INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

TOYNBEE HALL: ITS IDEOLOGICAL ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT

by

Loretta Lagana

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1980

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in History in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

12/11/80
date

Chairman, Examining Committee

12/8/80
date

Executive Officer

Professor Ann Burton

Professor Corinne Weston

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In 1884 Toynbee Hall was founded in East London under the leadership of Canon Samuel A. Barnett (1844-1913). The first university settlement was a response to the persistent problem of urban poverty confronting later Victorian society and a reflection of the heightened interest in social questions during that period. The failure of existing social institutions to deal effectively with the mounting distress of the urban poor challenged prevailing social theories and practices and led some men to seek alternative methods of social reform.

Recognizing the economic and social inequities of contemporary capitalistic society, the Christian Socialists in 1848 had proposed a model for social organization based on Christian values. Guided by F.D. Maurice, an Anglican clergyman and university professor, and J.M. Ludlow, a working class sympathizer educated in France, the Christian Socialists sought to remedy current social ills by replacing the principles of unbridled competition and individualism with the Christian ideals of brotherly love and mutual cooperation. By uniting Christianity to the cause of social justice, Maurice and his followers inspired a new generation of social reformers. At the universities the spirit of social reform implicit in Maurice's teachings was imbibed by future

members of the university settlement movement and the primary importance which the Christian Socialists placed on the education of the working class would provide the settlement with one of its principal goals.[1]

In the later decades of the nineteenth century the increasing secularization of society and the deteriorating condition of the urban working class encouraged the growth of reform organizations whose aim was the reconstruction of society according to the principles of secular socialism.[2] During the early 1880's H.M. Hundman's Social Democratic Federation and William Morris' Socialist League were founded on something like a Marxist ideology, while the Fabian Society adopted a more moderate version of socialistic theory.[3] This latter group had ties with the university settlement movement since Samuel Barnett had helped launch Beatrice Potter, the future Mrs. Webb, on her career of social investigation. Over the years their continued friendship proved mutually stimulating. In addition to the Webbs, Sidney Olivier and Graham Wallas, both prominent members of the Fabian Society, were closely associated with the work of Toynbee Hall.[4]

While a product of the ferment in social thought in the early 1880's, the university settlement movement, like the Fabian Society, eschewed the radical prescriptions for social change offered by more militant groups and instead chose to work within the established framework to improve the condition of the urban working class. The goal of the university settlement was to promote social harmony through the close

association of the university graduates who resided in the settlement house and directed its activities and the inhabitants of the district who availed themselves of the services provided by the house. It was believed that from this shared experience of urban life the underprivileged would derive cultural and spiritual benefits while the settlers would acquire the knowledge and expertise necessary to promote effective social reform. In its social philosophy and methodology the university settlement movement incorporated features of both the older traditional charitable institutions and the newer "scientific" ones, as they thought of themselves.

Earlier nineteenth century private philanthropy can be broadly characterized as local, voluntary, individualistic, uncoordinated and often temporary. Since poverty was viewed as a condition of moral as well as material destitution, attempts were made to meet the spiritual and physical needs of the poor through personal service. Funds raised through private subscriptions or endowments provided direct aid in the form of doles, soup-kitchens, meal and coal tickets, blankets, clothing, Biblical tracts and devotional literature. Hospitals, schools, clubs, and societies were established and supported through voluntary effort. Important philanthropic work was undertaken by private individuals, numerous denominational and secular societies and, to a large extent, by the clergy of the Anglican church.

By virtue of its position as the established church and the parochial organization of local government, the Anglican

church had assumed a well defined role in the areas of Poor Law administration, public health, and education by the mid-nineteenth century.[5] With the urbanization of English society the social responsibilities of the church were extended. Acting on the parochial principle which charged the Anglican clergyman with the responsibility for every resident in his parish and not just every churchgoer, the urban clergy struggled to meet the social and spiritual needs of a rapidly growing and often impoverished urban population. Eventually the intensity and scope of urban poverty proved an overwhelming burden for the traditional clerical and secular philanthropic agencies and fostered a change in the philosophy and practice of charity.

The thrust of later nineteenth century philanthropy was towards the development of what was called "scientific" charity. The relationship between character and poverty was emphasized and the need to prevent pauperism as well as to achieve individual rehabilitation was stressed. To realize this dual goal character tests and investigations were employed and the principles of self-help and thrift were applied. Indiscriminate charity and temporary relief were condemned as ineffective and even harmful. In their stead, a system for evaluating the total needs of the applicant and for developing a comprehensive program for his relief was advocated. The need for uniform procedures and trained personnel became evident. In addition, the confusion and wastefulness of uncoordinated charitable agencies pointed to the

advantage of organized charitable effort to promote effective administration. The Charity Organisation Society (C.O.S.) can be seen as embodying the "scientific" principles and practices of later Victorian social work. The Society played an important role in the rationalization of nineteenth century philanthropy and through its development of case work and its training of social workers laid the foundation for modern social work.

The university settlement combined aspects of both traditional and scientific charitable institutions. Like traditional philanthropic agencies, the university settlement was a local, privately funded voluntary body. Although non-sectarian, Toynbee Hall was founded by a churchman and the enthusiasm of many of its members had its roots in spiritual and humanitarian impulses. The settlement ideal was spontaneous, personal social service and much of the settlement work in the areas of public health, education, and local government was modeled on the functions of the urban Anglican clergy.

Important components of university settlement thought and practice reflected the influence of the Charity Organisation Society. Samuel Barnett was an early member of the Society and many Toynbee men received their initiation into social work through their affiliation with the local C.O.S. committees in East London. The university settlement shared with the Charity Organisation Society a commitment to the principles of scientific charity. It opposed indiscriminate

public and private relief, recognized the need for character rehabilitation among the poor, and supported efforts to coordinate the administration of social services. However the C.O.S. and the university settlement assumed divergent positions on the issue of state intervention in social reform. While the C.O.S. remained steadfastly opposed to state action, Toynbee Hall, under the leadership of Barnett, recognized and advocated the need for state involvement and later cooperated with state agencies in the nascent welfare state. This attitude of the university settlement regarding the role of the state in social reform distinguishes it as a modern social service institution.

As an institution embracing traditional, scientific, and modern philanthropic attitudes and practices, the university settlement made unique contributions to social work and social reform. Toynbee Hall provided an outlet for the philanthropic energies of university men and funished them with first hand knowledge of urban problems. As an unusual experiment in social integration, the university settlement became a social laboratory and a training ground for future social reformers. Through its programs and investigations Toynbee Hall prepared the way for state action, particularly in the areas of education and unemployment. Former Toynbee men filled the ranks of the civil service and assumed elective office. Hubert Llewellyn Smith, the Secretary of the Board of Trade and a prime mover of New Liberalism legislation, Vaughn Nash, private secretary of H.H. Asquith, William

Beveridge, architect of much of England's social insurance programs, and Clement Attlee, Labour leader and prime minister, were among a distinguished list of Toynbee Hall associates who carried social reform into government.

The ideological origins and development of Toynbee Hall may be examined through the thought and work of John Richard Green, Edward Denison, Arnold Toynbee, and particularly its founder, Samuel A. Barnett. As graduates of Oxford all four shared a common intellectual heritage and each contributed to the formation of the social philosophy of the university settlement. Working among the poor of East London in the 1860's, Green, an Anglican clergyman and later social historian, and Denison, a socially concerned layman, were involved in the operation of the traditional philanthropic machinery of urban relief. As a result of this experience they became advocates of the principles of scientific charity and of the idea of a university settlement as an innovative instrument of social reform. During his career at Oxford from 1875 to 1883, Toynbee played a primary role in preparing his university for the favorable reception of a university settlement scheme. Barnett, Vicar of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, created an institutional bond between the university community and East London with the establishment of Toynbee Hall and until 1906 he successfully guided and directed the policies and programs of the first university settlement.

As founder of Toynbee Hall, Barnett's career merits

special attention. With his appointment in 1873 to St. Jude's, Whitechapel, largely on the recommendation of Edmund Hollond, Denison's friend, Barnett began his long association with East Londoners. Following the tradition of social service of the Anglican clergy, he attempted to relieve the social as well as the spiritual destitution of his parishioners. Working among the poor of Whitechapel he came to recognize that educated altruistic young men could perform an important service in his district. To recruit such men he journeyed to Oxford in 1875 and there met Arnold Toynbee. The resulting friendship provided Barnett with a valuable entree into Toynbee's circle of followers, young men of aroused social conscience who would become eager recruits in the university settlement movement.

Through his personality and his work Toynbee helped awaken Oxford men to their social responsibilities and direct their attention to the poor of East London. As a student and later as a tutor at Balliol College, he impressed his contemporaries with the nobility of his character and the sincerity of his social commitment. The ideals of Christian humanism and the responsibilities of citizenship taught by his mentor, T.H. Green, found practical expression in Toynbee's work as a member of the local Board of Guardians and the Charity Organisation Society. His writings and lectures on the industrial revolution contributed to an intellectual attack on the traditional theories of political economy that had tended to discourage efforts at social

reform. His premature death in 1883, hastened by his rigorous lecture tours, made him a martyr to the cause of social justice in the eyes of many Oxford men, and their memorial to him was Toynbee Hall, the university settlement conceived and planned by Barnett.

When Barnett began his ministry in Whitechapel he was an adherent of orthodox political economy and scientific charity. As an active member of the Charity Organisation Society he applied its precepts in his work among his poor parishioners. As his knowledge and experience of East London poverty deepened, however, his approach to social reform gradually changed. His evolving social philosophy proved incompatible with the accepted dogmas of the C.O.S. and ultimately caused a rupture in the relationship.

Barnett's views on charity, Poor Law reform, unemployment, old-age pensions, and housing illustrate the development and direction of his social thought. His transition from a belief in laissez-faire to that of moderate state-intervention signified his rejection of C.O.S. orthodoxy and his acceptance of more modern attitudes and methods of social reform. Yet he never ceased to condemn indiscriminate charity and to extol the ultimate value of personal service and character development in social reform. The essentially undogmatic nature of Barnett's philosophy, which by the end of his career constituted an eclectic blend of traditional, scientific, and modern views, had an important influence on the ideological and institutional development of Toynbee Hall.

The university settlement was the practical expression of Barnett's philosophy and his most significant contribution to social reform. The early years of Toynbee Hall under his direction witnessed the institutionalization of the settlement idea and the formalization of its activities. During and after his wardenship administrative problems, along with changing political, economic, and social conditions, fostered a modification of the original concept and purpose of the university settlement. However, free from the restrictions of a dogmatic ideology, Toynbee Hall was able to redefine its role in the emerging welfare state. The modern history of the settlement reflects its successful adaptation to the changes in contemporary society and its continued contributions to social welfare.

There have been two studies of Toynbee Hall, Werner Picht's Toynbee Hall and the Settlement Movement (London: G. Bell and Sons Ltd., 1914) and J.A.R. Pimlott's Toynbee Hall, Fifty Years of Progress (London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1935). Both are primarily institutional histories concerned with its organization and activities, and shed little light on the background of the settlement. Nor do they explain its ideological origins and development. It is these deficiencies that this study seeks to remedy.

In preparing it I have utilized a variety of new sources. Green's letters in Lambeth Palace Library shed light on his early years and on his assignment to St. Phillip's.

The Public Record Office has a collection of Barnett's letters and papers relating to Toynbee Hall that have proven extremely useful. These have been supplemented by the letters of Octavia Hill and William Beveridge at the London School of Economics. These documents, combined with the published materials, provide important insights into the character and methods of those involved in the establishment of Toynbee Hall and into the nature and effects of the institution.

INTRODUCTION - FOOTNOTES

[1]J.A.R. Pimlott, Toynbee Hall (London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1935), p. 4.

[2]Granting the accuracy of the term "secularization" to describe the trend in British society during this period, Owen Chadwick points out the difficulty and complexity of precisely defining that word. See Owen Chadwick, The Victorian Church (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 423-425.

[3]For a discussion of the roots of Fabian socialism see Willard Wolfe, From Radicalism to Socialism (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975).

[4]Ibid., pp. 221, 231.

[5]G. Kitson Clark, Churchmen and the Condition of England 1832-1885 (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1973), pp. xix, 98.

CHAPTER I

EAST LONDON POVERTY IN THE 1860'S: THE THOUGHT AND WORK OF JOHN RICHARD GREEN AND EDWARD DENISON

John Richard Green and Edward Denison came to East London in the 1860's motivated to social service by their desire to translate Christian principles into social action. Within the framework of traditional philanthropy, they sought to alleviate the acute distress of the urban poor during a period of economic decline. From this experience, their analysis of the causes of urban poverty and their suggestions for its cure helped form the ideology from which scientific charity and the university settlement movement emerged.

Green was born on December 12, 1837 in Oxford where his father, Richard, was registrar and gown-maker for the University. As a young child of delicate physique and shy disposition, Green possessed superior intellectual abilities which impressed his father who resolved to provide his son with a good education. Thus when he was eight years old, Green was sent to Magdalen College.

Dazed and shy at first, Green soon took delight in his new surroundings. "All that innerness of life, that utter blindness to outer things which leaves my childhood such a blank to me, disappeared with Magdalen."[1] However the school's brutal disciplinary practices and its stifling educational methods eventually alienated him. In the spring of 1854

James Millard, the Headmaster of Magdalen, informed Richard Castle, John's uncle and guardian after the death of Richard Green in 1852, that his nephew would have to leave Magdalen and be placed with a private tutor. On Mr. Millard's recommendation John was sent to Mr. Ridgway who promised to "try every means in my power to make him a well-ordered man."[2] When Ridgway's tutelage proved unsatisfactory, he was replaced by Charles Yonge. Under Yonge's guidance, Green developed an appreciation for classical literature and an interest in history. Following a suggestion from Yonge, Green competed successfully for a scholarship to Jesus College and, on December 7, 1855, his university career began.

Unfortunately Green's first two years at Oxford were years of alienation and rebellion. Oxford society shunned the predominantly Welsh undergraduates at Jesus College; and since he achieved neither outstanding athletic nor academic distinction, he remained virtually unknown outside a small circle of friends. Intellectual life at Jesus College was equally uncongenial. The tutorial system of the history school, structured to meet examination requirements, was particularly distasteful to him. Reviewing those first two years Green vividly recalled their effect upon his state of mind and attitude to his studies, writing:

> I came up to Oxford a hard reader and a passionate High Churchman - two years of residence left me idle and irreligious. Partly from ill-health, partly from disgust at my college, I had cut myself off from society within and without it. I rebelled doggedly against the systems around me. I would not work, because work was

> the Oxford virtue. I tore myself from history which I loved, and plunged into the trifles of archaeology, because they had no place in the university course.[3]

Nor did the university's religious atmosphere offer any solace. "High Churchmen fell with a great crash and left nothing behind - nothing but a vague reverence for goodness, however narrow and bigoted in form. I saw only religious parties unjust to one another as I stood apart, unjust to them all. I had withdrawn myself from Oxford work, and I found no help in Oxford theology."[4] A chance visit to a lecture given by Dr. Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, professor of Ecclesiastical History, ended Green's alienation and gave new direction to his life. Dr. Stanley's description of work as something worthy in itself motivated Green to resume his historical studies and Stanley's religious liberalism, based more on the principle of fairness than on doctrinal considerations, helped reconcile Green to the Church.

The Anglican Church of Green's era had undergone significant changes as the result of the teachings of the Tractarians and of Frederick Denison Maurice, the spiritual leader of the Christian Socialists. Led by Oxonian scholars and churchmen John Keble, John Henry Newman, and Edward Pusey, the Tractarians in 1833 sought to construct an unassailable defense of church authority. Although primarily theological in nature, their series of essays, Tracts for the Times, contained important social implications. The Tractarians' historical studies revitalized the medieval

concept of social relationships governed by ethical considerations and social regulation and in so doing offered social thinkers an alternative to laissez-faire capitalism.[5] Perhaps of even greater importance was the emphasis the High Churchmen placed on the historic foundations of the English Church and on the existence of a divine society in which all men shared a spiritual brotherhood. These views of the Tractarians formed the theological justification for the participation of the Anglican Church in social questions.[6] By its articulation of the social mission of the Church, the Oxford movement gave many clergymen a heightened sense of their pastoral responsibility.[7]

The Tractarian vision of the noble and active place of the Church in human affairs was further amplified by the teachings of F.D. Maurice. While a professor at King's College, London, from 1840 to 1853 and later at Cambridge from 1866 to 1872, Maurice preached a message of spiritual renewal and social action. Accepting Coleridge's interpretation of the social role of Christianity, Maurice viewed economic relationships as legitimate matters of spiritual concern. He declared that the whole competitive principle, with its postulates of selfishness and conflict, was a denial of the law of love and a repudiation of the divine order as revealed by Christ. By setting each individual against his neighbor, competition was a destructive force in society. Maurice taught that brotherhood and cooperation must replace the selfishness underlying the competitive system and

Christianity should become the agent of social unity and reconciliation. Maurice's views were prominently featured in the ideology of Christian Socialism, a movement which developed under the leadership of John Malcolm Ludlow as a reaction to the Revolution of 1848 and the Chartist threat. By uniting Christianity with social progress, the doctrines of Maurice, it has been said,'for forty years kept the whole forward movement in the social and political life of the English people in union with God and identified with religion.'[8]

As a resident of Oxford and later as a student, Green could hardly escape the influence of such teachings. He had been familiar with the famous figures of the Oxford movement and as a youth had been impressed by their eloquence and "by the new grace with which they invested religion."[9] During his last year at Oxford Green studied Maurice's writings and from them formed an idealized vision of the role of a clergyman of the Church of England serving the spiritual and social needs of the neglected masses. Upon completion of his undergraduate work at Jesus College, Green began to consider a clerical career.

Such a career attracted him not only for altruistic reasons but also for more practical ones. As a clergyman he would be free to pursue his historical studies with a degree of financial independence which would permit him to write without being 'driven to toadyism or hackwork'.[10] Motivated by these considerations, Green applied and was accepted for ordination in 1860. He spent the next five

years serving as curate in various London parishes until, in November 1865, Bishop Archibald Tait appointed him Vicar of St. Philip's, Stepney.

This appointment was enthusiastically accepted by Green. When advising his uncle of his good fortune, Green described his new parish.

> It was formerly notorious as "Bonwell's parish" but after terrible vicissitudes was undertaken five years ago by the late Bishop's son, Alfred Blomfield, who has raised it into one of the most important and best-known spheres of work in the East of London. There is a good Church, good schools, a capital Parsonage, and four curates (two of them working separately in a mission district). The population is 16,000, all poor or of the lower middle-class. It is a glorious place for one who is as young as I am and has his spurs to win, and such as a Bishop seldom gives to a man only five years in orders.[11]

For the present Green acknowledged that he would have to supplement his yearly stipend of £360 to pay £150 for salaries and debts. Despite this difficulty he was very optimistic about this new post. "Humanly speaking, this appointment places me on the road to high preferment, and it is for this reason that I don't mind the immediate expense. It is in fact a mere investment in capital." With the formal acceptance of his appointment, he felt "the great responsibilities"of his new position "but...also recognized that opportunities for good" were.."opening on every side."[12]

As part of his new pastoral duties Green became involved in the implementation of social policy in the areas of Poor Law administration and sanitary code enforcement. In-

deed, his social role was dramatically demonstrated shortly after his arrival when a cholera epidemic summoned him to extraordinary service. Although his parish was not so severely affected as others the mortality rate in some sections was high. Green took an active part in removing infected beds and caring for the sick and dying. Ironically, the only people willing to assist him were the town prostitutes. According to his friend, Reverend H.W. Haweis, "These poor girls rallied round the active and public-spirited clergyman; and it was no uncommon thing to see Mr. Green going down the lowest back streets in Stepney, on his way to some infected house, between two women of the town, who had volunteered with him on such sad and perilous service to the dead and dying."[13] He also served on a Cholera Committee which directed local voluntary relief effort. At the same time, East End Guardians were authorized to grant additional aid to victims of the epidemic by the Poor Law Board. Eventually the battle against the cholera outbreak was won but that victory did not end Green's involvement in social issues.

The year 1866 was a year of economic crisis for East London. Business failures, particularly the collapse of Overend and Gurney, led to trade contractions, lower wages and rising unemployment. These developments were symptomatic of a basic shift in the shipbuilding industry from London to the northern provinces. The technological change from wood to iron construction eliminated the need for the skilled labor of London shipwrights and favored the growth of the

industry in areas close to the source of raw material. Thus not only East London shipwrights but also workers in allied maritime industries -- sailmaking, rigging, rope-making and dock workers faced a precarious economic future. To add to the severity of the problem, an extraordinarily harsh winter in 1866-67 threw the skilled artisans in the building trades of East London into the ranks of the unemployed. Rising bread prices (to 9d. a loaf) further intensified the acute economic distress of the area. By the spring of 1867 an alarming increase in destitution was reflected in Poor Law statistics for the Metropolitan area. In Poplar a 76% increase in recipients of poor relief was reported with other Metropolitan unions experiencing increases from 27 to 35%. Overcrowding of local workhouses forced suspension of the workhouse test, thereby producing a sharp increase in outdoor relief to the able-bodied.[14] Poor Law rates mounted and threatened the economic survival of the small shopkeepers upon whom the burden most heavily fell. As the situation worsened, sporadic bread riots ensued which posed a serious threat to public order. East London was unable to meet the challenges of the economic crisis since the rapid urbanization of the area had prevented the development of administrative institutions and local self-consciousness and civic pride. In desperation the clergy and concerned citizens of East London issued urgent appeals for aid from their more prosperous West End neighbors. Alarmed by the civil disorders, the West responded

with a flood of contributions which were directed chiefly to the East End clergy for distribution. From his vantage point in Stepney, Green was able to observe the deleterious effects of such a charitable system on the clergy and people of East London.

Green claimed that in the process of soliciting money from the West, the East London clergymen had become "a class of mendicant parsons whose whole business seems to lie in trading on public sympathy by harrowing tales of distress which would draw on meaner heads the wrath of the Mendicity Society."[15] And by distributing such large amounts of alms, the clergymen, aided by their staff of volunteer district visitors, had assumed the role of relieving officers. In his opinion such a role was beyond the duty and capacity of these clerics. The notoriously careless bookkeeping methods of the clergymen were incompatible with efficient administration; and to support his position Green revealed that in four neighboring parishes between £5000 and £6000 had been distributed without either inspection or accounting. One overwhelmed incumbent had confessed that his system of recording donations consisted of putting money in his pocket with one hand and taking it out with the other. These kinds of practices, along with their "sympathy and narrowness of benevolent aim", made the clergy unfit dispensors of any large amount of public alms.[16] Privately Green confided, "I am horrified at the things I see going on this winter...How I wish the clergy would strike and throw up the relief business altogether."[17]

The clergy however were not the only participants in this "business", for Societies, local ad hoc committies, and private individuals had joined the churchmen in this massive East London voluntary relief effort. According to Green such activity resulted in a "hundred different agencies for the relief of distress are at work over the same ground, without concert or co-operation, or the slighted information as to each other's exertions, and the result is an unparalleled growth of imposition, mendicancy, and sheer shameless pauperism."[18]

Green's assessment of the effects of this system of indiscriminate charity on the people of East London was based on his perception of the origin and nature of East London's economic and social problems. In essence, he believed that the problem of East London was "no new problem of destitution, but the old problem of pauperism."[19] Using a local area as a case study, he traced the economic and social developments, which he claimed were typical of all East London, to support his thesis. He asserted that initially the economic distress had been sudden and exceptional; the skilled artisans who lost their jobs were in no way responsible for their misfortune. Since a large but limited number of men had been affected, it seemed possible to support them with voluntary charity until they could relocate. To a large extent this objective had been achieved, for a thousand artisans had moved and there appeared to have been a slight improvement in trade. Surprisingly, however, requests

for aid continued and even increased and this was due to the fact that indiscriminate charity had transformed the acute distress into chronic poverty. Attracted by the prospect of gneerous alms, a large number of poor migrated to areas vacated by the unemployed artisans, thereby creating a need for continued relief. Over the past few years money from the West had demoralized both the individual and the community. Industry, thrift, and self-reliance had been destroyed by the doles. "Families avowedly refuse to 'lay by' in summer because they know that with winter money will flow down from the West."[20] And because of those contributions, East London employers and landlords (the ultimate beneficiaries of alms-giving) were able to shirk their legitimate responsibilities for relieving the distress. Obviously to minimize its harmful effects, indiscriminate charity must be organized and its activities coordinated and directed in cooperation with Poor Law authorities.

In an attempt to rationalize the relief efforts in his district, Green reported,"I am working hard to organise something like a Committee supplementary to the working of the Poor Law in Mile End; and I think it will work."[21] Modeled on the Cholera Committees of 1866, Green's committee was to provide additional relief in deserving cases since the Poor Law was "in practice too rigid and inelastic to satisfy all cases of distress." Local committees such as his were better able to discriminate among applicants because it was impossible "for any large economic administration to enter into

the differences, moral or social, of the applicants."[22] For proper discrimination the employment of a labor test was essential and formed the basis for any sound program of poor relief. Finally his committee would perform another important social service for to "weigh the facts, to note defects, to collect evidence, to form public opinion on a point where it is so profoundly uninstructed, is work quite as charitable and more beneficial to the poor than the institution of soup-kitchens, or the sowing lanes and alleys with coal-tickets."[23] Green cautioned that committees such as his should regard themselves as only temporary bodies. Every effort should be made to effect an adequate Poor Law administration since ultimately, "if the problem of pauperism is to be solved at all, it must be solved, not by spasmodic benevolence, but by an increased action of the Poor-laws."[24]

The East End Board of Guardians, a body of elected officials, was responsible for the administration of the Poor Law in East London. Financed out of a local tax or poor rate, public assistance in the form of indoor (i.e. workhouse) or outdoor relief was to be granted by the Guardians in accordance with the directives set forth by the central Poor Law Board. Until 1868, however, under the exemptions provided by the Gilbert Act of 1782, fully one-third of London's Poor Law unions were independent of the central authority thereby permitting wide divergence in local practice. Despite a series of reforms - the Metropolitan Poor Act of 1867 and the Poor Law Amendment Acts of 1867 and 1868 - designed to rationalize

public relief administration, serious flaws remained in the system. Oppressive rates, harsh and inefficient management, incompetent Guardians, and lack of uniformity in rating and procedures were abuses frequently cited by Poor Law critics. In fact a sizeable segment of public opinion regarded the Poor Law as incapable of dealing with the current problem of East London destitution. However, rather than abandon the Poor Law, Green thought it would be more profitable to analyze the reasons for its alleged breakdown.

One of the problems interfering with the effective operation of the system was a personnel problem. Green conceded that East London Guardians, by their corrupt practices, petty squabbling, and disorderly meetings, had destroyed public confidence and respect. The hostility of some Guardians towards the poor and the sheer ignorance of others resulted in harsh and often incompetent Poor Law administration.[25] The personnel problems of the Guardians could have been alleviated if a provision of the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1867 had been implemented - namely the right of the Government to nominate a certain number of officers to each Poor Law Board. The quiet opposition of local Guardians had succeeded in preventing the exercise of this authority, thus depriving the East End Boards of members of higher social and intellectual character who certainly would have improved Poor Law operations.

Green was quick to acknowledge that regardless of who served on the Board, the task confronting East End Guardians

was an almost impossible one. The accumulated pauperism of previous years had forced an increase in rates at a time when the Reform Bill of 1867 inadvertently had made collection more difficult and the Metropolitan Poor Act 1867 had mandated greater expenditures for the local Boards. He cited the case of Bethnal Green where the poor-rate was eighteen pence in the pound for the current quarter and was thought likely to rise to as high as two shillings the next quarter. The provision of the 1867 Reform Act for personal payment of rates had converted an area where previously three-fourths of all rates had been paid by the landlords into an area where the majority of the new individual rate payers refused to pay their rates. At this time of sharply lowered revenues, the Bethnal Green Board was required by new Poor Law regulations to build additional schools, separate infirmaries and dispensaries, thereby nearly doubling its expenditures. Appeals to the Central Board were ignored or dismissed and the local Boards were left to grapple with this impossible dilemma.

Thus, in the face of increasing costs and demands for relief, the local Guardians did nothing to discourage the flow of funds from the benevolent public and had even come to rely on that money. "By a miserable inadequate pittance of out-door relief, by forcing the poor to walk four miles to get it, by refusing to organise any better system of distribution, the Guardians throw back their burden, as they imagine, on public charity," Green charged.[26]

Green thought the administrative and financial difficulties

of the Poor Law formidable but not insoluable. It would seem that Poor Law reform must be the first step in solving the problems of East London. Various suggestions for such reform were put forth by concerned citizens. Admirers of the French and North German welfare systems urged their adoption in England. Enthusiasts for the French system claimed that the problem of pauperism had been solved in Paris. "Starvation, say its advocates, is impossible; the feelings of the poor are respected; the agencies of private benevolence are organised and placed in harmony with those of public charity."[27] However, in its structure, principle, and practice, the French program was vastly different from the English.

The Bureau de Bienfaisance, a centralized body composed of representatives from private and public philanthropy, was the administrative agent of French public assistance. All charitable revenues, whether private donations or public grants, were distributed by the Bureau under the direct control of the state. In France, unlike England, no citizen had a legal claim to public alms. Furthermore the relief granted by the Bureau in the form of small amounts of food, clothing or alms, was designed merely to assist rather than to maintain the recipient as was the case in England. "For good or ill", Green wrote, "England is the only country in world in which the State confers upon every man with an empty stomach a legal right to get it filled at the public expense...The idea, in fact, of a family living exclusively upon charity is never for a single moment, entertained at Paris."[28]

The Elberfield system of North Germany had also attracted many English reformers. Based on the principle of close personal supervision of the poor, the system was essentially paternalistic. Under its provisions three hundred citizens were appointed by the central Board of Guardians to act as "fathers" to families in receipt of public relief. The unique position of the "father" carried with it duties and powers far more extensive than the English almoner or district visitor.

In addition to investigating the causes of his clients' distress, the father was expected to exert a moral influence on the families he supervised and to find work for those who were unemployed. Moreover, the father possessed broad penal powers. His reports of gambling, idleness, drunkenness, or refusal to work to capacity, could subject the offender to arrest and imprisonment. This "penal power," Green explained, was the "backbone of the whole system."[29] And in his view, that power made it inappropriate for English adaptation.

However, Green did not reject all the proposed remedies for the Poor Law. He believed that what was wanted, was in fact, "not a radical change of system, but less rigidity and less red tape."[30] The problem with the suggested reforms was that each claimed to be the exclusive remedy. Thus he dismissed as impractical a scheme for massive emigration to America or Australia but considered that such a scheme adopted on a small scale to local areas such as Poplar and Limehouse where temporary unemployment existed, could be

beneficial. The "heroic remedy" calling for the penal treatment of pauperism -- by the withdrawal of such civil rights as control over one's children from any parent applying for relief for a third time, or by the treating of drunkenness as a crime -- was too enormous to administer. However it would be feasible to put a father, who by his deliberate misconduct makes his family destitute, on the same legal footing as one who by his desertion throws his family on the rates. Even some features of the Elberfeld system could be adopted with profit. The inclusion of artisans as district visitors and as members of Boards of Guardians would be a valuable adaptation of the Elberfeld system and would dramatize the principle that poor relief was the concern of every citizen. Moreover, Green strongly endorsed the Elberfeld practice of personal supervision for he thought that this was the true field of private benevolence. The current activities of the clergy and other charitable agencies were too wide and diffuse to amount to anything more than mere almsgiving but "the man who would devote himself to the moral and social elevation of half a dozen pauper families would be cutting off the very spring of pauperism."[31] Money was the wrong gift to give the poor, for benevolence destroyed the very relation a true friend to the poor wished to establish. Interest, sympathy, and advice were moral gifts of inestimable value in the rehabilitation of the poor. Attendance at school, improved habits and manners, and employment could be promoted with the assistance of a concerned friend since the character

of the poor was especially amenable to personal influence.

> No one who has not worked personally among the poor knows how wanting they are in shiftiness and inventiveness, how thriftless in poverty, how apathetic when the bad time comes. But it often needs only a suggestion to induce them to 'lay by', or to rouse them to obtain employment. That, as a class, they are wonderfully grateful for any sympathy, and inclined to repose only too great a confidence in any whom they believe to be their friends, the experience of every clergyman and district visitor could tell.[32]

These sentiments regarding the nature and character of the poor would be echoed by other social reformers such as Octabia Hill and by Barnett and his wife. The unconscious condescension of the reformers - their tendency to regard the poor as irresponsible children - encouraged the promotion of schemes which stressed personal contact. The good influence of a higher class character was regarded a potent remedy to lower class vice. Thus it is possible to trace the university settlement, the instrument of social integration, partially to this attitude expressed by Green.

An analysis of Green's social thought reveals other assumptions and proposals which both reflected and advanced contemporary philanthropic opinion. His definition of pauperism as a demoralized state and his insistence on discrimination in charitable relief work were commonly held notions of his day. However, his suggestions for rationalizing social work tended to promote more scientific attitudes and practices in the philanthropic community. His recognition of the need to coordinate and direct local charitable agencies, his recommendation that relief work be entirely removed from

clerical control, his emphasis on the importance of gathering factual data and influencing public opinion were positions later held by both the Charity Organisation Society and the university settlement movement. And his condemnation of indiscriminate charity became a basic tenet of enlightened philanthropists, one of whom was Edward Denison, the first university settler.

Born in Salisbury in 1840, Denison was the heir of a prominent Nottinghamshire family. His uncle, Lord Ossington, was Speaker of the House of Commons and his father, also Edward Denison, was the bishop of Salisbury. As bishop the elder Denison was actively involved in charitable activities spending large sums on philanthropic causes. During recurring cholera outbreaks he acted as both spiritual comforter and sanitary reformer to the sick poor of his diocese. Undoubtedly Denison's concern for the poor had an important influence on the career of his son.

Like his father, the younger Denison was educated at Eton where he became a famous oarsman. During his undergraduate years at Christ Church, Oxford, his frank, earnest,and generous disposition made him a popular figure, although years later he confessed to a lifelong feeling of self-distrust,"a sort of wicked careless assumption that I cannot do anything."[33] Despite this feeling of inferiority he graduated with a second class in law and history, missing a first class only because of ill health.

After leaving Oxford, Denison spent the next few years reading law and traveling in Italy, southern France, and Switzerland. On returning to England in 1866 he found his contemporaries gravely concerned over the recent economic and social distress of East London. Troubled by the unemployment, hunger, and disease plaguing the East End and the apparent impotence of existing relief agencies to deal with these problems, he began to meet frequently with Baldwyn Leighton, a reform minded barrister, and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, a Tory M.P., to devise a plan for social relief. Denison believed that in order to formulate such a program one must gain first-hand knowledge of the origin and extent of East London poverty.

With this objective Denison joined the Society for the Relief of Distress in 1866 as an almoner in Stepney. However by October of that year he became doubtful of the value of the Society's efforts. "I don't believe in these doles of bread and meat,... (which) are only doing the work of poor-rates, and are perfectly useless."[34] The only positive function of such a Society was to acquaint members of the upper class with the misery of the poor and thereby convince them of the pressing need for social reform. Certainly his own encounter with urban poverty reaffirmed his dedication to social improvement. Thus, after his resignation from the Society in December 1866, Denison continued working in the Stepney district of St. Augustine.

That missionary district, which was attached to St. Philip's parish, had a population of roughly six thousand

people, three-quarters of whom were low income families while the rest were small shopkeepers just slightly better off than their neighbors. Denison regarded this socially segregated neighborhood as "the blight over East London" for it intensified any temporary distress and made any attempts to improve conditions more difficult. The absence of a resident gentry allowed sanitary violations to continue uncorrected. In addition, the lack of social diversity produced a low cultural level and prevented any thought beyond securing the necessities of life. The resultant ignorance and religious indifference of the lower class was responsible for the improvidence, dirt, crime and disease in the area. Since living in West London wasted time and energy in travel, Denison decided that the effective implementation of his social reform program required that he live in Stepney. "My plan is the only really practicable one, and as I have both means, time, and inclination, I should be a thief and a murderer if I withheld what I so evidently owe."[35]

One might speculate on the reasons for Denison's strong sense of personal responsibility for improving the conditions of the poor which prompted his leaving the comfortable West End for the squalor of the East End. No doubt he was motivated in part by a sense of moral outrage. He called it "a monstrous thing...that in the richest country in the world, large masses of the population should be condemned annually by a natural operation of nature to starvation and death."[36] His commitment to social justice was also strengthened by his

religious convictions. Rejecting the popular trend which divorced religion from morality, he insisted upon a Christian theology which found expression in social action. He thought it was time to redress the social injustices suffered by the poor. "I am convinced that these days are pregnant with as much spiritual as temporal good for these down-trodden brothers of ours, whom we have elbowed out of our churches as well as ignored in our laws."[37] He believed it his Christian duty to live among the poor and bring Christ's message to them.

Therefore in July 1867 Denison rented rooms on Philpot St. which was centrally located amidst the narrow dingy streets of East London. And here he pursued his independent course of social reform. He taught in the parish school operated by Rev. Thomas Dowle, the local curate, a "sensible, energetic man" whom he had met as an almoner. In addition to his teaching duties, Denison acted as an ombudsman for his poor neighbors. He reported infractions of local statutes and improper performances of duty and scrutinized the operations of the local Board of Guardians. He also enlisted the parish doctor in a campaign against sanitary abuses which he regarded as being responsible for much of the disease and death in the neighborhood. Of all his activities the most satisfying was his instruction of a group of workmen in an elementary Bible course. In essence, his social work was an adaptation of the traditional function of the rural gentry to an urban environment. And as a layman, he ministered to the temporal and spiritual needs of his neighbors, a task which hitherto had been primarily the responsibility of the Anglican urban clergyman.

Several months after initiating his plan, Denison called on his Vicar, John Richard Green, to acquaint him with his work. Green vividly recalled this first meeting. He confessed to having "a certain horror of laymen from the West-end" who came with a bishop's letter of recommendation in hand along with a head full of theories about the "heathen masses." As a minister, he had met many of these men who wanted to display their eloquence in large rooms filled with large audiences. He had known "charitable" laymen who pounced down on the parish from time to time flinging meat and blankets and demoralizing half the parish in the bargain. There was also the "statistical" layman who calculated spiritual sums by dividing the number of people in free seats by the number of bread tickets annually distributed. This assortment of do-gooders had one thing in common, according to Green: "a perfect belief in their individual nostrums and perfect contempt for all that was already doing in the neighborhood."[38]

It was therefore understandable that Green greeted Denison with less than enthusiasm. However, "a single glance" convinced Green that this layman was of a different stamp. "There was something in the tall manly figure, the bright smile, the frank winning address of Edward Denison that inspired confidence in a moment." "I came to learn, and not to teach," Denison replied to Green's hints of the dangers of abstract social theory.[39] Green was favorably impressed by Denison's fair and moderate temper which avoided extremism. All in all, Green decided that Denison was "a very jolly,

simple-hearted fellow."[40]

From this initial meeting, a cordial relationship developed. Denison advised Green of his recent work on John's Place where, with the aid of a dedicated postal worker, he had converted the local Sunday-school into a regular day school and had built a new schoolroom for his workingmen's classes. And Denison joined Green's Mile End Committee where they worked in cooperation with the Poor Law authorities to alleviate the distress in East London.

Gradually, however, the enormity of the problem of East London poverty began to overwhelm Denison and the insignificance of his own efforts began to depress him. He became acutely conscious of "the vast and frightful gulf of misery" which surrounded him and "the impossibility of filling it up." He tried to ignore what he could not improve but the burden of "the perpetual contemplation of human agony" proved the real trial of living in East London.[41] The monotony and ugliness of ghetto life blunted his wits and the presence of "the meanest and vilest of men and man's works," and the complete absence of "the sight of God and his works" depressed his spirit.[42]

Therefore in January 1868 when his uncle, Lord Ossington, the Speaker of the House of Commons, suggested he stand for the seat from Newark, Denison agreed. It was with mixed emotions that he left East London. "I am sensible that it might be a worthier course to throw up the more attractive game for the sake of interests undoubtedly higher than those of politics

or society;" and he blamed "the curse of indolent dilettantism" for influencing his decision.[43] Nevertheless he took solace in the conviction that as a member of Parliament he could continue his efforts for social reform. A trip to France and Scotland to study their poor relief methods preceded his successful candidacy but unfortunately his parliamentary career ended abruptly with his premature death in January 1870. Thus it was that Denison's most significant contributions to social reform derived from his brief sojourn in East London.

His residency in that area provided him with important insights into the cause and remedy of urban poverty. In his analysis Denison, like Green, divided East London poverty into two categories, the first of which was the acute temporary distress experienced by the artisans of Limehouse and Poplar. The unemployment of these men was attributable to the transfer of the shipbuilding industry from London to the north. The inevitable move had been delayed by the American Civil War, for during this period of accelerated demand and excess profit, the superiority of London as a loading port obscured its inferiority as a building port. However, after the war, the desirability of cheap construction dictated building ships close to coal and iron deposits.

To solve this temporary economic dislocation Denison proposed large scale relief measures beyond the confines of the Poor Law. In addition he suggested the establishment of a free exchange of labor throughout the nation, the universal

diffusion of information regarding conditions in each trade, and the assistance of organizations to help laborers adapt themselves to these circumstances. The Poor Law Guardians would be logical promoters of these schemes.

The second category of East London distress, the chronic poverty of Bethnal Green, Whitechapel, and Stepney, was due in part of the general trade recession and high food costs but primarily to the wholesale distribution of alms. Along with Green, Denison condemned this method of indiscriminate charity. He claimed that such a practice frustrated natural law and helped create a pauperized population. When society guaranteed a man's subsistence without labor, it fostered "the gambling spirit" and this spirit of improvidence violated the natural law of self-preservation and caused destitution and disease. Failure to save for the inevitable periods of unemployment and sickness destroyed the family as well as the individual. To prevent this social tragedy, Denison advised that young single workmen save half their weekly wages. In five years they would have saved enough to prevent pauperization. And if workmen had enough foresight to organize and contribute to an insurance scheme, there would be no need for a state system of poor relief. Under existing conditions Denison predicted it would take two generations with good laws, compulsory education, and individual effort to inculcate those habits of industry and morality conducive to that end. If left unchecked, indiscriminate charity would perpetuate the life of poverty and degradation of the current

generation of East Londoners.

Indiscriminate charity contributed to the uniquely urban problem of overcrowding and high rents which had its roots in the movement of rural workers to cities in search of employment in manufacturing industries. This rural migration created a continuous supply of surplus labor which was promiscuously hired and fired by manufacturers who, unlike their rural counterparts, were not responsible for the maintenance and housing of current or former employees. Unemployed workers had to be maintained out of the union's poor rates and the burden of local taxation, in the indirect form of realty taxes, ultimately fell on the poor who paid the higher rents. At the same time the wealth of the capitalists was virtually untouched. The obvious answer to this problem was to halt the migration of rural workers and clearly indiscriminate charity had the exact opposite effect. By attracting rural workers to the city by its promise of doles, indiscriminate charity frustrated the operation of the law of supply and demand. The certainty of additional alms enabled workers to accept below subsistence wages and perpetuated irregular occupations which otherwise would have disappeared. Charitable supplements also enabled East Londoners to pay the exorbitant rents for housing which the surplus population created a constant and insatiable demand for. Overcrowding, disease, and poverty were the inevitable results.

To discourage rural migration, indiscriminate charity ought to be curtailed. Denison urged all charities to cease

aiding habitual mendicants and proposed that self-proclaimed destitute vagrants be detained in Houses of Correction for a month or two of penal labor. He considered public works projects counterproductive since they created an artificial demand for pauper labor.

Mass emigration was often proposed as a method of dealing with surplus population but Denison noted that all previous attempts "to regenerate the refuse of our great towns" had proved unsuccessful since paupers carried with them the same vices they had in England. He claimed that honest and industrious workers had no difficulty in finding work at home. Despite this fact the flower of England's workingmen were migrating.

> They prefer to leave a country in which the whole weight of custom, the whole might of law, is bent to dig deeper and deeper the gulf between rich and poor, of which the whole structure, industrial as well as political, is ingeniously framed to keep the people in a state of serfage; in which every attempt to mitigate the effects of this infernal conspiracy against humanity is solemnly anathematized by the Plutocratic Papacy, in the names - oh blasphemy! In the sacred names of Truth and Liberty.[44]

On a clamer note, he thought that one long-range positive result of such migration was the creation of a labor shortage which ultimately would better the conditions of the English worker.

Another effective means of producing a labor shortage was to promote the emmigration of rural workers. Denison proposed than an association be formed to buy land in the

western United States under the terms of the Homestead Act and to recruit and outfit prospective emigrants. The association would pay for their passage and maintenance on condition that the money would be repaid in installments after the first harvest. He calculated that it would cost L80 per family and once repayment was made, the association could then sponsor other emigrants. In this way with a decreased rural labor supply, the flow of rural workers to the cities would end and, finally, the conditions of urban labor would improve. Although such a scheme would be difficult to administer, it was, nevertheless, a feasible plan.[45]

Before these long-term goals could be achieved, the immediate problem of East London distress had to be solved. And in this context Denison, like Green, condemned indiscriminate charity for undermining the effective operation of the legitimate relief agency, namely the Poor Law authority. Sensational newspaper accounts of East London conditions had stimulated public contributions which in turn had produced an increased demand for relief. The Poor Law Guardians, in their desire to hold down the rates, then refused to offer the workhouse or labor test. Instead they distributed small amounts of out-door relief to the able-bodied. This lack of discrimination naturally led to an even greater number of relief applicants. Shocked at this demand Guardians gave a mere token relief. Concerned citizens, reading stories of dire distress, attributed these circumstances to a breakdown in the Poor Law and proceeded to contribute more funds which,

in effect, caused that breakdown.

As the first step in breaking this vicious cycle, Denison called for the re-education of the public regarding the purpose and function of the Poor Law since, he alleged, the public had always been quick to pronounce the legislation a failure without giving it a fair trail. The original intent of the Poor Law regarding the able-bodied poor was to prevent starvation and in order to function properly careful discrimination among applicants was required. A primary method of determining validity of need was the imposition of the labor test. Unfortunately the labor test provided by the framers of the New Poor Law, the workhouse test, was neither supported by the public nor universally applied thereby, in practice, nullifying the reformed Poor Law. However if an effective labor test were devised and other administrative changes introduced, Denison believed the Poor Law capable of extirpating pauperism in one generation.

The employment of a greater number of capable relieving officers from a "sufficiently high class" would contribute towards the effective discrimination and improved operation of the system. Current case-loads of eight to ten thousand households made it virtually impossible for relieving officers to judge adequately the claims of the applicants. The position of relieving officer should be better paid since higher salaries would attract men of superior moral and intellectual qualities. Such expenditures, in the long term would be economical because they would save the ratepayers the expense

of unnecessary relief.

As another means of promoting effective relief Denison proposed that instead of the entire Board of Guardians meeting in one place on one day, it divide itself and sit at different ends of the district. The current practice led to confused and hurried procedures which often ended in harsh treatment for the applicant and wasted money for the ratepayers. Wasted funds also resulted from the current interpretation of the role of the Guardian as being solely a dispenser of doles to the destitute. This inadequate and perverse view of the paternal office of the Guardian had cost the ratepayers large amounts of money. Denison wondered, "How many thousands of paupers have lived and died, and been buried at the public expense, whom a little friendly advice, a little search for friends or relations, some pains taken to find proper work, when the first application to the Board was made, would have lifted out of the mire and set on the rock of honest industry."[46]

These rather practical suggestions were coupled with a more radical proposal calling for the removal of the children of any family who had been receiving relief for one year or who had received assistance for four months in two consecutive years. The children from such families should be placed either in a rural Workhouse school or boarded out with a country family. An inspector would be sent periodically to investigate the nutrition and education of the boarded children and to examine the fitness of the adopting family. Infants

would be exempted from these provisions and parents allowed, after two years, to reclaim their children once they had convinced the Guardians of their ability to both maintain and educate their youngsters.

This scheme had a two-fold advantage. First it relieved parents of a hindrance to their economic recovery while providing them with an added incentive to work diligently; and secondly it placed the children in an environment conducive to the inculcation of orderly and industrious habits which would prevent future pauperism.

Regardless of such positive benefits, Denison was aware that this suggestion would be highly controversial since there was strong popular objection to any interference with natural ties. However he maintained that when parents failed to provide for their children and transferred their legitimate responsibility to their neighbors, they forfeited any right to dictate the method ratepayers used to maintain their children. Regardless of opposition he insisted his proposal was "the most important improvement of our present Poor Law practice which could be adopted."[47]

A reformed Poor Law had to be coupled with the rationalization of charity. Denison urged that the objectives and methods of all charitable agencies be well-defined and limited and it seemed the appropriate time to organise charity. Because of the English penchant for individual initiative and voluntary effort, he thought that any charitable organization would have to be on a voluntary basis. From his experience

on the Mile End Committee he perceived that denominational differences were the major obstacle to such organization. He was hopeful that since men of different denominations could cooperate in other areas, they could also join together in relieving the misery of the poor and unfortunate.

The scheme for charity organizations which Denison put forth was based on his investigation of the French system of poor relief. The Bureau de Bienfaisance might prove a useful model for organizing English philanthropic resources. Denison suggested that in every parish or union a recognized public body, similar to the French Bureau, should supervise, audit, and administer funds supplied by voluntary charity and dispensed by voluntary visitors. Ideally, that body should be the municipality but in London the archaic conditions of administration would have to be reformed before his scheme was feasible. The merit of his proposal was that it combined the enthusiasm of voluntaryism with the order and stability of institutionalism.

Denison hoped that in the future charitable effort would be directed towards self-help. In the midst of despair he had written, "I am beginning seriously to believe that all bodily aid to the poor is a mistake, and that the real thing is to let things work themselves straight; whereas by giving alms you keep them permanently crooked. Build school-houses, pay teachers, give prizes, frame workmen's clubs, help them to help themselves, lend them your brains, but give them no money, except what you sink in such undertakings as above."[48]

This principle of self-help was to become an important guideline for the methodology of scientific philanthropists and these suggestions of educational and social programs for workingmen became the foundation of university settlement activities. Other aspects of Denison's thought contributed to a broader understanding of the causes of urban poverty and a more comprehensive program for its remedy.

In discussing the cause of London's acute distress, Denison recognized that London's shipbuilding industry was the victim of the technological revolution and that its apparently sudden decline was precipitated by the end of the American Civil War. In his analysis of the chronic poverty of East London, he joined his colleague, John Richard Green, in condemning indiscriminate charity as a principal cause. However Denison also indicated the adverse effects of massive rural migration on urban labor and housing and the need to reverse that trend.

To solve the problem of East London poverty both Denison and Green suggested measures designed to foster the effective administration of state and private charity; but Denison went beyond Green in proposing more innovative remedies. His self-help schemes included a saving program for young single workers and a system of workingmen's insurance. The establishment of workingmen's clubs and classes was to be an important part of his proposals for effective individual improvement.

Private and public charitable institutions might employ

their efforts in more productive ways. Charitable societies could sponsor and administer emigration projects for rural workers. Poor Law officials could establish a national exchange of labor and facilitate the publication of information on trade conditions. Finally, in his most radical proposal, the authority of the Poor Law Guardians would be extended to include the removal and placement of pauper children.

Although the contribution of Denison's thought to later nineteenth century philanthropy deserves recognition, the impact of the example of his residency in East London ought not be overlooked. His unique experiment of living among the urban poor, publicized through his letters which were printed posthumously, captured the imagination of socially concerned younger men, inspired many of them to social service in the East End, and indeed became the model for future university settlers.[49]

While still living in East London, Denison and Green were invited by John Ruskin to Denmark Hill to suggest a project for aiding the poor. At that meeting they proposed the idea of a university settlement, a colony of men to continue the work of Denison and his friend, Edmund Hollond. Unfortunately Green's appointment to the Lambeth Library in 1869 and Denison's premature death in 1870 aborted their plan, and it would be fifteen years before the university settlement came to be.

CHAPTER I - FOOTNOTES

[1]John Richard Green to unnamed recipient, November 4, 1873, Leslie Stephen, ed., Letters of John Richard Green (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1901), p. 5 cited hereafter as Letters.

[2]Mr. Ridgway to Richard Castle, April 19, 1854, Lambeth Palace Library, John Richard Green Letter File.

[3]Green to A.P. Stanley, December, 1863, Letters, p. 17.

[4]Ibid., p. 18.

[5]Georgiana Putnam McEntee, The Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927), p. 3.

[6]W.G. Peck, The Social Implications of the Oxford Movement (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1933), p. 68.

[7]K.S. Inglis, Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963), pp. 263-264.

[8]Charles E. Raven, Christian Socialism 1848-1854 (London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., 1968), p. 76.

[9]Philip Lyttelton Gell, "John Richard Green", Fortnightly Review, 39 (n.s. 33) (1883): 735.

[10]Green, Letters, N.D. p. 21.

[11]Green to Richard Castle, N.D., Lambeth Palace Library, Green Letter File.

[12]Ibid.

[13]H.R. Haweis, "John Richard Green", Contemporary Review, 43 (1883): 734.

[14]The Poor Law Board, Twentieth Annual Report, 33 (Session 19 Nov., 1867-31 July, 1868), pp. vi-viii, 58.

[15]Green, "The East-End and Its Relief Committees", January 11, 1868, in Stray Studies, Second Series (London: Macmillian & Co., 1903) p. 144.

Chapter I - Footnotes (cont.)

[16]Ibid., pp. 143-144.

[17]Green to Rev. Issac Taylor, N.D., 1867, Letters, pp. 187-188.

[18]Green, "Pauperism in the East of London", December 28, 1867, Stray Studies, p. 133.

[19]Green, "The East-End and Its Relief Committees", p. 137.

[20]Green,"Pauperism in the East of London", p. 135.

[21]Green to Rev. Isaac Taylor, 1867, Letters, p. 188.

[22]Green, "The East-End and Its Relief Committees", pp. 145-146.

[23]Ibid., p. 147.

[24]Ibid., pp. 141-145, 147.

[25]Green, "Pauperism in the East of London", pp. 128-129.

[26]Green, "The East-End and Its Relief Committees", pp. 138-140. It was reported that in Bethnal Green 82.3% of Poor Law funds were allocated to indoor maintenance and only 7.7% were distributed for outdoor relief. The East London Observer, March 31, 1866.

[27]Green, "France and French Poor-Relief", October 24, 1868, Stray Studies, pp. 159-160.

[28]Ibid., pp. 163-164, 165-166.

[29]Green, "Benevolence and the Poor", January 23, 1869, Stray Studies, p. 170.

[30]Ibid., p. 168.

[31]Ibid., p. 172.

[32]Ibid., p. 173.

[33]Sir Baldwyn Leighton, ed., Letters and Other Writings of the late Edward Denison (London: Richard Bentley and Son,

Chapter I - Footnotes (cont.)

1875), pp. x, 55. The names of the recipients of these letters were not provided by the editor; therefore, subsequent citations will include only the dates of Denison's letters.

[34]Denison, October 16, 1866, December 17, 1866, Letters, pp. 30, 34.

[35]Denison, August 28, 1867, p. 63. It is interesting to note that this sense of personal responsibility for relieving distress became a common attitude among the next generation of social reformers. Canon Barnett referred to "a sense of sin" as the beginning of progress. Beatrice Webb commented on the feeling of "class guilt" which was part of her intellectual milieu, and Arnold Toynbee confessed that guilt in his lectures to workingmen.

[36]Denison, January 26, 1867, Letters, p. 44.

[37]Denison, January 27, 1867, Letters, pp. 45-48.

[38]Green, Stray Studies from England and Italy (London: Macmillan & Co., 1876), pp. 14-15.

[39]Ibid., pp. 15-16.

[40]Green to E.A. Freeman, January, 1868, Letters, p. 191.

[41]Denison, October 12, 1867, Letters, pp. 73-74.

[42]Denison, January 2, 1868, Letters, pp. 81-82.

[43]Denison, January 17, 1868, Letters, pp. 82-83.

[44]Denison, September 16, 1869, Letters, pp. 188-189.

[45]Denison, September 27, 1869, Letters, pp. 195-197.

[46]Ibid., p. 249.

[47]Ibid., pp. 250-253.

[48]Denison, December 24, 1867, Letters, p. 80.

[49]Karl de Schweinitz, England's Road to Social Security (New York: A.S.Barnes & Company, Inc., 1943), pp. 144. See also Edward Denison. Dictionary of National Biography, Vol.V p. 803.

CHAPTER II

THE AWAKENING OF THE OXONIAN SOCIAL CONSCIENCE: THE THOUGHT AND WORK OF ARNOLD TOYNBEE

If the scheme of a university settlement was to be successful, the presence and support of a socially concerned, idealistic academic community was a prerequisite. Herein lay Toynbee's contribution for it was, in large measure, his thought that inspired his fellow Oxonians with the ideals of good citizenship and moral responsibility and his example that motivated many of them to social service in the East End.

Born in London on August 23, 1852 Toynbee spent the greater part of his childhood in the pleasant rural village of Wimbledon. Here he grew into an attractive child, with a pleasant disposition and a superior intelligence. His precociousness impressed his father, Joseph Toynbee, the famous ear specialist, who was to play a dominant role in Arnold's early intellectual development. The elder Toynbee shared with his second son his knowledge and love of art and literature and also an interest in social improvement that had been displayed when he helped build model cottages and a lecture hall in Wimbledon. As a young child, Arnold attended the lectures in elementary science that his father conducted for local working men.

When he was eight years old Toynbee began his formal education at a private school in Blackheath where his strong

will made him a leader among his schoolmates. In his academic studies he displayed a marked distaste for languages and mathematics, and a decided preference for history. His fascination with military history prompted his enrollment, at the age of fourteen, in a military college to prepare for a career in the army. The sudden death of his father that year came as a severe shock to Arnold and altered his plans for the future. After two years of military training had convinced him of the uncongeniality of army life, his second career choice - that of the bar - was rejected by his mother because of the family's financial difficulties. Bitterly disappointed, Toynbee then decided to go to Oxford and he spent the next two years reading privately in preparation for his university career.

During this intellectual retreat, first in the village of Bracknell and later in the seacoast town of East Lulworth, Toynbee decided to devote his life to the study of the philosophy of history.[1] His solitary studies ended when a small inheritance gave him the opportunity to begin his undergraduate work. Pembroke College was his choice "because it is a small one with good 'Dons', especially in classics, and inexpensive."[2] He believed that his university experience would contribute to his intellectual and emotional growth and prepare him for a scholarly life dedicated to the pursuit of truth.

With this lofty purpose, he became a member of Pembroke College in January 1873. Shortly after matriculation he

stood unsuccessfully for the Brakenbury scholarship to Balliol. Despite the failure, the examiners were impressed by parts of his essays and invited him to enter Balliol. The requested transfer was refused by Pembroke's Master who charged that "Balliol, sir, is a kidnapping College - they wish to have not only the first-rate men and second-rate men, but even the third-rate men and the fourth-rate men."[3] Eventually Toynbee's persistence, supported by Benjamin Jowett, the Master of Balliol, won out. As it happened ill health forced Toynbee to postpone taking up his residency until January, 1875 when his association with Balliol began; it continued for the rest of his brief life.

The Oxford of the mid-1870's was in many ways vastly different from the Oxford of previous generations. The University Reform Act of 1854 began a series of administrative and institutional changes which eventually transformed Oxford into a modern university. And over the years there developed a reorientation of intellectual life.

The great controversy which had dominated Oxford thought for fifteen years gradually receded in the years following Newman's conversion. At its height, the Tractarian movement had encouraged classical studies by its emphasis on aesthetics, history, antiquity, and languages. However, with the end of that theological debate, attention could now be focussed on the important scientific developments which hitherto had been neglected and ignored. The "abject deference" for

authority, as one contemporary called it, - whether of the Fathers, or the Church, or the Primitive Ages - was abandoned.[4]

The vigorous pursuit of scientific truth led to an inevitable clash with theological dogma and the resulting intellectual ferment contributed to the crisis of faith experienced by many Oxonians. Confronted with the challenge of new scientific discoveries, traditionalists denied the veracity of these revelations and clung to their religious heritage while modernists enthusiastically embraced the new teachings and abandoned their faith. Others of more moderate persuasion sought to accommodate scientific knowledge to accepted dogma. The facets of this conflict were dramatically demonstrated by the debate between Huxley and Wilberforce over Darwin's Origins of Species in the summer of 1860. That same year the plea for latitude put forth in Jowett's Essays and Reviews was endorsed by the bishop of Natal and condemned by the bishop of Oxford.[5] Tension between traditionalists and modernists, and attempts at reconciliation continued throughout the 1860's and into the early 1870's. By the later years of the seventies, this major intellectual preoccupation was supplanted by a growing interest in contemporary social questions.

In 1875 when Toynbee entered Balliol, he joined a student body which was drawn largely from the privileged upper class of British society. Almost from the beginning, he enjoyed a unique reputation among his fellow undergraduates.

Lord Milner, a brilliant Balliol scholar and close friend, later wrote of Toynbee: "His intellectual gifts were great, rare and striking, but they were not, by themselves, commanding. What was commanding was the whole nature of the man - his purity, his truthfulness, his unrivalled loftiness of soul."[6] Toynbee's attractive appearance further enhanced his appeal. And his extraordinary eloquence elevated the tone of any discussion he participated in. As Milner testified: "No man has ever had for me the same fascination, or made me realise as he did the secret of prophetic power - the kind of influence exercised in all ages by the men of religious and moral inspiration."[7] Socially Toynbee was a success but ill health forced him to curtail his academic studies and to go for an ordinary Pass degree rather than to try for Honours. Despite this handicap Toynbee enjoyed his college days. "The life here is very sweet and full of joy; at Oxford, after all, one's ideal of happy life is nearer being realised than anywhere else."[8]

Toynbee's Oxford experience was enlivened by some unusual undergraduate adventures. As a dramatic demonstration of the value of manual labor, John Ruskin, Slade Professor of Fine Arts at Corpus Christi, persuaded some students, including Toynbee and his friends, to repair a road about two miles from Oxford in the village of Hinksey. His zeal led to Toynbee's being made foreman of the group; and several times a week, he led his men from Oxford with picks and shovels

and supervised their work on the project. Although the repairs were never completed, Toynbee came away from the task with a reverence and affection for Ruskin.

As an undergraduate Toynbee formed a friendship with Benjamin Jowett. Apparently Toynbee never suffered from the shyness which afflicted almost all of Jowett's pupils. While maintaining a graceful deference to Jowett, he was able to express freely his deepest religious and philosophical convictions and his glowing visions of the future. Jowett listened sympathetically to these youthful outpourings and maintained a continued interest in Toynbee's undergraduate progress. During the winter holiday of January, 1876 Jowett invited him to Malvern where they engaged in some very pleasant conversations. And during his last semester as an undergraduate Toynbee became the tutor of the second son of the Duke of Bedford, at a stipend of L300 a year, through the efforts of the Master of Balliol.

Toynbee was also indebted to Thomas Hill Green who became his spiritual guide and intellectual mentor. As Professor of Moral Philosophy,Green exerted a profound influence on Toynbee and his contemporaries. Despite his abstruse thought and painfully labored speeches, Green "came, almost against his will, to be regarded as a sort of prophet by many of the ablest men in the University."[9] Besieged by spiritual doubt, these earnest young men found in his philosophy a resolution of their conflict between faith and science. Green transformed historic Christianity into

an undogmatic theology based on Idealistic metaphysics. And he offered an ethic of humanism which required altruism, good works, and amelioration of the lot of others as signs of genuine faith. In Green's hands, Idealism became not only an arbiter between religion and science, but also a philosophy of social reform.

To motivate his students to social action Green converted guilt about their waning faith in traditional Christianity into a guilt about their privilege. He recast the old view of philanthropy - that wealth conferred a stewardship of the poor - into a newer version which implied a guilt about the wealth obtained in a system of unjust distribution. To atone for past injustices, he urged his students to sacrifice their selfish advantages so that the underprivileged might be given the chance to realize their potential abilities. In return, the privileged would be freed of troubled conscience and able to attain a higher moral development. Green's message struck a responsive chord in Toynbee who, by different roads, had come to hold the same position on religious, philosophical and social questions.

The condition of the working class was a matter of deep concern for Toynbee and his mentor. Since Toynbee believed that a knowledge of the laws governing the production and distribution of wealth was an essential prerequisite to material improvement he began a study of political economy. Upon the completion of his undergraduate work in 1878, he was

appointed tutor to the Indian civil servants attending Balliol. Part of his duties included instructing his students in political economy and his lectures soon attracted a wide university audience.

Extensive reading in this subject had led Toynbee to conclude that the abstract theories of political economy were often unrelated to historical fact. In attempting to explain the complexities of a new industrial society, political economists had constructed simple laws which had gone untested by empirical observation of the real economic world. Yet these laws were cited to justify the status quo and to frustrate efforts at social reform.

To root political economy more firmly in fact and to divest its laws of their pretensions to infallibility, Toynbee subjected its theories to a critical examination using the historical method. The result of his analysis was to revolutionize political economy, "not", as he said, "by showing its laws to be false, but by proving that they are relative for the most part to a particular stage of civilisation. This destroys their character as eternal laws, and strips them of much of their force and all of their sanctity."[10]

Toynbee was eminently successful in his endeavor for by the next decade the dominance of political economy was overthrown. According to Milner, "In this remarkable change of opinion which restored freedom of thought to economic speculation and gave a new impulse to philanthropy, Toynbee took,

as far as his own University was concerned, a leading part."[11]

However Toynbee was hardly the first to criticize classical political economy. Thirty years earlier in his Principles of Political Economy, John Stuart Mill had distinguished between production of goods and the distribution of wealth, making only the former subject to the laws of supply and demand. In his Oxford lectures Toynbee elaborated on this distinction as he analyzed the development and social ramifications of political economy.

Toynbee noted that Adam Smith's devotion to individual liberty and his identification of self-interest with the general welfare had created an economic system dedicated to unrestricted competition. While socialists were to condemn such a system as inherently evil, laissez-fairists steadfastly defended unrestricted competition as inherently good. Every attempt at regulating competition was denounced by them as an interference with a providential scheme. Toynbee suggested a more balanced view: competition should be regarded as a force of life, neither good nor evil. Distinguishing between competition in production and competition in distribution, he thought the former was beneficial to the community while the latter must be controlled. By the wise regulation of the competitive impulse many existing evils of the present system could be corrected.

Perhaps the foremost evil resulted from the application of the principle of unrestricted competition to labor. Political economists' demands for freedom of contract became

"the principal weapon against the methods by which the labourers have sought to improve their condition."[12] As Toynbee saw it the fallacy of this doctrine of freedom of contract was its assumption of free competition between equal industrial units; in reality these units were unequal. The factory system vividly demonstrated this inequality and subsequent factory legislation and repeal of anti-combination laws represented society's recognition of that fact.

The abstract theoretical basis of political economy was broadened by subsequent writers. Following the tradition of Adam Smith, first Malthus, and then Ricardo, promulgated their invariable laws which governed material existence. Toynbee pointed out that at the time Malthus wrote his famous treatise on population, the working class had been experiencing severe economic hardship due to the advent of the industrial revolution which was accompanied by a tremendous population growth, a Continental war, and several years of disastrous harvests. Malthus' theory of population, initially constructed to explain these conditions, gradually evolved into a natural and inexorable law of economics which dominated English thought long after those particular crises had passed. Different economic conditions, including the development of labor emigration and food importation made Malthus' law no longer applicable to England.

Although disputing the validity of the Malthusian theory, Toynbee did endorse the principle of moral restraint as a remedy for overpopulation. Artificial checks on population

were morally repugnant since sexual gratification was achieved while corresponding duties were avoided. Moral restraint could be exercised by the superior artisans but for "the labouring masses..., with whom prudential motives have no weight, the only true remedy is to carry out such great measures of social reform as the improvement of their dwellings, better education, and better amusements, and thus lift them into the position now held by the artisans, where moral restraints are operative."[13]

In addition to its moral and social implications, the law of population had important economic consequences. Malthus' theory, which set a physical or natural limit to the prosperity of the people, was followed by its corollary, the wage fund theory, which set a monetary limit to wages and thus had a profound impact on the condition of the working class. Political economists viewed trade union attempts to increase wages as not only futile but also in conflict with the natural law. Public acceptance of this viewpoint strengthened the hand of employers and weakened labor's case for higher wages.

Toynbee believed the wage fund theory, based upon the incorrect premise that wages were drawn from a fixed amount of capital, was an erroneous argument to use against attempts to increase wages. In actual practice the negotiation of wage rates depended upon the relative strength of the contracting parties. To have equal bargaining power both capital and labor must possess a knowledge of supply and demand, reserve capital,and mobility. Given this criteria, it was obvious

that labor was at a disadvantage. However, contrary to the opinion of political economists, labor's position had been strengthened by the growth of trade unions. Through collective bargaining trade unions had transformed the isolated laborer into part of a united group and had supplied the worker with reserves of capital which enabled him to hold out for higher wages. Despite these improvements the position of labor remained inferior since the employer could substitute machinery or hire foreign workers and thus retain his advantage over his employees.

It was this basic inequality which had produced an uneven distribution of wealth and it was this unsolved labor question on which political economy foundered. For the gospel of unrestricted accumulation of wealth was silent on the right distribution of wealth. Toynbee charged that political economy's central doctrine of individualism, its absolute reliance on individual action, and its assertion of pecuniary interest as a sufficient, even primary bond between men, failed to satisfy the needs, not only of workingmen,but also of philosophers, moralists, and statesmen. They came to regard the doctrine of individualism as a disintegrating element of social life,a doctrine whose supremacy threatened to break the moral, ethical and political bonds of society.

The negative social effects of unbridled individualism suggested the need for an alternative economic system to achieve social justice. One such alternative had been proposed in 1882 by Henry George. In Progress and Poverty he sought

to create a synthesis between political economy and socialism. Denying any natural limit to prosperity, George insisted that private landownership was the only obstacle to an equitable distribution of wealth.

George's treatise was the result of his investigation of the problem of pauperism in California, a state with extensive natural resources, a relatively sparse population, and a heavy concentration of landownership. In essence George offered Ricardo's theory of rent as an explanation and Mill's proposal for land tenure reform as a solution to that problem. George's thesis was that as the margin of civilization advanced, rents would increase and wages and interest would decline; therefore private landownership should be abolished by the expropriation of rent. He concluded that "nothing short of making land common property can permanently relieve poverty and check the tendency of wages to the starvation point."[14]

Alarmed at the radical repercussions for English society if such a remedy were adopted, Toynbee sought to convince the public of the "fundamentally dangerous" errors of Progress and Poverty. Having exposed the fallacies of political economy he believed he could not allow the public to be deceived by "a fair, but delusive panacea."[15]

Toynbee believed George's thesis to be self-contradictory since his theory of rent assumed a law of diminishing returns, a law which George had previously rejected. Moreover, Toynbee maintained that the economic conditions in California could

not be explained in George's terms because the margin of cultivation there had clearly not reached the point of diminishing returns.

Empirical evidence also tended to disprove George's theory. Statistical studies indicated that since 1800 wages in California and throughout America had risen and that, contrary to George's view, the American laborer was sharing in the increased agricultural and industrial wealth of that new nation. As for older developed nations, while his thesis might hold true for some countries such as India and Ireland, it was not valid for England where, according to all available evidence, rents did not directly lower wages or profits. Therefore there was no reason to confiscate rents. Even if George's scheme were adopted, Toynbee estimated that the Treasury would receive only L60 million. And for that sum it was hardly worth risking an entire civilization.

Such drastic changes were not necessary to achieve a more equitable distribution of wealth. Although both Henry George and the political economists would deny the possibility of working class improvement under the present system, Toynbee took a more optimistic view. As he interpreted the dynamics of the distribution of wealth, the limit on wages was not a physical one, as the political economists had said, nor an institutional one, as Henry George had maintained. The true limit on wages was a moral one - the will of the employer. Working on this assumption, Toynbee traced the historic relationship between capital and labor to determine the extent of working class progress and the prospects for future

gains under the capitalistic system.

The industrial revolution was, in Toynbee's view, a watershed in English economic history for it destroyed the social and economic relationships of the old world and created new ones in their place. The bonds of loyalty and affection between the worker and his employer were severed, and this estrangement was exacerbated by the physical suffering of the worker in the new industrial society. The Old Poor Law which stimulated the growth of a degraded population, and the Corn Law which increased the price of bread contributed to the destitution of the working class. Devoid of political and economic power the worker was oppressed by the exhausting conditions of new industrial methods, and he experienced the acute pain characteristic of all transitional periods.

Toynbee explained that with the advent of the modern industrial era the long struggle to improve the status of the worker began. A vital step in that improvement lay in obtaining political power for the working class. The Reform Bill of 1832, the Repeal of the Corn Laws, and the Charter were important landmarks on the road to material improvement. Triumph came in 1867, for with the winning of the suffrage, the workman "had at last reached the summit of the long ascent from the position of a serf, and stood by the side of his master as the full citizen of a free state."[16]

With the achievement of political power the quest for further economic gains continued. Toynbee believed that since 1846 the condition of the working class had improved. Free

trade, by establishing more stable wheat prices and by fostering a greater stability of trade, had contributed to that improvement. The real wages of both artisans and laborers had risen and savings statistics reflected this growing prosperity. Factory legislation had improved the conditions of employment and trade unionism had taught workingmen, through organization and self-help, to become more self-sufficient. However, representative bargaining had destroyed the last remnants of personal ties between individual workers and employers. Fortunately democracy was helping to bridge the gulf separating capital and labor. By transforming wage disputes from social feuds into business bargains, democracy"sweeps away the estranging class elements of suspicion, arrogance, and jealousy, and freeing the pent-up economic elements whose natural tendency is not towards division,it enables workmen and employers to take the first step to unite."[17] In assessing the overall gains of the working class it seemed there were grounds for optimism because the wages and living standard of the artisan and, to some extent, the laborer, had risen; rents were expected to fall and interest rates to stabilize in the future.

Despite this favorable projection, the general enthusiasm for the proposals set forth in Progress and Poverty demonstrated the basic discontent and impatience of the working class with the capitalistic system. Toynbee acknowledged that Henry George had reminded Englishmen "of the widespread suffering that is concealed beneath the smooth surface of our ordinary life."[18] Society in 1883 was threatened, not

by the hungry multitude clamoring for bread, but by the large class of men whose wants had grown faster than their incomes. The great problem of how to improve the condition of the working class remained to be answered.

Toynbee believed that trade unionism offered labor hope of greater economic benefits in the future. Properly organized unions, supported by public opinion, could introduce the notion of equity in labor negotiations which would eventually increase wages. The newly established boards of conciliation in Nottingham and other northern towns were proof of the changing attitude of the employers in their dealings with the wage demands of their workers. Toynbee thought that trade unions had acted responsibly in adopting constitutional methods of agitation which averted violent industrial dislocations. He pointed out that the largest unions had authorized the fewest strikes. Moreover, trade union societies were making important contributions towards alleviating the problems of sickness and old age among their members.

In addition to trade unionism Toynbee believed the cooperative movement offered an alternative method of improving the condition of the working class. For the goal of cooperation was to abolish competition and to end the separation of capital and labor. He suggested that small scale trades and ones which did not require large amounts of capital were most suitable for cooperative ventures. Because of the complexities of modern industry workmen of high moral and intellectual qualities were needed if cooperation were to be

successful. One important function of cooperation would be to educate the workman to his civic duties. "Men who still dream of the reconstruction of industrial life by the union of capital and labour will recognise at once that this education is the necessary preliminary to any such attempt."[19]

While trade unions and cooperatives promised the industrial worker a better economic future, the rural worker had no such self-help organizations. The improvement of his economic status hinged on the prevention of further concentration of landownership. To discourage large holdings Toynbee called for the abolition of the perquisites of landed property. He advocated that the House of Lords be reformed, game laws abolished, and county boards established to place local government in the hands of laborers and residents of the county. Hopefully, when all the privileges attached to large estates were eliminated, wealthy Englishmen would be content with smaller holdings in the future.

Toynbee did not favor the current proposal for land equalization, the peasant proprietorship scheme, which he regarded as "a highly dangerous and foolish experiment to make at the present time."[20] Such a scheme should be entertained only in the most tentative way because of the uncertain future of English agriculture. It would be far more prudent, in his opinion,to wait until economic conditions stabilized before introducing such a program. As an interim measure he proposed that all remaining commons and waste lands be transferred from the land commission to the county boards, thereby

preventing further enclosures. Perhaps this land could be leased to rural workers as an experiment in peasant proprietorship. Implementing these suggestions would contribute to the economic betterment of the agricultural laborer.

Although both the industrial and farm workers could expect, to some extent, a more favorable economic position, Toynbee noted an alarming trend which threatened the achievement of economic justice. The increasing concentration of ownership in industry, manufacturing, as well as agriculture, and the resulting accumulation of capital in fewer hands had a significant effect on the distribution of wealth. He believed such concentration "is the one great reason why wages have not risen in proportion to the increase in productive power; it is because the economic structure of society is such that the huge employer and the huge capitalist can practically dictate terms to the labourers."[21]

In the face of these economic realities, the time had come to recognize that the era of free trade and free contract was over and that the era of intervention had come. The state must now intercede on behalf of the people. Toynbee interpreted the passage of the Irish Land Act as signifying Gladstone's commitment of his party to a socialistic program, or Radical Socialism, a version of socialism which extended the protection of the state to women, children, and if necessary, to men who all too often were not free agents. In analyzing its principles, Toynbee stated that the Radical Socialism of the 1880's, as its name implied, suggested its

association with the old Radical creed of justice, liberty, and self-help which had found political and economic expression in agitation for universal suffrage, free trade and free contract. Of course the old Radicalism had been firmly opposed to any policies of state interference. He pointed out, though, that socialism had many precedents in English history. The acute distress of the 1830's and 1840's had fostered the paternalistic socialism of the great landowners who opposed the new Poor Law and sponsored factory legislation. And Robert Owen had advocated another kind of socialism which promised to substitute cooperation and brotherhood for competition.

The recognition "that between men who are unequal in material wealth there can be no freedom of contract" formed the basis for this new alliance of Radicalism and Socialism. Accepting this economic reality meant abandoning the old Radical faith in laissez-faire, thus paving the way for support of state action. The criteria for such action were: "First, that where individual rights conflict with the interests of the community, there the State ought to interfere; the second, that where people are unable to provide a thing for themselves, and that thing is of primary social importance, then again the State should interfere and provide it for them."[22] State assistance must be practicable and must not diminish self-reliance. Nothing must be done to weaken the Radical virtues of self-help and voluntary association which had contributed to the greatness of the English people. Toynbee was confident

that without resorting to revolution or continental socialism, a better distribution of wealth could be achieved within the present economic framework by this program of Radical Socialism.

To finance the state's social reform measures, Toynbee thought that rather than tax the unearned increment of rent, as Mill and George had suggested, a higher graduated income tax should be levied on both capitalists and landowners. In this way the greater burden would not rest on just one class. He was certain that the rich would not object to increased taxation once they realized that the money would pay for programs designed for the betterment of the people.

Toynbee outlined the kinds of projects which the state might undertake. All monopoly industries, such as the utilities, should be subject to either state take-over or regulation. But perhaps the most fertile field for state action was working class housing. Municipalities could be authorized to buy land and lease it for building purposes below the full competitive market value. Because the preservation of open spaces in the suburbs was also an important consideration, local municipalities could buy land for this purpose as well. Before embarking on such projects, people like Octavia Hill, who were knowledgeable in the field, should be consulted. The benefits of a well-thought out municipal program of working class housing were considerable. "We could make no better investment of national capital. A higher standard of comfort would be reached and improved habits of living established

among the people; a great diminution in pauperism, drunkenness, and crime would inevitably follow." Anticipating some likely objections to the scheme, Toynbee insisted that it was not class legislation since "we cannot call ourselves safe until all citizens have a chance of living decent lives"[23]; these proposals would not lessen self-reliance because their purpose was to make the working class self-sufficient.

State action alone did not guarantee the solution of all social problems. The improvement of sanitary conditions, for example, required the cooperation of individuals in voluntary association. Existing sanitary statutes providing for the inspection and enforcement of sanitary codes were ineffective because the officers were dependent on the local bodies for their positions and were therefore reluctant to incur their emnity. Moreover, many inspectors were too busy or too apathetic to fulfill their duties. To remedy this condition Toynbee called for the formation of vigilance committees composed of workingmen and middle class men who would insure the enforcement of existing sanitary legislation.

Insurance was another area where the combined efforts of the state and voluntary association might prove most helpful. Toynbee observed that middle class advocates of various self-help insurance schemes failed to perceive that thrift, as much as drink, can brutalize a man by making him intent on his own advantage and uncaring of his fellowmen. To help men raise themselves without being brutalized in the process, he suggested government grants, similar to educational grants,

be given to the great friendly societies under carefully considered conditions of state audit. With this aid, friendly societies would be able to reduce gradually their rates, thereby allowing more men to participate in their insurance programs. The advantage of his proposal was that pauperism would be reduced without "invoking State aid on a large and monstrous scale, without interfering with those great self-helping voluntary institutions which have built up this nation."[24]

Although self-help through trade unions and cooperatives, voluntary association, and state intervention were important instruments of social reform, they were not the ultimate solution to the problem of working class improvement. In England the traditional method of achieving social reform had been through class alliance. To create a lasting union between the classes it was necessary that the gospel of rights be replaced by the gospel of duties. Political economy had established principles for optimum production; a new economy based on moral principles was now needed to insure a more equitable distribution of wealth . Thus Toynbee's intellectual quest for the improvement of the working class began with a critical examination of political economy and ended with his construction of moral economy.

It was in the context of mutual class obligations that Toynbee preached his moral economics and in this new order he expected the educated class to play a decisive role. He urged capitalists to regard their wealth as a great national trust and to support social reform programs designed to im-

prove the condition of the working class. He called upon the workman "to reform his own social and domestic life - to put down drunkenness and brutal violence."[25] And he dedicated the educated of the middle class to the service of the workers as part of their civic and moral duty.

Toynbee feared that with the advent of democracy, politicians were becoming less the leaders and teachers of the people and more their instruments. Therefore he believed it essential that members of the intellectual community intervene in the political and social affairs of the nation. In his schema, the socially concerned student, free of social and political bias, would act "as an impartial, public-spirited mediator between the conflicting interests and prejudices of class and class."[26] In view of past injustices, service to the disadvantaged was the moral obligation of the privileged. In a famous speech, Toynbee verbalized the sense of class guilt which would motivate the students to social action.

> We-the middle classes, I mean, not merely the very rich-we have neglected you; instead of justice we have offered you charity, and instead of sympathy, we have offered you hard and unreal advice; but I think we are changing. If you would only believe it and trust us, I think that many of us would spend our lives in your service. You have - I say it clearly and advisedly - you have to forgive us, for we have wronged you; we have sinned against you grievously - not knowingly always, but still we have sinned, and let us confess it; but if you will forgive us - nay, whether you will forgive us or not - we will serve you, we will devote our lives to your service, and we cannot do more. It is not that we care about public life, for what is public life but the miserable arid waste of barren controversies and personal jealousies,

> and grievous loss of time? Who would live in public life if he could help it? But we student, we would help you if we could. We are willing to give up something much dearer than fame and social position. We are willing to give up the life we care for, the life of books and with those we love. We will do this, and only ask you to remember one thing in return. We will ask you to remember this - that we work for you in the hope and trust that if you get material civilisation, if you have opened up to you the possibility of a better life you will really lead a better life.[27]

The ultimate goal of this alliance between the educated and the wage earner was not the achievement of economic improvement as an end in itself. "We want higher wages in order than an improved material condition, with less anxiety and less uncertainty as to the future, may enable the working man to enter on a purer and more worthy life."[28] To realize this lofty goal, university men should devote themselves to "the removal of sin and pain, the increase of knowledge and beauty, the binding together of the whole world in the bond of peace."[29]

Toynbee's years at Oxford were spent in translating his social thought into social action. His active involvement in civic and social affairs set an inspiring example to his fellow Oxonians and furthered their commitment to social reform. As an undergraduate, Toynbee had visited workhouses and had participated in charity work. After graduation he formed a study group at Oxford to formulate a body of principles on which to base future political and social action.

To obtain valuable knowledge of social institutions and to fulfill his civic responsibility, Toynbee became a Poor

Law Guardian at Oxford. He served three years on the Board, conscientiously attending its weekly meetings and bringing a wide range of knowledge to its discussions. Like Green and Denison, he was opposed to granting out-door relief because he believed it lowered wages, degraded recipients, and diminished self-reliance. And like Green, he suggested the inclusion of working men on the Poor Law Boards to gain their support for the abolition of out-door relief. He thought, as had Green and Denison, that organized charity, rather than out-door relief, offered the most effective assistance to the deserving poor by creating a bond of kindness and gratitude between the donors and the recipients. In an effort to coordinate public and private charity, he joined the Oxford branch of the Charity Organisation Society. As an active member he made an extraordinary effort to investigate thoroughly the cases of all applicants and he worked to establish uniform procedures in the administration of the Society.

His concern for the poor attracted Toynbee to Samuel Barnett, the Vicar of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, and their friendship formed the basis for Toynbee's direct connection with the university settlement movement. In June of 1875 Gertrude Toynbee, Arnold's sister,introduced him to Reverend and Mrs. Barnett who were making the first of many visits to Oxford. Barnett met with Toynbee and other socially concerned students and acquainted them with the problems of his East London parish. After listening to Barnett, Benjamin Jowett unexpectedly joined the group and warmly supported Barnett's

work. Jowett advised each of the students to "make some of his friends among the poor."[30]

Following Jowett's advice, Toynbee visited Whitechapel during his vacation and took lodgings over the C.O.S. office on Commercial Road. He assisted Barnett at St. Jude's, worked with the local branch of the C.O.S., and visited the Tower Hamlets Radical Club to get a taste of East End politics. But East London life had a depressing effect on his health and spirits, and after a few weeks he was forced to end his residency. However his friendship with the Barnetts continued over the years and formed a lasting bond between Oxford and East London. Toynbee's efforts on behalf of social reform severely taxed his frail constitution and may have contributed to his premature death in March, 1883. Perhaps the best evaluation of his life was provided by his contemporaries. Alfred Milner believed that Toynbee's greatest contribution was the inspiration and direction he gave to the newly aroused interest of the educated in social questions. The view of another Oxonian supports this assessment.

> About the middle of the Seventies...a new doctrine, a new endeavor...became somewhat suddenly manifest in Oxford. Ruskin and Carlyle superseded Mill and Spencer in the mind of young Oxford; Idealists and Churchmen alike responded to the challenge; altruism, philanthropy, a passion for social study and social service, took possession of the too introspective and scrupulous soul of Oxford. This salutary and missionary new departure must ever be associated by those who witnessed it with the name of Arnold Toynbee. ...Toynbee, and the Toynbee touch, set Good Samaritanism in a new light, gave it almost a scientific charter, brought it into connecxion with good citizenship, and established a special relation between the Univ-

> ersities and the wage-earning masses. Directly and indirectly this movement has given us the University and College Settlements in London and other slum-cities;[31]

Therefore, in 1884 it seemed a fitting tribute to dedicate the first university settlement to the memory of Arnold Toynbee who, by his thought and work, prepared Oxford for the favorable reception of Samuel Barnett's unique proposal for social reform.

CHAPTER II - FOOTNOTES

[1]Francis C. Montague, Arnold Toynbee (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1889), pp. 8-9.

[2]Reminiscences and Letters of Joseph and Arnold Toynbee, edited by Gertrude Toynbee (London: Henry J. Glaisher, 1910), pp. 109-110.

[3]Evelyn Abbott and Lewis Campbell, The Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett (2 Vols.; London: John Murray, 1897), II, 65-66.

[4]Mark Pattison, Memoirs (London: Macmillan and Co., 1885), pp. 237-238.

[5]Abbott and Campbell, Benjamin Jowett, II, 300, 293.

[6]Arnold Toynbee, Lectures on the Industrial Revolution of the Eighteenth Century in England, "Addresses, Notes and other Fragments," with a Reminiscence by Lord Milner. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908), p. xiv.

See also Montague, Arnold Toynbee, p. 53.

[7]Ibid., pp. xiv-xv. Toynbee's circle included Alfred Milner, Michael Glazebrook, James Wilson, T.H. Warren, Philip Gell, James Bonar, F.C. Montague, R.L. Nettleship, Bolton King, and Albert Gray.

See also Cosmo Ebor, "Samuel Augustus Barnett. Some Lessons of His Life," Charity Organisation Review (December, 1913) p. 353.

[8]Arnold Toynbee, Lectures on the Industrial Revolution in England, "Popular Addresses, Notes, etc." with a Memoir by Benjamin Jowett (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1902), p. xxii.

[9]R. Nettleship, "Professor T.H. Green In Memoriam", Contemporary Review, 41 (1882): 861.

[10]Arnold Toynbee, Lectures on the Industrial Revolution (second edition London: Rivingtons, 1887), p. 25.

[11]Toynbee, Industrial Revolution (1908), p. xxv.

See also J.A.R. Pimlott, Toynbee Hall Fifty Years of Progress (London, 1935), pp. 22-23.

Chapter II - Footnotes (cont.)

[12]Toynbee, Industrial Revolution (1887), pp. 16-17.

[13]Ibid., pp. 112-114.

[14]Henry George, Progress and Poverty (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1882), p. ix.

[15]Arnold Toynbee, "Progress and Poverty" A Criticism of Mr. George (London: K. Paul, Trench & Co., 1884), p. 8.

[16]Toynbee, Industrial Revolution (1887), p. 196.

[17]Ibid., p. 199.

[18]Toynbee, A Criticism of Mr. George, pp. 5-6.

[19]Toynbee, Industrial Revolution (1887), pp. 227-229.

[20]Toynbee, A Criticism of Mr. George, p. 48.

[21]Ibid., p. 22.

[22]Toynbee, Industrial Revolution (1887), p. 216.

[23]Ibid., p. 219.

[24]Toynbee, A Criticism of Mr. George, pp. 52-53.

[25]Toynbee, Industrial Revolution (1887), pp. 220-221.

[26]Toynbee, Industrial Revolution (1908), p. xxiv.

[27]Toynbee, A Criticism of Mr. George, p. 54.

See also B. Webb, My Apprenticeship (London, 1926), pp. 176-177. Here Mrs. Webb cites Toynbee's speech as an example of "class-consciousness of sin."

[28]Toynbee, Industrial Revolution (1887), pp. 175-176.

[29]Ibid., p. 233.

[30]Henrietta O. Barnett, Canon Barnett His Life Work and Friends (2 Vols.; Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1919), I, 302-305.

Chapter II - Footnotes (cont.)

[31]R.W. Macan, Religious Changes in Oxford During the Last Fifty Years (London: Oxford University Press, 1918), pp. 36-37.

See also Donald O. Wagner, The Church of England and Social Reform Since 1854(New York, 1930), p. 178. Wagner calls Toynbee "Barnett's most important disciple" and "an effective propagandist." In recalling the beginnings of Toynbee Hall Mrs. Barnett assessed Toynbee's contribution to the university settlement movement. "His share of the movement was at Oxford, where with a subtle force of personality he attracted original or earnest minds of all degrees, and turned their thoughts and faces towards the East End and its problems" Henrietta O. Barnett, "The Beginning of Toynbee Hall" The Nineteenth Century 53 (1903): 312.

See also Stefan Colleni, Liberalism and Sociology: L.T. Hobhouse and Political Argument in England (Cambridge, 1979), p. 55.

CHAPTER III

EAST LONDON POVERTY IN THE LATE NINETEENTH AND EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY: THE THOUGHT AND WORK OF SAMUEL AUGUSTUS BARNETT

Samuel Barnett began his career in East London as an Anglican clergyman in 1873 and during the course of his thirty-three year ministry became an outspoken social reformer. The post of Vicar of St. Jude's, Whitechapel afforded him a unique opportunity for gaining first hand knowledge of East London problems and for furthering the cause of social reform. Trained in the doctrines of political economy and scientific charity, he undertook his assignment dedicated to the effective treatment of the social as well as spiritual ills of the community. In attempting to solve the complex problems of urban society, he gradually recognized the inadequacy of existing public and private relief institutions and methods. As his knowledge and experience of East London poverty deepened, his social thought became more enlightened and his reform proposals more innovative. An examination of his views on poverty, charity, Poor Law reform, unemployment, old age pensions, and housing illustrates the development and direction of his thought. By the close of his East London career in 1906, Barnett's social philosophy incorporated features of traditional, scientific, and modern philanthropy. His ideology was, perhaps, best reflected in the university settlement, his most significant

contribution to social reform.

The founder of Toynbee Hall was born in Bristol on February 8, 1844. As a child Barnett was docile, retiring, and delicate and his frequent bouts of illness, anxiously tended by his mother, sowed the seeds of a hypochondriacal tendency which plagued him all his life. No doubt his fragile health prompted the decision to educate him at home with private tutors. However at the age of sixteen, having chosen the ministry as his career, he became a weekly boarder at a "crammer." Unfortunately his rough schoolmates made life quite unpleasant for him and the following year a private tutor was engaged to prepare him for Oxford.

On June 18, 1862 Barnett entered Wadham College. The following three years he would later recall with affection and appreciation. In 1865 he graduated with Second class Honours in Law and History and accepted a teaching position at Winchester College. He then visited America, a trip which, it has been said, "knocked the Toryism out of him."[1]

On his return, Barnett was ordained a deacon and the following year, in 1868, he became a priest. His first assignment was to St. Mary's, Bryanston Square, as the curate of William H. Fremantle. A strong advocate of social Christianity, Fremantle found his young curate "diligent and dutiful in all ways...always liberal in thought and act, his heart was with the poor, and he sought their good."[2] Fremantle assigned Barnett the task of administering the parish relief fund and these duties brought Barnett into contact with Octavia Hill, a leading reformer in housing for the poor and a supporter of

organized charity.

As the granddaughter of Dr. Southwood Smith (who had helped pass the Public Health Act of 1848) Octavia Hill inherited a family tradition of social service. Her involvement with the poor began when her family's financial reverses forced her to become the manager of a toy-making class in a charity school. Inspired by F.D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley, she decided to devote herself to the service of the poor. And John Ruskin provided her with the opportunity to begin a career in property management.

At Octavia's suggestion, Ruskin invested some of his recently inherited fortune in housing for the poor. As overseer of Ruskin's property Octavia Hill inaugurated a system of management based on the concept of mutual duties and obligations between landlord and tenant. Essential repairs were made promptly but further improvement depended on the responsible behavior of the tenants. Extreme punctuality in the payment and collection of rent was also required. Octavia found this policy gave her tenants "a dignity and glad feeling of honorable behavior which has more than compensated for the apparent harshness of the rule."[3] Her management extended beyond the mere collection of rent and included the provision of wholesome recreational and cultural activities.[4] And because the success of her methods depended on close personal supervision and interest in her tenants, Octavia Hill began to train women as professional rent collectors. These activities brought her into prominence in philanthropic circles

and made her an important spokesman of methodical charity.

The need for a more rational administration of charity had been recognized by many socially concerned Londoners. Proposals for organizing charity had been put forward by G.M. Hicks in 1861, and by Reverend Henry Solly and Dr. Hawksley in 1868 and 1869. Finally a prospectus, which combined aspects of all three plans, was submitted to Lord Lichfield by W.M. Wilkenson and that prospectus became the basis for the establishment of the Charity Organisation Society. In the spring of 1869 Lichfield furnished an office at 15 Buckingham St. and the Society began operations. In the summer of 1869 the Marylebone Committee, the first District Committee of the C.O.S., was established under the direction of Lichfield with Octavia Hill as one of its earliest members. In addition to her work in the C.O.S., Octavia Hill was appointed honorary supervisor of the Parish Relief Committee of St. Mary's and joined Barnett in organizing a rational system of parish relief.

Barnett found Miss Hill a strong-willed woman, often dictatorial in manner, who took enormous pains with her workers and allowed no interference with even the smallest details of her plans. Such a forceful personality exerted a profound influence on the gentle priest and he came to regard her with admiration bordering on veneration. Barnett became Octavia's protege and she indoctrinated him in her principles and methods of charitable relief which initially he accepted completely and uncritically.

From Octavia Hill Barnett learned that almsgiving was an evil and that it was the duty of the wealthy to withhold such gifts.[5] The gift of time was far more precious than money. Only by patient individual care would the semi-pauper class be raised. Therefore the rich and educated should share their superior intellectual and moral qualities with the poor and should devote themselves to civic work on the local level. The positions of vestrymen and Poor Law Guardians offered enormous opportunities for service to the poor. Finally, when dealing with the problems of the poor, there was an urgent need for gentle sympathetic investigation and thoughtful decision to promote their welfare. In later years Barnett would abandon some of his mentor's precepts but he retained many of these early lessons and applied them to his subsequent social activities.

Barnett owed his introduction to "scientific" charity, as she called it, to Octavia Hill and he was also indebted to her for introducing him to his future wife. At Octavia's birthday party, he met Henrietta Rowland, one of her beautiful young district workers. Although Barnett was only twenty-seven at the time, he already had the appearance of a kindly elderly gentleman. He was of average height with a rather frail physique. His head was bald, his brow high, and his eyes were fairly wide apart. He dressed poorly, wearing an ill-fitting mail order hat and cotton gloves two or three sizes too big. However his modest, self-effacing and generous nature seems to have compensated for his physical

appearance and in June, 1872 the couple became engaged.

Shortly before his marriage Barnett was offered the position of Vicar of St. Jude's, Whitechapel.[6] In making the offer the bishop of London characterized St. Jude's as 'the worst parish in my diocese, inhabited mainly by a criminal population, and one which has, I fear, been much corrupted by the doles.'[7] Barnett accepted the challening appointment and in March 1873, he and his bride began their work in St. Jude's.

The population of the parish numbered about 6,270, according to the census of 1871, with most inhabitants living among a network of courts and alleys in houses not more than six feet apart. The majority of men who worked were employed as casual dock workers but unemployment was an endemic problem. Those who had no work resorted to stealing, begging, hawking, and gambling. These activities, coupled with excessive drinking, produced a decidely unattractive environment. As Mrs. Barnett recalled, "Whole streets were given over to the hangers-on of a vicious population; people whose conduct was brutal, whose ideal was idleness, whose habits were disgusting, and among whom goodness was laughed at, the honest man and right-living woman being scorned as unpractical."[8]

If its surroundings were discouraging, the conditions in the church were scarcely better. St. Jude's, 'unserved by curate, choir, or officials, was empty, dirty, unwarmed. The schools were closed, the parish organisation nil, no Sunday school, no communicants' class, no library, no guilds, no music, no classes - nothing alive.'[9] Undaunted by these

difficulties the Barnetts set to work and within a year the school was reopened, adult classes begun, a girls' night school and a penny bank established, and a lending library organized.

In addition to regular Sunday services of worship, Barnett provided cultural programs at St. Jude's believing that "somehow Sunday must be rescued from its present degradation, saved from being a day of sleep, feasting, and working, to become a day of learning, enjoyment, and rest. Somehow the people must be brought within a refining influence, such as that which comes from knowledge of the best of things within men's reach."[10] Barnett considered lectures, music, and art to be refining influences and therefore proper activities for Sunday. He invited well-known clergymen to lecture at St. Jude's and he scandalized the "puritans" by providing oratorios and two classical concerts by Francke on Sunday evenings.[11] He also arranged a Whitechapel art exhibit in 1881 and through his pioneering efforts the Whitechapel Art Gallery was built and opened in 1901. A parish library established in 1876 became the model for the Whitechapel Public Library. Underscoring all Barnett's activities was the belief that cultural deprivation was a sin which must be overcome.

Unfortunately Barnett's motives and methods were often misinterpreted and criticized and he was accused of failing to perform his primary religious function. Octavia Hill shared this view.

> Are you thinking that music, and benevolence and all those things if you sympathise with poeple in them will alone lead them up to God? Or will you have to speak to them more of the

> things few of them are ready to see, yet the need for which, the witness for which is in their hearts, deep down? I sometimes think the intense desire you have to feel you are one with men makes you just a little (?) the speaking to what is latent there.[12]

Barnett's views found little favor with the official church. The more orthodox members were shocked by the breadth of his appeal and some even tried to drive him outside the church. Barnett's supporters claimed that the church refused to make full use of his talents or reward his efforts and their argument had some merit. For example, in August 1880 the Barnetts had requested a transfer to a Stepney parish which offered a more spacious residence and an opportunity for quiet parish work. When the bishop failed to grant the request, Octavia Hill wrote that she was sorry but not surprised at the refusal. She thought that the bishop would want to offer the post to one who gave a larger share of his time and strength to distinct Christian teaching. Recognizing the difficulties he faced at St. Jude's she nevertheless believed he had failed in his spiritual ministry. The primary reason for that failure, she thought, lay in a certain flaw in his character which she analyzed.

> And this I believe it is largely - to your own intense desire not to separate yourself by criticising or marking, or dwelling on, differences between yourself and any single human soul you come in contact with - but I have often felt of late years as if there were in you a want of the - power - will - what is it? to lead men to Christ and to their Father. - If I am wrong I should be glad to be shewn it.[13]

In spite of what she perceived as his weakness, she had urged the bishop to appoint Barnett, because, she explained to Barnett,

"yours is the only way of beginning."

> There needs the sympathy with the causes men care for. There needs the clear call to put their lives in order. There needs the appeal to all that is noble and generous in them. There needs the deep personal sympathy. There needs the liberality which grants them all that is true in what they see. There needs the readiness to work hand in hand with them whatever they believe before these men can listen, or turn to, the Church or any distinct teachings.[14]

Despite the lack of ecclesiastical recognition, Barnett's appeal spread to wider fields. Statesmen, civil servants, landlords, journalists, workmen - men of all creeds and classes - became his followers. The spirit of social service was spread by his disciples to all levels of society, influencing departments, newspapers, and even governments. And on a visit to England, Georges Clemenceau met with Barnett to discuss the conditions of the poor. Later Clemenceau reported that he had met but three great men in England, 'and one was a little pale clergyman in Whitechapel.'[15] During his years at St. Jude's Barnett had been confronted with the increasingly severe problem of urban poverty and, in attempting to deal with that problem, he had become an important social reformer.

In his analysis of the problem of poverty, Barnett believed a distinction had to be made regarding the kind of poverty which needed remedy. He thought that the poverty which enabled a man to live a full human life was not an evil. But the poverty which degraded life, which made it impossible for a man to develop his talents was an evil which

demanded correction.

From his experience in Whitechapel Barnett knew the hardships of a laborer earning twenty shillings a week, providing for a family of three or four children in a single room. His life, said Barnett, was an endless struggle to feed and clothe his family and he lived in constant fear of losing his job. The workhouse and the grave were his only future. The laborer earning forty shillings a week scarcely fared much better for he was deprived of pleasure and denied protection from old age and illness. And the working man who managed to save for the future paid a terrible price.

> England is the land of sad monuments. The saddest monument is that erected to Thrift - 'the respectable working man.' His brains, which might have shown the world how to save men, have been spent in saving pennies; his life, which might have been made happy and full, has been dulled and saddened by taking 'thought for the morrow'.[16]

In addition, disease and crime continually threatened East Londoners. The death-rate among poor children was twice that among the rich and the occupants of prisons were of mostly one class - the poor.[17] But "the saddest of all experiences of life among the poor is the gradual declension of respectable families into the ranks of the destitute, when loss of work finds them without resources in body or skill."[18] Thus Barnett believed that the poverty of the working class was the primary problem of England's urban society. That poverty left families undernourished, weak and vulnerable to the temptations of drink. It made men slaves to work, uninterested in life and nature. And it was this poverty which allowed

thousands of people to sink into pauperism.

Barnett declared that pauperism, the disease of poverty, was detrimental to both the individual and society. It destroyed the intellectual and moral capacities of the individual and left him unable to learn of God's love and to respond to that love by self-development and service to the common good. A society in which a mass of people were ignorant of God, in which starvation and drunkenness abounded, was potentially unstable. Such a society was in danger of falling prey to a dictator who would offer the masses a higher standard of living in exchange for their liberty.

That such a danger existed was due in part to a complacent attitude among the public. Ignorance of the extent of the problem had led to the assumption that the poor were a minority, and therefore, a manageable portion of the population. However, the true dimensions of the problem of poverty began to emerge with the distress experienced in the winter of 1886. In his district of Whitechapel Barnett reported that out of a population of 70,000 20% had applied to the Mansion House Fund for relief; in St. George's East 29% of the 50,000 population had applied. And it could be safely assumed that all in need had not requested relief or had received assistance from other agencies.[19] Faced with so grave a situation Barnett lamented that there were so few students who had "reverently and patiently" studied the problem. He urged socially concerned citizens to adopt a scientific attitude, to accumulate facts and investigate cause and effect.

It was ironic, he thought, that the scientific method had made great advances in all fields except in those social areas which most concerned humanity.

The need for a scientific investigation of the problem of urban poverty was recognized by Charles Booth who in 1886 undertook his social survey which provided England with a new basis for the discussion of poverty. Studies of Thomas Bernard and Sir Frederick Morton Eden, conducted in the previous century, had focussed primarily on rural areas. Using improved sources and techniques of social research Booth investigated the condition of urban poverty. His revelation of the extent of urban poverty shocked the public and created a sense of urgency in public discussion of the issue.

The results of Booth's survey, and the subsequent study of York by B. Seebohm Rowntree, revealed that 30% of the urban population had incomes below, or hardly above, the minimum standard - 21 s. 8 d. a week set by Rowntree. Barnett and his contemporaries were shocked to learn that more than one-third of the entire income of the United Kingdom was enjoyed by only one-thirtieth of its people. Twelve million people earned less than minimum incomes and millions more lived in anxious fear of the future. These disclosures confirmed Barnett's view that "it is the poverty of the great multitude of the working people and not the destitution of the very poor" which was the principal social concern.[20]

While it was believed by some that the poor had only themselves to blame for their condition, Barnett argued that the

wealthy shared a responsibility for the plight of their fellow citizens. The segregation of the poor into urban ghettos had lowered their standard of living by denying them the knowledge and friendship of the better-educated. Moreover the self-indulgence of the rich contributed to poverty. "The fact that 5,000,000 persons spend upon themselves half the national income, leaving 35,000,000 persons to feed, clothe, enjoy themselves on the other half is in itself sufficient evidence that the small minority have over-abundant means for expenditure in the gratification of personal enjoyment."[21] By such indulgence the rich consumed the products of labor which might better be directed towards enriching the lives of their fellow Englishmen.

Barnett called upon the church to preach against the sin of luxury and to denounce some of the unfair business practices of the wealthy. The church must also teach the rich that giving consisted in sharing and in sacrifice. If the rich adopted this attitude, they would make friends among the poor - sharing, and not only giving, their best. Ultimately the permanent cure of poverty would be found when all men were raised to the level of Christ - when the rich were as generous and just and the poor as honest and brave as Christ. Until then, the problems of contemporary society would have to be met by the established methods of nineteenth century philanthropy.

The nineteenth century, Barnett thought, was an age of conflict - the conflict between past and present, tradition

and modernity. This conflict, reflected in politics, theology, and social life, was also present in philanthropy. Based on accepted religious teachings, traditional philanthropy believed that one should give to another in need without inquiry. However with the passage of time, gifts were shown to increase rather than relieve misery and recipients of these gifts were now demanding justice not charity. In an attempt to remedy the defects of the old system of charity, scientific philanthropy stressed the need to investigate before giving, to refuse some requests for aid, and to organize charity. Advocates of these newer methods, however, lacked a certain zeal and vision and therefore were unable to convert others to their views. Thus old and new philanthropic methods coexisted, producing a charity that was either detrimental or ineffective.

While Barnett appreciated the idealism of traditional philanthropy, he was uncompromising in his condemnation of its practice of indiscriminate charity. His opposition to that practice, originally formed under the influence of Octavia Hill, was reinforced by his experience in St. Jude's. When he had come to Whitechapel Barnett discovered that a West End parish had been supplying St. Jude's with £500 a year which had been indiscriminately distributed among the parishioners. As a result the people had come to regard alms as their right and so they came to the vicarage to demand their doles from their new pastor. Unlike his predessors, Barnett refused and referred all requests for alms to the

local C.O.S. Indignant at such treatment ugly crowds would gather outside the vicarage, bang on the doors and throw missiles through the windows. Years later Barnett could vividly recall the experience of being confronted by a mob whose individual faces reflected not only misery but ill-will and hatred.

The obvious evils of the practice were compounded when, in the face of mounting economic hardship, indiscriminate charity was employed on a wide scale. A trade depression in 1884, followed by a severe winter the next year, produced the predictable distress in East London. Against the advice of a special committee established to investigate the problem, the Lord Mayor issued a public appeal for funds to cope with the economic crisis. No doubt political pressure and fear of public disorder prompted the Lord Mayor's action and within a few weeks events confirmed this fear.

In February 1886 a demonstration on behalf of the unemployed erupted into violence. The meeting, called by the moderate Labourers' League, began as an appeal to the Lord Mayor for aid and relief work. After some 15,000-20,000 men had listened to the speeches of the League's Secretary, Mr.Kenny, and the more emotional harangues of Hyndman and Burns of the Revolutionary Social Democrats, a group of "roughs" formed a mob and proceeded to break the windows of the clubs and shops of fashionable West End. For several days rumors and threats of violence forced shopkeepers to board up their stores and created a state of panic in London.

Fortunately the police were able to disperse the unorganized crowds before any further damage was inflicted.

The riots had a dramatic effect on the Mansion House Fund. The Fund had been opened for about twenty days before the rioting and had collected £19,000. Two days after the riots, subscriptions to the Fund totalled £72,000.[22] Samuel Barnett,in a letter to The Times, denounced this mode of dealing with East London's economic hardship. He described the disastrous effects of the Fund on the people of East London and on those who were working on their behalf.

> Suddenly the advertisement appeared that £60,000 were to be given away. People whose imaginations hardly grasp the meaning of £100 felt this sum to be sufficient to meet all needs. They came forward in crowds to make their applications, and found themselves face to face with administrators without organisation, without principles, without even leisure to listen patiently...The poor are rightly angry. The crowd who have travelled up from the country for their share feel they have been deceived. The struggling workers who know that the wages weekly earned are insufficient, protest that the fund is being wasted. The idle threaten to break more windows if their wants be not more easily satisfied. The servants of the poor break their hearts. They see the work of years undone, as some of their friends give up trying, and waste days begging for relief. They see evil returning as they catch sounds of grumblings, bitter speaking and suspicion. They see people of goodwill hurried and anxious to give money, forgetful of the real needs of brother men and they lose hope. It seems as if there would be greater poverty in the future, and what is worse than poverty, greater class hatred.[23]

By the spring of that year even the Lord Mayor had to

admit that "the large sum, which had been contributed with the best of intentions, had brought forth thousands of applicants, who, in many cases, were unworthy of help."[24] Despite the large contributions, the aid that was given was inadequate. By July 1886 warm weather eased the acute distress and the Fund was terminated. Reviewing the administration of that relief effort it was found that when such vast numbers were involved, it was impossible to distinguish "honest inability to earn a livelihood" from "mere unwillingness to labour."[25] It was also shown that the marginally independent population could be easily pauperized by the receipt of alms. Since this crisis was likely to recur, the need to devise a more adequate method of relief on the part of established societies as well as the rich and benevolent was unquestionable.

Although condemned by the evidence, indiscriminate charity remained a popular means of poor relief. Barnett complained, "The evil of indiscriminate charity - the gift to the poor man whose needs it does not meet, the gift from the sense of duty, the bare gift without the giver, all this has been again and again denounced",[26] but to no avail. When a sharp rise in unemployment was experienced in 1904-1905, the press, ignoring the lessons of the Mansion House Fund, initiated a campaign for donations. Rival newspapers established their own funds, their own agents and machinery for relief, thus perpetuating the abuses of the old system of indiscriminate charity. Money was wasted, bitter feelings engendered, and the

work of established philanthropic agencies disrupted and confused.

Another serious consequence of the press funds was that in order to raise money, the newspapers had engaged in the practice of publicizing sordid accounts of ghetto life. This tactic made poverty a sort of domestic asset and it degraded the poor by the advertisement of private suffering. The end result of such sensationalism was a hardened public conscience which demanded more and more sensation before contributing money.

The sensational accounts of poverty rendered by the press funds was an example of a trend in social reform which Barnett had observed several years earlier. Gladstone's Midlothian speeches, the "Bitter Cry", and the religious revivalism of the Salvation Army had demonstrated the effectiveness of this method of social reform. Very often sensationalism had moved public opinion to demand legislative action. Furthermore the widespread publicity given to the horrors of poverty had encouraged a growth of humanitarianism among the rich which expressed itself in personal service to the poor of East London.

Opponents of sensationalism, however, were unconvinced of the long term benefits of such a method of social reform. They argued that action caused by emotional excitement was often followed by apathy and, in their opinion, it was better to educate the emotions and the reason of the people slowly for more lasting results. They also insisted that, rather than promoting unity, sensationalism, by its use of strong

statements, encouraged a party spirit. And Barnett thought such a spirit was a corrupting influence. "Party spirit - the spirit, that is, which is roused and limited by some hasty view of truth or right - is likely to make men unjust and cruel, and a method of reform which produces this spirit cannot be approved."[27]

Sensationalism also accelerated another trend in social reform, a growing disposition among all classes to trust in societies. Barnett thought that the large number of independent charities was as marked a feature of the times as the appearance of socialism. The public had come to regard these societies as pillars of strength and as the optimum method of social action. As representatives of voluntary associations, societies originally had a strength, a spontaneity and a power of innovation not found in the work of either the individual or the state. The societies' members had been pioneers in charitable work and experimenters in new methods of service; in many instances they paved the way for state action. However the rapid proliferation of charitable agencies had produced regrettable results.

The vast amounts of money expended by the greater number of institutions had led to waste, inefficient management, advertisement and competition. Pride was often a defect in philanthropic societies, making them resistant to reform. Jealously guarding their privileges of service as other might guard their property, these institutions sometimes refused to allow the state to assume their functions. And, since

charitable organizations did grow old and obsolete, Barnett suggested perhaps every twenty-five years a public inquiry could call upon each organization to justify its existence. Because charities owed their being to some defect in the organization of the state or in the habits of the people, it should be their legitimate objective to become unnecessary.

Until the ills of society were corrected, Barnett believed that private charities could be made more effective promoters of moral and social progress. The first step was to strengthen each society by having every socially concerned person join a society. Once strengthened, each society should then define the limits of its operations to avoid the dangers of competition and duplication of service. To further guard against these defects he proposed "a sort of Charities' Clearing-house - a place where, week by week, the representatives of various charities could meet to pass out to the other the work fittest to each."[28] Effective organization and cooperation of charities would then be achieved.

By the first decade of the twentieth century Barnett perceived that the function of charities must change to accomodate changing times. The greater extension of state operations, with its inherent dangers of depersonalized social service,offered new opportunities for charitable work. There was a growing need for volunteers to supply the human touch to state administered programs. Knowledgeable men and women could work in cooperation with state agencies and also act as liasons between the poor and official administrators.

In view of the complex nature of contemporary social work Barnett advocated a change of method and attitude on the part of charitable organizations. Their philanthropic effort must be the result of thought and study; their relief must take into account not only the need but also the individual who was needful. Aid must not be given at the expense of the recipient's self-respect. And to be effective, modern philanthropy should be inspired by hope rather than by pity. True charity must be a means of education, a means of enabling the recipient to grow in physical, mental, and spiritual strength. This was the sort of charity Barnett desired for East London. Clearly private philanthropy had failed to achieve this ideal and public relief had fallen far short of this standard.

Addressing himself to the issue of Poor Law reform, Barnett in 1893 expressed a growing dissatisfaction with the operation of the existing system of public relief. He charged that as presently administered, the Poor Law not only failed to prevent starvation, it demoralized the poor. While many of his contemporaries admitted the need for Poor Law reform there was no general consensus as to the method of that reform. Individualists, on the one hand, were calling for the abolition of all out-relief and the imposition of penal labor; socialists, on the other hand were demanding that the state undertake all relief. Barnett suggested a more practical course to follow. Reform of the Poor Law should proceed along existing lines, recognizing both the authority of the Poor Law and the role of private charity

in relieving the poor. The scope of the Poor Law should neither be limited nor extended. Instead its designated responsibilities for the care of the poor must be thoroughly fulfilled and other areas left to voluntary charity.

Treatment of the able-bodied poor was a traditional responsibility of the Poor Law and Barnett claimed that current methods failed to relieve the poor or stimulate the idle. He thought the weekly dole of out-relief "brings out the greed of the applicant, destroys his self-respect, checks his energies, and has had a distinct effect in keeping down wages. Its indoor treatment sends out every poor man embittered by the contempt he has experienced, and in no way strengthened, either in body or mind, to fight the battle of life."[29] He condemned the prison discipline of the workhouse, the degrading labor chores, the foul talk, and the sparse diet which contributed to making the workhouse unfit to rehabilitate its inmates. If the responsibility of the Poor Law were to be thoroughly carried out in regard to the able-bodied poor, outdoor relief must be abolished and casual wards closed. The unfortunate must be separated from the idle by some means other than an official's judgment; training must be offered to the unfortunate and discipline to the idle.

Barnett looked favorably on the abolition of outdoor relief because he had witnessed the beneficial results of such action in Whitechapel. He recalled that when he first came to East London in 1873, the Whitechapel Guardians had

been administering weekly relief to 1,000-1,500 people. However a few years earlier it had been decided to abolish out-relief and gradually the results of that decision began to bear fruit. Workhouses were providing jobs in various trades instead of degrading labor chores and the 'house' was becoming more like an industrial school. The care of the children and the sick was also improved.

While the effects of the Whitechapel system were not perfect - omissions and frauds had occurred - there was abundant proof that the poor were better off when Guardians refused out-relief and when the good will of charity was enlisted. The old system of widespread out-relief produced only negative results for it weakened self-reliance, reduced wages, and raised rates. Barnett concluded, "Out-relief is a sort of monster which destroys its own parent, the local rates from which it is drawn."[30]

In dealing with the able-bodied poor, indoor relief was preferable to out-relief since it offered an opportunity for training. By providing training instead of punishment, the workhouse could be transformed from a place of degradation into a place of hope. Barnett proposed that an able-bodied applicant be offered training in a workhouse or a farm colony for a six to twelve month period, during which time his family would be supported and the applicant taught an industrial or agricultural skill.

An important advantage of this scheme was that it automatically separated the unfortunate from the idle since those

who refused or abused training would be sent to a house of correction to work at hard labor for as long as seemed necessary. Severe discipline would be enforced while at the same time education would be provided and wages paid.

The need to separate the loafer from the honest man was essential for the effective treatment of the unemployed. The mass of "ragged, wretched human beings who throng relief offices and hang about street corners, is made up of drunkards and idlers."[31] Therefore "the aim of Poor Law reform should be to get hold of the loafer, to take him out from among the poor, and to confine him until he had learnt some habits of punctuality and of work."[32]

Barnett strongly opposed the practice of Poor Law officials judging the character of applicants. Bitter experience had shown that even the most humane Board members were unable to distinguish evil from good and any attempt to judge the character of another was in itself a degradation. An honest man wrongly judged became less honest and if rightly judged became humiliated by having to prove his honesty. And the successful dishonest applicant became confirmed in his dishonesty. Barnett's scheme provided both an automatic test, which was not degrading, and a deterrent, in the form of education, which was essentially an instrument of improvement. For above all else loafers hated to be improved. Separation from families and submission to training would be unattractive to the idlers but an honest man would gladly endure such conditions if ultimately he were able to earn a living and support his family.

Another advantage of Barnett's proposal was that it would direct the well-meaning benevolence of the public into the constructive channel of honorable job training. The public, aware of the wretched condition of the idlers and unable to ignore their pleas for help, bestowed food, shelter, and indiscriminate doles upon a class who made poverty a means of livelihood. Public generosity frustrated reformers' efforts to hold the idler and educate him. If, however, the people knew that an opportunity for job training were available they would no longer resort to such measures.

In Barnett's program there would also be a place for private charity in the form of personal service to those in the workhouses and houses of correction. He believed that optimum results would be achieved by supplementing the official action of Poor Law administrators with the services of volunteers. Official bodies, like the Board of Guardians, provided stability while charitable workers, by their enthusiasm, added individual care and attention.

The resources of public and private charity became increasingly strained by the problem of unemployment, which during the early years of the twentieth century, was reaching major proportions. A wave of trade depressions in 1903-1904 and a severe winter the following year swelled the ranks of the unemployed and intensified demands for relief.

Barnett's involvement in efforts to relieve the distress of unemployed Londoners made him aware of the complex nature of modern unemployment. He recognized it as a deep-seated disease which had its roots in ill-health, bad nutrition, un-

trained labor, disorganized industry and declining argiculture. To some extent, he thought, the unemployed could be considered the victims of society and thus entitled to society's aid. The evident inability of the Poor Law and private charity to render adequate relief indicated the need for more effective measures. Therefore, during the first decade of the twentieth century, Barnett evolved a more innovative methodology for the treatment of unemployment.

For casual or unfit workers he advocated the establishment of labor schools in which inmates would be taught agricultural and industrial skills. However, in a departure from his earlier scheme, he urged that these schools be disassociated from the Poor Law Unions and governors appointed by the county councils and the Local Government Board. Skilled workers should be assisted in finding new employment in their community or in other areas of England or the colonies.

Barnett realized that greater participation of the state would be required to provide more permanent treatment for all classes of unemployed. As part of its enlarged responsibilities the state should directly supplement the unemployment benefits of trade union members perhaps with the condition that continuation classes be attended. Vagrancy laws ought to be amended to provide for the detention of habitual loafers and vagrants for periods of three or four years during which time good work habits and skills could be taught on farms or in workshops. As for future action a system of unemployment insurance should be established. And a better

arrangement of employment in both the public and private sector would avoid overtime and help eliminate seasonal unemployment.

Several years later Barnett expanded his proposals for state action to include roadbuilding and afforestation programs designed not to give work to the unemployed, but to employ those qualified for the jobs. Furthermore as a remedy for the problem of boy labor, he called for legislation which would require employers to obtain a weekly certificate of attendance at three evening classes from every youth of sixteen or under in their employ. Such a requirement would regulate the young employee's life and maintain his intellectual development thereby decreasing the likelihood of future employment.

Although his later proposals envisioned a greater role for the state in the problem of unemployment, Barnett did not endorse a scheme which was gaining favor among some reformers - namely state-sponsorship of public relief projects. While conceding that during periods of economic slowdown skilled workmen temporarily laid off must be protected against not only starvation but also loss of self-respect, he believed that doles of work were as counterproductive as doles of money. Public relief work as a rule was poorly done and costly. The employment of casual workers, who constituted the majority of the workforce, reduced the wages of qualified workers, and lowered the standard of work. Therefore state subsidies to local authorities to finance "make-work" projects for the unemployed actually fostered incapacity.

A more rational alternative would be to provide training for the unskilled and to place skilled workers, through regular channels, in appropriate positions in either the public or private sector of the economy. The Unemployed Workmen Act of 1905, through its provision of labor exchanges, was improving the operation of job placement and was a good example of effective state action in the area of unemployment.

In addition to the problem of unemployment, the needs of the aged poor had become a matter of growing concern by the later nineteenth century. Barnett was critical of the provisions for the aged poor under the existing Poor Law system. The elderly who were receiving indoor relief were subjected to the wearisome monotony, and the selfishness and pettiness of workhouse life. Those in receipt of out-relief were forced to submit to the interrogation of the relieving officers and bear the psychological wounds of pauperism.

To ameliorate the lot of the aged poor, Barnett, in 1875, had provided a weekly stipend to his deserving elderly parishioners. But receipt of this charity had a deleterious effect on the character of the people, increasing discontent, dishonesty, and deceit. A pension therefore, seemed the obvious substitute. In 1877 he established the Tower Hamlets Pension Committee and served as its first chairman. The Committee awarded a pension of five shillings a week to those over age sixty who could give evidence of character and thrift. However arriving at a satisfactory and practical definition of thrift proved extremely difficult. The evils attending out-relief soon appeared and investigation broke down. These developments con-

vinced him of the danger of all relief schemes which required the careful discrimination of the deserving elderly.

> There is no way in which strangers can judge character; the good and evil must be let grow together; and he who attempts to separate them will destroy the good with the evil. Beyond this there is something humiliating, a loss of self-respect, which is entailed in submitting to such judgment. The secrets and sorrows of a man's life are his own; his efforts to save, his charities to children or to friends, his afflictions, the sins of his youth, are not for public use, and he who is called on to expose them suffers irreparably in character.[33]

Since all attempts to discriminate weakened character, Barnett believed that the only remedy was a system which required no investigation and to which every citizen had an equal right. Therefore in 1883 he called for a pension scheme which would provide eight or ten shillings a week to every citizen who had kept himself until the age of sixty without workhouse aid. Such a scheme, without creating a privileged class or encouraging deceit, would secure for all the freedom from anxiety in old age. It would also eliminate the chief objection to out-relief - the need of a stranger to judge another's desert. And the cost would be no greater than the cost of infirmaries and almshouses.

Barnett was not the first to suggest the establishment of a pension system. In 1878 Canon Blackley had proposed a national compulsory insurance plan based on the idea that provision for old age could best be made while a worker was young and single. He therefore suggested that employers be required to deduct a part of their workers' wages until the

sum of £15 had been deposited with the Post Office. This saving would then entitle the worker to collect a pension in his old age. This scheme, and others like it, Barnett termed impractical since there were many classes of youths - factory girls and farm laborers, for example - whom it would be impossible to compel. Then there were many workers such as costermongers who had no employers. In addition such a program would require an army of officials and a system of registration that would be unpopular.

Joseph Chamberlain and his Parliamentary sub-committee on old age pensions in 1892 had proposed a variation of Blackley's scheme. Chamberlain's version called for the state to award a bonus of £15 to any worker who had saved £5 in a savings bank by age twenty-five. From then on the worker would be required to add 20s. a year to his fund until age sixty-five. To secure the cooperation of the Friendly Societies it was further suggested that workers who insured with those Societies would receive the same benefits as those who insured with the Post Office.

Among the many objections to Chamberlain's proposal was Blackley's criticism of the inclusion of Friendly Societies in the plan. He held that Friendly Societies could claim no vested interest in old age pensions since they had never successfully provided that service. Moreover, the financial stability of these Societies was questionable for statistics had shown even the larger Societies were insolvent. Barnett, however, doubted the effectiveness of any scheme based on the supplementation of savings. Many workers could save nothing

beyond what was needed for sickness and layoffs and therefore a large number would still be dependent on the Poor Law in their old age.

In Barnett's opinion the most effective proposal was the universal pension scheme of Charles Booth. In 1891 Booth had outlined his scheme for a state funded pension of five shillings a week for every citizen sixty-five and over. The cost, estimated at £17,000,000 a year, would be met by taxation. While there were many who opposed this plan Barnett gave it his strong support.

In considering Booth's scheme Barnett said that the crucial question to ask was whether the adoption of his universal pension scheme would enable the state to discharge its obligation to the aged - whether it would cover all the aged and enable them to live an honorable, peaceful and self-respecting life. The obvious answer,said Barnett, was yes. A regular pension, delivered by dignified means, would be given to all- the highest noble and the lowest commoner - and would involve no loss of self-respect to either. None of the other proposals currently under discussion could meet this test.

The debate on old age pensions continued and in 1895 the Royal Commission on the Aged Poor, headed by Lord Rothschild, was established to study the many proposals under consideration. In the summer of 1898 the Commission issued its report. That report disclosed that in the United Kingdom, out of a total of two million people over age sixty-five, two-thirds, or one million three hundred thirty-eight, were in want. Having documented the colossal dimensions of the problems, the Com-

mission offered no remedy.

> We have been forced to the conclusion that none of the schemes submitted to us would attain the objects which the Government had in view, and that we are ourselves unable, after repeated attempts, to devise any proposals free from grave inherent disadvantages.[34]

While such a conclusion produced consternation among supporters of old age pensions, those of conservative opinion no doubt applauded the statement. Charles Loch, the Secretary of the Charity Organisation Society was uncompromising in his opposition to all proposals for state pensions. Such schemes, he insisted, were based on false principles and false assumptions. Self-support was an expected duty and not a virtue which should be rewarded by a pension. Contrary to the popular belief, the majority of aged paupers received out-relief and not indoor maintenance. And rather than anticipating an increase in aged pauperism, Loch thought that there would be fewer elderly poor in the future. The benefits of national education, higher wages and lower prices could be expected to reduce the number of aged in need of relief. Thus in Loch's opinion, instead of state support, the poor should be expected to provide for themselves with the aid of Friendly Societies, trade unions, and private charitable contributions.

Loch's views however were not acceptable to a large segment of public opinion and with the passage of New Zealand's Old Pension Bill demands for similar legislation in England were renewed. And in 1908 the Pensions Act was finally passed. While welcoming the Act, Barnett regarded it as only a step towards the more desirable universal pension system.

Barnett's insistence on a wider role of the state in the treatment of the unemployed and the aged eventually led to a rupture with the Charity Organisation Society. Over the years relations between Barnett and his long-time associates in the Society had become increasingly strained by their often divergent positions on current issues of social reform.

From the beginning of their career in social work, the Barnetts had always been closely connected with the C.O.S. and had assisted in founding most of its East London branches. Barnett was a life-long member of the Whitechapel Committee and Mrs. Barnett was the Honorable Secretary of the Stepney Committee for many years. With the passage of time, however, Barnett became troubled by the growing bureaucratic mentality of the C.O.S. and its failure to assume a positive role in social reform.

As a friendly critic Barnett urged the Society to be charitable and to render its decisions as friends of the poor. He feared that the C.O.S. did not always inquire into the causes of a family's poverty with a spirit of tenderness and too often regarded human beings as cases. He also opposed the C.O.S. practice of classifying deserving and undeserving poor, holding that such action alienated young potential workers. Finally he warned the Society against becoming too "official", substituting a relief-giving machinery for a helping hand.

Mrs. Barnett, at a C.O.S. meeting in February 1884, criticized the Society for its resistance to new ideas and its

rigidity in methodolgy. She thought that if the C.O.S. were more adaptable and more sympathetic, it would become a powerful leader in social reform. Barnett hoped that his wife's speech would rouse the Society to a fuller appreciation of its work. He thought the C.O.S. would realize its mistake in applying out-dated methods to current problems. Unfortunately Barnett was to be disappointed. The C.O.S. tenaciously clung to its principles and practices and opposed many of Barnett's positions on social reform questions.

In January 1888 Barnett presented his program of farm training for the unemployed to the Mansion House Committee which included members of the C.O.S. As he reported, they "knocked on the head my scheme...and will I expect suggest a new Society. I am almost inclined to take a pledge to join no new Societies. They represent more of the spirit of revolt than of service, they are got up because men will not restrict themselves to control, they live with the strength of their first promoters and when those faltered they go out and cumber the Earth."[36]

In the face of mounting problems and the continued opposition of the C.O.S., Barnett began to question the ability of organized charity to deal with existing social problems. The Charity Organisation Society had been established to revitalize and coordinate charitable effort. In this missionary work the Society was deserving of the highest praise. But because of present conditions even "the most earnest member of a Charity Organisation Society cannot now hope that organised charity will be powerful so to alter conditions as

to make the life of the poor a life worth living."[37]

Barnett's conflict with the C.O.S. reached its climax at the Society's Council meeting in July 1895 when Barnett read his paper, "A Friendly Criticism of the Charity Organisation Society", to the assembled membership. He began his critique with an acknowledgement of his debt to the Society for giving direction to his youthful enthusiasm and for providing him with some of his most valued friends. But he admitted disillusionment with the results of the Society's work. Charity was as disorganized and poverty as prevalent as when the Society was founded. The Society was not as effective as it might be because it had failed to realize that times had changed since its founding and democracy had created a new situation. Another reason for the ineffectiveness of the C.O.S. was its unpopularity. The Society was served by District Committees whose work was laudable. But the Council, with its accessories of staff and sub-committees, represented the Society to the public. "The unpopularity of the Society has seldom, I think, been caused by the action of Committees, which in many districts are popular. It rises rather from the resolutions, the debates, and the letters of Council."[38]

The Council had formulated a set of principles, referred to as 'C.O.S. principles'. One of the most staunchly held beliefs was that 'dependence demoralises'. Because of this dogma, state relief was condemned and thrift was glorified. In line with these views, the C.O.S. steadfastly opposed state

pensions and rejected any suggestions for finding work for the unemployed through municipal agencies. Moreover Barnett charged that the Society based its opposition to state aid on the economic arguments and experiments of fifty years ago. "There appears to be no evidence of inquiry as to the respective results of State or voluntary relief, and the Council seem to think the proposal for municipal control is sufficiently crushed when it is condemned as a form of State socialism."[39] And thrift, the other exalted principle was, under certain circumstances, a crime rather than a virtue. Barnett cited these principles to show that "the Council has set up certain dogmas in the place of living principles - that it has narrowed the teaching which inspired its founders into a set of rules, that it has substituted for a gospel fit for all times laws which never grow."[40] Bound by its dogma the administration of the C.O.S. limited spontaneity of charity, failed to lead public opimion, and offered no remedy for current social ills. "The mind of the Council, constantly concerned for its dogmas and its forms, tends thus to become thin, i.e., unable to hold the enthusiasm of the day, narrow, i.e., unwilling to leave the ruts which it has made."[41] Barnett thought it was a pity that the C.O.S., which was the center of devoted work, had not captured the goodwill and enthusiasm of the time.

At the conclusion of his address and after a few comments had been made, Charles Loch took the floor and delivered a lengthy and heated rebuttal. As Secretary of the Council,

Loch viewed Barnett's criticism as a personal attack and he accused Barnett of having to be "in harmony with the current philanthropic opinion of the moment or perhaps just a few seconds ahead of it."[42] He denied Barnett's charges that the Society had criticized programs without knowledge and had offered no alternative solutions. He elaborately explained current C.O.S. studies and activities regarding free meals, shelters, and medical care. He outlined at great length the Society's position on pensions - its encouragement of the development of Friendly Societies on a strong and independent basis. Barnett and his friends, Loch claimed, were advocating reforms which would encourage dependence during life as well as dependence in old age. And Loch concluded that Barnett had "not proved his case and... the bitterness of his attack indicates how very far he has drifted away from those who were once his fellow-workers."[43]

The extent of Barnett's divergence from orthodox C.O.S. positions can be gauged by his subsequent views on Poor Law reform. By 1908 he had become convinced of the inadequacy of the Poor Law as a system of public relief and he condemned its confused and lax administration and its enormous costs. The mass of poverty which it had allowed to accumulate was decisive proof of the Poor Law's deficiency. In addition to being ineffective in practice, the Poor Law was inappropriate in principle. In 1834 because idleness had been interpreted as the primary ill of society, reformers had enacted the New Poor Law based on the principle of less eligi-

bility. Underlying this principle was the assumption that poverty was the fault of the individual and therefore methods of relief were designed to both deter and punish pauperism.

The investigations and experience of later reformers indicated that complex economic factors were responsible for the problem of poverty in modern society and society must acknowledge its role in exacerbating the problem by allowing unsanitary overcrowded housing, substandard wages, and inferior education. Present day reformers also recognized self-respect as man's greatest asset and realized that national wealth was the result of willing, not forced, work.

In view of this new awareness, Barnett believed that less eligibility must be replaced by a principle which reflected current attitudes and conditions. That principle, he thought, should be that relief must develop self-respect. If that principle were adopted the logical consequence would be the abolition of the Board of Guardians and all the special machinery of relief. Indeed the principle, perhaps, implied the abolition of the Poor Law itself since Barnett believed that there was no class of the 'poor' as there was a class of criminals. Poverty was not a crime and loss of self-respect must follow when those in need were made to feel set apart by special treatment. Those who could not support themselves were still members of the nation and there was no reason to place some citizens under a special law and label them 'paupers'. Reason dictated that all should be restored to economic health by the use of all the educational and

social resources of the state. There was no need for a special law, a specially elected body of administrators and a special rate. The same municipal body which was responsible for the health, education, and industrial fitness of some members of the community should be responsible in the same way for all the members, whatever their position.

Barnett's support of state intervention in social reform was based on the belief that in a free society such as England, if citizens were to exercise their right of self-government, they must be fit for self-government. Therefore the state had a responsibility for the well-being of all its members. Furthermore since it was God's will that the capacity of each individual be developed, within the framework of existing institutions, and without endangering the independence of the people, the state should help create a society in which all citizens had equal opportunity to realize their potential capabilities.

To provide equality of opportunity one of the first duties of the state must be to strive to effect a more equitable distribution of wealth. The benefits of the industrial revolution, which origianlly promised a higher standard of living for all, seemed to have accrued primarily to a minority while the majority of Englishmen continued to live at a subsistence level. Barnett in 1883 believed that an improvement in the living conditions of the poor could be achieved through a redistribution of the benefits

of wealth, or a redistribution of culture.

> It is only a larger share of the wealth which can increase comfort and relieve men from the pressure brought on them by the close atmosphere of the great towns; it is only a larger share of the wealth which can give to all the results of thought and open to all the life which is possible...And since any distribution of wealth in the shape of money relief would be fatal to the independence of the people, the one satisfactory method of social reform is that which tends to make more common the good things which wealth has gained for the few - which tends, in fact, to nationalise healthy luxury.[44]

The state could utilize existing resources to give the people access to the best. The Libraries Act could be extended and every parish furnished with rooms and books. The services of galleries and museums could be organized to enable the people to gain greater knowledge of nature, cultivate their imaginations, raise the standards of taste, and extend the horizons of their minds. These measures, however, would not solve the fundamental problem.

In 1913, near the end of his life, Barnett realized that "the greatest need of the greatest number is a larger income."[45] By some means the thirty-nine million poor must receive a larger proportion of the great national wealth. Essentially, the law which had determined the direction of the present distribution should be changed to make the rich poorer and the poor richer. Barnett suggested extending the minimum wage laws, encouraging a better organization of labor and taxing accumulated wealth as measures which would help achieve a better distribution of wealth.

In addition to increasing the wealth of the majority of the people, existing laws must be reformed to protect the citizens from oppression and to stimulate individual effort. The state should intervene to remove the power of great combinations; monopolies must be taken out of private hands. Land laws, which guaranteed one man absolute land ownership and denied another land tenure must be changed. And the current tax law and the Poor Law must be reformed so that the rich and poor idlers of society might be stirred to more productive efforts.

Education, in Barnett's opinion, offered the most fruitful field for state action. The Education Act had perhaps the greatest potential for far-reaching social change. Unfortunately state-aided education was falling short of its great promise by its failure to encourage intellectual and character development. As the result of current rigid, narrow, and unimaginative educational practices, the products of the state educational system were neither interested, critical, nor creative in their intellectual lives. Cramming facts into children's minds had not taught them to think. And state-supported elementary schools had not considered the need for character training. Recognizing that the traditional institution for character development, the home, had failed in its function, the schools of the wealthy had assumed that function and had generally produced self-reliant men and women. But working class institutions made no attempt to develop character and their graduates were unresourceful and

afraid of adventure. They lacked the character to enjoy the struggle and to resist the inroads of poverty. These children had no ideals which would force them to sacrifice and they depended on others rather than themselves.

Barnett proposed a series of reforms in elementary education to develop character and individuality in young children. He advocated employing more teachers and using less equipment. Smaller classes would allow teachers more time to know and treat their students individually. Better teacher-training and greater flexibility in methods and goals should be encouraged. To provide further enrichment, Barnett urged lengthening the school day and the school year. And he demanded children be kept in school until the age of fifteen or sixteen with maintenance provided if necessary. "A universal free education with necessary board need be no more degrading than is the provision of the scholarships now enjoyed by only a few."[46] Finally he suggested that continuation schools be established with compulsory attendance to age eighteen or nineteen.

To help implement his suggestions Barnett in 1884 founded the Education Reform League which aimed at enlisting the cooperation of the working classes in an effort to improve state-aided elementary education. The League sought to obtain university education for teachers in primary schools and to promote equal opportunities for all children for training in technical, physical, and intellectual fields to enable them to realize their potential.

While Barnettt actively sought to improve elementary education, his greatest efforts were directed towards adult education. As a pioneer in that field he pleaded for cooperation between the universities and the working class in the establishment of a popular system of higher education. Such a system should be available not just to the brilliant children of the working class but to every adult working man and woman. Higher education was essential if the working class were to fulfill its political responsibilities. Political power was falling in the hands of Labour and as the future leaders of the nation, workingmen needed the knowledge and training which university education bestowed in order to rise above petty class interest and to formulate long-term policies in the national interest.

Higher education would also compensate for the lack of religion among the working class, which was evidenced by the fact that less than five percent of the adult population of East London attended Sunday services.[47] A broader education would enable workingmen to understand the meaning and implication of religion and would inspire them with idealistic goals. The power the people had within themselves would be revealed and the presence of Christ recognized through higher education.

University training would help solve a grave social problems. Disraeli had deplored England's "two nations" but Barnett throught that current class divisions were greater than when Disraeli wrote. Segregated neighborhoods had ex-

acerbated the problem of class separation. Increased wealth and the spread of education had created suburbs wholly inhabited by one class or another. These homogeneous neighborhoods fostered different tastes, pleasures, manners and habits. The rich and the poor even developed different ethical standards. These deep class cleavages were reflected in all areas of life - in political, philanthropic, as well as social circles. To narrow the distance between the classes Barnett favored the formation of an alliance between democracy and the universities.

To date the universities had been very reluctant to influence the working class movement and they had not done enough to attract workingmen to the universities. Universities, though, were the leavening agents of national thought and they possessed the knowledge that workmen needed. Therefore, besides conducting free lectures in working class neighborhoods, the universities should offer workers the opportunity to come and study in the academic environment of the universities.

To encourage this development Barnett called for a reform in the financial structure of the universities. By placing the surplus incomes of the colleges under university control, a fund would be established which could be used to provide a free education to all citizens. As an advisor to the Workers' Educational Association, Barnett worked to achieve this reform and he urged the creation of a Royal Commission to compel the cooperation of the universities.

Along with education the people also must be given equal opportunity for a healthy life. Over the years the importance of improving health and enforcing sanitary regulations had been generally recognized. But yet the death rate and the infant mortality rate among the poor remained high and East London recruits continued to be rejected by the army. Adequate health care and sanitary housing facilities were still not universally available. For the improvement of health care, health services should be organized under one authority. The Medical Officer should be responsible for the health of everyone in his district and should be the recognized center for information.

The problem of providing sanitary housing for the working class would be more difficult to solve. The Artisans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act had not as yet produced the anticipated improvements. In 1880 Barnett complained that although a large number of buildings in his parish had been condemned under the Act, nothing had been done to remove the houses. In only one instance had demolished homes been replaced. The effective operation of the Act was hindered by the complicated procedure and the enormous costs involved. Nevertheless, if more efficiently administered, the Act provided local government with adequate authority to alleviate the housing problem. Under the Act's provisions town councils could purchase land and sell it at below market value for the construction of dwellings which conformed to certain sanitary specifications. While this undertaking would incur a financial loss, the money would be well spent for the benefits

of improved living conditions far outweighed the costs.

In 1883 the publication of "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London" had an "immediate and cataclysmic" impact on the question of working class housing.[48] The revelation of the enormity of the problem and the demonstration that overcrowding was in itself a moral and physical evil divorced the question of housing from the larger issue of sanitary reforms. Public interest in the question was aroused and demands for reform were intensified.

In 1901 Barnett issued a note of caution to those concerned with improving urban housing for the poor.

> Reformers who set themselves to solve the housing problem must not expect to cure all the ills of society; they can only co-operate with other agencies. They cannot do what is reserved for personal force to do...There is much to be done for the lowest class by education, by the Poor Law, and by personal service: but to consider this class as the first object of improved housing is to let feeling blind reason.[49]

Reformers must be aware of the existence of a class of people who preferred to live in squalid housing and who cherished their freedom to be dirty and to live in a crowd. These people would not be helped simply by providing better housing. The most effective way of eliminating a slum was "to break it up - to treat the inhabitants as the police treat loafers, make them move on."[50]

Public action in the area of working class housing was best limited to encouraging private enterprise and improving communications. To encourage private enterprise cheap land should be made available for construction and condemned

property compensated only at the value of the land as a building site for workmen's dwellings. All vacant land within the borough or townships (and in certain areas outside those limits) should be rated thereby making more land available to private builders.

Barnett was wary of popular demands for municipal housing because such an enterprise could create a privileged class of tenants. If local bodies did not administer economically, the community would be called upon to subsidize the housing of a minority. Furthermore, municipal housing would discourage private enterprise and ultimately benefit the landowners by becoming a rich competitor for his land.

Perhaps the most important contribution of public authority to improved housing was to increase transportation facilities. Tramways and good roads might be provided and every railway operating out of an urban center might be required to provide low-cost transportation to the suburbs.

While these improvements could be made, the principal need in housing reform was "the individual consciousness of duty."

> The housing problem cannot be solved by itself; it is bound up with the industrial problem, with the education problem, with the social problem, and with the religious problem. When each individual or more individuals take pains to get knowledge - to know what is good and what is evil - ..., then the community will certainly find guidance to action safer than that which any reformers or politicians can give.[51]

Years spent in ministering to the poor had reaffirmed

Barnett's conviction that reforms of laws and institutions alone would not save society. From his experience the best changes in East London had occurred through individual effort and the most effective social reform was that which uplifted men's character. "It is as the character of men is raised that all reforms become permanent...Methods of reform are valuable just in so far as they tend to increase sympathy, justice, honesty, reverence and all the virtues of high character."[52]

The only test of progress was in the development of character, in the ability to make men stronger to choose good and refuse evil. Judged by that standard, the best reformers were those who worked patiently - without fame, societies, or schemes - to build character and impart virtue. These people,"the unknown good", were the real reformers of the world and by their efforts the Christian spirit permeated society. By converting one sinner to righteousness or by making one rich man more thoughtfully unselfish, these individuals had contributed to lasting social progress.

In the final analysis Barnett declared, "No social reform will be adequate which does not touch personal relations, bind classes by friendship, and pass, through the medium of friendship, the spirit which inspires righteousness and devotion."[53] The righteous man, because he did most to extend righteousness was, in a real sense, the master of society. Bad habits would be overcome and good habits

substituted by the example of righteous men in personal contact with the poor. And a company of these men, he thought, would be able to destroy the evils of poverty, ignorance, and sin.

In analyzing the social philosophy of Samuel Barnett, it is interesting to note the progression of his thought from a primarily laissez-fairist viewpoint in the 1860's and 70's to a predominantly state interventionist position in the early twentieth century. Schooled in political economy and trained under the guidance of Octavia Hill, he began his career as an exponent of laissez-fairism, a philosophy which he shared with his C.O.S. associates. In their approach to social reform Barnett and his colleagues placed great emphasis on the individual - on the need for character development, self-improvement, and individual responsibility. Measures designed to promote the virtues of self-help, thrift, and industry were supported. Reliance on state action, which in their view fostered dependency, was condemned.

The relationship between character and pauperism was the basic orientation of their thinking regarding the problem of poverty. Weak and demoralized character was seen as the cause and effect of pauperism. Thus the administration of a character test was the first step in determining the appropriate treatment of the poor. Those who were classified as deserving were eligible for the services of private charity while those deemed undeserving were referred to the Poor

Law authorities. Implicit in this methodology was a fundamental faith in the ability of the existing system of public and private relief to meet the needs of the poor.

The deficiencies and inequities which were experienced in the administration of social welfare were attributed to two evils in the system - the practice of indiscriminate charity in the private sector and the granting of outdoor relief in the public sector. Both practices were considered detrimental to character since they rewarded imposture. "Furthermore indiscriminate charity, by encouraging improvidence, and outdoor relief, by depleting the wage fund and lowering the wages of all workers, were seen as contributing to the perpetuation of poverty.

During the 1880's and 90's a deeper understanding of the complexity of the problem of poverty produced a greater sophistication in Barnett's views on social reform. As the adverse effects of the environment on character became apparent, increased importance was given to bringing about an improvement in the living conditions of the poor. To accomplish this end, Barnett in 1883 took his first step in the direction of a state interventionism with his proposal of a "practicable socialism", a formula of limited state action. However, with the exception of aged paupers, he believed the traditional welfare institutions were still responsible for relieving the distress of the poor.

To achieve more adequate treatment for the poor, Barnett's suggestions for Poor Law reform during this period went beyond his previous call for abolition of out-relief and included training and rehabilitative measures. In the area of private

charity he called for not only the end to indiscriminate charity, but also more concentrated and coordinated voluntary action.

The first decade of the twentieth century witnessed Barnett's growing reliance on state action. The patently inequitable distribution of national wealth and the obvious inability of the Poor Law and private charity to alleviate the massive problem of working class poverty, had convinced him of the necessity for more drastic measures which could only be undertaken by the state. His strongest endorsement of state intervention was made in 1908 when he called for the abolition of the Poor Law and in 1913 when he declared the need for a redistribution of wealth through legislation and taxation. Despite these recommendations, he stopped short of a total commitment to state intervention. He opposed, for example, the provision of public make-work projects and the construction of municipal housing.

And there were other aspects of his thought throughout his career which seemed contrary to the general thrust of his philosophical development. During the nineteenth century, although Barnett followed the orthodox laissez-fairist line regarding indiscriminate charity and out-relief, he also supported universal pensions and opposed character tests, both advanced positions for that time. Later, in the twentieth century, when his thought reflected a more liberal approach to the problem of unemployment, he called for the detention of loafers for long periods of time.

The explanation of these seeming inconsistencies lies in

Barnett's view of the object of social reform. In his ideology the aim of all social reform was to enable the individual to realize his full potential. Therefore his position on any reform issue was determined by his assessment of the effect of proposed measures on the character and development of the individual. This consideration, which remained a constant factor in his social thought, makes it difficult to categorize Barnett's philosophy in any one period as either orthodox laissez-fairist or thoroughly state interventionist and suggests an empirical pragmatic, rather than doctrinal, approach to social reform.

During a career which spanned the later nineteenth-early twentieth centuries, Barnett may be considered a transitional figure and his philosophy viewed as an attempt to reconcile traditional individualism with modern socialism. Recognizing the legitimate and necessary role of the state from the 1880's onward, he sought to create a latitudinarian program of social reform which allowed for voluntary as well as state action and which preserved the virtues of individual service while it promoted the benefits of official administration.

Barnett's later views on charity, for example, represent an attempt to redefine the role of voluntary action in the face of increasing state involvement in social welfare. He perceived that the expansion of state action had produced a corresponding contraction in the scope and function of private charity. Private charity no longer could claim broad jurisdiction over the deserving poor and many of its traditional services were now being provided by official programs.

To insure the continued participation of voluntary

charity in the nascent welfare state, he sought to establish a new relationship between private philanthropy and public relief. While carrying forward its experimental and pioneering efforts in social service, private charity was to supplement official action. Voluntary charitable workers were to work in conjunction with public administrators and provide the individualized treatment and friendly relationship so necessary for an effective and humane welfare system

In a similar way, Barnett's views on housing during the later stages of his career reflect an effort to define the appropriate areas of private and state action. His proposals for housing reform included measures aimed at preserving individual initiative while at the same time promoting necessary and positive state action. Rather than municipal building which he feared would be poorly administered and inefficient, he preferred to see housing construction left in private hands. Official action would be better directed towards supplying cheap land and improving transportation and communication facilities.

In the area of housing, as well as in all other areas, Barnett emphasized the importance of the role of the individual in social reform. He believed that fundamentally the problems which beset society resulted from the apathy and neglect of individual citizens and only their active interest and involvement would bring about permanent improvement.

In comparing Samuel Barnett's social philosophy to that of other contemporary reformers, it has already been noted that during his early career Barnett's views were congenial

to the "scientific" philanthropy of Octavia Hill and Charles Loch. In the early 1880's Barnett's "practicable socialism" closely resembled the "radical socialism" of Arnold Toynbee. Each called for state intervention on a limited scale with the preservation of personal independence. In later years some aspects of his thought were compatible with the views of the Fabians and radical liberals. His proposals for Poor Law reform in 1908 paralleled the thinking of the Webbs and his remedies for unemployment, propounded by many radical liberals, eventually became incorporated in the New Liberalism of the Asquith government. Thus in the latter part of his career Barnett advanced and supported measures which helped establish England's modern system of social security.

Barnett's unique contribution to social reform, however, was the university settlement. Conceived in 1883, the idea of the university settlement embodied his commitment to personal service and voluntary action and reflected his continuing faith in the value of the individual as an instrument of social reform. With the advent of the welfare state, the development of the university settlement closely approximated his later vision of the function of private charity. Toynbee Hall became a pioneer in many fields of social service, cooperated with offical agencies, and provided the human touch to bureaucratic welfare programs.

CHAPTER III - FOOTNOTES

[1]Francis W. Aitken, Canon Barnett (London: W. Partridge & Co., 1902), pp. 24-25.

[2]Henrietta O. Barnett, Canon Barnett His Life Work and Friends (2 vols.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1919), I, 22.

[3]Octavia Hill, "Cottage Property in London", Fortnightly Review, 6 (1886): 683.

[4]For a description of these activities see Octavia Hill, Early Ideals (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1928), pp. 193-194, 202-204, 207.

[5]Almsgiving, in its narrow sense, meant the giving of money in response to begging.

[6]Miss Hill had written to Edmund Hollond, a friend of Edward Denison who had continued his work in East London. Hollond, in turn, had suggested Barnett's name to the Bishop of London.

[7]Westminster Gazette, June 18, 1913, p. 1.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Canon Samuel A. Barnett, Worship and Work, selected and edited by his wife. (Letchworth: Garden City Press, Ltd., 1913), p. 15.

[11]H.O. Barnett, Canon Barnett, I, 95-96.

[12]Octavia Hill to Samuel Barnett, n.d., 1880, London School of Economics, Archives, Octavia Hill Letter File.

[13]Hill to Barnett, August 6, 1880, ibid.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Henry Bradford Washburn, "The Religious Motive in Philanthropy", Pennsylvania University Boardman Lectureship in Christian Ethics, No. 14 (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931), p. 60.

Chapter III - Footnotes (cont)

[16]Barnett, "Practicable Socialism", The Nineteenth Century, XIII (1883): 555.

[17]Barnett, "Great Cities and Social Reform", The Nineteenth Century, XIV (1883): 810.

[18]Barnett, "Our Present Discontents", The Nineteenth Century 73(1913): 331.

[19]Barnett, "Distress in East London", The Nineteenth Century XX (1886): 679.

[20]Barnett, "Our Present Discontents", p. 331.

[21]Barnett, Religion and Politics (London: Wells Gardner, Darton and Company, Ltd., 1911), p. 58.

[22]Helen Bosanquet, Social Work in London (London: John Murray, 1914), p. 324.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Ibid., p. 325. In St. George's East £2,000 was allotted to relieve 2,400 families, a total of 12,000 persons. In Mile End, £2,539 was distributed among 2,133 families.

[25]The Times, July 6, 1886, p. 9.

[26]Barnett, Religion and Progress (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1907), p. 54.

[27]Barnett, "Sensationalism in Social Reform", The Nineteenth Century, 19 (1886): 283.

[28]Barnett, "Charity Clearing House", The Newberry House Magazine, 6 (1992): 516.

[29]Barnett, Poor Law Reform", Contemporary Review, 63 (1893): 323.

[30]Barnett, "Charity Versus Outdoor Relief", The Nineteenth Century, 46 (1899): 826.

Chapter III - Footnotes (cont)

[31]Barnett, "Poor Law Reform", (1893), p. 325.

[32]Ibid.,p, 331.

[33]Ibid., pp. 238-329.

[34]Francis Herbert Stead, How Old Age Pensions Began to Be (London: Methuen & Co., 1910), p. 9.

[35]Barnett,"Poor Law Reform", Contemporary Review, 94 (1908): 566-567.

[36]Samuel A. Barnett to Frank Barnett, January 21, 1888, Greater London Council Public Record Office and Library, Samuel Barnett Papers.

[37]Barnett, "Great Cities in Social Reform", p. 812.

[38]Barnett, "A Friendly Criticism of the C.O.S.", Charity Organisation Review, 11 (August, 1895): 339.

[39]Ibid., p. 341.

[40]Ibid., p. 342.

[41]Ibid.

[42]Ibid., p. 365.

[43]Ibid., p. 371.

[44]Barnett, "Great Cities in Social Reform", p. 812.

[45]Barnett, "Our Present Discontents", p. 332.

[46]H.O. Barnett, Canon Barnett, I, 295.

[47]Barnett, Vision and Service (London: Hazell, Watson and Viney Ltd., 1917), pp. 61-62. In 1904 47,282 men 61,301 women and 70,930 children in East London attended Sunday services at Church or Chapel. 60,086 attended Anglican services and 81,816 attended Non-Conformist worship. Percy Alden, "The Problem of East London" in The Religious Life of London, ed., by Richard Mudie Smith (London: Hodder and Stoughton 1904), pp. 24-25.

Chapter III - Footnotes (cont)

[48]Anthony S. Wohl, "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London", International Review of Social History, XIII (1968): 189.

[49]Barnett, "The Housing Problem", The Ninettenth Century, 49 (1901): 797.

[50]Ibid., p. 796.

[51]Ibid., pp. 803-804.

[52]Barnett,"Sensationalism in Social Reform", p. 281.

[53]Barnett, "Great Cities in Social Reform", p. 817.

CHAPTER IV

THE UNIVERSITY RESPONSE TO EAST LONDON POVERTY: THE ESTABLISHMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF TOYNBEE HALL UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF SAMUEL BARNETT

The university settlement was conceived in response to a particular phenomenon of late nineteenth century urban society. Barnett, along with other social reformers, was alarmed by the growing class division which threatened to develop into outright social schism. Mindful of Disraeli's earlier warning, Barnett observed: "There is still in England the possibility of two nations, a nation of the rich and a nation of the poor. Already they dwell apart. Each has its own quarters, its own language, its own manners, its own interests."[1] Class exclusivity encouraged the growth of suspicion and antagonism. And ignorance, the natural product of a socially segregated society, exacerbated the feelings of ill-will between the classes.

London offered a dramatic example of the effects of social cleavage. Barnett pointed out that in London the terms East and West were both geographic descriptions and social distinctions. "The East is the city of the poor -- The West is the city of the rich."[2] He noted that the inhabitants of the West knew nothing of the lives and thoughts of East Londoners. And the poor were just as ignorant of the rich. They resented the wealth and suspected the motives of their upper-class neighbors. Moreover the people of East London,

deprived of knowledge, lacked the sense of humanity which recognized the kinship of all human beings - the rich and the alien. This deficiency intensified the poor's suspicion of the upper class and fostered among them an interest restricted to their own class and a loyalty confined to their own trade. Unless these attitudes were changed, England would become a nation divided between the forces of capital and labor, and in a time of crisis private or class interest would triumph over the common good. Thus class hostility posed a serious threat to the national well-being.

If England were to maintain domestic peace and retain imperial power, the classes must be reconciled and society united. Previous social reforms which merely changed the environment had failed to achieve social harmony. To be an effective agent of social unity, a reform measure must "make the best common, and by bringing the 'rich' in contact with the 'poor', increase good will."[3]

The university settlement, Barnett's remedy for social disunity, had a simple goal and method. The unification of the classes would be achieved by the social integration of university men in poor urban neighborhoods. His scheme was based on the assumption that the methods which united individuals would also be effective in uniting the classes.

> Familiarity with the person and the surrounding do away with prejudice and give the sense of relation which is necessary to knowledge. We believe that East and West may be brought together if the members will by like means get to know one another, if they will meet often, if they will visit, talk together, associate in

> the same pursuits and share in the same pleasures.[4]

Living in a poor neighborhood would afford the rich and educated a unique opportunity of gaining a first-hand knowledge and understanding of the problems of the lower classes. In performing their duties as citizens - on local Boards, as school managers, on relief committees, in workmen's clubs - the residents' knowledge would be broadened and their sympathies deepened. They would learn the interests, opinions, and language of the working class in a way not possible for non-residents. The knowledge thus gained would help check ill-directed charity and improve the administration of justice and the formulation of legislation. Of even greater importance, the diffusion of this knowledge among the upper classes would help heal the alienation and end the division between the classes.

University men in East London would also serve as conduits of upper class knowledge and culture to the lower classes. Residents of settlements, in the spirit of friendship, would demonstrate the pleasure derived from intellectual pursuits. The best manners would no longer be the characteristic of one class but the pride of all. In the presence of educated men Labour would acquire the knowledge to make it one with Capital. A sense of unity with other classes would tend to be created among the poor by exposure to the thought and taste of the representatives of the upper classes. The university settlement would thus become an instrument of edification and an agent of social reconciliation.

The university settlement would also contribute to the formation of the often sought alliance between the working class and the universities. With the coming of democracy, the working class, more than ever, needed the knowledge which the universities contained.

> Workmen have the energy, the honesty, the fellow feeling, the habit of sacrifice which are probably the best part of the national inheritance,but as a class they have not knowledge of human things, the delicate sense which sees what is in man - the judgment which knows the value of evidence - the feeling which would guide them to distinguish idols from ideals and set them on making a Society in which every human being shall enjoy the fulness of his being.[5]

Unless the working class had contact with the educated class, they would not understand their intellectual heritage and would not be able to solve effectively the complex economic and social problems of modern society. The universities, with their understanding of the nation's historical traditions, were better able to interpret the social changes wrought by industrialization, to grasp the needs of the working class and to propose effective remedies.

Although such an outcome was clearly in the national interest, the universities and the working class had not as yet joined forces. The university settlement was an important step in that direction. "The friendship of one man of knowledge and one man of industry may go but a small way to bring together the Universities and the working classes, but it is such friendship which prepares the way for the understanding which underlies co-operation."[6] Previous contact between

the universities and the poor - through university extension, college missions, and individual university men - had failed to establish a permanent connection but had provided precedents for Barnett's proposal. The experiment of Frederick Maurice and his Workingmen's College, established in 1854, had demonstrated the beneficial results of university teaching among the working classes and had helped inspire the University Extension movement. In the autumn of 1877 a local committee, headed by Barnett and composed of university graduates, local clergymen, officials of workmen's clubs, a few tradesmen, and a group of young workmen, met to establish university extension in East London. Leonard Montefiore, an associate of Barnett and an Oxford man, eloquently pleaded for the proposal. As a result of this meeting university extension classes were begun in Whitechapel on October 16, 1877 and later, with the establishment of Toynbee Hall, the classes found a permanent home there.

College missions, which were begun in 1881, sought to establish spiritual ties between the universities and East London. Although often compared to settlements, missions were essentially proselytizing bodies created by the pleas of earnest East London clergymen and the responding generosity of university undergraduates. To achieve its goal, conversion, the mission established its own organization and machinery and required no more of its patrons than an annual guinea subscription. Of necessity a churchman's effort, the mission failed to enlist the sympathies of non-dogmatic university men or to satisfy the desire of those university men

who wished to share personally the burdens of the poor.

Over the years individual university men, convinced of their duty to help their less fortunate neighbors, and desirous of first-hand knowledge of their condition, had come to East London. In 1867 Edward Denison was the first such "settler" and he was soon followed by Edmund Hollond who was instrumental in bringing the Barnetts to Whitechapel. Early in his ministry at St. Jude's Barnett appreciated the need for men of culture in East London. In 1875 he visited Oxford to discuss the problems of urban poverty with Arnold Toynbee and a group of interested students. At the end of this visit each undergraduate was invited to come to Whitechapel for a few weeks or longer. And over the next decades, as Barnett continued to spread the gospel of the duty of the educated to the poor, this invitation was extended to many earnest university men.[7]

Some of these students, upon graduation, came back to live in East London. Many men, however, found conditions of bachelor life in Whitechapel unsatisfactory and so preferred to live in the West and commute eastward. This arrangement was not only time-consuming and exhausting, it also deprived the men of a sense of citizenship in East London. A university settlement offset the social disadvantages of residency in a poor neighborhood by providing the cultural amenities of collegiate life.

In addition, the idea of a university settlement would appeal to university men who were seeking some non-institutional method of reaching their neighbors. From his visits

to Oxford and Cambridge Barnett was aware that many socially concerned students distrusted the mechanical methods of philanthropy. They abhorred the patronizing and superior attitude of charities and missions and resented the humility forced on the poor by charitable gifts. As compassionate individuals, they wished simply to help their fellowmen.

This humanitarian impulse was accompanied by the desire for more accurate information about the condition of the poor. Barnett appreciated that the new scientific spirit required factual data, critical investigation into the causes of poverty, and personal knowledge of the poor. The university settlement was ideally suited to fulfill those needs.

The goal of the university settlement was mutual knowledge and to achieve that goal it employed personal influence and favored human contact. The distinguishing feature of a settlement was the absence of a program and the presence of men who recognized their obligations as citizens without committing themselves to a specific ideological cause.

Barnett first proposed his scheme for a university settlement in answer to a query from some Cambridge students at St. John's College. In June 1883 Moore Smith had written to Barnett for some suggestions as to what could be done for the poor. The letter arrived just as the Barnetts were leaving for Oxford. Enroute a train delay gave Barnett time to reply. As Mrs. Barnett later recalled, after disembarking from their disabled train, "we seated ourselves on the railway bank, just then glorified by masses of large ox-eyed daisies, and there

he wrote a letter suggesting that men might hire a house, where they could come for short or long periods, and, living in an industrial quarter, learn to 'sup sorrow with the poor'."[8] On July 9,1883, a group of Cambridge men met with Barnett and some of his parishioners; no immediate action was taken, however, and the initiative for the scheme passed to Oxford.

In the late autumn of 1883 Barnett preached a sermon in St. Mary's, Oxford, about the claims of the poor and shortly after, on Saturday, November 17, 1883 he was invited to address a meeting held in the rooms of Sidney Ball, a Fellow of St. John's. There Barnett outlined his proposal for a university settlement. One listener, Cosmo Ebor (who later become Bishop of Stepney), recalled Barnett's talk.

> I well remember the effect of his words, or, rather, of his personality. There was no gush, no exaggeration, no claim to provide a solution to the social problem. There was simply the quiet and earnest plea of an Oxford man busy in the service of the people to other Oxford men to 'come and see', to learn the needs by sharing the life of that to us, 'dim and strange outer world' of East London.[9]

He had chosen an opportune moment to plead the cause of East London. At the time Oxford, along with the entire nation, was shocked by the sensational disclosures of a small anonymous penny pamphlet, "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London. The sorid facts of ghetto life revealed in the pamphlet were given widespread publicity by W.T. Stead, the editor of the Pall Mall Gazette. The pamphlet stated, for example, that in the London slums "incest is common; and no form of

vice or sexuality causes surprise or attracts attention!"[10]

In the words of a contemporary:

> It is difficult after thirty years to realise the shock of novelty with which revelations of the condition of the poor came to comfortable people in the seventies and eighties, or the sensation which such a pamphlet as the "Bitter Cry of Outcast London" made when it was first produced.[11]

The conditions depicted in the pamphlet were felt by some Englishmen to be an imputation of the failure of English civilization. Others feared that "the cry may soon become a howl - the howl of a crowd of injured brothers."[12] And the working-class enthusiasm for Henry George's land nationalization scheme and the revival of Hyndman's Democratic Federation seemed to confirm the worst fears of the propertied classes of society.

The effect of the "Bitter Cry" on the Oxford community was reported by Cosmo Ebor.

> Our conscience had felt the rebuke of the contrast between the wealth of inheritance and opportunity stored up in Oxford and the poverty of the life lived amid the mean streets and monotonous labour of East London. In a vague way we felt the claim of that poverty on our wealth.[13]

These feelings were made more poignant by Toynbee's recent death. Many Oxonians regarded him as a martyr to the cause of social justice and were anxious to keep alive the memory of his scarifice. Exploiting these sympathies, Barnett offered Oxonians an opportunity to discharge their social obligations and to perpetuate the spirit of Arnold Toynbee.

Therefore his scheme was enthusiastically received and the decision made to undertake the establishment of a university settlement in East London.

A committee was appointed to inquire into the most suitable site and the best qualified head for the proposed institution. After careful study the committee recommended the purchase of the Boys' Industrial School behind Commercial Street and Barnett's appointment as warden. A general meeting on February 23,1884 approved and adopted the recommendations and an association was formed.[14] During a commemorative service on the first anniversary of Arnold Toynbee's death, the idea of calling the settlement "Toynbee Hall" simultanelously occurred to Mrs. Barnett and to Bolton King, the secretary of the settlement committee. With the approval of the committee, the new settlement received its name. Also in the spring of 1884 a group of Cambridge men met and resolved to join Oxford in this venture and thus the Association for the Universities' Settlement in East London was founded.[15]

In addition to the Association there were to be two general committees - one in Oxford, the other in Cambridge - which would form the administrative links between the universities and the settlement. These committees were to stimulate undergraduate interest in the needs of East London and to raise funds from the various colleges to support the work of the settlement.

While its administrative structure was being organized, the plans of the Association were being implemented. By March 1,1884, Barnett reported that the Boys' Industrial

School had been purchased for £6,250. Elijah Hoole had been engaged to survey the property and had drawn up the architectual plans. The Hall was to have thirty rooms for sixteen (later seventeen) men, a class room for a hundred students,a large dining or conversation room, and a drawing room. When completed, Toynbee Hall promised to be "a manorial residence" in Whitechapel.

A method of financing this "manorial residence" had to be devised for, in addition to the initial purchase price, the proposed renovations on the building would cost £4,000. An appeal was made to the universities and £1,652 were subscribed. To finance the additional money the Association registered as a Joint Stock Company and issued Debenture Bonds for £8,300.[16] It was decided that the Hall should be self-supporting and therefore prospective residents would be charged rents varying from twenty-two shillings a week for a furnished sitting-room and bedroom to ten shillings six pence per week for a single bedroom.[17]

It had been expected that Toynbee Hall would be in operation by September 1884 but technical and financial difficulties postponed the opening. In July the Metropolitan Board raised objections to the lighting and fire-proofing provisions of the building and the Association was unable to sell its bonds. An offer by one of the Association's members to advance the necessary funds pending the sale of the bonds solved the immediate financial crisis and eventually all the other obstacles were removed. On December 24,1884 the first residents, H.D. Leigh and C.H. Grinling, moved in to Toynbee Hall. Thirteen

other residents soon followed and the experiment of the university settlement was begun.

The character of this first settlement was to be determined, to a large extent, by its size and composition. Barnett's original plans for the settlement called for the establishment of a residence large enough to house at least twelve men. A smaller company, it was thought, would not allow for diversity of personality or opinion and would produce either friction or narrow uniformity among its members. Furthermore, a small group of men might be overwhelmed by the negative influences of their poor neighborhood and succomb to the slovenliness and ill manners often characteristic of such an environment. A residence of twelve or more members, however, would be able to exert a greater influence on an industrial neighborhood and would encourage individual growth and a variety of views.

A broad spectrum of opinion was to be represented since no doctrinal affiliation was attached to membership. This policy was in keeping with Barnett's views of the proper attitudes and objectives of university men in East London. Residents must understand that "they have not come as 'missionaries', they have come to settle, that is, to learn as much as to teach, to receive as much as to give."[18] Thus the first object of a Toynbee Hall resident was not to help but to learn. The second objective of the university settler was to let himself be known to the local inhabitants- to pursue his own career and interests and maintain his accustomed

standard of living. Barnett acknowledged that some people recommended an austere life style for settlers, but he disagreed. If residents were to familiarize their neighbors with upper class values and increase good will, "there must be no affectation of asceticism, and no consciousness of superiority. They must show forth the taste, the mind and the faith that is in them."[19] Given this philosophy, a broad-based membership was a logical and even necessary condition for the functioning of Toynbee Hall.

The non-sectarianism of Toynbee Hall had certain advantages for it attracted men who otherwise would have remained aloof. Moreover the presence of educated men with differing opinions and tastes extended a wider and more sophisticated knowledge among the lower classes. And finally, this kind of membership insured against the development of a "Toynbee Hall" policy, candidate, or advocacy of any special form of religion.

The official non-partisanship of the university settlement, coupled with the wide variety of causes and interests supported by its residents, led to some confusion in the public mind as to the precise object and function of Toynbee Hall. Several years after its founding Barnett commented:

> Within the past few weeks I have heard the object described as socialistic and as ecclesiastical. I have heard some say it cares for nothing but culture and I have heard others declare that its chief function is teaching small boys to smoke. I know that the place is feared by Tories and by Radicals. I know also it is looked on as a strong-hold by both sides.[20]

Visitors to Toynbee Hall, depending on what activities they observed, thought that it was either an educational center, a mission, a charitable institution, or a sort of bureau of social information. In reality, Barnett declared, Toynbee Hall was both a club and a college.

> It is a club in so far that the University men who make it their home live their own life, follow their own pursuits, and make their own friends; it is a college in so far that classes are held within its walls, and that students' residences flourish under its shadow. Whether the club will develop till through its members the influences gathered at the Universities affect the local government, the amusements, and the religion of East London; or whether the college will develop till all the buildings round Toynbee Hall be occupied by students under the direction of tutors and teachers, it is impossible to foretell. There is room for either development.[21]

As Warden of Toynbee Hall from 1884 to 1906, Barnett was in a unique position both to shape and to observe the development of the institution he had created. In February 1884, when the Committee for the University Settlement offered him the Wardenship, he and his wife were weary from eleven years work in East London and were looking forward to more time for leisure and travel which improved family finances would now allow. However the opportunity of heading the first university settlement offered a challenge which Barnett could not refuse.[22]

The appointment of Barnett as warden was not only approiate but also fortunate for he possessed the character and the ability to guide successfully the course of Toynbee

Hall through its formative years. A resident of Toynbee Hall, Thomas Hancock Nunn, described Barnett as essentially a university man whose great intellectual gifts "were hidden by his beautiful manners, his constant humility, his high courage, and lastly, by his extraordinary administrative capacity that instinctively made the best use of the stream of men who flocked to him for guidance."[23]

The young men who came to Toynbee Hall referred to Barnett as the "Prophet" because of his ability to foresee great social changes. But there was another lighter side to his personality. He possessed a lively sense of humor, considerable social grace, and a demeanor which was a rare mixture of gravity and gaiety. As warden, Barnett "was the background, the strong support, of that Settlement life which is so curious a mixture of hope and frivolity, of casualness and constant endeavor."[24] He saved the settlement from priggery and absurdity by a simplicity and directness which made life in Whitechapel natural and neighborly and banished all self-consciousness and superiority.[25]

The influence which Barnett exerted on the young men at Toynbee Hall was tactful and subtle. Once a week he would meet with each resident in the Warden's Lodge for a half hour's talk during which he would sit leaning forward and clasping his knees. A resident recalled such an interview. "The Warden, with his ripe experience and wide influence, treated you as an equal, never preached or scolded, listened tolerantly to the crudest ideas, and found unsuspected cores of wisdom in them."[26] Another resident reported that "when you had

left him, you thought that you, not he, had been talking and giving opinions; but the opinions were those which, by some uncanny process,he formed in you."[27] According to Mrs. Barnett, "he thought carefully of each one, first discovering what he would call his "Christed" self - that is, his self moved with the Spirit of Christ - and then considering methods to help him towards his hope."[28] Their warden's care and concern was recognized and appreciated by the residents. "Every Toynbee man felt that in the Warden was a friend who would give, freely and sympahtetically, sound and inspiring advice and... valuable help."[29]

In addition to being a wise counselor, Barnett continued to be an active recruiting agent for Toynbee Hall. The year after the establishment of the settlement he returned to Balliol and was encouraged by the reception he received. "I once more fiddled on the settlement string and found the men ready to dance. In fact the men altogether are as responsive as ever and put us in good heart."[30] In succeeding years the Barnetts frequently visited Oxford, as guests of either Canon Fremantle or Benjamin Jowett, to enlist men for Toynbee Hall. On one such visit Jowett admitted to Mrs. Barnett that initially he had been afraid to send his men to East London, not knowing what would be done with them; "but now I safely send them, for you are ambitious for them. A man's career should be his first concern."[31]

Almost from the beginning Barnett complained that his duties as warden demanded a great deal of his time and energy.

"The place is absorbing us both. Old interests have to be cut. I can give neither time nor thought to relief."[32] And the burdens of his office now began to weigh more heavily upon him. In 1890, six years after assuming the post, Barnett found it necessary to leave Toynbee Hall for a year's travel. "It is not that I feel tired - it is more as if I were dry - empty of force and in danger of becoming a mere actor - acting out a play written by ourselves long ago."[33] While on their world-wide trip the Barnetts decided to change the direction of their lives - to leave Whitechapel and begin work in a parish on strictly spiritual lines. On his return Barnett's requested transfer was never acted upon by Bishop Temple. Pained by this apparent rebuke, Barnett resumed the wardenship of Toynbee Hall where relations with his residents were to become at times less than harmonious.

As the nineteenth century drew to a close the issue of British imperialism became a source of tension between the residents of Toynbee Hall and their warden. The jingoism of the majority of the men and their elation over British victories in South Africa clashed with Barnett's pacifistic views and Pro-Boer sympathies; at times feeling ran so high that Barnett refused to dine in the Hall. And as the war continued he became disheartened and fearful that the aggressive patriotism of his residents would dampen their enthusiasm for social reform.[34] No doubt this conflict of views was, to some extent, symptomatic of a generation gap between Barnett and the younger men at the Hall. At last Barnett was forced to confess, "I am old and don't know the modern words of the

old tune."[35] He came to believe that the time had come to transfer the leadership of Toynbee Hall to the younger generation.

Barnett had already relinquished part of his control of Toynbee Hall when, in 1893, he had become Canon of Bristol, an appointment which required spending part of his time in that city. However by 1906 he decided the time had come to leave Whitechapel. Mr. T. Edmund Harvey, a Quaker and a First Class graduate of Oxford, was ready to assume the duties of warden, leaving Barnett free to concentrate his efforts on spiritual teaching. Upon retiring from Toynbee Hall Barnett refused an offer of a Deanery and instead requested an appointment to Westminster. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Prime Minister, complied with his request and in June 1906 Barnett was appointed Canon of the Collegiate College of St. Peter, Westminster. Unfortunately his years at Westminster were plagued by deteriorating health and on June 17,1913, only a few months after being made Sub-Dean of Westminster, he died. It was Toynbee Hall, however, which remained Barnett's living memorial, for under his leadership the role of the university settlement was defined and expanded.

The work of Toynbee Hall, carried on principally by the residents and a body of Associates, could be broadly divided into educational, social, and civic activities. The educational activities of the settlement were guided by the principle "that knowledge imparted should serve to stimulate, to strengthen,

and to widen the learner's own personal life, rather than to serve as a means of livelihood. Not for competitive purposes, but for the sake of individual character and social helpfulness shall the knowledge be given."[36]

The more formal educational offerings of Toynbee Hall consisted in a regular series of four lecture courses conducted by the University Extension Society. Over the years higher educational costs required raising tuition fees and this gradually excluded the lower classes from attending these courses.[37]

In an effort to extend higher educational opportunities to the working class of East London, it was decided to offer craftsmen courses in the scientific principles of their trades and to deliver lectures in the East End workingmen's clubs. These efforts, it was hoped, would create a demand for higher education, a demand which would eventually lead to the establishment of a democratic university in East London.

With this end in view, in 1887 a student residence, Wadham House, was opened. The purpose of the House was to allow its members to pursue their respective occupations during the day but to spend their leisure hours in an environment conducive to intellecutal growth. Students at Wadham House were assigned a tutor and advisor from Toynbee Hall and had access to the Toynbee Library and all the cultural and intellectual activities at the Hall. After some initial difficulty recruiting residents, Wadham House became firmly estalbished and its men became the core of the university extension's student body. Encouraged by the success of Wadham

House another student residence, Balliol House, was opened in 1890.[38]

Increasingly educational activities came to dominate the work of the settlement and its vitality as an educational center was evidenced by a wide variety of informal intellectual offerings. Classes and reading parties were conducted by the residents and a program of popular lectures and debates were sponsored by the Hall.

Educational reform measures were actively promoted by Toynbee Hall residents. The Education Reform League was established to enrich the elementary education curriculum and more classes for pupil-teachers were encouraged. Moreover, Toynbee men were instrumental in forming continuation classes in several East London schools and in introducing recreational subjects - musical drill, drawing, clay modelling, basketwork - to the curriculum of several schools in Stepney and one in Limehouse.

Despite its apparent success, the educational work of Toynbee Hall was not without its critics, principally because it generally catered to the relatively better-off classes. University settlers had to agree with this assessment for within the first year of its establishment residents discovered that their efforts were not reaching the lower classes. It was found that only skilled artisans, lower middle class people, and the more well-to-do of East London were taking advantage of the settlement's program. One possible explanation for this lack of workingmen participation

was thought to be that the men were too proud to come to the Hall in their working clothes and to change to their Sunday best was too great an effort.[39] However, despite the generally low level of working class involvement, Toynbee men defended the value of offering educational enrichment to the more affluent classes since the education received at the settlement often stimulated many of the students to social service. "It is because of this that the Settlement has been justified in attracting to itself a large body of students, many of whom are among the well-to-do of East London."[40] It was also believed that the knowledge acquired by teachers, employers, and highly skilled intelligent workers would be of greater personal and social benefit than that gained by those of the lowest socio-economic order.

> No doubt good work can be and has been done by direct contact with classes holding the lowest moral standards, but there is a disregard of economy of labour in such dealings, and vitality seems to pass out of the worker so quickly without corresponding gain.[41]

The most effective method of influencing the lowest classes was found to be through the children. Teaching in the schools of the poorest districts enabled settlers to establish contact with the students and their parents. For all levels of East London society, howevever, the goal of the educational work of Toynbee Hall remained the same - to foster the character development which would enable the individual to realize his potential abilities and better meet his social and political responsibilities.

Although the work of the university settlement was closely identified with the field of education, in the original concept the social activities of Toynbee Hall were expected to play an important part in implementing the settlement ideal. The hospitality offered by the settlement was regarded as an effective means of promoting unity and good will. In a spirit of friendship university settlers were to share themselves and their home. Groups of friends were to be entertained by the residents in their private rooms or in the larger common rooms of the Hall. Toynbee Hall was "to provide a meeting place where, simply and naturally, without undue conventional restraints and wearying etiquette, people may come to know each other's characters, thoughts, beliefs."[42]

In addition, it became the center of cultural programs designed to enrich the lives of East Londoners. Concerts and art exhibits were presented at the Hall and museum and garden visits were arranged by Toynbee residents. While critics scoffed at these attempts to improve the condition of East London 'by pictures, pianos, and parties', Toynbee men maintained that, deprived of the natural beauty and spiritual solace of a rural environment, their methods were legitimate, albeit artificial, attempts to fill the emptiness of the urban dweller's life.

To further this goal numerous clubs and societies were initiated by Toynbee residents. A brief description of two of the many flourishing organizations will serve to illustrate their contributions to the individual and the community.

A Travellers' Club was founded at Toynbee Hall in 1887 to provide East Londoners with the opportunity for low-cost travel to the Continent. In 1888 one member of the East London party visiting Florence, J.M. Dent (the future successful publisher), recalled the effect of that experience.

> Try and imagine what it was to come out of the East End of London (I had no knowledge of the West at that time, nor have I had much since) with its sorid grime, to cross the Alps in glorious sunshine.[43]

For Dent, that trip was the revelation of a new heaven and a source of renewed hope and energy. Through the Travellers' Club he and many other East Londoners enjoyed the personal benefits of foreign travel.[44]

The Lolesworth Club, one of the most successful Toynbee initiatives, was an important extension of the social activities of the settlement. Begun by a Toynbee man in 1887, Lolesworth was a social,self-governing and self-supporting club based on tee-total principles. Consisting of tenants of Lolesworth and other neighboring streets, the Lolesworth Club provided its members with concerts, lectures, debates, social evenings and summer excursions. Members of the club also helped promote a Whitechapel branch of the Tower Hamlets Co-operative Society, supervised open playgrounds and served on Streets Committees. These activities were organized under the leadership of Toynbee men and were part of the community service of the Hall.

The civic work of Toynbee Hall was based on the belief that permanent improvement in East London could be achieved

through existing institutions and individual effort. Proceeding on this theory, Toynbee residents took an active role in the civic affairs of East London and under Barnett's leadership the broad outlines of the settlement's civic involvement began to emerge.

Almost from the beginning, as citizens of East London Toynbee Hall residents provided the intelligent leadership necessary for effective local government by their service on local political committees and school boards. And as the settlement became more established its men were elected to positions of greater influence on borough and country councils.

Within a year of its opening Toynbee Hall became the headquarters of the Whitechapel Sanitary Aid Committee formed to improve the enforcement of existing health codes. Through the Committee's patient and persistent efforts a number of specific nuisances in the area were removed and a greater vigilance on the part of local authorities and landlords was effected.[45] Although initially local officers were suspicious of the work of the Committee they gradually came to welcome its services and tenants became more cooperative in its inquiries. And perhaps more important, through their work on the Sanitary Aid Committee, Toynbee men became more familiar with the lives of their neighbors.

Working with the local committees of the Charity Organisation Society provided new Toynbee residents with an opportunity to help their unfortunate neighbors, to gain an under-

standing of the complexities of urban problems, and to receive valuable training in social work. And the assistance of Toynbee men enabled the Charity Organisation Society to provide more individualized treatment for their clients and to maintain more careful records thereby improving the quality of the relief given to East London poor.

While the settlement's cooperation with the C.O.S. continued, in the closing years of the nineteenth century labor organization became an area of growing interest to many Toynbee men who became involved in the movement as educators and impartial mediators. Residents of the Hall worked closely with the Cooperative Aid Association in promoting productive enterprises and in educating cooperators. During the winter of 1888-1889 Toynbee Hall sponsored a series of conferences which explored the principles and the problems of the cooperative idea. The Hall also became the meeting place of several cooperative societies.

As an alternative to cooperation, the growing trade union movement in East London sparked the interest of many settlers. During the critical London Dockers' Strike of 1889 several Toynbee residents helped the dockers present their case to the public. In September 1889 they invited the Central Strike Committee, including Ben Tillet, John Burns, and Tom Mann, and sixty other guests to a supper at Toynbee Hall.[46] Later a debate on the question of a trade unionism, conducted at the settlement, received a great deal of public notice.

The responsible behavior of the workers during the Dockers' Strike won the sympathy of the public and the subsequent

success of the dock workers encouraged the spread of unionism, especially among the unskilled workers of East London. The valuable assistance given by the Toynbee Hall men formed an attachment between the settlement and the newly-formed labor unions, several of whom began to use the Hall's facilities for their meetings. And because of its good relations with labor, Toynbee Hall was able to serve as a conciliator at critical stages of industrial disputes.

In 1905, for example, the settlement aided the formation of a Tea Packers' Union, an action which averted serious problems for many employees of the Cooperative Wholesale Society. The following year the Hall was again the scene of a settlement of the dispute between the East End Jewish tailors and their middle-men. Through the intervention of Rev. Alexander Francis who had been staying at Toynbee Hall, a compromise agreement was reached.

Through their dealings with labor issues, and indeed with every aspect of their civic work, the residents of Toynbee Hall came to realize the importance of systematizing and publicizing the facts concerning the social and economic conditions of East London; and this recognition led to their involvement in numerous social surveys and investigations. Based on their experience with the C.O.S. two residents wrote an article on the endowed charities of Stepney for the Charity Digest. Many Toynbee men also contributed to Charles Booth's famous study and a mass of information in the Toynbee Hall archives was utilized by the investigators. The close

association of the settlement with Booth's work enhanced its prestige and won national and international recognition of its value as a source of social research.

The problem of unemployment became the subject of inquiry at Toynbee Hall when, in 1892, East London was faced with the possibility of another period of severe economic distress. To meet the impending crisis, Barnett proposed the establishment of a Toynbee Commission to make an independent inquiry into the condition of the unemployed and to draw up recommendations for dealing with the problem. Information was obtained from trade societies and employers, charitable, and official agencies; important statistics, supplied to Mr. Booth by the Joint Committee of the Dock Companies, were placed at the Commissions' disposal. As a result of that inquiry a Mansion House Commitee for the Relief of the Unemployed was formed.

Further studies by Toynbee men were undertaken of various subjects of social and economic importance. The most significant perhaps was William Beveridge's investigation of the unemployment problem. His work contributed to the Unemployed Workmen Act and made him a recognized expert in that field.

The continuance of the civic work, as well as all the other activities of Toynbee Hall, depended on adequate financial support. The income from residents and guests more than covered domestic expenses but subscription income failed to keep pace with expanded services. The issuance of special

appeals and the renegotiation of the debenture debt at a more favorable interest rate brought a temporary improvement in the financial position of the settlement.[47] However the need for additional facilities required the purchase of another property, the Exhibition Buildings, and the construction of the Warden's House; fortunately both these projects were made possible by the generous gifts of Toynbee Hall supporters.[48] Finally in 1892 Toynbee Hall received its first grant from the trustees of the City Parochial Charities and it appeared that this additional income would help ease the financial burdens of the Hall.

The future of Toynbee Hall was also dependent on its manpower resources. During the wardenship of Barnett the lack of new settlers and the short duration of many others' residency forced the settlement to rely on visitors for assistance and created an uncertainty about the current and future programs of the university settlement.

Given the many opportunities for personal growth and community service Barnett thought it remarkable that relatively few university men had chosen to come to Whitechapel. However he recognized several factors which may have accounted for this lack of enthusiasm. The attractions of West London society exerted a powerful appeal to those within its circle and it required courage to choose to live outside one's class. Nevertheless for those concerned with social problems, living among the poor was the optimum method of gaining accurate knowledge of their condition. A misunderstanding of

the nature of the settlement might be another reason for a lack of new recruits. "It is because settlements seem to be 'a fad' - an experiement of 'cranks' - or another mechanical invention, that they keep aloof."[49] Or, he speculated, others "who might have come, may think that enough has been done, that other methods have been shown to more effectual, and that Settlements have not a 'definite aim'."[50] Whatever the reasons for its failure to attract new members, Barnett was confident that, as the younger men gradually assumed leadership of Toynbee Hall, the settlement would be revitalized. His optimism seemed justified for by 1904 Toynbee Hall and the student residences were filled to capacity.

With the future of Toynbee Hall apparently secure Barnett cautioned against the danger of the settlement becoming institutionalized.

> In the history of charitable enterprises the hurry to make machinery may often be noticed as the cause of failure. Hearts which have been roused, refused to await the slow growth, and energy is exhausted in making Institutions.[51]

Often movements which had begun as protests against machinery became, in their turn, yoked to a machine. The settlement had come into existence in 1884 because "a few men at Oxford and Cambridge felt that neither missions, nor systems of organised chairty, not law, could do what a friend could do for a friend, or a man for a man."[52] The enduring object of a settlement was to bring people together, to promote the contact of human beings by which virtue passes, and to provide the personal touch which breaks down the social barriers

strengthened by fear and suspicion. The machinery of education and entertainment which had developed over the past decades should not obscure the fact that "a Settlement offers lives and not schemes for the solution of the social problem, and that the best workers are not those who start clubs and classes, but who make friends with their neighbours."[53]

As the years of his association with Toynbee Hall were drawing to a close, Barnett evaluated the success of the university settlement movement. In judging that success, others, both critics and supporters, had based their opinions on what had been done by the settlement in the areas of education, relief, and entertainment. They had compared lists of classes and examination results, counted numbers relieved and amounts spent on social functions. In short, whether to blame or praise, they had formed their judgments by weighing and measuring external factors. But Barnett insisted that settlements were not fairly judged by such standards. The real evidence of the movement's success was "not that it has spread opinion, or increased temperance, or relieved distress, but that it has promoted peace and goodwill."[54]

Using this criteria Barnett believed that Toynbee Hall could make a valid claim to having helped mitigate class suspicion. Over the years the action of Toynbee residents had shaken off old prejudices and, by their service during the Dockers' Strike, convinced East Londoners of their fair-mindness. Perhaps of even greater value, genuine friendships between the university men and their neighbors had developed

and because of this friendship good will had been spread.

But the settlement movement was not without its flaws. Barnett thought that settlements had too often yielded to the temptation to rival other organizations with a display of their works and perhaps had come to stand for 'work among the poor' rather than for the 'being' of a body of educated people.

> Twenty-two years' experience has, of course, chastened the hopes of the founders of Toynbee Hall. There has not been such an extension of the way of residence as to touch East London with the spirit of culture of the Universities with the desire to draw the working classes within the sphere of their influence... But my faith still holds that it is the contact of the rich and poor - the neighbourly intercourse of University and working-men which will form the healthy public opinion in which good laws can be made and obeyed.[55]

His experience at Toynbee Hall had confirmed his belief that "infection is the fact of life. Everything passes by contact... A settlement - ugly as is the word - is the solution of social problems."[56]

Those who served at Toynbee Hall shared Barnett's faith. They believed that in the final analysis the social question "is fundamentally one of character. Political, industrial, and educational reforms will but mock our hopes in the absence of the vitalising breath of personal reform whose charter must be given or withheld by men and women for themselves. This is the reform to the advancement of which, whatever the channel may be, the efforts of Toynbee Hall are ultimately directed."[57]

CHAPTER IV - FOOTNOTES

[1]Samuel A. Barnett, "Class Relations in East London", a sermon preached at Carfax Church, Oxford University, June 22, 1889.

[2]Barnett, notes of an address given to a gathering at Toynbee Hall, June, 1889. Lambeth Palace Library, Arnold Toynbee file.

[3]Universities' Settlement in East London, Eighth Annual Report (London: Penny & Hull, 1892), p. 11.

[4]Barnett, an address at Toynbee Hall, June, 1889. Abbreviations in this and all other quotations have been spelled out.

[5]Barnett, "University Settlements", The University Review, I (1905): 135.

[6]Ibid., p. 136.

[7]Among the men who came to East London was Leonard Montefiore who organized flower shows and promoted University Extension programs. B.F. Cosletoe talked to men's clubs and Arthur Hoare worked with the boys. All the visitors helped with the parish socials or visited for the Children's Country Holiday Fund. Henrietta O. Barnett, Canon Barnett His Life and Friends (2 Vols.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1919), I, 306.

[8]Henrietta O. Barnett, "The Beginning of Toynbee Hall", The Nineteenth Century, 53 (1903): 310.

[9]Cosmo Ebor, "Samuel Augustus Barnett: Some Lessons of His Life", Charity Organisation Review, 34 (1913): 353.

[10]Anthony S. Wohl, "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London", International Review of Social History, 13 (1968): 268.

[11]"Barnett of Toynbee Hall", Westminister Gazette, June 19, 1913, p. 2.

[12]Reverend Brooke Lambert, "Esau's Cry", Contemporary Review, XLIV (1883): 917.

Chapter IV - Footnotes (cont)

[13]C. Ebor, "Samuel Augustus Barnett", p. 353.

[14]The committee chosen to select the site and warden consisted of Professor Bryce, P. Lyttleton Gell, C.S. Loch, Bolton King, and Alfred Milner.

[15]For the objectives and the administrative structure of the Association see The Universities' Settlement in East London, Memorandum and Articles of Association (Oxford, 1886), pp. 3-11.

[16]Universities' Settlement in East London, First Annual Report (Oxford: Universities' Settlement in East London, 1885) p, 10.

[17]Ibid., p. 11

[18]Barnett, "University Settlements", pp. 136-137.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Barnett, an address given at Toynbee Hall, June, 1889.

[21]Universities' Settlement in East London, Fifth Annual Report (London: Penny & Hull, 1889), p. 4. In 1887 a student residence, Wadham House was opened and in 1890 another one, Balliol House, was established.

[22]Samuel Barnett to Frank Barnett, March 1, 1884, Greater London Record Office and Library, Samuel Barnett Papers. Along with his acceptance Barnett requested that his annual salary of £250 be used to further the work of the Settlement.

[23]T.H. Nunn, "Canon Barnett", p. 143.

[24]"In Memoriam. Canon Barnett", The Toynbee Record, 25 (1913): 148.

[25]"Barnett of Toynbee Hall", Westminister Gazette, June 18, 1931, p. 2.

[26]Ibid.

[27]"In Memoriam. Canon Barnett", p. 148.

Chapter IV - Footnotes (cont)

[28]H.O. Barnett, Canon Barnett, II, 40. The advice he gave was of a practical nature. For example, he advised a new resident wishing to acquaint himself with the work of Toynbee Hall to master the Toynbee Reports and to read the Introduction of the Charities Register. Ibid., p. 123

[29]"In Memoriam. Canon Barnett", p. 149.

[30]Samuel Barnett to Frank Barnett, May 9, 1885, Greater London Record Office and Library, Samuel Barnett Papers.

[31]H.O. Barnett, Canon Barnett, II, 23.

[32]Barnett to Frank Barnett, January (?) 24, 1885, Ibid.

[33]Barnett to Frank Barnett, April 19, 1890, Ibid.

[34]Barnett to Frank Barnett, February 16, 1900 and December 14, 1901, Greater London Record Office and Library, Samuel Barnett Papers. H.O. Barnett, Canon Barnett, II, 39.

[35]Barnett to Frank Barnett, November 24, 1900, Ibid.

[36]Samuel Hales, "Toynbee Hall", The Library, 5 (1893): 182. New residents were elected to the Hall by other residents with the approval of the Council after serving a brief probationary period. Associates, while not living at the Hall, were admitted by the same procedure and shared the same club privileges as the residents.

[37]The higher fees ranged from 5s to 10s 6 d for courses. Universities' Settlement of East London, Sixth Annual Report, (London: Penny & Hull, 1890),p. 17.

[38]Unfortunately Balliol House was not as successfully integrated into the Toynbee Hall community. Most of its residents refused to work individually with the poor and instead contented themselves with rowdy Christmas parties. They treated the House as a cheap lodging and used Toynbee privileges as so many personal assets. H.O. Barnett, Canon Barnett, II, 14-15.

[39]Universities' Settlement in East London, Second Annual Report (Oxford: Universities' Settlement in East London, 1886), pp. 35-36.

Chapter IV - Footnotes (cont)

[40]Universities' Settlement in East London, Seventh Annual Report (London: Penny & Hull, 1891), p. 16. Instead of "well-to-do", probably upper working or lower middle class would be a more accurate description.

[41]Universities' Settlement in East London, Second Annual Report, p.22.

[42]Universities' Settlement in East London, Fifth Annual Report, p. 25.

[43]J.M. Dent, Memoirs 1849-1926 (London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1928), p. 53.

[44] Eighteen-day trips to Italian cities or to Switzerland cost between L12-16 per person. The size of the travel parties varied from fifty-seven to eighty people. Generally the travellers were students from university extension classes; a large number were elementary school teachers and school masters.

[45]Between July 1892 and January 1893, for example, 193 complaints were brought to the Committee. Of these, the Committee reported 133 cases to the Sanitary Authority and 20 to the Central Committee. Thirty-one cases were dismissed as trival. Universities' Settlement of East London, Ninth Annual Report, p. 21

[46]While not discouraging his residents, Samuel Barnett did not want to identify the Settlement with the strike lest Oxford opinion be alarmed. H.O. Barnett, Canon Barnett, II, 66.

[47]Income from residents' fees rose from £2,119 18s in 1886-1887 to £2,419 23s 12d in 1887-1888. Universities' Settlement of East London, Fourth Annual Report, pp. 3-4. The deficit between expenditures and subscription income amounted to £177 10s 7d in 1885 (Second Annual Report, p. 8) and £362 3s 2d in 1888 (Fourth Annual Report, p. 4). By 1892 approximately £8,652 were owed by the Settlement. This amount included £76 9s 7d debt of the Maintenance Fund, £576 19s 3d deficit for the Exhibition Building and the Warden's House and the original debt of £8,000. Eighth Annual Report, pp. 16-17.

[48]The Exhibition Buildings, adjacent to Toynbee Hall, had been offered as a gift to the Council on the condition that the

Chapter IV - Footnotes (cont)

property's debt of £600 could be assumed. Sixth Annual Report, p. 16. £400 were raised through subscriptions and the buildings were purchased. Seventh Annual Report, p. 21. All but £400 of the total construction costs of the Warden's House were met by two anonymous donations totaling £2500. Eighth Annual Report, pp. 16-17.

[49]Canon and Mrs. S.A. Barnett, Towards Social Reform, p. 270.

[50]Universities' Settlement in East London, Seventh Annual Report, p. 11.

[51]Ibid.

[52]Universities' Settlement in East London, Eigth Annual Report, p. 9.

[53]Ibid.

[54]Barnett, "University Settlements", p. 141.

[55]Universities' Settlement in East London, Twenty-Second Annual Report (London: Penny & Hull, 1906), pp. vii-viii.

[56]Barnett to Frank Barnett, October 11, 1902, Greater London Record Office and Library, Samuel Barnett Papers.

[57]Universities' Settlement in East London, Sixth Annual Report, p. 37.

EPILOGUE -

THE UNIVERSITY SETTLEMENT: AN APPRAISAL

When Samuel Barnett left Whitechapel in 1906 the university settlement movement had spread from England throughout the Empire, and to Western Europe and even China. And in the United States the idea of university settlement had been enthusiastically received.

Toynbee Hall, with its residents of various faiths serving in a neighborhood of diverse ethnic and religious cultures, seemed particularly suited to the needs of American society.[1] At least four settlements in the United States owed their origins to direct contact with Toynbee Hall. Jane Addams came to Whitechapel in 1887 and again in 1889 when she formed a deep and lasting friendship with the Barnetts. Hull House may well be regarded as the fruit of their association. Stanton Coit, while a student at the University of Berlin, heard of Toynbee Hall and visited the settlement where his social conscience was roused and his thoughts directed to social reform. After returning to New York City he established the Neighborhood Guild early in 1887.[2] The founder of South End House, Robert Woods, was a resident and frequent visitor of Toynbee Hall. And Charles Zueblin was inspired by his visit to Whitechapel to establish Northwestern University Settlement in Chicago in 1891.

While the American settlements generally adopted the nonsectarian character of Toynbee Hall, the majority of the newly-formed London settlements became established under the auspices of various denominations. Oxford House, inaugurated shortly after Toynbee Hall, was the first such settlement, founded on Church of England principles.[3]

Among supporters of Toynbee Hall, the establishment of a sectarian institution raised theoretical as well as practical objections. A religious settlement was thought to be inconsistent with the original settlement concept since it introduced a certain subordination to an existing organization and confused the carefully made distinction between a settlement and a mission.[4] Moreover, a sectarian settlement was deemed inappropriate for East London neighborhoods. For example, in Whitechapel, with its heterogeneous population, a non-denominational institution was required. In addition, the working class in this area seemed to be more receptive to secular reformers. Reverend Brooke Lambert, for one, was convinced that the less prominent the religious element was made in the settlement, the greater the chance of its success. Religious reformers, he thought tended to emphasize the need to prepare man for the next world and to urge the joining of a particular sect as a means of achieving that goal. This message, he believed, would not be well-received by members of the working class.[5] Despite these objections, Toynbee Hall and Oxford House achieved a state of peaceful, even cordial coexistence, and were quickly joined by other settlements

throughout London.[6]

The proliferation of university settlements following in the wake of Toynbee Hall was, no doubt, a source of satisfaction to its founder. However, before Barnett's death in 1913, problems began to emerge which indicated that Toynbee Hall and the university settlement movement had reached a crossroads in its development.

E.J. Urwick, a former sub-warden of Toynbee Hall under Barnett's leadership, believed that the negation of the original settlement ideal was a prime cause of current difficulties. "The Settlement movement began by a revolt - a revolt against half-measures of social service on one hand, against well-meant but ill-planned panaceas on the other. Especially was it a revolt against machine work of all kinds."[7] In its original concept, university settlement residents were to act simply and humbly upon the principles embodied in the mottoes: Not gifts, but personal service; Not money, but ourselves. Urwick maintained that this fluidity and formlessness of settlement activity was, in the view of its founder Samuel Barnett, the distinguishing feature of a settlement as opposed to a mission.

It could be argued, Urwick thought, that such an ideal was incompatible with the establishment of any institution and because of this and of other developments within the movement itself, the original ideal of a settlement had not been preserved.

> First and foremost, the original idea of simple neighbourliness has dropped out of

> sight...The entertainment of our friends has degenerated into treats; our reading clubs into ordered institutions for physical and moral training and recreation; and our very visiting into a system of object lessons for the application of scientific treatment. Those who should come to be friends too often stay to learn methods or manage a piece of machinery, more often still they leave before even a pretence of neighbourliness or friendship can be established.[8]

Urwick noted that in women's settlements in place of the careful study of living conditions among the poor, "a quasi-scientific sociology" had developed. Schools of scientific training for social work had been founded and many settlements encouraged their residents to enroll in these courses. As a result of this professionalization, people entered settlements not as residents but as transient visitors bent on using their settlement experience to gain entry into the ranks of professional social workers. By serving their needs, many settlements were becoming institutions for vocational training rather than homes for socially concerned university men. These changes within the settlement movement - the substitution of machinery for personal service, of stereotyped activities for spontaneous help, and of professional objectives for the simple aim of forming friendships with the poor - denoted the insitutionalization of settlement work.

Perhaps that development was inevitable, given the kind of residents the settlement was designed to attract, namely "the most unsettled class of all - the young people from the

Universities who have not yet settled down to anything."[9] According to Urwick the youth, restlessness, and inexperience of settlement residents forced the heads of settlements to establish a nucleus of organized activities which would direct their energies and provide them with experience. These activities required machinery to insure their continuance in the face of changing personnel. The more rapid the turnover of residents, the more dominant this institutionalized activity became.

The dependence of the settlement on the public for approval and financial support was an even greater reason for the corruption of the original settlement ideal and function.

> We have allowed the outside world to judge us by results; we appeal to our works as a proof not of our faith, but of our energy... We vie with one another in the achievement of our doing, rather than in the effectiveness of our being - tempted sometimes even to the verge of the picturesque, in order to satisfy the expectations of visitors or the demands of supporters.[10]

The competition between settlements for public attention increased their dependence on outside support. In their desire to create impressive institutions, settlement administrators had acquired elaborate buildings and equipment. Such facilities not only isolated the settlements from the neighbors they were meant to serve, but also burdened them with the high costs of an enlarged plant. To gain the necessary financial support, the settlements had to woo an apathetic public by issuing annual reports and public appeals, and by demonstrating important achievements; all such activities diverted

their energies and distorted their proper function. Urwick believed that since its inception, the university settlement had gradually lost its sense of identity and its direction, and these developments were responsible for the lack of enthusiasm which permeated the entire movement.[11]

The state of crisis in the settlement movement was reflected in the condition of Toynbee Hall. In May 1913, a group of concerned residents reported that there was "a general impression, which we believe is not confined to present residents, that Toynbee Hall is not flourishing at the present time. There is a certain atmosphere of decay; Toynbee Hall, in fact, seems to be living on its reputation which was built during the earlier years of its existence."[12] Part of the reason for this languished state of the settlement was to be found in the stultified educational and social activities of the Hall which alienated and isolated Toynbee residents.

The formal educational offerings of Toynbee Hall, the university extension courses and the evening school courses, had become routine and mechanical. The university extension courses no longer attracted serious students and were deemed a failure. The evening school courses were taught by instructors employed by the London County Council. Many of the clubs and societies which comprised the social life of Toynbee Hall had long since lost their original reason for being and had become entrenched cliques which excluded current residents. "The final result is that the residents, since so

many of the activities of Toynbee Hall are foreign to them, feel like strangers in their own home."[13]

To remedy this situation the residents proposed certain changes in the current activities and suggested new directions for the future which would attract new residents and provide scope for their energies, and further the original objectives of the university settlement - the provision of education and recreation for the poor and the investigation of social problems.

It was recommended that the educational offerings of the settlement be limited to voluntary and tutorial classes in which the residents could take an active role, directing their efforts towards making Toynbee Hall the East London equivalent of the Working Men's College in North London. The reconstruction of the social institutions of the Hall should be made on the basis that only those activities which enhanced the reputation of the settlement as a center of information on social problems and as a serious platform for discussion of important social issues would be retained or revived. Thus it was proposed that, with some procedural changes, the Thursday Evening Debates be preserved. The Enquirers' Club, founded in 1904 to examine questions of social concern but subsequently disbanded, should be reinstituted.

As for the future direction of the settlement, it was advocated that the scope and influence of Toynbee Hall be extended. The establishment of relations between the Hall and other centers in foreign countries would facilitate the mutual interchange of information on social problems. In

addition, a series of pamphlets might be published to inform the public of the results of the settlement's social investigations. The active promotion of Toynbee Hall as a meeting place for social conferences was also suggested.

In addition to becoming a center for social information, it was urged that the settlement move towards strengthening its relations with labor organizations. For many years various trade unions and Friendly Societies had held their meetings at the Hall and this practice should be extended. Finally, greater cooperation between the Hall and the Workers' Educational Association was strongly recommended. These measures, it was hoped, would restore the vitality of Toynbee Hall and attract new residents, men who were "the keener, more intelligent section of the younger men of every generation."[14]

Implicit in these recommendations was the recognition of the need to redefine the purpose and function of Toynbee Hall since changing times and changing social values had challenged the relevancy of the university settlement to modern society. The magnitude of the nation's social problems, dramatically demonstrated by social investigators and social reformers, had convinced many Englishmen of the need for the direct intervention of the state. In the decade preceeding World War I, the state, recognizing the need and bowing to the increasing political power of labour, took its first cautious steps towards providing social security for its citizens. Along with state action, the spread of education and the rise

of trade unionism had given new dignity and strength to the working classes.

These changes in society were accompanied by a change in social values. In Barnett's view, the victories of British militarism had captured the national imagination and for university men, dreams of imperial glory rivalled their predecessors' visions of social service. The sense of identification with the lower classes and the sense of class guilt lost its hold on many of the university students as the ideology of individualism replaced the idealism of the previous generation. Among many of the working class, socialism seemed to offer the greatest hope for the future. Under these conditions, the survival of Toynbee Hall depended on its ability to adjust to the changes in English society and serve its needs.

During World War I Toynbee Hall lost a number of residents and students from Wadham and Balliol House to military service and many of them never returned. Despite its losses, Toynbee Hall continued after the war as a center for the study of social problems. In 1921 the American Seminar was founded to bring American educators and reformers to Toynbee Hall to study the British political and social system.

Between the wars Toynbee Hall took an active role in supporting social legislation. It was a formidable force in gaining the passage of the Education Act of 1936; and through the experience of the Poor Man's Lawyer at Toynbee Hall, the Hire Purchase Act was passed to correct the abuses of the

credit-buying system. Finally the Settlement's Council of East London Citizens, by its protests against the excesses of Mosley and his Fascists, was instrumental in winning parliamentary approval of the Public Order Act.

World War II took a disastrous toll on Toynbee Hall. The Warden's Lodge, the entire library, and part of the residential quarters were destroyed during the London blitz. While much of its normal work was halted, Toynbee Hall remained a place of refuge for war-torn East London. The settlement became the center of special wartime services and its warden was given the responsibility of supervising the distribution of food for air-raid shelters throughout London. Toynbee Hall also organized entertainments for these shelters and became the headquarters of the American Fund for London Mothers and Children which sent children under five to the country to escape the bombings.

After the war evening classes at Toynbee Hall were resumed with approximately fifteen hundred men and women in attendance. The settlement became the seat of the Juvenile Court of East London. It remained the meeting place for numerous clubs and societies and it sponsored Scouts and Guide troops for the youth of the area and a Veterans' Club for the elderly. The social investigatory work of the settlement continued as residents studied the causes of racial tension in East London and industrial friction on the docks. The social problems arising from the growing number of immigrants from the Empire were also the subject of settlement inquiry.

By the 1970's the scope of Toynbee Hall was extended. A group of model houses was opened under the Toynbee Hall Housing Association and plans for future housing developments were projected. The needs of the elderly were met with the establishment of a Senior Care and Leisure Center. Young children and youths of the area were serviced by a playgroup and an Arts Workshop. A Citizens' Advice Bureau offered marital, financial, and legal counseling to East Londoners; and a Center for the Mentally Handicapped was opened in December 1974 to aid the mentally impaired and their families.

In reviewing the major developments of the post-war settlement it will be noted that its adaptation to changing conditions had insured its survival but, in the process, Toynbee Hall had been transformed. No longer a collegiate club, Toynbee Hall had become a community center for the neighboring population. As a voluntary social service agency, the university settlement had found expanded opportunities for supplementing state and local action. In keeping with the increasing specialization of social work, the settlement's staff had become more professional. And in view of changing composition of East London's population, the social services offered by the settlement had become more diversified. Thus, although altered in form and function, Toynbee Hall continued as a vital force in East London life.

The contribution of Toynbee Hall and the university settle-

ment movement in the early stages of its development has been a subject of interest to contemporary observers and more recent social writers. For contemporary commentators, part of the problem of assessing the effectiveness of the settlement was, as Barnett had noted, that its value could not be judged by its clubs and classes but rather by its permeating influence on the surrounding community. By the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the settlement had not been established long enough to gauge effectively that influence. Furthermore, since the settlement worked in cooperation with other agencies it was often difficult to separate its contribution from that of the entire community effort.

Among early critics of the idea of settlement, however, there was little expectation of any real achievement. Upon the opening of Toynbee Hall the Spectator had confessed its skepticism.

> To the practical and disillusionised it must be owned that this effort brought only a certain misgiving...That the inhabitants of East London, who labour chiefly under the blank, immeasurable dullness of a restless but sordid life, were to be regenerated by the efforts of undergraduates and the sight of aesthetic furniture and Japanese fans, was a notion which appeared to be a preposterous, dull jest.[15]

Many years later, George Lansbury, an important trade union and Labour leader who had lived in East London and was acquainted with the Barnetts and Toynbee Hall, offered an unflattering evaluation of the settlement's contributions.

> Years after I first entered St. Jude's I discovered that what Toynbee Hall actually accomplished was just this: men who went in training under the Barnetts, ..., could always be sure of government and municipal appointments. The number is legion of those, who, fafter a few months, or at the most a year or two, at Toynbee have discovered themselves as experts on social affairs and, on the reputation created by the atmosphere and surroundings of the Settlement, claimed and received very fine appointments. The one solid achievement of Toynbee Hall, and the most important result of the mixing policy of the Barnetts, has been the filling up of the bureaucracy of government and administration with men and women who went to East London full of enthusiasm and zeal for the welfare of the masses, and discovered the advancement of their own interests and the interests of the poor were best served by leaving East London to stew in its own juice while they became members of parliament, cabinet ministers, civil servants;... In any case my sixty years' experience in East London leaves me quite unable to discover the permanent social influence of Toynbee Hall or any other similar settlement has had on the life and labour of the people.[16]

Although not as condemnatory as Lansbury, Urwick shared his negative opinion of the achievements of the settlements.

> Settlements have not become a great force in the guidance of public opinion or in the direction of social reform. They have tried and failed to raise the level of local politics. Some of the achievements credited to the movement can not really be called the direct work of individuals who happen to be connected with a settlement.[17]

However a more favorable viewpoint was expressed by other observers who had studied the university settlement movement in the years prior to World War I. To them, one of the immediate and most obvious effects of many settlements was the great stimulation to education which had occured. Efforts

towards self-improvement had been encouraged by the voluntary clubs which brought new interest to home life, extended areas of friendship, and productively employed the leisure time of East London citizens.[18]

Another positive effect of the university settlement was the development of a greater understanding and respect for the poor of London. Through the settlement experience it had been discovered that the poor, as well as the rich, appreciated the best in art, history, and drama. The fixed impression that the poor were only motivated by the cash nexus had been shown to be false.[19]

Finally, after twenty-five years existence, the sum total and effect of settlement work was deemed to have been significant and far-reaching.

> The settlements have set an example of disinterested social service which is catholic in its sympathies and aims; they have provided a common rallying-ground for workers of diverse political creeds and religious beliefs; and they have done something...to coordinate charitable and philanthropic effort. They have helped to raise the standard of local government; they have served as experiment stations for many schemes - in regard to education, public health, and public assistance which have become, or are now becoming, recognized and integral parts of a national system, and thus they have hastened the humanizing of administrative methods;...[20]

The university settlement had also contributed to an improved social climate in East London. Class suspicions had been mitigated and citizens awakened to their social responsibilities. There was an increased interest and concern about questions of education, national health, industrial organization,

and economic well-being. Numerous reform measures were suggested and the need for more information on social problems was recognized.[21]

In their analysis of Toynbee Hall and the university settlement movement, more recent writers have emphasized its contributions to the field of social work. Although the Charity Organisation Society was generally considered to be the codifier and training center of social case work principles and practices, the university settlement was seen as advancing their development.

Basing the settlement's case work on C.O.S. principles - on the worth, integrity, and dignity of individual relationships, and on self-determination - the founder of Toynbee Hall had added a new dimension to social relief; he had combined a scientific methodolgy with a Christian attitude.

> Where Barnett showed his greatest insight was in focussing attention on barriers to social change, and in recognizing that it was only educated men of good will who could tackle them... His first emphasis therefore was equally on research and love; research in the sense of studying the social structure of the neighborhood and understanding the needs of the individuals in it; love in the sense of loving one's neighbor as oneself, - giving them a helping hand when they needed it and sharing in their hopes and aspirations...[22]

The primary contribution of Barnett and the university settlement to the theory and practice of social group work was also recognized. Barnett, it was noted, initiated the modern practices of group dynamics by making each man feel that he could make a worthwhile contribution to the group. Barnett

used group relationships to unleash a man's capabilities, to give him a feeling of self-worth, and to strengthen him to play a vital role in society at large.[23]

The university settlements, however, made significant contributions beyond the narrow confiens of professional social work.

> They led to a better understanding of the effects on the lives of individuals of changing economic and social conditions in a rapidly industrialised society, and they offered a useful training ground for future social reformers... The settlements are of particular interest to our study of the relation between voluntary organisations and statutory bodies ... They did much to foster a spirit of co-operation between public and private agencies.[24]

This last observation refers to a pertinent subject which merits further consideration - namely the role of the university settlement as a voluntary body in an era of an expanded welfare state.

At the time Toynbee Hall was founded voluntary action occupied a preeminent place in the English social welfare system. The wide range of settlement activities attested not only to the spontaneity and inventiveness of individual residents but also, in a larger sense, to the numerous areas of vital social service which had been left to voluntary institutions to provide. However by the first half of the twentieth century most of the original educational, social, and civic functions of the university settlement had been assumed by the state.

The expansion of the welfare state necessitated a redefinition of the purpose and function of the university set-

tlement in order to maintain its relevancy in modern society. In the past Toynbee Hall had served as a model of successful cooperation between private agencies and public bodies. While the welfare state was still in its early developmental stage, as has been noted, the residents of Toynbee Hall, as members of local boards and councils, worked in cooperation with public officials.

In more recent times the proliferation of public agencies and social services has required an even greater degree of cooperation and interdependency between Toynbee Hall and public institutions. In providing legal and financial counseling to the residents of East London, Toynbee Hall enlists the cooperation of the Greater London Council and the Borough of Tower Hamlets. A close liason between the settlement and local public health and educational agencies has been established in connection with the Hall's work with the mentally handicapped. And the settlement relies on government support to help finance its housing programs and other community activities.

Along with the growth of centralized government, which is often remote and insensitive to local problems, the settlement has maintained its traditional role as a meeting place for community organizations and as a center for neighborhood action. Moreover the Hall provides both private individuals and private industry the opportunity for community service. While serving to centralize and coordinate community programs, the settlement continues to foster a sense of

neighborhood identity and a spirit of civic pride among the residents of East London.

Since its inception Toynbee Hall has been involved in the field of education and although state intervention has usurped the primary function of the settlement's activities - the education of the working class - there remains a place in modern society for the university settlement as the educator of the public and public opinion makers. Despite the availability of governmental studies, the social investigations and publications of Toynbee Hall provide the public with a disinterested, independent source of information regarding present problems and future needs.

In addition, as a social laboratory the university settlement offers a unique training for future leaders in the fields of social service. What earlier was regarded by some critics as a defect in Toynbee Hall - the fact that its residents used their settlement experience to build careers in social work or government - can, in retrospect, be viewed as a virtue, a positive accomplishment. For although contrary to the original settlement ideal, this development has enabled former Toynbee men to carry forward their vision of social justice in their respective fields and to exert an important influence on the shaping of modern social work and the welfare state.

Throughout its history the university settlement has acted as an advocate for the people of East London. During its formative years Toynbee Hall championed the cause of the work-

ing class poor, publicizing their problems and attempting to meet their needs. As the state assumed greater responsibility for the improvement of the condition of the working class, the settlement turned its attention to other groups of underprivileged East Londoners. In the 1970's for example, Toynbee Hall has given valuable assistance to the aged, the children,the handicapped, and the growing number of Asian immigrants in East London and in an era of monumental government bureaucracies, the personal social service of the university settlement has offered a humane alternative to the impersonal welfare practices of official administrators.

In concluding the discussion of the university settlement is well to note that in one sense the critics of Samuel Barnett's experiment in social integration were correct. The condition of the poor has not been improved by the permeation of the upper classes but rather by the massive assistance of the state. Nevertheless Toynbee Hall remains a tribute to Barnett's faith in the improvability of the human condition. For almost a century the university settlement has responded to the needs of East London and through its research and service, Toynbee Hall has contributed to the amelioration of human suffering.

EPILOGUE - FOOTNOTES

[1]Whitechapel had a significant Irish Catholoc as well as Jewish population. R.A. Woods, The Settlement Horizon (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1922), p. 29.

[2]Although the Guild was organized in accordance with Coit's own ethical system, the nucleus of the Guild was a group of college men who resided in a tenement house. Like Toynbee Hall, the Guild provided educational and social activities for the children and young adults of the area. Charles Stover, "The Neighborhood Guild in New York" in F.C. Montague, Arnold Toynbee (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1889), pp. 66-68.

[3]Although Oxford House was similar to Toynbee Hall in many of its essential features, there were significant differences between these early settlements. Oxford House residents were all professed Churchmen who worked in close association with the neighboring parishes. The Bethnal Green settlement placed less importance on university extension programs and was less venturesome in labor politics than its neighbor. Donald O. Wagner, The Church of England and Social Reform Since 1854. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930), p. 85.

[4]E.J. Urwick, "The Settlement Movement", Quarterly Review, Vol. 222 (1914): 218.

[5]Rev. Brooke Lambert, "Jacob's Answer to Esau's Cry", Contemporary Review, Vol. 46 (1884): 381.

[6]The non-sectarian Women's University Settlement in Southwark was founded in 1887, and in 1890 Mansfield House in Canning Town was established under Congregational leadership. The same year University Hall was opened by Mrs. Humphrey Ward under Unitarian auspices; Bermondsey House in 1891 was under Weslyan leadership. Newman House, a Roman Catholic institution, was established in the same year. Browning Hall was another Congregational settlement and Cambridge House was Church of England.

[7]E.J. Urwick, "The Settlement Ideal", Charity Organisation Review, Vol. XI n.s. (1902); 119.

[8]Urwick, "The Settlement Ideal", p. 121.

Epilogue - Footnotes (cont)

[9]Uriwck, "The Settlement Ideal", p. 121.

[10]Ibid., p. 125.

[11]Urwick, "The Settlement Movement", pp. 221-223.

[12]Memorandum, May 1913, Greater London Record Office and Library, Toynbee Hall Papers, p. 1.

[13]Ibid., p. 14

[14]Ibid., p. 12. In an effort to solve the difficulties of Toynbee Hall, Mrs. Barnett offered to return to the Warden's Lodge and quietly help restore the confidence of subscribers. (Her offer was not accepted.) Henrietta Barnett to Lord Milner, September 20, 1913, Greater London Record Office and Library, Toynbee Hall Papers.

[15]"From Oxford to Whitecahpel", The Spectator, Vol. 58 (1884): 79-80.

[16]George Lansbury, My Life (London: Constable and Co. Ltd., 1928), p. 131.

[17]Urwick, "The Settlement Movement", p. 220.

[18]J. Gorst, "Settlements in England and America" in The Universities and the Social Problem, ed. by J.M. Knapp (London: Rivington, Percival & Co., 1895), pp. 18-19.

[19]Philip Whitwell Wilson, "The Settlement Ideal" in The Religious Life of London, ed. by Richard Mudie-Smith (London; Hodder and Stoughton, 1904), pp. 298-299.

[20]Percy Ashley, "University Settlements in Great Britain," Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 4(1911): 199.

[21]Ibid., pp. 199-200.

[22]A.F. Young and E.T. Ashton, British Social Work in the Nineteenth Century (London; Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1956), p. 234.

[23]Kathleen Woodroofe, From Charity to Social Work (London; Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968), pp. 74, 73.

Epilogue - Footnotes (cont)

[24]Madeline Rooff, Voluntary Societies and Social Policy (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957), p. 11.

Selected Bibliography

Primary Sources

Manuscripts

Greater London Record Office and Library. Samuel Barnett Papers.

_____. Toynbee Hall Papers.

Lambeth Palace Library. Archives, Canon Barnett Letter File.

_____. John Richard Green Letter File.

_____. Tail Papers - Official Letters, London.

_____. Arnold Toynbee Letter File.

London School of Economics, Archives, William Beveridge Papers.

_____. Octavia Hill Letters.

Newspapers

East London Observer, March 31,1866, September 22, 1866, February 13, 27, 1869, March 13, 1869.

The Times (London), February 9,11, 1886, July 6, 1886, January 27, 1888, September 19, 1888, January 21, 1889, December 1, 1890.

Westminster Gazette, September 20, 1895, August 1, 1902, June 18, 19, 1913.

Reports

Charity Organisation Society. Reports of the Council and District Committees. 1875. London: Central Office, 1876.

The Poor Law Board. Nineteenth Annual Report. 34. Session 5 February - 21 August, 1867.

Selected Bibliography (cont)

_____. Twentieth Annual Report. 33. Session 19 November 1867 - 31 July, 1868.

Universities's Settlement in East London. First Annual Report. Oxford: Universities' Settlement in East London, 1885.

_____. Second Annual Report. 1886.

_____. Fourth Annual Report. 1888.

_____. Fifth Annual Report. London: Penny & Hull, 1889.

_____. Sixth Annual Report. 1890.

_____. Seventh Annual Report. 1891.

_____. Eighth Annual Report. 1892.

_____. Ninth Annual Report. 1893.

_____. Fifteenth Annual Report. London: Universities' Settlement in East London, 1899.

_____. Twenty-Second Annual Report. 1906.

Sermons, Notes, Memoranda

Barnett, Samuel Augustus. "Class Relations in East London". A sermon preached at Carfax Church, Oxford University, June 22, 1889.

_____. Notes of an address given to a gathering at Toynbee Hall, June, 1889.

_____. Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, June 15, 1884.

Lambert, Rev. Brooke. "Seven Sermons on Pauperism". Preached at St. Marks, Whitechapel. London: H. Sotheran & Co., 1870.

Selected Bibliography (cont)

Toynbee Hall. "Memorandum", May, 1913.

The Universities' Settlement in East London. Memorandum and Articles of Association. Oxford, 1886.

Articles and Books

Adderly, James. In Slums and Society. London: T. Fisher Unwin Ltd., 1916.

Ashbee, C.R. The Building of Thelma. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1910.

Barnett, Henrietta Octavia. "The Beginning of Toynbee Hall". The Nineteenth Century. 53 (1903): 306-14.

_____. Canon Barnett His Life Work and Friends. 2 vols. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1919.

Barnett, Samuel Augustus. "Charity Clearing House". The Newberry House Magazine. 6 (1892): 513-18.

_____. "Charity Up-to-Date". Contemporary Review.101 (1912): 225-31.

_____. "Charity Versus Outdoor Relief." The Nineteenth Century. 46 (1899): 818-26.

_____. "A Democratic Church". Contemporary Review. 46 (1884): 673-81.

_____. "Distress in East London". The Nineteenth Century. 20 (1886): 678-92.

_____. "A Friendly Criticism of the C.O.S." Charity Organisation Review. 11 (1895): 338-72.

_____. "Great Cities and Social Reform". The Nineteenth Century. 14 (1883): 810-18.

_____. "The Housing Problem". The Nineteenth Century. 49 (1901): 794-804.

_____. "Our Present Discontents". The Nineteenth Century. 73 (1913): 328-37.

Selected Bibliography (cont)

_____. "Poor Law Reform". Contemporary Review. 63 (1893): 322-31.

_____. "Poor Law Reform". Contemporary Review. 94 (1909): 563-69.

_____. "Poverty, its Cause and its Cure". Progress. 2 (1907): 155-61.

_____. "Practicable Socialism". The Nineteenth Century 13 (1883): 554-60.

_____. "The Press and Charitable Funds". The Independent Review. 9 (1906): 64-69.

_____. Religion and Politics. London: Wells Gardner, Darton and Co., Ltd., 1911.

_____. Religion and Progress. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1907.

_____. "The Religion of the People". The Hibbert Journal. 5 (Oct. 1906-July 1907): 879-92.

_____. "The Religious Difficulty". The Independent Review. 8 (Sept. 1906-Mar. 1906): 252-60.

_____. "A Scheme for the Unemployed". The Nineteenth Century. 24 (1888): 753-63.

_____. "Sensationalism in Social Reform". The Nineteenth Century. 19 (1886): 280-90.

_____. The Service of God. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1897.

_____. "Sixty Years' Progress". Sunday Magazine. 27 (1898): 848-51.

_____. "Social Reform". The Independent Review 1 (Oct. 1903-Jan. 1904): 28-38.

_____. "Twenty-Five Years of East London", Contemporary Review. 74 (1898): 280-289.

_____. "The Unemployed". Fortnightly Review 60 (1893): 741-49.

_____. "The Universities and the Poor". The Nineteenth Century. 15 (1884): 255-61.

Selected Bibliography (cont)

_____. "University Settlements". The Nineteenth Century. 38 (1895): 1015-24.

_____. "University Settlements". The University Review. 1 (1905): 129-42.

_____. Vision and Service. London: Hazell, Watson and Viney Ltd., 1917.

_____. "The Ways of 'Settlements' and of 'Missions'". The Nineteenth Century. 42 (1897): 975-84.

_____. Worship and Work. selected and edited by his wife. Letchworth: Garden City Press Ltd., 1913.

Barnett, S.A. and H.O. Practicable Socialism. London: Longmans, Green Co., 1895.

_____. Towards Social Reform. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1909.

Bell, George M., ed. Social Services. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1908.

Blackley, W.L. "Mr. Chamberlain's Pension Scheme". Contemporary Review. 61 (1892): 382-96.

_____. "National Insurance: A Cheap, Practical, and Popular Means Of Abolishing the Poor Rates". The Nineteenth Century. 41 (1878): 834-54.

Blathwayt, Raymond. "Religion and the Working Class. A Talk with Canon Barnett". The Treasury. 8 (1907): 337-40.

Booth, Charles. "Condition and Occupations of the People of East London and Hackney". Royal Statistical Society Journal. 51 (1888): 276-309.

_____. "Enumeration and Classification of Paupers and State Pensions for the Aged." Royal Statistical Society Journal. 54. (1891): 600-43.

_____. Labour and Life of the People. Vol. I - East London. ed. by Charles Booth. 3rd. edition. London: Williams and Norgate, 1891.

Bradley, A.C., ed. Philosophical Remains of Richard Lewis Nettleship. London: Macmillan & co. Ltd., 1901.

Bryce, James. "John Richard Green. In Memoriam." Macmillan's Magazine. 48 (1883): 59-74.

Selected Bibliography (cont)

Chamberlain, Joseph. "Labourers' and Artisans' Dwellings". Fortnightly Review. 40 (N.S. 34) (1883): 761-76.

_____. "Old Age Pensions". The National Review. 18 (1892): 721-39.

Dent, J.M. Memoirs 1849-1926. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1928.

Ebor, Cosmo. "Samuel Augustus Barnett: Some Lessons of his Life". Charity Organisation Review. 34 (1913): 352-57.

Farnell, Lewis Richard. An Oxonian Looks Back. London: M. Hopkinson Ltd., 1934.

"From Oxford to Whitechapel." The Spectator. 58 (1885): 79-80.

Gell, Phillip Lyttleton. "John Richard Green". Fortnightly Review.39 (N.S. 33) (1883): 734-47.

George, Henry. Progress and Poverty. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1882.

Green, John Richard. Letters of John Richard Green. Edited by Leslie Stephen. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1901.

_____. Stray Studies. second series. London: Macmillan and Co., 1903.

_____. Stray Studies from England and Italy. London: Macmillan & Co., 1876.

"John Richard Green". The Church Quarterly. 54 (1902): 282-95.

Hales, Samuel. "Toynbee Hall" Library.5 (1893): 177-89.

Haw, George, ed., Christianity and the Working Classes. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1906.

Haweis, H.R. "John Richard Green". Contemporary Review. 43 (1883): 732-46.

Hill, Octavia. "Cottage Property in London". Fortnightly Review. 6 (1866): 681-87.

_____. Early Ideals. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1928.

_____. "The Future of Our Commons". Fortnightly Review. 28 (N.S. 22) (1877): 631-41.

Selected Bibliography (cont)

_____. House Property and Its Management. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1921.

_____. Letters on Housing 1864-1911. London: The Adelphi Book Shop, 1933.

_____. "A Word on Good Citizenship". Fortnightly Review. 26 (N.S. (1876): 321-25.

"In Memoriam. Canon Barnett". The Toynbee Record. 25 (1913): 145-49.

Lambert, Rev. Brooke. "Charity: Its Aims and Means". Contemporary Review. 23 (1873-74): 462-76.

_____. "Esau's Cry". Contemporary Review. 44. (1883): 916-23.

_____. "Jacob's Answer to Esau's Cry". Contemporary Review. 46 (1884): 373-82.

Lansbury, George. My Life. London: Constable and Co. Ltd., 1928.

Laurie, A.P. Pictures and Politics. London: International Publishing Co., 1934.

Leighton, Sir Baldwyn. Letters and Other Writings of the late Edward Denison. London: Richard Bentley and Son, 1875.

Living in Stepney; Past, Present and Future. Compiled by the Stepney Reconstruction Group, Toynbee Hall. London: Pilot Press Ltd., 1945.

Loch, C.S. "Charitable Provision for the Aged". Charity Organisation Review. 8 (1885): 337-47.

_____. Charity Organisation. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1890.

_____. Charity and Social Life. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1910.

_____. "Fallacies About Old Age Pensions". The Nineteenth Century. 44 (1898): 807-18.

_____. How to Help Cases of Distress. London: Longmans & Co., 1895.

Selected Bibliography (cont)

_____. "In Memoriam. Miss Octavia Hill". Reprinted by permission from the Charity Organisation Review for the Associated Charities of Boston, 1913. pp. 1-15.

_____. Old Age Pensions and Pauperism. London: S. Sconnenschein & Co., 1892.

Macan, R.W. Religious Changes in Oxford During the Last Fifty Years. London: Oxford University Press, 1918.

Maurice, Frederick, ed. The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.

Mearns, Rev. A. "Outcast London". Contemporary Review. 44 (1883): 924-33.

Nettleship, Richard. "Professor T.H. Green. In Memoriam". Contemporary Review. 41 (1882): 857-77.

Nunn, Thomas Hancock. "Canon Barnett". One and All. August, 1913, pp. 143-44.

Pattison, Mark. Memoirs. London: Macmillan and Co., 1885.

Rogers, Frederick. Labour Life and Literature. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1913.

Salisbury, Marquis. "Labourers' and Artisans' Dwellings". The National Review. 2 (1883-84): 301-16.

"Settlements and the Social Problem". Progress. 19 (1925): 7-10.

Sims, G.R. How the Poor Live. London: Chatto & Windus, 1898.

Snell, Henry. Men, Movements and Myself. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1936.

Spender, Harold. "Barnett the Sower". Contemporary Review. 115 (1919): 31-37.

Stead, Francis Herbert. How Old Age Pensions Began to Be. London: Methuen & Co., 1910.

Toynbee, Arnold. Lectures on the Industrial Revolution. 2nd edition. London: Rivingtons, 1887.

_____. Lectures on the Industrial Revolution in England. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902.

Selected Bibliography (cont)

_____. Lectures on the Industrial Revolution. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1908.

_____. "Progress and Poverty" A Criticism of Mr. George. London: K. Paul, Trench & Co., 1884.

Toynbee, Gertrude, ed. Reminiscences and Letters of Joseph and Arnold Toynbee. London: Henry J. Glaisher, 1910.

Urwick, E.J. "The Settlement Ideal". Charity Organisation Review.11 (1902): 119-27.

_____. "The Settlement Movement". Quarterly Review. 222 (1914): 216-24.

Webb, Beatrice. My Apprenticeship. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1926.

"The Work of Canon Barnett". Progress. 8 (1913): 142-46.

Selected Bibliography (cont)

Secondary Sources

Abbott, Evelyn and Campbell, Lewis. The Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1897.

Addison, William George. J.R. Green. London: London Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1946.

Aitken, Francis W. Canon Barnett. London: W. Partridge & Co., 1902.

Alden, Percy. "The Problem of East London". in The Religious Life of London. ed. by Richard Mudie-Smith. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904.

Ashley, Percy. "University Settlements in Great Britain". Harvard Theological Review. 4 (1911): 175-203.

Bell, Enid Moberly. Octavia Hill. London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1943.

Besant, Walter. East London. New York: The Century Co., 1901.

Beveridge, Lord William. Power and Influence. New York: The Beechhurst Press, 1955.

_____. Voluntary Action. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1948.

Binyon, Gilbert. The Christian Socialist Movement. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1931.

Bisno, Herbert. The Philosophy of Social Work. Washington D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1952.

Bosanquet, Helen. Social Work in London 1869-1912. London: J. Murray, 1914.

Bourdillon, A.F.C., ed. Voluntary Social Services. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1945.

Bruno, Frank J. Trends in Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948.

Carpenter, Spencer Cecil. Church and People 1789-1889. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1937.

Chadwick, Owen. The Victorian Church. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Selected Bibliography (cont)

(Secondary Sources)

Clark G. Kitson. Churchmen and the Condition of England 1832-1885. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1973.

Cockburn, Jacqueline. "Octavia Hill". Quarterly Review. 272 (1939): 324-41.

Davies, John Llewellyn, ed., The Workingmen College London: Macmillan and Co., 1904.

Escott, T.H. Social Transformations of the Victorian Age. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1897.

Freeden, Michael. The New Liberalism. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Freeman, Arnold. Education Through Settlements. London: G. Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1919.

Glass, Ruth. "Urban Sociology in Great Britain: A Trend Report". Current Sociology. 4 (1955): 5-19.

Gray, B.K. and Hutchins, B.L., eds. Philanthropy and the State or Social Politics. London: P.S. King & Son, 1908.

Hamilton, Gordon. Theory and Practice of Social Case Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

Inglis, K.S. Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1963.

Gorst, J. "Settlements in England and America" in The Universities and the Social Problem. ed. by J.M. Knapp. London: Rivington, Percival & Co., 1895.

Lockhart, John Gilbert. Cosmo Gordon Lang. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1949.

Low, Sampson. A Handbook to the Charities of London. London: Sampson Low, Son and Marston, 1867.

McEntee, Georgiana Putnam. The Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927.

Mayo, Elton. The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization. Boston: Harvard University, 1945.

Montague, Francis C. Arnold Toynbee. Baltimore: John Hopkins University, 1889.

Selected Bibliography (cont)

(Sedondary Sources)

Mowat, C.L. The Charity Organisation Society. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1961.

Newman, R. "Work and Wages in East London Now and Twenty Years Ago." Charity Organisation Review. 3 (1887): 269-75.

Owen, David. English Philanthropy 1660-1960. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964.

Page, H.A. (H.A. Japp), Golden Lives. London: Strahan & Co., 1873.

Paine, Robert Treat. "Pauperism in Great Cities". Proceedings of the International Congress of Charities, Correction, and Philanthropy. Chicago, June 12, 1893.

Peck. W.G. The Social Implications of the Oxford Movement. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1933.

Pelling, Henry. Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian Britain. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1968.

Picht, Werner. Toynbee Hall and the Settlement Movement. London: G. Vell and Sons Ltd., 1914.

Pimlott, J.A.R. Toynbee Hall. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1935.

Pringle, J.C. "Methods of Social Work". Church Quarterly Review.88 (1919): 241-52.

_____. Social Work of the London Churches. London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1937.

Rae, John. Contemporary Socialism. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1891.

Raven, Charles E. Christian Socialism 1848-1854. London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., 1968.

Reason, W., ed. University and Social Settlements. London: Methuen & Co., 1898.

Richter, Melvin. The Politics of Conscience. T.H. Green and His Age. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Roberts, Robert Davis. Eighteen Years of University Extension. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891.

Selected Bibliography (cont)

(Secondary Sources)

Rooff, Madeline. Voluntary Societies and Social Policy. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1957.

Seaman, L.C.B. Victorian England. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1973.

Smith, Hubert Llewellyn. The History of East London. London: Macmillan and Co., 1939.

Wagner, Donald C. The Church of England and Social Reform Since 1854. New York: Columbia University Press, 1930.

Washburn, Henry Bradford. "The Religious Motive in Philanthropy." Pennsylvania University Boardman Lectureship in Christian Ethics. No. 14. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931.

Wilson, Philip Whitwell. "The Settlement Ideal". in The Religious Life of London. ed., by Richard Mudie-Smith. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1940.

Witmer, Helen Leland. Social Work: An Analysis of a Social Institution. New York: Farrar & Rinehart Inc., 1942.

Wohl, Anthony S. "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London". International Review of Social History. 13 (1968): 189-245.

Wolfe, Willard. From Radicalism to Socialism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.

Woodroofe, Kathleen. From Charity to Social Work in England and the U.S. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

Woods, R.A. The Poor in Great Cities. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1895.

_____. The Settlement Horizon. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1922.

Young, A.F. and Ashton, E.J. British Social Work in the Nineteenth Century. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1956.