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The social and economic dislocation experienced in Victorian Norfolk during the later nineteenth-century derived from the fall in land and grain prices, declining rental incomes, the spread of cattle disease, imports of cheap grain and its transportation by rail, and tensions between labourers and farmers. In this context, an assessment of one Masonic lodge indicates that Freemasonry provided a space where men might meet to develop trusting strong ties to one another and resolve their conflicts. However, lodge members were increasing isolated from the working-class brethren who were members of other fraternal associations. They found refuge in the Conservative Club, the Masonic lodge and the Church, while poorer men supported the Chapel, friendly societies and Liberalism. The development of weak ties to friendly societies helped to shape those bodies and to provide the Freemasons with an inexpensive and pragmatic means to improve the flow of useful knowledge and promote social harmony.
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In 1775 Samuel Johnson defined a gift as simultaneously ‘bequest, endowment, or alms to the poor’ and also ‘an obligation, offering, bribe’. The Scottish word for mutual help (giff-gaff) and the English term (‘give and take’) suggest that the unity of donating and receiving was a firmly embedded notion. Such exchanges enabled patrons, under the aegis of charity, to create an obligation and aid the preservation of the status quo. They were often reinforced through the public displays, rituals and social activities of mutual aid societies. While pervasive, the death of systems of reciprocity has frequently been pronounced. In 1905 Weber argued, in The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism, that modernity had replaced obligation with personal calculation. Kropotkin felt that during the 300 years following the late fifteenth century, mutual aid institutions had been ‘systematically weeded out’ of villages. A few years later Mauss concluded that a gift economy of cyclical exchanges, whereby people gave, received and reciprocated had been at ‘the heart of normal social life’ in pre-modern times but the nineteenth century saw a ‘victory of rationalism and mercantilism’. The Reformation, the rise of markets, urbanisation and the Poor Laws have all been proposed as contributors to the shift from Gemeinschaft communities to contractually-organised Gesellschaft. For Valenze the transition occurred in the seventeenth and eighteenth
centuries, Polyani suggested that a system of reciprocity had been replaced by the market by the end of the eighteenth century, and Ismay conceptualised the same century as ‘the commercial society of strangers’. Gillis argued that ‘by the end of the nineteenth century the old gift economy had virtually disappeared’, while Vernon felt that population growth, urbanisation and the development of impersonal negotiations had resulted in a society of *Distant Strangers*. Stedman Jones memorably concluded that ‘where the rich and poor had been separated, the social powers supposedly inherent in the gift had disappeared’.

These chronologies are imperfect, as the dual foci of this article show. Freemasonry, described as ‘a system of morality, veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbols’, sought to improve the standing of members through allegorical guidance. Members were obliged, as long as this did not conflict with their own interests, to help fellow Freemasons, and were reminded of this obligation by their coded regalia and through rituals performed at their monthly meetings. Friendly societies paid pooled money to members unable to work at their normal trade due to a variety of problems (including injury or old age) and supported members’ bereaved spouses and offspring. These fraternal associations overlapped in memberships, shared some perspectives and encouraged participation in role-play costumed dramas and rituals which reinforced their values. In Warrington, the Masonic Lodge of Lights had both a Masonic Benefit Society and links to the White Hart Benefit Society. In Bristol the Temple Lodge Benefit Society was both a Masonic Lodge and a friendly society. The Masonic Lodge of Friendship, Oldham, ran both a Benevolent Society and a Sick Fund.

The spatial focus for this article is, however, rather different to the examples above. In Norfolk during the second half of the nineteenth century land prices, grain prices and rental incomes all fell, cattle disease spread, the hegemony of coastal and inland water transportation was challenged by rail, and tensions between labourers and farmers intensified. The consequences for fraternal and other multi-level membership organisations were fast and direct. There was an increasing dominance of wealthy men within Freemasonry, while the membership of friendly societies was increasingly composed of unskilled men. The overt discourse of brotherly love as a non-material, gender-specific mutuality persisted, but friendly societies produced actuarial tables. This formalised reciprocity and Cordery concluded, ‘contributed to the diffusion of commercial values’. It is unsurprising in this context to find Snell proposing that rural workers developed a sense not of cross-class community but of ‘deferential bitterness’. The particular locus of eastern England is important here. Norfolk had little industrial employment and was dominated by very large estates, such as that of L’Estrange at Hunstanton. This ownership pattern was associated with overcrowding and restrictions on settlement. Poaching and animal maiming occurred and in Norfolk and Suffolk there were 1,972 incidents of arson between 1815 and 1870. This indicates the weak bargaining position of the arsonists, often labourers, of East Anglia. Lee defined the 1870s as when ‘the idea took hold among the
labouring poor that the parson, *per se*, was their sworn enemy*.14 In 1892 one vicar noted that,

> In the vast majority of parishes the squire, the parson and the large farmers form a ‘ring’ which controls all parochial affairs so that no outsider has a chance of knowing what goes on.13

In 1893, evidence to the Royal Commission on Labour suggested of Norfolk that there

> is the tendency for relations between employers and employed to become confined solely to business matters, there being no identity of interest after each has, during the working hours, fulfilled his part of the contract.

The Commission concluded that ‘the familiar and quasi-patriarchal terms upon which farmers used to live with their men are fast giving way to mere contractual relations’.16 In 1897 A. H. H. Matthews noted how, in Norfolk, sectarian and political divides coincided:

> To have seen the clergyman of a parish first is enough to prevent every nonconformist from attending your meeting. If a Conservative takes any active part the Radical avoids it like poison and *vice-versa*.17

Both Howkins and Scotland concluded that Norfolk was dominated by ‘the oligarchical troika of parson, squire and farmer’ and that as a result the poor turned to the ‘permanent triad of Liberal-union-chapel’.18 Newby took the view that, while landowners and farmers deployed charity as ‘an integral part of the relationship between the agricultural worker and his social superiors [which] complemented the Poor Law’, by the 1880s it was obvious to ‘even to the loyal agricultural worker [of East Anglia] that the “organic community” was beginning to fall apart’.19

Against this backdrop, the article explores the history and activities of Kings Lynn’s only lodge of Freemasons between 1851 and 1906, the Philanthropic No. 107 (hereafter the Philanthropic). This lodge remained a node for business and social linkages, providing opportunities for members to develop, learn about civil, civic engagement, and to forge links to other fraternal bodies. It protected relatively narrow common interests through strong ties within the lodge and engendered weaker connections to fraternal bodies with similar perspectives and values.20 A first section is focused on the prevalence of local fraternal reciprocity, while the second considers the shifting class composition of philanthropy. A final section foregrounds external networks, suggesting that the death of the gift convention is exaggerated.

**Local fraternal reciprocity**

The recognition that fraternal networks could reduce free riding, moral hazard and transaction costs for members owed much to the business, religious and charitable tradition of King’s Lynn. In the fourteenth century half the Lynn’s men
were members of religious and merchants’ guilds. Following the Reformation, craft guilds and Lynn Corporation fulfilled similar functions, providing opportunities for collective self-help, processions, rituals and feasts and the channelling funds to the poor. In the sixteenth century 66% of Lynn merchants left money to the poor by entrusting funds to the Corporation. Gifting and informal support were ubiquitous, often stimulated by the market. In 1729, when Freemasonry was ‘the most pervasive and influential form of secular voluntary organisation in most English towns’, Lynn’s first lodge of Freemasons opened. It was also when networks of credit and commerce were built on ‘affability, courtesy and reliability’ and ‘commercial honour was closely linked with masculinity’. By 1800 Freemasonry in the town was widespread.

A study of business success in Lynn concluded that it ‘depended on the ability to make connections to other retailers and wholesalers who could co-operate in offering valuable information on markets and help to buy things’. As informal agreements developed in complexity and debts were built up, the importance of trustworthiness grew so that ‘all had to trust and also be trusted’. The writing off of debts was described as charity and, in early modern Lynn, ‘as the market became all pervasive, reciprocity and forgiveness tempered by thrift and discretion became more pervasive in notions of charity’. A local cleric’s diaries indicate the entanglement of reciprocity, hospitality and power. He sought favours rather than payment and recorded gifts given and received.

In the 1820s and 1830s Norfolk had the most charities per acre of all counties and Lynn was particularly well-endowed with them. In this context, the Freemasons understood ‘fraternal charity’ as ‘an ideology of interdependence, its practical manifestation being giving and receiving’. Charity was presented primarily in terms of their own self-realisation. To ‘make’ a mason, archetypically formed and regularly tested to the ‘working’ of his lodge was itself the best form of charity because it conferred those attributes of ‘character’ without which charity was wasted on the recipient.

Their charitable efforts merged with support for fraternal ventures. To reduce the impact of being unable to work at their usual trade, from at least 1634 sailors in King’s Lynn formed ‘box clubs’ for mutual aid. The box was often kept in a pub where the members met. William and John Bagge owned The Royal Oak pub and managed the Sailors Friendly Society which was based there. William Bagge was a member of Lynn’s first Masonic lodge and was mayor in 1739, 1751 and 1785. John Bagge, another founding member of the lodge, was Lynn’s mayor in 1731. Examples of Masonic support for, and patronage of, forms of mutual aid and reciprocity were echoed by others and from at least 1778 a number of ship owners in the town ran mutual insurance clubs. There were at least 20 friendly societies in Lynn during the first half of the nineteenth century. They modelled how the poor might be treated and how masculine-based sociability could promote exchange and trust. The one based at the Green Dragon had 109 members and an annual procession to a church and a dinner. Many merchants used these
friendly societies as banks for their employees’ savings. The Seaman’s and Orphan’s Society raised money from ship owners and had convivial elements to its activities. The meeting of 1825 included ‘nautical recitations from a hearty tar’. The Shipwrecked Fishermen and Mariners’ Benevolent Society, founded 1839, relieved widows and orphans. By 1842, 428 sailors and relatives had enrolled in Lynn and at least 213 had received assistance.

Members of the Philanthropic lived across Norfolk, and beyond and could have witnessed many examples of structures designed to bolster trust and mutual aid. Merchants in Lynn traded around the coast, inland via the Ouse and with other countries. They used credit to facilitate exchange and to expand production, distribution and the capital available. Indeed,

credit arrangements were essential for all social orders as a result of the expansion of internal trade and the lack of liquidity. Mutual support between kin, friends and acquaintances was a basic necessity for survival.

Some 118 vessels were registered at Lynn in 1829, and 164 in 1851. The number then fell to 120 in 1870. Each ship was a separate commercial enterprise. As there could be up to 32 owners holding up to 64 shares in any one vessel, decisions about insurance, cargo and the appointment of a Master required the development of trusting relationships. Networking was the ‘key to understanding the organisation and behaviour of the shipping industry’. In the 1860s and 1870s cattle disease spread across Norfolk. Presented as Divine Judgment by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Carlisle and amidst calls for a ban on imported livestock, there was affirmation of the tradition of mutual insurance to mitigate the impact of rinderpest. Cow clubs were established, some of which were registered as friendly societies and there was the foundation, in 1849, of the Norfolk Farmers’ Insurance Co. In 1859 the Prince of Wales supported the creation of the Norfolk Cattle Plague Association. By 1872 the fraternal tradition was adapted when the wealthy of the area once more turned to structured mutual aid and established the co-operative West Norfolk Chemical Company.

The shifting class and occupational composition of the Philanthropic

The Unlawful Societies Act of 1799, banned the meetings of groups that required their members to swear an oath. In order to gain exemption Freemasons provided members names, addresses, occupations and ages to the local Clerk of the Peace, providing a substantial resource with which to investigate local patterns of freemasonry. To create a prosopographic database, information from that source has been added to self-descriptions from the 1881 census of 352 people known to have been past or current Philanthropic members in 1910 and to printed material about members. This database reveals much about the membership and meaning of the Lodge in our period.

Thus, the Philanthropic was founded when Freemasonry faced problems across the county:
Initially the lodge was dominated by artisans and mariners, boat builders and shipwrights. The coopers, butchers, carpenters, pilots, whitesmiths, blacksmiths and bakers all joined before 1840. They may have been unable to be accepted as members of the nearby United Good Fellowship Lodge, Wisbech which attracted members of a higher social class. The fate of that lodge, which was soon to close, was intricately tied up with the development of the Philanthropic. The whitesmiths and pilots left the Good Fellowship by 1818, the blacksmith by 1820, the cooper in 1829, the butcher in 1831, the carpenters by 1833 and the bakers by 1837. The boat builders and shipwrights had left by 1815 and other men associated with maritime trades joined the Philanthropic. These included a captain, a man in the Merchant Service, a Coast Guard, a Customs Tide Waiter, a Tide Waiter, two Excise Officers, two dock managers, a dock master, a shipping manager, a marine store dealer, a rope maker, a warehouseman, a water bailiff, a steam ship agent, ship brokers and ship owners. The wealthier seafarers, the captain, master mariners and naval officers, were all members between 1832 and 1842 and two master mariners remained after the latter date.

Perhaps attracted by the possibility of connections for trade or a place to relax while in Lynn, some members came from outside the town. Two hawkers from Lopham (Norfolk) joined but had left by 1825. Two mariners from Knottingley (Yorkshire), Thomas Bolton and George Howard, joined in 1811 and another Knottingley mariner, Richard Darnbrook, became a member of the lodge in 1813. Two mariners from Robin Hood’s Bay (Yorkshire) joined in 1811 and another mariner, from Thorne (Yorkshire) in 1813. Harrison Marshall, a mariner of Sunderland was a member in 1810 and 1815 and the Master Mariner Johann Heisel from Breman joined in 1837. In 1833 ten of the 24 members were master mariners and the jobs of another nine are unknown.

Frank Bedford Glasier remained a member, along with his father, even after he was appointed as Government Railway Manager for the Lagos Railway. He then helped to found a lodge in Lagos. Yet some members of the Philanthropic retained their links even while overseas. Ernest Palmer Clarkson continued to subscribe from Ontario and when John Mason died in Napier, New Zealand, the Philanthropic tried to pay his funeral expenses. Other fraternal bodies supported emigration. They also supported emigrants. In 1891 the Loyal Trafalgar IOOF lodge granted ‘clearance’ to Brother Henry Hollis when he went to America from Norfolk and in 1908 made a sick payment to Brother Ward, who, although ‘residing in Australia’ had maintained his membership. In addition to similar ethical guidance and ritual accoutrements, vestments, rites, sermons and feasts, Norfolk’s fraternal associations all facilitated migration and valued international
links. They could bond over their shared perspectives on how best to bolster connections. Freemasons provided members with ‘lodge certificates’ which enabled them to gain access to lodges throughout the Empire.

One clerk was a member 1813 to 1816 but other clerks only joined the Philanthropic after 1839. There were four by 1873 and six in 1876. A merchant joined in 1835 but he was the sole merchant until 1857 when two more joined. In 1875 a fourth was added and there were seven by 1878 and nine by 1881. The hospital Treasurer, Alderman and mayor Francis Cresswell became a member in 1845, as did seven brewers and two brewery proprietors, a wine merchant's manager, three hotel keepers five hotel proprietors and an innkeeper. Samuel Nicholas Marshall, a farmer, was the licensee and owner of the Duke’s Head Hotel (where the Philanthropic Lodge met until 2016) between 1856 and 1881. Following his death the subsequent licensee and owner was also a lodge member.45

This sort of membership clearly offered possibilities for the development of business networks that improved the flow of information, strengthened contract enforceability and helped to resolve problems of agency.46 We see this very clearly in relation to the transport sector in the town. The arrival of railway in 1847 initially undermined the traditional importance of the docks.47 Coal imports had fallen by a third by 1855 and the town’s population, which had doubled to 20,000 in the first half of the nineteenth century, fell by 3,000 in the next decade.48 There was some maritime recovery with the construction of a Corn Exchange in 1854 and a new quay in 1856.49 A new dock, for larger vessels, was opened in 1869 by the Prince of Wales. It had a hydraulic lift, steam cranes and a branch line to the railway system.50 In 1880 over 580 vessels used it. The dock was further extended in 1883 which, as Kelly’s Directory for that year noted, added ‘much to the prosperity of the town’. Colonel William Pattrick, a one-time Philanthropic Worshipful Master, ran a timber company with an important contract with Great Eastern Railway Company. He was also chair of the Dock and Railway Company which expanded the port. One of that company’s directors was jeweller and Lynn mayor William Read Pridgeon, a member of the Philanthropic 1860–69. He was also a director of the King’s Lynn Gas Company. Pattrick was, with his brother Thomas, in the United Good Fellowship Lodge, Wisbech, before he joined the Philanthropic. He joined the Norfolk Lodge in 1901 and Le Strange Lodge, Hunstanton in 1914 where fellow members included Austen Le Strange (also in the Philanthropic) and the son of John Dyker Thew, Frank Sherwood Thew. Other Philanthropic members included men who were recorded as being a Station Master, an Engine Driver and a Locomotive Superintendent. There were also two Railway Traffic Managers and the five railway agents. In addition, Pattrick chaired the New Hunstanton Local Board and its successor the Urban District Council and he was a Lynn mayor 1882–1883, and a member of the King’s Lynn Conservancy Board, the Lynn Charity Trustees and other bodies. When was involved in a legal dispute he sought the advice of fellow mason Charles T. Ives.51 Ives went on to become Provincial Assistant Grand Director of Ceremonies, Provincial Grand Senior Warden and Lodge treasurer.
Another brother in the lodge was Thomas Marsters Kendall, the surgeon to the Great Eastern Railway. In 1900 about 1% of the British male population were Freemasons. A study of over 400 companies found that almost a fifth had a Freemason manager and that the same percentage of managers were Freemasons. In the railways and breweries sectors 34% and 32% of firms respectively, were run by Freemasons. Kendall was also the Admiralty and West Norfolk & Lynn Hospital surgeon and the medical inspector of seamen and army recruits. In his capacity as surgeon to the Lynn Rifle Corps Kendall would have had contact with the other eleven Philanthropic members who helped to found the Corps in 1859. This was a body which echoed some of the values of the lodge. It took a pride in discipline, uniforms and badges and promoted civic pride and patriotism through healthy recreation and cross-class co-operation. As an Alderman, churchwarden of St Margaret’s Parish Church (where the vicar and three curates and the Vestry Clerk were Philanthropic members and where the choir stall were erected in the memory of another Philanthropic member) and as partner in his father-in-law’s firm of spirit merchants, Kendall and his fellow company partner in the Philanthropic (Charles Miller) might have valued the contacts they made with other Philanthropic members who were involved in civic activities, the drinks trade or the regulation of licensing legislation. Those in local government and administration included a Chief Constable of Lynn for 32 years, at least 11 JPs and Solicitor Robert Huxley Aldham who was Clerk to the Guardians of Freebridge Lynn Union as well as being Superintendent Registrar & Vestry Clerk of South Lynn, and Steward to the Manors of Howards in Terrington & Docking Hall in Docking. He joined in 1876, was Worshipful Master in 1883 and also held regional posts and membership of other lodges. Kendall was a Commissioner for a land tax in 1866, along with two fellow Philanthropic members. He was one of two Apothecaries to the Prince of Wales, both of whom were lodge members, as was the owner of the nearby royal estate at Sandringham the Prince himself. In addition, Kendall was the Worshipful Master of the Philanthropic Lodge in 1859 and Provincial Junior Grand Warden in 1864 and 1865 and he joined United Good Fellowship Lodge, Wisbech in 1860. This would have provided him with other connections.

In turn, the occupation of the Worshipful Masters over the course of the century indicates the change in the social base. The first Worshipful Master was a ‘yeoman’ from Swaffham. In 1823 the funds and records were stolen by the men who were Worshipful Masters in 1816, 1820 and 1822. One Worshipful Master, John Danderson, a labourer based in Boston, was imprisoned in 1834. John Whaley, a gunsmith, was one of the eight initiates of the Philanthropic in 1810 and the Worshipful Master in 1811, 1812 and 1814 while Sir William H ffolkes (Worshipful Master in 1880, 1899 and 1910) owned the Hillington estate. He was Lynn MP 1880–1885 and a director of the Norfolk Estuary Company. The rural dean of Lynn, the Rev H. E. Browne ffolkes (1823–1912) was Rector of Hillington from 1853 and he was followed by the Rev. F.A.S. ffolkes, M.V.O.,
J.P., a brother of the Baronet. Martin William Browne ffolkes, Robert Walling ffolkes and George Browne ffolkes were also Philanthropic members. The number of clerics in the lodge also reflects this shift. A cleric joined the Philanthropic Lodge in 1861 and there were eight Anglican clerical brethren by 1876. The Reverend Bridgewater was both a member and Hon. Chaplain in the Norfolk Volunteers. He married the daughter of a vicar who was a member of another prominent Lynn family, the Everards. Many vicars were closely connected to the landed gentry. Forty-four (and 33 of the top 42) of the 72 individuals in Norfolk with land worth more than £3,000 in 1876 had members of their families in the church.

In 1877 both linen draper John Swann and tailor William Wagstaff Wilkin joined from other lodges. Wilkin became Worshipful Master, while Swann’s business boomed. Unusually for a Liberal Methodist, Alfred Jermyn, another draper, joined the lodge. He became Lynn’s mayor in 1897. Other Philanthropic Lynn mayors include George Gold Seppings. Brother Sir William John Lancaster was mayor of Wandsworth and also spent 62 years with the Prudential Assurance Company, including work as a secretary, a director and as deputy chairman. Within the lodge in 1869 there were members who were insurance agents for eight different companies. The first bank manager to join became a member in 1873 and, leaving aside one who was a founder member in 1810, the first brewer joined after 1887.

There were four farmers in the Philanthropic by 1812 and there remained that number until 1873 when the number rose to five and soon afterwards to six. They may have been attracted by the need for mutual aid. Local grain prices fell from 65/- a quarter in 1872, to 22/10d a quarter in 1894. More fruit was grown and in 1899 fruit farmer Henry George Welchman joined. Land prices also fell from £35 to £20 an acre between 1876 and 1896. The prestige of land ownership fell and Barnes thought that ‘it is significant that the brewers, diamond millionaires and magnates of industry clustered around King Edward VII did not even aspire to ownership of large estates’. Locally farmers increasingly sought to retain male farm workers and wages rose. Through the Philanthropic networks they might have learned of the fraternal associations for their labourers, notably the trade union and the friendly societies. The number of casual labouring women and children fell. Farming became less popular and landowners reduced rents to attract tenants. Some Philanthropic members diversified. Rental income on the vast Holkham estate (about 25 miles east of King’s Lynn) fell from £51,308 in 1881 to £31,939 in 1900 and 28 of the 70 Holkham farms changed hands more than once between 1880 and 1900. Indeed, 25% of England changed ownership between 1917 and 1921.

The Prince of Wales became a Freemason in 1868. During the period that he was the Freemason’s Grand Master, 1874–1901, about 50 new lodges were created each year and about 30 of them were called Albert Edward or another variation of his name. His membership was followed by an influx of wealthy men.
Members have been characterised as an elite convivial club by Cordery and ‘socially exclusive’ and ‘closely associated with status and respectability’ by Tosh.\textsuperscript{70} Prescott concluded that in England between 1856 and 1874 Freemasonry became ‘an overwhelmingly middle class vehicle’ important to ‘the cohesion of the social elites in provincial towns’ which by 1900 had ‘settled in its position in society’.\textsuperscript{71} In Wolverhampton and Leicester ‘masons were increasingly drawn from professional and business backgrounds’.\textsuperscript{72} Masonic links between councillors and civic officials have been noted in Norwich.\textsuperscript{73} At least a third of the 154 men elected to Blackpool corporation 1876–1914 were Freemasons as were 14 of the town’s first 42 mayors.\textsuperscript{74} In the Lodge of Lights, No.148, Warrington, by the 1850s ‘a more middle class membership in the lodge became evident’ while the number of professions, concluded a study of lodges in Stockport, Warrington and Oldham, ‘rose very sharply in the 1860s marking a permanent change in the membership of these lodges. What was also noticeable was the decrease in importance of men following a trade’.\textsuperscript{75} Newman concluded that increasingly, across Freemasonry, regional posts were ‘restricted to various narrow social groups’.\textsuperscript{76} Gunn felt that this element of ‘bourgeois culture [...] became increasingly closed and secretive in the course of the nineteenth century’.\textsuperscript{77}

Echoing this development, the Philanthropic began to attract wealthier men. The first ‘gentleman’ joined in 1858. However, there were three or fewer gentlemen Philanthropic members at any point until the 1870s. After the Prince joined the Philanthropic (which was located close to his residence at Sandringham) the number of members grew. His interest was such that when Philanthropic member George Smith Woodwark, a Lynn timber merchant and former mayor died in 1898 his funeral was attended by Sir H B ffolkes under special command of the Prince of Wales. Between 1859 and 1872 there were between 33 and 52 members of the Philanthropic in any one year, rising to 66 by 1874 and 73 in 1875. The number of members did not fall below that latter figure for the next 15 years. In 1896, there were 66 members, making the Philanthropic the second largest of any lodge in the county. The number of gentlemen also grew. There were eight by 1878 and nine by 1880, some of them from other Masonic lodges.\textsuperscript{78} In 1873 over 40 Philanthropic members owned land in the county. Some 17 owned less than 20 acres each, a further 13 owned between 20 and 80 acres and 10 had between 100 and 500 acres. Robert Elwes owned 3,313 acres and while Granville Pitt did not own the 6,768 acres at Langley Park where he lived, his father did. Such observations suggest that there were opportunities for social advancement and patronage.\textsuperscript{79} George Baker, who joined in the Philanthropic in 1903, was a stud groom on the estate of the ffolkes family. When Edmund Beck, an auctioneer, became Agent to the Prince of Wales he moved to live at Sandringham. Within a few years he gave away, in marriage, a Sandringham housekeeper to the head gamekeeper and fellow Philanthropic member, Charles Henry Jackson. The marriage was solemnised by the Rev. F A S ffolkes, the domestic chaplain to their Majesties.\textsuperscript{80} Philanthropic member Charles Penny also worked at Sandringham.
He was Head Gardener at Aldenham House, a country house near Elstree. In 1873, aged 45, he moved to become Head Gardener at Sandringham, was initiated into the Philanthropic in 1876 and remained a member until 1891.

External networks

The Freemasons were among those who sought to provide a haven where members could meet in conditions of discretion and civility. They also reached out to ameliorate Norfolk’s social and economic divisions. There was ‘a great increase in private charity at Christmas from the 1870s and an increase in [Anglican] harvest festivals’ 81 The Prince of Wales launched a Masonic educational charity in Lynn in 1885, which gave lodge members links to poorer people. 82 The Lynn Agricultural Association promoted friendly societies and was supported the Reverends John Freeman, Henry Ffolkes, W W Clarke and J L Brereton. 83 In the 1890s Lord Winchilsea established the National Agricultural Union. It stressed the importance of loyalty to the parish, estate and workplace and encouraged landowners to support friendly societies. 84 Although the union failed, in the eastern counties ‘the ideology remained strong’. 85 In turn, Norfolk’s friendly societies and unions were often associated with Primitive Methodism. At least seven National Agricultural Labourers’ Union officers were Primitive Methodists and active within friendly societies. President George Edwards was a member of the Independent Order of Oddfellows, Manchester Unity, Friendly Society IOOF, and a former Chief Ranger (chair) of a court of the Ancient Order of Foresters Friendly Society, AoF. The Watton Benefit Religious Society and the Primitive Methodist Benefit Society, in Thetford were founded by preachers. 86 Zachariah Walker was active as a Primitive Methodist, Liberal, trade unionist and an IOOF lodge secretary. Some vicars also made connections. All the treasurers of the lodge in Salthouse between 1894 and 1900 were vicars, the United Sisters Friendly Society was founded by a vicar and had numerous branches in the area. Its president was a honorary member of the AoF. In 1906 the vicar of St Margaret’s Lynn was a AoF Vice President.

The model of fraternal conciliation, adopted by the National Agricultural Labourers’ Union was bolstered by its successor, the Eastern Counties Agricultural Labourers and Small Holders’ Union. Rather than focusing on wages it campaigned for improvements in housing and small holdings and took the view of labour relations that as disagreements were difficult and expensive, all possible conflicts had to be approved by the General Secretary. 87 A pay increase for labourers was agreed through private talks with a local landowner, the Earl of Leicester. He was supportive of friendly societies and had an IOOF lodge named after him. 88 A Norfolk and Norwich Unity Independent Order of Odd Fellows lodge was named after the Hon F Walpole MP and an IOOF lodge named after Lord Stanley, a Lynn MP. A number of AoF Courts were named after landowners. 89 When a union breakaway, the National Agricultural Party, was formed by local labour activist Sam Peel, it appealed to Norfolk localism and unity with
employers and gained support within the county committee, but not at national level. Peel spoke for many farm workers who had close relationships with their employers.

In turn, the AoF and the IOOF ‘provided the agricultural worker with administrative experience and an organisational model’. There were 95 AoF courts in Norfolk in 1885 and the jobs of 64 of the secretaries and 42 of the treasurers can be identified in the 1881 Census. In contrast to the general membership, only 12 of these 106 officers were labourers. The others identified themselves as craftsmen, tradesmen or farmers. The friendly society in Catton had three trustees, all of them farmers. From the 1870s more people lived longer, but many were unable to work. This had an adverse impact on societies. Those in Massingham and Hillington collapsed while providing friendly society services hastened the demise of the National Agricultural Labourers Union. Farmers could provide financial and other support. As a Trustee of a friendly society with about 500 members in the Norwich area noted: ‘We are a plain lot of uncultivated agricultural labourers [who need] 10 or 20 percent of middle class to keep [us] straight’. The patronage model, noted elsewhere, retained its popularity in Norfolk. Between 1867 and 1915 within the IOOF King’s Lynn and West Norfolk District, there were 60 men who held the posts of Provincial Grand Master, Deputy Provincial Grand Master, Corresponding Secretary or Trustee. The occupations of 29 of them in 1881 can be identified. A number of those occupations were also held by members of the Philanthropic Lodge. There was at least one cleric, a tobacconist, a gardener, a chemist, a baker, a butcher, a solicitor, a brewer, a coal merchant and a timber merchant in each organisation. Links between those involved in the same trades and formal institutional-level links between fraternal associations are likely to have been mutually beneficial. Hamon L’Estrange the Freemasons’ Provincial Grand Treasurer 1876–1886, Grand Deacon and Grand Master, initiated an IOOF Lodge in Hunstanton some 17 miles from Lynn. John Rust, the Philanthropic Worshipful Master in 1892 was another IOOF Grand Master. James Lister Stead was also active in both the Philanthropic and the IOOF. In 1866 Charles Theophilus Ives became Provincial Grand Master of the Lynn District of the IOOF and in 1867, Philanthropic Worshipful Master. Charles Edward Ward a solicitor’s clerk in Lynn, was a Master and Provincial Grand Senior Warden in the Freemasons, a patron of the IOOF and, in 1906, the AoF High Chief Ranger. Ward was married to an honorary member of a female Foresters court which he had helped to found. When the AoF High Court (annual delegates meeting) was held in Lynn there were representatives of a number of trade unions and friendly societies in attendance. Ward would have been in an excellent position to make connections with them. The AoF called him ‘a mason of distinction’ and suggested that there could not be ‘a more popular member of the craft than he in the eastern counties’.

In 1880 400 IOOF delegates attended an annual conference in Lynn. The MP for West Norfolk who was also the Sheriff of Norfolk in 1866, a Freemason, local
landowner and patron of at least three local churches offered support and the Prince of Wales hosted delegates at Sandringham. The influential IOOF Estimates Committee was chaired by a Freemason who was also a civil servant, Robert Moffrey. When the AoF opened its first court in Lynn (in the Freemason’s Tavern) it established a benevolent fund ‘for brethren in distress’. Almost half a century later in 1906 at the AoF High Court, Lynn the society recognised the importance of the charitable traditions:

Forestry appears to have flourished in King’s Lynn and West Norfolk as might only be expected in view of the fact that in the very early days of the 14th century, King’s Lynn was noted for the large number of social and benevolent guilds held in the borough. … Their work appears to have been on very similar lines to the modern Friendly Society.

The Prince of Wales gave land for an AoF hall in nearby Dersingham and provided lunch to 1,500 delegates at Sandringham to AoF. This was followed by tea at the ffolkes family, Hillington. The AoF was proud to announce that a court that it opened in 1899, Pride of South Lynn, had ‘a large number of honorary members, several scales of contributions and benefits and receives its members accumulated savings for investment’. Other Philanthropic Lodge members with links to the AoF included Richard Bryant, a Master and Provincial Grand Senior Warder and AoF National Committee member, Hamon L’Estrange, Sir W H B, Ffolkes Bart and William Pattrick (AoF Vice-Presidents) and two other members who were on the AoF executive. In addition, solicitor John William Hyner, a Master of the Philanthropic and Provincial Grand Registrar in the Freemasons, followed Ward and became an AoF High Court Ranger. William Bennett, a Chief Ranger in the AoF Prince of Wales Court, worked for Philanthropic Lodge member, John Dyker Thew. President of the Union Club, a JP and Lynn mayor 1871 1876 and 1885, Thew published the Lynn Advertiser and owned 116 acres of land from which he derived an income, in 1873, of over £450. He was resident, with fellow Philanthropic members William Pattrick, William Thompson, Francis Cresswell, John Samuel Bedford Glasier and Lynn Mayor 1887, George Smith Woodwark of a watering place, St Edmounds, which adjoined Hunstanton. In 1879 the Prince of Wales opened a £7,000 Convalescent Home there.

There was thus no complete replacement of a mutualist ethic by a free market. Examples of working-class neighbourly support and reciprocity abound. According to the satirical magazine Porcupine in 1880 the poor ‘have a system of mutual assistance, a habit of helping each other, which prevents many of them ever becoming rich in anything but nobleness of character’. The notion of reciprocity was also employed to embed social superiority and stability. In King’s Lynn the Philanthropic became the node where men could not only build fictive kin relationships but could also exploit weaker ties to fellow fraternal bodies. A commitment to the tenets of brotherly love enabled members of the Philanthropic to develop and maintain a psychological and communication space inside the lodge and to make connections beyond it. Through blurring the distinction
between economic and symbolic capital formation, generating community and emphasising reciprocity, civility and probity, these men were able to reduce transaction costs and build and maintain communities of obligation. The lodge was more than a haven which enabled spiritual enlightenment to be nurtured, it offered a route across class lines and modelled and promoted civility and respectability in a locality where social relations had been bitter and violent.
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