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'Most men of all times of life seem to have been apt to say, 'the former days were better than these.' Yet the wise man reproves the folly of such complaints, and if we analyse our feelings, to ascertain the origin of this prevalent prejudice, we shall, I fear, find it to arise, in part at least, from that jealousy of contemporaries, who are all in some sense our rivals, the tendency to which, in all men, is one of the evidences of our native depravity and that discontent with our own condition which is so apt to take root in our hearts, partly from forgetfulness of our own unworthiness of God's great mercies and partly from ignorance of the peculiar troubles and disadvantages belonging to other conditions of life. We do not so easily give to our contemporaries, as to those of former ages, the credit which they may deserve. Of the dead, we have no jealousy, and to praise them may serve sometimes to disparage living rivals, or to lower unbeloved superiors. (J.H.Riggs, WATCHMAN, 21 Feb. 1841 p.62)
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Preface

The thesis intends to look at the Wesleyan effort in elementary education in the second half of the nineteenth century and aims to assess the educational work of Dr. James Harrison Rigg, who was President of the Wesleyan Conference on two occasions and acted as Principal of the Wesleyan Westminster Training College for 35 years. The only work published on Dr. Rigg is a biography, written by his son-in-law, John Telford, in the year of his death, 1909. (John Telford: The Life of Dr. James Harrison Rigg, Culley, London 1909.)

The Methodist educational effort has been surveyed in a number of studies. H.F. Mathews has looked in some detail at the Methodist contribution before the 1850s in his book Methodism and the Education of the People 1791-1851, (Epworth, London, 1949) and conducted a broad survey of the period 1851 to 1954 in his unpublished PhD. thesis of 1954 'Methodism and the Education of the People (since 1851)' (London (Ext) PhD. 1954) Only a small proportion is devoted to the later 19th Century and he does not analyse the philosophical bases of Wesleyan education, largely ignoring the works of Rigg, with only two of his published works quoted in the thesis. F.C. Pritchard has written studies of Westminster College and of the Wesleyan contribution to secondary education (Methodist Secondary Education, Epworth, London, 1949) but he also ignores elementary education. H.F. Cloke studied the wide period 1739-1902 in his unpublished M.A. thesis 'Wesleyan Methodism's Contribution to National Education, 1739-1902', London 1936. Over half this thesis looks at the work of John Wesley and early educational initiatives, and only few pages are devoted to the period 1850-1902. Although he does make several references to Rigg, Cloke does not analyse his influence on Wesleyan policies.

Little research has taken place on Methodist education since the 1940s. The late Marjorie Cruikshank made mention of Methodist reactions to the educational legislation after 1870 in 'Church and State in Religious Education' (1963). D. Hempton has made valuable contributions to Wesleyan history in Methodism and Politics in British Society, 1750-1850 (Hutchinson, 1984) and in his article in the HISTORY OF EDUCATION, 1979, entitled 'Wesleyan Methodism and Educational Politics in Early 19th Century England' as well as his thesis on 'Methodism and Anti-Catholic Politics, 1800-1846' (St. Andrews, 1977). All of these studies concentrate on the early 19th Century. The Wesleyan contribution to education after 1849 is largely ignored. H. Foreman's unpublished M.A. thesis, 'Nonconformity and Education in England and Wales, 1700-1902,' (London M.A. (Ext) 1967)
is also a very wide survey. The latter part of the thesis does deal with the period in question, but concentrates on the work of the National Education League and other dissenting bodies, and does not deal with Methodism in great detail. Nor does he assess the work of Rigg. This study hopes to fill the gap by researching the influence of J.H.Rigg on national elementary education in this period and the philosophical bases of Wesleyan elementary education after 1849. In particular it will assess the influence of anti-clericalism in formulating Wesleyan education policy. It will use previously unused reports of the Wesleyan Education Committee, the Methodist newspapers of the period and the reports of H.M.I. and the unpublished correspondence of Rigg, as well as his published work on education. It will also reassess the Methodist attitude towards government legislation in this period. 1849 is chosen as a starting point simply because it was the year in which Rigg published his first article on educational policy.

My thanks are due to the John Rylands Library in Manchester, with its most helpful staff, to the Greater London Record Office, to Lambeth Palace Library, to Lord Harrowby for permission to research papers at Sandon Hall, and to Peter Connell and Sheffield University Library for the Mundella Papers. The British Library have been most helpful, as have the staff at Hull University Library. Many have written to me after my search for Rigg's correspondence, among them the W.H.Smith Group Archive, which informed me of letters in the Hambledon Papers. My thanks are due to Sue Briggs for her support. My greatest thanks must go to Professor V.A.McClelland, who has been a constant encouragement and support and without whom this thesis would never have been completed.
Dr. J.H. Rigg
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INTRODUCTION
Introduction: Methodism and Education before 1849

In the late 18th and early 19th centuries, Methodists channelled most of their educational energies into the development of Sunday schools. In 1834, for example, Methodist Sunday schools accounted for 32% of all Sunday schools in Manchester, Salford, Liverpool, Bury and York, a figure only marginally smaller than that for the Church of England and obviously substantially greater than that of any other denomination. Methodists had more schools than Baptists, Congregationalists, Roman Catholics and Unitarians taken together (1) The Methodists were slow however in developing weekday schools. Moreover, their animosity towards the Church of England and the Roman Catholics prevented their co-operation with a number of government schemes proposed before 1850. This antagonism seems to have been greater than a desire to see the poor educated and it was to be one of the most important principles of Wesleyan education policy throughout the century.

The first major clash with other denominations occurred in 1820, when Henry Brougham introduced a Bill for the government to establish schools where there was a vacuum. However, the proposal gave the Church of England influence in these schools, causing 'considerable alarm' to the Wesleyans, as it required all teachers to be members of the Church of England and allowed clergy to plan the teaching in schools. (2) They were unwilling to concede supremacy to the Anglicans even if it was 'our parent church' (3). Jabez Bunting, the primary Wesleyan spokesman of the generation, was not opposed to government action per se. He wrote expressing his view to Joseph Womersley, Superintendent of the Carlisle Circuit:

> Party interests and petty considerations should not hinder so great an object. Particular clauses it is desirable to have omitted or modified; and to this the Committee will attend in due time. But as to opposing the Bill in toto...this would on our part be unbecoming and improper. Dissenters are opposed to all Religious Establishments....But the Methodists as a Body have not adopted such views... (4)

The Methodists would accept a National system if it incorporated the teaching of the Scriptures and did not give the Church of England undue privileges.
In 1836, the Wesleyans' growing interest in elementary education was shown by a Conference decision to appoint three ministers to inquire into educational matters. They made their report in 1837, stating that Methodism had only nine infant weekday schools, with twenty two others for older children. A provisional Education Committee was now set up to administer the existing schools. The philosophy behind the formation of new schools was twofold. The Wesleyan Conference of 1837 announced that they wanted not merely schools, but Church schools 'which, being systematically visited by the Preachers may prove doors of entrance into the Church of God: not merely education, but an education which may begin in an Infant School and end in Heaven.' There was also a clearly defensive aim, to prevent the spread of Catholicism. 'Should Popery and infidelity ever attempt, under any pretence, to take the direction of the youthful mind of this country, it is to be hoped that Methodism will resist the attempt, even to death; and in order that we may then be in a condition to resist with success, let us now hasten to the field and as far as possible, pre-occupy the ground.' (5) The temporary Education Committee became the General Committee of Education in 1841, consisting of at least fifteen ministers and fifteen laymen appointed annually. It was to report to the Conference annually, showing the growing importance of day-school education to the Wesleyan church.

In 1839 Lord Russell introduced new proposals to pay state grants to 'reputable' schools, according to local need, even if they were outside the two main education societies - the National Society and the British Society. The Wesleyan schools would obviously benefit, but it was anti-Catholic sentiment which sank the idea. The Wesleyan Committee of Privileges was totally opposed to state money being offered to Catholic schools. The WATCHMAN of 20 Feb. 1839 explained the Methodist dichotomy:

'It is far safer for our institutions and a policy far more magnanimous and worthy of a Protestant people, that the voluntary principle shall alone be confided in, and every denomination of Christians be left at liberty to educate their own youth in their own principles. Who amongst us would not cheerfully forego Government grants in aid of education, if thereby Roman Catholic ambition, left to its own unassisted resources, shall be baulked of its contemplated prey? (6)

In May a meeting of the Wesleyan Education Committee, the London ministers and the Committee of Privileges passed eight resolutions expressing Methodist opposition. (7)
They declared that Russell’s scheme was in violation of the Protestant Constitution ‘inasmuch as it contemplates the training and employment BY THE STATE of Romish (among other) teachers and particularly recognizes the corrupted Romish translations of the Scriptures’. Bunting carried a resolution that:

any attempt to instruct, in the same school, the children of the poorer classes by teaching adapted to every prevailing variety of religious belief or opinion, will...be found impracticable; and even if practicable...could only lead to perpetual collision...and would, in many instances, produce among the children so incongruously mingled together, a dangerous spirit of scepticism and unbelief. (8)

He continued his opposition, even after government plans had been amended, as grants would still be available to Roman Catholic schools ‘in which the errors, the superstitions, and the idolatries of Popery will be inculcated’ (9) It was anti-Catholicism which was guiding his policy. A standardized petition was now drawn up by the committees and sent to all Methodist congregations and the WATCHMAN continued to publish articles criticizing the state schools. (10) Peel described the Wesleyan dispute with his opponent, Russell, with scarcely veiled approval:

The Wesleyan Methodists have been treated like children. When they came forward in support of the anti-slavery question, and so strongly advocated the abolition of the slave-trade, then credit was given them for the highest discretion and for the purest motives; but now that they have come forward to oppose the Government scheme of education, although it is impossible that they can be influenced by any but the purest motives, they are designated as the victims of credulity and misapprehension. (11)

The Methodist Conference of 1839 showed its revulsion of the proposals, and also displayed the anti-Catholicism, which was becoming a major motivating factor in Wesleyan educational policy. The Conference condemned the attempt to introduce the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures into any school supported by public money, as it afforded facilities for the ‘propagation of the corrupt and tyrannical system of Popery, highly detrimental to the best interests of this country, the security of the Protestant faith, and the spiritual welfare of the community at large, particularly of its children and youth.’ (12) It went on:

The Conference takes this opportunity of recording its sorrow and alarm at the methods employed by different parties to revive and extend the influence of Popery in the United Kingdom...and considers itself called upon...to pledge itself to the employment of all the Christian and legitimate
means in its power to arrest the progress of this evil, and to support the
general Protestantism of the country...

The result of the clash was the withdrawal of most of Russell’s proposals, with only the
establishment of an educational Committee of the Privy Council remaining. The
Conference still regarded this with suspicion, as it might threaten the ‘foundations and
progress of evangelical truth , by introducing a merely secular or essentially pernicious
system of education’, that it would taint society at its very springs by bringing the children
and youth of the age under a defective, irreligious, and worldly system - and thus, in
several ways, prepare the public mind for the reception of the dangerous errors of
Popery.’ (13)

Without government aid, the Wesleyans now had to devote themselves to creating their
own denominational week-day schools. They were undoubtedly hampered by lack of
finances, but nevertheless the twenty two weekday and nine infant schools of 1837 had
been increased to 234 weekday and twenty eight infant schools by 1842.(14)

New government proposals were put forward in 1843 in Graham’s factory legislation.
Child workers in cotton, woollen, flax and silk factories were to receive three hours
instruction a day in new factory schools, built and inspected by the government. They
again placed great influence in the hands of the Anglicans. Schoolmasters had to be
approved by the bishop as being competent to give Anglican instruction. The chairman of
each board would be the local Anglican clergyman and in certain periods of the day there
would be instruction in Anglican catechism and liturgy (though dissenting parents could
extract their children from such teaching). The Bill particularly affected the Wesleyans, as
they were strong in the factory towns of the North. Moreover, by this date the Wesleyans
regarded the Church of England with increasing suspicion as ‘Romanish’, after the
Oxford tracts and the religious controversy between Church and Chapel. In 1841,
Bunting had made a notable speech at the Manchester Conference:

No person on earth or in heaven... can reconcile Methodism and High
Churchism...I wish the Evangelicals would disavow the Puseyites...Unless
the Church of England will protest against Puseyism in some intelligible
form, it will be the duty of Methodists to protest against the Church of
England. (15)

Anglo-Catholicism was first mentioned at the Conference of 1842. In that year a series of
Wesleyan Tracts for the Times was published to counterbalance the Oxford Tracts. They were particularly angered by Pusey’s Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which criticised the Evangelicals and Methodists. Their beliefs, according to Pusey, centred only on nature and grace, 'that by nature we are corrupt, by grace we are saved':

Faith alone was made the act of the mind - believing and appropriating to itself the merits of our Blessed Lord, the rest of the Christian system of God's gifts - the church, the sacraments, good works, holiness, self discipline, repentance were looked upon as introductory or subsidiary; or to follow as a matter of course upon these, but if thought of any value in themselves, pernicious. (16)

In his third edition, Pusey points to the Wesleyan heresy of making justification by faith practically a 'justification by feelings'. He complained that 'believe (not in Christ) that you will be saved and you will be saved' was early Wesleyan doctrine, but its character was being held in check partly by the church system in which those who adopted it had been educated, partly by the continued use of the sacraments in the Church of England, as the Wesleyans did not institute their own sacraments.

In the section of the Wesleyan body which is becoming more alienated from the church and ceases to communicate with it, the original error has been fatally developing itself ... the mind is worked up until it loses its fear and gains what it thinks an assurance of salvation ... the 'means of grace' are with him not the sacraments, but the 'class meeting', 'bands', 'love-feasts' ... the state of their feelings, not God's commandments are the standards, whereby they judge themselves. (17)

Thomas Jackson replied to this in 1842, pointing to the flagrant dishonesty of the 'half-Papists' of the Oxford Movement. (18) The controversy ended there as Pusey made no reply. The fears were shown again however at the Conference of 1843:

Opinions concerning the insufficiency of Scripture, as the sole authoritative and universal rule of faith and practice, the exclusive validity of Episcopal Ordination, and the necessary saving efficacy of the Sacraments...which in their necessary consequences lead directly to Popery, have been revived when they were almost extinct. (19)

It was in this atmosphere that the Methodists were confronted with Graham's proposals. In the Minutes of Conference of 1843, the Bill is called 'most objectionable and alarming ... and likely to inflict the greatest injury to the numerous Sunday and weekday schools already supported by voluntary zeal and liberality of the Wesleyan Body.' Lord Ashley blamed the 'perilous pranks of Dr. Pusey and his disciples', which had made the hitherto friendly Wesleyans fearful of Popery in the Church of England. (20) Letters were sent to
Bunting from the Northern manufacturing areas expressing grave concern. One such letter commented:

the whole party publicly hold and avow that everything good is to be discarded which cannot be brought within the pole of Establishment and that all our efforts put forth during nearly a century in raising congregations...building expensive places of worship and collecting thousands of children in Sunday Schools...ought to be swept aside to make an open platform for the full operation of the Oxford Tractarians. (21)

The Wesleyan response was strong and well organized. The WATCHMAN of 29 March 1843 commented that 'if the Church of England were at present what it was even a few years ago, when it was regarded as the grand bulwark of Protestantism in this country, we should have less objection to such arrangements as these.' (22) However, the clerical trustees of the 'Graham' schools all too often would be 'a disciple of the Tractarian sect who would employ his energies in opposition to sound Protestantism.' Jabez Bunting welcomed the use of the Authorized version of the Bible in schools and the saying of the Lord's Prayer at the start and end of the schoolday. He saw this as 'a devout acknowledgement of Almighty God' (23) However he still condemned the terms which gave the Anglicans a preponderant influence and a special meeting of the Committee of Privileges in May 1843 declared that it would place education under the 'control and influence of a sect in the Established Church, whose Popish doctrines and practices all sound Protestants must regard with abhorrence and alarm.' (24)

Graham himself wrote to Peel of the antagonism of the Wesleyans, claiming that it was clearly the 'Puseyite tendencies of the Established Church' which had 'operated powerfully on the Wesleyans and are converting them rapidly into enemies' (25). In the Commons, he praised their previous work in education and 'the immense efforts made by them with regard to the establishment of Sunday Schools in districts where such a system was wanted to supply a deficiency in imparting religious instruction.' He considered objections 'emanating from such a source should be treated with the greatest respect.' (26) As a result, he tried to make further concessions, with the teaching of the catechism and liturgy placed at the beginning or end of the day to facilitate the removal of children. The bishop's veto was restricted to the headmaster alone and there would even be time allocated for dissenting children to receive religious instruction by a minister. The board of Trustees proved to be still a stumbling block for the Wesleyans.
Amid such hostility, Graham withdrew the educational clauses of his Bill. There had been 25,205 petitions with almost four million signatures against the Bill, of which 8,949 and 910,000 signatures had been Wesleyan Methodists. On 20 June, the United Committee of Wesleyan Methodists congratulated the denomination 'for the unanimity...for the Christian temper in which their opposition had been conducted...'

There had been great co-ordination, with deputations to the Commons and petitions circulated throughout the Connexion. One recent historian has suggested that their effectiveness as an extra-parliamentary pressure group was only rivalled at this time by the Anti-Corn Law League. (27)

The failure of Graham's legislation put greater urgency on the creation of denominational day schools. The Wesleyans had only 290 in 1843 and Bunting called for an increased building programme:

Let us make no farce about day school education; we must have more money if it is to be done. In the estimation of public men Sunday schools are not national education. I am of that opinion. Why not admit this to ourselves?...Let us establish day schools...Let us go body, soul and spirit into it. (28)

In October 1843, The President of Conference, John Scott, carried a motion committing the Wesleyans to the provision of 700 schools in seven years. In reality, the building proved to be less successful, with 332 schools in 1844, 370 in 1846 and 395 by 1847. (29) The main problem for the Wesleyans as a Body was lack of finance, and they therefore began negotiating with the government in 1847 to obtain some State aid. The Government had begun a form of 'maintenance' grant, as opposed to a 'building' grant, in the previous year, with the institution of the pupil-teacher system. Government grants were offered to supplement teachers' salaries, if they taught pupil-teachers. The Wesleyans were however divided on this issue, again not for educational reasons, but for reasons of anti-Catholicism. It was thought by many that if Wesleyan schools accepted government grants, this would open the door to Roman Catholic schools similarly benefiting. At a meeting of the principal members of the Wesleyan Education Committee held at Centenary Hall in early 1847, William Bunting emphasized the danger 'that if the Evangelical Churches consented to share the task of National Education with the State,
the Roman Catholics could not be excluded from State countenance and pecuniary help in their Day School work.' (30) J.H. Rigg, who was an observer at the meeting, later recalled that Lord Ashley appeared at the meeting and calmed the Wesleyan fears on the issue. He reassured them that no grant would be made to any school where the Holy Scriptures were not regularly read, and that this provision would be likely to exclude the 'Romanists'. (31) John Scott was empowered to formulate a resolution to be put before the Wesleyan Conference of 1847, which accepted government financial help and assured delegates of the protection of 'the Scriptural and Protestant Religion throughout the country.' (32) Government money was therefore granted to the Wesleyans and they accepted government inspection of their schools, with an assurance in a letter from Landsdowne that no inspector, who would visit Wesleyan schools would be appointed without the approval of the W.E.C. In fact, the H.M.I.s who were appointed to visit the British schools were accepted by the Wesleyans, although many were not of the denomination. (33)

The Roman Catholic issue did not die down however. In 1848, Roman Catholic schools made application to the government for grants similar to those offered to the Wesleyans and immediately, at the Conference in Hull in 1848 Beaumont, Osborn and William Bunting attacked their leadership. They claimed that Methodists should not accept grants in common with the Catholics. Jabez Bunting however was rather less critical of the Roman Church than he had been previously and clearly advocated the continuation of the grant:

Ultra Dissenters say that all state-aided education should be secular; the country says: 'We cannot recognise any system as education of which the Christian religion does not form an essential part'; we have not an absolute right to say that Roman Catholics shall use our authorised version, or to say that Roman Catholic schools are too bad to be dealt with like others. We have gained a national recognition of the principle that the Scriptures and the doctrines of our religion shall be an essential part of British education, and, that no Popish priest can be a master in these schools. (34)

There had clearly been some compromise by the Wesleyan leadership by 1848, but there were still many Wesleyans who saw anti-Catholicism as a fundamental motivation for building schools. T.J. Graham, in a pamphlet of 12 October 1848, expressed the worries of many lay Wesleys about the State grants to Roman Catholics:
It is utterly impossible not to be without serious apprehensions as to what this may lead in future, since there exists in high quarters the strongest disposition to favour Popery - to impart to it strength, and to invest it with honour. The Council of Education is invested with unlimited powers, so that they can hereafter introduce any new minutes, or make alterations in existing minutes, according to their pleasure. We have no security whatsoever. (35)

He concludes with an analysis of the reasons for his anti-catholicism:

I have a real desire for the welfare of the Roman Catholics, but their religion being essentially a system of mental tyranny, a vast conspiracy against the civil and religious liberties of mankind, it cannot be either lawful or safe to strengthen their hands. Even Locke, the wise and mighty champion of toleration, properly made an exception on civil grounds...to their admission to equal privileges, because they swear allegiance to a Foreign Power, and therefore form a party necessarily and permanently inimical to our Protestant Constitution, both in Church and State. (36)

For Wesleyans, the Bible was the sole authority of the Christian faith, and Papal pronouncements were seen as a usurped authority, which demanded an unthinking acceptance by the adherent. They did not wish to see children brought up in Romanist schools which would teach them these principles. There were other theological reasons for anti-Catholicism. Many Wesleyans objected to the concept of a sacrificial priesthood, as they saw no need for an intermediary between God and man. One writer explained in 1849:

That which renders Popery so dangerous, is that it seeks to relieve an individual of responsibility in working out his own salvation with fear and trembling...His substitution of a father on earth for our Father in Heaven. (37)

The Mass itself was seen as derogatory to Christ's salvation, as it, in effect, repeated again and again his sacrifice. Ritual observance could not be a substitute for faith in God's grace. Anglican Ritualism had also begun to arouse hostility from the 1840s. Ritualistic churches came to be distinguished by the practice of six points in their liturgy - taking the eastward position at Eucharist; wearing full Eucharistic vestments; mixing water with wine in the chalice; using lighted candles on the altar; using unleavened or 'wafer' bread in the Eucharist and incense during the service. They were disliked because of their commonly supposed desire to 'romanize' the Anglican Church and return it to the Papal fold. The use of statues and crucifixes in the church was not accepted by the Wesleyans. One Methodist minister, William Arthur, wrote in 1845:

Protestants have distinctions; but they have not different religions. They acknowledge alone the Holy Trinity in unity...the canonical Scriptures as the standard of faith...But the Roman Catholic having objects of worship to
The new insistence on the apostolic succession of the priesthood, that only the laying on of hands by a Bishop could ordain a priest, particularly offended the Wesleyan ministers, whose credentials were brought into question. Newman wrote in Tract One, 'We must necessarily consider none to be really ordained who have not been thus ordained.' (39) Wesleyan ministers thus found their position repudiated. Within Methodism there was deep hurt at being unchurched by the Tractarians, which led them to assert their own validity, typified, for example by the adoption by Wesleyan ministers of clerical robes! The Wesleyan Church did not have bishops, and William Arthur pointed out that until the time of Queen Elizabeth I, the Church of England had not insisted on episcopal ordination. This aspect of the Church of England was a reflection of Popery and not true Protestantism and was seen as:

an inoculation from the diseased body of Rome, poisoning the system of the English Establishment, and leaving its subject to periodic attacks of Romish fever, followed by cold fits of rationalism...It is ...the greatest permanent danger to our national Protestantism...the only fulcrum on which Rome can rest her lever for disturbing the ecclesiastical mind of this country. Every Methodist who bows his head for re-ordination in deference to this doctrine, deliberately disowns all Christendom, but the Church he is then adopting deliberately sanctions a divisive figment; the day will never come when the Methodists, as a body, will be prepared for a proceeding so incompatible with fraternal respect for all non-Anglican Churches of the world. (40)

There was therefore much anti-Catholic sentiment in existence by the middle of the century and this was to be one of the most important motivations in Wesleyan elementary education policy for the next fifty years.
CHAPTER ONE
By 1849, the Wesleyan interest was growing and James Rigg made his first comment in print in the WATCHMAN praising the Wesleyan schools in this year. He wrote in March:

Day schools have of late years wonderfully increased among us and still go on to increase. Connected with these we have a Board for the examination and direction, and provisions for the education, of masters in these day schools. They form in fact now a special department of Methodistic organization of great and ever increasing importance (1)

The H.M.I., J.Bowstead praised the Wesleyan schools in his report four years later:

Wesleyan schools in the country make, upon the whole, a nearer approach to the excellencies of their metropolitan model than those of any other class subject to my inspection, and it has struck me as a particular merit in the Body by which they are promoted, that they not only make vast exertions to establish schools, but take special care that the schools which they establish shall be good ones. There is no instance in my district of a Wesleyan school being taught by an untrained teacher and the great majority both of masters and mistresses hold Certificates of Merit. It results naturally from this state of things that the standard of efficiency is high upon the average and the duties of the Inspector are comparatively light and agreeable. (2)

There are a number of reasons for the vigour of Wesleyan interest. There were desires for the religious education of their own young people, there was amongst some a true desire to spread learning for its own sake and there was also the continuing negative element in this interest in the fear that a Romanised Church of England was poaching their young. The religious training of their young was obviously of great importance to the Church, as was asserted by the Wesleyan Education Committee:

The Bible in the Authorised Version only shall be the basis of all the religious instruction and a certain portion of every day (at least half an hour each morning and afternoon) shall be set apart for the devotional reading of the Holy Scriptures, with explanations by the teacher... (3)

The school day must begin and end with prayer. All the teachers of the Wesleyan schools had to be connected with the Wesleyan church, as the Wesleyan Education Committee (W.E.C.) asserted:

Next in importance to the religious experience of teachers of youth, is their doctrinal soundness. The Wesleyan Methodists have always been accustomed to attach great importance to pure doctrinal teaching in their pulpits and they will not be less careful to maintain it in their schools. (4)
The reason behind this is to convince children of their need for Christianity, and as such the schools seem to be purely proselytising institutions. They had to teach:

The original and entire depravity of human nature - the atonement for sin made by the Son of God - the divine and saving operation of the Holy Ghost... are as necessary to be known by children as by persons of adult age. (5)

Methodist schools must therefore 'avoid a latitudinarian character, by being avowedly and practically connected with Wesleyan Methodism.' (6) At the same time, the Wesleyan church believed in a conscience clause. They should 'avoid a sectarian exclusiveness, by admitting children, whose parents, of whatever denomination shall voluntarily place them under care.' (7) When proposing a new Methodist school at Great Grimbsby in 1856, the Wesleyan Body asserted that 'no difference whatever will be made between Wesleyan children and others, excepting such as the parents may themselves desire' (8) The Deed of Settlement upon which Wesleyan schools were to be founded emphasized that, 'no child shall, in any case, be required to learn any catechism or other religious formulary, or to attend any Sunday school or place of worship, to which respectively his or her parent or guardian shall on religious grounds object.' (9) The government itself accepted this view in 1847. Landsdowne and Russell wrote to the Wesleyan Committee of Privileges condemning the blatantly sectarian stance of Anglican schools:

their Lordships cannot but hope that the clergy and laity of the Church of England will admit, that the view they take of the obligations resting upon them, as to the inculcation of religious truth, must be limited by their duty to recognize the state of the law as to the toleration of diversities of religious belief... (10)

In the parliamentary debates on education, Lord John Russell had praised this Wesleyan stance in that, 'the principle on which the Wesleyans conduct their schools is the least open to objection.' (11)

John Scott pointed out to Westminster students in 1855 that religious teaching would give moral benefit to society and 'by God's blessing upon his teaching, he (the teacher) gives a number of godly persons to the church... he trains persons to be the true servants of God,' although he emphasised:

If the youth's parents attend some place of Christian worship where evangelical truth is taught, in the Establishment or out of it... he will commit him to the guidance of his parents... When the parents are members of no Christian church, attend no place of worship, in that
case he cannot hesitate; he will seek to commit him to the care of that
church of which he himself is a member. And if, through the child, he
can reach the parents, who may be living ungodly lives, and can bring
them under Christian instruction, he widens his range of usefulness.(12)

However, the W.E.C. reports also show the desire for the secular education of their
children. The 1849 Report asks:

Can it be thought unreasonable that parents, who worship in the chapel
and seek for themselves and their offspring all their religious helps there,
should expect to have the means of secular knowledge through the same
instrumentality? (13)

The Wesleyans saw no contradiction in the demands of religious and secular education.
The denomination demanded the reading of the Word of God by its members and
literacy was an important aspect of religious teaching. The Report comments:

It is ... truly gratifying to find from the tables compiled by the
Inspector (Armstrong) that so large an amount of valuable secular
instruction is communicated in the various schools - this being found by
no means incompatible with the moral and religious teaching, but rather
the contrary: the two being mutually helpful of each other and the morals
of the children improving most when both are combined. (14)

Wesleyan weekday schools were: 'actuated...by a sincere desire to improve the condition
of the lower classes, by giving to their children a sound intellectual, moral and religious
education.'(15) They saw nothing wrong with secular education, if it was given in a
religious context. In 1850 the Education Committee wrote that it was 'anxious that it
should be fully understood that they are far from undervaluing the advantages of secular
knowledge in the education of youth, of such knowledge as shall both qualify the children
of the poor for the duties of their daily employment, and enable them, if occasion serve,
to improve their position in society.' The Wesleyan schools had been dedicated to this
task. However they did object to 'the principle of making secular teaching the exclusive
object of week-day schools, by forbidding the use of the Holy Scriptures and instruction
therein, as a regular, though it may be comparatively small part of the school
routine...'(16) Later in the Report, they again assert that it was the general duty of
schools to give instruction in the 'various branches of secular knowledge' though the
scriptural education was a 'still higher and indispensable advantage to which, by the law
The process is yet to be invented by which science may be transmitted into morality, or literature into religion... Even admitting our main objective to be the secular instruction of children, it were still unwise on our part to neglect that higher element, by the infusion of which alone, the proper tone and spirit of the school can be maintained...But ours are higher professions and nobler objects. (18)

By 1853, the worries of the W.E.C. had increased further. They saw the 'secular party' as a growing threat to their own schools and their philosophy of education:

For after all the shifts and doublings which have been employed in certain quarters to keep it out of sight, it is now perfectly clear that there is a considerable party in this country, who are not prepared to be satisfied with any national system, but such as will exclude religion altogether from such routine, or otherwise will in practice go very far to weaken the process of religious teaching, or even nullify entirely its power and adaptation to the production of truly religious effects. Were such a system to be established by law, one of the consequences would be that the Wesleyan schools established at so large a cost, and working with so much effort in the communication of religious, in conjunction with secular instruction, would be offensively and injuriously interfered with, and, in the issue, would probably be broken up, or come under totally different management. (19)

The fear of secular education had grown by 1855. At their first Annual Meeting on education at Centenary Hall the resolution was passed that:

a christian education can only be secured to the children...when the agents who carry it on are taken out of the hands of the Church and rendered, by legislative enactment an affair of the State...no satisfactory security could be given that the agency employed would be religious, or the teaching more than secular. (20)

A letter of the same year sent to Lord John Russell by John Scott expressed Wesleyan reactions to the proposed Milner Gibson Bill, which would have separated religion from secular education in all schools. He deplored the proposal to 'interdict all direct religious teaching in school hours and to proscribe all religious instruction as part of the process of education.' (21) The bill was in fact defeated in parliament. Sir John Pakington's Bill of the following year brought a stronger reaction from the Wesleyan Education Committee with a resolution on 27 February 1857:

That this Protestant nation, professing as it does to base its religion upon
the Bible, and its legislation and jurisprudence upon Christianity, and professing also to derive its morals as well as its religion from that source, has hitherto...made the daily reading of the Holy Scriptures, in Protestant schools, an indispensable condition of receiving aid from the public funds; but this Committee finds, with deep regret, that, in the Bill now before Parliament, this principle is abandoned; no teaching of religion or morals is required; and schools, which are to supply a complete education to the children of the poor, and on this ground are to be maintained by a tax on all classes of the community, may leave them in utter ignorance of that Divine revelation which Almighty God has given to enlighten men's minds, purify their affections and regulate their conduct... (22)

The Methodists objected to any restrictions being placed on the teaching of religion in their schools. They would not accept a clause in the Bill which demanded a set time in the schoolday for the teaching of any 'distinctive Religious Formulary' and which implied that doctrines should not be taught outside this set time in any form whatever:

Besides the Scripture lesson with which their schools daily open, and in which it is sought to make Divine truth intelligible to children of all capacities, an able christian teacher will find throughout the day, when teaching Geography, History, Physical and Moral Science, and the knowledge of common things, frequent occasion to illustrate and enforce truths of religion - and that religious teaching may be made to impart life and spirit to the whole process of education. (23)

They called on the Government to declare that all school managers were as free to teach religion as any other branch of knowledge 'at any time and in any manner they deem best'.(24)

The Reports do emphasise the further aim of Wesleyan education in the negative task of preventing their adherents from drifting away to other churches, as the Education Report pointed out, '...they will expect to be protected against the influence of a proselyting aggression on the part of other educational societies.'(25) The inspector's report on Mansfield Woodhouse for example comments:

All the children attend the Wesleyan Sabbath school and the catechisms are taught. This school is likely to be beneficial... in checking aggressive inroads on Methodism... (26)

This displays a fear of the Anglican church and also the anti-Catholicism which had been seen earlier. The 1850 report attacked Roman Catholic influence directly:

It is not a question whether the youth of our country shall be educated, but who shall educate them. If Christian churches do not their duty, the
irreligious, the worldly and the infidel will wrest the opportunity from them. If the Protestant people fail to meet the emergency, the priests of a dark, degrading and polluting superstition will seek to inspire devotion with images of saints - will teach the morality of Loyola and Liguori - endeavour to frighten infant minds with superstitious fears and will instil into susceptible youth a hatred of the Bible and of their fellows...So long as British Christians are faithful to their high trust, this will never be. (27)

The Report of 1850 also praised the new training college at Westminster for its defence against Catholicism. It describes Westminster as 'the theatre on which Protestantism and Popery shall contend for the possession of the neglected poor...the very midst of that dense and destitute population, which a certain Romish ecclesiastic has threatened to pervade by his own peculiar agency.' This report concludes with the enjoinder:

Let the emissaries of that apostate Church do what they please, the Committee hope by God's blessing to teach some thousands of poor children so to read, believe and love His Holy Word, that they shall be forearmed, forewarned, and saved from their corrupt influence. (28)

The mistrust of the proselytising vicars and priests led them to accept without argument a government instruction that grants could not be paid to schoolmasters in Holy Orders. This limitation was extended to Wesleyan lay preachers in 1849, but the W.E.C. refused to fight this. They told Methodist teachers to reconsider their calling to lay preaching, claiming that this could be accomplished in the school context, in which there is 'so much direct religious instruction and in which all instruction is to be given religiously afford a sphere of constant and daily usefulness, sufficient to give scope to the highest exercise of evangelical zeal.' (29) Anti-Catholic sentiments appeared again in John Scott's speech to Westminster College in 1860, when he advised future teachers to watch out for measures which would 'tamper with the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God; and that they shall not be taught to rest their hopes for a future life on ritual observance'.(30)

The Wesleyan attitude to children is also indicative of their philosophy of education. The President of Conference in 1847, Samuel Jackson, saw all children as of great value, and needing to be cherished. He characterises them as 'olive plants round their father's table'.
Christian churches may be compared to olive yards...Here are the olive plants growing up among us. Let these be cared for and cultivated...children are a heritage of the Lord...To neglect them is to insult the memory of our ancestors and is base ingratitude to the God we serve. (31)

John Scott, in his Inaugural Address to students of Westminster College in 1855 showed very liberal conceptions of discipline and school atmosphere. He deplored schools where 'sentiments of fear are habitual', and praised Wesleyan schools, which H.M.I.s had found 'present a happier appearance'. He pointed out to future teachers:

If the teacher is sullen and ill-natured; if, instead of open countenance and straightforward look, his features are darkened with a scowl, and there is a sinister cast of face seldom thrown off; if he is often out of temper with the children, imputing to their dullness...what is more justly attributable to his own ill-humour and want of skill in commanding and directing them; if he has recourse to the discipline of violence, and reliance is placed on corporeal punishment, rather than upon the influence which mind may exert over mind -firm and authoritative reason over even untamed passion, you do not wonder at the type the school exhibits: the affections of the children are not won; and the 'morning face' of the master is watched with as much anxiety, and construed with as much foreboding, as in the days when the cane and the ferule were the principal instruments relied on to ensure order and stimulate application.(32)

This attitude towards pupils is praised by Matthew Arnold, who was H.M.I. of Methodist Schools from 1851. In particular he notes in 1857 the Wesleyan Infant schools which had 'most sensible views as to the management of infants; what I have often heard made a matter of reproach against their infant schools, that they are play-schools, is really...the highest praise.' He agrees with John Scott's interpretation, that they should not 'seek to develop prematurely and forcibly the faculties of the mind not developed in the young child, but employ their attention mainly in the direction of faculties which nature teaches the child vigorously to put forth, perception, observation and curiosity'. He concluded that the Wesleyan Infant-school system was 'in my opinion a healthier and a more successful one than that of any other educational body.' He commends the spirit of the vast number of Wesleyan teachers he had met, who worked for the good of others, and not simply for their own livelihood. He agreed with John Scott's promise that in future the scholars would recall their school-days with pleasure, would think of their teacher with affection and mention with honour. (33)

The Wesleyans' own inspector explained in 1861 that:
an infant school should give play to the emotions, exercise to the limbs, and use to the senses: moral training, and not intellectual forcing, is the highest result. The teacher loses her power who does not hold the affection of her school, whose rule of action is not the law of love. (34)

The Wesleyan schools also regarded girls to be of equal importance with boys, which was an advanced concept at that time. Every soul was of equal value to the Wesleyans and they saw the teaching of reading as essential for both sexes, to enable them to read the Scriptures. However, they did have a wider interpretation of girls' education. The 1849 Report praises those schools which give a wide instruction:

girls have been rescued from the listlessness and vacuity which have sometimes...characterized their period of instruction. Over and above the expert use of the needle...the girls are securing branches of education hitherto deemed of little practical utility to them, or above the range of their capacity; the soundness of the latter notion is overthrown by the successful competition which many a school presents...The question of female education is of deep importance. The spirit that would limit woman's capacity and responsibilities to the mere material of this life's duties and enjoyments is at once alien to the spirit of Christianity. (35)

Matthew Arnold reported, with approval, the Wesleyan tradition of having mixed schools which were more economical than two single-sex schools, the savings allowing the creation of infant schools in the area. He praised the Wesleyan schools which followed this plan as gaining a great advantage 'and one which the British schools often lose by their anxiety to separate the boys from the girls'. He concluded:

I must say that I have never yet seen any inconvenience arise from bringing together boys and girls in the same schools, if their playgrounds are kept distinct. Indeed the education of girls, when they learn with boys and from a master, appears to me to gain that very correctness and stringency which female education generally wants; while a female teacher is no doubt the person best qualified to instruct infants of both sexes. (36)

In his Address to Westminster College in 1858, John Scott expressed a desire for a wide education for girls:

The notion is still prevalent, that to aim at cultivated intellect and elevated feeling in those who are probably destined to move in the humbler walks and to do the drudgery of life, is practically to interfere with providential arrangements, and to render such young people dissatisfied, and unfit for their proper station. (37)

He concludes that character can only be formed by dealings with the mental and moral susceptibilities of the subjects treated...The time will come but it is not yet -
when all that belongs to womanly education will be valued and sought. Meanwhile, those who have to maintain principle...must adhere to the purpose of rearing a higher standard of female worth...According to opportunity and ability, each should be taught the principles and habits, as well as the arts, by which she may be qualified to become useful and virtuous in the station it pleases God to assign her...Motive and intelligence will be brought into action, which cannot be supplied by any amount of mechanical acquirement. (38)

The 1859 Report pointed out that 'a strong feeling' was spreading amongst Methodist teachers that instruction for girls should 'first be as thorough as possible in the elementary branches of reading, writing, and arithmetic, and then assume whatever special form the character of the children or district may dictate as desirable.' In general, teachers are called on firstly to teach children to think: 'you must give them thoughts, and their thinking right direction, and so train their intellectual powers that they will readily apprehend and appreciate the importance of...lessons, on whatever subject.' (39) The emphasis was for both boys and girls. The actual timetable for girls' schools, which the W.E.C. outlined in its report of 1865, laid down the same subjects as those for the Model School at Westminster, with only the addition of Needlework. Girls were expected to study Reading and Arithmetic for five hours each per week, and one hour a week was to be spent on History, Geography and Singing.

James Harrison Rigg had become a force in English Wesleyanism by this time. His interest in education could be traced back to his early days. He was a pupil and then for four years a pupil teacher at Kingswood School for preachers' sons in Bristol. At the age of eighteen, he became an assistant teacher in the Rev. Firth's Academy at Hartshead Moor near Leeds, where he remained for two years. After a brief attempt to set up his own school in Islington, he became a Classics and Mathematics master at John Conquest's school in Biggleswade in 1843 where he taught for a further two years. His only published comment on his early experience as a teacher was that 'on the whole, my work had been congenial, though it was arduous and onerous.' (40) Rigg followed these eight years of teaching with entry into the Methodist Ministry. He was briefly posted to Woodhouse Grove, with its famous Wesleyan school, in 1846, and was a frequent visitor to the school. He later recalled: 'there was the school where I was soon and easily at home. I liked preaching to the Grove Boys and also to the neighbouring people... I soon
found and felt that we were all at home together.' (41) A pupil at the time, Dr. Moulton, later recalled Rigg 'who used to delight us with his graphic exposition of the parables and miracles, but he was considered by the authorities too good for us and to our great disgust, he was soon removed to what was considered a more important sphere.' (42) (He was in fact transferred to a London circuit.) Rigg's interest in education was such that he and his friend, William Arthur were invited to attend the special Methodist Select Committee in 1847, which finally accepted government aid for Wesleyan schools. His first reference in print to education appeared in an article in the WATCHMAN in March 1849, and in this he praised the advance which his church had made:

And be it remembered that increase in intelligence and knowledge is increase of faculty and therefore, if adequately informed and sustained by divine grace, increase of religious power and influence. The more of truth a man knows and has acquired a capacity for knowing, the more he may love, the happier, the holier and nobler Christian he may become. Let none then slight intelligence and knowledge. Intelligence, even in religion, is capacity; store of knowledge is material for usefulness; mental discipline and acuteness will assist both in learning and teaching the 'deep things of God'. Only let the Spirit's grace be added. (43)

His own sentiments at this time might also be gauged from his analysis of a speech, delivered at Penzance in 1851 by the Rev. Thomas Vasey, which he found most impressive. In 1906 he claimed that Vasey 'today might be stigmatised as sectarian; forty years ago they were called sometimes denominational, sometimes Evangelical or distinctively Christian, but never sectarian......politically he was known as a Liberal, whilst he had felt it to be a point of conscience to lecture in his circuit against Popery, but greatly as he dreaded Popery, he dreaded secularism and religious indifferentism or infidelity yet more, far more...' (44) Rigg's views clearly followed those of Vasey and on a number of occasions he applauds these views in his writings. (45)

His first Connexional delegated work was in 1852, when he was requested to act as a deputation in the Channel Islands District, to explain the object and show the pressing need of a Training College, such as that at Westminster that had just opened, and of a system of Wesleyan day-schools under trained teachers. (46) He joined the Wesleyan Education Committee in 1859. He had described something of his own educational philosophy in the previous year in an article in the LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW. While analysing the origin and cure of the pauperism of the country, he disagreed with a
belief that education was a panacea for all social evils. It could not create a prosperous and moral population without other social reforms. When speaking of pauperism, he attacks the 'common error' of supposing that one remedy alone could achieve the 'great reformation needed':

Nothing, perhaps, has been so generally regarded as the one and all-sufficient remedy for the improvidence, pauperism, and demoralisation of...the masses of our population, as Christian education....unless other reforms are advancing hand in hand with educational improvement and progress, it will not be possible to provide ...a Christian education for all the children of the lower orders; nor, if it were provided and imparted in the schools, would it be possible thus to counteract and subdue the hostile, anti-Christian, demoralising education which existing social causes and conditions conspire to render inevitable out of school. Let it never be forgotten that the home, the street, the workshop, the pit and factory... cheap newspapers and periodicals...form the effectual means...of our national education; these train up the men and women of our land. Doubtless the school and pulpit may do a great deal directly for those who come regularly under their influence. But yet much of their work must be destroyed, if the subjects of their instruction are at the same time continually under the action of hostile influences...School education alone can by no means achieve the grand result of making the working people of Britain frugal and provident, sober, moral and well behaved. (47)

He sees the need to counteract the tendency of the poor to find their relaxation and excitement in the indulgence of their animal passions' but the first necessity was the removal of the pauperism.'Assuredly, education in many cases will be of little purpose so long as our slums and courts, and many-storied tenements in low neighbourhoods, remain as they are. THEIR education is undoing the Christian school education.' (48) He calls for the working classes to be allowed to buy land and small properties, and 'rise a little in the world' and then they would begin to value education for their children.'Let parks be added in our great towns, good and cheap libraries be provided, wholesome cheap literature be multiplied, and then the preliminary conditions to the success of any national provision of education will be fairly fulfilled'. (49) His personal belief in the limitations of education are reiterated in the following year, in an article on 'Popular Education':

the combined effects of poverty, and vice, and hopelessness, and furious passion, have almost blotted out the last trace of human nobleness. That mere education can ever absolutely cure such evils as these, we do not believe...(50)
Rigg's own conception of what should be taught in schools is broader than that of many of his Wesleyan colleagues. He sees literacy as the prime objective. In an article published in 1859, he writes:

A complete human education must include the physical, the intellectual, and the moral elements of man's nature. What God has joined together and made mutually helpful and dependent, man must not separate. No one of these elements can be neglected without injury to the others. (51)

The call for physical education was novel. He saw physical health to be a help to 'moral rectitude and virtue.' He claims that children should not only be taught to read, but also a love of knowledge:

It is not enough to teach letters and spelling, and pronunciation. These things the teacher may be ever hammering into the child for months and years together, and yet he may never learn to read with intelligence and ease. His apprehensive faculties must be brought into play... a certain amount of general knowledge must be imparted, especially about 'common things ...Unless he gets so far as this, he will seldom keep up his reading after he has left school... If, on the contrary, the scholar has once learned to read easily and intelligently, there is little fear as to his keeping up the habit, and increasing his knowledge continually... his mind will be stirred and kept alive. (52)

In addition to this, Rigg called for the teaching of a 'legible hand' as the penny post was an excellent aid to education. There should be instruction in Arithmetic as an intellectual discipline as well as valuable in the ordinary business of life. Rigg even called for the rudiments of drawing and music for all children and for the scholar who 'in English shows a decided genius for linguistic studies' there should be the possibility to acquire other languages. He even called for tuition in science and natural philosophy, which was an almost radical claim for educationalists of the period. (53) Equally radical, though certainly accepted by the Wesleyan church, was that girls should be given the same lessons and the same curriculum as the boys, with no adaptation except 'in their case, there must be added careful and thorough instruction in those household accomplishments which are an indispensable part of their education.' (54)

He does see the spiritual aspect of education as being of great importance, as indeed the W.E.C. had outlined for many years. He writes that 'the highest and most needful part of man's education is that which directly regards his nature as moral and responsible being... The spiritual life is at once the highest and the deepest in man, the strongest and
most enduring. Its seat is in the very core and centre of his being, and its energy is all-pervasive and all-regenerative.' (55)

Rigg does not accept the philosophy of the 'ultra-voluntaryists' who saw all government interference in education to be wrong. He maintained that, if children were not being 'restrained from crime' or fitted for discharging their duties in society, it was 'the right and duty' of the State to 'interpose on behalf of the child's just claims...and to take measures for providing and imparting such an education. (56) The State required a certain standard of morality by law and thus had to take some responsibility for educating children in this morality and Rigg in 1859 saw only minor limits on this interference:

The nation...cannot claim an absolute right and authority in all matters over either parent or child. It cannot coerce the conscience, and has no right to make the attempt. It cannot enter the sphere of religious conviction, or interfere between God and the conscience of either parent or child. But it can claim to regulate almost all except this. (57)

This is one of the broadest interpretations of the Government's role in education yet propounded by the Wesleyan Church. He goes on to deny that a child was the property of the parent, and if the parent failed in his responsibility to teach his child morality, this responsibility must devolve upon the State: 'it is the mere fanaticism of ultra-voluntaryism to deny that government has a right to take action to the extent required for the accomplishment of such desirable results.' (58) Like Bunting, he approved of the grants, which Wesleyan schools had accepted since 1843 as this system avoided any State monopoly and provided that 'all shall be impartially aided who do the State real service.'(59)

He does show some sympathy with the Voluntaryists' criticism of Church of England influence, which he sees as a 'usurpation, as if this were a right inherent in the Church endowed by the State, neither to be controlled in its exercise by any co-ordination of lay associates, or of political functionaries, nor to be shared with any dissenting Christian communities...' (60) The language shows Rigg, like so many Wesleyans, to be antagonistic towards the Anglican Church. When analysing the history of the 1843 Graham Factory Bill, he condemns the assumption that the Church of England clergy, 'the quasi-National church'...'had a constitutional right to be the directors. as to the
religious element, of whatever might be provided as in any sort a national system of education'. He implicates many Anglicans in this:

...there is yet a considerable section of Churchmen in this country who adhere to this medieval principle. They still maintain, in Church Unions and secret conclaves, that it is the sacred and indefeasible right of their order to take the oversight and direction, at least in matters spiritual, of all educational efforts...by the State; and they regard the assistance rendered by the State to Dissenting schools as nothing less than a misappropriation of revenues of which they ought themselves to have the control. (61)

He portrays this 'arrogant section of Churchmen' at a Church-Education Meeting of February 1850, where the Rev. G.A. Denison, the great champion of this party, expressed their principles. He maintained that the education of the people should be exclusively in the hands of the Church of England and Rigg concluded:

The Rev. Archdeacon and his fellows have no business in Protestant England in the middle of the nineteenth century. Since it is their misfortune not to have been born in the Middle Ages, the best thing they can do in these degenerate and unchurchly times is first to go over to the Romish Church, and then to migrate to Austria. There, under the shadow of the Concordat, they would find their natural rest. In this country they are out of date... (62)

Rigg's anti-Catholicism reflected the attitude of many Wesleyans of the mid century. He is wary of 'superstitious Popery':

The priests will always see to it that the children of their flock get as much Popery as it is likely to do them any good. A Popish community of the lower orders will never be utterly irreligious, whatever else they may be; and the basis of religion which they do get, will be greatly improved in quality by admixture with the secular elements of a good general English education. If the schools are left under the predominant direction and influence of the priesthood, whatever tends to real liberty and independence of thought will...be repressed; the children will be trained... in mental servility. (63)

However, his anti-Catholicism is not as strident as that of many Protestant contemporaries. He is wary of the undue influence of priests:

As to the Roman Catholics in Ireland...whatever else they may be, they are not irreligious, nor is their religious instruction, such as it is, neglected by the priests. What was mainly wanted for Ireland, therefore, was a free and efficient secular education, conducted by true, upright, honourable men, who held fast a sincere and fervent faith in the main Bible facts and moral principles of our common Christianity. All that the Government could attempt to do was to improve the mental and moral staple...of those whose Romanism was an irremediable evil...if...it were compulsory on the children of any district, not being Romanists, to attend Romanist schools, that would be an intolerable evil. But none send their children to these schools BUT...
Romanists... The parent, not being a Romanist, who sends his child to a Romanist school, does so merely because he so chooses. In so doing, he proves himself to be a religious indifferentist, a practical unbeliever or a callous latitudinarian; and the child of such a parent will not be taught a worse religion than his father's even though he be taught at a Roman Catholic school. (64)

Like the Buntingite faction of the Wesleyan Church, Rigg does not even resent Government grants paid to Roman Catholic schools from 1848. He believes that they had been granted too many concessions by the Government and that some of these could have been avoided, but he asserts:

we confess that we have no scruples of conscience as to the aid of Roman Catholic schools under these Minutes. If the Government have not maintained all that they should have done, they have yet gained a good deal. Schools assisted by their aid, managed according to their regulations, and visited by their inspectors, cannot after all be mere seminaries of ignorant and bigoted Popery... The Roman Catholics educated in these establishments must grow up, as a class, more imbued with the spirit of liberty and more accessible to a wholesome public opinion, than if they had been taught in ordinary Popish schools... more loyal and less virulently Romanist. (65)

He sees this as far preferable to the Maynooth grant, which was given to train priests and where the Government had no power of visitation and inspection.

Rigg's attitude to 'secular' education shows less of the antagonism displayed by the Wesleyan Education Committee:

(The secular party) would have the government to provide merely a secular education, leaving the religious element to be supplied either by the parents at home or by the ministers of the different denominations attending the schools at certain times. The school teacher would not be allowed to teach any particular form or creed of religion; but he would be expected to inculcate morality... We concede... that under certain conditions, it might constitute a fair platform of national education. (66)

He praises the secular schools in Canada, but points out that almost the whole population there attend church and are therefore supplied with efficient religious instruction by their pastors. The children thus grow up under 'civilising and more or less moralising influences.' Such a secular system is however seen as inappropriate for England as fewer people actually attended churches:

Those are to be educated, whom no parents train in the fear of God, and whom no pastors have the opportunity of taking under their care. In schools intended to meet this want, religion must assuredly be the principal thing
...the force of religious character must be the great secret of the master's power to train and mould his scholars. The patience and love of Christian zeal and charity must be the prime qualifications for success in his work. A grand moral work is to be done. (67)

The diversity of denominations in England prevents one system of religious instruction, but he suggests a system, which 'being catholicly Christian, all denominations, or at any rate all Protestant denominations, might unite in common.'...‘distinguishing the instruction in religion as consisting of what was general, or what was accepted throughout Christendom as the foundation of Christian morality and doctrine.' (68)

The Methodist reaction to the Revised Code of 1862 was predictably critical. Before its introduction, the 1860 Address by John Scott to Westminster College condemned attempts at government interference in schools:

the substitution, by authority of Government and the legislature, of a national for a denominational system of education, is an idea which has found some earnest advocates and may possibly be urged on the country again: I should like you to understand the views which we take of the subject, and the reasons why...we adhere to the denominational system...First: we hold that if education is to be decidedly and thoroughly religious, it must be denominational...' On the teaching of religion, Methodists could not ‘temporize’. (69)

It was regarded as one of the most important aspects of education, as it teaches a child that he has a life in two worlds, this and a future life in a world to come. 'We have no controversy with those who contend that all children should be educated and that children in schools such as ours should give the knowledge which is wanted for this world...for the business and pursuits of the present life'. (70) After the introduction of the new code, the criticism was vociferous. The Education Committee Report of 1861 outlined the opposition, stating that it would lead Methodists and their schools to the promotion of 'an education that would be constantly exposed to the danger of becoming in effect godless as well as national, and subject at all times to the further changes that may be dictated by any central administration that may arise, for rendering more potent the secular spirit that seeks to usurp the authority which the Christian spirit of the country at large has so legitimately gained in the question of education of the people.' (71)

The secular element is still recognized as a secondary and less important aspect of the curriculum:
Reading, writing and arithmetic cannot be accepted as the complete curriculum of education even for the most neglected and ignorant of our population; indispensable as these are, and carefully as they should be taught, they constitute only a power valuable because of the extent of application. Education must then be something more than the creation of a power. (72)

Circuit and District organizations were formed, public meetings were held by Methodists and pamphlets were circulated in opposition to the Government measure. M.P.s were also lobbied. John Scott toured the country, encouraging teachers and school managers to disregard the limiting aspects of the Code and to continue their existing high standard of 'educating not merely instructing'. His report to Westminster students in 1861 encouraged the prospective teachers to see their pupils not as 'machines', but as 'the children of men...with human feelings, human interests.' They should not therefore be taught in mechanical ways in the three 'R's. In a letter to Earl Granville, dated 18 September 1861, the Wesleyan Education Committee wrote:

The New Code, limiting the attainments by which money to the support of the schools will be obtained from Government, must concentrate the attention and efforts, both of teachers and managers, mainly on what the standard requires - the attainments which are allowed a money value; and must prove a great temptation to regard as secondary, or to put out of sight altogether, the prime object of education, the intellectual and religious training of the rising generation...we are greatly surprised at these attainments being made the 'maximum' in inspected schools...in our judgement, the poor man's child deserves a better education than the new regulations will give. (73)

A 'United Committee' was also formed with other denominations to resist the Code.

Dr. Rigg spoke to the last of these pointing out their objections to the changes.

Rigg's attack on the Revised Code and on its author, William Lowe, was strident. In a speech, delivered at the Annual Public Meeting of the Wesleyan Day School Committee on May 7 1862 and later published as a pamphlet, 'Last Words on the New Code', he attacked Lowe personally. He deplored that the Educational Department of the Government had ever been placed in his hands:

I believe that Mr. Lowe, with all his ability - and no one can deny he is a man of great ability - was altogether unprepared for the position he assumed ...(he) does not understand the history nor the principles of popular education in this country. I think it important that we should bear that in mind; for I cannot but attribute chiefly to Mr. Lowe the mischievous course into which his Government has been led. (74)
Rigg's philosophy of education does reflect that of the Wesleyan church in general at this time, with a call for the continued emphasis on moral and religious teaching, and a deep suspicion of the government's increasing bias towards an exclusively secular education. He analyses the previous work of the denominational schools and the government's interest in the following terms:

Is it true... that the position of the Government in regard to education has from the beginning been merely that of an umpire amongst sects, and of a party responsible for the secular education of the people? I say the position of the Government has been this: it has been that of a party determined that the people of England should have a moral and religious education: but between 1839 and 1846, Government found out that the only way of securing for the people of England a moral and religious education was to devolve the responsibility of the religious, and therefore of the explicitly moral instruction, principally and immediately upon the various denominations; Government, however, contributing its bounty to the denominations for the sake-not only or chiefly of the secular results - but mainly... for the sake of the moral, humanising, civilising results which were to be obtained by means of the education imparted by their instrumentality. (75)

He quotes a letter of Lord John Russell to the Marquis of Lansdowne, which deplored the large number of prisoners in British gaols, who had never been given any knowledge of 'fundamental truths of natural and revealed religion'. The letter is shown as evidence of the Queen's sentiments, that 'the youth of her kingdom should be religiously brought up, and that the rights of conscience should be respected.' Rigg also quotes a pamphlet of 1839 by Kay-Shuttleworth, that the Government's intention was the education of the 'whole man', to save the lower classes from lawlessness, demoralisation and degradation. Rigg quotes Kay Shuttleworth again, from an 1846 pamphlet, that religion was a primary and indispensable part of education. He also puts forward his own view: 'I hope that we hold, at the same time, that without true religion there can be no sound morality; and, on the other hand, that to promote, in combination with true religion, the intellectual advancement of the people, is to secure for the truths of religion more effective operation and a wider sphere.' (76) He criticises Lowe's supposition that the Government had never been interested in the religious and moral element, and concludes that:

he has shown himself to be utterly ignorant of the origin, the history, and the principles of the very department of which he is the effective head.... his attempt was to eliminate altogether the moral element from the educational aims and responsibilities of the Government,- to reduce the function of the
Government to that of a mere secular agent and inspector...that the only purpose and object of these schools which the Government will directly encourage by means of pecuniary premiums,-shall be the impartation of a low type of rudimentary, and for the most part, mechanical or memoriter instruction. (77)

Rigg shows himself to be in a new strand of Methodist thought which did value the secular instruction highly. He criticises the accepted norm of the beginning of the century:

It used to be the prevalent belief... amongst good old-fashioned Churchmen, that it was one of the most disastrous things in the world to teach poor children too much; and if they could teach them to curtsey when they happened to meet the Minister in the road, and if they could get through their Belief somewhat ...and if they could say their Catechism in the same way, it was thought to be quite sufficient, and that this was as much education as a poor man's child had a right to expect. He went to school that he might be taught his Catechism, his duty to his betters and a little superficial civilisation. I am afraid that that sort of feeling is not quite extinct yet...The modern system has ...been condemned for the demerits of the old, and just because the defects remaining from the old system were not quite purged out of the new. We that were doing everything in our power to improve and reform the old state of things, have been condemned for the sins of the old system which it has been our main object to explode. (78)

He states his 'new' concept of a broader secular education, that was needed:

Illiterate, improvident, and absolutely under the sway of their passions, too many of them have grown up with their intellect altogether undeveloped, and their conscience utterly dark. These men need education in another and higher sense than being taught to read, write and cypher. And we must insist upon it that for the working classes of this country there must be something better than that sort of education upon which alone the New Code insists, or else we can never offer an education which will elevate the lowest classes of our countrymen. If we had no other purpose than that, it would never have been necessary to have a national system at all; if we had had no other purpose than that, we might have been content to let men go on getting education just as they could. But a national education was 'for moral and social reasons, found necessary and it ought...to be made as good, as thorough, as full of Christian principle and discipline, and full of intellectual quickening and enlargement as it possibly can be....In Lancashire we want better educated mechanics; and the employers of labour are calling out for them. They want, not only those who can read, and write and cypher, but those whose intelligence is trained,- those who are taught lessons about objects and common things, and who know something of the elements of philosophical science; and unless they can get workmen of that kind, England's industrial economy, energy and development can never be what they ought to be. (79)

He vehemently defends the existing teachers from the stated and implied criticism of the Revised Code. Rather than accepting poor methods of teaching, he praises new methods of instruction, which had been introduced at Westminster College and which he
calls 'educational science'.

Why is it then, that, as is alleged, only one fourth of all scholars actually attain this first class standard of education? The reason is, not as has been with incredible ignorance or base dishonesty assumed by the TIMES, and repeated, parrot-like, by the railway reading public,- that three fourths of the children have been negligently or inefficiently taught, but that only one fourth stay long enough at school to go into the first and second classes; that nearly three fourths leave school before they are eleven years of age; to which it may be added, that no time has yet been allowed for the full development in the majority of schools of the fruits of the pupil-teacher system. (80)

He puts forward the teachers' case, when he asked rhetorically:

Would a lawyer choose to be paid by results; would a doctor choose to be paid for results; would you or I like to have our salary depend upon payment for results? No; and in reference to everything which touches the moral power of man, and everything which is conditioned by the intellectual character and moral quality of men, women and children, it is a most ignorant thing for any one to get up and talk of the philosophy of payment by results. (81)

The teachers had clearly found a powerful advocate in J.H. Rigg.

The Wesleyan Church followed Rigg's philosophy. The Education Report praised his speech and advised teachers not to teach solely to the Code. In 1864 they recommended that teachers considered carefully the purposes of their schools: 'New methods will be suggested, and temptation will be offered to aim directly at the preparation for the yearly examination, on which the pecuniary result depends.' The Wesleyan Inspector recognised the need for teachers to prepare their students well in the secular subjects, which earned the grant, but at the same time they should trust their previous teaching experience. The 'modes of dealing with the whole child, mentally, morally, and physically, are to be such as will abide higher tests than the Code supplies.' Children would have to be given periodic rehearsals of the examination, but this demand on school time must not hamper the 'real education of the children'. (82) In addition, the Report deplored the effect on the pupil-teacher system, which it saw as being virtually destroyed by the Revised Code. All the inducements for parents to allow their children to be pupil-teachers were gone, as there would be no payment, and would receive all their instruction outside school time, in evening classes. The master was therefore expected to 'work efficiently after having taught a public school during the day.' (83)
In his Inaugural Address of 1864, John Scott described Wesleyan determination to maintain the full curriculum as before, and not concentrate solely on the Code subjects:

What will satisfy a Government examination under the New Code will not satisfy us. We have had from the first our own standard of education...we see good reason to keep it up, and raise it rather than reduce it. No subject on which our schools gave instruction before the change is omitted now...some people seem wonderfully afraid that the children of the poor should receive too good an education; they appear jealous lest the humbler should obtrude into the ranks of the superior classes. As we have often declared, our community has no such fears. (84)

The H.M.I. reports did seem to indicate by 1865 that there had been the feared diminution of the curriculum. Bowstead, the Inspector for both the British and Wesleyan schools, did complain that grammar, geography, history and higher mental arithmetic had been much less taught than previously. 'Most teachers tell me that they have been obliged to curtail their work in these departments, and some admit that it has been entirely laid aside.' (85) However, this general report refers to both the British and the Wesleyan schools inspected, and Bowstead does mention that a few of the best schools had not changed their timetables. 'It is the case generally in Wesleyan schools, the Education Committee of the Wesleyan Conference having a very strong desire that it should be so.' (86) By 1866 the W.E.C. Report had to comment that the unpaid subjects could not compete with the paid and that 'teachers are disinclined to go beyond the letter of the Code requirements.' (87) The criticisms went on inside the Wesleyan Church, and two years later Dr.Russell Roberts castigated the Code in sarcastic terms:

I trust that huge windbag, called the 'New Code', may be pricked, never again to be inflated. This 'New Code' - our present Government system - virtually stamps the power to read, write and cypher - and that in a very elementary degree - as 'education'. No greater sham was ever foisted on the country... (88)

It has been well said, 'Reading, writing and arithmetic are no more 'education', than a knife and fork are a dinner; they are only the means to an end - not the end. (89)

Rigg increased his personal profile in educational circles further, when he continued the criticisms, with a motion proposed at the 13th Annual Meeting on behalf of Wesleyan Education in May 1867:

That the meeting, after a consideration of the results of the voluntary
educational efforts in the past, would deprecate any scheme, whether of
local rating or otherwise, which would endanger or compromise the
principles of religious education, and is of the opinion that every effort
should be made so to extend the present denominational system, as to
overtake the necessities of the country. (90)

The motion was carried and shows the continuing devotion of both Rigg and the
Wesleyan church to their denominational schools, at a time when arguments were
starting about more direct governmental influence in elementary education. He took up
the Principalship of the Westminster Training College in the following year, at the sudden
death of John Scott, and thereby became the primary, educational spokesman for the
Wesleyan Church.
CHAPTER TWO
2. The Wesleyans and the 1870 Education Act

Wise men are men both of the past and of the present; to such men only it is given to forecast and guide the future. No nation, no church, no great life, can afford to break with its past; or in fond sympathy with the past, to seclude itself from the present. It is given to every plant of God's planting to live in the present, no less than in the past. The Methodist Church must have its place and its vocation now, if it is to be a true and vital Church, no less than fifty years ago; the Methodist work of education must be a work of today and tomorrow, as well as of yesterday, if it is to be founded on true and permanent principles. (1)

Rigg spoke these words to Westminster students in his second Inaugural Address, on 11 February 1870 (six days before Forster presented his Education Bill to the Commons). He was emphasising the necessity of supporting the Wesleyan denominational schools as well as looking to the future, with a stress on secular instruction and state involvement. A year earlier, he had explained that the Wesleyans held two positions:

Whatever comes to pass...our schools are and must be schools of religion. We can disperse with the learning of the catechism if the parent requires it, but we cannot dispense with the Bible. The Bible must be read in them daily...so long as they are Wesleyan schools. We have no faith in education without religion—religion, we mean, as taught in the Holy Scriptures. Our teachers and our schools are denominational, but our religion is not denominational. It is Catholic; anyone may read it in the orthodox theologians of the Protestant Church. But State authority must not throw religion out of the schools, nor settle for us what religion we shall teach the children...We hold at the same time, that without true religion there can be no sound morality; and on the other hand, that to promote in combination with true religion, the intellectual advancement of the people, is to secure for the truths of religion, more effective operation and a wider sphere. (2)

Rigg's Inaugurals were most important. They were not intended merely for the students. They were often attended by noted educationalists as well as the Methodist hierarchy, and they were printed in full in the Wesleyan newspapers. Rigg himself prefaced his speech in 1869 with the comment that his address, 'though delivered to students present, is in reality also an address to the teachers of our Connexion.' On this account, he adds that he had felt bound to refer to 'some topics which would perhaps be more keenly appreciated by teachers...than by students, some of whom may just be entering the College.' (3) At this same meeting, Dr. John James emphasised the importance of Dr. Rigg. He proclaimed, amid cheers, that 'for accurate and varied
scholarship, for clear and penetrating insight, for philosophical breadth of culture and of
view, for the mastery of all the public bearings of the great question of education and
from a noble sympathy with all human progress, God had given them in Dr. Rigg the
right man in the right place.' (4)

It was at this time that W.E. Forster, Vice-President of Council, was planning a new
Education Act. He had spoken in early 1869 at St. James's Hall that he did not wish to
'destroy anything in the existing system which was good' but wanted to establish a
system that would embrace the whole of the country, and leave no children without a
chance of education, whilst at the same time making the best of the existing
machinery.' He presented a draft memorandum to the Cabinet on 21 October 1869. (5)
The Wesleyan Education Committee had already made contingency plans to define its
stance on any new proposals, as from 1868 the machinery was provided for the
Committee to summon the Wesleyan Committee of Privileges to join it at any time to
discuss any government legislation. Two hundred and fifty representatives of the joint
committees did in fact meet for a three day session from 30 November 1869, before the
bill was actually framed. (6)

What did the Methodists want from the forthcoming legislation? They did recognize
the need for schools to cover the country and Rigg himself recognized the deficiencies
of the existing system in 1868:

I know how very far indeed we are from being an educated people. I know
that, at this very day, at least a third - probably a larger proportion - of the
grown men and women of the working people of England are unable to
write their names. I know too that Methodists have lagged very far behind
in the work of day-school provision; that while we have 111,000 children in
our day-schools, we have 582,000 children in our Sunday schools... But
our progress has been encouraging. (7)

At the Annual Meeting on Education in May 1869 the Wesleyan Church resolved:

that this meeting, recognising the urgent demand for the extension of a
sound and Christian education among the children of the poor, deems it
especially important, at the present time, and with a view to permanent
educational development in our connexion, that Wesleyan Day schools
should be established wherever favourable openings can be found,
particularly in towns and thickly populated areas. (8)
However the Wesleyans did accept the impossibility of filling all the gaps with Wesleyan schools, but made it a prerequisite that there should be clear religious teaching in all schools which might be created by the State. At the meeting, the chairman, Isaac Hoyle, stressed the importance of schools to the Wesleyans as a body. He emphasised (in the manner reported in the WATCHMAN):

Next to preaching of the Gospel, nothing was so important as the education of the young. The question, 'What must I do to be saved?' must of course be the first, but after that every consideration should be given to education. The changes (thus brought about) were so gradual that they were not startled; and yet in a very few years, the face of society was quite altered. The children of today would in a few years be occupying the pulpits of our land; some engaged in literature and swaying public opinion; some would enter Parliament; some controlling commerce...they determined to educate their children morally, physically and intellectually, so as thoroughly to equip them for the battle of life...They, as Methodists...had higher work still; for Methodists had to spread scriptural holiness through the land and by the influence they wielded in Parliament, in town councils...

The rejection of a purely secular system of education was again emphasised by the Committee. If new schools were 'undenominational, in character, then they should not be unchristian'. Dr. James said that he:

rejoiced to believe that the advocates of a purely secular system of education were a very small minority and the great mass of the people believed that the greatest curse that could come upon the land would be the enthronement of the intellect without God in our public schools...they would never carry out the work of education unless religion were made the pervading element, infused into all teaching and brought to bear in all subjects...

Thomas Vasey claimed in November 1869 that:

no system of national education can answer the purpose intended by it, unless it combines the elements of secular and moral training, and it must be an integral part of education to teach the children their duty to God and their neighbour... I believe that the Methodist people have this question almost entirely in their hands...Bad as we Methodists are, there is not another educating body in the country that has so much religion in it. so much felt, experimental, vital godliness... I speak of the schools I have myself visited.... there is still a large amount of educational destitution. Let us admit that. It is a fact which cannot be denied. We see it everywhere. Can we not also say that before other measures are tried we think it desirable to attempt some extension of the existing arrangements?...Can we not say that for the Arab population on the streets...we hope the Government will devise some measures...but whatever you do, if you are going to deal with the Arabs of the street, don't offer them merely secular
The Annual Meeting of May 1870 continued the demand for Christian education, even in Board Schools which might be created:

The Methodist Connexion has during a quarter of a century unwaveringly resisted the proposals of those who have advocated a national system of exclusive secular education; that this Meeting cannot but still maintain that in order to be truly effective as a means of improving Christian civilisation, it is needful that public schemes of primary instruction should provide an education pervaded with a Christian spirit and founded on Christian revelation; that it is very important that, as far as possible, this principle should be recognised in the case of schools receiving aid from national funds; and above all, that this Meeting and the whole Methodist Connexion would resist with all their power, any proposal to exclude by law the Bible or Christian instruction from the elementary public schools of the Nation. (12)

There was however the negative motivation on the part of the Wesleyans. There was a strong fear among Wesleyans of both Roman Catholicism and of Anglicanism. They wanted to limit any further expansion in Anglican schools, which their children might be forced to attend. Rigg went so far as to propose that all building grants to the denominations should cease, as they were too great an encouragement to the Anglican Church to build sectarian schools. More and more Methodists were seeing State schools as the solution to their mistrust of proselytizing schoolmasters poaching their young. Some, such as William Arthur, believed that State schools should supplant the existing denominational schools, not simply supplement them. He believed the opportunity to diminish Anglican influence in education should not be wasted. In a letter to Rigg on 23 October, 1869 he condemned the denominational system as 'friendly to Popery and to High Churchism, and shuts up Methodism to certain localities. If perpetuated it will destroy our agricultural circuits, and will proportionally train the agricultural population to anti-Protestant feeling'. He recommended secular schools for all, with compulsory Bible reading and separate religious teaching by denominational ministers at set times. This would, 'open to our influence schools wherever we have ministers. It would effectively baulk Tractarian and Romish claims...It would relieve us of heavy financial claims...to go in for 'supplementing the denominational system'... is not only short-sighted, but a public wrong.' (13)
The strength of anti-Anglicanism in determining Wesleyan Education policy is reflected in an editorial in the WATCHMAN of 25 May 1870, which commented:

No education measure, says the organ of the Conference, will be trusted by the Methodist people unless it provides a remedy for clerical influence ... Messieurs le clergy! This is what your bigotry, your assumptions, your Sacramentalism, have brought your old friends and allies, the Wesleyans, to. (14)

The fear of Roman Catholicism is visible throughout the pages of the WATCHMAN. Dr. John James at the 1869 Annual Meeting clearly showed some of the prevailing Wesleyan fear, when he commented that he was 'not so great an alarmist as some of his friends, who seemed to think that the Pope would soon come and eat us all up.' (15)

One Day-school teacher on 2 February 1870, for example, complains of the superstition and symbolism of Popery, which endangers education. The Rev. Holland, a noted anti-Catholic, saw the continuation of any denominational schools as a disaster. In a speech at Bilston, he asked, if, for the sake of a few paltry day-schools, they were prepared to hand over millions of money and millions of children to the Church of England, 'to be by that church in too many instances prepared for ultimate adhesion to the Church of Rome? ... A denominational system would be helpful to Popery... ' (16)

The President of Conference, Dr. Jobson spoke to the Wesleyan Annual Meeting on education in 1870:

They could not move along in the streets without seeing signs and badges of Popery - priests and Sisters of Mercy, and nurses for the sick... This was not confined to formal and professional Popery; they had it in the Anglican Church, to an extent that was abhorrent and discouraging; for Protestants had to support and pay those who were openly corrupting and misleading the youth of the land. (17)

The religious controversy intensified in 1869, with Gladstone's Irish Disestablishment Bill, and particularly the compensation offered to the Roman Catholic Maynooth College at the cessation of public grants. The WATCHMAN in an editorial of 7 July deplored the continuing financial support to 'Popery' which was said to be 'marching forward without one faltering step' and overflowing like a deluge. The paper went on: 'Its most vigorous opponents are nearly silent... As for the Church of England, its finest qualities are neutralised by the infusion of infidelity, false doctrine and a superstition,
which gains strength from day to day...The popular breath is well-nigh spent and gone with declaiming against Ritualism, but thus left untouched dogmatic Popery, which is the root and life of Ritualism...Real, thorough, undisguised Popery has the advantage of it all...Its churches, colleges, convents multiply around us.' (18) William Arthur claimed that 'Methodism has a great work before it as the antagonist of Romanism' (19) and the then President of Conference, Frederick Jobson, also protested at further grants to the Roman Catholics.

Rigg's own views do seem rather more moderate in tone. In a letter to Gladstone on 30 June 1869, he commented;

Perhaps it may be of some importance to you to know that the Methodists will next week follow the example of the Liberation Society. If I do not myself attend the Protestant meeting of the Dissenters against the Maynooth on Friday, the sole reason will be that I do not stand theoretically on the platform of the Liberation Society. The agitation that is about to be awakened will be most deep and earnest and will be sustained by all Nonconformist denominations. The Maynooth arrangement has been endured with great difficulty. Some of us have been able to restrain our people on the strength of general equity, equity as between the Romanists and Presbyterians. But now the Connexion is prepared to rise en mass.

He comments that he does not accept the principle of pure and universal voluntaryism. (20) In an article in the LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW of January 1870, he emphasises the anti-Catholic element in Wesleyan thinking, of which he did not totally approve:

Protestants of all denominations recoil from sustaining a system by means of which Roman Catholic day-schools, in fulness of superstitious symbol and dogma are to an extent supported out of national revenues. We cannot but admit that there is much to be said against the system... (But) it must not be forgotten... that if Roman Catholics receive a share of public money for educational purposes, they also pay their share of the national taxes, and still further, that a child educated in an inspected school can hardly fail to grow up less superstitious, less entirely at the mercy of his priest, and more valuable to society, than one left uneducated... an education in an efficient secular school would be much better for a Romanist child on his own account and on the nation's than in a Roman Catholic school. The priest may be trusted to keep his young people pretty well instructed in his and their religion and they may easily have an overdose of it. But then we must not violate the principles of religious liberty, even to antagonize the Roman priesthood. It was a strong temptation to the Pope to take away the Jewish child from his parents... yet the world
cried shame upon him and his bigoted faith. So it is a strong temptation to us to force Roman Catholic children into undenominational schools. But we must ask if we have any right to do this, whether without the Bible... or with the Bible (21)

On the specific issue of Ireland, Rigg wrote:

We have no right to refuse to Ireland the same consideration in all respects which is granted to England on any such ground merely as that the nation is Romanist. Roman Catholics who pay taxes like others, and constitute the bulk of a nation, have a title to be treated with equal civil justice. In such matters as national education for Ireland we cannot legislate as Protestants, on theological grounds. But we are bound to legislate as Englishmen, as citizens of a free commonwealth; and as such, we have not merely a right, we are bound, to separate equitable Roman Catholic claims from Ultramontane pretensions, and to refuse absolutely to give up the education of the people into the hands of the priesthood. (22)

This meant, for Rigg, refusing to allow sectarian symbols in 'national' buildings. He concluded: 'There is a Roman Catholicism which is common to the Western Church called Catholic; and there is a Roman Catholicism which is merely Papal. There is a national 'Catholicism' and a Catholic nationalism, which we are bound to respect...As Englishmen we cannot refuse civil and educational rights to our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects. But we have a right to resent and spurn the dictation of a Cullen.' (23)

The Rev. Thomas Vasey, who was so much admired by Rigg in his educational thinking, expressed a similar viewpoint at the first special meeting of the United Committees on Education on 30 November 1869:

It has been said that the Clergy are animated by sectarian motives, and that their object is to build up Church influence. I must say that I would have liked to have seen a grain more of charity in the strictures that have been passed in these respects. For my part, I am not so much afraid of the action of the High Church party in our day-schools as some people are. I believe that the Clergy are not able to indoctrinate the minds of the children with their peculiar views. A great deal of the error which they wish to teach is put into such form that it is not accessible to the juvenile mind...

But, granting that there are many schools in which there is a strong clerical and proselytising influence, are we, for the sake of those schools, to alter our whole system? When I look at all these things together, I tell you plainly that rather than shut up the poor children of this country to mere secular instruction, I will accept High Church teaching - nay, more, I will accept Roman Catholic teaching in these schools. (Cries of 'No, No' and 'Hear, hear')...’What is the theological teaching, or what are the
dogmas taught in High Church schools and Roman Catholic schools? Are they not in the main such dogmas as we ourselves would teach, and which form the basis of a proper national education? To begin with, there is the dogma of a Creator. Are we not all agreed about that? I should like to ask whether Professor Huxley is prepared to tell any child who made him? The only answer which he would be prepared to give would be - 'Protoplasm!'...Again, the Roman Catholics teach that there is a moral Governor, that is a doctrine taught in all schools of religious bodies, and it is something which every child ought to know...Again, we are all agreed on the doctrine of Retribution... (to inculcate moral duties)... It is well known that I am a strong Protestant, in fact, an Orangeman. Nevertheless, when the Earl of Arundel said the other day, 'I don't appear here as a Roman Catholic, I appear here on the common ground of Christianity, and I appeal to you as Christians, that you will not divorce the religious element from the education of the country' I felt a brotherly feeling towards him. You perceive that I am taking the worst view of the question before us, and I say that even in the case of the Roman Catholic schools there are three things taught there which we have in common. But further: I believe we are all agreed that when a man can't get on by his own strength when he is struggling to do right, he can get help from heaven...The Roman Catholic teaches that also. He teaches a child to pray. If you go farther than that, of course, I part company with the Roman Catholic... I repeat it, if I am driven to the alternative of sending a child to a Roman Catholic or a secular school, I wouldn't hesitate a minute; I should prefer the first to a bare, dry, miserable system of secular education, which would be made obligatory upon the children of the working classes, while it would not be obligatory upon the children of the higher classes. (24)

At the 1870 Annual Meeting, he commented that some people were dreadfully afraid of the Roman Catholics having anything to do with education, but his own opinion was that when Catholics had educated even their own children, if they only taught them reading and writing, they had 'half spoiled them for being Catholics, for they could not take up a penny paper without reading something against Popery and there was a certain amount of intelligence which was always unfavourable to a blind adhesion to...such an erroneous system as they believed that of the Roman Catholics to be.' (25)

A second desire of Wesleyans in 1869 which was directly associated with their fear of Anglicanism and Roman Catholicism was for an effective Conscience Clause. The Methodist's own 'educational constitution' (indeed every one of their school deeds) emphasised the freedom of conscience of its pupils. Children of other denominations were admitted to Wesleyan elementary schools and they were not compelled to attend Wesleyan Sunday Schools or to learn any Wesleyan catechism, if their parents objected. They wanted a similar freedom to be guaranteed to their own children in
Anglican schools. The Wesleyan Education Committee had complained on a number of occasions of the lack of such liberality in the schools of other denominations, especially as their children were often forced to attend such schools because of the want of a Wesleyan school in a village. The Minutes of Council of 1839-40 had demanded a conscience clause as part of the constitution of all new schools. However there had been severe abuses of this, to the detriment of Wesleyan children. The W.E.C Report of 1865 complained of the lack of toleration in National schools, which had not been required to accept a Conscience Clause in the Minutes of Council of 1840. The National Society had argued that the clause was unnecessary for the protection of Dissenters and that it was quite safe to leave the admission of their children to the Church school... 'to the mild, tolerant and enlightened discretion of the Clergyman.' But the Wesleyans pointed to the aggressive attitude of Archdeacon Denison, shown in his words to Sir John Pakington's Committee:

My rule, which I observe strictly, and always shall observe, with regard to all schools in my hands, is, that I do not admit any child to a school unless that child has been baptized in the Church of England; and therefore, those children, unless their parents are prepared to bring them to baptism in the Church of England, would not be admitted into my school. (26)

The Rev. Dr. Temple's evidence to the same Committee pointed out that this view was not unusual:

Quest.8188 - Have you ever considered the operation of the Conscience Clause, or its necessity in parish schools?

Ans.- I should have said that you have no security for justice in parishes where there is only one school; and where, from the nature of the case, there can be only one school, unless the Conscience Clause be made for such parishes universal. I am sure that there is a great deal of injustice now, of which you know and hear nothing, and of which the Government and the House of Commons are not the least aware, because the people who suffer from it are not of the rank whose complaints would reach you.

Quest.8189 - What sort of injustice do you allude to?

Ans. - I mean that in many cases parents have no other school to which they can send their children; and they are obliged therefore to have them taught what they disapprove. But in many cases, also, they suffer an injustice which they feel very much more keenly, in that they are required to send their children to Church, instead of taking them where they are in the habit of going themselves, namely to the Dissenting Chapel.

Quest.8190 - Have you ever known children excluded from schools on account of their religious belief?
Ans. - Yes, very often

Quest.8192 - You think that the prevailing opinion, that in practice the clergy act on the principle of the Conscience Clause, is not well founded?

Ans. - I think that the majority of the clergy act on the principle of the Conscience Clause; but I think that there is a very considerable minority that do not. (27)

The W.E.C.concluded that the conduct of the Clergy did not warrant the confidence which they claimed to act benevolently towards Dissenting children, and it quoted a letter from the Secretary of the Committee of Council to the National Society of 27 November 1863: 'If the Dissenter's position is one of injustice, it ought not to remain a matter of private discretion whether or not he shall be placed in it.' (28) The position had become even worse, as the Committee of Council had declared that, where the number of children of school age in a parish was less than one hundred and fifty, two schools could not be efficiently supported with a Government building grant. It proposed: 'In such cases therefore, the Council Office aims to establish the practice of aiding the school belonging to the dominant sect (in most cases the Established Church). Bruce, the Vice-President of Council, did tell the Pakington Committee that there would be a loose conscience clause:

Where the number is a large number, such as 140, and it is proved that the parents of many of the children are Dissenters, I should not, in that case, consider it right to make a grant to the school in connection with the National Society, without taking proper security for the religious convictions of that minority; but where the number of children was sixty and one seventh of them only were Dissenters, the number would be so small,that I should not think it necessary to insist on a Conscience Clause.

However, the W.E.C. called for a strong clause, which was applicable for the yearly Government grant, as well as the initial building grant. The W.E.C. in particular objected to the requirement for children to attend Anglican Sunday schools: ' even the compulsory teaching of the Church Catechism is not felt to be...so serious a grievance.' (29) Archbishop Dennison showed the extreme view of the 'Church' party in the 1850s, when he commented:

Under no circumstances whatsoever could I consent to admit a single child to a school of which I have the control and management, without insisting most positively and strictly, on the learning of the catechism and on attendance at church on Sunday. (30)
The 15th Annual Meeting in May 1869 condemned those who 'demand religious instruction without regard to liberty' and the WATCHMAN of the same month demanded that:

In any state-aided school, a poor child ought to be able to read, write and cypher in peace, without being dragged away, at the dictation of a clerical bigot, from the Sunday school to which he belongs and which his parents prefer. (31)

The criticism intensified in July with the WATCHMAN claiming: 'an organised conspiracy has been at work throughout the country, by means of the National schools, to extinguish Dissenting and especially Methodist Sunday schools and to infuse into the minds of the children of Nonconformists, in their tenderest years, the pernicious leaven of the High Church, that is, of essentially Popish, principles.' (32)

The prospect of legislation allowed the Wesleyans to redress their grievances. At the 1869 Preparatory Meeting on education, before the Methodist Conference, Rigg read a letter complaining of the coercive methods adopted by some of the denominational schools to force Wesleyan children to attend Anglican Sunday schools. He told delegates that he had made official complaint to the Council Department, both by letter and in person. He was told that the Government's hands were greatly strengthened by such complaints and that they might be compelled to make the payment of Government grants, 'year by year directly on the condition of a conscience clause'. In the discussions, Rigg made a powerful speech, deploring the attitude of Dr. Osborn, who had wanted a moderate and conciliatory policy towards the National Society in order to obtain a conscience clause. Rigg commented:

Anyone who read the correspondence between the Government and National Society in the years 1846 and 1847 must come to the conclusion that the National Society was very much in the wrong, unless they happened to belong to that section of intolerants who had sustained the National Society in the views it held on the subject. He could not conceive any reasoning more dignified, more effective, more conclusive from the point of view of a Protestant and one who recognised the rights of conscience, than the arguments brought forward by the Government and urged in vain on the authorities of the National Society in a most protracted correspondence. (33)

He condemned the intolerant and exclusive system and demanded that if a school
received state grants, they had to be subject to government restrictions.

The fact that the Church of England professed to be Protestant put it in a different category from the Roman Catholics. But the authorities in Roman Catholic schools declare that in this country, they were prepared upon a principle of a conscience clause. It might be that their bishops would object to a conscience clause, but it must be insisted upon. After all there were men among the Roman Catholics in England who knew what English liberty meant... Practically, Dr. Osborn said, petition but don't insist. Ask the Government to get it for you, but do not be prepared to stand for it as your right. He asserted that they had to stand firm and said that he knew and felt at liberty to say that the Government did not regard the matter either as impracticable or unfair, but most fair and most righteous... (34)

Rigg's words carried the Preparatory Committee with him and his idea was carried unanimously, with even Osborn accepting his view.

The Wesleyan Conference itself moved a resolution in 1869 regretting that country clergymen were refusing to admit Wesleyan children unless they attended Anglican Sunday Schools and calling for the enforcement of 'an adequate conscience clause' in all schools receiving Parliamentary grants to protect their people (35)

Rigg himself wrote in the LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW in January 1870:

the strong Dissenter dislikes... a system in which the Anglican clergy hold so predominant a position; this last feeling has been greatly aggravated and the feelings of the Methodist body in particular have been kindled into indignation, by the numerous instances of clerical oppression in the management of schools and especially by the enforcement of a rule requiring children who go to the National day-school to attend the Church Sunday School. (36)

The Wesleyans were not as united in their view of compulsion. Rigg told the Manchester Educational Congress on 4 November 1869 that he believed a law for DIRECT compulsion would be impractical, although personally he had no 'sort of objection to the law or its enforcement.' It would have to be imposed on all classes, including the higher classes, who would resist such a measure, and he saw the inducement of child labour to be so great that no realistic fine could be imposed as a deterrent. No English magistrate would be prepared to impose such a huge fine for non-attendance at school as would, 'bear any proportion to the inducement perpetually operative day by day to violate the law.' (37) He also doubted that magistrates would be
prepared to imprison parents for not paying fines. He did claim that practical compulsion was a desirable end, but this would be better achieved with indirect legislation. (38) He wrote later that: 'we agree with an overwhelming preponderance of opinion on the part of experienced educationists in thinking that the principles of the Factory...and the Workshops' Regulations Acts should be extended to all classes of children, whether in towns or in country parishes; and that these Acts should be made thoroughly effective; and that in addition, no child or young person should be allowed to go to work, either for half time or full time, without having passed an appropriate examination before the H.M.I.' (39) He complained that the greatest weakness in educational provision was not that children did not go to school, but that they did not go with sufficient regularity. (40) This he claimed was the 'master-evil'.

However, he took pains to dissociate himself from the stance of the National Education League, which claimed that compulsion would necessitate a universal system of secular schools. Some parents would find it oppressive to be compelled to send their children to secular schools. 'A secular school is as sectional and objectionable, if it is to be forced upon a population by State authority, as a denominational school' (41) He therefore saw a need for both types of school, denominational and secular, to exist, with parents given the right to choose the place of the child's education, but without the option of non-attendance. He also condemned the League's platform of free education as a humiliation for working men. 'Decent working men will not send their children to a free school as long as there is a suitable school charging moderate fees to which they can send them.' (42) He admitted that the very poorest in society would have to be helped. As might be expected from Rigg, there was a very practical argument against free schools:

> It can never be proper that the whole charge of the schools...should fall as a rate upon the eighty or ninety millions of rateable annual value and not against the 600 millions of personal income distributed throughout all classes of the nation. (43)

The proposals put forward by W.E.Forster to the Commons on 17 February, 1870 certainly satisfied many of the demands of the Wesleyan Church. There would be a Conscience Clause for all schools, which allowed children to be withdrawn from religious teaching. Forster himself commented that the number of abuses in the system
were not large, but he said: 'I cannot deny that there is practical evil, for I found in my department more of it than I expected. I have found but very few cases of undue interference when compared with the enormous number of schools, but I have heard of instances...in which clergymen, from mistaken zeal, have endeavoured to oblige children to attend Sunday School, even when their parents objected.' (44) The influence of vicars was to be curtailed, reflecting again the Wesleyan demands. The chief Wesleyan criticisms of Forster's proposals stemmed from his proposal to allow school boards to determine the religious teaching in their schools, or indeed whether to have purely secular education. There would therefore be no restriction on religious catechisms, and worse for many Methodists the prospect of no religious or moral education whatsoever, in some board schools. The original Bill also proposed that school boards should be chosen by town councils in the boroughs and by vestries in the parishes, and there were immediate objections to the latter, as it would give the Church of England undue influence on rural school boards.

In May 1870 the Wesleyan Special Committee met again, in a four day session to discuss the actual bill presented to Parliament. Before this met, Rigg saw the prospect of a schism in the Wesleyan ranks over the terms of the Education Act. He wrote a letter to the WATCHMAN on 3 May 1870, calling for calm:

Nonconformists, taught by the experience of centuries, should beware of the spirit in which they push their controversies, even when they have been greatly wronged, and should not pursue their triumph too far. A generous moderation will be their wisdom and safety... The difference between Methodist supporters of the Bill and the majority of Methodist opponents of the bill seem to be this. The first party says, 'This is a well conceived bill and mainly founded on right principles; but such and such amendments are imperatively necessary.' The second party says, 'This bill will never do; it wants altering in such and such a manner.' But when we come to compare, the alteration insisted on by the second party are almost identical with the amendments insisted by the first. Let the alterations be made. It will be of little account whether with the first party, the bill is said to have been amended; or with the second, to have been transformed into a new one. (45)

At the opening of the meeting of the United Committees on 10 May 1870, the President of the Conference, Dr. Frederick Jobson succinctly portrayed the Wesleyan view. He believed that they were all 'wishful to guard against Popery on the one hand and
Rationalism on the other hand' but in general the Government Bill had been received with considerable favour. (46) The meeting was dominated by Rigg. He proposed all except one of the resolutions of the committee. His proposal to exclude all denominational formularies from new board schools was accepted almost unanimously, as was his own proposal that H.M.Is should not have the right to examine religious instruction. There was some opposition to his call for religious instruction to be allowed in the board schools, as some of his brethren believed this would be a great advantage to the Anglican Church. Pocock complained that if religious instruction were permitted at all by far the greater portion of this would become denominational and, he feared ritualistic, even though the religious formularies might be excluded. Rigg's friend, William Arthur also spoke strongly against Papist influence, deploring, in the process, the Maynooth grant and the £33,000 a year given to Roman Catholic schools. Nevertheless, Rigg's views were accepted overwhelmingly. He proposed that no clergymen should be given influence on the school boards or in the classrooms, although this proposal was modified to forbidding clergymen to give instruction and was accepted unanimously. He spoke against and blocked a motion to make religious instruction in denominational schools the same as board schools, and it was Rigg who proposed the Conscience Clause, pointing out that the bill required parents to object in writing to school managers, and that the words 'in writing' should be deleted, as it was too burdensome and might dissuade some parents from making justified objections. A similar criticism was made of the stipulation that objections had to be on 'religious grounds'. He also proposed a resolution on the question of compulsory attendance, to the effect that the bill was defective for the general provision for enforcing education throughout the country 'whether by direct or indirect legislation' and in particular 'that the regulations respecting the attendance at school are not sufficiently searching and stringent to secure the education of pauper and neglected children.' This was similarly accepted unanimously by the 250 members.

There was only one proposal, which Rigg did not originate at the meeting. William Arthur proposed that: 'While denominational schools shall retain all rights which they have acquired under past legislation, it is not desirable that, in any new legislation, any
measure shall be taken for the further extension of the denominational system.' Rigg did not totally agree with his old friend, and called on them not to give up the Wesleyan schools. A compromise was reached in the form of an amendment of William McArthur: 'that this meeting is of the opinion that the existing denominational schools should not be interfered with, except so far as requiring the adoption of a satisfactory Conscience clause; but that in the case of all rate aided schools denominational formularies should be excluded; and that from the time at which the Act shall come into operation, the present system of building grants from the Education Department should be discontinued.' There would therefore be no year of grace for the denominations to take advantage of building grants to fill the gaps in educational provision themselves. It was clearly thought that this would be too great an advantage to the Anglicans, who had far greater resources and did not have to finance their own clergy. Rigg later recalled that the Wesleyans were the first body to formulate distinctly this demand, as well as the above demand that the 'function of government in the oversight and government of schools should be limited to testing purely secular results.' (47) Rigg did second this amendment, which was again carried by the meeting. Finally, there were calls for school boards to be elected directly by ratepayers, and all influence by vestries should be dissipated. It was therefore clearly Rigg's achievement that there was no split in the official Methodist ranks and he wrote to the WATCHMAN on 10 May of his satisfaction. (48)

The Special Committee therefore put forward a list of sixteen Resolutions, on their reactions to the bill. The WATCHMAN published these Resolutions immediately after the meeting:

1. That a School Board should be formed for every district in the country
2. That such School Boards should be formed immediately on the New Act coming into force
3. That it is essential to the well working of the Bill that wherever the population of a School District would be less than 7000, the principle of grouping Districts recognised by the Bill should be put into operation.
4. That the election of School Boards, whether in Boroughs or Parishes, should be by
the ratepayers, each ratepayer having only one vote for each candidate.
(This would avoid the block voting by Anglican vestries and municipal corporations.)
5. That in schools created under a School Board, which may be called School Board
Schools proper, no denominational formularies (such as creed or catechism) ought to
be permitted by law to be taught or used; but that no bye-laws of the School Board
should prohibit reading out of the Scriptures, or instruction out of the Scriptures by the
teacher.
6. That in the School Board Schools proper, no person whatever except the school
teacher should give instruction in religion
7. That no bye-law of any School Board affecting religious instruction should have force
unless it receive the sanction of the Education Department
8. That in any enquiry as to educational deficiency to be made under the Bill, no school
should be considered to give efficient instruction which does not offer education on
conditions fair and equal to all and accept the Conscience Clause to be presented in
the Act
9. That the existing denominational schools should not be interfered with, except so far
as to require the adoption of a satisfactory Conscience Clause; but that in the case of
all rate-aided schools denominational formularies should be excluded; and that from
the time
at which the Act shall come into operation, the present system of Building grants from
the Education Department should be discontinued
10. That no clergyman, priest, member of any religious order, or Minister of any
religious denomination should be eligible to be appointed school teacher in any public
elementary school
11. That under no circumstances should her Majesty's Inspectors examine scholars in
any public elementary school in Religious Knowledge
12. That the third section of Clause 7 should be amended so as to read: 'That no scholar
should be required, as a condition of being admitted into, or of attending, or of enjoying
the benefits of the school, to attend, or to abstain from attending any Sunday School, or
any place of worship, or to learn any such catechism or religious formulary, or to be
present at any such lesson, or instruction, or observance, as may have been objected to by the parents of the scholar, making known his objection to the managers or principal teacher of the school (49)

(The original Bill concluded with the phrase: 'as may have been objected to on religious grounds by the parent of the scholar, sending his objection in writing to the managers or principal teacher of the school.') (50)

13. That the Bill is defective in regard to the general provision, whether by direct or indirect legislation, necessary for enforcing education throughout the country; and in particular, that the specific provisions of the Bill are not sufficiently searching or stringent to secure the education of pauper and neglected children

14. That considering the provision of Clause 7, Sect.2, in connection with Clause 83...
The Committee would have been prepared to offer strong objections to these... but for the existence of a general understanding that these Regulations would undergo a complete revision (51)

(Clause 83 of the original Bill reads: 'The conditions required to be fulfilled by an elementary school in order to obtain an annual parliamentary grant shall be those contained in the minutes of the Education Department in force for the time being, but such conditions shall not require that the school shall be in connection with a religious denomination or that religious instruction shall be given in the school.') (52)

15. That Clause 21 of the Bill should be amended. That the first paragraph should read thus: 'The trustees, or where there are no trustees the managers, of any elementary school in the district of a school board, acting in such manner and with such consent, if any, as is defined by the instrument declaring the trusts may, with the consent of the Education Department, make an arrangement with the School Board for transferring their school to the Board and the School Board may assent to such an arrangement.' That the fourth paragraph should read thus: 'In cases where there are no Trustees, the Managers may convey to the school board the whole interest in the school house and endowment, or such smaller interest as may be required under the arrangement.'
16. That Clause 87 of the Bill should be omitted. (53)

(This clause in the Bill reads: 'The managers of every elementary school shall have power to fulfil the conditions required in pursuance of the Act, to be fulfilled in order to obtain a parliamentary grant, notwithstanding any provision contained in any instrument regulating the trusts or management of their schools and apply such grant accordingly) (54)

The negative stipulations in Resolution 5, that Scripture instruction should not be prohibited, while not calling for its compulsion, gave the impetus to individual teachers to teach from the Bible as they saw fit. It clearly avoided conflict with the 'secularists', some in the Wesleyan Church, who suspected denominational indoctrination. It also reflected Rigg's own conception of, and confidence in, the teaching profession as a moralising and evangelising body of people. He had written ten years before:

> The work to be done in this country is, in fact, pre-eminently Christian and missionary work; the men and women that are to do it effectually need to be a religious order... only a Christian teacher who cleaves to his vocation from motives far higher than any that are merely secular and selfish, can do all this...The work of education that England needs at this day, in order that she may possess a common people, intellectual, industrious, frugal and moral, can only be accomplished by means of teachers themselves, Christianly trained. (55)

He told Westminster students, shortly before the meeting of the United Committees that their highest power in teaching was their Christian principle. (56) He concluded that they had:

> pre-eminently and peculiarly a religious vocation. Your greatest desire should be to be successful in imparting the principles of a Christian education and discipline, under the influence of the Holy Spirit. Hence it has for thirty years been one of the rules of our Connexion, a rule which will never grow obsolete, that every candidate trained for teaching in Methodist schools 'must be of a decidedly religious character.' (57)

The influence of Methodist teachers certainly went wider than the Wesleyan denominational schools, as many were to take up posts in State schools, after their creation.

A deputation, under Rigg and the President of Conference Dr. Jobson, was authorised to put the resolutions of the United Committees to Gladstone, whom they met on 25
May. Rigg was the primary, though not the sole spokesman here. Dr. Jobson began by assuring Gladstone that the Wesleyans did not oppose the main principles of the bill. 'They believed it to be a truly honest endeavour to meet the educational wants of the country... and they appreciated the fair and generous spirit which dictated it.' The first question which Gladstone asked was whether they intended the Scriptures to be read in school, at which Jobson maintained that it should not be prohibited. It was Rigg who gave the full interpretation that there had been a 'prevailing idea' in society, that 'in order to make a system of education generally acceptable, it was desirable a priori to exclude the Bible; this they thought to be wrong and no board ought to be at liberty to lay down bye-laws' to exclude the Scriptures. Gladstone also agreed with Rigg that in Board elections, there should be one vote for each ratepayer, without any cumulative vote based on property. (58) When Lord Frederick Cavendish brought his proposal in Parliament for direct elections by cumulative vote, the Government accepted it. It was adopted by the Commons without a discussion and was welcomed by Nonconformists, enabling them to obtain representation for their views on local boards.

Rigg later recalled that one of their primary demands before Gladstone was that building grants to denominational schools should immediately come to an end. They had obviously been an advantage to the Anglican Church and again reflect the anti-Anglican motivation in the Wesleyan educational policy. (59) On the Conscience Clause, he recalled that they took up a very bold position that, 'no school which did not to the fullest extent accept a satisfactory (clause) should have any standing at all as a public elementary school.' (60) He told the Prime Minister that they were all of one mind that the words (in the bill) 'on religious grounds' and 'in writing' should be expunged. He admitted that they were divided on the Timetable Conscience Clause.

Finally Rigg called on newly created rate-aided quasi-denominational schools to allow no Catechism or religious formulary of any kind. The Bill in its original form would have given boards the option of aiding voluntary schools out of the rates, to meet the deficiencies in an area, rather than building schools themselves. The conversation went on:

(Mr. Gladstone) In order to secure undenominational character, you are satisfied that the Scriptures should be used, but no further? (Perfectly) You forbid the Catechism but you do not ask for further legislation, respecting the use of Scriptures?
Rigg went on to comment that they had left a very wide distinction between the new rate-aided schools and the board schools. 'The rate-aided schools would be denominational in committee, in government, in respect of their teacher, and of minister, and the connection of the day-school with the Sunday School. The Sacrifice of the Catechism seemed to be the smallest concession which the denomination could make...' T.P. Bunting admitted that it would bear heavily on the Church of England, but as an ex-President of the Wesleyan Church, John Bedford, concluded, 'the general mood of the country had to be considered... and many ministers and members of the Church of England would not object to the proposal.' (62)

The Wesleyan deputation undoubtedly had influence on Gladstone, although this influence has to be ranged alongside that of other deputations on the same day, from Nonconformist M.P.s, Public School Headmasters and even from 'miscellaneous worthies' (63) Gladstone was later also lobbied by Congregationalists and more extreme Nonconformists, such as Edward Miall, the creator of the Liberation Society. On 29 May, the Prime Minister wrote a long memorandum to Granville and other ministers, which reiterated the aforementioned Nonconformist views.

Some churchmen and many Nonconformists are at present averse to this plan (i.e. that no religious instruction should be paid for by the rates) as savouring too much of secularism and think that the rate may be applied to the use of the Holy Scriptures in the schools, all creeds and formularies remaining excluded. This concord of opinion appears to be due to a great anxiety to maintain a direct connection between religion and popular education. (64)

He also comments that the Church of England was being required to surrender its catechisms, while the Wesleyans were the only Nonconformist body which actually had a catechism to surrender in compromise. Other Nonconformists had no such surrenders to make, and the compromises therefore appeared rather unfair. He personally felt that the best solution was a restriction to purely secular teaching - a course he again recommended to Forster on 8 June (65) and to Sir G. Grey on 10 June. (66)

Nevertheless, in the Cabinet of 14 June, he did accept the Cowper-Temple Clause.
excluding religious formularies. He later wrote to Lord Granville on 14 June 1874, 'I have never made greater personal concessions of opinion than I did on the Education Bill to the united representations of Ripon and Forster.' (67) He in fact salved his own conscience and appeased the denominational schools somewhat by doubling the state grant to those voluntary schools which accepted inspection and were pronounced satisfactory. This measure brought further objections from the Wesleyans as yet another encouragement to Anglican schools.

The government concessions were obviously unknown to the Wesleyan Sub-Committee on Education, which organised a printed petition to be sent to every Member of Parliament, and to the officials in the Education Department, as well as being presented formally to the Commons by the Methodist M.P., William McArthur, on 20 June. This demanded further amendments - that ratepayers should have only one vote in board elections; that in board schools no religious formularies should be used; that no bye-law should be allowed which prohibited Bible instruction, provided such was given only by the teachers; that refusal to accept a conscience Clause would render a school educationally deficient; that building grants should cease immediately that the Act came into force, and that no priest or clergyman should be eligible to be a school teacher. (68)

Gladstone had in fact made many concessions to Nonconformist feelings. In his speech of 24 June, he introduced his new proposals on the Conscience Clause:

The intention of the Government is that a liberal arrangement shall be made so far as regards the great Nonconforming bodies in this country. I have called it a compromise; but it is one which undoubtedly the Church of England, with the free assent of its members, with the grudging or at least reluctant assent of many more, and with the positive disapproval of a large proportion, has surrendered its existing formularies, without exacting any corresponding concessions from the Nonconformist body...the nonconformists have no formularies and therefore none to abandon... (The Church) has abandoned the system of denominational inspection, by which they set great store and they have agreed to a conscience clause long contested. (69)

He courted favour with the Nonconformists by recognising the unfairness of earlier educational proposals and by pointing out that in the new bill, as amended, 'there is no such recognition of the Church now proposed.' The proposal to allow boards to create
rate-aided quasi-denominational schools was withdrawn. He also announced that building grants to Voluntary Schools would cease:

The building of schools is the easiest of all the efforts made by the promoters. Their great difficulty is the maintenance of the schools; and when we give liberal assistance to the maintenance, I think we may fairly leave to the locality the cost of the building. (70)

He did soften the blow, by continuing building grants for new schools for which plans were submitted before the end of 1870.

Rigg contacted Gladstone again on 22 June 1870, by letter, explaining the Wesleyan view on the plans which the Prime Minister had that week laid before Parliament. Gladstone replied on 25 June: 'I read (your letter) with great interest, and found it conceived in the practical and conciliatory spirit which I should have expected from you. I do not know how far anything said by me yesterday may have tended to allay your apprehensions...' He invited Rigg to a breakfast meeting on 7 July to discuss the matter. Rigg does seem to have made a favourable impression on the Prime Minister. He later commented after a committee at the Commons on National Education:

...the Rev. Dr. Rigg, Principal of Westminster Training College...is one of the ablest men I have met on committee; and when he has spoken on the subject of Education there is no need for any other person to speak on the same side. He presents the question in such a clear, convincing and reasonable manner as to carry conviction to every mind. (71)

Rigg was also in close contact with W.E. Forster, who was formulating the bill. They were in constant correspondence with each other and had various interviews on the subject. Unfortunately the majority of Forster's papers were destroyed on his own instructions at his death and evidence of their discussions is limited. He did secure Rigg a place in the Commons in 1869, for the debate on Irish Disestablishment. (72) Rigg's son-in-law also refers to another letter from Forster to Rigg which says intriguingly: 'Thankyou for your note. It confirms my conviction that the Church have to thank solely their Ritualists for any hostility from the Wesleyans'. (73). Forster's wife was to write to Rigg, after her husband's death: 'I remember well how warmly you assisted him in the great struggle for the Education Act, and how valuable your support to it then was.' (74) Rigg, in a speech of 1896, also recalled that Forster had talked over the matter of time-table Conscience Clauses with him and even asked him to draw up a
Conscience Clause, and see what was to be learned from the Irish Conscience Clause. (75)

The Wesleyans were in general satisfied with the final Act. The WATCHMAN of 29 June 1870 could comment that, 'It may be fairly said that the suggestions of our own committees have borne a larger share in modifying the Government measure in a liberal direction than any others submitted to the Government. Arrangements have been made by which every suggestion of the committees, which has not already been conceded will be brought before the House in the form of an amendment. Nearly all of these proposed by Mr. McArthur.' (76) The changes included the creation of boards immediately with no twelve month delay, the prohibition of creeds, catechisms or religious formularies in board schools and the cessation of building grants after six months. Ratepayers would have only a single vote in board elections and the provision in Clause 29 that at elections each voter would be allowed to cast as many votes as there were members to be elected and that they might give all their votes to one candidate, meant that the Nonconformists, and other minorities could obtain greater representation by plumping their votes. Only a complete and specific prohibition of religious inspection by H.M.I.s and the exclusion of clergy from schools and boards were left out of the Act, which read:

The school shall be open at all times to the inspection of any of Her Majesty's Inspectors, so however, that it shall be no part of the duties of such inspector to inquire into any instruction in Religious subjects given at such school, or to examine any scholar therein in religious knowledge or in any religious subject or book. (77)

They also failed to obtain the exclusion of Clause 87, which was included as Clause 99 of the Act. (78)

There were Wesleyan opponents of the bill, the most strident being the Rev. H. W. Holland, who wrote:

Mr. Forster boldly lubricated the wheels of the State with the corrupting slime of concurrent endowment in the hope that his repulsive work would make the machinery go smoothly... By Mr. Forster's evasive arrangements all sorts of contradicting doctrines may be taught in state-aided schools. Through the hands of the tax-gatherers, the Protestant pays for the teaching of Popery in Roman Catholic schools, and the Roman Catholic, equally opposed, is obliged to pay for the teaching of
Protestantism in Protestant schools. The Churchman pays for dissenting doctrines to be taught in dissenting schools, and the dissenter pays to uphold the doctrine of the Established Church in the minds of the rising generation...it pays the Romist to teach that the Protestant is a heretic, and it pays the Protestant to teach that the Romist is an idolator. (79)

In the Methodist Conference of 1870, the ex-President said that they had to admit that the Government had paid as much attention to their representations as they could have expected them to do. They had not got all that they could desire, but they had reason to acknowledge the attention which they had been given. (80) Rigg spoke on 24 August, stating that he was thankful for the Bill, because it had 'abated and reduced to a minimum the sectarian element in existing schools' whilst it respected their claims and rights and 'left fair play to the denominations and opened the way to the wide establishment of school board schools.' He welcomed the Conference's acceptance of school board schools in many areas, as well as recognising the value of the established Wesleyan schools. Indeed, he pointed out that it would be 'much easier to maintain small Methodist schools in struggling circumstances' than it had been hitherto. He even expressed his hope that there would be a large, continuing expansion of Wesleyan schools in the villages. His support for the government was plain, as he expressed his regret that 'some reflections had been cast on the government and in particular on Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Forster in the Committee of Review before the Conference' and he felt his duty to declare his own conviction, formulated on his own personal knowledge and experience, that they had not acted unfairly in the interests of the Church of England. (81)

The Wesleyan Education Committee itself showed satisfaction at the new Act. They called on members to make a comparison of the resolutions given to Gladstone with the corresponding provisions of the Bill as it was originally introduced and the Act as finally formulated. It showed that the 'acts of the Committee was attended by important and beneficial results.' The Conscience Clause, the principle of local rating for schools, the withdrawal of the distinctively denominational aspect of inspection and the provision of schools 'where they were needed' are all praised and the hope is expressed that the intensity of the denominational character of schools 'where this has been excessive'
might be mitigated. (82)
CHAPTER THREE
3. The Wesleyan Church in the School Board Era (1871-1875)

At the Methodist Conference of 1870, Mr. Olver asked:

What were they to do now? What the Established Church and the Roman Catholics were doing was known to all. They had not waited for a single week; they had organised themselves and were now raising large funds for the purpose of opening day schools in every part of the country... and so pre-occupying the ground... The question was whether they were to sit still and do nothing. (1)

He proposed to make special enquiry into the position of day schools in circuits and the desirability of establishing schools there. Rigg favoured this and enquiry was instigated.

The Methodists had mixed feelings about how to proceed. They had at that time 743 day schools and therefore had a vested interest in the existing denominational system. Like the other denominations, they took advantage of the 'period of grace' offered by the Act to qualify for building grants. 146 new schools were built by Christmas, 1870, with an additional 22,000 pupils. There were virtually no dissentient voices at this stage. The 1871 Conference passed resolutions celebrating the advance in the number of Wesleyan schools. In the Preliminary meeting on education, the Rev. R. S. Heel had suggested that 'by and bye' it might be advantageous for the Committee or the full Conference to consider 'whether it would be a good, wise and profitable thing in many instances where they had day-schools in towns where school boards existed, to hand over these schools to school boards and multiply (instead) their institutions for raising teachers' (2) The suggestion was deplored by most speakers. The Rev. Dr. Rule hoped the idea would not be entertained, as it would turn over 'their precious schools, leaving their children at the mercy of school board majorities, and at the mercy of what sometimes might be school board compromises... the suggestion would be highly perilous to the future spiritual prosperity and conscientious fulfilment of their duty in the sight of God and of the world.' (3) The Rev. J. Hargreaves said that they needed the Wesleyan schools as much as ever. Although he recognised that the school boards were in the main religious bodies and he had confidence in the board schools, the Wesleyan schools were needed in rural districts and large towns, (4) Rigg was clearly in favour of continuing and even increasing the Wesleyan denominational schools. In his Inaugural of 1871, he commented:
I rejoice in the principle of local responsibility and school board action. But I rejoice certainly not less, and with a homelier and more personal joy, in seeing Church action in regard to national education. I cannot forget that there would have been at this hour no public elementary education for the working people of England, but for Church action and voluntary activity...but for these there would now have been no supply of teachers for the school board schools. I believe in school-board schools, because I believe in the training which the teachers who will have to handle these schools must have received in the Christian colleges, most of them denominational. (5)

He goes on to deplore the prospect of school boards having a monopoly of education:

The idea which underlies much modern declamation and very much newspaper writing on the subject of education, is that all elementary schools of the country should be essentially of the same pattern ... But is the plan of stereotype life-like? Is it in harmony with the variety, freshness and spontaneousness of life? Above all, is it in keeping with the vast fecundity and various abundance of life which belong to a country like England, with its blended races, its variety of conditions, of modes of life and of worship, of taste, prejudice and culture...? The men who advocate this plan of stereotype would divide the whole country as it were into rectangular plots, and in every plot would fix a school of the same type. But such mechanical uniformity is incompatible with life or true greatness. Life...means multiplicity of types and kinds... spontaneous development, vivid and various colouring, and boundless diversity of character... (6)

He praises the system, as created by the 1870 Act, as 'less systematic, less rigid' than the Prussian system, with its 'unbending method and rubric of Teutonic drill-mastery', and also a better model than the American system, with its 'looseness and expedients'. (7) He rejected the idea that denominational schools should have a monopoly, any more than State schools, but, he believed that they could form one element in the national system, if they were managed in a 'catholic spirit, taught by denominational teachers, yet not in the interest of any denominational Shibboleth, and ... limited and regulated by national rules, and examined and inspected by national officers' (8)

Rigg also favoured denominational training and it was he who proposed a new Wesleyan Training College in 1871. There had been a rush of applications from students for Westminster Training College and candidates had had to be turned away. At the Education Meeting before the 1871 Conference, Rigg stated:

There was more teaching power in Methodism in proportion to the numbers than in any other church in England: and if they could only get hold of the teachers, keep them under their hand, give them the powerful training of their system, and at the same time the moral and spiritual care and protection which they were in the habit of rendering, Methodism in the future would be advantaged...and the national education of the future be advantaged. (9)

Almost all the representatives at the meeting accepted that Wesleyan trained teachers would
have enormous influence in elementary education, even if, as J. Chubb pointed out, they went on to teach in board schools. The Rev. Alex McAulay said that if they had a choice 'between having no Methodists on school boards and having a Methodist teacher in every school' the choice should be obvious. 'The teacher came in direct contact with the child and he was there as a living epistle, to be known and read by all.' He even claimed it was a matter of Home Mission, particularly in East London. (10) There was in fact only one dissentent when the issue was put to the vote. The Conference accepted the building of a second college, Southlands, to be for women, thereby freeing Westminster for male students. It added a further 200 training places in Wesleyan educational training.

Some doubts about the efficacy of Wesleyan schools were expressed again, by William Arthur at the Education meeting, before the Methodist Conference of July 1872 and at this meeting he gained significant support. The division in the Wesleyans was once again centred on the attitude towards the other denominations. Those who feared Anglicanism and Roman Catholicism began to press for the end of all denominational schools and a universal school-board system. Those who were prepared to come to some compromise with these two older denominations were prepared to accept the continuation of the existing dual system of schools. William Arthur was the champion of the former. His broadside to the pre-Conference meeting on 31 July expressed his distaste for the existing system, and as an ex-President of the Methodist Conference, he carried much weight. He claimed that no system of education would 'bring up so many of the future population of the country in a condition unfriendly to Methodism and other evangelical teaching...' (11) He believed that the 'national' element of the 1870 Act was favourable to 'all Protestant Christianity, but the denominational element was 'favourable to Romanism and anti-evangelical religion of all kinds.' It had 'legalised the Romish school on the soil, in which God's word was shut out, and it had given Romanism and anti-Bible religion a status that it had never had since the Reformation...the liberty of religious teaching... meant the power of the priest to teach his religion in connection with the money and the authority of the State... it had endowed an anti-Bible system... (12)

At the Conference itself, in August 1872, Arthur proposed a motion that, 'considering the difficulties of the denominational system, the Conference judges it desirable that it should be
gradually merged in a system of united, unsectarian schools, with the Bible under school boards.' (13) The Conference was split down the middle on the proposal. Arthur objected to Methodists being in 'the same boat' as Roman Catholics and High Churchmen and proclaimed to loud cheers:

Let not the Methodist banner be the Pope's banner. He saw a long and noble band of men of the Church of England marching under the banner of denominationalism, and the Pope blessed the banner and his best men held it up. That was not the flag that he would serve under. On the other hand he saw a vast body of dissenters marching under the banner of secularism, and the infidels said, 'Well Done'. That was not the flag in which he could fold himself up and comfortably lie down and die on the field of battle... He believed the Methodist Conference would set up a Methodist banner, which should be a Bible school for united England. They should go for a system of united Bible schools for all England. He was against the denominational system, because it was anti- Bible and it endowed the Romish school which put the Bible down. It endowed and empowered the High Church schools, that did everything it possibly could to smother up the Bible under ecclesiastical vestments and millinery. It endowed the Infidel school, in which the religion 'there is no God' might be taught and as a consequence of all that it converted by the thousands the best men in the land to a system of non-Bible schools (because) men pleaded for the Bible and meant the sectarian system; they argued for the Bible in schools and then went on heaping endowments on Popery and on all other sects (14)

He therefore called for a single system of Bible- reading schools, because it would lead to the 'union of Protestants, and the policy of Rome was to split up Protestants throughout the world.' He went for the Bible which was 'not the Shibboleth of any sect, but was the common Shibboleth of all who loved Jesus Christ...'

He was seconded by Dr. Waddy, who added that there was an attempt to get the education of the common people into the hands of the clergy, and that in rural districts in particular, this would be successful if the system was not changed. (15) J.R.Hargreaves pointed out that the Wesleyans could no longer build schools on a large scale, as they did not have the finances and the government's building grants had ceased. Wesleyans were therefore being forced into Church of England schools in the villages and he asked why they were risking this to retain a system 'that supported Romanism in this country and made its aggressions and assumptions possible in Ireland.' Mr. McAulay called for an end to all schools where clergymen and ministers were allowed to 'meddle and muddle'. (16) The Rev. Holland was more strident in his denunciation of Roman Catholic schools. When it was mentioned that Martin Luther had once said that if he had not been a minister, he would have been a schoolmaster, Holland retorted:
If Luther had been told that he could not teach religion as a schoolmaster paid by the State unless he consented to 500 Papists being paid out of the public funds for teaching Popery, Luther would have refused complicity with Rome and chosen rather to be a home missionary than a schoolmaster. With one hand the Methodists were clinging to denominational schools in large towns, which were being starved out by school board schools and with the other hand they were beckoning for schools in rural districts which would not come to life. And while both hands were thus fast, the Church of England and the Romanists were reaping all the harvest. Something had been said about ships and vessels and it did seem ... that there was a good deal of fishing going on in national waters. There was a great fleet out and the salmon fishing was very active. But while the Episcopalian and Romanist boats were catching all the salmon, they only got the fishes' tails in the Methodist boat... (17)

Those who favoured the denominational schools tended to show a much more tolerant attitude towards the Roman Catholic and Anglican churches, although many emphasised their Protestant credentials with words critical of the Papacy. Mr. Bedford, for example, addressed the meeting in the following terms:

He had as great a detestation of Popery as such as any man in that Conference, but he did not the less believe there were many sincere and honest Roman Catholics ... If he were a Roman Catholic, would he think himself well treated by the course which had been taken in that discussion?... The Romanists had their name and place in the State, they contributed to the taxes out of which the State paid all those things and was it for them to say that they would force the Bible upon them, whether they liked it or not? Was that the principle of justice? Let them put themselves in the position of the Romanists and ask whether they would like it themselves... (18)

Mr. Shaw similarly began:

He hated Popery as much as any of them, but neither he nor they hated any of their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects ... They were taunted with being in the same boat with Romanists. He wanted to know what kind of crew they had in the boat on the other side; they saw Atheists, Deists, Socinians, Unitarians and Communists and people of that sort. Both sides were placed in circumstances which rendered them equally liable to that kind of imputation. (19)

The split was not clear-cut, with the anti-Romanists always totally against denominational schools. One speaker, W. Simpson, expressed his fears of the Church of England as a reason for maintaining the Wesleyan denominational system, not for destroying it altogether:

The great question with some of them seemed to be how could they best repel the advances of the Church of England. If they gave up their schools, the result would be that they would soon have in the country a thousand more schools in which there would be the Puseyite parson and ritualistic teaching. (20)

One correspondent to the WATCHMAN expressed this same fear of other denominations as
a justification for the continuation of the denomination's schools. If they were merged into board schools, 'what guarantee would you have that your own Methodist children would not have teachers, clear headed enough, intellectually able enough, but Unitarians, Romanists or even Jesuits in their religious principle?' (21)

Rigg himself was against any attack on the Wesleyan denominational schools and he maintained this stance throughout the year. At the Conference he was criticised by some of the members for his personal, overbearing authority on the educational question. William Arthur was a friend of Rigg and was generous in his words that, 'there was no man who thought that Dr. Rigg, with all his denominationalism, was in his heart less a Protestant than he was.' (22) F. Greaves also defended Dr. Rigg:

A great deal had been said, not only there but elsewhere, about the way in which the President of Westminster College had endeavoured to push that matter on the Connexion. (He) sat on the Committee and on the various sub-committees ever since Dr. Rigg came to Westminster and he would challenge the testimony of every member of these committees as to the fairness, the frankness, the open-mindedness with which Dr. Rigg had always met them. He had always met everyone, from the oldest to the youngest, with the greatest respect and kindness. He had never heard him at any time say an unkind word of anyone who had spoken on the other side, or breathed a thought that their opposition in this respect had lowered them in his opinion. They had in Dr. Rigg, if an opponent, at least a fair and honourable opponent.

At the Conference, Rigg repeated his former arguments in favour of denominational and board schools in a dual system, and defended himself only with the assertion that it had been he who had first suggested the discontinuance of building grants to denominational schools, before the 1870 Act. He later expressed his fears that Bible lessons, and even children's hymns and simple prayers 'would presently be done away with' if there were only board schools. He told students at his Inaugural of September 1872, 'The badge-word unsectarian would harden into secular.' (23) The division was so great at the Conference, that all the resolutions were withdrawn and the whole issue had to be referred to a special united committee, which was called for December.

In the interim, Rigg did express his belief that changes were necessary in the Act. At a speech at Lowestoft on 20 November 1872, he urged that:

school districts should be universally constituted ... in every such district there
should be not only a school board, but at least one board school. He would have a board school within reach of every family, and especially of every child destined to be a pupil-teacher ... He would give school boards certain powers of visitation even over inspected voluntary schools during hours of secular instruction, for example as respects their sanitary condition... He would not allow any clergyman or minister to give religious instruction in a board school. All these have for years past been his views... He would repeal both the 17th and 25th Clauses and adopt for England, as to the payment and remission of fees, the principle of the Scotch Education Act... (24)

This latter would refer all cases of inability to pay fees to the poor Law Guardians who were better equipped to investigate the claim than the boards. Rigg concluded:

The people generally much preferred liberally conducted voluntary schools to board schools, if not too dear. That was becoming every day more evident throughout the country and especially in London. The reaction in favour of voluntary schools was decisive. But the mixture of schools was good for all and no children ought to be left in the power of unregulated denominational schools. The power of compulsion would fill both board and voluntary schools.

By 3 December 1872 when the special Committee was held, more Methodists had begun to doubt the value of purely Wesleyan schools. A seemingly innocuous proposal began the proceedings, from the ex-President, Dr. John James, that, 'no national system of education will meet the necessities of the country which shall exclude from day schools the Bible and instruction therefrom suited to the capacities of the children.' Even this met with dissection and renewed attacks on Roman Catholicism. William Arthur commented immediately that he was impressed that the resolution had omitted 'the Roman terminology "religious education"' and had the 'old Methodist terminology "the Bible"' (25) and he felt committed to it. One of his supporters, Mr. Flitch, however complained that anyone might teach from the Bible, but 'what kind of instruction would the Roman Catholics give?' and H.W. Holland pointed out that they objected not to religious teaching, but to being forced to pay for 'the teaching of all sorts of religion' and that the Roman Catholics and Ritualists were getting all they wanted.

Nevertheless the resolution was adopted by a large majority. The meeting was then split decisively on a motion put forward by William Arthur:

That considering the difficulties of the denominational system of education it is desirable that future legislation, while showing just regard for existing interests, should aim at gradually merging the denominational system in one of united, unsectarian schools, with the Bible under school boards. (26)
He introduced his motion, by claiming that the existing system, 'whilst it might secure one Methodist school' it helped others to set up fifteen schools in which the children would be taught that Methodism was not the way to heaven.' (27) He was suspicious that the Church of England were trying to gain a monopoly in the agricultural parts of the country, after which compulsion would be introduced by the government to force Nonconformist children into Anglican establishments. He called on the Wesleyans and the government to accept the principle in future 'the national system was the system, the denominational element the exception.' The same anti-Anglican phobia was displayed by Mr. Fowler, who conceded that the faith of the Wesleyans and that of the Church of England were identical, but that 'the men who were now teaching and doing the work of the Church of England were not teaching that faith, but were rather paving the way to the Church of Rome.' (28) It was left to a Mr. Dingly to give a more down-to-earth reason for ending the denominational system. The Wesleyans could not afford to support new schools. They needed to double their number of ministers, to improve their chapels, some of which were 'hovels' and to add to the Home Mission Fund. He believed that if their rural population would be content with school board schools, 'he should say let them have them!' (29)

This attack on the denominational element was strongly resisted. Unlike other Nonconformist denominations, it was pointed out that the Wesleyans had a large body of schools to preserve. (30) A Mr. Sibley stated that if their object was to promote godliness, then 'he could think of no way more instrumental than that of scriptural teaching at the hands of Wesleyan trained teachers; for wherever such men were found, the principles of truth and integrity and the laws of Christian love...would be accepted in all parts of the country.' (31) In this way, he believed Wesleyan teachers would continue to be influential, in Wesleyan schools or board schools. Other delegates drew lines of demarcation in the same pattern as the previous meeting. Those in favour of the denominational schools continued to be more liberal towards the Roman Catholics. The Rev. S Coley for example said:

Their greatest enemy was not Popery. Popery was a mighty evil, but God had been hitting it hard lately. The great evil of all that they were afraid of was infidelity. The great trouble of this world would be Rationalism; and the spirit of Rationalism was growing apace. (32)

The Rev. W. B. Pope added:

The Committee should bear in mind that in the present day infidelity was spreading widely. It now took the form of Pantheism, Polytheism and so forth and was propagated by means of most fascinating textbooks. These modern
scientific teachings percolated swiftly down to the strata of our children ... What were those high sounding names? Pantheism - it used to be Atheism; it was now Pantheism; one God, one substance, but no Person in that God ... Philosophically it had come to be called Positivism, that is the simple assertion of what can be proved, and the acceptance only of that which can be scientifically established as a fact and nothing more. Materialism, which would allow no distinction between matter and spirit ... There were other dangers. There was the great danger of Romanism and Sacramentarianism ... But these were great superstitions - they added to the truth, nevertheless, the truth was there... With the Roman Catholics and Sacramentarians the doctrines of the glorious Trinity, the Person of Christ, the everlasting Atonement protesting against every other expiation, were all safe... But if they handed over the children of this land to what was a pure secular education - an education that was not necessarily connected with the economy of Christian truth...they would bring back the obstacle to the truth and put the land in darkness (33)

Rigg said that he cared deeply for the future of Methodism and the 'country villages of Methodism' and yet foresaw the prospect of school board schools in the towns and Church of England schools in all the villages, and asked why the Connexion was proposing to sacrifice its own schools for this prospect. He concluded that 'a more fatal policy than that of consenting to strangle their own system and their own schools, that they might have nothing but school board schools and uninspected Church of England schools could not possibly be imagined.' (34) He maintained that nothing could be more blighting to the Wesleyan Education Department, than to say that they discouraged and discountenanced 'anything like a natural increase of Methodist day-schools. It would paralyse all their operations.' (35)

Dr. Jobson likewise suggested that if they passed a resolution for merging Wesleyan day schools 'all zeal for such would cease ... and the next collection on their behalf would seriously decrease.' He asked, 'would the Romanists merge theirs? No. Then let not the Methodists voluntarily cut off their arms from their hands and leave others to retain theirs.' (36)

W.W. Pocock curtly summarized the whole meeting, when he commented that the Committee were only unanimous in opinion on one point, 'viz, that that meeting had been evoked by their jealousy of and opposition to Popery and to infidelity wherever it might be.' (37) After agreement appeared to be impossible, patched compromise measures were suggested. Rigg had already been approached privately by William Arthur, with a request to make some concession in his view for the sake of Wesleyan unity. Dr. Jobson finally proposed:

That this Committee, while resolving to maintain in full vigour and efficiency our Connexional day-schools and training colleges, is of opinion that, due
regard being had to existing institutions, full legislation for primary education at the public cost, should be provided for such education on the principle of unsectarian schools, under School boards. (38)

The policy did not follow his own beliefs, but he claimed it was necessary to compromise to preserve the unity of the Wesleyan Church. Rigg accepted this, but his opponents demanded the further concession, that the words 'only on the principle of unsectarian schools under school boards' should be substituted. This was too direct an attack on the Wesleyan schools for Rigg and about twenty other members of the Committee, who could compromise no further. Other members accepted the resolution, for the sake of unity and it was passed. (39)

The Committee was united finally in urging that the 1870 Act should be amended so that, 'the whole country should forthwith be divided into School Districts, and that a School board should without any delay, be constituted in every district.' Conference adopted the views of this Committee and recorded:

its deliberate conviction that, in justice to the interests of national education in the broadest sense, and to the religious denominations of the country, School boards should be established everywhere and an undenominational school placed within reasonable distance of every family. (40)

The December Convention also recorded:

That the radius of no School board should be less than three miles, except in the case of borough towns, or towns having a local government, unless within the area so defined there be a population of at least 7000.

That wherever the population of any school district would otherwise fall below 7000, the principle of grouping districts, recognised in the Act should be imperative.

That in every school district, one or more board schools, or schools under undenominational management and Government inspection, should be so placed that, so far as possible, one such school shall not be farther distant than three miles from any family in the district. (41)

Rigg later wrote that he did not find anything 'wild or extreme, nothing destructive or secularist' in these proposals, as it would enable any child to walk to an undenominational school, either as a pupil or pupil-teacher, when they might have been reluctant to attend an Anglican or Roman Catholic school. They would not have to be introduced to a training college through the avenue of 'distinctly denominational instruction'. (42)
The Committee also urged the government to enhance the power of the boards, so that they could inspect the sanitary conditions and efficiency of all schools within their district, whether they received grants or not, with particular reference to the observance of the Conscience Clause. This would increase the role of the boards, rather than merely giving the powers of compulsion 'without any charge, authority, oversight, or power in any respect with regard to the schools to which they make their children go.' (43.)

These recommendations were put before Gladstone in January 1873 and a memorial was again sent to Forster, by the President of the Methodist Conference in July 1873, asking for changes in the Act.

The dispute about the future of their own schools continued in Methodist ranks. Their numbers did not appreciably alter in 1873, and only sixteen were known to have been transferred to school boards, while other new schools had in fact been built to maintain their numbers. (44) However, the fears of the Anglican and Roman Catholic churches had not diminished. The Wesleyan Inspector, Cucklow, complained in his report of a new manipulation by clergymen, who were letting their schools out to the school boards, who would finance the lessons from 10 a.m., while clergy conducted their denominational work between 9 a.m. until 10 a.m. Many Methodist children were being trapped into dogmatic lessons, and Cucklow therefore concluded that the practical lesson was that they must retain 'any influence for good we at present have over children in Wesleyan rural schools, by maintaining those schools in vigorous efficiency and not hastily to transfer them to school boards. (45) Anti-Romanism was still rampant. At the Wesleyan Annual Meeting on Education in May, 1873, William Arthur commented:

There was nothing in the world which Popery feared so much as an open Bible and united Protestants standing round the common centre of their faith and hope. God had given England an open Bible... After the Reformation, the ground was well cleared, and the dividing line became tolerably distinct between those who adhered to the Bible and those who did not...(In Catholic states) the husband was not the head of the wife, for the confessional made the priest the head; the father was not the head of the child, but the priest; the king was not the head of the State, but the Pope was head of all, and so every authority God had set up was made to totter... The best thing was to get as many converted men and women trained for school teachers as they possibly could. (46)

The Wesleyans also complained about many Roman Catholic text-books which contained...
sectarian elements, a complaint first outlined by the Wesleyan Dr. W. H. Rule of the Evangelical Alliance. (47) One of the 'objectionable' writing lessons was to write out the 'Hail Mary' several times. The Wesleyans found this particularly mischievous, because of the number of Protestant children attending Roman Catholic schools. They did not believe this was in accordance with the provisions of the Education Act, but complaints to the Chairman of the Committee of Education had not been satisfactorily dealt with. (48)

Rigg was to have influence in another sphere of educational activity, as a member of the London School Board from 1870 to 1876. In the elections of November 1870, he addressed the ratepayers with his views:

I need hardly say that I regard no education as either complete or suitable, from which instruction in the Scriptures is excluded. At the same time, I would sacredly respect the religious rights of parents in the education of their children and strictly enforce the absolute liberty of conscience required by the Act. While insisting, as a member of the School Board, upon the strict economy of public money, I should aim at securing for every child such an education as would adequately prepare him for the intelligent discharge of his duties as a citizen of this country. I rejoice especially that, by means of school boards, there is reason to hope that education may before long be carried down to the level of the neediest and most ignorant classes in the country. (49)

He went on to outline his interests:

It might be asked why he, the head of a specially denominational college, should ask for election on a general board. The reply was that if those who had taken an interest in denominational schools were excluded, he feared that they would not get working boards at all. In the Wesleyan schools, they did not seek to make Wesleyans, but Christians... His desire would be to give every child an education worthy of an Englishman... He must be instructed in that book which was at once the book of man and of God. (50)

He was duly elected to the first London School Board. The Board itself was a significant model to other boards, and as such, Rigg's work was most important for national education. He served on many of the sub-committees of the Board, which drew up the policies to be adopted. The first major area of dispute, which had to be resolved, was the nature of religious education to be allowed in Board Schools. Many believed there should be no more than a Bible reading to the class with no explanations. The compromise suggested by W.H. Smith in March 1871 read:

That in schools provided by the Board, the Bible should be read, and there shall be given such explanations and such instruction therefrom in the principles of morality and religion as are suited to the capacities of the children, provided always: 1. that in such explanations and instruction, the provisions of the Act in sections 7 and 14 be strictly observed both in letter and spirit, and that no
attempt be made in any schools to attach children to any particular denomination; 2. that in regard to any particular school, the Board shall consider and determine upon any application by managers, parents or ratepayers of the district, who may show special cause for exception of the school from the operation of this resolution in whole or in part. (51)

Professor T.H. Huxley tried to get a 'selected' Bible accepted, which would include only the acceptable passages, but the majority of the Board opposed this.

Rigg stated his own views on the matter in a very long speech on 8 March 1871. He stated that there was no denominational problem in the compromise, because there was such a thing as a 'large Christianity' which was agreed by the denominations. He also stated:

If no lesson touching the sympathetic or moral nature of the child was to be taught, if no question relating to such lessons or to any moral point in the portion of Scriptures read was to be asked by any child - if in these respects an embargo was to be laid on Scripture teaching, not imposed as to any other subject, or any other book, which might be read... he thought an amount of mischief would be done which would be serious to contemplate and which he would not like to have the responsibility of seriously proposing... Nothing could be more illogical than in a proposal for the education of children altogether to ignore the deepest and most cardinal faculties of a child's nature... Nothing was more illogical than to propose that religious education should be provided by parents, who were incapable of imparting it, or by ministers and Sunday Schools who had not the opportunity. (52)

He rejected the suggestion that many would object to the teaching of the Bible in board schools, through conscience:

They were told that they ought not to commit an injustice against the minority; and that they had been reminded that they must be 'faithful in a little'... If the point of conscience was raised he must ask, if the small minority had rights of conscience, had vast majorities no rights of conscience? When vast majorities had declared in favour of a free and unfettered teaching of the Bible, ought not the Board to do violence to the consciences of that majority?... They ought not. (53)

He disputed that there was a denominational objection to the compromise:

The real difficulty was this - that children who were sent to school on a week-days were required also to attend Church and Sunday Schools on Sundays. That... was the only religious difficulty he had ever heard seriously raised.

This had obviously been ended by the terms of the 1870 Act. He commented amid cheers from the members:

He had never heard a whisper of a religious difficulty that arose out of the teacher's Bible lessons. He had never heard of such a grievance arising out of
the Bible lesson taught by a teacher of a national school... Here were Church
teachers, with a clergyman at their back, who had not given offence. Church
teachers in Ritualist parishes perhaps; and they had not given offence by their
Bible lessons; and were they therefore to suppose that when the teachers had
no clergyman at their backs, but a committee of managers appointed by the
Board instead, they would become teachers of Ritualistic and other doctrines?
If they were to look on this question as practical men, there was really no
religious difficulty with regard to the Bible lessons given by the teachers.

He quoted the H.M.I. of the Wesleyan schools, Sir J. Fitch, who had said that almost without
exception, they were 'essentially Christian schools, in which the Scriptures were read and
accepted as the rule of life, but in which no attempt was made to dogmatise on those points
on which Christian people differed from each other'. Rigg comments that if this was the case
in specifically denominational schools, 'how much more could the system be carried out at
schools which were not expressly denominational?' (54) He taught his own students at
Westminster Training College, that the 'teaching of the Bible lesson and the general influence
should be in the broadest sense Christian, apart from denominationalism.' He also rejected
the claim that the compromise would be in the exclusive interests of the Church of England.
He did not see this as grounds for rejection, when the alternative was either 'to give the
Church this advantage or to leave multitudes on multitudes of children without any moral or
religious instruction, to leave these children to perish for lack of knowledge'. But in any case
he rejected that it did give the Church of England an advantage:

No doubt the general effect of establishing their schools would be to elevate
and stimulate moral and religious feeling in the rising generation. This would
lead to a general increase of attendance at the different places of worship and
those who would take the most advantage from this and who were most
favourably situated for doing so (were the Established Church)... Eventually this
must do all good, and it must certainly do the largest amount of good to the
Church of England.

Nevertheless, all the churches would benefit, and this was a case for rejoicing. He did see a
problem for the Roman Catholics, and he showed genuine sympathy to their case, but it
would be worse for them, if religion was left to Sunday schools alone, 'would not
denominationalism and proselytism there come in?' Finally, he disputed Professor Huxley's
words of the previous week, when he had claimed that the Board was neither Christian, nor
Mohammedan nor Buddhist, but they were 'simply a Board to do certain work.' Rigg claimed
that it was a Christian Board, because it had been elected by a population who were 'most
predominantly of Christian sentiments, and who had elected them with the express understanding and intent that they should solve the questions before them in a Christian sense.' He concluded:

The vast majority of their constituents were agreed in recognising the Bible and Christianity as the basis of morals and education...It must be remembered that Christian ideas and principles were a reality. There was such a thing as a Christian heritage, which ought to be common to the children of this nation; and there was such a thing as Christian civilisation...all the children of England should receive them.

He did not accept Huxley's scientific approach to the Bible and to religious faith:

He did not believe that children could be taught religion and morality on a basis of ethical philosophy or scientific evolution. They must be taught on authority, the authority of revelation, sustained by historical evidence and experience, and by appeal to their own consciences....Christian truth and ideals, Christian principles and influences, were part of the national inheritance, of the birthright of English children (55)

Lord Sandon supported Rigg's ideas. He said that he hoped the teacher would be allowed to read whatever portion of the Bible he liked, 'not as an archaeological treatise or a history book, or a specimen of fine English, but in order to inspire in the mind of the child those great rules which would guide his present life and give hope for the future.' (56) The Roman Catholic member, Mr. Langdale similarly believed that religion must be taught, although he wished the Douai version of the Bible to be allowed. The other Roman Catholic member, Mr. Hutchins, put this forward as an amendment. Both Rigg and W.H.Smith dissuaded him from making this an issue connected with the Smith Compromise. Dr. Rigg actually said at the Board that some of the members had been unwise and provocative in their statements against Catholicism, and he welcomed the 'candid, sound and friendly' attitude of the Roman Catholic members (57) and Smith suggested the question should be settled by school managers rather than the Board. The question was in fact shelved for a later debate. (58) (When it was finally raised again the Board turned down the use of the Douai version of the Bible).

Huxley himself finally accepted the compromise, even though it did not follow his own beliefs. The resolution itself was left deliberately vague, with no attempt to define the doctrines and principles to be taught. The interpretation was left to the individual teacher. In fact teachers interpreted it differently, some carefully avoiding all dogmatic teaching, and
others teaching such dogmas as they considered to be common to all Christian churches. (59) Rigg approved of this freedom given to the teachers. He had great confidence in their own religious faith, especially as most of the school board teachers had been trained in denominational institutions such as Westminster College. He actually told his students in his 1871 Inaugural:

You will be at liberty, in endeavouring to bring Christian truth and influence to bear upon the minds and hearts of the children, to use words and phrases which most vividly express your own personal convictions and feelings as to Christian truth. You will not aim at inculcating distinctively Wesleyan principles with a view to make young Wesleyan retainers of the children in your care. Your one aim will be to inform and quicken their susceptible natures with Christian doctrine, Christian principles, and Christian sympathy, to enlighten their conscience and inlay their character with the truth of our holy religion. But this can hardly be done effectually except by such a vivid and unembarrassed presentation and application to the children of the lessons of Scripture as a man gives when he speaks straight and full out of his own experience... It will be a comfort and a source of special power to you that you are at full liberty to do this... Your religious power, which begins with the Bible lesson...should be the grand motive force in training your scholars. (60)

Even more pertinently, he wrote in his book, *National Education and Public Elementary Education* in 1873 that he believed in school board schools because he believed in the training which teachers 'who will have to handle these schools' had received in the Christian colleges, 'most of them denominational'.(61)

A second area of concern, which had to be resolved by the London Board, was that of compulsion. Clause 74 of the Act had allowed boards to make bye-laws to compel parents to send their children to schools, when sufficient places were available. This was brought up before the Board on 15 February 1871. Rigg himself proposed a sub-committee to discuss the whole question of compulsion. He told the members that the Board was agreed on the necessity of compulsion, but that it required preparation. He suggested that the 'great crying evil' was irregular attendance and that would not be met by making children attend school somewhere:

There were only two ways of carrying out compulsion, the enforcing of some regulation with regard to labour and the infliction of a fine for non-attendance. It would not be enough to pass a bye-law; machinery must be provided for carrying it out. (62)

The sub-committee was agreed upon and eighteen of the Board, including Rigg himself, became its members. (63) They reported on 28 June 1871. The report had many dissentients
and only Rigg, James Stiff and James Wallace gave their names to the submission in full.

The Report read:

Your Committee entered upon their duties under a strong sense of the responsibility devolved upon them...and with the conviction that the compulsory clauses of the Act form one of its most important features, as marking a new epoch in the history of national education in England, and, as affording the only means of making that education universal. (64)

They comment that they had received evidence from other countries where compulsion was operational, and also from the reports of Matthew Arnold;

Compulsion, although adopted in the Factory Act and other more recent legislation, is, in its direct application, new in England, and should therefore, be carried out, especially at first, with as much gentleness and consideration for the circumstances and feelings of the parents as is consistent with its effective operation.

In a passage which reflects Rigg's own previous speeches, the Report comments:

Your Committee have endeavoured to provide against the evil, widely felt, of habitual irregularity, as well as total non-attendance, while at the same time admitting the total or partial exemption of children who have attained a fair amount of education, or, who are necessarily at work during part of the day.

The Committee then submitted a series of Bye-laws to the Board. The Education Act permitted the period of compulsion to extend from five to thirteen years, and the Committee recommended that their bye-laws should cover the whole of this period. In order to enforce the bye-laws, they recommended the appointment of 'Visitors' who would check on truant children. It was Professor Huxley who moved, and Rigg who seconded, a proposal on 11 October 1871;

That Inspectors be appointed by the Board to examine its schools and pupil-teachers in all subjects taught in each school and to report to the Board from time to time upon the discipline and general efficiency of the schools provided by the Board. (65)

Rigg defended the proposal very strongly to the full Board. On 11 October, he told the members that they were about to take over a large number of Ragged Schools and needed reports on their condition. Their inspectors would not have the same area of investigation as...
the H.M.I.s, as there were 'extra subjects and other things apart from the Government platform which the Board thought it desirable to teach'. (66) He also pointed out that the Wesleyans themselves had difficulties, as they did not have 'visitors' The proposal was eventually accepted, after the defeat of an amendment which would have limited the Board's inspection to the 'general efficiency of schools'.

The sub-Committee had much dispute on the definition of the term 'school' for the purposes of the Bye-laws on compulsion, and a compromise was reached that it should mean 'either a Public Elementary school or any other school at which efficient Elementary instruction is given.' The seven members dissenting from this view signed a minority report, claiming that it would be sufficient to obtain the compulsory regular attendance of all children at 'some' school, and that the Board should leave until a later date the powers to ascertain the suitability of accommodation or the efficiency of the instruction. These dissentients included Lord Lawrence, Lord Sandon and W.H.Smith.

Rigg's interest in the area of compulsion did not end with the demise of the sub-committee. In December 1871, the Board resolved, on Rigg's motion, to call on the Management sub-Committee, of which he was a member to 'take all necessary steps towards carrying into effect the compulsory Bye-laws.' (67) On 6 December Rigg's proposal to this sub-Committee was accepted that:

This Board do forthwith give public notice calling the attention of the parents of children between the ages of five and thirteen years, who are not receiving efficient instruction in some other manner to the compulsory power conferred by Section 74 of the Elementary Education Act 1870, also expressing the determination of the Board to exercise that power and urging such parents to send their children to any existing Public Elementary school under Government inspection, or to any other school at which efficient elementary instruction is given, which they may prefer. (68)

A notice was drafted and it was decided to print 2000 posters and 50,000 handbills to be distributed around London (69) These were issued in February 1872 (70) Rigg also pressed for further government legislation. In his Inaugural of September 1872, he commented that the 'problem of compulsion is not yet solved and will not be until needful laws of indirect compulsion, making the employment of children first for half time, and then for the whole time, to depend on an educational test, have been added to the present powers of direct
compulsion conferred by the new Act.' (71) He spoke again to the Board in June 1873 praising the work of those who had visited parents to try to persuade them to send their children to schools, but he admitted that the Board had now found out 'how practically and experimentally hard, and how exceedingly difficult and complicated an undertaking the enforcement of compulsion was.' (72) He commented:

No doubt some members were surprised to find how little could be accomplished by mere resolutions and fulmination of any kind. They must expect it to be long, tedious and gradual work, and to see sometimes something like a reflux of the tide... Many were finding out clever ways of more or less evading the Board, and as they applied the screw home, of course the resistance would increase. He hoped the amendments proposed in the new Bill would considerably assist the Board in their work and that other schools would be compelled to give the Board such information they required.

He also said that there would be a diminution of infant attendance, as parents would refrain from sending children to school below the age deemed compulsory by the Factory Acts, and that they would not make progress until they had an amended Act of Parliament.

Rigg again writes in his book National Education in 1873:

Experience in London teaches thus far what was foretold by men who knew the (semi-pauper) classes, that compulsion can only be partially brought to bear on them. It is found necessary, in such cases, when they are got hold of, to allow the children to attend only half-time, earning what they can the other half, and sometimes the school half-time is partly made up in the very unsatisfactory mode... of evening instruction. Of many of these children, with all its resolute endeavours and steady working, and with all the diligence of its visitors, the School Board has never got hold at all. The number of children still in the streets, day by day, is not, in the worst districts, greatly diminished. When seized for a moment these classes, whether parents or children, are as hard to hold as an eel. Besides which, the compulsory provisions possible under the Education Act are, if made the most and the best of, exceedingly inadequate: Only in few cases comparatively is it possible to secure the conviction of negligent or recalcitrant parents. Many of the meshes of the School Board's net are very wide and loose...some of the magistrates refuse to convict; there are none who like the responsibility which the Act devolves upon them... Meanwhile, these shifty and migratory classes become more cunning week by week, are becoming more perfect in their 'dodges'... (73)

A major cause of dispute on the first London School Board was the proposal to pay school fees. The National Education League had made suggestions for free education during the debates of 1870, but even many of its supporters had been lukewarm on the subject and it was not a prominent demand made of the Government. (74). However, Article 25 of the Act allowed boards to pay fees for children who could not afford to pay. The Bye-laws dealing
with the remission of fees was the subject of much debate, both in the sub-Committee and in the full Board. The question had first been raised in the full Board in April, 1871, when John Rodgers had put forward a motion that would have prohibited the Board funds being given to denominational schools. He told the Board that the object of education was to 'develop the powers of the child' and he thought that denominationalism 'restrained, restricted and limited rather than developed'. It would 'force upon the mind of a child a certain dogma, or a certain code of doctrines, a certain creed, certain notions, certain opinions, and it would force those notions and opinions upon the mind of the child at a particular period of its existence when it was most susceptible and tenacious, when it most effectually grasped what it was taught.'

(75) Many, including Rigg, thought that a blanket ban on remission of fees would be wrong at that stage and would have tied the hands of future Boards. His views were outlined in his book, National Education which rejected free education as a denial of parental responsibilities, and even a reviling of the family. The State would be claiming to be 'the mother and nurse of its children; these must be rescued from the hands of their natural parents and must be brought up by the common wisdom and bounty of the State for the common good.' He concluded that such ideas were 'the common stock of Continental Communists' (76) However, payment could be accepted as a temporary measure, until parents had learnt to value education. He shows the profoundest sympathy for the Roman Catholics in this question on 5 April 1871 when he told the Board that he rejected a large scale payment of fees and free education, but:

If the resolution were conceded, there was an end of all relief and help to the ragged and industrial schools. He had always felt the case of our Roman Catholic fellow citizens to be one of particular difficulty, and it would be defeating the spirit of the Act if they determined that no Roman Catholic should be at liberty to get relief for his child except by sending it to a Board school. Protestant as he was, his principles, as to what was due to the consciences of his fellow-citizens, would not allow him to entertain such a proposition as this.(77)

Emily Davies agreed that it would 'press with undue weight upon Roman Catholics' and that the Board should not tie its hands as proposed. She commented, 'the more impossible it was to give relief otherwise, the more necessary it was to consider the consciences of Roman Catholics whenever it was possible.' (78) Canon John Cromwell put forward an opposition amendment, that the Board would pay the fees of all pauper children, which the agnostic
Professor Huxley denounced as against the spirit of the Act and the Smith Compromise, which he had personally accepted. The Act was clearly undermining of the denominational schools, he said, while the payment of fees to them would be encouraging them. It would give the sects the means of barring out the Board schools. When Cromwell gained a majority of twenty three votes to twenty, Huxley threatened that he would 'raise a discussion on the case of every child brought before the Board.' He said that he had given 'his best support to the carrying of Mr. Smith's resolution - but if he had imagined that the spirit of that resolution would have been so thoroughly and completely violated... he would have done his best to vote against it.' (79) He said that he sincerely wished that no greater hardship would fall upon a poor widow that 'that of being obliged to send her child to one of the Board schools rather than to one in which her pet denomination was taught.' (80) Rigg and Sir Edmund Hay Currie urged the Board not to submit to Huxley's threat, but the members accepted the reservations. While Rigg regretted Huxley's threat, he did believe that the resolution should not be made at that stage. The Board finally agreed to adjourn the question to a later date, and it was in fact resumed, when the sub-committee brought up its proposed bye-law for the payment of fees in October.

The sub-Committee's report reflects Rigg's views closely on this matter. One passage states:

Your Committee, by a small majority, have decided that, in order to carry out Section 74, some provision must be made for the payment and remission of fees. But they are unanimously of opinion that the power given by Bye-law viii. should be most cautiously and sparingly used, and that the utmost care should be taken to avoid conveying to the poor the impression that they are to be relieved from the obligation of paying their children's schooling. Your Committee submit that the encouragement of anything like a general expectation on the part of the parents that, as a matter of course, and on the untested allegation of inability to pay the fees, they will be relieved, at the cost of the ratepayers, from their duty to their children, would be a great evil, as tending to pauperise a class of the population who should rather be stimulated to a sense of their duty and to a manly spirit of independence (81)

A small group of the original sub-committee had objected to the possibility of fees being relinquished in denominational schools and had refused to accept this part of the report. Their stance was merely the prelude to the arguments in the full Board where the question took up six meetings, with more discussion on this issue than on all the other bye-laws put together. The greatest opposition as might be expected was not to the payment of fees for
Board school children but to the proposal that fees should be paid for poor children who attended denominational schools. Many members were opposed on principle to public money being used in schools which were not under public control. Rigg and Canon John Cromwell believed that the Board should pay all or part of the fees. Rigg’s view did not in fact carry the whole of the Wesleyan Church with it. On 25 October, 1871, William Arthur wrote to him, that on that very day he would be on his way to the School Board to ‘plead for the payment of fees in Denominational Schools out of the Rates.’ He told his old friend that he abhorred this stance:

If you tax me for that purpose the payment will be made with a protest of conscience and a revulsion of judgement such as I have never felt in any payment for national uses. I shall feel myself compelled by law and force to pay for the efficient endowment of all kinds of religions ... to pay for the most effective opposition possible to my own religious views and denomination; to pay for the discouragement of sects which foster self-reliance and the subsidising of those which breed pauperism, to pay for encouragement to a system of extremes (82)

On the Board itself, one of the other Wesleyan representatives was Sir William McArthur, who spoke out against the payment of fees:

I have no wish to hinder or retard the denominational schools already in existence...The denominational schools have rendered good service to the State and may still continue to do so...But not to injure or retard denominational schools, and to endow and perpetuate them are very different courses of action. It appears to me ...that we should be doing the latter, if we determine to pay school fees for poor children attending denominational schools and to this I am decidedly opposed... I object because I believe the payment of school fees would practically amount, in London especially, to an unequal and unfair endowment of the Church of England and Roman Catholic schools, and here let me repudiate in the strongest language I am capable of using a statement which I have heard and which I have been sorry to see in some of our newspapers, that those who oppose the payment of school fees are influenced by feelings of hatred towards the Established Church... I can say for myself, at all events, that I entertain no such feelings either towards the Church of England or any other denomination of Christians in the land. They have all enough to do in fighting against sin, ignorance and crime, and so long as they do this successfully, I rejoice in their prosperity. With regard to our Roman Catholic fellow countrymen, while differing widely from them, I would give them all the civil and religious rights and privileges which other sections of Her Majesty’s subjects enjoy, but I would not give them any special privileges or immunities... I object...because, while I doubt not many denominational schools are conducted in the most objectionable manner, I am equally convinced that the teaching given in not a few of them is of highly sectarian and objectionable character and we have no right to pay public money for such teaching. (83)
He goes on to quote statistics from Manchester, which had begun to pay the fees to denominational schools. The Church of England had received, according to McArthur, payment for 3,394 children, the Roman Catholics 2,126, the Undenominational schools 543, the Wesleyans only 158 and the Presbyterians a mere seventeen. He claimed that this was because the poor belonging to the Methodists and Nonconformist denominations were 'as a general rule, more prudent, careful and self-reliant than the poor of some other churches, and that fewer of them become chargeable on the parish, or would require their children to be paid out of the rates'. He points out that the Board itself had recognised in many speeches that the Roman Catholics had more 'extremely poor members in proportion than are to be found in connection with other churches.' His conclusion was that, 'these two churches would gain the lion's share of the money, while other denominations would enjoy the luxury of paying the lion's share of the taxes...'. (84) He deplored even more the possibility of imposing compulsion, which would, through the inadequacy of board schools, force children into existing denominational schools. However, the Wesleyan division of opinion on the matter was clearly shown in the Board. One Methodist member, Mr. Pearce spoke against McArthur and pointed out that the Act of Parliament had been a compromise, which they ought to accept. (85)

Rigg's defence of the sub-committee's proposal shows continuing sympathy for the Roman Catholic cause. He points out that Huxley himself had opposed any attempt at compulsion of Roman Catholic children into schools against which they conscientiously objected and he put to the Board the following question:

Whether it was harder for a Wesleyan to go to a school taught in the spirit inculcated by the Bishop of Peterborough, or a Roman Catholic child to be compelled to go to a school board school? They all knew what a Roman Catholic must think if his child went to a Protestant school. The one case was far harder than the other and no candid man could look fairly at the two cases without saying that the latter was a greater hardship than the former. For a Wesleyan to go to a school taught by such a teacher might be hard, but was it no case of conscience at all to gather rates from Roman Catholic parents in order to uphold and maintain board schools? He must speak the truth on this matter, if it were against all the prejudices in the world... It was impossible for them to look at this matter on the principle quoted by one of the speakers, 'Do unto others...' without thinking that the cases were dissimilar, that any hardship comparatively speaking, in one case, was immensely overbalanced by the hardship in the other. (86)
He did recognise the objections of his fellow Methodists and commented that:

for this feeling of suspicion and this feeling of soreness with regard to the National Schools and the schools of the Church of England, a certain section of the clergy of the Church of England had themselves to blame. If their conduct in the National Schools in the past had been other than it had been; if there had not been frequently a straining of authority and influence and an oppression of conscience, so as to give grievance and just umbrage to Dissenting and Wesleyan parents, there would not have been such feelings on the matter as there was today. They had sown the wind and were reaping the whirlwind.

He reassured his fellow Nonconformists that there was now a Conscience Clause, and nothing to fear for 'the child of a Methodist, if there were no Methodist school to be found, going to a well-conducted Church school'. But, if they were to have compulsion, it would be impossible to avoid paying the fees of the poor.

Rigg's chief opponent on the Board was Professor Huxley, who stated that if the proposal were passed, he would also oppose any bye-law to make attendance compulsory, because 'he would never be a party to enabling the State to sweep the children of the country into denominational schools'. On 4 November he delivered a bitter attack on the Roman Catholic Church, as destructive of intellectual freedom and political freedom:

He held as one of the most fixed and distinct articles of his belief that there was no engine so carefully calculated for the destruction of all that was highest in the moral nature, in the intellectual freedom, and in the political freedom of mankind, as that engine which was at present wielded by the Ultramontane section of the Roman Catholic Church. He carefully separated that section from the great movement to which he wished all success... the Old Catholics... The Catholic body could never be satisfied with anything whatever but complete possession of the whole minds and souls of the children whom they had in their care.... the preponderance of those views was destructive of all that was highest in the nature of man. It was destructive of freedom and intellectual progress... it was the duty of every man... to consider carefully what they were about before they lent any support whatever to this system... he was not one of those who held the modern liberal doctrine that we ought to tolerate everything... If he had the power he would wield it against that Catholic organisation; but let them make up their minds, at any rate, not to help it and not to build up something the force of which they would discover too late. (87)

He rebuked the Church parties in general:

There were some of them who had made great sacrifices for the sake of peace and for the sake of education...He had hoped that the compromise would be reciprocal, but he could not say there had been any relaxation of those attempts to get back by any means possible into the hands of the ecclesiastical parties in
the country, that denominational education of which it was the whole purpose of the Act to deprive them. (88)

Eventually, the bye-law was withdrawn and an independent resolution was adopted, that fees might be paid for a twelve month period 'exceptionally, on proof of urgent temporary need, each case being dealt with on its own merits, without prejudice to the principles involved on either side, it being understood that such remission or payment of fees is not to be considered as made in respect of any instruction in religious subjects.' (89) The latter rider was a form of compromise, proposed by the Rev. Angus and seconded by Dr. Rigg himself. (90) The compromise was intended to be temporary, but it was acted upon by the Board until 1876, when the power of the Board to pay fees in voluntary schools was ended in the Sandon Education Act.

The question of the abolition of all fees and hence free education in board schools appeared again in 1872. Rigg maintained his former objections and set out his view in April 1872, when he told the Board that the opinion in favour of free education was held by only a small minority and he believed the adherents of free education were decreasing daily. (91) In the following October, he had seen the danger of free education being introduced and told members of the Board that he could not hear of this being mentioned 'without expressing his entire dissent from it in the interest of everything most dear to education.' He continued:

It might be that some objected to free education through fears for the schools previously existing; but there were persons opposed to free education even before the Board schools were established. Many persons objected who could not be expected to have any sympathy with denominational schools... Nothing would raise up so many difficulties in the way of securing the object they had in view; nothing would so fatally prevent that co-operation on the part of the parents without which it would be difficult to carry out compulsion. (92)

The proposal was in fact defeated, but a suggestion was put, in March 1873, that fees should be kept very low. Rigg responded:

It was said that to fill schools the fee must be low; but that was an argument also for doing away with all difference of fee and for even establishing halfpenny schools. The best plan would be to ascertain how high the fee could be placed in the direction of the actual cost of education without damaging the attendance. (93)

He went on to point out that parents did not value cheap or free schools. In New York, education was free, but the average attendance was only 50% and yet in Germany, which
had high fees, the attendance was very regular. He believed that 'many of the working classes who did not care about a penny fee would, if they had to pay more, send their children to school more regularly'. (94) In a following meeting, he supported the proposal that fees should be graduated, so that children paid more as they advanced into the higher standards. His book, National Education, published in 1873, comments that education was being state-aided to an 'alarming extent' and comments:

> It must be abundantly evident that a system of vast and national education relief cannot be allowed to continue for an indefinite period... It infects ... the accepted ideas of national administration with a sort of taint of organized pauperism... a temporary provision... in order to rouse the whole people to intelligence and action and a true sense of responsibility on the subject of education, does not lie open to the same objections... so long as the parent is obliged to find part of the cost of his child's education, the principle of parental responsibility is recognised. (95)

He spoke again against free education in December 1874. (96) In the following month, a motion was put forward that school fees should be regulated 'according to the conditions of the neighbourhood and the circumstances of the parents' and Rigg spoke at some length that this threatened to introduce free education by the back door. He suggested an amendment: 'That the fees in Board schools shall be determined for every school according to circumstances, careful regard being had in each case to the condition, both educational and social, of the neighbourhood in which the school is placed.' The Board however accepted the original proposal and Rigg's amendment was not voted upon. (97)

One of the most important sub-committees to be set up by the first London School Board was the Scheme of Education Committee, commonly called the Huxley Committee, after its chairman, Professor T.H.Huxley. It consisted of eighteen members, among them Dr.Rigg. Its aim was to define the curriculum of the new London Board schools, and it reported on 13 June 1871. Professor Huxley proposed the findings to the full Board on 21 June 1871 and it was significant that Rigg was asked to second almost every one of these proposals. Together they moved that if children were withdrawn from Religious Instruction, the time would be given over to secular work. (98) They then moved that 'the frequent use of corporal punishment is a mark of incompetency on the part of the teacher' (99) and that 'every occasion of corporal punishment be formally recorded in a book kept for the purpose, that
pupil-teachers should be absolutely prohibited from inflicting such punishment and that the headteacher be held directly responsible for every punishment of the kind.' (100) Rigg and W. Hepworth Dixon had already proposed the establishment of P. E. and Drill in the curriculum, on 1 March 1871 (101) and Rigg again seconded the proposal brought forward by Huxley, 'that drill and music be taught in every school during part of the time devoted to actual instruction.' (102) It was decided by the Board that attendance at Drill, under a competent instructor, was to be permitted for 'not more than two hours a week for twenty weeks a year, to count as attendance at school.' (103)

Huxley and Rigg also put forward the Committee's recommendations on the syllabus of Infant, Junior and Secondary schools. Infant Schools were to teach:

a. The Bible and principles of Religion and morality.

b. Reading, Writing and Arithmetic.

c. Object lessons of simple character with some exercise of the hands and eyes as is given in the 'kinder-garten' system

d. Music and Drill part of the time devoted to actual instruction. (104)

In Junior and Senior Schools, the 'essential subjects' were to include:

a. The Bible and Principles of Religion and Morality, in accordance with the resolutions of the Board

b. Reading, Writing and Arithmetic; English Grammar and Composition and principles of book-keeping in Senior Schools with mensuration in Senior Boys' Schools

c. Systemised Object lessons, embracing in the 6 school years a course of elementary instruction in physical science, and serving as an introduction to the science examinations which are conducted by the Science and Art Department.

The two men also proposed that the History of England, Elementary Geography and Elementary Social Economy be included in the list of essential subjects to be taught. Discretionary subjects were to include Algebra, Geometry, Latin or a modern language. It was Rigg who responded on behalf of the committee to requests in July to expand the number of optional subjects. He told members:

The discretionary subjects already passed were such as might be taught to boys generally who possessed the faculty and aptitude for learning them. Algebra was of a general nature; geometry, mensuration and domestic economy were all matters of general application and it was desirable that every child who could get high enough should be taught these subjects.
But he did think that it would be a mistake to adopt exceedingly specialised subjects, because 'if they began, he could not see where they would be able to stop'. (105) He thought it impractical to include such 'peculiar and specialised' subjects as Navigation, and said that masters would not be able to teach Telegraphy.

Rigg was therefore instrumental, as part of the Scheme of Education Committee, in drawing up a very broad curriculum, the antithesis of the narrowed curriculum which had been created by the Revised Code of 1862. It is difficult to assess his influence more precisely, as the Minutes of the Scheme of Education Committee no longer exist, although it is interesting to note that Professor Huxley asked him to second all of his proposals, when they were presented to the Board. (Interestingly, in spite of their religious and other differences there was a good rapport between the two men and when Huxley was forced by ill health to retire from the Board in 1872, Rigg expressed his regret: 'They were losing one of the most valuable members of the Board, not only because of his intellect and trained acuteness, but because of his knowledge of every subject connected with culture and education, and because of his great fairness and impartiality with regard to all subjects that came under his observation. He (Dr. Rigg) had a very great and true respect for Professor Huxley, both personally and in regard to his services in connection with that Board.' He commented amid much laughter, 'It would not perhaps be proper to pass any resolution, in as much as if they did, they would have to repeat it very often in other cases during the next few months.' (106)

The Curriculum itself proved to be difficult to transfer to the classroom and there were many accusations that the scheme was too idealistic. The Final Report of the School Board for London stated in 1904:

There is no definite information as to the extent to which instruction was given in the various subjects at the end of 1873, but it would appear that the only subjects taught in the schools of the Board, with very few exceptions were the three obligatory subjects of the Government Code, with Singing, Drawing, Needlework and Physical Education. The Government Reports received during the year ended December 1873, show that only a very small number of children earned grants in the specific subject areas of the Code, the figures being: Geography, 150; Grammar, seventy; History, forty two; Algebra, six; Animal Physiology, two. (107)

In 1873, in the final report of the first Board, the clerk, G.H. Croad, stated that the scheme had been carried out 'as far practicable with the very raw material to be found for the most part in
Board schools. It could not of course be regarded otherwise than as an ideal, to which however the Board hope that their schools will approximate more and more with each succeeding year.' (108) By giving a wide definition of acceptable curriculum, the Board gave a lead to the Education Department. The opposition which it aroused complained of extravagance on the Rates, and if the Board had begun with a very narrow curriculum, they would have had little hope of widening it at a later date. Some of the managers of voluntary schools were also worried that they might have to compete with the board schools in offering all the prescribed subjects. One observer still claimed that it was a 'revolution in educational ideals, and if those ideals were never absolutely realised, the ends achieved were none the less important.' (109)

Rigg did chair one of the minor sub-committees of the Board, appointed to look into the number and arrangement of classrooms in schools, as well as school design. There were no obvious models for the Board schools which were about to be built, although by 1870 the ancient idea of a school as a single classroom had largely given way to the idea of partitions to divide up the area, sometimes wooden and sometimes merely curtains. There were obviously problems, not least the noise from other classes. The Board looked to the Prussian system for some guidance. This consisted of separate rooms and a separate teacher for each class. A number of the members of the Board expressed grave concern about the expense of staffing such a school and one member believed that it would lead to a lack of co-ordination, with each teacher becoming a head in his or her own classroom. The expense of employing a teacher in each class would have to be offset by large class sizes, of over eighty pupils. Nevertheless, the Board decided to build one of their new schools on this design as an experiment (the Johnson Street School in Stepney ). Rigg told the Board that he did not believe that upto eighty children, which was being envisaged for each class in the Prussian school, could be taught with 'thorough efficiency'. He admitted that he had seen classes of eighty to 100 pupils, but 'had found by experience that a great deal of what was so taught to such large classes was scattered and lost... excellent teachers... could not possibly undertake to make that learning thorough over the whole length, breadth and depth of eighty children'. After questioning many teachers on the matter, he concluded that 'very able teachers might teach fifty children, perhaps pretty effectively in most subjects, but that forty
was the ordinary limit of effective instruction...’ (110) In the following week, he told the Board that thirty to forty children per class was a more feasible idea. He had already taken a personal interest in the design of schools. In March he expressed the desire that, if children were shut up in small rooms at home, it was all the more necessary that they should have ‘good, airy schoolrooms’. (111) He later told members that he had looked into the subject in detail and that ‘most of the teachers who broke down after twenty years habitual teaching did so because their duties were carried on in a bad atmosphere’ that ‘ventilation was cared very little about in day and Sunday schools’ leading to the children’s faculties becoming ‘torpid’ and that schools could be healthy places. (112) He suggested that the Board had to draw up their own arrangements, which could then be presented to architects. (113.) In December 1871, he proposed that a sub-committee should be appointed to investigate the more general requirements of the other schools to be built in London and he was given the chairmanship of this committee. (114)

Rigg’s sub-committee reported back to the Board on 7 February 1872 that:

1. The best numbers for a class may be considered as thirty, and the number ought in no case to exceed forty
2. The schools (except Infant schools) ought to be arranged or graded according to Government Standards
3. A Junior Mixed School ought to embrace Standards I to III; Senior to embrace the three higher Standards
4. As far as possible, in each school of only three Standards, one teacher should be held responsible for the children in each Standard...The teacher specially responsible for each section may be an Assistant teacher, and ex-pupil teacher or a pupil teacher of not less than three years standing (115)

After detailing statistics, the Report goes on:

6. When a section in any school building belonging to one Standard numbers sixty children, it may be conveniently divided into two classes, for each of which, a classroom should be provided, but so that the two classrooms may be thrown into one for the use of the whole collectively when required, care being taken that the partition between the two rooms be such as to exclude or sufficiently to deaden in each room the sound from the other.
7. In graded schools, the area of the classroom should be calculated at nine square feet per scholar...

The differences with the Prussian system were that in the 'experimental' school, classes would not exceed eighty, while those in the Rigg model should not exceed forty. Only one class could be taught in the schoolroom of the Prussian model, while two classes could be
taught in the others. The greatest difference was on staffing. In the experimental school, it was intended that each class should be under a certified teacher, but this was not the case in the Rigg model, with only the words 'responsible teacher, who could be a pupil teacher'. In the Graded schools, (above Standard III) the teacher would be responsible for three Standards, with the assistance of a pupil teacher. Neither the experimental, nor the Rigg design proved a practical success. The 'Prussian' school proved to be too big, having too wide a catchment area and was said by a future Board architect, to have a 'comparatively useless Hall'. (116) The Board's scheme proved not to allow sufficient area for desk accommodation for the classes. About thirty schools were designed according to the Rigg specifications, and then, in July 1872, the Board decided to employ its own architect, who could create his own design, based on the needs of the neighbourhood. The plan of separate classrooms was retained, but they were based on a class size of sixty children instead of either eighty or forty of the previous plans. The idea of the partitions in the schoolroom were dropped. (117) The area allowed to each child in the Rigg scheme, (nine square feet) proved insufficient, but no change was made in it until 1878, when it was increased to ten square feet in Graded schools, though not Infant classes. The laudable aim to limit classes to thirty to forty pupils was soon abandoned.

Another sub-Committee which Rigg proposed was that on books. (118) The Board asked the six members to investigate the various school books on the market and to define those to be used in Board Schools. (119) He personally reviewed Dictionaries (120) and Class Registers (121) while other members looked into books on Arithmetic, Geography, Grammar, History and Music. The Committee finally decided not to give a definitive list of books to be used. In fact there was some dissatisfaction with the existing books and it was debated whether the Board should not itself prepare and issue its own Text-books. The idea was turned down and it was resolved to confine itself only to reading books, with the summary of the sub-committee being:

The number of books on Arithmetic, Geography and Grammar is very large, and fresh books are being constantly published. Under these circumstances, the Committee do not think that it would be advisable to make a selection which would need continual additions and to which objections might be raised on the ground that certain books were omitted.

It was therefore left to the discretion of the school managers, with the Board reserving the
right to object to any particular book. (122) Only three of the members actually drew up this summary, one of them being Dr. Rigg. In 1874 the rules with regard to reading books were applied to all other books and apparatus.

Rigg did use his position on the Board to support one Wesleyan School, the Radnor Street school, which complained of unfair competition from the Board. (123) The School Board had proposed to establish a school for 1200 children in Bath Street, St. Lukes, which was close to the Wesleyan school. A deputation was sent from the school and Rigg introduced this to the Statistics Committee, to give their case, on 7 March 1872. He then moved that, as previously the circumstances of the school had not been fully placed before the Board, 'in particular, that arrangements were in process for enlarging the Radnor Street schools...this Committee is of opinion that a school is needed in Block w...instead of the site which had been selected in Bath Street.' (124) The Committee looked into the matter and found there to be a deficiency of 1900 places in the area, but in the Bath Street area, taken separately, there was a deficiency for only 506 children. As the Wesleyan deputation had promised an extension, with 400 places, it was decided to concentrate on other adjoining areas for the Board schools. They were still looking for another site in September 1872 (125), and the Radnor Street managers complained to the Committee again, through Rigg, about the continuing competition from the temporary Board School there. It was finally resolved to abandon the premises in December (126) and to make it into Board Offices.

The years 1873 to 1876 saw Rigg and Canon Robert Gregory, Principal of St. Mark's Church of England teacher training college, attacking the Board's building programme. Canon Gregory began the onslaught with a motion calling for a cut in the Board's building estimates. At first, Rigg did not support this. He told the Board in February 1874 that he was conscious of the costs that had been involved in building, but as an advocate of economy, he was yet free to say if the schools are necessary and had cost three times as much as they had, he should think it cheaper to spend the money than to leave the children uneducated in the future as in the past.' He could not accept Canon Gregory's motion as, if they had universal compulsion, they would need an increase in school board places in a number of areas; 'a surplus in one district was of no use in supplying the deficiency of another district.' He said
that he did not believe the Board should be censured that its building programme had been excessive.; although he was 'voluntary to the backbone' he did not wish there were no school boards. (127) In the following month, he proposed his first motion to the Board, that the Statistical Committee should conduct an inquiry to ascertain whether, 'after the experience and information gained during the last three years' any modifications had to be made in the building programme. He called on them particularly to investigate the deficiencies for girls' and infant schools and also to report the locality in which any deficiency existed and the total surplus places in all areas of London. (128) In proposing the motion, he said that the Board had acted with the greatest moderation, and although he did not think them infallible, 'yet they had been more careful in regard to the basis on which their proceedings were founded than any other board in the kingdom.' (129) Unlike Canon Gregory, he made no suggestion that there had to be a reduction in numbers educated by the Board. The motion was welcomed as bringing 'pure, unsullied light' to their plans and passed unanimously. (130) The Statistical Committee took eighteen months to complete their enquiry and reported back to the Board in November 1875. Their findings were immediately questioned by Canon Gregory, Canon Cromwell and the Rev. Evan Daniel. Rigg proposed the following on 6 November:

1. That while the experience of the last four years proves that... several errors, more or less serious, occurred in the hypothetical allowances and calculations which the Board were called upon to make, at a time when they could have no direct or strictly apposite experience on which to rely - the Board regard it as a matter for great satisfaction that, owing very much to the prudence and caution of the Statistical Committee... as well as the care exercised by the Board themselves... the Board have been preserved, in nearly all cases from serious practical error as to the number or capacity of the schools which they have established...

3. That nevertheless, the Board deem it important to place on record one result of their experience in correction of the too sanguine early expectations of the first Board, viz.: That 5% is far too low an allowance for the proportion of absenteeism from the schools of the Board... and that for some years to come, and until many concurring causes shall have greatly altered the present condition of things, 20%... must be regarded as by no means too large an allowance for the difference which may be expected between the number of children on the school register and the average attendance...

4. That (the Board) deem it proper and needful to record their conviction that an accurate educational census of London, throughout all grades of its population, ought to be taken at least once in six years, and that such a census must always be recognised as the general working basis for all the calculations of... the Board... and that the Board venture, accordingly to express the hope that such a census may be taken early in the history of the third School Board for
He said that he had attempted to avoid party extremes. Although there was an element of censure of the Statistical Committee, he said he believed that in general they had acted with great prudence.

It was natural that the statistics of the Board should be challenged as well as the policies of the Board. For himself, he did not think that the Board had done anything extravagantly in regard to the number of children provided for or with regard to the outlay on schools; but at the same time, he was quite unable to defend all the calculations of the Board.

He lamented that the 1872 Report had not been discussed by the Board as a whole. This had been one of the cases of 'headlongness which, added to the headstrongness of the Board, had injured their fair fame'. He saw one error in their calculations, in that it had been on the basis of a mere 5% absenteeism:

The 5% allowance was ridiculous and it was a great pity the Board ever sanctioned it. He trusted Mr. Picton would not persevere in saying the Board must build for all children, whether they would come to school or not. He denied that interpretation of the Act in toto.

He advised the members that in the past two years, average attendance had only risen by 1% and 'as the Board got down to the lowest stratum, they found difficulties of compulsion increase'. He therefore did not expect any great improvements in the next five years and he asserted that the average absenteeism would be 20%. He also pointed to the Radnor Street School to show that the Board had been overbuilding in some areas.

Rigg was opposed energetically by William Rodgers:

It was a very nice thing for Dr. Rigg to write out those sentences at home about 'several errors in the Board's calculations'. 'Hypothetical allowances and calculations' was a very nice phrase and no doubt Dr. Rigg looked upon it with complaisance when he had written it; but no hypothetical allowances or deductions were ever made. The children were not all at school and allowances and deductions were made on account of them and that was all.

Referring to a letter which Rigg had addressed to all the members, calling for an increase in the space allowance for each child to ten square feet, he said sarcastically:

Dr. Rigg grew terrified at the ghost, which he had raised and he rushed home and wrote a letter which he printed and addressed to every member of the Board, in which he said 'I will give you ten square feet per child instead of eight feet.' (132)

The greatest objection to Rigg's suggestions was that they would bind the hands of any future boards. Lord Napier castigated Rigg:
The Statistical Committee made a deduction of 5% and Dr. Rigg made a deduction of 20%; but then Dr. Rigg proposed to make such an increased allowance of space per child as raised the accommodation necessary... The resolution would be a proclamation to teachers that the Board did not expect to get an attendance of more than eighty out of every 100 children on the rolls; and if they blamed teachers for low attendances, the teachers would be able to turn round and say to the Board, 'Your own standard is 80%'

Rigg's measure was finally defeated after the members tied, and the Chairman had to make a casting vote. Rigg did not in fact attend the Board for the following six months, either through other pressures or as a reaction to this humiliation. Six weeks of this time was spent on a visit to America. When he returned, he and Canon Barry continued the attack on the Board's building programme. A formal protest was put forward on 8 November 1876:

We, the undersigned members of the School Board for London, desire respectfully but firmly to protest against the decision of the Board of 25 October, adopting certain proposals of the Statistical Committee, to ask leave from the Education Department to provide 4,716 additional school places, on the following grounds:

1. That at the close of duties and responsibilities of the School Board, as at present constituted - the Board having already provided for 53,499 places beyond the estimate of 112,000 presented by the late Board in 1873, and it being a matter of controversy whether the Board has not already provided for at least as many school places as are practically needed - it is highly undesirable to ask permission for a large additional number of places, on which permission, if granted, the present Board will not be able to act, and thereby to interfere with the full freedom of deliberation and action in the Board to be elected in the present month...That in estimating the requirements of the various localities, the authorised statistics of the Board are (as it appears to be) alternatively regarded and disregarded (133)

It was signed by sixteen members of the Board. Mr. Watson replied to this complaint on behalf of the Statistics Committee. He said that the Board had not made a serious error in the number or capacity of the schools which had been established. He pointed out that a new Board would soon be elected and that they might think that the provision for building was unnecessary. However, they could rescind the plan, or even refuse to tender for contracts from builders. The new Board would not therefore be finally committed by the old Board. He did however assert:

On the other hand - and this alternative is conceivable - the new Board may approve the proposed provision. Would it be fair to them in that case that the erection of schools, which as it is, must take two years at least, should be still further delayed so as to take three years? ... (It had been) declared by the mouth of the Vice President in August last year that the Board were far from having overtaken the arrears in London. It is alleged that the authorised statistics of the Board are alternately regarded and disregarded. It is true that in
neighbourhoods, where new houses have been built, and the population has increased, the Board are compelled to rely on evidence beyond the statistics of the Board and especially on the reports of the divisional committees. But where districts are settled and no variation of population has taken place, the statistics based on the Census are invariably taken into account. (134)

The proposal was accepted to maintain the programme until the new Board was constituted, Rigg himself did not attend any further meetings of the Board and he did not stand for election to the third Board in December 1876. He later showed some pride in his achievements on the London School Board. In particular, he expressed to his son-in-law, John Telford, a great satisfaction in the 'School Board Compromise' of W.H.Smith, which he had fought so hard to support. (135)
CHAPTER FOUR
In the turmoil of administrative changes in education, it was easy to forget the work at the chalkface in the early 1870s. Dr. Rigg's position at Westminster brought him into contact with student teachers and pupils at the Westminster College's model school, as well as the politicians formulating education policies. In his Inaugural Address of 1873, Rigg restated his philosophy on teaching, which he said was in danger of being forgotten 'in the late tumult and excitement'. (1) He believed that teachers must be of a Christian character and told his students:

I hope none of you will ever need to teach in a secular school. If however such a misfortune should befall any of you, even then your Christian character and influence will be by no means without value or important relation to your teaching and its results. Your power to train will be greatly diminished, but will not be wholly done away. Your example will still be potent to influence, even when it is unhappily forbidden to you to inculcate Divine precept and Christian truth and doctrine. (2)

He emphasised that a 'passion for gain or worldly preferment' could not be a teacher's dominant motive, that the 'harvest of eternity' had to be a greater motivation than the 'prizes of time.' (3) He points out that the influence of a Christian teacher is like 'songs without words'. He is a 'living epistle' to his pupils and his good influence will be contagious. He went on:

Banish the Bible and the Gospel from the schools and the only foundation left on which the teacher can attempt to ground the authority of his moral injunctions, is his own word and assurance, backed by whatever testimony of conscience may have been previously evoked in the mind of the scholar. Morals will rest for their only recognizable authority on the teacher's own declaration and the fear of punishment by the teacher... either there will be no discipline in the school, or there will be only the discipline of fear... the reign of barbaric force will return in our schools... The alternative may be set down as 'the Bible or the birch' (4)

He points to the breakdown of discipline in secular American schools, which were increasingly secular. Rigg also pointed out to students that 'the best learner is not always the best teacher'. He suggested that the two processes required different faculties:

Earnest and thorough sympathy, combined with a self-forgetting patience, constitutes the finest basis of character for the teacher. Intellectual eagerness and rapidity are not easily combined with such intellectual self-sacrifice, such intellectual lowness, such patience with the slow, and also with the careless, as are necessary to the character of the most successful
teacher, the teacher who can quicken and take hold of and draw out all the intellectual capabilities and endeavours of the pupil. Intellectual eagerness, and rapidity, and ambition are the characteristics of the successful scholar. Intellectual patience and lowliness, entering into all the difficulties and sympathizing with the dullness of the scholar, bearing even with his waywardness and heedlessness - these qualities, themselves founded on Christian lowliness and sympathy - are the prime characteristics of the best teacher. But they seldom belong to the most brilliant student. It is harder for the very quick and rapid to be intellectually patient, than for a slower learner... the self-forgetting student... wins the confidence of his pupils... is never wearied or impatient merely because of honest dullness, forgets all thought of merely intellectual companionship or progress... The qualities are the direct fruit of Christianity. (5)

From his own experience he comments that often there have been high students who have been less successful teachers 'through impatience, ambition, and want of simplicity'. The teachers who were prized in Methodism were those who not only knew what to teach, or how to give a lesson but those who were intrinsically good:

The mere able teacher who gets through his work efficiently and then leaves it, will never be beloved and esteemed like these...(who) loved their scholars, body and soul.

He also looked to new methods in teaching, and at Westminster he introduced new college courses for prospective teachers, including Psychology from 1884. His 1880 Inaugural concentrates almost solely on the art of teaching, welcoming the ability of some teachers to 'magnetize' their scholars. He shows his own understanding of the difficulties of classroom teaching, especially to children of the lower classes:

In their case, not seldom, in those parts of the country where strong provincial dialects still prevail, the language of books is really a foreign language; the labour of mastering which is added to the task of learning to read. If in these cases the children are not made thoroughly to understand, perfectly to follow and appreciate, the language they are called upon to read, it is evident that it will be as if foreign children, Dutch or German children, were being taught to read English in schools. ...If the children of the better classes pick up reading much more easily than children of the lower classes, and read naturally and instinctively, with much more expression and propriety, the reason is that in their homes they are familiar with the speech and style they find in books (6)

He encourages the skill of reading above others, particularly if it is successfully taught:

We know what it is for colours to be fast colours in dyeing, colours that won't wash out. So the children in our schools must be taught reading in such a manner that it will not rub out and be altogether lost, after they have left school and been a year or two at close work. But in order to do this ...the understanding must have been developed step by step as the practice of reading was kept up. The reading lessons must be thoroughly understood
by children; subjects must be selected suitable to their capacity and condition; their sympathies must be brought into play, and their minds filled as far as may be with ideas of a different character and a wider range from those which they learn at their homes. (7)

He stresses the value of pictures, maps and scientific charts around the schoolroom and of the 'object-lesson' which might 'clothe their world of thought, imagination, sympathy.' (8) Although they were no longer required in elementary schools, they still were 'a great advantage and for many a necessity'. He deplores the type of lesson, which still prevailed in many high schools, of putting a text-book into the hands of young students and leaving them to 'fight the battle of learning out between themselves and the book, and the master or mistress with ferule or penal imposition'. (9) He stresses that the rules of arithmetic should not be taught 'merely by rote' and even in Geography the same method was sometimes used, which had 'no oral explanation or description':

All the teacher had to do was to hear the lessons, that is, to note whether the scholars had correctly learnt their task or not, and to punish the defaulters. In all this there really was no teaching whatever. The principle of our Training Colleges is the reverse of this, and you are taught to reverse it in your schools. Your business there will be really to teach... your duty is to explain the principles of the rules on which the children are to act. (10)

On class technique, he advises:

the teacher should have a sharp eye and a quick ear, so that he may keep strict account of all the members of his class, and not allow any to hide himself amidst the multitude. He must give good heed to individual backwardness and dullness, and must take those who are behind the rest and have not mastered his lesson, apart for special instruction, or, if need be, put them into a separate section, that they may receive extra care from himself or his assistant... (11)

The Wesleyans as a body had a number of complaints at the working of the Education Act by this time. They continued to fear Anglican schools dominating their children and as in 1872 they still called for school board schools within reach of every family, even though this might disadvantage some of their own schools. Rigg, as a great defender of his denominational schools, nevertheless did not fear such competition. He admitted in 1875 that inefficient Wesleyan schools would 'go down', but he showed no regret about this. He defined denominational schools as either congregational schools or mission schools. The congregational schools were intended to be solely for the Wesleyan children of the chapel and hence should be 'superior schools', since they had children of a better class, 'the
teachers being cheered by the sympathy and fellowship of the Church, the management being superior in simplicity, directness, unity and cordiality. An inferior congregational school would be a great discredit to the chapel, and if it could not be improved, he had no regret in it being closed in favour of a board school' (12) The mission schools were intended to bring religious and secular influence to bear on those outside the church, and he said that these should be maintained with a missionary generosity. The Wesleyan inspector, Mawbey showed sympathy with this view, when he reported in 1876 that board schools were not a real competition with Wesleyan schools, as they were regarded as a poor-man's schools. Wesleyan children had left their own schools, when a board school had been set up in an area, only to return, because of the security of religious teaching. (13)

However, by 1876 there had been a drop in the number of Wesleyan schools and for the first time a drop in the number of children taught in Methodist day-schools. This led to some concern in Wesleyan circles. The Wesleyan Education Committee had been forced to set aside money to 'prop' up Wesleyan schools. At the Preparatory Meeting on Education, in July 1876, the Rev. G. W. Olver proposed a resolution regretting the decline. He welcomed the new fund for necessitous schools which the Committee had installed and hoped that 'the annual income of the fund will be so enlarged as to permit the continuance of such aid without prejudice to other claims.' (14) There had been a number of cases where schools had been helped to survive, with a special grant of only £5, £10, or £15. One school had closed for want of such funds, and the consequence was that 'the Roman Catholics had stepped in and did the work which the Methodists were doing previously.' He believed that 'no Methodist layman' would have objected to a few pounds being spent in this way. He pointed out that the only denominations which had schools were the Church of England, the Roman Catholics and the Methodists, and that the other Dissenters wanted to see denominational schools closed:

Whatever they might do, it was evident that other educating bodies were resolved to maintain their own schools. No action they took would lead to the closing of a single Roman Catholic school or a single Church of England school. Every one of their own schools which had been closed or abandoned simply lessened their powers as a Connexion to represent the great question of education in the country whenever an occasion arose for so representing it. The loss of a school represented also the loss on their
part of so much direct influence upon the religious education, the truly scriptural education of the children in the school.

Although he admitted that some of the board schools were satisfactory, he remained suspicious of universal school board schools. There was nothing in them which could prevent 'the insinuation that the historical records found in Scripture, though very ancient and very remote, were not to be trusted'. He said that this was happening in some schools. The 'insinuations' were thrown out, and the children went home' saying to their parents that, whatever they were taught in the schools, the teachers did not believe the Bible'.

There were two speeches against this view, by Mr. Moore and the Rev. Holland, who had been such a consistent opponent of Wesleyan schools. Mr. Moore identified that the Wesleyan efforts were characterised by a 'jealousy of the action of the other churches'. He saw their day-schools in rural districts as an 'incubus' which directed money away from 'spiritual objects':

Where was the spirit of power of the Methodist fathers, who in the face of State opposition, established that grand temple of Methodism, which some of them seemed to fear would crumble to nothingness if some mighty effort were not made to undo the loss of 390 school children, who had been tempted to taste the forbidden sweets of board school education?...When and where had it ever been shown that day-schools were essential to the well-being of Methodism?

He preferred their efforts to be made with Sunday schools, but he did emphasise that they should not bring 'shame upon their body by referring to the action of other churches'. The Rev. Dr. James denied this jealousy, but said they were attempting to spread the 'honour of Christ and the maintenance of a pure Gospel' in the rural districts:

If they were sure that the children who left them were still brought up in what they as Methodists believed the true nurture and admonition of the Lord, they would not feel upon the subject as they did.

Dr. Rigg reminded the delegates that in 1872 they had made a firm promise to maintain their existing schools and he totally favoured Olver's motion. At the end of the meeting, the proposal was in fact accepted unanimously. The special grants to needy Wesleyan schools were continued. In 1876, nine schools were helped, with a grant amounting to £90 in all. In the following years, these were increased to seventeen schools and £240 in
1877, and twenty schools and a total of £395 in 1878. Clearly the Wesleyans were finding it increasingly difficult to finance their endeavours from government grants and school fees.(15)

The prospect of universal school boards did raise some problems. One of the greatest worries of the Wesleyans at this time was the complexion of new village school boards. They wanted some guarantees embodied in a new act to avoid these boards being hijacked by the Church of England. Rigg wrote to the WATCHMAN on 16 June 1875 about the subject:

I have steadily advocated the principles of school boards for the whole country. But I have always said the school boards in rural districts, if established under the Act as it stands, would turn out, save in a few exceptional cases, to be only clergy boards under another name, and would in fact prove to be the means of maintaining the church schools at the expense of the ratepayers. (16)

He quotes an extract in the TIMES of the previous Thursday, which encouraged the Church of England to go for board schools and pointed to Wales and Cornwall, the homes of Dissent, where boards had been established and where:

The clergyman is always a member of the board and in the large majority of cases he is chosen by his fellow members as their chairman. He is used to having at least one good friend among the other four and if he is a man of discretion, he guides the board. With these facts before us who can doubt what would happen if school boards were generally established in rural England? The clergyman, his churchwarden, his wife or his sister, or the wife, sister or daughter of his friend, the squire, would be three out of the five members... The clergyman would find himself armed with machinery for obtaining money for the parish schools and for bringing children into them ... All this is so obvious that the instinctive repugnance of the clergy to give up a shadow of authority will certainly disappear as new men take the place of the old.

Rigg saw this as clear evidence that the Methodists could not expect justice for their interests, particularly in rural areas.

In the following August, he identified a practice which threatened Wesleyan interests and which had been identified two years earlier by the Wesleyan inspector, Cucklow. The Anglicans had hired their schoolroom to a school board, although the latter could not take possession of it until ten o'clock each day. The scholars and pupil-teachers met at nine o'clock each day, when the master 'voluntarily gives religious instruction'. Twice a week
this is given by the clergyman together with the master. The National Society had even issued a form of 'user' to facilitate the arrangement. The Wesleyan Education Committee addressed a memorial to Forster, when he was proposing an Amendment Bill in 1873 asking for a regulation preventing such transfers and McArthur moved an amendment in the Commons so that occupancy should be 'from 6 a.m. to 5 p.m. on all school days' but he did not gain support in the House. (17) The Wesleyans complained again to the Government in 1875 in a memorial which stated these abuses, pointing out that they violated the spirit of the 1870 Act and asking the Government to legislate to render this illegal. (18)

Rigg regarded this as a flagrant violation of the Act. (19) His Inaugural of the same year added other complaints. The schoolteacher was being appointed to such schools by the board, but also had to be approved by the clergyman, and was to regard himself 'equally the servant of the board and of the clergyman... of the clergyman as respects the religious education, and especially during the first hour when the school is open.' (20) He claimed that the arrangement was being used in a number of parishes and rural towns. At Bletchingley, the schoolmaster even had to act as the organist on Sunday in the Anglican Church, and as the choir-master, which Rigg regarded as turning the Cowper-Temple Clause 'inside out'. It should teach Wesleyans not to put their faith in board schools in rural parishes, unless a number of parishes were grouped together as a district board.

The 1875 Wesleyan Conference continued these complaints. Dr. James said that it would be a great calamity to the liberties of the English people for the school board system to have a monopoly in the villages:

The parson, the squire, the churchwarden and somebody else, at their absolute disposal, would constitute the local board; and in thousands of instances where the clergyman and squire now paid for their own tyranny, they would make ratepayers pay for it. (21)

Rigg also pointed out that in rural districts, the Methodists were often poor and obscure, without the leisure, means or political training to enable them to act on school boards and thereby to protect their consciences. Dr. James' conclusion, and that of the Wesleyan body
as a whole, was that there had to be the grouping of parishes to secure a large and comparatively independent board. The complaints were renewed in the following year. At the Annual Wesleyan Meeting on Education, in March 1876, the Rev. G. O. Bate pointed out that the Wesleyan Education Committee had been the only voice which had been raised up against the discrepancies between the spirit of the Education Act and the clauses allowing transfers of denominational schools. (22)

At the July meeting, the Rev. T. B. Stephenson showed some of the continuing paranoia, that:

a most careful, deliberate and determined effort was being made by the members of the Church of England to get the control of the board schools all over the country into their own hands; they aimed at getting in Church managers; to get the whole school board machinery into their hands, only in order to use it for the purposes which they believed to be the best, but which they, as Methodists did not approve. (23)

If the future Act of Parliament introduced compulsion, there was only one class of school left in the villages which their children would be forced into, the Church of England schools.

In January 1876, the WATCHMAN newspaper complained that the Conscience Clause was still being countered by the Church of England, and it called for a campaign to inform the working people of Methodism that they could not be required to attend Church or Sunday School as a condition of entry into an elementary school. They suggested that tea-meetings might give a suitable opportunity for disseminating this information. While the National Schools were not making Church Sunday School attendance a requirement for the entry of children, which would be in direct breach of the 1870 Act, the Editorial of the paper suggested that 'more flies are caught with honey than with vinegar'. and that the school managers were using devious means to reach this end:

The scholars are admitted freely enough and then - invitation, remonstrance, gentle or angry threats and presents - very various are the means employed to secure this end., that the poor man's children shall obtain the education for which the Nation helps to pay, only on condition of conforming to the church ... The grants obtained by some schools from the Nation's purse are simply money obtained on false pretences. (24)

They saw the greatest danger in compulsion, under these circumstances, as it would merely help this Anglican proselytism. With some bitterness, the Editorial concluded:
If the country five years ago decisively rejected the proposal, 'Free, Secular and Compulsory', what will it say now to the demand for schools which shall be 'Subsidised, Clerical and Compulsory'?

The fear of Roman Catholicism remained. At the 1876 Annual meeting on Education, Dr. Punshon referred again to 'Romish aggression' and pointed again to the continuing use of Roman Catholic textbooks which they had found so objectionable in 1873. He particularly objected to writing exercises to write out the 'Hail Mary', and study the 'martyrdom' of Thomas More 'for the cause of God'. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were described as being 'built by the liberality of Catholic princes...but since the Reformation, they have been used for Protestant purposes'. He believed that Roman Catholic schools were being allowed to 'falsify history in school hours for their own purposes.' (25)

On the 17th and 25th Clauses of the 1870 Act, which allowed for the payment of fees for 'poor' scholars, there was much division in Methodist ranks, but there was some consensus that such payments had to be rare and carefully controlled. Rigg himself proposed changes in his book on National Education:

the principle of these two clauses, to pay or to remit the fees of indigent scholars, according to circumstances is old enough... As respects these two clauses, the English Education Bill should have been framed as the Scottish Education Act, on the motion of Mr.W.H.Smith... that all cases of alleged inability to pay for the education of children should be referred to the Poor Law Guardians to investigate, and if proper, to relieve by payment of the fee to the school to which the children are sent... the school boards are not adapted to investigate and discriminate between the merits of the vast crowds of cases which are sure to come before them... Such a business requires great and specialist knowledge and experience... The Poor Relief Department already possesses all these; the school boards have them not, and are not organized to obtain them... (26)

He continued to resist universal free education. He hoped it would never come, and suggested that:

It would be a great and noble distinction for England, if Privy Council money-grants to schools could be brought to an end; and if board schools... were to meet their own expenses, with the exception of such remission of fees... as might be necessary to meet the case of the really poor day-labouring or out door paupers. (27)

There was also some dispute over compulsion. Rigg criticised the compulsory provisions of the Act, 'especially as to the evidence which is held admissible against a parent'. He also suggests that, without indirect legislation, direct compulsion could never be
accomplished. He claims that even in London the problem of securing 'regular attendance' had been an 'utter failure'. The Wesleyan Committee had suggested that the principles of the Factory and Workshops' Acts ought to be applied to all children and that 'no child should be allowed to work either half time or full time without having... passed an appropriate examination, in a manner satisfactory to one of Her Majesty's Inspectors'.

(28)

Lord Sandon was appointed Tory Vice-President of the Committee on Education in 1874, after Disraeli's election victory. Dr. Rigg and Lord Sandon do seem to have struck up a keen friendship. They were both members of the first London School Board and both were devout Christians of the Evangelical wing. They had conducted a significant correspondence in 1874, over the Government's Endowed Schools Bill, which indicates that Rigg felt closer in view to Sandon than to many of his own Church. The Endowed Schools issue involved predominantly grammar schools, not elementary education, but the furore in Wesleyan ranks is indicative of the anti-Anglicanism. The arguments of 1874 were a prelude to their reactions to the later Education Bill, for elementary schools. The Endowed Schools Act of 1869 had redefined the terms of foundation of all endowed schools, after the Endowed Schools Commission had reported on sectarian anomalies. Forster had been a leading member of this commission and received praise from Wesleyans for his recommendations in 1869. The Editor of the WATCHMAN saw these old schools as 'originally intended for national use and benefit, but which had come to be regarded and managed as belonging especially to the Church of England'. They did not pillory the Church for this, as when many of these endowments had been made, there was only one Church in England:

Since the Act of Toleration and since the removal of all Nonconformist disabilities, the state of the case is entirely altered... It is not fair that all Nonconformists should be excluded from being trustees or teachers, in connection with the great Grammar Schools, like those of Birmingham or Manchester. The Act of 1869 recognises in effect, although not in any offensive or ostensible manner, the equitable claims of Nonconformists. Provision was made for renewing the trusts on such terms as would not exclude Nonconformists, elected by proper constituencies, from being trustees... The religious instruction in the schools always protected by a very searching Conscience Clause, was left in each case to be regulated according to local circumstances... It assumed all foundations to be National and to be such as should be managed undenominationally, except
The Church of England had complained continually after the passing of the 1869 Act, that it was not working fairly. They urged that since the Act of Toleration, many foundations had been created by members of the Church of England, the trust deed of which contained no express provisions assigning them to their Church. An Amendment Act of 1873 had clarified that foundations made after the 1689 Toleration Act, which had clear evidence that they had been created for the Church of England, yet lacking any such express provisions in their deeds, could still be regarded as the sole concern of the Church.

The new bill would undermine again the rights of the Nonconformists, and create almost religious tests for entry to the old grammar schools. In the deed of Birmingham Grammar School for example, the Bishop was recognised as the 'referee' in regard to the instruction or management of the school, and it was now declared a 'strictly and exclusively Church of England School', or as the WATCHMAN phrases it 'a denominational seminary of the Church of England.' (30)

At a Conference of Opponents to the Endowed Schools Bill on 22 July 1874, it was pointed out that the main emphasis of the Endowed Schools Act of 1869 had been to open up the endowed schools, so that they no longer remained in the hands of local cliques. The new bill was seen as an attempt to re-endow the Church of England. John Morley proposed that the Conference:

strongly protests against the retrogressive and unprecedented course pursued by the present Government in seeking to reverse the policy deliberately sanctioned by Parliament and the Nation in passing the Endowed Schools Act of 1869...By the Act it was virtually affirmed that the ancient educational foundations of the country were the common property of all and not of any particular religious community and that in regard both to instruction and to management, they should be thrown open to all classes, without reference to ecclesiastical distinctions, while at the same time the wishes of the moderate founders were scrupulously respected... Nothing has occurred to justify the withdrawal or curtailment of the rights and privileges that were granted by the Act in the interest, not of religious equality alone, but of liberal education also... The bill of the government, while professing to amend, virtually repeals the Act of 1869, first by putting an end to the Commission appointed to carry it into effect and transferring their powers to another body... and by re-establishing... the sectarian exclusiveness which the Act was intended to destroy and by practically
placing the control of the great majority of the schools... in the hands of members of the Church of England. (31)

The Wesleyan Committee of Exigency met in special session and proposed a Petition to Parliament calling for its complete withdrawal. They pointed out the speed with which the measure was being pushed through Parliament and thus their need to act quickly. The Editor of the WATCHMAN commented that the Connexion would not have forgiven them for any 'negligence or inertness' and that Conference would have been too late to stop the bill. They admitted that it was 'never desirable, never congenial for the Methodist body to be driven into a line of political agitation' but this was seen as unavoidable in the present case, as it affected the 'rights and privileges of the Methodists as such.' (32)

Rigg deplored the rabid anti-Anglicanism and anti-Catholicism of many Wesleyan spokesmen. On 16 July 1874, he wrote to Lord Sandon:

I grieve over your Bill. Methodism unitedly and with, I fear, a painful revival of embittered feeling will go against your Bill before the Parliamentary Committee meets tomorrow. Our General Committee meets this day fortnight. Its first act after being constituted will be a hot discussion and a heavy vote and memorial against your Bill. For Methodism, it will go far to rehabilitate the Liberal minority in favour and even to procure condonation for Mr. Gladstone. It is a curiously infelicitous change of policy. (33)

On the following day, he wrote to Sandon:

I am more than sorry that it has so happened, but this morning we have been in committee on the Bill and have agreed to a Petition to the House, which Mr. Alderman McArthur will probably present on Monday night. I can assure you that to enter into our agitation on this subject is to me a great trouble. There can be no doubt however that the Committee when it assembles will (only too warmly I fear) sustain the action our Committee has taken. All such occasions for building up and rekindling sectarian feelings I deeply deplore. Our Press is speaking out on the subject and we shall have plenty of allusion to it in our Wesleyan Conference Committee next week and the week after. Cornwall and Devonshire have distinguished themselves of late by their anti-Church of England feeling. (34)

Lord Sandon did try to compromise, and he told the House, on 20 July 1874, that he never intended the measure to lead to such extreme results. He reasserted that 'where the terms of the founder's bequest required it, the trustees must be selected from one denomination.' He added:

For himself and for the Government, he disclaimed any intention of
excluding Nonconformists from the governing bodies of the endowed schools. On the contrary he admitted that their presence there would be of the utmost educational value. (35)

He added a clause that, 'unless there was express declaration to that effect in the founder's will, the Commissioners shall not be compelled to appoint the governing bodies from any one particular Church or sect.' Forster and the Wesleyans were agreed that this amendment would not have been of any value. In the following week, the Government decided to shelve the bill.

Sandon's withdrawal of the Endowed Schools Bill was a relief for Rigg personally. He wrote to his brother, on 27 July, from the Camborne Conference, that 'the government have surrendered as to the Endowed Schools Bill. Our petition and our Connexional activity have had a full share in producing this result.'(36) He wrote to Sandon from the Conference at Camborne on 25 July 1874:

Forgive me if I write a line to say how thankful I am to be spared from the painful duty to which I was looking forward, of moving the Conference next week to memorialise both Houses of Parliament and to move our Connexion at large to petition Parliament and put pressure on Representatives in regard to the measure. Only last evening, I was afraid, between myself and our chief officials here, that I should have to prepare resolutions to be submitted and be ready to move them. If the measure had been hastily passed, we should have been launched on a career of agitation for its repeal. Well I hope that danger is over for ever. To me it would have been particularly distasteful. But on no subject have I seen all parties of our Connexion in my time so calmly, resolutely, profoundly united. We include many Tories, but all our Tories on this matter were prepared to go with the rest in steadfast agitation. I think I understand your position, my Lord. I have no doubt your personal influence within the Government has been wise and liberal. But I hope the measure will never be revived. The lines on which our body rests in regard to it are sufficiently, although somewhat rudely, indicated in the leading article which I took the liberty of sending you a couple of days ago. I am sure we have much to thank you for in regard to the fortunate ... transitional result. (37)

The friendship between Rigg and Sandon continued after the disputes over the Endowed Schools Bill. John Telford, Rigg's son-in-law and biographer, probably reflecting the old man's own reminiscences, states that in 1875 Lord Sandon asked him to go over the considerable alterations about to be made in the Education Code. (38) In the following year, prior to a three month visit to the U.S.A., Rigg asked Sandon for letters of
introduction from the Foreign Office to Sir Edward Thornton, the British Minister in Washington. Lord Sandon replied:

I cannot imagine you will need letters of introduction. The prominent position you have occupied on the London School Board, your representation there of the ancient historic city of Westminster, your admirable contribution to our literature in connexion with the great education questions of the day, as well as your leading position in your own important Church, must be well known in influential circles in the United States. I wish I could convey to them the warm regard and respect for you which is felt by your friends here (amongst whom I am happy to be able to claim a place), and the gratitude which is entertained by those in London, whose opinion is worth having, for your unwearied and judicious labours on behalf of the religious and social improvement of our people and the friendly co-operation of the Protestant Churches. (39)

On 4 April 1876, Rigg wrote to Lord Sandon, to thank him for the letters of introduction:

How can I sufficiently thank you for the great trouble you have taken, the help and honour you have done me by the letters enclosed, the long and far too kind letter you have written me yourself. I have tried to do some good in respect of education, of the social condition of my countrymen, and of the mutual good feeling of Christian churches. But I am far from having merited the praise you so kindly give. I can but thank you very sincerely. Let me also be allowed through you to convey to his Grace my warm thanks for his kind note of introduction. I will take the liberty tomorrow of sending you a copy of a little book I have lately published, entitled 'The Living Wesley'. Perhaps Lord Harrowby might find some interest in looking into it. It seems to me that your modifications in the Code are very considerate and judicious. (40)

He signed the letter, from 'your much honoured and obliged friend'.

On the issue of elementary education, the Anglican Church continued to assert their own interests. A clerical deputation headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and several bishops lobbied Lord Sandon, and the Duke of Richmond in March 1876, calling for educational changes, which would have enhanced the position of the Church of England. They demanded that 'unnecessary' school boards should be dissolved, and that where they existed, the Education Department should exercise more control on the number and extent of the schools they erected. This obviously shows the Anglican fears of school board competition. They also petitioned that, where a school board did not exist, a poll should be held only once every three years to decide, instead of once every twelve months. They also suggested that a voluntary subscriber to a public elementary school, which for them would be a voluntary, Anglican school, should be able to claim this
subscription as part of his educational rate. He could therefore avoid paying the school board rate, which the WATCHMAN believed would bankrupt some boards, and force others to demand an oppressively high rate on the residue of the ratepayers. (41) As might be expected, the Anglican deputation also called for an increase in government grants to denominational schools, to cover the increasing expenditure demanded by the new requirements of the Education Department. They felt that the grant should not be limited to half the income of a school, and that, in any case income from whatever source should be allowed in qualifying the school for grants. They strongly favoured compulsion and asked Sandon to make extensions in this, and that 'in places where there is no school board, power should be given to existing authorities to enforce the attendance of children at school.' (42) This would obviously mean that in rural areas the Church of England schools might be able to enforce attendance in its own schools. The Wesleyans were diametrically opposed to some of these suggestions. They had called for universal school boards and an end to clerical influence, and interference in rural areas and the Editorial in the WATCHMAN claimed:

The present prospects of elementary education are far from reassuring to those who do not wish to see it controlled too extensively by clerical influence and employed as a formidable means of religious coercion... Meanwhile it will be prudent to preserve and even to extend the educational opportunities of our own Connexion, for the prospect of any such thing as a 'painless extinction' of the denominational system is just now sufficiently remote. (43)

Lord Sandon introduced his Bill into Parliament in May 1876. He told the House that he rejected the idea of establishing school boards everywhere, as it would sound the death knell of the voluntary schools and lead to a general system of secular education, of which he personally disapproved. He proposed that all localities that already had school boards should retain them, but he told Members, 'we hold the power of obliging a parish to form a school board where its educational machinery may be insufficient.' (44) He also proposed to allow town councils, not simply school boards, to pass bye-laws for compulsory school attendance. He also introduced a measure of indirect compulsion, by affirming that children under ten years old, would not be allowed to work, and those between the ages of ten and fourteen would have to provide a certificate of competence in reading, writing and arithmetic, or of proof that the child had attended school 250 times in each of the
preceding years. He explained the need for the alternative certificate, because, 'it is impossible to shut our eyes to the fact that there are a great many stupid children!' The only exception he would allow, was at harvest times in the countryside, when children may be needed for farm work.

Dr. Rigg was at this time on a long tour of America, and not in a position to respond to the Bill. The WATCHMAN actually recalled that he had proposed the call for universal school boards and districts to the Conference in 1873 which alone would guarantee religious liberty in the rural areas, and it now regretted that 'Dr. Rigg is not in the country to defend it.' (45) However, Rigg's attitude may have been more positive than that of the Wesleyan Education Committee and the leaders of Wesleyan education. The Editorial in the WATCHMAN complained that, although the only reference that Sandon had made in his speech to interests other than the Church of England had been to the Methodist proposals, he had nevertheless rejected the call for a board school within reasonable distance of every family. (46) The conclusion was that the greatest gain would be to the Church of England, and the 'Methodist platform will be destroyed'. The paper complained:

His Lordship proposes to drive Methodist children in nearly all the rural parishes of England into Church of England schools... and he stands behind the hedge with indirect compulsion in his hand to sweep the Nonconformist children into Episcopalian schools... School boards are not an absolute guarantee of religious liberty, but school boards and educational districts are the best guarantees we can get. No Education Bill of any Government, whether Conservative or Liberal, can have our support, if it refuses to grant the requests of the Newcastle Conference. (which adopted the resolutions of the 1872 Special Committee)

The Special Wesleyan Education sub-committee met again on 7 June 1876, to draft its reactions to the Bill. It commented that it was not totally unfavourable, but reaffirmed its desires that the whole country should be divided into school districts, with a radius of no less than three miles, unless more than 7000 people lived in an area. Every school district should have a school board, and that, as they had stated in 1872, a board school should be within three miles of every family. To avoid the anomaly of part-time hire of school buildings, which had worried Wesleyans so much since 1870, they demanded that 'any religious instruction given on school days in the premises of any school transferred to a
board shall be only such as the Act of 1870 permits to be given in schools which have been provided by school boards.' (47) If this was not accepted by Sandon, the Wesleyans demanded that town councils and boards of guardians be given the power to provide and maintain out of local rates a school which 'shall be subject to the same regulation as schools provided by school boards'. They also pointed out that any schools transferred to any town council must only give religious instruction on schooldays, in these premises, according to the Act, just as if the school had been provided by a school board. To avoid clerical influence on the new committees set up (in Clause 24 of the Bill) they suggested that the minimum membership should be raised to five, with at least three members from the local authority. The Wesleyan Committee were also afraid that an increase suggested in grants, to two thirds in poor schools (Clause 13) was too large an amount. It would clearly benefit some of the Anglican schools, which they resented.

On other aspects of the Bill, they suggested that there needed to be more rigid exemption clauses, to prevent undue absences from school, and that the Certificates of Attainment needed careful explanation. They wanted to add a proviso, on the attendance exemptions, that of the five years attendance demanded to qualify, two of these should be within the last three years. On Clause 37, which permitted nine year old children to be taken into employment for the last time during the year 1877, the Wesleyans believed this should be expunged. (48)

A deputation was sent to Lord Sandon from the Wesleyans, and some amendments which the Education committee had urged were included in the final Act. The most important addition which they had pressed for, was not made. (49) Alexander McArthur had moved an amendment, when the Bill was in committee, to repeal the final paragraph of Clause 23 of the 1870 Act, and to substitute it with a clause which would prevent the part-time hire of school buildings to school boards. This had not received sufficient support. (50)

Rigg did not approve of the line taken by the Wesleyans. When he returned to England, he immediately wrote to Lord Sandon, on 1 July 1876:

I write to express my grief and vexation at the tone of criticism, the temper, the unfairness with which your Bill has been treated by many Wesleyans and Wesleyan writers. If I had been at home during the last three months at least it would not have been so bad, although it is hard to restrain ecclesiastical jealousies and enmities, which are only too often inflamed by
petty annoyances, and are sometimes aggravated by substantial injustice inflicted by clergymen of a certain class and character. The gentlemanly and Christian clergy - the really high minded clergy - are quite aloof from our people as a rule and from our ministers, the other sort are active, intrusive, officious. Hence the majority don't count; they are in fact confounded with the minority. I am doing what I can to modify all this. But I have to be prudent. If they all lose confidence in me - 'because I have personal friends in the Church' - or 'because my son is at Oxford' - my power as a moderator is gone. Last Wednesday however at our School Board -at much more length and with more emphasis than is indicated in the abridged Report, - I took sides with your Bill, and by private letters I am trying to change the tone of some of our own writers. I earnestly hope postponement does not mean shelving. So very valuable a measure ought on no account to miss. I am persuaded not to carry it will be a great encouragement and aid to many evil forces. (51)

He also pointed out to Lord Sandon an article on compulsion in the U.S.A. which he had published in the SPECTATOR on that day, and one due to be published in the following week.

Rigg wrote again to Lord Sandon on 12 July 1876 after amendments had been accepted into the bill:

Allow me to congratulate you. I greatly regret the line taken by my friend, A. McArthur. As to S. D. Waddy, he is an ambitious lawyer. But your victory is complete and will be more assured everyday. Yesterday was an excellent omen. Let me thank you too, on account of the amendments you have made or accepted. Yesterday, I had the chance, in a long and influential committee, and in the presence of our most mischievous agitators, of defending your Bill. Mischief indeed has been done in my absence, which will probably produce some ugly speeches in our Committees of Review next week. But I believe our leading Press will quite alter its tone and that the impression left on the Connexion by the time the session is ended will be very favourable to the Bill and yourself. As I am expected shortly this year or next to be chosen President - though I have not sought the office and my educational conservatism has hindered my earlier election and may even now make the election doubtful - it behoves me to be careful as to my ground and my words. Once chosen, a freedom and force of authoritative speech will be in my power, the benefit of which I wish to give to the cause of moderation and of Christian education.

He points out that these troubles had been caused by 'the spreading and deepening ritualism', which had a 'host of symptoms.' (52)

After the Bill had successfully passed, Rigg wrote to Sandon in joyous terms:
The Act will hand down your Lordship's name to history as one of the truest, fairest and most courageous educationists of the present critical transition period. I confess that I like the Act almost throughout, and where I think it swerves from the line of perfect fitness, I admit that the exigencies of Parliament made it necessary to do so. I grudge the factory interest, the concession which allows them half time to be sufficient, without fulfilment of the preliminary conditions binding on others. Everyone knows that parents now neglect to send their children to school before the factory age, because of the compulsory half time afterwards. This was an evil to be remedied not to be allowed to continue. - Then, theoretically - and in order to perfect equality - the school boards ought not to have the power to remit fees; but to be obliged to refer that matter to the Guardians. The present regulations put voluntary schools to a disadvantage. Nevertheless, any other provision than the one adopted would have been under the circumstances irritating and impolitic. So far as I can see, the concession to the factory people is the only real blot and that, I suppose, could not be helped. As to the outcry against the Bill, on the grounds taken by the extreme Dissenters, whether first or last, I can only express my sense of shame. The regulation as to the school boards is most proper. The contention against the compulsory character was hollow and fictitious in an extraordinary degree. It must die in a year or two, for there was nothing in it, nothing at the bottom. Those who honestly make the cry imagine the Act to be what it is not. (53)

He went on to ask for some clarification whether a school needed to collect fees and grants equal to 17s. 6d, if they were to receive this as a minimum grant. He also asks for a private meeting, to clarify some points of 'administration of some delicacy and importance' and suggested joining Sandon in Manchester or at Sandon Hall.

Although the Government had not made all the changes in their Education Bill which the Wesleyan Education Committee had requested, the Wesleyans were still pleased with the protection of the Conscience Clause. The Wesleyan Education Committee was soon again under the dominance of Rigg, as can be seen by its Report of 1876 (54) which expressed its satisfaction with the opening declaration of the Act that 'It shall be the duty of the parent of every child to cause such child to receive efficient elementary instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic, and if such parent fail to perform such duty, he shall be liable to such orders and penalties as are provided in this Act'. (55) The Committee also expressed its satisfaction with the provisions for compelling, directly or indirectly, parents to perform this duty, including the sending of truant children to special 'industrial schools'. (56) It also approved of the limits on child employment. (57) They were also pleased with a request that School Boards and School Attendance Committees should report to the Education Department any infraction or any complaints of infraction of the Conscience
Clause. This had been proposed by W. Forster and was accepted by Sandon and incorporated into the final Act. (58) This safeguard was one that the Wesleyans had 'earnestly desired and advocated'. (59)

An Editorial of the WATCHMAN in November continued to criticise the new Act in certain respects. In the rural areas, a school board, according to the Wesleyan newspaper, meant a committee of five men, 'all of a sort - namely, the clergyman, the squire, the churchwardens and some obsequious tenant farmer.' The Wesleyan suggestion for a grouping of parishes into educational districts and the erection of undenominational schools by these new boards, would have checked 'clerical encroachment and intolerance.' Their comment on the Sandon Act was that 'the clergy of the Church of England will have very plain sailing and the primary education of the country will be more than ever under their control.' Their final comment points to the continuing mistrust of the mother church:

We should not so much quarrel with this if we could be assured that this advantage would not be diligently worked in favour of that Romanising movement within the Church, which is now in so many cases distinctly avowed. (60)

By early 1877 the WATCHMAN was analysing the new Act more favourably. It welcomed the abolition of Clause 25 of the 1870 Act which had allowed boards to pay all school fees for a period of six months if they thought fit. As a body the Wesleyans had condemned this. They also welcomed the means of compulsion and the end to limits on State grants. All schools could now receive a grant of 17s. 6d per child in average attendance, regardless of any fees acquired from other means at the school. (The original Act had demanded a school income of 17s. 6d to qualify for this grant.) The newspaper's only complaint was that school boards were allowed to remit school fees, without being compelled to send the cases for investigation and sanction to the Board of Guardians. (61) The WATCHMAN claimed that this gave a clear advantage to board schools over their own voluntary schools. The paper claimed that the Wesleyan proposals of four years before had been 'more strictly impartial as well as truer to the requirements of political economy.' (62) However the Editorial, which was undoubtedly influenced by Dr. Rigg, did comment that their favourable interpretation might surprise some Wesleyans. but it asserts that they had presented the proposals in
'unvarnished form'.

The Wesleyans had other complaints at this time, outside the sphere of the Act. The Wesleyan inspector, Cucklow, first expressed concern in 1874, that a number of schools had been condemned by H.M.I.s as insufficient to satisfy the conditions of the Code, because of the nature of their classrooms or playground. Some schools had had to close because this had led them to losing their government grant. He complained that this affected long established schools with a good record of success and no previous objections from the H.M.I.s and he concluded:

It seems hardly reasonable that the adequacy of old and accepted buildings should be determined by a standard very properly applied to new erections created by an entirely new system of education. (63)

The Wesleyan department in 1874 and 1875 sent suggestions to the Privy Council to remove the bad effects of the Education Code. Rigg himself commented in 1875 that the Wesleyan Committee had 'during the last few years led the way in this direction, and our suggestions have been for the most part endorsed by the School Board of London and other Boards in the country'. (64) The problem was renewed in 1875, after the Castleford Wesleyan day-school had been castigated, by a H.M.I., as there was not a high wall between the playgrounds of the boys and girls. He threatened that if a separate access was not built, they would no longer receive a grant. (65) This was followed by a similar complaint about Snaith School. The cost of modifications to all Wesleyan schools would obviously be great and the Wesleyan Education Committee made a formal protest in a deputation to Lord Sandon. They recognised that 'separation between the offices for boys and girls...is required in the interest of propriety and morality' but they did not accept that a wall built across the playground was necessary. They told Lord Sandon:

especially during the absence of the teacher from the schoolroom, such a wall would be ineffective for the prevention of improprieties; and not only so, but that in many cases it would, by affording opportunities for privacy and by lessening the sense of responsibility on the part of the Principal Teacher, tend to increase rather than diminish the danger against which it is sought...(66)
Sandon was more impressed with their second argument, that the requirement struck at; a principle, to which the W.E.C. have held fast during many years, namely - that great moral advantages...arise from the mingling of the sexes in the Schoolrooms and in play-grounds under proper oversight - a principle which the Church regard as having been endorsed by the unquestionable success and high character secured by Wesleyan Mixed schools during the last 30 years. (67)

Sandon did respond to the call, by advising his Inspectors on 16 March 1877 that, before they reported in particularly unfavourable terms on the premises of a school with which they were unfamiliar or whose history they did not know, they should consult the Reports of their predecessors. He pinpointed the Wesleyan schools and told H.M.I.s:

in the Wesleyan Organisation, the Playground is an important part of the school system and many years ago the Department agreed that, in the case of the schools of this denomination, separate playgrounds for Boys and Girls should not be required, even where a Building Grant was made. This arrangement was sanctioned on the understanding that strict personal supervision would at all times be exercised by the Principal Teacher in the Playground. (68)

A second complaint arose in 1875. The Education Department had written to a number of Wesleyan teachers and managers, pointing out that, according to the wording of Article 42 of the Code 'Lay persons alone could be recognised as teachers in Public Elementary Schools' and that 'by the arrangement made in 1850 with the Committee of the Wesleyan Conference it was settled that their Lordships would not recognise as a Certificated Teacher any person who officiates as a local preacher'. (69) Many teachers had been taking on the duties of a preacher, and the Education Department demanded that they should 'wholly refrain from preaching whilst master of the Schools'. After surveying their teachers, the Wesleyans found that a considerable number were in this predicament and that such a ban would deeply affect the preaching potential of many chapels. They therefore addressed a letter to the Government on 10 February 1876, asking for dispensation of this rule, pointing out that the original regulations had referred to full-time priests, and that members of Roman Catholic Religious Orders were now acting as teachers in schools under Roman Catholic management, as well as a similar practice by Anglican lay readers. They therefore claimed that they were being singled out as a body. (70) Sandon finally replied to them in December, withdrawing the restriction, by recognising that Wesleyan lay preachers were in fact lay persons and not clergymen. In
response, the Church had to guarantee that such lay preachers would not undertake church duties in school hours. As a result, a long standing grievance of the Wesleyan body was overcome. (71)

The third area of concern in 1876 appeared after a Minute of the Education Department on 7 August, which suggested that new schools should not receive government grants, if the Education Department thought the school was 'unnecessary'. (72) The Methodists asked Sandon to clarify this, pointing out that they were anxious that no provisions should be introduced into the Code which would 'obstruct the establishment of Wesleyan Schools, especially in districts where the only existing schools might be under objectionable management'. (73) Sandon did in fact remove this clause from the 1877 Code, although it would reappear in following years.

The work of Lord Sandon throughout 1876 brought some praise from the Wesleyan Education Committee, reflecting the views of Dr. Rigg. They reported in that year:

The favourable consideration which Her Majesty's Government have given to the communications of the Education Committee during the year claims their appreciation and recognition. The decision of their Lordships respecting the three questions of 'Teachers and the Office of Lay Preacher', 'the Refusal of Grants to Schools' and 'the Partition of Playgrounds of mixed schools' have been in accordance with the expressed wishes of the Committee. (74)

At the ground level of Wesleyanism, there seems to have been a similar move towards Rigg's desire to protect Wesleyan schools. The Wesleyan Inspector, Mawbey, who toured the country in 1876, found Wesleyan Chapels strongly in favour of their own denominational education. He reported in 1876:

I have found that the inclination once felt by some of our Committees to transfer their schools to school boards, has been succeeded by an almost complete reaction. The Methodists, like the other denominational educationalists are now in almost every place I have visited, staunch for the maintenance of their schools. (75)

They saw it as a further agency in 'warring against irreligion'.

-o0o-
CHAPTER FIVE
The period after the 1876 Act saw a continuing decline in the number of Wesleyan schools. After reaching a pinnacle of 912 schools in 1873, they dropped to a total of 884 in 1876, to 856 in 1878 and to a low of 849 by 1880. This worried many in the Wesleyan Education Committee. They believed that some of their schools had been transferred or closed unnecessarily, and that alternatives could have been worked out, if they had contacted the Committee, 'without entailing any financial burden upon the localities concerned.' (1) The Conference of 1877 had in fact strongly recommended that the Education Committee should be informed before any steps were taken to transfer or close a Wesleyan School, enabling the Committee to help the school, financially if necessary. (2) The Committee also asked the Wesleyan Inspector to give assistance, by examining details along with the teachers and managers, and 'his practised eye enables him to detect sources of pressure or weakness and to suggest remedies for them.' (3)

The worries over Wesleyan closures were in part a reflection of the continuing element of denominational competition in elementary education. An Editorial of the WATCHMAN pointed out in May 1877 that the Roman Catholics had added 6,000 new scholars to their numbers in the past year, though they were still less numerous than the Wesleyan numbers. The Church of England had added ten times that number (60,000). The Wesleyan response might have been equally high, if not for 'hesitation and doubt (which) have paralysed enterprise'. The paper expressed concern that 2,000 Wesleyan scholars had been transferred to board schools and feared the prospect that, in the future, the number of Roman Catholic day-scholars would outnumber those in Wesleyan schools. (4) This indeed happened in the following year.

Old anomalies favouring the Church of England also continued to annoy the Wesleyans. In March 1877 Rigg wrote to the WATCHMAN complaining of a further transfer of a Church of England school, Ealing School, to the local board, after the first
hour of religious instruction. He pointed out that:

Methodists are alone indeed, whether without or within Parliament, in their opposition to this adroit, but unfair, application of Mr. Forster's Education Act. When Mr. A. McArthur moved an amendment last year in the House of Commons which would have rendered such a perversion of the original intent and meaning of the Act impossible, the Liberal Party helped him just as little as the Conservatives. For the present - it is evident - the injustice must be allowed to grow. (5)

He also commented, with a hint of humour, on the board school at Westham, where the schoolmaster, a Mr. Trigger, was also sexton and parish clerk. The schoolmaster brought a complaint to the board that the curate, Mr. Webb, had entered the school and called him a liar three times in the hearing of some of the children. The result is described by Rigg as a 'comedy of distinctions and evasions'. The Chairman of the Board was the Vicar of Pevensey and Prebendary of Chichester, the Rev. R. Sutton, who proclaimed that Mr. Trigger had only been 'hypothetically' called a 'liar', 'if so and so were so and so, he was e.t.c.' Moreover he declared that Mr. Webb had not attacked him in his capacity of schoolmaster, but only in his capacity of sexton, and therefore the Board had nothing to do with the matter. (The schoolmaster had failed to inform the curate of a funeral, which had been kept waiting) Mr. Trigger told the Board that he received no salary, either as clerk or sexton, but only as schoolmaster, adding that fees were given occasionally, but never for attending any service during 'the regular school hours.' Rigg commented on the matter that:

His school board salary therefore covered all his work, provided that his work as sexton had been done during the time he ought to be teaching and is paid for teaching! No wonder that Mr. Trigger objects in his capacity as sexton to be called a liar by the curate of the parish, when he receives no pay or consideration whatever for the work he does. To do the work for nothing and then to be insulted before his scholars is more than an Englishman can be expected to bear, even though he have the threefold capacity and experience of parish clerk, gravedigger and schoolmaster.

The Chairman however was totally in sympathy with the curate and even castigated Mr. Trigger for taking time from his teaching duties to attend the Board Meeting! Rigg commented that the Chairman had said nothing against paying board money for doing Church work as clerk or sexton, or against being absent from schools at funerals during school hours. (6)
Rigg bemoaned the influence of the Church of England at the Methodist Annual Meeting on Education in 1879:

there was more direct power brought to bear upon the population by the Church of England through the influence of its day-school teachers, than in any other way. Who was it that laid the foundation, at last, of the preparation of the children for the clergyman's lessons and for confirmation? The day-school teachers in the school. Who was it who trained the choir? The day-school teacher. Who superintended the Sunday School? The day-school teacher. Who was it who was perpetually upon the ground quietly inspiring and instilling all that belonged to Church doctrine and style and influence into the rising generation? The day-school teacher of the parish. And those day-school teachers - numbering roughly about as many as the active and working clergy - were thus doing the work... from month to month, and from year to year. (7)

Another complaint was aired at the meeting about the Church of England schools which were not in receipt of Government grants and not therefore subject to the Conscience Clause. Yet, under the 1876 Act, Wesleyan children were sometimes forced into them for want of another school. They asked Sandon to extend the Conscience Clause to all schools, but the Committee of Council refused to do this. They preferred to leave it to individuals to complain about specific abuses. The W.E.C. did not approve of this stance, claiming that, 'in their judgement religious liberty, even though it be that of a single peasant and his child, is not a privilege to be conceded on an appeal against legislative regulations which invade it, but is a common right which the State should be most careful by no means to infringe.' (8) Rigg also said at the same meeting that there were thousands of such Church of England schools, with uncertified teachers and therefore not in receipt of a grant:

It was just in those little parishes Methodist children were being compelled, under the stringent, indirect compulsory clauses of Lord Sandon's Act to go to school ... and to pass certain examinations, or else to attend a certain number of times at the school - or not to go to labour .... there ought not to be a single school in any parish of this land, however obscure and small the population into which children might be compelled ... that was not under the protection of the Conscience Clause. (9)

The WATCHMAN on 16 July 1879 complained in its Editorial:

The truth is that Nonconformists and Wesleyans in small towns and country villages have learnt thoroughly well that, unless there be either a British or a Wesleyan day-school available for their use, the power of the Church of England day-school, supplementing the influence of the parish church and its various agencies, will before long reduce their
Nonconformist organizations to a condition of extremity (10)

The same fears were seen three years later, when the Wesleyan Education Report complained that in rural districts it was still found that 'neither the Conscience Clause nor the establishment of a school board is a sufficient guarantee of the religious liberties of our people'. They continued to encourage the establishment of Wesleyan day-schools to 'protect both the Sunday school and the general interests of Methodism, where dominant and intolerant Anglicanism prevails.' (11)

Rigg personally did much to promote Wesleyan schools in this period. In his Inaugural of 1878 he reaffirmed his belief in the denominational system. Although there had been a diminution of the number of schools, the number of scholars in Wesleyan schools stood higher than at any time in their history, over 179,000. He claimed that, although many feared that the Wesleyan schools would not be able to survive the 1870 legislation, at that time many stood 'stronger and more flourishing' than ever:

> It is true that some really good schools have been handed over to school boards... the number of such transfers of good schools has been small. And in some of these cases the loss and injury have been diminished by the fact that Methodism was already the prevalent religion of the neighbourhood, that the managers of schools, after their transfer, were still Wesleyans, and that a predominant proportion of the members of the school boards were Wesleyans... A considerable proportion of the schools which were started in 1871 and 1872 were opened as experiments, in the hope that they might succeed and become permanent, but not without considerable fear that they would prove too feeble for prolonged existence. It has been a matter of surprise, on the whole, not that so large a proportion have proved unequal to the struggle for life, but that so large a proportion have developed into very successful and efficient schools.(12)

Many Wesleyans were unsure whether to favour the establishment of a Wesleyan school, in an area where a school was clearly needed, or promote the creation of a board school. Rigg pressed for the Wesleyan school, which guaranteed religious instruction, and protected Methodist parents and children, and indeed the general population from 'ecclesiastical usurpations or superstitions'. (13) Again he pointed out that 'not seldom' the school board was under strong Church influence and 'to trust to it as a defence against sacerdotalism would be a serious delusion':

> I meet with not a few such boards and board schools (which) afford no
defence for Methodist or any other children against ecclesiastical exclusiveness or superstition. On the contrary, the Board and its school may afford a strong shield for bigotry or error, and become a source of large and easy endowment for the purposes of Church education, paying all the expenses and maintaining the school and school fabric in ample means and high efficiency. (14)

In addition, he believed that a Wesleyan Day-school improved the efficiency, and even the singing of the Sunday school!

A few months after this, the WATCHMAN in 1878 clearly showed the reasons for its continuing fears of Roman Catholic ideas:

Both in St. Roch and Notre Dame sermons have been preached by Jesuit orators in which all the objectionable doctrines of Popery were carefully concealed. So it is with some of the priests of the English Episcopal Church. Let our Methodists, who occasionally listen to these English orators be on their guard. The preachers use old terms in a new sense. Justification by faith, forgiveness of sins, regeneration, saving faith, the witness of the Spirit, when used by a Ritualist, mean quite another thing from the significance attached to them by Wesleyans... such doctrine as this sweeps away altogether the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith, and clearly proclaims a salvation by Sacraments... According to Ritualists, the foundation of salvation is baptism -in fact baptism and salvation are practically synonymous terms. If you sin after baptism, you are restored and your forgiveness is renewed by penitence, by general faith and by the Eucharist. When a Ritualist preaches to us a sacramental salvation, he preaches a method of salvation entirely opposed to the Scriptures... His Sacraments are exclusive Sacraments. According to him, there are no Sacraments where there is no episcopacy and no apostolic succession. According to this principle, it logically follows that Nonconformist Sacraments are no Sacraments at all. (15)

As President of the Wesleyan Conference, in 1879, Rigg conducted a correspondence on the matter with Canon Jenkins, who responded to him that the Church of England had to make concessions to recognise Methodism. He wrote:

There must be a just concession on our part that the Methodist Communion is a true branch of the Church and therefore can claim to negotiate on equal terms. there must be an admission that episcopal ordination is not necessary, the priesthood being really the highest order, even in the Roman Church, while the episcopate is only a ‘gradus hierarchiae’ (16)

In 1880 the Wesleyans set about revising their own liturgy in the light of continuing antagonism in Protestant circles to the ritualism in the Church of England. Rigg wrote an article condemning such ritualism in the METHODIST MAGAZINE and the WATCHMAN commented in 1880:

We ought not to continue to use a book which contains sacerdotalism and baptismal regeneration. We must bear witness for the truth of God by
purging out this un-Christian leaven. We can have no complicity with Popery either in the Prayer book or out of it. There is not an evangelical church in Christendom which would not condemn us for the use of an unpurged Prayer Book. .. The development of Popery in the Church of England during the last forty years has intensified the opposition, until the majority of Wesleyans are calmly, resolutely and irrevocably determined to be clear of all complicity with sacerdotalism, come what may. Some tell us that the ritualism of our time is only a passing wave; but whoever heard of a wave forty years long? (17)

Rigg wrote to Gladstone on 2 January 1885, criticising Dr. Pusey for the Romanisation of the Church:

those who feel as so many do besides myself, that Dr. Pusey has done vastly more than any other man to introduce into the Church of England some of the worst and most fundamentally evil superstitions - superstitions of the sacraments and (horrible to say) of the confessional, cannot be expected to agree with you in approving a Memorial to Dr. Pusey. On several grounds - on the widest grounds - they look on him as an enemy of the Gospel in its real faith and purity, and they have no personal ties of obligation to him. (18.)

The controversy continued to influence educational policy of the Wesleyans, either, as Rigg, to support their own schools, or as others, to undermine the Church of England's denominational schools by supporting board schools. Whichever view a Wesleyan might take, he would not regard Anglican educational institutions as attractive for his own children.

Nevertheless, the decline in Wesleyan schools continued to shock the Wesleyans in the 1880s. Ten schools were closed and three transferred in 1879, though others had been opened. Statistics quoted in their Annual Report showed that Church of England schools outnumbered board schools by three to one, and that there were, almost 50,000 more children educated in Roman Catholic than Wesleyan schools by 1880. (19) The worries over school closures led the Conference to pass a Resolution in that year, that: ‘in all ordinary cases of day schools conducted on Wesleyan Trust premises, no such schools shall be discontinued so long as there is a reasonable prospect of their being carried on without serious embarrassment’. (20) Even Rigg was forced to admit in the Westminster Inaugural of February 1880:

It is sadly true indeed that we have missed great opportunities as a Connexion; that we failed to take the tide at its flood; that our educational work and organization are permanently less than they might have been and ought to have been; that in comparison with the Church of England especially, we have, to our serious loss and their great gain, allowed them
to cover ground which we might have held, and to occupy vacancies which we might have claimed to fill. (21)

The W.E.C. Reports of 1880 and 1881 tried, by all means in their power to dissuade school managers from closing their schools. In these two years, they repeated an analysis of the reasons for closure or transfer of schools and discounted these systematically. The W.E.C. pointed out that in certain cases, it was thought that a school, once closed, might re-open at a later date, but the Report warned that this was erroneous and that when a Wesleyan school was abandoned, it was unlikely to be re-established. It pointed out that any deficiency created by such a closure would lead to the establishment of a board school or the increase of an existing denominational school. The re-establishment of the Wesleyan school would then be regarded by the Government as 'unnecessary' and not open to receive grants. The Reports suggested that it would be 'manifestly unfair, after the expense of making such additional provision had been incurred, for the promoters of a school the closing of which had made that expense necessary, to reopen the school which had been closed.' (22)

Those who wanted to transfer Wesleyan Schools in the hope of rents from boards for the use of the premises were warned that they were:

seldom, if ever, content permanently to pay a considerable rental... such rented premises seldom compare favourably with the structures which public money, freely expended, enables school boards to provide. Hence the tenancy of such premises by boards is generally brief. The board occupies them but little longer than is necessary to permit it to provide premises of its own. Into those premises the scholars from the rented school are transferred, and the once rented premises are returned empty to the Trustees, who thenceforward are left without the rent which tempted them; and the premises, which it aforetime made Methodists glad to see filled with boys and girls under some of the best influences of Methodism, are left, in the intervals of Sundays, desolate and unused. (23)

The Report gave evidence from Leeds, where there had been a tendency to transfer their schools to the local Board. The number of Wesleyan day-schools there had been totally depleted:

From the list of such schools, among others, there disappeared the following which passed into the hands of the Board: - Wesley School, Hunslett, Kirkstall, New Wortley, and Armley. Not one of these is now held by the Board. The trustees neither receive rent for any one of these school premises, nor have they the satisfaction of knowing that in them the good work of the Wesleyan day-school is being done. The Board has transferred the scholars to its own premises; and what the Leeds Board
Those managers who wished to save money, by closing their schools in the expectation of a board school being set up in their place, had also been disappointed, and are mildly castigated in the 1880 Report. There was no certainty that a board school would in fact be the substitute, and in some cases other denominations had supplied the deficiency, either by enlarging an existing school or opening a new one. The W.E.C. conclusion was that, 'the monopoly thus created is not one which managers of Wesleyan schools would regard as desirable'. (25) If boards did take on the old Wesleyan school, the W.E.C. pointed out that there was no guarantee that Wesleyan teachers would be retained. This, they informed managers, was forbidden by the 'Orders and Instructions' of the Education Department:

If at first Wesleyan teachers are retained, it cannot be expected that when vacancies occur, school boards will show preference for Methodist applicants, while it is possible and not unlikely that they may fill the vacancies by appointing teachers whom none of our people could see in daily use of our Trust premises without painful regret. Besides, Wesleyan schools which by transfer become board schools... must cease to be thought of as such centres of earnest and saving religious influence as many of our day schools are; their doors are closed against the visits of our ministers and their former association with the Sunday school cannot be maintained. (26)

The results of Wesleyan school closures are painfully outlined in the Report. They 'relinquish the possibility of their afterwards taking part, as Methodists, in the public elementary education of the district concerned.' (27) The Sunday schools would be deeply affected, with no introduction through the day-school. More importantly, 'it must lessen and might destroy the influence which the Connection can now exert in reference to national arrangements for elementary education, and perhaps for not "elementary" education alone.' (28)

The President of the Methodist Conference, speaking at the Annual Meeting on Education in April 1881 added his weight to the defence of Wesleyan schools:

If the Churches were to sit still and fold their hands while the children of their congregations, in immense numbers, flocked to board schools, the education imparted in these institutions would be practically atheistic ... Let it never be forgotten that thousands of these children have no religion in their homes; that from one week's end to another, the name of God is never heard within their circles, except to give point to an oath, or profane coarseness to a joke... To have no divine law enunciated in the school, to have impressions rectified upon other subjects which it is necessary a child should know, and to leave untouched a child's natural impression of
God, which I think to be rebuking and dismissing that impression; to unroll before their eyes the page of knowledge ... and to erase the word 'God' from that page wherever it occurs and to insert the word 'law' is to perpetuate a huge fraud on the unsuspecting credulity of the children of Christian England. (29)

The efforts of the Education Committee and the Wesleyan Conference do seem to have borne some fruit. There was only a small decline in the numbers of Wesleyan schools throughout 1880 and they even began to increase again in 1882. The number of scholars on Wesleyan rolls also rallied, and in fact rose to over 181,000 by 1883. Only one school was transferred in 1881 and the Report of 1882 was at pains to point out, 'an erroneous impression obtains in some places that Wesleyan Day-schools are declining in numbers if not efficiency.' (30) No schools were transferred at all in 1883, and the numbers of Wesleyan scholars reached their peak. (31) Nevertheless, although the decline had been arrested, there was no further growth in Wesleyan schools. It became a question merely of consolidation, which appeared gravely disappointing to many, when compared with the record of other denominations. After the Connexional returns of 1881, the WATCHMAN complained, 'If we take the number at 179,000, it is lamentably small. Rural Methodism, in particular, is in most parts of the Connexion, at a great disadvantage for want of day-schools.' On the other hand, the newspaper complained of the Anglican competition. The Church of England was increasing its numbers of day-scholars every year and had in fact in the previous 10 years advanced by 'leaps and bounds'. It had, by 1881, nearly double the number to be found in board schools.

The WATCHMAN reiterated in 1882 that the increase in attendance at British schools had been, over the previous eleven years, three times as large as the rate of increase in Wesleyan schools. The Roman Catholic and Church of England schools had also doubled:

That is a hard fact, a fact to make the ears of Wesleyan educationalists tingle. What would our fathers say, if they were witnesses to this? How would it affect such souls as the venerable John Scott? Is there so much more zeal for Christian voluntary education among the friends... of British than Wesleyan schools? It was confidently predicted that British schools would as a class be handed over to school boards. On the contrary, they have been maintained and increased more zealously and courageously than Wesleyan schools, and they are the strength of Nonconformist denominationalism over a great breadth of the country ... and they are
often great and essential aids in the maintenance of Methodist congregations in rural districts... But there is one last touch to be added. Small as is the Wesleyan total, it seems as if it had begun to decline... If the eloquence of such facts does not plead, no arguments can much avail. (32)

At the Annual Meeting on Education in 1882 Rigg continued to support the denominational element of the Wesleyan church:

The influence of denominational day-school education ... was increasing; the worst of it was that the Wesleyans were almost out of the running; they had scarcely got a place in the race; others were beating them; that was the hard fact they had to lay to heart ... If they were to say the influence of Wesleyan day-school teaching showed symptoms of decline, they would be telling the truth... The denomination that would give up its day-schools would never keep up its colleges; it would not have heart or soul... It would be a woeful time for their denomination if the Church of England had both training colleges and day-schools all the country over, if the Roman Catholics had both training colleges and day-schools all the country over, and that they should have lost their life and liberty, and had no day-schools in the country. (33)

The 1882 Methodist Conference actually censured the managers of the Bolton Wesleyan school for transferring this to the School Board, against the protests of the W.E.C. The managers told the Conference that they had seen nothing in prospect but 'pecuniary embarrassment', as the school was surrounded by board schools. Rigg was instrumental in making the Bolton managers an example. He told the Conference Meeting on Education:

This is a matter of the utmost importance. I do not think that the interests of Methodism can ever be promoted by such action as that which has been taken at Bolton, by shutting up on a Friday evening a Wesleyan day-school, which was paying its way, and opening it on the following Monday morning as a board school. It is supposed that by retaining the Methodist teacher, therefore you are saving the interests of Methodism. I demur to that. How long may that teacher stay there for certain, and suppose he lives and continues for some years, who will be his successor? There was a Wesleyan day-school in London which was transferred to the London School Board. The clergyman who was chairman of the managing committee of that school said to me: 'I think as the school is held in your Wesleyan premises, you ought to have a Wesleyan master in it, and if you will send two or three names to us, I hope we shall choose one of them.' But he could not control his managing committee and not one of these men was chosen. Another man was chosen who had no sympathy whatever with Methodism. It has been said that the Fletcher Street schools at Bolton are surrounded by board schools. Let me say we have plenty of schools in London hemmed in by board schools and yet our schools, with scarcely an exception have been maintained and have
flourished. Is it right that Bolton should set an example which threatens to paralyse the educational zeal of our friends throughout Lancashire, and more or less throughout the kingdom, and which is in danger of infecting with a sort of dry-rot contagion the whole of our system of day-schools? (34)

In more general terms, he foresaw a danger of secularism throughout the country, if denominational schools declined:

The more Wesleyan schools you have, the more likely are you to have religious teaching in the board schools, and the fewer Wesleyan schools you have, the less effective religious teaching are you likely to have in board schools.

He related the story of a mistress recently appointed to a newly transferred Church of England school, who had been reluctant to teach the Bible lesson and told the headmistress that she did not believe in the Bible 'nor the God of the Bible'. More and more of the board teachers were agnostic, and he concluded:

We could not help having a board school system, but if you are going to let your Methodists schools die, the board school system will in proportion grow more secular and less Christian. It will be mottled over largely with influences and growths, the spirit of which is the spirit of French secularism of today. (35)

There was one area of optimism for the Wesleyan educational effort. The Wesleyan schools still received the largest grant of any schools from the Government. In 1881, their average grant was 16s.0½d, while that of board schools was 15s.73¹/₄d and the Church of England schools 15s.3³/₄d. The low figures of the Anglican schools was explained by the fact that a large proportion of these schools were small village schools, which could not hope to compete with those of a larger size. The Government's own statistics showed that the Wesleyan schools continued 'in consequence of their general excellency' to earn the largest Government Grant and that the income from school fees was the highest in any class of schools. This continued until 1884 and until the early 1890s the Wesleyan schools were behind only board schools in the amount of grant earned by their scholars. Thus, although the numbers had stagnated, it could not be claimed that the standards had declined at all.

The Wesleyan Inspector, Mawbey, reported in 1882:

During the first two years of my work as Day-School Visitor, nearly all the Committee meetings I attended had reference to financial difficulties, or
the contemplated transfer of schools to school boards: during the last two years the majority of such meetings -of which there have been far fewer-have had reference to the enlargement of existing, or the establishment of new schools. Only a few in the past year, have had reference to financial difficulties, and only three to transfer to boards. (36)

He puts this improvement down to the increase in school fees, which had made many schools, which had formerly been 'burdensome', now 'almost or quite self-supporting'. He reports a greater interest in Wesleyan schools among the Wesleyan people than he had seen in any previous year of his work and states that, 'the old question,"What are our schools doing for our Church?" is seldom heard: the consideration now is, what the schools are doing for the children.' He explains this change of attitude, in the 'fading' novelty of school boards and in the consequent 'oppressive' local taxation, as well as the growing earnings of the Wesleyan schools. But he reserves the greatest praise for Dr. Rigg:

the powerful addresses of Dr. Rigg in various parts of the country, on the subject of general and Methodist education, have removed many misconceptions and established sounder views of our educational work and policy. (37)

There had been other educational battles fought by the Wesleyans in this period. 1877 saw the Wesleyan Education Committee objecting most strongly to the Committee of Council on two matters. Their first complaint arose from a critical Report by H.M.I., E.H. Rice-Wiggin. He complained in 1877 that the 'Wesleyan day-schools, as a class, are badly managed and inefficient, and that Wesleyan School Managers generally are incompetent.' (38) The complaint was printed in the Report of the Committee of Council on Education for 1876-1877. The Wesleyans took particular exception to the following passage:

Wesleyan and board schools are of course the very ones the management of which we should expect to find defective. The former are generally under Managers who, with every good intention, are of social position and education little superior, or too often inferior, to that of the Teacher, and are thus ill qualified to exercise an effective control over him, while they are also but indifferent judges as to whether the school itself is in a proper state as regards premises, work, subordinate staff, etc. (39)

The H.M.I. also charged certain Managers with 'unworthy motives' for maintaining Day-schools, including the subsidising of ministers' stipends with school funds. The Wesleyan Education Committee made a formal complaint about this in September
1877, asking the Committee of Council to make further enquiries, and hoping they would exonerate them from any implication that 'Wesleyan Day-schools generally are badly managed and inefficient'. They also claimed that no single H.M.I. should have published statements which 'in general terms, assert the inefficiency of Wesleyan Day-school management; and much more, that no one of H.M. Inspectors can be justified in using language which implies that the "social position and education" of Wesleyan Methodists are such as to make it a matter of course that H.M.I.s should "expect" to find that the management of their schools is "defective".' The Education Department replied in March with a gentle rebuke to their H.M.I., regretting that the remarks reflected poorly on a 'Body which has contributed so largely... to the promotion of popular education in this country.' They suggested that he should have omitted some of his remarks 'or at all events postponed, till larger and wider experience in the discharge of his duties should have either dispelled his first impressions, or, if it confirmed them, given greater weight to his statements.' (40) They did however refuse to restrict the freedom of their H.M.I.s Reports. Rice-Wiggin himself refused to compromise, saying that he was 'wholly unshaken in his views' and that he was unable to modify any word in his Report on the subject of management, although he might have added 'some such words as "so far as my experience goes" to appear less critical to the Wesleyans as a Body.'

The W.E.C. did take the opportunity to alert managers to their responsibilities. They believed that most Wesleyan schools left nothing to be desired in the area of vigilance, efficiency and the interest shown by Managers in the success of pupils. They did now demand a more rigorous approach to Managers' duties, recommending that Managers' meetings must be held at least once in each quarter, that Registers should be checked and signed by them and that there should be a constant and friendly intercourse with the teachers and children. (41) A circular of Instructions to H.M.I.s of 16 January 1878 had instructed them to make particular note of the moral training of the children, and to recommend reductions in grant if this was unsatisfactory. The W.E.C. took pride in this aspect of Wesleyan schools, 'in view of the training and religious character of their Teachers'. They emphasised the opportunities which day-schools afforded to Ministers to influence 'the religious belief and decision of large numbers of children, many of whom are not otherwise accessible to them.' (42)
The Committee also pointed out in their publicity that, according to the Government's Blue Books, Wesleyan schools were in fact regarded as efficient. The average grant paid per scholar in 1876-7 was 13s.10½d, while that to British schools was 13s.5¾d, the average grant to Schools other than Wesleyan was only 13s.2³⁄₄d:

Consequently the statistics of that same Blue Book in which Mr. Rice-Wiggin appears to allege that the incompetency of Wesleyan School managers generally, brings with it a corresponding inefficiency of Wesleyan Schools, supply evidence that the Grant earned in them was for that year 7½d in excess of the average Grant for the country and 4½d above the Grant paid to Schools ranking next in success to Wesleyan Schools. Since the greater part of the Grant is earned upon Examination, it evidently affords a trustworthy indication of the actual and relative efficiency of Schools... an adequate disproof of statements which disparage Wesleyan Schools generally. (43)

Rigg, in his Inaugural of 1878, also castigates the Inspector, who had insulted 'our whole Connexion'. He was a young man, who had only had the post for two or three years! He shows that government grants show the efficiency of Wesleyan schools:

It is true that schools can earn a good average grant by very elementary work, especially if the great majority of children are young and only take the three lowest standards. This is characteristically the case in Roman Catholic schools. The children are nearly all young - that is they leave school very early; with scarcely any exceptions they are in the first or second, or at the highest, in the third standard; the influence of the Roman Catholic clergy is assiduously exerted to keep them steadily to school; the consequence is that the children in Roman Catholic schools pass, on average, remarkably well, although they pass only in the lower standards, and ... earn... a good grant... A large grant, a grant exceeding on an average 15/- per child in average attendance, is hardly to be earned without a good deal of extra instruction; instruction, that is to say, in the special subjects connected with the higher standards. Now what we find from the Government returns is that a larger proportion of Methodist schools earn high grants, sometimes for elementary work and special subjects, than any other class of schools. Our Wesleyan average, on the whole, is higher than the average of any class of schools... by means of excellent teaching. Among our schools are found some not to be excelled, hardly to be equalled, by any in the country (44)

He defended the teachers themselves and castigated the 'new inspectorate':

Now the epoch of Mr Lowe - which may be called the age of brass - has been succeeded by a driving iron age of new and juvenile inspectors, some of them men very much of the type of Rehoboam's young counsellors. With what yearning and regret must some of our teachers look back to the pre-compulsory age... Now our very best and most devoted teachers - men long proved and never found wanting - I grieve to have to say, are sometimes and in some places so harassed and driven that they have lost much both of their happiness and of their
honest and wholesome pride in their profession ... I say this also, not only for the sake of my young friends, but to encourage our teachers everywhere. It was perhaps inevitable that, following our recent educational changes, some such chafing experience as those to which I have referred, should have come upon some teachers, even though they were teachers of ability and merit. During the last eight years, the staff of inspectors has been nearly doubled, and it now amounts to 120. Many of these inspectors knew little or nothing to begin with of the science, little or nothing of the art, of collective teaching, and especially knew nothing practically of the elementary instruction and the training of young children belonging to the lower classes of the people ... From all this followed vexatious interferences with established methods, arbitrary alterations as to furniture, as to playgrounds ... Ignorance and inexperience also led sometimes to pedantry, to impossible requirements, to a harshness and severity for which the blind zeal or the blinder blundering of a perfect novice under necessity to act as judge in a case which he is unable to appreciate, can form the only apology. Such things as these have for years past been a sore trouble to Methodist schools; perhaps especially to Methodist schools, because our methods, our school organizations, and even our school furniture, have differed from those generally found in Church of England schools, being intermediate between the methods in use in schools of the National Society and the Scottish methods. (45)

He shows some gratitude that in future the influx of young inspectors would be checked and that recruitment will be slower. He is also thankful that 'at the insistence very mainly of our Education Committee' Sir F.R. Sandford had issued a circular to inspectors and the Press that the only test to be applied is whether the results are satisfactory or not. The circular also points out:

It is no part of the inspector's duty either to find fault with or to reprove a teacher. If he finds it necessary, or a kindly act, to give advice or warning to a teacher, it should not be done in the hearing of the scholars or pupil-teachers. (46)

A second area of complaint was that permission to enlarge a Wesleyan School had been refused on the ground that sufficient public Elementary School accommodation already existed in the parish. Therefore the W.E.C. concluded that numerical requirements alone were now governing the building and financing of schools. They believed that schools were necessary, and if the whole cost of providing and furnishing the schools and of maintaining them came from voluntary supporters, the Government ought not to withhold Grants. This complaint had already been aired in the previous year, but the Wesleyans had thought this had been resolved after communications with Sandon. In January 1877, Rigg had attended a meeting at the Education Council Office, where the question of grants to unnecessary schools had arisen, and at Lord
Sandon's request, the W.E.C. views were sent to him in writing. As no reply was made by Sandon to their request for a deputation, the Wesleyan Committee concluded that their demands had been granted. In fact, the Minute was laid before Parliament in their ignorance and their complaints had seemingly been lost by the Department. The New Code for 1878 contained the following statement:

No grant is made for or in respect of any School which is not previously in receipt of an Annual Grant, if the Department think that the School is unnecessary. (47)

On the issue of 'unnecessary' schools, in his Inaugural of 1878 Rigg commented that they brought no additional charge on the Government, in their zeal to build new schools, 'except it be that the Government Inspector is put to the trouble of visiting our schools in addition to those of the school board or of another church.' (48)

The freedom of religion requires no less that, especially where there are no board schools - that is to say, in thousands of villages and small towns, there should be maintained besides the National School of the Church of England, a Nonconformist voluntary school, British it may be, or Wesleyan. We never hear of any attempt to limit the provision of schools established by Roman Catholics to meet the wants of their co-religionist population. Any interference of this sort would at once be recognized as equally unjust and impolitic. But I know no reason why concessions should be made to the Roman Catholics as to this point which are withheld from other Churches. Methodists may, and sometimes do, feel as much religious repugnance to send their children to a particular board school, or a particular Church of England school, as Roman Catholics feel to send their children to anywhere except to their own schools. Whether such a repugnance is just or not is a question little to the purpose. In cases of religious feeling one man cannot judge for another, nor can the State be allowed to arbitrate on this matter between sect and sect, or between man and man. .. There are board schools where all teaching of religion...is forbidden. There are other board schools, and many of them, which though nominally secular are practically exclusive Church of England schools, where children of Methodists are not even protected by a Conscience Clause, and which only differ from the most sectarian and bigoted of the old-fashioned National schools ... in having all their expenses, which are not met by the government grant and the school fees, defrayed out of the rates instead of being provided for by the contributions of the clergy... There are, I am compelled to add, some Church of England schools which do not differ in any essential particular from Roman Catholic Schools. (49)

He went on to point out that 'where there already exists a board school, or a good National school, no Methodist school will be set up unless there is a constituency and a case to warrant it.' The Wesleyan Churches were not particularly rich, and obviously a Methodist school would involve 'much care and trouble and some considerable
pecuniary responsibility... and will not be unadvisedly established'. The Chapels were obliged to build and furnish the schools at their own cost, and this was seen as sufficient deterrent against 'unnecessary' schools. (50)

He mentions in 1878 that the previous Conference had seen more 'testimonies' to the effect of Wesleyan schools than ever before. (51)

The W.E.C. summoned a special meeting to formulate action against this clause. A deputation was sent to Sandon in March 1878 to discuss the problem. This obviously included Rigg, and it was introduced formally by W. Forster. Rigg was the first to speak, complaining that they had no conception at the beginning of 1877 that the proposed clause was then virtually before Parliament and on its course to become law. He continued:

It came as a painful surprise to them! - they could not but object to have the natural increase of their schools hampered and embarrassed by numerical calculations as to the number of children in the parish or district, or by an inspector's views as to the necessity of enlargement or otherwise; or to consult the rector of the parish as to whether he would allow them to erect a school ... They thought the Education Department, by taking upon itself such responsibility, was undertaking what could not be adequately administered. No department could be wise enough, or well-informed enough, to be able to deal with all the cases all over the kingdom... and it was against all ideas of religious liberty, altogether un-English, and Continental to interfere ... with matters so intimately connected with religious conviction and social liberty.

He pointed out to Sandon that the Wesleyans felt most aggrieved at the proposal:

It was a very fundamental question. It stirred the souls of their people deeply; and they would never be content that this principle should be established and kept in operation ... Just let it be understood by any Methodist congregation that a matter had been adjudged against them by their Lords of the Council, however wisely, it would immediately be said they had done so because they were in favour of the Established Church (or of the School Board) ... It was said that unless there was some such regulation in force there would be a multiplication of unnecessary schools. He held that no school was unnecessary that was required because of the religious convictions of a particular congregation, and that if education in this country was really to take hold and keep hold in a natural - not mechanical - way, it must be by being continually associated with religious convictions. Respect for religious conviction was a sacred plea which ought to prevent any school from being regarded as unnecessary... There was sufficient check in the cost of voluntary schools against such schools being needlessly set up. It was very different with board schools, which were paid for by the rates and involved no personal sacrifice.
Those who supported voluntary schools would not set them up without good reason - either that they needed them themselves, or that there was something objectionable about other schools, and there were many schools that were really objectionable, where no objection could be established by pen and ink argument. (52)

He said that he could not understand such a clause being promoted by the 'friends of voluntary liberty' and feared that a rigid, mechanical system of schools would lead to 'a rigid, secular system of schools'.

At the meeting, the Rev. G. W. Olver pointed out that the Government would not dare to enforce it on Roman Catholics as they were doing on Wesleyans, and that it was impossible for the Government to judge whether a school was necessary, as there were so numerous and various reasons for establishing them. The question, he told Sandon, was between 'voluntary schools and voluntary schools, far more than between voluntary schools and board schools.' (53) Rigg agreed that the 'evil is mitigated in the case of school board districts, where it does not, as we think, press so hardly as outside school board districts.' (54)

Although he did not impute blame to Sandon, if it went ahead it would be 'misconceived in the provinces and villages and would damage the hope of friendliness between the Church of England and the Methodists' (55) The desire of the deputation was that any school should be entitled to a grant, as long as it qualified as efficient. Sandon gave no immediate answer, but reminded them that 'the Education Department had been in the habit of acting in a friendly way with all the representations that came from the Wesleyan body.' (56)

The N. B. to Article 7b of the Code was in fact added in 1879, which modified the regulation. The Department was now empowered to withhold annual grants from schools deemed 'unnecessary', but only within School Board Districts. Outside these districts, new schools, though deemed unnecessary, might after twelve months' probation, receive grants. This concession was achieved through the efforts of the Wesleyan deputation (57) and at the Annual Meeting on Education in April 1879, the Rev. G. O. Bate was able to boast:

It is not difficult to imagine how prejudicial to Methodist interests and to religious freedom such a state of things might have proved in many
districts of the country. It would have given to existing schools a permanent monopoly of the education of rural districts and at the same time it would have emboldened their managers to conduct them in a manner which, while not in conflict with the Code, would have been open to serious objection. But now, under the explanatory minute, which the W.E.C. has obtained from the Department (for no other public elementary body took part with the Committee in their effort), if for any reason the existing school... of a district not under a School board be deemed unsuitable or unsatisfactory, another school can be opened; and if the conditions already mentioned are fulfilled, it will in its second year be entitled to the ordinary annual grants in aid from the Government. (58)

Punshon at the Annual Meeting said that he was thankful that 'by dogged perseverance', the Committee had succeeded in getting 'some remarkable concessions from the Government'. However he asserted the greatest praise for:

the one remarkable concession of being regarded by the Government as a troublesome body, and of being told in so many words that they were so regarded. That was a very considerable triumph, because most Governments - especially when an election loomed in the distance - were made of squeezable material, and so soon as any Committee got the reputation for being determined to push itself forward into notice, particularly if it had good ground to stand upon, the chances were that it would in the long run succeed. (59)

It was Rigg who was the most dogged character on the Committee and at the same meeting, one delegate praised him for acting for so many years as ' the head practically, of their Education Department' (60)

The Committee still remained somewhat dissatisfied that their 'promoters' of new schools could not be told, before building that it might be placed on the list of schools receiving annual grants, and they had therefore to incur the outlay of providing the school, and appointing and salaring a certified teacher, with only the hope of government grants. In certain cases, the new schools had been denied grants. (61) In addition to this dissatisfaction, the Wesleyan Committee complained that grants were only available after a twelve month probation, but this only began after the initial inspection, which might itself take upto a year, depending on the H.M.I.'s schedules for inspection of the particular locality. A deputation actually met the Vice-President of council, A.J.Mundella on this complaint, and one of the schools was admitted to grants without this undue delay. (62)

The WATCHMAN had been quite extreme in its comments on the whole matter, displaying that fear of Catholicism was at the root of its complaint. An Editorial recited
an extreme case, that the Department was empowered to say that, because a Roman Catholic school in some place provided ample accommodation and efficient secular instruction, although the precise class of population for which it was originally provided, by the aid perhaps of a Government building grant, may have migrated elsewhere - the Church of England, Methodist and Baptist parents in that place shall 'under penalties of the Act of 1876 be compelled to send their children to that Roman Catholic school, and to subject them to all the influences which may reach them, through reading books, school songs, pictures and the winning ways of semi-ecclesiastical ladies and gentlemen, who, dressed in instructive garments, give the secular teaching of the school.' Withdrawn from the religious instruction under the Conscience Clause the children may be, but 'can any Protestant parents be content that a Government Department should have power to make such a public elementary school the only one available for their children to qualify in for labour passes?' (63)

Mundella's Education Act of 1880, which made bye-laws on attendance compulsory in all areas, received little comment in the Wesleyan Press. The Wesleyans expressed no opposition to this measure, seeing it as merely the fulfilment of the Sandon Act of four years before. (64) However, in August 1881, the Committee of Council on Education issued a series of 'Proposals for Revision of Code and Examination Schedules' which did worry the Wesleyan Education Committee. They saw an increase in the expenditure of their schools, while the proposals would have lessened their income from the Government. They appointed a Special Sub-Committee, which presented their suggestions to an extraordinary meeting of the Education Committee in October 1881.

The Wesleyans accepted the Government's proposal to abolish the requirement of 250 attendances as a condition for examination, and they approved of proposed extension of grants for 'average attendance'. They did not like Proposal 14, which would continue examination grants, especially as this would now be based on 'the proportion of passes actually made to those that might have been made by the scholars examined'. A full grant in the three 'R's would be payable only if there were a 100% pass rate, and
the W.E.C. pointed out that the existing rate for all schools was only 81.2%, with the test administered solely to those who had completed 250 attendances and were the most proficient scholars. The new regulation would demand that all scholars who had been on the registers for six months had to be examined, regardless of proficiency or attendances. The Wesleyan Memorandum complained:

To secure such a percentage of passes a very large amount of mechanical mental drill must have been imposed upon the duller children of the school, which would not be for the advantage even of such children themselves. The time and labour given to attaining such a result would have been better employed in developing their general intelligence and exciting their interest in the general subjects of education ... in the case of children under eleven, of the lower classes, faultless accuracy, at the first trial, in every point, however small, of elementary instruction, can hardly be regarded as the one or the most important and fruitful object of school training. While the Committee would in no degree underrate the value of sound instruction in Reading, Writing and Arithmetic, they hold that a satisfactory education, especially in the case of such children, must be one which shall touch all the faculties of the child. Such an education it is scarcely possible to give to children of such a class, so long as the principle of payment by results is the predominating influence in the schools. (65)

They did not approve of the proposal to reserve a new 'merit' grant to those schools which had reached the closest to a 100% pass in the examinations. (66)

The mechanical, rote learning of the weak children would, according to the Committee, take up the teacher's time, and would thus disadvantage the brighter children, who would be ignored. They therefore called for the 'examination grant' to be a subordinate element in the system and that there should be more weighting to allowances for attendances and for 'special merit'. The largest proportion, which they suggested should be 50%, should be for average attendance, as this 'necessarily measures the amount of work actually done in an elementary school'. (67) They wanted examinations to qualify for only 30%, with the remaining grant reserved for 'special merit'.

The result of the changes in grants, according to the Wesleyan Memorandum, would be to cripple some of the voluntary schools financially, and force some to close. They would receive less grant, and there would be a diminution in school fees, because the incentive to regular attendance (which arose from the required 250 attendances to qualify for the examinations) would be removed.

A deputation was then sent to Earl Spencer and A.J. Mundella, the Vice-President of the
Committee of Council. This deputation was well received by the Government, showing again the standing of the Church in educational affairs. The TIMES suggested that the deputation would have terrified weaker ministers than Mundella. (68) It suggested that Dr. Rigg was speaking 'ostensibly on behalf of the whole Wesleyan body', but also giving expression to 'objections which the Education Committee will have to encounter from the managers of denominational schools of all persuasions.' It also suggested that denominational education was certain to survive 'so long as it can yield results like those of the Wesleyan schools.' The WATCHMAN pointed out, in reference to the TIMES' comments, that the array of ministers brought together was one which might have 'terrified weaker and less well furnished speakers than Dr. Rigg and his companions.' They were met by Mundella, Earl Spencer, two under-secretaries, T.W. Sharp (the Inspector of Training Colleges for Masters), the Rev. Canon Warburton (the Inspector of Training Colleges for Mistresses) and J.G. Fitch. The fact that such an array of educationalists was put together was a tribute to the Wesleyan threat. The opening remarks by Rigg were however quite amicable and complimentary about the good aspects of the New Code. (69) He told Mundella that his committee 'when they read the proposals felt they were in the region of educational enlightenment' and that their objections would be few. (70) This conciliatory attitude helped the discussions and led to concessions on the part of the Government.

Rigg wrote to the TIMES on 26 November 1881, describing his meeting. He began by expressing their objection to the regulation which opened the annual examination to all children who had been half a year on the register, suggesting that the percentage of passes was sure to dwindle, as these children had not been as adequately taught as those with a minimum of 250 attendances. He said that the proposal which required an adult teacher for every infant department of over forty children, would be a 'needless hardship.' He portrayed to Mundella a village school, under a mistress, which would be placed under an 'oppressive' requirement to employ another teacher, where 'a pupil-teacher of sixteen or seventeen years of age, especially under the oversight of a mistress, would be amply sufficient.' (71) Much of the discussion was taken up with the suggestion, 36, that an assistant teacher would count for sufficient for sixty scholars rather than eighty, especially as, under 34 and 35, every fraction of sixty additional
scholars in the larger schools, of over 200, would demand an additional certified teacher. He pointed out that this would 'bear with particular severity on larger schools... and in all schools in which by reason of the difficulty of obtaining pupil-teachers a large proportionate number of certificated teachers has to be employed.' This, he told the Secretary, was a large proportion of Wesleyan schools. He had surveyed a sample of Wesleyan schools and found the extra charge would be over £80 a year. The result of the extinction of the voluntary schools would vastly increase the school rate but would also lead the board schools becoming 'merely secular schools, some sort of special concordat being made - practically if not professedly- with the Roman Catholics'.

Rigg also complained to Mundella that any serious strain on the resources of existing Wesleyan schools would result in many of them being handed over to boards. and that this would place the Government under increasing financial burdens. There were in fact 341 Wesleyan schools in school board areas, with over 56,000 scholars. (72) Rigg added the further objection:

It was to be feared that the proposals in regard to special merit, instead of correcting, might aggravate the evil of payment by results. He objected to the proposals which vested such large discretion in the inspectors ... It was an opinion universally held that the teachers ought to feel comparatively calm ... the teachers should receive a considerable proportion for doing their work and they should be left free to do that work... (73)

One particular clause which the deputation objected to, was Proposal 32, which intended to permit clergymen, Roman Catholic priests and other ministers of religion to be recognised as teachers in elementary night schools aided by Government grants. This was Mundella's own suggestion, and he regarded the Wesleyan objection as unreasonable, as Wesleyan lay-preachers had been allowed to teach in day-schools. He told Rigg that:

What we propose to do ... is to extend the usefulness of the night schools, so that children of 11 years of age, who have left school to follow the plough, may be brought to the school to follow their education and be taught something of what we call 'specific subjects' - botany, geography e.t.c. You know that the only man in the village who can teach such a subject is the clergyman or curate and the only man at leisure will be the clergyman.(74)

The WATCHMAN saw a major difference in the fact that the Wesleyan lay preachers
received no payment for their work on Sunday, whereas the clergyman was expected to be paid for his preaching and his night-school teaching. It would enable a rural rector to announce in advertising for a curate, that his salary would be so much money in addition to his salary, because of the Government night-school grant. (75)

Mundella concluded with a compliment about the Wesleyan schools:

Yours are the best scholars in the country and take the largest grant... Has not (the School Board system) made your the Ecole d' elite of the working classes? Do you not get higher fees in your schools by having a more select class than those obtained in any other schools?... You get a better class of children in, because the working classes like to grade themselves, just as other classes do, and the respectable working man likes his children to go to a school, where they meet children of other respectable classes.(76)

Rigg continued to defend the Wesleyan stance in the national Press. He wrote to the TIMES again on 1 December 1881, complaining of the unfairness of one of their comments:

you close your article by saying that voluntary schools 'can only exist by showing their readiness to advance in the path of educational progress and their capacity to compete on equal terms with their rivals'. Will you indulge me with the opportunity of saying that on equal terms we have shown that we can more than compete with our rivals. Our contention is that a large and sudden increase in the cost made necessary for the maintenance of our larger schools, in competition with board schools, is competition on unequal terms, because we cannot resort to the rates to obtain the large additional amount of expenditure thus imposed upon us. (77)

The original proposals were revised in the Code of 1882 in response to the Wesleyan representations and the Wesleyans proved to be quite satisfied with the resulting Code. (78)

The WATCHMAN of 1882 commented:

The New Code will disappoint many fears. It is a well considered document. Nearly all its changes are improvements and on the whole, it is a great improvement on former Codes...We are inclined to say that every Code since 1861 has been an improvement on its predecessor, but certainly no Code has contained so many marked and important changes for the better ... by the wisely frank and conciliatory policy of the chiefs of the Department... It still falls short of the ideal conditions, which earnest teachers would desire ... But it must never be forgotten that so long as a third of the cost of the schools is contributed in the form of Government
bounty, it is simply impossible for teachers to be left at the liberty to organise and teach in each school in the special manner that is best for that school. The country will have, in some form, the public payments made for results, and only for results - results ascertained by inspection and examination, and appraisable according to some precise rule of arithmetical calculation... this system of examination... must be uniform and stereotyped... Public grants can be had on no other terms. Mr. Mundella has... done as well as could be expected... We confess that we had hardly expected to see so good a Code, had scarcely thought it possible. It is evident that the suggestions made to the Department, in the closing months of last year have been most carefully considered and have borne good fruit. The criticisms of the W.E.C. in particular have been adopted, more or less exactly, in a considerable number of instances. (79)

There was no longer the qualification of 250 attendances before a child could be examined and the Code also embody a principle of average attendance for all its grant arrangements. Thus the dominance of the Revised Code of 1861, with the payment solely by results, was ended. This would end the 'temptations, vexations, incongruities and substantial injustice' which the Editorial of the WATCHMAN saw in the old system. The 'evil payment by results on individual examination is thus reduced to a minimum':

Nothing can be more ingenious or more simple in its working than the proposed plan of payment for examination passes on the basis of average attendance. 100 scholars examined, if they all passed perfectly, would make 300 passes, each passing in all three elementary subjects. In this case, for each scholar in average attendance... the grant would be 100 pence - 8s, 4d... If a school only made 50%, or half of the possible passes, the grant would be 50 pence - 4s, 2d for each scholar in average attendance. We must confess however that in our judgement the amount thus obtained on the pass-examination is proportionally too great. The direct grant given on the average attendance, given unconditionally, is 4s, 6d (6d more than at present). (80)

The Wesleyans would have preferred 7s, 6d and then halving the examination grant. Nevertheless, 'all things considered, the proposal of the Department is judicious'. The newspaper also praised the institution of a Merit Grant, given for 'general intelligence and good tone' in the school. It amounted to 2s., 4s, or 6s in Infant schools, according to the grade of merit assigned by the Inspector, as fair, good or excellent. In other schools, it amounted to half this. The Department made a substantial concession to the Wesleyans in regard to pupil-teachers. The number allowable in a school would not be diminished, with three for the principal teacher, and one for each of the assistant teachers. Clause 83, on minimum staff requirements, conceded that the principal certified teacher was sufficient for an average attendance of sixty, although each
additional teacher would qualify for eighty children, and each pupil teacher for forty, with pupil-teachers in their first year on probation, counting for twenty children. The Wesleyans were also pleased that there had been no changes in the grants for 'additional' class subjects. The Clause allowing ministers of religion to perform as night-school teachers did remain, though it was stated that they could not act as day-school teachers. Moreover, the New Code contained the following proviso (Clause 96d), reflecting other previous complaints of the Wesleyans, that 'the principal teacher is not allowed to undertake duties not connected with the school which occupy any part whatever of the school hours, or for the time appointed for the special instruction of pupil-teachers. (81)

Rigg himself believed the New Code would be good for the Wesleyans, because many of their schools were excellent and would gain Merit Grants. He believed they had few weak schools. The Code was regarded as 'distinguished by enlightened principles and by excellent aims'. (82) However, the actual working of the Code proved to be a disappointment. The cramming for examination went on and the Inspectorate continued to act in a miserly fashion towards the schools. Rigg made this a major part of his Inaugural of February 1885:

When schools think of little but methods and processes, when mechanical results quickly arrived at by mere rote work, without any knowledge of principles, are generally recognised as the end aim of education in the public school ... and find their reward in money payments from the public revenue... It was expected that Mr. Mundella's New Code would have done much to lessen the evil. But by some strange fatality, that Code has thus far to a large extent failed of its aim. The Merit Grant was, I think I have a right to affirm, intended ... to afford the opportunity of signalizing the merit and of adding to the means of support, of schools whose technical results were no true index of their real merits, because of unfavourable conditions, especially in regard to the class of children in them which affect their working. Unfortunately too many Inspectors make it a rule to give no high Merit Grant unless high technical results are obtained. What should have been a mitigation and a relief has thus been turned into an aggravation of an evil which was previously complained of with great justice, viz. the unequal conditions under which teachers are compelled to work up to a common standard. The Merit Grant has added another turn to the screw. Those Inspectors - and especially those Inspector's Assistants, sometimes the greatest offenders in this matter - who were before too exacting, have thus been enabled to make their severe virtue severer still ... they have done not a little to defeat the beneficent object of the Code, which was framed under enlightened inspiration, and of which, in particular, this Merit Grant clause was intended to obviate those
complaints of iron uniformity in school standards ... which for nearly twenty years had been iterated and reiterated by the teachers of inspected schools everywhere. (83)

He also blamed the 'excellent Act of 1876 for the cramming, as it was necessary for children to pass a certain standard before they were allowed to be accepted for employment, and he suggested that these labour children should be required to have 'less breadth of knowledge':

Teaching in too many of our schools, after all these years, is mechanical and superficial to a lamentable extent. The principles insisted on by the trainers of thirty years ago ... are totally neglected in practice in a large proportion of our schools today. (We are told) they have to get the children to pass ... and they cannot afford to spend time and labour on principles and the reasons of processes. (84) ...
A slow, thoughtful scholar, working out his question in Arithmetic according to principles he understands and follows, might not get his work done promptly enough for an Inspector's examination. What is wanted for the production of these requisite results is mainly, often merely, practice ... so practice is given and principles are ignored... (85)

He concluded:

It was because of such considerations as these that our W.E.C., three years ago, urged on the Government to reduce very considerably the grant paid on the results ascertained in examination and correspondingly to increase the grant calculated and payable on school-attendance. With this material exception, nearly all the principal suggestions of our Committee were adopted in the New Code ... If that suggestion had been adopted, much less would certainly have been heard of over-pressure and the teaching in the schools, I venture to think, would have been more patient, more intelligent and more thorough... However, we cannot have all our own way, and we have to make the best of the existing Code - a Code which in itself, and if the Merit Grant were only worked as it ought to be and was intended to be, would deserve high praise for its enlightened spirit and its firm and consistent grasp of the whole subject to which it relates ... Let us hope that, by such an administration of the Merit Grant as shall really encourage merit and discourage mere ... cram, the potent material inducement which has warped the aim of teachers ... may be driven away. (86)

The same complaint was shown in the report of the Wesleyan Inspector Maybey, in 1884, who pointed to the 'inspectorial arbitrariness' of the New Code:

Throughout the year the teacher is not only working at high pressure, but is anxiously thinking of the estimate of his school and himself, which will be announced at the end of the year in the one word, 'Fair', or 'Good', or 'Excellent' - a word which will be known to school Managers, friends, and rivals..

He considered the 'Merit Mark' to be the great defect of the New Code, causing 'deep
discouragement', and 'over-pressure. (87) In the following year he reported that an 'excellent' merit mark was being withheld when school premises were regarded as 'unsatisfactory' and that in general the Code was causing 'apprehensive discouragement' for teachers. (88)
CHAPTER SIX
Lord Salisbury took office as Prime Minister in December 1885, with the pro-denominationalist Irish Parliamentary Party holding the balance of power in the Commons. The new government failed to survive the debate on the Queen’s Speech, but did survive long enough for a Royal Commission on Education to be established under Sir Richard Cross. It was officially appointed in January 1886, and among other denominationalists, such as Cardinal Manning, Lord Harrowby and Canon Gregory, Dr. Rigg was called on to be a member. He was to make his presence felt in the cross-examination of witnesses. Rigg’s questioning style made his own views of the various questions apparent. He took particular interest in the matters outlined by his own Committee, as well as emphasising the necessity for Bible teaching, and the continuation of the pupil-teacher system. David Waller, the Secretary of the Wesleyan Education Committee, also appeared before the Commission, as a witness, along with several other Wesleyan teachers and officials.

The W.E.C. outlined its desires for the Cross Commission. In 1886 they suggested that it should modify and relax the ‘root idea’ of the present system - the principle of payment by results’, and also to take whatever ‘additional precautions against the possibility of over-pressure can be devised.’ (1) They also called for the removal of Article 114 of the Code which limited the amount of grant to a school to its total income from all other sources, and in any case to a limit of 17s.6d per pupil. This had penalised many Wesleyan schools, in poor localities, which had earned the highest merit-grant and yet had suffered large deductions, because of this. The Wesleyan Education Committee had written to the Education Department complaining of this in February 1885, pointing out that board schools were practically exempt from the restriction. They claimed that it was frustrating the design of the merit-grant, particularly in poorer areas:

whilst schools in which high fees are paid seldom suffer from loss under Article 114, schools situated in neighbourhoods where fees are necessarily low, because of the social condition of the parents, are often subjected to loss of part of the grant earned solely on account of the operation of Article 114 ...the operation of Article 114 has become more objectionable since the introduction of the new Code of 1882 by frustrating the design of the merit grant, for in many instances the pecuniary advantage arising from the award of ‘Excellent’ is lost by the limitation imposed by clause (b) Article 114. (2)
The original intention of the 17s.6d restriction, embodied in the 1876 Act, had been to stimulate voluntary subscriptions to qualify a school for additional monies to match these contributions, but now it was penalising schools. They called for its removal from the 1885 Code (3) but the Department ignored their call.

Rigg remained a convinced denominationalist at this time and he intended to defend the Wesleyan schools before the Commission. He told the Wesleyan Conference in 1885:

> The Church of England knew well how necessary it was to keep up the Church schools, but the Conference was trying to keep up Methodism without schools. Among the hundreds of villages in which Methodism had been given up, one cause that had led to that result very often, was the fact that there were no day-schools and that there were Church schools. One Wesleyan day-school society would save a society from extinction in the villages, but to leave the whole country stripped of schools was a great mistake. It was said that the Connexion could not afford to keep up the day-schools. Then they could not afford to keep up Methodism; for that was what was involved. (4)

In his 1887 Inaugural, Rigg commented:

> The danger is not lest voluntary schools, as a class, should die out, but there is some danger lest Wesleyan schools should be allowed to droop and die...Wesleyan day schools...are especially necessary where Methodism is struggling to get well-rooted in a hard soil. Nothing commends an undervalued community ... to the respect of the general population like a really good, Christian day-school. When such a day-school has once gained repute and influence, the minister connected with its management begins, even in such a locality, to obtain influence and recognition beyond his own community. The clergy become aware of his existence, when they are made to feel the influence of the school. The parochial authorities ...become aware of him. He is invited to consultations and to public committees ... Before, in this strange soil for Methodism, the chapel represented a locally obscure and disparaged sect; now it is beginning to take rank, in relation to the public well-being, almost beside the parish church, sometimes, indeed, where our school has shown itself to be very good, the chapel begins, with some of the parents, to rank even above the parish church. It is ... often the only way of succeeding in a region, where Anglicanism and intense Dissent have got between them, root in, and hold over the whole of the ground, and surely in such regions, Methodism is very badly needed. In such neighbourhoods, without a day-school, the position of Methodism will always remain obscure, its influence will never be great... (5)

Rigg also intended to bring before the Commission all the former complaints of his Church against the School boards and the devices used by the Church of England to manipulate the board system. In questioning the witnesses for the First Report, one of the first subjects that he emphasised was the Wesleyan grievance of the temporary loan of premises to school boards, He told Rev. J. Duncan, Secretary of the National Society:

> Taking the school in its concrete effect, the first hour cannot be separated from
the other hours; it is strictly a denominational school; there is no conscience clause even exhibited in such schools, because it would have no application, and the school is entirely maintained out of the rates! ... I have seen not a few letters in the GUARDIAN referring to such arrangements, written by clergymen, saying how admirably they work, and that the clergyman is relieved of all trouble and charge in respect of the maintenance of the school which formerly used to cost him and the subscribers a great deal, whilst the school is actually under his hands as strictly and fully as it ever has been. (6)

Rigg also deplored the power of school boards to be the sole judges of the educational requirements in an area, that they were allowed so much discretion that 'they may count whatever number they like without making a real arithmetical calculation as to the actual supply afforded by existing public elementary schools.' (7) Any projected Voluntary schools could be turned down by the board. Rigg asked the Secretary to the Committee of Council on Education, P. Cumin:

supposing there were a large influx of Roman Catholics into a population, and that there were an offer at the same time of a Roman Catholic inspected school to meet that need, would the board have an unconditional right to refuse the Roman Catholic school? (8)

Cumin said that this had just been discussed by Ministers and they would totally support the board. The same complaint was brought to the Commission by D. J. Waller who claimed that 'practically no denominational school can be opened in a school board district without the concession of the board.' (9) School boards could also refuse to build board schools if they believed existing Anglican schools were sufficient in their area. The board were allowed to determine the necessity and suitability of schools in their area, and they determined this on the principle that 'any public elementary school is suitable for all children' (10) The Wesleyans believed that the religious preferences of parents ought to be taken into account and that in some areas 'objections reached us that Wesleyan children are compelled to attend schools where symbols are exhibited to which parents have a conscientious objection.' (11)

Rigg persisted with his argument to E. Hance, the Clerk to the Liverpool School Board:

The question was whether a board school might not be established in a certain neighbourhood ... where the inhabitants of that neighbourhood were dissatisfied with the provision of the denominational schools; I thought you said that you could not imagine the necessity for a board school where a district was provided with voluntary schools that were acting under a conscience clause?

Hance replied:
If my answer went to that extent, perhaps it was a little too absolute. Of course a district might be entirely supplied by Roman Catholic schools, and there might be a minority of Protestants in that district; I scarcely think that even under the conscience clause a Roman Catholic school is a fitting place into which Protestant children should be required to go. (12)

He similarly asked the Vice-President of the Bradford School Board, J. Hanson:

May I ask whether, in refusing to recognise the conscientious religious beliefs of citizens who happen to have a distinct religious belief, the State is providing equally for all? ... As I understand your recent answers, you regard the specific religious beliefs of citizens as luxuries ... What did the term luxuries refer to, if it was not to specific beliefs?

Hanson replied:

Taking the case of the Roman Catholics, the State provides education in those subjects that all alike need, whether they are Catholic or Protestant, or whatever they might be, all the elements of education are provided for, and those points that they differ upon, those definite religious beliefs, I am anxious that they should be provided with, and I think that every parent thinks it his duty to provide them, but they cannot be provided by the State. (13)

Rigg's comment to this, was that he found it a religious tyranny under the name of liberalism.

Rigg also complained about the Merit Grant to one of the witnesses on the Commission:

I myself took part in representations which led to its being instituted on purpose to meet that case; and I will ask you whether you remember the language used here in the instructions on the merit grant. This is addressed to the inspectors: 'Your own experience must often have led you to conclude that the full value of a school's work is not accurately measured by the results of individual examination as tabulated in the schedule, and that two schools in which the ratio of passes is the same often differ materially in the quality of those passes.' That is the very preamble of the merit grant, and the reason why the merit grant was instituted was to meet the difficulty there stated ... No doubt its administration may have failed, but would you be surprised to be informed that an inspector this very day told me that he had given the grant of excellence two years in succession to a school in the north in which not 85% of passes were made? (14)

David Waller reiterated the Wesleyan complaints about the Merit Grant, when he was interviewed at length by the Commission. He commented that there was 'worry and a great deal of nervous strain and special anxiety, when the whole year's work is brought under examination on a certain day.' (15) He told the Committee that teachers were under an undue amount of tension:

I am bound to say that I do not think the special anxiety of the teachers is so much for the money payment as for their reputation. ... the opinion of the majority of the teachers is that they would do away with the Merit Grant altogether... it should be upon the appointments and general circumstances of the school and should not be held to determine to so large an extent the ability of the teacher. (16)
He also told the Commission that the Wesleyans had initially welcomed the Merit Grant, as a reward and recognition for good work, but its original aim had disappeared. (17) He would now like to see the complete abolition of the 'excellent' grade, which had become another 'testimonial of the teacher', and was a cause for so much stress. He suggested that teachers should at least be given the liberty of classification of their own students, and of withdrawal and exemptions from the examination. He also said that he would make it illegal to keep children in after the school day 'for the purpose of cramming and preparing for examinations.' (18) He also proposed more frequent inspection and less individual examination, to ascertain the true tone of a school.

Dr. Rigg also showed concern for the workload of teachers. He commented to one witness on the Commission:

Do you not think that a great deal of the outcry that we have heard of late as to over-pressures has arisen from that effort on the part of teachers to work during the daytime and also at night; in fact to burn the candle at both ends? (19)

In the following year, he brought up the subject again, when questioning the headmistress of a National School about the effect of over-pressure on her health. (20) The Wesleyan teacher, J. Devonshire told Rigg that he 'scarcely knew a teacher' who was not affected by the anxiety of examinations and that it had caused the premature deaths of 30 schoolteachers, whose children had been forced to enter the Orphanage at Peckham. (21) His solution was the total abolition of payment by results, or freedom of classification given to teachers.

He complained about the pressure caused by the examination grants. He quoted a letter by one of the 'most respected' Wesleyan teachers:

The desire for high percentages of passes induces a striving after a high percentage as the one test of the school's efficiency. The difference between 90% and 99% in most schools only amounts to a few children, these are the weakly, the slow, the stupid; the whole reputation of the teacher comes to depend on his dealing with these few. He must exercise overpressure or get rid of the children; the latter is done about here, sometimes barefacedly, sometimes by all sorts of dodges and excuses, and so there comes a distinct lowering of moral tone in teachers themselves. This will tend to become more marked by reproducing its own consequences, until I begin to wonder what the moral tone of the children will be in ten or twenty years hence. (22)

On the Cross Commission, Rigg firmly advocated Bible teaching. He asked P. Cumin, the Secretary to the Education Department to confirm that the original purpose of the Government grant and the institution of the Privy Council Aid in 1839 was the 'moral and religious more
directly than intellectual needs of the children?" (23) Cumin admitted that in those days the grant was not open to secular schools. Rigg was also concerned about the 'mechanical' form of instruction and that, because of the emphasis on the numbers of examination passes "the clever children are neglected for the sake of the dull?" (24) In 1887, Rigg cross examined the Rev. Dr. H. Crosskey, the Chairman of the School Management Committee of the Birmingham School Board:

You must be aware that a large proportion of those whom most people think are the very best teachers hold that their best influence depends upon the Bible lesson; and moreover, they have chosen their vocation because of the religious character which they understand properly belongs to it; and they would feel that they were degraded if they were obliged to be merely secular teachers; have you no sympathy with those views?

Crosskey replied that such people should be in the ministry rather than in teaching to which Rigg responded that "the greatest teachers that the world has ever known in its history have had that feeling." Crosskey would not accept this, asserting that:

If a teacher insists on inculcating his own creed in school hours he interferes with the public rights; he is an agent of the Church and not the educational servant of the State. (25)

On the issue of opening training colleges to all, regardless of their religious views, Rigg stood firm, that prospective teachers should be Christians. Crosskey saw it as 'a great grievance to school boards that they could not have trained teachers apart from any sect or denomination' (26), at which Rigg questioned to whom this was a grievance, as parents did not see it as such. Crosskey maintained:

My answer to that is that the grievance of which I am speaking is a public wrong, that it injures the education of the nation, and I should not take the opinion of parents in such cases as those to which you allude with respect to the advantages and disadvantages of the denominational system of training teachers. That is a question of high public interest, which has to be decided on public grounds. (27)

He cross-examined Crosskey about the causes for the reinstatement of Bible teaching in the Birmingham Board schools:

I was visiting Birmingham off and on at the time; I may have been wrongly informed, I was told that it was discovered that there was an important deficiency of religious knowledge and influence on the part of the juvenile population, and that it made a great impression on the public opinion of the town, and that that led to the cry for at least the Bible being read in the schools; is that all fiction?

Crosskey replied that he did not know of any special discovery of such ignorance, to which
Rigg responded:

Then what was the ground that led a board committed strongly as a whole to secular principles, when those principles were working well, as you have asserted, and producing general reformation, and excellent results in the juvenile population, to abandon the secular system and bring the Bible in?... Was it not because public opinion had prepared the way for such a compromise and was already strongly in favour of it and convinced of the need for it, whether rightly or wrongly?

Crosskey did admit to Rigg that there was a considerable amount of public opinion on the necessity of using the Bible in the schools. (28)

Rigg took pains to defend the pupil-teacher system on many occasions on the Commission. He pointed out to a number of witnesses that pupil-teachers often made better teachers than those moving straight into college, and when asked by Rigg for his views, C. Mansford replied:

I do not think that very much could be done in a year or two to teach a man how to teach; and therefore, if they came up well instructed, but bad teachers, I should say that it would be more fatal to their success as elementary teachers than if they came up poorly instructed and good teachers. (29)

To another witness Rigg commented:

I have been looking into that subject rather particularly for a good while. You said that you could not get pupil-teachers, except with great difficulty, because of the pressure of other occupations, that they were offered good wages and that 14 was too old to get pupil-teachers... Does it not occur to you that if you cannot get pupil-teachers at the age of 14 when they are paid well, as they are paid by the London School Board, the prospect of obtaining a supply for our colleges from the same class, who would keep at school, getting no wages, and perhaps entering college four or five years afterwards, would be a very doubtful one? (30)

When Rigg asked the Wesleyan teacher, Mr. D. Holdsworth, if the abolition of the pupil-teacher system would affect the supply of candidates for the training colleges and for the profession, Holdsworth dutifully replied that the supply would be limited, and that those who come into the profession would not be so good teachers. (31)

Rigg had a heated discussion with the Rev. Dr. H. Crosskey, over the matter, which shows his abrasive style. He asked Crosskey:

Do you think that it is any advantage to those about to follow a profession, which is also an art, that they should begin their practice whilst their faculties are exceedingly plastic and pliable; is it not the case with all arts that those who are to practice them begin early?

Crosskey: You would not say that a student of surgery is to begin his profession by practising on the vile body of some poor person; and I do not think that a
teacher should begin his profession by practising on young children in public elementary schools.

Rigg: I should be disposed to think that it always has been a great advantage to young men to have had some experience as pupils under a medical man before they walk the hospitals?

Crosskey: Yes, before they walk the hospitals, but this is not parallel to an engagement in the practical work of teaching.

Rigg: More or less assisting?

Crosskey: But not at the very young age at which it occurs in schools with pupil teachers.

Rigg: That is to say, from fourteen to eighteen years of age?

Crosskey: They would be much better taught in a training college.

Rigg: I suppose you are aware that the opinion of those who are responsible for conducting training colleges is almost universally against your own opinion on this subject?

Crosskey: Yes.

Rigg: And that the universal result of their experience is that it is the teachers who have been pupil-teachers beforehand who make by far the best teachers in schools?

Crosskey: Unfortunately, I think that the teachers at present in our schools do not have the proper preparation.

Rigg: Pardon me, that was not the question; I asked you whether you were not aware that the opinion of those who have the practical responsibility for training at present is that by far the best teachers are those who have been pupil-teachers before they come to college; that is the question I put?

Crosskey: I should say that very often it is not cause and effect.

Rigg: Are you aware that it is the opinion?

Crosskey: I have heard it stated.

Rigg: You think it a matter of little consequence whether it is the opinion or not?

Crosskey: No, I do not take any such position.

Rigg: Then what would you say in reply to that?

Crosskey: A person having a faculty for teaching, no doubt as a pupil teacher becomes a good teacher in a training college; he begins and goes on with the faculty of teaching; and the best pupil-teachers become the best teachers; the best teachers are those who have the faculty almost inherent in them. But I say that they would be very much better teachers if they had not gone through the pupil-teacher drudgery, but had entered college and had there had proper instruction in teaching.

Rigg: Are you aware that the principals of training colleges having two classes under their eyes, namely, those who have been trained as pupil teachers and those who have not, from the experience of many years have come to the conclusion that those who make the best teachers in after life are not those who have not been pupil-teachers?

Crosskey: I can only speak of teachers as I have to deal with them.

Rigg: I asked you if you were aware of the fact?

Crosskey: I have heard it stated...the present supply of assistant teachers in this country is not a highly trained or a proper supply in an educational sense; how they are produced, the manufactory where they are made, and what they think of them there, does not come within my cognizance.

Rigg: I submit that that is hardly a reply to the question I put! (32)

Rigg had a similar disagreement with the Vice-President of the Bradford School Board, Mr. J. Hanson, who believed that no one under the age of eighteen should be engaged in
teaching. He commented:

I presume you are aware that that opinion is contrary to the great mass of opinion which is held by experienced persons? ... You know that Her Majesty's inspectors have commonly differed from that opinion?

Hanson: I know that many of them dislike the pupil-teacher system.

Rigg: That is not the question; I asked whether young persons under the age of eighteen can or cannot teach valuably in school? ... Is there anyone besides yourself in England, so far as you know, who holds the opinion that you have expressed with such sweeping generality?

Hanson: I do not know what all the people in England may say upon the subject.

Rigg: Do you know of anyone else that holds the same opinion?

Hanson: I know several persons who think similarly to myself generally, but I cannot state that they would distinctly phrase their expression as I have.

Rigg: Are you aware that H.M.I. have, as part of their duty, to hear pupil-teachers teach? ... Should they not be competent judges in a case of that sort?

Hanson: ... It is not my business to judge Her Majesty's inspectors.

Rigg: Are you aware that Mr. Fitch, one of the inspectors, holds an entirely different opinion from you?

Hanson: I did not know that.

Rigg: Are you not aware that Mr. Stewart, who is one of the most experienced of Her Majesty's inspectors, holds an entirely opposite opinion to you on that subject?

Hanson: I am quite ready to admit that many of Her Majesty's inspectors have spoken highly of the pupil-teacher system....

Rigg: If I were to say that many have found that trained young persons of sixteen or eighteen years of age can handle classes very much more efficiently than untrained persons of much superior knowledge and upwards of twenty one years of age, would you be somewhat surprised at that statement? ... With regard to the young people who have been at secondary schools and who have finished their preparatory education there, and then go to college to be trained, what would happen if they should discover that they had mistaken their vocation?

Hanson: I cannot tell what would happen.

Rigg: You do not think that it is at all desirable that there should have been any previous practice, with a view of ascertaining whether or not they were likely to develop into good teachers?

Hanson: There should be some practice before they finally settle as teachers.(33)

To another witness, Rigg expressed the view that pupil-teachers were not always given the best training by headmasters:

I may tell you that my own experience is that pupil-teachers are very often slighted where they belong to very large schools indeed, and that many of the best taught pupil-teachers have come from comparatively small schools, not seldom from rural schools. ... What I find in some of the very large and effective schools is that the pupil-teachers are made to contribute unduly to the education of the children, that the children are taught in school hours, and sometimes out of school hours, and that the headteacher and certified teacher of the school are so exhausted that they really do not pay adequate attention to pupil-teachers.(34)

The witness, C. Twiss, head of a British school in Warrington, agreed that some teachers
showed much enthusiasm for the training of pupil-teachers, although this added to the pressure on them and the Wesleyan teacher, J.H.Devonshire, similarly commented that the instruction imparted by pupil-teachers depended on the supervision they received and that they could be 'a most important factor in the teaching staff. (35)

A growing rift was however appearing in Methodist ranks. Opposition to Rigg, in general and on his educational stance in particular, was led by the METHODIST TIMES (under the editorship of Hugh Price Hughes) which was the organ of the 'Forward Movement' of young Methodists. It did not accept Rigg's view and made many remarks criticising him. Hughes reported in 1885, on Rigg's Inaugural, that it was worthy of his great reputation, but that 'it was a pity that he did not satisfy himself with reading extracts merely; two hours is a very long time to sit listening even to such an address'. (36) It did, nonetheless, recognise Rigg's abilities. After an article by Rigg in the WESLEYAN METHODIST MAGAZINE, criticising Congregationalism for its involvement in Politics, the METHODIST TIMES accepted his retraction with good grace:

Dr. Rigg is really one of the most amiable and catholic spirited of men. He never intended to wound anybody's feelings and is much grieved at the widespread pain and indignation which his words have caused. (37)

In 1887, the METHODIST TIMES castigated Rigg's Inaugural for its criticism of board schools:

Neither the majority of those who took part in the decisions of the Special Committee on Primary Education in December 1872, nor any considerable section of the Wesleyan community will sympathise with the depreciation of the board school on moral and religious grounds. The priest, of course, says 'godless', but the facts of our everyday life and increasing family and friendly associations with the institution, are convincing us all round that the Christian common school is not only a possibility for us, but that it is a fact becoming one of the most valuable features of our times. The people will take care that the Bible is there and also that the teacher has his proper status and influence. (38)

The METHODIST TIMES in 1888 severely criticised the Report of the Cross Commission, and Rigg's contribution in particular. Hugh Price Hughes wrote a leader, entitled, 'Will the Methodists be caught Napping?' which condemned the Majority Report:

The majority of the Commissioners have adopted suggestions which, if they ever became law, will enable Canon Gregory to carry out the fierce programme of the CHURCH TIMES. Already, under the provisions of the Act of 1870, thousands of sectarian schools have been established in villages and small towns, for the purpose, inter alia, of coercing Nonconformist children into the Ritualistic fold. The Act of 1870 was the most ingenious and successful method of establishing
and endowing the Episcopal Church that has been devised since the reign of Charles II. The concurrent endowment of the Roman Catholics and Wesleyan Methodists was tolerated, because those communities received only insignificant sums in comparison with the millions of public money poured into the Episcopal treasury. It might have been supposed that the militant clerics would have been satisfied with the enormous advantages and opportunities which the Act of 1870 gave them. The majority of the children of England were placed in their hands to be taught that Nonconformity is sin, that in the absence of a bishop there is no Church, and that outside the Episcopal Church there is no salvation. Moreover, Nonconformist children were taught these dogmas very largely at the expense of Nonconformist taxpayers. That surely might have satisfied even the editor of the CHURCH TIMES. But no; there was a fly in the pot of ointment. The national public schools established by school boards spread in all directions. Their superior efficiency, their Scriptural morality and their freedom from ecclesiastical bitterness and intolerance, commended them to the masses of the people. (39)

Hughes claimed that the Commission had been packed in order to 'buttress the sectarian schools' with enormous additional grants of public money.

The majority of the Royal Commissioners have done the work which was expected of them. They have listened to unjust and absurd attacks on board schools. They have judged suggestions for increased educational efficiency from the narrow standpoint of their effect on sectarian interests. The great question has not been how to secure the thorough education of the boys and girls of England, but how to secure the triumph of Canon Gregory and the ecclesiastical party. They have finally capped every previous performance by the astounding recommendation that sectarian schools, while still teaching sectarian formularies and still retained under private control, shall be supported by the rates, as well as endowed by Imperial taxes. Canon Gregory's triumph is complete ... But a considerable share of the glory is due to Cardinal Manning and Dr. Rigg, who have been his energetic and untiring lieutenants during the two year's campaign ... The extreme Sacerdotal party is already rejoicing at the prospect of crushing rural Nonconformity by the combined forces of Ritualism, Romanism and Wesleyanism. Is that rejoicing well founded? Does Dr. Rigg really represent the attitude of Wesleyan Methodism? He did not represent us in 1870. As soon as the lay representatives from the Districts assembled in the Special Committee, it was found that an overwhelming majority agreed with William Arthur. Officials of all sorts denounced Arthur in extraordinary terms, but the Methodist people supported him. Dr. Rigg was in a hopeless minority. He has however persuaded the Royal Commissioners that Methodists have changed their opinions during the last eighteen years and are now enthusiastic supporters of denominational education.

The Methodist Conference of 1888 had constituted an Extraordinary Committee to look at any Government proposals on education. This was to consist of the Committee of Privileges, the Education Committee and one minister and one layman elected from each of the September District meetings. The METHODIST TIMES criticised the existing Education Committee as 'people generally interested in a denominational school and therefore predisposed to look at
the question from the narrow standpoint of their own school.' (40) The paper called on the Wesleyans to be vigilant and not to allow a Committee to be created, which was composed of persons 'whose local interest in a handful of Methodist schools blind them to the vast National and evangelical interests at stake'. It concluded:

Nearly every position of influence in the Established Church is now in the hands of the extreme Sacerdotal party. They despair of weaning the adult population from the evangelical and Protestant principles in which they have been trained. But they believe - not without cause - that if they are allowed to do what they like for the next 20 years with the boys and girls of England, they will be able once more to lay this country at the feet of a triumphant priesthood. If our ministers and people do not wish to promote that medieval reaction, they must take care who are elected on the Extraordinary Committee. That Committee will be the voice and arm of Wesleyan Methodism when ecclesiasticism renews its attack upon civil and religious freedom.

The METHODIST TIMES also claimed:

If we had responded more promptly to the appeals of William Arthur and declared boldly for unsectarian Bible schools, the 'year of grace' would not have been given to the party of persecuting intolerance, school boards would have been established everywhere and the sacred rights of conscience would have been protected even in small towns and villages... We greatly regret that Canon Gregory and Dr. Rigg have forced this controversy upon us... We would not injure a solitary hair on the head of a Ritualist or a Romanist. We would not restrict in the slightest degree the liberty and the rights of priests and their friends. They may teach what they like - at their own expense. They may teach what they like - to those who wish to be taught by them. But we protest with all our might against the cruel law which enables these priests to teach their dogmas at our expense and to our children. Thousands of Nonconformists are forced to send their children to Ritualist schools. Thousands of Nonconformists are forced to pay for the maintenance of such schools; and now they actually want to support these sectarian establishments out of the rates as well as out of Imperial taxes. (41)

Two weeks later, the METHODIST TIMES quoted Isaac Holden's criticism that Forster had informed him that he would not have attempted to carry the 'objectionable clauses' in the 1870 Act, had he not been influenced by Dr. Rigg:

It is because we do not want the present Government... to repeat Mr. Forster's disastrous mistake, that we have with great reluctance referred to Dr. Rigg at all in this controversy. As it is our misfortune to differ from him on several questions of importance, we greatly dislike giving this discussion an apparently personal turn. We yield to none in our high appreciation of Dr. Rigg's great ability and his special service to Methodism. If it had been possible, we would have kept silence in grateful memory of the aid he once rendered to enlightened and progressive Methodism. But Dr. Rigg has gone out of his way to give the sectarian party strenuous support and he has laboured with incredible ardour for two long years...
to convince the Royal Commission and the Government that sectarian education must be strengthened and perpetuated. With the best intentions and the purest motives, he misled Mr. Forster and did rural Methodism irreparable injury. We dare not stand by and allow him to mislead Lord Salisbury. We must not repeat the mistake we made in 1870. (42)

A week later, the journal commented:

We believe Dr. Rigg himself would prefer a national and unsectarian system, were he not persuaded that a national system means, in the absence of rival, sectarian schools, an utterly godless system. The overwhelming majority of his fellow Methodists have just declared that they do not agree with him, but think, with Mr. Arthur, that we may have healthy, Scriptural morality, apart altogether from priestly control. (43)

In both the CONTEMPORARY REVIEW and the METHODIST TIMES in February and March 1889, Hugh Price Hughes wrote a damning article on 'Canon Gregory's Educational Policy'.

He criticised the sectarian system of the Majority Report as a 'dismal educational failure in the country districts, as well as a gross injustice to Nonconformists'. He went on:

As a sincere lover of the Church of England and as one much indebted to her theologians and devotional writers, it is most painful to me to publish these facts. But when Canon Gregory poses as the champion of the Bible and of religious liberty, bare justice compels a summary reference to the fact that, from the beginning of the century until now, it is the party he champions that has persistently imperilled the Christian character of our elementary education, by demanding too much and by refusing at every turn to co-operate with religious Nonconformists. The demand for a purely secular system would never have arisen if the exclusiveness and intolerance of Canon Gregory's party had not driven catholic-minded Christians to despair. Even now - although almost irreparable mischief has been wrought by this uncatholic temper - even now, as the Rev. Charles Williams of Accrington stated before the Commission, if there was a school with unsectarian Christian teaching within reach of every child, it would 'very likely silence altogether the demand for purely secular schools.' The only persons who have it in their power to drive this country into what is called a 'godless system' are those clerical extremists who, by their extravagant demands and irreconcilable attitude obstruct the progress of a reasonable, moderate and conciliatory policy.

The bitterness of many Wesleyans against the Anglican Church is apparent in Hughes's words. He condemned the 'unsuitable buildings, incapable teachers, low exemption standards and lax inspection' and the 'most unjust favouritism' which were shown to the 'petted and pampered clerical schools':

(The board school) being entirely detached from the machinery of the parish, its headmaster is not a hewer of wood and drawer of water for the parish priest. He is under no obligation, as part of his salary, to play the harmonium at Church and do other little odd jobs for the vicar, who holds his fate in the hollow of his hand, who can dismiss him with a word as easily as he dismisses an under nurse. The
board school has a 'single eye' to learning. It has not 'one eye askew' in a very different direction... These schools are 'the nurseries for Church principles' not for effective popular education. School board schools have no raison d'être, except the educational well-being of the people. But the National Society has other fish to fry, and as we have seen, the educational fish of the poor villages are consequently badly cooked. When two ride on horseback, one must ride behind, and the question which this country must very soon settle is whether Canon Gregory or the English child shall ride behind on the horse of education ... There are today 10,000 parishes in which the children of Non conformists are driven by the direct compulsion of Mr. Mundella's Act into the private and uncontrolled day-schools of the sectarian party. Dwellers in great cities have little idea what is going on day by day in the villages of England ... We ask for the Bible of God and they give us the catechism of man ...(44)

When the Commission finally reported in 1888, Rigg in fact toured the country, defending his position. Speaking at Banbury in October, Rigg defended the Commission findings:

The Report was disappointing in many respects. Still, it had not produced any recommendations in favour of secularism, nor of free schools, although one of the ablest advocates of secular and free schools had been examined for eighteen hours; the Commission could not recommend such sweeping and impracticable schemes, for they were against the facts of life in England ... There was the impression that there was to be a revival of the building grant, but that was a mistake. There was a proposal for a grant in lieu of the school pence, by which the Methodists would be fined simply because of the higher fees they charged and which would have been a great gain to the Established Church and the Roman Catholics. (45)

Rigg said that he had opposed Gregory and Manning over this issue, which proved that the suggestion of an agreement between them was absurd.

In November, he spoke to 500 Wesleyan teachers at the Wesleyan Teachers' Association, claiming that he had foreseen the necessity for board schools as far back as 1857, and that he had been a party of one, when he first advocated the division of the country into school board districts:

On the Commission he had been accused of belonging to a party of three. It was a pure invention -fortunately an invention which could be refuted by the Division lists. Denominational schools received Government grants for teaching reading, writing and arithmetic, not for religious instruction. They received payment for work done. Certain uninspected sectarian schools received grants from South Kensington for science teaching and he had never found a secularist who would stop those grants. What was the difference? (46)

He repudiated that he was in favour of building grants, pointing that he had caused their rejection in 1870. He was in favour of grants for 'rebuilding' where the Government, after formerly approving of schools, required expensive alterations. He also spent some time in his speech criticising Hugh Price Hughes's 'slanders' upon him.
One Wesleyan teacher, William Dalby, defended Rigg, in a letter to the METHODIST TIMES:

Your well-known and very useful 'audacity' has, for once, carried you too far. You say 'there can be no doubt that immense official pressure is being brought upon Methodist day-schoolteachers to resist the movement on behalf of unsectarian education.' This is news to me, although I attended the Manchester meeting. Neither Dr. Rigg, nor any other official, is guilty of this charge. The truth lies the other way - the teachers brought the pressure to bear upon Dr. Rigg, with the object of learning from him the facts and opinions respecting the Royal Commission. To me it seemed that a more calm, thoughtful, unrhetorical and dispassionate address than the Doctor gave us could hardly have been uttered. You mistake Wesleyan teachers, if you think they all advocate undenominational education only. Most of them, like teachers in general, can see that the settlement of 1870 - with its two classes of elementary schools - is the best for them. Besides, it appears both fair and just to the country at large, inasmuch as it provides for all our sects, teachers of definite religious convictions, and by furnishing many such men for the board schools, it, to some extent, Christianises the whole national system ... I have little faith in undenominational religion ... it means no religion at all, or utter indifference, or the blank misery of Agnosticism.

Rigg justified his work on the Royal Commission in his Inaugural Address to Westminster students in February 1889, saying that he had drawn up a resolution, which he privately submitted to several friends, for bringing all Voluntary schools under the jurisdiction of the school boards, and for making school board districts universal. But this could not be brought forward before the Commission, because the Government was already discussing the Local Government Bill. He said that he very much regretted that this Bill's passage through Parliament limited the deliberations of the Commission:

It tied it down too rigidly, so as to make it not very much more than an analysis of the mere scholastic efficiency or otherwise of the existing Education Acts and of the Codes of the past and present.

He complained that he had been 'grossly and widely misrepresented' in connection with the Royal Commission:

Nor is it anything strange ... if a few Methodists have made free with facts and with me in some personal attacks, which, I dare say, were not maliciously intended. It is a high and rare fruit of Christian civilisation when public writers or speakers have learnt, in discussing what are called burning questions, neither to say nor to imply anything for which they have not good evidence; to abstain from adopting or circulating, as if they were credible statements, injurious rumours which might serve their turn to report as matters of fact, but which rest on no responsible authority; to eschew religiously ... mere partisan gossip and invention. ... I have been accused, as a member of the Royal Commission, of departing from the principles to which I was pledged, and of uniting in a sort of plot with others against those principles. I doubt whether, after the consideration
and discussion of the subject during the last few months, these imputations will be believed by many Methodists, whatever partisans belonging to other denominations may be prepared to believe. The charges are not only baseless - they are happily contradicted, point by point, by the division lists published in the Report - they are utterly false. (49)

He admits that on one point alone, to sanction payment of money from the rates to help denominational schools, he gave no vote, having been absent when the matter was discussed, and yet accepting it with his final signature on the Report. He had not written any reservation from the decision:

The recommendation ... was adopted during the sessions in May, which were held on three days in the week of our Second London annual District Meeting, during the four long days of whose session even a more peremptory duty than that which bound me to the Commission compelled me to be in attendance. The recommendation is one to give power to school boards ... to contribute aid from the rates to Voluntary schools on suitable conditions to be agreed upon. I did not, in signing the report of the Commission, make any reservation against that solitary and special point, because no point of principle compelled me to do so. The form of the recommendation was not exactly to my mind. (50)

He says that he had himself drawn up a resolution to help Voluntary schools which were 'unfairly pressed and overweighted in their attempt to meet local educational demands by their having, with strictly limited resources to compete with the unlimited resources of the rate-endowed board schools.':

My own proposal was that there should be school districts and school boards throughout the whole country; that all Voluntary schools everywhere should be correlated to the school boards; that the school boards should have the liberty to help the Voluntary schools out of the rates to an amount not exceeding 5s. per scholar in average attendance per year - the average charge on the rates throughout the country for board schools being 20s. per scholar ... and on the other hand that school boards should have certain powers of oversight in regard to the management of Voluntary schools.

The Majority Report read:

The cost of the maintenance of voluntary schools has been largely increased by the rivalry of rate supported schools. If the power of the purse upon which the school boards have to draw has involved the managers of voluntary schools in a large and it may be, uncalled-for, expenditure, there is good reason why that purse should be made to contribute to the thus increased cost of the voluntary system. We therefore recommend that the local educational authority be empowered to supplement from local rates the voluntary subscriptions given to the support of every public State-aided school in their district to an amount equal to these subscriptions, provided it does not exceed the amount of 10s. for each child in average attendance. (51)

Rigg did not like this proposal, as it offered too much from the rates and it made no demand
for administrative oversight for the board. (52) He said that he had been pledged for over sixteen years to this school board oversight. He had officially called for board powers to oversee sanitary conditions, the conscience clause and other complaints which might arise from parents.

The claims and counter-claims about Rigg's participation in the Commission need to be investigated. There was undoubtedly a good relationship between Rigg, Manning and Gregory on the Commission. Correspondence did take place between Rigg and Manning, but little of this appears extant. Manning and Canon Gregory, representing the Roman Catholics and Anglicans, had formed an alliance to press the government for more school assistance, as early as 1883. The Wesleyans would not join this, as they saw any change as antagonising the secularists into demanding the end of State aid to denominational schools. Rigg met Manning on 20 March 1883 and the only evidence of their discussion comes from a letter, written on the following day by the Cardinal, thanking him for a copy of his book:

I shall read (it) with great interest; all the greater for our conversation the other night. With all who believe in our Divine Master I have a true sympathy; and with Wesleyans, above all Nonconformists, I have a Christian brotherhood, for I believe that they gather while others scatter in our Lord's field. (53)

The 'alliance' was mentioned in a letter from Mundella, the then Vice President of the Education Committee, to his President, Lord Carlington, in June of that year:

Cardinal Manning and Canon Gregory have struck up an arrangement (in which they have endeavoured, but unsuccessfully, to include the Wesleyans) to agitate for increased grants to voluntary schools. A series of articles have appeared in the NINETEENTH CENTURY from the pens of these two ecclesiastics making out the best case they can find for their claims. These have been very effectively replied to by the Rev. R.W.Dale ... who not only showed with great force and clearness the injustice of the demand, but also the consequences likely to follow upon it, viz. a renewed agitation for the abolition of all grants to schools set up by various religious bodies. (54)

Manning at least saw Rigg as a fellow traveller, if not a firm ally. After the appointment of the Royal Commission on 28 December 1885, the Cardinal had written to Bishop Clifford of Clifton:

The other members are Mr. Mundella; Dr. Rigg, Wesleyan but SOUND; Dr. Dale of Birmingham, UNSOUND; Mr. Alderson SOUND; UNCERTAIN, Lord Beauchamp, Lord Harrowby, Bishop Temple. The Denominationalists are in a large majority. (55)

Co-operation between the 'majority' commissioners reached its height when the Final Report
was under consideration. Manning wrote to Lord Harrowby in November 1887 suggesting a special meeting of like-minded members:

I hope, if it be in your power, that you will come to the National School Rooms on Saturday at 4 o'clock to meet Dr. Morse and Dr. Rigg. I am writing also to Mr. Talbot and the Duke of Norfolk. We must be carefully prepared. (56)

After this, whenever a key issue was about to be debated at the Commission, it became their regular practice to meet beforehand to discuss their approach. These meetings took place at the National Society's Rooms in the old Central School Buildings in Westminster, and at the meetings a united, denominationalist front was ironed out, to be presented when the Commission met. (57) Lord Sandford even styled the group the 'Caucus' in a letter to Manning in December 1888. (58) Rigg was certainly a member of this group. Manning wrote to Harrowby on 25 March 1888 about one disagreement they had had with Rigg, who objected to 'passes and statistical results and publication' (59) The united, denominational front broke down however over the call for Rate Aid to be given to Voluntary schools. The proposal was instituted by Manning and was supported wholeheartedly by Sandford, but many members would not accept this. Some did not wish to embarrass Salisbury's Ministry, which was steering the Local Government Bill through Parliament at that time, as the proposals suggested that new local governments should be given control of educational rate grants. Rigg actually claimed in his 1889 Inaugural that the Local Government Bill 'made high statesmanship in the Report almost an impossibility'.(60)

The record of the divisions of the Royal Commission do show frequent co-operation between Rigg and the Caucus. Of the ninety divisions in which Dr. Rigg voted, he supported Gregory and Manning on fifty one occasions, he voted with Canon Gregory on a further twenty seven votes. He opposed both Manning and Gregory on only four issues and voted against Gregory on only seven occasions. (on one vote, neither Gregory nor Manning were present) Moreover, his rare opposition to Canon Gregory came over most contentious issues, on which he could not be expected to support the Church party. When, for example, Gregory himself proposed the insertion of the following clause, seeking the end of the Conscience Clause, Rigg joined those who threw out the suggestion:

We have already mentioned the conscientious objections to the 14th section of the Act of 1870, known as the Cowper Temple Clause, which are entertained by many zealous friends of education. This section appears to us to exclude the
mode of teaching to the benefit of which the Christian Church has borne invariable testimony. The exclusion from rate-supported schools of distinctive formularies, though its ill effect is kept in check by the voluntary schools, where no such prohibition exists, cannot but grievously interfere with the proper teaching of revealed truth, and hamper the Christian training essential to the highest training of man. Moreover, the clause is felt by many to be a serious violation of religious liberty, and entirely opposed to the principle that the ratepayers who provide the money for establishing and maintaining board schools are to govern them. (61)

Rigg not surprisingly opposed both Gregory and Manning over the suggestion that building grants should be renewed to denominational schools, as he had originally agitated for their abolition in 1870. The proposal of 1888 read:

As in consequence of the Act of 1870, our school system has been extended over the whole country, the reasons which gave rise to section 96 of that Act appear to be no longer applicable. The beneficent stimulus to school building given by the year of grace has fulfilled its object; and we see no reason why the restriction upon building grants shall now be continued. We therefore recommend the repeal of section 96... leaving it open to voluntary as well as board schools, to enjoy the advantage accorded to them prior to the Act. (62)

The proposal was rejected.

On one vote, Rigg had personal reasons for opposing both Manning and Gregory. He had spoken on the Commission against the introduction of compulsory History into the school curriculum. He had told one witness:

I happened to be a member of the London School Board when we had to consider whether we would teach History at all, and unfortunately I belonged to that maligned committee which brought in a report to the effect that History could not be taught in the schools of the London School Board, but our difficulty was as to the question of religion. How far do you think that difficulty might be surmounted in schools, in communion with a thorough systematic and consecutive study of History?

The witness, Mr. W.B. Adams replied that he saw the difficulty to arise from the text books, which had become almost standard, set texts, but which 'imparted a spirit of bitterness with regard to religious persecution.' (63) Rigg had maintained a scepticism about the subject, and when a proposal was made, during the final divisions of the Commission, he unsuccessfully opposed the suggestion that:

Geography and History are not placed on the same footing in the present Code, and as a consequence, the attention which they respectively receive as subjects of instruction is very unequal. While Geography, as a class subject, is taught in the majority of our elementary schools with increased skill and by methods which interest as well as inform the mind of the learners, History has dropped out of the timetable of all but a few schools. The restriction of the latter subject to the Fifth and higher standards has greatly discouraged its systematic teaching, and checks the diffusion of a branch of instruction which not only properly forms part
of the curriculum of the elementary school, but in other countries is regarded as obligatory. (64)

Both Manning and Gregory supported Dr. Rigg in the two proposals which he made to the Final Report. The first was accepted by thirteen votes to seven votes and reads:

As to the claim for the compulsory introduction of a conscience clause into training colleges, it may be doubted whether many who have made, or echoed, such a demand have formed a distinct conception of what would be the actual effect of a conscience clause as applied to students residing in training colleges - a question, it will be observed, wholly distinct from that of the conscience clause as applied to day scholars. It would mean, in the first place, that no student resident in the college who, on the grounds of conscience, made objection so to do, should be required to attend any lectures or pursue any course of study of a directly religious character, included in the college course, and that every student would have a right to object to any specifically religious instruction, which might be incidentally given in connexion with the teaching received from the college staff. But it would also mean that no student, who claimed exemption on the ground of conscience, should be required to be present at any act of common worship, public or collegiate, as, for example, at family prayers in the college, morning and evening. Such liberty of exemption, it is evident, would destroy all unity of Christian family life, whether in a denominational or an undenominational college, and would interfere fatally with the framework of ordinary domestic and moral discipline, which, more perhaps than anything else, by its gentle and continual influence, secures order and Christian propriety in the college. Even more far reaching would be the operation of a conscience clause, such as would satisfy the demand of a few representatives of extreme secularist principles, by securing, without respect of creed or religious opinion, free access of all candidates who seek training as teachers, to the advantages of residence in all residential training colleges. A conscience clause, to meet this demand, would preclude, in the maintenance of college discipline, all appeal to Divine Revelation or to the law of God. (65)

Rigg's second proposal was defeated by one vote, in spite of the support of Gregory and Manning. It again was concerned with teacher training, and called for:

the adaptation of arrangements so as to meet the case of the two very different classes of students for whom these colleges are meant to provide, viz., the 'persons of superior education' referred to by Mr. Cumin, and those Queen's scholars who now fail to enter training colleges, in many cases because of the low place they take in class lists at the entrance examination. The latter class would require the same careful instruction which is given to students in residential colleges; the former, having never been pupil teachers, would require much less instruction in some subjects of general information, and much more instruction and practice in the art of teaching. (66)

Rigg made one further proposal to make half time exemption of children dependent on them reaching Standard III. This received the support of only Lyulph Stanley, Canon Gregory being absent for the vote. (67)

Thus, if one accepts Dr. Rigg's assertion that there was no 'bloc' on the Commission, one can at least understand the fears of other members of the Wesleyan Connexion, who continued to
look on the Church of England and Roman Catholicism with great suspicion.

After publication of the Final Report, Manning suggested to Sandford that the 'Caucus' should hold its own conference to promote their own proposals. He secured the support of some leading Catholic laymen and wrote on 6 December 1888:

>This, with a bishop or two will be enough for us. You and Dr. Morse can pick men from all your Dioceses. Dr. Rigg could also find a Wesleyan or other Nonconformist. We shall want three or four short and sharp resolutions, carefully prepared and entrusted to well-chosen hands ... London is spiked by Canterbury. But he has not changed. (68)

The suggestion was actually quashed by Harrowby, who thought that the Government was already preparing legislation. However, the 'Caucus' did defend their stance in print. Rigg published his 1889 Inaugural, and Cardinal Manning wrote a Tract on 'Fifty Reasons why the Voluntary schools of England ought to share the School Rates' which called for Rate Aid within a system of County Council control of education. The Majority Report, which Rigg had accepted, had included a vague suggestion of Rate-aid.

Now Manning looked for a system which was 'equal, uniform and common to all.' He emphasised that this would safeguard the schools against a centralised, and sectarian, system of education on the French pattern and that the only alternative would be 'slow defeat and extinction' for the voluntary schools. (69)

Copies were sent to all members of the 'Caucus' as well as members of the Government and of those who wrote to Manning in appreciation. Rigg gave the most enthusiastic welcome, in a letter of 17 December 1888. He asked for further copies to distribute among friends and totally supported the views expressed:

> Your 'Fifty Reasons' are a masterpiece. ... It is admirably clear and arranged in most logical and effective order, with cumulative force. How can you get the whole well before the general Christian public of educationalists, and into the minds of statesmanlike and far-sighted men generally? I wish you could oblige your intemperate Temperance coadjutor, our Methodist firebrand, Hugh Price Hughes, to study the series. ... Our Methodist voluntaries are beginning to recover courage and vigour. Unfortunately Gladstonianism fiercely divides us - and Gladstonianism among us just now means almost everything that is unscrupulous, latitudinarian and secularist. I believe that henceforth the movement must, with deepening hold and growing volume of conviction, be towards your goal - as indicated throughout your Series, but especially in the later articles. The old Secularism is all but dead-beat; the Birmingham of 1869 is behind us; in a true sense we may now 'forget those things that are behind' and
'press' onwards towards the mark of a Christian national education. In this, thank God - and also in much more - I am one with your Eminence. How I long increasingly for holiness and continual fellowship with God in Christ. - Believe me, dear Cardinal Manning, yours with great respect and Christian affection, James H. Rigg (70)

Under Rigg's influence, the Wesleyan Education Committee dispatched a Memorandum to the Committee of Council on Education in December 1888 in answer to the findings of the Royal Commission. This approved of the curriculum outlined in the final Majority Report, but believed that the Minority Report's definition of the minimum curriculum of a village school was regarded as 'impracticable'. (71) They did approve of the proposal to introduce History as a class subject, and called for a Syllabus to be laid down. On attendance, the Commission had recommended that Registers should be marked before the religious teaching and observance began. The Wesleyan Memorandum saw some problems unless a separate classroom were provided in every school for the children whose parents objected to religious instruction according to the Conscience Clause. (72) The Memorandum of 1888 welcomed the opening of the Inspectorate to teachers and the proposal to secure time for 'a more leisurely examination of schools' and more frequent occasional visits by H.M.I.. It also applauded the support for the pupil-teacher system, stating that 'the preliminary training of young people at the most impressionable age for the practice of teaching tends in very high degree to fit them for the exercise of a vocation which, though founded on scientific principles, is pre-eminently an art requiring experience and practice.' (73) It claimed that the system created the most 'unfailing and trustworthy supply' of teachers for the elementary schools. The Committee did though call for 'very little of their time' to be spent in actual teaching in their first year, and rather more to be spent in observing lessons. They also suggested that the pupil-teachership should be split into two portions, so that there would be the opportunity for some to leave at sixteen, if they did not wish to pursue the career. They did accept the Commission's recommendation to revert to a minimum age of thirteen for the pupil-teachers. They also praised the Commission for its suggestions on grants:

The Wesleyan Education Committee, which for a number of years past has repeatedly urged upon the Government the desirability of relaxing the pressure of the system of payment by results, and of increasing the Grant on average attendance, strongly approve in general of the recommendations of the Royal Commission in regard to the Parliamentary Grant. In its judgement, neither the fixed Grant nor the variable Grant should be less than 10s. This recommendation will of course be inoperative unless the 17s.6d limit be removed. (74)
They also showed concern at increased costs which would be incurred by Voluntary schools, because of the 'general raising of requirements in regard to staff and curriculum' demanded by the Commission Report, when, in rate-aided schools, 'these requirements would present little or no difficulty.' Rigg also continued to maintain a firm defence against the worst elements of Church of England manipulation of schools. In his Inaugural of 1889, Rigg complained:

In some parts of the country hateful bigotry is taught in public inspected schools of a certain class. A catechism of bigotry and intolerance, worthy of the spirit of Spanish Popery in its worst times, is taught to infants in some Church of England schools... to destroy our own truly unsectarian day-schools - schools which are the most effectual protest and the best defence against such blinded and worse than dark-age bigotry - seems to me to be suicidal blundering. Not only are our own schools the best, they may often be the only defence. A board school in a rural parish is very likely to be the safe stronghold of clerical exclusiveness and intolerance. (75)

He also asserted:

The Wesleyan contingent of the national educational machinery is but one thirtieth of the whole. It is true that the Wesleyan Education Committee has, from the beginning, exercised an influence in questions of public education out of all proportion to the actual dimensions of the educational work under its care. This has been owing to its intermediate position and its freedom from violent prejudices or extreme aims. But there could not well be a Wesleyan Day-school Department after there had ceased to be any Wesleyan day-schools. (76)

In 1889 a New Code was laid on the table of the House of Commons. This accepted the Majority and Minority recommendations that ten square feet and not eight square feet should be the minimum accommodation for each child in average attendance. It also proposed that day training colleges be opened, so that more teachers would be trained. The staffing ratio was reduced from one adult assistant to eighty children to one per seventy children. The Code also tried to relax the rigours of 'payment by results', by ending individual examination, except to ascertain the school's general efficiency. To give voluntary schools greater financial security, the Code proposed a fixed grant of 12s. per child in average attendance. When the Code was published in April 1889, it was met by a storm of opposition from denominationalists. They considered that the modifications in payment by results would by no means compensate them for the extra expenditure which the rest of the Code entailed. The SCHOOL GUARDIAN for several weeks repeated the charge that it demanded increased expenditure, without providing sufficient increased grant. Three Roman Catholic Bishops
prepared a memorial demanding its complete withdrawal, while the National Society demanded its suspension for at least a year. There was particular Anglican opposition to the 17s.6d limit on grants, which was not changed by the Code. Gregory argued that the new requirements would sound the death-knell of many voluntary schools:

To raise the requirement for each child to ten square feet diminishes the accommodation by 20%, and must compel a board in many places which have hitherto defended themselves from it;...it will secure the erection of numberless more board schools. (77)

There was also strong opposition to the institution of day training colleges. The Majority Report had suggested an experiment with this, but the Code would bring a proliferation. Sandford in particular feared that 'there is a great danger lest the country should (be) flooded with a large body of irreligious teachers'. (78)

Dr. Rigg was similarly shocked by the proposal. He had relied for many years on the personal integrity of teachers and their own religious influence, rather than any legislative demands. As he proclaimed in 1889:

so long as the training of teachers in earnestly Christian Training Colleges secures a supply and succession of Christian teachers, teachers trained and competent to give interesting and effective Bible lessons, it may be hoped that the Board schools of England may escape the fate of what were once the unsectarian schools of the United States, but which have become secular, in many instances absolutely godless, schools. (79)

However, he had begun to have reservations on this stance. If, he claimed, religious instruction was left, for all future generations, absolutely in the hands of teachers, it might indeed disappear. On the existing teachers, he trusted them as 'true unsectarian Christian teachers' implicitly:

But where were our present teachers trained? How and from whom did they learn to give Bible lessons adapted to the character and needs of the children? It is... from the Voluntary schools and the Christian Training Colleges ... Do away with Voluntary schools, do away with family Christian Training Colleges, and whence then is the national supply to be obtained? The distinctively Christian schools, under the direct inspiration and influence of the Christian Churches; and the family Training Colleges, conducted under strictly Christian direction ... these are the sources from which the whole education of the country, including the school board system has been replenished with Christian influence ...Let these be done away, and the present harmony is likely before long to give place to discord. Instead of organised and sustained Christian influence, there will be, as regards religious instruction, untrained individualism. (80)

After several meetings of the Education Sub-Committee, the Wesleyan Education Committee
dispatched a Memorandum to the Council on Education in April 1889. It was again sent under the signature of Dr. Rigg and David Waller. They approved of many of the changes, although they did not like a restriction that pupil-teachers had to pass Standard VI and have been in school for two years before being accepted. They also showed concern at the definitions in the New Code (Article 72) on minimum school staff, and claimed that each Assistant teacher should be allowed to count for sixty pupils, and that each pupil-teacher should count for 'not less than thirty five'. (81) A similar concern was shown at the new regulations on premises, particularly the call for there to be ten square feet of internal area for each pupil in average attendance. They saw no objection to this for new schools, although were worried that this would be demanded 'in every case'. Finally, they showed concern at the demand that H.M.I. Reports on schools should be published. The Memorandum claimed:

The requirement... is, in the opinion of the Committee, highly unjust and objectionable. The compulsory publication of such Report is more or less objectionable from the Managers' point of view, but what the Committee desire particularly to insist upon is that it is exceedingly unfair to the Teacher. In the case of an unfavourable Report, which, it must be remembered, may not always have been merited, the Managers, in order to put themselves right with the public, will probably feel it to be necessary at once to dismiss the Teacher, without affording him the opportunity either of justifying himself or of securing a more favourable Report... The Report of Her Majesty's Inspector has hitherto been regarded as a confidential document which might well be a medium of special suggestions to the Teachers or Managers in regard to the conduct of the School. The requirement in question would destroy the confidential character of the Report, and would do away with the special advantages in the way of suggestions to which the Committee have referred. (82)

The Vice-President of Council did respond to some of these complaints. He declared that the demands on minimum area would not be applied to existing schools. However, the Government later decided to abandon the whole of this New Code and revert to the old Code operative from 1888.

When the succeeding Code was introduced to the Commons in 1890, it had responded to some of the Wesleyan criticisms. The H.M.I. Report would now be open to inspection under considerable restriction. (83) It would not be widely published, and Rigg wrote again in April 1890 to the Council on Education asking that it should only be available to 'subscribers and parents of scholars.' (84) He also repeated the objection to the 17s.6d limitation, claiming that 'the apparent benefits of the Code in respect of increased liberality will be frustrated in the case of many schools' so long as it remained.
However, the New Code gave considerably more financial help. As in 1889, variable grants were retained for class subjects and attendance grants were replaced by a large 'principal grant' for each child in average attendance. It was to be either 12s. or 14s. and there would also be a 'discipline and organization grant' of 1s. or 1s.6d per child. There was an insistence that the discipline and organization grant was not a revamped 'Merit Grant', but a grant for moral tone and atmosphere. Minimum staffing requirements were increased, though not as much as in the 1889 Code. The building requirements were rephrased and were now stated as a general rule about the necessity of healthy, adequately ventilated, well lit schoolrooms. If they fulfilled these requirements, existing schoolrooms with only eight square feet per child would still be regarded as satisfactory. All new schools had to conform to the ten square feet rule. There was in addition a special grant of £10 for small schools which had a population district of less than 500, within a two-mile radius of the school. The 17s.6d restriction however was not altered. Chamberlain made it clear that the Liberal Unionists would oppose any attempt to raise this - and Salisbury depended on their support in the Commons. (85)

Nevertheless, the denominationalists were disarmed by the extra grants.

Inspector Mawbey reported in 1890, that the new Code would give relief from the 'many objectionable and irritating provisions' contained in the former Code, although much still depended on the way the H.M.I.s administered the new regulations. He welcomed the abolition of the 'merit Mark', which damaged the 'professional reputations of many teachers':

Government grants were not commensurate with the efficiency of many schools; and Voluntary schools in general, and perhaps our own, in particular, were, by plausible and unfair comparisons, injured in public estimation. That the Voluntary schools were under serious disadvantages as compared with board schools, the following will show: - Nearly all the school board buildings are new, or nearly new, and they were built and fitted in accordance with plans approved by the Government. The great majority of Voluntary school buildings are comparatively old and are not so well designed and fitted. A portion of the Government grant made to a school has, for some years past, depended upon the 'Merit Mark' awarded by the Inspector... Many schools of high educational efficiency have obtained only the 'Good' mark, while many others of the same degree have obtained the 'Excellent' and the teachers of the former schools have stood before the world as inferior to the teachers of the latter. (86)

In the following year he praised the New Code more highly:

That the effects are beneficial is undoubted. The former tedious individual examination has given place to a not less thorough, but a fairer system of
examination by sample; classification of the children for examinations at the discretion of the teacher has replaced classification according to age; the 'Merit Mark has been abolished; the carrying out of the peculiar notions of certain inspectors has been made more difficult; and a freer hand has been given to teachers with regard to the subjects taught. At the same time, the amount of grant given per child has not been reduced. (87)

Meanwhile, there had been enormous friction within Wesleyan Methodism over its educational policy. The 1889 Annual Meeting saw open division. The chairman reported:

> It amazes us sometimes to observe how some of our modern leaders, whilst insisting that Methodism should recognise her manifold responsibilities, stop short of this one urgent duty, the importance of which would seem at least as evident as some of the new departures, but I would make the development of Wesleyan elementary education an indispensable feature of our 'Forward Movement'.... The dividing line between the supporters of Methodist education and their critics was just this - some most feared Sacerdotalism and others most feared godlessness, as the greatest danger ahead. (88)

The Rev. G. Oliver said that religion was the salt of true education and it was 'absurd to talk of using the salt-cellar only on Sundays,' while Mr. T. Osborne commented that they were imperilling their dignity by 'parading minor differences and posing before the world as a house divided against itself.' The sentiment was in fact reflected in a speech by Rigg at Shepherd's Bush in July, when he maintained that they were a very amiable and brotherly set of people, but every now and then, some members of the family lose their temper'. (89)

At the 1889 Conference, Rigg put forward a call to the Government to create a board in relation to the new County Councils, thereby superseding the school board system in the villages. He told the meeting that they had never intended that there should be a board in every village, and if this had occurred, it would have simply been a Church of England arrangement for maintaining their Church schools out of the rates. The County Councils made it possible to have an adequate arrangement throughout the country, and the Education Committee unanimously supported him.

He claimed that the intention of the 1872 Resolutions was to demand large educational districts; the aim was to obtain an undenominational school in every district, under electoral government.:

> But when ratepayers' government was brought home in that way, were they to say that it was not to be done in a particular mode, not to be done, because the districts were not called 'school board districts', or the schools 'school board schools'? They might leave it open as to the particular phrase to be used, but
what he contended for was that there should be suitable districts throughout the whole country. (90)

He was opposed by the Rev. J. R. Hargreaves, who condemned any proposal to hand over children to County Councils which were elected for 'sanitary and other purposes'. (91) A Mr. Myers claimed that it would be a mistake to trust such large educational monies to 'comparatively irresponsible parties, who were not qualified, in an educational sense. Hughes again opposed Rigg on this issue. He told the Conference that he was prepared to accept a delay in the summoning of the Special Committee until Government proposals were published, but that in the meantime the Education Committee must take no action on its own initiative, in the name of Methodism. He claimed that the unilateral action that they had taken on the New Code of 1889 was very questionable:

Their Committee was very much more committed to the denominational system of education than the Connexion at large. In the nature of things, men on one side naturally gravitated towards a Committee which had that work to do. But the Committee did not represent the opinion of the great majority of their people. It would be unwise for that Committee to commit them on that great question before the Representative Committee had been called together. Questions might be determined in the New Code entirely opposed to the sentiments of Methodism. There could be no objection to any action of the Committee if the matters were non-contentious. But with the one-sided evidence given before the Royal Commission, the Government were led to suppose that Dr. Rigg represented Methodism. It was almost impossible to avoid that conclusion, and therefore if, in any projected changes in the Code there were proposals with which they could not generally agree, the Education Committee should not be allowed to approach the Government. (92)

His words led to a major argument within the Conference. Waller complained that he could not conceive 'anything more unworthy of the dignity of Conference, than for it to appoint committees to take charge of its departmental business, in the presence of the country and the Government, and then for it to be declared that those committees did not represent the opinions of Methodism'. Rigg was similarly angry. He told them that he was appointed by the Conference and that if he were fettered by Conference he would resign:

It was perfectly impossible for any man with self respect, if, when codes were published which threatened the whole of their schools, they were to be prevented from making such representations to the Government as they thought desirable. It was a monstrous proposal. (93)

The Conference could not agree, and a compromise solution was found, to leave the decision to the Special Committee on education soon to be called. Hugh Price Hughes wrote to Rigg at
the height of the disagreement, in September 1889:

Do me the credit for having enough sense to appreciate the immense services you have rendered to Methodism, and the lofty Christian motives which inspire your educational policy and the whole of your public life. (94)

On 11 February 1890 he wrote:

I greatly regret that I am not able to work in harmony with you in this Education question, because I am convinced that what you want is what I want - generous, catholic, scriptural education. You think the denominational system will secure that. I can't help feeling that the denominational system is the only thing that prevents it from being achieved in every district in England. (95)

The 1890 Annual Meeting saw renewed division, this time over the failure, for the past two years to summon the Special Committee. Hugh Price Hughes had complained about this in the METHODIST TIMES, and at the Annual Meeting, a Mr. Hargreaves demanded an immediate call on the issue of free education. Waller commented that it would cost £300 to summon the Special Committee and that this would be wasted unless the Government had laid definite proposals before the country. The Meeting did accept this and left it to the President, the Committee of Privileges or the Education Committee to call the Committee into existence, when the time was opportune.

There had been a problem in Salisbury, where the School Board had been created, but had refused to create any schools, as they saw the existing school, a Church of England institution, as sufficient. Olver proposed and Rigg seconded a motion, calling on the Government to introduce an amendment to the law, to avoid such a breach of religious freedom.

Rigg defended himself again at the meeting:

Only during the last few days, I have reaffirmed my views and judgements as to the absolute necessity for school districts and of establishing an undenominational school in each school district ... I have been grossly misrepresented by people who hate Methodism and by people who hate me and this kind of thing must stop. (96)

The Rev. J. Posnett commented at this:

Dr. Rigg, all his life has been a fervent lover of liberty ... but those with whom Dr. Rigg has unfortunately allied himself neither love liberty, nor fraternity nor equality.

Rigg was also castigated in the METHODIST TIMES and the CRUSADER of 28 August 1890, which commented dryly that if he had been a Roman Catholic, he would have 'aspired to the tiara and thundered from the Vatican'. (97)
The Special Committee was finally summoned on 25 January 1891. The first resolutions were formulated by Waller, Dr. Rigg and Dr. Greaves and clearly supported their existing denominational schools and claimed:

* That a measure merely for giving further assistance to different sorts of inspected schools, provided and managed as at present and organised on existing lines, must be deficient alike in symmetry and elasticity and altogether inadequate to meet the requirements of the Nation in respect of public education ...  
* That in view of the fact that the Local Government Act with its organisation of County Councils has now come into operation and that a District Council Bill has been prepared and must before long be brought into Parliament, this Committee is of opinion that Government should be urged to carry into effect the principle embodied in the recommendations on the subject of National Education adopted by the Wesleyan Conference of 1873, without interfering with the existing School Board system, so that the whole country might be divided into educational districts of a proper size and character, with provision made at the same time that an undenominational school should be brought within a reasonable distance of every family. (98)

Percy Bunting put down a resolution calling for the establishment of a complete, national unsectarian system of schools under public management, to 'prevent their use for sectarian purposes'. He said that:

No other things were of such importance to them as Methodists as the securing their scholars from ecclesiastical oppression in rural districts. He was no advocate for closing their own schools, but he would rather see them closed tomorrow than continue the subjection of their scholars to the teaching of many of the clergy of the Church of England... the question was of the country(side)...

Rigg's annoyance at the Forward Movement spilled over once again, when he referred to a leading Article in the METHODIST TIMES, which had claimed that he had been put onto the Royal Commission, because he was a well-known advocate of sectarian education. He told them that 'of course he was an advocate of denominational education, because he had been put into a position of trust by the Conference to watch over its schools', and if he were not an advocate for them, he would be a traitor to Conference:

But the words he had quoted were intended to mean that he was an advocate of exclusively denominational education. That was perfectly untrue. He could not see how he, as the Senior Principal of Training Colleges in the kingdom could be kept off the Commission, except by the miserable spirit which would exclude all Methodism.

The Article had suggested 'on the highest authority' that if William Arthur had had his way, Gladstone would have covered the land with school boards in 1870. Rigg reacted strongly at this. The only 'highest authority' he knew was Gladstone himself, and he had written to the old
man and received the answer:

the expression concerning the highest authority can have no reference to me, as it would be absolutely without foundation ... Speaking after twenty crowded years and quite apart from any preference or aversion, I think I may say that on the Education Bill I had no sort of understanding in any quarter on any point as to what was to happen, in any contingency that had not arrived!

Rigg was not prepared simply to say 'set down school boards', because a village school, under a village school board would almost inevitably come under dominant sectarian control. It was certain that the schoolmaster himself would be the nominee of the clergyman and would teach accordingly. He had worked constantly, sending private communications to leading members of the Government, of Parliament, and to bishops , stating what the effect of the High Church management of schools had been, how it had acted oppressively, so far as Non-conformist parents in the villages were concerned, ... producing the sense of grievous injustice. (99) But would destroying their schools in the manufacturing districts help their people in the rural districts? It was proposed to destroy the Methodist schools in order that they might destroy the Church schools - to destroy the places which were the strongholds in order to check sacerdotal aggression. This, he saw, was as unwise a policy as it was possible to conceive of.

Hugh Price Hughes again totally disagreed with Rigg. He claimed that their schools were found 'mainly where they were least needed for self defence.' There were scarcely any in the villages and he felt strongly convinced that board schools were carrying out Methodist ideas, of unsectarian Biblical teaching, and as there was a national system carrying out their convictions, he asked, 'why should we go to further expense and why create division among themselves in the matter.' He claimed that the rank and file of Methodist people had no heart for the system and he criticised Rigg for supporting Rate aid on the Commission. (100) In the voting, Percy Bunting proposals were given priority over Rigg's suggestions, after a division vote of eighty two to fifty seven. It was the first time that Rigg had been outvoted at the Conference on educational matters.

The Special Committee finally decided on Bunting's motions, some of which called clearly for the ideal of an end of their denominational schools:

- That the primary object of Methodist policy ... should be the establishment of school boards everywhere, acting in districts of sufficient area and the placing of a Christian unsectarian school within reasonable distance of every family,
especially in the rural districts.
- That in the opinion of the Meeting no National system of Education will meet the necessity of the country, which shall exclude from the day-schools the Bible and religious instruction therefrom by the teachers, suited to the capacities of the children.
- That all modifications of National policy... should be made in view of the ultimate establishment of a complete National system of schools under adequate and representative public management.
- That so long as Denominational Schools form part of the National system of Education, our Connexional Day-schools and Training Colleges should be maintained in full vigour and efficiency.
- That the Committee is prepared to accept any reasonable proposals for Free Education; but insists that all schools freed by the aid of public grants must be so far placed under public management, as to 1) secure the efficiency of the schools, and 2) To prevent their misuse for sectarian purposes. (101)

Rigg's suggestions were then included, and read:

- That no scheme of Free or Assisted Education can be acceptable to Wesleyan Methodists which will place the schools of Protestant Nonconformists at a disadvantage in comparison with those of the Church of England or of the Roman Catholics.
- That no measure will be satisfactory to Wesleyan Methodists which provides for the payment from the Consolidated Fund of a sum in lieu of school fees, while it makes no provision for the due representation of the public on the Committees of Management.
- That the experience of twenty years has shown that the Conscience Clause has, to a considerable extent, proved to be ineffectual and unreal as a protection for parents and children against religious intolerance and oppression; that moreover, in not a few Day-schools of the Church of England religious intolerance and bigotry of an exceedingly offensive character are systematically taught the scholars during the hours set apart for religious instruction by means of a special Catechism, such as it ought not to be possible to teach in connection with any public school of the Nation; and that the way of appeal to the Education Department against such grievances is difficult, tedious and often altogether unavailable. This Committee therefore would strongly urge upon the Government that the Local Education Authority, which is responsible for enforcing educational compulsion on children and their parents, should have authority to take cognizance of any complaints which may be made by parents or guardians of offences against conscience or religious liberty in the conduct of any inspected school....And further... to take cognizance of the sanitary conditions of the Schools within their Districts which it may be their duty to require children to attend...
- The Committee having heard that certain schools have been transferred to school boards for their use only within specified hours of each school day, so limited as to enable clergymen and teachers, without the guard of a Conscience Clause, to give religious instruction by means of catechisms and otherwise before the hour in which the premises are under the School Board Regulations, regards this arrangement as an evasion of the spirit of Clause XIV, sect.2 of the Act of 1870, which declares that 'no religious catechism or religious formulary, which is distinctive of any particular denomination' shall be taught in any school under a school board; and resolves to recommend that the Act of 1870 be amended by the insertion of a provision to the effect that premises of transferred
schools shall be held to be in the occupation of the School board from 6 a.m. to 5 p.m. on all school days. (102)

The Committee also created a Sub-Committee of 7 members - the President, Secretary, Dr. Rigg, Dr. Greeves, Hugh Price Hughes, Percy Bunting and Marshall Hartley - to formulate their policy.

Rigg gave his 1891 Inaugural to Westminster students, just a week after the Special Committee. He gave his views on their decisions. He firstly proclaimed that the 'ideal' of a public elementary school for the citizens of the country was an 'unsectarian Christian school, and he affirmed that Wesleyan schools had been such from the beginning. In 1872, they had sought unsectarian schools under school boards:

The resolution adopted last week is distinctly an advance on that position. A Christian unsectarian school is a school with a high and positive character of catholic but definite Christianity; whereas an unsectarian school under a school board might be a school without any religious character or influence whatever; might be a school where the Bible is barely and formally read, or is not even read at all. (103)

He described the tone of the meeting:

There was doubtless excitement at that large meeting. There was a breeze of life during its two day sitting. The result has been wholesome and invigorating. At one point and in one respect indeed, it seemed as if something like a storm were gathering. That was, however, occasioned by the numerous and painfully impressive testimonies as to the intolerant use of day-school influence in connection with not a few schools belonging to the Church of England. The pent-up discontents and indignation of twenty years seemed to express themselves last week. The result was an adoption of an emphatic resolution which was my duty to move and which was carried unanimously... stigmatising the intolerance complained of, and making a suggestion which it is hoped may curb and restrain it in future. To me personally it was no pleasing duty to move that resolution. That there are many true liberal clergymen I have good reason to know. It has been a ruling principle with me all my life to strive after friendly relations with Christians of other denominations both on my own behalf and on behalf of my Church. The last thing which I would have willingly done would be to commit myself to a public accusation of offensive intolerance against even a section of the clergy of another Christian Church. The principles of Romanism, however, during the last thirty years have been increasingly developed among the clergymen of the Church of England, and Romish intolerance and bigotry in doctrine and in spirit, combined with the peculiar arrogance which is so natural to clergymen of small experience and narrow views, who are members of the Established Church, have become too common in all parts of the country. In large towns, Nonconformists are too numerous and powerful to suffer greatly...in rural districts, especially those remote from great centres of population, clergymen of the character I have indicated are as intolerable as they are intolerant. Nonconformist artisans and peasantry are provoked to indignation and bitter hostility, the results of which are making, and will make themselves more and more politically felt in the country.
This is a lamentable evil: a national calamity... A board school in such parishes ... is seldom a remedy for this evil, because the school board itself is usually under the control of the clergyman, and the teacher of the school is his nominee. Hence the needful clause inserted in the resolution ... to the effect that school boards in country districts should be established within sufficiently large areas. (104)

Opposition to the Church of England was thus still in 1891 one of the most enduring motivations for Wesleyan educational effort. Rigg still saw Wesleyan schools as the bastion of Bible teaching and the bulwark against extremist Anglicanism. The Forward Movement saw the greatest protection for religious education, and the strongest bulwark against Anglican oppression to be universal board schools and the complete end of all denominational education.
CHAPTER SEVEN
Dr. Rigg had for many years spoken against free education. He rejected the idea in principle in his book *National Education* in 1873 as a denial of parental responsibilities and even a 'reviling' of the family. He rejected the 'communistic philosophy' of the State taking over the responsibilities of the family in regard to education. (1) Such a view brought him into conflict with Joseph Chamberlain, who renewed the call for free education in a speech in Birmingham in January 1883, where he proclaimed:

I marvel at the patience with which Englishmen bear an infliction which has been abolished long ago in the U.S.A., which hardly exists at the present time in a single English colony, and which has been removed in almost every Continental country. (2)

He claimed that, by depriving parents of the earning power of the children they had imposed 'as great a sacrifice as we are entitled to do' and that the community 'which had established this system, in the interest of all, ought to pay for it.' (3) Moreover, the collection of school fees placed a heavy burden on the teachers and made compulsion unpopular.

Rigg spoke against free education at the International Conference on Health and Education at South Kensington on 6 August 1884, where he chaired one of the sections. He also wrote an article in the LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW of July 1884 condemning the proposals. He condemned the suggestion as 'communistic' State socialism and he had seen this in France in 1870 as an example of the individual existing only for the state. Moreover he feared that 'private schools' could not compete successfully against schools where no fee was charged. (4) He accepted the payment of fees in certain conditions, when parents could not pay:

The question is this: Is the individual, or is the family, the unit, the germ-cell, in the living tissue of society?... Is the family a sacred and necessary element - is it the essential element - in civilized human communities or is it not? If it be, the parent must still be held and left responsible for providing for the wants of his children... for their education as for their other wants... The parental right is a sacred thing, rooted in the divine order... the parental duty is a solemn obligation, laid upon the parent alike by Scripture and conscience, and by the traditions and customs of all nations... (5)

He pointed to the example of America to deny the suggestion that free education would ensure regularity of attendance, as in New York it was increasingly difficult to get the
poor to attend schools. In Germany, he wrote, free education had been introduced after the 1848 'revolutions' but 'after a short trial it was found to work badly and was given up.' since which time small fees had been charged. (6) He also claimed that when parents paid nothing for their children's education, they would value it the less. One of his greatest fears was that free schools would mean secular schools:

In America the free schools are for the masses of the people, and they have become almost universally secular. For the most part, the Bible is not even read. If it is read, that is all - mere reading - and the verses read are very few... free education in France, and free education as proposed for England, is intended to do away not only with the Bible, but with all recognition of religion or of Divine government and influence. (7)

Free Education became a major issue again in September 1885, precipitated by Chamberlain in an election speech at Warrington, where he declared that he believed it would aid the spread of education, and would be a 'just concession to the necessities of the poor.' He believed it prevented regularity of attendance and accounted for the great majority of empty seats in schools. He did however state:

I think there is some misconception as to the scope and nature of the proposal we make on this point. I see sometimes a statement that it would destroy the denominational schools and put an end to religious education. These are questions of grave importance which, some day or other - perhaps at no distant day - will be discussed on their own merits. But I wish to say, that they are altogether outside and apart from the particular proposal I am making. You might free the schools tomorrow without in the slightest degree affecting the denominational system ... At the present time the total of fees receivable in all schools of England and Wales amount to a little over a million and a half, and I believe an addition of income tax of three farthings in the pound, as a method of providing the money, would be sufficient to throw open tomorrow every schoolhouse in the land, leaving all other and collateral questions entirely unprejudiced and untouched. (8)

The proposal shocked the Wesleyans. The Wesleyan Inspector, Mawbey reported in 1885:

We have been surprised by information from political platforms concerning crying evils and cruel defects in the country's system of education, but of which we knew nothing ... During the few months in which 'free education' has been prominently before the public, I have conversed upon the subject with some scores of school managers and teachers ... and only one of them has expressed an opinion in its favour. Their general opinion is that its name is a captivating fallacy, that it is neither necessary nor practicable, and that its covert object is to exclude religion from the education of the people. (9)
The Wesleyan Education Report of 1885 itself criticises the idea from a practical viewpoint of its effect on Wesleyan schools. The Committee was particularly concerned that Wesleyan schools would be at a grave disadvantage if grants were given in lieu of fees. If compensation were made according to the average rate of fee throughout the country, the Wesleyan schools, which had proportionally the highest fees, would lose. The Committee reported that the Government returns showed the total received from fees in 1885 was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Av.Attendance</th>
<th>Fees Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>1,607,823</td>
<td>£854,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
<td>128,584</td>
<td>£102,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>167,841</td>
<td>£79,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Board</td>
<td>253,044</td>
<td>£168,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>1,115,832</td>
<td>£528,674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fee per scholar, for Wesleyan schools was 15s. 11\(\frac{3}{4}\)d, whereas that for the Church of England was only 10s. 7\(\frac{1}{2}\)d and Roman Catholic, 9s. 5\(\frac{1}{4}\)d. The Wesleyans therefore saw a compensatory grant, taken on average attendance alone, would disadvantage them more than any other class of schools. (10) If the total amount derived from fees were distributed, in compensation, to the schools in proportion to the average attendance, the Church of England would have a loss of £3,167 and the Wesleyans of £34,520, while the Roman Catholics would gain £9,907. Wesleyans would therefore lose a third of their income. (11) However, any other compensation, for example to give the different classes of schools a sum equal to their own average fees received, would be seen as manifestly unequal and even the Wesleyan Education Committee regarded it as 'not at all practicable'.

Chamberlain did relieve some of the denominational worries that the 'fee grant' would be given only to board schools. On 1 October at Bradford, he suggested that it should apply to both Voluntary and board schools, though he added:

The existence of sectarian schools supported by State grants is no doubt a very serious question in itself and one which some day or another ought to receive consideration. Whenever the time comes for its discussion, I for one shall not hesitate to express my opinion that
contributions of Government money, whether great or small, ought in all cases to be accompanied by some form of representative control. To my mind the spectacle of so-called national schools turned into a private preserve by clerical managers and used for exclusive purposes of politics or religion, is one which the law ought not to tolerate. But this is a question which can be treated by itself. It is independent of that which I have brought before you, and it seems to me that it should not be mixed up or confused with the just claims of the working classes to a free education in all the common schools of the country. (12)

On 24 October 1885, Chamberlain sent a list of Scottish M.P.s in favour of free education to Gladstone. He mentioned Rigg's opposition by name and on the following day, Gladstone replied that, 'Rigg, whom you thought rather small beer has been followed by a weightier authority, Illingworth.' (13) Under Alfred Illingworth, Nonconformist M.P. for Bradford, the National Liberal Federation held that all the public elementary schools should be placed under the management of duly elected representatives of the people, and that they should be made free. This antagonised the denominationalists. Nevertheless, Chamberlain tried to reassure them with letters to the Dean of Wells published in the TIMES:

... all schools, voluntary as well as board schools, should at once be made free and that to meet the cost an additional grant should be provided from the Consolidated Fund. ... I am personally desirous of going further. I think that the present position of the voluntary schools is anomalous, and that in every case there ought to be some popular representative control of the schools (14)

There is a dichotomy in Rigg's attitude to such proposals, as, while many condemned free education on principle, the Wesleyans, and particularly Rigg, had for many years supported the call for public control of schools. The Anglicans and Roman Catholics were more strident in their opposition. The CHURCH TIMES described it as 'a bait which cannot conceal the hook from any but the dullest eyes'. (15) On 21 November, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Salford declared in the TABLET:

The time is near for a hand to hand struggle with the doctrinaires and the representatives in this country of the principles of the French Revolution. They are bent on establishing State supremacy over education, on making the religion of the children a civil disability, on driving Christ out of the school room, and repeating in England the course of despotism which has been adopted in France... (16)

Cardinal Manning was in the forefront of opposition to free education, asking Catholics to put certain questions to parliamentary candidates about their support for a Royal
Commission and for Rate Aid for schools. Manning, like Rigg, was opposed to free education on principle. He later told one visitor that he could not accept the transfer of the duty of education entirely from the parent to the State and thus weaken parental authority. (17) However, unlike the Anglicans, Rigg and the Methodists were in an anomalous position, favouring public control of denominational schools, as the Wesleyan Conference had frequently announced that this would prevent the worst excesses of sectarian education.

Chamberlain was however defeated in the election of 1885. He had not been trusted by denominationalists after his speeches and record of hostility to denominational education. After the electoral defeat, Chamberlain told Labouchere, 'I put my money on free schools, but judging by London the electors do not care much about it.' (18) His past had made him suspect to the denominationalists. The campaign of Manning and the Established Church had been strongly supported by Rigg and the W.E.C., which adopted an attitude of extreme hostility to the proposal of free schools, as meaning the closing of all Wesleyan day schools and colleges. Rigg commented on Chamberlain in his 1887 Inaugural:

A statesman of great ability, having declared himself in favour of gratuitous education, when he found that that declaration was regarded on all sides as equivalent to a threat of destruction against the voluntary schools... hastened to explain that in any scheme for gratuitous education which he should approve of, the existence of our voluntary schools would be sacredly regarded and a full equivalent provided for any pecuniary loss, which his proposals might involve. He declared that he appreciated the work that had been done by the churches and voluntary educationists far too highly to be any party to a scheme for doing any injury. I give him credit for his good intentions in this matter...Free schools... would be absolutely incompatible with the maintenance of existing voluntary schools - must of necessity extinguish them - and that with the destruction of voluntary schools also of necessity, come the destruction of our denominational training colleges. (19)

On the Cross Commission, Rigg took a particular interest in the discussions on Free Education. He commented to the Chairman of the London School Board, the Rev. J. R. Diggle:

During my six years' experience of the Board I found that the number of applications for children to be allowed to leave school altogether earlier, or for a while, in order to take a place or that they might bring some help to their parents, was very numerous, but at that time the
applications for remission of fees were very few, even in the poor Westminster district with which I was associated; it seems to me that applications for the remission of fees have proportionately increased of late years; is that your opinion?

Diggle replied that the question had become so complicated as to forbid an answer, as some parents asked for a remission of fees, and others a remission of arrears. Rigg went on to comment that:

is it not the case that where parents can afford the fee the payment of the fee adds to the motives of parents for promoting the regular attendance of children?

Diggle responded that he was sure the the 'great majority of English people desire to have their money's worth for their money, to that extent, no doubt, it does act as a motive.' (20) He also questioned the Chairman of the Ragged School Union, H.R. Williams, over his suggestion that education must be free if it had been made compulsory. He claimed that no one regarded it as incumbent on the State to provide food for children, though it did compel parents to feed their children. Williams told Dr. Rigg that education was an exception, and a birthright which ought to be made free. (21) After the publication of the Final Report, Rigg welcomed the fact that even the Minority Report had not called for free education. (22) The Majority Report declared that: 'provision of the due necessaries of education, as well as of the necessaries of life, is part of the responsibility incumbent on parents.' (23)

During his Second Ministry, Lord Salisbury revived the question of free education. In a speech to the National Union of Conservative Associations at Nottingham in November 1889. He did not like the term 'free education':

I should rather call it assisted education, because I do not know that anybody, however extreme his views, would desire that all the inhabitants of the country, whether rich or poor, whether capable of paying for the education of his children or not, should enjoy free education at the cost of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. On the other hand... I expressed four years ago, before the last two general elections - at Newport, that by making education compulsory, by forcing the people to send their children to school, whether they ask it or not, you were incurring a certain obligation to relieve the burden of that compulsion, where the circumstances of the parent were such that it was too heavy for him to bear. (24)

This took his Cabinet colleagues entirely by surprise. They had all spoken against free
education in 1885 and the Majority Report of the Cross Commission had firmly rejected it. Why did Salisbury change his mind on fees? He did claim that the Liberals would introduce a measure, if they took over the government, which would threaten the voluntary schools, and which would certainly involve local control of these schools. He therefore thought that the voluntary schools would suffer less, if the legislation was brought forward by a Tory government, which sympathised with the voluntary schools. In particular, if he could make the schools free, without popular control, it might be very difficult for the Liberals to legislate for popular control on its own. (25) The abolition of fees would also attract working class votes to the Tory Government and it would assure the support of the Liberal Unionists, and Chamberlain in particular. It would also help the voluntary schools financially, while avoiding the contentious issue of the 17s.6d limit which, Chamberlain made it plain to the Prime Minister, the Liberal Unionists would not contemplate amending. (26)

At the 1890 Inaugural, the Principal of Southlands College, the Rev. Dr. Greeves, condemned the proposal for free schools. He said that it would destroy a large proportion of Wesleyan schools, which were 'at present giving a good education, for Wesleyans would be unable, or unwilling, to bear the heavy loss, which would certainly fall on them'. He also believed it would lower the standing of the scholar and the tone of education in all the best voluntary schools and reduce greatly the amount they received in voluntary contributions, as a large proportion of this was given 'for the express purpose of keeping the schools independent of local control. (27) He told his audience:

Let any one visit our Wesleyan day-schools and inquire of our teachers, and he will find that in many cases they are surrounded by board schools more commanding in appearance, and stronger in financial resources, where the fees are very low, 2d or 3d a week; and yet our schools, charging 6d and 9d, are constantly filled with children; and in Wesleyan day-schools alone hundreds and thousands of pounds are paid as school fees by parents who are glad and thankful to pay them, that they may give their children what they think a little social and intellectual advantage. Such is the spirit of English artisans, clerks and small shopkeepers... (28)

He urged all Wesleyans to preserve their schools and concluded:

after what has happened at Salisbury and York, I am not sure that the best way to secure our objects will be the universal establishment of school boards. School boards will represent the opinions of majorities,
while in this matter it is the rights of minorities we desire to protect... I regard our day-school system and the influence it gives us in the councils of the nation as a sacred heritage and trust. (29)

At the same meeting Rigg rebuked the Press for their 'blindness in regard to the effect of free education. They had said that free education would 'crowd the schools', but he refuted this, pointing to the United States, where free schools had an inferior attendance to that of English schools. He criticised a writer in the TIMES who had argued that compulsory education necessitated free schools. He maintained that there was already provision for free education in the case of those who could not afford to pay. He also took a TELEGRAPH editorial to task, in the assertion that it would fill the schools at once and concluded:

Pecuniarily free education might be a present benefit to the Roman Catholics, though it might not last very long; probably also to the Church of England in certain rural parishes, for a little season strengthening the hold of the Church of England on the villages. But in the case of the Wesleyans, who had made provision for higher education, it would, with very few exceptions, destroy their schools... what they received in grants would only enable them to maintain a low class of schools, instead of select, high class schools whose praise was in all the Blue-books. (30)

He wrote to the TIMES on 5 February, pointing out that compensation was to be based on an average of the fees received. It could not compensate the 'high fee' schools to the detriment of the lower. 'If this were done, the compensation made to Wesleyan schools would be double what would be paid to Roman Catholic schools, an arrangement which no Parliament would enact and no Government propose.' Yet, if there were a blanket compensation of 3d per week for each scholar in average attendance, the Wesleyan schools would lose out:

In a large proportion of Wesleyan schools as in the best higher grade schools of the Church of England and the British and Foreign School Society, the average fee actually paid amounts to, from 6d to 8d a week. In all such schools accordingly the proposed scheme would mean a reduction of the income of the school... for example, in a school averaging 400 children, where at present the fee is 6d, the loss per week would be £5; and the yearly loss, reckoning forty six weeks in the year, £230... (31)

He saw this as being particularly damaging in the North and Midlands, where hundreds of schools would be affected:

It will be evident ... that the effect of the scheme would be to destroy a large proportion of our Wesleyan schools and injuriously to cripple and degrade the present high class and technical schools of the training colleges ... What has astonished those of us who are familiar with the facts involved is that this aspect of the case seems to have been
absolutely passed over in silence by nearly all who have spoken or written on the subject. (32)

A week later, in the same newspaper, he called again for universal school districts throughout the country, with an undenominational school within each district, either a board or a British school, available for any family, a policy, which he pointed out, had been urged by the Methodists for almost twenty years.(33)

The Wesleyans were however far from united in their opposition to the abolition of fees. Hugh Price Hughes agitated for the acceptance of the measure, and at the 1890 Wesleyan Annual Meeting on Education a Mr. Hargreaves claimed:

there was a strong feeling abroad in Yorkshire and the North of England, and he shared in the conviction, that the recent utterances of the Education Department do not represent the feeling of the Methodist people in this matter. The artisan population in the North of England is decidedly in favour of free education; they are familiar with free institutions and there is not the slightest idea in their minds that they will be in the least degraded when the great boon of free education comes. They have free parks and museums, and know how to prize them.(34)

Rigg also spoke at the Meeting, saying that he and many others were committed to their existing schools and would resist anything which tried to ruin them:

We cannot allow fatal proposals to be made without throwing light on them. As to parks and museums, there is no analogy. I believe in promoting elementary education for the people. No man believes in it more than I do. It is the obligation of the Nation to do so up to the point of need; but if you go beyond that, you traverse all the laws of political economy and political equity (35)

Many voluntaryists remained fearful about the measure. On 16 October 1890, Rigg circulated a memorandum to the Prime Minister, the Archbishop of Canterbury and many other political and religious leaders, which attacked again the concept of free education. He reiterated the expected damage to Wesleyan schools, although he did not analyse his own philosophical objection to the proposal. He claimed that it would prove fatal to Wesleyan 'high class schools' which would not receive sufficient compensation. (36) His greatest objection however is the further endowment of Anglican schools which had antagonised almost all Wesleyans. Rigg describes their 'absolute unanimity' and their 'intense', 'bitter' and 'indignant' feelings towards the proposal. They deplored the further endowment of the Church of England's religious
teaching and Rigg reflected their vitriol:

The villages of England will be bound over - it will be said that they are sold over - to the ecclesiastical influence and what will be described as the sectarian teaching of the Church of England. The development of Ultra High Church doctrine, of sacerdotal claims and of extreme forms of ritualism throughout the community and especially in the rural districts has embittered the feelings of Methodists generally against the Church of England. In this respect the feeling of Methodism has been revolutionised during the last thirty or forty years. Professed political dissenters hardly regard with as much alarm and dislike, the recent developments ... as do the vast majority of country Methodists. A large proportion of the clergy teach that dissent in any form ... is fatal sin. Methodist children are liable to be taught this doctrine in Church Day-schools. Special catechisms even are taught in not a few Sunday schools with which the Day-schools are in close connection, which inculcate this doctrine in the most offensive and insulting form. No Conscience Clause, no legal provisions whatever, can mitigate this evil or restrain the gross and grievous violence to conscience and religious feeling which it involves. (37)

He deplored the prospect of an alliance of the Conservative Party and the Church of England, faced by the 'bitter antagonism of the whole Protestant and Nonconformist churches', (38) and he was alarmed that Roman Catholics would be arrayed alongside the Anglicans against the 'total Protestantism of the country'. The Catholics would gain enormously from fee-grants, as they were largely low-fee institutions, and Rigg complained that this amounted to a 'special endowment' of the Roman Catholic Church. He saw 'irreconcilable antagonism' everywhere between the body of Wesleyan Methodism and the Church of England (39) which would threaten the 'peace and mutual good understanding amongst the various religious denominations'. (40) He also believed it would be politically fatal to the Government, losing the Conservatives their Methodist voters. Rigg ended by reminding his readers that this had not been written 'as is well known; by an enemy of the Church of England, or by a sectarian bigot'.(41)

W.H. Smith wrote to Lord Salisbury on the matter on 25 October, reminding the Prime Minister that Rigg had never shown hostility or sectarian bigotry. Smith was 'astonished at the vehemence of his language.' (42) Salisbury responded:

He is very angry: and his anger may represent the loss of some Wesleyan clerical votes. But that prospect would not justify us in leaving the matter to be dealt with by our opponents and even electorally the agricultural labourers are worth more than the Wesleyan clericals. (43)

On 21 November 1890, Chamberlain wrote to Lord Hartington in reference to Rigg's Memorandum:

As to free education, I do not gather from Rigg's Memorandum that he
really knows what the Government proposals will be. But I have no doubt that he is right in anticipating possible danger. If the Scotch precedent is followed ... there must be an average scale of compensation for the abolition of school fees. This will be below the sum received in high fee schools, and above that in low fee schools. The former will suffer and may be extinguished if they do not increase their subscriptions from voluntary sources. This is, I take it, Rigg's grievance, and the only answer is that change is inevitable. The Gladstonians are pledged to it with the additional provision that all existing voluntary schools must go under popular management. If therefore the Government proposal is rejected, its Methodist opponents will find themselves scourged by scorpions instead of whips. (44)

He pointed out that they could not shelve the measure, without losing the support of the working class 'in the towns and in the counties'.

The Wesleyan Special Committee was finally summoned on 25 January 1891. Much of the debate centred on the public control of all denominational schools, especially those of the Church of England, which had a monopoly in many villages. The Wesleyans as a whole were prepared to accept public representation on their school management committees, if this would bring the control of Anglican institutions. The first resolutions were formulated by Waller, Dr. Rigg and Dr. Greaves:

1. That no scheme of Free or Assisted Education can be acceptable to Wesleyan Methodists, which will place the schools of Protestant Nonconformists at a disadvantage in comparison with those of the Church of England or the Roman Catholics.
2. That no measure will be satisfactory to Wesleyan Methodists which provides for the payment from the Consolidated Fund of a sum in lieu of school fees, while it makes no provision for the due representation of the public on the Committee of Management.

These were accepted by the Special Committee along with the resolutions:

3. That the Committee is prepared to accept any reasonable proposals for Free Education; but insists that all schools freed by the aid of public grants must be so far placed under public management, as to a) secure the efficiency of the schools, and b) to prevent their misuse for sectarian purposes. (45)

The Bill itself did not demand any measure of popular representation into voluntary school management, in spite of the calls from the Liberal Party. H. H. Fowler, the Wesleyan M.P., put forward the denominationalists' objections in the Commons. He reiterated the complaints about sacerdotal teaching of Wesleyan children and he quoted a Catechism which he had been informed by the Wesleyan Education Committee was being used by the Church of England, which asked children how
dissenters should be regarded:

A. As heretics; and in our Litany we expressly pray to be delivered from the sins of 'false doctrine, heresy and schism'

Q. Is then their worship a laudable service?

A. No, because they worship God according to their own evil and corrupt imaginations...

Q. But are there not some Dissenters who use the same form of prayers as ourselves?

A. Doubtless, but the prayers of the Church, being for the most part for the priests to offer up in behalf of the people; it must be sinful and presumptuous for those persons who are called Dissenting teachers to address the throne of Grace usurping the priestly office.

Q. Is it wicked then, to enter a meetinghouse at all?

A. Assuredly... it is not dedicated to His honour and glory and besides this, we run the risk of being led away by wicked, enticing words. (46)

He quoted Rigg's objection to the Conscience Clause, which had been accepted by the Wesleyan Conference of 1890 as well as his complaints that Wesleyan pupil-teachers were not being allowed in 10,000 parishes where there were only Anglican schools. He introduced an amendment that in single school districts where the school was a voluntary school, the election of local representatives to its management committee should be a condition for the receipt of the Fee Grant. Chamberlain turned down the motion saying that it would not be acceptable to the Church of England and that he wanted free education immediately, without added complications or delay. He claimed, inaccurately that Rigg and the Wesleyans were opposed to control of voluntary schools. (47) With Liberal Unionist support, the government rejected the motion by 267 votes to 166. (48) The Bill's generosity to voluntary schools did overcome the Wesleyan complaint that it would destroy their schools. It offered fee grant which was exempt from the 17s 6d limit relieving the parents from payment of school fees which amounted to less, and upto, 10s. a head for each child, between the ages of 5 and 14, in average attendance, and paid the full 10s. to the school managers, in lieu of fees, for each such child.

The Special Committee was convened again on 24 June 1891, to formulate Wesleyan reaction to the Education Act. It concluded that it found the Bill 'very defective and unsatisfactory' in certain areas, chiefly in what it omitted to do:

1. Because it fails to provide for the immediate establishment of school boards everywhere, acting in districts of sufficient area. The Committee is strongly of opinion that, unless the school board districts are
sufficiently large, the extension of school boards, especially in rural districts, will neither serve the purpose of efficient education nor afford the necessary security for religious liberty.

2. Because it does not provide an unsectarian school, under the management of a school board, within reasonable distance of every family.

3. Because it makes no further provision with regard to the Conscience Clause. The Committee reaffirms its strong protest against the religious oppression carried on by means of the rural schools, and the extreme sacerdotal teaching given therein to children of Nonconformist parents; and urges that some provision should be made in the Bill for remedying these crying grievances.

4. Because the Bill makes no provision for placing all schools receiving the fee-grant under effective representative supervision: a principle which Wesleyan Methodists are prepared to accept in regard to their own schools.

5. Because by limiting the fee-grant to children only between the ages of five and fourteen it discourages the education of those under five and above fourteen.

Copies of this resolution were sent to the Prime Minister, the Education Department and every Member of Parliament.

The METHODIST TIMES boasted its delight that even Dr. Rigg had supported the first resolution (50) although, under his influence, the Education Committee issued a call on managers not to act hastily, in response to the new regulations, and they reminded all managers of the resolution of the Special Committee that their schools should be maintained 'in undiminished number and efficiency'. A convention of Managers and Teachers was held at Westminster and all Headteachers of Wesleyan schools attended. The generosity of the new measure won over many of the Wesleyan denominationalists. (51) The Act included a provision that, where fees charged were in excess of 10 shillings per scholar, managers could accept the fee-grant and then charge as fees the amount of excess. The Education Committee believed this was introduced into the Bill 'in order that the best Elementary schools might be safeguarded' and they boasted that the 'majority of Wesleyan schools belong to this class'. (52) There would be no financial loss for the Wesleyan schools. Most, though not all, took the opportunity to abolish fees.

The Wesleyan Inspector, Mawbey, reported in 1891 on the effects of the Act on Wesleyan schools:
In the case of many of our schools, that full sum of 10s, called the Fee grant, will provide the managers with a larger annual amount that the former amount of school fees and will therefore give a financial advantage to the extent of the increment. The schools which will gain the advantage are, generally speaking, just those which it has been the most difficult to maintain and which are the most important for the preservation and advancement of Connexional interests, being situated in rural districts and in lower-class localities in large towns. To the majority of our schools, the Fee grant will of course, provide a smaller sum than the fees charged to the scholars formerly produced. In these cases, the deficiency may, according to the Act, be made up by a fee charged to the children...(53)

He did see two problems that had arisen. Parents had become reluctant to pay anything more than a nominal fee for very young children, and that there was an increase in the number of children seeking admission to the fee paying schools, which were seen as superior to the 'free' board schools. The thorny problem of popular representation on all denominational school committees remained to be solved to the satisfaction of the Wesleyans.
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CHAPTER EIGHT
In 1892 Rigg was elected to his second term as President of the Methodist Conference. Hughes gained 126 votes to Rigg's 192. In the educational field, his biographer, Telford, maintains he had become regarded with 'something akin to veneration' as day-school masters, trained under him at Westminster were by now scattered all over the country. (1) Even the METHODIST TIMES commented that he stood head and shoulders above all his contemporaries in 'ability, service and influence' and that if any Methodist preacher living was entitled to a second election, it was Dr. Rigg. (2) Throughout 1893-1894 Rigg was preoccupied with the 'great legislative proposal' which he made to Conference to change the status of District Chairmen, so that they would be relieved of the responsibilities of circuit superintendents and other circuit duties. He was supported by the ex-President, Dr. Pope and by Hugh Price Hughes, who had suggested the change several years before. Hughes actually quipped to the Conference that this was one of the many issues on which he and Rigg were united. However, many Wesleyans saw the change as the setting up of a bench of Wesleyan bishops and it was rejected by 216 votes to 146. The METHODIST TIMES commented that the best known, the 'most experienced and most trusted members of the Conference... the wise and prudent members' had voted with Rigg. (3) He also spent much of 1894 working on his book Oxford High Anglicanism. Naturally, these were great distractions from his educational work.

Meanwhile, the financial benefits of the 1891 Act had begun to be eaten away by increasing costs. The 1893 and 1894 Wesleyan Education Committee Reports complained that their schools were passing through a severe crisis because of the government requirements with regard to the premises and school plant under Circular 321. This had been issued to H.M.I. in January of 1893 with a questionnaire to be answered on all schools and called for improved classroom area, the division of playgrounds in Mixed schools and improved sanitary arrangements, although the instructions to the H.M.I. did not make an immediate alteration to a school a necessity in every case that there was a deficiency. After an appeal to the Committee in Council, H.M.I. were instructed that the Wesleyans had already, in 1877 been given the right to
have single playgrounds for both sexes, as long as they had rigorous supervision. (4) However by 1894, the H.M.I. had become quite rigorous in their application of the rules. The Wesleyans were particularly worried about the implications of the ten square feet per pupil which had been proposed. Many Wesleyan schools had been 'brought into a position of peril' and there had been great anxiety during 1893. The Wesleyan Education Report claimed there was 'panic' (5) and their Inspector, Mawbey pointed out that their schools were in general older than the board schools and often planned or adapted for both day and Sunday school purposes. (6) Eighteen schools had closed, rather than have to comply with the government demands for 'costly structural alterations', although others had converted classrooms into cloakrooms to satisfy the demands. This obviously had reduced the school accommodation. The Committee remarked on the government's mandatory demand for a playground in each school, which previously had been merely a recommendation. Nevertheless many Wesleyans had continued to support their schools generously to provide the necessary improvements, which the Report regarded as remarkable at a time of agricultural and commercial depression and a clear sign of the fears of the denomination that if their schools closed they would be replaced by an increased accommodation in existing denominational schools rather than new board schools. (7) In response to Circular 321 the Wesleyans had spent a special expenditure of £62,000 by 1895. (8)

The denominational arguments appeared again in 1894 precipitated by the London School Board. In 1871 it had agreed to the compromise that in their schools, the Bible should be read and 'there shall be given such explanations and such instruction therefrom in the principles of Morality and Religion as are suited to the capacities of the children.' This led to discontent among some on the Board after one of their members had visited a school in 1892 and found a lesson on the birth of Jesus without a mention of his divinity. The denominationalists led by the High Anglican, Athelstan Riley, persuaded the Board to issue a Circular attempting to define the words 'Christian religion'. The word 'Christian' was added to the words 'Morality and Religion' in the definition of Bible teaching. The teachers were told to impress upon the children the 'relation in which they stand to God the Father, as Creator, to God the Son, as
Redeemer, and to God the Holy Ghost, as the Sanctifier. There were immediate reactions. Teachers were resentful and 3000 asked to be relieved from giving religious instruction altogether. There was an outcry from Nonconformists, who suspected the Anglican doctrines were to be introduced as the definitive 'Christian' teaching.

The METHODIST TIMES condemned the Church of England's attempt to increase its influence and called all true Protestants to vote against the 'Diggleites' (so called from the chairman of the Board, J.W.Diggle) in the School Board elections of 1894. They claimed that all who voted for Diggle were promoting 'intolerant clericalism' and the 'fanatical bigotry' of Mr. Riley:

Every vote for the Diggleite is a vote aimed at the heart of everything that Methodism holds dear. We are evangelical Christians; we are enemies of bigotry, sectarianism and intolerance. Our opponents try to minimise the interests at stake. They lift up the word 'Christian' and ask us with a taunt how we can object to that being added to the word 'religion' in the stipulations of the London School Board. But there are times when a word is not chosen because it expresses a truth, but merely as a symbol of a cause, or as a flag of an advancing foe... it is now obvious to the densest intelligence that 'Christian' meant 'clerical' and that 'clerical' means 'Roman Catholic'. We have all seen the man who sums up his creed in the familiar words: 'By religion, I mean the Christian religion, and by the Christian religion I mean the Protestant religion, and by the Protestant religion, I mean the religion of the Church of England.' Mr. Riley executes a variant of this and tells us in effect that by the religion of the Church of England he means the religion of the English Church Union, and by the religion of the English Church Union he means that of the Roman Catholic Church... according to Mr. Riley and the CHURCH TIMES it is baptism which 'makes N.or M. a child of God, an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven'; it is this specific ecclesiastical act which settles the 'relation' to God the Father; and so 'baptismal regeneration' in the Sacerdotal sense of the English Church Union was ... the intended and natural corollary of the word 'Christian' as defined in the Circular.(9)

The journal asked all Wesleyan preachers to call on their congregations to resist this move in London and thereby preserve the schools from the 'dominion of the priests'.

In September, the Sion House Committee was instituted of Nonconformist leaders, among them Rigg and Hughes, to formulate their combined reaction to the Circular and they issued an Address to Electors of the London School Board, claiming that for 20 years the London Board system of Bible Education had worked well and that the few cases of improper teaching had been satisfactorily dealt with by the Scripture sub-committee as a breach of the law against attaching children to 'any particular
The circular has not proved a success in its policy and method and to many it has been a source of vexation and alarm. The only safe course is therefore to support such candidates for the new Board as will pledge themselves to the withdrawal of the Circular and to the frank and loyal acceptance of the Compromise of 1871 (10).

The Address complained that there had been absurd and untrue representations, to prejudice electors, that, without the Circular the Board would fall into the hands of Unitarians or become secular:

The great peril is that if one section persists in their attempt to impose definitions on the teachers, this will lead to a political revulsion which would deprive the children of Bible teaching altogether. If only there be a general agreement to act together on the common basis of the Bible, Christian teaching will be assured in the London School Board and the Board cannot be captured for any Denomination whatsoever... The 3000 teachers who have remonstrated against the Circular have done so, not from differences about teaching the Bible... (but) from vexation at the imputations cast upon them and from the dread of indefinite further interferences.

After the elections, the METHODIST TIMES wrote:

In every part of England, the Established Church has declared war... against all who do not submit to her sacerdotal yoke... By actions which speak more loudly than words... she has declared that her dearest friend and her chosen ally is the Church of Rome, while her implacable hatred is reserved for the Church organised by John Wesley. Once the bulwark of Protestantism, the Church of England has become the one hope of the Pope. (11)

In the event, the Moderates were returned to power on the School Board, under the new chairman, Lord George Hamilton. They however did modify their policy, the Circular was allowed to become a dead letter and Riley announced his retirement from the Board before the following election. It had certainly shown the strength of feeling in Wesleyan circles, and the continuing anti-Anglicanism, as well as a rare unity in the Wesleyan Church..

The METHODIST TIMES renewed its criticisms of Dr. Rigg and the Wesleyan Education Committee in 1895. They complained that its Annual Report and the suggestion by Inspector Mawbey that Rate-Aid might be accepted without local management were against the feelings of the Church as a whole:

Outsiders naturally believe that Mr. Mawbey and his superior, Dr. Rigg, represent on this question the sentiment of Methodism. Memories are very
short, or men would not have forgotten that the representatives of Methodism, with practical unanimity, repudiated Dr. Rigg during the last educational controversy. Dr. Rigg vehemently supported the late Cardinal Manning and the present Dean of St. Pauls on the Royal Commission, the advocacy of the predominant views of Methodism being left to the late Dr. Dale. When at last this question was fairly put before the Methodist people, every Synod in the kingdom elected representatives who were instructed to oppose the views championed by Dr. Rigg... When the Special Committee met in London, the first incident was absolutely unprecedented in its significance. By a long established custom, the representatives of departments are always allowed to have precedence and to move resolutions affecting their departments. But on this occasion, the breach between Dr. Rigg and the Methodist Connexion was so acute, that the meeting resolved by vote that it would not allow Dr. Rigg to move a resolution which he had prepared and it insisted that the first resolution to be submitted should be one prepared by Mr. Percy Bunting. (12)

The journal claimed that since 1891, the whole tendency of the documents issued from Westminster was to discourage the establishment of school boards and to gain increased the grants, from any source, to denominational schools, 'completely oblivious to the fact that while it would ease the career of a handful of Wesleyan Methodist schools, it would permanently establish and endow Anglican and Roman Catholic schools in every part of the country.'

Dr. Waller, Rigg's follower and companion, was elected as President of the Conference at Plymouth in 1895. Hughes obtained only forty seven votes, to his 190, showing that the majority of the Conference still favoured traditional policies, rather than the 'Forward' Movement. At the Conference a Memorial was presented by 980 Wesleyan teachers, calling for continued protection for their schools, and pointing out that when a Wesleyan school was closed, this was followed not by the creation of a board school, but by the extension of existing Anglican schools. (Rigg later suggested that 1,103 teachers had signed such Memorials to the Conference.) (13)

At the Conference, Rigg defended his position on the Royal Commission yet again. He claimed that he had brought forward again and again the call for the whole country to be divided into school board districts, and that Viscount Cross had refused to allow this as it would interfere with the passing of the Local Government Bill then going through Parliament. Archbishop Benson had introduced a Bill to increase aid to denominational schools, and Rigg denied that he supported it. He told the Conference that from the
beginning, he had told his friends that it was an impossible Bill. He called for a Special Committee to be called to reassert Methodist policy, but Hugh Price Hughes suggested that a reassertion by the full Conference would have more force. As a result, Hughes proposed, and Rigg seconded the following resolution:

1. That the principle objective of Methodist policy in the matter of elementary education should be the establishment of school boards everywhere, acting in districts of sufficient area, and the placing of a Christian, unsectarian school within reasonable distance of every family, especially in the rural districts.

2. That all modifications of the national policy in respect of elementary education should be made in view of the ultimate establishment of a complete national system of schools under adequate and representative public management.

3. That no national system of education which shall exclude from day-schools the Bible and religious instruction therefrom, by the teachers, suited to the capacities of the children, will meet the necessity of the country.(14)

There was much dispute over a fourth proposal which was made that 'so long as denominational schools form part of the national system of education, our Connexional day-schools and training colleges should be maintained in full vigour and efficiency.' This was not passed, and Hughes proposed to split the resolution, to read:

4. That our Connexional training colleges should be maintained in full vigour and efficiency.

5. That with respect to our Connexional day-schools, the Conference repeats its often declared sense of the great service they have rendered to Methodism and to the sacred cause of national Christian education, and it emphasises their special importance in those localities where it is impossible to establish school boards acting in districts of sufficient area and having under their control, Christian, unsectarian schools.

The final resolution was undoubtedly a climb down on the former blanket support for the Wesleyan schools. The METHODIST TIMES claimed that it was 'the utmost limit that the majority of the Conference would tolerate.' (15) The Editorial later wrote:

The resolutions do not go as far as they wished, but in matters of this kind, when there are grave differences of opinion, all parties, especially those who are in a minority' must be prepared to make concessions. The immense majority of our people are not prepared to assert that all our existing schools must be maintained under all circumstances and they would be strongly opposed to their maintenance wherever that had the practical effect of preventing the establishment of a board school. On the other hand, the friends of the board school system have no wish to close any of our schools, where they can be kept open without strengthening the hands of the clerical party and of the enemies of Evangelical Christianity.(16)
The Archbishop of Canterbury, Benson, invited Rigg to consult on the Education question in October 1895, but Dr. Rigg had to decline the offer. He wrote to Benson on 19 October describing the mood of the Wesleyan Conference and sent a copy of the Minutes of the Conference of 1895. He mentioned that a Special Committee would be constituted with authority, if it thought fit, to 'co-operate with the representatives of other Nonconformist churches.' But, he went on:

The Conference did not contemplate the possibility of co-operating with the Church of England. Personally I intimated my dissent from this resolution. But the general feeling of the Conference was too clearly in favour of it to admit of prolonged debate. The dominant feeling of the Conference was one of jealousy and distrust as to the influence of the day schools of the Church of England. I am sorry to say that a considerable proportion of our people - of ministers even, and still more of laymen - would gladly see all our day schools given up if, by such a sacrifice, the extinction of the schools of the Church of England could be secured. There is a considerable minority - a minority more considerable by reason of character than numbers - who see that such a result would inevitably bring after it... the complete secularisation of all public day schools and ...the destruction of our Church Training colleges. But this is not understood by a large proportion of our people. Ecclesiastical animosity blinds the mind, and ecclesiastical animosity lies at the bottom of this whole controversy. (17)

Rigg summed up the anti-Anglicanism of his Church:

The increasing intensity of alienation from the Church of England which has shown itself in the party politics and votes of the Methodists, finds vent also in antagonism to Anglican day schools ...For myself, much as I deplore sacerdotal excesses in doctrine and practice and parochial assumptions and exclusiveness, I should regard it as a grievous calamity if the day schools of the Church of England were destroyed. (18)

A Wesleyan Deputation was sent to Lord Salisbury in November 1895 of the President of Conference, Dr. Waller, Dr. Rigg, Hugh Price Hughes and Percy Bunting. The deputation was introduced by Sir Henry H. Fowler, who reminded Lord Salisbury that the Wesleyans throughout the country were two million strong, and that in Wesleyan Sunday schools there were approximately a million scholars. As their day-schools held less than 200,000 children there must be 800,000 children obliged to attend day-schools belonging to School boards or those of other denominations, which were in the main Church of England. He particularly introduced Dr. Rigg who 'will speak with an authority very few men can pretend to on this question, so far as the Wesleyan denomination is concerned.'
Dr. Waller pointed out that the Wesleyans had no intention of abandoning their schools and that the Conference was not demanding universal board schools, but for universal Boards and undenominational schools in every area. Their greatest grievance remained the temporary transfer of Anglican schools to boards for four hours a day, and 'in all such cases a rural board school is, to all intents and purposes, only a denominational school by another name and supported by the rates.' (20) Percy Bunting complained that their children in rural districts were compelled to go to a school of another denomination. (21) A second complaint, brought up by both Waller and Rigg, was that their children were not being allowed to become pupil-teachers in the elementary school that they attended, if this school belonged to the Church of England. They were being forced first to become members of the Church of England and thus the teaching profession was being barred against the 'conscientious Nonconformists...in thousands of parishes'. Finally the Wesleyans again called for the abolition of the 17s6d limit and especially for representative public management of schools. Hughes claimed:

> We have no objection to denominational schools as such, and if the catholic spirit in which our own schools have always been conducted had been universal, I think that most of the present difficulty would not exist at all. But, unhappily, as things are, we find ourselves in this painful position in many parts of the country, that our children are compelled by law to go to schools where much is taught to which their parents conscientiously object. (22)

He claimed that in many cases the Church of England had taken advantage of its monopoly of education to instil objectionable beliefs into the minds of children. He pointed out that their last resolution 'uses language of unusual strength for a conservative body like the Wesleyan Conference, but we were driven to it by the terrible proofs which came to us from many districts.' (23) This resolution had originally been formulated by Rigg in 1891 and complained that 'the experience of twenty years has shown that the Conscience Clause has to a considerable extent proved to be ineffectual and unreal as a protection for parents and children against religious intolerance and oppression... that in not a few day-schools of the Church of England religious intolerance and bigotry of an exceedingly offensive character are systematically taught during the hours set apart for religious instruction.' (24) He called for a 'common' Christianity to be taught in all schools, which 'the immense majority of Christian men of every communion believe, for the main historical and biographical facts of Christianity are held in common'.
He claimed that differences only arose with 'human explanations of those facts.' (25) Rigg spoke in favour of their own schools, saying that he believed that a majority of Wesleyans were with him and that 'whatever else we may be divided upon, we are wholly agreed that there ought not to be a secular system of education in the country.' (26):

if the Church of England School is what many Church of England Schools are, kindly, and tolerant, and liberal in spirit, there is no hardship there; but may I be allowed to say that there are fewer, in proportion, of that sort today than there were thirty years ago, that there has been an increasing insistence upon points of difference which touch the conscience, and that social influence has been increasingly used to force children into the profession of another faith than that to which they have been accustomed... we are grieving and complaining, our people are groaning under this hardship, our people are irritated by it. I grieve to say it. They are alienated from the Church of England, and if only something could be done towards remedying this evil a very great thing would be done for the future of England.(27)

Lord Salisbury said that he fully accepted their grievance but his only remedy in reply was to multiply the denominational schools. After hearing from an Anglican deputation in the previous week, he concluded that they would not accept that their religion could be 'cut into bits and a certain number of bits served up without the rest'. (28) A large number of Anglicans repudiated the idea that there was a 'common ground of religious education'. He also took offence at the Rigg resolution, saying that, if a man tried to teach what he believed, it should not be denounced as 'religious intolerance and bigotry'.(29) The METHODIST TIMES reported on the meeting that Salisbury was 'profoundly ignorant of...the magnitude of our grievances' and that he was 'preoccupied with the conviction that the friends of unsectarian education are the enemies of the Church of England.' (30)

The start of 1896 saw a renewed clash between Rigg and Hugh Price Hughes after the publication in E.S. Purcell's Life of Cardinal Manning of one of Rigg's private letters of 1888 to the Cardinal. In it he had criticised Hughes as a 'Methodist firebrand' and he had shown his support for rate-aid being given to voluntary schools. He had praised Manning's pamphlet, 'Fifty Reasons". The letter was in an obscure part of the second volume of the 'Life' but it had been found by the METHODIST TIMES and had been published in full on 13 February, along with an editorial condemnation under the title,
'The Self-Revelation of Dr. Rigg'. They claimed that they were revealing the letter, because Dr. Rigg was still an 'active and potent force'. He was the 'most influential of our ex-Presidents' and still the head of the Education Department. On the issue of Rate Aid to school, the article claimed that every Methodist Synod had repudiated the proposal but 'the responsible head of our Methodist Education Department was eager to co-operate with Cardinal Manning in distributing a tract, which advocated a policy diametrically opposed to the wishes of the Methodist people.' Rigg's letter had claimed that the Gladstonianism in their Church meant 'almost anything that is unscrupulous, latitudinarian and secularist' yet the METHODIST TIMES pointed out that three quarters of all the influential Methodist laymen were Gladstonians. The article went on:

at that particular time, when the Educational controversy was raging, we stated again and again that Dr. Rigg was acting with Cardinal Manning... Dr. Rigg in language quite as personal and quite as strong as is found in the letter before us, publicly denounced us in committee meetings and in the Conference for daring to say anything of the sort. We have no doubt that a number of simple-minded Methodist preachers and laymen felt very indignant with us for asserting that (he) was acting energetically and enthusiastically with the representatives of the Pope. But now Dr. Rigg himself is found to have stated with his own hand to Cardinal Manning that the 'goal' which he wished to reach was Cardinal Manning's 'goal'...

The editorial concluded that they doubted whether English, Scottish, Irish and Welsh Methodists would join Rigg in thanking God that he was 'one with an Ultramontane Cardinal on the subject of Christian National education':

We ourselves have always expressed a high sense of Cardinal Manning's personal devotion to the cause of the poor... But with all our regard for (his) good qualities, we have never forgotten that he was a fanatical Ultramontane, the intimate personal friend of Pius IX and at the Vatican Council, a most determined and frantic advocate of the personal infallibility of the Pope. Yet this is the man of all others whom Dr. Rigg, the head of the Methodist Education Department, effectively accepts as his guide, philosopher and friend; and whom he addresses in language of eulogy and devotion as extravagant as that he employs on the other side to traduce those prominent members of his own Church who refuse to be tied to the chariot wheels of Cardinal Manning. All this we should be quite ready to bury and forget if it had referred simply to the dead past. But unfortunately the educational controversy is revived in full force. The present Government will make a determined effort to endow the clerical schools out of public funds... It is true that last autumn Dr. Rigg acquiesced in the Plymouth programme... but there is no evidence that he has altered his views... (31)
known character as a man of honour', who had always demanded public representation in the management of rate-aided schools, who had stoutly defended Methodist interests. Nonetheless, Sir Frederick Howard felt compelled to resign as Treasurer of the Wesleyan Education Fund, writing to the President that he could not 'forbear to condemn the impropriety of the Head of the Education Department betraying alike the interests and wishes of the Methodist people.' (32)

During the furore, Rigg received many private letters of support. One wrote:

In reading the article... I was forced ... to the conclusion that the writer was glad of an opportunity, however flimsy of casting unworthy imputations at one who he has the misfortune to differ with him... the love and reverence for yourself and work is too deeply seated in the heart of Methodism to be affected by the spite of one man, no matter how highly placed or clever he may be...This new apostle for the regeneration of modern society would apparently have us form friendships solely among those whose views religiously and politically are in harmony, but I fear such a course would make many of us more angular than we now are... (33)

The Rev. J. G. Osborn wrote that he had kept out of the question but believed that the only way to secure religious teaching was to accept the Roman Catholic position. (34) The Rev. E. E. Jenkins wrote that he had known Rigg to be completely consistent in his views for many years, and there had never been a change. The Liberal M. P., H. H. Fowler wrote to Rigg that he had once had a 'long private educational conversation with the Cardinal' which he would not want to be published. (35)

Rigg also defended himself in the Press. He wrote to the TIMES that the letter published in the Life of Cardinal Manning by Purcell was:

one of a sacredly personal and private character, one which ought never to have been published, and to publish which without obtaining or even asking the writer's permission was no less than an outrage. The letter contains moreover, personal reflection on gentlemen from whose political opinions and proceedings I have often gravely dissented, but with whom I have not been personally unfriendly. (36)

Two days later (17 February 1896) he wrote to the TIMES that his 1889 Inaugural and his book of 1873 had both suggested that voluntary schools ought to have assistance from the rates 'to a limited extent' and that on the committees of rate-aided schools there ought to be a 'local public representation'. (37) He also maintained that all voluntary schools should be correlated to school boards. Rigg also wrote a large article in his own defence in the METHODIST RECORDER on 27 February 1896. In it he claimed that
unfounded slanders had been laid against his personal integrity. He had been accused of surrendering himself to the 'influence and guidance of a Roman Catholic Prelate' and to have therefore been untrue to the 'principles of Protestant Nonconformists and especially of my Church'. He had also been accused of attacking the Methodist followers of Gladstone. He commented:

The Cardinal and myself were near neighbours at Westminster for twenty years. During all that period his reputation as a ... 'democratic' philanthropist was increasing and in Westminster itself, his influence was extensive. (Even the METHODIST TIMES had praised his philanthropic work). I myself from 1870 to 1876 was one of the members for Westminster of the London School Board and the Cardinal was one of my constituents. He called on me at the College twice. I did not return his call and he called no more. But after a considerable time had elapsed he wrote to beg that I would call on him. I could not refuse, but I took care, as early as possible in our interview, to intimate in the most distinct manner how radically opposed I was to him on the subject of Church principles. His answer was that it was just there that he expected me to take my stand. After that we never were in danger of misunderstanding each other. We recognised the secular and non-Christian spirit as the enemy we had to fight in common. (38)

He recalled that on the Royal Commission they were agreed in their opposition to secularism and that they both defended the school board system. They also saw the need for 'additional help for denominational schools, especially as to the teaching of certain extra subjects'. They desired 'special or additional aid to denominational schools to be provided to a strictly limited extent from the Rates, but always as accompanied by proper guards and guarantees as to their expenditure and by public audit and inspection on the part of the local Rating Authority.' They also wanted this body to have control of the curriculum, the discipline and the sanitary conditions of the schools, which the Church of England would not accept. On his criticism of Hughes, he wrote:

In this private letter, I spoke of Mr. Hughes as our Methodist 'firebrand'. Mr. Hughes has often written private letters on political subjects. If those confidential letters were published, it is certain that I should be able to find in them very pungent epithets applied to his more conservative brethren and at times to me in particular. Mr. Hughes has stirred up agitation and kindled flame after flame in our Church for many years past. At the time when I wrote this note, he had for years been writing in the strongest way against myself, now on one ground, and then on another, but chiefly on the subject of education. He had sometimes ... varied his attacks by pronouncing a eulogy. That was when it was my fortune to agree with Mr. Hughes. (39)

He mentioned the clash over Indian missionaries at this time, which had spilled over into the Conference of 1890, and had resulted in the censure of Hugh Price Hughes. Rigg
concluded:

I am exceedingly sorry to have been compelled to write all this. I have tried hard for years past to maintain friendly personal relations with Mr. Hughes himself; perhaps indeed I have gone too far in that respect. At my time of life I would fain live at peace with all men, even with my enemies, though I hope they are not very many ... The atrocity of his attack has made it necessary for me to speak the truth plainly in reply.

After a letter critical of him in the METHODIST TIMES of 13 March 1896, Rigg replied in the newspaper on the following day:

My 'policy', if it is to be so called, disclosed in my letter to the Cardinal, was one approving of limited grants in aid from the rates to denominational schools on condition of due representation on the managing committees of the local rating authorities. That principle has never been condemned by the Wesleyan Conference, but on the contrary, has been approved... The principle is in fact in harmony with the resolutions adopted by the conference on several occasions during the last ten years. (40)

As the heat subsided over the letter, Sir John Gorst published his Bill to reform education. This proposed to offer a grant of 4s. per head for children in voluntary schools, to abolish the 17s6d limit, to raise the age of compulsory attendance to twelve, to exempt voluntary schools from the payment of rates on their property and to create an Education Authority. It also suggested that provision should be made for giving 'such definitive religious instruction as a reasonable number of parents desired'. The METHODIST TIMES condemned the Bill as 'the most deadly attack in modern English history upon Protestantism in general and Methodism in particular'. (41) They saw the proposed abolition of the 17s6d limit as placing 'the whole cost of sectarian education' onto the State. The journal claimed that the proposal to abolish school boards and leave education to County Councils would place schools 'in the hands of men who hate dissent, dread the education of the poor and desire above all things to keep down the Rates'.

We asked that there should be no increased grant without 'adequate and representative public management'. We are mocked and insulted by the offer of indirect, obscurantist County control together with a fatal weakening of the authority of the Education Department in London... This Bill showers gold, favour, everything man could desire on Mr. Riley, Cardinal Vaughan and all the clerical host. For the rest of us it has nothing except discouragement, disability and implacable ill will. (42)
They repeated the old Wesleyan complaint that the law prevented the provision of 'an adequate supply of board schools, where there happen to be clerical schools as well', with the result that tens of thousands of Methodists, Baptists and Congregationalists were driven by the law of compulsion into Anglican and Roman Catholic schools, even in school board districts. They welcomed the plan to sweep away the smallest board schools, and commented that Dr. Rigg had rendered 'excellent service by the persistence with which he has dwelt upon the objections to purely parochial school boards.' (43)

When a Special Education Committee met on 22 April 1896, the President, Dr. Waller, outlined the greatest objection to the Gorst Bill to be over Article 27, which specified that if a 'reasonable' number of parents demanded denominational instruction in a board school, or indeed non-denominational instruction in a voluntary school where such was not provided, the L.E.A. would have to arrange for such teaching if it were 'practicable'. He pointed out that this was contrary to the spirit of their own third Resolution at the Plymouth Conference, that religious instruction should be given by the teacher, and suited to the capacities of the children. Instruction by individual vicars would have to be done in groupings of all children from Standard I to VII and could not be suited to their capacities. Their own ministers were not numerous enough to give instruction to over 10,000 National schools in rural areas, where they saw the greatest grievance.

If this is intended to relieve the religious difficulty of the Nonconformists, it will entirely fail to do so...Whilst the Bill offers what the Nonconformists could not possibly avail themselves of, the clergy of the Church of England and the Roman Catholic priests will not be slow to enter board schools and thus the unsectarian character of these schools will be completely broken down. (44)

He also condemned the Bill for failing to end the injustice felt by Wesleyans that the teaching profession was barred to them in thousands of parishes, where they were prevented from becoming a pupil-teacher unless they became members of the Church of England by confirmation. The Wesleyan Schools themselves had not debarred any children of other denominations.

Two sets of Resolutions were proposed at the meeting by Rigg and by Hughes. By a vote of 65 to 48, it was agreed to hear Hughes' first - an initial defeat for Dr. Rigg, which was a clear sign of the mood of the Committee. Hughes' resolutions were markedly more
critical of the Bill in tone than Dr. Rigg's. His first stated that the Bill was 'directly opposed to what the Conference declared to be the primary objective of Methodist policy'.

Dr. Rigg's preamble read that they recognised that the time had come for 'decentralisation to our National Education' but 'is of opinion that the measure now proposed... is, in various respects, faulty in its application of this principle and at the same time is defective in respect of the provision which ought to be made to meet the just and reasonable requirements of those Christian churches which are separate from the Church of England...'. In his speech, Rigg called for a moderate and conciliatory tone.

He claimed it would be a grave mistake for them to use 'very strong words';

It was better to use strong reasons. Although the Bill had its faults, speaking broadly he believed in the bona fides of the Bill. It was conceived and intended in good faith. He knew a little of past history and how much of honesty and gentlemanliness there was on both sides. He did not believe in either side condemning the other. It was a mistake of inexperience.

The latter snipe at Hughes was greeted with laughter, and he then called for amendments in the Bill, but he feared they would be disregarded:

The Government might say 'What is the use of looking to them. They give no credit for good faith whatever'. They would not get (what they wanted for pupil-teachers) simply by railing at this Bill.

In the vote however, Rigg's resolution was rejected, although the Committee resolved by 71 votes to 19 that Hughes' resolution should be accepted with the Rigg amendment that the Bill 'failed to accomplish' what the Plymouth Conference had called for. (45)

Rigg's defence of the proposal to give County Councils the right to appoint an L.E.A. was also defeated by Hughes, who passed a resolution that they were 'unsuitable bodies to direct and control Elementary education' and that L.E.A.s should be elected ad hoc, directly by the people.

On the objectionable Clause 27, Hughes's resolution ran:

This Committee regards Clause 27 as highly objectionable. It is unjust to the teacher, who is the proper person to give religious instruction. It is also contrary to the wishes of the parents... The Committee therefore strongly hopes that there will be no tampering with the Cowper-Temple Clause.

Rigg's motion was again the more moderate:

The attempt, however well intended it may be, is in the judgement of this Committee, unworkable when regarded in one aspect and injurious in another. The provision which is proposed in order to relieve the religious difficulty of Nonconformists in regard to the attendance of their children at denominational schools and especially schools of the Church of England, is
one of which Nonconformists generally will be entirely unable to avail themselves, especially where that difficulty is most keenly felt - i.e. in the villages of the country; while the counterpart provision, which will allow the clergy of the Established Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church to give instruction in religion on the premises of board schools is one which the meeting regards as contrary to the original principles of the Bill of 1870, offensive to the religious feelings of the majority of the Nation and likely to increase the area of sectarian strife so fatal to the interests of education. It also tends to withdraw from the teacher the religious instruction of large numbers of children and to place it in unskilled hands to the injury of both teachers and children. (46)

The Rigg proposal was in fact accepted, although the words 'however well intended it may be' were expunged. He also had a call accepted, for all denominational schools to be open to Wesleyan pupil-teachers.

At present the children of Nonconformists are subject to great hardship and injustice by being prevented, in many localities from entering the pathway to the teaching profession on any other condition but that of joining another Church and becoming alienated from the religious principles and worship of their parents. The Committee is therefore of opinion that in places where the only school in receipt of public money is a denominational school, no denominational test ought to be imposed, especially in the case of pupil-teachers and assistant teachers. (47)

Rigg's final resolutions approved the raising of the leaving age to twelve and repeated the Wesleyan call for representative management on all schools receiving a grant, of at least two appointees of the L.E.A. In a further attack on the impositions on teachers in Anglican schools, Hughes got the Committee to demand that all teachers should have a right of appeal against unfair dismissal and the imposition of compulsory service outside the school duties. Hughes had dominated the proceedings and at the following session, on 23 April, Rigg did not speak at all. The METHODIST TIMES gloated that Hughes had accepted some of the 'verbiage' of Rigg's resolutions, but whenever the resolutions of Dr. Rigg differed from those advocated by Hughes they were rejected. (48). The Wesleyans had arrayed themselves alongside the great body of Nonconformist opposition and the Government was forced to withdraw the Bill after its second reading. (49)

In 1897 the Government introduced a Bill specifically for the relief of Voluntary schools, with the former objectionable clauses removed. The Voluntary Schools Act brought great benefits to the Wesleyan schools. It introduced an Aid grant of upto 5 shillings per
scholar, to be distributed by 'associations of schools'. The Education Department reserved the right to audit the accounts of schools in receipt of this. The Act finally abolished the 17s6d limit and it also exempted all land or buildings used for schools from the local rate. Six Wesleyan Associations, comprising every Wesleyan school, were constituted immediately thanks to Dr. Waller and were among the first in the country to be recognised by the Department. (Dr. Rigg was no longer signing the official communications of the Department, but remained its nominal head with Waller as the Secretary). The Act fixed different rates for town and country schools, at 5s9d and 3s.3d respectively, but three quarters of the Wesleyan schools were town schools and they thus gained enormously from the classification. As a result, their share of the total Aid Grant was over £35,000. The repeal of the 17s6d limit brought them a further £2,000 and the exemption from rates saved a similar amount. (50) The total income of all Wesleyan schools at this time amounted to £245,593 (51) and the additional income would be a great addition to this. The Wesleyan Education Report claimed that it had relieved the financial strain and had given the movement an impetus. (52) In the following year not a single Wesleyan school in England had either been closed or transferred, although some managers were using the increased grants to abolish all their fees. The secretary, Waller, wrote to all Wesleyan schools to dissuade this. He pointed out that they had received more than £30,000 in fees, whereas the total Aid grant was a little over £35,000, so that if all the Wesleyan schools became free they would practically be in the same financial condition as they were before the Act came into operation. (53) Numbers of schools did stabilise temporarily, although they began to decline once more in 1900.

In 1897, Hughes was defeated again for the Presidency, by the Rev. W. Watkinson, by a massive vote of 427 to 160. There was an outburst of clapping and cheering at the vote - and one onlooker reported that even 'the venerable Dr. Rigg, whose devotion to order and decorum is unrivalled so far forgot himself, or was carried away by his feelings, that he joined for a few seconds in the clapping'. (54) In the following year, Hughes was finally elected. His first address to the Conference continued his, and the Wesleyan attack on the Romanised Church of England:

I say here deliberately - every Roman doctrine, without exception, is today taught in Anglican pulpits and symbolised in Anglican worship. There can
be nothing more futile than the attempt of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, to minimise and explain away the facts, ominous and sinister beyond expression ... It is no use to use language of violent abuse. These Roman conspirators are men of blameless life and thorough sincerity; but having accepted the Jesuit ethos, which Pascal exposed, their conception of truth and honour, and straightforwardness, and frankness, and duty, differ toto coelo, from those of ordinary Englishmen. (55)

However, he and Rigg did co-operate and the old man wrote to his daughter on the following day from the Hull Conference, with magnanimity, that he was 'on the whole a very good President'. (56) The two co-operated in 1899 over a constitutional change in Conference (to have the Representative Session first).

The next major educational clash between them, their last, came over the 1902 Education Bill. It was introduced into the Commons on 24 March 1902 by Balfour. For the first time control of education was to be invested in popularly elected bodies, with one third of school managers to be appointed by the new L.E.A.s, and in exchange, denominational schools would be given rate aid. (Balfour also stressed the rights of parents to have schools of their choice, and thus the right to specific denominational teaching as well as undenominational.) He declared that the idea of voluntary schools being swept away was 'absurd'. The Bill was welcomed by the Catholics and most Anglicans, as it allowed their schools to compete on equal terms with 'council' schools for the first time. Nonconformists however were outraged, seeing a new 'church rate' which would support denominational schools with an additional £2,400,000. The Wesleyans were the only Nonconformist church which was divided on the issue. Rigg was seriously ill in the first few months of 1902 and Dr. Waller became the leader of the Wesleyan 'denominationalists'. He welcomed the Bill as a great help to their schools, although it needed some amendment. Hughes wanted to stand wholeheartedly with other Nonconformist churches. The struggle between the two sides began immediately on the publication of the Bill and continued throughout the summer and autumn.

In mid-March, even before its introduction, Waller spoke at a London meeting, referring to the beneficial effects of the 1897 Voluntary Schools Act, which had brought the Wesleyan schools an extra £36,000 p.a. and without which they would have been in desperate straits. However their costs were continually rising and the Government now
required their schools to spend an extra £50,000 p.a. on equipment. A new source of income was therefore urgently needed and, he said, 'if we are to get the money, we shall have to get it from the rates.' He could not see why children in denominational schools should have less money spent on them than board school children and there should be full financial equality between the two systems, subject to adequate public control. (57) He claimed that the Wesleyans themselves could not do much more financially to support their schools. On religious instruction he did not accept that any minister of any Church should be 'paid a penny' for any religious instruction he might give... 'Let those give it who were most qualified - the teachers'. The Rev. Dr. T. B. Stephenson praised the efficiency of Wesleyan schools, their lack of intolerance and their record in building Christian lives. The Rev. A. E. Sharpley told the meeting that they were a valuable addition to Methodism's spiritual power. The METHODIST RECORDER's editorial concurred that it had no objection to rate aid, provided there was public control. When the Bill appeared two weeks later the METHODIST RECORDER welcomed the establishment of L.E.A.s and did not condemn the demise of school boards. It believed that the degree of public control was sufficient and approved of the possibility of the foundation of new Wesleyan schools where the parents requested them. Almost the only defect identified in the Bill was that it did not require the presence of women on the new L.E.A.s. (58) The RECORDER did report the W.E.C. claim that 'the Wesleyan schools are again suffering from an intolerable strain as great and in many cases greater than that which existed before the passing of the 1897 Act.' (59) It called again for 'adequate and representative public management'. They saw a third of popularly elected managers as an inadequate number. They also welcomed the Clause which provided that denominational or undenominational schools might be opened where it was desired by parents. There could therefore be an expansion of Wesleyan schools - about 8000 localities where there was no choice Wesleyans could now appeal for one of their choice.

Hughes had been seriously ill himself at the start of the year, but he drew up battle lines at the Free Church Council, which met in London on 15 April. He claimed that the new L.E.A.s would not 'so jealously guard the public interest or promote so efficiently public education, as boards specially elected'. (60) He also asserted that it was absolutely
intolerable to make Nonconformists 'further support schools in which their children were taught to despise the faith of their fathers'.

In April a special education committee, appointed by the 1901 Wesleyan Conference met in Wesley's Chapel. The W.E.C. was not represented on the ad hoc committee, which consisted of members of two other Standing Committees, and one Minister and one laymen from each district synod. Rigg was too ill to attend the meeting, although he sent a letter which was read to the Committee calling for 'reasonableness in their decisions' and warning against decisions which might lead to 'absolute secularism' which ignored religious teaching altogether. (61) Waller moved three resolutions approving the Bill with certain modifications. He was concerned that there should be adequate public representation, that the 'permissive clause should be removed from the Bill and that pupil-teachers should be allowed into any denominational school, if no undenominational school was present in an area.(62)

Hughes proposed three resolutions condemning the Bill outright. He referred to the fact the primary objective of Wesleyan Education policy, as reaffirmed repeatedly by Conference, was the establishment of universal school boards and therefore it would be absurd to consult the pecuniary interests of a few schools and forget the immense majority. (63) He could not accept any increase in grants to denominational schools without public control of management bodies. He also quoted the Conference decision of the previous year that it strongly disapproved of any policy 'which would tend to weaken the direct popular control of Primary Education or imperil the work of the school boards... and deeply regrets that recent Governments have taken no steps to carry out the primary objective of Methodist policy.' The seventh Clause of the Bill caused most friction. This provided for only one third of the managers of every school to be chosen by the L.E.A. Hughes demanded a majority of publicly nominated managers and claimed that the proposal 'added insult to injury... in a hostile Committee of Management which in many parts of the country had been engaged in persecuting Methodists'.(64) The Government had rejected public control, as it would have destroyed the denominational character of the schools. At the Special Committee, the ex-President, Dr.T.Allen claimed:

They had been considering Elementary Education simply and thinking about the parson in the village and the oppressed child. He was prepared to
claim anywhere fair play as against the proselytising tendencies of the Anglican Church, but they could not determine their education policy in regard to the whole nation by any single factor. There were multitudes of people who seemed always to be fixing their eyes on 'one red-hot spot' but he submitted that they must take wider views.

He therefore called for modification of the Bill rather than its complete rejection. Hughes responded that there was a bellicose minority who said, 'Once we get this Bill, we will crush the Methodists in the villages'.

Nobody wished to give up their schools and colleges... but of the 160,000 children in their schools, only about a third were Methodist children... The Government had consulted the Roman Catholics and Anglicans but had not come to the Nonconformists ... they were now fighting for their life and they must destroy a measure founded on ill-will to the Methodists and to Protestants generally... (65)

The Chairman finally accepted Hughes' resolution as the substantive motion and Waller's an amendment. Waller was defeated by forty four votes to twenty two and Hughes' motion of uncompromising hostility was approved by forty nine to twenty three.

The METHODIST TIMES hailed the decision, declaring that Wesleyans now stood, and were seen to stand, shoulder to shoulder with other Nonconformists in the struggle for religious freedom and social justice. The paper alleged that there were 9,000 parishes in which the only school was Anglican and where no Nonconformist could be employed as a teacher or even become a pupil-teacher. Nonconformist children were under constant pressure to renounce their faith and Wesleyans should not allow further subsidising of such institutions, which were already receiving 77% of their funds from the taxpayer. (66) Almost all the annual May synods passed resolutions condemning the Education Bill, many simply endorsing the resolution of the special Education Committee after little debate, but with large majorities. Even in the Second London District, which Dr. Rigg had dominated for twenty years as Chairman until his retirement in 1896, the Bill was condemned. There had been a great clash here as Rigg and Waller confronted Hughes, and the vote had been comparatively close (eighty five votes to sixty four) but Rigg still lost the issue. (67) The METHODIST TIMES exulted:

Never has Wesleyan Methodism pronounced more decisively against any Bill ... In vain has it been attempted to divert us from our loyalty to justice and righteousness by the offer of a pitiful bribe to our own handful of
schools ...(Dr. Waller) is out of touch and out of sympathy with the great majority of those he is supposed to represent. (68)

The METHODIST RECORDER sadly acknowledges its opponents' victories and regretted the lost opportunities to influence events. It had preferred to urge amendments upon the Government, but 'stonewall opposition tactics preclude amendments'. (69)

Dr. Thomas Allen, the ex-President, wrote to the METHODIST RECORDER on 5 June:

While the discussion which is now proceeding will serve the cause of Education, it will, I fear, damage the cause of religion. The fanatical extremists on both sides are doing their best to degrade National Education to a miserable quarrel between Church and Chapel... Many cases of abuse do occur; I merely say that my experience suggests that the evil is magnified for party purposes. But the ecclesiastical bigotry which is displayed on one side and the ecclesiastical narrowness and bitterness which are displayed on the other, are producing deep disgust in M.P.s, in teachers of all grades, in Educational experts and in millions of parents. (70)

Scott-Lidgett wrote to the METHODIST TIMES and the METHODIST RECORDER in June that the difference between the two sides were so great that 'detailed arguments are not helpful' (71). The hostility towards the Church of England was instrumental in the views of the Hughes' party. As the METHODIST TIMES declared in its editorial of 14 August:

Fifty years ago we claimed to be Nonconformists, not Dissenters. We are now rapidly taking our place with other Free Churches. We inherited from John Wesley a special kindly feeling towards the Church of England, but long-continued intolerance and the petty persecuting spirit of Anglicans have at last destroyed that sentiment. (72)

The same journal commented:

Clericalism, the caricature of Christianity, is now as it ever has been, the deadly enemy of civil and religious freedom. We are bound therefore to offer unending opposition to Mr. Balfour's proposals... The revival of Romanism inside the Church of England has given the clerical party one more, and probably its last, opportunity. (73)

The Church of England which had formerly been 'good tempered and genial, as well as somewhat indolent and careless' had become 'earnest and devout like the Spanish Inquisition'. According to R.W.Perks, M.P. the Anglican clergy had ceased to be Protestant, though they were educating a million Nonconformist children in their schools with an 'intolerable tyranny'. (74) However, the 'denominational' party rejected this attack on the Church of England. A 'senior minister' wrote:

It is only fair to recognise ... the immense services rendered to village education by the (Anglican) clergy; it is unfair to assume that they have
Another minister said that he had laboured in three circuits, containing 56 villages and with only six or eight exceptions at the most, the Anglican vicars had been 'fair-minded Christian men' who respected the consciences of Nonconformists. (76)

At the end of July the Wesleyan Conference convened at Manchester. Dr. Rigg did not attend the educational session, through ill-health. Hughes, himself a sick man, moved a resolution on education which surprised everyone by its moderation. His manner was conciliatory and while he regretted the destruction of school boards and demanded at least 50% public representation in management boards, he denied any desire to abolish sectarian schools:

The Conference does not wish to abolish denominational schools or prevent them being used with equitable restrictions for the purpose of giving denominational instruction to those children whose parents desire it; but the Conference expresses once more its deep conviction that no increased grant from public funds should be made to denominational schools unless...accompanied by adequate and representative management. (77)

He called for at least a majority of publicly elected persons on the L.E.A. and of the governing committee of every school, if they were 'to be almost wholly maintained'.

Hughes commented:

The views of Wesleyan Methodism have been misrepresented to the Government in various ways... and Mr. Balfour was under the gross delusion that the Methodist Church was widely divided in opinion on this subject. He seemed never to have heard of the decision of the Synods. (78)

He admitted that Balfour had made some concessions, and Hughes said he was for the unity of Methodism:

He was staggered that anyone should hesitate to support this resolution, except some of his friends, who might think he was becoming weak-kneed on this question. At Plymouth, when Dr. Waller was in the chair, he (Hughes) entered into a concordat with Dr. Rigg that had given the Church peace for some years, a peace which would have continued if it had not been disturbed by Her Majesty's Government. He had been led to make some concessions and in the same spirit he held out the olive branch that afternoon.

R.W. Perks seconded and expressed some surprise at Hughes's conciliatory tone, as did Dr. Waller. Waller proposed an amendment that the Bill was the most substantial educational advance proposed by any Government and urged its acceptance, subject to greater public participation in management and provision for Nonconformists to teach in
all elementary schools. Hughes's supporters were as vicious as ever towards Waller. He was denounced for the deviant policies of the W.E.C. Mr. Tudor Walters said that church officials should either follow Connexion policy or resign. When the vote was taken, Waller was decisively defeated by 471 to sixty six and Hughes's motion was carried by 454 to sixty eight votes. (79) The Wesleyan Connexion was therefore formally committed against the Government's Education Bill.

Rigg's 81 years had begun to take their toll on him. At the Conference, he wrote to his daughter that he felt very tired and that he could only attend about half the day. (80) Hughes fell seriously ill again in September and his death on 17 November, at the age of fifty five, abruptly muted controversy among Wesleyans. The Education Bill became law in December in an atmosphere of unusual calm in the Wesleyan Connexion.

Rigg made his final speech on the issue at a special conference in February 1903. He objected to the Conference criticism of the new Act as causing 'grave dissatisfaction', and he pointed out that Wesleyans might now be assistant teachers or pupil teachers in schools from which they had formerly been excluded. It prevented the clergyman from having 'a monopoly of direction in schools.' as it placed the management into the hands of laymen, some of whom would be Nonconformists. Rigg asked 'Was that no advance?':

Virtually the Methodist policy was winning. They had never said there was to be a school board in every village. They knew that a board in every village would be the mere instrument of the clergy. It was to be within a district sufficiently large. It had been found impracticable to make districts sufficiently large for school boards and in the new Educational Boards, although not called school boards or elected ad hoc, they had the substance of what they had been contending for to a very large extent. He objected to no notice being taken of these things - and to no recognition being made to the attempt to meet their needs (81)

The special committee nevertheless passed a resolution that the Act deliberately contravened the main principles of Wesleyan policy, and could not regard it 'as a remedy for the serious grievances which the Wesleyan Methodists suffer in common with other Nonconformists.' The Committee advised the Methodist people to continue to use 'every legitimate means to secure an early amendment of the Act.' The issue of a rate-strike remained to be decided for Nonconformists in general, although the Committee expressed some sympathy for those who had undertaken to act in this way. Dr. Rigg and other conservative Wesleyans continued to support the 1902 Act. He wrote to Balfour in
September 1904:

as regards the tangled education question, which as things now are, is
unsusceptible of a complete or consistent solution, may you continue deaf
to the outcries of intensely sectarian, anti-sectarian blind-eyed zealots who
would land us in a blind, atheistic chaos (82)
CONCLUSION
9. What manner of man was James Harrison Rigg?

At the end of 1902, Dr. Rigg retired as Principal of Westminster Training College, at the age of 81 years old. Rigg was to spend seven more years in retirement, until he died in 1909. He had struggled for many years against the anti-Anglican stance in his Church in the field of education. This anti-Anglicanism - the legacy of the Oxford Movement, Ritualism and Romanism in the Church of England - was still strong in 1902 and was one of the motivations, for most Methodists, in their desire for universal State schools. Rigg had however seen the greatest danger to the children of England and of Methodism in particular, to be the secularisation of education. He still felt in 1909 that denominational schools were the best guarantee of religious instruction in schools. Most of his fellow Wesleyans took it for granted that State schools would teach the Christian religion, and saw no need for the supposed encouragement so to do, which came from denominational education, which they castigated as 'sectarian', or even 'ritualistic'.

He maintained an active interest in the educational question during his retirement and occasionally wrote to the Press, although, as he emphasised in a letter to the SPECTATOR in 1906, he had no longer any right to speak on behalf of the Wesleyan Church. (1) In 1906 he wrote to the TIMES that he still believed that Bible teaching should be part of the curriculum of all primary schools. (2) In the same year he again supported the notion that Training Colleges had to have their work and training based on the Christian faith, and that 'no mere scholarship or cleverness will enable our national teachers to train the children into a truly Christian nation'. (3) He maintained his long held belief that the teacher must be 'true hearted... sincere and settled Christian, neither bigoted nor wavering, neither sectarian nor half-hearted' and although he recognised this as an ideal, he claimed that he had known thousands of such teachers. His last letter to the TIMES, in January 1907, defended the Cowper-Temple Clause, which, in his view, had rescued the boards from 'the ragings of the secular flood' which he still regarded as perilous to the Christian faith. (4) One of his final letters was addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Davison, in May 1907, complaining of a Bishop who had permitted a 'confessional' to be enforced on children by parish clergy:

I know you will give me credit for having done my best to prevent my own Church from ranging itself definitely and conclusively on the side of
Disestablishment, and as antagonist to the National Church... I have taken this part not a little to my own inconvenience. I have been much calumniated and maligned in consequence. But all Methodism, and all Nonconformists, regard me as being, though a resolute antagonist of Oxford High Anglicanism, a steadfast friend of the Church of England...(5)

The Archbishop promised to take some action on the matter and replied that he had valued Rigg's friendship for many years and believed he had always looked at controversial questions fairly:

I should be sorry indeed if you were to change in any way the attitude whereby you have for so many years given support to religious life in England in the best possible way.(6)

Short, stocky and pugnacious, Rigg's somewhat rough manner had caused many to compare him to Dr. Johnson. After his death, his daughter, Caroline recalled his strong will, and that he was 'not a little autocratic, very quick tempered and with strong dislike to opposition, he was not always easy to get on with.' (7) Yet she also recalled his love of children, and his 'sympathy for their small troubles', his 'tenderness, thoughtfulness and care for those dependent upon him in any way'. (8) She recognised that he was too afraid of change, and 'attached exaggerated importance to matters which... were not of crucial moment - perhaps even deemed himself and his own intervention more necessary to the well-being of the Church than was the case.' (9) He had been capable of fundamental change in his opinions, as was shown by the Sandwich compromise on lay representation at the Conference and in his proposal for the 'great legislative change' in 1894. His views of denominational education never altered.

The Rev. John Simon wrote in the WESLEYAN METHODIST MAGAZINE of his committee style:

He turned a subject round ... and seemed discontented until he had shown us all its facets...He had a marked power of lifting a discussion out of the commonplace onto a high plane of thought ... by the necessity that was laid upon him to search for principles. He was not content until he had found them. Discovering them he expounded them, enforced them; he made a trivial or tedious topic important by showing that wrong action on our part might jeopardize the supreme interests of Methodism. 'All roads lead to Rome'; and with Dr. Rigg everything led to Methodism ... Those who watched Dr. Rigg's committee methods were also struck with his mental adroitness. He had strong convictions and often expressed them vehemently. Adversaries were toppled over by the vigour of his charge, the discussion proceeded and the table was encumbered with resolutions ...Meanwhile, he ruminated with closed eyes. Then he took up a piece of
paper and began to write carefully on it. Rising again, he read out a new resolution that reconciled all parties. Stubborn as he appeared to be, he was a great pragmatist. (10)

His opponents saw his style in a different way. The LITERARY CHRISTIAN wrote:

Dr. Rigg is evidently a practised controversialist and knows that when he has a bad case, the best course is to raise some other issue and then, under cover of the dust raised in its discussion, to escape from closing on the main point of the discussion. (11)

Nevertheless, his intellectual power was recognised. Hugh Price Hughes' daughter, Dorothy, wrote in 1904 that 'to listen to Dr. Rigg and my father as they debated ... was...an 'intellectual pleasure.' (12) and Hughes himself, in private to a member of his family said:

There is one Minister in Conference who knows the exact importance of all that is passing and wither each proposition and detail is tending. That man is Dr. Rigg. He misses nothing. (13)

He wrote on Dr. Rigg's 80th birthday in 1901:

God has given us a succession of three very eminent men - Dr. Bunting, Dr. Osborn and Dr. Rigg - who during the last century preserved the continuity and distinctive features of Wesleyan Methodism. Some of us have tried, in successive generations, to induce these three great, ecclesiastical leaders to move a little faster with the times. But I, at any rate fully realize the necessity for these conservative influences, which have brought it to pass that desirable reforms are now being effected with practical unanimity and general goodwill. (14)

The METHODIST TIMES, so long his critic, wrote of him:

Even those who differed from him most widely on ecclesiastical and public questions recognised to the full his wonderful grasp and ability, his courage and his sense of duty, and the kindness of heart which lay behind what can only be called his pugnacity ... He never dealt with any question without illuminating it, and except in the height of controversy, his openness and detachment of mind made it impossible to attribute to him narrowness or illiberality of spirit. (15)

His old friend, Dr. Waller wrote that those who only saw him at Conference, or chairing meetings did not truly know him:

Those only who were brought into close relationship with him, and especially those who had the privilege of joining him in Christian fellowship, knew the tenderness of his affection and the depths of his loving heart, which sometimes he seemed to take pains to conceal ... There was nothing about Dr. Rigg either mean or small. Whether in agreement with him or not, one was bound to respect him, and he respected none the less those who differed from his views. (16)
The Rev. T. E. Bigden, who also worked with him at Westminster, wrote to his daughter after his death that he had 'learned how possible it is for a wealth of affection to enrich a strong combative man's character'. (17)

He was nevertheless capable of humour. When reprimanded on the London School Board for straying off the topic under consideration, to make a political point, his immediate, wry response was, 'It is perhaps fortunate that I had finished what I had intended to say'. (18) When accused of being rather 'narrow' at one Wesleyan Conference, he pointed out his great corpulent frame to deny the accusation. When, at the age of 71, he was elected to the office of President for a second time in 1892, he commented with self-deprecating humour:

> It is an amiable weakness on the part of the English Nation to think all the more of a man as he becomes older (Laughter). That is a weakness which is sometimes pushed to idolatrous extremes (Laughter)... That amiable weakness of the English people, I think, has led them probably to overrate my services and my merits, and if I were to live to be ten years older, and remain in good health, there is no telling how much I might be publicly utilised. (19)

Rigg's personal humility is shown by his refusal to write an autobiography in spite of encouragements of Hugh Price Hughes (20) and Dr. Dale (21) At the end of his 'Reminiscences', he refused to write further than 1847, as he himself had become a principal participant! He told the Conference at his retirement, in August 1903, that he 'knew a great deal against himself that nobody knew...That was something to prevent him from being lifted up too far and it deepened his gratitude to God and the Conference' (22)

The GUARDIAN in tribute commented in 1909:

> Methodism, especially Methodism of the old, strong type, with its wonderful power of conviction and conversion, is poorer for the loss of Dr. Rigg ... If Cardinal Manning could playfully describe himself as 'a bit of a Methodist', he might have claimed that his friend and admirer, Dr. Rigg, was a bit of a Papist. In fact he belonged to a section of the Non-conformists who are much nearer to the Catholic Church than to their brethren of the 'down-grade theology'. His Protestantism was of the positive, dogmatic sort ... such a man was bound to range himself in the great educational controversy of our time, in line with Churchmen and all other upholders of definite religious instruction for the young; and his championship of their views carried the more weight that he was not only a writer of ability and culture, but an educational expert of high standing, versed alike in the theory and practice of teaching. (23)
He had been the strongest bulwark for Methodist denominational schools and it had been he who had led the opposition to William Arthur, Hugh Price Hughes and others who would have ended Wesleyan denominational education. His forcefulness placed the Wesleyan denominational viewpoint before all the leading politicians of the day, among them Gladstone, Forster, Harrowby, Salisbury, Chamberlain and Balfour, giving the Wesleyan Church a greater influence than their numbers might warrant. He had been instrumental in the abolition of building grants to denominational schools, and in the establishment of a Conscience Clause. He had also contributed much to the success of compulsion, both in the London School Board and in the wider field. His mark on education could be seen in the School Board Compromise, the books which were used in schools in the later Nineteenth Century and even in the design of School buildings. Most of all he secured the continuance of religious education in the schools, although his Wesleyan critics would maintain that in doing so, he sacrificed Wesleyan interests to the Church of England.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A:  Number of Wesleyan Schools and Scholars
(Source: Wesleyan Education Committee Annual Reports, figures based on Connexional Returns)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Scholars</th>
<th>Average Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8,193</td>
<td>No figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>11,462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>18,533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>20,804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>25,463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>30,686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>34,285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>37,341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>37,804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>39,968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>38,623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>37,972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>39,216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>42,085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>45,168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>47,143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>52,636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>55,685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>61,023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>68,605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>73,183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>76,052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>79,582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>82,333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>88,525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>93,194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>99,128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>111,004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>119,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>128,809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>150,765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>166,405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>171,372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>178,717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>178,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>173,379</td>
<td>114,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>175,933</td>
<td>118,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>179,001</td>
<td>121,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>179,988</td>
<td>124,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>179,900</td>
<td>126,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>179,385</td>
<td>125,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>181,514</td>
<td>125,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>181,598</td>
<td>129,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>177,436</td>
<td>130,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>178,059</td>
<td>132,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>176,973</td>
<td>131,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>178,152</td>
<td>132,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>178,918</td>
<td>133,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>179,578</td>
<td>135,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>180,840</td>
<td>137,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>177,015</td>
<td>134,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Figures</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>828</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>176,593</td>
<td>179,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>133,528</td>
<td>138,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B:

Statistics of the Committee of Council on Education of Elementary schools inspected for Annual Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>WESLEYAN Average Attendance</th>
<th>WESLEYAN On Registers</th>
<th>C. of ENGLAND Average Attendance</th>
<th>C. of ENGLAND On Registers</th>
<th>ROMAN Average Attendance</th>
<th>ROMAN On Registers</th>
<th>CATHOLIC Average Attendance</th>
<th>CATHOLIC On Registers</th>
<th>BRITISH Average Attendance</th>
<th>BRITISH On Registers</th>
<th>BOARD Average Attendance</th>
<th>BOARD On Registers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>3,176</td>
<td>56,589</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>6,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>6,612</td>
<td>83,585</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>10,818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>11,103</td>
<td>162,863</td>
<td>7,971</td>
<td>25,547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>26,529</td>
<td>312,709</td>
<td>22,593</td>
<td>56,355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>28,841</td>
<td>380,779</td>
<td>26,779</td>
<td>68,945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>36,458</td>
<td>447,101</td>
<td>33,567</td>
<td>82,777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>38,978</td>
<td>463,461</td>
<td>39,690</td>
<td>82,997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>549,362</td>
<td>44,859</td>
<td>99,466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>45,449 **</td>
<td>576,067</td>
<td>47,265</td>
<td>99,274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>602,929</td>
<td>49,247</td>
<td>146,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>600,422</td>
<td>43,644</td>
<td>153,715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>649,231</td>
<td>51,583</td>
<td>160,149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>666,333</td>
<td>49,868</td>
<td>168,474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>700,525</td>
<td>55,244</td>
<td>178,703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>754,116</td>
<td>62,400</td>
<td>201,631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>808,364</td>
<td>67,768</td>
<td>217,438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>882,432</td>
<td>71,666</td>
<td>247,592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>933,820</td>
<td>80,203</td>
<td>272,098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>972,339</td>
<td>84,546</td>
<td>304,849</td>
<td>6,472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1,014,117</td>
<td>90,274</td>
<td>304,169</td>
<td>54,939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1,124,532</td>
<td>1,637,944</td>
<td>100,213</td>
<td>157,421</td>
<td>329,228</td>
<td>481,211</td>
<td>125,353</td>
<td>221,026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1,203,788</td>
<td>1,735,895</td>
<td>109,299</td>
<td>163,850</td>
<td>341,094</td>
<td>492,588</td>
<td>231,381</td>
<td>351,967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1,246,336</td>
<td>1,793,952</td>
<td>113,801</td>
<td>168,135</td>
<td>341,060</td>
<td>488,911</td>
<td>333,234</td>
<td>492,776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1,305,033</td>
<td>1,857,324</td>
<td>121,691</td>
<td>178,464</td>
<td>346,409</td>
<td>492,315</td>
<td>435,335</td>
<td>626,870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>119,009</td>
<td>174,847</td>
<td>1,398,224</td>
<td>1,983,124</td>
<td>130,159</td>
<td>191,341</td>
<td>246,631</td>
<td>339,355</td>
<td>567,675</td>
<td>807,225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>122,183</td>
<td>176,479</td>
<td>1,451,696</td>
<td>2,034,885</td>
<td>140,861</td>
<td>204,752</td>
<td>253,703</td>
<td>341,158</td>
<td>679,082</td>
<td>953,609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>122,637</td>
<td>174,785</td>
<td>1,492,357</td>
<td>2,079,510</td>
<td>149,557</td>
<td>213,580</td>
<td>253,663</td>
<td>342,069</td>
<td>778,771</td>
<td>1,085,880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Wesleyan *Average Attendance</td>
<td>C. of England *Average Attendance</td>
<td>Roman *Average Attendance</td>
<td>Catholic *Average Attendance</td>
<td>British *Average Attendance</td>
<td>Board *Average Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>121,466</td>
<td>173,995</td>
<td>1,508,380</td>
<td>2,101,578</td>
<td>155,676</td>
<td>223,986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>126,123</td>
<td>177,840</td>
<td>1,552,973</td>
<td>2,133,978</td>
<td>163,157</td>
<td>232,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>126,324</td>
<td>175,826</td>
<td>1,573,939</td>
<td>2,134,719</td>
<td>163,718</td>
<td>226,567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>129,281</td>
<td>172,284</td>
<td>1,617,242</td>
<td>2,121,728</td>
<td>169,115</td>
<td>226,082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>129,032</td>
<td>172,347</td>
<td>1,640,540</td>
<td>2,128,888</td>
<td>174,069</td>
<td>230,904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>130,088</td>
<td>173,515</td>
<td>1,634,637</td>
<td>2,125,981</td>
<td>179,777</td>
<td>237,357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>129,899</td>
<td>174,396</td>
<td>1,654,622</td>
<td>2,157,204</td>
<td>185,493</td>
<td>245,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>131,223</td>
<td>173,923</td>
<td>1,674,434</td>
<td>2,154,915</td>
<td>188,754</td>
<td>248,402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>133,292</td>
<td>176,230</td>
<td>1,688,366</td>
<td>2,166,513</td>
<td>191,036</td>
<td>251,772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>132,260</td>
<td>174,773</td>
<td>1,690,934</td>
<td>2,168,229</td>
<td>194,099</td>
<td>255,777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>131,725</td>
<td>171,687</td>
<td>1,688,017</td>
<td>2,157,975</td>
<td>196,083</td>
<td>254,043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>130,713</td>
<td>172,079</td>
<td>1,728,752</td>
<td>2,226,536</td>
<td>203,018</td>
<td>264,951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>137,503</td>
<td>175,905</td>
<td>1,821,696</td>
<td>2,266,756</td>
<td>216,511</td>
<td>272,585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>133,757</td>
<td>168,463</td>
<td>1,847,660</td>
<td>2,278,921</td>
<td>223,057</td>
<td>276,079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>129,724</td>
<td>161,479</td>
<td>1,850,545</td>
<td>2,273,320</td>
<td>230,392</td>
<td>284,537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>125,998</td>
<td>157,477</td>
<td>1,871,653</td>
<td>2,297,659</td>
<td>235,505</td>
<td>294,627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>125,171</td>
<td>155,978</td>
<td>1,871,773</td>
<td>2,300,267</td>
<td>240,784</td>
<td>302,420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>126,553</td>
<td>158,173</td>
<td>1,880,124</td>
<td>2,306,001</td>
<td>245,028</td>
<td>307,799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figures taken from Reports of Committee of Council on Education, 1855-98)

*The Average Attendance figures are final totals from Government returns of later years, not from the Annual Reports of Inspection.

**Wesleyan Schools were included with British schools between 1863 and 1877. The figures for Wesleyan Schools after 1877 differ from Wesleyan estimates as some of these schools continued to be included as 'British Schools.
## APPENDIX C:

**Rate of Annual Grant, per scholar in Average Attendance**

(Statistics from the Committee of Council for Education, Annual Reports)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wesleyan</th>
<th>C of E</th>
<th>R C</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>12s. 2½d</td>
<td>11s. 11¾d</td>
<td>9s. 11d</td>
<td>12s. 8d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>12s. 4d</td>
<td>12s. 4½d</td>
<td>10s. 10½d</td>
<td>12s. 8d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>12s. 8½d</td>
<td>12s. 10¾d</td>
<td>11s. 5½d</td>
<td>13s. 0½d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>13s. 3½d</td>
<td>13s. 3½d</td>
<td>13s. 0¾d</td>
<td>13s. 7½d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>14s. 2½d</td>
<td>14s. 1½d</td>
<td>14s. 5d</td>
<td>14s. 9d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>15s. 7¾d</td>
<td>15s. 0½d</td>
<td>15s. 1¾d</td>
<td>15s. 6¾d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>15s. 8½d</td>
<td>15s. 0½d</td>
<td>15s. 1¾d</td>
<td>15s. 6¾d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>16s. 0½d</td>
<td>15s. 3½d</td>
<td>15s. 3½d</td>
<td>15s. 9¾d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>16s. 2½d</td>
<td>15s. 6¾d</td>
<td>15s. 5½d</td>
<td>15s. 0½d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>16s. 4½d</td>
<td>15s. 8d</td>
<td>15s. 6½d</td>
<td>16s. 2d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>16s. 6½d</td>
<td>15s. 10d</td>
<td>15s. 8½d</td>
<td>16s. 6d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>17s. 1½d</td>
<td>16s. 3½d</td>
<td>16s. 4½d</td>
<td>17s. 11d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>17s. 6½d</td>
<td>16s. 6½d</td>
<td>17s. 13½d</td>
<td>17s. 7d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>17s. 5½d</td>
<td>16s. 8½d</td>
<td>17s. 0½d</td>
<td>17s. 10d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>17s. 8½d</td>
<td>16s. 10½d</td>
<td>17s. 1d</td>
<td>18s. 1d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>17s. 8½d</td>
<td>17s. 0¾d</td>
<td>17s. 1d</td>
<td>18s. 1½d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>17s. 11d</td>
<td>17s. 3½d</td>
<td>17s. 3½d</td>
<td>18s. 3½d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>18s. 0½d</td>
<td>17s. 5½d</td>
<td>17s. 4½d</td>
<td>18s. 5½d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>18s. 2½d</td>
<td>18s.</td>
<td>17s. 7½d</td>
<td>18s. 9½d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>18s. 2d</td>
<td>18s. 0½d</td>
<td>17s. 9d</td>
<td>18s. 11d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>18s. 1½d</td>
<td>18s. 1½d</td>
<td>17s. 11½d</td>
<td>18s. 11½d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>18s. 4d</td>
<td>18s. 2½d</td>
<td>17s. 10½d</td>
<td>19s. 1½d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>18s. 3d</td>
<td>18s. 5½d</td>
<td>18s. 1½d</td>
<td>19s. 5d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>18s. 6½d</td>
<td>18s. 8d</td>
<td>18s. 3d</td>
<td>19s. 7½d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>19s. 0½d</td>
<td>19s. 0½d</td>
<td>18s. 6½d</td>
<td>19s. 4d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>19s. 6½d</td>
<td>19s. 9½d</td>
<td>19s. 2½d</td>
<td>£1.0.0d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>19s. 10½d</td>
<td>19s. 11½d</td>
<td>19s. 3½d</td>
<td>19s. 10½d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D:

J. H. RIGG (1821-1909): Placements

1830-1835: Pupil at Kingswood School for Ministers' Sons, Bristol
1835-1839: Pupil-teacher at Kingswood School, Bristol
1839-1841: Assistant Teacher, Firth's Academy, Manor House, Hartshead Moor
1841-1842: His own school at Islington
1843-1845: Assistant Teacher, John Conquest's School, Biggleswade
1845-1846: Probationary Minister, Norfolk Street, Sheffield
1846: Minister, Penzance (3 months)
1846-1847: Minister, Woodhouse Grove (6 months)
1847-1848: Minister, Spitalfields (3 months)
1848-1849: Minister, Stroud
1849: Minister, Worcester
1849: First Article in the WATCHMAN
1850: Minister, 4th London District
1851-1853: Minister, Guernsey
1853-1856: Minister, Hammersmith
1856-1859: Minister, Stockport North
1859-1862: Superintendent Minister, 2nd Manchester District
1859-1903: Member of the Wesleyan Education Committee
1859: Article "Popular Education" in LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW
1859: Book, Modern Anglican Theology
1862: Article "Last Words on the New Code"
1862-1864: 4th Manchester District
1864-1867: Folkestone
1865: Chairman of Kent District
1865: Doctor of Divinity, Dickinson College, U.S.A.
1867-1868: London (Stoke Newington)
1868-1903: Principal of Westminster College, London
1870-1876: Member for Westminster on London School Board
1873: Book, National Education in its social conditions.
1875: Book: The Living Wesley
1877-1896: Chairman of 2nd London District
1878: President of the Wesleyan Conference
1886-1888: Member of the Cross Commission
1886-1898: Editor of LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW
1892: President of Wesleyan Conference
1895: Book: Oxford High Anglicanism and its chief leaders
1904: Book: Wesleyan Reminiscences, Sixty Years Ago
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>Rev. Thomas Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Rev. J. Beecharn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. John Hannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>Rev. John Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Rev. John Lomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Rev. John Farrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Rev. Isaac Keeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Rev. Robert Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>Rev. F. A. West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>Rev. John Bowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Rev. Samuel Waddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. William Wood Stamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Rev. John Rattenbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Camborne</td>
<td>Rev. Charles Prest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. George Osborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Rev. William Thornton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Rev. William Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Rev. William Arthur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Rev. John Bedford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>Rev. Samuel Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. Frederick Jobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Burslem</td>
<td>Rev. John Farrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. John James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Rev. Luke Wisemann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Rev. George Perks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Camborne</td>
<td>Rev. W. M. Punshon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. Gervase Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>Rev. Alexander M. Auley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Burslem</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. William Pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. James Harrison Rigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. Benjamin Gregory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Rev. E. E. Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. George Osborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Rev. Charles Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>Rev. Thomas McCullagh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Burslem</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. Frederick Greeves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Rev. Richard Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. Robert Newton Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Rev. John Walton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Camborne</td>
<td>Rev. Joseph Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>Rev. C. H. Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. W. F. Moulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. T. Bowman Stephenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. James Harrison Rigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>Rev. H. J. Pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Rev. W. Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. D. J. Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. Marshall Randles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Rev. W. L. Watkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>Rev. H. P. Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Rev. F. W. Macdonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Burslem</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. T. Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. W. T. Davison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Rev. J. S. Banks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1870.

NOTICE

To Parents and others who have Charge of Children

THE School Board is empowered to compel Parents of children of from 5 to 13 years of age, to send them to School unless there is some reasonable excuse.

There are now numerous vacancies in existing Schools.

The School Board therefore gives notice that Parents of children who are absent from School without sufficient reason, are liable to a Penalty, and that steps will be taken to carry out the Law.

By order,

GEORGE HECTOR CROAD
Chair of the Board

March 12th, 1872

Poster issued by the London School Board on Rigg’s suggestion in 1872
Dr. Rigg in circa 1902