JOHN MALCOLM LUDLOW

AND

THE CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST MOVEMENT, 1848-1852

by

Ellen King Neff

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the

History

Program

Agnes M. Smith 3/1/73

Adviser Date

Karl E. Lee March 7, 1973

Dean of Graduate School Date

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

March, 1973

ABSTRACT

JOHN MALCOLM LUDLOW

AND

THE CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST MOVEMENT, 1848-1852

Ellen King Neff

Master of Arts

Youngstown State University, 1973

The thesis contains an investigation of the roll played by John Malcolm Ludlow in the formation of the Christian Socialist movement in England between 1848 and 1852. Ludlow, with Frederick Denison Maurice and Charles Kingsley, both Anglican clergymen, was appalled at the condition of the working classes in England at mid-century, but opposed to the political remedies proposed by the Chartists. By 1850, after much searching, the three men, with a small group of followers, decided upon a practical method of extending Christianity to Socialism. They established producers' associations made up of working men who were willing to try an alternative to capitalism that would be a reconciling rather than a destructive force in English society. An overview of the entire thesis is contained in the first chapter.

The movement evolved from the turmoil suffered by England as a result of the Industrial Revolution. A great reform era began in the 1820's as England was recovering from the wars of the French Revolution. The second chapter of the paper is an explanation of events that led to the condition of England in 1848.

In 1848, Ludlow and his friends published their first newspaper. It is from this newspaper and other publications by the Christian Socialists that the greater part of the information for this thesis has come. Therefore, the thesis deals in depth with the philosophy propounded by Ludlow, first in the 1848 publication, Politics for the People, later in Tracts on Christian Socialism and finally in the Christian Socialist: A Journal of Association, the last united contribution by the Christian Socialists.

Investigation into the publications of the Christian Socialists reveals the evolution of their philosophy and the part played by John Ludlow. In addition to the chapters devoted to the literary efforts of Ludlow and his friends, connecting chapters deal with the group's activities. Chapter 3 introduces the main figures in the movement and Chapter 5 discusses their search for a cause after the demise of Politics for the People. Since the Tracts on Christian Socialism emerged from their new organization devoted to promoting working men's associations, Chapter 6 includes the formation of the Society.

After a discussion of The Christian Socialist: A Journal of Association, the thesis treats the influence of Ludlow and his compatriots on the passage of enabling legislation for the Co-operative Movement. Following the chapter recounting this great triumph of the Christian Socialists, the paper turns to the critics who disapproved of their activities, the responses made to the criticism by Ludlow and others.

Criticism from without and dissention within led to the dissolution of the organization of Christian Socialists. The final chapter

contains an analysis which probes the causes for failure and then turns to a general evaluation of Ludlow, his relationship with Maurice, his philosophy of Christianity and Socialism and his success in attaining his goals. Included in the summary is a survey of Ludlow's shortcomings which account in part for the demise of the organization known as the Christian Socialists.

I here wish to express my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Agnes Smith and Mrs. Hildegard Schnuttgen for the great assistance they gave me on this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to examine the role played by John Malcolm Ludlow in the activities of a small band of Englishmen who called themselves Christian Socialists. These men attempted a new approach to the economic and social problems of their day through a fresh application and interpretation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Two of the three leaders were Anglican Priests; the other, a business lawyer. The two priests have become quite famous: Charles Kingsley was a noted 19th century novelist whose major works include: Alton Locke, Yeast, and Westward Ho; Frederick Denison Maurice was noted as an outstanding theologian. Contemporaries and historians alike have largely ignored the part performed by the lawyer, John M. Ludlow, which will be the subject of this paper.

Its thesis is that John Malcolm Forbes Ludlow was the substantial leader of the Christian Socialist movement. Modern students, less dazzled by the brilliance of Maurice and Kingsley than nineteenth century contemporaries, have become progressively more aware of the influence exerted by Ludlow. Investigation of the writings of the Christian Socialists and the records of their activities reveals the continual reference to Ludlow's central function. Research indicates that it was Ludlow who originated the ideas for nearly all of the Christian Socialist projects and who most clearly perceived the practical efforts needed to Christianize socialism and socialize Christianity. Hence this

paper will center on his Christian Socialist work, his policies, his religion and most important, his concept of socialism.

The paper will concentrate on the exertions of Ludlow and the Christian Socialists during their four most active years, 1848-52. Since the turmoil of the times spurred these men to action, the paper will begin with a brief account of what has been referred to as the "condition of England" question. Three streams of thought, conservative, liberal and socialist jousted to pose and facilitate solutions. These will be traced to expose the elements of thought and action which bore most strongly on Ludlow and his friends in 1848.

After exploring the setting in which the Christian Socialists carried on their activities, the paper will introduce the three main figures of the movement: Ludlow, Maurice and Kingsley; and it will discuss their early relationship. Their first venture was the publication of a penny paper called Politics for the People, edited by Ludlow who evidenced the most highly developed philosophy. An examination of Politics, will show Ludlow's political and social views prior to his espousal of socialism.

With the cessation of publication of the paper after three months, the small group floundered for almost a year without a clear philosophy or goal. At this point, Ludlow's new interest - the working men's productive associations - was adopted by the others. The year of seeming aimlessness was significant, for it proved to have been the needed incubation period from which a well-developed philosophy of Christian

socialism would emerge. During this period, others such as the famous Rugbyan, Thomas Hughes, and the French socialist Jules St. Andre Lechevalier joined the group.

With new blood and a new concept, that of association, the Christian Socialists moved to put the idea into practice. The group's nebulous philosophy coalesced in a series of tracts published in 1850-51, and in another newspaper, The Christian Socialist: A Journal of Association published in 1850. Ludlow contributed to the former and edited the latter. Concentration on the thoughts of Ludlow expressed in tracts and newspaper will demonstrate his leadership in the definition of the Christian Socialist philosophy and practice.

In the Christian Socialist appeared a session — by session account of the testimony heard by the Slaney Commission, which, in 1850, investigated the opportunities afforded to the middle and working classes for the investment of their savings. Specifically, Mr. Slaney's committee was occupied with the legal impediments to associative activities. The laws concerning partnerships and joint stock companies on one hand, and friendly societies on the other failed to include legal recognition and protection for co-operative activities. Critics and admirers agree that achieving the legalization of associations was the Christian Socialists' most significant practical contribution to the British working classes.[1] Ludlow, with his experience in business law, was most instrumental in procuring a favorable report from the Slaney Committee and in securing the passage of the "Industrial and Provident

---

[1]G. D. H. Cole and A. W. Filson, British Working Class Movements: Select Documents, 1789-1875, (London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd., 1951) p. 422.

Societies Act of 1852". Chapter Six of the paper will discuss the testimony before the Slaney Committee, the content of the act and Ludlow's pervading influence in the proceedings.

The multifaceted activities of a small band of seemingly eccentric gentlemen soon attracted the attention of social critics. The unfavorable articles by reviewers and reporters damaged the movement and deflected Christian Socialist energy. Therefore the paper will examine the criticism and the answers with which the movement responded to it.

Criticism foreshadowed the failure of the working men's associations. External and internal differences eroded the Society to Promote Working Men's Associations and Ludlow finally withdrew his support. This paper will chart the disintegration of active Christian Socialism and will propose that Ludlow's dissatisfaction was a key factor in the failure of the movement.

Ultimately united effort by Christian Socialists failed because of the differences between Ludlow, the practician, and Maurice, the theologian. The summary of the thesis will delve into their philosophical divergence, and will expose the beliefs of Ludlow, his goals and his socialistic vision. Since John Ludlow could not bring himself to take the leadership of the movement to which he had devoted himself, he went on to a long life of loneliness. A discussion of Ludlow's decision will conclude the thesis.

CHAPTER II

THE CONDITION OF ENGLAND

In the first issue of 1850, the editor of Fraser's Magazine surveyed the achievements of a half century of British progress with a sound mixture of approval and dismay. On the whole, the nation showed tremendous prosperity, morals were improved, education had been extended to the lower orders and the dignity of labor was universally recognized. There still existed deplorable conditions among the poor, and the rural landless were suffering. But the truths of political economy were sure to correct these unfortunate circumstances, given a free rein. The editor ended with a classic statement which embodied the prevailing attitude in England at the time: "The duty of the State is to promote the greatest good for the greatest number; the duty of the individual to help his neighbor in cases of well-ascertained emergency; the duty of all men to promote the accumulation of wealth, not as an object of worship, but as a ministry of good, avoiding equally the two extremes of despising riches, and of placing their trust in them".[2]

The optimism of the editor of Fraser's was well placed. Britain had weathered a phenomenal transition from an agricultural to an industrial nation in fifty years, and yet the kingdom, although severely strained, remained in one piece. The Industrial Revolution had blessed

---

[2]"The First Half of the Nineteenth Century", Fraser's Magazine, Vol. XLIII, No. CCLIII, (January, 1851) p. 14.

the nation with unquestioned world leadership in trade. Further, she was indeed the "workshop of the world". British iron provided tracks for British locomotives to steam their way across Europe and America. British mechanized looms digested most of the world's cotton, and disgorged millions of yards of cheap cloth. Her ships ruled with confidence the seas of the world. Her mechanics' skills and her technological advancements were the envy of nations. Throughout what is now recognized as the greatest economic and social revolution in the history of man, Britain's crowning achievement was the maintenance of a stable government that had successfully avoided the plague of Europe: violent revolution.

Revolution had been avoided by a combination of good fortune, a peculiar brand of political flexibility and humanitarian concern.[3] The fates had smiled on the Island by providing physical isolation from the political infections of Europe. Further, Britain was blessed with a tradition of peaceful government reform and an assertion, at least in theory, of "the rights of Englishmen". Her attempts at outright suppression had been sporadic and half-hearted. In the relative intellectual freedom afforded in Britain, the nation harbored men who were able to present numerous alternative solutions to the problems besetting the nation. The pragmatic philosophy of those in power tolerated experimentation within the system. The predominant philosophy of the age was

---

[3]David Thomson, England in the Nineteenth Century, (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1950) p. 27.

well expressed by the editor of Fraser's — a free economy, a well governed nation that allowed individuals latitude in the pursuit of their own good to the betterment of the whole society.

Entwined in the statement were both the philosophy of Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and the economic theory of Adam Smith (1723-1790). By 1850, the two diverse theories — one social, one economic — had been transformed and combined by men like the social reformer James Chadwick and the economist John Stuart Mill.[4] Benthamism or Utilitarianism proposed the social theory of the greatest good for the greatest number which was expressed in the quote from Fraser's. The worth of an idea or action in Bentham's view, lay in its usefulness or "utility". Men, he claimed, naturally avoided pain and sought pleasure. That which provided the least pain and the greatest pleasure for the most people was good and useful. Originally a philosophy which rejected governmental interference in the natural laws of utility, Benthamism was later interpreted by men like John Stuart Mill to include government action in liberal social reform.[5]

The new science of the nineteenth century was economics, introduced to England by Adam Smith and others. Centered also on individual effort unfettered by governmental interference , capitalism as economic theory was put forth by Smith as the material law of the market. The laws of nature extended into the market place, said Smith, where left to function freely they would provide everyone with material benefits.

---

[4] Ibid., p. 31.

[5] Ibid., p. 31.

Prices were to be determined by the amount of the consumer's demand and seller's supply. If a good in short supply commanded a high price and good profits due to its popularity with the consumer, other producers, eager to share in the returns, would increase the supply until prices would fall. In this way the consumer would benefit. If a producer was inefficient and/or the market became overcrowded, he would be forced out. Thus only the most efficient producer, the one who could produce the best product for the lowest price while still receiving a profit (the reward for his risk) would survive. By 1850, the entwined systems of utility and competition, according to popular middle class theory, would result in the elimination of all the evils attendant upon traditional money-making. This conviction explains the last statement in the quote from Fraser's.

Unfortunately, theory and practice stood poles apart; great groups of British citizens suffered indescribable horrors in the transition from agriculture to industry.[6] Neither Bentham nor Smith seemed to anticipate that those producers, pursuing the goal of self-interest through competition, would achieve low prices and high profits by extorting the maximum use from the elements of production at a minimum cost. Since land was limited, machinery expensive, natural resources dear - the burden of cost-cutting fell squarely on the worker's wages and hours.

The agricultural revolution which preceeded the industrial, had created a whole new system of food production. Arranged upon the same

---

[6]Pauline Gregg, Modern Britain,; A Social and Economic History Since 1760, 5th ed. (New York: Pegasus, 1965) Ch. VI.

assumptions of maximum efficiency and utility, farmers aimed at producing, cheaply, food for more people. This led to a reduction of human labor, consolidation of land and mechanization. In human terms, it meant a great dislocation of agricultural labor, for enclosure left thousands without land. These landless poor either hired themselves out as tenants or migrated to the new industrial centers to swell the throng of cheap, unskilled labor.

The early capitalist, unrestrained by either laws or compunction, ignored the humanity of his workers. For each one on the job, multiples were unemployed. Workers -- men, women, and children -- labored fourteen to sixteen hours a day for a pittance. There was no concern on the part of the owner for safety or health within his factory, and even a worse callousness was exhibited toward living conditions in the new towns. The wealth and power of England, "rested on foundations of harsh sweated labour, appalling slum conditions in her new towns, and immense human misery".[7]

John M. Ludlow, writing of the period in retrospect, said, "The absence of education stunted the mind, whilst increasing labour dwarfed and deformed the body, and the short hours of relaxation from toil allowed to the factory worker were commonly spent in the most sensual and degrading pursuits. The educational, moral and physical condition of England's workers was beginning to be felt as unbearable".[8]

Basically, the British turned to a combination of three strands of thought to remedy the evils of unbridled industrialization - Liberalism,

---

[7] Thomson, p. 32.

[8] John M. Ludlow and Lloyd Jones, Progress of the Working Class 1832-1867, (London: Alexander Strahan, Pub., 1867) p. 10.

Conservatism and Socialism. Each represented a divergent philosophy and goal. The nineteenth century economic "liberal" who drew philosophy from both Benthamism and capitalistic Laissez Faire, proposed practical mechanistic changes in the existing system. Between 1823 and 1848, this trend produced a spate of legislation in response to political pressure from the materially powerful middle classes. The new laws were economic, political and social.

Early in the 1820's the Whigs had begun a pressure for reduction of customs duties that did not cease until virtual free trade became a reality in mid century (1860).[9] Systematic reduction of duties met little resistance except in one outstanding case, that of the corn or grain duties. Merchants, manufacturers and workers joined to fight tariffs which kept the price of grain high to the benefit of aristocratic land owners. The impetus came from the industrial north of England, where men like Richard Cobden and John Bright welded together the Anti-Corn Law League. With the success of the League a new element was introduced into British politics, that of high pressure lobbying on the part of the newly enfranchised middle classes, aided by the protest of the masses, in challange to the long entrenched power of the landed aristocrat and gentry. In the Corn Law fight, the new industry was firmly pitted against the old agriculture. In 1846, the free traders won an important round when they secured the repeal of the Corn Laws.[10]

---

[9]Gregg, p. 116.

[10]Ibid., p. 162.

Manufacturers, merchants and the bourgeoisie, because of the wealth produced by trade and industry, began to exert their financial power against the old structure of land and crown in the 1820's. By 1832, they had achieved major political power through the passage of the Reform Bill. The lower classes who had joined with the Bourgeois in the struggle to enlarge suffrage were bitterly disappointed when they found themselves still excluded from the right to vote; however, the Bill enlarged the franchise and redistricted England, giving large industrial cities such as Manchester and Liverpool a voice in Parliament which they had long been denied. The reformed Parliament, reflecting the economic and social philosophies of the newly enfranchised, quickly began to institute a far reaching program of legal simplification and codification.[11]

Economic law was liberalized by abolishing duties and restructuring the partnership laws — a subject dealt with later in the paper. The theories of efficiency were extended to the social realm. For example, prisons were a veritable cesspool of iniquity and vice which led not to rehabilitation, but to further crime. Two reforms were interlocked here; the streamlining of criminal justice with reductions in death penalties and the rehabilitation of criminals in a wholesome atmosphere.[12]

Another area of waste was seen in the old poor laws, which lent themselves to analysis by the new science of statistics. Under Benthamite Edwin Chadwick, the problem was investigated with scientific precision, statistics amassed, and a corrective mechanism devised. The machinery of the new Poor Law of 1834 replaced the old parish system with a Board of Guardians responsible to a central Poor Law Commission.

---

[11]Thomson, p. 30.

[12]Gregg, Ch. XII.

The application of relief was to be uniform throughout the nation, with the poor divided into neat catagories. In clarity and efficiency, the plan was admirable, but it was not particularly humane or flexible. The centralization of power for the administration of poor relief in a national body under Parliament was a significant step in the development of English social legislation.[13]

Another area of important reform in the liberal trend was that of municipal government. Industrialization had created large cities out of crossroad villages and therefore these new urban areas had few adequate tools of administration. Under the new Bill passed in 1835, rate payers received a role in newly formed city government. They elected municipal councils that had the power to make certain by-laws to control the police and municipal property and to collect the rates. Here again, power passed from the old landed interests to the new middle class.[14]

Utilitarian reform and economic mechanisms had their devotees, but there were many who were not entranced by Bentham. John Stuart Mill, who began as a Benthamite Utilitarian once said, "Every Englishman of the present day ... is by implication either a Benthamite or a Coleridgian ..."[15]

In the realm of literature the poetry and thought of Coleridge, the histories of Carlyle and the romantic fiction of Sir Walter Scott

---

[13]Thomson, p. 69.

[14]Ibid., p. 72.

[15]Max Beer, History of British Socialism, (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1940 ed., 1948 reprint) p. 177.

combined to produce a reaction to the sterility of mechanics. This was a rich mixture which at its best brought a humanitarian paternalistic concern for dislocation and suffering.[16]

In political life, the greatest practical paternalist of the period was Lord Antony Ashley Cooper, later Earl of Shaftesbury. Motivated by a sense of noblesse oblige combined with evangelical protestantism, Shaftesbury believed that it was the duty of the state to protect the exploited poor. He was primarily responsible for the many factory acts passed between 1833 and 1847.[17] In continuing legislation the working hours of children and women were reduced and working conditions were improved. Another conservative paternalist, Benjamin Disraeli, a "Young Englander" in Shaftesbury's day, summed up the concern and views of Conservatives in his novel, Sybil, published in 1845:

> Since the passing of the Reform Act the Alter of Mammon has blazed with triple worship. To acquire, to accumulate, to plunder each other by virture of philosophic phrases, to propose a Utopia to consist only of wealth and toil, this has been the breathless business of enfranchised England for the last twelve years, until we are started from our voracious strife by the wail of intolerable serfage.[18]

All sorts of charitable efforts were begun. Societies to protect needlewomen and governesses, to start ragged schools and Sunday education for the poor, to develop model housing and sanitation -- all became the reassertion of the duty of the rich toward the poor. Max Beer stated:

---

[16]Thomson, p. 47.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Benjamin Disraeli, Sybil, (London, Oxford Univ. Press reprint 1969, Orig. 1845) p. 31.

> Looking behind all these various measures, one notices conservative thought brooding over the social chaos and searching for the kindly light to lead the country to permanent and stable order, based on the authority either of the laws of God, or of historic tradition, or of some heroic personality.[19]

Woven into the tapestry of paternalism and utility and drawing from both was British Socialism. Robert Owen, Scots industrialist, perceived the "condition of England" in pragmatically utilitarian terms; "If social conditions are bad — change them ..."[20] Owen was a materialistic determinest; he believed that men are molded by the external conditions of their lives. His paternalism came forth in his solution: the creation of industrial and agricultural communities governed by the workers for their own benefit. Education, adequate and pleasant housing, recreation and culture, blended with intelligent business management would not only benefit the worker but would increase productivity. Owen practiced his theory in his own mill at New Lanark, Scotland, with great success. For the rest of his life, he then pursued the goal of voluntary, self-governing co-operative communities. Owen wrote and lectured, formed a labor union, attempted a labor exchange, began an agricultural community in America and influenced the entire history of modern socialism.[21]

Owen's socialism was scientific in the light of 18th Century rationalism. Society, like all of nature, had laws which, if discovered

---

[19]Beer, p. 177.

[20]Thomson, p. 44.

[21]Thomson, pp. 44-46.

and applied, would produce a "New Moral World".[22] However, utopian socialist schemes which reflected paternalism and romaticism abounded in 19th Century England. Most of these plans involved rural communes and scorned industrialization. John Minter Morgan, a friend and follower of Owen, proposed village communities — Church of England self-supporting villages — where Christianity and socialism could be reconciled. Morgan went to great expense to construct a diorama of an ideal village and offered £ 20,000 to anyone who would carry out the idea. He had no takers ... or followers.[23]

Even more exotic was James Pierrepont Greaves, the "Sacred Socialist". He aimed not toward an ultimate material prosperity of all, but for the training of souls away from materialism to love. This was to be accomplished through active self denial, an important element of which was vegetarianism.[24]

Socialism, sacred and secular, gave many the desire to revamp society completely and create a workers' paradise. More practical men, the ones who actually labored, grasped the promise of both Utopia and reform. The working classes, in keeping with the general philosophy of self-help, engaged in a number of programs for their own improvement.

---

[22]E. V. Neale, "On the Characteristic Features of Some of the Leading Systems of Socialism", in The Christian Socialist: A Journal of Association, Vol. I, conducted by Several of the Promoters of the London Working Men's Associations, (London: John Tupling, 1851) p. 164.

[23]J. M. Ludlow, "Some of the Christian Socialists of 1848 and the Following Years" Part I, The Economic Review, Vol. III, No. 4, (October, 1893) p. 486.

[24]Neale, "On the Characteristic Features ..." The Christian Socialist", p. 165.

The repeal of the Combination Act made it legal for the lower classes to organize, and during the eighteen thirties and forties, the trades union movement played a prominent and ever growing role. In addition, the older self-help groups called Friendly Societies, encouraged savings and provided insurance programs for the working classes. The Friendly Society was a unique blend of fraternal order, insurance agency and social center. The largest of these were the Oddfellows and the Foresters. Some were mainly social in nature, others simply acted as a collection agency for sickness and death benefits.[25] Both trades unions and Friendly Societies provided the worker with security and a sense of numerical solidarity.

For many workers, numerical solidarity was not enough, it had to be converted into political power. The failure of Owen's National Consolidated Trades Union, disappointment engendered by the exclusion of the working classes from the franchise in the Reform Act of 1832, degradation threatened by the new Poor Laws and exploitation of workers in north England mills combined to produce general political unrest. In 1836, William Lovett founded the London Working Mens' Association to foster self-help among the workers, and two years later, Lovett and Francis Place drew up the People's Charter. The charter proposed six political reforms: universal male suffrage, equal electoral districts, removal of property qualifications for members of Parliament, payment for members of Parliament, secret ballot and annual general elections.[26]

While the masses of continental Europe turned to violence and

---

[25] Gregg, p. 315.

[26] Thomson, p. 83.

revolution during the eighteen thirties and forties, it was significant that British workers put their faith in legal political reform. For many, the Charter became "something of a religion which was expected to bring universal salvation".[27] Chartist activities had three centers: Lovett and Place's London group, the intellectual base; Birmingham, home of the general popular agitation; and Leeds, where Feargus O'Connor radicalized the movement and joined it with land reform schemes. Mass meetings were held, propaganda societies formed and finally the first of the mass petitions was circulated throughout the country. The climax of the movement came in 1839, when a monster petition for the Charter was presented to Parliament and rejected by that body.[28]

The refusal of Parliament to act upon Chartist demands did not result in revolution, as many had expected. There was sporadic agitation, but the effects were manifested more in a split within the party. Feargus O'Connor and his followers advocated violence; Lovett propounded "moral force". After 1839, the middle class deserted the Chartist cause for that of the Anti-Corn Law League and workers turned toward trades unions.[29]

Chartism continued to attract fringe support until 1848. On April 10th of that year, a third monster petition was brought to London under the aegis of Feargus O'Connor and his more radical following. The people

---

[27] Ibid., p. 85.

[28] Gregg, p. 214.

[29] Thomson, p. 86.

of London expected violence and armed hundreds of special constables to meet the threat. O'Connor backed down in the face of the government's determination to prevent bloodshed, and the mob behind him disintegrated.[30]

The Charter had been defeated, the movement decimated, but British concern for the plight of the working classes remained. Later, in the summer of 1849, The Morning Cronicle published a series of articles called "London Labour and the London Poor", in which the author detailed the conditions of the lower classes by occupation from costermonger to prostitute.[31] This expose shocked and horrified middle and upper class sensibilities. Many began to wonder how the Chartists had let the country off so easily.[32] Again, the voices that counted began to clamor for reform.

One used to modern social gospel action, would assume that priests and ministers with the support of the national churches would have been in the forefront in the demand for social reform. This was not true of English churches in 1848. There were two streams of theological thought in and out of the Church of England. Neither was concerned with social action. Continuing from 17th century dissent, the older Evangelical movement stressed personal salvation by faith and election. It was concerned with the souls of the poor, but not their bodies, since its

---

[30]Thomson, p. 85.

[31]Henry Mayhew, London Labour and the London Poor, Vol. I, The London Street Folk, (New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1967, Reprint, Orig. 1851).

[32]Charles E. Raven, Christian Socialism 1848 - 1854. (New York: Augustus M. Kelley, Pub. Reprint 1968, Orig. 1920) p. 144.

message was one of salvation in another world through suffering in this one. Further, the Evangelicals stressed the absolute, literal truth of the Bible. This Calvinistic, fundamentalist emphasis tended to be cold, intolerant and narrow. Evangelical Protestantism remained a lower middle and middle class faith which held little attraction for the poor, despite fervent missionary activity carried on among them.[33]

Although there was an Evangelical movement within the Anglican Church with such luminary adherants as Bishop Samuel Wilberforce and Lord Shaftesbury, the mainstream of the movement was in the dissenting churches. The Church of England of the 1840's was enthralled with a new theology, that of the Oxford Movement, which was politically, socially and economically a reaction to the social turmoil brought on by the industrial revolution. Its reaction took the form of almost total preoccupation with the ideals of the medieval church and the order of society in Christendom. The followers of the Oxford Movement were anti-liberal in the classical sense. They abhorred industry, capitalism, and the economic laws. They yearned for the natural, Christian order of society where the church regulated the life of King, noble, and peasant. This manifested itself in a return to the doctrine and liturgy of the Roman Catholic Church. Unfortunately, the Oxford theology did not release in the Church of England the spirit of concern, unity and inclusiveness of the early church. Its result, the revival of much cermonial liturgy, is today referred to as the "high church" movement. Canon Raven, a low-church partisan, summed it up well when he said:

---

[33]Gilbert Binyon, The Christian Socialist Movement in England, (New York: McMillan Co., 1931) p. 56 ff.

> They were allowing the vintage of the Catholic religion, which might have been for the refreshment of nations, to remain sealed up and useless, while its discoverers engaged in learned disquisitions and heated controversies over the shape and ornamentations of the bottles in which it was contained.[34]

The church followed a policy of non-intervention and laissez faire toward the problems of the working classes. It was not difficult therefore to understand why the working classes had rejected the church, both state and dissenting. As the laborer moved from farm to factory, he left behind both parish and church. Both the Evangelical and the Oxford movements agitated about how to attract the working classes to the church, but neither seriously considered advocating social change. Again Canon Raven sought the essence of the dilemma:

> "...Churchmen, of sound education, delicate sensibilities, and often genuine devotion, closed their eyes and ears and deliberately refused to act, babbling meanwhile of the new Jerusalem and of the Catholic religion".[35]

Obviously there existed a theological gap to be filled with a new outlook.

The self-satisfaction of British capitalism so well expressed in the Fraser's editorial at mid-century was not shared by the whole of society. The trend of reform had begun to alleviate the sufferings of the lower classes; this combined with new prosperity had blunted the revolutionary force of Chartism. But abject misery still existed in city and country untouched by reform; and socialism, both native and foreign versions, enchanted many of the more thoughtful of the working classes. The church had seemed to abjure any moral responsibility for

---

[34] Raven, p. 20.

[35] Ibid., p. 25.

the continuing misery of the poor. The condition of England called for new solutions, combining the best of reforms and socialism with a regenerated church that would reconcile man to man, class to class and all to the fatherhood of God. In 1848, three men heard the call and pledged themselves to shoulder the mighty task of reconciliation. They called themselves Christian Socialists.

CHAPTER III

THE FOUNDERS OF CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM

The Christian Socialists had a new vision of the Gospel of Christ, one which saw the whole of human activity within the domain of Christ's concern. Not only was a man's soul to be ministered to, but his whole life; his human relations and his physical, mental and moral well-being were important also. If men were to be one with Christ they must be able to develop to the fullest of their capacities and to live in harmony and co-operation with their fellow men. The Christian Socialists believed that for the Kingdom of Christ to be realized, Christians must take an active part in all aspects of human endeavor. Writing on the theme of Christian Socialism, Max Beer expressed the thought of F. D. Maurice, theological leader of Christian socialism, in this way:

> He desired to see Christianity not only a faith, but a deed. The Kingdom of Christ was not to come, but to be realized. God's order was mutual love and fellowship, while selfishness and competition were the direct result of man's disorder.[36]

In addition to Frederick Denison Maurice, the major figures who led the struggle of the new social theology were John Malcolm Forbes Ludlow and Charles Kingsley.

Today, John Malcolm Ludlow is recognized as the real originator of Christian Socialism. It was he who best understood socialism and was the most consistent in pursuing a practical policy for working class improvement. It has only been in this century that his contribution has

---

[36]Beer, p. 180.

been recognized, for Ludlow was self-effacing and preferred to give the credit to Maurice and the others. His personality tended to be prickly and rigid; he was not particularly congenial. Although most of the ideas were his, he did not seem able or willing to lead the others.[37]

John M. Ludlow was born in Nimach, India, on March 8, 1821, the second son of Colonel John Ludlow of the East India Company service and Maria Brown Ludlow, daughter of Murdoch Brown of Madras.[38] Ludlow's father, who died a few months after his son's birth, was a descendent of Edmund Ludlow, a general in Cromwell's army. This side of his family endowed Ludlow with Whig sympathies combined with the romanticism of Indian service. Murdoch Brown, Ludlow's grandfather, had been one of the earliest merchant princes of India. Brown had an Indian mistress by whom he had numerous half-caste children — a fact which profoundly influenced young Ludlow's sympathy for the struggles of the colored races of the world.[39]

Maria Brown Ludlow had spent a happy girlhood in France and it was to Paris that she took her children after the death of her husband. The family was close and loving. Young John was a precocious, outgoing child whose sisters taught him to read when he was only four. After

---

[37] J. M. Ludlow, Autobiography, (unpublished) Ch. XXXVII, cited in Torbin Christensen, Origin and History of Christian Socialism, (Aarhus: Unwersitetsforlaget, 1962) p. 365.

[38] Dictionary of National Biography, (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1912 Supplement) p. 48.

[39] Neville Masterman, John Malcolm Ludlow, Builder of Christian Socialism, (Cambridge: University Press, 1963) p. 16 ff.

being tutored by a fine German governess, John entered the Collége Bourbon in 1832. Here his performance was excellent; he won prize after prize for scholorships and was popular with both his teachers and his contemporaries.[40]

France provided Ludlow with both an academic and a political education. For France in Ludlow's youth was the political cauldron of Europe. As a child, Ludlow observed the revolution of 1830 with fascination. Politics became a central facet of his life and his clear concept of political realities lent great strength to the Christian Socialist movement. Educationally, politically and spiritually Ludlow was a Frenchman when he left the Collége in 1837 with a Bachelor's degree from the University of France.[41] Those who knew him predicted an outstanding career for him in France.[42]

However, Ludlow did not remain in France; he went to England instead. This seems to have been a severe blow to his emotional security from which he never appeared to recover.[43] As he and his mother discussed future plans after his graduation, she casually mentioned that it had been his father's wish that his son go to England. Out of an extreme sense of duty, Ludlow took the suggestion as a command, although

---

[40]Masterman, p. 17.

[41]Christensen, p. 35 ff.

[42]Masterman, p. 17.

[43]Ibid., p. 22.

it demolished all his hopes and plans for a life in France. In 1837, he and his mother moved to London. "But this immolation of all my wishes to a dead father aged me ten years", Ludlow wrote in his autobiography.[44]

At the age of sixteen, John Ludlow entered Lincoln's Inn to read for the bar in the chambers of Bellenden Ker, a famous conveyancer who was mainly responsible, in the 1830's, for the reform in British law concerning joint stock companies.[45] Although Ludlow was still very young, he had matured far beyond his age and soon became Ker's brightest and most favored pupil.[46] He mastered the intricacies of business partnerships and joint stock companies, which information he would use successfully in gaining legal statues for co-operative associations in later years. Due to his excellent training, Ludlow knew a great deal more about the value and functions of corporations than did most socialists of his time.[47]

Ludlow, writing editorially in retrospect, modestly described his legal role in working class legislation. "He has been led by his profession to consider especially the legal difficulties which stood

---

[44] Ibid.

[45] Christensen, p. 47.

[46] Masterman, p. 36.

[47] Ibid., p. 38.

in the way of that [working class] improvement, and the means of removing those difficulties; and also, and in an increasing proportion of late years, the openings afforded by legislation for promoting the welfare of the worker".[48]

During his early years in England, Ludlow, lonely and alienated, kept a diary (in French) in which he confided his feelings and observations.[49] The personal observations show that politically, Ludlow was a radical democrat, not influenced by party creed, but a pragmatist who realistically attempted with all resources to solve the problems at hand. His diary reveals a bare toleration of monarchy, as long as it remained the servant of Parliament and the nation. He championed universal suffrage and instinctively abhorred political and social priviledge. Above all, political life, in Ludlow's view, demanded a personal integrity which would defend a correct decision against opposition. His diaries contained finely drawn political portraits and detailed accounts of national events of both England and France of his day.[50]

Naturally, Ludlow was attracted to the political activity surrounding him in Ker's chambers. Although somewhat repelled by Ker's coarse Whiggery, he admired the tactics employed by the economic liberals, like Ker's friends Richard Cobden and John Bright.[51]

---

[48]Ludlow and Jones, pp. 2-3.

[49]Christensen, p. 40.

[50]Ibid., p. 40 ff.

[51]Masterman, p. 36.

Ludlow met these men through Ker and became a member of the Anti-Corn Law League. He was never active in the League, for he disliked its lack of concern for the working classes. Ludlow was more attracted by the efforts of Lord Brougham and the Irishman, Daniel O'Connell. He greatly admired the latter, for he felt that the Irishman best represented the interests of the people he led in Parliament. To Ludlow, O'Connell was an example of the best instincts of the people, while Lord Brougham represented the worst.[52]

Ludlow was not only concerned about the conditions of the lower classes at home, but his international, radical outlook led him to involve himself in the causes of the other downtrodden abroad. He was especially dismayed at the plight of the natives of his birthplace, and was an early member of the British India Society which had been founded by his uncle, Frank Brown in 1839. Inspired by Brown's dedication to the people of India, Ludlow considered joining him actively, and working to reform British legislation relative to India. But he found himself turning instead to reform of the civil code.[53]

Underlying his humanitarian concern was Ludlow's view of Christianity. His mother held strong religious interests which pervaded family life.[54] She belonged to a French Protestant Church, The National Reformed Church, where services were conducted by an outstanding liberal protestant, Athanase Coquerel. Coquerel, a progressive, emphasized a

---

[52]Christensen, p. 43.

[53]Ibid., p. 46.

[54]Ibid., p. 36.

need to adapt Christianity to the science and technology of the modern age. He stressed personal and moral Christianity that manifested itself in social concerns. Although influenced by Coquerel, Ludlow was also impressed by the liberal Catholicism espoused by many of his friends. His independent mind rejected orthodoxy.[55]

Ludlow felt lonely and isolated in England, where he seemed unable to make close friends or form emotional attachments. Alienation permeated his religious life also, for he held the Church of England in contempt as a political institution with no root in the people, a Church for the aristocracy which "oppressed the nation".[56] In London, he and his mother attended either the French Protestant services or a nearby Congregational Church. Although attracted by dissenting evangelism, he still felt strange in English churches and longed for the vitality of Coquerel's congregation in Paris.[57]

In 1839, a violent earthquake shattered Martinique, the home of Ludlow's sisters and their families. The British papers reported the disaster, but included no casuality lists. Ludlow, believing the worst and cast into the depths of personal agony, railed against God -

> What had I done that He should take away at a swoop all but one of those whom I loved best? Had I not sacrificed virtually all earthly happiness in renouncing France? Did I not feel the bitterness of the sacrifice daily more and more?[58]

---

[55] Ibid., p. 35 ff.

[56] J. M. Ludlow, Diary (unpublished), September 28, 1839, cited in Christensen, p. 47.

[57] Ibid., p. 48.

[58] J. M. Ludlow, Autobiography (unpublished), Chp. X, Cited in Christensen, p. 48.

Slowly his rage calmed and in its place came a sure peace and faith in the goodness of God, which was rewarded when Ludlow received word that his family had been spared.[59] For Ludlow the experience marked his spiritual conversion to Christianity, in contrast to the purely intellectual convictions he had held before this, the turning point in his religious life.

When Ludlow surrendered his will to God, he adopted a fundamentalist view which was intensified by hearing Adolphe Monod, a French revivalist, in Paris, in 1839. Emotionally won over by Monod, Ludlow began to take religious strength from fundamentalist Christianity and rejected much of the teachings of Coquerel. However, he was too cultured and intellectual to accept the negative, science-denying side of the Revival. In the works of Alexandre Vinet, the intellectual leader of the French revivalists, Ludlow found the inspiration to combine revivalism and modern culture.[60]

The excitement of French revival abated for Ludlow in 1842, as dwindling fortunes forced him to work hard at law for a living and denied him the opportunity to make any real contribution toward the reforms he dreamed of. Life seemed dark and dreary for Ludlow and thoughts of suicide often consumed him. He wrote:

> The weariness of life lay upon me at this time - say just before my falling in love with my cousin ... I was now assailed with a real desire to kill myself, and be rid of life in which it seemed to me that I had no work to do and might perhaps do more good to others by dying than by living.[61]

---

[59] Ibid.

[60] Christensen, p. 50.

[61] Ludlow, Autobiography cited in Christensen, p. 51.

In 1843, Ludlow's perception of life brightened considerably, for he fell in love with his wealthy, Tory, high church cousin, Maria Forbes. Although Maria was fond of Ludlow, her sense of duty toward her ill and aging parents prevented her from accepting his proposal of marriage. In love, as in other convictions of his life, Ludlow exhibited dogged tenacity and consistancy once convinced of the rightness of his decision. He courted Maria Forbes for twenty-six years, until at last she agreed to marry him in 1869.[62]

Sustained by love, Ludlow became increasingly open to new philosophical influences during the 1840's. He became an ardent admirer of Thomas Arnold, whose philosophy of church and society sowed the first seeds of Christian Socialism in Ludlow's thoughts.[63] Arnold proclaimed that the salvation of society lay in a radical Christian reformation in societal relations patterned on the Gospels. Since Ludlow found in Arnold's work a philosophy toward which his experiences had already inclined him, Ludlow was inspired to begin where Arnold had left off.

Inspired by Arnold's social Gospel, Ludlow was open to another life-changing experience in Paris in 1846. At that time he met a Lutheran Clergyman, Louis Meyer, an evangelical convert who recognized a Christian command to minister to the social needs of the poor in the neighboring slum districts near his church in Paris. In the early 1840's, Meyer founded a society of zealous young men, the Society of Friends of

---

[62] Masterman, p. 22.

[63] Christensen, p. 53.

the Poor, who, united in Christian brotherhood, dedicated themselves to the service of the underprivileged. They formed groups throughout France and kept in close contact with each other.[64]

Meyer was the first clergyman with whom Ludlow became intimate. With the greatest gentleness, he inquired of Ludlow's work to relieve the conditions of the lower classes. Ludlow shamefully had to admit that he had as yet done nothing. Upon his return to England, Ludlow immediately attempted to engage in some kind of social mission, but he soon despaired of the groups already at work in London. He overcame his shyness enough to enlist the help of a few fellow lawyers around Lincoln's Inn, and together they approached their new Chaplain, Frederick Denison Maurice. When Maurice offered no support and his other friends dropped away, Ludlow attempted to visit the poor by himself; but he was soon overcome by the enormity of the task.[65] However, the significance of the attempt lay not in his failure in the mission, but in that he had met Maurice, his future mentor.

By the young age of twenty five, Ludlow had experienced a number of important philosophical encounters. From the Revival, he had received an emotional faith that reached his lonely heart. Intellectually, he needed more; he searched to combine the spiritual force of fundamentalism with some kind of practical action which carried Christian commitment into the realities of society. He discovered two avenues in the philosophy of Arnold and the activity of Louis Meyer, both of which brought him

---

[64] Ibid., p. 54.

[65] Masterman, p. 46.

to an enlightened faith that demanded of him active involvement to reform society. Since Ludlow did not have confidence in himself, he had to be a follower. He would project that leadership he sought in F. D. Maurice. After Ludlow and Maurice joined forces in 1848, Ludlow consistently deferred to Maurice's theological leadership in the Christian Socialist movement. Later in his life, Ludlow looked back on the experience and declared, "Maurice was ... the central figure of the movement, towering spiritually by head and shoulders over all the rest".[66]

The man to whom Ludlow ascribed all leadership in Christian Socialism, Frederick Denison Maurice, was born in Suffolk in August, 1805, the son of a poor Unitarian minister. As a young boy, Frederick found himself in the midst of a theological tug of war between his father and the women of the family who had been converted from Unitarianism by various forms of Evangelism.[67]

Since Maurice's father forbad religious discussion in the household, the women resorted to writing long letters to each other, and especially to Frederick, explaining their various positions. The bitter controversy definitely affected the sensitive young boy. In the introduction to a collection of Maurice's letters, the editors maintained that

---

[66] J. M. Ludlow, "Some of the Christian Socialists of 1848 and the Following Years", I, Economic Review, Vol. III, No. 4, (October, 1893) p. 488.

[67] John F. Porter and William Wolf, Toward the Recovery of Unity, The Thought of Frederick Denison Maurice, (New York: Seabury Press, 1964) p. 6.

the psychological impact of the dissention may have been partially responsible for Maurice's drive for reconciliation and unity which formed the central theme for his ministry.[68]

In 1823, Maurice entered Cambridge, and though natural shyness tended to inhibit him socially, had a brilliant career as a student. He did not receive his degree however, because he refused to subscribe to the Thirty Nine Articles, a requirement of British law.[69] From Cambridge, Maurice went to London, where he took his place among the outstanding radicals of his day. At first, he tried to study law, but finding it dull, he turned to writing for various liberal intellectual magazines. His main contributions were to the Athenaeum which he purchased and edited in 1828. It failed within the year.[70]

Torbin Christensen has written an excellent survey of this part of Maurice's life. Christensen points out that Maurice became a part of the group of young radicals headed by the Benthamite, John Stuart Mill, who made up the London Debating Society, but he rejected their utilitarianism. Instead he espoused some the romatic idealism of Coleridge and Wordsworth.[71] Like the romantics, Maurice viewed man as having the faculty which enabled him to encounter universal truth beyond his sensuate experiences.[72]

---

[68] Ibid.

[69] Ibid., p. 6-8.

[70] Christensen, p. 16.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Ibid.

Here Maurice attacked the Utilitarians and eighteenth century rationalists because they held that man could only deal with what was existant in the visible world. However, Christensen adds the fact that Maurice agreed with the philosophical radicals in his views on social reform. He could not, says Christensen, accept the romantic defense of England's "ancient institutions".[73]

Maurice had developed a broad theology during his days in London that was compatible with his social philosophy. His Unitarian heritage was obvious in the notion of an all-inclusive God under whom all men were brothers. According to his view, the whole universe was God's and evidenced His all-pervasive unity. Maurice decried sects that divided men from each other in the name of God and that became exclusive systems which worshipped their own machinery. Within the broad strokes of this universalist view, Maurice had conceived a rational, unemotional concept of God.[74]

Maurice found, however, that his impersonal religion did not sustain him through the agony of watching his sister die in 1830. During that year, he experienced a conversion to the personhood of Christ and realized a sense of his sin and need for salvation.[75]

Due to Maurice's acceptance of personal redemption, his life was profoundly changed. To the surprise of his friends, he turned to the very heart of the establishment that he had attacked so brilliantly

---

[73] Ibid., p. 15

[74] Ibid., pp. 18-19.

[75] Christensen, pp. 22-23.

only a year before. In 1830, he entered Exeter College, Oxford, to study for ordination into the Church of England.[76] But for Maurice, the Anglican Church embodied that very reconciling stand which became the focal point of his theology.

According to Maurice, God works through history to bring men to Him. The Anglican Church, because of its peculiar history, was neither Roman or Protestant, but a unique bridge between the two; thus, for Maurice, it was the best expression of God's reconciling mission among all the sects and denominations. In his most famous theological work, The Kingdom of Christ, (1838), Maurice explained his vision of the roll laid out by God for the Church of England.

Beginning as a series of letters to a Quaker, The Kingdom of Christ contained an analysis of all the prominent Christian denominations of the day. In summarizing the book, Maurice's biographers said:

> His basic conclusion is that nearly every one of these movements is right and truthful in its positive assertions, but wrong in its negations. These negations are compounded into systems that further divide men and shatter the unity of Christ's Church.[77]

The key to understanding Maurice's theology is embodied in his antagonism toward man-made systems. Maurice believed that the divine order is an existing reality in which man is already living. Since human relationships are arranged by God, it is man's vocation to discover and develop his place in the divine order and in his ministry to others. Maurice rejected man-made systems because he believed they

---

[76] Porter and Wolf, p. 7.

[77] Ibid., p. 9.

promoted exclusiveness and alienation, thus interfering with God's reconciling work between men.[78] In practice, Maurice's belief in a Divine Order meant that he was loath to join organizations whose purpose it was to change some aspect of society. Because of this antipathy, Maurice's friends would find it quite difficult to get him to cooperate in practical ventures organized to improve working class conditions.

Another key to comprehending Maurice is recognizing his all-prevading sense of humility. Because he was so careful not to interfere with others, it often led them to misunderstand him. His son, Frederick Maurice, explained the problem:

> As a rule he carefully avoids a specific answer to the specific question put to him. He does this deliberately and on principle; dreading lest he should thereby substitute himself as leader and answer for Him whom he believed that it was his duty to turn the eyes of all men.[79]

As Ludlow and others saw the situation, Maurice suffered personally for the sins of men and felt himself implicated in the sins of the age. Thus he drew back from any act on his part that would cause any man pain. Instead, he was open and sensitive to all with whom he came in contact. He had the unique ability to feel with others and take their burdens as his own.[80] However, this meant that it was extremely difficult to get Maurice to take a clear stand; thus many

---

[78] Christensen, p. 24.

[79] Frederick Maurice, The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice, 2 Vols., (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884), Vol. II, p. 4.

[80] Ludlow, "Some Christian Socialists" I, p. 493.

thought he agreed with them, because of his loving concern, only to find that, on principle, he could not join their enthusiasm.

Contemporary opinion on Maurice differed, although all who met him felt warmly toward him.[81] Some of the praise was almost adulatory. For example, the biographer, Sir Edward Strachey said that Maurice fit the words of St. John, "A man sent from God ... the same came for a witness to bear witness of the light".[82] Frederic Harrison, a lawyer with Ludlow, felt differently: "A more utterly muddle headed and impotent mind I have never known".[83] Alfred Lord Tennyson disagreed: "The greatest mind of them all".[84]

Present day thought is no less divided. Philip Backstrom, in an article in Victorian Studies, expressed the conviction that, "few tangible benefits have emerged from the Maurician stream of influence".[85] But John Porter and William Wolf, who edited an edition of Maurice's letters, credited him with originating two of the predominent trends in theology today, ecumenicism and the social gospel.[86] A local Episcopal

---

[81]Porter and Wolf, p. 18.

[82]Sir Edward Strachey in Life of Maurice, Vol. I, p. 201, quoted in Raven, p. 75.

[83]Frederic Harrison, Autobiographic Memories, Vol. I, p. 151, quoted in Raven, p. 75.

[84]Alfred Lord Tennyson, Memoir, Vol. II, p. 168, quoted in Raven, p. 76.

[85]Philip Backstrom, "The Practical Side of Christian Socialism", Victorian Studies, Vol. IV, no. 4 (June, 1963) p. 307.

[86]Porter and Wolf, pp. 3-6.

minister commented that Maurician theology is immensely popular in the Episcopal Seminaries throughout our country today.[87] Max Beer points up the clear contrast between Maurice and John Henry Newman, leader of the Oxford Movement, which seems to sum up Maurice's influence:

> In nobility and saintliness of character, in theological learning and sublety of intellect he may perhaps be compared with Newman. But the spheres of their work were poles asunder. Newman was a great ecclesiastic, essentially medieval in temper and intellect, while Maurice, by his religious and social philosophy and intensely national feeling, represented one of the spiritual forces of the 19th century.[88]

Maurice's influence did not come because he held high church offices. Since he persistently shunned promotion, for many years the only position he held was that of Chaplain at Guy's Hospital in Southwalk.[89] In 1845, he became the chaplain for the law students of Lincoln's Inn, and in 1846, he accepted the chair of divinity in the school of theology of Kings' College, London. It was at Lincoln's Inn in 1846 that Maurice was first approached by Ludlow who asked him to help in ministering to the poor of the neighborhood.[90]

Ludlow received no response from Maurice until after the French Revolution of 1848, which served to rouse Maurice's concern for the working classes. Ludlow heightened Maurice's interest by writing from Paris his eye-witness account of the revolution. In 1848, Ludlow, concerned

---

[87]Rev. David Bowman, Rector. St. Andrews Epicopal Church, to the author, May 1971.

[88]Beer, p. 180.

[89]Christensen, p. 30.

[90]Porter and Wolf, p. 6.

for his family, went immediately to Paris upon hearing of the violence there. He soon sensed that this revolution, unlike the others, had social rather than political aims exhibited in the demand for socialism to be achieved through universal male suffrage. Ludlow had been very much aware of the theories of socialism, but he felt that without Christian love, they were nothing more than machinery "to manufacture a Paradise".[91]

Convinced that his mission was to Christianize socialism, Ludlow seriously considered staying in France and joining Louis Meyer's group. Although he and Maurice were not yet intimate friends, Ludlow wrote to the London chaplain, pouring out his impressions of Parisian activity and his conclusions concerning the necessity of injecting Christianity into socialism. Many years later, in 1896, Ludlow reminisced about the enthusiam of Paris for social revolution. He described what he had written Maurice in 1848 and ended by saying "The conviction was forced upon me that Socialism must be Christianized, but that only a true social Christianity could do the work. Such was the purport of the letter in question".[92] Maurice said that this letter "had a very powerful effect" upon his thoughts at the time and had "given a direction to them ever since".[93]

---

[91] J. M. Ludlow, letter to Charles Forbes, March, 1848, cited in Christensen, p. 59.

[92] J. M. Ludlow, "The Christian Socialist Movement of the Middle of the Century, Atlantic Monthly, Vol. LXXXVII, (January 1896) p. 111.

[93] Ibid.

Maurice, stirred by the social upheavel at home and abroad, also saw the need for a truly social Christianity, a need not filled, in his view, by the man-made atheistic sects in Europe. Further, he felt that this reconciliation could not be accomplished by the Church of England, torn as she was by high church dissention. Although he was influenced by Ludlow's enthusiasm, Maurice's goal was to work within the Anglican Church and the English nation. Ludlow later wrote: "My idea at the time was that of throwing up all thought of an English career and going to Paris to set up a paper to be called "La Fraternite Chretienne".[94] Maurice listened sympathetically to the young man, but managed to discourage the idea.[95]

Meanwhile, the British Chartists, inspired by revolution on the continent, were preparing what was to be their last monster petition. It was to be presented to Parliament after a mass rally in Kennington Common on April 10, 1848. All London feared violence from the mob, led by Feargus O'Connor, the most reckless of Chartist agitators.[96] To protect herself, the city created hundreds of "special constables" from the middle classes, armed them and sent them against the mob. Maurice had signed up, but was prevented from serving by a bad cold. Ludlow, who did not anticipate violence, did not volunteer for duty. He wrote:

> For my own part, I could not feel alarmed. I had lived in Paris through one insurrection more bloody than the revolution itself,

---

[94]Maurice, Vol. I, p. 458.

[95]Ibid.

[96]Gregg, p. 222.

> and had recently been there again on the morrow of another revolution. I did not believe that revolutions came off by the calendar; and did not see what I seemed to know as the signs of revolution in the streets.[97]

On April 10, Ludlow went as usual to his chambers in Chancery Lane to work.[98] Around two o'clock, an earnest young clergyman rushed into Ludlow's office with a note of introduction from Maurice. "Will you let me introduce to you my friend, Mr. Kingsley. He is deeply earnest and seems obsessed with the idea of doing something with handbills".[99]

Charles Kingsley was the third member of the small group who founded Christian Socialism, and perhaps the best known because of his literary achievement. Kingsley was born in June, 1819, in Holme, Devonshire. He was the son of Charles Kingsley, an impoverished country gentleman who became an Anglican clergyman for a respectable living, and Mary Lucas, the daughter of a judge and planter in the West Indies. The elder Kingsley put in the requisite time at Harrow and Eaton necessary to his station, but the pleasures of the hunt and the conviviality of country squires appealed to him more than academic pursuits. Young Kingsley also enjoyed country life and athletic activity.

Brought up in a series of small parsonages, Charles was sent away to school at the age of twelve, first to Clifton, Bristol, and later to Helston Grammar School. He was an excellent student, but tended to be shy and had a bad stammer which plagued him all his life. Finally, in

---

[97] Ludlow, "Some Christian Socialists" I, p. 495.

[98] Ibid., p. 496.

[99] Ludlow, "The Christian Socialist Movement" p. 111.

1836, his father got a good assignment at Chelsea near London, and Charles went to King's College to prepare for Cambridge. Kingsley, like his compatriots, Maurice and Ludlow, was successful academically, but he went through a period of religious struggle which was not resolved until he fell in love. The emotional impact of adult affection brought Kingsley back to a faith in the divine love of God. He then entered study for ordination and in 1842 he took his first curacy in Eversley, Hampshire, where he spent most of his life.[100]

Kingsley had come under the influence of Maurice and maintained contact with him throughout his life. Ludlow wrote of the relationship between the two men:

> "... indeed he owed himself spiritually to Mr. Maurice. He could not help being a genius, and he would have been one had he never heard of Mr. Maurice. But his whole theology is drawn from Mr. Maurice; his chief mission was to be a popularizer of the principles set forth by Mr. Maurice".[101]

Kingsley, whose medium was essay and novel, was a prolific writer throughout his life, although his first efforts remain among his best. He tended to fling himself into a project heart and soul, then quickly burn out. This is to be seen in his association with the Christian Socialists. While his novel Alton Locke, his articles in Politics for the People, and later in Tracts on Christian Socialism brought the movement both fame and notoriety, he left the plodding, tedious organizational work to others. Cannon Raven pointed out that Kingsley did supply the vigor and dash lacking in the other two.[102]

---

[100] Robert Martin, The Dust of Combat: A Life of Charles Kingsley, (London: Faber and Faber, 1959), Chs. 1-3.

[101] Ludlow, "Some Christian Socialists" I, p. 499.

[102] Raven, p. 100.

Kingsley anguished over the conditions of labor and the poor, especially rural workers with whom he had contact in his country parish. According to Ludlow, the local squire who had hired Kingsley fully expected a genial young man who would hunt and drink with him. To his chagrin, the new curate showed no interest in conviviality, but a great deal of interest in the squalid living conditions of the squire's tenants. He further alienated the local gentleman by asking him for money to support a school for the parish poor. Instead, the squire cut the funds and Kingsley had to depend on other meager sources of income for parish work. Despite the lack of funds, Ludlow felt that Kingsley was extremely successful in his ministry, attracting even the old reprobate poachers and smugglers that inhabited the district. "I have never seen a country church so well attended as that of Eversley in Kingsley's day", wrote Ludlow.[103]

Even while performing a vigorous parish ministry, Kingsley found time for the fiery attacks on social injustice for which he is so famous. Because of his writings, Kingsley was often classified as the most radical of the group, which was a deception. Kingsley, and to a certain extent Maurice, were essentially romantics, devoted to the notion of the benevolent English squire, hearty, kind and rugged, who represented the best in Tory Paternalism.[104] Professor Masterman pointed out that Kingsley also tended to be a British Chauvinist later in life. He had no sympathy

---

[103] Ibid., pp. 496-97.

[104] Masterman, p. 132.

with the native struggle in British India or the cause of the Blacks in America. Disagreement concerning the latter issue would finally end the friendship between Ludlow and Kingsley that began on April 10, 1848, on the way to Kennington Common.[105]

On that spring day in the year of revolutions, Ludlow and Kingsley hurried toward Kennington Common, but never got there, for at Waterloo Bridge they met the peaceful remnants of the Chartist mob, dispersed by the surrender of Feargus O'Connor. The two hurried to Maurice's to share the good news. Ludlow wrote, "We had talked all the way from Chancery Lane; we talked all the way to Queen Square, and by the time we were there, we were friends".[106] He further remarked that it had taken him two years to develop his friendship with Maurice, but "I was intimate with Kingsley the very first day that I became acquainted with him".[107]

The three men decided some statement had to be made to the Chartists immediately. Kingsley wrote to his wife describing that day: "Maurice is in great excitement. He has sent me to Ludlow, and we are getting out placards for the walls, to speak a word for God with".[108] Kingsley wrote a message for a large placard which was published by his friend, John Parker. It was addressed to "Workmen of England", and signed "A Working Parson". In it Kingsley said:

---

[105] Masterman, p. 194.

[106] Ludlow, "Some Christian Socialists", I, p. 496.

[107] Ibid., p. 495.

[108] Charles Kingsley, Letters and Memories, Vol. I, edited by Fanny Kingsley, (New York: The Co-operative Publication Society, 1899) p. 125.

> "... you think the Charter would make you free - would to God it would! The Charter is not bad; if the men who use it are not bad! But will the Charter make you free? Will it free you from slavery to ten-pound bribes? Slavery to beer and gin? Slavery to every spouter who flatters your self-conceit, and stirs up bitterness and headlong rage in you? That I guess is real slavery; to be a slave to one's own stomach, one's own pocket, one's own temper. Will the Charter cure that? Friends, you want more than Acts of Parliament can give".

He ended with these words:

> "But there will be no true freedom without virtue, no true science without religion, no true industry without the fear of God, and love to your fellow citizens ... Workers of England, be wise, and then you must be free for you will be fit to be free".[109]

The placard was hardly noticed by the defeated Chartists as they straggled away from London in disillusionment. They certainly could feel no need of pompous advice on self-improvement from middle class churchmen. However, the cooperation on the placard led to a more ambitious effort on the part of Ludlow, Maurice and Kingsley. With a few friends, they launched the publication of a penny paper called Politics for the People which first appeared a few weeks after the last Chartist rally and which provided the impetus toward developing a philosophy of Christian Socialism.[110]

---

[109] Ibid., p. 127.

[110] Ludlow, "Some Christian Socialists" I, p. 496.

CHAPTER IV

POLITICS FOR THE PEOPLE; REFORMERS WITHOUT A CAUSE, 1848-1849

When Maurice, Ludlow and Kingsley first met on that April afternoon, 1848, they discussed the possibility of a series of tracts, for Maurice had a horror of courting public opinion through newspapers. Kingsley reported the plan to his wife: "He [Maurice] has taken me into counsel, and we are to have meetings for praryer and study ... and we are to bring out a new set of real "Tracts for the Times" addressed to the higher orders ... He says: "If the Oxford tracts did wonders, why should not we?"[111] However, Maurice's friend, Archdeacon Hare encouraged the idea of a paper, "more like Cobbett's 'Political Register'",[112] and on April 12, Kingsley wrote, "I have spent [the afternoon] with Archdeacon Hare and Parker, starting a new periodical -- a penny "People's Friend", in which Maurice, Hare, Ludlow, Mansfield and I are going to set to work".[113]

The impetus begun by the Chartist events resulted in Politics for the People, edited by Ludlow and Maurice. Although the group had not crystalized their Christian Socialist doctrine, Ludlow later wrote:

---

[111] Kingsley, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 125.

[112] Maurice, Vol. I, p. 461.

[113] Kingsley, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 125.

"Properly speaking, that journal represents the beginning of the Christian Socialist movement in its application to political subjects".[114] Because the Chartist's activity received most attention, some thought that Maurice and Kingsley were in sympathy with the movement itself. Maurice's biographer pointed out that both men were certainly opposed to the physical force aspect of Chartism, but viewed it as a symptom of wrongs which needed redress, not to be met only by counter-violence of an insensitive society.[115]

It was to the wrongs of working class life that the little paper addressed itself. Politics for the People, which first appeared May 6, 1848, published only seventeen issues and lasted three months. Each issue contained sixteen quarto pages and cost the reader one pence.[116]

While it was in print, Politics for the People dealt with every conceivable subject. The major contributors were Kingsley, Maurice, and Ludlow, each under a pseudonym. That of Kingsley was the most famous: "Parson Lot". Thomas Hughes, a consistant and outstanding Christian Socialist who joined the movement late in that summer of 1848, explained the origin of Kingsley's pen name in his introduction to Alton Locke.

> It was at one of these gatherings towards the end of 1847 or early 1848, when Kingsley found himself in a minority of one, that he said jokingly, he felt much as Lot must have felt in

---

[114]Ludlow, "The Christian Socialist Movement", p. 112.

[115]Maurice, Vol. I, p. 472.

[116]Maurice, Vol. I, p. 471.

> the cities of the Plain, when he seemed as one that was mocked to his sons-in-law. The name "Parson Lot" was then and there suggested and adopted by him as a familiar nom de plume.[117]

Ludlow used the name of "John Townsend" or "J.T.", indicating his residence on the edge of London.[118] Maurice simply signed himself "the editor" or "a clergyman".

A fourth contributor to Politics was Charles Mansfield, Kingsley's best friend at Cambridge. Ludlow said of him, "He is the man I have loved best of any I have ever met in this life".[119] Mansfield, one of the first converts to the little group, in April, 1848, was a poet and a scientist. He had a wide span of interests from mesmerism to flight. Ludlow described him as having "crotchets", which included vegetarianism; he was, however, one of the most dependable and persistant workers among the Christian Socialists. He lived a strange, sad life and he died from burns received as he carried from his house a still of flaming naphtha, which he spilled over his entire body.[120] In Politics for the People, Mansfield signed himself "Will Willow Wren".[121]

---

[117]Thomas Hughes, "Prefatory Memoir" in Charles Kingsley, Alton Locke, Vol. I, (New York: The Co-operative Publication Society, 1899), p. 5.

[118]Masterman, p. 70.

[119]Ludlow, "Some Christian Socialists of 1848" II, The Economic Review, Vol. IV, no. 1, (January 1894), p. 24.

[120]Ibid., p. 27.

[121]Raven, p. 110.

The editors stated the philosophy which would guide the paper on the first page of the May 6th issue:

> The world is governed by God; this is the rich man's warning; this is the poor man's comfort; this is the real hope in the consideration of all questions, let them be as hard of solution as they may; this is the pledge that Liberty, Fraternity, Unity, under some conditions or other are intended for every people under heaven.[122]

The expression of Maurice's belief that all of man's relationships were of concern to God and that they were to be judged by Christ's standards was consistent throughout Politics for the People. The small journal dealt with Chartism, suffrage, class relations, sanitation, and a variety of other subjects. Ludlow contributed the bulk of the material, no less than thirty eight articles,[123] including editorials on the six points of the Charter, political parties, law, the French Revolution of 1848, taxation and the Irish question. He, unlike Maurice, had great faith in the effectiveness of newspapers. To his cousin, Charles Forbes, he wrote, "the great daily teacher of mankind in modern times is not the pulpit, but the press, ... if that teaching be not thoroughly Christian, mankind will never be Christianized".[124]

Ludlow presented his views most clearly; they were an intelligent evaluation of contemporary issues seen in the light of Christ's teachings. However, he hewed to Maurician philosophy, exhibiting very little tendency toward the radicalism or socialism which would appear in his later writings.

---

[122] Politics for the People, (London: John W. Parker, 1848) no. 1, May 6, 1848, p. 1.

[123] Edward Mack and W.H.G. Armytage, Thomas Hughes, the Life of the Author of Tom Brown's Schooldays, (London: Ernest Benn, Ltd. 1952) p. 56.

[124] Ludlow, ms. letter to Charles Forbes, cited in Christensen, p. 62.

One of the most interesting and perceptive series of articles by Ludlow was on the political parties in England. He classified himself as a radical reformer. He stated: "Certain I am that the term is one which corresponds with a true and deep feeling, the latest outgrowth, the last realized development of Christianity in the field of worldly politics".[125] The Radical, he wrote, was one who constantly warred with evil and mammon, to the glory of God, but who refrained from wrecking vengeance on his fellow man. Ludlow believed that Christian radicalism was the process of cleansing that began with an individual and spread outward to the world.[126]

The Conservative position was a good one, too, Ludlow wrote, for they preserve what is good. However, he did not choose that path because if everything was preserved, then the seeds of evil also would be retained and would poison the whole. "The ideal of society is no shining spotless mahogony table, but a fruitful field well weeded".[127] When writing of the Conservatives, Ludlow was careful to praise the best of their intentions and cautioned the radical to be patient,[128] but elsewhere he stated, in a burst of true feeling, "It is not the Radical Reformer who is destructive, it is the blind conservative who looks upon the thorns and thistles as holy, instead of feeling they are God's curse".[129]

---

[125] Politics, no. 13, (July 15, 1848) p. 221.

[126] Ibid.

[127] Politics, no. 7, (June 10, 1848) p. 115.

[128] Ibid., p. 116.

[129] Ibid., p. 222.

When writing of Conservatives and Radicals, Ludlow was indeed earnest, but the Whigs and Tories felt the jovial edge of his wit. He classified all four succinctly: "Opinion makes the Conservative and Radical; feeling mainly the Tory; character, mainly the Whig".[130] Here Ludlow had indicated that the Radical and Conservative arrived at their position intellectually, the other two came to conclusions which were formed by another sort of consideration. The Whig, he maintained, was bound by party loyalty, and the tradition of constitutional opposition which limited their effectiveness. In Whig positions, the reforming potential was present, but badly withered. Ludlow condemned them:

> They are a great party, but which can, from henceforth, produce no more great men. They are a progressive party, but with limits they can never pass. They are useful to initiate reform, but unless furnished with a precedent, they cannot make it radical, nor can they ever build upon it when made, any wholly new truth.[131]

In this statement Ludlow's almost prophetic political insight was clearly apparent, for indeed the Whig party was destined to fade from the scene in the next few decades.

The old Tory evinced from Ludlow good natured indulgence, the sort one directs at a senile, but loved grandfather. "In truth, I cannot say much for his reasoning powers ... But he has a noble heart.[132] Ludlow went on to describe the Tory as an affable, Christian old squire who was concerned with his people, those who lived inside the parish limits. At his best, the Tory hated oppression "instinctively" and

---

[130] Politics, no. 12, (July 8, 1848) p. 199.

[131] Ibid., p. 200.

[132] Politics, no. 4, (May 27, 1848) p. 57.

expected obedience which, "hangs on no coercion or fear, and is but the shape of harmonious co-operation".[133] Ludlow saw him as being in grudging sympathy with the Chartists as long as they were not seditious.

Ludlow propounded that there were basically two parties, Reformers and Conservative, which subdivide to form four opinions -- "two mean and two extreme".[134] In the couse of the party articles, Ludlow's position seemed to emerge. He was a liberal reformer who based his rationale on Christianity, but he was not yet a socialist.[135]

The primary demand of the Chartists was for universal male suffrage. Ludlow dealt exhaustively with this topic in a series of articles. Ludlow was a democrat, one who had no attachment to class priviledge, but he could not accept unrestricted franchise. Instead he envisioned individual self-discipline as the starting point for collective self-government or democracy.[136] His was a Christian, humanistic approach, one which called for providing the environment and education which would enable each person to develop to his full capacity and worth. The unbridled despotism of an uneducated majority would, Ludlow feared, wreck its vengeance on minorities. He cited two examples: The way in which the democratic government of France after 1848 crushed socialists and communists, and the slavery of Negroes in democratic America. The suffrage should not, in his opinion, be extended to those who would use it to abuse their fellow men.[137]

---

[133] Ibid.

[134] Ibid., p. 56.

[135] Christensen, p. 83.

[136] Politics, no. 1, (May 6, 1848) p. 10.

[137] Ibid., p. 13-14.

In a more practical vein, Ludlow proposed that taxation and education should form the basis for suffrage. He felt that a man who could not read his Bible should not vote.[138] Furthermore, taxes should be yoked with the franchise. In this way all voters would have to pay taxes, and to increase the suffrage, the government would lower the tax base and increase revenues; likewise, additional tax burdens could not be levied without a corresponding increase in voters participating in government.[139] Ludlow saw no reason why those who were eligible to vote in the municipalities could not be equally fit for national enfranchisement.[140] He was not in favor of the proposal for household suffrage which would be based on property tax alone, which he saw as "ambiguous, if not fraudulent".[141] On this subject, Ludlow did indicate some socialist tendency. He saw the trend of the age away from splitting of society into a greater number of individual households, and toward the uniting of several households in one common dwelling.[142]

Ludlow believed that in determining the extent of the franchise, the government should begin on the basis of total inclusion and then begin to exclude. Men who had governmental or judicial influence should

---

[138] Politics, no. 6, (June 3, 1848), p. 104.

[139] Politics, no. 7, (June 10, 1848), p. 120.

[140] Politics, no. 6, (June 3, 1848), p. 103.

[141] Politics, no. 5, (May, 1848, supplement), p. 85.

[142] Politics, no. 7, (June 10, 1848), p. 119.

be excluded, he wrote, and anyone who was a pauper or who failed to pay taxes. He utterly rejected wealth as the criteria for voting priviledges.[143] Ludlow admitted that, although eligible, he did not vote. He believed that ideas expressed in various media were much more influential upon government than votes.[144] Balanced, well-reasoned and sincere views on the suffrage question demonstrated Ludlow's sympathy for democracy.

Ludlow, as a practicing member of the bar, had a great respect for the law. In another series of articles, he dealt with the idea of the law as the birthright of the English people. "The law is the great bond of human society — a chain which no link can be snapped without danger".[145] In Ludlow's view, the law did not exhibit justice when it enriched one group at the expense of another.[146] Class legislation was always damaging, said Ludlow: "One man's selfishness cannot make another man happy".[147] On the other hand, he reasoned, the law was to be obeyed, whether evil or good, because one cannot choose which laws he wishes to obey without putting the whole system in jeopardy. According to Ludlow, the only outcome of revolution in England would be the destruction of the

---

[143] Politics, no. 5, (May, 1848 supplement), p. 85.

[144] Politics, no. 2, (May 13, 1848), p. 30.

[145] Politics, no. 1, (May 6, 1848), p. 11.

[146] Ibid.

[147] Politics, no. 2, (May 13, 1848), p. 17.

national birthright, the legal rights of the people. "For that mess of pottage, are they fools enough to sell it?"[148] On this point, he chastised the Chartists for taking such a risk; a risk that would bring no change, but only increasing severity in the law.[149]

More specifically, Ludlow focused on the poor laws, which he viewed as fallacious in principle because at the time the condition of independent labor was not desirable. He condemned the notion of maintaining a man in idleness, believing that one who was willfully idle should be jailed. The workhouse, in Ludlow's mind, should be a temple of labor, a laboratory for new techniques and for new relationships between workers.[150] In his observations on law and on suffrage, Ludlow answered what he viewed as the most dangerous proposals of the Chartists — the target toward which Politics for the People was aimed. Therefore he also dealt with the other points of the Charter. He did not support the proposal for a secret ballot. "By what right are the electors to claim for themselves secrecy and irresponsibility, which are denied to all above them?"[151] The ideal voter, in Ludlow's mind, must have those characteristics of honesty and courage that could stand the light of "full, searching, universal publicity".[152]

Ludlow agreed that members of Parliament should be paid, but at the same time argued that payment would tend to demean the honor of the

---

[148] Politics, no. 17, (July, 1848, extra supplement), p. 275.

[149] Politics, no. 1, (May 6, 1848), p. 11.

[150] Politics, no. 13, (July 15, 1848), p. 220.

[151] Politics, no. 11, (July 1, 1848), p. 186.

[152] Ibid.

office. If the nation paid the salary, it risked having men who ran simply for the income and would not work; salaries would be a huge drain on the national budget and many members would not need them. Therefore Ludlow proposed that, "not the nation at large, but the constituencies, should be charged with the payment of members, where they think fit to take it upon themselves".[153]

Ludlow rejected annual elections for Parliament, since he saw a need for order and continuity. At the same time he felt the House always benefited from new blood. Again he offered a practical solution: elect a certain percentage every year.

> This would keep up for ordinary purposes a sufficient identity of feeling between the Parliament and the country, without impairing the business habits of the members, and without periodically convulsing the country by a general election; a measure which should then be reserved for extraordinary emergencies.[154]

Ludlow also had practical, if complex, solutions for the problem of electoral districts.[155]

In his breadth and grasp of the political scene of his day and the complexities of the law, Ludlow far outdistanced the rest of the contributors to the paper. He gave each question the kind of careful scrutiny that all great issues deserve but sometimes do not receive from the press. Ludlow never ranted; instead he pursued a fairly consistant level-headed approach to his subjects, while remaining true to his

---

[153] Politics, no. 12, (July 8, 1848), p. 203.

[154] Ibid., p. 204.

[155] Politics, no. 13, (July 15, 1848), p. 213.

convictions. These convictions included faith in God, and in the goodness and reasonableness of men and a belief that the problems could be solved by shaking up the system, but not destroying it.

Although Ludlow's views dominated the paper, this did not mean that Kingsley and Maurice failed to make significant contributions. Neither treated topics in the same practical detail as Ludlow did. Kingsley produced an excellent series on the Bible, and another on sanitation.[156] Maurice's special vehicle was dialogue in which several speakers, representative of different classes and professions discussed current topics. He used the Socratic method in both writing and speaking. In one of these dialogues Maurice made a stirring plea for the worker who he felt should improve his own lot and not depend upon the upper classes. He castigated the University and the Church for ignoring the working man.

> Or he [the worker] might lift up his voice and say, this is my complaint of you, gentlemen, tradesmen ... that you have not laboured more to make me feel and know that I am a man, and so to make me your fellow citizen. I demand this recognition of you! Refuse it to me and you refuse it to yourselves; ... we workingmen determine that we will ask strength from God to assert our priviledges as men; to prove that we are not animals, to cast aside all the false and degrading doctrines and doctors, who would make us so.[157]

In the first issue of Politics for the People, Maurice called for an end to party and class divisiveness. He commended each party for its strengths and delineated their weaknesses, which he summed up as selfishness, power hunger and greed rather than true concern for the betterment

---

[156] Politics, no.'s 2 and 4, (May 13, May 27, 1848), p. 28 and 57.

[157] Politics, no. 2, (May 13, 1848), p. 18.

of all. Maurice ended the editorial with a disavowal of any party connection of the paper. This article rather epitomized his aversion to man-made organizations which further denied God's order.[158]

Kingsley shocked the church hierarchy with an almost Marxian attack on the then-current view of the Bible.

> We have used the Bible as if it was a mere special constable's handbook — an opium dose for keeping beasts of burden patient while they were being overloaded — a mere book to keep the poor in order ... there are two sides to the Bible; that instead of being a book to keep the poor in order, it is a book, from beginning to end, written to keep the rich in order.[159]

Kingsley and Ludlow both received a blast of criticism from Archdeacon Hare in a letter he wrote to Maurice. But in defense of Kingsley's article, Maurice said, "He felt he was confessing his own sin, not taking honor to himself for discovering it in others". In support of both young men, Maurice admonished Hare:

> You say that Kingsley and Ludlow are very conceited and that young men are so generally ... I have never met with men of more reverent spirit ... Kingsley and Ludlow are, it seems to me the very best mediators possible between the one and the other, between young England of the middle and the working people.[160]

At the same time that Maurice was so ardently standing up for Ludlow and Kingsley to others, he was reproving them for their rashness. In a letter written by Maurice to Ludlow it was obvious that the young lawyer had castigated the clergyman for being swayed by his ecclesiastical friends. Maurice had vetoed the inclusion in the paper of Kingsley's

---

[158] Politics, no. 1, (May 6, 1848), p. 4.

[159] Politics, no. 4, (May 27, 1848), p. 58, (emphasis Kingsley's).

[160] F. D. Maurice to Archdeacon Hare; May 28, 1848, in Maurice, Vol. I, p. 476-77.

story, The Nun's Pool, and an article by Ludlow as well. Maurice, the reconciler, was quite sensitive to any kind of rant. The main thrust of the letter was Maurice's insistence on not wounding the conscience of any man.

> When so many things need to be said and done, wrote Maurice, why spend your time in trampling upon people's corns and gouty feet; supposing them to be nothing more? I think it is bad to hurt anyone if we can help it; and as we must hurt so much that people cherish, we ought to be the tenderer of all that we can respect.[161]

This and other letters from Maurice seem to indicate that one of the heretofore unexplained causes for the termination of the paper may have been Maurice's continued resistance to commitment to a cause. In any case, Politics folded in July, ostensibly due to lack of money. On July 1, the editors wrote:

> Its circulation is as large as that of a paper which has had so very short trial could well be ... But it is not large enough to cover the outlay; probably never would be ... Under such circumstances we have very small right to ask that our publisher will continue the work ...[162]

The articles in Politics for the People were uneven in value. The language and tight logic of some of Ludlow's political pieces seemed difficult for the worker to understand. Kingsley at times sounded patronizing, especially in a series entitled "The British Museum" in which he held forth on the delights of the paintings and proposed to explain them to his readers. There were also poems — some good, some terrible — and letters to the editor. Although the paper was directed

---

[161] F. D. Maurice to J. M. Ludlow, (June 10, 1848) in Maurice, pp. 478-479.

[162] Politics, no. 11, (July 1, 1848), p. 177.

to workingmen, it failed, as Ludlow later admitted, to deal with the matter of capitalist/labor relations. The admission came in the successor to Politics, a much more ambitious publishing project called The Christian Socialist, A Journal of Association, which was published after Maurice's followers had dedicated themselves to worker's associations.[163] Only in the last issue of Politics did the editors indicate that socialism was becoming one of their concerns.

> Chartism and Socialism, we said to ourselves may be as vulgar in their outward shapes as you please. But woe to our countrymen if they content themselves with laughing at their outward shapes, or with crushing them! The heart must be studied; not merely anatomized, but seen living, beating, in its healthy and in its morbid conditions, else we shall not understand the real state of our own times, or be prepared for the future.

Torbin Christensen surmised that only a miniscule number of the two thousand subscribers were working men. Nevertheless, he said:

> The paper was the first real attempt on the part of the Church of England to overcome the prejudices of the working classes in regard to the Church and Christianity.[164]

It seems to have received very little notice, Ludlow's claim to the contrary notwithstanding.[165] Max Beer has pointed out that the summer of 1848 was a time of severe revolutionary persecution and radicals were in no mood to heed the advice from clergymen and other members of the establishment.[166] Looking back, Ludlow agreed with that analysis.

---

[163] The Christian Socialist: A Journal of Association, Vol. I, Conducted by Several of the Promoters of the London Working Men's Associations, (London: John Tupling, 1851) no. 10, p. 73.

[164] Christensen, p. 88.

[165] Christian Socialist, no. 10, p. 73.

[166] Beer, p. 185.

They had failed to deal with the question of capitalism and labor. He said that they had been abused by Chartists who were, "clear-sighted enough to see in the writing of a water-drinking lawyer the handiwork of a jolly parson over his bottle of port".[167] Though the little paper did not penetrate the crisis of the times, it did mark, as Ludlow pointed out, the beginning of the Christian Socialist movement, and a nucleus from which a much more profound policy of Christian socialism would emerge.[168]

The spirit engendered among the men who published Politics for the People did not dissipate. As Ludlow wrote:

> They carried it on, each one according to his opportunities, in schools and lecture rooms, in town and country pulpits, in the pages of periodicals -- in the common meditation of the word of God, and gradually also in friendly conferences with working men.[169]

The first effort to carry on in spirit was a project to serve needs in the neighborhood around the Inns of Court. Maurice, Ludlow and the others established an informal night school for workers in Little Ormand Yard -- a rough and lawless neighborhood, which, Ludlow claimed, the school "ended by civilizing".[170] It started as a school for men,

---

[167] Christian Socialist, no. 10, p. 73.

[168] Ludlow, "The Christian Socialist Movement", p. 112.

[169] Christian Socialist, no. 10, p. 73.

[170] Ludlow, "The Christian Socialist Movement", p. 112.

but boys began to attend and adult attendance dropped. Thus they ended with classes for boys and girls.[171] One of the projects of the school was a trip into the country which foreshadowed the Fresh Air Fund of later years.

Activity in the school helped the group get acquainted with the laboring poor, laid the path for the Working Men's College which they founded in 1854, and also brought in one of their most outstanding compatriots, Thomas Hughes.

Hughes, who epitomized the healthy and simple, athletic, Rugby-Oxford gentry, remained devoted to the cause of Christian Socialism throughout his life.[172] His fame came from his immortalization of Rugby under Dr. Arnold in the book, Tom Brown's School Days. The Christian athlete, who kept body and mind pure for the holy struggle, was the ideal of Tom Hughes. At the school in Little Ormand Yard, where Hughes taught wrestling and boxing, neighbors became accustomed to seeing the genial giant stripped to his waist, gently sparring with a puny slum boy. Hughes's biographer noted his role among the Christian Socialists in this way: "All the rest were prone to criticize either themselves or each other, but Hughes radiated goodwill and tolerance. When Kingsley was prejudiced and reckless and Ludlow complained, Hughes calmed them both".[173] Hughes brought respectability and normality to the group, for they tended

---

[171]Maurice, Vol. I, p. 482.

[172]Raven, p. 131.

[173]Mack, p. 58.

to be eccentrics of a sort. Alexander Macmillan, the publisher called them the "crotchet club".[174] Beards, then as now, were taken as a sign of radicalism and nonconformity; many of the men with whom the group associated wore them, to the great annoyance of Kingsley.

According to Ludlow, "the very heart of the movement while they lasted" were the weekly Bible meetings led by Maurice.[175] The meetings, which were usually held at Maurice's home, included Kingsley, Ludlow, Hughes, Mansfield, and his cousin, Archibald Campbell, among others. Ludlow pictured Campbell as a bluff hearty Scotsman, who was a "fonetic nut".[176] Mansfield described the group:

> There was a steady Tory alongside of an ardent Radical; no decided Whig was there, though the cautions reforming tendancies of one or two might seem to savour a little of Whiggery. There were one or two who would strenuously assert that the doctrines of Whig and Radical were combined in their political creed. Amongst the party there was certainly not one who was quite contented with the world as he found it.[177]

Through prayer and study the group groped toward a new view of social action undergirded by the Gospel. Maurice led the men, while Ludlow "played the devil's advocate" by presenting alternate view points and thus stimulating the others to discussion. This put Maurice in touch with views of laymen whose position was much ignored by the Priests of that day.[178]

---

[174] Raven, p. 130.

[175] Ludlow, "The Christian Socialist Movement", p. 112.

[176] Ludlow, "Some of the Christian Socialists", Vol. II, p. 29.

[177] Maurice, Vol. I, p. 488.

[178] Ibid., p. 494.

While considering a question, Ludlow wrote, Maurice would either pace up and down the room, or sit with his hands covering his face. When the answer finally came, phrased so as to offend no one, Maurice would pronounce it in a low voice, head bowed. The group secretly referred to him as the "Prophet". Kingsley commented humorously on Maurice's humble posture: "What shall be done with the prophet who prophesieth into his waistcoat pocket?"[179]

In the spring of 1849, Maurice further expanded his horizons by meeting with groups of working men. Through Politics for the People, Ludlow had met Walter Cooper, a tailor of some promise whom he persuaded to hear Maurice preach at Lincoln's Inn Chapel. Deeply moved by Maurice's sincerity and concern, Cooper assembled a small group of Chartist workers and Maurice, with Ludlow's support, began a series of dialogues with the working men in April, 1849. Ludlow wrote that he felt the talks to be fruitful because they, "brought Mr. Maurice and his friends into direct contact with all that was most thoughtful and most earnest in the London working class, together with a good deal that was merely frothy and unreal".[180]

Occasionally the "frothy" element caused trouble. One evening during the national anthem, when some of the "Revolutionary Chartists" hissed, Tom Hughes announced that he would take them all on physically. Before that became necessary, however, the disorder was silenced by "the

---

[179]Ludlow, "Some Christian Socialists" Vol. I, p. 493.

[180]Ludlow, "Christian Socialist Movement", p. 113.

turmult of enthusiastic singing with which the words were given forth by the loyal members of the meeting".[181] In the modern day of flag burning and obscenities, gentle people are often afraid to mix with those of other races and classes. If today slum work and demonstrations appear threatening, how much more so it was for a small band of Victorians. But with Christian strength and love, Maurice and his group risked much through the paper, the school and the worker's meetings to achieve a genuinely social Christianity.

In the autumn of 1849, Ludlow returned to Paris where he observed the newly-formed workers co-operatives, Associations Ouvrieres. Deeply impressed, Ludlow became convinced that they offered a practical solution to the problems of the workers.[182] He came to see that mere charity was not enough to relieve the laborer's plight; what was needed was co-operative combination. He wrote: "Never before or since have I seen anything to equal the zeal, the self-devotion, the truly brotherly spirit which pervaded these co-operative workshops".[183]

Ludlow wrote to Maurice that he saw Socialism as a great power which had gripped the consciences of the workers. Because it appealed to

---

[181] Maurice, Vol. II, p. 10.

[182] Ludlow, "Christian Socialist Movement", p. 113.

[183] Ibid.

men's higher instincts, Socialism had to be Christianized or it would destroy the church.[184] Ludlow believed that Association was the answer to, "the very mischiefs we were anxious to grapple with".[185] Ludlow returned to England, burning for action; he was ready to form co-operative associations there.

Maurice's group, with all London, had been stirred by the series of articles on "London Labour and the London Poor", by Henry Mayhew, serialized in The Morning Cronicle. When Ludlow returned his friends were fired to begin concrete social reform. When a cholera epidemic, caused by the dreadful sanitary conditions, swept the slums of London, Charles Walsh, a member of the Bible study group and a surgeon, alerted Maurice's group to the truly awful conditions on Jacob's Island, a section of Bermondsay where Walsh was a health inspector.[186] All through the autumn of 1849, the band fought a losing battle with the squalor of Jacob's Island. It was here that Kingsley observed the horrors so distinctively described in Alton Locke, which made the Mayhew report pallid by comparison.[187]

As a result of the experience, Ludlow and Mansfield, with the help of Hughes and Kingsley, drew up a plan to form a health league. Designed to promote public health, the League would cost a shilling

---

[184]Maurice, Vol. I, p. 458.

[185]Ibid., Vol. II, p. 13.

[186]Ludlow, "Some Christian Socialists", II, p. 30.

[187]Raven, p. 145.

per year for membership, and it would lobby much in the fashion of the Anti-Corn Law League, which Ludlow admired. Eagerly, they presented to Maurice their plan, which, said Ludlow, "Mr. Maurice relentlessly crushed".[188]

Maurice explained his action to Ludlow by writing:

> It was with much self suspicion and a grievous sense of inflicting pain upon you that I threw cold, or what is worse perhaps, tepid water over your plan last Monday. I should have to go into a long personal history if I undertook to explain how the dread of societies, clubs, leagues, has grown up in me ...[189]

In response to Ludlow's suggestion of using the Anti-Corn Law League's tactics, Maurice wrote: "To all you say about the rapid success of the Anti-Corn Law League, I answer in the words of the Bhagavad - Gita: 'Those who worship the Devatas obtain speedy answers to their prayers'."[190] Courting public opinion, according to Maurice, was wanton idolatry, a sin of which he found Cobden, Bright and Fox guilty. Ludlow and the rest were severely disappointed, but humbly obeyed the 'Prophet' even when they failed to understand.

Worker's co-operatives on the French model were still uppermost in Ludlow's thoughts despite the blow Maurice administered to the Health League. Activity in the direction of forming associations was encouraged by a new member who joined the group sometime during the early fall of 1849, Jules St. Andre LeChevalier. LeChevalier was a French refugee who claimed that he had been exiled from his homeland because of his

---

[188] Ludlow, "Some Christian Socialists" II, p. 30.

[189] Maurice to Ludlow, Nov. 24, 1849, in Maurice, Vol. II, p. 23.

[190] Ibid., p. 25.

socialist activities in 1848.[191] As an old acquaintance of Ludlow's, he contacted him upon arriving in England. Ludlow had never really cared for LeChevalier, since he considered him fickle and unprincipled.[192]

However, LeChevalier was very persuasive and he greatly impressed the group, especially Maurice, with his blend of Christianity and French socialism. Prior to his arrival the band of men around Maurice had been discussing the Owenite approach to socialism; thus Ludlow's French experience coupled with LeChevalier's ideas gave them a whole new outlook.[193] Sparked by LeChevalier and Ludlow, the group began seriously to consider acting on the French association idea as 1849 drew to a close.

---

[191]Jules L. St. Andre, Five Years in the Land of Refuge, (London: Pelham Richardson, 1854) Introduction.

[192]Christensen, p. 114.

[193]Ibid., p. 117.

CHAPTER V

ACTION FOR ASSOCIATION: MAURICE COMES TO DINNER

Convinced of the need to expedite the idea of association, Ludlow provided the initiative for action. For the first time, he decided to work around Maurice, or if necessary, without him, feeling sure that any move toward formal organization would incur the master's displeasure. Since the Health League debacle, Maurice had again reiterated his position in opposition to man-made systems in relation to a conflict between Charles Mansfield and Sidney Herbert.

In response to Mayhew's revelations concerning the conditions of the London needle-working women, Sidney Herbert proposed in a letter to the Morning Chronicle that the poor emigrate to overseas colonies. In answer to Herbert, Charles Mansfield furiously replied that England had no right to export her problems and further, that it was cruel to deny these people the home of their birth just because they were poor.[194] As an alternative, both Ludlow and Mansfield supported the idea of home colonization.

Maurice was angered by the bickering between men who were concerned with the same problems, but fought over solutions. Home colonies were a grand plan, he said, but emigration was a solution readily at hand. Maurice wrote to Ludlow, "The sea is not an evil element for English

---

[194]Christensen, p. 125.

men or women. They do not think it so. You have no business to put it into their heads".[195] Ludlow chastised Maurice for his harshness to Mansfield, which evoked the typical Maurician agony of humiliation and self-accusation. But the 'master' did not change his mind concerning the unfortunate tendency of people to form a group - "I mean a tendency to be quick-sighted in detecting all errors in the schemes of other men, and to set up their own in opposition to them".[196] In Maurice's belief, God abhorred the divisive behavior of men in systems. Maurice wrote: "He will not let me ever be the leader or subleader of any school or party in this land".[197]

Ludlow responded to all this with impatience and determination to act, for he perceived in the dilemma of the tailors who were forced to work in overcrowed garrets on sub-contracted piece work, a perfect opportunity to try an alternative to both home and overseas colonies: association on the French model. Ludlow wrote concerning Maurice's obstructiveness:

> The way in which Mr. Maurice seemed to check our efforts in this new direction was a great disappointment to us.
> We could no longer remain content either with mere talk on the one hand, or with evening schooling and some individual visiting of the poor on the other.[198]

Obviously, this was about all that Maurice would tolerate. Therefore Ludlow called the group together for dinner at his house to discuss possibilities of association, telling Maurice about it, but not inviting

---

[195]Maurice to Ludlow, Dec. 6, 1849, in Maurice, Vol. II, p. 28-29.

[196]Ibid., p. 29.

[197]Ibid.

[198]Cited in Maurice, Vol. II, p. 30.

him. As they gathered, however, the door opened and Maurice appeared.[199] What motivated Maurice to join the rest in forming associations remains a mystery, especially in light of his consistent theological opposition to human schemes. Torbin Christensen suggests that Maurice, already deeply disturbed by the conditions depicted by the Mayhew report, was swayed by the unanimity displayed by Ludlow and the rest in their determination to act.[200]

Maurice's appearance at the dinner in December, 1849, reassured his followers of spiritual leadership and the righteousness of their cause. That evening, the first co-operative associations were planned. In early January, an association for working tailors was begun in quarters rented at 34 Castle Street, and the group hastily drew up a skeleton constitution based on the Paris associations.[201]

At the same time, Maurice and the rest decided to publish again -- this time a series of Tracts to be called Tracts on Christian Socialism. The new name, Christian Socialism, now committed the group to social action. Maurice's delight with the title was expressed in a letter to Ludlow:

> 'Tracts on Christian Socialism' is, it seems to me, the only title which will define our object, and will commit us at once to the conflict we must engage in sooner or later with the unsocial Christians and the unchristian Socialists. It is a great thing not to leave people to poke out our object and proclaim it with infinite triumph. 'Why, you are Socialists in disguise'. "In disguise"; not a bit of it. There it is staring you in the face upon the title page!' 'You want to thrust

---

[199] Raven, p. 149.

[200] Christensen, p. 132.

[201] Raven, p. 150.

> in ever so much priestcraft under a good revolutionary name.'
> 'Well, did we not warn you of it?'[202]

The name represented a clear commitment to a new philosophy. The socialism of the Christian Socialists was not the state socialism of Marx, rather it pointed to the social implications of the Gospel. It looked toward inspiring co-operation among individuals with Christian love that would spread in ever widening circles to embrace all people. Seeing the selfishness of the competitive system as a barrier to developing the Kingdom of Christ, Maurice wrote to Kingsley:

> Competition is put forth as the law of the universe. That is a lie. The time has come for us to declare that it is a lie by word and deed. I see no way but associating for work instead of strikes ... We may restore the whole state of things, we may bring in a new one. God will decide that.[203]

Maurice's socialism was fundamentally Christian. Peter Allen, in his article on Maurice and Ludlow in Victorian Studies, stated: "Christian Socialism then really means Christianized Socialism, that is, the reduction of socialism to a basic moral truth which is clearly compatible with Christianity".[204] Maurice included within his broad definition of socialism, "Anyone who recognizes the principle of co-operation as a stronger and truer principle than competition has the right to the honour or disgrace of being called 'a Socialist'".[205] Maurice further saw this kind of socialism as necessary to God's order.[206]

---

[202]Maurice to Ludlow, 1850, in Porter and Wolf, p. 151.

[203]Maurice to Kingsley, Jan. 2, 1850, in Porter and Wolf, p. 51.

[204]Allen, "F. D. Maurice and J. M. Ludlow", p. 472.

[205]F. D. Maurice, "A Dialogue between Somebody (A Person of Respectibility) and Nobody (the Writer)", Tracts on Christian Socialism, no. 1 (London: 1850) p. 1, as cited in Allen, Ibid., p. 473.

[206]Maurice, Vol. II, p. 44.

In Tracts on Christian Socialism, Maurice set forth his theology of socialism. Ludlow and Kingsley also contributed to the literary activity of the group in addition to their offerings in the first series of Tracts. In 1850, Kingsley wrote "Cheap Clothes and Nasty", in which he exposed the horrors of slop-trade tailoring and ended with an eloquent plea for co-operative association. The little pamphlet later became part of a second series of tracts put out by the group and entitled Tracts by Christian Socialists. "Cheap Clothes and Nasty" was a prelude to Kingsley's most important novel of the Christian Socialist period, Alton Locke, which brought much publicity to Christian Socialist activities.

Kingsley's writings of this period had a two-fold aim; to inform the ruling classes of the suffering and thoughts of the working man, and to convince the worker that mere political change would not achieve a better life. Alton Locke was much more successful with the former than with the latter objective.

While Kingsley's two exposes of the "sweating" system in the tailoring trade brought the greatest publicity to the new Christian Socialist movement, and Maurice's "Dialogue" defined their theology, the clearest exposition of the philosophy of the program came from Ludlow. In an article called "Labour and the Poor" published in the January, 1850 issue of Frasers' Magazine, Ludlow clearly delineated the rationale of Christian Socialism.

In the first part of the article, Ludlow ranged over all the conditions Mayhew had revealed, from farm to factory to the city. Ludlow focused on the isolation of the London worker, as opposed to factory labor in northern England's industrial cities who had, at least, strength in numbers. To relieve the problem of the neglect of children by working mothers, he proposed day care centers to be sponsored by the factory.[207] Masterfully, Ludlow delineated the stark economic facts concerning wages of the needleworking trade in London. The alternatives afforded to the women were obvious, either starvation or prostitution.[208] Ludlow railed against the answer that these conditions were the natural result of the law of competition, "If this be necessary, I say, in English society, then English society is the devil's own work, and to hell with it as soon as possible!" However, Ludlow did not despair completely, for he saw society as the work of God capable of overcoming the evil of competition through co-operation.[209]

In the second half of the article, Ludlow systematically reviewed the proposed solutions. Charity, he said, sprang from noble sentiments, but acted only as a subsidy payment to augment wages that were viciously low, thus perpetuating the system. Protective tariffs and duties were not the answer, since competition came not from foreign goods, but from 'sweaters' who played the isolated workers off against each other. Protection, said Ludlow, was a positive evil when it was imposed on food,

---

[207] J. M. Ludlow, "Labour and the Poor", Fraser's Magazine, Vol. XLI, no. CCXLI, (January, 1850), p. 2.

[208] Ibid., p. 8.

[209] Ibid., p. 9.

thus denying the city worker his pitiful daily bread.[210] Emigration, he noted, was a great dream, for the world should share in the blessings of sturdy Saxons establishing new Englands throughout the globe, but emigration would not solve the problem of competition at home. "It is a mere pumping or baling out of water whilst there is a leak open", he wrote.[211]

After rejecting the easy alternatives, Ludlow outlined his grand program. The basic change required was a change of spirit. He said, "We must learn to feel that all property, all talent, all strength, all learning, all labour, is but a trust for the benefit of all".[212] This change, of course, said Ludlow, would not happen at once, therefore other measures should be supported. He indicated that trades unions were necessary to force wages up, although he deplored strikes when the product of labor was so needed by the world. He went on to propose tax relief, especially of duties burdensome on the worker. The penal institutions should stop competing with free labor and instead become experimental workshops to test new processes. He proposed that the government should establish a minimum living wage to be paid to workers on government contracts; further he suggested, the crown should establish its own clothing workshops to combat slop-selling.[213]

---

[210] Ibid., p. 12.

[211] Ibid., p. 13.

[212] Ibid., p. 13.

[213] Ibid., p. 15.

The workers were called by Ludlow into positive combination, not just to resist abuses, but to establish their own co-operative stores through which they could obtain and provide pure goods at wholesale prices. Moreover, the worker was called to co-operative producer associations based on the French model in which the workers would control their own labor in co-operation. These associations were to be financed, hopefully, with the worker's own capital, or if not, then they should be organized on a profit-sharing, management-sharing basis with manufacturers who would provide capital.

Ludlow capped his program with a plea to the church to lead with cadres of orders dedicated to the improvement of society. This involved a church socialism in which dedicated Christians became nurses, prison attendants, workhouse personnel, teachers, surgeons -- "bodies of men and women that shall shew forth in its purity the essential communism of the Church, and leaven the whole of society with a spirit of self-devoted industry".[214]

Embodied in the Fraser's article lay the essence of Christian Socialism as envisioned by Ludlow. It was the most complete plan ever explained by the group. Ludlow, unlike Kingsley and Maurice, was unhampered by a romantic view of class and property. He called the Church to action, rather than to a restatement of theology. When Ludlow invited his small group to dinner in December, 1849, he already had a concept of the future of their association.

---

[214] Ibid., p. 18.

As has been noted, the Christian Socialists began immediately to establish associations. Tom Hughes expressed the exhilaration of the group - "I certainly thought ... that here we had found the solution of the great labour question, but I was also convinced that we had nothing to do but to announce it, and found an association or two, in order to convert all England, and usher in the millennium at once, so plain did the whole thing seem to me".[215]

The promoters procured £ 300, rented the Castle Street space and began a tailor's association with thirty associates under the strict management of Walter Cooper, the Chartist tailor. The manager was paid a salary of £ 2 per week; the rest of the tailors were paid by the piece made on the premises. The contract between promoters and associates required that the manager be absolute master until the association repaid the capital advanced to it with 4% interest. One third of the net profit was designated for the extension of associations, and the remainder was to be divided among the men according to their earnings.[216]

For the promoters of associations, Maurice, Ludlow and the rest, the purpose of the venture was first, a practical experience in Christian brotherhood and secondly, an exercise in the principle of self-help. Walter Cooper, in his testimony to the Slaney Committee later that year explained:

> It will be recollected that those letters which appeared in the Morning Cronicle on labour and the poor created a very great

---

[215]Thomas Hughes, Memoir of a Brother, (Boston: J. R. Osgood, 1873), p. 110.

[216]Holyoake, Vol. II, p. 339.

> impression on the public mind; and a number of gentlemen well disposed towards the working classes met with a few working men and the question was asked, "What can be done not only to rescue the working classes, but to show them what they can do themselves by unity and sobriety?" And believing that the principle of association was a sound one ... [We] began one.[217]

Self-help associations were so appealing to London workers that by November, 1850, there were eight advertised in the Christian Socialist: associations of tailors, needlewomen, shoe makers, printers, bakers and two of builders.[218] The promoters were deluged with requests daily for help to form and advise new associations.

It soon became apparent that the associations needed firmer control and centralization than could be given by the loosely-knit group of promoters. Charles Sully, a bookbinder by trade, who had recently joined the group, suggested the creation of a central board to coordinate and manage the spread of associations. Ludlow immediately agreed, but Maurice rebelled at the idea. In a series of letters to Ludlow, Maurice stated his objections, the grounds for which lay in his phobia regarding systems.

He saw in the Central Board a means of forcing co-operation among men who were motivated purely by self-gain. If the spirit were not already present, no amount of organization could turn evil into good. "I have no hope of entering into terms of peace with the devil", wrote Maurice, "I have no notion that I can make him my servant by a mere

---

[217]Walter Cooper, testimony in Great Britain, Parliament, "Select Committee Reports on the Savings Banks and the Savings of the Middle and Working Classes ... 1849-1850", Monetary Policy, Savings Banks, Vol. I, Parliamentary Papers, (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1969) pp. 592-593. Hereafter referred to as "Slaney Committee".

[218]The Christian Socialist ..., no. 1, (Nov. 2, 1850), p. 8.

ingenious and extensive combination. I believe the more skillful and large the combination of such elements, the worse and more deadly will be the result".[219] Ludlow had evidentally chastised Maurice for pulling out, for Maurice answered "Talk as much as you like about putting the hand to the plough and drawing back. I never did put my hand to this plough".[220]

Again, Maurice threatened to destroy the group, and again, Ludlow hastily devised a way to get around his objections. It was decided to create two groups; the first was to be the Society for the Promotion of Working Men's Associations, which would help to secure needed capital for associations and to be a general superintending body to furnish assistance and advice, but not control. Maurice would be the head of the Society and have complete control over its membership.[221] The central Board, on the other hand, would be made up of the manager and two delegates from each association, and would deal with questions of business detail and their relation to each other.[222] In this way, Maurice would not have to be involved with the operation of association, only with its promotion. This he agreed to do. Ludlow and the rest met for weeks at six in the morning to hammar out a constitution, which finally appeared as Tract #5 on Christian Socialism in June, 1850.[223]

---

[219] F. D. Maurice and J. M. Ludlow, March 17, 1850, in Maurice, Vol. II, p. 43.

[220] Ibid., p. 43.

[221] G. D. H. Cole and A. W. Filson, British Working Class Movements: Select Documents, 1789-1875, (London: Macmillan and Col, Ltd., 1951) p. 434.

[222] F. D. Maurice and J. M. Ludlow, March 26, 1850 in Maurice, Vol. II, p. 46.

[223] Christian Socialist, no. 29, (May 17, 1851), p. 227.

New blood was being added to the original group of promoters constantly. One of the first new members of the S.P.W.M.A. introduced by Maurice was Edward Vansittart Neale. E. V. Neale became so prominent in the movement that its leadership has sometimes been mistakenly ascribed to him.[224] Neale was an extremely wealthy barrister at Lincoln's Inn who was attracted to the group by one of their advertisements. Neale already knew more about socialism than any of the others except Ludlow, and, according to Tom Hughes, was ready to place his entire fortune at the disposal of co-operative enterprise.[225] Ludlow was frankly shocked at Maurice's inclusion of Neale, for Neale did not share the Christian convictions of the rest. "He was Mr. Maurice's contemporary, not his disciple", wrote Ludlow, "he seldom cared to hear him preach, and in fact their theological views differed widely, those of Vansittart Neale being vague and lax".[226] Neale reinforced Ludlow's suspicions of his theological purity when he later said:

> 'Christian Socialism' was a name which I never liked, but regarded as a mistake, tending to alienate on the one hand Christians who were not socialists and on the other Socialists who did not like to call themselves Christians. But being myself a Christian as well as a Socialist, I had no personal reasons for objecting to the name.[227]

---

[224]See E. W. Brabrook, Provident Societies and Industrial Welfare, (London: Blackie and Sons, Ltd., 1898) p. 136.

[225]Thomas Hughes, "Edward Vansittart Neale as a Christian Socialist", Economic Review, Vol. III, no. 1, (January, 1893). pp. 40-41.

[226]Ludlow, "Some Christian Socialists" II, p. 33.

[227]E. V. Neale, Co-operative News, quoted in Holyoake, Vol. II, p. 538.

Neale's secularism frightened Ludlow, but they worked closely together, sharing chambers with Tom Hughes in Number 3 Old Building, Lincoln's Inn. Neale's mind and money were ever concentrated on consolidating and expanding co-operatives, especially the stores. Ludlow often found himself in conflict with Neale; he said, "When we were working together, I not infrequently felt called upon to oppose schemes which his then over-fertile brain and over-hasty judgement suggested".[228] However, it was often impossible to stop Neale's schemes since he had the money to carry them out. Because the rest of the Promoters were relatively poor, Neale's wealth put him in the forefront.

Others who joined the Promoters included Cuthbert Ellison, a "Young Englander" who was a lawyer and roommate of Thackeray. He was the original model for Thackeray's character, Arthur Pendennis. Another was Charles Sully, who had been violently involved in the Paris uprisings of 1848 and 1849, but had given up physical force. He wrote most of the constitution of the Society for the Promotion of Working Men's Associations. Joseph Milbank and Thomas Shorter were watch case finishers who had helped arrange the first meetings between Maurice and the workers, and in 1850, they became secretaries of the S.P.W.M.A. Ludlow said of them, "Both men were of sterling honesty, high purpose; well-read, good speakers, Chartists".[229]

A man most helpful to the movement was Lloyd Jones. Jones was a well-educated master tailor — an Owenite Socialist who had traversed

---

[228] Ludlow, "Some Christian Socialists", p. 33.

[229] Ludlow, "Some Christian Socialists", II, p. 38.

England encouraging co-operatives since 1831. In 1849, he edited a paper called The Spirit of the Age. Jones was an eloquent and fiery speaker for the working class movement in England, and he and Ludlow remained close comrades throughout their lives. In 1867, the two men wrote a valuable little book together called Progress of the Working Classes, 1832-1867.[230]

Another early Christian Socialist was an aristocrat of noble heritage, Lord Goderich, Marquess of Ripon. Goderich had been in Paris in 1849, and like Ludlow had become convinced that associations could be made to work in England. Goderich joined both the S.W.P.M.A. and the Central Board, but, mysteriously, there exists little trace of his activities as a Christian Socialist in either the official records or his personal correspondence. However, his one divisive contribution was an article radically avocating democracy which was never published.[231] Max Beer captured the essence of this mixture of individuals when he said, "They formed altogether a remarkable group of men — leaders and officers, but without any army behind them".[232]

---

[230] Ibid., p. 39.

[231] Lucien Wolf. Life of the First Marquess of Ripon, Vol. I, (London: John Murray, 1921) pp. 22-27.

[232] Beer, p. 184.

CHAPTER VI

THE CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST: A JOURNAL OF ASSOCIATION

Beatrice Potter Webb perceptively noted that the great literary ability of the Christian Socialists gave their work extraordinary prominence.[233] Indeed, they published an amazing amount of material in a very short time. Their most ambitious undertaking, however, was a weekly newspaper, The Christian Socialist: A Journal of Association. Its purpose was not only to clarify and promulgate the idea of Christian socialism, but to provide an organ of communication for the snowballing associative movement. When Ludlow and Kingsley perceived the need for such a paper, soon after they began the first associations, Maurice balked again. Maurice's son described his father's reaction: "His own profound dislike of newspaper writing made him at first resist and afterwards reluctantly submit to the necessity".[234] Ludlow assumed the editorship of the journal, and more than any other aspect of Christian Socialism it was uniquely his, expounding his ideas and molding the movement on the basis of his perceptions. Maurice contributed very little and Kingsley, a bit more, most significantly a series on "Bible Politics" which got him in trouble with the hierarchy again.[235]

---

[233]Beatrice Potter, The Co-operative Movement in Great Britain, (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Son, 1895), p. 122.

[234]Maurice, Vol. II, p. 55.

[235]Christian Socialist, no. 2, (Nov. 9, 1850), p. 9.

Ludlow not only wrote most of the lead editorials, he wrote a column of advice to the associations and commented on the correspondence. He had complete control over what was published in the paper, but he was careful to separate his opinion from that of the Society as a whole. The heading of the paper carried the note that "The only portion of this Paper for which the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations is responsible is the Gazette".[236] The Gazette was the section in which Joseph Milbank and Thomas Shorter reported the proceedings of the Society. In addition to the Gazette, there was a section devoted to "Associative News", another to correspondence, special articles by other Christian Socialists and often fillers of poems and novels. Each issue ran eight pages, divided into three columns. Thomas Hughes wrote that the paper was printed by "a diminutive one-eyed costermonger" who had been in prison as a Chartist leader.[237] The weekly began on November 2, 1850 and continued into two volumes. It ceased to be The Christian Socialist when Ludlow resigned in 1852, but was continued as the Journal of Association until 1854.

Ludlow projected his vision of Christian Socialism on page one of the first issue in an editorial entitled "The New Idea". He maintained that socialism, the youngest force in society, was but an outgrowth of the oldest force, Christianity. He believed that even the most perverted forms of socialism were but Christian heresies, because these manifestations had as their aim to bind men together in fellowship

---

[236] Christian Socialist, Vol. I, no. 1, (Nov. 2, 1850), p. 1.

[237] Mack, p. 61.

instead of dividing them by competition. Ludlow viewed Christian Socialism as a new reformation, a new livery put on for "a broader and heavenlier flight".[238] Christian socialism, for Ludlow, recognized the truth of the Gospel, "ye cannot serve God and Mammon". Implicit in Jesus' words he saw a condemnation of any political economy which "proclaims self-interest to be the very pivot of social action".[239] Evil, then, was a doctrine that taught that one individual or group should endeavor to take more from a brother than he gave to him.

Practically, explained Ludlow, Christian Socialism embraced all who chose as their economic motivation "exchange" and "co-operation" instead of "competition" and "profit". To support those who agreed to that maxim, he said, the Society for the Promotion of Working Men's Associations had been established. The function of the Society was "to diffuse the principles of co-operation as the practical application of Christianity to the purposes of trade and industry".[240] Members were not required to make a profession of Christianity, nor to be church members. Thus Ludlow outlined a broad, open movement, which called to itself all who were ready to commit themselves to the worker and to a new economic relationship.

On the second page of that same first issue, Ludlow stated a more specific format for the paper itself. In it would be welcomed all shades of political opinion — socialism being a common ground between Christian and infidel. The editor clearly expressed his stand on major issues: he

---

[238] Christian Socialist, Vol. I, no. 1, (Nov. 2, 1850), p. 1.

[239] Ibid.

[240] Ibid.

declared for a major extension of the suffrage and a thorough remodeling of the electoral and representative systems, and for free trade, because it provided cheap goods for the consumer. Further, he said that the paper would be concerned with educational reform, its emphasis being on drawing out the individual, rather than putting in stagnant facts. Finally, the paper would deal with the question of responsibility for property and land use, poor laws, legal reform, taxation and church reform.[241]

When Ludlow first encountered the idea of association, he had seen it as one of the alternatives to help solve economic inequity, but by 1850, he thoroughly embraced co-operatives as the answer to social ills.[242] Therefore, advice to and concern for the infant associations occupied major space in the Christian Socialist. Ludlow envisioned associations as experiments in Christian brotherhood and sharing, experiments that must succeed if true socialism of all society was to grow out of them. His first plea was for mutual trust, with discipline and authority of the manager totally dependent on trustful co-operation which extended to trust in the associative idea itself.[243] Ludlow decried the tendency on the part of workers to disparage and criticize those among them who raised themselves to positions of leadership.[244]

He was led to consider the problem of leveling equality in wages. Since equal wages, he felt, would ignore individual needs and achievement,

---

[241] Christian Socialist, no. 1, (Nov. 2, 1850), p. 2.

[242] Christensen, p. 153.

[243] Christian Socialist, no. 4, (Nov. 23, 1850), p. 27.

[244] Christian Socialist, no. 7, (Dec. 14, 1850), p. 48.

he advised against them saying, "Equality is a spiritual principle and not a mechanical rule ... Brotherhood does not require the sacrifice of the good to the bad, of the hardworking to the idle, as the adversaries of our ideas always insinuate".[245] However, the sharing of profits was, to Ludlow, a visable sign of the operation of the principle of brotherhood. Because of the struggle to survive that plagued the associations, material rewards were often scanty. Ludlow had to remind the associates constantly that discipline and self denial were necessary at that time, so that gainful wages could be achieved as a long term goal. To succeed, Ludlow advised that the associations must work diligently to develop a market for their goods and co-operate in the establishment of new groups. He decried the tendency to become exclusive, to deny their trade to other associations and to pursue cheapness on the open market instead of buying from each other.[246] To reward associates with a truly living wage at once, Ludlow noted, would force association prices too high to be competitive.[247] This kind of pre-occupation with wages Ludlow called "the union mind".[248]

In his letters to the associates, Ludlow warned against the misuse of time. Evidently, some workers were getting work in late and doing it in a shoddy fashion. He pointed out that in an association they were their own employer, thus this kind of negligence was criminal. Ludlow

---

[245] Christian Socialist, no. 30, (May 24, 1851), p. 234.

[246] Christian Socialist, no. 25, (April 19, 1851), p. 195.

[247] Christian Socialist, no. 16, (Feb. 15, 1851), p. 125.

[248] Christian Socialist, no. 25, (April 19, 1851), p. 195.

urged that associations must ever work to streamline and reduce the costs of production. They must not fight mechanical improvement, for, he said:

> The world needs mechanical improvements my friends, the world needs that cheapening of production which is the result of it; it will have it, whether we choose it or no, and the most strongly organized scheme of trade societies which could ever be devised, would be swept away ... if it simply endeavoured to resist the onward rushing of the age.[249]

Ludlow's emphasis again and again was the socialist concept of "collective mastership:, to be worked out in associations.[250] As each individual within a co-operative was to be encouraged, developed and placed in the position in which he could do the most good through the democratic process; so too associations must constantly work to lift each other up until all society was converted to Christian brotherhood, co-operation, socialism.[251] Ludlow realized, of course, that his ideal was not to be easily reached, that associations would be subject to internal and external testing, that, at the time, they were like small boats on a furious sea with no harbor in sight.[252]

With association at the core of his interest, Ludlow branched into all aspects of society. He consistently viewed contemporary events in connection with association. He believed in democracy and in universal suffrage, but not a suffrage granted before the worker freed himself and his labor from the thralldom of vicious capitalist competition. True democracy for Ludlow evolved from individual and co-operative self-control; "the government of the people must mean, not the letting loose

---

[249] Christian Socialist, no. 6, (Dec. 7, 1850), p. 43.

[250] Ibid.

[251] Christian Socialist, no. 11, (Jan. 11, 1851), pp. 83-84.

[252] Christian Socialist, no. 2, (Nov. 9, 1850), p. 11.

of all the accumulated selfishness of the many, but the giant self-control of the nation.[253] The French experiment of 1848 proved that universal suffrage did not automatically usher in socialism, Ludlow pointed out, for at the time socialists were being persecuted in France.[254] Instead, said Ludlow, national democracy should begin with democracy in co-operative workshops; based on Christian love, it would grow to encompass the entire nation.

Ludlow was not wedded to the existing class order. In an answer to a correspondent who had emphasized the idea of a divine order which commanded master-servant relations, Ludlow defended the concepts of obedience and order, then said, "But we are far from believing that their preservation is inseparably linked with the maintenance of the relationship of master and servant considered as a permanent or even as an absolute condition of life".[255] Christianity, he believed, commanded that men should be servants to one another and to God. In this kind of Christian service he envisioned "a great and prosperous Socialist state, wherein every member of the population shall be 'well-placed, well-employed, well-educated'".[256] Ludlow agreed with the goals of scientific socialists like Robert Owen, but felt that the only means to achieve them was through Christianity, "A truly social state [is] the highest earthly embodiment of the Christian Church".[257]

---

[253] Christian Socialist, no. 7, (Dec. 14, 1850), p. 49.

[254] Ibid.

[255] Christian Socialist, no. 9, (Dec. 28, 1850), p. 70.

[256] Christian Socialist, no. 26, (April 26, 1851), p. 201.

[257] Ibid.

Another indication of Ludlow's adherance to the idea of State Socialism came in answer to a request for him to oppose certain newspaper advertising taxes. He refused the request, saying that the nation should "grow daily more into the habit of looking how many, and not how few, purposes of common advantage can be compassed by the state, out of the vast sums which a nation can always gather from assessments trifling to themselves".[258] Ludlow urged direct state involvement again, when he called the government to establish a mandatory minimum wage in their contracts for uniforms and livery instead of letting bids to sweaters.[259] This was a development of a proposal put forth the previous year in the Fraser's article in which he had called the then-present system "wretched national cheese-paring".[260]

Early in 1851, Ludlow predicted the end of the Whig ministry and the rise of a new conservative government under Benjamin Disraeli. Although this did not actually occur until 1852, when Lord Derby, instead of Disraeli, was chosen as Prime Minister, Ludlow had outlined a program for the conservatives in advance. In the pages of the Christian Socialist, Ludlow proposed that the new ministry should revise taxes by doing away with specific obnoxious duties and correcting the inequality of the income tax. Further, they should supress child labor entirely; reform the laws of partnership to include association; reform the Government contract system and establish minimum wages; give more power for local self-government, including the right to tax for education, religion

---

[258] Christian Socialist, no. 29, (May 17, 1851), p. 225.

[259] Christian Socialist, no. 18, (March 1, 1851), p. 137.

[260] Ibid.

and sanitation; reform the Anglican Convocation to include laymen; reform and humanize the poor laws; and finally, give colonies local self-government and representation in Parliament.[261] Ludlow's Christian Socialism included not just Utopian ideals but pragmatic, if radical, solutions to current problems.

A problem that often came under Ludlow's purview was that of organized religion. Since he expected socialism to be achieved by the Christian churches, he was often disgusted with their pettiness and lack of concern for social issues. In a number of articles, Ludlow attacked the controversy between so-called "low" and "high" churchmen, the dissipation of energy by dissenters bickering over form and creed, and the subversiveness of the Roman Catholics. He saved his most rabid barbs for the Roman Catholics, whom he saw as insidiously involved in a world plot to overthrow British Protestantism. On this issue, Ludlow lost his usual objectivity, sounding almost paranoic and definitely Chauvinistic. He saw "foreign Princes backed by French bayonets dividing all England into Bishoprics of their own".[262]

In a calmer vein, and with an international socialist view, Ludlow ascribed Roman Catholic power to its world-wide unity and order. The anarchy and disunion of states and Protestant denominations helped the Roman Catholics to fill the breach. Therefore he propounded that international socialism rebuild Christendom into an organic whole -- a Marxian internationalism, but again, based on re-born Christianity.[263]

---

[261] Christian Socialist, no. 19, (March 8, 1851), p. 145.

[262] Christian Socialist, no. 3, (Nov. 16, 1850), p. 17.

[263] Christian Socialist, no. 27, (May 3, 1851), p. 219.

Throughout the pages of the Christian Socialist, John Ludlow consistantly developed his version of Christian socialism. At times he was petty, and his class prejudices and nationalism were evident. Often he was paternalistic and annoyed as workers continued to display the same kind of competiveness that they had condemned in their former employers. Ludlow was disgusted by what he termed "trade union mentality" which exhibited itself in wage demands and reduced working hours — goals he felt to be so small in light of the ultimate task of the regeneration of labor. Although Ludlow's voice and views put forth in the paper greatly influenced the movement,[264] they differed from those views dearly held by his 'master', Maurice. The Christian Socialist gave coherence and unity to the co-operative movement while it was published, but the ideas espoused by Ludlow in it would soon be the rocks on which Christian Socialism as a movement would be destroyed.

Many pages of the Christian Socialist were devoted to the slow progress of Ludlow's most outstanding contribution to co-operation, the passage of a bill to legalize associations. Although workers and consumers were perfectly free to form co-operatives, existing law offered them no recognition or protection. In 1846, the Friendly Societies Act had been expanded to include the 'Frugal Investment Clause' which allowed members to use their savings to buy food, clothes or other necessities to sell within the group.[265] They were not allowed to own land or to sell

---

[264]Christensen, p. 152.

[265]Great Britain, Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd. series, Vol. 84, (March 11, 1846), pp. 929-935.

to the general public. A co-operative store, like that of the Rochdale Pioneers, could qualify to register under this extension as a Friendly Society, but the law excluded producers' associations because they had to sell to the public.[266]

Workingmen's Associations, therefore, had no legal protection against fraud by any of their members. They could not sue a member if he absconded with the funds, and any member could pledge the entire credit of the association. Further, Associations could not sue or be sued corporately. The only possibility of legalization open to an association was to register as a joint stock company, which did not apply to it in many instances. Joint stock company law required an organization to have twenty five or more members, and entailed numerous rules concerning deeds of settlement and the amount and division of capital, among others, which were inapplicable in the case of an association. Above all, registering as a joint stock company would cost over £50, often the total sum of the entire wealth of the associates.[267] Since associations could register neither as a joint stock company nor as a Friendly Society, they fell within the bounds of common law, which regarded them as partnerships, with each associate assuming equal and unlimited responsibility for all transactions.[268]

---

[266] W. R. Greg, "Investments for the Working Classes — A Review of Five Bills", Edinburgh Review, Vol. XCV, American Edition (April, 1852), pp. 230-31.

[267] Ibid., p. 230.

[268] Philip Backstrom, p. 309.

Since partnership law had been his speciality as a student of Bellenden Ker, John Ludlow was acutely aware of the legal drawbacks to association. He realized that both workers and investors were frightened away from association due to its lack of legal status.[269] In 1850, Ludlow drew up a bill to change the law making it applicable to association and presented it to Lord Ashley, Earl of Shaftesbury, who seemed sympathetic to working class causes. Shaftesbury, however, declined to sponsor it, probably because of his intense dislike of Socialism, a position openly maintained by the advocates of the bill.[270] Robert Slaney, another member of Parliament who was deeply in sympathy with the associative movement, requested that the House appoint a special committee to investigate the whole question of safe investments for the middle and working classes. The proposal was agreed to with little discussion and in May, 1850, the committee was approved.[271] Vaughn Johnson, who was charged by Slaney with providing evidence, contacted his friend Tom Hughes and his partners, Ludlow and Neale, who proceeded to dominate the course of the hearings.[272]

The list of witnesses read like a roll from the Society for the Promotion of Working Men's Associations; Ludlow, Neale, Hughes, Cooper, Jones, Milbank and Shorter all testified. But the most impressive event

---

[269]Mack, p. 67.

[270]Christensen, p. 273.

[271]Great Britain, Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. CX, (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 8 April - 13 May, 1850), p. 424.

[272]Christensen, p. 273.

was the appearance of two of Britain's most distinguished economic experts, Bellenden Ker, the famous author of the Joint Stock Company Acts, and John Stuart Mill.[273] Through the efforts of Ludlow and Neale, the two great men had been induced to present evidence to the committee.[274]

Apart from the prestigious testimony of Ker and Mill, Ludlow, the first witness to appear, presented the most complete evidence to Slaney's Committee.[275] Much of the debate revolved around the need for limited liability for associative investments specifically, and for philanthropic projects such as low cost housing generally. Ludlow wanted associations to be granted limited liability, and to be able to register with the Friendly Societies. The argument put forth against limited liability was that it would encourage the working classes to speculate recklessly. Ludlow's answer to this was surprising in light of the radical faith in the working classes which he usually exhibited in the Christian Socialist and other writing. He admitted: "Unlimited liability [does] tend as a check to prevent wise people going into those speculations; but unfortunately the working classes are often not very wise. They are easily deceived as to the probable success of an enterprize; they are like children, children always hope for more than they can get."[276]

The main plea was that the workers deserved to try their experiments under the law, so they could not blame the government for casting

---

[273]Slaney Committee, Testimony.

[274]Hughes, "E. V. Neale", pp. 4-5.

[275]Slaney Committee, (May 9, 1850), pp. 541-553.

[276]Christian Socialist, no. 10, (January 4, 1851), p. 76.

obstacles in their path if they failed. Throughout the testimony of almost all witnesses -- with the exception of Mill, there appears a supercilious assumption that associations would fail. Even Ludlow exhibited this attitude; at one point he said, "...Even if they were disappointed, it would promote their submission to things as they are".[277]

Modern Communists condemn the Christian Socialists for diverting the workers' revolution by the idea of association and thus delaying the advent of Socialism.[278] Ludlow certainly confirms this suspicion in answer to the question of whether association would lead to contentment or discontent on the part of Labor. He said, "Quite so; it would have this beneficial effect of taking away their attention from political subjects, which have engrossed them very much". He went on to observe that in France, many former agitators were then completely occupied with their working associations.[279]

There is no evidence with which to evaluate Ludlow's motivation for the seemingly contradictory attitude which he took before the Committee. He may have been saying what he felt the members wanted to hear. On the other hand, he was consistant with his class attitude of paternalism, and having worked closely with some of the dregs of the working class, probably assessed their state correctly. For Ludlow always maintained that workers had to improve their own lot and prove themselves worthy of being the vehicle of democratic, Christian socialism. Obviously

---

[277] Ibid.

[278] John Saville, "The Christian Socialists of 1848", in Democracy and the Labour Movement, (London: Lawrence and Wishart, Ltd., 1954), p. 136.

[279] Christian Socialist, no. 10, (Jan. 4, 1851), p. 76.

he felt that they had not reached that point. Secondly, Ludlow had never advocated social change by political means and he remained adamant against universal suffrage.

In his testimony, Ludlow clearly and cogently presented the drawbacks to existing law and his suggestions to remedy them. He delineated the difficulties of the joint stock company act and further, discussed the problems the poor confronted when they wished to purchase land. Many committee members asked about the possibility of using the French system of 'commandite' — in which there were two kinds of partners. Active members with unlimited liability, and a larger group with liability limited to the amount of their subscriptions. Ludlow did not feel that commandite would be useful, since it would interfere with associative equality.[280]

John Stuart Mill was most enthusiastic about the possibilities of associations in the British economy. He indicated that they could work well, if given a proper chance, but not privilege, before the law. He supported limiting liability, not to enable the poor to give capital to the rich, but "to enable the rich to lend to those who are poor".[281] Mill deplored the amount of money which went to middlemen not engaged in production, and he would have liked to see enterprises carried on, not as they were then, "by a capitalist, hiring labourers as he wants them, but by the labourers themselves, mental as well as manual, hiring the capital they require at the market rate".[282] Mill believed workers'

---

[280] Ibid.

[281] Slaney Committee, p. 618.

[282] Christian Socialist, no. 3, (Nov. 16, 1850), p. 19.

co-operative ventures to be the best way for laborers to invest their funds.[283] His testimony helped to bring the idea of association into the realm of respectability.[284]

Whereas J. S. Mill had been friendly toward association, Bellenden Ker was not. Further, the committee was split concerning the advisability of a provision for limited liability,[285] and both sides, wrote Tom Hughes, were determined to extract "a response from the oracle [Ker] weighty enough to break their opponents' heads with".[286] Ker tried to escape the dilemma by presenting a written brief to the committee, but they were not so easily put off. He objected to altering the law of partnership for a particular group because he opposed class legislation. Ker testified that the investments of the working classes should be limited to savings banks and under no circumstances should the lower orders be encouraged to speculate. He was hostile to the principle of limited liability, which he characterized as "evil".[287] When pressured by the interrogators, Ker conceded that for some large public undertakings, limited liability might be desirable; however, in order to make it available for one group, he maintained that the entire joint stock company

---

[283] Christian Socialist, no. 7, (Dec. 14, 1850), p. 51.

[284] Raven, p. 295.

[285] Slaney Committee, general.

[286] Christian Socialist, no. 19, (March 8, 1851), p. 151.

[287] Slaney Committee, p. 599.

structure should be reformed. Later, in his testimony, Ker agreed that associations should be protected by an extension of the Friendly Societies Act, rather than by any major change in the laws of joint stock companies, but he continued to assert that co-operatives should not be granted limited liability.[288]

Ludlow criticized Ker's caution in his comments on the great barrister's testimony. He agreed in theory with the principle that an entire revision of corporate law was needed, since piecemeal changes were a "nuisance". But, he said, "Let us move onward, for God's sake, were it only to the next station, sooner than stand stock still because the engine has not the power to carry us beyond".[289] Because Ker was greatly distressed by the badgering of the committee and the resulting adverse publicity, he republished his evidence before them in a book form with prefatory remarks addressed to Ludlow.[290]

The remaining witnesses before the Slaney Committee included Tom Hughes and Lloyd Jones, members of the associative movement, and two barristers, J. Stewart from Lincoln's Inn, who was quite sympathetic with the problems of the poor, and Denis LeMarchant of the Board of Trade, who was not. Joseph Milbank, secretary of the S.P.W.M.A., presented an interesting insight from the worker's point of view. When asked why workers did not use the savings banks backed by the government, he answered that

---

[288] Christian Socialist, no. 19, (Mar. 8, 1851), p. 150.

[289] Christian Socialist, no. 8, (Dec. 21, 1850), p. 59.

[290] Christian Socialist, no. 16, (Feb. 15, 1851), p. 126.

a laborer dared not use a savings bank in his own neighborhood, for if the employer discovered that the man had a surplus for savings, he would lower his wages.[291]

When the Slaney Committee — obviously influenced by the Christian Socialists — issued their report in July, 1850, it represented favorably the proposals of Ludlow and his group. The committee reported that the existing law of partnership placed very real obstacles before working men's associations; further, the law offered neither protection against fraud by an investor, nor legal recourse for enforcing rules agreed upon by associates. The committee assented that, "ultimate benefit will ensue from any measures which the Legislature may be enabled to devise for simplifying the operation of the law and unfettering the energies of trade".[292] Though no specific measure was outlined, the committee urged immediate action by Parliament.

Unfortunately, the Whig Parliament was not disposed to act, and no legislation was introduced in 1850. The next year, Slaney convinced Parliament to form another special committee to investigate laws of partnership and limited liability as they applied to the working class. Its hearings, conducted with out the aid of the Christian Socialists, produced nearly the same conclusions as had the first.[293] Henry Labouchere, chairman of the Board of Trade, representing the Whig government, went so far as to ask Ludlow to prepare a bill embodying his suggestions

---

[291]Slaney Committee, p. 590.

[292]Slaney Committee, Report, p. IV.

[293]Christensen, p. 275.

and submit it to the Board. Vastly encouraged, Ludlow did so in the fall of 1851, only to find his effort completely ignored.[294] After fruitless lobbeying on behalf of their bill, the Christian Socialists despaired of the Whig government.

In February, 1852, however, the Tories came to power, eager to show their good will to the working classes. The next month, Slaney presented Ludlow's bill to Parliament, with one major adjustment, a clause had been inserted denying associations limited liability.[295] Ludlow and the promoters struggled vainly with Slaney and other backers of the bill to remove the offending clause, but they became convinced that to do so would jeopardize the entire act.[296] On April 21, the bill was given a second reading,[297] and it was passed with no debate on June 3, 1852. Royal assent was given the Act on June 30, and it was duly registered as 15th & 16th Victoria, "An Act to Legalize the Formation of Industrial and Provident Societies".[298]

Ludlow called the act the "Magna Carta of Co-operative trade and

---

[294] Raven, p. 296.

[295] "Parliamentary Debates", Vol. CXIX, p. 1256.

[296] Raven, p. 299.

[297] "Parliamentary Debates", Vol. CXX, p. 967.

[298] Great Britain, Laws, Statutes, etc., An Act to Legalize the Formation of Industrial and Provident Societies, 15th & 16th Victoria, (London: Her Majesty's Printers, 1852) Ch. 31, p. 62 - hereafter referred to as "The Industrial and Provident Societies Act".

industry ..."[299] The twentieth century British historian, G. D. H. Cole agreed, describing it, together with many ammendments, as the "main legal basis for the movement of today".[300] Although the Act was a milestone in British working class history, it had many drawbacks, the most glaring of which was the absence of provision for limited liability. In addition, the act did not provide for federated or joint action by many different associations.

The Industrial and Provident Societies Act spread the benevolent umbrella of the Friendly Societies Act over the associations and the co-operatives, providing that each would register with the redoubtable Tidd Pratt, registrar of the Friendly Societies. They were not, however, eligible to enroll as a joint stock company.

The new act established rules for societies concerning payment of members, wages for non-members, loan regulations, capital subscription dividends, and the division of profits and co-operative purchase dividends. It also provided regulations for managerial actions, allowed the Societies to make contracts, collect dues from members, arbitrate disputes, regulate withdrawal of members and formulate "winding up" rules. Further, it defined court jurisdiction for legal arbitration of disputes.[301]

The shortcomings of this act were corrected then years later, when it was amended to grant limited liability.[302] However, the Act of 1852

---

[299] J. M. Ludlow and Lloyd Jones, Progress of the Working Class, 1832-1867, (London: Alexander Strahan, 1867), p. 49.

[300] Cole, p. 446.

[301] Statutes of the Realm, Industrial and Provident Societies Act, pp. 62-67.

[302] Ludlow and Jones, p. 49.

was of great credit to Ludlow, Neale and Hughes, for, although the Christian Socialists as a group would no longer provide leadership, it gave co-operative ventures the impetus that launched them as one of the most important parts of the working class movement in Britain.

CHAPTER VII

CRITICISM AND COLLAPSE

The philosophy and activities of the Christian Socialists elicited a clamor of criticism from the contemporary press. From other socialists, like George Holyoake, editor of the Reasoner, came accusations that they were using the good name of socialism to proselytize. Holyoake admonished them: "A co-operative coat need not be a Christian coat".[303] More disapprobation came from the right, which sometimes amounted to outright vilification. J. Wilson Crocker in the Quarterly Review, writing on Kingsley's works, accused him of "out - Herod [ing] both Louis Blanc and the Chartists,"[304] and continued, "These ravings of rapine, blasphemy and nonsense are the epilogue -- the moral, if we may so misuse the term, but in short, the summary of this manifesto of Kingsley -- Maurician socialism".[305]

The Edinburgh Review in January, 1851, loosed a diatribe unexcelled even by Crocker. It was entitled "English Socialism and Communistic Associations", and was essentially a review of "Cheap Clothes and Nasty", and Alton Locke. The editor defended political economy as the true embodiment of the natural laws of economics, and predicted dreadful

---

[303] Christian Socialist, no. 13, (Jan. 25, 1851), p. 97.

[304] J. Wilson Crocker, "Revolutionary Literature", Quarterly Review, Vol. 89, (September, 1851), p. 525.

[305] Ibid., p. 530.

CHAPTER VII

CRITICISM AND COLLAPSE

The philosophy and activities of the Christian Socialists elicited a clamor of criticism from the contemporary press. From other socialists, like George Holyoake, editor of the Reasoner, came accusations that they were using the good name of socialism to proselytize. Holyoake admonished them: "A co-operative coat need not be a Christian coat".[303] More disapprobation came from the right, which sometimes amounted to outright vilification. J. Wilson Crocker in the Quarterly Review, writing on Kingsley's works, accused him of "out - Herod [ing] both Louis Blanc and the Chartists,"[304] and continued, "These ravings of rapine, blasphemy and nonsense are the epilogue -- the moral, if we may so misuse the term, but in short, the summary of this manifesto of Kingsley -- Maurician socialism".[305]

The Edinburgh Review in January, 1851, loosed a diatribe unexcelled even by Crocker. It was entitled "English Socialism and Communistic Associations", and was essentially a review of "Cheap Clothes and Nasty", and Alton Locke. The editor defended political economy as the true embodiment of the natural laws of economics, and predicted dreadful

---

[303] Christian Socialist, no. 13, (Jan. 25, 1851), p. 97.

[304] J. Wilson Crocker, "Revolutionary Literature", Quarterly Review, Vol. 89, (September, 1851), p. 525.

[305] Ibid., p. 530.

consequences for those who went counter to its rules.[306] Kingsley, he said, had no understanding of political economics. "His feelings were strongly excited by Mr. Mayhew's letters in the Morning Cronicle"; he went on, "and, as he himself states, he incontinently became demented, and put forth a tract full of raving wholly unworthy of his scholarship and station".[307] In regard to the Christian Socialist, the editor saw that as "a weekly journal conducted with great ability as to everything but logic" and completely devoted to Communist propaganda.[308]

After berating Kingsley, and cataloging all the past "horrors" of Socialism, the Review's editor presented in the rest of the thirty nine page article a closely reasoned attack on association and on socialism in general. He described the associative idea as medieval, a throwback to guilds. He saw it as an attempt to regulate the number of laborers in each trade in an effort to meet the problem created by an oversupply of workers in proportion to the demand for their services. The editor pointed out that in order to avoid the mechanism of competition, the Socialists would have to institute a type of central agency to allocate surplus labor and products. This, the author stated, would amount to a virtual monopoly as restrictive as any capitalistic combination.[309] In addition, the associations had masters who exercised complete control

---

[306]"English Socialism and Communistic Associations", The Edinburgh Review, Vol. XCIII, no. CLXXXIX, (January, 1851), p. 8.

[307]Ibid., p. 7.

[308]Ibid., p. 12.

[309]Ibid., pp. 16-17.

over the shop and over other workers. The reviewer failed to see how this differed from the capitalist master. Even the ardent opposition of the Christian Socialists to competition was suspect, for Kingsley's tract had proposed competing with sweaters and "beating them at their own game".[310] The editor saw another paradox in the demand by Christian Socialists for inexpensive goods for workingmen's consumption, coupled with a plea for higher prices on labor's products.[311]

The presentation in the Edinburgh Review, of the critical articles read for this thesis, contained one of the most logical and well presented arguments against socialism. The Quarterly Review and others became carried away with anti-communist rhetoric and the horrors of communal living, thus ignoring the real weak points of the socialist proposal. Since the Christian Socialists could not afford to ignore such persuasive criticism, in early February, Ludlow wrote an article for the Christian Socialist in which he answered the Edinburgh Review with a generalized reaffirmation of self-sacrificing Christian brotherhood as the premise on which associations were based. He stated that he could not envision how brotherhood would ever proceed from the existing system of competition, which the Review advocated. In this first article Ludlow did not deal with the hard facts of economic life which the Edinburgh Review had presented. Instead he avoided them, using Christianity as a

---

[310] Ibid., p. 21.

[311] Ibid., p. 23.

shield — the travesty upon economic socialism that the Christian Socialists had been accused of by Holyoake in the Reasoner, that is, obfuscating the economics with Christianity.[312]

Later in the month, Ludlow spoke before the Society for the Promotion of Working Men's Associations to answer the economic questions raised by the Edinburgh Review. He chastised the Review for confusing communism and socialism. Communism, he said, is the very essence of Christian spiritual life, because the blessings of Christianity are common to all. But Associations did not advocate material communism, since they did not absorb private property. The secretary of the society went on to record that "The Lecturer now showed that the word Communism had a special reference to things, which were common to several, whilst Socialism had special reference to persons, who were socii, partners or associates. The one stood thus in essential antagonism to absolute property, the other, to human discord and rivalry".[313] Ludlow attacked political economists for their narrow concept of economy which neglected the full meaning of weal or welfare that transcended the production and distribution of wealth.[314] In grappling with the question of monoply control, he pointed out that the legislature and the crown exercised a monoply in determining government service. He also answered the question of an over supply of workers, stating that it was strange that the advocates of competition wanted workers to limit their numbers to prevent

---

[312] Christian Socialist, no. 14, (Feb. 15, 1851), pp. 107-108.

[313] Christian Socialist, no. 17, (February 22, 1851), p. 133.

[314] Ibid.

competition among themselves. Although Ludlow was clever at the use of semantics and reverse logic to confound his opponents, a more competant answer to the Edinburgh Review was delivered by Louis Furnivall.

Furnivall dealt with the statistics on the London tailors which had been published in the Review. He divided them into new catagories that showed that by eliminating certain groups of people, there was no surplus of labor. Furnivall's analysis demonstrated that if the profits of the middlemen were removed, if the hours and workload were trimmed, and if women and children were relieved of the burden of augmenting meager family incomes, the number of good jobs and the number of male workers would be brought into balance. He further pointed out that a new demand for clothing would be created by the rise in prosperity of the worker.[315]

In a whole series of lectures, Ludlow and the others fielded the criticisms leveled by the Edinburgh Review, the Reasoner and the Eclectic Review. The organ of the Oxford high church movement, The Guardian, also attacked both Kingsley and the Christian Socialists in two articles. Their argument was theological, couched in the most Christian terms. They did, however, accuse Kingsley of heresy. These attacks prompted Maurice to take up the pen in the Christian Socialist. The first article, signed only "a clergyman", was warm and reconciling,[316] but the second was much more blunt. Maurice writing under his own name, accused the Guardian of what in Maurice's theology, was the greatest sin, that of devisiveness within the church and of creating a church party. While admitting Kingsley's

---

[315] Christian Socialist, no. 15, (Feb. 8, 1851), pp. 114-115.

[316] Christian Socialist, no. 21, (March 22, 1851), p. 161.

rashness, Maurice defended the author against them. Reading the passage, one has the vision of a puppy with his nose nipped, quailing behind his master who is vanquishing the enemy. The article is full of "Mauricisms"; a caress, sensitivity in the most modern sense of the term, and then a razor slash, light but wounding.[317] Kingsley, in a letter to Maurice, described the result of his tangle with the Guardian: "I cottoned to the Guardian and found that I had been doing very much like the gentleman who asks for a kiss out of the window in Chaucer's tale and gets to kiss — you recollect what".[318]

The whole Christian Socialist idea and endeavor aroused criticism from as far away as France, the great bulk of which was aimed at Kingsley.[319] Although the Christian Socialists united in confronting this criticism, it indeed sowed doubt in the minds of the men struggling with associations.

As early as the winter of 1850, it was obvious that many of the associations were in deep trouble. Competition from slop-working firms drove associative prices down to the point that the principle of a living wage had to be sacrificed. Ludlow noted that to complicate the financial picture further, no one in the associations was familiar with a simple system of bookkeeping.[320] Associations were not at all selective in membership, nor, more importantly, were they electing educated managers.[321]

---

[317] Christian Socialist, no. 33, (June 14, 1851), p. 257.

[318] cited in Robert Martin, The Dust of Combat, (London: Faber and Faber, 1959), p. 140.

[319] Christian Socialist, no. 30, (May 24, 1851), p. 234.

[320] Christian Socialist, no. 3, (Nov. 16, 1850), p. 20.

[321] Christian Socialist, no. 7, (Dec. 14, 1850), p. 52.

In December, the Council of Promoters found the Working Tailor's Association virtually dissolved due to a disagreement with their manager. The Council reconstituted the Association with Walter Cooper at its head and reappointed an entirely new group.[322]

In 1852, the Society for the Promotion of Working Men's Associations issued a blunt report, authored by Joseph Milbank and Thomas Shorter, reviewing the failures and giving reasons for them. In some cases, they said, associations had been advanced funds with no sign of preparedness to change their old competitive attitudes and had not supplied any funds of their own. The men quarreled with each other and their managers. If an association did become successful, the report went on, it became exclusive and thus tended to compete with others. Milbank and Shorter, in their official capacity as secretaries to the S.P.W.M.A. and basing their conclusion on two years of experience in the effort, made a damning indictment in their report: "Working men in general are not fit for association".[323]

In the fall of 1851, Ludlow and Thomas Hughes toured the co-operatives of Lancashire and Yorkshire, the heartland of the movement. They found very little spirit of true brotherly co-operation, and a great deal of joint stock company-type combination. Consumer co-operatives were doing quite well, but producer's associations there were not paying their way.[324] Failure of the associations was especially heartbreaking to the Christian Socialists because they failed in the very quality on

---

[322] Christian Socialist, no. 9, (Dec. 28, 1850), p. 69.

[323] Cole and Filson, pp. 440-441.

[324] Mack, p. 65.

which Ludlow and the rest had based their hopes — the achievement of Christian brotherhood.

The biographers of Tom Hughes aptly pointed out that conditions in 1852 were not ripe for producer's co-operatives and London, with the nation's most isolated work force, was the worst place to have started.[325] Max Beer reiterated that idea and added, "Besides, there is no worse human material to experiment with than the remnants of a defeated revolutionary movement. Embittered and demoralized, they are a thorn in the side of their old friends as well as their new ones".[326] This kind of rationalization was cold comfort to the Christian Socialists, especially Vansittart Neale, who had lost an estimated £60,000 in three years in associations.[327]

Neale's prodigality in investment may have been one of the factors referred to in the report by Millbank and Shorter. The fervid activity of Neale definitely produced a fatal split in the S.P.W.M.A. Already beset by virulent criticism from without and associative failure within, the movement was irreparably damaged by an ideological break between Ludlow and Neale in 1851. From the beginning of the formation of the Society, when Maurice had brought Neale into the group, Ludlow had disapproved of his being included. Ludlow wrote in his autobiography:

> ...I still think it would have been more judicious not to have included him, at all events at the first. For he had taken no part in any of our previous work; he could not in any sense of the word be termed a Maurician, ... we could not feel sure of him as we did (or seemed to do) of each other.[328]

---

[325] Mack and Armytage, p. 72.

[326] Beer, p. 186.

[327] Mack, p. 63.

[328] Ludlow, Autobiography, Ch. XXIII, cited in Christensen, p. 150.

In October, 1850, Neale, at the instigation of Jules Lechevalier, had proposed the establishment of a co-operative store as an outlet for associative goods. Lloyd Jones, an enthusiastic supporter of co-op stores, agreed to run it, and with little discussion it was established as another association -- financed by Neale and housed in the same building as the S.P.W.M.A.[329] Lechevalier was especially interested in extending the Society's work on a national level; and in spite of the fact that the Society under Ludlow's leadership had remained cool to the idea, Neale was definitely interested. Consumer co-operatives were, in their thinking, a better vehicle for the propagation of the associative idea than producers' associations, since the former had gained such popularity in the north. Therefore in the early part of 1851, Lechevalier, Neale and Jones developed a proposal to create a business center for the whole co-operative movement.[330]

Lloyd Jones presented the plan for a Central Co-operative Agency to a meeting of co-operators at Bury in April, 1851, in an attempt to solicit their support. Although the conference decided to establish their own co-operative wholesale agency, they did endorse the purchase of goods from the London stores.[331] Nevertheless, Neale and Lechevalier created the Central Co-operative Agency in May and June, independently of the Council of Promoters of the S.P.W.M.A.[332]

---

[329] Christensen, p. 182.

[330] Christensen, p. 183.

[331] Christian Socialist, no. 31, (May 31, 1851), p. 244.

[332] Hughes, "E. V. Neale", p. 41.

This action began the struggle between the concept of wholesale consumers' co-operatives backed by Lechevalier and Neale with Hughes' support, and of workers associations, which Ludlow and the rest of the council perceived as the true vehicle for Christian Socialism. Neale's group developed a tremendous publicity campaign in which they pushed consumers' co-operatives to the forefront, obviously in competition with the work of the council of Promoters.[333]

Ludlow's socialism was that of the producer involved in a democratic workshop. He saw little moral worth stemming from consumer co-operatives. Further, he viewed Neale's agency as a threat to the work of the S.P.W.M.A. and Christian Socialism with which it seemed to compete. In a series of articles in the Christian Socialist, Ludlow attacked the whole concept of co-operative stores. "A working association exists for the purpose of production", he wrote, "A co-operative association for the purpose of consumption. Now production is essentially an unselfish act, consumption, a selfish one".[334] The danger of associations, he admitted, was that of exclusiveness, but a co-op store was entirely too inclusive, taking in anyone who wanted to save a penny, regardless of his sentiments. Ludlow drew the distinction between spiritual and material socialism, the former exhibited in the working men's association, the latter in the co-operative store. The new society needed both, he concluded, but production was to be regarded more highly for it necessitated brotherly love.[335]

---

[333] Ibid.

[334] Christian Socialist, no. 31, (May 31, 1851), p. 242.

[335] Ibid.

Neale's answer, printed in the Christian Socialist a few weeks later, pointed up the inherent ideological differences between himself and Ludlow. Ludlow had a vision of a radically altered society evolving out of Christian Socialism. With this concept, Ludlow was much more akin to revolutionary socialists like Marx than to paternalistic conservatives like Neale. For Neale, one of the strong points for co-op stores was that they in no way altered or displaced anyone in the existing society. They were thus much easier to establish and they would acquaint the poor with the ideas of co-operation without demanding a change in their life style (the very change which Ludlow's view demanded that they make). Neale went on to claim that since the stores were the natural outlet for associative products, they would unite the conflicting interests between producer and consumer. Consumer co-ops were, he felt, more in tune with the times and thus had a much better chance for success.[336] Neale, as has already been noted, had no real dedication to Ludlow's vision of converting society through Christian Socialism, but was devoted to the principle of extending and consolidating the co-operative movement as successfully as possible, and including anyone who had that goal.

Ludlow, of course, did not allow Neale to have the last word. Realizing the impending breach between them, Ludlow softened his approach and praised Neale's concern with distribution.[337] But in a continuation of the article in the following issue of the paper, Ludlow again attacked co-ops on specific principles. He objected to the authoritarianism

---

[336] Christian Socialist, no. 33, (June 14, 1851), pp. 261-262.

[337] Christian Socialist, no. 34, (June 21, 1851), p. 267.

of the managers, who were only answerable to the Trustees in Neale's Agency, and not to the workers. He drew a meaningful parallel: "A benevolent mastership may be a very excellent thing, but it is not association; just as an enlightened despotism may be a very excellent thing, but it is not constitutional government".[338] Ludlow viewed co-op subscribers as simply collective capitalists who have hired a distributer -- "The bargain between them need be only the old buy-cheap-and-sell-dear struggle, in which the weaker goes to the wall," he wrote.[339] In reference to Neale's claim for co-ops creating a demand for associative goods, Ludlow answered: "Dear friend, let us both avoid with equal care imputing to the mere machinery the wonderous effects of the force which sets it in motion."[340]

Neale with the enthusiastic support of Lechevalier and the co-operation of Hughes went ahead with the expansion of the agency. They distributed a massive appeal not only to the existing co-operatives, but to the trades societies as well, which was received with great interest. In the advertisment, Neale hardly mentioned the S.P.W.M.A. except to say that no one subscribing to the agency was required to have any connection with that body.[341] By this action, Ludlow's worst fears had been confirmed; therefore in November, 1851, he engineered a showdown in a meeting of the Council of Promoters. The issue was provoked when Ludlow insisted that the Agency must either follow the policies laid down in the constitution

---

[338] Christian Socialist, no. 25, (June 28, 1851), p. 274.

[339] Ibid.

[340] Ibid., p. 273.

[341] Masterman, J. M. Ludlow, p. 122.

of the S.P.W.M.A. or withdraw. When Neale and his supporters refused, Ludlow, now defeated, tendered his resignation to Maurice. He also promised to resign as editor of the Christian Socialist.[342]

Maurice had to arbitrate the dispute. At first, he refused to accept Ludlow's resignation, chastising him for "really risking a principle — the whole principle of association and brotherhood, for the sake of a particular notion of yours respecting the necessary way of carrying it out".[343] Maurice engineered a complete separation between the Council of Promoters of the S.P.W.M.A. and Neale's Central Agency; both were to operate side by side with the understanding that the latter would receive no support from the former.[344] Ludlow adamantly withdrew from the Council of Promoters, but remained a member of the S.P.W.M.A. He also fulfilled his promise to resign the editorship of the Christian Socialist, an act which Maurice welcomed.[345]

Maurice had never been pleased with the paper, and was under pressure from his friends to end its political tone. Maurice's position at King's College was being seriously challanged by many who looked upon him as a dangerous radical because of his connection with the Christian Socialists. In 1851, he had been examined by the trustees and cleared of any suspected heresy. However, he casually mentioned to Ludlow that changing the name and tenor of the journal held out a "remote, but

---

[342] Ibid., p. 123.

[343] Maurice, Vol. II, p. 76.

[344] Hughes, "E. V. Neale", p. 42.

[345] Masterman, J. M. Ludlow, p. 124.

still possible chance of my retaining my professorship at King's College".[346] This had the desired effect on Ludlow, never would he risk exposing his beloved "master" to censure, thus he turned his paper over to Tom Hughes in January, 1852, and it became simply The Journal of Association.[347]

Maurice had come to believe that Ludlow indeed planned a much more rigidly ideological program for Christian socialism than the "master" wanted. Maurice encouraged Neale and the others to spread co-operation beyond the group to avoid the creation of a sect gathered around himself. He saw associations as small experiments rather than vehicles for a great new economic machinery. He wrote to Ludlow in this vein in March, 1852: "I feared the Christian Socialist Journal because I feared it would embarrass the question more; strongly asserting the religious principle, being very busy with the commercial details, leaving the public in doubt whether we were pressing a commercial scheme upon religious maxims, or introducing a new religion into commerce." "I did prefer, as you say rightly, that it should become merely commercial, just that it might not lead anyone to fancy that Christianity or politics were commercial".[348] He went on to say that this was also why he had opposed Ludlow's plan to bring the Agency under the control of the Council of Promoters.

---

[346]Maurice to Ludlow, Dec. 1851, unpublished M.S., cited in Masterman, J. M. Ludlow, p. 125. Interestingly, the letter in which this suggestion was made was omitted from the account by Maurice's son.

[347]Maurice, Vol. II, p. 104.

[348]Maurice to Ludlow, March 21, 1852, in Maurice, Vol. II, p. 115.

In spite of their obvious differences, Ludlow continued to delude himself that Maurice still held the same views of Christian Socialism that he did, and he ascribed the "Prophet's" reluctance to pressures exerted on Maurice by his wife, her brother Julius Hare and others.[349]

Relations between Ludlow and Maurice continued to deteriorate throughout 1852 and 1853, for it became more and more obvious that the two had entirely divergent views on the purpose of Christian Socialism. In justice to Maurice, it can be said that he was reluctant to assume the leadership of the group from the first, but once the position had been forced upon him, he consistantly remained true to his concept of the Divine Order, which involved essentially a conservative paternalism of an aristocratic class system.[350] Because he allowed and encouraged diverse opinions, seeming often to actually support them, Maurice was tragically misunderstood by his followers, and especially by Ludlow. This situation arose from his horror of imposing his will on others. Yet when Maurice saw himself being forced into what he considered a sectarian position, he would suddenly and arbitrarily reverse the new direction.[351] Maurice remained essentially a theologian, and as he attempted to explain his position to Ludlow:

> My business, because I am a theologian, and have no vocation except for theology, is not to build, but to dig, to show that

---

[349] Masterman, p. 124.

[350] Maurice to Ludlow, Nov. 24, 1849, in Maurice, Vol. II, p. 25.

[351] Maurice, Vol. II, p. 55.

> economy and politics ... must have ground beneath themselves, that society is not to be made anew by arrangements of ours, but is to be regenerated by finding the law and ground of its order and harmony the only secret of its existence in God.[352]

The Kingdom of God, for Maurice, was to be discovered, not created. He embraced Christian Socialism because he believed it revealed a truth about human relationships, that men were meant to co-operate as brothers in all spheres of their earthly existence. The motivation for that kind of care and concern was the recognition by the individual of the Christ in each man and in himself. No man-made scheme could impose Christian love, no matter how well it was conducted. Thus associations, for him, were a way to make a statement about the merits of brotherhood, an experiment in which to test the proposition that men would behave in a Christlike manner toward each other if placed in a situation which encouraged them to do so. Therefore Maurice, unlike Ludlow, was not interested in the machinery which would use his experiment to radically alter existing social relations, especially when he began to realize that men within the freedom of association continued to be petty, jealous and vindictive.[353] Maurice did not want to offer the associative idea as a cure-all, when the experiment had shown almost insurmountable odds against even marginal success.[354]

---

[352]Maurice to Ludlow, Sept. 24, 1852, in Maurice, Vol. II, p. 136.

[353]J. Llewelyn Davies, Social Questions from the Point of View of Christian Theology, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan Co., 1886), p. 238.

[354]Maurice, Vol. II, p. 104.

John Ludlow was emphatically not a theologian. He could only dimly follow the tortuous depths of Maurice's logic. Instead, Ludlow was essentially a politician, a lawyer and a socialist with a rather simplistic view of Christianity.[355] He was quite willing to allow God His mysteries, but he saw the poor, the hungry, the thirsty, the imprisoned whom Christ came to save being crushed by a society that followed a policy which he could only interpret as Mammon worship. For him, the Christian message was clear: love, concern, sharing and brotherhood had to replace the system of capitalism, or the society would be destroyed through the violence of the masses, demented because they had been denied God's love.[356]

In many ways, Ludlow, like Marx, saw Socialism as inevitable; but unlike Marx, he believed that untouched by the essentials of Christ's social gospel, which proceeded from a changed heart, the movement would result in anarchy.[357] According to Ludlow, unrestrained socialism imposed by the masses through the seizure of political power, would only loose upon society forces of retribution that would not build, but would trample their old oppressors, creating a new system more repressive than the old.

Ludlow had become convinced that a system of association could provide the starting point for peaceful though revolutionary change. Not only were they meant to change the control of production, but more

---

[355] N. C. Masterman, "J. M. Ludlow's Criticism of F. D. Maurice's Theology:, Theology, Vol. 56, (1954), p. 347.

[356] Politics, no. 12, (July 8, 1848), p. 197.

[357] J. M. Ludlow, "Two Dialogues on Socialism", Economic Review, Vol. IV, no. 3, (July, 1894), p. 336.

importantly, they were to be mini-schools -- education by doing -- for responsibility, brotherhood and sharing.[358] To make associations work, these virtues must be practiced, and for Ludlow, a machinery of rules, enlightened management and careful selectivity must be devised to make them work.[359] Further, for the associative experience to be an effective vehicle for change, associations must spread rapidly to encompass the elite who were the leaders of the working class, he believed.

Maurice realized that his vision and that of Ludlow were incompatible long before the determined little lawyer did. In his letters, Maurice tried patiently to explain their divergence again and again, without damaging Ludlow. But Ludlow could not accept it. He blamed Maurice's friends and wife for the "master's" lack of will; many times he harshly castigated Maurice for lack of devotion to the cause.[360] In the last years of the movement, from 1852 to 1854, the crusty, rigid barrister managed to alienate almost all of his devoted friends as he relentlessly lashed out at Maurice and the rest in a frantic attempt to save his dream.[361]

Ludlow's faith rested upon two elements: the discovery of a better system and the leadership of Maurice. In the fall of 1852, Ludlow, in a last desperate effort, drew up a proposition for reconstituting the Christian Socialist group, a even more rigid system than the one that Maurice

---

[358] Ludlow and Jones, p. 143.

[359] Ibid., p. 144.

[360] Maurice to Ludlow, Aug., 1853, in Maurice, Vol. II, p. 173.

[361] Mack, p. 69.

was protesting. The failure of the associations he laid directly to the lack of will and of a sense of sacrifice on the part of the Promoters. Ludlow therefore proposed a type of holy order, based on democratic self sacrifice, the aristocracy of a carefully chosen and rigidly tested few under the absolute authority of a clergyman — Maurice. Discipline was to be complete, each member would be expected to dedicate his entire life and fortune to the project of co-operative association. Everyone would suppress individual will; to exert that would be considered traitorous to the whole body. All would accept assignment to jobs which they could best perform, decided by the group. Only in this way could associations learn from example, for Ludlow felt that the Promoters had asked sacrifices from associated workmen that they themselves were unwilling to make.[362]

Ludlow, the democrat, had here exhibited an oligarchic design that not even the aristocratic Maurice could accept. For Ludlow, the starting point was complete devotion to Christ, and fired by His zeal, the job of the Promoters was to spread Christian Socialism to all society. He believed that this plan contained a logical answer to the conviction of Maurice that he, Maurice, was only a "digger". Maurice rejected and suppressed Ludlow's proposal. Only a few closest to Ludlow ever saw it: Hughes, Kingsley and perhaps Mansfield. The plan remained buried until the 1950's, when Ludlow's unpublished autobiography was brought to light.[363]

---

[362] Masterman, J. M. Ludlow, p. 143.

[363] Christensen, p. 35.

Hughes admitted that he, too, had conceived of such a plan, but he had recoiled from it as he realized that its attraction lay in self-aggrandizement and dreams of power.[364]

As has been shown earlier in this paper, Ludlow seemed to require a mystical leader, one who would embrace Ludlow's mission and in turn guide him. He had the system, but needed someone whom he idolized to give his plans fruition. He had no confidence in his own ability to inspire; he assigned that task to others. Even after 1854, when Ludlow finally realized that Maurice had given up the idea of association, he refused to assume the leadership, and he continued throughout his life to give all the credit for Christian socialism to Maurice.[365] At the end of the century, the resurgence of interest in Christian socialism brought forth from Ludlow a great spate of literature, most of it in praise of Maurice. Scott Holland, a leader of the new Christian Social Union around the turn of the century remembered the gaunt little man struggling to his feet to remind the group, "Maurice and Kingsley, if you please!" It was not Kingsley and Maurice -- the "Prophet" was supreme.[366]

The religious historian Phillip Backstrom did not view Maurice as a Christian Socialist at all. As he saw Maurice: "He stood alone in the Romantic, Conservative-Platonic tradition of Coleridge and Southey".[367]

---

[364] Masterman, J. M. Ludlow, p. 145.

[365] J. M. Ludlow, "Maurice's Place in the History of Co-operation" The Spectator, (Oct. 11, 1884), pp. 1339-1340).

[366] Henry Scott Holland, A Bundle of Memories, (London: Wells Gardner, Darton and Co. Ltd., 1915), p. 284.

[367] Backstrom, "The Practical Side of Christian Socialism", p. 307.

"Ludlow", wrote Neville Masterman, "wanted Maurice to accept the doctrines of French socialism and act upon them, which Maurice consistently refused to do".[368] Ludlow, then, really evolved his particular philosophy of Christian Socialism and for six years projected it onto Maurice, becoming more and more frustrated as the reflection became distorted.

When the national co-operative conference meeting at Leeds in 1854 voted to establish a co-operative union which by-passed the work being done by the Christian Socialists, Maurice decided that the work of the Society to Promote Working Men's Associations was effectively ended. In any case he was much more interested at this time in starting a Working Men's College, so the formal organization of the Christian Socialists was dissolved. The haste in which Maurice acted to terminate associative activities revealed that he no longer would involve himself in a venture which had drifted far from his purpose -- the proclamation of God's divine order.[369] The Working Men's College experience offered him a new avenue in which to vindicate his philosophy.

Ludlow, on the other hand, had fully expected the Society to continue in national leadership of the co-operative movement. Once more Maurice had acted capriciously in opposition to Ludlow's plans. There was only one explanation: Maurice was no longer interested in Christian Socialism. Ludlow finally realized the obvious and he later described the agony it inflicted upon him:

---

[368] Masterman, J. M. Ludlow's "Criticism", p. 346.

[369] Ibid., p. 361.

> Mr. Maurice himself at the time evidently did not feel — nor did he ever understand, even when many years after I told him what I had felt myself — the crushing nature of the blow he was giving me. For to me the very bond of our friendship lay in the work to Christianize Socialism. For that I had virtually risked if not sacrificed everything — much more than I had told him of. I had wished for nothing ... but to be his first lieutenant in the campaign, merging my work in his, never coming forward but to ward off from him a blow if I could do so. But I saw that I was myself at fault; that I had willfully blinded myself; that the Maurice I had devoted myself to was a Maurice of my own imagination, not the real Maurice. He was not to blame, I was.[370]

The crisis for Ludlow was one of the most profound in his life, for he had to decide what his new role was to be. Many of his friends urged him to take up the leadership in the co-operative work, but Ludlow felt he could not. He wrote, "Maurice was much wiser and greater than all of us put together, and ... we had better follow him still."[371]

The years 1855-56 were the most bitter of Ludlow's life as he sadly took up teaching at the Working Men's College.[372] He had to endure the tragic death of his beloved Mansfield, the refusal of marriage by Maria Forbes and finally his dismissal from the councils of his mentor, Bellenden Ker.[373] He again became an isolated man, shy and withdrawn, warding off all approaches by friends and admirers. He declined to take any new leadership position, "for this conviction was forced upon me, that if I was not fit to lead in the one cause on which I had set my whole heart, I was fit to lead in nothing."[374]

---

[370] Ludlow, Autobiography, Ch. XXXVII, in Christensen, p. 364.

[371] Ibid., p. 365.

[372] Masterman, J. M. Ludlow, pp. 150-152.

[373] Ibid.

[374] Ludlow, Autobiography, Ch. XXXVII, in Christensen, p. 366.

After his marriage to Maria Forbes in 1866, Ludlow again took up an active role in the co-operative movement. Throughout the rest of his long and busy life, he remained convinced that socialistic associations based on Christianity would have been the answer to the problems of British labor.

In this study, Ludlow has emerged as the author of the associative concept, a concept which in the form that Ludlow's unique continentalism gave it, was a new element in British life. Earlier British socialists had constructed Utopian schemes, most of which were based on land ownership and a medieval concept of community. An alternative had developed along side the rural artisan view of socialism — that of workers determining their own fate through political power. The two concepts merged together, then diverged time and again prior to 1848 and the final defeat of Chartism. At that time a new solution was put forth by Ludlow and others like him. The answer had been imported from the turmoil of France, that of industrial workers associations, self-governing and open to technology. Through their example, the Christian Socialists introduced a new role for the British middle class that endured after their particular effort ended.

Practical middle class men offered their talents as technicians, bookkeepers, lawyers and financiers to the working classes. These men sympathized with the aspirations of the laboring man, did not feel threatened by the prospect of lower class advancement and did not try to control labor for their own ends. Middle class men, who like John Ludlow, were

not greatly attached to the society as it was, had a real desire to promote a national socialist experiment. They did not always agree on the methods to be used; Hughes, Ludlow and Neale were constantly at odds in later years with George Holyoake, Beatrice Webb and the Fabians, although they shared the goal of socialism.

In 1848, when Ludlow was casting about for action to relieve the distress of the poor, his association with Maurice offered him both a sounder philosophy than he had possessed and the theological experience that he lacked. Ludlow brought his new, practical knowledge of French Socialism which he combined with a thorough understanding of law and the legislative process. By 1850, he had arrived at a clear concept of Christian Socialism. Ludlow became convinced of the merits of association and proceeded to convince his friends that action must begin. Once the collective wisdom of the group around Maurice was exerted, associations proliferated. When Ludlow realized that much more was needed than a few ragtag workmen and a converted warehouse, communication and legalization became his prime concern. He aired his views in the Christian Socialist, and before Parliament through the Slaney Committee.

All this activity was practical work for practical men; the Society to Promote Working Men's Associations had a vast reservior of talent in Ludlow, Hughes, Neale, Jones, Walter Cooper and the others. John Ludlow was in his element, writing brilliant essays on the philosophy and work of the group, drawing up impeccable legislation, visiting associations around the country and sharing the delights and disappointments of associative work with sympathetic friends. The break with

Neale over co-operative stores was unfortunate but temporary; later Ludlow embraced that concept and he and Neale worked together on the councils of co-operation.

The tragic flaw was Ludlow's blind devotion to Maurice, for Ludlow wanted to lead the action, yet he demanded that the philosophical motivation come from someone more worthy than himself. Maurice, protesting gently, allowed himself to be cast into the philosopher's role. However, Ludlow needed more from Maurice: a willingness to follow the design that Ludlow had drawn. The tragedy of the tale was that neither Maurice nor Ludlow understood what the other wanted of him. Ludlow, blinded by his search for a monastic, personal obedience, could not carry on the work once Maurice's difference of opinion became clear. Therefore a movement which by many contemporary accounts held brilliant promise and solid achievement was destroyed. The strong concerted voice of Christian Socialists proclaiming Christ's love, sympathy and sharing was lost to British socialism. Ludlow was correct, socialism did become the dominant political and economic force in England, but it was a cold, State-imposed socialism grounded in the power of trade unionism. Ludlow, Hughes and Neale fought that kind of state socialism until their deaths, not together, but as individuals on boards, committees, bureaus and in Parliament. Ludlow's vision was not to be realized; perhaps it asked too much of a secular society dedicated to self-gratification.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES: Books

The Christian Socialist: A Journal of Association. Vol. I. Conducted by Several of the Promoters of the London Working Men's Associations. London: John Tupling, 1851.

Great Britain. An Act to Legalize the Formation of Industrial and Provident Societies. 15 & 16 Victoria, ch. 31, 1852.

Great Britain. Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd ser., Vol. 84 (1846), Vols. 119, 120 (1852).

_____. Parliament. Parliamentary Papers. Monetary Policy, Savings Banks, Vol. I. "Select Committee Reports on Savings Banks and the Savings of the Middle and Working Classes ... 1849 - 1850". Shannon: Irish University Press, 1969 reprint.

Hughes, Thomas. A Memoir of A Brother. Boston: J. R. Osgood, 1873.

Kingsley, Charles. Alton Locke. Vols. I & II. New York: The Co-operative Publication Society, 1898.

_____. Letters and Memories Vol. I. edited by Mrs. Fanny Kingsley. New York: The Co-operative Publication Society, 1899.

Ludlow, John Malcolm & Jones, Lloyd. Progress of the Working Class, 1832 - 1867. London: Alexander Strahan, Pub., 1867.

Maurice, Frederick. The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice, Vols. I & II. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.

Mayhew, Henry. London Labour and the London Poor. Vol. I, The London Street Folk. New York: Augustus M. Kelley Reprint, 1967, orig. 1851.

Politics For The People. London: L Parker, Publishers, May - July, 1848.

St. Andre, Jules Lechevalier. Five Years in the Land of Refuge. London: Pelham Richardson, 1854.

Periodicals

Crocker, J. Wilson. "Revolutionary Literature". Quarterly Review, Vol. 89, (Sept., 1851).

"English Socialism and Communistic Associations." The Edinburgh Review, Vol. 93, No. 189, (January, 1851).

"The First Half or the Nineteenth Century". Fraser's Magazine, Vol. 43, No. 253, (January, 1851).

Greg, W. R. "Investments for the Working Classes: A Review of Five Bills". Edinburgh Review, Vol. 95, American edition, (April, 1852).

Hughes, Thomas. "Edward Vansittart Neale as Christian Socialist". Economic Review, Vol. 3, No. 1, (January, 1893).

Ludlow, John Malcolm. "The Christian Socialist Movement". Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 87, No. 459, (January, 1896).

_____. "Labour and the Poor". Fraser's Magazine, Vol. 41, No. 241, (January, 1850).

_____. "Maurice's Place in the History of Co-operation." The Spectator, (October 11, 1884).

_____. "Some of the Christian Socialists of 1848 and the Following Years." 2 parts. The Economic Review, Vols. 3 & 4, NOS. 4 & 1, (October, 1893, January 1894).

_____. "Two Dialogues on Socialism." Economic Review, Vol. 4, no. 3, (July, 1894).

SECONDARY SOURCES: Books

Beer, Max. History of British Socialism. Vol. 2. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Son, 1919.

Brabrook, E. W. Provident Societies and Industrial Welfare. London: Blackie & Son, Ltd., 1898.

Christensen, Torbin. Origin and History of Christian Socialism. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1962.

Cole, G.D.H. and Filson, A. W. British Working Class Movements: Select Documents, 1789-1875. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1951.

Davies, J. Llewelyn. Social Questions from the Point of View of Christian Theology. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan Co., 1886.

Dictionary of National Biography. Sidney Lee, ed. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1909, 1912 suppliment.

Gregg, Pauline. Modern Britain: A Social andEconomic History Since 1760. 5th ed. New York: Pegasus, 1965.

Holland, Henry Scott. A Bundle of Memories. Wells Gardner, Darton, & Co. Ltd., 1915.

Holyoake, George Jacob. History of Co-operation. Vol. 2. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1906.

Mack, Edward and Armytage, W.H.G. Thomas Hughes, the Life of the Author of Tom Brown's Schooldays. London: Ernest Benn, Ltd., 1952.

Martin, Robert. The Dust of Combat. London: Faber & Faber, 1959.

Masterman, Neville. John Malcolm Ludlow, The Builder of Christian Socialism. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.

Porter, John, and Wolf, William, ed. Toward the Recovery of Unity: The Thought OF Frederick Denison Maurice. New York: Seabury Press, 1964.

Potter, Beatrice. The Co-operative Movement in Great Britain. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Son, 1895.

Raven, Charles E. Christian Socialism, 1848-1854. New York: Augustus M. Kelley Pub. reprint, 1968, orig. 1920.

Saville, John, ed. Democracy and the Labour Movement. London: Lawrence & Wishart Ltd., 1954.

Thomson, David. England in the Nineteenth Century, 1815-1914. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1950.

Wolf, Lucien. Life of the First Marquess of Ripon. Vol. 1. London: John Murray, 1921.

Periodicals

Allen, Peter. "F.D. Maurice and J.M. Ludlow, Leaders of Christian Socialism." Victorian Studies, Vol. 9, No. 4, (June, 1968).

Backstrom, Philip. "The Practical Side of Christian Socialism in England." Victorian Studies, Vol. 4, No. 4, (June, 1963).

Masterman, Neville. "J.M. Ludlow's Criticism of F.D. Maurice's Theology." Theology, Vol. 56, (1954).