Cotton spinner and farmer. In the 1850s appointed an inspector for the township of Monton under Board of Health regulations. Quaker elder.

59. ECCLES AND PATRICROFT: MRS ROSTRON (£10)
c. 1804-80. Sister of the wealthy prohibitionist James Simpson (cf. No 81) who died 1859. Widow of Mr Laurence Rostron of Salford, who died 1854 and was an active supporter of Joseph Brotherton, the pioneer teetotaler, in Salford elections. Mrs Rostron was a Quaker and vegetarian.

60. EDGEWORTH: LAWRENCE HARWOOD (£10)
No information.

61. LANCASTER: THOMAS BARROW (£5)

62. LIVERPOOL: MRS BEAKBANE (£25)
No information.

63. LIVERPOOL: THOMAS BEAKBANE (£10)
Tanner in 1867, Quaker and subscribed to Liberation Society. By 1901 had become JP. Member of the old local board, chairman Litherland Urban Council, managing director of Liverpool Tanning Co.

64. LIVERPOOL: MRS BLACKBURN (£50)
c. 1808-1875. Feminist, prohibitionist, mother of Mrs Jacob Bright.
65. **LIVERPOOL: REV. JOHN JONES (£10)**


66. **LIVERPOOL: W. W. RAFFLES (£5)**

1830-95. Third son of Rev. Thomas Raffles, DD, LLD, the well-known Liverpool Congr. minister. Cotton broker for many years in Liverpool, later moved to London and died an Anglican.

67. **LIVERPOOL: BENJAMIN TOWNSON (£5)**

1819-88. Born Oldfield, Mewithneam, Lancs. Quaker ancestry and parentage. Educated grammar school. Qualified as a doctor, Univ. Coll. London 1838. Early member of Northern Medical Society, and anxious for medicine to progress through greater interchange of information among practising doctors. Medical officer to Liverpool post office for 42 years. Married a distant cousin, Mary Thorp of Leeds, 1846. Very fond of his children. Keen on ensuring that his daughters were educated in cooking as well as in female “accomplishments”. Bought his brother-in-law’s Liverpool practice. Retired 1883. Greatly upset by death at age 11 of his only son, who he hoped would succeed to his practice. Quaker, and intensely religious. Strict sabbatarian. “God first” his motto – the interests of his practice came after. His daughters became Anglicans, but their father joined them only towards the end of his life. Active philanthropist and mission supporter. New Testament always in his pocket. Opposed smoking, supported YMCA. “The poor clerk or shopman who was trying humbly to serve his God had as much interest in his eyes, and was esteemed as worthy of his friendship as the rich City merchant who could drive his carriage and pair” (A. Townson, *Benjamin Townson*, n.d., p. 79). Enthusiast for botany, rising as a student early in the morning to collect specimens. Well-known as the quickest walker in Liverpool. Rather hot-tempered. Teetotaler 1844 – a convert of Grindrod’s medical mission. Probably the first Liverpool doctor to oppose treating acute disease with the aid of alcohol.

68. **MANCHESTER: W. H. BARNSLEY (£5)**

Traveller. Left £57.5.5. to UKA in 1883.

69. **MANCHESTER: SIR THOMAS BAZLEY, BART, MP (£20)**

1797-1885. Born near Bolton, son of merchant who later retired for scholarly pursuits. Educated Bolton grammar school. Began business on his own account in Bolton, 1818. Moved to Manchester with his father, 1826. Married 1828. Methodical by nature and in early years often self-denying. Became very prosperous partner and later sole proprietor in cotton-spinning firm. A strict disciplinarian, but also a pioneer in personnel management. Erected works kitchens, employee accommodation, lecture hall, and library in his factory, and cooperative store for employees. The first large employer to pay weekly wages on Friday instead of Saturday. His factory became the largest fine cotton and lace thread manufactory in the kingdom, with over 1,000 hands. Anglican, but very tolerant of religious and political views in his employees. Liberal. Chairman Manchester Chamber of Commerce 1845-59. A convinced free trader even when Manchester businessmen were turning to protection in the 1870s.
Strongly opposed purchase of Suez Canal shares. Favoured expenditure on public works and cotton-growing in India. MP for Manchester, 1858-80. Supported “peace, retrenchment and reform”. JP, actively supported mechanics' institutes. One of the earliest supporters of Lancashire Public Schools Association. A founder of the Manchester Anti-Corn Law Association and a member of the League council. Advocated ballot, and a new university for Manchester. Knighted, 1869. Wrote several papers on commerce and education. Consistently teetotal. Though not prominent in temperance movement, gave the Permissive Bill crucially important support during 1860s. Agreed to his name being placed on the back of the Bill when it was first introduced in 1864. Owned a village from which he excluded drink facilities.

70. Manchester: W. T. Blacklock, JP (£20)
Member of the firm of Bradshaw and Blacklock, publishers of Bradshaw’s Railway Guides. A director and one of the largest shareholders of Lancashire and Yorks Railway Co. Magistrate, prominent in charities and religious institutions, died 1870.

71. Manchester: James Boyd (£20)

72. Manchester: Brunskill and Jones (£5)

73. Manchester: William Romaine Callender (£20)
1825-76. Born Manchester. His father a cotton manufacturer, nonconformist, city councillor, prominent Manchester Liberal and Anti-Corn Law Leaguer. From his youth, William connected with his father’s cotton manufacturing firm, which he greatly extended late in his life by incorporating the mills of Sir Thomas Bazley (No 69). When aged approx. 20, changed his political and religious connexions, at first becoming a High Churchman, but later more moderate. Married a daughter of Samuel Pope, the prominent prohibitionist, in 1849. Devoted much energy to promoting Manchester Conservatism: “it is no exaggeration to say that he became the life and soul of the party in this district” (Manchester Examiner and Times, 24 Jan. 1876). Enjoyed personal influence with Disraeli, and was his host on his 1872 visit to Lancashire. Conservative MP for Manchester 1874-76. Early in life connected with Manchester Athenaeum and, after 1859, with volunteer movement. Supported Nine Hours Factory Bill for women and children, and “seemed to conceive it his especial duty to inveigh against the Liberal school of political economists”. Championed trade unions, and in 1870 published Trades Unions Defended. A noted collector of china, he was a member of Manchester’s first school board, and supported the co-operative movement. Generous to local charities. Managed to remain on good terms with the publicans while remaining vice-president of the UKA.
74. **MANCHESTER: JOHN CAMERON (£10)**  
Engineer and machine-maker, Hulme.

75. **MANCHESTER: THOMAS CLEGG (£20)**  
1802-77. Born Heywood, one of 17 children. Father a cloth spinner. Entered mill at age 9, but later attended school and in 1835 left Heywood for Manchester. Made a fortune in cotton and became a well-known Manchester merchant. Among the first to establish the West African trade there. Appointed Liberian consul in Manchester, 1839. Retired from business c. 1862. Active within Church of England in supporting church extension and educational movements, to which he was most generous. Opposed ritualism. Churchwarden, Manchester Cathedral from c. 1850. Conservative. Anti-slavery. After much overseas travel helped establish Cotton Supply Association to encourage the growth of cotton all over the world. Deputy-chairman Lord Derby’s Relief Committee during the cotton famine. Signed anti-spirits pledge 1832. Secretary Heywood Temperance Society, and a Sunday school superintendent there. Teetotaler 1836. Chairman Sunday Closing Association 1866.

76. **MANCHESTER: HENRY CRABTREE (£40)**  
1816-87. Working dyer, then schoolteacher, then employer-dresser, dyer, bleacher, finisher of velvets, at Manchester from 1852. Selfmade man. In 1837 joined several other working men to found a co-operative dyeing business in Manchester but this failed. Unitarian of retiring disposition. Liberal, married with 3 children. Teetotaler 1836. Supported all phases of the temperance movement.

77. **MANCHESTER: ELIJAH DIXON (£5)**  
1790-1876. Born Kirtburton-in-Wooldale, Yorks. His father a manufacturer, but lost his money and was forced to become a Manchester fustian cutter. Elijah got work as a scavenger in a cotton mill in Ancoats at age 11. Present at Peterloo and active in Chartist and other movements, for which he suffered 2 months’ imprisonment. On his release, became a travelling pedlar, then milkseller, then pill-box-maker, then, from 1841, a matchmaker. This eventually became the prosperous matchmaking firm of Dixon and Evans. Self-educated, Liberal and became a preacher. Favoured co-operation, Sunday schools, popular education, teetotalism. Active in the movement for franchise extension in the 1860s, and a pallbearer at the funeral of Ernest Jones, Chartist.

78. **MANCHESTER: A. E. ECCLES (£20)**  
Born 1830, parents Congr. His father built the first cotton mill in Darwen. When aged c. 27, Eccles became manager of the Manchester warehouse, and later added a large cotton mill in the area. Regular Sunday school teacher, married a banker's daughter. Prepared to retire at age 43, and regularly attended Smedley's Hydropathic establishment at Matlock Bridge (No 14). Subscribed to Liberation Society. A good sportsman, who later became a teetotaler, and a keen distributor of temperance literature. A keen supporter of UKA and gave evidence to the Select Committee of House of Lords on Intemperance.
79. **Manchester: James Fildes (£20)**
c. 1825-96. Manufacturer for 30 years with Messrs Jabez Johnson and Fildes. Wesleyan. At one time well-known for his orchid and grape growing. Joined UKA 1858.

80. **Manchester: John Greenwood (£10)**
Born 1818, Pendleton. His father founded a carriage and omnibus firm. Took over the firm on father's death, 1851. Connected with Bethesda Sunday school, Pendleton, but later an Anglican. Liberal, Salford town councillor.

81. **Manchester: Alderman William Harvey, JP (£5)**

82. **Manchester: Abraham Haworth (£20)**

83. **Manchester: John Heywood (£10)**
1832-88, son of John Heywood (1804-64) the stationer and city councillor, and nephew of Abel Heywood the radical. Errand-boy in a solicitor’s office. Succeeded to father’s firm 1864, and greatly expanded it.

84. **Manchester: William Hibbert (£5)**
No information.
85. Manchester: James Holden (£30)
No information.

86. Manchester: E. Jackson (£20)
No information.

87. Manchester: Ebenezer Robert LeMare (£10)
c. 1798-1881. Married, silk manufacturer, JP. Died at Clevedon, Som., leaving much property. Some of it was assigned to Church Missionary Society, British and Foreign Bible Society, Church Pastoral-Aid Society and Colonial and Continental Church Society.

88. Manchester: Councillor J. B. McKerrow (£10)

89. Manchester: William McKerrow, DD (£5)
1803-78, born Kilmarnock. Father a wheelwright and turner, and a seceder of liberal views. Mother died when William aged 3. Well educated at Kilmarnock High School, and strongly influenced by local covenanting traditions. Glasgow University, then in 1828 to Presb. chapel at Manchester, where at that time there was only one such chapel. From observing his sermons, John Evans’ Lancashire Authors and Orators (1850), p. 180 concluded “we should say he is not near so eminent for theological attainments and reasoning powers, as he is for brilliancy of style, beauty of imagery, and ingenuity and aptness of illustration.” Evans continues (p. 181): “he is a man of strong feelings, and when fairly roused into action, betrays a fervency of feeling that almost electrifies his congregation.” Liberal. Chaired 1839 meeting at Manchester to found Manchester Voluntary Church Association, which championed voluntarism for several years. Elected moderator of Presb. church of England. Subscribed to Liberation Society. Of the seven men who formed Manchester Anti-Corn Law Association, 1839, six were from his congregation. First Christian minister in England to identify himself with the movement. At an Anti-Corn Law meeting in 1841 said “he had no sympathy with the religion that showed itself merely in singing psalms and attending meetings.” Argued from Anti-Corn Law League platforms purely on religious grounds. Helped force government considerably to modify its educational measures of 1843. Strongly opposed Maynooth Grant primarily because he disliked state endowment of any form of religion. President Manchester and Salford Peace Society. Helped promote Manchester Examiner, organ of advanced Manchester Liberals. A founder of Lancashire Public Schools Association. DD Heidelberg 1851. Retired from active ministry 1869. On Manchester school board from 1870 till his death. Active on Manchester city mission and Manchester Ragged School Union. “To enumerate the topics on which he so often addressed his fellow-citizens...
with acceptance and effect would be to relate the social, political, and, in particular, the educational progress of Manchester during the past half-century" (Manchester Guardian, 5 June 1878). In c. 1830 he befriended Rev. Francis Skinner, the Presb. minister at Blackburn who pioneered anti-spirits association there. McKerrow signed teetotal 1843. As active in organising the 1857 UKA ministerial conference as in organising the Anti-Corn Law League ministerial conference of 1841.

90. MANCHESTER: G. AND E. PEARSON (£30)

Edward Pearson, 1836-1912, born Manchester. Parents left Church of England for Quakers, then left Quakers during Beaconite controversy. His father a founder of Manchester City Mission. His three sisters died from scarlet fever 1845. Parents moved to Wilmslow, Cheshire, where Edward spent his lifetime. His father a friend of Cobden. Edward youngest of the 25 original students who entered Owen's College Manchester 1851. Father died 1857, so Edward became partner in one of the oldest firms in the Manchester woollen trade. Married 1873. As a youth, he attended Anglican and Congr. places of worship, but at age 21, under the influence of the teetotaler Joseph Thorp, he became a Quaker. Held a weekly Bible class. Supported Sunday schools and foreign missions. Active in Quaker business. Interested in comparative religion. Teetotaler, and in 1864 established and maintained for some years a public house without intoxicants. For 45 years a member of UKA executive.

91. MANCHESTER: THOMAS SHIRLEY (£5)

Tailor, supported Liberation Society.

92. MANCHESTER: FRANK SPENCE (£10)

Manufacturing chemist and son of Peter Spence (No 93). A founder of the English Anti-Tobacco Society.

93. MANCHESTER: PETER SPENCE (£25)

1806-83. Born Brechin, son of a weaver. Educated parish school, but mother died, and at an early age Peter apprenticed to a Perth grocer. In youth wrote a poem celebrating the career of Bolivar. Studied chemistry in spare time, and formed partnership in grocery with an uncle before establishing himself as chemical manufacturer in London 1834. Took out a patent in 1836 for manufacturing Prussian Blue. In 1845 moved near Carlisle to take charge of chemical works, and discovered a process for manufacturing alum from the refuse shale of collieries. Patented the invention, and established Pendleton Alum Works, Manchester. After initial difficulties was by 1869 manufacturing half the alum manufactured in England. Also made sulphate of ammonia, and exported it abroad as fertiliser. Fellow of Chemical Society. Author of over 50 patents. Advocated nationalisation of railways and waterways, and gave evidence to that effect before a government inquiry. Staunchly advocated canal from Manchester to Liverpool. Liberal, Congr. Active member of Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society. Ardent sanitary reformer. In 1857 published Coal, Smoke and Sewage, advocating diversion of factory smoke into sewers, from which it could be drawn by very high chimneys. In that year, he was forced by a lawsuit to move his works to Newton Heath – after being accused of air pollution. A leading supporter of the Anti-Narcotic Leage and founded
English Anti-Tobacco Society. JP. Director of Manchester mechanics' institution. Subscribed to Liberation Society. Opposed CD Acts. Never re-employed any employee who absented himself through drink. Beecher's *Six Sermons on Intemperance* caused him to stop drinking spirits in 1831. Teetotaler 1841. Vice-president UKA, which he joined shortly after its foundation. Gave £1,000 to the 1871 guarantee fund, and was still annually subscribing £200 in 1883. Active in Blue Ribbon movement.

94. MANCHESTER: HENRY M. STEINTHAL (£10)
Merchant. Pallbearer at the funeral of Ernest Jones, Chartist.

95. MANCHESTER: REV. S. A. STEINTHAL (£10)

96. MANCHESTER: JOHN STUART (£165)
1796-1878. Born Markethill, Ireland. Eldest of large family. Worked on father's farm till at age 26 he emigrated to USA. Established a firm there, and in 1831 founded the banking house of J. and J. Stuart and Co., in 1834 settled in Manchester. Railway director. 1846, established the banking firm of John Stuart and Co. Presb., and generous to Presb. chapel-building. Liberal. For many years principal supporter of a Manchester refuge for fallen women. Supported YMCA and generously supported Irish famine funds. Also supported Irish orphanages.

97. MANCHESTER: COUNCILLOR CHARLES THOMPSON, JP (£5)
1819-1903. Born Morland, Westmorland, Quaker parents. 10th son in family of 15 children. Educated Friends' School Ackworth. Grocer's apprentice at Liverpool for 6 years, then Manchester employee of Harrisons and Crossfield (of Liverpool and London). Joined his friend Nathaniel Card, the founder of the UKA, as cotton spinner c. 1853. Married, Quaker, radical. Manchester town councillor 1866-70, JP 1870, the first local Quaker to accept the post. Stood at Bath by-election 1873 on purely temperance grounds, and again at Whitehaven by-election 1875. The first Manchester councillor to propose Sunday opening of the Manchester free libraries. Appointed JP in Westmorland in 1881, but declined to sign the formal declaration, and was permitted to take his seat. Retired from business in the late 1870s to Morland, where he died.
Manchester Evening News, 23 Feb. 1903, speaks of “his constant geniality and heartiness”. On the original UKA committee, and for many years on its executive committee.

98. MANCHESTER: BENJAMIN WHITWORTH (£600)
1816-93. Born Manchester, 5th son of Nicholas Whitworth, Drogheda merchant. At age 16, went to Manchester, apprenticed to fustian manufacturer at 5/- p.w. From 1838 fustian and velvet manufacturer and merchant. After 1842 in partnership with his brothers. Married 1843, seven children. Owned large factory at Drogheda, the first to introduce cotton manufacture there. His perseverance obtained an improved water-supply there. Largely responsible for developing Fleetwood as the point of entry into Lancashire for American cotton. Erected large clubs for his employees there and at Drogheda. Director Metropolitan Railway. Advanced Liberal, favouring compensation to Irish tenants for improvement, disfranchisement of “the intelligent and industrious portion of the working classes”, non-intervention in foreign policy. MP Drogheda 1865-69, 1880-85, Kilkenny 1885-86. Liberal Unionist after 1886. Supported Liberation Society, feminism, Sunday opening of museums. Life-long abstainer. On UKA executive committee from 1863, chairman 1871-91. Gave £5,000 to its 1871 guarantee fund. Curiously silent in House of Commons, though, when Permissive Bill being debated.

99. MANCHESTER: ROBERT WHITWORTH (£5)

100. MANCHESTER: THOMAS WHITWORTH (£5)
Son of Benjamin Whitworth, born Manchester 1844. Cotton and commission merchant, and a member of his father’s firm. Liberal.

101. MANCHESTER: THOMAS READ WILKINSON (£10)
Born Manchester 1826. His father had been an apprentice and assistant to the proprietor of Manchester Mercury. He founded a printing press. At age 14, T. R. Wilkinson learnt letter-press printing and attended the mechanics’ institution. 1841, entered the Manchester and Salford Bank, and in the evenings attended classes at Owen’s college. Worked his way up to sub-manager of the bank. Radical.

102. OLDHAM: THOMAS EMMOTT (£10)
1823-92. Born Oldham, father a master-joiner who became an engineer and manager of Oldham Gas Co. He later became a cotton manufacturer and gained much from buying up land near Oldham which was later built over. His son educated at Ackworth Quaker school, trained as surveyor, then in 1847 started with father in cotton trade. Eventually took charge of the business which became one of the largest in the district. Married the sister of a Manchester merchant. Six sons, one of whom – Lord Emmott – was MP for Oldham 1899-1911. Prominent Quaker minister, subscribed to Liberation Society.
Liberal, but not an active public speaker. Staunchly supported North and opposed slavery in the American Civil War. Quietly but generously relieved distress during cotton famine. Active in local charities, especially in Oldham mission. An old folk's tea-party was given by him annually. Strong supporter of Oldham Lyceum. A member of Oldham school board 1888-90. President Oldham Temperance Society for 27 years.

103. **OVER DARWEN**: **DR GRAHAM** (£20)
c. 1809-74. Originally a working tailor, then commercial traveller, and later partner in a large paper manufacturing firm. Nonconformist and a member of the local board. A much-respected local figure. Local townspeople requested a public funeral when he died, but his family knew his dislike of display and refused it. Twelve of his principal workmen acted as pall-bearers, and two workmen officiated as carriers. He had no family, and left £500 each to British Temperance League, UKA and Darwen Total Abstinence Society.

104. **OVER DARWEN**: **WALMSLEY PRESTON** (£10)
No information.

105. **RAMSBOTTOM**: **JAMES PORRITT** (£5)
Started a woollen manufacturing firm 1838, and later founded the firm of Porritt Bros. and Austin – manufacturing textiles and paper manufacturers' goods. Congr., and deeply religious. His family helped build the local Congr. chapel. By 1880 he had become a JP.

106. **RIVINGTON**: **C. J. DARBYSHIRE**, JP (£5)
No information.

107. **ROCHDALE**: **THOMAS WATSON** (£20)
Born Galgate, near Lancaster, 1821. Worked at father's silk-waste manufacturing mills there. At age 25, obtained work as manager of silk spinning dept. with Messrs Briggs and Grattan Bright (a younger brother of John Bright) at Rochdale. The business failed after Watson had been there 3 years, and he became silk-hatter on own account. When this trade declined, he turned to manufacturing silk velvet from spun silk. Very successful, and built further mills in Rochdale. United Methodist Free Church, deeply religious. Made large gifts to this and to Baptist denomination. Built two chapels. Liberal, and in 1885 MP for Ilkestone division of Derbyshire. On local school board from its formation, and chairman 1884. JP and for a few years Rochdale town councillor. Gave approx. £7,000 to Rochdale Infirmary. Established Watson Scholarship, teetotaler and built a coffee-house.

108. **SOUTHPORT**: **DR JOHN GOODMAN** (£5)
Born 1809, practised in Southport for over 30 years, and founded the Hydropathic Hospital. Founded Southport Hydropathic Charity and Dr. Goodman's Dispensary in 1855 and 1859 respectively. Prominent in good works, especially in the religious and temperance worlds. Laid foundation-stone of the "Fisherman's Chapel" – the first place of worship built by Southport Independent Methodists. In 1878 helped lay foundation-stone of a Primitive Methodist chapel.
109. Southport: Walter Smith, JP (£5.5.0)


110. Ulverstone: Miss Hannah Goad (£10)

1802-85, born Ulverstone. Member of a well-to-do local Quaker family. 3 of her sisters died in childhood. Brought up with the surviving sister, till father died 1837. Mother died 1839. In youth “was naturally of a high and proud spirit, manifesting considerable strength of will, and the desire and power of governing others” (Annual Monitor, 1886, p. 54). This disposition mellowed in later life. Her sister died 1851. She then developed an almost sisterly attachment for Mary Nicholson of Whitehaven. Deeply religious, active in Quaker work, very hospitable to visiting Quakers and helped local Quakerism to prosper. Supported Peace Society, Liberation Society. The temperance hall built in 1851 was financed largely by her. “The plain well-dressed Quaker lady whose philanthropy and charity were for years a household word in Ulverston” (Furness Worthies, 1889).

111. Warrington: R. Garnett and Son (£5)

1805-77. Born Farnworth. His grandfather a watchmaker, his father an Anglican watchmaker. Mother died 1808. Garnett educated at school and was strongly influenced by Quaker neighbours. 1819 apprenticed joiner to a bad master, and later obtained release from indenture. Became a watchmaker, but never liked the trade, and although when his father became ill he took over the family watchmaking business, he got himself apprenticed at age 21 to a joiner. His new master was drunken but well-intentioned. Robert’s wages often went unpaid. With his sons, he became a cabinet-maker and timber merchant in his own right at Warrington and Penketh, and prospered. Also a house-builder. Anglican, till converted to Methodism at approx. age 35. Never hostile to Anglicans though, and deeply religious. Devoted to British and Foreign Bible Society.
112. Wigan: Timothy Coop (£5)
Born 1817, West Houghton, near Bolton. Youngest of 7 brothers. Also had 4 sisters. Son of a self-educated Methodist, who had fought in Napoleonic Wars. Parents poor and could afford to send only one child - Timothy - to school. Timothy also attended Wesleyan Sunday school. Left school 1829. Silkweaver, then apprenticed to Wigan tailor/draper. Promoted to manager of the Wigan shop. Wesleyan, but left the denomination after seeking the remedy for his religious anxieties through baptism by total immersion. From 1841 began to baptise others. His employer left him £100 in c. 1841. He became partner in the Wigan firm, open-air preacher. Impressed by the American Brethren led by Alexander Campbell, known as the Church of Christ. Became corresponding secretary to the Wigan Church. Intensely evangelical. His new denomination attracted the very poorest in the town and was scorned by other denominations. Opposed strict sabbatarianism, favoured following the New Testament as opposed to the Old. His religion modelled on the primitive Christian church. Strongly influenced by Cobden, and admired Gladstone for his conduct over Irish Church disestablishment, and over the Alabama claims. Admired American institutions. His biographer W. T. Moore says he was not naturally pacific by temperament. "Very many of his habits of life were formed and conscientiously practised in direct opposition to the natural promptings of his impulsive and intensely aggressive nature." Became a teetotaler in the 1830s.

Leicestershire

113. Leicester: J. G. Tatlow (£5)
Elastic web manufacturer.

Lincolnshire

114. Ruskington: S. and W. Pattinson (£10)
S. Pattinson a bricklayer at Ruskington by 1842. By 1856 he had been joined by W. Pattinson, and was a successful builder. By 1872 the family firm had premises in Ruskington and St. Ives (Hunts.). They were builders, contractors, brick and tile makers, and appraisers. By 1882 the firm had opened a builders' merchants at Sleaford and had an office in Parliament Street, Westminster. Samuel Pattinson a Methodist, poor law guardian, district councillor, and lifelong subscriber to UKA. Died 1902. William Pattinson had 19 children, and his wife was cook at one of the big houses. The family was Liberal and originally nonconformist. By 1892 they had become one of the principal landowners in the village. William's eldest son John became a very large railway and public-works contractor. His second son Robert became director of both businesses, knighted 1934, and prominent in Lincolnshire local politics.

London

115. Frederick Braby (£15)
Liberation Society subscriber. No further information.
116. **George Dibley** (£10)

Built Albert Hall, Kentish Town, for temperance and other causes. In 1870 treasurer of UKA London auxiliary.

117. **Andrew Dunn** (£21)

South London iron merchant. Liberation Society. Unsuccessful Liberal candidate for Southwark Feb. 1874 (3121 votes) and Feb. 1880 (6830 votes).

118. **Lady Jane Ellice** (£20)

Signed the pledge after hearing J. B. Gough. President Christian Workers' Temperance Union 1876-78, and very prominent during the 1870s in women's temperance organisations. Philanthropist, and wrote several temperance pamphlets. Died 1903.

119. **R. E. Farrant** (£50)

Probably the witness who, as Deputy Chairman and Managing Director of the Artizans', Labourers' and General Dwellings Co. gave evidence in 1884 before the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, and in 1887 before the Select Committee on Town Holdings. He was appointed to the Board after the frauds which were exposed in 1877.

120. **John Green** (£20)

No information.

121. **A. J. Larking** (£5.5.0.)

c. 1810-84. Liberation Society. Distributed large amounts of temperance literature.

122. **G. T. Livesey** (£20)

1834-1908. Born Islington, eldest son of the secretary of the South Metropolitan Gas Co. Entered the Co. at age 14. Chairman 1885-1908. Having worked in almost all depts of the Co. he was an authority on all aspects of gas manufacture. In 1889 introduced a co-partnership scheme for giving employees a bonus related to the size of the year's profits. When trade unions resisted by calling a strike, he defeated them at the cost of £100,000, and walked out of the room when Cardinal Manning (No 123) rebuked him during negotiations with the strikers. Firmly repressed agitators who frustrated his desire to supply the public with gas cheaply and efficiently. Aimed to foster thrift in his employees. His men also enjoyed direct representation on the board of the Co. He saw in the partnership of capital and labour the solution to many social problems. A member of the 1891-94 Labour Commission and wanted the 1871 Trade Union Act modified, so as to clarify the legal responsibilities of trade unions. A vice-president of the Employers' Parliamentary Council, founded in 1898 to counter the parliamentary influence of the TUC. Married 1859. Generous to his local church. On the council of the Institution of Civil Engineers. Knighted 1902. “A commanding figure in the industrial world” (Times, 5 Oct. 1908).
123. **Archbishop Manning (£5)**

1808-92, son of MP and West India merchant. Educated Harrow and Oxford, double-first 1830. Unable to develop his bent towards politics because of father's business losses. Fellow of Merton College, 1832. Energetic but autocratic rector at Lavington from 1833. Archdeacon of Chichester, 1840. Married a sister-in-law of Bishop Samuel Wilberforce. Her death in 1837 removed one bar between him and the Catholic priesthood. After Newman's secession, he became a high church leader, but was furious when, in the Gorham Case, the privy council pronounced on the orthodoxy of a clergyman's theological views. Became Roman Catholic, 1851, thus sacrificing a dignified position in a Church he loved for a humble post in an unfashionable and poverty-stricken minority-group. Against the wishes of the English Old Catholics, Pope Pius IX made him Archbishop of Westminster, 1865. He vigorously supported papal infallibility, 1869. A thorough ultramontane. Promoted Catholic schools. Cardinal 1875. Active in hospital work and housing reform. Supported agricultural labourers' unions. Sat on the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes 1884-85, Royal Commission on Elementary Education Acts 1886-87. In Jan. 1888 maintained the right of the unemployed to "work or bread". Urged relief works in 1889, and supported the London dock labourers in August. Ascetic in habits, distinguished in appearance, fine manners, great tact. His desire to secure "the conversion of England" and to strengthen his own position in the Catholic world encouraged him to support temperance work, for this would increase the self-respect of the democratic (and Irish) element in the Catholic church. Personal visitation convinced him that the drink problem was serious, and in 1868 he joined the UKA. For the rest of his life one of its staunchest supporters, though not sharing its sectarian refusal to accept government compromise offers. Founded League of the Cross, and championed Catholic teetotalism as a conscious continuation of Father Mathew's work.

124. **Josias Nottidge (£10.10.0)**

Anglican. Ramsgate philanthropist. One of the first amateur oarsmen of his day. Paid special attention to the welfare of local boatmen. Founded the Workmen's Club and was president Ramsgate Temperance Society. Teetotaler, died 1873.

125. **William Saunders (£150)**

1823-95. Born Market Lavington. Educated Devizes Grammar School. Won his initial capital by opening a large stone quarry adjoining the Box Tunnel on the GWR. Married 1852. Moved to Plymouth in the 1850s and in 1860 founded *Western Morning News*, one of the few newspapers in the 1860s to defend the UKA. As a newspaperman he was full of resource. Founded *Eastern Morning News* and the Central News Agency. Radical. Wrote several books. MP for East Hull 1885-86. Active on LCC 1886-92. In 1892, elected MP for Walworth. Reluctantly supported 1886 Home Rule Bill, but voted against it in 1893. In his last years was drifting away from Liberal party. At the end of his life, favoured taxation of ground values, local option, the legal 8 hours day. In 1893 wrote pamphlet urging enactment of the Newcastle Programme and closer concentration by the Liberals on social questions. Largely responsible for restoring the Dauntsey Charity to its rightful beneficiaries. Vice-president, UKA.
126. J. Simms (£5)
No information.

127. T. B. Smithies (£5)
1816-83. Began as clerk in a York fire insurance company. At age 15 became Wesleyan. 1849, was asked to go to London as managing secretary of a gutta percha company. Active in Sunday school work and friend of the Earl of Shaftesbury. Founded Band of Hope Review 1851, and British Workman 1855 – periodicals setting a new standard of illustration and attractiveness among religious publications for the people. Sabbatarian, opposed animal cruelty. Early member of London school board. Temperance advocate.

128. R. A. Wainewright (£20)
No information.

129. William West (£20)

130. Frank Wright (£5)

131. James Wyllie (£40)
c. 1815-91. Scottish temperance reformer.

Middlesex [recte Surrey]

132. Upper Norwood: Sir W. à Beckett (£10)

Northamptonshire

133. Brackley: Thomas Judge (£5)
Prosperous Brackley grocer and radical. Vigorously anti-Tory. Strongly sympathised with the needs of the poor. “The enfant terrible of Northamptonshire politics” (W. R. D. Adkins, Our County, 1893, p. 28). County councillor from
1890. See also Adkins, p. 30: "as a rule the tradesmen in small towns and villages take one of two courses: if a Conservative, the shopkeeper follows piously and modestly in the wake of the local gentry, and takes with elaborate gratitude such crumbs of patronage as fall from the Ruling Councillor's table. If a Liberal, he gives a timid half-crown to the local association, and when an election is safely passed thanks God that he has been able to vote straight, though quietly, and yet not lose the whole of his custom. Neither of these methods has commended itself to Mr. Judge. He has proclaimed his opinions on many platforms. There is little done at the Brackley Town Council or Board of Guardians without his knowing the reason why. He has shown that it is possible for a tradesman to be aggressively independent, and yet to lose nothing in consideration or material prosperity. He is much more of an example than a warning."

Northumberland

134. Newcastle: James Morrison (£5)

1806-78, born Glamorgan. Parents poor and both from Northumberland. At 19, James went to South America, returning in 1830 to Monmouthshire. 1836 returned to the North, where he was appointed manager of the Ridsdale Ironworks. 1840, began working for the Consett Iron Co., then shortly after left for France and in 1845 began work for the Guisnes and Marquise Works. 1851, returned to England and settled in Newcastle. 1859, began the Ferryhill Ironworks. He also owned collieries in Northumberland and works at Staveley in Derbs. Radical. Active Newcastle town councillor, and mayor for two successive years.

135. North Shields: Thomas Barker (£10)

No information.

136. Wallington: Sir W. C. Trevelyan (£600)

1797-1879. Born Newcastle. Eldest son of 5th baronet, who owned estates of 35,000 acres. Educated Harrow and Univ. Coll. Oxford, BA 1820. Scientific studies at Edinburgh. Married 1835 the daughter of a clergyman – an intelligent woman, friendly with Ruskin, the Carlyles and Swinburne, all of whom were entertained at the Wallington family seat. A childless marriage. Both partners somewhat passionless and eccentric. Wife died 1865, Sir Walter re-married 1867. A. J. C. Hare in 1862 said that Trevelyan was "a strange-looking being, with long hair and moustache, and an odd careless dress". A mine of miscellaneous information. Much travelled, till he settled in 1846 on the family estates and succeeded to the title. A public-spirited agriculturist who greatly improved his inheritance. An enthusiast for spelling reform. President phonetic society, Fellow Geological Society, 1817. FRS (Edinburgh), and FSA. Art patron and naturalist. In 1865 bought an estate at Tynemouth, where his nephew was standing as radical candidate, for £61,000 in order to secure for him the votes of the tenants. After the election, he sold it. Died leaving an estate of 29,110 acres worth £24,463 p.a. Though an Anglican, Trevelyan did not hesitate to appear on temperance platforms with dissenters. Publicly auctioned his wine-cellar in 1852, but his wife induced him to allow alcohol to his guests. He abolished all public-houses on his estate. First president UKA, to which he generously subscribed.
**Nottinghamshire**

137. **NOTTINGHAM: WILLIAM ENFIELD (£5)**

1801-73. Succeeded his father as town clerk 1845, resigned 1870. The last member of the firm of solicitors, Enfield and Coldham, who had acted continuously as town clerks from 1790-1870. By 1870 the Corporation's work had so increased that a full-time official was needed. Alderman. Generous philanthropist. His drawing-room always available for meetings in favour of any good cause. Conducted the business of the General Cemetery Co. for 36 years. Among the first in Nottingham to take up in a practical form the question of better housing for the poor. Worked in the Sunday school for 50 years.

**Oxfordshire**

138. **BANBURY: JAMES CADBURY (£20)**

Born Birmingham 1803, brother of John Cadbury (No 154). Came to Banbury 1840, bought a grocery and wine business 1844, but soon disposed of the wine department to a druggist. Other occupations – fruiterer, draper, fire and life agent, but seems to have retired from all but the latter c. 1847. From c. 1858 he was a government agent for emigration to Australia. Agent to National Provident Institution and Birmingham insurance companies. Married into the Sturge family, Quaker. By the late 1870s had strong Wesleyan sympathies and connexions. Personally visited Banbury beerhouses on religious mission work. Auxiliary Bible, Temperance, London Peace, Mutual Aid and British School Societies, Science School Teachers and Band of Hope. Enthusiastically defended animals and climbing boys, and prominent during the 1850s in applying the Health Act to Banbury. Tried to enlist working-class support for sabbatarian restriction. Joseph Taylor (Temperance Star 30 Sept. 1870, p. 3) recalled his fast walking habit: “a quicker, more active man I should think was not to be met with.” In 1859 by-election voted for the moderate Liberal, Samuelson. Teetotaler 1824, wrote several temperance tracts, and prohibitionist from the early 1850s. In 1868 actively promoted Permissive Bill during election, and refused to support Samuelson unless he would back it too. At Corn Exchange meeting asked: “Is Banbury to be bound hand and foot and rolled into the House of Commons in a beer barrel?” Eventually voted for the Conservative candidate who seems to have made no promises at all on the temperance issue. (I am most grateful to Mr Barrie Trinder, of Banbury Historical Society, for almost all this information.)

139. **BANBURY: CHARLES GILLETT (£10)**

1830-95. Eldest surviving son of a Banbury Quaker banker. Educated Univ. Coll. London. Partner in family firm from 1853, and rescued it from doldrums. Built a large house for himself, 1865. His energy caused the banking business to expand rapidly in the 1860s, and the bank eventually opened a branch in Oxford. By 1880 he was distributing free breakfasts to poor Banbury children during the winter. Always carried a pledge-book in his pocket.

140. **TETSWORTH: THOMAS TAYLOR (£10)**

Born 1810. Wigan cotton spinner who bought Aston Manor, Oxon. in 1858.
for £33,549, together with nearby property. Lived in Aston Rowant House apparently till 1889, when the estate and manor were sold by his creditors. A substantial landowner locally, who in 1879 owned 8,028 acres, worth £17,565 p.a.

Rutland

141. Exton: Hon. and Rev. Leland Noel (£30)

Shropshire

142. Cheriton: Miss J. P. Gale (£15)
Probably related to Dr Frederick Gale of Cheriton, brother of the temperance reformer Rev. Henry Gale (No 144).

Somerset

143. Bridgewater: F. J. Thompson (£7)

144. Treborough: Rev. Henry Gale, DCL (£20)
1800-77. Born near Shepton Mallet, into an old Somerset family. Father a Malmesbury doctor. Educated Gloucester College School. Articled to Malmesbury solicitor, then went to Cambridge. First-class degree, then BCL. Practised for a time as lawyer near Malmesbury, and married. The first churchman in the West of England to champion Anti-Corn Law League, and among the first clergymen to support UKA. The death of a much-loved child, c. 1850, caused him to seek religious comfort and to sacrifice income to become a clergyman. Ordained to Ashford curacy, Kent. Popular as a preacher there, but this provoked jealousies and he had to resign. Licensed to the curacy of All Saints Birmingham. Again made enemies, and at a CMS meeting there he was assaulted and ejected after trying to move that Christian missionaries should be teetotalers. Vindicated by a monster meeting. Then curate of Low Ham, and chaplain to the workhouse, Langport. 1856, presented by Sir W. C. Trevelyan (No 136)
to Treborough rectory, near Taunton, Soms. Wrote several temperance works. A born fighter, happier attacking the government for tolerating drunkenness than he was in winning teetotallers. "The strong language he might occasionally use covered a warm and loving heart" (Alliance News, 4 Aug. 1877, p. 493).

**Staffordshire**

145. **Burslem: William Wildblood** (£10)

Engraver.

146. **West Bromwich: John and Mrs Williams** (£20)

John Williams c. 1828-89. Congr., excellent singer. Largely responsible for ensuring that non-intoxicating wine available for those who preferred it at Dr Dale's chapel, Carr's Lane. Active Birmingham prohibitionist from the start, and in the early Band of Hope. Teetotal.

**Suffolk**

147. **Ipswich: Frederick Alexander** (£10)

1814-83. Born Ipswich, 4th son of a partner in an Ipswich banking firm. Trained for several years with a farmer and later held a farm near Ipswich, but on his father's death became partner in the bank, and lived for c. 18 years at the Woodbridge branch. 1864, returned to Ipswich, and shared in the active management of the bank. Quaker, simple in manners, honest in business. Conciliatory and pacific personality. Local treasurer for British and Foreign Bible Society. Unsectarian in religious outlook. A Whiggish Liberal. Not an active partisan. Ipswich town councillor 1864-73. Member of Ipswich dock commission and treasurer to East Suffolk Hospital. Not as firm as some of the Alexander family on the temperance question. Owned R. D. Alexander's temperance hall.

**Surrey**

148. **Bagshot: Thomas Richardson, BA** (£7)

c. 1816-85. Tall, thin and slightly stooping wealthy and cultivated gentleman, BA. Promoted teetotalism during travels in France. In later years a strict vegetarian. UKA candidate at 1875 Horsham by-election, advocating female suffrage, county franchise, disestablishment and other radical tenets.

**Sussex**

149. **Rye Harbour, Hastings: H. D. Lucas Shadwell** (£5)

Probably a misprint for W. D. Lucas Shadwell, JP, who chaired many important temperance conferences and co-operated in temperance work with his wife, the authoress of many temperance tales. He died at Florence 1875. The family was wealthy, and prominent in local government. It established a sailors' rest, maintained temperance missionaries and rooms, and was closely connected with the Church of England Temperance Society.
150. SHOREHAM: ROBERT H. PENNEY (£7)

1822-1902. Born Poole. 3rd in a family of 9. After school was apprenticed to Fordingbridge sailcloth manufacturer. Later became partner in the firm, till 1852. Then moved to Southwick near Brighton, became shipowner and merchant, and married the daughter of the firm’s proprietor. Remained head of the business till his death. Large interests in the shipping trade, and was owner and manager of many ships trading all over the world. Married, 8 children. Quaker, regularly attended Quaker meetings, and active in Quaker business. Distributed tracts against drinking, smoking and war. Objected to Quakers participating in the Queen’s Jubilee Service in St Paul’s Cathedral — regarding it as a military pageant. Opposed Boer War. Liberal. For about 20 years chairman Brighton Corn Exchange. For many years Brighton JP. Teetotaler 1841, active in Sussex Band of Hope Union and National Temperance League. Vice-president UKA, to which he left £100 in 1902.

Warwickshire

151. BIRMINGHAM: MRS MARY ANN AVERY (£10)

Daughter of the much-respected Birmingham citizen Thomas Beilby. Childless wife of T. Avery, scalemaker and three times mayor of Birmingham. Birmingham Daily Mail, 17 Feb. 1894, described him as “the Nestor of the Birmingham City Council” and “the embodiment of municipal dignity”. He was a Conservative, much interested in sanitary reform. His wife was born c. 1812, died 1893.

152. BIRMINGHAM: GEORGE CADBURY (£25)

1839-1922, son of John Cadbury (No 154) the founder of the cocoa firm. Apprenticed at age 15. With his brother Richard, took over his father’s failing business 1861. Rigid personal economy helped restore its fortunes. The 1860s saw Cadbury’s cocoa perfected, and enlightened innovations made in the firm’s industrial relations. Severely methodical in domestic habits, George Cadbury was rather autocratic in supervising employees’ morals and welfare. From 1866 work began with a brief religious service. The firm was the first in Birmingham to introduce Saturday half-holidays. 1880, the factory moved out to Bournville and after 1895 George Cadbury promoted the Bournville garden village scheme. Had 11 children by 2 marriages. Fond of Bible reading, early abandoned distinctive Quaker dress, worked for freer forms of Quaker worship, tried to adapt Quakerism to new forms of religious thought, worked for Christian unity. His religion was “practical”. He scorned theological differences, and was generous to Salvation Army. In 1859 began teaching for the adult school movement, a lifetime’s favourite cause. Always intimate with the life of the poor, and disliked “society”. “I never blame a man for getting drunk who lives in the slums”, he said in 1917. Tried to bring Christian principles to bear on public life. Emotionally moved by suffering and felt an intense personal responsibility for social evils. A lifelong Liberal, and contributed heavily to party funds. Strong sense of trusteeship for his wealth, much of which he gave away. Favourite philanthropies in later life were Sunday schools, cripples’ homes, overseas missions, Liberation Society, YWCA, National Old Age Pensions League, Anti-Sweating League. An unusual combination of astuteness and innocence, he disliked publicity and party politics, refused to stand for parliament and refused all honours. But quietly helped to promote the municipal
revolution associated with Joseph Chamberlain, though only briefly a town councillor. Home Ruler, opposed imperialism. His Liberalism gradually changed character. In later life he tried hard to bring Liberal and Labour parties together. Contributed £500 to ILP election fund in 1900. His purchase of the Daily News for the anti-imperialists during Boer War brought him into national politics. Its profits were limited by his refusal to make it the instrument of the drinking and betting interests. It promoted his favourite causes at this time – old age pensions, smallholdings and suppression of sweating. By the 1900s he favoured taxing land values, doubling death-duties, national appropriation of unearned increment and gradual nationalisation of mineral resources and monopolies unsuited to private control. Loved order and cleanliness, disliked gossip. Always refused to admit alcohol to his table. In the early 1870s publicly championed Permissive Bill, but by 1890s was publicly attacking prohibitionists for obstructing moderate temperance reform. He now supported schemes for trust houses and liquor municipalisation – realising that the drink problem must be solved by experiment, not by denunciation.

153. BIRMINGHAM: JOEL CADBURY (£5)

154. BIRMINGHAM: JOHN CADBURY (£10)
1801-89. Born Birmingham, 3rd son of R. T. Cadbury. Apprenticed for 7 years to Quaker grocer in Leeds, then spent 1823 in the bonded tea-houses in London. Then began, with father’s capital, as Birmingham tea and coffee dealer. 1826 married Priscilla Dymond, who died after 2 years. Re-married 1832, 5 children. Divided his business 1849, henceforth concentrating on cocoa manufacture. Prostrated by wife’s death in 1855, and in 1861 handed over the failing business to his sons. Several missionary journeys to Ireland for the Quakers. At age 28 elected to Birmingham Board of Commissioners. Poor law guardian 1830-41. Courageously defended climbing boys and strongly opposed feasting among Birmingham poor law administrators. Campaigned against air pollution, setting a good example in his own factory, and largely responsible for getting legislation on this. Devoted later life to philanthropy. Promoted local hospitals, savings banks and asylums for the blind. Peace Society, Sunday schools. Teetotaler 1832, and influenced his father in the same direction. Pillar of Birmingham teetotalism. Supported Blue Ribbon movement.

155. BIRMINGHAM: C. E. MOILLIET (£5)
The Moilliets a distinguished Smethwick family, which originally came from
Geneva. By 1803 they were active as local merchants. During 1820s they founded the bank which in 1865 merged with Lloyd's Bank. The family was related to the Galtons and to Erasmus Darwin. No specific information about C. E. Moilliet.

156. BIRMINGHAM: WINFIELD AND Co. (£5.5.0)

R. W. Winfield (1799-1869) born Edgebaston, 3rd son of a Birmingham merchant. Brass and iron manufacturer 1820-66. Became well-known for his honest dealing, and for employing the best workmen. “A type of a high-minded, up-right, conscientious English merchant” (E. Edwards, Personal Recollections of Birmingham, Birmingham 1877, p. 120). He bought the Union rolling mills near his foundry, and carried on wholesale trade in rolled metals and brass and copper wire. Council’s gold medal at the 1851 Great Exhibition. By 1865 his firm employed c. 800 workmen. Began a factory school c.1845 on the voluntary attendance and teaching principle, but this failed. About a year later he therefore built larger premises, obtained professional teachers, bought musical instruments etc. He then compelled all boys in his factory to attend night school at least three times a week. The school grew and became well-known locally. He gave an annual fete on Whit Thursday at his home and invited all the scholars at the factory school. He “probably paid higher wages and salaries than any manufacturer in the district” (E. Edwards, op.cit., p. 118). Henry Mayhew’s Shops and Companies of London, 1865, III, p. 113 praised the factory highly, noted that it was unusual in Birmingham at the time for educating its employees, and praised “the order, regularity, and system preserved throughout” which were “at once the admiration of all under whose notice they come”. Winfield was a JP, Anglican and Conservative, “truly Liberal in all secular affairs” (Edwards, op. cit., p. 122). He suffered a great blow in 1861 when his only son died. By the end of his life he was “one of the oldest Birmingham manufacturers to whose enterprise the largely increased industrial resources of the town and district were due” (Birmingham Pictorial and Dart, 3 May 1907).

157. STUDLEY: THEODORE MOILLIET (£10)

See No 155. Theodore Moilliet was brother of James Moilliet, head of the family bank at the time of its merger with Lloyd’s. Theodore was a partner, and after the merger retained an extensive interest in Lloyd’s Bank.

Westmorland

158. KENDAL: C. L. BRAITHWAITE (£12)

1811-93. Born Kendal. Quaker family and brother of the prominent Quaker J. Bevan Braithwaite. Father worked for a drysalter, mother a banker’s daughter. Educated Quaker school, apprenticed Liverpool wholesale grocer, then returned to Kendal to work in father’s business. c. 1834 his father and uncle bought woollen manufacturing firm, and this was handed over to Charles and his brother. Prospered, and eventually Charles became chairman. Married 1838. Quaker minister, active in promoting local educational movements. Sunday Schools. Later a member of Kendal school board. Borough magistrate, prominent in getting the London and North Western Railway to pass through Kendal. A highly respected local figure. Treasurer, Kendal branch of London
Missionary Society, president local auxiliary of British and Foreign Bible Society. President for many years of YMCA. Committee member of mechanics' institute. Teetotaler.

159. **KENDAL: MRS E. LEBRETON (£20.7.0)**

No information.

160. **KENDAL: EDWARD WHITWELL (£25)**

1817-93. Born Kendal, Quaker parents. Educated Quaker school, but left the Quakers and became Congr. shortly before his marriage, 1841. 4 children. Till 1849 worked in family carpet manufactory. Then bought estate in Western Ireland, hoping to live there and aid the famine-stricken population. For some years, spent some months of each year there. Lifelong philanthropist, energetic in local religious work. Often distributed tracts to passengers at local railway station. When he died Kendal Mercury commented: "such men as he . . . are an honour to the community in which they live." One of the earliest members of Kendal Temperance Society. Teetotaler 1835. For 27 years hon. secretary Sunday Closing Association. Vice-president UKA and British Temperance League.

161. **MERE: CHARLES JUPE (£400)**

1806-83. Born Mere. Rather wild in youth, very grave in maturity. Made fortune in silk manufacture. Married, one son. Left Anglicans for Congr. Generous in local chapelbuilding, schoolbuilding, etc. Unostentatious in charity. Distributed gifts to the poor at Christmas. Clearly tried to model his life on Christ's and distributed food to the poor from his meal table. Active in civilising the surrounding district. Subscribed to Liberation Society. President Mere Temperance Society. A leading donor to the UKA.

162. **OAKSEY: W. P. WARNER (£20)**

Born c.1801, farmer who owned Church Farm Oaksey (101 acres) c.1845-1880. Liberal, generous supporter of Western Temperance League, died 1883.

163. **BELL BROUGHTON: ELIJAH HIGGS.**

No information.

164. **BRADFORD: EDWARD PRIESTMAN (£5)**


Often spoke for good causes. Strongly supported Bradford city mission. Subscribed to Liberation Society. Opposed CD Acts. Lived at Ilkley, and chairman Ilkley Temperance Society, and also of Bradford YMCA.
165. **Bradford: Frederick Priestman (£5)**


166. **Bradford: Mrs Mary Priestman (£100)**

1815-72, born Uxbridge. Second wife of John Priestman, the leading Bradford Quaker, textile manufacturer and temperance reformer. She was a Quaker, had 2 children, and was one of the leading UKA donors.

167. **Dewsbury: M. Olroyd and Sons (£5)**

Mark Oldroyd, Sen. came from a family of handloomweavers near Dewsbury and married a handloomweaver’s daughter. He became connected with a local woollen mill in c.1817 and became one of the pioneers of the heavy woollen industry. He set up his own business, which was a very important employer of labour in Dewsbury till closed after World War II. By 1868-9, the chairman of the firm would have been either George or John Oldroyd, Mark’s eldest sons. Nothing is known about George but John left the company c. 1876 to found a woollen mill in Silesia, where he died c. 1895. Mark Oldroyd Jun., the third son, (1843-1927) was born at Dewsbury, educated locally, and then went to New College London, intending to enter the Congr. ministry. An outstanding student there, but joined the firm 1862, and from 1877 sole life member of the board. Also a director of the Airedale Colliery Co., Castleford. In 1871 married daughter of Banbury Methodist William Mewburn. Keen Liberal, JP 1875, Dewsbury councillor 1884-89, 1910-20, alderman 1885, mayor 1887 and Dewsbury’s first honorary freeman 1919. MP for Dewsbury 1888-1902. Knighted 1909, and was consulted by government during World War I on the question of importing from Switzerland dyestuffs which had previously come from Germany. A leading local Congr. layman. Generous philanthropist and keen on missionary work. According to Dewsbury’s present borough librarian Mr Frederick Smith, “he was highly respected and a much-liked citizen of this town – possibly the most prominent we have ever had” (I am most grateful to Mr Smith for generous help with this memoir).

168. **Halifax: James Crossley (£20)**

Born c.1838, Hebden Bridge. Moved to Halifax c.1867 to fill a post at Messrs Bowman’s cotton mill. Five years later began as bookseller and stationer, and continued in this for the rest of his life. Congr. chapel deacon, and “a well known and esteemed resident of the town”. Well informed on botany, and “of a quiet, kindly disposition” (Halifax Courier, 23 Oct. 1897).

169. **Halifax: Charles Watson (£50)**

1812-90. Born Dundee. Educated high school till age 12, then for some years in an engineer’s office. Later in cloth trade. 1837 moved from Scotland to
Leeds, where employed with flax-spinners. Married, but wife died early and re-married while still in Leeds. Then became trainee teacher in Glasgow. In early 1850s went to Halifax to take charge of a factory school. Worked at this for 8 years. Met a wire worker there, who had patented an improved ventilation system. Seeing its possibilities, Watson bought the rights and became sole patentee. Soon became well-known in connexion with ventilating public buildings, including Windsor Castle. At first connected with Methodist New Connexion, but later joined Wesleyans. Became liberal donor to local Wesleyans and an active layman in chapel. 1872 elected to Halifax Board of Guardians, and remained so thereafter. Mainly responsible for introducing the Yorks. Penny Bank to Halifax. Teetotal for over 40 years. Joined UKA 1868, elected vice-president 1873. Sent out tracts by the ton, so that the Manchester Guardian once called him “the Napoleon of tract distributors”.

170. HAWES: O. F. ROUTH (£10)
Born 1812, became teetotaler c.1853, and an active temperance reformer. Still alive in 1898, and was then living at Battle, Sussex.

171. HUDDERSFIELD: THOMAS FIRTH, JUN. (£5)
1797-1879. Apprenticed to Leeds tea-dealer, then pursued the trade in Huddersfield. Gained reputation as an honest tradesman and retired affluenty 1860. Liberal, but his prior concern was for religious, moral and social progress – so that he was not politically very partisan. An Improvement Commissioner, and one of the old Huddersfield Waterworks Commissioners. Quaker, and a generous philanthropist. Peace Society, Anti-Slavery Association. Early friend of education and temperance. Supported local hospital, schools and charities. Rather eccentric, with a fund of anecdote. Teetotaler for 40 years, and supported Huddersfield Temperance Society from its origins.

172. HUDDERSFIELD: WILLIAM WHITE (£5)

173. HULL: THOMAS HOLMES (£5)
Born 1836, son of religious parents. Married 1860, 9 children. His business talents drew him into local government. Chairman Hornsea Local Board, director Hull Banking Co. Ltd. and Hull and East Riding College. JP for East Riding, 1888. Prominent local Wesleyan. Sunday school teacher 1851, class leader 1870, Wesleyan representative on Hull School Board 1876, chairman of the Board 1882-89. President for 2 years of Hull Young People’s Christian and Literary Institute, and president Hull University Extension Society. Wesleyan conference representative for Hull, Wesleyan Missionary Treasurer for Hull and district, a treasurer of Dr Stephenson’s Children’s Home. A good speaker “of tall and commanding presence” (Hull Wesleyan Methodist Church Record, Apr. 1893), and “a man of marked single-mindedness and well-known integrity of purpose. In Hull . . . his name is a household word” (Yorkshire Leaders: Social and Political, II, 1893).
174. **Hull: Dr Henry Munroe, FLS (£5.2.0)**

1818-87. Born Hull, 2nd son of a sea-captain. Qualified as doctor at King's Coll. London. Married 1840, settled in Hull where he built up a wide practice. Lectured for 25 years in medical jurisprudence and histology at the Royal School of Medicine. Lectured also on literary subjects, and gained reputation as humorous speaker. 1853, elected Hull town councillor. Active local philanthropist. Suffered from gout, and in 1861-62 experimented on himself and discovered that alcohol not a necessity of life. Close friend of the prominent Wesleyan temperance reformer Charles Garrett, who induced him to give his famous lecture "On the Physiological Action of Alcohol" to the Royal Institution, 1865. Published several other works on the medical aspect of temperance. Joined UKA 1860s, established a Hull auxiliary and acted as president. Active in Good Templary.

175. **Leeds: Alderman Barran (£5)**


176. **Leeds: William Clare (£5)**


177. **Leeds: Benjamin Croft (£5)**

Born c.1819, and is described at various times in directories 1851-72 as blacksmith, whitesmith, engineer, ironfounder and manufacturer of patent cart axles and springs. Vice-president Leeds Temperance Society 1868-78. Teetotaler c.1837. A pioneer teetotaler and prohibitionist. Died 1895.

178. **Leeds: John Lupton (£10)**

1822-92. Youngest son of William Lupton, Leeds cloth merchant. Delicate as a child, and privately educated, whereas his five brothers went to Leeds Grammar School. At age 23, visited America for health reasons. Apprenticed to an engineering firm on his return, but when this failed he joined the family firm. Energetic as a traveller, and though cloth being increasingly sold direct from mill to tailor at this time, the firm survived difficulties and gradually combined merchanting with manufacture. Retired 1871. Married 1858, 6 children. Unitarian, Liberal, and much occupied in his retirement with philanthropy. Active
in National Association for Promotion of Social Science. Treasurer of Charity Organisation Society from its beginning, and took a close personal interest in individual cases. On committees of District Nurses’ Institute and Cookridge Convalescent Home. On the weekly board of the Leeds General Infirmary, and regularly visited the wards. In the 1870s one of the first locally to throw open his garden in summer, to the poor. Interested in the Leeds Industrial Dwelling Co., an early effort to attack Leeds slums. Deeply interested in literature and art, and keenly supported Leeds Library. Abrupt in manner, but a kindly man. The family retains his saying “if there is anything unpleasant to be done, I shall be happy to do it”. Member of the 1876 Leeds temperance committee. (I am most grateful to Lupton’s great-nephew, Dr C. A. Lupton of Leeds, for much generous help here.)

179. LEEDS: PARKER, BROS (HUNSLET) (£5)

Directories describe the firm, 1857-90, as flax, hemp and waste dealers. 1892-1915, mungo manufacturers and waste merchants. From 1857 to 1861, the firm run by Frank, John and William Rodwell Parker. From 1863-99 by John and William only. Parker Bros contributed to Leeds Temperance Society’s Christmas festival 1869-78. A John Parker was vice-president of the Society 1870-79, and guardian of the Hunslet Union c. 1872 – c. 1882.

180. LEEDS: WILLIAM ROBERTS (£5)


181. LEEDS: ALD. TATHAM (£20)

1815-92. Born Leeds, youngest of 6, into an ancient Lancashire family. Father partner in Leeds flax-spinning firm. Family background of religious persecution. Quaker education, and in 1830 joined the firm. Remained there 10 years, then retired. Entered into flax-spinning with a brother on his own account, but not successful. In 1848 entered into partnership with brother-in-law Henry Walker, and with John Joseph Wilson, leather workers. Quaker, clerk to the overseers, and elder and clerk to the building committee of the Leeds Quakers. Married 1845, 3 daughters. First wife died 1851. Re-married 4 years later. President Leeds Liberal Registration Association and later of Leeds Radical Association. JP and poor law guardian. Town councillor 1861, one of the first teetotalers to join the council. Alderman 3 years later. 1875 refused mayoralty because felt the Council not yet ready to conduct their entertainments teetotally. On 2nd request 4 years later, he agreed when this obstacle removed. Twice consecutively re-elected. Campaigned for franchise extension, disestablishment, universal school boards, compulsory secular education, removal of compulsory vaccination laws and CD Acts, female suffrage, abolition of game laws, reform of land laws, triennial parliaments. A common saying of his was that every man should be a good citizen of his own city. “Leeds has lost one of her worthiest and best known citizens” (Leeds Mercury, 13 Dec. 1892). Teetotaler 1838, for many years president Leeds Temperance Society, a founder of Leeds UKA auxiliary.
182. **Leeds: John Whiting (£20)**

1818-99. Born Hitchin, Herts. Educated Ackworth Quaker School. At age 14 apprenticed to James Hotham of Leeds, a draper. Taken into partnership 1846, and when Hotham died Whiting continued the firm as Hotham and Whiting. Virtually created the trade in ready-made women’s clothing, carpets and woollen goods. “In business he was regarded as a man of sound judgement and sterling integrity” *(Yorkshire Post, 23 Nov. 1899).* Married into the Quaker Gilpin family 1850, 3 sons, 2 daughters. Quaker overseer and elder for many years. With 6 other Quakers, founded the Friends’ First Day Schools in Leeds. Liberal, poor law guardian, town councillor 1865-69. On committee of Leeds General Infirmary, and supported local orphanages and Cookridge convalescent hospital. Vice-president YMCA, anti opium trade. Anti-Corn Law League. Overcame a hot temper in youth and was of a retiring disposition. Fond of children, agile into old age, played cricket with his grandchildren at age 79. Early teetotaler, at age 18. Treasurer Leeds Temperance Society c.1850-99, vice-president 1871-75. Member of the 1876 Leeds temperance committee. In his last years enthusiastically displayed the blue ribbon on his coat.

183. **Pickering: James Ellis (£5)**
c.1793-1869. Quaker.

184. **Pontefract: George Pearson (£10)**

Subscribed to Liberation Society, no other information.

185. **Rotherham: John Guest (£10)**


186. **Rotherham: Thomas Tasker (£5)**

1810-82. Born Rotherham, Father a corn miller. Tasker trained in this business and for many years a grocer and corn-factor. For a time member of Rotherham local board, and personally interested in Rotherham Gas Light and Coke Co. A leading shareholder in Rotherham Literary and Mechanics’ Institute. Subscribed to Liberation Society. Bachelor and local antiquarian. Treasurer, Rotherham Temperance Society for many years.

187. **Saddleworth: F. Midwood (£20)**

No information.
188. **Scarborough**: Joseph Petrie (£5)

Wealthy and probably of independent means. Liberation Society. No further information.

189. **Selby**: Jonathan Hutchinson (£10)

c. 1794-1872. Born Gedney. Mother died during his childhood. At age 14 apprenticed to an uncle flax merchant, and remained in this occupation for life. Married 1825, 11 children, wife died 1869. Took up small farming as hobby, and became an active philanthropist. "When occasion required, he could administer rebuke with force and dignity" (*Annual Monitor*, 1873, p. 71). Quaker, and active in denominational work. Subscribed to Liberation Society. Teetotaler 1836. Active temperance reformer for nearly 40 years. His temperance work "appears to have been the means of bringing more prominently before him his responsibility as a citizen" (*ibid.*, p. 70).

190. **Selby**: Charles Hutchinson (£5)

Son of No 189. Subscribed to Liberation Society, for some time secretary to Selby Temperance Society. Emigrated to USA.

191. **Sheffield**: Rogers Broadhead (£20)

c. 1808-76. Senior member of a firm manufacturing Britannia metal and electro-silver plate goods. Quaker. Retired c.1864, and gave all his time to charity. On the weekly board of Sheffield General Infirmary. Frequent donor to Sheffield branch of the Iron, Hardware and Metal Trade Pension Society.

192. **Sheffield**: William Johnson Clegg (£6.6.0)

1826-95. Born Sheffield, father a working cutler. Educated Anglican schools. Began work at age 12 as solicitor’s clerk; apprenticed 7 years. Then for 10 years collector of the highway rate. Began on own account as accountant. Admitted solicitor 1868, and founded firm of W. J. Clegg and Sons. Appointed the first official receiver in bankruptcy for Sheffield and Barnsley districts, 1883. Regular Anglican churchgoer, and a keen Liberal. Town councillor from 1872, alderman from 1880. Mayor 1887, 1888, 1890. Teetotaler at age 13. Became acknowledged leader of Sheffield temperance movement. President Sheffield Band of Hope Union. As early as 1854, secretary Sheffield auxiliary of the UKA. In 1889-90 elected vice-president UKA.

193. **Sheffield**: William Hargreaves (£50)

1804-74. Son of a Sheffield merchant and manufacturer in the cutlery trade and carried on his father’s business. Quaker. Too retiring to be active in public life. Generous philanthropist, supported Peace Society and disestablishment. Committee-member of Sheffield Total Abstinence Society. Died taking a Turkish Bath.

194. **Sheffield**: Dan Taylor Ingham (£5.5.8)

1860 he had become secretary to Sheffield and Rotherham Building Societies. Teetotal at age 13, temperance enthusiast.

195. Sheffield: Abraham Shorman (£50)

1802-83. Early life and apprenticeship was hard, but later founded successful grocery business. At an early age became Wesleyan and was trustee and class-leader of Brunswick Chapel. Later very active and generous member of Sheffield United Methodist Free Churches. Subscribed to Liberation Society, and an uncompromising reformer. Gave generously to local Sunday schools and chapels. Eccentric in speaking manner and appearance. Not active in city politics, but still “one of the best known men in the town” (Sheffield Daily Telegraph). For many years a notable speaker at UKA annual meetings. Left £300 to UKA in 1883.


No information.

197. Wakefield: W. H. Lee (£20)

1818-99. Senior partner in Messrs George Lee and Son, worsted and yarn manufacturers, one of the largest manufacturing firms in Wakefield. A founder, and for approx. 14 years president, of Wakefield Chamber of Commerce and Shipping. Married 1856, one son. Wife died 1877. Congr., and active local dissenter. Liberation Society. Supported Wakefield mechanics’ institution, art school and charities. One of the chief promoters of Wakefield Industrial and Fine Arts Exhibition 1865. A director of the public baths before they became Corporation property. Member of Wakefield school board and once vice-chairman. A director of Wakefield and Barnsley Union Bank. “For many years the leader of the Liberal party in Wakefield” (Wakefield Herald, 9 Dec. 1899). President Liberal Association. Stood for parliament 1885, but defeated. City councillor 1859. Alderman 1864-74, 1885-92. Six times mayor – 1864, 1867, 1879, 1880, 1883, 1888. “Cool-headed, shrewd, judiciously calculating in all that he said and did, and clinging to his convictions with great earnestness, he was nevertheless a sociable, genial, and very attractive personality.” His name “stood as the embodiment, locally, of all that was manly and honourable”. Lifelong teetotaler.

198. York: Fielden Thorp (£10)


Wales

199. Brymbo: C. E. Darby (£20)

1822-84. Father for some years partner in Coalbrookdale Iron Works, Shropshire. His family long interested in iron manufacture. Joined his brother W. H.
Darby and Mr Robertson MP, in 1846 to form a company for exploiting the Denbighshire mineral wealth opened up by the new railway. Later the firm acquired coalfields. Managing director and partner in the firm. Strict Quaker. Member of Brymbo School Board, and chairman from 1882. A very methodical man, very active in philanthropy. British and Foreign Bible Society, National Reform League, Peace Society, Liberation Society. Very unassuming and unostentatious. Wrexham Advertiser, 30 May 1884, comments: "he has been connected with every philanthropic work not only in the immediate locality but in North Wales and the country generally, having contributed very large sums of money from time to time to various educational and religious institutions in North Wales." Generous to British Schools and financed the Broughton Reading Room. Subscribed to many local chapels and remembered the poor at Christmas. Towards the end of his life grew very depressed because of ill-health and the death of his brother W. H. Darby in 1882. Committed suicide 1884. Teetotaler, keen on social and moral advancement of the working classes.

200. CARDIFF: JOHN CORY (£20)

201. CARDIFF: R. CORY, JUN. (£10)
1830-1914. Born Bideford, Devon, 2nd son of Richard Cory I. After 1859 when father retired, he and John (No 200) carried on the family shipowning and coal trading firm as Cory Bros. and Co. The firm established coal agencies all along world trade routes, and became coalowners in own right after 1868. Also became the largest waggon owners in UK. Richard Cory II was Baptist, active in philanthropy, especially in YMCA, Salvation Army, Baptist churches, etc. Liberation Society subscriber.

202. CARDIFF: JOHN DAVIES (£5)
At age 24 came to Cardiff from London in the 1840s to work for shipbrokers. Eventually became shipbroker and coal shipper on his own account. Sole partner in the firm of Ogleby and Davies. Connected with timber trade and shipowning business. Also colliery proprietor. "One of the great commercial pioneers of Cardiff" (South Wales Daily News, 24 Aug. 1896). Helped lay foundations of the great Cardiff coal export trade. One of the earliest to see that Cardiff must expand its docks. Married the eldest sister of Mr John and Mr Richard Cory. Wesleyan and generous to Wesleyan churches. Active Liberal. Possessed marked individuality of character. Keen but not ostentatious in philanthropy.

Ireland

203. BELFAST: MRS MARION WORKMAN (£5)
Came from Fenwick, Ayrshire, a place with strong Covenanting traditions.
Her husband, Robert Workman, born at Saltcoats 1790, youngest of 12, and became a successful muslin manufacturer. His family were originally Protestant emigrants from Holland. He was a strong Liberal, and progressive in religion. He died 1870, but Mrs Workman long survived him and was active in Presb. temperance circles.

204. Bessbrook: J. G. Richardson (£20)

1813-90. Born Lisburn, into a united family of 10 children and pious parents. Educated Quaker schools and at 17 entered his father’s linen-merchant business. Accidents in youth helped prepare his mind for religion; “I remember carrying about Bunyan’s ‘Pilgrim’s Progress’, and going into quiet corners to read and weep over the struggles of Christian” (quo. in Annual Monitor, 1891, p. 105). In 1841 crossed on one of the first steamers to the USA to establish his brother as agent for the firm, which already had outposts in Belfast and Liverpool. At first merely purchased brown cloth in the markets to bleach and sell, but later decided to keep pace with the times and become a flax-spinner and manufacturer. 1846 began to build at Bessbrook the model temperance estate which inspired the Cadburys’ Bournville. 1863 became sole proprietor of the firm, and became chairman when the firm became a limited company. Helped found the Inman Line of steamers, but retired 1854 when the firm was involved in providing ships for the Crimean War. Married 1844, first wife died c. 1849. Re-married 1853. Quaker. Welcomed the 1870 and 1881 Land Acts, but refused in 1882 the baronetcy Gladstone offered him. Bought a large Irish country house and enjoyed landscape gardening there. Opposed Home Rule. Generous in personal charity. Distributed tracts when travelling.

205. Dublin: Richard Allen (£10)


206. Dublin: James Haughton (£7.10.0)

1795-1873. Born Carlow, parents Quakers, father a water-drinker. Quaker education. 1812 went to Cork to learn business with an uncle. 1817 went to a Dublin uncle for 2 years. 1819 began business on own account in corn and flour trade with his brother John. Became Unitarian. Unsectarian in religious outlook. Wanted Christians to unite in attacking slavery and war. Radical, admired Joseph Sturge, opposed capital punishment, slavery and drunkenness. Life-member of Royal Dublin Society, 1834. Favoured repealing the Union, but urged Repealers to hold to moral force methods. Believed that peace alone was compatible with Christianity. Opposed British aggression in the opium wars. Supported RSPCA and urged it to attack blood sports. Became a vegetarian 1846. An early member of Dublin Statistical Society, founded 1847. Read many papers to the Society. Strongly supported Dublin Mechanics’ Institute. Opposed the anti-Catholic panic of 1850-51. Opposed Crimean War. Prominent in getting parks opened on Sundays 1858-51. Eventually came to see that the state must intervene between landlord and tenant if tenant was to be secure. JP 1862. Enthusiastic for co-operation in industry.
Opposed compulsory vaccination and CD Acts. Joined anti-spirits movement, teetotaler 1839. His temperance principles induced him to give up the sale of malt and barley. Strongly supported Father Mathew and Anti-Corn Law League. During the Famine urged provision of employment, institution of a minimum wage, and the closing of the drink manufactories. Strongly condemned the compromising nature of Bruce's 1871 Licensing Bill. Vice-president UKA, which he supported from the first.

207. DUBLIN: MRS MARY EDMUNDSON (£5)
Sister of J. R. Wigham (No 210), wife of Joshua Edmundson.

208. DUBLIN: W. H. PIM (£5)
c.1811-78. Well-known in Dublin as an upright man of business. Keen Bible reader, Quaker minister. Very energetic. His family prominent in Irish temperance work.

209. DUBLIN: HENRY WIGHAM (£5)
c.1822-97. Employed for over 40 years by Edmundsons Ltd. Married, 4 sons. Quaker, Liberation Society. Life teetotaler. Anti-slavery, supported peace, international arbitration, anti-opium movement, Bible and temperance societies. 1856 moved to Dublin and became well known as Christian temperance reformer. UKA member from the first.

210. DUBLIN: J. R. WIGHAM (£5)
1829-1906. Born Edinburgh, brother of Henry Wigham (No 209). Mother died after a year, and he was brought up by his sister, who married Joshua Edmundson of Dublin. He joined her there at age 15, as apprentice to her husband. When Joshua Edmundson died, Wigham and his sister (No 207) ran the firm. Largely self-educated. Developed the system of home gas-lighting which Joshua Edmundson had helped introduce to Dublin. Improved design and manufacture of small gasworks suitable for lighting public institutions and private houses. In 1865 won fame by patenting a widely adopted system of gaslighting in lighthouses. Later patented a lighting system for buoys and beacons. Prominent in Dublin business circles and secretary for many years of Dublin Chamber of Commerce. Twice refused offers of knighthood on grounds of conscience, keen Quaker. Married a daughter of Jonathan Pim. She died 1899. Active temperance worker.

211. PORTLAW: WILLIAM MALCOLMSON (£10)
1813-92. Born into a Scottish Presb. family connected with the textile trade since they had moved to Ireland. During the 18th century the Malcolmsons became Quakers, and by the 1780s had moved to Clonmel. In the early 19th century they were active in corn dealing and textile manufacture. By 1828 David Malcolmson's Clonmel corn mill was, according to Shiel, "the finest in Ireland". Fearing that the Irish corn trade might be hit by changes in the corn laws, in 1825 he established his textile factory at Portlaw which by 1837 was employing over 1,000. In 1843 the family established the Neptune ironworks at Waterford for building their own ships, and in 1844 they were prominent among the founders of the Clonmel Gas Co. They eventually acquired the
£100,000 share capital of the Waterford Commercial Steam Navigation Co., which improved shipping connexions with English ports. The firm also helped build local canals. David Malcolmson retired 1837, leaving his 7 sons (one of whom was William) in charge. Conditions in the Portlaw mill in the 1830s were far in advance of their time, with educational facilities, resident surgeon, temperance club and thrift society. The firm’s Mayfield factory had taken a lead in local temperance work as early as 1835, when it banned drink from its Christmas festival. Drunken workers were immediately dismissed. The corn dealing part of the business was much hit by corn law repeal. By the 1850s the factory village at Portlaw was a model township, with water and gas works, public buildings, wide streets. English and other mill-hands and artizans poured in, so that the community became practically self-contained (named locally, English-town) and dependent on the local countryside only for farm produce. The family backed the South in the American Civil War. William Malcolmson in 1864 bought a site for a new cotton factory at Carrick-on-Suir and the Clonmel premises were closed. He lost much of his fortune on unsuccessful efforts at local land reclamation. The firm was already in financial straits, and American grain imports finished it off. Bankruptcy 1877, and all spinning in Portlaw ceased 1904. (Much of this information comes from Sister M. Magdalene’s article in Nationalist, 14 Dec. 1968.)

Scotland

212. BARRHEAD: MATTHEW CRAIG (£6)

Jointly owned a Barrhead cotton mill with his brother. Prominent in Barrhead Evangelical Union church, which admitted only teetotalers to membership.

213. DUMFRIES: WILLIAM HOWAT (£5)

No information.

214. DUMFRIES: DR J. M. MCCULLOCH (£5)


215. DUNDEE: EDWARD HOWAT (£5)

Merchant and insurance agent.

216. DUNDEE: DAVID O'GILVIE (£5)

Partner in firm of jute manufacturers which he founded 1851. Took charge, of the commercial section and by 1864 they employed over 1,000 hands. Killed in an accident at the works 1868.
217. **DUNDEE: JAMES AND WILLIAM SCOTT (£5)**
James Scott, 1841-1908, associated all his life with Dundee textile trade. His father, who came from Montrose, was handloom weaver, and founded the large jute mills at Dundee. There James Scott conducted a warping-mill. Associated with him was his brother William. In the late 1850s the power loom was installed there. James Scott fostered extensive trade with New York and the River Plate. William Scott died 1893.

218. **GLASGOW: E. BELL (£5)**
Agent for Midland Railway Co.

219. **GLASGOW: WILLIAM COLLINS, II (£5)**
1817-95. Born Glasgow, son of William Collins I, the anti-spirits movement pioneer and publisher. In 1829 entered the family business as apprentice, partner 1843. Inherited father’s determination and Calvinistic rectitude in business. Believed strongly in hard work. Developed the school textbook aspect of the firm. 1862, appointed Queen’s Printer for Scotland, and the firm became well-known for its Bibles. Took the lead among Glasgow publishers in reducing employees’ working hours. Pioneered personnel management, with works outings, dining and recreational facilities. Twice married, 11 children. Free Church of Scotland. Liberal. Too humane to oppose the factory acts on grounds of political economy. Glasgow city councillor from 1868, elected on a platform of municipal economy. Attacked civic estimates as eagerly as Joseph Hume in his day had attacked budget estimates in parliament. Lord Provost of Glasgow 1877-80. Firmly advocated creating public parks in Glasgow. Knighted 1880. A generous philanthropist, and president Scottish Temperance League. Bequeathed £10,000 to the many public institutions he had generously supported in his lifetime.

220. **GLASGOW: ROBERT CURLE (£5)**

221. **GLASGOW: EADIE AND SPENCER (£10)**

222. **GLASGOW: WILLIAM EUING (£100)**
1788-1874. Born Partick. Shipping insurance broker. United Presb. and philanthropist. Strongly supported Sailors’ Homes and founded chair for music teaching in the Andersonian University. Collected books and music, and his music library was perhaps the most complete in Scotland. Generous to Scottish libraries. Left £200 to UKA in 1874.

223. **GLASGOW: JAMES HAMILTON (£5)**
224. **Glasgow: John McGavin (£20)**


225. **Glasgow: Robert Simpson (£5)**

1807–87. Born Saltcoats, Ayrshire. Moved to Glasgow 1821. Apprenticed 4 years, then became draper on his own account. When aged 30 entered himself as student of Glasgow university, and in 1837 entered Congr. Theological College. While studying, preached in open air and was active in general evangelical work. Ordained pastor over a church he had established in the Glasgow suburbs, 1841. Glasgow town councillor 1868–71, and a well-known merchant in the town. Active in Evangelical Union, strongly supported D. L. Moody's evangelism. 1832 joined temperance society.

226. **Glasgow: John Smith (£10)**


227. **Glasgow: James Torrens (£5)**


228. **Glasgow: John H. Watt (£20)**


229. **Inverness: John Mackenzie, MD, JP (£10)**

1803–86. 4th son of Sir Hector Mackenzie of Gairloch. Took a medical degree, but does not seem to have practised medicine. Served in army for a few years, retired to Inverness. Married 1826, 8 children. Took up farming, and was factor for the Gairloch Estates. Elder in Free Church of Scotland. Progressive in outlook. Advanced agriculturist. Favoured land reform in the interests of the crofters and sincerely interested in elevating the people. Refused to see emigration and pauperism as the only alternatives. Always wore Highland costume, and deplored the subjection of the Highlanders in the past. Helped establish Gaelic Society in Inverness. Active in local government, never feared unpopularity. While Provost of Inverness (1867–73) did much to improve sanitary

230. **Kelso: Robert Lyal (£5)**


231. **Perth: Peter Campbell, Jun. (£5)**


232. **Perth: James Whittet (£10)**

Tea merchant in Perth High Street. Subscribed Liberation Society. Published pamphlet at Perth 1842, entitled *Letter to the Ministers of the Gospel on Matters which Deeply Interest the Working Millions of Great Britain and Ireland*. This shows great concern to bring dissenters and working people together. “Talk not of Negro Slavery: our working population, many of them, although industrious, are only a shade removed from it.” Favours further franchise extension, and wants joint effort for man’s moral elevation to replace religious disputes about doctrine. Blames promiscuity on drink.

233. **Rothesay: Lockhart Dobbie (£5)**

No information.


Younger son of Sir Charles Trevelyan, who bought him the estate of Tyneholm. No occupation, but an enthusiastic amateur chemist. Conservative, probably Anglican. Died 1880.