

CHAPTER 8

THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT

The Temperance interest was an important influence within Norwich all through the Victorian period. It became significant and remained so because of the critical importance of Christian ethics for those who had power and wealth. Historians of the nineteenth century may be diverted by their own secularism from an appropriate understanding of the degree to which the Christian faith provided a framework of absolute truth and yet at the same time sustained a range of ethical systems for those who held power and responsibility or who aspired to do so. Within this framework, the competing ideologies that developed represented alternative ways, all supported by scriptural authority, of making sense of the new world created by industrialisation and urbanisation.

The responses to the drink issue of two members of the Norwich urban elite illustrate the extremes within Christian belief. Jeremiah Colman (1777-1851) gained his status and wealth through the manufacture of mustard and flour; he was a devout non-conformist and teetotaler and elected Liberal mayor of Norwich in 1846. Henry Staniforth Patteson (1816-1898) owed his fortune and influence to the family brewery; he was an Anglican, a 'sincere evangelical' active in the Church of England Young Men's Society and elected Conservative mayor of Norwich in 1862.¹ He, too, would have been concerned about the consequences, both personal and social, of individuals drinking to excess, yet remained firmly identified with the Drink interest. Both men shared a Christian faith and were active

within their own churches, yet the Teetotal movement and the Drink interest were fundamentally opposed. Moreover, attachment to different and competing political ideologies added further complications to this spectrum of belief. Throughout the Victorian period, the urban elite generally attended a Christian service on Sundays and yet was divided on party lines. By the 1870s, the Conservatives clearly favoured the Drink interest; the Liberals, the cause of Temperance.² There were even divisions amongst those Christians who saw drink as a 'problem'. Some who identified with the Temperance Movement believed that drinking in moderation was an appropriate response, not teetotalism, and they even accused the 'Abstainers' of setting up an alternative 'Gospel' in the Christian faith.³

The Temperance Movement became important, and remained so for over sixty years, as a consequence of the challenge to traditional Christian ethics posed by the consumption of drink in a new industrial and urban context. This challenge is evident in the following two episodes, featuring the most senior Anglican cleric in East Anglia, that help provide an initial perspective on how a religious debate underpinned what became known as the 'Drink Question' throughout much of the nineteenth century. First, at the beginning of the reign in 1837, the new Bishop of Norwich, Dr. Edward Stanley, presided over a Temperance Festival at St. Andrews Hall organised by the Norwich Society for the Suppression of Intemperance. Describing himself as a 'convert' to the cause of temperance after what he had seen of the personal and social miseries caused by drunkenness amongst the poor during his residence in the north 'sixteen miles from Manchester', the bishop acclaimed the formation of temperance societies as 'a miracle suited to the times in which we live'. Bishop Stanley was unusual; members of the Anglican episcopacy did not generally espouse the cause of Temperance, yet his thoughts were otherwise typical of the

elite in society. When he claimed ‘We are the finest people in the world – we should be if all people were temperate – if we were all what we ought to be’, Stanley was not only articulating a common sense of British racial pride but also a unifying Christian morality. He went, however, a step further; he identified a force within society that was working against such shared values: ‘But we have enemies ... in the whole phalanx, rank and file, of the beer-shop keepers’.⁴ For ‘beer-shop keepers’, it was only too easy for some to read ‘publicans’ and ‘brewers’, and once that path had been taken the ‘Drink Interest’ itself with all its claims to patriotism and importance in the national economy became the demonised ‘enemy’. In such a fashion, the conflicting ‘Drink’ and ‘Temperance’ interests began to develop.

At the end of Victoria’s reign, in 1900, the then Bishop of Norwich, Dr. John Sheepshanks, appointed Septuagesima as Temperance Sunday stressing the ‘pressing nature of the evil of intemperance’ and referring to the evidence produced by the Royal Commissioners’ *Report on Licensing Laws* (1899). He spoke of the ‘degradation’ that followed from drunkenness at ‘either end of the social scale’ and supported the Church of England Temperance Society in its aim to secure Sunday closing of licensed houses.⁵ Although the ‘evil’ has now crossed the boundaries of class and is no longer presented as the affliction of the poor alone, the Bishop was still responding to the issue of intemperance from a similar Christian ethical position to his early Victorian predecessor. ‘Temperance’ is still a term to identify the ‘good’; ‘intemperance’ is linked with ‘evil’. The act of drinking is demonised when it takes place on the ‘Lord’s Day’. The ‘Religious Question’ involved a number of inter-related issues that centred on the nature of good and evil and the place of God in an industrialising society.

It is this industrialising society that has received the most attention within the historiography of the nineteenth century rather than the competing Christian ideologies that underpinned the attempts to make sense of its consequences.⁶ With specific reference to drink, industrialisation and urbanisation certainly altered the context in which alcohol was consumed, but they also led to both a re-evaluation of the Christian ethics of alcoholic consumption and a re-statement of the traditional Christian justification for alcoholic drink. I have already made a case that alcohol was a drug that had a most significant part in the economic and social life of the nation and that so much of the Victorian period was shaped by the interactions of two competing models for society and its social control and public order: one presented by the Temperance Movement, the other by the Drink Interest.⁷ Both these models depended on particular interpretations of Christian ethics.

Before further analysis of these Christian ideologies and their relationship to industrial society in general, and to alcohol consumption in particular, it will help to place the phenomena of industrialisation, urban development and alcohol consumption in a wider context.⁸ James Roberts has argued that:

‘In Germany, as in other industrializing countries of Europe and North America, the Drink Question – the discussion of the causes, consequences, and control of popular drinking behaviour – was a matter of persistent public concern throughout the nineteenth century.’⁹

Patricia Prestwich echoed this view in her study of drink, temperance and industrialisation in France:

‘The history of drink in France and of attempts to limit its consumption may therefore best be seen as one aspect of the process of industrialization, which, as in other countries, has produced both material progress and more visible social problems’.¹⁰

Yet although the studies of Roberts and Prestwich support the view that there is a significant link between industrialisation and attitudes to drink, they also point to a

difference between the continental and the British or North-American responses. Roberts noted that:

‘In contrast to its British and American counterparts, the German temperance movement never embraced teetotalism and prohibitionism and never entered the area of electoral politics.’¹¹

Prestwich concluded that:

‘Most notable in the French movement has been its ... commitment to moderation, or true temperance, rather than to total abstinence’¹²

Why should the continental response have been different from that in Britain and America?

The connection between Britain and the United States was all-important. Bishop Stanley in his 1837 address noted that temperance societies began in the U.S.A. in 1827 and then spread from Ireland in 1830 to the English mainland.¹³ Brian Harrison has emphasised the significance of the Anglo-American connection:

‘Temperance, peace, anti-slavery, penal reform and Christian missions all campaigned on an Anglo-American basis. For the nineteenth-century non-conformist moral reformer, as for the seventeenth-century puritan, America constituted a laboratory for social experiment.’

Later, the introduction of prohibition by the state of Maine in 1851 sparked the formation of the United Kingdom Alliance in 1852-3 and the American connection persisted long after with the pseudo-masonic Independent Order of the Good Templars arriving in 1868 and temperance organizations for women in 1876.¹⁴ Not only was there a common language; there was also a shared enthusiasm for evangelism and religious commitment that a significant minority felt on both sides of the Atlantic. This zealous desire to return to the purity of the original gospel message shaped both the Teetotal Movement and Prohibitionism. On the Continent, such extreme responses are not apparent, in part due to different religious histories but probably more importantly due to differences in the social, economic and cultural background which seem to have led to less drunkenness.

Evangelicals contrasted English drunkenness with French and Belgian sobriety but were generally slow to highlight the living and working conditions of the working class in Britain that were factors in explaining the inebriation.¹⁵

The 'Drink Question' for various Christian clergy became an issue that seemed to encapsulate the crisis that had developed in society over a couple of generations. Industrialization and urbanisation were raising theological problems which some Christians, lay and clerical, were resolving by supporting the teetotal position, others by affirming the path of moderation, and yet others by adopting a course which recognised the value of both paths. Within Norwich, the appointment of Stanley as Bishop must have raised the profile of the theological issues that were now shaping the 'Drink question'. The occasion of the visit of Father Mathew, the Irish Catholic missionary for teetotalism, to Norwich in 1843, and Bishop Stanley's sharing of the platform with him, gave further impetus to the debate within the Christian community as is indicated by contemporary sermons.¹⁶

One such Norwich sermon, delivered in response to Father Mathew's visit in 1843 by the Rev. J.W. Crompton, argued that it was 'the deficiency of vitality ... due to concentration on doctrinal issues' that explained why there was now a need 'to reach the drunken and the abandoned'. Any sense that 'the advocacy of the temperance societies are liable to the charge of excess in their language and proposals' was but 'a natural effect of a reaction against an evil which has been allowed to increase almost to a state requiring divine retribution' At such a time, '...(the) priest of Rome, members of the Church of England, and dissenters, are all one ... because then we are all truly Christian'.¹⁷ A sense of crisis is evident in this preaching. There is a feeling of being almost overwhelmed by an evil that

required in response a renewed recognition of common Christian identity. The evil is presented as drink but was this rather the ‘presenting problem’? The ‘Drink Question’ is more a symptom of the underlying structural problem of a society in economic transition and at the same time coping with a revolution in ideas that seemed to threaten religious certainties.

The authority of the Holy Bible as literal truth was one of the underpinnings of the Christian faith, not least in its account of creation. Darwin’s theory of evolution, together with advances in geology, challenged such biblical literalism. Such was his anxiety about its social consequences that Darwin had held back publishing his theory for nearly twenty years until 1859 when *The Origin of Species* was immediately denounced in pulpits throughout the land and “Darwinism” became almost a synonym for disbelief. Yet by the 1870s the theory was becoming part of the changed intellectual landscape.¹⁸ Christian theology had adjusted to the need to match belief with the most plausible scientific theory. However, it took longer for the theology of the social world to come to terms with those equally plausible analyses of society that identified the rich and powerful as having a measure of responsibility for the social conditions of the working class which all lamented. Instead, many members of the Victorian middle class, Christian by religion, thought that virtue usually led to prosperity and sin often led to poverty.¹⁹ Within this world-view, drink naturally became a symbol of evil and an explanation for poverty. Perhaps unconscious motives refused to accept any theory that threatened property interests. It was not until the 1880s that the example of Frederick Denison Maurice who became a socialist because he was a Christian proved a precedent for others and the churches began to face the question of the relationship between Christianity and socialism.²⁰

A sermon preached in the 1840s in Norfolk by the Rev. James Lee Warner illustrates the differences within the spectrum of Christian thought that saw drink as a 'problem'. Lee Warner's sermon in 1843 encouraged a middle course that rejected the teetotal case but urged fellow Christians not to 'despise' those who argued for abstinence. He acknowledged that 'most Christian congregations are divided in their notions of temperance' with one party believing '...they may drink all things, and hold the moderate use of the strongest liquors to be allowable, provided ...they stop short within the limits of sobriety', and another party 'for conscience sake' giving up 'a portion of their natural liberty [to] deny themselves the use of intoxicating drink altogether, because this abstinence removes an occasion of offence out of the way of Christian brethren, and of their own. And of this conduct they enforce by a solemnly recorded vow'.²¹ By the 1860s, for perhaps over one million Christians, this pledge of abstinence, following a searching of the soul, provided a Christian witness in the face of those forces associated with William Blake's "dark satanic mills".²²

This extraordinary demonstration of religious feeling by a significant minority was caused by a crisis of conscience as the governing classes faced the consequences of industrialization and urbanisation and seemed in many ways powerless to prevent the suffering of the working class. In a religious culture that paid homage to the great commandment: "Love thy neighbour" not to act was to risk eternal damnation. It was not until the end of the century that values like 'liberty' and 'property' lost their absolute claims and the governing classes could begin to deal with such structural problems as poor housing, impoverishment, sickness and unemployment through higher taxation. Until then, teetotalism served as a symbol of Christian action, a token of solidarity with the poor for those outside the working class and a virtuous means of social advance for those born

within it. Since the brewing industry continued to prosper and most of the working class continued to drink and sometimes to excess, there are ways in which the teetotal movement can be viewed as failing. Yet the impact of the experience of personal abstinence for many individuals who played significant parts in Victorian and later developments should not be underestimated.²³

Lee Warner's sermon also provides a valuable insight into a vital contemporary debate that was dependent on an acceptance of the authority of the Bible taken as the literal word of God. Developments in biblical criticism that led to the scriptures being seen rather as containing passages inspired by God were later Victorian developments, like the acceptance of Darwinism and the Christian accommodation with socialism. In 1843, it was still almost impossible for members of the Christian governing classes to consider the 'Drink Question' without determining what God commanded through his word, as revealed in Holy Scripture.²⁴ Lee Warner, paraphrasing the apostle Paul's precept: "Let not him who eats, despise him who abstains" (Romans 14, 3-4.), argued that those who drank should not judge adversely those in the Temperance interest. By extension however, the reverse of the argument was also true. Those who abstained should not criticise those who continued to drink in moderation, not least because 'there was no scriptural command to abstain from strong drink'. Lee Warner refuted the arguments of the teetotalists with reference to each biblical passage they cited in their support. The blessing to the house of the Rechabites was given because they had obeyed all the precepts, not just the one to abstain from wine (Jeremiah, 35). There was no record of the Rechabites or the Nazarites censuring the conduct of other men. Drinkers may be as 'temperate' as abstainers; 'true Christian temperance has many branches ... Too much may be attributed to the wisdom of a temperance pledge.' Jesus had been accused by his enemies of being a wine-bibber

which suggested that the wine was alcoholic. Moreover, 'if the wine of the Lord's table was not a fermented liquor in the days of the early church, Paul's reproof to the Corinthians makes little sense when he says that the cup was liable to be abused by the intemperate.'²⁵

However, the teetotal case remained irrefutable for those who were its adherents. An anonymous thirty-one-page tract was published in Yarmouth in 1844 to counter such temperance arguments as Lee Warner's and to defend the position of J.J. Gurney, a teetotal convert since 1842 and now president of the Norwich Temperance Society. It concluded that total abstinence 'shall last for ever'. Impassioned in style, the writing is nevertheless intent on presenting a rational argument based on scriptural authority. The Rechabite declaration that 'We will drink no wine' is used to effect; there is an insistence on the lack of positive proof of the existence of alcohol in the wine made and used by Christ.²⁶

Nationally, by the 1860s teetotal progress was being made in all denominations but especially within the Anglican Church. In 1866 a list of teetotal ministers included 2,760 names, 22 per cent of whom were Anglican with the rest non-conformist. By contrast, a list of teetotal ministers in 1848 had 566 names only 4 per cent of which were Anglican.²⁷ The evangelical concern to address the 'evil' of drink in contemporary society, which had been initiated by non-conformists, was now increasingly shared by the Church of England itself.²⁸ The Church of England Total Abstinence Society (later Church of England Temperance Society [CETS]) was founded in 1862 and ten years later adopted the 'dual basis' membership in which teetotal association was combined with non-abstainers.²⁹ By the end of the century, the CETS was the largest temperance society in the United Kingdom with 7,000 branches, 100 Police Court Missions and between 150,000-200,000

subscribing members.³⁰ In the 1890s Charles Booth, discussing temperance societies, could claim that they were ‘almost all connected with some Christian church or mission, and there are few churches or missions which do not interest themselves in work of this kind.’³¹

Christian congregations faced the problem of making sense of urban societies in which often less than half of the population attended church.³² One solution was to identify ‘drink’ as an ‘evil’ that tempted the working class from the ways of righteousness and church attendance, and the drinking place as less than ‘respectable’. Temperance periodicals highlighted the individual’s ‘choice’ between wealth, respectability and virtue on the one hand and drink, disease and death on the other.³³ The church and the tavern offered different ways to re-create the self and the competition between the two was recognised even before the Alehouses Act (1828) stipulated closure during the hours of divine service on Sundays, Good Friday and Christmas Day since magistrates already often closed taverns during Sunday morning church service.³⁴ The demonising of drink by many Christians was as much part of the battle for the souls of the working-class ‘neighbours’ they were called to love as the rapid expansion of church building in urban centres in the second half of the nineteenth century or the new emphasis within the churches on moral reform and mission work.

Christians in Norwich, and elsewhere, were also more likely to be drawn into the ‘Drink Question’ after the founding of the United Kingdom Alliance (UKA) in 1853 with its programme of prohibition through parliamentary legislation. By 1872, ‘...the prohibitionist movement was flourishing, and dominated the entire temperance movement.’³⁵ The arrival of the ‘Drink Question’ at Westminster had brought with it a degree of respectability for the issue that had previously been missing. When the Alliance launched itself ‘with

hymns, prayers and a sermon', its leadership was largely non-conformist but the support it gathered between 1853 and 1872 was wider than its non-conformist core. Cardinal Manning joined in 1868; across the denominations there was a developing shared sense that the evil of drink had to be countered by Westminster legislation. The fluidity of the political situation in those years, highlighted by the extension of the franchise in 1867 and the increasing identification of the Liberal party with the Temperance cause and the Conservative party with the Drink Interest, also encouraged more and more Christians to take an explicit position on the 'Drink Question'.³⁶ Gladstone himself by 1868 had expressed himself in favour of a 'local option' to prohibit the sale of alcohol where possible but judged that the "ripeness of the public mind" was not yet mature enough.³⁷ The politicisation of the 'Drink Question' had ensured that the Temperance Movement had entered the mainstream of Christian discourse.

Articles published in 1874 by J.F. Bateman and J.D. Ballance, two Anglican clergy with parishes close to Norwich, convey this sense of moderation and respectability that the Temperance Movement now carried. They also communicate the authors' sense of being part of a coalition of forces with a history of development over four decades that had emerged to conquer the darker side of the drink trade. Brian Harrison's seminal work (1971) may end its detailed research in 1872 but the Temperance Movement continued to remain important both at Westminster and in the regions for at least a few more decades. The turning-point for Temperance seems to be the nineties when the expansion of counter-attractions for the working class, the decline in per capita consumption of alcohol, a decline in drunkenness, the rise of a secular ideology in the form of socialism and the relative decline in non-conformity, all combined to weaken but not end its appeal as a cause.³⁸

Bateman, in his paper delivered to the annual general meeting of the Pastoral Work Association at Yarmouth, acknowledged that drink was still ‘our fearful national vice’ but contrasted the position in the early-sixties, when there was ‘...the danger of men making “total abstinence” their religion, and treating it as a new gospel’, with that in the mid-seventies when ‘...people are more moderate ...and the language of temperance meetings is far more temperate’.³⁹ Bateman was no abstainer and delivered a biblical refutation of teetotalism citing Paul’s recommendation that Timothy drink a little wine for medicinal reasons and Jesus’ turning of water into wine to promote the joyousness of the marriage feast. The politicisation of the ‘Drink Question’ is apparent in his advice to other clergy not to support the “Permissive Bill”, on the grounds that it was unfair for a majority of ratepayers to prohibit the sale of all ‘exhilarating beverages’ and also that the prohibitionist Maine Law of 1851 had failed in its aim. Yet he insisted that the clergy must wish well the Association of “Good Templars”, which by 1874 had 3,600 lodges and approaching one quarter of a million pledged members.⁴⁰ Bateman was a loyal member of the Church of England which two years previously had reformed its own temperance society to accommodate both the teetotallers and the non-abstainers like him.

Ballance had taken the pledge twenty-one years previously and is more evangelical in tone, quoting the Archbishop of Canterbury’s warning that ‘The evil of intemperance was eating out the very heart of society’. According to Ballance, ‘It is our privilege, as Clergy, to lead the way in every upward movement’ although he accepted that ‘...too often we regret that our hold is so slight upon the sympathies of the working men’. His recommendation was to establish a Diocesan Board of Temperance with meetings in every parish where the

clergyman approved.⁴¹ It is such parish temperance societies whose foundation is recorded in the local press in the late-seventies, a half-decade later.⁴²

Within Norwich, identity with the Temperance Movement is a feature of Christian witness across the denominations from the 1870s. Alfred King and Bessie Lomas each kept a diary in 1878, the year of their marriage, and the entries provide an insight into the influence of Temperance. King was twenty-five, an employee of the temperance family firm of Colman, in which he was to spend his working life and reach the position of manager in the sawmills. In his leisure time, he was a lay preacher at an unidentified non-conformist chapel, and a Sunday school teacher; he attended lectures and concerts, read for self-improvement and interest (Macaulay, for example), rowed and played quoits, and went for long walks with Bessie during their engagement. Lomas was eighteen; when her time was not occupied in family duties at her parents' home where she lived, she attended lectures and Band of Hope meetings. She accompanied Alfred to a meeting at St. Andrews Hall on the 'Permissive Bill' and together they went to the Victoria Hall to an entertainment given by the Princes Street Chapel children where the singing was 'very nice' but 'the piece "John Alcohol" was very badly played'. At the age of seven in 1867, she had taken the Norwich United Temperance Society pledge.⁴³ Alfred King and Bessie Lomas lived their lives under the influence of Temperance, two individuals among perhaps one million who were pledged never to set foot in a public-house. The survival of their diaries illustrates this type of Christian witness within the upper-ranks of the working class. For them, drink had been demonised and the poor drinker singled out as a 'neighbour' in need of Christian love and redemption. Moreover, alcohol was an impediment to Alfred and Bessie's individual advance as well as a blot on the landscape of Victorian progress.

As Shiman has argued, 'To many temperance reformers of the 1870s and 1880s, a teetotal England at last appeared to be a possible achievement in the near future'. The extension of the franchise meant that many teetotallers had become voters in national and local elections, and some had become candidates, especially for local government.⁴⁴ Such optimism derived from evangelical conviction but lacked substantial grounds. Per capita consumption of beer peaked at the end of the seventies but the figure for England and Wales show a remarkable consistency from 1800 to 1913.⁴⁵ The Temperance Movement may have waited with eager anticipation for the publication of the House of Lords' Select Committee *Report on Intemperance* in March 1879 but little could or did change as a consequence.⁴⁶ The production and consumption of alcohol was an essential part of the economic and social life of the nation. A teetotal Britain would remain a pious dream. Too many of the wealthy and powerful had a personal stake in some aspect of the agricultural and brewing and retailing industries connected with alcohol; too few of the working class could or wished to free themselves from their dietary or social dependence on the drug.

By this later Victorian period, a critical national divide is apparent - the Drink Interest on the one hand and the Temperance Movement on the other. The latter was a broad church, ranging from teetotallers to non-abstainers, from those in the UKA who put their faith in parliamentary legislation to CETS teetotallers like Rev. S. Linton, a Norwich clergyman, who saw only betrayal by the highest secular power, arguing it was 'no use appealing to Parliament in which there were many brewers and supporters of the Brewing interest'. He instead advocated a personal crusade of individuals within the Temperance Movement.⁴⁷ Prohibitionist or moral-suasionist, nearly all shared two characteristics: they were evangelical in their Christian faith, and their idealism tended to make both their aims and methods unrealistic.

Yet in Norwich in early 1879 many in the Temperance Movement would have thought that the tide was turning in their favour. The House of Lords' *Report on Intemperance* raised the national profile of the issue and within Norwich there were significant new initiatives. Parochial branches of the CETS were established, emphasising the inter-denominational nature of the Christian front against the evil of drink. Dr. Peter Eade was the guest speaker at the inaugural meeting of South Heigham branch of the CETS.⁴⁸ Other branches had been proposed or formed in 1879 at St. Michael Coslany, St. Giles, St. Philips, Heigham, and St. Bartholomew, Heigham.⁴⁹ At the meeting of the Norwich Board of the CETS in May it was reported that 131 clergymen and others had joined as subscribing members of 5s and upwards annually, 593 adults were paying 1s each and 462 juveniles were paying 6d each.⁵⁰ Over one thousand temperance Anglicans were increased by even more Norwich temperance non-conformists, most of whom would have been pledged to teetotalism. When the annual meeting of the Norwich auxiliary of the United Kingdom Alliance took place, also in May, its secretary George White reported that there had been seventy public meetings in the city and county in the past year, the first Drink Map of Norwich had been published and 4,000 printed, and Temperance Cafes had been opened.⁵¹ As H.P. Shield, the editor of the *Licensed Victuallers Gazette*, said at the third annual banquet of the Norfolk and Norwich Licensed Victuallers Association in April:

‘many large and influential societies (were) doing their utmost by electoral and other means to do all the injury they could to the licensed victuallers.’⁵²

However, guests like the mayor and the sheriff of Norwich, the brewers Harry Bullard and Donald Steward respectively, had enough business acumen to know the real limits of the threat.

The opening of Temperance Cafes in Norwich, and across urban England, at the end of the 1870s, was accompanied by high hopes and met with brief success in places, followed by failure. Their history provides a metaphor for the temperance movement in general, and within Norwich illustrates the extent to which temperance was an attempt to impose a more acceptable leisure culture on the working class by those who had wealth and power. Coffee was hailed as a substitute for beer; the coffee house as an alternative to the public house. Victorian temperance, commerce and philanthropy came together in the Café Movement.⁵³ Coffee houses were commercial enterprises, or at least they were explicitly presented as such. But they were also visible signs of middle-class anxiety about the under-world of the public house culture of working men. When the Norwich Café Company opened *The Victoria Café* in St. Stephens in February 1879, the speeches of those present provided several insights into the hopes and anxieties of those attracted to Temperance.

The president of the Norwich Café Company, J.J. Gurney, a member of the Quaker Gurney family, claimed in February that the Café movement had been successful in Birmingham and Leicester and elsewhere and saw no reason why it should not succeed, 'financially and morally', in Norwich. The locations had been chosen to help attract 'the class for whom the house was intended', as Hardy, one of the directors, said, explaining that a ticket system would operate so 'charitably minded people would ensure that their philanthropy was not wasted'. These tickets could be exchanged for food and drink in the café. Thrift and the easing of class conflict were combined with the virtue of Christian charity. The Member of Parliament for Norwich, J.J. Colman, and his wife, were also present and he reassured his audience that not all the supporters of the Coffee House were teetotallers. His intention was evidently to emphasise the moderation of the contemporary Temperance Movement, as well as suggesting that the future lay with that cause. He looked forward to

the publication in the future of a map to show the coffee houses in Norwich rather than the public houses marked on the recent UKA drink map. A sense of Norwich as a provincial 'back-water' is perhaps apparent in the recognition by Rev. J. Wilson of St. Stephens that Norwich was 'behind other towns' in the founding of Temperance Cafes. Nevertheless, he welcomed the initiative as 'better late than never'. Rev. G.S. Barrett pointed out that the poor condition of working men's homes were such as to explain the pull of the public house in Norwich where there was one public house for every 130 of the population.⁵⁴ Middle-class Christians from across the denominations had come together to herald this new initiative that might at last prove effective in the fight against the evil of drink and all that it symbolised.

The 'condition of the people' issue, Christian duty, and anxiety about the social and moral consequences of failing to address the problem of the 'outcasts' in society were all central themes in the address of Councillor J.H. Tillett, in April 1879, at the opening of *The Alexandra Café* in Ber Street. From the Christian position, Tillett argued, there was 'an obligation on those more highly favoured to provide the humblest class with a way of escape from temptation and trial.' He was sure that poor housing was responsible for so much of 'the evils complained of in our society.' Children who were sent to Sunday and day schools (compulsory day schooling had been introduced in 1870) were taught moral lessons but when they got home, 'they heard foul expressions, and were penned up, perhaps in close apartments where health was not regarded and hardly decency'. In these circumstances, it was not surprising that 'in between the closing of the factory or the workshop and retiring to rest the working man needed a change' and found it in the public house. 'There was', Tillett declared:

'something threatening in the aspect of the lowest strata of society... In large towns thousands were outcasts to a certain extent ...and in them lay a source of danger to the

country from a moral point of view...thanks to the want of education, of thought, and of thrift.'

In such circumstances, the Café movement appeared heaven-sent to many evangelical temperance men and women; Tillett, a subtle analyst, saw it as '...one of the means which would help the people to help themselves', realising that living and working conditions also needed to be improved before there could be 'a change in the morals and behaviour of sections of the working class'.⁵⁵

Change did take place in the last two decades of the century even though the Café Movement that arrived in Norwich in the late 1870s failed to fulfil its own high expectations. The future belonged to Temperance, not so much because of the successes of initiatives that were targeted on traditional enemies within the 'Drink Trade' but rather due to the amelioration of the conditions in which the working class lived. A leader in the *Eastern Daily Press* in April 1879 had argued that 'The Café Movement is a response to the vice and crime and misery of drunkenness' for which licensed victuallers had to accept a measure of responsibility.⁵⁶ The gentlemen-brewers who produced the alcohol and employed many of the publicans do not feature in this analysis, but according to many in the Temperance Movement they too played their part. However, it seems that drunkenness became significantly less only when a new sense of civic concern developed and municipal housing and health initiatives led to a marked improvement in living conditions.⁵⁷

Yet there is a case to be made that the strength and visibility of the Temperance Movement through the late 1870s and into the 1880s helped shift the attitudes of those in power so that municipal housing and health reform became possible. The continued vitality of the Temperance Movement in Norwich in the 1880s is evident from a number of sources, including the first annual report in November 1883 of the executive council of the Norfolk

& Norwich Gospel Temperance and Blue Ribbon Union. This report records that the former Norfolk & Norwich Temperance Society had held its last conference, in September 1882, presided over by Francis Murphy who had just completed a successful Blue Ribbon Mission in St. Andrews Hall.⁵⁸ By April 1883, the former Society had been amalgamated into the new Union, under the presidency of George White. In the year 1882-83, there had been more than four hundred meetings, four thousand pledges had been made, the Temperance Hall opened, a Blue Ribbon Brass Band established, and a Ladies' City and County Conference ('a somewhat new feature') arranged.⁵⁹ Established on moral suasion lines, the Union's aim was to assist:

'in moulding public opinion in favour of Sunday Closing of Public-houses and in adopting the principle of Local Option in the matter of granting and renewing licences for the sale of intoxicating drinks in the city and county'.

Their successes called for 'gratitude to God'; the 'power of the Gospel in our meetings...has a most winning effect upon the outcast and all who are suffering from the cruel wrongs so certain to follow the drinking habits of our country'. A format for public meetings was presented with singing from the Gospel Temperance hymnbook, readings from Scripture (with commentary if possible), prayer and addresses.⁶⁰ Christian evangelism was still shaping the Temperance Movement in Norwich in the 1880s as it had in the 1830s.

It seems that one significant way of making a public statement about personal religious faith, middle-class identity or aspiration, and probably Liberal political allegiance, was to join a Temperance organization. The 1883 annual report of the Norfolk and Norwich Gospel Temperance and Blue Ribbon Union records five other 'kindred societies' conducting 'valuable work ... in some of the towns and villages of the district': the East of England Temperance League, the Church of England Temperance Society, the Band of

Hope movement, the Independent Order of Good Templars, and the Temperance Benefit Societies known as the Sons of Temperance and the Rechabites.⁶¹ Across the denominations, there was now a concerted effort to identify Christian virtue with sobriety and to associate drink with those forces that stood in the way of progress and civilisation. ‘The evil of drink’ had become a metaphor for the shadow-side of the Victorian world, representing all those images of poverty, poor health, and wretched living conditions that any urban centre still presented. It was a rallying-cry for those who considered themselves as ‘respectable’, to confirm them in that status, and for some at least it served as an incentive to address those working and living conditions that contributed to the problem of drunkenness. The three leading subscribers to the Norfolk and Norwich Gospel Temperance and Blue Ribbon Union in 1882-3 were Mr. Councillor White (£10), J.J. Colman, Esq., M.P. (£5), and Mrs. S. Jarrold (£3).⁶² The White, Colman and Jarrold households were three of the wealthiest non-conformist, Liberal families in Norwich and they were active in seeking political solutions to social deprivation.⁶³

Christian evangelism and the targeting of drunkenness as an evil force to be overcome had become identified with ‘respectability’ by the 1870s but the arrival of the Salvation Army in Norwich in the early-1880s, with their commitment to temperance goals, added a rather awkward new element since General Booth’s followers acted on their Christian principles in ways that hardly seemed respectable to some other Christians. The survival of copies of the *Methodist Sunbeam*, a Norwich church magazine, for 1882, has provided a glimpse of how disconcerting some Christians seemed to find the activity, and success, of the Salvation Army.⁶⁴ Its editor, Rev. C. Ogden, observed ‘with deep regret that some of the churches think it no disgrace to contemptuously sneer at the way in which the [Salvation Army] conducts its business’. He conceded that:

‘the Army works in altogether a different fashion to many of the churches that the world designates “respectable” (but) we believe their Army is doing more good in the land than any other existing organization ... they have reached men and women, steeped in sin and iniquity of the deepest dye, whom the churches have failed to reach.’⁶⁵

By October 1882, ‘the most important question of the day’ had become ‘What need was there for the Salvation Army to come to Norwich?’ Ogden was firm in their defence:

‘The answer is simple enough. An officer was sent down by General Booth ... and he reported that there were thousands of men and women deep sunk in ignorance, superstition, and sin, whom the Churches made no effort to reach. There was plenty of room for the Salvation Army to work ... Under Captain Hookey and Lieutenant Games, they are doing a work we failed to do.’

Ogden lamented that ‘we have allowed our religion to become too genteel.’⁶⁶

Ogden’s evangelical sense of exasperation came from a Methodist standpoint, but even within the Anglican Church similar frustrations were evident. In 1902, John Abby, organising secretary for the Norwich diocese of the Church of England Temperance Society, published a 197 page argument, passionate but reasoned, against the failure of the Church to face up to the Drink Problem, in the form of an open letter to William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury.⁶⁷ He claimed that ‘After 60 years of temperance teaching, many of the Clergy are totally indifferent and utterly uninformed’; there were ‘10,000 parishes where clergy will not have a temperance society’.⁶⁸ Furthermore, ‘The magistrates, police, coroners, professional men and tradesmen are influenced by the awful liquor traffic’; it was a ‘truth [that] must be told at all costs’.⁶⁹ Such temperance passion was fuelled by Christian principle but the Drink Interest too maintained its Christian support in the ranks of the wealthy and powerful.⁷⁰ One is left with the impression of two phalanxes locked in positions of enmity as they had been for the previous sixty years, each continuing with their business and neither having much impact on the other, whilst the effective forces were now active outside this battleground, in the form of economic changes bringing more

diversification in leisure pursuits and consumer products, and improvements in living and working conditions.

An individual temperance man, like John Abby, did play what seemed at the time an important role within the movement in Norwich, even if with hindsight his influence appears less significant. Abby's letter of frustration came in 1902 after a working life spent in the temperance cause. His was a typical biography of the self-made Victorian whose social advance owed so much to sobriety. Abby had risen from a working-class background and educated himself in evening classes at the Royal Polytechnic, the Working Men's College, and King's College, London. A virtual life abstainer, his ladder of advancement was Anglican rather than non-conformist. Whilst resident in Oxford, his work as a secretary made it impracticable for him to take holy orders and instead he became organising secretary of the CETS for the Oxford diocese from 1875 to 1885, then assistant secretary and cashier for the London diocese till 1889 when he moved to Norwich. In his work in the temperance cause, and in arranging the seating of the congregation at the cathedral on Sunday evenings, he was 'greatly helped by the quiet untiring assistance of his wife and daughters'.⁷¹ The female aspect of temperance, the role of women in the Temperance cause, is again evident, albeit as part of Victorian family duty.

How significant was the role of other individuals who were identified with the Temperance Movement in Norwich; men who had a more significant social standing in the city than John Abby, such as Joseph John Gurney, the two Jeremiah Colmans, Jacob Henry Tillett, and George White? This chapter will conclude with an evaluation of their individual contribution that makes the case for the crucial importance in the long-term of political

action, not to secure legislation for a 'local veto' or restrictions in the licensing hours but rather to bring closer a vision of society as a community.⁷² Such an ideal had its roots deep in Christian evangelism and it is through this avenue of communal responsibility that the Temperance Movement left such an important mark on the new century. Cooper Pattin, Medical Officer of Health for Norwich, wrote in 1905: 'Now we think as communities ... the growth of collectivism among us is an unconscious preparation for the coming condition...' and saw that future as one shaped by 'inter-racial contests ... upon the seas or on the exchanges'.⁷³ Sir Peter Eade, writing in 1910, noted:

'the increasing feeling of the whole country of the duty of those in authority to supplement, when necessary, the means of those in the lower classes of life ...'⁷⁴

A change in the 'structure of feeling' had occurred, and this paradigm-shift owed much to the Temperance movement in general and to the work of particular individuals within it.

Those individuals within the urban elite, who had been moved by Christian belief to become teetotal, or who otherwise supported the Temperance cause, were making a religious statement that had social and political consequences. Dr. Stanley, Bishop of Norwich, had led the way in 1837.⁷⁵ By 1842, Joseph John Gurney (1788-1847), the Quaker banker resident at Earlham Hall outside the city:

'after the most anxious deliberations ... became convinced that it was his duty to give up the use of all intoxicating beverages, and to encourage his household in a similar line of conduct'.

In 1843, he took the chair at the request of the Bishop, on the platform with Father Mathew.⁷⁶ Gurney was a member of a family committed to Christian duty and with a strong sense of social reform and welfare. He himself had been part of the anti-slavery movement from his time at Oxford; his response to the sufferings of the Norwich poor in the winter of 1829-30 was to donate £500 and set up the District Visiting Society for the poor of Norwich, comprising both the Soup and Coal Societies. He campaigned against

bribery in Norwich elections and, once teetotal, published in 1844 a widely circulated tract titled: *Water is best*.⁷⁷ However naïve that title seems, given the problems of access to safe, drinkable water in Norwich as elsewhere, Gurney represents that sense of responsibility towards others which was only to become more generally accepted at the end of the Victorian period. In many respects, Victorian progress was far from linear.

Another contemporary Christian advocate within the urban elite with a sense of communal responsibility was “Old Jeremiah” Colman (1777-1851), the mustard and starch manufacturer who was the great-uncle of Jeremiah James Colman (1830-1898). “Old Jeremiah” was a devout non-conformist with radical Whig beliefs who helped set up the Lancastrian school in 1810, championed electoral reform, and in 1845 together with J.D. Copeman and J.H. Tillett set up the *Norfolk News*, the forerunner of the *Eastern Daily Press*.⁷⁸ When elected mayor of Norwich in 1846, he broke with tradition by choosing a Baptist minister for his chaplain and, most significantly, as a teetotaler always drank toasts at civic banquets in water not wine.⁷⁹ Even before the middle of the century, when there were comparatively fewer people in the Temperance movement, “Old Jeremiah” and Joseph John Gurney represent this link between Christian duty, temperance and social responsibility.

Historians have pointed out the difficulty of generalising about Victorian values and the need to distinguish between early, middle and late Victorian.⁸⁰ However, the non-conformist, evangelical connection between Christian ‘love of neighbour’ and social and, if necessary, political action to improve the working and living conditions of those ‘neighbours’ does seem to remain constant during the Victorian era. It is evident throughout the life of Jeremiah James Colman who took over the management of the

family firm on his father's death in 1854 and continued the family tradition of non-conformist, Liberal beliefs and actions that in turn determined attitudes to drink. The memoir of his life by his daughter, Helen, suggests how much he was shaped by this Christian imperative. Aged twenty-one, he recorded in his Journal the observation:

'Politics, literature, science, commerce, aye, and we trust religion too, have advanced. But – "how much is to be done?" ...I would mourn ... (how little I have done in the past)... but still look up to my Saviour for his counsel and guidance.' ⁸¹

The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, a bar to municipal or Crown office for non-conformists as well as Catholics, had been as recent as 1828 and opened up the opportunity to remake the new industrial and urban world in the way of the Lord. Families like the Colmans were energised by a sense of moving in harmony with the contemporary *Zeitgeist*, directed by their God.

His treatment of employees was indicative of these evangelical values, given fresh impetus by his membership of St. Mary's Baptist Chapel from around 1856. On returning from honeymoon in 1856, after his marriage within the Norwich non-conformist, Liberal fraternity to Caroline Cozens-Hardy, he addressed the six hundred workers of the firm at the Carrow site to which it had moved in 1854 and insisted that:

'The bond between us should be mutual respect ... My father always felt strongly that that the relations between Employer and Employed ought not to end with the mere payment of £ s d for work done'.

In 1857, a school for workers' children was opened; a kitchen to provide meals at the work place was started in 1868; a sick nurse was appointed to visit the families of work people in 1874. His support for the temperance cause is evident in a letter he wrote in 1892:

'Since my Firm removed to Carrow they have closed 6 out of the 9 Public Houses which formerly existed within a quarter-mile of the Works'.

Within Norwich public life too, Jeremiah James Colman provided a prodigious witness to his faith and mission. He served as a Liberal councillor from 1859, becoming sheriff in

1862 and mayor in 1867. As leader of the Norwich Liberal party he stood successfully for Parliament in 1871 and remained a Norwich M.P. for most of the period until his retirement in 1895.⁸²

For Colman, and his friend and ally, Jacob Henry Tillett, the issue of Temperance was one element in a manifold assault on ignorance and vested interest in the name of ‘social progress’, itself determined by divine providence. In the pursuit of this Christian mission, Colman and Tillett acquired a public esteem that was acknowledged by political friends and opponents.⁸³ Serving the dictates of their conscience, they not only secured a reputation for integrity but also distanced themselves at times from the extremes of the Temperance movement. Such moderation perhaps made their wider social and political perspective more acceptable and may in turn have contributed to the eventual shift in the ‘structure of feeling’ and the new sense of responsibility for the whole community. Ideas about social justice dear to men like Colman and Tillett were beginning to prevail in the 1890s, the decade of their deaths.

In the case of Colman, his daughter’s memoir provides an insight into his Temperance convictions, his moderation, and his distaste for ‘the system of Test Questions’ that single-issue campaigning groups, like some Temperance reformers, had developed. In 1885, Colman had argued that it was ‘better to accustom the new voters to choose their candidates by their principles rather than their promises’. Helen Colman observed that ‘With Temperance Societies, Labour Leagues, Disestablishment Associations, and Anti-Vaccinationist Societies all running their particular tenets as Test Questions, my father felt there was a grave danger of splitting up the Liberal Party ...’, at the expense of achieving objectives that all were agreed upon. Her father believed that in Norwich, as elsewhere, “the extreme demands put forth by the teetotallers do mischief”. While supporting the

movement to counteract ‘the crying evils of intemperance’ with ‘his sympathy, financial help, and votes in the House of Commons’, he had his own views ‘as to the best methods of trying to establish that change in the habits of the people which all Temperance Reformers have at heart’. He would not support the Sunday Closing Bill as long as it attempted to force the closing on unwilling districts. However, he did support Sir Wilfred Lawson’s Local Option Resolutions in the House of Commons once the proposal conferred the power to close all public houses in a district on more than a bare majority of the ratepayers. He did believe that the licensed victualler should be paid ‘some equitable compensation’ whilst denying they had a ‘legal claim’. He linked his argument that reducing the number of public houses would lessen the amount of intemperance with a belief in the importance of providing counter-attractions in the form of coffee houses.⁸⁴ Colman’s Temperance principles are clear; so too is his moderation.

Colman’s personality and moderation was such that he could bridge the divide that was opening up between the Temperance Movement and the Drink Interest. During Colman’s shrievalty from 1862 to 1863, H.S. Patteson - an Anglican, a Conservative, and a brewer – held the mayoralty. Nevertheless, Colman still held him in ‘high regard’. Membership of the inner circle of the urban elite within a provincial city such as Norwich, with its relatively small number of influential and powerful families, may have served to limit the effects of political and religious differences that could perhaps be more marked in a less intimate metropolitan context. In a revealing coincidence, thirty-nine years later the mayor was Russell James Colman, the son of J.J. Colman and the sheriff T.H.S. Patteson, the son of H.S. Patteson.⁸⁵

Jacob Henry Tillett (1818-1892) was another extraordinary personality, combining non-conformity and Christian evangelism with radical Liberal political beliefs that included

support for the Temperance cause, together with a moderation that even some of his opponents came to recognise and respect. Like Jeremiah James Colman, he had been brought up within a non-conformist tradition in a Norwich commercial family. Refusing a scholarship rather than submit to the thirty nine articles, he was educated at King Edward VI Grammar School and by the age of twenty-one had opened his own solicitor's office in Post Office Street, Norwich and six years later helped found the *Norfolk News*, becoming its chairman and editor. Throughout his life he supported various religious movements in Norwich but was not attached to any particular denomination.⁸⁶ Again like Colman, the religious imperative was at the centre of his life. In 1890, speaking at St. Andrew's Hall on the twenty-first anniversary of Norwich First [Adult] Day Schools, he referred to:

'the great cause which we all here have so much at heart – the sacred cause of Christianity – 'to make all men like Christ' ... If all men were like Christ there would be no drunkards, liars, thieves, no hatred, no selfishness ...' ⁸⁷

Tillett's devotion to Norwich public life was as exemplary as that of Colman. He too served for many years as a Liberal councillor, twice serving as mayor, first in 1859-60 and again in 1875-76. Between 1868 and 1886, his attempts to extend his political influence to Westminster and the House of Commons saw him fight six contested elections as a Liberal candidate (in 1868, 1870, 1874, 1875, 1880 and 1886), suffer defeat three times, and face three Election Petitions, once as Petitioner and twice as Defendant, plus a Royal Commission.⁸⁸ Mrs. J.J. Colman in her obituary notice for Tillett wrote in 1892 that:

'He was ever the true friend of the poor, the troubled and the tried. In his political work he strove to raise the working classes by *trusting* them, and to this end he strove to obtain for them the right to vote for representatives to the House of Commons. But he never spoke to them of the franchise as being the panacea for all ills. He strongly believed in Christianity as the only power which could raise man to the right level.' ⁸⁹

Tillett regarded the cause of Temperance in a similar fashion; it would never become for him an end in itself.

In 1873, Tillett identified 'Excess in drink' as one of seven 'obstacles to social progress'. Convinced that 'the more intelligent, free and virtuous the people are, the happier, stronger and more permanent will be the nation, and the more blessed will be its influence upon its neighbours', Tillett argued that 'now we have Democratic Government ... the thing necessary is to raise the standard of public opinion ... to enlarge their intelligence, and to raise their aspirations'.⁹⁰ To this end, he urged two courses: 'the tyranny of drink' had to be resisted, when 'interested parties combine together to vote against anything and everything liberal with a view to maintain the ascendancy of beer', and working men should 'recreate and enjoy themselves to the utmost' but 'let them not waste their strength, time and money upon that which in excess must destroy them and ruin their families'.⁹¹ Tillett was keen to endorse the Temperance Movement but only so far as it might serve its purpose in a greater cause and mission determined by his God.

With such a view, Tillett was unlikely to fulfil all the expectations of those on the extreme wing of the Temperance Movement and, in 1882, a rift emerged between the Norwich Auxiliary of the United Kingdom Alliance and Tillett as their Member of Parliament. The reply of the UKA to the statements on 'Local Option' made by Tillett in January was published in February and sold at newsagents for 1d.⁹² They had 'looked upon Mr. Tillett as a Temperance reformer' claiming that he had spoken 'most vigorously' on the need for legislation ever since the Bruce Act of 1872. And yet he had not supported Sir Wilfred Lawson's resolution for Local Option, unlike Jeremiah James Colman, the other Liberal M.P. for Norwich. The Alliance had approached Tillett before the 1880 election through its secretary, George White, and had been told that he did not wish to receive a deputation 'because otherwise the Publicans would follow suit'. The mistake made by the Alliance

was to think they ‘knew his views’.⁹³ In fact, Tillett was prepared to separate from other Liberals on this issue because in conscience he had come to believe there were limits to the effectiveness of such legislation. As he said in his January speech: ‘He rather believed in moral suasion, in education, in religious training,’ Tellingly, he declared that he was ‘ready to do all that was consistent with the liberty of the people and consistent with the rights of property, which the law had created.’⁹⁴ The moderation of Christian Liberals like Tillett and Colman and their respect for property rights and compensation claims may have annoyed others in the Temperance Movement but, in the longer term, played its part in making Liberal social and political beliefs more acceptable within the urban elite in Norwich.

Remarkably, there was in Norwich a third outstanding non-conformist Liberal and supporter of the Temperance Movement – George White (1840-1919) – who became a Member of Parliament. He was a teetotaler, although in gaining a reputation for ‘robust common sense’ his moderation is apparent too. White, like J.J. Colman and J.H. Tillett, was driven by evangelical conviction. A Baptist at St.Mary’s Chapel, White had moved to Norwich in 1856 – the year J.J. Colman joined St. Mary’s - to take up a clerical post, working his way up to become chairman and managing director of Howlett and White, the largest boot and shoe manufacturers in Norwich. In 1876, he had entered the town council, later becoming an alderman and serving as sheriff as well as becoming chairman of the Norwich School Board. Politics, education and temperance within Norwich provided avenues for Christian witness outside his manufacturing concern until 1900 when the focus widened after his election as Liberal M.P. for North-West Norfolk.⁹⁵ White was wealthy, influential and determined to spread the gospel of social responsibility, even in his sixties.

In his mission, White was steadfast but eventually influenced by ideas of social responsibility that shifted the onus away from individual failings. Even those at the extremes of the Temperance Movement were affected by the shift in the 'structure of feeling' towards more acceptance of social responsibility. In 1894, White was still presenting the typical teetotal argument that drink was responsible for more 'poverty and want of employment *than all other agencies put together*'.⁹⁶ But in 1911, after a decade of national political life that included a period as president of the Baptist Union and vice-president of the United Kingdom Alliance, White, who was knighted in 1907, had modified his views. In a parliamentary speech, Sir George now claimed that:

'I have long since come to the conclusion ... that by far the larger portion of the poorer classes amongst us are in the condition in which we find them through no fault of their own. I do not ... ignore the fact that drink for instance is a factor of poverty in our midst and a large factor. But ... the greater portion of the ...poor ... are in that condition through no fault of their own, and for this class of our population I think society in general is responsible.'⁹⁷

It had taken perhaps over half a century, but at last this individual Christian had begun to accommodate his faith with the economics and morality of socialism.

White had a religious imperative but as a capitalist employer he had other motives too, even if they were consciously linked. In a paper addressing the issue of how non-conformists should make sense of shifts in contemporary society, delivered in 1903, White advised:

'Do not be alarmed by the socialistic tendency of the changes. The communion of the early church does not look inviting to those of us who have all to contribute and nothing to receive, for we have not yet reached even the spirit of the Master's teaching in this respect.'

Employers should look to a future where 'a proper subsistence level for the whole people' could be achieved and 'the scandal of some 30 per cent of the population being below that level should be quickly removed.' As an employer, he argued that drink 'cripples the

industrial capacity of our artisan, who spends twice the amount of his American co-worker, though he earns less than half his wages' and it 'causes a loss of fifteen per cent in the time worked, and, therefore, it threatens our industrial supremacy more seriously than the worst strike which ever happened.' ⁹⁸ As Barry Doyle has concluded:

'(Sir George White) saw a reduction in alcohol consumption as part of a general policy to order urban society and discipline the workforce required to operate an increasingly capitalised and mechanised industry.' ⁹⁹

In conclusion, the Temperance Movement had become significant in Norwich and remained so through the Victorian period as a consequence of the challenge to traditional Christian ethics presented by the consumption of drink in a new industrial and urban context. Commanded to show love and compassion for their neighbour and concerned to make the best sense for their national economy, those who had wealth and power argued and divided over the problem of drink and its consumption to excess by the working class. A Temperance Movement that ranged from teetotalers to moral-suasionists emerged to confront the Drink interest; by the 1870s, this polarization was reinforced by a political division between a Liberal Party that had become associated with Temperance and a Conservative Party now supported by the Drink Interest.

Within Norwich, key personalities in the Temperance Movement like Jacob Henry Tillett, Jeremiah James Colman, and George White were highly influential in raising the public profile of Temperance. As leading members of non-conformist chapels, their views helped shape the lives of at least some sections of the working class.¹⁰⁰ In their moderation, they were also likely to have helped make Liberal social and political beliefs more acceptable within the urban elite in Norwich. Those less moderate, like John Abby, who wished to see the diminishing of the Drink Interest, were to be disappointed. Prohibition efforts failed. But those who wanted to see a society based on values they associated with their Christian

faith, that is a more compassionate, fairer, healthier, and more just community, one in which the need to drink to excess was less, did have a measure of success as the 'structure of feeling' shifted at the end of the century.

Footnotes to Chapter 8

¹ Patrick Palgrave-Moore, *The Mayors and Lord Mayors of Norwich 1836-1974* (Norwich, 1978), pp.4, 13; *Steward and Patteson*, p.44. For H. S. Patteson, also see above, pp.230-232; for Jeremiah Colman, also see below, p.289.

Gordon Marsden in *ibid* (ed.), *Victorian Values: Personalities and Perspectives in Nineteenth Century Society* (second edition, London, 1998), p.9, noted that ‘an important trend in Victorian studies (has been) the restoration of religion to a central position in discussing the history of the period and the motivation of its prime movers’. Clyde Binfield, ‘Temperance and the Cause of God’, *History*, 57 (1972), pp.403-410, in his review of Brian Harrison’s *Drink* which Harrison (second edition, 1994, p.18) himself found to be one of the ‘most perceptive’, noted (p.410) that Harrison refers to God only twice, despite valuable sections dealing with religion.

² See below, pp.276, 314-316.

³ See below, p.277.

⁴ *NM*, 30 Sept. 1837. This Festival is also mentioned in P.T. Winskill, *The Temperance Movement and its Workers: a record of social, moral, religious and political progress* (4 vols., London, 1892), I, p.257. This rather hagiographical series of volumes cites the *Preston Temperance Advertiser*, 1837, p.86 as its source. Winskill records an entertainment with ‘No fewer than 980 persons ... admitted by ticket at fifteen-pence each ... sat down to partake of the beverage “that cheers but not inebriates”’. *Drink*, p.167, noted that ‘In the 1830s the progressive Stanley of Norwich was the only bishop prominent on teetotal platforms’.

⁵ *EDP*, 10 Jan. 1900.

⁶ Harrison, *Drink*, p.18, acknowledged in 1994 that ‘It seems to me rather more important now than it did then (in 1971) to re-create the lost world of British nonconformity with the fullest sympathy’.

⁷ See above, pp.210-211.

⁸ Harrison, *Drink*, p.18, also noted in 1994 that ‘Another improvement that a re-written version of the book could incorporate would be a wider comparative perspective now that several studies of temperance activity in Europe have appeared’.

⁹ James S. Roberts, *Drink, Temperance and the Working Class in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Boston, Mass. and London, 1984), p. xi

¹⁰ Patricia E. Prestwich, *Drink and the Politics of Social Reform: Antialcoholism in France since 1870* (Palo Alto, Calif., 1988), p.5.

¹¹ Roberts, *Drink in Germany*, p.7.

¹² Prestwich, *Drink in France*, p.287.

¹³ See above, pp.266-267.

¹⁴ *Drink*, pp.98-9, 182.

¹⁵ *Drink*, p.99, recorded that ‘Hume in 1834 said that a man could land at Ostend and visit Brussels, Antwerp and Liege without seeing as many drunken men *en route* as he could see in London in half-an-hour’.

¹⁶ Charles Mackie, *Norfolk Annals: a chronological record of remarkable events in the nineteenth century, compiled from the files of the Norfolk Chronicle* (Norwich, 1901), I, p.431, 7 Sep. 1843: ‘Father Mathew attended a temperance festival at Norwich ... at which the Lord Bishop and Mr. J.J. Gurney were present. On the 8th, Father Mathew, from twelve to six o’clock, administered the pledge to all who cared to receive it’. The conservative *Norfolk Chronicle* observed: “We cannot but feel that the members of the Church of England are pledged to temperance already, and have therefore no necessity to repeat the pledge before a Romish priest.”

¹⁷ NHC, C252, Rev. Joseph William Crompton, *The Temperance movement considered in relation to the Christian Church – a sermon suggested by the visit of Father Mathew delivered at the Octagon Chapel, Norwich, Sunday 10 September, 1843*, pp.8-9, 12.

¹⁸ Bernard M.G. Reardon, *From Coleridge to Gore: a century of religious thought in Britain* (Harlow, 1971) p.74.

¹⁹ Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church* (2 vols., London, 1970), II, p.277.

²⁰ Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, II, pp.272, 278-280. *Drink*, p. 93. pointed out that ‘The problem for the temperance movement was that some types of property had to be attacked ... the hated “trade” was therefore attacked as a crime of “traffick”, quite distinct from all other commercial activity’.

²¹ NHC, Z283, James Lee Warner, ‘The Christian liberty in relation to the temperance pledge: a sermon preached in the parish church of Little Walsingham ... before the Rechabite Association of that place’ (1843) in *Church Sermons & Pamphlets*, pp.1-12.

²² *Drink*, p.308, calculated a figure of ‘at least a million adult teetotallers’ by the 1860s. The language of the visionary Romantic poet and artist, William Blake (1757-1827), makes explicit the link between industrialization and the forces of evil.

²³ *Drink*, p.308, concluded that ‘by the 1860s there existed an influential and literate minority in the country of ‘opinion makers’, numbering well under 100,000 teetotalers. Within Norwich, the influence of non-conformist Christian teetotalers like J.J. Gurney and George White, and temperance men such as J.J. Colman and Jacob Henry Tillett, was of particular importance - see below, pp.287-297.

²⁴ This degree of scriptural scrutiny seemed to bring in its wake a measure of doubt about biblical authority itself. How could an absolute scriptural authority be open to alternative rational interpretations? The ‘Drink Question’ was one debate among many in the nineteenth-century that led to a decline in the belief in absolute certainties, an increasing acceptance of relativism, and a loss of traditional Christian faith.

²⁵ Lee Warner, *Christian liberty*, pp.6-12. Lilian Lewis Shiman, *Crusade against Drink in Victorian England* (Basingstoke, 1988), pp. 68-73, provides a full treatment of the Bible wine question.

²⁶ NHC, 29C, “*Argus*” overlooked, by Ithuriel: or the man of light proved to be in darkness, *Review of a Tract, entitled “Temperance versus Abstinence”, a letter addressed to the President of the Norwich Temperance Society* (Yarmouth, 1844), pp.14-28. J.J. Gurney’s significance within the Temperance Movement in Norwich is considered below, pp.288-289.

²⁷ *Drink*, p.168.

²⁸ Shiman, *Crusade*, pp 51-52, argued appropriately that ‘not all clergyman were sympathetic to the temperance movement’. She seems to over-generalise however with her claim that English clergymen between 1840 and 1870 – like the rest of the population – were indifferent to the problem of intemperance, believing it to be none of their concern.

²⁹ *Drink*, pp.170-1.

³⁰ Shiman, *Crusade*, p.107. Shiman, pp.52-53, also claimed that ‘Many Anglican clergy still believed that the drinking habits of the people were not the concern of the church’, even after 1872. Despite the absence of a reliable statistical survey, it seems reasonable to emphasise that many Anglican clergy did identify with Temperance.

³¹ Charles Booth, *Life & Labour of the People in London* (Third Series, London, 1902), VII, p.20, quoted in *Drink*, p.171

³² See below, pp.112-115.

³³ See, for example, the illustrations reproduced in *Drink*, pp.264, 270.

³⁴ Paul Jennings, *The Public House in Bradford, 1770-1970* (Keele, 1995), p.78; *Drink*, p.175.

³⁵ *Drink*, p.182.

³⁶ *Drink*, p.208. Harrison, p.239, also made the point that ‘Franchise reform in 1867 made it much easier for parliament to face the licensing question...many people outside the temperance movement realised democracy must be made safe through educational and licensing reforms.’ For party divisions over the ‘Drink Question’ see below, pp.320-322.

³⁷ *Drink*, pp.239-240. The first ‘Permissive Bill’ or ‘local veto’, supported by the UKA, was debated in 1857. At first, it was designed to give ratepayers the right to prohibit the sale of alcohol on a simple two-thirds majority. Later, this annual parliamentary bill (from 1864 introduced by Wilfred Lawson) was modified as a ‘local option’ that allowed ratepayers several choices of policy - see *Drink*, p.183. The UKA, however, were more concerned with principle than the legislative detail. The end of the evil of drink was always more important than the parliamentary means adopted which perhaps helps explain the failure of the tactic.

³⁸ NHC, CL283, J.F. Bateman and J.D. Ballance, ‘The proper attitude of the clergy toward the temperance movement’ (1874) in *Pastoral Work Papers, 1870-1876*, pp.109-120 (Bateman) and pp.121-141 (Ballance). J.F. Bateman was rector of North and South Lopham; J.D. Ballance was vicar of Horsford and Horsham St. Faith. For the strength of Temperance in the later Victorian period in Wales, at least until the 1890s when its decline began, see W.R. Lambert, *Drink and Sobriety in Victorian Wales, c.1820-c.1895* (Cardiff, 1983).

³⁹ Bateman, *Temperance*, p.110. The Pastoral Work Association was concerned with ‘improving the condition of the people’.

⁴⁰ Bateman, *Temperance*, p.116. The Independent Order of the Good Templars was an American organisation that arrived in England in 1868. By 1894, their membership had more than halved after they took an ‘uncompromising political stance on licensing legislation issues’, campaigning against compensation for the loss of licences and for ‘Local Option’ and Sir Wilfred Lawson, the UKA president. Yet with a membership of 100,000 the Templars were still a significant segment of the Temperance Movement – see Shiman, *Crusade*, p. 178.)

⁴¹ Ballance, *Temperance*, pp.121, 131, 141.

⁴² See below, p.280.

⁴³ NHC, MC 230/1 and MC 230/2, ‘The Diaries of Alfred and Bessie King of Norwich, 1878’. The visit to Victoria Hall is recorded in Bessie’s diary for 22 January 1878. Her father was perhaps W. Lomas, one of the two secretaries of the Society recorded on the pledge. The non-conformist printer and stationer, S. Jarrold, is named as President of the Norwich United Temperance Society. In the pledge, Bessie promised ‘to abstain from all Intoxicating Liquors as a beverage, and in all suitable ways to discountenance their use throughout the community.’

⁴⁴ Shiman, *Crusade*, pp.97-98.

⁴⁵ See above, pp.220-223.

⁴⁶ *Lords Intemperance Report, 1879, Final Report*. Sir Wilfred Lawson asked whether the Government intended to propose legislation in the present session based on the recommendations of the Lords’ Committee; a week later the printed Parliamentary answer was in the negative – see *EDP*, 22/ 29 March 1879. A leader in the *Daily News*, quoted in the *EDP*, 19 March 1879, offers part of the explanation: ‘...how can new restraints be safely applied, without provoking reactions?’ The fear of the mass and anxiety about working-class riot prompted by interference with traditional drinking patterns: these are powerful underlying concerns that add another dimension to an already complex situation – see *Drink*, p.186.

⁴⁷ *EDP*, 21 Jan. 1879.

⁴⁸ *NM*, 5 Mar. 1879. For Dr. Peter Eade, see below p.288 and also above, p.153.

⁴⁹ *EDP*, 21/ 29 Jan. 1879.

⁵⁰ *NM*, 10 May 1879.

⁵¹ *NM*, 21 May 1879. For George White - shoe manufacturer, Norfolk Member of Parliament from 1900, knighted in 1907 - and his temperance role, see below, pp.295-297.

⁵² *EDP*, 9 April 1879.

⁵³ *Drink*, p.296.

⁵⁴ *EDP*, 13 Feb. 1879. *The Victoria Café*, and *The Alexandra Café* that opened in April 1879, shared the same architect. There were three floors: on the first there was the main drinking and eating area; on the second, a reading room; and on the third, a games room with billiard table and bagatelle boards. Drink, food, and wholesome games were all provided in this middle-class and Christian attempt to reinvent the pub. So too were lavatories, welcome public facilities in a city where the working class disposed of their sewerage in external bins - see above, p.165.

⁵⁵ *EDP*, 9 April 1879.

⁵⁶ *EDP*, 9 April 1879. The leader was titled: 'The Licensed Victuallers and the Café Movement' and developed the case that 'the publican has allowed the drunkard to grow up in society ... The publican is tempted to be untrue to his best interests and too often sells his article till the customer is drunk. Thus the tradesman who exists to serve a public want is transformed into the occasion for public vice and wretchedness.'

⁵⁷ See above, pp.170-171.

⁵⁸ NHC, C178, *Norfolk and Norwich Gospel Temperance and Blue Ribbon Union (NNGT), First Annual Report* (Norwich, 1883).

⁵⁹ The list of twenty Norwich representatives on the Ladies General Committee includes the names of Mrs. S. Jarrold, Mrs. A. Tillett, and Mrs. G. White. The activity of the non-conformist, Christian Liberal sector of the middle class now had a female as well as male aspect, within the same influential families.

⁶⁰ NHC, N285.8, Rev. M.Baxter (ed.), *Christian Herald and Signs of Our Times*, Jan. supplement, 1883. 'Gospel Temperance', by that name, had come to England in 1881 from the United States where in 1877 Francis Murphy had adopted the Blue Ribbon as a token of teetotalism. Baxter, p.31, observed that 'It is important to notice that the title of Blue Ribbon Army is thus at least one year older than the title of General Booth's Salvation Army in England, which was first so called in 1878'. Baxter, p.32, also claimed that the Grand Temperance Reception for Francis Murphy and his son, Thomas, in Norwich in September 1882 matched the carnival atmosphere of a political rally supported by the Drink Trade: '... more than 30,000 people in procession, with bands of music and banners of welcome, paraded the streets with bottles with corks drawn hung out of numerous windows. [They travelled in] ... a carriage with four grey horses and outriders dressed in scarlet'. Shiman, *Crusade*, p.112, noted that by the end of the 1880s, 'when the Blue Ribbon Movement had burnt itself out', over one million had taken the pledge and donned the blue ribbon. She also observed, pp.119-120, that '...without Gospel Temperance, the teetotallers could hardly have aroused such anti-drink interest in the 1880s and 1890s' or have secured the support of the Liberal Party programme in 1895.

⁶¹ *NNGT Annual Report 1883*, p.13. Rev. J.D. Ballance, writing in 1874 (see above, pp.277-278), had recorded the activity of four of these five temperance organizations, the exception being the Rechabites. A sermon preached by Rev. John Gould in 1891 at the Wesleyan Chapel in Norwich celebrated the foundation of the 'Self Help' Tent in 1880 under the auspices of the Independent Order of Rechabites - see NHC, C368/4 in 21F/C252, *Sermons: 1818-1891*. According to Gould, p.1, this was the 'oldest, largest and wealthiest temperance friendly society in existence' with 100,000 adult members and

50,000 juveniles, nationally, and over £500,000 in funds. Alderman George White was an honorary member; abstainers aged from 15-40 were eligible for membership on payment of a proposition fee of 2s 6d and the presentation of a medical certificate. There was a separate 'Female Tent' and one for 'Boys and Girls 3-15' on payment of an initiation fee of 6d. Gould's sermon was emphatic in its warning cries to the young: '...it is the one thing I would like to make the occasion of an appeal to the young ... never to wander into the barren regions of vice, and folly, and drunkenness, and sin' (p.5). Gould's congregation was addressed as 'you respectable people' (p.7); the Temperance Movement in general and the Teetotalers in particular offered the stamp of middle-class respectability in this world, either as an aspiration for those seeking to rise socially or as confirmation of existing social status. It also offered the promise of bliss in the after-life. These were powerful incentives for some, but had little meaning for many others.

⁶² *NNGT Annual Report 1883*, p.20.

⁶³ See below, pp.291-297.

⁶⁴ NHC, N287 (05), *The Methodist Sunbeam*, vol.1, nos. 2-12 (Feb.- Dec. 1882): a magazine for the Norwich United Methodist Free Churches.

⁶⁵ *Methodist Sunbeam*, June 1882.

⁶⁶ *Methodist Sunbeam*, Oct. 1882.

⁶⁷ NHC, Z261.832, John Abby, *The Church of God at the Gates of Hell: or, Why is Christianity so great a failure?* (London, 1902).

⁶⁸ Abby, *Church of God*, p.143.

⁶⁹ Abby, *Church of God*, pp.162-172.

⁷⁰ See above, pp.265-266.

⁷¹ NHC, CABB, *The Illustrated Temperance Monthly of the Church of England Temperance Society*, no.31 (May 1893), pp.126-127.

⁷² Joseph Rowntree and Arthur Sherwell, *The Temperance Problem and Social Reform* (ninth edition, London, 1901), p. x, acknowledged from a Temperance position, that 'the Local Veto will not solve the problem of intemperance in the great urban centres'. They also argued, pp.545-586, for a 'Constructive as well as Controlling Reform' that recognised and acted on the problems of poverty, housing and overcrowding.

⁷³ NHC, Z178, Harry Cooper Pattin, *The ritual of temperance and state hygiene: contributions towards a rationale in national healthiness* (Norwich, 1905).

⁷⁴ See above, p.153.

⁷⁵ See above, pp.266-267.

⁷⁶ See above, p.270.

⁷⁷ Joseph Bevan Braithwaite (ed.), *Memoirs of Joseph John Gurney* (Norwich, 1854), I, pp.365-367; II, pp.302-303, 368-369, 410-411.

⁷⁸ The *Norfolk News* was to be based on civil, religious and commercial freedom and was in opposition to the official Whig journal, the *Norwich Mercury*.

⁷⁹ NHC, CCOL, Joyce Gurney-Reid, *The Colman Family* (Norwich, 1990); Helen Caroline Colman, *J.J. Colman – A Memoir by one of his daughters* (London, 1905), pp.23-37. For the significance of toasting in Victorian society, see *Drink*, pp.55-6, 351.

⁸⁰ Gordon Marsden (ed.), *Victorian Values*, p.3, quoted Asa Briggs on the need for this distinction: 'Professional historians have long pointed out how difficult it is to generalise about Victorian values ... we rightly distinguish between early, middle and late Victorian'.

⁸¹ Quoted in Colman, *J.J. Colman*, pp.61-62.

⁸² Colman, *J.J. Colman*, pp.124-134; Palgrave-Moore, *Mayors of Norwich*, p.17. Also see below, pp.325-327.

⁸³ Mackie, *Norfolk Annals*, II, pp.426-427, 30 Jan. 1892; pp.492-493, 18 Sept.1898.

⁸⁴ Colman, *J.J. Colman*, pp.336-342. Helen Colman noted, p.342, that her father ‘showed his practical interest ... by putting up [a coffee house] at Corton (where the family had a sea-side house), with a Bowling Green attached, and, in conjunction with his Partners, another at Trowse, besides giving facilities for his own Workpeople at Carrow to obtain non-intoxicating drinks on the premises.’ He also refused to subscribe to a Juvenile Oddfellows Lodge, despite his enthusiasm for encouraging thrift, because he thought ‘the close connection between the Lodge room and a public house very undesirable’.

⁸⁵ Colman, *J.J. Colman*, pp.187-188. Helen Colman recounted that her father had told his sister in 1862: “I had a few minutes chat yesterday with my Colleague Elect, Mr. Patteson ... He was very pleasant and said he was glad to have me with him which of course I reciprocated, and then alluding to our political differences, said in a joking way, “Well, extremes meet, so we shall get on well together”. I suppose you know he is a thorough Tory and Churchman, but about the best of them in Norwich.’ By contrast, relations between the Temperance and Drink interests seem to have been more strained in Liverpool. William Caine, a local employer, parliamentary candidate, and advocate of temperance, gave evidence before the Lords’ Select Committee on Intemperance in 1877 that many public houses in Liverpool were owned by men who were also brewer-councillors (as in Norwich). However, Caine claimed an abuse of authority was taking place, arguing for instance that ‘a policeman whose wages are at 24s a week ... may be very largely influenced by the fact that the chief magistrate of Liverpool (the mayor) ... is the owner of 78 public houses.’ Moreover, when these powerful brewer-councillors ‘appoint a manager to one of their public houses ... they get him to sign a blank transfer ... the object being to protect the owner of the house against losing his licence by endorsement’. Every six weeks a transfer could be applied for. Caine claimed that at such hearings, the bench would be packed with magistrates known to be favourable, for the purpose of obtaining a removed licence for a given house or for hearing a number of transfers all together at the same time. (*Lords Intemperance Report*, 1877, First Report, pp.65-82.)

⁸⁶ Mackie, *Norfolk Annals*, II, pp.426-427, 30 Jan. 1892. In the obituary notice in the conservative *Norfolk Chronicle*, Tillett is described as ‘the most potent political personal force that the century produced in Norwich ... Whatever the Conservative Party may have thought of his political faults and shortcomings, Mr. Tillett was no Socialist or Revolutionist. He was staunch in his loyalty to the Throne ... he was naturally of a kind, considerate, and affectionate disposition’. Also see Palgrave-Moore, *Mayors of Norwich*, p.11.

⁸⁷ NHC, N289.6, *Norwich First [Adult] Day Schools, address by Mr. J.H. Tillett, reprinted from Norfolk News, 22 November 1890*. Tillett (p.5) took this opportunity to laud the work of the Salvation Army in Norwich: ‘It has reclaimed scores of drunkards, turned miserable homes into happy ones, converted blasphemers into preachers of the Gospel, and done an incalculable amount of good amongst the humbler classes’.

⁸⁸ Palgrave-Moore, *Mayors of Norwich*, pp.11-12; Mackie, *Norfolk Annals*, II, pp.426-427, 30 Jan. 1892. The obituary notice in the *Norfolk Chronicle* observed that in 1880, ‘Mr. Tillett reached the goal of his ambition too late to derive any satisfaction from it, and the five years he spent in Parliament were among the most irksome and worrying of any in his life’. This view receives some confirmation in another obituary notice written by Mrs. J.J. Colman – see Colman, *J.J. Colman*, pp.313-315.

⁸⁹ Colman, *J.J. Colman*, p.313.

⁹⁰ NHC, N301, *The People: their Strength and their Weakness – an Address delivered by Mr. J.H. Tillett at the New Catton Schoolroom, Norwich, Friday April 4 1873*, pp.2-7. See pp.5-11 for the full seven ‘obstructions to social progress’: 1 Brute force; 2 Priestcraft –

not just the Church of Rome but exemplified by it; 3 Fashion and money; 4 Excess in drink; 5 Waste; 6 Indifference to politics; 7 Mental inactivity.

⁹¹ Tillett, *The People*, pp.7-8.

⁹² NHC, N178.1, *The Reply of the Executive of the Norwich Auxiliary of the United Kingdom Alliance to the Statements on Local Option, made by Mr.J.H. Tillett, M.P., at St.Andrew's Hall, on Monday, 30 January 1882*, 25 Feb. 1882.

⁹³ *UKA Reply*, pp.4-8.

⁹⁴ *EDP*, 31 Jan. 1882.

⁹⁵ Barry Doyle, 'Temperance and Modernity: the Impact of Local Experience on Rank and File Liberal Attitudes to Alcohol', *The Journal of Regional and Local Studies*, 16, (1996), p.1; F.W. Wheldon, *A Norvic Century and the men who made it – 1846-1946* (Norwich, 1946), p.48.

⁹⁶ G. White, *The Drink Traffic and its Relation to Work and Wages* (Edinburgh, n.d. [1894]), quoted in Doyle, 'Temperance', p.2. Emphasis is in the original.

⁹⁷ *Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons*, 5th Series, vol. 26, 29 May 1911, pp.808-809, quoted in Doyle, 'Temperance', p.3.

⁹⁸ NHC, NOR: QA, *The Nonconformist Conscience in its Relation to Our National Life - Presidential address delivered by Alderman George White, M.P. at the Spring Assembly of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland in the City Temple, London, Monday 27 April 1903*, pp.9, 14.

⁹⁹ Doyle, 'Temperance', p.2.

¹⁰⁰ See note 60 above for evidence of the temperance influence within the working class. Supposedly, more than 30,000 paraded the streets of Norwich for the Grand Temperance Reception for Francis Murphy and his son in 1882. Working-class chapel members would have formed part of such a parade.

