

## **THAT PRIEST-RIDDEN CITY: POLITICS, POWER AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN DURHAM, 1820 – 1930**

On 28 December 1841, Lord Londonderry's chief agent, John Buddle, wrote to the vicar of St Giles Church, Durham, the Rev. F. Thompson. It was a brief business letter, in which Buddle agreed that the newly-appointed schoolmaster of St Giles parish, John Wandliss, should be allowed to occupy one of the pitmen's cottages at Broomside.<sup>1</sup>

Buddle's letter was a rather low-key start to what proved to be several years of trouble and strife for Thompson as vicar of St Giles. There were, first of all, regular complaints from Wandliss and his wife about their poverty. In September 1842, Ann Wandliss wrote to Thompson explaining that her husband would be too ill for a day or two to attend to his duties:

You must, reverend sir, be as lenient with him as possible. His illness has been brought on not through any indiscretion on his part but through overwork. He never has taken a holiday. Now he has been ill so much that he has not been out at the harvest. The loss is ours, and he not being able to work at the harvest makes the loss serious.

A few years later Thompson was to receive an even more plaintive request direct from Wandliss himself:

I mentioned to you if you had a castaway coat, that you were entirely done with, I would be very grateful to you for the gift of it. Indeed if you think me deserving, any of your cast off clothes will be thankfully and gratefully received.

Already our attention might be drawn to one or two subtexts to these letters: we have a schoolmaster regarded as of no higher status and deserving no better housing than the colliers whose children he teaches; so poor that he has to seek cast-off clothes from the vicar and has to help out with the harvest; above all, perhaps, a schoolmaster clearly owing his position not to the parish clergyman but to Lord Londonderry's agent. It is the last of these points that is central to this article.

As time went on, it became increasingly clear that the Londonderrys no longer wished to employ Wandliss as the schoolmaster at St Giles. In July 1848 Wandliss wrote to Thompson, complaining that:

One of the Marquiss of Londonderry's agents called at my house yesterday, and informed my wife that the Marquiss was going to withdraw my salary from the school and that they would want the house directly. The last words he said were 'mind you will have to shift'. As I got the house granted by the Marquiss through your application, I have no thought of shifting, as he called it, till you Revd. Sir, give me an order to that effect.

Wandliss's faith that Thompson could intervene on his behalf with the Londonderrys is as touching as it was misplaced. Thompson had already acknowledged where the power of patronage lay in a letter to another Londonderry agent, Nicholas Hindhaugh:

Lady Londonderry's subscription to the Belmont school empowers her to send any number of children she thinks proper to the school. As her ladyship is about to become the patroness of the new district of Belmont, it is extremely desirable that she should continue to exercise that influence over the school which the gift of her subscription entitles her to.

Soon, Thompson was being given direct orders from the Londonderry camp. Hindhaugh told him:

The school master at Belmont occupies a house for which we pay rent. Under existing circumstances I do not feel authorized to permit this to be continued and have caused intimations for him to quit to be given to him. These have been disregarded, and as I feel reluctant to have recourse to any extreme measures I wish you would make him aware that his occupation is only during the pleasure of Lord and Lady Londonderry.

It may be unfair on Thompson, the vicar of St. Giles, to suggest that he used the ongoing creation of Belmont parish as a means of side-stepping this unpleasant task. Whatever happened, the job landed in the in-tray of the new priest-in-charge of Belmont, Thomas Crossman, as another anguished letter from Wandliss to Thompson makes clear:

Mr Crossman had the key of the school to examine what repairs were needed. On August 28th he came to our house desiring to see me. I went to him. He begun, the children have vacation now, this is the time to repair and in the meantime you must look out for some other situation, for I do not know whether any

school will be resumed any more. I listened, he proceeded, you are done with the school now: you must notice I give you notice to quit three months since. Reverend sir, he could not discharge me, for I never was agreed to him by any conditions whatever. I asked him for the key twice, as soon as the school was finished, and he said I should never have it any more. He treated me with base treatment such as I never deserved.

If this episode from Durham St Giles suggests to us that clergymen could sometimes act as the agents of powerful operators like the Londonderrys – in this case told what to do by the Londonderrys’ representatives – I want briefly to use four other little cameos from the history of the Durham coalfield to set the scene for what I am trying to say about the complex political relationship between the Church and local society.

The first of these cameos centres upon a quote from the radical lawyer, Henry Brougham, who wrote this about the Church in Durham in 1822:

That the Durham Clergy, and more especially those connected with the cathedral, have long taken a very forward part in all the contentions of local politicks, is not denied by themselves and their supporters. That in electioneering especially, they have been most active, every one allows; and ... those who espouse liberal principles, who resist the progress of corruption, and defend the rights of the subject, are exposed to their particular hostility.<sup>2</sup>

The second of my cameos concerns an incident probably well-known to many readers; that never-to-be-forgotten day when, for the Dean of Durham Cathedral, George Welldon, the 1925 Miners Gala took a sudden, unexpected and unpleasant turn. Making his way across the Gala field, the Dean suddenly found himself surrounded by a jeering crowd of miners, some of them waving placards that read ‘To Hell with Bishops and Deans’.<sup>3</sup> Welldon was soon being pushed and shoved towards the banks of the River, and only the hasty arrival of a police motor-launch saved him from the dunking that was clearly intended.

The third cameo is a quotation from a Durham clergyman, Alexander Begg of Usworth. His comments, made in 1924, suggest that there was a good deal of ill-feeling among clergymen who felt let-down by their ecclesiastical bosses and who felt their careers on the coalfield had washed them up in the equivalent of far-flung colonial stations:

In regard to this Diocese, so largely colliery, the uphill conditions of work, the clerical isolation, the absence of social & other amenities, the heart breaking discouragement, the prolonged neglect on the part of Ecclesiastical Superiors, the sense of being abandoned in outposts of spiritual danger & difficulty, the constant degrading struggle to make ends meet, if duty is to be done by wife and family – something radical & far-reaching must be done to mitigate & undermine all this.<sup>4</sup>

Fourthly, and finally among these introductory cameos, a further clerical intervention suggests that, at the very end of the twentieth century, the diocese of Durham was still trying to make sense of its relationship with the coalfield. In 1996 the Rev. Martin King of Trimdon Grange thought the time had come for the Church to apologise for its role in the coal strike of 1810, when prisoners had been held under guard in the Bishop's stables. The episode was, he thought, symptomatic of an era during which the Church of England had often been associated with the coalowners and not with the working people.<sup>5</sup>

Between them, I think these quotes and cameos lay down some intriguing threads for us to follow. In them we can see expressions of hostility towards a conservative Church spanning over one hundred years; a mid nineteenth-century clergyman doing the bidding of the Londonderry family; an early twentieth-century clergyman suggesting that the Church's mission in the coalfield was failing; and a late twentieth-century clergyman offering the view that the Church in Durham has always been too close to the coal-owners' interest.

These are the threads I want to try and untangle in this article, as I attempt to follow the parish clergymen of Durham on their journey through the political minefield that the industrialised diocese had become. How did they manage when confronted with the grievances of both sides of industry? How could the Church's well-established links with the owning and employing classes be reconciled with the needs of an increasingly democratic age? Was their role that of the 'honest broker', concerned to act as a mediating force in industrial and social relations? For one radical nineteenth-century political grouping there was never much doubt. 'To the Chartists, Durham was "that priest-ridden city", and the Anglican coalowners were both "coal mine, cottage, and slave proprietors"'.<sup>6</sup>

\*

With the church of St Brandon at Brancepeth offering one notable exception, the emblematic combination of mansion and church in the same grounds – the church as the private chapel of the big house – is much less evident on the

Durham coalfield than in other landscapes. This is a symptom of the fact that large parts of County Durham were historically lacking in the usual direct links between landownership and parish administration that are visible elsewhere in rural Britain. In Durham it was often the *township* rather than the *parish* that was the principal unit of local government.

Even so, it can still be argued that the Church of England in Durham retained strong links with local secular authority. Firstly, although an exact parish/landownership relationship was relatively rare, parishes consisted of a tapestry of townships, a number of which were predominantly in the ownership of one family. Consequently, when new parishes were created from old townships, a parish/landownership relationship that had not previously existed suddenly came into being. Secondly, the early decades of the nineteenth century saw the advent of the company town in the north-east, its development often driven by one dominant man or family: Seaham Harbour (Lord Londonderry); Hartlepool (Ralph Ward Jackson); Jarrow (Charles Mark Palmer); Darlington (the Pease family). Not all were Anglicans by any means, but most saw to it that the Church of England was enabled to flourish in the new towns. Thirdly, the Church of England was itself a considerable land and coal-owner. Its interests were frequently tied up with, if not identical to, the interests of the other land and coal-owning concerns.

In the nineteenth century there were certainly many places where the landowner and parish priest worked inseparably together: to swear in special constables in advance of a miners' strike, perhaps, as was the case at Castle Eden in 1844<sup>7</sup>; or naming the parish church and school in honour of the dominant local family, as happened at Bensham St Cuthbert<sup>8</sup>; or where, in a number of Durham parishes (among them St Giles) as late as 1861, no Nonconformist meeting house had yet been allowed.<sup>9</sup>

Occasionally, the principal coalowners in the diocese would involve themselves in the task of parish-creation and boundary-drawing. At Seaham Harbour the Londonderry family were very active in determining the shape and size of the new parish. A letter from Londonderry's agent to his legal representative made it clear that the driving force came from the family. The vicar's input was secondary, and amounted to a rubber-stamp:

I have seen the vicar of Seaham ... and shewn to him the plan which I send you herewith, and he is quite satisfied with the division of the Parish and the district I have assigned to the New Church.<sup>10</sup>

It is inevitable that any discussion of land and coal-ownership and politics in County Durham is going to be heavily overshadowed by the actions and attitudes of the Londonderry dynasty. Of course we must remember that there were no fewer than seven marquesses of Londonderry between 1810 and 1920 – not to mention a very influential marchioness – each, we must assume, with individual strengths and weaknesses and nuanced political views. Even so, given the enormous scale and reach of Londonderry power, a rather monolithic view of the family-as-an-institution seems unavoidable. Moreover, theirs' was a power that was periodically exercised so autocratically and with so little prior consultation that it caused considerable problems for those institutions – among them the Church of England – which the Londonderrys numbered among their friends. The significance of this to my discussion lies in the fact that, in many pit communities, the Londonderrys' approach to industrial relations created the political and economic atmosphere in which the Church of England had to operate.

There is no doubt that successive heads of the Londonderry family celebrated paternalism as the single most effective means of managing industrial relations, and regarded themselves as among its most accomplished practitioners. 'I conceive my colliers were really attached to my family and their old establishment,'<sup>11</sup> the Third Marquess once said. Less appealingly, the Third Marquess was also known to refer to his workforce as his 'little black family',<sup>12</sup> a description which, even allowing for the likely allusion to workers covered in coal dust, carries more than a hint of colonialism and slavery. It was a hint that seems to have occurred to contemporary minds, too, for John Buddle was driven to address it on at least one occasion, writing to Londonderry that 'if our meddling, morbid humanity mongers get it infused into their heads that it is cruel and unnatural slavery to work in the dark and to be imprisoned twelve hours a day in the pit, a screw in the system will be let loose.'<sup>13</sup>

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the reputation of the Londonderry family as tough employers became somewhat ameliorated by the recognition that they were beginning to provide some excellent worker housing – particularly in Seaham<sup>14</sup> – although this, too, was not without its darker side. With almost ninety per cent of County Durham miners living in company accommodation during the nineteenth century<sup>15</sup>, it was easy for employers to turn housing provision into a weapon in the industrial relations war. Evictions took place in all the major strikes of the nineteenth century.<sup>16</sup>

Paternalistic power in the company town took many forms. Pease, for instance, had a reputation as a good and generous employer, a sponsor of flower shows, colliery bands, cricket matches, and aged miners homes, but his policy

of stamping the company name on all the bricks used in building colliery houses at Esh Winning and Waterhouses was a subtle, psychological reminder of his constant, subliminal presence and the all-pervading nature of his power.<sup>17</sup>

The power relationship between employers and employed on the coalfield was something that periodically had an effect on religious observance. In collecting oral testimony from the miners of the Deerness Valley, Robert Moore found evidence that people would choose their denomination according to which put them in greatest favour with colliery management. Consequently, with the all-seeing eye of Mr Crofton, the authoritarian church-going manager of Esh Winning colliery, constantly upon them ‘people went to church to keep in his good books’.<sup>18</sup> But employer power was just as likely to work *against* the Church as in its favour. The Rev. Firth Newsome of Stillington, for instance, told his Bishop in 1904 that ‘the greatest opposition to church work in this parish comes from the managing director of the iron works Thomas Kirk Esq. and the local manager of the works Thomas Kirk (junior). They don’t like me and as every bodys bread depends on their works, they fight shy of the Church.’<sup>19</sup>

Complex religious relationships were given added spice by the fact that the Church was itself a major landowner in Durham and benefited greatly from the renewal of leases charged to the mining concerns. By 1890 ‘the annual income from coal-mining royalties accruing to the Church of England [in Durham] exceeded £200,000’.<sup>20</sup> The terms of coalmining leases were highly complex, but the system essentially ensured that the Church received a guaranteed income for each year of the lease, irrespective of the amount of coal drawn from the mine or the general state of the coal trade. As the owner of the surface of the land as well as what lay under it, the Church also had a good deal of scope for charging for the movement of coal and equipment across its land.<sup>21</sup>

\*

That the Durham clergy were highly politicised, and in a way that was antagonistic to Radicalism, was hardly doubted by some observers. We have already heard Henry Brougham’s view on the matter, expressed in 1822. Brougham was no detached, neutral observer – he was a radical Presbyterian hostile to the whole idea of an established church – but few in the cathedral community could have dissented from his view that the cathedral close was a very political place. Influential figures in the Durham chapter like Henry Phillpotts had led the charge against political radicalism, launching vitriolic attacks on the process of parliamentary reform and outraging popular opinion over the Queen Caroline affair in 1822.<sup>22</sup> At some point in the nineteenth century, however, the political stance of the Church in Durham *had* to change. A Committee of the House of

Lords, appointed in 1858 to enquire into the state of spiritual destitution in the mining districts, reported that the counties of Northumberland and Durham were worse provided with church accommodation than any other counties in England. With immigrant communities bringing with them their own Catholicism, or turning in vast numbers to the welcoming embrace of Methodism, the Church of England was confronted with the unpalatable fact that if it tried to organize in some communities it would, in effect, be arriving as a minority, dissenting sect. The diocesan authorities called a public meeting, held in Newcastle in January 1860, at which a commitment was made to 'provide clergy who shall minister among that portion of the population which cannot be fully reached by the existing parochial machinery, more especially among the Pitmen, Miners and Ironworkers in the outlying districts'.<sup>23</sup> What followed the 1860 meeting was a new diocesan mission into the coalfield, with new parishes created, new churches built and a new breed of clergyman – often working-class in origin – appointed to livings in the colliery townships.<sup>24</sup>

In advocating this mission, the Church's calls for practical help usually met with a positive response from coal owners and coal companies. To some observers, this co-operation merely confirmed their view that the Church had become no more than the tame creature of the Big House, and it was certainly true that, in some hands, Church funding could become a direct assertion of wealth and local power.<sup>25</sup> Certain coalowners launched themselves whole-heartedly into church building projects, not least the Londonderry family with the construction of SS Hild and Helen, Dawdon, between 1910 and 1912.

Between them, Lord and Lady Londonderry gave the land for the church and vicarage, laid the foundation stone, gave £1,000 towards the building fund, gave a further £500 to the Diocesan Building Fund, contributed an annual sum towards the clergyman's stipend, donated the font, gave the bells, gave the organ, and gave the alms bags, kneelers and altar linen. Their personal contribution amounted to just less than half the total cost of £10,400.<sup>26</sup> Such a level of input conferred power of an almost medieval kind: the Londonderrys had a private pew with strategically placed screens so that the occupants could only be seen from certain angles<sup>27</sup>, and there was even the suggestion that Lady Londonderry herself might be depicted on the rood screen. The diocesan architect wrote to the Seaham agent: 'I thought her Ladyship was going to be S. Helen, who of course was our Empress, and would have been in robes of gold and silver.'<sup>28</sup>

It wasn't just the Londonderrys, of course. In many other places massive payments by landowners and men of business command our attention. We might ask ourselves whether they really envisaged nothing more than a *spiritual* return on their investment, or whether something else may have been

anticipated: a social discipline dividend, perhaps? In any event their involvement was a mixed blessing for the diocese, for while the Church could not complete its church-building programme without contributions from the very-rich, such a close association with elites and employers must have been counter-productive as far as connecting with the working-class was concerned.

The Londonderry family were also probably the most significant (though by no means the only) coalowners who were patrons of Church of England livings. Many patrons acquired their position by building a new church or by being its principal benefactor. In return they frequently demanded an almost autonomous level of power in local church affairs, a situation that could stretch relationships to breaking-point. When the Rev. William Scott at Seaham chose to liaise with his Bishop rather than his patron over the appointment of his curate, it was soon made clear to him by Lady Londonderry that he had exceeded his authority. An apology was called for, and Scott duly obliged:

It grieves me to learn that you still feel aggrieved by my having written to the Bishop without consulting you. You will believe me when I assure you that no thought of interfering with your Ladyship's intentions had anything to do with my application.<sup>29</sup>

Three months later it was Scott's turn to feel aggrieved, as Lady Londonderry postponed the consecration ceremony of New Seaham church without telling him. This was, wrote Scott, merely the latest in a long line of actions by his patron that were 'felt by others as well as myself to be deeply humiliating to our feelings as men and gentlemen, and degrading to our office as God's ministers'.<sup>30</sup> Certainly, Lady Londonderry had some form in this regard. Five years earlier she had planned, commissioned and started building the church at New Seaham without consulting either the Bishop or the incumbent at Seaham, the Rev. Robert Baxter. The first Baxter knew about it was when he was invited to attend the laying of the foundation stone:

Mr. Baxter presents his compliments to Lady Londonderry, and must confess that he is much disappointed in not having been made more fully acquainted with her Ladyship's intentions respecting the new church at Seaham Colliery.<sup>31</sup>

For her part, Lady Londonderry did not trouble to conceal her lack of respect for Baxter, with whom she 'certainly had no more communication ... than was absolutely necessary ... My object would be to have this Church filled and not like Mr. Baxter's entirely empty'.<sup>32</sup> The cracks in the relationship between

Baxter and his patron began to spread, becoming personally disruptive to the friendship between Lady Londonderry and Bishop Maltby. At the time Maltby was in poor health, almost blinded by cataracts. Much of his correspondence had to be handled by his wife. Through her he pleaded with Lady Londonderry to suspend the work until things could be put on a right footing and all the rules adhered to, a solution that her ladyship dismissed as unnecessary bureaucracy and ingratitude:

I am very much pained at your letter as I really was not aware that any further forms were necessary. I thought you would highly approve of my building the Church and as it was on my own land and at my own expense and where one was notoriously requisite.<sup>33</sup>

Lady Londonderry refused to accept Maltby's advice to suspend the work.

Now I really feel I have not been kindly or courteously treated. I have not stopped the Building and I hope it will please God to permit me to complete it next year when should I meet with a refusal to license or consecrate it, I shall at least have the satisfaction of knowing I am not to blame if the population of New Seaham are deprived of the advantage of religious worship in a Church of England of which I am prepared to pay the minister's stipend.<sup>34</sup>

She would build it and be damned. Like a breach in planning regulations, Lady Londonderry presented the diocese with her church as a *fait accompli*, and dared them not to consecrate it. Her victory was achieved at a cost. Maltby's last letter to her on the subject was written more in sorrow than in anger: 'We have been very good friends for a long time and it shall not be my fault if we cease to be so just as I am in the ordinary course of nature about to quit the world'.<sup>35</sup>

\*

Problems with patronage tended to be compounded by the continued adoption of parish churches as the private memorial space for elite families. In addition to tombstones, effigies and wall tablets, commemorative fixtures and fittings included communion plate, altar cloths, kneelers, alms bags, lecterns, clergy desks and stained-glass windows. Seaham church was dominated by memorials to the Londonderrys, while the east window at Hetton-le-Hole became a memorial to the coalowner Nicholas Wood.<sup>36</sup> In 1829 churchwardens at Chester-le-Street approved a family pew and vault for Lord Durham to the design of

Ignatius Bonomi, adding to the generations of Lumleys already commemorated there in memorial tablets and effigies.<sup>37</sup> The Londonderry mausoleum at Long Newton was even grander, its Minton floor tiles alone costing £2,960 in 1856, an amount that might tellingly be contrasted with the amount of time, effort and expenditure being spent on colliery houses elsewhere in the diocese.<sup>38</sup> A few dissenting voices were raised in Seaham in protest at the cost of the memorial to the 6th Marquess of Londonderry in 1915, with particular reference to the wisdom of such extravagance in wartime, but the estate could still afford to disregard such querulousness. The vicar was even directed by Londonderry's agent, Malcolm Dillon, to see if 'the boys and girls of the church schools would make a contribution? We might look for £10 from these sources'.<sup>39</sup>

Consequently, to the jaundiced contemporary eye, pre-disposed to see the worst in any relationship between the Church and local elites, a good deal of the evidence pointed to the relationship being unhealthily close. This was dangerous. If its coalfield mission was to work, the Church had to retain credibility in the eyes of the workforce, and could not allow itself to become the coal interest's uncritical and utterly compromised bedfellow.

\*

For a time, the Church's status as the county's principal coal and landowner saw it established as a rival power bloc to some of the secular coal interests. From the late eighteenth century, for instance, there had been signs of a new, business-like approach by the Church to its mining interest, which had a harsh impact on some of its aristocratic tenants. By this time the Church had accumulated over 1,700 tenants, and although most of these were small freeholders or copyholders there were among them a good number of local gentry as well as figures who were considerable magnates in their own right, such as the Lords Lonsdale, Scarborough and Widdrington. Viewing the scene in the 1820s as part of his *Rural Rides*, William Cobbett recorded a remarkable economic and power relationship between the Church and these powerful landowners: one that would be substantially altered – perhaps even reversed – in the latter decades of the nineteenth century.

Almost the whole of the country hereabouts is owned by that curious thing called the *Dean and Chapter* of Durham. Almost the whole of South Shields is theirs, granted upon leases with fines at stated periods. This Dean and Chapter are the *lords of the Lords*. Londonderry, with all his huffing and strutting, is but a tenant of the Dean and Chapter of Durham, who souse him so often with their *fines* that it is said that he has had to pay

them more than a hundred thousand pounds within the last ten or twelve years.<sup>40</sup>

There were certainly signs in the 1820s that business relations were becoming strained between the Dean and Chapter and the Londonderry interest. The Chapter was especially unhappy with the operation of the Rainton Colliery, and when the lease became due for renewal in 1819 it set a fee which John Buddle – Londonderry’s agent – regarded as ‘exorbitant in the highest degree, and even absurd ... so far beyond the bounds of reason that I really think they must have made some error’.<sup>41</sup> The Chapter’s demand for £90,000 – increased from the £27,000 previously charged – Buddle considered must have originated from younger members of the Chapter, flexing their muscles in an attempt to put the Church’s business on an ever more profitable footing. Buddle urged his employer to call their bluff: to announce his own terms and to cease operating the colliery if those terms were not met. ‘This I think will *stagger the old ones* who may probably yet have interest enough to induce the junior members to come into their measures,’ Buddle wrote.<sup>42</sup>

Alongside this financial independence the Church also began to demonstrate its political independence, even allowing for the fact that the political profile of its clergy was predominantly Tory. An analysis of clergy votes cast in Durham in mid c19th general elections demonstrates the dominance of Conservatism: almost 84% of clergy votes were cast for Conservative candidates at these polls.<sup>43</sup> If, then, Durham had a Tory Church, its most powerful political alliance might be expected to lie with the leaders of secular Torydom, the Londonderry family. In the first half of the nineteenth century Londonderry’s political hold over Durham had usually – though not always – been based on marital links. Tory candidates nominated by Londonderry included Henry Hardinge his brother-in-law, Arthur Trevor (Viscount Dungannon) his son-in-law, and Capt. Fitzroy his nephew<sup>44</sup>, and the campaign to have each of them elected was unremitting, as Londonderry himself made clear in a letter to John Buddle: ‘[We] look to our Agents ... to leave no stone unturned with every Individual & every particle of interest connected with our concerns to secure & influence every vote in our power.’<sup>45</sup>

This stone-turning naturally embraced the cathedral close. In 1831 Londonderry had written to Bishop Van Mildert in an attempt to determine the bishop’s voting intentions. Would he support Londonderry’s candidate, Henry Hardinge? Could he swing the Dean and Chapter behind him? In reply the bishop gave Londonderry his discreet (but definite) support.<sup>46</sup> He could not vouch for the Dean and Chapter, but Van Mildert strongly implied that they were, though independent, all inclined to the Tory side.<sup>47</sup>

Of course, Londonderry was far from unique in the level and use of his political influence, but there was concern in the first half of the nineteenth century, even within the ranks of the Conservative party, that Londonderry's pocket-boroughs had settled a little too deeply in Londonderry's pocket. In 1841, for instance, the official Conservative candidate Henry Liddell became convinced that Londonderry was going to favour the candidacy of his own son ahead of Liddell in the forthcoming election. Such a tactic would risk losing the seat to 'a Radical Whig', Liddell warned.

Liddell's fears eventually proved prescient, for in 1843 Londonderry took the extraordinary step of using his influence to have John Bright – a Chartist, a Radical, and a supporter of the Anti-Corn Law League – elected as Durham's MP after the local Conservative association refused to endorse his favoured candidate. Londonderry's reasons for backing Bright, whose views were diametrically opposed to every contemporary Conservative value, were made crystal clear in a letter to Robert Peel: 'I deeply lament the momentary inconvenience of having an anti-corn law Leaguer ... but had Mr. Purvis [the official Conservative candidate] been returned the seat was lost to my family and friends for ever. Now I have shown my power and nothing can prevent my regaining it.'<sup>48</sup>

Londonderry's extraordinary tactic tested the loyalty of his 'interest' to the limit. In the event it is estimated that between 80 and 100 freeholders voted for Bright at Londonderry's behest. But how did such a move play in the cathedral close? Would the clergy there prove equally biddable? Using contemporary poll books, we can analyse clergy voting patterns in the 1843 election. From them, we can see that the largest group of Chapter clergy (15 out of the 25 men) defied Londonderry by voting for Purvis, the official Tory candidate. Another 7 abstained, leaving only 3 who followed Londonderry's lead and voted for John Bright. This group included two men who had always been radical Liberals, and a third, George Townsend Fox, whose position as vicar of St Nicholas, Durham was dependent upon Londonderry's patronage.

In 1819 over the Rainton Colliery fees, and again in the 1840s over John Bright, we see a stand-off between the Church and the Londonderry interest and a stubborn resistance on the part of the church to yield to Londonderry's secular powers. Or so it seems, for in the background changes were already afoot that would alter the balance of power for good. From the 1840s the Ecclesiastical Commission began to take control of Church land in Durham.<sup>49</sup> This was a highly significant administrative change, but it may be that change of a more deep-rooted kind had already shown itself in the clash between the cathedral close and the Vane Tempest interest over those Rainton fees in 1819, and in John Buddle's audacious response. The fine for the Rainton colliery was eventually set at £40,000, and the

Londonderrys stayed on as lessees.<sup>50</sup> This still represented a considerable increase, but historical perspective casts the Rainton dispute in a new light, perhaps as a defining moment in the business relationship between Church and coal interest in the nineteenth century. Confronted with a massively-inflated rent demand, Buddle had called the Church's bluff. The titan of eighteenth-century wealth had clashed with the titan of nineteenth-century commerce, and in the event it was the Church that blinked first.

\*

For the remainder of our period, a good deal of the Church's criticism of the coal interest seemed to emanate from a changing political atmosphere within the diocese, when the post-1860 influx of working-class and lower-middle-class clergy began to adopt positions that were increasingly empathetic towards the coalminers, and much more antagonistic towards the coalowners and towards their own diocesan leaders.

As the nineteenth century became the twentieth, strikes on the Durham coalfield began to change in character, becoming progressively less local in focus. Henson recognised this as soon as he took over as Bishop in 1920. 'In Bp. Westcott's time,' he wrote, 'a strike was local & economic, now it is national or even international, and political. Then the miners' leaders were almost without exception Christian men, mostly local preachers of some Methodist sects, now they are atheists.'<sup>51</sup> This was not a transition that Henson thought the clergy had handled well. As somebody who viewed class-consciousness as one of the early twentieth century's greatest threats, Henson found himself at the helm of a diocese in which a vocal minority of clergymen appeared to have become apologists for class conflict. To an extent Henson blamed his predecessors, Westcott and Moule, for this: he thought they had both been too lax in their acceptance of ordination candidates and, in Westcott's case, too political. But perhaps Henson underestimated the part played by Durham's internal mission. Could not the class-conscious *recruitment* of clergymen since 1860 have contributed to the class-conscious *nature* of the clergy by 1920?

The working conditions of miners had concerned clergymen at significant points throughout the nineteenth century. The Rev. John Hodgson of Felling, for instance, had responded to the colliery explosion of 1812 by collaborating with Humphry Davy in the development of his safety lamp.<sup>52</sup> There had been sympathy for striking miners from the coalowning clergyman, Richard Brandling in 1831 – 'they have endured much hardship for many years. I certainly feel for them'<sup>53</sup> – and the vicar of Waterhouses in 1892, who was moved by the sight of families scrabbling over waste heaps in search of coal to write in his parish

magazine of ‘an amount of suffering which is truly appalling’.<sup>54</sup> But over the same long period there had also been a series of interventions by the Church that were less sympathetic, one of the first of them – the willingness of Bishop Barrington to allow the use of his stables as a temporary prison for striking miners in 1810 – acquiring a mythic status that seemed to encapsulate the Church’s attitude to industrial relations.<sup>55</sup>

What was developing by the 1920s, however, was a different conflict; a conflict between the kind of day-to-day practical experience of coalfield life that parish clergymen were gaining and some of the political theory that emanated from Henson’s Auckland Castle. The fact that Henson was no longer on the same wavelength as some of his coalfield clergy became increasingly apparent from their responses to his visitation questions.

Henson’s Visitation of 1928, in which the Bishop asked his clergy certain questions about developments in their parishes, enquired, among other things, how the spiritual life of each parish was being affected by unemployment.<sup>56</sup> The replies he received were laden with ill omens for the Church. The overwhelming view was that people were thoroughly demoralised by unemployment, and that spiritual life was affected very seriously. As the Rev. H. J. Cheeseman of Deptford St Andrew put it, ‘it makes many bitter against religion and fosters a spirit of discontent and envy towards the well to do, and makes them in some instances cherish hard thoughts against the clergy & affects the attendance at the services of the Church, and chapels, and draws them towards Communism.’<sup>57</sup>

Throughout the preceding century there had been a debate about the role the Church should play in strikes. Should the Church be a negotiator? a conciliator? An arbitrator? Or should it stay on the sidelines and allow the forces of political economy and divine will to run their course? For Bishop Henson in the 1920s, however, the issue was clear cut. ‘The strike is wrong,’ he wrote of the General Strike, ‘Therefore do not negotiate. To bargain is to bargain with sinners about their sin ... For the sake of the country, for the sake of County Durham, for the sake of the miners, for the sake of the miners’ children, the government must win’.<sup>58</sup> Henson’s stance could hardly have contrasted more starkly with that of Bishop Westcott, much of whose reputation in County Durham still rests on his intervention in the 1892 coal strike. Westcott’s action was founded upon an unswerving belief that the only viable future lay in co-operation between both sides of industry.<sup>59</sup>

Westcott’s political position was certainly unusual among senior Church figures in Durham in the nineteenth century, even though he was by no means the first to follow the path of interventionism in industrial matters. Other prominent

Durham clergymen who had involved themselves in strike negotiations over the preceding century included John Miller of Pittington (1844), John Burdon of Castle Eden (1844) and William Nesfield of Chester-le-Steet, whose solution to the 1810 dispute formed the basis of bonding arrangements in the coalfield until the 1870s. Mediation by the Church remained an issue that caused unease in some quarters, even among those much more sympathetic to the miners' cause than figures like Henson. Many now believed simply that the Church's role should be to create the atmosphere of Christian charity in which negotiation might be achieved, rather than to involve itself directly. Mediation should be a last resort and a rare event.<sup>60</sup>

There were those among the miners' representatives who would have seen in this mere sophistry, designed to conceal the Church's true position, shoulder-to-shoulder as ever with the employers and owners. Even Westcott's actions became tainted by this view. There is evidence that some collieries, particularly a group on the Tyne, were advocating radical action in 1892, and that miners were contemplating the possibility of re-starting the pits under worker control.<sup>61</sup> In this context, we might think again about Westcott's intervention and see it perhaps as the repackaging of an old Church strategy: the acceptance of *moderate* reforms as a means of avoiding something much worse.

Westcott was never keen on describing himself as a 'Christian Socialist', thinking it too vague a definition.<sup>62</sup> The quest for socialism within the Durham diocese should not end there, however. By the 1920s a small but significant cohort of clergymen were beginning to make their voices heard: a group of turbulent priests who espoused a much tougher politics than mainstream Christian socialism; one that was forged and tempered in the crucible of their daily parish work. In November 1926 the Rev. Harry Watts of Shildon addressed a meeting of the women's section of Easington Labour Party. As the *Durham Chronicle* reported it:

Mr. Watts said he strongly believed in Mr. Cook, whose two crimes were that he believed in a decent standard of living for the miners, and that he spoke the truth and stuck to what he said. He was not a minister who had gone 'Red' but a Socialist who had gone Minister, and his reason for disavowing the Conservative Party was that he was disgusted with the rotteness within its midst. No-one could accuse him of being a traitor to his cloth because Socialism had taught him that religion was a reality. Christ was the great founder of Socialism, and because the Gospel he had commanded to be preached to the poor was not being preached as it should be, matters were as they were today.<sup>63</sup>

Harry Watts was not alone. In 1922 eight parish priests in Durham had signed a letter of congratulation and support to Ramsay MacDonald after Labour's strong showing in the general election. The signatories were Alexander Begg (Usworth), William Hodgson (Escomb), Thomas Hurrell (Hunwick), William Rowland-Jones (St Oswald, Durham), Francis Aubrey Leake (West Boldon), Charles Lockyer (Leadgate), Harry Watts (Shildon) and William Wright (South Shields St Francis).<sup>64</sup> Among those names, that of William Hodgson at Escomb would probably have rung most alarm bells in the mind of Bishop Henson. The year previously Hodgson had been at the centre of an acrimonious dispute over the succession to the valuable living of Houghton-le-Spring. The Durham Miners' Association and the Houghton Urban District Council – itself now dominated by the Labour Party – had canvassed on Hodgson's behalf, arguing that his appointment would pave the way for 'a more harmonious feeling to exist between the miners and the established church'.<sup>65</sup> The intervention incensed a number of leading parishioners and the outgoing incumbent, the Rev. Cuthbert Adamson. Here was an outrageous attempt to interfere in Church affairs, they claimed, driven by miners, trade unionists and Labour Party officials who never set foot inside the church to attend services.<sup>66</sup> Hodgson and Henson briefly exchanged letters themselves, before Hodgson was given a sharp reminder by the Bishop's chaplain that 'The Bishop thinks that it would be extraordinarily foolish for you or anyone else to frame any expectations as to his decision'.<sup>67</sup> Probably, the outcome was a foregone conclusion. Far from appointing a socialist and a candidate favoured by the miners' union, Henson gave the living to the Rev. Samuel Kirshbaum Knight, lecturer in Pastoral Theology at Durham University and Henson's examining chaplain at both Hereford and Durham.

The socialist cohort among Durham clergymen undoubtedly extended beyond the eight signatories of the Ramsay MacDonald letter. Cuthbert Headlam's diary contains an entry from June 1924, in which he laments the hopelessness of the Barnard Castle constituency for the Conservatives, made unwinnable because 'the clergymen are usually socialists'.<sup>68</sup> For his part, Henson condemned those of his clergy that were 'mere parasites of the Labour Party'<sup>69</sup> and pointed out that 'the least respectable clergymen in any diocese are those who thrust themselves into politics, generally as protagonists of Labour'.<sup>70</sup> As Henson must have perceived it in the 1920s, something was misfiring badly in the engine-room of the Durham Diocesan mission. Little progress seemed to have been made in the great project of getting miners to come to church. Instead, relaxed standards of recruitment and ordination had allowed in a host of clergymen of moderate ability and suspect political beliefs. They had adopted a stance that was alienating the Church's traditional allies while achieving little in terms of recruiting new members. Henson was eventually provoked into throwing down

a gauntlet at the Bede Day celebrations of 1927. His comments were actually directed at trainee teachers, but they were equally applicable to his clergy. He demanded that they make a choice: ‘Which will you be?’ he asked, ‘The trade unionist or the pastor?’<sup>71</sup>

### **Conclusion**

For Bishop Henson, political fragmentation was a sign that the centre could not hold, but problems of the kind he was encountering were not entirely novel. The whole issue of the relationship between the Church and politics – and whether there should be one at all – was a recurring one throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Despite being such a politically contentious figure himself, Henson argued that it was the business of his clergy to distance themselves from politics, believing that ‘The Church never received from Christ any commission to deal with the social and political arrangements of men’.<sup>72</sup>

The notion that the Church should be politically neutral was enthusiastically endorsed by others throughout our period, but the hope that the Church might stay out of politics was, of course, expressed in vain. Just as Henson and Dean Welldon continued to intervene and comment on political matters in the 1920s, so, too, did Van Mildert, Henry Phillpotts and others in the 1820s.

The political *direction* in which the Church leaned, at least as a corporate, diocesan body, was overwhelmingly Conservative. Most radicals took the Church’s position on the social order to be a sign that the interests of the Church and the coalowners were essentially the same. There was nevertheless a significant shift in the balance of power during the course of the 19th century. The Church’s decision, taken in 1860, to press ahead with a major church-building and parish-creation programme may well have accelerated this power shift. Almost overnight the Church had placed itself in the position of supplicant as it went in search of funding. The *quid pro quo* was that people who gave money to the Church gained an influence over Church affairs, which some of them exerted to the utmost.

As a result, many churches became physical embodiments of the power of local individuals or companies. A number of them came to resemble the private chapels and memorial spaces of great families in a way that was passing out of fashion even in the semi-feudal landscapes of rural England. Everywhere the congregation’s eyes turned – towards stained-glass, lecterns, hangings, kneelers and collection plates – they fell upon reminders of the local employer. The Church was at the heart of a paradox. The post-1860 mission into the Durham coalfield was never intended to be an exercise in democracy, but it was an outreach project, driven by a desire to compete with more socially inclusive denominations like

Primitive Methodism. The project simply could not succeed without an injection of money from local elites. The paradox was that the heavy involvement of elites made churches *less* attractive to the very working people that the mission was attempting to attract.

The Church's difficulty was exacerbated by the fact that it was, by the 1920s, deeply divided. A significant factor here was the post-1860 strategy of recruiting clergymen from lower-middle and working-class backgrounds. A number of them were now more sympathetic to the political cause of the miners than ever before, and they found themselves answerable to a Bishop who was, arguably, more antagonistic to that cause than any of his predecessors since the 1830s. The extent to which Auckland Palace and the parish clergy, or the Durham diocese and the Durham coalfield, reached some kind of *rapprochement* in the decades between Henson and the dawn of the twenty-first century is a matter for studies other than this one. By 1996, however, as the Rev. Martin King's assessment of the situation makes clear in the fourth of my introductory cameos, the Church was looking back over a two-hundred year period in which it was too often perceived to have sided with the coalowners against the coalminers. The problem was, in common with many of the Church's dealings with the coalfield, this was a recognition that came rather too late. By 1996 it was not only the Church that had been marginalised: the Durham coal industry had gone, too.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> The synopsis of letters that follows is taken from Durham County Record Office (DCRO) EP/Bel 11/10-18, Correspondence re. Belmont schoolmaster, 1837-49.
- <sup>2</sup> H. Brougham, 'Durham Case – Clerical Abuses', *Edinburgh Review* 37 (November, 1822), p.356.
- <sup>3</sup> See, for instance, the description of this incident in N. Emery, *Banners of the Northern Coalfield* (Stroud, 1999), p.48.
- <sup>4</sup> Durham University Library (DUL) Palace Green (PG) AUC 4/13 Clergy Visitation Returns, 1924.
- <sup>5</sup> Emery, *Banners*, p.48.
- <sup>6</sup> H. Beynon and T. Austrin, *Masters and Servants: Class and Patronage in the Making of a Labour Organisation* (London, 1994), p.36.
- <sup>7</sup> National Archive (NA) Home Office Papers (HO) 45/349, Correspondence re. disturbances in Durham, Rowland Burdon to Sir

- James Graham, 12 December, 1843. Burdon is reporting on the work being done by himself and the Rev. J.A. Park.
- <sup>8</sup> DUL PG AUC 4/5 Clergy Visitation Returns, 1882. Rev. John Day, St Cuthbert, Bensham, is describing the naming of church and school in honour of the Ellison family.
- <sup>9</sup> Based on assessment of Nonconformist meeting houses recorded in DUL PG AUC 4/1 Clergy Visitation Returns, 1861.
- <sup>10</sup> DCRO Londonderry Papers (D/Lo E657), Robert Anderson (Seaham Harbour Offices) to William Clayton, Esq. (Lincoln's Inn), 22 June 1857.
- <sup>11</sup> Beynon and Austrin, *Masters and Servants*, p.22.
- <sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p.27.
- <sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p.24, Buddle to Londonderry, 16 May 1842.
- <sup>14</sup> See, for instance, the *Newcastle Weekly Chronicle*, Our Colliery Villages series, 1 February 1873.
- <sup>15</sup> Beynon and Austrin, *Masters and Servants*, p.30.
- <sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.
- <sup>17</sup> See N. Emery, 'Pease and Partners and the Deerness Valley: Aspects of the social and economic history of Waterhouses, Esh Winning and Ushaw Moor', unpublished MA thesis, Durham University (1984), p.162 and Beynon and Austrin, *Masters and Servants*, p.38.
- <sup>18</sup> DUL PG MISC 1996/97:4, Robert Moore research notes.
- <sup>19</sup> DUL PG AUC 4/10, Clergy Visitation Returns, 1904.
- <sup>20</sup> D. Spring, 'The English landed estate in the age of coal and iron, 1830–1880', *Journal of Economic History* XI (1951), p.5.
- <sup>21</sup> W. Fordyce, *The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham* (Durham, 1857), p.148 offers a detailed explanation of how leases and rentals worked on the coalfield.
- <sup>22</sup> Readers attempting to get a flavour of the Queen Caroline affair might like to think of the Church taking the side of an unpopular Royal family against a wronged and newly-deceased 'People's Princess' and draw their own conclusions as to whether there are any more modern parallels.
- <sup>23</sup> *Statement Illustrative of the Amount of Spiritual Destitution in the Diocese of Durham* (Durham, 1859).

- <sup>24</sup> These issues are explored in full in my book, R. Lee, *The Church of England and the Durham Coalfield, 1810–1926: Clergymen, Capitalists and Colliers* (Woodbridge, 2007).
- <sup>25</sup> C. Brooks, ‘Building the rural church: money, power and the country parish’ in C. Brooks and A. Saint (eds), *The Victorian Church: Architecture and Society* (Manchester, 1995), p.66.
- <sup>26</sup> DCRO D/Lo F1137 A short sketch of SS Hild and Helen, Dawdon, 1912.
- <sup>27</sup> DCRO D/Lo E547 Correspondence re. new church at Dawdon, W.H. Wood (diocesan architect) to Malcolm Dillon (Seaham agent), 30 November 1911.
- <sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, Wood to Dillon, 23 November 1911.
- <sup>29</sup> DCRO D/Lo C201, Rev. W.A. Scott to Lady Londonderry, 12 July 1860.
- <sup>30</sup> DCRO D/Lo C201, Rev. W.A. Scott to Lady Londonderry, 5 September 1860.
- <sup>31</sup> DCRO D/Lo C552, Rev. Robert Baxter to Lady Londonderry, 14 August 1855.
- <sup>32</sup> DCRO D/Lo C552, Lady Londonderry to Mrs Maltby, 16 August 1855.
- <sup>33</sup> DCRO D/Lo C552, Lady Londonderry to Bishop Maltby, 20 August 1855.
- <sup>34</sup> DCRO D/Lo C552, Lady Londonderry to Bishop Maltby, 22 September 1855.
- <sup>35</sup> DCRO D/Lo C552, Bishop Maltby to Lady Londonderry, 1 October 1855.
- <sup>36</sup> *Newcastle Weekly Chronicle*, ‘Our Colliery Villages’ series, 18 January and 1 February 1873.
- <sup>37</sup> DCRO EP/CS 4/96. Thanks to Pat Mussett for helping to put the Bonomi development in context.
- <sup>38</sup> DCRO D/Lo C795 1/64,65 Long Newton church restoration, 1856.
- <sup>39</sup> DCRO EP/SeaH 67–72 Church memorial to 6th Marquess of Londonderry, Malcolm Dillon to Rev. James Colling, 9 February 1916.
- <sup>40</sup> W. Cobbett, *Rural Rides* (London, 1832), p.294.
- <sup>41</sup> DCRO D/Lo B238 Correspondence re. lease of Rainton Colliery, Buddle to Iveson (Stewart’s agent), 16 and 31 August 1819.

- 42 *Ibid.*, 16 August 1819.
- 43 Analysed from surviving poll-books for Durham City and Durham County.
- 44 T.J. Nossiter, *Influence, Opinion and Political Idioms in Reformed England: Case Studies from the North-East, 1832–1874* (Brighton, 1875), p.119. Fitzroy would later captain Charles Darwin's vessel, *The Beagle*.
- 45 DCRO D/Lo C257, Londonderry to Buddle, n.d. 1837.
- 46 DCRO D/Lo C108 Van Mildert to Londonderry, 3 May 1831.
- 47 DCRO D/Lo C108 Van Mildert to Londonderry, 23 July 1831.
- 48 Londonderry to Peel, 25 July 1843, cited in D. Large, 'The election of John Bright as member for Durham city in 1843', *Durham University Journal* 47 (1954), p.23.
- 49 O. Wilson, 'The Bishops of Durham and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners as landlords in Stanhope in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries', *Durham County Local History Society Bulletin* 47 (December, 1991), p.81.
- 50 DCRO D/Lo C310/10 Buddle's report on Rainton Colliery, 18 July 1832.
- 51 DUL Cathedral Library Henson 103, Henson to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 2 September 1920.
- 52 DCRO Strathmore Papers (D/St) C1/10/82, Rev. Hodgson and Humphry Davy alliance on safety lamp development; see also R. Colls, 'Primitive Methodists in the northern coalfields' in R. Samuel, L. Roper and J. Obelkevich (eds), *Disciplines of Faith: Studies in Religion, Politics and Patriarchy* (London, 1987), p.324.
- 53 C. Jones, 'Experiences of a strike: the north-east coalowners and the pitmen, 1831 – 1832' in R. Sturgess (ed), *Pitmen, Viewers and Coalmasters: Essays in North-East Coalmining in the Nineteenth Century* (Newcastle, 1986), p.31.
- 54 Emery, 'Pease and Partners', p.116.
- 55 R. Fynes, *The Miners of Northumberland and Durham: A History of their Social and Political Progress* (Sunderland, 1873), p.13.
- 56 DUL PG AUC 4/14 Clergy Visitation Returns, 1928.
- 57 *Ibid.*

- <sup>58</sup> O. Chadwick, *Hensley Henson and the Durham Miners, 1920–1939* (Durham, 1983), p.18.
- <sup>59</sup> DUL PG Earl Grey Papers B196/1 Conference of ‘The Labour Association for Promoting Co-operative Production based on the Co-partnership of the workers’, October 1899.
- <sup>60</sup> D. Dale, *The Church’s Attitude Towards Strikes and Wage Disputes* (London, 1890), p.5.
- <sup>61</sup> D. Douglass, *Pit Life in County Durham: Rank and File Movements and Workers’ Control* (1972), p.72.
- <sup>62</sup> P. d’A. Jones, *The Christian Socialist Revival, 1877–1914: Religion, Class and Social Conscience in Late-Victorian England* (New Jersey, 1968), p.197.
- <sup>63</sup> *Durham Chronicle*, 27 November 1926. I am indebted to Hester Barron for bringing this to my attention.
- <sup>64</sup> NA 30/69/1346 Again, my thanks are due to Hester Barron for this information.
- <sup>65</sup> DUL PG AUC 2 Parish files, Houghton-le-Spring, Durham Miners’ Association to Earl Durham, 5 January 1921.
- <sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, See, for example, the letters written to Henson by Mrs E. Hunter, 6 January 1921, and the Rev. C. Adamson, 14 January 1921.
- <sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, Rev. J.F. Clayton, 12 January 1921.
- <sup>68</sup> Cited in Benyon and Austrin, *Masters and Servants*, p.321.
- <sup>69</sup> H.H. Henson, *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life* (London, 1943), Vol 2, p.120.
- <sup>70</sup> From Henson’s journal, 28 June 1926, cited in Chadwick, *Henson and the Miners*, p.9.
- <sup>71</sup> *Durham Chronicle*, 3 June 1927.
- <sup>72</sup> E.R. Norman, *Church and Society in England, 1770–1970: An Historical Study* (Oxford, 1976), p.252.

ROBERT LEE  
*University of Teesside*