Abstract

This thesis is a study of the changing role which Toynbee Hall, the first university settlement, played in East London between 1884 and 1914. The first chapter presents a brief biography of Samuel Augustus Barnett, the founder and first warden of the settlement, and analyzes his social thought in relation to the beliefs which were current in Britain during the period. The second chapter discusses the founding of the settlement, its organizational structure and the aims which underlay its early work. The third chapter, concentrating on three residents, C.R. Ashbee, W.H. Beveridge and T. Ldmond Harvey, shows the way in which subsequent settlement workers reformulated these aims in accordance with their own social and economic views. The subsequent chapters discuss the accomplishments of the settlement in various fields. The fourth shows that Toynbee Hall's educational program, which was largely an attempt to work out Matthew Arnold's theory of culture, left little impact on the life of East London. The fifth chapter discusses the settlement residents' ineffectual attempts to establish contact with working men's organizations. The final chapter seeks to demonstrate that in the field of philanthropy the residents were far more successful than in any other sphere in adapting the settlement to changing social thought.
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Introduction

A study of Toynbee Hall between 1884 and 1914 helps to illuminate various aspects of the social history of the period. The settlement is significant first because it attempted to work out the social and economic doctrines of the 1880's. Embodying the beliefs held by a significant proportion of informed opinion, it was hailed at its foundation as one of the most constructive attempts to deal with the novel problems created by urbanization and industrialization. An analysis of the activities undertaken by the residents in the fields of education and philanthropy thus reveals the extent to which the social thought of the time proved relevant to the problems actually confronting the society. Toynbee Hall can also be viewed as a force in the history of social reform in Britain. Although members of an institution established with precise goals, the residents sought to remain responsive to the changing climate of social opinion. Moreover, as the settlement workers gradually recognized the futility of some of the settlement's activities, they themselves helped to shape the social thought of the period. By 1914 many of the residents were involved in types of social work which the founders would have considered inappropriate to a university settlement. The history of the changing concerns of the residents demonstrates the way in which the nation's ideas about the nature of poverty in an industrial society slowly developed.
Two works have generally been regarded as the standard sources for Toynbee Hall. Both, however, are inadequate. Henrietta Barnett's two-volume biography of Canon Barnett, while incorporating a considerable amount of primary material, is highly subjective. Mrs. Barnett misconstrued large aspects of the life of her husband and many of her facts are inaccurate. Most seriously, she edited Barnett's personal letters. Some of her revisions were relatively minor. She substituted complete words for his abbreviations, corrected his punctuation and spelling, and added a few words and phrases for clarity. It is more significant, however, that she rewrote many sentences and frequently combined several letters into one, thus obliterating a sense of the progression of Barnett's thought. The collection of his letters, formerly in the possession of his nephew, Mr. S.H.G. Barnett, and now available at the Greater London County Record Office, permits the historian to revise the portrait which she presents.

Toynbee Hall: Fifty Years of Social Progress, 1884 - 1934 by J.A.R. Pimlott is not as deliberately misleading as Henrietta Barnett's work. It suffers, however, from reliance both on her biography and on the settlement's annual reports and monthly journal, The Toynbee Hall Record. Perhaps because the latter portray only the public side of the settlement's life, Pimlott does not consider either the way in which the residents actually viewed their work or the
impact which it had on East London. It is hoped that by making use of the private papers of such important residents as C.R. Ashbee, Canon Barnett, W.H. Beveridge and T.L. Harvey it will be possible to present a more realistic impression of the history of Toynbee Hall.
Chapter I: Canon Barnett

The period between 1880 and 1914 was marked by an increasing uneasiness among the wealthy in Britain about the gulf between the ideals and reality of their society. Samuel Augustus Barnett, the founder and first warden of Toynbee Hall, both sharpened this sense of moral obligation and provided ways and means of expressing it. He was born in Bristol on February 8, 1844, the son of a manufacturer with strong Conservative views. The only document from his childhood is a journal he wrote during a trip with his father to Ireland where he was impressed with everything but one town: "in truth it was not much to see being one long irregular street and mostly poor inhabitants." Educated during most of his youth at home, he entered Wadham College, Oxford, in September 1862; according to his wife, his family chose the college because of its Tory and evangelical views. Although he later glorified the life of an Oxford student his own university career was undistinguished. He made no lasting friends, took little part in any of the societies he would eventually praise and graduated in 1865 with a second class degree. He spent the following two years as a master at Winchester College, thus gaining his only experience of a public school, the

frame of reference for a large part of Toynbee Hall as for other late Victorian middle-class institutions.

On 6 April 1867, Barnett sailed for New York, beginning a trip of nine months through post-Civil War America. Many years later he encouraged his brother to allow his son to take a similar trip: "I remember how it stirred me. The language, the social interests at once appeal to an Englishman and Uely will find himself a social reformer without knowing it." He also reputedly said: "Born and nurtured in an atmosphere of Toryism what I saw and heard there in America knocked all the Toryism out of me." But his journal belies these recollections. His first concern in every city was with the standard of comfort, of food and of service in the hotel. The journal began: "With the 'Scotia' as a ship and a steamer no fault can be found, but it is a question whether the accommodation and comfort are such as might be expected by passengers paying £31." Upon landing in Baltimore he wrote: "I stayed at the 'Eutaw House' not a good one, the so-called gentleman's parlour being totally unfit to sit in." In St. Louis, many months

5. Unless otherwise noted, the subsequent quotations in this and the following two chapters are from S.A. Barnett, Journal of Trip to America, 6 April 1867 - 13 July 1867. (The individual entries are not dated.)
later, he complained: "With no fat animals, no good butchers & no good means of cooking & a barbarous fashion of serving, it is almost impossible to enjoy dinner in American hotels." A perceptive sight-seer, he scrupulously recorded the details of everything he saw and heard, but women's dresses, the architecture, the layout of the streets and the nature of the foliage interested him as much as social questions. He was unimpressed by the one philanthropist he met and his conscience does not appear to have been touched by his first sight of a New York slum. The wealth of a few individuals, subsequently the object of his scorn, merely filled him with awe. Only the certitude with which he pronounced his opinions and his consistently moralizing tone foreshadow the man he was to become.

From the beginning to the end of the trip he retained the views of a Tory, determined to preserve social prerogatives. Henrietta Barnett later claimed that "in spite of his inherited principles against slavery, he had always an apologetic appreciation of the dignified generous-hearted free-living ex-slave owners of the Southern States." Barnett himself would not have agreed. Horrified by the violence he found throughout the South, he concluded: "The Southern is a would-be aristocracy ... very far removed from

my idea of a polished gentleman." But the manner in which he expressed his criticism also shows that he was not attracted by the northern ideals of democracy or equality. Irish waiters in New York had "too independent an air." The American constitution "fails to govern men & men in their present state must he governed." He noted the disparity between his thought and that of a Radical lawyer: "his starting point being that every man had a right to vote, mine being that it is also first every man's duty to make himself fit to vote, we of course could not agree." In general, the Republican Party was composed "of men with extravagant ideas." Ten years later Barnett's foremost aim had become to encourage contact between the different social classes. But he now noted that the mixing of the classes in a Boston high school had "no evil effects for the meeting takes place simply at school, I doubt though whether this system could produce the 'gentleman' wh. our public schools ... produce." In Ottawa he approved of the "free intercourse but not familiarity between the classes."

What Barnett did imbibe in America was racial prejudice. He agreed with teachers who considered it impossible to educate Negro children: "the black waiter when he is doing nothing has as vacant, inane a look as it is possible for any animal to have." After visiting a Negro school in Baltimore, he slightly revised this
conclusion, but he continued to be disturbed by the physical appearance of the Negro: "The great objection to the negro is his odour & that some insist may be removed by cleanliness; his face, I grant, may be improved by education but whether the awkward gait is as some doctors say the result of incest, I much doubt."

He was more approving of the Florida Negroes because they were "more childish & good humoured ... A great number seemed to hang abt the hotels & were ready to do anything for anybody." His final comment was in New Orleans: "The boy nigger seems bright enough & has a most intelligent look, but he is not the father of the man; the chin & forehead of the man nigger recede, the nose flattens out, & the lips protrude & nothing of intelligence is left."

It was during the next period in his life that Barnett developed into a social reformer. On 22 December 1867, five months after his return, he was ordained deacon and immediately assumed the position of curate to the Reverend W.H. Fremantle (later the Dean of Ripon) at St. Mary's, Bryanston Square, Marylebone. Two years later Fremantle established the first district committee of the newly formed Charity Organisation Society. This prominent society embodied mid-Victorian social and economic ideals. Viewing poverty as the direct result of individual failing, it condemned indiscriminate almsgiving and sought to control both Poor Law relief and private charity in order to prevent the demoralization
of the poor. Members were instructed to categorize each applicant for relief as either 'deserving' or 'undeserving' and to aid him only in ways which would enable him to become self-reliant.

Fremantle turned his parish funds over to the St. Mary's Relief Committee which in turn was guided by the Marylebone Committee of the C.O.S. The liaison between the two committees was Octavia Hill. A determined and dogmatic woman, she campaigned for the preservation of open spaces in London and laid much of the groundwork for the National Trust. Her fame, however, rests on her somewhat dubious experiments in working-class housing. She converted slum tenements in Marylebone into blocks of self-supporting model dwellings which in turn served as the means by which she attempted to improve the character of her working-class tenants. Believing that "the people's homes are bad because they are badly built and arranged; they are tenfold worse because the tenants' habits and lives are what they are", she introduced improvements in the


8. O. Hill, Homes of the London Poor (London, 1883), 68-75.
dwellings only when the tenants evinced a corresponding desire to reform themselves; a corps of volunteer lady rent collectors, whom she carefully supervised, provided the necessary friendship, encouragement and instruction. By the turn of the century it had become fashionable to challenge her rigidly individualistic views, but in the 1860's and 1870's she was revered as a courageous and imaginative social reformer. Barnett, who worked with her closely for a number of years in the administration of Marylebone's relief, was greatly impressed.

On 8 February 1873, Octavia Hill's sister Miranda wrote to a friend:

Did I tell you that Mr. Barnett, the curate who has worked with Octavia so admirably in St. Mary's, has just married Miss Henrietta Rowland, one of Octavia's best workers; and now they are going to live and work in the East End? Octavia thinks it such a splendid thing to have such a man at work down there - she thinks it quite a nucleus of fresh life; and Mrs. Barnett, of whom Octavia is very fond, is admirably fitted for the work too. The wedding was very touching - the church was crowded with poor people; even the galleries were filled with them. 9

Henrietta Octavia Weston Barnett was born in 1851 to a wealthy family in Clapham. While still a young woman she became one of Octavia Hill's volunteers, investigating the credentials of applicants.

for relief. As the wife of Samuel Barnett, she was known as an arrogant, opinionated woman who freely displayed her contempt for such various categories of men as employers of sweated labour, slum landlords, Jews and pacifists. Although Townbee Hall residents frequently ridiculed her inflated sense of propriety and her self-righteousness, they grudgingly acknowledged their respect for her determination and energy. She was the first nominated woman Guardian in 1875 and served as manager of a district school from 1875 to 1897, as a member of the Departmental Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Poor Law Schools in 1894 and as honorary secretary of the State Children's Association which she helped to found. She also organized committees for sending ailing children to the country, for visiting the inmates of workhouses and for aiding young girls to obtain positions as servants in respectable households. In addition, she executed many of her husband's schemes and, most impressively of all, founded the Hampstead Garden Suburb. In 1917 she was awarded an O.B.E. and in 1924 she was made a Dame of the Order. Capable, masterful and intolerant, she was the adored wife of a gentle and religious man.

One month after their marriage, the Barnettts moved to East London where Barnett became vicar of St. Jude's, Whitechapel. Mrs. Barnett later described the way in which her husband obtained this position:
As ... we were determined to go to East London, she set to work to get us there. She wrote to Mr. Edmund Holland who had followed the steps of Mr. Edward Jenison who in 1869 had gone to live as a layman in Stepney. Dr. Jackson was then Bishop of London, and when the living at St. Jude's, Whitechapel, fell vacant, Mr. Edmund Holland asked that it should be offered to Mr. Barnett, who would then marry a lady who had long wished to take up work in East London.

The Bishop's letter to Mr. Barnett was kind and fatherly, the letter of a general sending a young captain to a difficult outpost.

'Do not hurry in your decision' - he wrote, 'it is the worst parish in my diocese, inhabited mainly by a criminal population, and one which has, I fear, been much corrupted by doles.'

This version of the Bishop's letter has been frequently quoted.

But in fact his actual letters were somewhat different:

St. Jude's Whitechapel is about to be vacant, its Incumbent Mr. Haines having accepted another living. It is perhaps the worst district in London containing (with a certain number of respectable and well to do tradesmen) a large population of Jews and thieves. Would you be disposed to undertake the difficult chores? The population is about 6000. The income was made up lately by the Eccles. Comm. to about 300. but the present Incumbent - not very wisely I think - has abolished the pew rents, very small no doubt but formerly considerable. There is a house. I do not press for an answer as I shall like you to see the place. There is a great though difficult work to be done there.

The Bishop's second letter was no more encouraging:

I am glad that you have decided to accept St. Jude's. It is, no doubt, a work of self denial, but undertaken in X't's spirit it will not be left without a blessing. Some of Mr. Haines' difficulties he will not leave behind him; but plenty remain. May God enable & bless you.12

Mrs. Barnett's amended version of the letter is a definite improvement. A "criminal population" was a more judicious way of describing Barnett's parishioners than "Jews and thieves." The Bishop's criticism of the practice of abolishing pew rents showed little understanding of the aims of those members of the clergy concerned about social inequality. On the other hand, had he in fact stated that the people of Whitechapel had been demoralized by indiscriminate almsgiving he would have justified the Barnett's almost singleminded concern with this problem during their first years at St. Jude's.

The Bishop's curt and unsympathetic letters, however, perhaps best illustrate the attitude of the upper classes toward a man determined to live in East London at the time. St. Jude's stood at the centre of an area filled with common lodging houses, inhabited by many who either stole or lived on charity. Barnett's parishioners included only a few of the thrifty, independent, upwardly mobile working man on whom most reformers pinned their hopes. Official statistics underlined the popular impression of

---

Whitechapel as one of the poorest and most overcrowded districts of London. Of the district’s approximately 76,000 inhabitants, 3,554 were dependent on some form of out-door relief in 1870.

The Medical Inspector for Whitechapel reported in 1873 that one-fifth of the district’s children died before they were one year old and one-third before they were five. In a section of the district close to St. Jude’s, moreover, the rate of mortality of children under five was as high as 61.1%. These figures were in large part attributed to poor housing conditions. The Inspector noted in particular that he had found one man, six women and three children sleeping in a room measuring 12 x 9 x 7 feet on Goulston Street, a few blocks from St. Jude’s in 1871. As late as 1891, over 44% per-cent of the population lived in tenements of one or two rooms. It should therefore perhaps have come as no surprise when Charles Booth discovered in 1889 that almost 40% of Whitechapel’s inhabitants were living beneath the "poverty line". When the Barnetts arrived at St. Jude’s, philanthropists and journalists

---

had barely begun to discover East London, and the clinics, wash-
houses, schools, and libraries which they could later point to as
the tangible results of their work did not yet exist. Some twenty
years later social work in the East End had become an acceptable
occupation for a university graduate and even alunming had become
a fashionable pastime. But in 1872 Barnett's decision to reside
in Whitechapel was an aberrant step for a man of his social standing
to take.

As Vicar of St. Jude's, Barnett's primary goal was to
attract his parishioners to the church. The impersonality of
London, the physical segregation of its classes and the absence of
strong social pressures, the same social conditions in feet which
later impelled Barnett to found Toynbee Hall, had weakened the
force of religion in East London. In 1880 Walsham How, the bishop
responsible for East London, remarked that East Enders thought of
religion 'as belonging to a wholly different class from themselves.'
Barnett's first parishioners were no exception. Placing the blame
partly on the Church of England's indifference to contemporary
social problems, he served from the late 1870's as a prominent
member of the Church Reform Union. This organization was formed
to bring the Church into closer harmony with the needs of the day,

19. Walsham How in Church Congress Report (1880), 94-95, quoted
in K.S. Inglis, Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian
hoping thereby to resist the pressures for disestablishment as well.

On the council of the Union Barnett worked closely with Philip Lyttelton Gell, the first chairman of the council of Toynbee Hall, and with T.H. Green and Arnold Toynbee, both of whom strongly influenced the foundation and early form of the settlement.

In both his private correspondence and public articles during the period Barnett frequently expressed his contempt for the vast majority of the members of his profession, criticizing their blindness to the nation's problems and their ostentatiously wealthy style of life.

In Whitechapel, Barnett attempted to act according to his image of the model clergyman. Finding St. Jude's in a moribund condition, he repaired the church, reorganized a choir and reopened the church schools. In 1889 he wrote to his brother: "There is grt. nonsense talked abt. peoples dislike of church. They have no dislike, they simply feel that church as it is does not help them." In an attempt to adapt the church to the demands of East

---


21. E.g. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 6 May 1893.


23. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 16 November 1889.
Enders, he modified the form of the Sunday services, instituted a "Worship Hour" and a children's service, organized oratorio concerts, hung pictures throughout the church and commissioned William Morris to redecorate it. On a wider scale, the Barnettts tried to fill the gap in moral and cultural leadership which they believed that the flight of the wealthy from West London had left. Barnett campaigned for better housing and for a more rigid enforcement of sanitary regulations and urged local authorities to build libraries, playgrounds, washhouses and dispensaries. He also served as a member of the Whitechapel Board of Guardians and organized local branches of the Metropolitan Association forbefriending Young Servants, the Sanitary Aid Committee and the Children's Country Holidays Fund. Together the Barnettts established a church library, held annual art exhibitions and brought University Extension lectures within the reach of members of the community. In addition they ran a boys' club with eighty-five members by 1883 and a men's club comprising 180 members, and offered their support to local cooperative societies. In order to "bring about that intercourse between classes which is one of the objects of our life here," they entertained their neighbours and friends from the West End together and took groups of their parishioners on

26. Ibid.
excursions to the universities or to the homes of the wealthy.

In many ways Toynbee Hall was an outgrowth of this work begun in the early 1870's; one theme of subsequent chapters will therefore be the gradual broadening of the settlement's efforts from the traditional nineteenth-century parish activities to those more in harmony with the needs of the early-twentieth century.

But these various activities made little impact on the size of Barnett's congregation. In 1878 he thus considered abandoning the work and transferring to a country parish; two years later he applied for a position in a slightly more prosperous section of East London where his parishioners might be more receptive to his teaching. Although he remained vicar of St. Jude's for many years, he grew no more confident about his effectiveness. Nine years after he settled in Whitechapel, Barnett reported: "In this parish strive as we may ... we are fain to confess that the Church services exercise no influence comparable to the work they involve." The following year he was even more disheartened:

"Year after year I have expressed my hope of what the Church might be in the parish, and year after year I have to confess disappointment. This year there is no success to chronicle which seems success

27. O.H. to S.A.B., 9 October 1878.
28. O.H. to H.O.B., 1 August 1880; O.H. to S.A.B., 6 August 1880.
when placed alongside of what might have been." In one sense the settlement movement, begun the same year, resulted from this sense of frustration; it had become clear to Barnett that East London could not be transformed by a few isolated clergymen.

Octavia Hill watched closely over the work of the Barnetts during their early years in Whitechapel, receiving copies of at least some of Barnett's sermons and of his parish reports and assisting him in numerous ways. When the Barnetts took a vacation in 1874, she superintended the alterations of the church. At other times she raised money for Barnett's parish activities and contributed a small sum from her own fund, helped to popularize some of his new ideas for social reform and suggested the names of volunteers who could assist the Barnetts in East London. Her letters show, moreover, that she was confident that Barnett was carrying out her own ideals in Whitechapel. She frequently sought his advice and worked with him closely both on C.O.S. affairs and in the campaign to preserve open spaces. As she wrote to Henrietta

30. St. Jude's, Report for Year 1883-84, 7.
31. O.H. to H.O.B., 26 December 1873; O.H. to S.A.B., 9 October 1878.
32. O.H. to S.A.B., 11 September 1874, 12 October 1874.
33. O.H. to H.O.B., 19 December 1875, 7 May 1876, 24 October 1876, 9 December 1876; O.H. to S.A.B., 25 January 1875.
34. O.H. to H.O.B., 20 November 1875, 19 December 1875, 6 March 1876, 24 October 1876, 5 February 1878, 18 February 1876, 11 March 1876, 20 June 1879; O.H. to S.A.B., 3 January 1873, 12 November 1875, 27 December 1875, 23 March 1877, 4 April 1877, 21 April 1877, 24 April 1877, 4 March 1878, 7 January 1879.
Barnett in 1876, she felt that "we are one utterly and entirely
in what we aim at."

The first major concern of the Barnetts outside the church
clearly reflected Octavia Hill's inspiration. In March 1875 she
wrote to a friend:

What do you think that the Barnetts' great
news was? That they had had a legacy, and
wanted to spend it in rebuilding their worst
court irrespective of making it pay ... Of
course I said by all means; and now, if they
can but purchase, I think it will give new
life to their future there, to see some
tangible and radical reform actually achieved.36

Within two years the Barnetts had bought an old building on
Wentworth street, near St. Jude's, and, with the help of friends,
had converted it into a model dwelling supervised by a group of
lady rent collectors. A more ambitious enterprise with which the
Barnetts were involved was the East End Dwellings Company founded
in 1883. In her testimony before the Royal Commission on the
Housing of the Working Classes Octavia Hill described the company
as the only one in London which was building houses in the manner
she recommended and identified Barnett, though not a director,
as "the heart and soul of the undertaking." Following her lead,

35. O.H. to H.O.B., 10 July 1876.
36. O.H. to Mrs. Nassau Senior, 28 March 1875, Octavia Hill, ed.
       Maurice, 324-25.
38. P.P. 1884-85, XXX Royal Commission on the Housing of the
       Working Classes, Q. 8849, 8850.
the Company provided accommodation primarily for workers who had
been removed from their homes by the slum clearance program of the
Metropolitan Board of Works, a segment of the working class too
poor to qualify for rooms in the buildings of the more famous
Peabody Trust. "Our intention," Barnett wrote, "is to build for the
unskilled labourers, the day workers at the docks, and the many
men and women who live by casual employment." Octavia Hill laid
down explicit guidelines for the construction of such model blocks:
"Instead of building what the promoters who come from comfortable
houses think ought to be wanted, they should build what really is
wanted, and what is essential to health ... Primarily, I should
not carry the water and the drains all over the place, I think
that is ridiculous. If you have water on every floor that is quite
sufficient for working people." The first block erected was called
the Katherine Buildings, situated near the Katherine Docks. It
was a five story building of one-room, "uniform, cell-like" apart-
ments, leading off from narrow passages and containing neither a
sink nor a toilet. Barnett himself found the buildings too austere

39. Beatrice Webb, My Apprenticeship (Harmondsworth, Middlesex,
1938), 310.
41. Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, Q. 8852.
42. B. Webb, Apprenticeship, 311-12. In 1885 The Link, edited by
Annie Besant and William Stead, called attention to the unsatis-
factory sanitary arrangements of the buildings. The
journal claimed that many members of one family had become ill
because their one window opened close to a sewerage trough and
urged the East 2nd Dwellings Company to close "this fever trap".
(The Link, No. 28 (11 August 1885), 4.)
and a few years after their opening remarked with approval that a subsequent venture, College Buildings, had been built "with some regard to beauty." But he remained as convinced as his mentor of the value of lady rent-collectors. Like Barnett's more famous enterprise, Toynbee Hall, this housing scheme was based partly on his belief in the beneficent potentialities of personal contact between the classes. The women who toured the buildings collecting the rent each week were expected to form friendships with the tenants, encouraging them to strive for self improvement and promoting social harmony. In 1882 he wrote: "Personally I am strongly of the opinion that houses so let can only be managed by collectors who make themselves friends of the tenant ... It is a cheering thought that in a few years ... by the relation of landlords and tenants friendships will grow, between all classes, between rich and poor, between Jews and Gentiles." It is unlikely, however, that this end was ever accomplished. Looking back on her experiences as a rent collector under Barnett, Margaret Nevinson later recalled primarily the ruses her tenants employed to avoid paying rent and concluded that "the greatest asset for a rent collector was a hard heart." Another rent collector was Beatrice Potter (Webb), who

43. St. Jude's, Report for Year 1886-87, 12.
44. St. Jude's, Report for Year 1882-83, 15.
undertook the work in order to gain first-hand experience of the way in which the poor lived. She replaced her sister Kate who had been trained by Octavia Hill and had worked in Whitechapel for eight years. Beatrice Potter was at first filled with awe at the idea that "the character of the community will depend on our personal influence." Three months later, however, she classified her tenants as a "rough lot - the aborigines of the East End."

After working as a rent collector for a year and a half she concluded: "The lady collectors are an altogether superficial thing. Undoubtedly their gentleness and kindness bring light into many homes: but what are they in face of this collective brutality, heaped up together in infectious contact, adding to each other's dirt, physical and moral?" Even Barnett could feel little sympathy for the new tenants: "I took a party of neighbours round Toynbee Hall ... There are few workmen who rise above the ruts, they were a body fr. the new dwelling ... & there was not one who was a bit superior to the gang wh. one meets at an at home." In October, 1888, Barnett

46. Kate Potter (Courtney), "Diary" (1875). Courtney Collection, L.S.E.; O.H. to H.O.B., 20 November 1875.
47. B. Webb, Apprenticeship, 314.
48. Ibid.
49. B. Webb, Apprenticeship, 325.
50. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 24 November 1884.
was writing optimistically about "a big building scheme ... I think we may try to rebuild the whole back quarter." But by then his interest in housing schemes had begun to diminish. Moreover, during the early 1890's the East End Dwellings Company was unable to find a sufficient number of tenants and was temporarily forced to circumscribe its activities.

Toynbee Hall was the second and far more significant undertaking in Whitechapel for which Barnett was largely responsible. He first presented his proposal for a university settlement in a speech which he delivered at St. John's College, Oxford, in November 1883. The settlement was opened in December 1884 with Barnett as its first warden. In August 1893 Barnett was appointed Canon of Bristol where, according to his wife, he took an interest in many of the projects of social reform which concerned him in Whitechapel. However, he remained warden of Toynbee Hall and devoted his primary attention to the settlement's activities. He resided in Bristol only during the months between July and September, the period during which the settlement was largely inactive. In 1906, when he became Canon of Westminster, he resigned the wardenship of Toynbee Hall and assumed the more honorary position of president.

From then on, he made only occasional trips to Whitechapel although he remained in close contact with the institutions and organizations he had founded there. He died in Hove on 17 June 1913. "It is like him," his successor as warden of Toynbee Hall remarked two days later, "to have chosen to have the funeral service in Whitechapel and not in the Abbey."

Barnett followed the example of Octavia Hill in his early social and economic thought as in his first major venture in the field of social reform. He began philanthropic work as a firm adherent of the Charity Organisation Society, sharing the widely-held belief of his day that indiscriminate almsgiving was a significant cause of social distress. As he later wrote, he "came ... to East London determined to war against a system of relief which ignorantly cherished by the poor, meant ruin to their possibilities of living an independent and satisfying life." He agreed that the only valid form of charity involved personal service and a continuing commitment to the poor, a belief which encouraged the C.O.S. to develop a professional case-work service and which motivated Barnett to found Toynbee Hall. As a leading member of the Whitechapel Board of Guardians between 1874 and 1903, Barnett helped to adapt

53. T.E.H. to Anna M. Harvey, 19 June 1913.
its policy to the tenets of the C.O.S. He also played an active role in the local committee of the C.O.S., through which he administered his own parish funds. In 1884 he veered slightly from Charity Organisation guidelines when, "in response to some pressure" he instituted penny dinners for the children of the parish. But the experiment was not a success: "After three months ... the children ceased to come in sufficient numbers to pay expenses, some because they got tired of novelty, some because they did not like the food, some because they were too poor. These last were all visited, and it was found that in most cases their poverty was due to vice or to, for the time, irremediable causes. A dinner in these cases would be cruelty."

In fact, Barnett had some rational basis for his strong aversion to the current practice of indiscriminate almsgiving. According to Mrs. Barnett, when they first moved to Whitechapel, their parishioners expected to be given money for food and backed their demands by intimidation. People who had been refused doles frequently organised a crowd to hurl objects at the Barnett's home. But Barnett's preoccupation with pauperism made him almost oblivious to poverty. In speeches, articles and sermons he reserved his most

55. S.A.B. to n.n. /Parishioners/, 7 March 1873.
57. H.O. Barnett, Barnett, I, 84.
vituperative language for charitable agencies which administered funds without adequate investigation rather than for the conditions he discovered in East London. The sensational accounts of the sufferings of the poor which led to these relief funds were equally at fault; the wealthy should carefully investigate the problems they hoped to solve instead of succumbing to "folly and passion."

In the winter of 1885-6, when a Mansion House committee collected £70,000 and distributed it without thoroughly checking the credentials of the recipients, Barnett won the praises of the Charity Organisation Review for a letter to the press in which he claimed that the Fund had "developed the causes of poverty."

The leaders of the Fund were "irresponsible agitators," whose actions had shown "that although poverty is great ... yet this poverty being due to weakness of mind and body, is out of the reach of such careless remedies as relief funds." Years later Barnett included Mansion House Funds "among the possible winter horrors of East London."

60. Charity Organisation Review (March 1886), 99-100; see also S.A. Barnett; "Relief Funds and the Poor", Nineteenth Century (November 1886), reprinted in H.O. and S.A. Barnett, Practicable Socialism, 58-77.
61. St. Jude's, Report for Year 1885-86, 27.
Viewing personal failure as a dominant cause of poverty, Barnett placed little faith in the curative powers of social legislation. Through his actions as a social reformer he hoped to enable other members of the upper classes to help the poor improve their own characters rather than to reorganize society. His goal was charity, not social justice. In fact, in the field of housing, Barnett never fully supported legislative intervention, perhaps because it was here that Octavia hill's influence had been strongest.

During the 1870's and 1880's he campaigned for a more rigid enforcement of sanitary regulations and urged the Metropolitan Board of Works to take action under the Cross Acts by buying dilapidated property in working-class districts and organizing rebuilding schemes. But he never questioned the greater value of personal influence.

When the Royal Commission on the housing of the Working Classes was being established under Charles Dilke he confided to his brother: "Monday I went to speak at a Dwellings meeting & said the cuckoo cry. It is not legislation, it is individual interest will put things right ... Shaftesbury said in private he thought the Royal Commission on Dwellings a mistake. It is so." In his annual parish reports, even while praising the model blocks erected by the East and Dwellings Company, he wrote: "As long as there are

---

63. S.A.B. to F.O.B., n.d. (A note in H.O. Barnett's handwriting states that the letter was written in 1889).
people content to live as pigs, houses will become sties. It is
the people and not laws which make homes, and before the people
can do so they must gain the taste and acquire the sense of dignity
which will refuse to occupy a house where a home is impossible."
Like Octavia Hill, even after the concept of municipal housing had
been widely accepted, he attacked the London County Council for
undertaking to build dwellings for the poor.

Nevertheless, in fields other than housing, Barnett's
views did not remain stationary. His social thought has frequently
been misunderstood by historians who believe that it can be gleaned
from one representative speech. In fact, he continually reformulated
his ideas in order to bring them into harmony with contemporary
social needs. A man strongly influenced by tradition and history,
he was also determined to understand and to further social change.

64. St. Jude's, Report for Year 1884-85, 13.
65. S.A.B. to F.C.B., 9 December 1899; S.A. Barnett, "The Housing
   Problem," Nineteenth Century and After (November 1901),
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66. For example, K.S. Inglis wrote: "Samuel Barnett ... hoped
to see social harmony, but not social equality. He wished to
see social justice done through sanitary reforms, relief work
(under severe discipline) for the unemployed, public feeling
of school children, garden suburbs and universal old-age
pensions." (Churches and the Working Classes, 171.) It is
true that from the standpoint of the mid-twentieth century
few of these measures can be considered radical. Between 1884
and 1914, however, the merits of free meals for school children,
relief work for the unemployed and universal old age pensions
were frequently debated. By tracing Barnett's changing views
toward just these measures we can discern the alteration of
his social ideas.
His unwillingness to commit himself to any ideology or programme and his attempts to avoid, in so far as possible institutional affiliations, made him continually open to new ideas. Between 1880 and 1914 thoughtful Englishmen attempted to redefine the nature of poverty in an industrial society and to reassess the roles which public and private philanthropy should play in its treatment. By the outbreak of the First World War a large percentage of social reformers, ceasing to view individual moral failure as a primary cause of social distress, had recognized the need for a redistribution of material wealth. The period which opened with the views of the Charity Organisation Society in the ascendency closed with the passage of a series of legislative acts, establishing a precedent for widespread state control. Because Barnett felt an obligation to question his own beliefs in the light of his experience in East London and of the insights of a younger generation, he was able to provide continual leadership throughout the period.

The first sign that Barnett had modified his views appeared in 1883 when he published an article entitled "Practicable Socialism". The title itself was significant: the experience of working in East London for ten years had made Barnett a Christian Socialist. Although he had succeeded in reducing the amount of doles distributed in the community, poverty remained.

We find ourselves face to face with the labourer earning 20s. a week. He has but one room for himself, his wife and their family ... By self-denial, by abstinence from drink, by daily toil, he and his wife
are able to feed and clothe the children. Pleasure for him and for them is impossible ... holidays are out of the question ... The future does not attract his gaze ... In the labourer's future there are only the workhouse and the grave.67

Even a skilled artisan earning 40s. a week could not save enough to use his few leisure hours productively, to obtain adequate medical treatment or to provide for his old age. While rejecting revolution as a solution, Barnett endorsed an active state policy through which the condition of the people could be immediately improved. The government should provide free libraries and parks, an improved and extended system of education and, most significantly, free medical treatment and old age pensions. Mrs. Barnett later claimed that her husband's support of state-provided pensions followed naturally from his work in connection with the Tower Hamlets Pension Fund founded in East London in 1877. But she overlooked the extent to which "Practicable Socialism" marked a turning point in Barnett's views. The Tower Hamlets Fund was a private association managed for many years by Albert Pell, a leader of the Charity Organisation Society and considered by the society as an embodiment of its views. Barnett, however, was now departing from the C.O.S. by insisting that private

philanthropy was not capable of dealing with the problem of poverty. As T.S. and E.B. Simey wrote, public old age pensions were "the symbol of the most urgent moral dilemma of the Victorian era; namely, the reconciliation of collective action designed to remedy social abuses, and promote the well-being of the individual, with the maintenance and encouragement of personal responsibility and initiative." Moreover, while the Tower Hamlets Fund distributed pensions only to men and women who had "given evidence of character and thrift" in this article Barnett urged that both pensions and medical treatment be awarded without character tests. In 1908 he explained why he made this second and equally important break with Charity Organisation dogma:

Difficulties soon arose in the administration of the Tower Hamlets Pension Fund. What was thrift? Was a man to be refused a pension because he had spent his savings in helping a friend or a child? Was a widow to be refused because her husband had been careless? ... Investigation broke down, as indeed, it must always break down when inquiry provokes a battle of wits, and when the standards of right differ in the various classes of society.

Writing to his brother about a provident dispensary which was to be established in East London in 1889, Barnett commented:

71. op. cit., 176.
Once I was keen for such a place & now I see how necessary it is to provide a means by which people may get good advice but the whole system is such a muddle. Who is to get the advice free & who is to pay. All these supplementary charities must vanish some day - medical & educational relief will have to be free. There is no law to discriminate desert except the law which lets the weakest starve & that law set in humanity contradicts. Free schools, Free Doctors, Free Books & Free Church are plainly in my platform.

In a speech which he delivered in Bristol in 1894, Barnett stressed that there "is something humiliating - a loss of self respect in submitting character to another's judgment."

Barnett's changing relationships to both the Whitechapel Board of Guardians and the Charity Organisation Society illustrate the ways in which he continued to develop the ideas embodied in this article. His break with the Society was a gradual process begun in 1884. In that year his wife read a paper at a meeting of the C.O.S. in which, in her self-righteous manner, she scolded
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72. C.A.B. to F.G.B., n.d. (a note in R.O. Barnett's writing states that the letter was written in 1889).
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the members for their indifference to broad social issues. Without questioning the cardinal doctrines of the society she urged members to break out of their narrow paths and consider positive ways in which they might help the poor even as they rightly restricted pecuniary aid. The same week Barnett wrote to his brother: "She read her earnest soul into chaff of the clumsy methods of the COS. I think her words will do good in rousing the society to a fuller appreciation of its work. It is useless to go on today with the methods of 15 years ago."

In 1886, when Barnett proposed that Boards of Guardians establish farm colonies to train certain groups of unemployed men, the divergence of his thought from that of C.O.S. leaders became more pronounced. In an article published in November 1886 he discussed in considerable detail the reasons why a public authority rather than a voluntary association should assume responsibility for these colonies. He realized that the consensus was that Poor Law relief should serve primarily as a deterrent and that the

75. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 1 March 1884.
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Guardians should therefore administer only such institutions as workhouses where conditions were as unpleasant as possible. However, education could serve as a deterrent; residence at a farm colony would not be degrading for the unemployed but the loneliness of the life and the hard work required would render the colony unattractive to "loafers" and "idlers." Although private agencies were as a rule more flexible and humane and could more easily attract enthusiastic volunteers, Poor Law authorities alone had the power and resources necessary to carry through the programme on the scale required.

Shortly after the publication of the article, C.S. Loch, the secretary and guiding spirit of the Society, expressed his disapproval in his diary. Barnett's article was "a strong medley":

he argues as if he shared the views both of the Poor Law Commissioners & Carlyle. Really he accepts neither. They were not for the extension of State training farms. He was for a strict government of the people & in the last resort the whip for the backs of the lazy or the pistol.78

The fact that Loch referred to Barnett's proposal again and again in his diary can perhaps be taken as evidence of his dismay at the heresy of a man whom he had formerly considered one of his closest colleagues. Barnett was also aware that his espousal of labour

78. C.S. Loch, "Diary", 3 November 1888. Goldsmith's Library, Senate House, University of London.
79. op. cit., 1 October 1888, 23 October 1888,
colonies marked a new stage in his relationship with the C.O.S. His only reference to the Society in a letter to his brother in 1888 was couched in more caustic terms than he had formerly used: "Wednesday I went to meet a lot of COS folk re training Farm. They were just impossible - refusing to do anything except to clothe themselves in the dirty rags of their own rightness. They were on true principles, the public could subscribe or not, they did not care, they wld not hold meetings &c, &c."

The following year the Charity Organisation Review printed a hostile review of Practicable Socialism, a collection of essays by the Barnettts in which, as in the article by the same title, they advocated state interference in a number of areas. From then on, Barnett's articles and speeches, formerly held up as models of good sense, were consistently criticized in the pages of the Review. In an article in 1892 Barnett attacked the Society for its lack of vision while reasserting his faith in the value of private philanthropy. An article published in the following year contained stronger criticism. Barnett condemned those reformers who "neglect the fact that wages ... cannot provide sufficient income to make a man independent in sickness and old age, and regardless of this

80. S.A.B. to F.G.B., n.d. (H.O. Barnett, however, dates the letter 1888 (Barnett, II, 265).)
81. Charity Organisation Review (May 1889), 197-220.
fact ... demand a reform which will make relief impossible for any one desiring to retain his self respect. They ask for prohibition of all out-relief, penal labour for the able-bodied and the cellular system for casuals." The Charity Organisation Review issued a vituperative reply.

During the same winter Barnett again found himself in conflict with C.O.S. leaders over the question of farm colonies. A Toynbee Hall committee, comprised of Barnett and another Toynbee Hall resident, representatives of both trade unions and the C.O.S., and other prominent men interested in the question of unemployment, had investigated the condition of the unemployed in London and had concluded that, although there was no general distress throughout the city, an abnormal number of dock laborers found themselves out of work as a result of the decasualization of the docks. The committee's report, written by Barnett and Sidney Webb, recommended that a scheme providing relief work be instituted whereby authorities could test the capabilities of this new group of unemployed and decide which men should receive further, more adequate aid.

A Mansion House Conference, including the majority of the members

84. Charity Organisation Review (April 1893), 149-53.
of the Toynbee Hall committee, subsequently obtained 40 acres of
waste land near Stratford and offered a fortnight's digging work
under strict supervision to unemployed dock laborers of East London.
Of a total of 716 applicants, 130 were eventually chosen for the
work. Although the Conference followed C.O.S. principles in selecting
the men, the Society withdrew from the management committee, on
which two of its leaders had served, when it refused to employ
the men only on piece-work. As the C.O.S. council wrote in its
annual report, "The Society could not ... be a party to any scheme
for increasing the habitual dependence of the poor." Once again a
project proposed by Barnett had been condemned by the C.O.S.
In the spring of 1894 Barnett organized a protest among
C.O.S. members when the governing council censured the Woolwich
district committee for endorsing old age pensions. Led by C.H.
Grinling, a former resident of Toynbee Hall and a friend of Barnett,
this branch had departed from the practices of the majority of
C.O.S. committees by becoming a center for social reform in the
community. Barnett urged that men be allowed to work with the
Society in organizing charity even if they condemned its individual-
istic principles.
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At a meeting of the C.O.S. Council in July, 1895, Barnett read a paper which he modestly called "A Friendly Criticism of the Charity Organisation Society." In fact, it was a scathing attack. He accused the society of narrowness and inflexibility, of turning its eyes "back to the past," and of being out of sympathy with "the forces that are shaping the time." Although the Society's method of dealing with individual cases of poverty was faultless, its "sort of panic at the suggestion of socialism" had alienated both the poor it attempted to aid and the wealthy it sought to enlist. By clinging to the "economic theories or the lady bountiful practices" of twenty-five years earlier, members had allowed the principles of the past to become the dogmas of the present. Moreover, the Society judged individual applicants for relief according to the standards of middle-class morality. Although Barnett himself never gained an understanding of the attitudes or ways of thought of the poor, like other middle-class men who have lived in a working-class community, he had realized that thrift was not necessarily a virtue. A man earning less than £1 a week could not save if he provided for his family, educated his children and enjoyed the few pleasures he could afford. More seriously, because the Society

90. Reprinted in Charity Organisation Review (August 1895), 338-44.
exalted the ideal of private charity, it condemned municipally admin-
istered farm colonies, state pensions and free medical aid, 94
Barnett's own timid concessions to socialism. He concluded that the Society, formerly the center of progressive thought and action, was not "stranded in shoals from which the tide has ebbed."

The speech had a strong effect on the Society. Its increasing alienation from the thought of the day could not be ignored when one of its earliest and most influential supporters defected. The discussion following the speech thus became a debate on the ideals and practices of the Society. Barnett was defended staunchly by C.H. Grinling and, more hesitantly, by Cokran, a Unitarian minister who had worked with him in Whitechapel. C.E. Maurice, the brother-in-law of Octavia Hill, upheld individualism. F.D. Occatta, the leading Jewish philanthropist and the one liaison between the C.O.S. and the Jewish Board of Guardians took a middle position, opposing all proposals for public pensions and employment by the state but endorsing free medical treatment. Another member expressed surprise that a man he had regarded as "the apostle of individual service" was now preaching against it. But the strongest reaction was that

94. Cit., 343.
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of C.S. Loch who reviled in a long, derisive speech. Interpreting Barnett's address as a personal attack on himself, he reasserted the C.S. verities, denounced every suggestion for state interference, and bitterly accused Barnett of desiring only to "be in harmony with the current philanthropic opinion of the moment or perhaps just a few seconds ahead of it."

The impact of Barnett's speech on the broader world of social reform was perhaps even greater. From the early 1880's until the First World War, informed opinion in Britain was divided between the individualism of the Charity Organisation Society and the collectivism of the growing number of socialist groups. Barnett's speech was generally interpreted as a condemnation of the conservative forces. Beatrice Webb later claimed: "The break-away of Samuel and Henrietta Barnett ... from the narrow and continuously hardening dogma of the Charity Organisation Society sent a thrill through the philanthropic world of London ... They had discovered for themselves that there was a deeper and more continuous evil than unrestricted and unregulated charity, namely unrestricted and unregulated capitalism and landlordism."

Barnett's changing attitude toward the policies of the Whitechapel Board of Guardians also provides an example of the

alteration of his social and economic views, he served as a Guardian from 1874 to 1903 and as Chairman of the Board in 1892. At his death the Guardians praised "the earnestness with which he identified himself with the work of the Whitechapel Board, and with the policy of its administration." But in fact Barnett's record of loyalty to the Board was not impeccable.

Whitechapel was one of three East London "model" Poor Law Unions which rigidly restricted the distribution of out-door relief. This policy, adopted in 1870, represented the most orthodox adherence to the guidelines of the Charity Organisation Society. Believing that pauperism was the most serious social problem and that private philanthropy should therefore assume the leading role in social reform, the Guardians attempted to revert to the principles enunciated by the Poor Law Commissioners in 1834. They agreed that relief should not be given to able-bodied men outside the workhouse and that the conditions within the workhouse should be less pleasant than those of the lowest group of independent laborers. In accordance with the Goschen Minute of 1869, the Whitechapel Guardians divided
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all applicants for relief into two categories. The Board itself assumed responsibility only for the "undeserving" poor who were denied monetary relief and sent to a harshly administered workhouse. The local committee of the Charity Organization Society dealt with those men who were thought to be redeemable. In this way the Board reduced its expenditure on outdoor relief from £6,685 in 1870 to £729 in 1911. The number of men receiving this relief fell from 104
3,554 to 79.

This extreme policy of "strict administration" was not widely followed throughout the country. Although in accord with current economic thought and with the propaganda of the Charity Organization Society, it was adopted by no more than fifteen other Poor Law unions. Its most direct challenge, however, came at the turn of the century from the Poplar Board of Guardians, dominated by George Lansbury. The son of a railway engineer, Lansbury spent a large part of his working-class childhood in Whitechapel and became a leading politician in the East End. He entered politics in the

104. Whitechapel Union, Report for Year Ended March 1911, xix. It should be noted, however, that factors unique to Whitechapel contributed to the success of this policy. The period was marked by a large increase in the proportion of the district's Jewish residents, most of whom applied for relief to the Jewish Board of Guardians, a philanthropic association, rather than to the poor law authority. (Raymond Postgate, The Life of George Lansbury (London, 1951), 46; Second, Vol. XV, No. 3 (December, 1902), 3.)

1880’s as a liberal, serving as an assistant to J.A.M. MacDonald, a former Toynbee Hall resident, in the Bow and Bromley Liberal Association. However, like other working men at the time, he was increasingly attracted to socialism and in 1892 he joined the Social Democratic Federation. He is important in this study primarily because he is one of the few East Ender who has written an account of his experiences. In general, the role which settlement workers assumed in East London insulated them from the reactions of the people they hoped to serve. Although Lansbury cannot be considered a typical East Ender, his autobiography helps to reveal the gap between the intentions of middle-class reformers and the actual impact of their actions on the working-class community. His description of his activities as a member of the Poplar Board of Guardians is a convenient vantage point from which to view Barnett’s relationship to the Whitechapel Board.

Lansbury was elected to the Poplar Board in 1892. When the Local Government Act of 1894 removed financial qualifications for election as a Guardian, he was joined by a number of other socialist working men. Although this new group of Guardians did not constitute a majority, they were powerful enough to guide the Board’s policy. Lansbury, the leader of the group, later defined his goal:
From the first moment I determined to fight for one policy only, and that was decent treatment for the poor outside the workhouse, and hang the rates! ... I know people drink, gamble, and are often lazy. I also know that taken in the mass the poor are as decent as any other class, and so when I stood as a Guardian I took as my policy that no widow or orphan, no sick, infirm, or aged person should lack proper provision of the needs of life, and the able bodied should get work or maintenance.106

Official figures show that he was largely successful in fulfilling this aim. Between 1894 and 1904 the number of Poplar residents receiving in-door relief grew from 2,623 to 3,465 while the number awarded out-door relief increased from 2,295 to 3,677. During the same period, the cost of in-door relief rose from £34,698 to £60,142 and that of out-door relief from £12,395 to £24,399. Moreover, in the year ending March 1895, the expenditure on relief per head of population was 5s 3d in London as a whole and 6s 3d in Poplar; ten years later the per capita expenditure in London had risen less than 3d while that in Poplar had grown to 12s 2d.

By 1906, when the Local Government Board conducted an investigation into the activities of the Poplar Board, "Poplarism" had become a byword. To many socialists it was the symbol of the most humane and progressive Poor Law policy but to those politicians and social workers who had been accustomed to look to Whitechapel for a model it stood for a corrupt and dangerous system.

106. George Lansbury, My Life (London, 1928), 133.
Lansbury later claimed that the primary motivation for his work as a Guardian was his resentment of Barnett and his abhorrence of the philosophy which he believed Barnett represented:

When I was at Bow I was asked by my branch of the SDF to stand as a guardian; my mind instantly went back to my early life in Whitechapel, and I remembered how heartless and how brutal in its effect on the life of the poor was the Charity Organisation policy of men like Canon Barnett and Mr. Vallance, the expert clerk to the Whitechapel Board. I remembered, because my mother was always doing little things for the poor who lived all around us; every Sunday a couple of dinners for an old couple living in a slum went from our dinner-table. My wife's mother also visited the sick and needy, and as we did this sort of work we came up against the malignant work of Mr. Vallance and the Board of Guardians. On at least two occasions these wretched experts in rate saving actually had the impudence to write and request us not to help certain people, as our assistance prevented the Guardians - the Guardians, mind you - from sending them to the workhouse, which in the judgment of these Christians was the best place for them.

I wrote Canon Barnett about these cases, and was told by him that "the workhouse was the best place for such people." This message and my later inquiries made me a most bitter enemy of the COS and its works. Consequently I jumped at the chance offered me to gain a seat on the Poplar Board of Guardians.¹⁰⁹

Although a revealing description of the working-class attitude toward the Charity Organisation Society, this quotation cannot be accepted as a definition of Barnett's final attitude toward relief. It is

¹⁰⁹. Lansbury, My Life, 132.
true that throughout his life he remained horrified by any practice which could be construed as "indiscriminate almsgiving" and that he therefore never endorsed Lansbury's generous policy. His only explicit reference to the Poplar Board occurred in a letter to his brother in December 1905: "Last night the Enquirers club dissected a Socialist Poplar Guardian. The position is tragic - The people are suffering & remedies make the suffering worse - Doubtless the cure is distant & the problem is to find innocuous palliatives."

Nevertheless, by the time Lansbury was elected a Guardian Barnett was no longer either an active or influential member of the Whitechapel Board. In January 1885, one month after the opening of Toynbee Hall and two years after the publication of his article entitled "Practicable Socialism", he told his brother that the new settlement "is absorbing us both. Old interests have to be cut. I can give neither time or thought to relief. The guardians I only visit at intervals." The following year he wrote in the annual report of St. Jude's: "I have ... continued to act as a guardian though I have not given the same attention to the duties as in former years."

It is likely that his imperfect record of attendance reflected not only the new burdens on his time but also his growing disillusionment.
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with many of the policies of the Whitechapel Board. In fact, by 1900, on matters other than the administration of relief, Barnett held views closer to those of Lansbury than to those of the majority of his fellow Guardians. Lansbury listed three major reforms of the Poplar Board for which he was in large part responsible: transforming the administration of the workhouse, remodelling a school for the children of paupers and founding an agricultural training colony. During the same years Barnett worked toward similar ends.

The substitution of a humanitarian administration for the former penal regime of the Poplar workhouse can be considered Lansbury's most significant achievement. His description of his first visit to the institution has frequently been quoted as an indictment of all late-nineteenth-century workhouses:

Going down the narrow lane, ringing the bell, while an official with a not too pleasant face looked through a grating to see who was there, and hearing his unpleasant voice... made it easy for me to understand why the poor dreaded and hated these places, and made me in a flash realize how all these prison or bastille sort of surroundings were organized for the purpose of making self-respecting, decent people endure any suffering rather than enter. It was not necessary to write up the words "abandon hope all ye who enter here." Officials, receiving ward, hard forms, whitewashed walls, keys dangling at the waist of those who spoke to you, huge books for name, history, etc., searching and then being stripped and bathed in a communal tub, and the final crowning indignity of being dressed in clothes which had been worn by lots of other people, hideous to look at, ill-fitting and coarse
... everything possible was done to inflict mental and moral degradation. Officers, both men and women, looked upon these people as a nuisance and treated them accordingly. Food was mainly skilly, bread, margarine, cheese, and hard, tough meat and vegetables, and occasionally doses of salted, dried fish. Clothing was of the usual workhouse variety, plenty of corduroy and blue cloth. It has been assumed that conditions in the Whitechapel workhouse were equally intolerable. Certainly the statement of accounts of the workhouse, listing the clothing and food which were provided, suggests that the life of an inmate was far from comfortable. Nevertheless, by the time Lansbury became a Guardian, the workhouse in Whitechapel had considerable advantages over the one controlled by the Poplar Board. In 1892 the Poplar institution was a "general mixed workhouse," in which, as Lansbury wrote, "sick and aged, mentally deficient, lunatics, babies and children, able-bodied and tramps [were] all herded together in one huge range of buildings." Twenty years earlier the Whitechapel workhouse at Baker's Row, which accommodated both the sick and the well, had been converted into an infirmary and the "able-bodied" poor had been transferred to the new South Grove Workhouse. As a member of the committee responsible

---

113. Lansbury, My Life, 135-36.
114. Postgate, Lansbury, 78.
for supervising the workhouse, Barnett was at first proud of what he considered its model administration. In 1893, he wrote: "the workhouse is in fact an industrial school wherein a man or woman may, if they (sic) will, learn what is useful." The Guardians' first reform was to substitute employment adapted to the capabilities of the inmates for such "useless and degrading" work as oakum picking and stone breaking. When Lansbury visited the Poplar workhouse, the men were still employed picking oakum and breaking stones.

It is true that the second major reform, the appointment of a "mental instructor" in 1882, for which Barnett has been given sole credit, had more dubious results. Mrs. Barnett claimed that the instructor "taught clumsy fingers to write, and clumsier brains to read and cypher." The Guardians themselves, however, had a different conception of his task. He was expected "to attend at the workhouse each week-day evening from half-past six till eight o'clock; the design being (notwithstanding the name given to the person employed) not so much to impart mental instruction as to exercise a salutary restraint upon conduct and conversation during the evening hours.

120. Lansbury, My Life, 136; Poplar Union, Report to the President of the Local Government Board on the Poplar Union, 13.
and to inspire the paupers to renewed efforts to obtain an honest livelihood." According to the instructor's own report, he read papers on such subjects as "self-reliance," "decision of character," "success and failure," "attention to details," "economy of time," "emigration," and "work and wages."

Nevertheless, after the turn of the century, Barnett took a position closer to that of Lansbury. Unlike Lansbury, he continued to believe that the conditions of men on relief should be somewhat less favorable than those of laborers who were able to support themselves. But he stressed far more strongly than before that the goal of the Guardians should be education and not deterrence. In 1908 he urged that all workhouses should be abolished and replaced by "Adult Industrial schools" where the unemployed would receive sufficient training to enable them to obtain permanent positions.

The Reformers of 1834 looked out on a society weakened by idleness, they faced a condition of things in which the chief thing wanted was energy and effort, and so they applied a stimulus.

The Reformers of to-day look out on a different society, and they look with other eyes. They see that the weak and the poor are not altogether suffering the penalty of their own faults. It is by others' neglect that uninhabitable houses have robbed them of strength, that wages do not provide means of living, and that education has not fitted them either to earn a livelihood or to enjoy life ...

The 'workhouse' as a place of punishment is thus out of place in modern society. It is not punishment, it is training which the people need.

123. Whitechapel Union, Report for Half-year ended Lady-Day 1882, 4-5.
The reforms of the South Grove Workhouse which had appeared progressive to Barnett in the early 1890's seemed by 1908 out of touch with social thought and social needs.

Another accomplishment of Lansbury as Guardian was the establishment of a training colony for the unemployed at Laindon, Essex.

He later wrote:

Canon Barnett, with a deputation of his expert friends, came to see and as usual to criticize... I was very much amused to find that Canon Barnett, because we were a Socialist Board, expected we would give visitors a swagger lunch—in those days we gave them bread and cheese and tea and coffee. The worthy Canon could not conceal his surprise or refrain from expressing it, saying how pleased he was to find we did not guzzle at the public expense.125

It is likely that Barnett did in fact believe that the conditions at the colony were far too comfortable. Nevertheless, he was more favorably impressed than Lansbury assumed. After his visit he reported to his brother: "On Monday some of us [from Toynbee Hall] went to inspect the first experiment of Guardians in putting paupers on the land. The experiment is as yet too young but it is very interesting." Moreover, it has been seen that as early as

126. Barnett frequently criticized the colony at Hollesley Bay, administered by Lansbury under the provisions of the Unemployed Workmen Act, on just this ground. (E.g. S.A. Barnett, "The Unemployed Workmen Act and Its Amendment" (originally published 1907), reprinted in H.O. and S.A. Barnett, *Towards Social Reform*, 91 - 92).
127. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 12 November 1904. In October 1903 the Toynbee Record had written: "The Poplar Guardians are moving the Local Government Board to allow them to open a farm workhouse. This proposal in one form or other is always appearing. It seems so obvious while land wants work and town people want both work and air that some plan should be adopted for taking people to the land." (*Record*, Vol. XVI, No. 1 (October 1903), 5).
1886 Barnett had recommended that Boards of Guardians establish training farms where some of the unemployed who would ordinarily be sent to the workhouse could learn agricultural skills. Two years later he had submitted the proposal both to a Mansion House Conference on the Condition of the Unemployed and to the Whitechapel Board of Guardians. It is likely that the reaction of the former helped to determine the response of Whitechapel's Guardians. In addition, statements of the Mansion House Conference illustrate, the extent to which Barnett's plan departed from current social and economic doctrine. According to a sub-committee which met to consider the question of agricultural colonies, "Mr. Barnett proposes, practically speaking, to make pauperism attractive ... would permit his employees to combine the liberty and self-respect of the independent labourer with the freedom from care and anxiety of the state pensioner."

Were Barnett's scheme enacted, it would "constitute a serious danger to the State and might even lead to the condition of affairs so disastrous to the independence and prosperity of the wage-earning classes from which we were rescued by the drastic legislation of 1834."

The sub-committee concluded that any experimental scheme of farm colonies would require conditions too comfortable for paupers and

must therefore be undertaken only by private charity. As Barnett wrote to his brother, the Mansion House Conference "knocked on the head my scheme for engaging the Poor Law to offer country work to the able bodied & will I expect suggest a voluntary scheme under a new society."

The Whitechapel Board debated the proposal for five years before taking a stand similar to that of the Mansion House Conference: the Board itself could not assume responsibility for an agricultural training colony. The Board agreed, however, to work in connection with the English Land Colonisation Society and in 1894 it sent six men from the workhouse to a farm administered by Walter Hazell in Langley, Essex. Of these six men, one failed to reach the farm, one left before his term expired and the remaining four received assistance in emigrating to New Zealand; the project was not subsequently repeated. Barnett was largely responsible for organizing the scheme, but in fact the action of the Whitechapel Board of Guardians was in a direction contrary to that which he had originally

130. Ibid.
encouraged. While he had hoped that a local governmental body would undertake an extensive program of training the unemployed, the other Guardians, remaining faithful to the principles which had guided them for twenty years, refused to accept such an incursion into the field of private philanthropy.

Lansbury's third major accomplishment, the reform of the local Poor Law school for orphans and the children of paupers, involved a confrontation between the Poplar and Whitechapel Boards. Since 1868 they had jointly administered the Forest Gate School. Henrietta Barnett served as a manager of the school from 1878 until 1897 and Samuel Barnett from 1877 to 1878 and between 1890 and 1893. In the mid-nineteenth century the establishment of large district schools had been viewed as a humane measure, enabling pauper children to be removed from workhouses and placed in healthier and more instructive surroundings. By the 1890's, however, the disadvantages of the institutions had become clear. A large majority had been constructed along the lines of military camps or prisons. Known popularly as "barrack schools," they housed large numbers of

133. P.P. 1896, XLIII Departmental Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Poor Law Schools in 1894, 4. Until 1877 Hackney had also shared responsibility for the management of the school.
children in buildings which seldom fulfilled basic sanitary requirements. Like the inmates of workhouses, the children were sternly disciplined and received little more than the most rudimentary education. The Forest Gate School, which accommodated about 700 children in the 1890's, provided one of the most notorious examples of this form of institution. In 1889 an epidemic of ophthalmia spread throughout the school. The following year twenty-six boys were killed when fire damaged the school. Three years later two children died during an outbreak of ptomaine poisoning.

In his autobiography, Lansbury wrote:

Another piece of work for which I was largely responsible was in connection with children ... Soon after my election to the Board I was elected as one of the managers of what was called the Forest Gate District School ... This school, when I first went to it, gave me another example of how good-intentioned people were able to treat themselves quite differently from those they considered pauper children. My first view of the school was a most disheartening one. The buildings are ... built on the barrack system - that is, long dormitories for scores of children to sleep in, very little accommodation for recreation, and at the time I first saw it the children were dressed in the old, hideous, Poor Law garb, corduroy and hard blue serge, and the girls with their hair almost shaved off. ... The food was quite coarse and I should think at times insufficient.

135. Departmental Committee, 4.
... Later on, we bought out Whitechapel and took over the school. ... It was no use our attempting to work in double harness with Whitechapel. That Board was a board which believed in making the Poor Law penal and of course we at Poplar had persuaded even our opponents that it was our duty as far as we could, and especially in regard to children, to humanize the business.

... No sooner did we get control of the school than we appointed a new superintendent and matron ... The Poplar Training School is known throughout the world ... 139

In certain respects, however, this account is misleading. The impetus for reform came from the managers of the school rather than from the Poplar Board. In 1894 they recommended that the school should be remodelled on the pattern of "cottage homes," thereby dividing the institution into smaller housing units. Because the percentage of children from Poplar attending the school was increasing, the Whitechapel Guardians insisted that the financial responsibilities of the two Boards should be reapportioned before any new buildings were erected. When the Local Government Board refused, the Whitechapel Guardians asked that the Forest Gate School District should be dissolved. An order was accordingly issued abolishing the district at the end of December 1897.

The Whitechapel Guardians then built a group of cottage homes at Grays, Essex, following ideals which were similar to those of Lansbury. The Board strove to "avoid an institutional appearance" in the buildings and to make "the everyday life of the children ... correspond to that of other children of the working class." Most significantly, the Guardians made arrangements for the students to attend the local elementary school.

It is also important to understand the role which the Barnetts played in the administration of the school. As a manager for almost twenty years, Mrs. Barnett in particular was proud of the ways in which she believed she had helped reform the institution. It is true that a pamphlet she wrote in 1886 suggests that her primary goal was to prepare the children to be obedient members of the lower classes. She hoped, for example, to teach the children "the lesson of care and thrift, for want of which so many, later on, help to swell the rates." But she also shared Lansbury's determination to humanize the administration of the school and to remove the institutional aura from its students' lives. Like him she urged that prizes be awarded, that opportunities for sports be increased and that the children be allowed more individuality.

141. Whitechapel Union, Report for Year ended Lady-Day 1899, xvi, xvii.
Moreover, she believed that the Forest State School was, by its very nature, an unsatisfactory institution. As a member of the Departmental Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Poor Law Schools between 1894 and 1896, she fought with her usual energy and tenacity for the abolition of all barrack schools. When their further development was prohibited in 1896, she helped to found the State Children's Association and, as its honorary secretary for many years, worked to secure better treatment for children who were wards of the state.

It can thus be seen that Barnett shared some of Lansbury's aims. In each instance Barnett or his wife not only worked in conjunction with the Whitechapel Board to improve the condition of "in-door paupers" but advocated reforms which went beyond the limit the other Guardians considered proper for governmental action. Barnett urged the Board to undertake extensive programs to educate the poor within their care, both in workhouses and in labor colonies, and he actively supported his wife's attempts to alter radically the care provided for pauper children. Clearly the gap between Lansbury's conception of the role of a Guardian and that of Barnett was still wide. Barnett's refusal to depart completely from the principle of deterrence showed that he still believed that poverty

was at least partially the result of individual failing. Moreover, adhering to the principles which had guided his action in the 1870's, Barnett was never able to support a system of generous outdoor relief. But he did realize increasingly that the strict administration of relief was not an end in itself. Like other thoughtful Englishmen during the period he sought more positive solutions involving the active intervention of both the local and national government.

The publication by the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws of utterly divergent minority and Majority Reports provided all social reformers with an opportunity to restate their social and economic views. Barnett's reaction to the reports, issued four years before his death, thus provides a useful summary of the relationship of his opinions to those current in Britain at the time. Characteristically, he assumed the role of a conciliator, stressing not the differences between the Reports but the strong points of each. The Minority Report, the Fabian blueprint for a welfare state, was correct in demanding that the Poor Law should be completely abolished. "There is no class of 'the poor' as there is a class of criminals. Poverty is not a crime ... Poverty is a loose and wide term, involving the greater number of the people." A general relief

authority, implying that the poor were morally at fault, placed a stigma on poverty. Therefore, the services formerly administered by Poor Law Guardians should be divided among the existing committees of local County or Borough Councils, giving, for example, public health committees jurisdiction over the sick, education committees control over the children of paupers and pension committees the responsibility for aiding the aged poor. "Some for health's sake need one treatment and some another. There is no reason in putting a few of them under a special law and calling them 'paupers'."

Similarly, the poor should no longer be divided into categories of deserving and undeserving, the latter being dealt with by a Poor Law authority, the former aided exclusively by voluntary agencies. But Barnett criticized the minority report for underestimating the value of private charity. If philanthropic organizations should no longer reign supreme within certain spheres, they nevertheless had a significant role to play in supplementing and humanizing the work of statutory agencies. Moreover, Barnett's partial endorsement of the principle of deterrence placed him on the side of the Majority Report, the embodiment of the C.O.S. point of view. The able-bodied unemployed who came under the jurisdiction of the state should not be granted aid which would enable them to reach the level of the lowest stratum of independent laborers.

By attempting to mediate between these irreconcilable reports, Barnett minimized the primary significance of the Minority Report, namely its unequivocal statement that poverty was caused by social and not moral factors. But this was not his intention. He believed that political controversy prevented men from solving crucial problems. The poor could not wait while social reformers debated their ultimate goals. Because the reports differed only in their underlying philosophies, the state could immediately enact the wide range of practical reforms they both endorsed. The reports agreed that labor bureaus and unemployment insurance should be established for able-bodied men and social services broadly extended for the sick, the aged, and the young. Barnett rightly feared that the advocates of the different reports would "fill the air with their cries while nothing is done for the poor." 148

Barnett's public speeches and articles provide only a partial impression of the change of his outlook. Perhaps because he generally wrote for an audience more conservative than himself, his vocabulary did not keep pace with his views. He continued to speak about actions which "demoralized" the poor, about the crucial need to "raise character", about "pauperism" as well as about "poverty", long after he had ceased to view personal failure as a significant cause of social distress. But his private correspondence shows that,

by the end of his life, Barnett was not only firmly committed to the principle of collectivism but stirred by the social, economic and political transformations he believed were taking place. He looked with enthusiasm on the assertions of the working men for independence and saw in their attempts to gain political power the only hope for the country. By the turn of the century he had begun to regard the Liberal Party as out of touch with the forces that were shaping the future. Writing to his brother in 1902 he remarked that Asquith was standing among "broken idols" and that the conviction of even the most progressive Liberal leader was "just a bit old fashioned". Two years later, he castigated the party for its lack of "vision". After a Liberal At Home in May 1905 he wrote: "The Liberal party has got old - men after men whom I had looked on for the future seemed suddenly to have become worn & weary. Asquith - Where are the young ones?" The first success of the Labour Party at the polls created a fresh, exciting feeling: "What a week! Has not the rising sun of Labour dispelled all wintry thoughts & made you feel young." The following week he continued to be exultant: "The joy & hope of victory still fill our minds" and he

150. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 13 March 1904.
laughed about the "the state of panic in the East End mind."

Even the increasingly violent agitations which occurred throughout all levels of society during his last years did not discourage him. His first comments, it is true, reflected great uneasiness: "How anxious is the world - As the preacher said this morning, some who are not young may live to see tyranny - civil war & anarchy."

But four months later he wrote: "There is so much moving & so little sign of guidance. But we must be thankful that there is movement, the guidance will come even if it leads thro. suffering." The following month he remarked on the pace with which events had moved during the past year, "It is startling, but as I say any movement is a sign of life, it is stagnation which is death." In one of his last letters, he wrote that social growth keeps us alive. It is hard always to be patient but unrest - strikes &c are a sign of life. The only real danger is apathy & indifference. Labour demands come from labour's increased capacity to enjoy." But above all Barnett felt that his generation could no longer either participate in or understand social movements. He increasingly believed that

155. S.A.B. to Loulou Barnett, 30 May 1912.
156. S.A.B. to Loulou Barnett, 13 June 1912.
age gave him less, not more, of a right to comment. The dominant
and encouraging aspect of the period seemed to him to be its growth
and ferment, and these only a young man could fully comprehend.

It was perhaps to be expected that by the 1890's Barnett's
relationship with Octavia Hill would be more distant than it had
been when he first arrived in Whitechapel. The first hint of their
estrangement came in 1884 when she threw her influence behind Oxford
House, a settlement inspired by Barnett but connected with the
Established Church, rather than behind Toynbee Hall. It is clear from
Barnett's letters after this date that he felt little of his former
respect for his first tutor in the field of social reform. In July
1886 he wrote to his brother: "On Thursday we went to an At Home
at 0. Hill's & met good folk who were a bit dull." In December
1897 he again commented on a meeting with Octavia Hill and her co-
workers: "Yesterday we called to congratulate 0 Hill on her 60th
birthday. We found the old group in the old surroundings aged &
not altered. She was very glad to see Jetta Henrietta Barnett &
we had some talk on the moral backwater. She fought for the good-
ness of the times but as Jetta shrewdly says her satisfaction is another
sign of the present stagnation." Six months later, Barnett wrote:

158. S.A.B. to F.C.B., 3 July 1886.
159. S.A.B. to F.C.B., 4 December 1897.
I went to a party at the Laurices & met the Octavia Hill gang - good folk - dowdy in appearance but pure in soul - I understood when I was with them how easily they might arouse anger & how their dress had become almost as a monks habit, something separating them from the world. It is hard to be in the world - to identify oneself with its spirit - to wash & anoint one's face with new fashions & yet not be of it. If half of us have to pray to be delivered from the spirit of evil, the other half have to pray to be delivered from the forms of good.160

Octavia Hill's letters to the Barnettts also reflect the growing coldness in their relationship. In place of her early letters, filled with details about her work and with advice about theirs, she now sent only infrequent, formal notes. In December 1889 she wrote to Henrietta Barnett: "We do indeed seem to see little of one another now ... I suppose these outward separations, & even differences of view if not ideal are appointed in life." In December 1905 she refused to become involved in the plans for the Hampstead Garden Suburb, then the center of Henrietta Barnett's concern. The following year she again alluded to the infrequency of their meetings and to the disparity between their ideas.

In one sense, however, Octavia Hill's influence did not decline. It is likely that she first showed Barnett the significance of the thought of F.D. Maurice and John Ruskin, two men who continued

161. O.H. to H.O.B., 20 December 1889.
163. O.H. to H.O.B., 6 December 1906.
to inspire him throughout his subsequent life. Despite his growing determination to help to transfer economic and political power to the poor, he shared their belief that it was far more important first to alter the basic values of society. It is often assumed that the nature of poverty was the main preoccupation of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries while the quality of leisure and mass culture in an urban and industrial society is a primary concern of the mid-twentieth. In fact, however, Barnett, following other Victorian reformers, considered the two problems to be interrelated. He sought to abolish poverty because the lives of the poor were flat, unproductive, stagnant and spiritually empty. Ignorant of the emotional and social compensations of the poor, he saw only the degradation poverty entailed. "People whose minds have been crushed under the

164. From the time she was seventeen Octavia Hill considered herself the disciple of Laurice and Ruskin, both of whom furthered her early career. She was secretary to classes which Laurice founded for working women in London and received his support when she undertook her first housing experiments. In 1855 she became one of Ruskin's art pupils. Ten years later he helped her buy three buildings in Marylebone which she then remodelled for working-class tenants. Her friendship with Ruskin ended in 1877 but she frequently acknowledged her debt to him. (E. Moberly Bell, Octavia Hill: A Biography (London, 1943)) Although Barnett's writings after he came to East London reflect the thought of Laurice and Ruskin, it is clear from the journal of his trip to America, written in 1867, that before he met Octavia Hill neither man had made a significant impact on him.
daily anxiety about the daily bread have little thought for any object but 'how to live,' and thus they are apt to lose the power of vision." At the same time he criticized the wealthy in Britain because their lack of ideals, of creative energy and of human sympathy prevented social and economic reform. Moreover, his only reservation about the economic and political changes of his last years was that they were not accompanied by a corresponding spiritual transformation. Like the romantics he condemned the material progress which had destroyed what was basic and eternal in human experience and he feared that members of the working class, by concentrating solely on their own material advancement, might not prove better rulers than their predecessors. Viewing the use of leisure as an index of the condition of a society, he was continually disheartened by the activities chosen by the poor. A walk through Hampstead Heath on Easter weekend showed him "the emptiness of the people - Their unconsciousness of that in which they live & move & have their being."

Barnett was convinced that the spread of education could re-invigorate society. Like F.D. Maurice, he insisted that the nation's primary goal should be to enable the members of all classes to obtain

166. S.A.B. to R.G.E., 1 April 1899.
a liberal education through which they could receive the humanistic ideals of the older universities. Using a phrase of Maurice, he spoke of education providing the "means of life, not of livelihood". The purpose of education was not to promote social mobility but rather to increase an individual's intellectual curiosity and enrich his personal life. A few months before his death Barnett stated his creed in a letter to his nephew: "You hear all our news & know what puzzling times we are passing through - I find more & more reason to believe in Liberalism - not a party that is wh. holds a certain creed but in the principles whose aim is the development of freedom ... The one thing wh. Liberals can compel is education because till people are educated they cannot be free or use freedom." Although it was important to strive for social justice, the spiritual development which education alone permitted was far more important.

Barnett was particularly concerned with adult education. From the early 1870's he was a leader of the University Extension Movement and in the first years of the twentieth century he actively supported the founders of the workers' educational Association. His interest in adult education, like that of other nineteenth-century reformers, led to a desire to alter the purpose and organization of the older universities. Between 1906 and 1913, he advocated the

appointment of a Royal Commission on Oxford and Cambridge and helped such men as J.H. Beveridge, R.H. Tawney, Richard Livingstone and A.E. Zimmern initiate a reform movement at Oxford. When the Labour Party first gained representation in the House of Commons he wrote that its primary goal should be to open the way "for an alliance between knowledge and industry, between the Universities and the Labour Party." After observing a meeting between a group of Oxford graduates and a Labour MP during the same year he wrote to his brother: "It was interesting to see the respective strength & weakness of knowledge & labour. Knowledge so clear sighted & so often hard, labour so blundering but always sympathetic." The first victory of the Labour Party was welcome "because it brings with it the force gained in the discipline of work and the sympathy learned by contact with sorrow and suffering." But working men lacked the wisdom which came from education. "A Government directed by the Labour Party would probably illustrate Ruskin's warning. It would be in earnest; it would have faith in its purpose; but it

170. S.A.B. to J.G.B., 10 February 1906.
would be "brutal" in its disregard for all the issues it did not understand. Oxford and Cambridge, the "national depositories of knowledge", must therefore be required to place a larger share of their resources at the service of working men.

This demand created a storm of protest at Oxford. But it also showed the limits of Barnett's desire for radical social change. The motivation for his actions as a social reformer was not an affection for the working classes but rather a contempt for their way of life. After thirty years' residence in east London he had begun to realize that the middle-class values he had formerly extolled were not absolutes; in a working-class community thrift and self reliance were not necessarily commendable qualities. But he remained convinced of the superiority of the traditions and ideals which he believed were transmitted by the older universities. Although the new elite should remain faithful to working-class goals, it should be trained by the universities which had traditionally been responsible for the education of Britain's leaders. Interaction between the different social classes was still the solution to the nation's problems.

Barnett also advocated that the national system of elementary and secondary education be reformed and expanded. He criticized the
tendency of educational reformers to concentrate on perfecting the scholarship ladder while remaining indifferent to the needs of the average student. It was far more important to raise the level of society than to enable a few exceptional working-class boys to gain entry into the professional class. Because reformers overlooked the demands of the ordinary working-class student, a chasm remained between paper legislation and social reality. Preparing notes for a lecture delivered in 1894, Barnett wrote:

Imagine a boy (in East London) - the son of working parents - & follow his career - He enters the nearest elementary school. As one of a class of 60 he can have no individual care & his teacher has long ago given up trying to discover hidden powers of his pupils - The boy feels self forced into groove ... At age of 10 ... he is tempted to go to work. If natural he yields - he goes as errand boy - forgets what learnt ... or suppose hating school he plays truant - then he is taken before a magistrate - taught to feel self a sort of criminal & goes off to an Industrial school ... - or suppose his parents die then he goes off to a pauper school or orphanage to become part of great machine & to be educated up to a standard good enough for paupers ...

But suppose that he neither plays truant - goes to pauper school or leaves for work ... If he is very fortunate ... he may get a scholarship for a high school, or a technical school at distance fr home but the scholarships are very small - If he fails then he goes to work ...

The educational ladder is thus very narrow & some of the rungs incomplete - Only a few boys & hardly any girls get up ... Large sums of money spent but result is obvious. The people not educated - the majority cannot read a book ... - many read trash, they cannot enjoy leisure - think or imagine - few know selves.174

Barnett emphasized the same point in a letter to his brother in 1900: "Obviously it is an advantage if thorough education is encouraged rather than the excellence of a few prize pupils. The Boards have pushed on the system of earning special grants & have not done enough for education, they have for example started classes in French etc. & not made the general classes smaller." Almost every article Barnett wrote during this period concluded with the recommendation that the school leaving age should be raised to fourteen and attendance at continuation schools made compulsory for children up to the age of sixteen. At the same time, the education provided by the School Board must be improved. The teachers themselves reflected the worst aspects of modern society; they were too determined to secure material advancement, too uninterested in more enduring human values, too indifferent to the individual characters and needs of their students. In 1887 Barnett wrote to his brother: "Thursday we had a party of elementary teachers, they are a set who need culture. We had 30 conceitedly ignorant, comfortably ugly men & women to whom is entrusted the power once held by students & priests. We brot them face to face with Mr. Holman Hunt & other real creatures." He was no more impressed with a group he entertained three years later: "On Tuesday we were overwhelmed by 300 teachers who came in greater

175. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 24 March 1900.
176. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 29 October 1887.
numbers than they promised — who came too early & who were aggressive in their gratitude . . . . Dear me, the teachers do want to be sent on the quest of the Holy Grail. They are so cocky & so ignorant."

Believing that the training which the teachers received was largely at fault, Barnett founded the Pupil Teachers Scholarship Fund in 1892. By 1903 it had provided funds for eighty pupil teachers to attend either Oxford or Cambridge. In 1911 he recommended that the teachers' training colleges should be abolished and their students sent instead to the universities. Because he thought that the current school boards prevented educational reform, Barnett supported the Webb's demand, in the early years of the century, for the abolition of the school boards and the reorganization of all existing educational authorities under the county councils.

It was equally important to provide the means by which the quality of the nation's leisure could be improved. Contemptuous of working class culture, Barnett never doubted that one of his primary tasks in East London should be to introduce members of the
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working class to the finest art and music. Paraphrasing Matthew Arnold he frequently urged that the "best be made current," an expression which reflected a belief, still not widely accepted in Britain today, that a system of mass education could be established without a lowering of standards. During the 1870's and 1880's he joined the campaign to permit the opening of museums, art galleries and libraries on Sundays. When a new Public Libraries Act was passed in 1892, he urged local authorities to build free libraries throughout East London. A few years later, he founded the Whitechapel Art Gallery, which was opened in 1901. His personal letters between 1897 and 1901, filled with details of the business arrangements, attest to his concern with every step in the undertaking and to his faith in its potentialities. "A visit to the Gallery," he told his brother a few months after its opening, "is fresh air - philosophy - drama - all in one."

Cheap culture for the masses as a panacea of social ills was a frequent object of ridicule, in Barnett's day as in ours. Using over-simplified and often trite language, he provided a ready target for the jibes of those who wanted to know how East London's problems could be solved by "pictures, parties and pianos." But if his
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analysis of social problems was occasionally superficial, his aim was not. It was to salvage what he found most worthwhile in Britain's traditions and ideals, to humanize the life of industrial society, and to increase human dignity.

The journals and letters Barnett wrote while on trips are frequently the most accurate guides to his character and ideas. The Barnettts firmly believed in the value of travelling as a means of self enrichment and spent every available holiday sight-seeing. A conscientious sight-seer, Barnett made a practice of recording his impressions almost every night.

Their first major trip was an expedition through Egypt between November 1879 and April 1880. Barnett's letters to his family reveal a sympathy for foreign cultures and ways of life which he did not frequently display. As a "settler" in East London, he intended to impose Oxbridge culture and middle-class standards on his working-class neighbours. But he hoped that the way of life of the Egyptian peasant would be preserved during the process of modernization. Although he himself made no attempt to understand the peasants, he had nothing but contempt for the British rulers' indifference to indigenous cultures:

"When will governors see that all progress must be on the lines of the old, that there must be development & not sudden adoption of results achieved by others. To make European streets, to establish European civilization, millions have been spent & the country impoverished."
... A better future is in store if only Egypt can be left to herself. Men are growing up who will govern her, not perhaps after our pattern but after a pattern better fitted to Eastern conditions.\footnote{183}

In fact, the Egyptian peasants served as a useful model to hold up to the English working man. Although impoverished, they had not lost their enjoyment of life or sense of dignity.

People talk of the oppression of these fellahs ... Still somehow their condition does not stir me as does the condition of the English labourer - These people ... enjoy life as children & seem to have resources both in prayer & play wh. take them out of themselves - Then too I suspect methods of reform wh. come fr the West & fear lest in trying to make these people more earnest our reformers may divest them fr. the real line of their progress - With our English labourers it is different - His image, worn & wearied with work in cold & rain, his face on wh. no memory or hope of joy leaves a mark, his life unhallowed by learning art or religion often comes as a shadow before the sum.\footnote{184}

He left Egypt convinced of the value of the goal he pursued in East London: "After 3 months I say as at first, it is the English pauper & not the Egyptian fellah who most needs help."\footnote{185}

Kate and Margaret Potter, two of Beatrice Webb's sisters, and Herbert Spencer, a family friend of the Potters, accompanied the Barnettts. The trip solidified their friendship with Kate Potter, which had begun when she came to East London to work as a rent...
collector and lasted throughout her marriage to Leonard Courtney.

But Barnett had no admiration for Herbert Spencer. His theories were "alien & dull" and Spencer himself was "small in character wh. he shows by his suspicion of his fellows, his incapacity to trust any one & his constant consideration of himself & of all small things. He is small too in that, his vision is limited to see only what his theories allow him to see."

In October 1890 the Barnetts embarked on a nine-month trip around the world. Barnett explained the purpose of the journey in a characteristic letter to his brother: "It does seem to us that if we are to go on we must stop for a bit to breathe. It is not that I feel tired - it is more as if I were dry - empty of force & in danger of becoming a mere actor - acting only a part written by ourselves long ago." His journal, when compared with the one he wrote in America as a young man, reveals his altered preoccupations. Whereas before he had described scenery and the conditions of hotels, he now concentrated almost exclusively on the religious, social, economic and political aspects of the countries he visited. He was preoccupied with appraising different educational systems and he measured each society by the standard of education he discovered.
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countless introductions, he appears to have used almost all of them to gain admission to schools and universities. Henrietta Barnett filled the margins of this journal with her own more dogmatic and self-righteous observations. Where he expressed his appreciation for foreign cultures and his sympathy with the determination of the underprivileged to obtain social and economic advancement, she pronounced only her belief in the superiority of everything British.

They stopped first in India where Barnett was even more critical than in Egypt about the goals and actions of British imperialism. Soon after boarding the ship, he complained: "We get used to thinking of the ignorance of the poor & assume that any of the other classes old be teachers - Here we have seen that women well dressed & fond of talking are ignorant of common facts, that colonels & majors use commanding voices to say nothing, that the stupidest books are the most popular, that pleasures sink into gossip... The are the people who guide India." Upon landing, his criticisms intensified. The English governors were narrow-minded, tyrannical and intolerant. Barnett was "disgusted" by a rule excluding Indians from one of the finest libraries and disturbed by "luxurious institutions wh the English have made for their exclusive use & discredit their talk abt equality." While recognizing the vast
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differences between British and Indian manners and traditions, he could not "understand a division as between a higher & lower order wh. English minds shrink even fr. the thought of bridging." A visit to Lucknow and Cawnpore "made us feel the native side of things & more than ever realise that there is hidden in their hearts feelings they never express." Moreover, educated Indians accepted the British belief in their own superiority and indiscriminately emulated British values. A meeting of the Indian National Congress was "so English ... that it failed to be national .... When there is a national movement it will be Indian & not English, it will move along Indian lines & demand Indian reforms." The universities were "the most mischievous of Western institutions in India, they force the Indian mind into western grooves - they develop powers of imitation & not of thought. What is most wanted in India is indigenous education & Western sympathy."

Barnett was more favorably impressed by Japan. Expecting to find another Eastern country "with its mystery, its stationariness & its abjection of women", he discovered instead a Western country "with people eager for progress, practical common sense & with
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women taking an equal place in the work of life". The educational system was equally commendable: "the marvel of it is that it is so new & yet so perfect." But Barnett believed that the Japanese had sacrificed basic human values and ideals to material progress. Soon after arriving, he wrote: "Japan seems to be an America with a nursery story for its past & a revolution for its future. I feel the absence of old buildings ... the worship of Herbert Spencer - the regard for material progress." Four days later he continued: "Japan ... has adopted fr. other nations what in theory is best - the newest philosophy & the newest instruments ... There is a something - an association with the past - a moral atmosphere wh. cannot be exported or imported - The people all work as few work at home. ... They have caught sight of "western progress & thinking it to be the holy Grail they pursue it with enthusiasm." One month later he was still blind to the spiritual values apparent to most western observers: "The Japs have few, hardly any, of the elements of religion, now awe, no reverence, no sense of humanity."

From Japan they sailed to America and slowly made the journey from San Francisco to New York. In this country Barnett found the same disturbing social distinctions he continually condemned in
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England. This was particularly true in Chicago where Jane Addams supervised his sight-seeing. An admirer of the Barnettts, she had founded Hull House, the first American settlement, on "the Commercial St. of Chicago", after visiting Toynbee Hall in 1887 and 1888.

Barnett was pleased with the way in which his ideals flourished in this foreign soil: "Hull house ... is modelled on Toynbee - it has residents - classes &c - It is without tests & occupies no platform. The spirit in which all is done is most beautiful - Miss Addams represents the simple - puritan & loving character of the old Americans ... Hull House represented by her is becoming a strong influence - It attracts & raises American sentiment - it wins both rich & poor."

A settlement could play the same role in Chicago as it did in London because the physical segregation of the classes had produced two unequal societies. Barnett was "shocked" by the authorities' refusal to clean the streets and alleys of the district inhabited by Italian immigrants. The sight of the armory built by the federal government after the anarchist riots "stirred me & must stir up bad feeling in people who see how wealth takes for itself the best things ... while it leaves the poor to live in wretched hovels - amid the smoke where grass will not grow." Travelling to New York, he now noticed
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that Central Park, an object of admiration in 1867, was "mils fr.
the poor quarter of the city."

Barnett had other bases for his aversion to America. Although he was more sympathetic to American egalitarianism than he had been in 1867, reservations remained. In Chicago he wrote: "The men to whom I talked were as a rule somewhat ponderous & their thots were not fresh - The head of the city Board of Charities - a congress-
men & a professor all said abt the same sort of thing - They suffer I shld say fr the "equality" of the society in wh. they move."

By exalting the concept of equality, Americans remained blind to the beneficent potentialities of "service", a recurrent word in the writings of Barnett as of other late Victorian reformers. The service which each class performed for the other was the means by which a nation could cement its inhabitants into an organic whole and thereby could resist the disintegrating pressures of industrialization and urbanization. Like numerous European observers, Barnett criticized the way in which Americans treated their servants. Because women felt that "a girl ought to resent service as beneath the dignity of a free woman," they did not "give the friendship which transfigures service." This was the source of Henrietta Barnett's most caustic
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comments. After speaking to a group of women about her work to train
domestic servants in London she wrote: "All their talk abt 'equality'
is mere self puff -- I thought of Kate Courtney - the beautiful
natural west-end relation to her maid & what on - tho' I never spoke
to an audience who while so clever yet were unanimous in class anta-
gonism to their servants." In New York she complained: "The
rudeness of such people as train conductors & tram men is quite
annoying! They either don't answer a question at all, or else in so
rude a manner as to make one quite uncomfortable. Equality! for
sooth - No I say to them 'You men speak in that way to ladies who
are strangers, are not equal to gentle men - who are always courteous.'"  

Barnett had an even more serious objection to America and one
which was central to his thought. A man strongly influenced by a
sense of the past and valuing highly the historical associations of
places and monuments, he found America too new a country. "Somehow
people in an old country pick up knowledge, the Americans have to
seek it thru books & I expect that Americans are often more ignorant
than Italian emigrants." As a result, Americans placed human values
beneath material advancement. The head master of a large public school
in California was a "hard uncultured man - but a good man of business
- cool - certain & undazzled by an ideal." A school providing manual
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instruction in Chicago tended "to develop practical power at the expense of thought & feeling. Perh. there ought to be a poet at the head of the perfect manual school." The University of Michigan was "rather a technical school in wh people are fitted for work than a reservoir of accumulated knowledge." Although pleased that Americans had adopted the University Extension movement, he feared that its aim would be perverted among these uncultured and materialistic people.

In Chicago he wrote: "Many of the people here are keen abt University Extens. I doubt tho if that tender plant endures their rough treatment, they hardly understand teaching wh. has no direct use - wh. is offered & not chosen & they will make popularity the test of goodness." American philanthropic associations, oblivious to the spiritual needs of their clients, sought only "to increase bread earning capacities."

American businessmen were "often narrow minded & ignorant with limited imagination & with a tendency to seek distinction thro. wealth - In their direct course they destroy beauty their children can never restore & to build a town as big as London make rivers foul & the earth crowded." The only hope for America was that it should regain a sense of tradition and high ideals by strengthening its ties with Britain. The journal ended: "Wld that England wld recognise that her future lies thro. the states as the eldest & greatest of her
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colonies & that out of her wealth she shld bestow on her treasures of art & that - The greatest loss America can receive is a break with the traditions thro. wh. her British characteristics can be strengthened.

This was a typical conclusion. No matter where Barnett traveled, his frame of reference was always England; her problems, her traditions, her position in the world remained his major concerns. Meeting the Barnetts in Athens in 1880, Octavia Hill wrote: "Mr. B's whole heart is at home, and in talking of it." Through such friends as John Gorst, C.F.C. Masterman, M. Nevinson, the Courtneys and the Webbs, and through former Toynbee Hall residents as they reached positions of eminence in journalism and the government, he was always in close contact with events. He watched with special concern the fate of every bill for educational reform. He was intensely troubled by the Boer War, by the militarism and excessive patriotism he believed it produced and by the extent to which it distracted men from urgent demands for social reform. Particularly during his last years, Barnett filled his weekly letters to his brother with his views about current problems and governmental policies.

Canon Barnett was not an original thinker. His belief that the art of a nation and its social and economic structure were closely
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related derived from Ruskin. He followed Matthew Arnold in his criticism of the way of life of the upper classes, in his disdain for practical politics and above all in his determination to spread the best culture throughout all levels of society. F.D. Maurice had shown him the need for an alliance between labor and knowledge. He became an influential social reformer primarily because he gave expression to the political dissatisfactions of men who refrained from endorsing radical solutions for the condition of England. He provided a rallying ground for the significant number of men who were uneasy about the inequalities of their society but remained convinced of the worth of its traditions and ideals. Uninvolved in party politics and disapproving of all sensational and popular remedies to problems, he was praised as a detached yet thoughtful observer. Like F.D. Maurice, the man he most revered and resembled, he was known to his followers as "the seer" and "the prophet."

Not everyone, however, agreed with these eulogies. While some praised his tolerance and respect for varied opinions, others criticized his "exasperating inability to commit himself to any political party or movement. In 1928 George Lansbury wrote: "I am more convinced than ever that their whole philosophy of life was wrong. They never took sides about anything, not even about religion. Nobody except themselves could possibly understand what they believed about God and the Christian religion, and as to politics,
Socialism, Ioryism and Liberalism all were a sort of jumble — nobody was right, everybody was a little wrong." Looking back after two years at Toynbee Hall, C.R. Ashbee, another socialist, noted in his journal that Barnett "is primarily a eunuch in spirit and heart ... He plays fast and loose with the moral enthusiasm of young men, and has not the strength either to lead or to be led by them. Being without moral courage he hides himself behind other people's ideas."

In The Building of Thelema, a novel written in 1910, Ashbee characterized Barnett as "the Rev. Simeon Flux" who "could not take the cold plunge of twentieth-century socialism, the ripple of which he touched with a shivering toe. Perhaps it was more honest of him even not to do this, not to be definite, dogmatic; but it lost him the love of the younger generation, who looked to him for leadership."

Nevertheless, Barnett did leave a strong impact on many younger social reformers. In August 1887 Beatrice Potter (Webb) noted in her diary: "The Barnettts' visit braced me up to further effort and stronger resignation." Many years later, she described their influence in more glowing terms:

"How can I make my readers see, as they are engraved in memory, the figures of Samuel and Henrietta Barnett, and the impression they made on the philanthropic workers and social investigators of the London of the 'eighties?"

What charmed his comrades at work in the East End, and I speak from personal experience, was Barnett's fathomless sympathy; his 'quickness at the uptake' of your moral and intellectual perplexities; his inspiring encouragement for your strivings after the nobler self. 223

Edward Harold Spender, a resident at Toynbee Hall in the 1880's, wrote: "How to explain to a new generation the extraordinary personal magnetism of that strange leader of men, half saint and half statesman, so simple and yet so profound ... As warden of Toynbee Hall - let it be said - Barnett exercised for a whole generation a deep and abiding influence over the picked men of England and at the present moment our Civil Service and public life are penetrated by men who fell under his sway." His brother, J.A. Spender, was equally laudatory:

What Barnett was to young men setting out in life can never be told ... Again and again when I have been at a loss for ideas or subjects to write about, I have been to Barnett and come away refreshed and encouraged and ready to set to work again. All through the subsequent years till his death, when in any serious perplexity, I went to Barnett or wrote to Barnett. 225

A.P. Laurie, a third Toynbee Hall resident, recalled Barnett as one of the "five personalities to whom I owe much, and who have profoundly influenced me." Henry W. Nevinson, a volunteer worker at

Toynbee Hall during its early years, claimed: "we made him our pattern to live and to die, though we did so without the smallest success."

Canon Barnett showed a generation of young men interested in social reform how they might act in accordance with the precepts of the great Victorian prophets. In part, he did this through the example of his own personality and life. Even more important was the founding of Toynbee Hall.

Chapter II: The Founding and Organization of Toynbee Hall

On 17 November 1883 the Reverend S.A. Barnett delivered a speech at St. John's College, Oxford in which he outlined a scheme for a university settlement. A few young Oxbridge graduates, employed in London in the civil service, the church, law, medicine or business, would live together in a working-class area. During their leisure they would serve as volunteers for charitable agencies, as assistants in co-operative associations, friendly societies and working men's clubs and as members of the local Vestry or Board of Guardians. In this way the settlement residents would fulfill three separate aims: they would obtain information about the working classes, teach them to obtain richer and more productive lives and provide the friendship which alone could promote social harmony.

Barnett presented this scheme a few weeks after the publication of The Bitter Cry of Outcast London, a penny pamphlet attributed to Andrew Mearns, a Congregational Minister, describing the plight of East Londoners in colorful terms. Many members of the middle class, formerly complacent about the condition of England, were shocked by the revelations of London's poverty and filled with resolves to act to improve the welfare of the people. One Oxford student, subsequently a Toynbee Hall resident and a prominent civil servant, wrote to his mother:

Have you seen that pamphlet that everyone is talking of – The Bitter Cry of Outcast London? Kerry says that there are just as bad things in his parish at Bristol – father, and mother and three children, the first ill with consumption and the three children with scarletina, all in one room with four pigs, and much worse than that.2

Another Toynbee Hall resident, who remained a lifelong friend of Barnett, later recalled that the pamphlet, published during his last year at Oxford, "drew me for a year or more to Whitechapel," 3 the beginning of a career devoted to social service. But, though the pamphlet may have made his audience at Oxford more receptive to his proposal, Barnett looked upon it with distrust and disdain. He believed that all sensational reports, written after cursory observation rather than careful, judicious investigation, were dangerous because they obscured the problems of the working classes. Not all East Enders were as destitute as the pamphlet suggested. Moreover, workmen needed a continuing personal commitment from the wealthy far more than the alms which popular accounts tempted them to distribute. Despite the widespread impact of Mearns' pamphlet, Barnett remarked at St. John's College: "The needs of East London are often urged, but they are little understood ... It is impossible but that misunderstanding should follow ignorance, and at the

present moment the West End is ignorant of the East End. A settlement would furnish the knowledge "which comes only from the sight of others' daily life, and from sympathy with 'the joys and sorrows in widest commonalty spread." Living as neighbours of the poor, the residents would receive accurate information about the extent of East London's poverty and an intimate understanding of the motivations, manners and ways of thought of the working classes.

The need for such information was clear. G.K. Chesterton subsequently recalled that the middle class in which he had grown up "really was a class and it really was in the middle ... It knew far too little even of its own servants ... There was neither the coarse familiarity in work, which belongs to democracies ... nor the remains of a feudal friendliness such as lingers in the real aristocracy. There was a sort of silence and embarrassment." Beatrice Webb admitted that until she began to investigate the lives of working men, "labour was an abstraction, which seemed to denote an arithmetically calculable mass of human beings, each individual a repetition of the other." Few socialists in the 1880's
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could boast of more intimate knowledge. William Morris, for example, did not enter the home of a workman in the East End until the end of 1884, the date of the opening of Toynbee Hall. His early attempts to communicate with East Enders were as awkward as those of the first settlement residents. After having gone "a-preaching Stepney way," in May 1885, he wrote, "it is a great drawback that I can't talk to them roughly and unaffectedly. ... I don't seem to have got at them yet - you see this great class gulf lies between us."

Some men believed that their isolation from the working classes made their own lives artificial. They thus went to the people in order to come in contact with reality. C.R. Ashbee, for example, was clearly motivated by this desire. Visiting Toynbee Hall for the first time in June 1886, a few months before becoming a resident, he noted his impressions of East London in his journal: "One gets I think more in contact with human nature in its essence in these parts, for one dispenses with the clothes & shams & gets to the man himself." Another resident, who continued to live in East London for a number of years after leaving Toynbee Hall, later recalled: "I passed the happiest years of my life in Stepney. East London is real. It is in touch with the facts of life." E.H. Spender, a third early Toynbee Hall resident, described

East Enders as "the real people of England." After living in East London for twenty years, Barnett complained to his brother about the "unreality" of a "big west London at home" and claimed that such events seemed "nothing but false." In similar terms he later expressed his approval of the Labour Party: "it brings an element of reality into a political situation which now partakes too much of the nature of a game." Workmen had a "simplicity of aim and a sincerity" and were not "so ready to pose" as people "familiar with the artificialities of luxury."

Settlement residents were also attracted by what they considered the exotic nature of working-class areas. C.R. Ashbee recalled that East London contained "the element of poetry and adventure into the unknown." Twenty years after Ashbee's term as resident an accountant in a west End firm took rooms at Toynbee Hall because "the East End of London had a thrill for me."

In one of his first speeches at Cambridge, Barnett also emphasized the romance of Whitechapel. According to The Cambridge Review, he remarked: "Individuals travel and read to gain wider interest and enlarge sympathy; but the knowledge of the poor would give as much
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interest as India or America, and would often stir deeper feelings than reading about heroes." Like all foreign regions, however, the East End was also an area one entered with trepidation. Although shortly before the opening of Toynbee Hall The Oxford Magazine expressed the hope that the settlement would prove that the East End of London was "quite as healthy" as the West End, not everyone was easily convinced. As late as 1900 an Oxford student, whose mother had attempted to dissuade him from visiting Toynbee Hall, dutifully sent a post card within a day of his arrival: "I write to say that I am getting on here most excellently and have not developed any large number of infectious diseases though I have been about & seen many things. I shall be back by dinner time tomorrow."

The second aim of the settlement revealed the limits of the founders' desire to understand the attitudes and ways of thought of the working classes. Although the early settlement leaders acknowledged their initial ignorance about East Enders, they never questioned the need of the poor for the culture and ideals university men could impart. Barnett stressed the differences between a settlement and a mission in his speech at St. John's College, Oxford.

Because a settlement would not be connected with a parish church,
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its activities would have a broader scope than those typical of a college mission, and its residents would be men of varied religious and political beliefs. But in the most important respect, settlement residents were to be missionaries. Believing that working men were amenable to drastic change, Barnett hoped to alter the behavior and values of his neighbors. The settlement would "stir up ... feelings of self respect" in such men as casual laborers who lacked "the necessaries of livelihood." Working men who "are in no want of bread or even of better houses" would be shown "the higher thoughts in which men's minds can move." Residents who helped to organize boys' clubs would "set up a higher standard of man's life and through friendship commend to these boys respect for manhood, honor for womanhood, and reverence for God." Although settlement residents could not directly improve the material welfare of East London's residents, they would work toward a more important goal, inculcating "habits of cleanliness and order ... thoughts of righteousness and peace." In a speech at Cambridge, P.L. Gell, who played a major role in the founding of Toynbee Hall, described the state of a large proportion of the working classes
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in black terms: "I don't know whether we realize sufficiently that
down below all we see there is a class which is not civilized,
because it never has been civilized. Their parents were uncivilized
before them. They are brutal and criminal and immoral, because from
generation to generation they have not received the tradition of
morality." Settlement residents must supplement the East End clergy
as "the outposts of civilization."

The early settlement residents thus assumed roles similar
to those of missionaries, explorers and district officers, bringing
light to the "dark" regions of London and returning with informa-
tion. It is likely that two of the founders of the settlement move-
ment, P.L. Gell, subsequently president of the British South Africa
Company, and Alfred Milner, the High Commissioner for South Africa
between 1897 and 1905, were both aware of the resemblance. As
students in Oxford in the 1870's, their interests in social reform
and in imperialism had been interconnected. It is also perhaps
significant that at least twenty-two residents of Toynbee Hall sub-
sequently worked for a period in some part of the Empire. The very
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term "settlement" suggested that the experience of an upper-class resident in East London was believed to be comparable to that of a settler in one of Britain's colonies.

To Barnett, the third and most important aim of Toynbee Hall was to establish personal relationships between members of different social classes. Like other observers of nineteenth-century England, he was disturbed by the atomization of industrial urban society. He described East London as a vast impersonal area, inhabited by a population with no ordered relationships, no attachment or loyalty to the community and no interest in solving its major problems. In fact, the ties of the inhabitants to the region were not strong. East London, like many other industrial working-class areas, contained relatively few settled, long-term residents. Artisans with sufficient means moved their residence, and thus their centre of concern, to surrounding suburbs. Their place was taken by two groups of newcomers: immigrants from the country and East European Jews, neither of whom was able to furnish strong leaders. In 1889 H. Llewellyn Smith, a Toynbee Hall resident and an investigator for Charles Booth, estimated that over a fourth of the population of East London had been born outside the district. Within East London itself, moreover, residents frequently moved in search of better jobs or housing.

Nevertheless, Barnett assumed that the single cause of the fragmentation of society was the physical segregation of the classes. As early as 1800 the social structure of East London had been easily distinguished from that of the West End. It was already known as a largely poverty-stricken area with notorious patches of slums. However, the opening of the docks during the early years of the nineteenth century set the seal on this development. The remaining open spaces were rapidly built over to supply homes for the increasing number of workers. At the same time, the few remaining wealthy squares disappeared as merchants and manufacturers moved to more prosperous areas of London. By 1872 when the Barnettts arrived, East London was an entirely working-class area, containing almost no representatives of the more leisured and cultured classes.

According to Barnett, the most serious result of this process was that the poor had lost the moral leadership of the wealthy. Moreover, the upper classes had lost the humanity and sympathy which came from contact with poverty. Different ideals and different standards of behaviour had in turn produced class-hostility. Barnett looked back nostalgically to the hierarchical, status relationships of the pre-Industrial village when society was not a mere abstraction but, he believed, an organic whole. Characteristically, he urged the settlement workers to refurnish for their use one of the large houses abandoned by the wealthy in their flight
from the East End; the settlers were to form a resident leisured class, providing the personal service which alone could unify the community. As E.J. Urwick, a sub-warden of the settlement, later wrote, the residents acted as "the squire and parson combined."

In the 1880's and 1890's the settlement movement was one of the most widely acclaimed attempts to grapple with the novel problems created by industrialization and urbanization, but in its conception it looked backward rather than forward. It idealized the social relationships of the early-eighteenth century and ignored the possibilities for a more impersonal and systematic form of social service inherent in modern cities. It sought to restore the "natural relations" which the growth of urban centers had destroyed. In the words of one prominent settlement leader, settlement workers were not an artificial importation of alien elements into conditions to which they do not belong and in which they have no natural office. It is simply the restoration of the natural conditions which our whole public life assumes. It gives back the very people who alone can functionize (sic) on behalf of the body. It restores the right relation of people to one another.29

Barnett laid no claim to having originated the settlement movement. Speaking at St. John's College, Oxford, he cited the example of Edward Denison who had established residence in Philpot Street, Stepney for eight months in 1867 in order to find out for himself how the poor lived. He engaged in such philanthropic and educational work as endowing and teaching in a school, lecturing on the Bible to a group of dockers, "the crown and glory of my labours", and serving as an almoner for the Society for the Relief of Distress. Disturbed by "the terrible effects" of indiscriminate almsgiving and determined to reform the administration of the Poor Law, he anticipated the work of the Charity Organisation Society. His conception of his role as a member of the leisured class in East London likewise influenced the founders and early residents of Toynbee Hall. Residence in the East End showed him, as it later showed settlement workers, that its inhabitants were not as destitute as they appeared from the outside: "The evil condition of the population is rather owing to the total absence of residents of a better class - to the dead level of labour which prevails over that wide region." Moreover, the proper functioning of local self government depended on the presence of a resident wealthy class. Denison
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explained to a friend the reason why he felt an obligation to ensure that a sanitary regulation was enforced on a street where serious epidemics were occurring: "These are the sort of evils which, where there are no resident gentry, grow to a height almost incredible, and on which the remedial influence of the mere presence of a gentleman known to be on the alert is inestimable."

Edmund Hollond, whom Mrs. Barnett credits with having played an integral role in bringing Barnett to Whitechapel, followed Denison to East London. Around 1869 Denison, the historian J.R. Green, then a vicar in Stepney, Brooke Lambert, a vicar in Whitechapel and subsequently a friend of the Barnettts, and possibly Edmund Hollond met at the home of John Ruskin in order to formulate a new scheme for aiding the poor. Denison and Green suggested that a settlement should be founded in East London in order that university men might continue the work they had begun there. As Brooke Lambert later wrote, "the proposal commended itself to us, mainly as enabling men of culture to influence the life of these parts by working on local boards." Although nothing immediately came of the suggestion it perhaps influenced the Barnettts to travel to Oxford on numerous occasions, describing the conditions of Whitechapel and recruiting

---
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volunteers for the philanthropic activities they had organized.

Barnett remarked that the Oxford students most receptive to his ideas were those who had been influenced by T. H. Green, then a tutor at Balliol. Green's philanthropic and civic activities later provided a model for settlement residents. Attempting to fulfill the ideals of the "social reformer" and the "citizen" which preoccupied his writings as well as Barnett's, he participated in local government and campaigned for the extension of education. He became the first Oxford don to be elected to the town council by standing as an ordinary resident rather than as a member of the University, worked for state-supported primary education first as a member of the Taunton Commission and then on the National Education League, served on the Oxford School Board in 1874 and actively supported the University Extension Movement. The beliefs which underlay such activities also had a strong impact on his students. According to his biographer, Melvin Richter, Green's appeal was to the members of a transitional generation who shared the strong sense of duty of their evangelical fathers but had begun to doubt the faith which had shaped Victorian society. Green taught such men how they might employ their religious motivations to solve secular problems. He sought to transform their guilt about their

declining faith into guilt about the inequalities and injustices of their society and to instil in them a belief in the value of personal service. Beatrice Webb underlined this view when she wrote that the origin of the social ferment in the 1870's and 1880's is to be discovered in a new consciousness of sin among men of intellect and men of property. 

The consciousness of sin was a collective or class consciousness; a growing uneasiness, amounting to conviction, that the industrial organisation... had failed to provide a decent livelihood and tolerable conditions for a majority of the inhabitants of Great Britain...

This class-consciousness of sin was usually accompanied by devoted personal service, sometimes by open confession and a deliberate dedication of means and strength to the reorganisation of society on a more equalitarian basis.

As she noted, Barnett frequently told his followers: "the sense of sin has been the starting-point of progress." Barnett also appealed to the evangelical sense of duty and dedication of his audience at St. John's College when he stressed that a settlement would provide "an outlet for every form of earnestness."

Arnold Toynbee, a friend and disciple of T.H. Green, was a second major influence on his generation of Oxford social reformers. His own career illustrates the changing emphasis from religious to social concerns. He was born in 1852, the son of a famous physician.
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Entering Pembroke College, Oxford in the spring of 1873, he studied religion as an undergraduate. In 1878, when he was appointed tutor in Balliol, he began to take an interest in economic and social subjects. During this second period he participated in the campaign to reform the established Church, becoming a member of the Council of the Church Reform Union and helping to organize its activity at Oxford. A letter which he wrote to Barnett, another leading member of the Council, in February 1879, shows the way in which this work served as a means of connecting his early religious interests with his subsequent secular preoccupations:

You know I daresay that I gave an address at the Palmerston about 6 weeks ago on Church Reform. I think it was successful, and ever since I have been thinking, what to do next. At last I have decided to form a society to discuss not only the principles of Church Reform but the whole range of political and social questions that are before us at the present time. Milner, Gell and myself were members of our original little club ... We have chosen subjects to work at and we intend to meet once or twice a term at London or Oxford. We hope to formulate a body of principles which will guide us in our political & social action and enable us to deal effectively with the great questions of our time. We propose to pick out the ablest of the younger men who come up to Oxford to join them on to us from time to time. Our great object to aim at is to maintain a vital relation in the growth of principles between men in Oxford and men in London, men with a peculiar and rather narrow

experience labouring at problems in their most fundamental aspects, and men with a wide and varied experience facing those problems in their immediate and practical aspects. ... In conclusion we do not wish a word or a hint breathed by any one as to the existence of such a society ... Those like yourself who, I hope, believe in us, will do us the greatest service by saying as little as possible about any supposed movement at Oxford in any given direction ... You will understand I doubt not, why, in the very act of confiding to an old friend what is as dear to me as my own marriage, I so carefully forbid the extension of this confidence.44

The aims of this group clearly foreshadowed those of Toynbee Hall. Moreover, the two original members dominated the founding and early work of the settlement. Philip Lyttelton Geal was one of the earliest supporters of the settlement movement at Oxford, one of the first residents at Toynbee Hall and chairman of its governing council from 1884 until 1896. In the early 1880's Alfred Milner served as secretary of the Whitechapel branch of the University Extension Society, which was founded largely by Barnett and was later under the direction of Toynbee Hall. In 1884 he was a member of the London Committee responsible for establishing the settlement and during the next few years frequently delivered lectures there to groups of working men. In 1912, hoping "to retire from

active public affairs but to devote some part of my leisure to social work," he became chairman of the Council of Toynbee Hall, a position he held for a number of years. When Toynbee's group held its meetings in London, one of its devoted members was the journalist E.T. Cook, a volunteer at Toynbee Hall in the 1880's and in 1886 the editor of the Toynbee Journal and Students' Union Chronicle, the journal of the settlement's branch of the University Extension Society. One of the younger men whom Toynbee inspired was Bolton King, secretary of the Oxford Committee which helped to establish Toynbee Hall and one of its leading residents for eight years. Held together by the force of his personality, Toynbee's circle of friends visited workhouses, took part in the current efforts to organize charity and participated in programs to educate pupil teachers: "for it was a distinguishing mark of those who came under Toynbee's influence, that they were filled with an enthusiasm for social equality, which led them to aim at bridging the gulf between the educated and the wage-earning class."
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Toynbee himself was the most active member of his group. He lectured to working men first in the north of England and then in London. In Oxford he assisted a local co-operative society, served as a Poor Law Guardian and campaigned for better houses, more open spaces and free libraries. During one Oxford vacation he took rooms in Whitechapel near St. Jude's, becoming the most famous of the early "settlers" in East London. As Beatrice Webb pointed out, the motivation underlying such activities was "consciousness of sin." In fact, Toynbee's most famous speech took the form of a confession to a group of working men in London:

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.51

Always fragile in health, Toynbee died in April 1883, seven months before Barnett's speech at St. John's College, Oxford. Considered a martyr to the cause of social reform, Toynbee was an obvious choice to be commemorated by the first university settlement, founded

by his friends, embodying many of his ideals and emulating his lead in the field of philanthropy.

One member of Barnett's audience at St. John's College in November 1883 later recalled: "We who heard the paper decided that we must act upon it." A meeting at Balliol College in January 1884 resolved to establish a university settlement along the lines Barnett had suggested and appointed a committee with responsibility for selecting residents and locating a suitable building in a working-class district of London. This committee in turn requested a group of men living in London to make the necessary arrangements.

Within a month they had chosen a vacant industrial school as a site for the settlement and unanimously elected Barnett director. A general meeting held in Oxford on 29 February decided to establish an association which would found and maintain the settlement and to offer the position of warden, with a salary of £250, to Barnett. At the same time, a committee was appointed to purchase the school,

52. In fact, some of the founders of Toynbee Hall saw the settlement primarily as a memorial to Arnold Toynbee. (See Sidney Ball to P.L. Gell, 5 November 1883 and Sidney Ball to S.A.B., 10 November 1883. Papers of P.L. Gell).
to supervise its alterations, and to raise funds. By the beginning of March Barnett was able to report to his brother: "The event of the week has been the settlement of the Settlement. The premises have been bought for £6250, a committee has been formed & one Oxford fellow has given £1000." Early in May, Barnett and Bolton King addressed a large meeting at Cambridge, describing in detail the plans for the settlement. At a meeting of the Cambridge Committee for the Study of Social Questions ten days later, Philip Lyttelton Gall outlined the steps which had been taken to establish the settlement; the meeting then resolved to form a committee to work in conjunction with Oxford. On 24 May, members of this committee, meeting with a deputation from Oxford, agreed to cooperate in the founding of the settlement. At the end of December 1884 Toynbee Hall opened its doors and began operating as the first university settlement.

The strong ties of Oxford and to a lesser extent of Cambridge with Toynbee Hall were always a mutual source of pride.
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Four days after Barnett suggested that a settlement be founded, The Oxford Magazine expressed its belief that the scheme "is an experiment which, of all others, is at this time most helpful and most worth trying." Barnett's speech and an address given by William Morris during the same week were evidence that "Oxford has turned from playing at the Middle Ages in churches, or at a Re-Renaissance in cupboards, and a new faith, with Professor Green for its founder, Arnold Toynbee for its martyr and various societies for its propaganda, is alive amongst us." Two years later the journal commented: "The most important movement of the three years has doubtless been the attempt to bring Oxford into connection with the East End of London." For many years both The Oxford Magazine and The Cambridge Review continued to support the settlement by reporting its activities in considerable detail and devoting space to appeals for new volunteers.

Toynbee Hall held annual meetings at both universities when the warden, accompanied by residents, prominent politicians and occasionally socialist or labor leaders, sought to recruit promising residents. In March 1892 The Oxford Magazine reported that Balliol Hall was "cramped full" with between 600 and 700 students. Asquith,
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the most prominent speaker, "roused the meeting to the last pitch of enthusiasm" when he described the future of Toynbee Hall "in language that thrilled through his audience." In subsequent years the meetings were smaller and the reporting more restrained. In 1899 two hundred students attended a meeting and in the following year between fifty and one hundred. In 1902 The Oxford Magazine noted that the annual meeting "was the fullest and most enthusiastic which has been held for some years ... and should give a fresh impetus to all settlement work." In February 1908 the hall of St. John's College was "completely filled". Between the annual meetings, such dons as Edward Caird, A.L. Smith, William Markby, W.H. Forbes and Sidney Ball continued to organize support for Toynbee Hall at Oxford. The most important of these was Sidney Ball in whose rooms at St. John's College Barnett had first presented his proposal for a university settlement. Influenced by T.H. Green and Arnold Toynbee, he was, from the mid-1880's, one of the leaders of Fabian socialism at Oxford. Moreover, he shared Barnett's interest in the extension of university education to the working classes. He became a member of the Council of Ruskin College, a working man's college established in Oxford, and actively participated in the
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founding and early activities of the Workers' Educational Association.

In the 1890's Barnett wrote to Ball: "If you had not kept up the fire of social interest where would Toynbee Hall ... have been?"

Barnett also sought to maintain his own ties with Oxford. His speech in November 1883 was the fourth he made during the year at the university; and he subsequently considered his annual visits there to appeal for support for Toynbee Hall his most enjoyable tasks. In 1884 he wrote to his brother: "Oxford is lovely, very lovely in this weather & there is that to be found in a college garden wh. is in no other country or garden." Twenty-seven years later he sent his nephew a similar letter from Oxford: "We are having a good time here ... rejoicing in the beauty & in the reviving old memories & friendships. Oxford has a great charm in its society of people who are cultured - human & not rich." Barnett was most impressed by Balliol, the college of T.H. Green and Arnold Toynbee. As he wrote to his brother in 1886, "The Balliol boys are the best." He partially explained his preference in 1889: "At present Balliol is easily top. There is more honest work, more humility & therefore more religion in it than in other colleges."
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In 1894 he was appointed a select preacher to Oxford, a position enabling him to visit the university more often. Moreover during the early years of the twentieth century Barnett revealed his continued faith in Oxford and Cambridge by participating in the movement to reform the universities in order that their values and ideals might have a greater impact on the nation. On 17 November 1913, exactly thirty years after he had presented his scheme for a university settlement, a group of his friends again met in the rooms of Sidney Ball and decided to found a memorial to Barnett at Oxford. On 6 June 1914 "Barnett House," an Oxford center for social and economic studies, was formally opened.

Barnett's affection for Oxford did not extend to Cambridge. After addressing a group in Cambridge in 1886 he wrote to his brother: "The meeting was large & took - I think - the proposition well. There was however an absence of Oxford enthusiasm & there were few questions." In 1902 he noted that a Cambridge meeting "was not large - Cambridge has not the life of Oxford, it is duller & gooder." Three years later he again remarked that Cambridge "has less life - or less show of life than Oxford." Such comments reflected the smaller role which Cambridge played in both the founding
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and subsequent work of Toynbee Hall. In February 1885 The Cambridge Review castigated members of the university for their relative lack of support for the settlement: "While Oxford, to whom the credit is due, has fully done her share toward its realisation, Cambridge up to the present has lent, comparatively speaking, but little assistance, either in money or men." At least one resident from Cambridge acknowledged that Toynbee Hall was basically an Oxford settlement.

The connection between Toynbee Hall and the universities was even broader than the frequency of Barnett’s visits or the number of university graduates working with him in Whitechapel would suggest. It will be seen that the settlement’s residents continually looked to Oxford and Cambridge for a frame of reference. The image of Oxbridge thus dominated every aspect of Toynbee Hall, limiting its revolt from the accepted standards of the day and restricting its adventurousness in the field of social reform.

Toynbee Hall was situated at 28, Commercial Street, a few yards from St. Jude’s Church, in a district administered in 1884 by the Whitechapel Board of Works and after 1900 by the Stepney Borough Council. When the settlement was founded the population of the neighborhood was rapidly changing. During the early 1880’s a great
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deal of demolition had been carried out under Lord Cross' Act. According to one early resident, in 1884 "the parish of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, seemed to be half pulled down." A few years later large model blocks were built, partly by the East End Dwellings Company, the housing association of which Barnett was a leading member. A primary goal of the builders was to evict the criminal element of the neighborhood and replace it with a more respectable segment of the working class. By 1890 Toynbee Hall was thus surrounded by a sizable proportion of independent, upwardly mobile working men, who the residents could reasonably hope would be more receptive to their overtures than Barnett's first parishioners. But the residents looked with less favor on the second and more significant change then occurring in the social composition of their neighborhood. Although Whitechapel was already the center of a Jewish community, a series of pogroms in Eastern Europe beginning in the early 1880's greatly increased the district's foreign population. Between 1881 and 1905 about a million Jews left Eastern Europe, of whom about 151,000 settled in Britain. Out of a total of 286,925 aliens in Britain in 1901, 135,377 lived in London and 54,310 of these were resident in the Borough of Stepney. The foreign community of Whitechapel increased more rapidly than that of any other district; it
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grew from 9,660 in 1881 to 29,188, or 37.02 per cent of the total population, in 1901. By 1899 much of the area to the north, west and east of Toynbee Hall was inhabited overwhelmingly by Jews.

The settlement reacted to this influx in two, somewhat contradictory ways. On the one hand, the residents campaigned to control the growth of anti-alien hysteria and to prevent the enactment of restrictive legislation. But few of the residents sought to establish contact with members of the Jewish community surrounding them.

Nevertheless, the residents stressed the advantages of the settlement's location. Its propinquity to St. Jude's enabled the residents to assume responsibility for many of the organizations the Barnetts had founded during their first years in Whitechapel. Moreover, the settlement was within easy access of all parts of London. Situated in the north-west corner of Stepney, it was close to the East End boroughs of Bethnal Green, Shoreditch and Finsbury. Similarly, it was no more than a fifteen-minute walk from the Bank of England and by 1905 a five-or-ten minute walk from five underground stations which connected it with the rest of London and the suburbs. In its location as in its intention Toynbee Hall was thus a bridge between "East and West."

Entering Toynbee Hall from Commercial Street, a visitor during the period passed through a long arched tunnel under the warden's lodge into a quadrangle surrounded by the settlement building. The first story consisted of a lecture room, a dining hall and a drawing room and the second of the residents' quarters. A raised yard in the rear had been converted into a tennis court. The architect had been forced to use part of the building already existing on the site but within this limitation he had striven to model the settlement on an Oxbridge college. It is likely that he was largely successful. In 1885 The Cambridge Review remarked that the apartment of a resident "differs in no respect from an ordinary college room." An Oxford graduate wrote to his parents fifteen years later that "the narrow winding corkscrew staircase rather reminds one of college." The similarity of the design of Toynbee Hall to that of a university college was increased in 1894 when some friends of Bolton King constructed in his honor a clock tower, perhaps also a symbol of the sense of order the residents hoped to impose on East London.

In other ways also Toynbee Hall was easily distinguished from the surrounding slums. The residents themselves frequently called the settlement "an oasis" in the midst of the city. Although
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an early resident drew in his journal a sketch of the tenement he
saw from his room and wrote to a friend at Cambridge that "the
factory chimney outside depresses," if a resident's room faced
in another direction he saw and heard far less of East London. One
settlement worker later remembered Toynbee Hall as an "oasis of
quiet" in the "roar of traffic" of Whitechapel. Another wrote to
his parents that his room, "being on the inside of the quad ...

is also very quiet, which is a great advantage." The early residents
also believed that in time their quadrangle could serve as a symbol
of the countryside, the virtues of which they frequently invoked.
It is true that an early drawing of Toynbee Hall in *The Oxford
Magazine*, showing a fountain surrounded by flowers in the center
of the settlement, was largely fanciful; but the *Magazine* noted
that the residents "hope it may not be long before a little oasis
of greenery may be planted amongst the dreary wilderness of bricks
and mortar that stretch away on every side."

The style of life of the settlement residents similarly
separated them from their neighbors. In his speech at St. John's
College Barnett claimed that members of the upper classes would be
better citizens after they had "shared the life of the poor."

89. C.R. Ashbee to m.m. [probably Roger Fry], 11 November 1886.
91. T.E.H. to William and Anna M. Harvey, 6 March 1900.
But four months later, having accepted the position of warden, he
94
told his brother that he would live "in space & comfort & quiet."

Visitors to the settlement during subsequent years frequently
remarked on the high standard of comfort which its residents
95
enjoyed. In fact, the congeniality of their surroundings was a
source of pride to many settlement workers; as the representatives
of the leisured class in the community, they considered themselves
responsible for providing a model of good breeding, cleanliness and
order. In an article in 1902 E.J. Urwick, then sub-warden, emphasized
this point:

It is sometimes thought that to be a part of
a poor neighbourhood we must ourselves become
like the poor - imitating, to some extent,
their conditions of living. If I am right
in my hypothesis, we shall attempt no such
thing. We want to fill the place of the well-
to-do cultured class as such; and while our
consciences ought to prevent extravagance or
undue luxury, it is not part of our duty to
lower our standard of living to a level of
marked discomfort.96

Writing to Beveridge two years later, Barnett stressed that the
annual expenses of the settlement could not be reduced if "the
standard of living is to be kept at a height of cleanliness &
comfort wh. shall be an example to East London. The ... point
seems to me to be important ... People in East London need to have
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before them a way of life at wh. they may aim." A memorandum written in 1913 by three residents and endorsed by four others stated that "the mere example of a well kept, bright, cheerful house is in itself of no little value to the people of the neighbour who frequent it. It can raise their whole standard of life & in a very real manner." The significance of comfort to these residents was shown by the fact that a discussion of the need for a new common room occupied about one-seventh of the memorandum, an attempt to evaluate the role of Toynbee Hall at that time. Settlement workers in the mid-twentieth century, hoping to establish the relevance of their work to the demands of the poor, have attempted to minimize the distinctions between themselves and members of the community; but Toynbee Hall residents, more confident of the superiority of middle-class values and standards, tried to emphasize their distance from their neighbors.

Even during the period, however, there were occasional murmurs of dissent. As a student at Balliol in the early 1900's, Stephen Hobhouse had been influenced by Canon Barnett and an admirer of Toynbee Hall. But in 1913, when he went to live at Toynbee Hall, he found the settlement "too comfortable for my present purposes, an oasis of Oxford and Cambridge academic life, whose doors shut
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one off from the drab poverty of most of the humble houses around."  

George Lansbury, a working-class neighbor of Toynbee Hall, was later more sarcastic about the way in which its residents shielded themselves from contact with members of the community. His comment cuts through the pieties which settlement workers were prone to offer:

Young men [who] came to east London answering the call of the Barnetts ... were to mix with the poor, learn about conditions and the health of the poor. What a good and blessed thing it would be that rich and poor should live together! But 'living' only extended to meetings ... in Toynbee Hall and its fine parlours, dining and other rooms.  

Despite the gracious style of life which the residents enjoyed, Toynbee Hall had no capital endowment and it was run with a minimum of operating expenses. In fact, the size of the budget was an integral part of Barnett's conception of the meaning of a settlement. Like Matthew Arnold, he frequently used the word "machinery" to describe means which were valued as ends. Institutions, societies, large and expensive buildings were all machinery. Toynbee hall, on the other hand, was not so much an institution as a group of individuals devoted to furthering the welfare of east London. Although the residents worked through existing organizations, they realized that the only goal worth achieving was the establishment of personal relations.
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The settlement movement was founded when "people became distrustful of the machinery for doing good. Men at the Universities ... were asking for some other way than that of institutions by which to reach their neighbours. ... They welcomed ... the proposal for a settlement where they might live their own lives and also make friends among the poor." In 1892 Barnett wrote to his brother: "A plague on schemes & politics & institutions. If a dozen people live rightly & neigh-bourly they are worth more than many organisations." Moreover, a large endowment was unnecessary because the residents paid for their own board and lodging and no settlement worker received a fee for the services he performed. This too reflected the founders' original definition of a settlement. The residents could be expected to support themselves because they were to be members of the upper classes who alone could exert a beneficial influence on the community through the example of their behavior, education and culture. Then too, the founders were convinced of the superiority of volunteers as opposed to professional, workers. According to Octavia Hill, only the volunteer knew "how to enlist that individual gentle help ... which the trained agent has neither the time nor capacity to give." E.J. Urwick, sub-warden of Toynbee hall at the turn
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of the century, agreed:

Your ideal settler must first have absorbed true principles as part of his or her nature; and so fortified, she or he will not bother very much about the theoretical correctness of each step. I would even put in a plea for the advantages of impulse and the value of occasional mistakes.\(^{104}\)

During the past fifty years social reformers have increasingly expressed doubts about the value of unpaid service. By 1914, some Toynbee Hall residents themselves realized that the relationship between a voluntary worker and the recipient of his aid was frequently patronizing and that the formal, structured relationship which existed between a professional worker and his client was more in accord with the demands of an impersonal, urbanized society. In the 1880's, however, the settlement founders, exalting the feudal relationship, did not question the necessity for voluntary work. Had Toynbee Hall residents been paid they would have lost the sympathy, spontaneity and enthusiasm which were the key to their work.

Toynbee Hall was the creation of the Universities' Settlement Association which was registered as a joint stock undertaking in July 1884. Consisting of men who contributed at least \$5 five pounds
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\(^{104}\) Urwick, "Settlement Ideal," Charity Organisation Review (March 1902), 123.

\(^{105}\) First Annual Report (1885), 3.
to the settlement and remained members for five years, of annual
subscribers of at least one guinea and of no more than fifteen men
elected by its council, the Association was responsible for pur-
chasing and maintaining the settlement building, providing the
salaries of employees, and receiving and allocating contributions.
In practice, however, members of the Association had little to do
with the actual functioning of Toynbee Hall. In January 1888
Barnett wrote to his brother: "Last afternoon the USA /Universities'
settlement Association/ had its pretence of a meeting, no share-
holder came & nothing was done good or bad." The council of the
Association administered the settlement. The first council consisted
of those men who had been elected by Oxford and Cambridge to serve
as an executive committee in 1884; subsequent councils comprised
twelve members elected by the association, one member elected
annually by the council itself and two elected each year by all
past and current residents. The warden and residents supervised
the daily operation of the settlement.

Samuel Barnett served as warden of Toynbee Hall from 1884
until 1906. During the 1880's and early 1890's he devoted most
of his time to the settlement. Soon after accepting the position
of warden he wrote to his brother that he intended to "give up the hard, wearing details of parish work to efficient curates."

Ten months later he described his new life at the settlement: "The weeks record will henceforth be a record of interviews more or less lively with the residents in Toynbee Hall. Every morning I spend in seeing them, stirring up some & repressing others so as to get them into work. I am only concerned because the place is absorbing us both." After becoming Chairman of the Whitechapel Board of Guardians in 1893 he wrote: "I must do the work fully for a spell & then retire - it may be honour but it is too costly. For the future we must more & more keep ourselves to Toynbee work."

By the turn of the century, however, he had begun to spend his time more at his home in Hampstead than at Toynbee Hall and to search for a competent assistant. Between 1900 and December 1906, when he resigned the position of warden and assumed the more honorary role of president, he rarely attended functions at Toynbee Hall more than twice a week. After 1906, the number of visits he paid to the settlement continued to decline. His attendance at a reunion of old
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residents in February 1911 was, as his successor, remarked, "his first visit for some 16 months." But Barnett's influence on the settlement did not diminish. Long after he had ceased to play a role integral to the life of Toynbee Hall the residents were still attempting to fulfil his aims in education and philanthropy. The two subsequent wardens, T.E. Harvey and Maurice Birley, will be discussed in the following chapter. Neither left a comparable mark on the settlement.

The ten to fifteen men who had rooms at Toynbee Hall were the heart of the settlement. Most residents remained at the settlement for approximately two years, but between 1884 and 1914 one man spent twenty-eight years there, another nineteen years, a third eleven years and two over ten years. The residents thought of themselves as members of a club which perpetuated its character by a careful process of selection. Each candidate lived at the settlement for a probationary period of three months, after which the current members judged his credentials. He was required above all to show that his residence would be justified by his activity in some field of social work. The residents and the warden governed themselves through a "grand committee" which acted under the guidance of the council of the Association.

113. T.E.H. to Anna M. Harvey, 11 February 1911.
Because Barnett believed that the primary goal of Toynbee hall was to establish personal relationships, he claimed that the settlement should be judged "not by what we do, but by who we are." Both the backgrounds and the subsequent professions of the individual residents were thus as significant as their corporate accomplishments in various fields. At the same time, an analysis of the residents' careers helps to indicate the changing direction of the settlement's concerns during the period.

In March 1884 Barnett wrote to his brother that as warden he expected to be surrounded by "the salt of the earth in the shape of Oxford men." For the following thirty years Oxbridge formed the background of a majority of Toynbee Hall residents. It has been possible to trace the education of eighty-seven of the 102 residents who lived at Toynbee Hall during its first fifteen years. Of these, fifty-two attended Oxford and twenty-seven Cambridge; twelve Oxford graduates, moreover, had been students at Balliol, the college of T.H. Green and Arnold Toynbee. Of the ninety-five residents between 1900 and 1914 whose education is known, sixty studied at Oxford and twenty-one at Cambridge; seven of the latter had been at Balliol. The settlement residents were thus largely drawn from the upper-middle classes; none had been required to work his way up from the bottom. They believed, however, that they were distinguished as a

114. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 1 March 1884.
group not by the material advantages they had always known but
rather by the values and ideals they had recently imbibed at the
universities. To working men whose first demand was a share of their
material wealth, they preached the need for moral and spiritual
reform. Although a few residents were men who had been established
in a career for a number of years, a high proportion came to the
Toynbee Hall within a few years of leaving university. The average
age of the 107 residents whose birth date is known was twenty six
when they arrived at the settlement. Toynbee Hall was thus a young
society; the activities organized by its residents reflected not
only the dominant social thought of the period but occasionally the
idealism and enthusiasm of youth.

Occupations of 178 Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1884-1899</th>
<th>1900-1914</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of residents were part-time social workers, who devoted their evenings to philanthropic or civic work in East London and their days to their professions in the City or West End. The table shows the careers which the residents assumed. The most important change between the first and second fifteen-year periods of Toynbee Hall was the decrease in the number of clergymen. In fact, the decline was sharper than the table indicates. Five, or one-third, of the original fourteen residents were or became clergymen; eleven of the thirty-seven men who resided at the settlement during its first three years had careers in the Church. On the other hand, between 1897 and 1914, only two residents became clergymen either while living at the settlement or upon leaving it. In part, these figures may be explained by the increasing attraction for the more religious university graduates of Oxford House, a settlement inspired by Barnett but founded by the leaders of Keble College and connected with the Established Church. Although it was opened a few months before Toynbee Hall, its work expanded far more gradually. When Arthur F. Winnington-Ingram was appointed warden in 1889, he found the settlement "not a very impressive affair," consisting of only three residents who lived in a disused Church school. By 1898, however, Oxford House had opened a new building and comprised over thirty residents. But the decline

in the number of clergymen at Toynbee Hall may also reflect a broader social phenomenon. During the period the number of clergymen ordained diminished each year and the proportion of Oxford and Cambridge graduates among the candidates for ordination similarly declined. Deterred from entering the Church by religious doubts, students at the universities were drawn to the expanding opportunities in the civil service, education, business, journalism and law, the major careers of the second group of Toynbee Hall residents.

Most significantly, the diminishing number of clergymen reveals the changing emphasis of the settlement. Just as the scope of its activities gradually broadened from those typical of a parish church, so did its interests begin to center less on the moral improvement of the community and more on wider social and economic problems.

Nevertheless, religious aims may have motivated some of the later settlement workers. At least twenty residents who were not themselves members of the clergy had fathers who were clergymen.


The wife of one of these men, W.R.L. Blakiston, who entered the civil service after twelve years as a settlement resident, believes that he was drawn to Toynbee Hall by "the idea of service" which he learned from his father, a country vicar. Robert Morant, a second and far more distinguished civil servant, appears initially to have viewed residence at Toynbee Hall as a practical alternative to a career in the Church. Arriving at New College, Oxford, in October 1881, determined to become a clergyman, he studied theology and actively participated in the evangelical work of the Inter-Collegiate Christian Union. During his last year, however, his religious ardor gradually weakened just as he began to take an interest in social and economic problems; at this time he was particularly anxious to gain information about the new scheme for a university settlement in East London. Soon after his return from Siem in 1895, where he spent seven years as tutor first to the nephews of the King and subsequently to the Crown Prince, Morant became a resident of Toynbee Hall. H.P.W. Burton was another settlement resident whose religious zeal declined while at university. The scion of five generations of clergymen, he entered St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1907, assuming "without question the truth

of the Christian faith" and considering it likely that he would be ordained. Disturbed by the higher criticism, sceptical literature and the arguments of free-thinking friends, he left Cambridge "in a state of intellectual confusion." For a time he considered law, politics and varied openings in the field of education, but "the pastoral urge was still alive, even though the mind was confused. So I compromised with both the secular and spiritual sides of my nature by taking a temporary post in the East End of London."

Then too, the work which T.E. Harvey undertook as warden of Toynbee Hall, can be considered an embodiment of his Quaker beliefs. A settlement inspired by T.H. Green was an attractive place to such men as Blakiston, Lorant, Burton and Harvey, motivated initially by religious feelings but increasingly concerned with the social and economic problems of the world in which they lived.

After 1900 Toynbee Hall workers frequently regarded residence at the settlement as a means of acquiring information which would help them assume careers as university professors, journalists and civil servants. The disciplines of seven of the eight residents before 1900 who became professors are known; of these, only two specialized in the social sciences. On the other hand, seven of the

124. This will be expanded in the following chapter.
125. William Macbride Childs, E.J. Urwick.
ten men residing at Toynbee Hall between 1900 and 1914 who became professors were in the field of social science. Significantly, at least six Toynbee Hall residents after 1897 held positions in the Department of Social Science and Administration of the London School of Economics, helping to divert its activities from the training of social workers to a consideration of the basic problems of poverty.

The Department had its origins in a small School of Sociology founded in 1903 and administered largely by the Charity Organisation Society. E.J. Urwick was director of the school in which Ronald C. Davison and W.H. Beveridge lectured. Urwick, assisted by Davison, remained director of the school in 1912 when it was merged with a new social science department in the London School of Economics. The department was given financial aid and in other ways connected with the Ratan Tata Foundation which, under the headship of R.H. Tawney, undertook investigations into the causes of poverty. Early in 1913 C.R. Attlee was appointed tutor in the department; after the war C.M. Lloyd succeeded Urwick as chairman. Moreover, from 1919 to 1956 the London School of Economics was led by former settlement residents. W.H. Beveridge held the position of director from 1919.

to 1937. His successor was A.M. Carr-Saunders, another sub-warden of Toynbee Hall.

The rise in the number of civil servants among settlement residents also indicates that an increasing number were more concerned with social investigation than practical philanthropy and moral exhortation. Six of the fourteen residents between 1884 and 1899 who became civil servants received appointments in the Board of Education. After 1900, when the major interest of the settlement shifted from education to the problems of poverty and unemployment, at least nine residents joined the Board of Trade or the Ministry of Labour. A large number of the settlement residents who became civil servants played significant roles in the framing and early administration of the social legislation enacted between 1900 and 1911. As an official of the Board of Education, Robert Morant devised the Education Act of 1902 which brought secondary education under the control of the state. Soon after the passage of the Unemployed Workmen Act of 1905, Henry Maynard, W.H. Beveridge and T.E. Harvey became members of the Central Unemployed Body for

129. R.E. Aitcheson, F.S. Marvin, H.M. Richards, R.L. Morant, R.E.R. Hart, F.E. Douglas. In addition, Cyril Jackson, listed as an elected officer in local government, served for a period in the Board of Education; E.B. Sargent had a career in educational administration in the Transvaal.

London, with responsibility for administering the act in London; Cyril Jackson served as **Honorary Secretary** of the Stepney Distress Committee of which at least four other members were either current or former Toynbee Hall residents. Robert Lorant drafted the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act of 1907 which, instituting medical inspection of school children, formed one of the early acts of "New Liberalism." As Chairman of the first Trade Boards, Ernest Aves took charge of administering the Trade Boards Act of 1909. The Labour Exchanges Act of the same year was largely the work of W.H. Beveridge who was appointed the first Director of the Labour Exchanges Department of the Board of Trade in February 1910. Beveridge and Hubert Llewellyn Smith, the Permanent Secretary of the Board of Trade, were the chief architects of the unemployment insurance sections of the National Insurance Act of 1911. Other former settlement residents dominated the history of the insurance sections. When Lloyd George travelled to Germany in 1907 to study old age pensions, a trip which intensified his interest in health

insurance, he was accompanied by Harold Spender, then a Liberal journalist. More significantly, William John Braithwaite, as Lloyd George's adviser, was largely responsible for drafting the National Health Insurance Bill. In this work he was aided by James Arthur Salter and William Hubert Stuart Garnett and, in a more minor role, by Samuel E. Minnis. After the passage of the Act, Robert Morant took charge of establishing the national health administration. Other early members of the National Health Insurance Commission included E.F. Wise, J.A. Salter and J.R. Brooke.

Canon Barnett considered the work of these residents an important means of extending the influence of Toynbee Hall. At the same time, he believed that residence at a settlement would enhance the prospects of any Oxford graduate. Presenting his proposal for a university settlement to Cambridge, he assured his audience that "residence would not be a halt; it might be the part of a man's career most rich in teaching, be his end Parliament, science or business." Throughout his tenure as warden he watched solicitously over the careers of his most promising residents, introducing

them to eminent men in public life and showing them the paths to success. A letter to his brother in 1905 illustrates his attitude:

"Beveridge has been made leader writer on the Morning Post at £500 a year so he has got home, Maynard is sec of the new Central Body on the Unemployed Fund. Nunn ... is on the Royal Commission on Poor Law. Toynbee men to the front !!!"

George Lansbury, however, viewed their good fortune from a different perspective. In 1928 he wrote:

What Toynbee Hall actually accomplished was just this: men who went in training under the Barnetts, just as men and women who later came under the spell of the Webbs, could always be sure of government and municipal appointments. The number is legion of those who, after a few months, or at 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. 135

He could have cited numerous examples of men who found residence at Toynbee Hall a means of acquiring positions of influence in the field of social reform. J.A. Spender, subsequently a prominent Liberal journalist, came to the settlement first in January 1886 and again in March 1891, with little prospect of a job. Encouraged by Barnett, however, he made use of the settlement to establish

136. Lansbury, My Life, 129.
necessary contacts and to gain an introduction to social problems. In 1903, when Beveridge hoped to convince his parents that his career would be furthered if he left law and became sub-warden of Toynbee Hall, he argued:

Toynbee Hall is prospectless if you actually stick to it in the same way that scientific work is prospectless; it gives you a living and the work you want to do. But just because it is not a mission but a residence & meeting place of men doing work it is not a cul de sac. It is known among men of position; I think the list of past residents would surprise you. I will however give you the one instance of Morant (who might have been Balfour's private secretary & has been suddenly rushed up very high in the Education department ...) yet he was first a resident with no other work at Toynbee Hall ...; he got his chance simply because he was known to Canon Barnett to have done excellent educational work ... & Canon Barnett knew great educational people. Toynbee is a force in the same way that Balliol is.¹³⁸

Fifty years later Beveridge concluded that he had taken the correct path: "Toynbee Hall gave me everything that my parents could have desired for me of launching on a career." During his four-year residence Beveridge acquired his first knowledge of the problems of unemployment and a taste for exercising power. More concretely, at Toynbee Hall he met Hubert Llewellyn Smith, later his superior in

¹³⁸ W.H.B. to Annette Beveridge, 11 May 1903.
¹³⁹ Beveridge, Power and Influence, 36-37.
the Board of Trade, and Cyril Jackson, a leader in London local
government and an investigator for the Royal Commission on the Poor
Laws. Jackson in turn introduced Beveridge to the Webbs through
whom, Beveridge later claimed, he gained "access to the seat of
power." Beveridge himself was instrumental in bringing at least
two other Toynbee Hall residents into the government. The wife
of W.R.L. Blakiston, a civil servant first in the Board of Trade
and then in the Ministry of Labour, recalls that Blakiston came to
Toynbee Hall "undecided about his career" and that he entered the
civil service because Beveridge "pressed him to join." As a
resident at Toynbee Hall between 1906 and 1910, J.S. Nicholson
assisted Cyril Jackson's investigation of boy labour for the Royal
Commission on the Poor Laws and subsequently undertook research
for Beveridge who was then writing Unemployment. In 1910 Beveridge
invited Nicholson to join the department of labour exchanges, the
beginning of his career in the Board of Trade and Ministry of
Labour. E.C. Bligh was a third Oxford graduate who arrived at
Toynbee Hall with a vague interest in social questions but with no
formulated plans for a career. After working in the field of pub-
lishing for a few years, he joined the Board of Trade at Beveridge's
behest. Increasingly, then, Toynbee Hall served as a meeting

141. Letter from Mary Blakiston, 1 May 1967.
143. Interview with Sir E.C. Bligh, 6 April 1967.
place for men determined to understand the problems of an urban society and to employ the power of the government in solving them.

A significant proportion of the residents were convinced that they were destined for prominence in public life. Because they did not seek identification with the poor, they were able to consider residence at an East London settlement as a means of advancing their own positions within middle-class society rather than of disassociating themselves from it. When they criticized Britain they did so as members of its establishment whose words should be heavily weighted. At the same time, their dissatisfaction with British society was sharply circumscribed. Despite their uneasiness about the poverty they discovered around them, they fully endorsed Britain's basic values, traditions and institutions.
Chapter III: Major Trends in the history of the Settlement

The aims of Toynbee Hall did not remain static. The residents saw themselves as individuals each of whom was committed to understanding and solving current social problems rather than as members of an institution bound by a fixed ideology or programme. Between 1884 and 1914 they thus continually reassessed the function of a settlement in order to adapt Toynbee Hall to changing social forces and needs. As the analysis of the residents' subsequent professions has indicated, although Toynbee Hall was founded as a means of restoring a leisured class to East London, it gradually developed into a centre for social investigation and reform.

The major trends in the history of the first thirty years of the settlement can best be discerned through the experiences of three residents, C.R. Ashbee, W.H. Beveridge and T. Harvey. Beveridge as the most important sub-warden during the period and Harvey as the warden between 1906 and 1911 influenced the settlement during their terms of residence, showing the inadequacy of practical philanthropy and the necessity for broader solutions to East London's problems. Ashbee, on the other hand, is an exception who proves the rule. Coming to Toynbee Hall with aims and social ideas which sharply diverged from those of his fellow residents, he was at odds with the settlement during a large part of his stay; his reactions and criticisms nevertheless reveal the spirit of the settlement during
its early years. The personal accounts of these residents are also significant because settlement leaders stressed that the value of the institution should be measured not only by its corporate accomplishments in various fields of social work but also by the impact it made on the lives of individual residents. These personal experiences thus represent an important aspect of the history of Toynbee Hall.

The decision of C.R. Ashbee to reside at Toynbee Hall, like that of all early residents, reflected the new uneasiness among middle-class men in the 1880's about the condition of England. Most residents, however, hoped to solve the problem of social distress without bringing into question the basic ideals and traditions of English society. Ashbee was attracted to movements and men espousing a deeper revolt against the established order. While studying at Cambridge, he found his model in Edward Carpenter who, he believed, gave expression to his sense of estrangement from the mainstream of nineteenth-century British life. Carpenter himself was a disciple of Walt Whitman. He first read an edition of Whitman's poems while a student at Cambridge in 1869: "From that time forward a profound change set in within me. I remember ... feeling all the time that my life deep down was flowing out and away from my surroundings and traditions amid which I lived—a current of sympathy carrying it westward, across the Atlantic."

Upon graduation, he became a Fellow at Cambridge, but Whitman's poems revealed the life of the university as "a fraud and weariness." In 1874 "it suddenly flashed upon me, with a vibration through my whole body, that I would and must somehow go and make my life with the mass of the people and the manual workers." For the next ten years Carpenter worked as a full-time University Extension lecturer in Leeds, Halifax and Skipton. Like numerous other teachers in the Extension movement, however, he found his pupils disappointingly middle class. In 1881, therefore, he moved to a small plot of land at Wlllthorpe, near Sheffield, where, inspired by Walden's Thoreau, he attempted to lead the life of a manual laborer. After reading England for All by H.M. Hyndman in 1883, "the mass of floating impressions, sentiments, ideals, etc., in my mind fell into shape—and I had a clear line of social reconstruction before me." Although Carpenter never joined the Social Democratic Federation, he helped subsidize its journal, Justice, and maintained close ties with many members. In Sheffield he organized a group of socialist working men inspired by William Morris.

Ashbee first met Carpenter in May 1885: "Seems to me a man much in earnest, of a hard but genuine type; ... we had an hour's

talk together ... but did not go deep - he was not of a disclosive
7
nature." In December, when Ashbee visited Millthorpe, his admira-
7
tion grew: "I dwell tonight under the roof of a poet. Edward Carpenter
seems to me to come nearer to one's ideal of The Man than anyone I
have ever met ... Millthorpe is a most ideal place ... in fact an
8
entirely idyllic haunt & fit for the dwelling of a poet." In London
four days later, he concluded: "London gloomier than ever, but I,
much refreshed from inhaling the fresh clear atmosphere of Millthorpe,
the ideal, the poetic. It was a recollection that last (sic) a
long while in my mind; a glimpse into the real & the true which we
9
are apt to forget in a world of smoke & folly etc." At the beginning
of January 1886 Ashbee and G. Lowes Dickinson accompanied Carpenter
to a private lecture at the Hammersmith branch of the Socialist
League in the home of William Morris:

Carpenter took us up to the platform afterwards
and introduced us to Morris, who received us kindly
and invited us all in to supper. Everything in his
house is beautiful, - such Rosettis, and such a
harmony of colours and tones! ... Sitting at table
one felt like one of the people in Millais' pre-
Raphaelite picture of Isabella. Everything was
harmonious. ... Old Morris was delightful, firing
up with the warmth of his subject, all the enthu-
siasm of youth thrilling through veins and muscles;
not a moment was he still, but ever sought to vent
some of his immense energy. At length banging his

hand upon the table: 'No!' said he. 'The thing is this; if we had our revolution tomorrow, what should we socialists do the day after?' 'Yes ... what?' we all cried. And that he could not answer. 'We should all be hanged, because we are promising the people more than we can ever give them!'

We set talking round the supper table till midnight and then wandered homeward, first accompanying the Miss Carpenters and Edward to their place, then going our own ways very thoughtfully. On the road we were joined by Bernard Shaw the socialist, - a very clever man and profoundly interesting to talk to. Carpenter had introduced us to him, and he kept us well engaged in the long walk back from Hammersmith, - on the coming revolution and the collapse of the Capitalistic system. ... He left us at the corner of Goodge St., Goldie and I walked on to Tottenham Court Rd., together slowly. 'And what do you think of it all?' I asked him when we were alone. 'I don't know' he said. 'I don't seem to feel any forrader with Socialism, do you?' 'I don't know' I replied 'but I believe I am more clear about one or two things, - though as to the whole ..., well ...' 10

While visiting Millthorpe again in April, Ashbee noted in his journal:

"This afternoon a long walk over the hills with Edward Carpenter ... He told me a deal about Walt Whitman, and I believe I am beginning to learn more of the workings of his own mind. Democracy, Socialism, Christian ethics of the finest type, - all seems to be compact and constructive."

At the end of June, 1886, Ashbee paid his first visit to Toynbee Hall, "my object to explore. I hope perhaps to live here later for a while, but rather as a sop to my own conscience, having

now for three years talked philanthropy." Motivated by Carpenter's ideals, he was impressed with Garnett: "I believe in the man. He is sincere & his work is a noble one. He has a gift of saying things clearly & calling them by their right names" but he mistrusted the settlement "for what seems at first sight a top hatty philanthropy."

Ashbee's comment

Ashbee's former after accompanying a resident on his rounds as district visitor for the Charity Organisation Society showed him to be more of a democrat than the majority of residents: "Fearful the sense of class distinction down here. I got into the workman's train today and my neighbours actually thought it necessary to apologise to me for my mistake. This is very painful."

At the end of July, when Carpenter spent some time with Ashbee and his circle of friends at Cambridge, Ashbee noted: "To have Edward up here is wonderful. It is as if we had a hero among us," Three days later he wrote: "Everything is wonderful just at present, but having Carpenter among us more wonderful than all." Soon after returning to Millthorpe Carpenter sent Ashbee a letter which, as Ashbee later recalled, provided the key to his work at Toynbee Hall: "I conjure you - get to know the people - you will never understand yourself or your work till you do - don't be baffled till you know
then thoroughly - that is the only thing that will save you from the deadly torpor of a profession." In September, Ashbee visited Lilithorpe for the third time: "The last of Lilithorpe for a while, but by no means the end I hope ... Edward's 'idea' is still burning within me. I feel so proud that he should have chosen me as a vessel in which to place it."

One month later, imbued with this sense of mission, Ashbee entered Toynbee Hall, confident that it would provide an antidote to his work as an apprentice in an architectural firm and the best means of fulfilling his ideals. He was not disappointed at first. The exuberant language he had formerly reserved for Carpenter he used during the following six months to idealize the life of the settlement. Soon after arriving, he reported to a friend at Cambridge that he was "perfectly and completely happy" with the settlement:

"Once and for all Toynbee is out of the charmed circle of grim & despicable detail, & here is all the enthusiasm of the university collected & concentrated. There are some splendid here & a great deal of silent unostentatious heroism." He enjoyed discussing religious and ethical questions with other residents and praised the opportunities for contacts between the different classes, no matter how formal:

17. Edward Carpenter to Ashbee, 29 July 1886.
19. Ashbee to n.n. [probably Roger Fry], October 1886.
An exciting time tonight. Debate between Champion & Benjamin Jones - Socialism v. Co-operation. And such a mixture in audience & speakers could only be at Toynbee. An aristocratic Socialist versus a working man Cooperator, a bourgeois 'trusted' politician Leonard Courtney in the chair, a bishop to propose a vote of thanks to the debaters & a radical sect of the working mens clubs to second it.21

The response of a working-class audience to whom he lectured at the beginning of February convinced him that "the influence of Toynbee 22 is spreading." On 23 February he told a friend: "Toynbee ... is one's reascent into salvation. Indeed life here is very wonderful - 23 if there were only more of it." Three days later he wrote: "You can't conceive how splendid it is to fly up to our little other world at Toynbee hall from the quagmires of Society, to meet men who are really men & not men plus top-hats, & to come whenever one will, in 24 actual living contact with great ideas."

Convinced that his goal in East London should be to establish contact with working men, he chronicled his somewhat self-conscious attempts in considerable detail. After entertaining a young builder in his rooms in November he admitted that he couldn't "get myself 25 into focus yet quite for the radical working man." His confidence

23. Ashbee to n.n. [probably Roger Fry], 23 February 1887.
24. Ashbee to n.n. [probably Roger Fry], 28 February 1887.
grew less than two weeks later when he delivered a lecture to members of a Liberal working men's club: "I felt myself getting nearer to these men, and beginning to understand the Whitmanic position ... the 'B.W.M.' is no more a terror for me."

After lecturing to a second group about a week later, he wrote to a friend at Cambridge: "I feel that I am learning a deal ... from the B.W.M., his keenness, his strength, his enthusiasm. You remember Edward's letter to me." In February Ashbee noted the impact which five months at Toynbee Hall had made on him: "I am beginning to perceive ... strangely enough that men are always men, even though they wear clothes of different colours, a curious fact which before I failed to conceive, & even yet do not understand; it seeming so natural to one - in this, one's rudimental state of development, - to think a man in a black coat different from a man in a brown."

27. Ashbee to n.n. probably Roger Fry, 30 November 1886.
Ashbee's Cambridge friends, however, were somewhat supercilious. Roger Fry wrote:

I am very much delighted about the Lecture & hope someday to feel sympathy with the beer-drinking shag-smoking B.W.M. for whom as you know I have already some potential love though not more than I extend to other classes perhaps.

(Roger Fry to Ashbee, 28 November 1886)

The tone of G. Lowes Dickinson's letter was similar:

It's excellent that your lecture went off so well. I hadn't somehow imagined you a successful sans-culotte, but then you're always developing some unsuspected faculty. And it must be very pleasant to discover that one can drink whisky & fraternise with the B.W.M. when necessary.

(G. Lowes Dickinson to Ashbee, 7 December 1886)

28. Ashbee to n.n. probably Roger Fry, 23 February, 1887.
Ashbee's work at Toynbee Hall centered around his efforts to disseminate the ideas of John Ruskin. Shortly after arriving at the settlement, he delivered a series of lectures on Ruskin to working-men's organizations throughout East London. He noted after his first lecture: "Ruskin is little known, but immensely appreciated, and they enjoyed the fiery humour of 'Fors'." The response to the second lecture was even more encouraging: "I lectured again last Sunday to an audience of about a hundred - very successful! Ruskin goes down like anything." In February he gloated: "Tonight I planted the standard of St. George in the Coop. Wholesale in Leman St. The Lecture took like powder. ... A working woman Miss Laurenson got up & made a charming speech. She had read 'Unto this Last' over & over again." Believing that Ruskin had a special message for members of the working classes, Ashbee organized a class which met each week to read Ruskin's works. Soon afterwards he established a second class for the study of design, attended by thirty students. In June 1887 he reported to a friend: "My classes at Toynbee are growing - the men & boys are very keen." These two classes provided

30. Ashbee to n.n. [probably doge sry], 30 November 1886.
33. Ashbee to n.n. [probably doge sry], 8 June 1887.
the basis for the Guild and School of Handicraft, Ashbee's major accomplishment as a settlement resident. He first conceived of the undertaking in September 1887 when he noted in his journal, "a good evening, cheered by the love of my men and boys. The inauguration of an Idea." Two months later, he discussed the project with William Morris:

William Morris and a great deal of cold water! Spent last evening with him, - by appointment, - a propos of 'Art Schools', He says it is useless, and that I am about to do a thing with no basis to do it on. ... If I could draw him it would be thus, - a great soul rushing through space with a halo of glory round him. ... I could not exchange a single argument with him till I granted his whole position as a Socialist and then said: 'Look, I am going to forge a weapon for you; - and thus I too work with you in the overthrow of Society.' To which he replied, 'The weapon is too small to be of any value.' How hard it is for a great mind to see the single point of a lesser. Were men of his metal we should need no weapons.35

The Guild and School were formally opened on 23 June 1888 on the top floor of a warehouse in Commercial Street, close to Toynbee Hall. Forming part of the arts and craft movement, they sought to encourage the union of art and industry by enabling East Enders to develop their creativity while acquiring the necessary technical skills. The Guild consisted of a group of workmen who produced and sold, on a cooperative basis, decorated metal and wood articles. Members of the

34. Ashbee, "Journal," 8 September 1887.
Guild also taught in the school which began with fifty students.

Ashbee was thus satisfied with the relationships he had been able to form with individual working men and with the fact that his early work had laid the foundation for the Guild and School of Handicrafts. Nevertheless, his enthusiasm for Toynbee Hall did not last. Unfortunately, he rarely mentioned the settlement in his journal after February 1887 and it is not possible to trace the process of his disillusionment. His journal does show, however, that by December 1888 he had decided that he could fulfill his goals only by leaving Toynbee Hall. More rebellious, more democratic and more receptive to socialist ideas than the majority of other residents, he criticized the settlement's unwillingness to endorse bold measures of social reform. As he later recalled, he saw Toynbee Hall as the center of "fashionable" philanthropy, "poking and prying into other people's lives" rather than establishing "human intimacies." Increasingly

37. Ashbee, A Description of the Work of the Guild of Handicraft, (London, 1902), 5-12; Ashbee, Endeavour, 1-9; Record, Vol. I, No. 2 (November 1889), 9. The settlement sought to promote the early work of both the Guild and the School and employed their members to decorate the settlement dining room. Nevertheless, the formal connection between the two organizations ended with Ashbee's departure from Toynbee Hall in March 1889. The School was closed in 1895. (Ashbee, Endeavour, 5) In 1902 the Guild moved from east London to Gloucestershire where the members were able to follow the example of Edward Carpenter, combining outdoor manual labor with their artistic work. (Ashbee, Description, 8-12; Ashbee, Endeavour, 36).

alienated from most of the settlement workers, he also felt the lack of any corporate life at Toynbee Hall. While the Guild and School of handicrafts, applying the ideas of Ruskin and Morris, expressed "the New Socialism," the settlement remained the embodiment of outmoded, middle-class social ideals.

Ashbee left the settlement in April 1889, moving eastward to Stepney Green with four Toynbee Hall residents. In a note in his journal he listed the other original members of the 'colony' as Arthur Rogers, Hugh Fairfax-Cholmely, Arthur Pillans Laurie and Hubert Llewellyn Smith. As a Yorkshire squire, Fairfax-Cholmely represented the type of man the founders of Toynbee Hall had glorified. The extent to which Ashbee's friends were consciously rebelling against the settlement is thus shown by the fact that while Fairfax-Cholmely considered residence at a university settlement to be in harmony with the ideas of his background, he believed that membership in Ashbee's community involved a complete break with his past. As he told Ashbee on April 17, his departure from the settlement would be "a cutting asunder of all the old ties." Four days later he wrote:

Only if you had known all my past life and connections, you would find that there are many things to go. I need not openly quarrel of course: but there are many things to part with for all that. ... But perhaps you will

42. Hugh Fairfax-Cholmely to Ashbee, 17 April 1889.
realize that ... I have been brought up for twenty years among people who would cut me tomorrow if they knew half of what I think and say.43

A close friend of Ashbee and subsequently a distinguished scientist, A.P. Laurie first became interested in social reform while reading Progress and Poverty as a student at Cambridge: "Up to then I had taken the social conditions for granted, or rather, absorbed in science, had not been aware of their existence." Like Carpenter, Laurie became an Extension lecturer after leaving Cambridge in order to establish contact with workmen, but he too was disappointed by the high social status of his students. "My audiences are cussedly well dressed unfortunately," he complained to Ashbee. In 1887, while working as a chemist in London, he established residence at Toynbee Hall. He later recalled his reasons for leaving the settlement:

> We liked East London, we had friends and interests there, but there was an atmosphere about Toynbee Hall which irritated us ... We wished a closer contact with the people and lives of East London, and more especially, the Labour leaders. As long as we lived in Toynbee Hall that was difficult.45

It is likely that Hubert Llewellyn Smith was motivated by similar aims. An investigator for Charles Booth, he assisted Den Tillett during the 1889 London Dock Strike and subsequently wrote an account of it with Vaughan Nash. Two months after the end of the strike, Nash joined Ashbee's group in Stepney.

43. Hugh Fairfax-Cholmely to Ashbee, 21 April 1889.
44. Laurie, Pictures and Politics, 57.
45. Laurie to Ashbee, n.d.
46. Laurie, Pictures and Politics, 73-74.
Despite the defection of a large group of residents, Barnett's faith in the value of the settlement remained unshaken. For over ten years, his letters to his brother expressed his pleasure with the large number of university graduates attracted by the work and his belief in their potentiality to transform east London. One month after the opening of the settlement, he wrote: "All are going well & working well together. Of course we shall have times of failure & depression but now we are gaining way." Within two months, he had grown more confident. Toynbee Hall would become "a centre to diffuse warmth as well as light, love as well as culture." In June 1889 two months after Ashbee's group departed, he still believed that "Toynbee might be extended & influence public opinion." In November 1895 he "realised once more its abundance of life." In other letters Barnett used the terms "flourishing" and "overflowing" to describe the settlement.

By the turn of the century, however, Barnett had begun to recognize the chasm between his initial hopes and the actual achievements of Toynbee Hall and to reappraise the value of a settlement. In part, his new mood was conditioned by social and political events.

47. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 24 January 1885.
48. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 28 March 1885.
49. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 1 June 1889.
50. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 9 November 1895.
51. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 17 September 1887, 6 October 1888, 6 November 1889, 11 July 1896.
As a result of the Boer War, he had a feeling of malaise about British society and a new awareness of the need for radical solutions to the nation's problems. The formation of the Labour Party and the ability of the Liberals to improve the condition of the people appeared to underline the inadequacy of personal relationships and private benevolence. But his discontent was also caused by his belief that Toynbee Hall had not kept pace with changing social forces. Its educational program, philanthropic activities and ties with working-men's organizations were all at a low ebb. Because the majority of Oxford graduates no longer viewed social work in the East End as an exciting or even useful endeavor, the settlement had difficulty finding competent residents. True, Barnett believed that Toynbee Hall could claim credit for a number of significant reforms in East London. Toynbee Hall residents had helped to reveal the inadequacy of the region's communal services and to raise the level of its sanitation, housing and education. In 1898 Barnett could point with pride to an increased number of recreational facilities, open spaces and public bathhouses, to better school-buildings and to improved teaching methods and to the demolition of some of the worst slums. Whitechapel's death-rate fell from 26.0 per 1,000 in 1879 to 19.3 per 1,000 in 1899.

But Barnett had always considered social harmony and the cultural and spiritual transformation of society to be Toynbee hall's primary objectives and in 1900 these were still distant and visionary goals. It was clear that the settlement had proved unequal to the herculean tasks to which he had set it.

Barnett first noted his discontent in a letter to his brother in October 1897: "Toynbee has not yet found its legs & I don't see any evolution in that direction. ... I expect I care too much & am too biased to be a good midwife to new ideas wh. may be coming to the birth. At any rate at the present moment I don't know where Toynbee is." By January 1899 he had become more convinced that Toynbee Hall's activities were not appropriate responses to East London's problems: "It is curious to note the change of society in wh. the place moves. The House floats down a river - the people who try to order its goings are the same but the currents are different - the winds are different & the scene of the bank is different." He continued his nautical analogy a few months later: "I ... am still putting TH in order for its winter voyage ... I have a good crew & am going to run the ship without changing either her shape or course - That must be done some day. It is curious how that has

54. o.A.B. to G.B., 9 October 1897.
55. o.A.B. to F.G.B., 22 January 1899.
changed." Toynbee Hall's annual report of 1901 echoed Barnett's discouragement:

In the early days a new enthusiasm lent a wider sweep to men's aims. The work took two directions; education on the one hand, co-operation with working-class movements on the other. Both were undertaken with the vigour which accompanies a new thing; both were successful, for a time at least.

... Times change rapidly; the spirit of the 'eighties,' and even the early 'nineties,' has already passed away. ...

... There is now, perhaps, less confident hope of great and far-reaching results. It has been felt that the ideals of seventeen years ago could be realised only in a more distant future, and after many years of slow and patient work.  

Barnett did not feel capable of transforming Toynbee Hall. Characteristically, he believed that only members of a younger generation could mould the settlement in accordance with present social thought. As he wrote to his brother in 1899, "there is nothing harder for us old pilots than to give up old methods but I am sure that it must be done ... If only I had a vigorous second I wld give him a free hand to change things to suit the present needs." The following year he was still determined to try the experiment "of leaving everything to a new generation"; in 1901 he wrote that he was looking "for new men with the new spirit." In the spring of 1903,

56. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 8 October 1899.
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60. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 30 November 1901.
when Barnett selected W.H. Beveridge as his sub-warden and possible successor, he began to write more confidently about the future of the settlement.

Beveridge was born in Rangpur, India, in 1879, the son of a judge in the Indian Civil Service. Returning to England for his education, he attended Charterhouse and, in 1897, entered Balliol College, Oxford. Years later Beveridge recalled that the most valuable advice he received in his youth was that of the master of Balliol, Edward Caird:

> While you are at the University, ... your first duty is self culture, not politics or philanthropy. But when you have performed that duty and learned all that Oxford can teach you, then one thing that needs doing by some of you is to go and discover why, with so much wealth in Britain, there continues to be so much poverty and how poverty can be cured.  

A friend and admirer of T.H. Green, Caird had been a leader of the university settlement movement in Scotland while Professor of Moral Philosophy at the University of Glasgow. In Glasgow he helped to found and organize the early activities of Toynbee House, a settlement modelled on Toynbee Hall, aiming, as he remarked, "to bridge the gulf that separated the well-to-do from the poor, and foster mutual understanding and goodwill by social intercourse."

61. Quoted in Beveridge, Power and Influence, 9.
62. Quoted in Henry Jones and John Henry Lairdhead, The Life and Philosophy of Edward Caird (Glasgow, 1921), 115.
When Caird succeeded Jowett as Master of Balliol in 1893, thus becoming more firmly rooted in the tradition of T.H. Green, his interest in the settlement movement continued. He took the chair at a meeting of Toynbee Hall at Oxford, visited and lectured at the settlement and entertained the Barnetts when they came to Oxford.

In accordance with Caird's advice, Beveridge devoted his years at Oxford to the pursuit of a liberal education. Entering as a mathematician, he soon switched to "Greats," in which he graduated in 1901 with first class honours. His almost weekly letters home were filled with accounts of essays, lectures, discussions with friends, social calls and sports. He also wrote frequently about George Eliot, for whom he displayed a typical Victorian veneration. It is clear from a letter in which he described a meeting of friendly societies at Oxford that he was both ignorant of, and supercilious about, working-class organizations: "We have been overrun yesterday and today by the Society of Odd Fellows. ... What their precise purpose is, has not transpired (sic), to me, but I believe they are some class of benefit club. There has also arrived a party of the Honourable and Ancient Order of the Foresters, who may have something to do with the Odd Fellows."

63. C.A.B. to F.C.B., 11 August 1894, 10 February 1900; Jones and Muirhead, Edward Caird, 149, 202, 210-11.
64. M.H.B. to Annette Beveridge, 30 May 1898.
Occasionally, however, Beveridge's letters did show the beginning of a social awareness. As early as 1898 he told his mother that he felt that he was somewhat wasting my time here, not in the way of idleness, but I should like actually to do some practical social work. The fact is I feel so immensely responsible at having the opportunities always said to be afforded by a residence at Oxford in my grasp, and feel that I cannot be employing them properly.

Uncertain about his future he believed that he would be "much happier if I knew that what I was doing would be directly useful."

By January, 1902, his sense of commitment to social investigation and reform had grown stronger:

I think that what perhaps is most of all demanded from ... my generation (while we are young at least) is a consideration of the big modern social questions & so I feel bound to join in that above all things. ... I have always seen two possible ways before me - one that of scholarship ... the other ... the chance of doing something immediately for this age. But I think that I can always come back to scholarship; for the present as I remember rather often telling me the thing is to get some ideas about modern problems. 66

One month later, Beveridge organized a society at Oxford for the study of social questions with R.H. Tawney, his friend and future brother-in-law. Perhaps because Beveridge was influenced by Caird,

---

65. W.H.B. to Annette Beveridge, 13 February 1898.
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his first ventures in the field of social work centered on Toynbee Hall. He spent two days at the settlement in January 1900, acted as host to a group of Toynbee Hall students who were visiting Oxford the following June, and in May 1901, considered working during the summer as a visitor for the Children's Country Holidays Fund, organization closely connected to Toynbee Hall. Nevertheless, in July 1902, when Barnett offered Beveridge a salaried position at Toynbee Hall, he replied that he intended instead to read for the Bar.

Beveridge spent the year following his graduation preparing first at Oxford and then at rooms in the Temple for fellowship examinations. Receiving a fellowship in September 1902, he began to read in Chambers. Five months later, however, he decided that he would not become a practising barrister. He outlined his reasons in a letter filled with adolescent resolves and ideals. Uniquely, he was able to look back on it fifty years later as having provided the key to his life. He criticized law because it was both "worldly in the extreme & remote from reality." The barrister's work was a mere "intellectual exercise", comparable to "the solving of endless chess problems"; moreover, it was "essentially solitary and self-centered

68. W.H.B. to Annette Beveridge, 16 January 1900, 5 June 1900, 8 May 1901.
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not to say selfish." Nor was Beveridge attracted by the "prize at the end", namely money and position:

That is to say one gets power in one shape and I suppose power is the thing that everybody desires to exercise. I too - but it is just that sort of power which rests upon money & position that I should care very little about; the power of knowledge and experience seems the only thing worth having.

He was already certain of the path his life would follow: "I think I may take it that the one thing in which I am interested wholly & completely is the getting to know something about human society & working at some part of its machinery."

Beveridge elaborated his goals about a week later in answer to a letter from his father suggesting that he should become a professor of law:

I have the conviction that in times such as these it is necessary for every man who possibly can to be out in the storm to some extent. The times seem stagnant; people seem to sit waiting to see in what direction things will move and therefore now above all there seems need of an effort to make them move in a direction dictated by reason rather than by the line of least resistance.

If Beveridge devoted his time to writing a book of purely technical interest he might forget about the outside world but he would always "awake from that forgetfulness to utter discontent & shame."

71. W.H.B. to Annette Beveridge, 25 June 1903.
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As alternatives to law, Beveridge first considered positions in local government and education. At the beginning of April, however, Barnett invited Beveridge to come and speak with him; at a meeting ten days later Barnett tentatively offered him the position of sub-warden, which Beveridge accepted on April 27. Beveridge was as certain of what he intended to accomplish at Toynbee Hall as he was of his longer range goals. When he informed his mother that he was considering the sub-wardenship, he told her that the position would not entail responsibility for all the "casual settlement work" such as organizing clubs and lecturing to small classes: "I have extremely little faith in the directly profitable results of such work; whatever they are they are wholly inadequate to the labour."

He stressed the ways in which the position would increase his abilities and further his career. First, he would receive "immediately practical experience in management organisation talking to & talking over people & the chance of really learning what I want to know about - the state of other kinds of people from my own kind." In addition, he would meet "the people who from my point of view are the right sort of people - and who should have the chance of many outlets when I knew what I wanted."
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Writing to his father soon after accepting the position, Beveridge defined his ideal of a settlement:

I do treated you to believe that you cannot possibly have a greater objection to 'soup kitchens' & 'genial smiles dispersed on horsey handed mechanics' & sentimentalism generally than I have. I am not going to Toynbee Hall to devote myself to such things. If anyone ever thought that colossal evils could be remedied by small doses of culture & charity & amiability I for one do not think so. The real use I wish to make of Toynbee & kindred institutions is as centres for the development of authoritative opinion on the problems of city life.  

In a more self-righteous manner he wrote to his mother a few weeks later: "I for one have no right to waste my education by becoming an organiser of charity or children's holidays or missions!" Beveridge claimed that Barnett "did not merely assent vaguely" to his interpretation of his role at the settlement "but agreed (or seemed to agree) positively." In fact, a letter Barnett wrote to his brother two days earlier suggests that he was initially hesitant:

"We have been weighing a man as sub-warden. He is very able - a whale for work - with definite views of fitting up his life in social service but not very patient of his tools, not a lover of the man in the fool - I hardly know what to say - He might draw together a more intellectual set but what abt dear boys, such as Douglas."
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This letter foreshadowed the conflict about the aims of a settlement which was to dominate the next ten years of Toynbee Hall's history. The residents who arrived at the settlement after Beveridge debated whether they should follow his lead in emphasizing social investigation or whether they should attempt to fulfill the original aims of the founders by continuing to participate in practical philanthropy.

Barnett's own doubts about Beveridge, however, soon disappeared.

At the end of May he told Beveridge that he hoped that young men would gather around him inaugurating "a new life" at the settlement "just as the first 13 men made the life which has gone on for the last 80 years." Although Beveridge's activities ran counter to the original meaning of a settlement, Barnett allied himself firmly with Beveridge's goals. His tenure as sub-warden should mark a turning point in the history of Toynbee Hall.

---

80. S.A.B. to W.H.B., 21 May 1903.
81. Beveridge was not of course the first worker at Toynbee Hall who was concerned with conducting research into current social problems. According to the "Articles of the Universities' Settlement Association," one of Toynbee hall's aims was to "inquire into the condition of the poor." (Record, Vol. I, No. 8 (May 1889), 96) Barnett himself strongly encouraged Charles Booth in his landmark investigation and two of Booth's leading assistants were H. Llewellyn Smith and Ernest Aves. What did distinguish Beveridge from earlier residents was that he emphasized social investigation to the exclusion of philanthropic activities and insisted that the aims of the settlement accordingly be reformulated.
Entering Toynbee Hall on 1 September 1903, Beveridge remained faithful to his ideal of the sub-warden of a settlement. True, he did participate in many typical settlement activities. He edited the Toynbee Hall Record, served a term as manager of a board school on Old Montagu Street, organized election campaigns for candidates for both the Stepney Borough Council and the London County Council, attended the meetings of a local working men's club and lectured to various organizations throughout East London. But he never forgot that these activities were not ends in themselves but rather the means by which he could gain the experience of leadership and an understanding of economic and social forces. Upon being appointed editor of the Record he wrote: "I have never edited a paper before & I am very glad to have this chance both for the experience & because I think the record wants reforming badly. Also I shall practice the art of self-expression." As a school manager he wrote less about his relationship with the students and teachers than about the power which the position gave him: "I ... chose a head mistress for a board school from three ladies each old enough to be my mother." He only once mentioned an evening spent at a working men's club, noting merely that he was "acquiring an exhaustive knowledge of beer." After speaking
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at the meeting of a local Ethical ociety be made this pronouncement:
"No more 'popular' lecturing to itbical or Self Improvement ocieties
86
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attending a meeting of the British Institute of bocial bervice in
uly 1904 also shows that his disdain for the ordinary activities of
a settlement did not diminish. He feared tiEt the organization would
become a center "for collecting information not on social subjects
but on mere philanthropic activities •.. As
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During the week ... I have been in two ways concerned with the 'Unemployed' — first in getting signatures to a letter for the papers written by Canon Barnett (& touched up by me), proposing a really sensible & non philanthropic way of dealing with the problem & abolishing street processions; second in getting together a joint committee of Toynbee, Balliol House & Wadham residents, which is to sit in the manner of a Royal Commission on the Unemployed examining in particular the various schemes proposed in the past.90

In a letter to his brother a day earlier, Barnett had expressed his own approval of the direction of Beveridge's activities: "My young men are I think rising & I am more & more convinced that Toynbee needs young men in the fort." 91

During the following few months Beveridge devoted most of his time to administering the Mansion House Fund of 1903–04. Sponsored by Canon Barnett, the Bishop of Stepney and other East London leaders, the Fund embodied Barnett's scheme for a farm colony, offering relief work in the country to the unemployed while supporting their families at home. Although the project lasted no more than a few months, it inaugurated Beveridge's career as an economist and provided the means by which he attempted to alter the function of Toynbee Hall.

90. W.h.B. to Annette Beveridge, 15 November 1903. (Balliol and Wadham houses were hostels for students at the settlement).
91. S.A.B. to F.G.B. 14 November 1903.
92. In a subsequent chapter this project will be discussed in greater detail and its impact on governmental programs will be considered; here we are concerned only with the way in which the project influenced Beveridge himself.
Shortly before the project ended, Beveridge wrote to his mother:

"I have been very busy studying the subject theoretically & have spent
the last few days constructing the most glorious curves representing
seasonal & cyclical variations of employment, the effect of frost,
strikes, etc., etc. I begin to think I know something!" A few
months later Beveridge and H.R. Maynard, a second settlement resident,
visited the men who had worked at the colony in order to discover
whether the experience had broadened their prospects of employment.
They found that, contrary to their expectations, few of the men had
obtained anything but casual labour. In a series of articles in
The Toynbee Record and in The Contemporary Review, Beveridge and
Maynard claimed that the results of the survey revealed the necessity
for a national system of farm training colonies supported by the state.
The colonies would be compulsory for men who were considered "unem-
ployable;" men temporarily out of work could voluntarily reside at
colonies with more favorable conditions. However, even while writing
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these articles, Beveridge was aware that relief work could no longer provide an adequate solution to the problem of unemployment. As he wrote to his father in November 1904, "Compulsory colonies of course are not meant to be & could not possibly be a remedy for the problem of unemployment - i.e. of the fluctuations of trade throwing out of work people willing to work. This problem seems to me much the harder one & I certainly don't see where the remedy is yet."

Beveridge's work in connection with the Mansion House Fund thus led him to conclusions which later encouraged him to advocate labor exchanges and unemployment insurance. In 1953 he wrote: "I remember asking myself what had gone wrong with economic laws in East London; if there was no demand for these men who had been trained at the farm colonies why did not they either go away or starve and die? What kept them just alive where they were? From this came the theory of underemployment and the reserve of labour, as I developed it later in articles and lectures and in Unemployment: A Problem of Industry."

By the end of the Mansion House scheme, Beveridge had begun to consider himself an important authority on economic problems. He was encouraged to believe that the articles he wrote at this time, analyzing the impact of the Fund, would be widely influential. In the middle of August 1904 Barnett asked Beveridge if he had finished

95. H.B. to Henry Beveridge, 19 November 1904.
96. Beveridge, Power and Influence, 24.
his first article on the unemployed: "There seems to be promise of trouble this winter & we must be ready." A few weeks later Barnett wrote to Beveridge that the problem of unemployment "is yours & Maynard's job whom I shall back with all my power." Soon after Beveridge's first article on the subject appeared in The Record, the publisher J.M. Dent wrote urging him to circulate it among social reformers and to consider expanding it into a book. During the following few months, moreover, Beveridge continued to make use of the information he had acquired as a director of the Mansion House Fund. In February 1905 Beveridge and two secretaries of Walter Long's Unemployment Fund, H.R. Maynard, a current Toynbee Hall resident, and Ernest Aves, a former sub-warden, spent an evening with Barnett devising an unemployed Bill to be presented first to Long and then to a Liberal M.P.: "It really is rather interesting being behind a person like Canon Barnett, who (through Maynard) will instil wisdom into Long, & on the other side has Herbert Samuel (M.P. for Whitechapel) coming down next Monday specially to be coached by him (& me) as to what he is to say in the House when the question comes up." The following month Barnett chose Beveridge to assist him while addressing a meeting of Liberal M.P.s at the House.
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of Commons on the problem of unemployment. "Some of the questions 101
Canon Barnett turned over to me," Beveridge proudly reported.
In letters to his parents during this period Beveridge mentioned
with increasing frequency having lectured to groups throughout the
country on various economic topics.

Barnett had originally hoped that Beveridge would devote his
primary energy to the settlement itself. He believed that the Mansion
House Fund was important partly because it could enable Beveridge
to alter the direction of Toynbee Hall, substituting social investiga-
tions and experiments for some of the out-moded philanthropic
activities. Barnett thus spent the months during which Beveridge
executed the scheme in Italy in order that Beveridge might have an
opportunity to mould the settlement in accordance with his own
ideals. At the end of January 1904 Barnett counselled:

I am writing to you abt. Unemployed & LOC
but I don't forget that our - yours & mine
- concern is the House. ... You said you
wished advice fr. me, all I can say I have
said & that is 'Remember to strengthen the
House.' I was always struck by the way
Jowett remembered Balliol. Whatever he
undertook in public & for the public, he
always made it lend to the glory of the
college. So it seems to me that for his
sake & for the future - whatever be the
object for which it may be used, the House
shld be strengthened.102

At the conclusion of his trip, Barnett again wrote,

101. W.H.B. to Annette Beveridge, 4 March 1905.
Our time is drawing to an end & our experiment will come to the judgment. For us it has, I think, been a success ... But the experiment was much more for the sake of giving Toynbee the means of "finding itself" than of giving us a holiday. Do you see any signs of its new life? "Things" are I know going well & the Bp. of Stepney has written to me his satisfaction re. the unemployed. That is a great matter but as I told you before it is the instrument - the House itself rather than the things it has done for wh. I care. Are you men at the centre conscious of a policy? Do you see more clearly what there is to be done? These are the sort of questions wh. my mind leaps to ask as time draws near.

Markby is here & we have been having some talks together. He with us is concerned for the future of Toynbee & recognises that new times demand new men & new ways. The experiment of leaving you has cost some anxiety but if the place gets the power of drawing in the enthusiasm of the time it will be more than repaid.  

In a letter to his brother seven months later Barnett expressed his satisfaction with Beveridge's leadership: "Toynbee is going very well & the young men cheer me much. The new spirit is I think going to find a resting place in the old form."

However, as Beveridge became more concerned with the problems of unemployment, he gradually withdrew his interest from the settlement itself. In July 1905, when he was appointed secretary of the C.O.S. Committee on Unskilled Labour which investigated casual employment at the London docks, he resigned the position of sub-

103. S. A. B. to W. H. B., 19 March 1904. (Sir William Markby, a Fellow of Balliol and All Souls', Oxford, worked in support of Toynbee Hall at the University.)
warden. In October 1905 Beveridge became a member of the staff of the Morning Post, responsible for its articles and leaders on social questions. "Just think of the people I should see & the wisdom I & the Canon, through me, should pump into the comfortable public about Poor Law, Trade Union Law, Unemployed, Garden Cities, Locomotion & Decentralisation," he wrote to his mother upon his appointment. One month later Beveridge was co-opted a member of the Central (Unemployed) Body for London. From then on, his connection with the settlement became more tenuous. He remained at Toynbee Hall until February 1907, but he regarded it as a useful place of residence rather than as a center of his concerns. In letters to his parents after the autumn of 1905 he rarely mentioned the settlement.

Although a resident for less than four years and sub-warden for only two, Beveridge left a strong impression on Toynbee Hall. His demand that the settlement should emphasize social investigation rather than philanthropic activities motivated a large number of the residents who followed him. Moreover, it is likely that he was responsible for the residence of R.H. Tawney who also influenced the settlement during the period. Beveridge later remarked on the

105. Beveridge, Power and Influence, 32.
106. W.H.B. to Annette Beveridge, 27 October 1905.
107. W.H.B. to Annette Beveridge, 20 November 1905.
paralleliams between them: "Nearly everything worth while in our lives and choices of careers was common to us." A friend of Beveridge at Balliol, Tawney had also received Edward Caird's advice that men should investigate the causes of poverty after obtaining an Oxford education. One week after Beveridge entered Toynbee Hall, Tawney wrote: "How are you and Toynbee? At first, before you settle down to anything in particular it must feel a bit lonely. But I envy you having made the plunge. A few months later, having obtained the position of secretary of the Children's Country Holidays Fund, Tawney himself became a resident at the settlement. He summarized his impressions at the end of his first year. A settlement was "something deeper than the desire of certain persons of the 'leisured' class to reside in a district where leisure is a rare possession, to make the acquaintance of individual working men." It was useful primarily because it served as "a common repository of social knowledge." Speaking at Oxford a few months later, Tawney again echoed Beveridge's ideas. According to Beveridge he urged students "not to do good at Toynbee Hall, but, while doing good if & how they can, at least to put themselves in a position

109. Ibid.
110. R.H. Tawney to W.H.B., 8 September 1903.
111. Twentieth Annual Report (1904), 22.
to get some sound comprehensive social theory." While a resident, moreover, Tawney increasingly became involved in the field of adult education. Soon after Beveridge's appointment to the Morning Post, Tawney joined the staff as Educational Critic. In September 1906 he told Beveridge that "teaching economics in an industrial town is just what I want ultimately to do." As a leading tutor for the Workers' Educational Association from 1909 to 1914, Tawney helped to link Toynbee Hall with the most important adult educational program during the period.

In June 1904, Barnett wrote to his brother, "We have now arranged that a man Harvey, a Quaker -1st class Oxford comes in to Toynbee as Deputy Warden. I hope the younger generation will gather round him." T. Edmund Harvey arrived at Toynbee Hall less certain than either Beveridge or Ashbee of what he intended to accomplish there. His experience and attitudes are nevertheless significant because they are perhaps typical of the majority of residents. Unlike Ashbee, his activities in the field of social reform were the result not of rebellion or rejection but of continuity with his background;

112. W.H.B. to Annette Beveridge, 28 November 1904.
113. Tawney succeeded Beveridge as leader-writer in 1908; Tawney in turn was followed by A.R. Brooke, a third Toynbee Hall resident. Although none of these men shared the conservative views of the paper, they were encouraged to express their own opinions on social questions.
he became a reformer by loyally following the values and traditions of his upbringing and religious training. Like the settlement itself he was never willing to challenge fully the basic assumptions of a previous generation.

The nineteenth century was a period of isolation for the Society of Friends in Britain. A regulation in force until 1859, requiring Quakers to marry within the Society, encouraged the growth of large, closely-knit families. Excluded from the Universities and thus from a majority of professions, Quakers were deprived of most contact with adherents of other faiths. A large proportion of the most promising members of each family entered business, a field in which their pooled financial resources, talents and energies won them a high degree of success. By 1900 the Society of Friends was dominated by an aristocracy of wealthy, interrelated families, observing Quaker austerity while enjoying a considerable degree of material comfort.

The Harveys comprised such a family; its wide ramifications were always a source of pride to T. Edmund Harvey, one of its most distinguished members. He was born at Leeds in 1874, the eldest son of William Harvey, a linen manufacturer, and of Anna Maria Harvey, the daughter of the Whitings, another prominent Quaker business family. Through marriage the Harveys were closely connected with

the Rowntrees; through common interests and participation in Quaker activities with such families as the Cadburys and Frys. In 1888, when T. E. Harvey was 14, his father was able to retire from business. From then on William Harvey provided a model of the wealthy, leisured philanthropist and civic leader whom the founders of Toynbee Hall frequently glorified. T. E. Harvey's brother later recalled his parents:

They were continuously busy, not only in the work of the Society, but in a multitude of philanthropic causes. There were public meetings, drawing-room meetings, committees and sub-committees to be attended, subscriptions to be given and appealed for, visiting Friends who were sometimes not entertaining to be entertained, hospitality to be provided for people who had lately appeared or would shortly appear on a platform, usually a Non-conformist platform, from which they would address solid Yorkshire Nonconformists on Opium, on Gambling, on the iniquities of the Trade (which should be controlled), on the blessings of Free Trade (which should not be controlled), on Peace, on Social Purity, on Foreign Missions.\textsuperscript{117}

William Harvey was a leader of the local Adult School, a member of most of the charitable institutions of the community, a Town Councillor \textsuperscript{118} and a Poor Law Guardian.

Religion was the force which knit the family together; daily prayers and attendance at Quaker meetings formed the center of its life. Between 1881 and 1884 William Harvey was \textsuperscript{17}erector of the

\textsuperscript{117}. William Fryer Harvey, \textit{We were Seven} (London, 1936), 2-3.
Brighouse Monthly Meeting and subsequently served as clerk of the Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting. While still a young boy, T.E. Harvey began to accompany his parents to the 'friends' meeting at Leeds. Known as a man of firm religious conviction, he always spent much of his time in the service of the Society. His letters to his family from Toynbee Hall were filled with accounts of the 'friends' meetings and societies he had attended and of the numerous Quakers with whom he maintained close contacts. At his death The Friend remarked that he "did very much throughout a long life to strengthen and enrich the witness of the Society of Friends ... His devotion to the society of Friends [was] shown both in eager care that its records should be preserved and studied ... and in steadfast support of contemporary Quaker activities." He observed Quaker habits as faithfully as Quaker rituals. He wrote to ask his father's advice about the wisdom of attending the theatre as late as 1898. As a student at Oxford he joined a temperance society; while at Toynbee Hall, he found it worthy of comment that at the annual dinner of a group of settlement classes, three-fourths of the men "only

119. Edward Milligan, "T. Edmund Harvey: His Life and Times" (eight chapters in typescript; not yet published).
121. T.E.H. to William Harvey, 16 January 1898.
drank water, and of the remainder half drank only mineral waters &
ginger beer." When he became friends with men who smoked at Oxford,
his mother encouraged him to find non-smoking companions. When
his grandmother heard a rumor that he himself had begun to smoke
she wrote: "We do long dear led that thy example may be pure in
every respect and I think we cannot call smoking pure."

Harvey's early education, like that of all nineteenth-century
Quakers, took place in the provinces. In 1887 he attended the York
Friends' Boys School, which his father and both grandfathers had
also attended. Known more popularly as Bootham, it was a small
boarding school founded in 1822, a Quaker version of the contemporary
public schools. In 1891, Harvey entered Yorkshire College, Leeds,
a second typical choice for a Quaker of the period. Nevertheless,
his career did not remain completely within the Quaker mold. By
the time of his birth the isolation of the Quaker community had
begun to diminish. Although some Friends took pride in preserving
their sense of distinction from the rest of British society,
others felt freer to participate in the world around them. In
1893, after spending four terms at Leeds, Harvey became a student at
Christ Church, Oxford, thus taking advantage of his foremost
opportunity to enter the mainstream of contemporary British life.
He graduated in 1897 with first class honors in "Greats".

123. T.E.H. to Anna M. Harvey, 26 January 1907.
124. Anna M. Harvey to T.E.H., 28 October 1894.
In another way also Harvey's generation differed from that of his parents. During the 1890's a number of his contemporaries, influenced by John Wilhelm Rowntree, began to question both the authoritarianism of the Society of Friends and its indifference to broad social questions. While remaining faithful to Quaker values, many younger members of the Society felt the need to make these values relevant to current social needs. T.E. Harvey was one of 126 Rowntree's leading disciples. He participated in the first summer school which Rowntree established in 1897 for Biblical and social study. At its conclusion, he joined a Summer School Continuation Committee responsible for promoting additional summer schools, 127 reading circles and lecture courses. When Rowntree died suddenly in 1905, Harvey and eleven other young Friends organized a series of tramps through the northern countryside to disseminate Rowntree's ideas. Moreover, he remained concerned with reinterpreting and applying Rowntree's thought throughout his subsequent life.

During his last year at Oxford Harvey considered both publishing and board school teaching as possible careers.

127. T.E.H. to William Harvey, 9 August 1897, 15 August 1897.
128. Lilligan, "T. Edmund Harvey".
129. Rough draft of message from the organizing committee to other interested Friends, 23 June 1905. Harvey Papers.
130. William Harvey to T.E.H., 5 February 1897, 23 February 1897; Anna M. Harvey to T.E.H., 23 February 1897.
Still uncertain at the time of his graduation, he spent a year travelling and studying in Berlin and Paris. He returned in 1900 and on March 6 began work as an assistant in the Prints Department of the British Museum. During the same month he established residence at Toynbee Hall. In June, however, he was appointed warden of Chalfont House, a small Quaker settlement in Bloomsbury, opened in 1894. The following day he wrote to his father:

You can imagine how overpowering the offer was, even with all he did to minimise the onerousness of the task... I told him that someone older was needed & that... I didn't think I would be fitted for the great responsibility. That might be a bit lessened by dropping the title 'warden'... But still it would be, I fear, a burden for better shoulders than mine...

Harvey accepted the position at the end of July although he still felt "very incompetent and unworthy of the post."

Harvey's involvement in political activity began while he was warden of Chalfont House. During his first years at the settlement he participated in the work of the Holborn Progressive Committee. At the end of January 1904 he was selected by the Finsbury Progressives as a candidate for the London County Council. Resigning his position at the British Museum in the beginning of February, he "plunged at once into election work." He was successful in gaining a seat.

133. T.E.H. to Anna L. Harvey, 10 January 1904.
135. T.E.H. to Anna L. Harvey, 7 February 1904.
Although Harvey's initial residence at Toynbee Hall lasted no more than a few months, he maintained his contacts with the settlement during his stay at Chalfont House. In the September after he left, he attended the opening "conversazioni" of Toynbee classes and societies. Two months later he canvassed for a resident seeking a position on the school board and delivered an address at a meeting of the settlement in Oxford: "On the whole I didn't find speaking as formidable as I had expected, and it was very enjoyable meeting the men, a very good set of fellows." After joining a gathering of old residents at the settlement he wrote that he "found it very stimulating ... and it was enjoyable to meet old friends agains." In June 1904, when it became clear that Beveridge's interests no longer centered on Toynbee Hall, Barnett invited Harvey to become deputy-warden. Harvey was as unsure about his ability to lead Toynbee Hall as he had been about his competency as warden of Chalfont house: "I went over on Thursday again to see the Canon ... I think I made him feel more doubtful as to whether I was equal ... to the height of the responsibility." A few days later he wrote: "I went to see Canon Barnett on Friday; he says all the members of

137. T.E.H. to Anna M. Harvey, 2 November 1900.
139. T.E.H. to Anna M. Harvey, 15 February 1903.
140. T.E.H. to Anna M. Harvey, 13 June 1904.
the Council (including 3 Residents) to whom he has told the news have been very pleased with the suggestion: Sir Charles Elliott only wishes I had been a Churchman, but otherwise is pleased, and he would much prefer a Quaker to a High Churchman, the Canon says!

Harvey began his tenure as deputy-warden at the end of September. In November 1906 he became warden, a position he held until his marriage in the summer of 1911.

Unlike Beveridge, Harvey was an enthusiastic participant in the settlement's traditional activities. As manager of the Baltic Street school he found pleasure in organizing excursions for groups of its students. A description of these outings was often the only reference he made to his life at the settlement in letters to his parents. For example, in May 1905, he wrote: "I enjoyed taking my four boys to Kensington Gardens & Palace on Saturday; two of them had never been before to Hyde Park, though there are no open spaces in East Finsbury and hardly a green thing to be seen. Baines & I took another party first on Sunday afternoon to the zoo." The following September he reported "a very warm greeting from my Baltic Street boys." He recognized the strength of his feelings for these students in 1907 when he was told he would be

141. T.E.H. to Anna M. Harvey, 19 June 1904. (Elliott was chairman of the Council of the settlement).
143. T.E.H. to Anna M. Harvey, 6 May 1905.
144. T.E.H. to William Harvey, 24 September 1905.
transferred to another school: "I am afraid it will never be possible to take up the work in the same way again." As late as 1913 he noted spending an afternoon "with one of my old Saltic Street boys."

But Harvey did not doubt that the problems of east London required more fundamental and farther reaching solutions. Significantly, John Wilhelm Rowntree, Harvey's mentor in the fields of both religion and social reform, had pointed out the inadequacy of practical philanthropy. Like his brother Beebohm, whose classic investigation of poverty in York was published in 1901, he stressed the need for careful research into the causes of contemporary problems. The philanthropic activities which preoccupied such members of the Society of Friends as Harvey's parents were no longer enough. In 1907, Harvey himself wrote in the settlement's annual report:

More and more men realize that good intentions and generous sympathies will not suffice to heal our social evils. We need patient study, on every hand, the collecting of information, the observation of existing experiments and the laborious putting together of the isolated stores of knowledge and experience which existing social agencies already possess.

145. T.E.H. to Anna M. Harvey, 3 June 1907.
146. T.E.H. to Anna M. Harvey, 23 February 1913.
As a member of both local and national governmental bodies Harvey attempted to fill this need. He held his seat in the London County Council until 1907 and served on the Stepney Borough Council between 1910 and 1911. From 1906 to 1910 he was a member of the Central (Unemployed) Body for London, succeeding Beveridge as Chairman of the Employment Exchanges Committee in November 1907. In 1910, when Harvey was elected a Liberal Member of Parliament from West Leeds, his interests began to center almost completely on parliamentary affairs. Because his tenure as warden of Toynbee Hall spanned the period during which the major Liberal social legislation was enacted, he was able to bring the settlement into contact with governmental agencies concerned with the control of poverty. In this manner he continued the trend which Beveridge had begun.

Harvey's political views were similar to those of the majority of other residents. During the period when socialist and collectivist ideas were becoming increasingly popular, he remained faithful to the individualistic tenets of the Liberal Party. Nevertheless, he also displayed some admiration for socialism. As a student at Oxford he seriously considered joining the Fabian Society, one of the few steps of which his father disapproved when he asked for advice. In a note in her diary in May 1904, four months

---

149. T.E.H. to Anna M. Harvey, 3 November 1907.
150. William Harvey to T.E.H., 2 November 1895, 5 December 1896.
before Harvey became deputy-warden of Toynbee Hall, Beatrice Webb described him as one of a "new group of friendly young men disposed to take our views seriously ... and anxious to see more of us."

While a resident at Toynbee Hall, Harvey often expressed his sympathy and respect for such East London labor leaders as Will Crooks and George Lansbury. In March 1910, when Lansbury was elected a Member of Parliament, Harvey sent him "heartiest congratulations." More concretely, in December 1918, Harvey wrote to his father:

I have been feeling increasingly drawn towards the Labour Party during the last ten days ... In many ways the greater freedom of Liberalism, at least as it exists ideally, is preferable, but it looks increasingly as though L.L.G. has broken up the party and the other leaders have given out no great positive programmes like the splendid Labour manifesto ... The international appeal of Labour, too, draws me very much and alas our old Liberal leaders seem to be far behind it.

But Harvey was never able to sever his connection with the Liberal Party. His activities in the field of social reform were rooted in

151. B. Webb, Our Partnership (London, 1948), 291. The note continued: "The relation of man's mind to the universe is constantly present as a back-ground in my own thought, and with some of our more intimate acquaintances - with T.E. Harvey, Masterman, Haldane, Russell - I have long talks; but the subject bores Sidney as leading nowhere and as not capable of what he considers valid discussion" (Op. cit., 292).
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153. T.E.H. to George Lansbury, 5 March 1910. George Lansbury Papers, L.S.E.

154. Quoted in Milligan, "T. Edmund Harvey."
his religious beliefs, in his family background and in his position in the Quaker community; his radicalism was always limited by his respect for tradition. In this manner he thus typified the settlement which he led.

Harvey was succeeded as warden by Maurice Birley. In the words of one former Toynbee Hall resident, Birley was "an old style gentleman whose conscience was touched." A man of independent means, he was the prototype of the leisured citizen whom the founders of the settlement had sought to reintegrate into working-class areas. His difficulties as warden lay in precisely this fact. At a time when a majority of the residents were concerned with investigating current problems and with applying new social legislation, he was preoccupied with boys' clubs and with a settlement branch of the Boy Scouts. He hoped to unify the different classes in friendship, not to frame social policy. Moreover, he was a modest and unassuming man, with few leadership qualities. As the other residents wrote at the conclusion of his tenure, he was never able to obtain "the support and help for which he might have looked to us who have lived in the house."

In 1912 Canon Barnett urged the Council to appoint Alexander Morris Carr-Saunders sub-warden as a means of supplementing Birley's leadership and of broadening the scope of the settlement's concerns.

155. Interview with Sir E.C. Bligh.
156. Record, Vol. XXVI, No. 7 (April 1914), 81.
His appointment, however, precipitated a crisis at the settlement. The residents split into two groups, each guided by a different conception of the meaning and purpose of a settlement. Those residents who supported Birley agreed that the primary function of a settlement should be to engage in practical philanthropy. The second and larger group, believing that the problems of East London were more complex than the founders of Toynbee Hall had realized, hoped to continue Beveridge's policy of emphasizing social investigation and reform. At a meeting of the Council on 2 June 1913, seven residents led by Carr-Saunders presented a confidential memorandum attempting to provide a "thorough review of the aims and work of Toynbee Hall." Such a reassessment was necessary because "Toynbee Hall has now been in existence for thirty years. During that period there have been significant changes not only in the social and educational condition of the East End but also in the work of the settlement and the position of its residents. ... But there has been no general review and restatement of its position, no attempt to judge the new Toynbee Hall in the light of the new London." Moreover, there was a general feeling "that Toynbee Hall is not flourishing at the present time. There is a certain atmosphere of decay; Toynbee

158. Interview with Sir E.C. Bligh.
159. Memorandum, l. /
Hall, in fact, seems to be living on its capital - on the reputation which was built up during the earlier years of its existence." The authors defined the goal of the settlement as social investigation and urged that new residents be men "with a serious and intelligent interest in the political, social and industrial problems of the day." In particular, they recommended that the settlement publish a series of pamphlets, embodying the results of research conducted by residents and organize conferences on current social and economic problems.

This memorandum provided a guideline for the policy of Toynbee Hall during the following months. Arriving at the settlement in October 1913, anxious to devote his time to organizing boys' clubs, Basil Henriques found the other residents "fearfully sociological." In December the council appointed John St. George Heath warden, a position which he assumed in March 1914. As an investigator of social problems and a participant in governmental organizations, Heath undoubtedly intended to follow the lead of Beveridge and Harvey. But the memorandum is also significant.

165. T.E.H. to William Harvey, 8 December 1913.
166. A Quaker by conversion, Heath went to Oxford, where he was President of the Union. Graduating in 1905, he sent the following letter to Beveridge:
because its presentation marked the end of the first period of Toynbee Hall's history. The memorandum was an acknowledgement of a decline in the influence of the settlement and of its increasing

I am writing to consult you as a father. I meant to stay up at Oxford a fifth year and take history but I have just received an offer which tempts me very much. Some of the residents in the West End of Sheffield, (principally business people but some connected with the University) are starting a settlement or Hall, something on the lines of Toynbee and have asked me to become the first Warden. At present this means simply being the secretary to their committee, but the future of the settlement would depend very largely on myself and I should have a great deal of initiative, more than I could hope to get elsewhere, at the age of twenty three ... Do you advise me to accept this. Personally I am very keen on doing so. But my people are against it. They say what will it lead to? and I have to say frankly that I don't know and don't care. All that I want is to make myself more or less master of the social problems and this seems to me an excellent way of doing so.

(John St. George Heath to W.H.B., n.d.)

Heath followed Beveridge's example, becoming warden of the Neighbourhood Guild Settlement in Sheffield. He then spent six months in Germany studying social questions. Returning in the autumn of 1906, he was appointed Lecturer on Social Economics at the Woodbrooke College, Birmingham. This was a Quaker College for advanced biblical and social studies founded in 1903 as an outgrowth of the summer schools organized by John Wilhelm Rowntree. An active participant in the summer schools, T.E. Harvey was also a member of the Woodbrooke Council for a number of years. In July 1912 Heath was appointed Secretary of Lloyd George's Land Enquiry Committee, a position he held until he assumed the wardenship of Toynbee Hall. He was also an active member of the Workers' Educational Association and of the British Committee of the International Association for Dealing with Unemployment. Soon after he became warden,
irrelevance to contemporary social needs. Moreover, the council was forced to recognize the fact that the two groups of residents had become irreconcilable and could no longer function within the same institution. At the meeting of the council on 2 June 1913, both Birley and Carr-Saunders resigned. The latter left within a few days; Birley remained until the following March when he moved eastward to Limehouse where he sought to continue the social work activities in which he had been engaged at Toynbee Hall. Although the settlement continued to operate until the outbreak of the First World War, it did not succeed in regaining its former position. During the war it was moved to Poplar and partially disbanded. When it was reopened in Whitechapel in 1918, it was reconstructed in harmony with new social ideals and in order to meet the problems of an altered East London.

166. (continued)
Heath decided to move Toynbee Hall to Poplar in order to inaugurate a new era. The experiment was not a success. The war drastically altered the condition of the country and Heath's own pacifist sentiments alienated many possible residents. He resigned the wardenship in 1917, obtaining a position in the Ministry of Labour. He died the following year.

167. T.E.H. to A. Irene Harvey (wife), 7 June 1913, 10 June 1913.
168. Interview with Sir E.C. Bligh.
Chapter IV: The Settlement's Educational Program

Social reformers are frequently differentiated by their interpretation of the nature of social change. One group believes that political reform can significantly alter the structure and functioning of a society. The other insists that a spiritual renaissance must precede any real social advance and that it is therefore futile to attempt to change governing institutions and policies until the values, attitudes and even the character of the individuals comprising the society are transformed. The majority of early residents at Toynbee Hall clearly belonged to this second group. As missionaries in East London they saw themselves regenerating the community by inculcating what they believed were higher ideals. A large portion of the activities of the settlement before 1900 can in fact be considered an attempt to work out Matthew Arnold's theory of culture. The term culture represented all that was opposed to the vulgarity, materialism and spiritual emptiness of modern English society; it stood for reason, idealism, religion and tradition. Accepting this definition, the early settlement residents set themselves the task of making "the best that has been known and thought in the world current everywhere." Like Matthew Arnold, moreover, they did not believe that culture could spring from the daily life

and institutions of the mass of the population. They regarded East London as a tabula rasa and its inhabitants as possessing no indigenous culture; the advancement of the working classes was dependent upon their being brought into contact with men of superior education and breeding.

One way in which Toynbee Hall attempted to give East London its share in the best culture of the nation was by organizing popular lectures, concerts and art exhibitions. Of these, the art exhibitions were clearly the most important. They were founded in 1881 by Samuel Barnett, then vicar of St. Jude’s. Although Toynbee Hall did not assume control of the exhibitions until 1894, the settlement residents took a leading role in both planning and superintending them. The exhibitions were held for about two weeks each spring and consisted of about 250 paintings, largely by Raphaelite artists. During the 1890’s the shows were attended by as

2. Matthew Arnold’s personal relationship with Toynbee Hall is also significant. In December 1884 he attended the presentation of a mosaic in honor of Barnett at St. Jude’s Church and spoke at a subsequent meeting held at the settlement. According to an account in The Times, “he was received with cheers” when he rose to speak and he recalled his own contact and interest in ‘the behind-the-scenes’ of English civilization.” (Quoted in W.F. Connell, The Educational Thought and Influence of Matthew Arnold (London, 1950), 165n.) In 1886 a report which Arnold wrote on elementary education abroad was published by the Education Reform League, an organization under the auspices of Toynbee Hall. (Connell, Matthew Arnold, 141) H.V. Nevinson, an early worker at the settlement, later wrote that Toynbee Hall “had received the blessing of Matthew Arnold, who assured the inmates that their names were written in the Book of Life.” (Changes and Chances, 78)

many as 72,000 spectators, a significant proportion of whom were working-class residents of East London. The settlement never doubted that the shows were able to improve the characters of these viewers: moral and allegorical paintings in particular inspired members of the working class with a sense of lofty ideal. One reporter of The Oxford Magazine confidently noted in 1884: "Those ... who noticed last year groups of rough hard-worked women becoming silent and calmed before Rossetti's Annunciation, can have no doubt of the refining influence of pictures." Mrs. Barnett was even more emphatic:

Mr. Schmalz's picture of 'For Ever' had one evening been beautifully explained, the room being crowded by some of the humblest people, who received the explanation with interest but in silence. ... I was standing outside the Exhibition in the half-darkness, when two girls, hatless, with one shawl between them thrown round their shoulders, came out. They might not be living the worst life; but if not they were low down enough to be familiar with it, and to see in that the only relation between men and women. The idea of love lasting beyond this life, making eternity real, a spiritual bond between man and woman, had not occurred to them until the picture with the simple story was shown them. 'Real beautiful, ain't it all?' said one. "'Ay, fine, but that 'For Ever' I did take on with that," was the answer."

5. Record, Vol. IV, No. 8 (May 1892), 100; Record, Vol. VI, No. 8 (May 1894), 120; Record, Vol. X, No. 8 (May 1898), 102; Seventh Annual Report (1891), 40; Eighth Annual Report (1892), 26.
The art exhibitions, moreover, paved the way for the Whitechapel Art Gallery, founded in 1901, largely through the efforts of Canon Barnett and other settlement residents. Music was also considered an important means of humanizing the life of the community.

Classical concerts, begun in 1897, were performed by Oxford and Cambridge musical societies each Sunday afternoon during the winter months and attended by audiences numbering 250. The popularity of the concerts was sufficient proof to the settlement residents that working men were as capable as members of the upper classes of appreciating "the best." "It is difficult to say how greatly they enjoy the concerts, who come from all parts of East London week by week," the settlement council wrote in 1910. "They give to men and women who have few opportunities of attending the great concerts in west London a chance to leave the racket of the streets, to get away from their crowded homes and the care and burden of industrial life, and ... to feel themselves

8. The Gallery still stands on Whitechapel High Street, two blocks from Toynbee Hall. Although it serves a somewhat different purpose from that originally envisioned by the early settlement residents, it can in a sense be considered a testament to their faith in the value of art in modern, mass society.

freed from the fetters of circumstances and to realise faculties of their natures which otherwise might have lain dormant."

Saturday evening lectures, generally on historical and literary topics, provided East Enders with an opportunity to hear such eminent figures as A.V. Dicey, Leslie Stephen, Arthur Sidgwick and Frederic Harrison. By 1902 they were attended by an average of 200 hundred people.

These popular cultural events, however, comprised only a subsidiary part of Toynbee Hall's educational program. Like Matthew Arnold, the residents generally identified culture with the ideal of Oxford. Until the turn of the century, the settlement was primarily a center for adult education, offering university-level courses to East London's working-class population. Following the example of the London Working Men's College, established by a group of Christian Socialists in 1854, the settlement emphasized liberal and humane subjects rather than those which could be directly utilitarian. The courses should enrich the personal lives of the students, not help them to improve their social and economic positions. The residents' goal was to share with the underprivileged the knowledge and values they themselves had recently acquired at the universities. Nevertheless, the residents did not fully distinguish

between the Oxbridge ideal of a liberal education and the traditions and atmosphere of the institutions. They considered the social, collegiate life of Oxbridge a natural and integral part of the educational experience of every student without recognizing the extent to which these were irrelevant to members of the working class. Hopefully, the settlement’s courses would pave the way for a university in East London, modelled on Oxford and Cambridge, and adapted as little as possible to conform to the values of the community in which it would stand.

The greatest dilemma facing the early residents lay in this discrepancy between the aims of their educational program and the interests of its consumers. Although the residents disavowed any intention to stimulate social mobility, they in fact expected each student to become culturally middle class without affording him traditional middle-class rewards. But working men wanted the material advantages Toynbee Hall residents had always enjoyed, not their attitudes, ways of thought or ideals. In place of liberal studies and a university social life, they demanded an education which could prove immediately useful. Like many reformers who have attempted to alter the values of others, the settlement residents thus found themselves rejected by the very men they had hoped to influence.

However, a number of residents sought to avoid this problem by redefining their objective. They spoke in terms of attracting
not the average working man but "the best." As one resident wrote in 1886,

Our endeavour has been, and I think should continue to be, to find out the best working men and women, and to interest them, leaving it in their hands to transmit the ideas worth preserving to those whose habits and thoughts are less in accord with our own. No doubt good work can be and has been done by direct contact with the 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 a corresponding gain.12

The settlement should concentrate on the men Matthew Arnold defined as "aliens," on those few men who had already rejected the dominant ideals of their class.

The tensions between the aims of the settlement residents and the demands of the community are illustrated by the courses the settlement offered in conjunction with the University Extension Movement. This movement was organized by the universities during the early 1870's as a means of broadening their influence over the life of the nation. It began at Cambridge in 1873 and spread to London three years later; an Oxford society, established in 1878, began work in 1885. These various societies provided university-educated teachers for courses consisting of ten lectures in urban centres throughout the country; discussion classes generally followed

the lectures, preparing students for examinations administered by
the universities.

In the spring of 1877 Barnett helped to establish a Whitechapel
center, under the direction of the London society. In October the
first hundred students attended four courses at the London Hospital.
Four years later the courses were conducted at St. Jude's Church
and in 1885 the center moved to Toynbee Hall. Until the turn of
the century, the Toynbee Hall Extension center offered four courses
during each of three terms in literature, history and natural science.
The peak year was 1891 when 542 students registered for the courses
and an average of 327 attended them each week. In general, at
least ten per cent of the students participated in the discussion
classes following the lectures and sat for the examinations.

The early intentions of the Whitechapel center may be seen
indirectly in the experience of one of its prominent students.
Frederick Rogers, subsequently a leader in the movement for old age
pensions and chairman of the Labour Representation Committee, has
described the impact which the courses had on him in considerable
detail. He was born in Whitechapel in 1846, the son of a docker,
and began work at the age of ten as an errand boy. When he was 14,

13. Frederick Rogers, Labour, Life and Literature: Some Memories
    of Sixty Years (London, 1913), 80.
14. Record, Vol. I, No. 1 (October 1888), 10; Record, Vol. IX,
    No. 5 (February 1897), 56.
he undertook to learn book-binding, a trade with which he was associated during most of his subsequent life. Nevertheless, from an early age he evinced a strong interest in literature and read voraciously whenever he had an opportunity. In 1870 he spent his first holiday visiting Oxford. Many years later he phrased his reactions in just the terms which would have pleased Toynbee Hall residents:

> It was early on Monday when I entered the city ... With the help of a popular guide-book, I was soon busy exploring its colleges and their gardens ... The spell of the streets soon began to work ... I had read of such streets, but had never beheld them before. No ambitious boy, coming to his university for the first time, felt a keener delight than I at all he saw ... it was a symbol of the intellectual growth of England for me; history and romance filled my mind, the phantoms of the great dead were with me, and a yearning to be, or to do, something worthy of those out of whose life the ancient city grew possessed me, and so, dreaming, aspiring and enjoying my holiday passed. 16

In 1877 Rogers attended the first public meeting of the Whitechapel branch of the University Extension Movement: "to me the speeches and the ideas they embodied came like a revelation which drew together and synthesized ideas that had been working for years in my imagination ... now had come the new movement which might bring me into touch with all I loved, and to this I resolved to devote myself." 17 Like other Extension students, Rogers was particularly inspired by the lectures of the historian S.R. Gardiner:

"I had dreamed of what scholarship might be, and perhaps I had fancied myself a scholar; but now I was face to face with true scholarship, and I sat silent and with bowed head." In 1878 Rogers became one of the secretaries of the center, responsible for introducing literature into its program. The following year he changed jobs, having secured a position with shorter hours. His increased leisure gave a new zest to my University Extension work, and I was constantly in touch with the varied activities which clustered round the church work of the Rev. S.A. Barnett. I lectured often at workmen's clubs all over London ... and had many inspirations from his sermons at St. Jude's, which an hour later I carried on to the platform of some well-filled workmen's hall. I left off talking politics and discussed education, history, and literature, and soon found eager listeners. It was at this time a desire, which afterwards became a passion, shaped itself in my mind of connecting, if I could, the various Labour movements which I instinctively saw were presently to mould the life of the nation with the finer elements in our national life - with religion, education, art and literature - and to that end I gradually worked.19

Thus although Rogers, like other working men, was attracted to socialism in the 1880's, it never gripped my imagination as it did that of my shopmates. This was because, when it arose as a new gospel of Labour, my mind was passing into a critical stage ... I had

begun to look at social problems from the human side, rather than from that of Machinery. I was greatly attracted by the early activities of the Fabian Society ... but the pull of Toynbee Hall was stronger. There I carried on the earlier traditions of my life, and saw later on that I was entirely right in doing so.  

In 1883 Rogers spoke in support of Toynbee Hall at a meeting held at St. John's College, Oxford and wrote a pamphlet endorsing the new settlement movement. Three years later, he began to participate actively in the work of Toynbee Hall, becoming secretary of one of its literary societies.

Rogers is perhaps most important because he was the type of student many of Toynbee Hall's residents hoped to attract. Like the settlement itself, he represented a rebellion against the nineteenth century assumption that a liberal education was proper to the upper classes alone. Moreover, he can be considered an example of Matthew Arnold's aliens; because he was inspired by the atmosphere and traditions of the older universities and was determined that the advancement of his life be measured by spiritual rather than by material standards, his vision transcended narrow class interests.

In general, however, Toynbee Hall was not successful in attracting East London's working-class population. Throughout the country, Extension lectures appealed primarily to middle-class groups. Of the hundred students who enrolled for the first courses in Whitechapel in 1877, only 12 were working men. In subsequent

years, a substantial proportion of the students were Board School teachers, most of whom were considered members of the lower-middle class. As a result, the extension courses had little impact on the immediate neighborhood of Toynbee Hall. According to an analysis of the student body in 1890, only half of the students were residents of either East London or Hackney; twenty per cent came from North London, ten percent from the south-east districts and about five per cent from the western districts.

The Whitechapel center's financial problems as well as the nature of its courses helped to determine the social composition of the students. The total annual expenses of the settlement's Extension program were about £250, of which only £50 came from outside subscriptions; the rest was raised by students' fees. The minimum fee of one shilling for a course of lectures at Toynbee Hall was in fact lower than that charged by the majority of other centers but even this sum was prohibitive to working men, many of whom could not expect to earn more than twenty shillings a week. Moreover, the students were encouraged to buy associates' tickets of five shillings to help to subsidize the center. In 1890 the center attempted to increase the number of associates' tickets.

23. Record, Vol. II, No. 7 (April 1890), 74. (The article does not account for fifteen per cent of the students, many of whom probably lived in the suburbs.)
although this policy "tended to circumscribe the classes from which the students are drawn." During the following few years about thirty percent of the Extension students paid five shillings for the course, a sum far exceeding the means of the average workman. A course of lectures was even more expensive for those students who lived a substantial distance from the settlement. On an average, transportation cost them 8s. 58d for each class or 3s. 9d for a full course. A significant proportion of students who bought the higher priced tickets thus paid as much as 8s. 9d for a single series of Extension lectures.

Despite the predominance of middle-class students at Toynbee Hall, Barnett was at first convinced of the value of its educational program. In March 1885, a few months after the opening of the settlement, he told his brother that he looked forward to Toynbee Hall becoming "a real centre of learning." The early students and settlement workers shared his initial optimism. The "Toynbee Journal and Students' Union Chronicle," edited by the journalist E.T. Cook and published during the term 1885-86 as the organ of the Toynbee Hall Extension Centre, most clearly expressed the spirit guiding
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the early work. The dominant tone was that of men embarking on an exciting adventure. The last page of the journal was devoted to quotes from such men as Ruskin, Carlyle, Bagehot and Toynbee, thus connecting the work of the center with the thought of great Victorians. Large segments of each issue recorded speeches by leading contemporary educationalists who stressed the long-range significance of the Extension lectures. The April 1886 issue contained a fanciful yet revealing letter by a correspondent from the United States in 1932 reporting a visit he had paid to the "University of East London", situated on a transformed Commercial Street. In handsome Gothic buildings surrounded by luxurious vegetation 400 clerks and mechanics from the neighborhood attended a six-year course of study. The students generally travelled for one month during the summer. Each week they held "spirited debates" in their "Union" and attended musical performances in a "lovely little Gothic church." About forty professors and tutors were associated with the university; the former devoted their full time to teaching and research but the tutors were largely mechanics, who worked in the same factories as the students. Most significantly, the lectures rooms were in "telephonic communication with Oxford and Cambridge" so that the best lectures from the universities were simultaneously conveyed to the students.

Barnett's satisfaction with the Extension program did not last. As early as 1888 he wrote to his brother: "On Friday I went to a Univ. Extens. meeting ... The society wants the sight of another peak, it has reached the height it saw ten years ago & is now deceived in thinking itself at the top." During the 1890's, when the number of students attending Toynbee Hall's lectures began to decline, he became more discouraged. By 1899 the attendance had fallen to two-thirds of what it had been in 1891 and for the first time the settlement offered three Extension lectures each term instead of the customary four. At the beginning of October 1901, Barnett told his brother: "The lectures are badly taken up & I fear it is our last year of the UES." He continued the following week: "We have had a good Toynbee week ... but some of the things in which we believed are gone. It seems impossible to get people to lectures - We have 22 where we used to have a 100 - Of course one might condemn the times but it may be that conditions are changed." Barnett believed that the ineffectuality of the Extension movement stemmed from its lack of co-ordination; it offered isolated miscellaneous lectures for adults with a casual interest in various subjects rather than intensive courses for the serious student. A program which provided students with no more than a smattering of
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culture could not effect the transformation of society he had envisioned. In 1892 the settlement thus began to continue courses for at least two years instead of concluding them at the end of each term. A more significant innovation was the formation of tutorial classes in place of the lecture courses. The first of these classes, in history, began in October 1899 and lasted for two years. By 1900 the settlement was organizing three tutorial classes each term, in history, literature and science. The classes were limited to ten or twelve students who agreed to devote considerable time to the systematic study of the subject.

In 1903 the settlement also participated in offering a four-year course of study in history, literature and art established by the newly reconstituted Extension Board of the University of London. Soon after the program was announced, The Record commented: "This means much for Toynbee people. It means that teachers and other busy people may during four years follow a course of reading marked out and approved by the highest authority as that most likely to lead them to the heights where the view is far and the air is bracing. It means that the teaching of Literature and History will be rescued from dilettante listeners and be made as serious a study as that of science." Barnett was also enthusiastic. He urged "the leaders
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of opinion" to give "bold advertisement" to the scheme in order
that "the imagination of Londoners may be struck and students collec-
ted." A month before the new courses began at Toynbee Hall he
asked Beveridge if the program had "set you on fire?" Beveridge,
as usual, was more skeptical. He wrote to his sister that the
syllabus of the new lectures "simply flabbergasted the education
committee ... the net result is that we have a lecture on 'Social
Forces in Modern Literature' which begins at 1700 & ends at 1820
& is splendidly learned & literary. It will be about two miles
& a half above the heads of any possible audience to be got here."

In 1905 Beveridge and Tawney made a final attempt to revive
the popularity of the University Extension program by lecturing on
"Labour and the Law" and "Social Aspects of Industry," two topics
which they believed were directly related to the current social
and economic interests of the working classes. A few days before
the term began, Beveridge wrote to his mother: "I know at least
one student who has paid his shilling to hear us; in fact I caught
him last night & made him sign on then & there ... I am told that
others are coming too; but I still firmly believe that neither of
us will get an audience above six." He need not have been so
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discouraged. His lectures were among the most successful held at Toynbee Hall that term and similar courses were offered during subsequent years.

Nevertheless, the extension program never regained its former position at the settlement. The residents had perhaps waited too long to seek to attract a new group of working-class students. Despite attempts to publicize the new programs, no more than forty students a term attended either the new humanities lectures or the social and economic lectures. In 1913 a group of residents reported: "The University Extension lectures ... are a complete failure from the point of view of numbers; they have ceased also to attract serious students. The few who attend them seem to come rather with a vague desire for a pleasant evening than for any other reason." By 1914, the extension courses represented only a peripheral aspect of Toynbee Hall's activities.

Toynbee Hall's efforts to broaden the scope and influence of its extension program did however have a long-range importance. The settlement formed one link between the extension movement and the workers' Educational Association, founded by Albert Membridge in 1903 and generally considered the most significant organization within the adult education movement in the twentieth century. Membridge himself later noted that the idea of the WEA was "in
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line with ... Barnett's well known efforts at Toynbee Hall."

In particular, he stressed Barnett's experiment in modifying the Extension program by providing opportunities for systematic and continuous study; it is likely that he modelled his tutorial classes, the core of the early work of the W.E.A., on those which Barnett had established at Toynbee Hall years before. Mansbridge had contact with the settlement from an early age, having heard about it from his mother, a member of a co-operative society which met at Toynbee Hall. In 1897 Mansbridge became an employee of the Co-operative Wholesale Society situated a few blocks from Toynbee Hall, and attended the settlement's art exhibitions and Extension courses.

Mansbridge's writings on education reflected the influence of Barnett. Like Barnett, he believed that education was ideally a spiritual experience, enriching men's personal lives rather than enabling them to better their economic or social positions. Then too, Mansbridge hoped that the W.E.A. would unify the different
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social classes in friendship rather than provide the basis for working-class solidarity. Finally, Lansbridge shared Barnett's reverence for the old universities and his belief that they should continue to train members of the governing classes. The W.E.A. in fact supplemented Barnett's own efforts during the period to increase the impact of Oxford and Cambridge over the life of the nation by augmenting the proportion of working-class students. As Lansbridge later wrote, "I found that much that I thought he had said years before."

Barnett also offered the W.E.A. concrete assistance, securing financial aid, helping it to establish ties with the University of London and organizing both a series of lectures at Westminster Abbey and pioneer classes in the south of London. With his encouragement, other men closely connected to Toynbee Hall assumed leading roles in the early history of the new Association. The first meeting of its provisional committee met in F.E. Douglas' rooms at Toynbee Hall in July 1903. The W.E.A.'s earliest supporters at Oxford included Sidney Ball and A.L. Smith both of whom had actively encouraged university graduates to become residents of the settlement.
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W.M. Childs, the Principal of the University College at Reading and a former Toynbee Hall resident, helped to devise the constitution of the W.E.A. and to establish its first branch. R.D. Roberts, then Registrar of the University of London Extension Board, assisted Canon Barnett in organizing the classes in South London, the first of which was taught by David Macgregor, a former resident; in April 1908 Beveridge was elected treasurer of the South London branch. As Secretary of the Board of Education, Robert Morant was instrumental in providing governmental assistance to the new movement. During part of his tenure as warden of Toynbee Hall, T.E. Harvey served as honorary treasurer of the Association, a position to which he devoted considerable time and energy. Above all, R.H. Tawney dominated the history of the W.E.A. He was the first tutor of the experimental Longton and Rochdale classes and remained a foremost leader of the Association throughout his subsequent life.

But the connection between the settlement and the W.E.A. should not be overemphasized. The W.E.A. was not only a natural continuation of existing University Extension programs but a revolt against the whole Extension movement and a denial of its appropriateness to the needs of the time. Founded and directed by upper-class
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men convinced that they had the right to make decisions for the underprivileged, the Extension movement always retained a patronizing spirit. As a product of the social and political ferment of the early 1900's, the W.E.A., on the other hand, attempted to unify the universities and the working-class movement in an equal partnership. The governing council consisted of an equal number of representatives from both the universities and workmen's organizations. The tutorial classes can be considered an early example of student power; they were democratic and self-governing bodies in which the students had a controlling voice in the appointment of teachers and the selection of subject matter. Moreover, the W.E.A. focused its activities on the working classes. It appealed specifically to those workmen who had received an elementary education following the Education Act of 1870 and sought more advanced instruction to prepare themselves for the new political responsibilities they hoped to assume. In place of the cultural lectures sponsored by the Extension movement, the W.E.A. established classes concerned with the contemporary social and economic problems directly affecting the lives of the working classes.

Toynbee Hall was more in harmony with the ideals of the Extension movement than with those of the W.E.A. Significantly,

the institutional ties between Toynbee Hall and the W.E.A. were never as strong as they had been between the settlement and the London Extension Society. The settlement did not attempt to become the East End center of the new movement or to merge part of its educational program with that of the W.E.A. Although a W.E.A. tutorial class, consisting of twenty-five members of the Co-operative Wholesale Society, met at Toynbee Hall in 1912, it was not conducted by a settlement worker. The few residents who did lead tutorial classes between 1910 and 1913 held them in other parts of London.

The residents who presented a confidential memorandum to the Settlement Council in 1913 noted that the W.E.A. captured exactly the type of student the settlement had consistently sought to attract. But in a movement from below Toynbee Hall could have only a minimal role to play.

The history of the small classes and reading parties taught by Toynbee Hall residents parallels that of the settlement's Extension program. By the term of 1888-89 the settlement was able to offer thirty-five such courses, half of which were in either English literature or foreign languages; other subjects included
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science, philosophy, music and history. The settlement emphasized the distinction between these courses and the lectures held under the auspices of the University Extension Society. Smaller and less formal than the lectures, the classes were expected to promote close relationships between the residents and East Enders: "The 'method of friendship' has been as much kept in sight as the positive communication of knowledge. Whilst instruction is given and received, the main object in view is the establishment of friendship and sympathy between the teachers and the taught." But the classes encountered the same problems as the Extension lectures in attracting the working-class population of East London. The students were largely teachers and clerks, few of whom lived in the immediate neighborhood of the settlement. Moreover, although 400 students attended the classes in 1889, the numbers began to fall shortly afterwards. In 1893 the average weekly attendance was 307 and in 1901 it was 250. In 1910 the settlement organized only seven classes, attended by fewer than 40 students.
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The conflict between the ideals of the settlement residents and the interests of the community in which they worked were also illustrated by the settlement's one attempt to provide elementary and commercial classes for men. The classes were organized in 1893 when a new Evening School Code enabled adult students to receive state aid. The staff comprised teachers from Board Schools and a few Toynbee Hall residents; a grant from the Board of Education provided half of the finances. In the autumn of 1893 between eighteen and twenty men attended the classes each night. By 1900 the average weekly attendance had risen to about forty. Reorganized in 1902, the classes soon ranked as the most popular educational venture at the settlement. The number of students rose from 150 in 1902 to 347 in 1913, a year in which few students still attended either the Extension lectures or the smaller classes and reading parties. Moreover, these classes were far more successful than any other educational endeavor in attracting working-class residents of East London. Of the 440 students who attended the classes between 1905 and 1908, 152, or 35%, were manual workers and 347, or 79%, lived in East London.

70. Twenty-fourth Annual Report (1908), 16.
73. Sixteenth Annual Report (1900), 38.
75. Twenty-fourth Annual Report (1908), 16.
But, though satisfactory to the community, the classes did little to fulfill the mission which the settlement residents had set themselves. While emphasizing elementary and commercial subjects, the curriculum included only a few of those subjects considered more fitting to a 'university' settlement such as English literature and history. Some residents nevertheless believed that the courses furthered Toynbee Hall's goals in two ways. Because they drew a large number of workmen to the settlement each night the courses promoted intercourse between members of different social classes. Moreover, the courses brought a new group of East Enders within reach of Toynbee Hall's influence. Students who might initially be motivated by a narrow desire for utilitarian instruction could imbibe from their surroundings a sense of the higher values of a liberal education. Although a disappointingly large proportion of the students continued to concentrate solely on commercial subjects, the residents periodically noted progress. In 1909 the Record remarked on the growing popularity of the literature and art courses which pointed to the "amended ideals" of the students. Two years later the settlement announced that "the broadening outlook of the Men's Classes", bringing them "more closely in touch with the more humane studies that have always characterised the Toynbee classes proper," had encouraged the residents to unite the two types of
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classes under one committee. The seven residents who presented a confidential memorandum to the Council of Toynbee Hall in June 1913, however, were far less sanguine about the possibility of altering the values and ways of thought of these working-class students. They argued that the "students who attend commercial classes are quite out of touch with the general work of the Settlement." Despite the encouragement of their teachers "very few indeed ever pass into any other class, and they are, moreover, drawn from a type that is as little susceptible as any would be to the influence of such ideals as Toynbee Hall seeks to promote." The following September the settlement decided to discontinue the classes.

Toynbee Hall's various categories of lectures and classes formed only one segment of the educational program. The social activities of the settlement, like those of the universities on which it was modelled, were believed to be as significant as the more structured and formal courses. The residents were proud of the large number of self-governing societies connected with the settlement and of the corporate, or collegiate, spirit they encouraged. It will be seen, however, that the mass of East Enders considered a university social life even more irrelevant to their interests than lectures on cultural subjects.
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The Students' Union, open to all students at Toynbee Hall, was the largest and most important society. Its membership reflected the attendance at the extension lectures during the period; it comprised 500 students in 1894, 400 in 1898, and no more than 250 after 1900. Its founding in 1885 was motivated by a belief that "if students could occasionally meet together in some place other than the lecture-room, with opportunities for social intercourse, one step nearer University education would have been made." Each October the Union sponsored an opening "conversazione", attended by as many as 1,200 students. Throughout the subsequent winter months the Union held smaller social gatherings and during the spring and summer it organized excursions throughout London. The high-point of the year's activity was a trip to either Oxford or Cambridge on Whit Monday when about 100 students toured the campus and received the hospitality of undergraduates. The settlement claimed that the trip served a valuable purpose, allowing East Enders to imbibe the ethos of the universities and promoting intercourse between the working classes and university students. As
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Canon Barnett wrote in 1902, it provided "ample opportunity for ex-
change of experience" and left "memories, which in after years help
85
to draw classes to a better understanding." But a letter which
Beveridge wrote to his mother after entertaining a group of Toynbee
students suggests that the expedition did little to dispel the
prejudices of even the most conscientious undergraduates about East
Enders. When he joined the students in the early afternoon he "found
that they had all emphatically had enough of college inspection
in the morning. N.B. they had only seen three whereas Uncle David
by comparison with them aged & presumably feeble got through 17
before 10 a.m." Beveridge therefore suggested that the group spend
the afternoon punting on the river. "They were most charmed at the
prospect - also extremely witty at the idea of going on the water
& encountering the perils of the deep." Nevertheless, the students
"behaved most excellently" although "their habit of commenting
freely or admiringly on passing canoes and their occupants was at
times embarrassing, though these comments were not at all ill meant
and in themselves quite polite!" Beveridge's last task was to
provide tea for the students in his rooms. "Finally the whole troop
departed about eight o'clock; I think my party at any rate enjoyed
themselves, and we managed to get quite sufficient conversation at
86
tea to prevent embarrassment."
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86. W.H.B. to Amnetie Beveridge, 5 June 1900.
Most of the societies affiliated to the settlement attempted more directly to combine education and fellowship. Members of the Adam Smith Club, founded in conjunction with an early Whitechapel extension course, read *The Wealth of Nations* together and discussed the various economic questions which it suggested. Although the club was one of the earliest to establish itself at Toynbee Hall, its connection with the settlement lasted only a few years; in 1892 it began to meet in the south of London. The Economics Club, which was more closely linked with the settlement, displayed a broader interest in social and economic problems. It was founded in 1891 when papers on such topics as trades unionism and General Booth's unemployment scheme were read and discussed at monthly meetings. Following its reorganization in 1899, the club chose one subject each term on which the members organized lectures and conferences and occasionally undertook their own investigations. Although the club was one of the few societies at the settlement directly concerned with the problems of East London, it was not a success. It ceased to hold meetings in 1903, resuming them again for only two years in 1906.

90. *Fifteenth Annual Report* (1899), 42.
Other educational societies sought to fulfill the settlement's goal of bringing culture to the masses of East London. A Shakespeare Club was founded in 1884 by Sidney Lee whose patronizing attitude was perhaps typical of many early settlement workers. He believed that Shakespearean Clubs may offer them a novel and valuable recreation and may aid appreciably in eliminating from their social life the many evils that spring out of their inability to amuse themselves rationally. To encourage a taste for literature, moreover, among those whose daily occupations have nothing about them that is morally or intellectually stimulating is to discover for them a new world, capable of breeding in them a fruitful disgust for the mortifying taints of the old one.\textsuperscript{92}

The club consisted of about forty members who met once a week to read and discuss Shakespeare's plays and performed one play each Christmas for the benefit of the other settlement students. Sidney Lee was also the president of the Elizabethan Literary Society; for many years he was assisted by Frederick Rogers and Ernest Baker, an East London errand boy. Established in 1886, the society held weekly reading parties and organized monthly lectures by distinguished scholars. With a membership averaging \textsuperscript{93} it was considered one of

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{92} Sidney Lee, "Shakespeare in East London," \textit{Oxford Magazine} (4 June 1884), 289.
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\end{itemize}
the most consistently productive club's connected with Toynbee Hall.

But it had little impact on East London. It drew its members increasingly from other areas and in 1903 it moved to King's College, London.

Two other literary societies met at Toynbee Hall during the 1890's. A Library Readers' Union was established in 1892 to "bring readers together for literary and social discussions." It flourished until 1902 and had an average membership of 50. Between 1893 and 1895 the Literary Association, composed of members of all literary societies and classes held at the settlement, sponsored lectures and study groups, held social gatherings and organized excursions to places of literary significance. A Musical Club, founded in 1901, and a more successful Art Students Club, with 90 members by 1912, also sought to spread an interest in culture among the residents of East London.

94. Rogers, Labour, Life and Literature, 156-71; Seventh Annual Report (1891), 51; Eighth Annual Report (1892), 38; Fourteenth Annual Report (1898), 40.
97. Fourteenth Annual Report (1898), 40; Fifteenth Annual Report (1899), 42; Eighteenth Annual Report (1902), 44.
The Antiquarian Society was, surprisingly, one of the most popular clubs at Toynbee Hall. It was founded in 1885 in order to "search into the history of East London and generally ... to promote in its members the knowledge and appreciation of the past."

Its 150 members held monthly lectures throughout the winter and organized excursions to local churches and monuments during the summer. For many years it was led by Canon Barnett who believed that it was important for men to have a sense of continuity with the past. East Enders who were aware of the richness of their area's history might well begin to lead fuller and more productive lives.

Most of the societies which organized expeditions, however, took students out of East London, demonstrating the limitations rather than the advantages of their surroundings. This was particularly true of two other major settlement societies, the Natural History Society and the Toynbee Travellers' Club. The former, founded in 1885, sought to encourage the study of nature among students at the settlement by sponsoring monthly lectures and weekend walks in the country. Although the only scientific society connected with the settlement, it was not devoted primarily to the


pursuit of science. Its leaders stressed rather the virtues of the countryside and the joy of fellowship which came from participation in the walks. They expected Toynbee students to become aware of the very ugliness and dulness of much of London," and to "learn to enjoy the country, and in learning discover new resources of pleasure and even of excitement." The reports of its excursions which the society printed in The Toynbee Record generally centered on the scenery along the walks, the views from the spots chosen for lunch and the extent to which the weather affected the pleasure of the day. Although tramping was a favorite pursuit of working men in the north of England, in London it was considered an occupation of the professional classes alone. It is thus likely that the club reflected not the concerns of the students themselves but rather the desire of a few settlement workers to inculcate their own interests. The society had 125 members by 1890 and 192 in 1901. However, after the turn of the century, when it faced competition from an increasing number of other nature study groups, its membership began to fall.

102. Seventh Annual Report (1891), 27.
105. Sixth Annual Report (1890), 40.
The Toynbee Travellers' Club, consisting of 200 members, was generally considered the leading society at the settlement. Of all the Toynbee Hall societies it most directly fulfilled Barnett's desire to improve the quality of popular holidays. An enthusiastic sightseer himself, Barnett firmly believed in travelling as a means of self-enrichment, and as president of the Toynbee Travellers' Club for a number of years he sought to convince East Enders that travelling represented the most productive use of their leisure.

The club, which was established in the summer of 1888, generally organized two trips each year. During the 1880's, many were mountain-climbing expeditions in Switzerland, a fashionable pastime of the professional classes in Victorian England. At least five early Toynbee Hall residents were avid mountaineers who did not doubt that East Enders would readily share their enthusiasm. Italy was the second focus of the club's interest and the destination of at least half of its trips. In addition, the club organized twelve trips to France, a few to Germany and Holland, a summer walking tour in Iceland and one twenty-five day excursion.


to Greece. Most of these trips lasted between one and two weeks and cost each member between eight and fifteen pounds.

But the settlement residents took pride not only in the ambitiousness of the club's enterprises but in its distinctiveness from the growing number of commercial travelling societies. It was a co-operative society, employing no paid officers and returning all profits to the travellers themselves. The members claimed that, as a result, they were unified by a feeling of corporate solidarity which participants in commercial groups could not share. The club's reports always closed with an account of the perfect fellowship which had characterized each trip. In 1891 the settlement spoke of the club as "the most effective bond of union among the students." Moreover, the club was, according to The Toynbee Record, "the first to identify education with tours of pleasure." At least six months before the beginning of a trip the members attended lectures on the art, history and social conditions of the countries included in the itinerary; the announcement of each tour contained a list of recommended books, encouraging private study among the travellers. Subsequent accounts by the members themselves attested to the value of the tours. The journalist Henry V. Nevinson recalled the trip to Greece as "one of the happiest events" in his life. J.M. Dent, the publisher, later wrote:

112. Record, Vol. XIV, No. 9 (June 1902), 122.
113. Nevinson, Changes and Chances, 131.
Try and imagine what it was to come out of the East End of London ... with its sordid grime, to cross the Alps in glorious sunshine with every mountain pinnacle draped in robes of crystalline snow, shining in light divine, with rushing waterfalls and spring tenderness adorning the hills and the borders of sapphire lakes. Oh! glory upon glories! those first great days of travel. I had literally been lifted into a heaven beyond my dreams, indeed my whole being had been transformed. Remember that I had come out of years of sordid struggle for a living, with hardly time to lift my eyes to the dull grey skies of the weary toilsome streets ... and suddenly was lifted up and carried by a magic carpet into a wealth of beauty and wonder not to be surpassed in all the world.  

In one sense, however, the club was a failure. Although it was expected to form part of the projected working-man's university, the expense and length of its trips generally restricted them to the middle classes. Only a rare workman had secured an annual holiday with pay during the period in which the club flourished. When H.H. Asquith offered travelling scholarships to artisans who were students at Toynbee Hall in 1890, none were able to accept them. The report of the first expedition to Switzerland in the summer of 1889 noted that five-sixths of the women and a substantial proportion of the men were elementary school teachers. Of the

116. Record, Vol. I, No. 12 (September 1889), 133
153 members of the club in 1892, sixty one were teachers at local board schools, eighteen were civil servants and seventeen were clerks or salesmen. The participants in the twenty-five day excursion to Greece in 1894, which cost each member over nineteen pounds, were either head teachers of the London elementary schools or residents and associates of Toynbee Hall. The significance of the Toynbee Travellers' Club lay in the fact that it was one of the earliest attempts to spread foreign travel, formerly the preserve of the leisured and wealthy, to a new class. But like numerous other organizations connected with the settlement, it had no impact on the mass of the population of East London.

In addition, the club gradually became divorced from the life of the settlement. Instead of gaining new members each year from the student body, the identity of the membership remained unchanged. A proliferation of travel agencies made the club appear less attractive to the current settlement students. Increasingly the members tended to regard the club as a purely social organization and in October 1913 it was disbanded.

Its place was taken by the Workmen's Travelling Club, the settlement's one attempt to interest working men in educational travel. At the beginning of 1902 Barnett organized a series of

conferences for members of trade unions and co-operative societies to encourage them to make excursions to London's monuments and museums. A few months later the settlement residents founded the club which was led by Barnett and open only to members of trade unions, friendly societies and cooperative organizations. For a few years the club restricted its activities to tours through London and its environs but in the spring of 1905 the club "realized one of its bolder dreams," organizing a four-day trip to Belgium. Subsequently between thirty and forty members of the club took part in an annual trip to France, Holland or Belgium, lasting a few days and costing each participant about two pounds. Established later than most of the other societies at the settlement, this club was one of the few which was still flourishing in 1914.

Two societies differed from the others at the settlement in that they attempted to show East Enders the value of "service" rather than the means of broadening their own experience. The first was a division of the St. John's Ambulance Brigade which began to meet at Toynbee Hall in October 1894. It held classes in first aid.

120. Record, Vol. XV, No. 3 (December 1902), 31.
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122. Record, Vol. XVII, No. 8 (May 1905), 130-33; Record, Vol. XVIII, No. 7 (April 1906), 92; Record, Vol. AIX, No. 8 (May 1907), 109; Record, Vol. XXI, No. 8 (May 1909), 137; Record, Vol. XXIV, No. 8 (May 1912), 115.
123. Memorandum, 5.
organized a Nursing Guild and provided elementary medical help for East Enders on holidays; during the Boer War seven of its members volunteered for service in South Africa. The Corps consisted of about forty members, many of whom lived in the immediate neighborhood of Toynbee Hall. However, it was necessarily run by paid officials of the Brigade and therefore had only a peripheral connection with the settlement. The Guild of Compassion, as a philanthropic society of women students at the settlement was self-righteously called, was more closely linked with Toynbee Hall. It was founded by Henrietta Barnett who believed that the hospitality the settlement afforded to the students was far in excess of what they deserved: "to expend so much work and to use up so much influence to provide social evenings and Saturday outings for clerks, shop assistants, factory foremen, and sons and daughters of tradesmen seemed to me but a new form of pauperising, especially for a class never backward in obtaining pleasure." In 1898 she thus organized a number of students into a society which took children from the neighborhood on weekend outings, held parties for the inhabitants of the Whitechapel workhouse and raised money to subsidize a home for young girls, old women and convalescents in Hampstead.

124. Record, Vol. VII, No. 8 (May 1895), 107; Record, Vol. VIII, No. 5 (February 1896), 63; Record, Vol. X, No. 1 (October 1897), 11-12; Record, Vol. XII, No. 9 (June 1900), 12; Eighteenth Annual Report (1902), 19.
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Most of the societies affiliated to Toynbee Hall followed a similar pattern of development. Founded in the late 1880's, they flourished during the 1890's but began to decline after the turn of the century. The history of these societies in fact supports the conclusions of numerous observers that settlements, like other missionary groups, draw out of society only those members who are already deviant. A man who was willing to conform to the middle-class standards of the settlement workers was less firmly committed to the dominant values of his community and more eager to reject his present way of life than the majority of his neighbors. Sharing the settlement's contempt for his district, he refused to look upon it as his permanent home. In other words, by its very nature a settlement was appealing primarily to the men Matthew Arnold characterized as aliens. It is likely that the problems of Toynbee Hall's societies stemmed largely from this fact. A club which consisted only of the marginal members of a community could make little mark on the life of that community. More seriously, the societies were unable to establish roots in East London because their members sought the first opportunity to move out of the district. Although the members of these societies were originally neighbors of Toynbee

Hall, by 1905 they had scattered throughout London. The annual report of that year noted that the membership of the three largest societies, the Antiquarian Society, the Toynbee Travellers' Club and the Natural History Society, was concentrated in the north of London; the other societies drew their membership from a broader area. Of the 644 members of all of the societies, only twenty five were residents of Whitechapel; sixty seven, or just over ten per cent, resided in the Borough of Stepney, 261 lived in some part of North-East London and 449 in the county of London; 195 were residents of outer London. In 1913 a group of residents traced the history of Toynbee Hall's societies in this manner:

It appears that in the earlier years of their existence the societies did fulfill their objects in a most admirable manner. What would appear to have since happened is as follows. The members have for the most part improved their position and moved away from the neighbourhood. The work has to some extent lost its serious character and the meetings have become pleasant social gatherings ... New members are not welcomed except from their own friends and class. The societies are, in fact, divided from the residents, on the one hand, for whose energies they offer no scope, and from those who frequent Toynbee Hall, on the other, whose participation in their work is discouraged.

The residents pointed to the Workmen's Travelling Club as the settlement's one attempt to attract new members from East London. The older societies, having made no effort to broaden the base of their membership, had lost their original purpose.

131. Memorandum, 4-5.
Student hostels, modelled on Oxford and Cambridge colleges, were also expected to promote a corporate life among the settlement's students. The first residence was Adahm House, named after the Oxford college Barnett had attended and considered "the germ of a university in East London." It was opened in 1887 with accommodation for 18 students. "There is no more pleasant feature in our neighbourhood than this house for students," Barnett wrote to his brother after attending the first annual dinner. The following October he remarked, "Adahm is so overflowing that we are contemplating opening another house to take in more men." When Balliol House, the second and larger residence was founded at the end of 1889, the Record expressed the hope that the settlement would "see something of the friendly inter-collegiate rivalry which adds so much to the salt of life at a big public school or the University."

The two hostels provided accommodation for a total of seventy seven students, each of whom paid about seven shillings rent a week for a room with a private bath and the use of a larger common room. After 1892 the settlement required that all residents either attend two settlement classes or study for a degree at the University of London, for an examination administered by the University Extension.

133. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 18 February 1888.
136. Record, Vol. IV, No. 7 (April 1892), 90.
Society or for professional qualification. At the same time, Toynbee Hall appointed settlement residents to serve as "censors of studies", or tutors, to the students. Students at both residences established a literary circle and a debating society, edited a house journal, organized parties and entertainments and participated in a settlement football club. It was also hoped that the students would acquire an interest in social service from "the spirit of the surroundings." They assisted boys clubs, visited the Whitechapel workhouse and held parties for local slum children. In addition, a few of the residents of the hostels were associates of Toynbee Hall and in that capacity helped to organize some of its activities.

But the hostels went no further than any other educational endeavor at the settlement in fulfilling the aims of their founders. Although intended to pave the way for a working-class university, they housed neither workmen nor serious students. According to Henrietta Barnett, of the fifty-six residents in 1895, twenty five were clerks in business houses, ten were elementary school masters, nine were clerks in the civil service, four were connected with journalism and six were medical students. Eight years later

137. Ibid.
Beveridge commented on the disappointingly high social status of the students in a letter to his sister:

Balliol House is in theory a place where men earning their own livings in the day study in the evenings. It was originally hoped that the artisan might come here but as a matter of fact the artisan is conspicuous by his absence & the men are most superior & educated people - second-class Home Civilians, electrical engineers, elementary & secondary schoolmasters, etc. - all of whom one addresses as Esq. 142

Moreover, few of the residents either attended a sufficient number of settlement courses or prepared for an acceptable examination. After the foundation of Balliol House, both hostels had difficulty filling their rooms. Balliol House was closed in 1913; Washington House lasted only a few years longer.

The final means by which the settlement residents sought to lay the foundation for a working-man's university in East London was by establishing a library at Toynbee Hall. Developed primarily through private donations, it contained 4,000 volumes in 1889, 6,000 in 1893 and 6,800 in 1896. Although open to all residents of the community, it was expected to serve primarily as a "students library." The settlement thus restricted fiction to five per cent of the total collection while publicizing the strong section on
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economics. According to the tabulations which the librarian
conscientiously published each year, however, fiction was generally
the third most popular category while economics ranked fourth.

Books classified as general literature, natural science and history,
the three main subjects of the Extension lectures, ranked, respectively,
first, second and fifth; the philosophy, theology and language
books were always lowest on the list. A total of 13,163 books and
periodicals were circulated in 1889 and 21,000 in 1892. The
opening of the Whitechapel Free Library the following year, however,
reduced the demand for Toynbee Hall's collection. By 1896 the total
number of volumes circulated had fallen to 11,130; ten years later,
a total of 2,100 books and periodicals were circulated, one tenth
of the number in 1892. In 1912 the library was placed under the
control of a joint committee of the settlement and the Workers'
Educational Association. While continuing to be consulted by some
Toynbee Hall residents and students, it began to serve primarily
as the central library of the W.E.A., responsible for sending
parcels of books to tutorial classes throughout the country.
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Thus, although the settlement library disappointed the hopes of its founders, it formed the basis of the National Central Library which Mansbridge subsequently founded.

Thus, by the turn of the century, Toynbee Hall's major educational ventures had begun to appear irrelevant and outmoded to settlement residents and East Enders alike. In part, the declining popularity of Toynbee Hall's programs reflected the extent to which they were being imitated throughout the metropolis. Travelling, literary and natural history societies, modelled on those which had flourished at Toynbee Hall during the 1890's, were being provided for members of the lower middle-class. The settlement residents themselves had been instrumental in establishing public libraries and art gallery in East London, reducing the need for their own exhibition and library. In addition, Toynbee Hall had helped to popularize the very concept of adult education. By 1902 at least 13,000 East Enders were attending evening courses at local Board Schools; students residing in other parts of London could now choose from an expanding number of polytechnics close to home. Because Barnett believed that a primary function of Toynbee Hall was to experiment with new forms of adult education, he could consider the diminishing demand for the settlement's classes and society a measure of their success. But the settlement's difficulties
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also stemmed from the residents' inflexibility and lack of imagination. Convinced of the value of their mission to spread culture to the East End masses, the residents had made only belated and inadequate attempts to adapt their educational program to changing social demands or to attract the new class rapidly gaining political power. The role which the settlement had to play in the world of adult education during the 1880's and 1890's thus vanished shortly after 1900. It was clear that, were a working man's university to be founded in East London, the impetus would have to come from a group of educationalists whose ideals were more in accord with the interests of the community.
Chapter V: Toynbee Hall's Ties with Working Men's Associations

The founders of Toynbee Hall did not question the ability of university graduates to establish contact with the mass of East Enders. They envisioned the settlement residents gaining the friendship of large numbers of working men primarily through participation in working-class organizations. But it was in this sphere above all that the actions of Toynbee Hall became increasingly inappropriate. During the years between 1884 and 1914 many voluntary associations radically altered their form and goals. Increasingly dominated by an ideal of class solidarity, they attempted to promote the autonomy of the working class and to secure economic advancement. The actions of the settlement residents, on the other hand, continued to be based on the nature of the organizations as they had existed in the early 1880's. At that time the governing classes had realistically been able to view the organizations as a form of self help, freeing members of the working class from reliance on charity. Many friendly societies were indistinguishable from ordinary insurance societies. Sharing the Victorian faith in the moral virtues of thrift and prudence, they worked to preserve the status quo. They campaigned in the 1890's against state-provided old age pensions and before 1911 against the adoption of a national system of health insurance. Many co-operative societies were
equally conservative. Ignored by the majority of socialists, they won the support of the upper classes by seeking to promote social harmony. Although a large segment of the trade union movement endorsed militant political and industrial action by the turn of the century, at the time of the foundation of Toynbee Hall most unions were craft societies with restricted membership and moderate goals. It was thus natural for the early settlement residents to follow the example of T.H. Green and Arnold Toynbee, stressing the potentialities of these voluntary associations and offering their own support.

During the 1880's and 1890's, the settlement demonstrated its sympathy with the ideals of friendly societies by providing rooms in which they could meet. The earliest society to establish itself at Toynbee Hall was Court Garibaldi of the Ancient Order of Foresters of which at least four residents became members. In 1896 this group was joined by the United Order of the Phoenix, a
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temperance society with 12,000 members. Barnett, a member of a branch of the Foresters while a curate in Marylebone in the 1870's, was frequently asked to address conferences of friendly societies held in London.

The residents' ties with the co-operative movement were somewhat more substantial. In 1886, when fire destroyed the Whitechapel office of the Co-operative Wholesale Society, the settlement offered its rooms for the monthly meetings of the branch. The Tower Hamlets Distributive Society, the major consumer society in East London during the period, was more closely connected with the settlement. It met at Toynbee Hall and was led by Thory Gage Gardiner, Barnett's curate and sub-warden of the settlement. Founded in 1882 with 180 members, it had 1,560 members and £5000 capital by 1889. In the St. Jude's Report of 1887 Barnett described the members of the Society as "the pioneers of a higher love of unity and brotherly love, they are to promote education, to put down selfishness, and to give expression to that public opinion
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which, though it is now often silent, is in East London for good and 8 against wrong." In his personal correspondence, however, Barnett appeared far more doubtful. He wrote to his brother in 1884: "On Thursday Gardiner's Cooperators came to dinner - They are a heavy & serious lot of men & women. They take pleasure as business & the main chance ends in their stomachs. I don't know if Cooperation is best able to raise them, if it is, it will be only just in so far as it conveys a bit of Xianity." He expressed similar sentiments when reporting a meeting of the same men at the settlement three years later: "Gardiner made them a fine speech but it was sad to see how uninterested the people were in men, politics or ideas. They were comfortable, they had enough & everything else was immaterial."

Following the example of the Christian Socialists, the residents also attempted to assist a number of productive co-operative enterprises. Between 1888 and 1890 the settlement held a series of fortnightly meetings in conjunction with the Co-operative Aid Association, an organization which advised workers on the methods of establishing a successful productive society. In addition, the residents were
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instrumental in founding several self-governing workshops during the later 1880's and early 1890's. The only one which survived more than a few years was the Co-operative Bass Dressers Association which originated during a strike in 1889. Led by Toynbee hall residents, it held most of its weekly meetings at the settlement for many years.

Toynbee Hall's claim to involvement in the trades union movement rested largely on its actions during two major strikes in East London. Henrietta Barnett later described the residents' activities during the Match Girls' Strike of 1888:

Toynbee Hall did not avoid labour questions, nor omit to try to strengthen trade-unions and to solve the troubles which lead to strikes. It was anxious work, and I remember the fear and trembling with which Mr. A.P. Laurie, Mr. Arthur Rogers, Mr. H. Llewellyn Smith, and I — in 1888 — interviewed the managing body of Bryant & May's, intimate information of the disputed conditions having come to us through many rough girl-friends. Perhaps we did no good, perhaps we did; in any case we cared, and later the London Trades Council intervened and a solution was found.13

Her account is significant primarily because she ignored completely the work of Herbert Burrows and Annie Besant, two socialists who helped to formulate the grievances of the girls, led their strike,

and assisted them in forming a union. In comparison, Toynbee Hall's role was insignificant. Shortly after the outbreak of the strike, the three residents Mrs. Barnett mentioned and an associate, Arthur Stevenson, interviewed both the girls and the directors of the company in order to evaluate their respective claims. They outlined the grievances of the strikers in a letter to The Times on 12 July and the justifications of the firm in a letter appearing two days later. On 17 July they summarized their own conclusions. They discovered that the girls were "substantially correct" when they charged that the company levied excessive fines on its workers and when they estimated that their average weekly wage was between 4s. and 6s. 4d. as the directors claimed. The residents also stated:

We are convinced that even the question of low wages, important as it is, is but a part of the wider question of the whole relation between employers and employed. To say nothing of the want of sympathy which we have observed on the part of the directors, and the dislike and fear on the part of the girls, the present strike furnished unanswerable evidence of the deplorable relations which exist in the factory of Messrs. Bryant and May ... In the factory at Bow large numbers of girls are drawn together, many of them from the poorest strata of society. They receive during a great part of the year a wage so small as to be totally insufficient to maintain a decent existence. ... All this time the company is dividing among its shareholders a phenomenally high dividend.  

14. Stevenson, a lawyer, was a friend of C.R. Ashbee. Unable to devote sufficient time to Toynbee Hall to become a resident, he resided in rooms close to the settlement. (Arthur Stevenson to Ashbee, 23 May 1887).
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The directors replied in a vituperative letter, accusing the Toynbee Hall residents of having conducted their investigation with "prejudiced minds" and of having been "easily misled by the strongly biased statements of some of our workers or their friends." It was unjust to speak of a lack of sympathy between the directors and their employees because the majority of the workers were thoroughly in accord with us until the Socialist influences of the outside agitators commenced to disturb their minds; and we can but regret that your correspondents should have associated themselves with these agitators, when we have no doubt that their influence in the opposite direction would have proved of real service to the strikers and prevented their further distress and demoralisation.16

Nevertheless, though the sympathies of the residents were clearly on the side of the girls, it is unlikely that the settlement had any impact on the outcome of the strike. The company and the workers reached an agreement the day the residents' final letter was published. Moreover, although Mrs. Barnett helped to interview the directors, the residents who wrote the letters considered themselves members of Ashbee's group. The following year they joined the colony he established in Stepney largely as a protest against Toynbee Hall's artificial and distant relationship with the working class of East London.

16. Letter to The Times (18 July 1888), 12.
The residents assumed a more prominent role in the Dock Strike of August 1889. More than any other single event this strike helped to transform the nature of trades unionism in London from a movement reinforcing the class structure to one working to alter it. The mass of strikers were casual, unskilled workers, comprising the lowest grade of labor. As Ben Tillett, the leader of the strike, later wrote,

The dock labourer in those days was scarcely regarded as a respectable member of society. He came in for the foulest contempt and most vicious abuse. ... So real was the stigma attaching to dock labour that those of us who earned a living by it concealed the nature of our occupation from our family as well as our friends.17

Tillett received assistance during the strike from Tom Mann and John Burns, two working-class socialists, whose leadership helped the dockers to win most of their demands after a month's struggle. Their unexpected success provided a stimulus to other groups of unskilled workers, many of whom established unions during the following few years. These 'new unions' differed from the older societies in two significant ways. They organized men by industries rather than by crafts and they endorsed a policy of militant industrial and political action. Toynbee Hall's attitude toward the strike and its aftermath thus demonstrates the extent to which the residents were willing to support working-class organizations when they developed a distinct labor ideology and thus departed from acceptable middle-class goals.

17. Ben Tillett, Memories and Reflections (London, 1931), 89.
Harold Spender, a Toynbee Hall resident, later recalled the settlement's contact with the strikers in romantic terms: "This revolt of the dockers, 1889, was a great uprising and it won all our hearts. The dockers were splendidly led ... we were all friends and brothers." Like numerous other East End clergymen and philanthropists, the residents helped to administer relief during the strike. Their job was not without significance. The dockers came out with 7s. 6d. in their treasury and with no organization supporting them. Their leaders were thus forced to obtain financial assistance and to devise a system of relief for thousands of workers. Both Tom Mann and Ben Tillett later acknowledged the cooperation they received from Toynbee Hall residents, many of whom devoted much of their time to supervising a relief committee near the settlement. It is likely, moreover, that their assistance contributed to the growth of public sympathy to which the dockers owed a large part of their success. The encouragement the strikers received from Oxford graduates may well have upset the stock notions the upper classes held of dock workers and enabled the dockers to justify their demands for improved conditions.

At the end of the strike, Toynbee Hall sought to maintain the contacts it had established with the dockers. In September the

residents invited the central strike committee to dinner. Although
Bernett stressed that the invitation should be interpreted as demon-
strating neither the settlement's identification with the strikers
nor its pleasure at the successful outcome of the strike, Leonard
Hobhouse, visiting the settlement at the time, was less judicious.
"Everyone seems to agree that Burns and Tillett have come out
splendidly", he wrote to a friend. "They and Tom Mann and the rest
of them are coming here to-morrow for a sort of triumphal supper."
Moreover, the settlement provided a forum for discussions on the
implications of both the strike and the subsequent expansion of the
trade union movement. In October 1889 Ben Tillett led a debate on
the future of the Dockers' Union. The following year a meeting,
opened by an official of the Dockers' Union, debated the issue of
"new unionism." In February 1890 the settlement held a conference,
attended by both dock directors and trades unionists, on the role
which strikes should play in industrial relations. A more significant
conference was organized by Toynbee Hall's committee at Oxford in
November 1890. In an attempt to arouse the interest of members of
the university in industrial questions such men as Tom Mann,

Life and Work (London, 1931), 27.
Benjamin Jones, Graham Walles, A.H.D. Acland and Leonard Courtney discussed various aspects of 'new unionism.' The settlement estimated that the audience numbered about 500 at the morning session and between 600 and 700 in the afternoon. Sidney Ball, the principle liaison between Oxford and Toynbee Hall, reported: "It really was a success and Mann's earnestness was very real and went home - I think the academic mind, - such as it is - was as much disturbed as we could wish."

The activities of four Toynbee Hall residents both during and immediately after the strike also lend some credence to Spender's recollection. Ernest Aves, a leading resident during the period, became the first president of the Irafalgar branch of the Dock, Wharf, Riverside and General Labour Union which met at St. Julie's for many years. Tom Mann later wrote that he owed to Thory Gardiner many of his invitations to speak on trade unionism during the early 1890's. Vaughan Nash and Hubert Llewellyn Smith played roles more integral to the strike. In his autobiography Ben Tillett characterized them as "two good friends of ours" who "came to us with no high-brow condescension." Shortly after the conclusion of the

25. Hobson and Ginsberg, Bobhouse, 28; Mann, Memoirs, 105-06; Oxford Magazine (19 November 1890), 95.
27. Sidney Ball to Oona Ball, quoted in O.H. Ball, Sidney Ball, 42-43.
29. Mann, Memoirs, 113.
30. Tillett, Memories and Recollections, 130, 137.
strike, they wrote what is still considered the standard history of it. It was an authoritative and sympathetic account, providing both informed opinion on the background and impact of the strike and detailed descriptions of the actual events which took place. Letters which Nash and Smith wrote to John Burns reveal that they sought his advice while writing the book and attempted to incorporate his suggestions. Tom Mann later referred to the book as "the best account" of the strike.

Nevertheless, the ties of the settlement as a whole with the strikers were far more tenuous than Spencer's comment implied. Both Vaughan Nash and H. Llewellyn Smith left Toynbee Hall largely in protest against its attitude toward socialism. It is likely in fact that Llewellyn Smith was no longer a resident when the strike broke out; Vaughan Nash joined Ashbee's group in Stepney shortly after its conclusion. Garnett's reactions to the strike and its aftermath provide the clearest indication of the attitude of the majority of residents. The discipline which the mass of strikers evinced did not soften his contempt for the average East End docker. On August 30 he wrote to his brother:

33. Mann, Memoirs, 92.
I don't know what this strike may bring forth.
The lesson I will enforce is the danger of
letting a system continue when outrages public
sentiment. It was that scramble round the
dock gates, the sight of the wretched creatures
who has brought out all trades to support men who
as individuals said perhaps get no [respect].

Perhaps because the strike led to an alliance between socialists and
trade unionists and thus widened the gap between the goals of the
labor movement and the aims of middle class reformers, he stressed
the need of union leaders for guidance. In November 1889, two
months after the end of the strike, he wrote to his brother: "I
wish I could be more with the Dock leaders ... I shd like to get
hold of Mann & Tillet for with you I feel that they are at a
 crisis & may turn up or down. At present we feel this world - our
35 world - a bit too big & many things drift with ought to be guided."

34. S.A.B. to F.C.B., 30 August 1899. It is difficult to decipher
exactly the final and crucial word. Henrietta Barnett's decision
that it is "commiseration" is clearly inaccurate. Her second
distortion of this letter is far more misleading. According to
her version, the letter continued:
My feelings are with the men, but how to give those
feelings expression is more than I know. As I walked
yesterday in Regent Street I wished I were young again
and beginning. How I should like to make the kindly,
well-mannered, and well-dressed people of the West
understand their selfishness and their folly. How I
should like to smash up the sympathy which does nothing
- which keeps knowledge and beauty for itself.

In fact, however, this paragraph was contained in a letter
Barnett wrote on 15 April 1893 about a strike then taking place
in Hull. His support of the dockers in 1889 was thus consider-
ably weaker than his wife's account suggests.

35. S.A.B. to F.C.B., 16 November 1889.
The following March he expressed the same apprehension:

Somehow without any evidence I have a sense of anxiety abt the Docks. I dont like either the feeling of Directors or Dockers. The first dont believe in the Union, the last dont know what Union demands. There may be another strike in wh the men will be beaten & driven back to strike again with renewed viciousness. In the end Labour must win but like Napoleon in Russia it may win in a field in wh. it will starve.36

The specific policy which Barnett advocated followed from his lack of sympathy with the dockers themselves. He criticized the determination of 'new union' leaders to organize general unions which departed from the pattern of craft societies by refusing to restrict entry into a trade. The dockers' union should be based on the principle of exclusion, not of class solidarity; it was wrong to allow the lowest stratum of the working class to continue to search for work at the docks. Addressing the members of the strike committee who assembled at the settlement a few weeks after the conclusion of the strike, he stressed this point: "Organisation will always mean the exclusion of the more inefficient and this will be a source of difficulty that will inevitably ensue from the larger gain. But it is a penalty that must be paid." In fact, the

36. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 1 March 1890. The last sentence probably does not mean that the demands of the workers would lead to economic collapse. Barnett believed that if the working classes were forced to become too hostile to the established order they would create a society in which it was not possible to lead a good life.

leaders of the dockers agreed. Seeking to replace the corps of casual workers by a small, permanent labor force, they continued to look to the older craft unions for a model of union organization. But in doing so they abandoned one of the tenets of "new unionism".

The activities of the majority of settlement residents during the strike did not necessarily imply their full support of the dockers' aims. They assumed a role similar to that which they held as visitors for the Charity Organisation Society or as Poor Law Guardians, judging the individual applicants for relief. An account of the strike in The Toynbee Record centered not on the goals of the dockers but on the problem of indiscriminate almsgiving which the strike had produced. It had been necessary to devise a careful process of relief to ensure that as little as possible "filtered through to the undeserving and the lazy." Moreover, significant as this work may have been, it did not bring the settlement residents to the center of the strike. As Tillett later wrote, "the real fight was fought on the picket line, at the demonstrations and in the committee rooms." But, with the possible exception of Llewellyn Smith and Vaughan Nash, no settlement resident participated in these events. Toynbee Hall undoubtedly performed an invaluable service by acting as an intermediary between the strikers and the governing

39. Tillett, Memories and Reflections, 137.
classes and by providing a center for information on the social and economic implications of the strike. The residents could undertake this work only by refusing to identify with the dockers themselves.

The residents' actions, although peripheral to the Dock Strike, represented the high point of the settlement's involvement in the trades union movement. Until the turn of the century, however, the settlement's ties with East London's unions did not completely disintegrate. The residents were proud of the roster of unions which held meetings at the settlement, including branches of the Clothiers' Cutters and Pressers, the Stickmakers, the Fellowship Porters, the Women Cigar-Makers, the Dock Labourers, the Railway Servants, the East End Tailoresses, the Jewish Cabinet-Makers and the Jewish Bakers. To some members of the upper classes it appeared that the

40. According to A.P. Laurie, he and H. Llewellyn Smith organized and directed a busmen's strike of 1891 in East London. (Pictures and Politics, 87-88). Both K.S. Inglis and J.A.R. Pimlott claimed that this represented a further example of the settlement's involvement in the trade union movement. (Inglis, Churches and the Working Classes, 163; Pimlott, Toynbee Hall, 86-87) However, neither A.P. Laurie nor Llewellyn Smith was still a resident at the time.

41. Labour Elector (23 December 1889), 412; Record, Vol. II, No. 2 (November 1889), 21; Record, Vol. II, No. 3 (January 1890), 43; Record, Vol. II, No. 10 (July 1890), 114; Record, Vol. IV, No. 1 (October 1891), 4; Record, Vol. VI, No. 8 (May 1894), 115; Record, Vol. VI, No. 9 (June 1894), 132; Record, Vol. VI, No. 10 (July-August 1894), 132; Record, Vol. VII, No. 2 (November 1894), 34; Record, Vol. VIII, No. 2 (November 1895), 26; Sixth Annual Report (1890), 28; Seventh Annual Report (1891), 43; Eighth Annual Report (1892), 31; Ninth Annual Report (1893), 25; Tenth Annual Report (1894), 4; Eleventh Annual Report (1895), 19.
settlement had thrown its influence behind the trade union movement. As the Record noted in 1891, "there are some, even among the warm friends of Toynbee Hall, who look with suspicion, not to say dislik[e]" on the settlement's association with trade unions. Many men who had helped to subsidize the settlement withdrew their support when Bernett offered unions rooms in which to meet. But in fact the settlement spoke about unions in terms which should have reassured even the most conservative member of the establishment.

The residents claimed that the settlement had two primary advantages over the public house as a meeting place for trade unions. First, it provided far more elevating surroundings. Second, those union members who came to Toynbee Hall might gain a new understanding of the attitudes and ways of thought of the governing classes.

42. Record, Vol. IV, No. 3 (December 1891), 38.
43. Interview with E.S.P. Catchpool, 17 February 1967. It is also significant that in 1889 The Oxford Magazine attacked the settlement for inviting Will Steadman, president of the Bargebuilders' Union and a Liberal-Labour politician, to address a meeting at the university on behalf of Toynbee Hall: 'Oxford is always glad to hear men of any views. ... But Mr. Steadman's name is mainly known ... for his behaviour during the Tram Strike, when, if we remember right, his conduct was not marked by modesty, good sense, or respect for law and order.' (Oxford Magazine (8 February 1899), 176). Ten days later Bernett wrote to his brother: 'We had the best meeting at Oxford we have had for a long time - Steadman spoke admirably the workmen view of TH.' (S.A.B. to F.G.B., 18 February 1899).
1891 the settlement remarked that the trade union advances of the past few years had been gained "in spite of, rather than through, the action of many of the more restive, and thus the more prominent, among the ranks of the newly organized." Both workers and employers should learn more about "their mutual obligations, and about that identity of interest which ... is the fundamental economic fact that no association of employers or combination of men can over-ride." Clearly, the settlement had continued to reject the fundamental aims of the "new unions".

It was perhaps for this reason that almost no unions met at Toynbee Hall after the turn of the century. The residents did, however, assist two groups of workers during minor strikes. In 1904, when 200 girls employed in the tea packing department of the Whitechapel branch of the Co-operative Wholesale Society left work, the residents provided a room in which they could organize their strike. T.E. Harvey, then deputy-warden, sympathetically described the incident in a letter:

We had a very interesting gathering of girls on strike from the Cooperative Wholesale Society here last Tuesday morning: they had another meeting on Friday ... I hope the girls may be able to win their point: they are now back again temporarily on the old terms, pending negotiations - they have been put from time work (at 12/- a week) to piece work which would have taken away their fortnight's holiday and sick leave.46

45. Seventh Annual Report (1891), 42.
46. T.E.H. to m.n., 16 October 1904.
The girls were able to secure their demands and to organize their own union. Two years later the Jewish branches of the Amalgamated Society of Tailors struck in protest against their low wages and poor working conditions. The tailors' distrust of their own union officials as well as of their employers hindered negotiations. However, a rabbi from St. Petersburg visiting Toynbee Hall at the time was known to many of the tailors and able to convince them to accept the intervention of the union. The residents themselves advised both parties in the dispute and presided over a series of meetings between the masters and the tailors. Harvey reported to his mother:

We had an anxious time last week over the East End tailors' strike some of the arrangements for its conclusion, including the final meeting of the men's representatives, being held here, and I have at the moment over £1,000 pay from sovereigns locked up in my room, being the strike pay from the general Union which is to be distributed... They have... won what is really a very great victory, their working day being now reduced to 12 hours, with 1 hour off for dinner & another for tea, & a number of the middlemen have been swept away.


49. T.E.H. to Anna L. Harvey, 25 June 1906.
Nevertheless, the residents' actions during these incidents should not be viewed as a reflection of their continuing commitment to the trades union movement. Each strike formed merely an isolated example of Toynbee Hall's participation in labor affairs. By 1900 the settlement was almost completely divorced from the mainstream of the London trades union movement. In labor affairs, as in the field of adult education, the residents had misjudged the changing ideals of East Enders and had thus found themselves without a role to play. A large proportion of those Oxford graduates who believed that a university settlement could continue to serve a useful purpose saw it primarily as a means of gaining information about the problem of poverty in an urban industrial society.
Chapter VI: The Role of Settlement Residents on Philanthropic Organizations

Private philanthropy was a significant force in the formation of the modern British welfare state. Charitable organizations were often the forerunners of governmental agencies, pointing out the needs of the day and pioneering with new forms of social action. At the same time, the inability of private benevolence ultimately to improve the condition of the people in an urban industrial society helped to reveal the full dimensions of the problems and the necessity for widespread state control. The history of Toynbee Hall’s activities in local public affairs between 1884 and 1914 illustrates this role of voluntary action. As some of the earliest members of the upper classes to gain information about East London, the residents felt a responsibility to identify its major social problems and to devise ways and means of dealing with them. During the 1880’s and 1890’s the settlement workers directed their actions toward reforming the characters of the individual members of the community. They thus participated in philanthropic organizations which sought to motivate the poor to strive for self-improvement. Although some early residents obtained positions on local government boards, they insisted that the problems of East London required a minimum of municipal planning or control. Reform would come when East Enders learned to demand a

higher standard for their community. The experience which the settlement workers gained, however, contributed to the revolution in social thought in Britain between 1884 and 1914 regarding the nature of poverty. After the turn of the century, the residents, like many other thoughtful men, became aware of the complexity of social and economic problems and looked to statutory agencies for their solution. Then too, the settlement was itself a voluntary organization and an experimental response to the new problems of an urban industrial society. The founders saw it as a means of establishing an ordered, structured community in East London by superimposing a residential leisured class. As the inadequacy of this answer became clear, many residents began to reconsider the meaning of a settlement and the objectives of a voluntary worker.

During the 1880's and 1890's, the settlement residents sought to improve the character of individual East Enders in three ways: by humanizing public elementary education, by transforming the physical environment of the community and by controlling the growth of pauperism.

In a speech at Cambridge in May 1884 describing the new proposal for a university settlement, F.L. Gell had remarked:

"The Public Educational system ... is founded upon the supposition that there are men of leisure in the Upper class, who will ... take care that the education prescribed by the State is afforded amidst fit surroundings, that the education of the young shall not be
degraded into the mechanical earning of state grants, but shall still draw its vitality and inspiration from the only true source—personal sympathy, personal stimulus, personal contact of mind with mind. Once more, apart from the Clergy in East London you can't find men to take this place, and here again we find the necessity of the leisureed class who will give some portion of their time to inspire the public Elementary Education of East London with a little more grace, a little more enthusiasm, and a little more sympathy.  

This view was widely accepted by the early settlement residents who believed that East London's board schools embodied the worst aspects of industrial urban society. They were rigid and anonymous institutions in which it was impossible for teachers to establish contact with individual children. Upper-class men living in the community must attempt to transcend the impersonality of the schools by supplying an interest in each student's intellectual and moral development.

The first need was for the settlement residents to obtain positions on the local school board. As early as the autumn of 1885 the settlement thus organized a campaign to elect J.A.M. Macdonald, a former resident. In the middle of October Barnett wrote to his brother:

Our sensation during this wk. has been the determination to run Macdonald, an old resident, for the Sch. Board. This means showing all

---

our resources but we think it to be a way 1. of spreading higher views of education 2. of using a good man. 3. of bringing our men into relation with the people. I cannot think we can win in such a big constituency. At present all are full of hope.3

MacDonald was unsuccessful in gaining a seat but six years later both G.L. Bruce and Cryil Jackson were elected members of the Tower Hamlets School Board. As two of the most prominent early residents, they formed an important link between the settlement and the Board.

But this was only a preliminary step. Personal service, not public reform, would ultimately improve public education. Although legislation had been necessary to establish the educational system, it could not function unless individual volunteers 4 fostered a sense of neighborly concern in the schools. One means

4. The residents also demonstrated their distrust of the School Board by their attitude toward free dinners. Although most of the socialist groups in London recommended that the School Board should supply meals to needy children, the majority of early settlement residents supported the position of the C.O.S. In 1889 the Society published a pamphlet denouncing any program in which a municipal body provided free meals. At the beginning of the following year, when the School Board itself was considering the issue, those residents who "feared the tendency of the Board scheme" held two meetings to formulate a scheme which would involve "a more personal relation between the donors and recipients." (Sixth Annual Report (1890), 21.) In 1891 two settlement residents formed part of a deputation which waited on the London School Dinners Association, an organization connected with the London School Board, urging it to institute a procedure for carefully investigating the backgrounds of the recipients of all free dinners. (Record, Vol III, No. 4 (January 1891), 49). It will be seen, however, that by the turn of the century many of the residents had altered their views on this subject and in 1906 the settlement as a whole worked in support of the Education (Provision of Meals) Act.
by which the settlement residents sought to do this was by serving as managers of local board schools. In the words of Barnett, "A School Board may at any moment become a hindrance to education, a mere educational drill-sergeant. The London Board has not been such a hindrance, and its success is largely due to the presence of managers who give a sort of human touch to the necessary machinery." The Toynbee Record wrote in a similar vein. The managers' mission was "to supply the personal interest and to foster the individual life of the school, for both of these must be largely wanting in a vast organization like our London School Board." Managers required no qualifications other than sympathy and zeal which would allow them "to become friends with teachers and children ... and to feel an interest in all the petty details." Each year at least five residents served as school managers. In this capacity they sought to broaden the children's experience by supplying pictures and flowers for the class rooms and by organizing excursions throughout London. They also hoped to inculcate habits of "discipline" and "self denial" by forming cadet corps and thrift clubs.

The second task of voluntary workers was to establish a program of continuation classes for the large number of East Enders

who left school at 15 or 16, the age when most upper-class boys were just beginning to receive the formative influence of the public school. Many working-class adolescents entered unskilled employment at this time, closing the door to further training and to opportunities for advancement. It was thus vital that they be brought into contact with the educated and well-to-do. During the 1880's and 1890's the settlement established a series of "old boys' clubs" for recent graduates of board schools. The first and only successful one was the "Old Northeyites," founded by Cyril Jackson in Limehouse in 1887. That year the Board of Education's continuation classes had failed at the Northey Street School and only three of their former students went elsewhere in East London to attend classes. Within six years, however, the club had sixty members, many of whom were factory workers or errand boys, and an average nightly attendance of 30. The club provided classes and recreational activities each weekday evening. The settlement had no doubts about their efficacy. The "club spirit and excellent behavior" of the boys attested to the club's ability to foster "both good manners and good feelings." At the same time, the classes were of a sufficiently high calibre to enable the club to

12. Record, Vol. IV, No. 9 (June 1892), 113.
receive a grant from the Board of Education. But the primary significance of the club, as of most Toynbee Hall activities, undoubtedly lay in its impact on the settlement workers who sponsored it. According to J.J. Braithwaite, Jackson's assistant at the club, Jackson relied on his experience when drafting a report on boy labor for the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws. Braithwaite himself drew on the information he had gained from the club in framing part of the Unemployment Insurance Bill.

But above all men of superior education and culture must establish contact with the teachers themselves. As P.L. Cell told his audience at Cambridge in 1884,

The Elementary Board School teachers are at present a somewhat depressed and overworked class. They are borne down by the work they have to do. They have little society, they get hopeless, they drop into a groove of routine, their object becomes merely to win the educational grant from Government and they lose sight entirely of those higher moral influences which were introduced into the English public schools by Dr. Arnold in the last generation, and which might be extended to the class below by you who have reaped the fruits of his work. You would find these masters most responsive to your advances, and thirsting for any knowledge you might be able to impart to them.

13. Record, Vol. III, No. 3 (December 1891), 28; Record, Vol. VIII, No. 6 (March 1895), 68.
In 1885, when the School Board established centers for the training of pupil teachers, Barnett offered them rooms at the settlement in which to meet and encouraged the residents to conduct some of the classes. One settlement worker organized his class into a rowing club which he believed would foster "manliness" and "the traditions of a public school". E.B. Sargent, a second early resident, was far more ambitious. In 1886 he founded the London Pupil Teachers Association in order "to unite the boy pupil-teachers of all the London schools into one community, and ... to kindle amongst them that espirit de corps which so strengthens the morale of our higher Public Schools." At the same time the Association reduced the isolation of the pupil teachers "from other classes of the community in which they live" and enabled them to form friendships "with that part of the community ... which has had the best opportunities in life." By 1889 the Association had 1,300 pupil teachers as members and over two hundred upper-class men and women as associates.

Two years later, Mrs. Barnett became president of the women's branch of the Association which, following the guidelines laid down by Sargent, sought to broaden the horizon of the girl pupil teachers

16. Pupil teachers were students between the ages of fourteen and eighteen apprenticed to teach in the board schools.
20. Ibid.
by bringing them into contact with women of a higher social class.

Public education no longer dominated the interest of Toynbee Hall residents after the turn of the century. With the exception of the Old Northeyites, none of the "old boys' clubs" continued to exist in its original form. When the Pupil Teachers Association was disbanded in 1903, the settlement severed its connection with the pupil teachers program. Cyril Jackson left Toynbee Hall in 1895 and G.L. Bruce in 1903. Although some residents served as school managers after 1900, the settlement did not show the same concern for the London Education Authority, established in 1903, as it had for the Tower Hamlets School Board. Moreover, by 1900 it had become clear that the settlement's own educational program had failed and the residents thus began to concentrate on other fields.

During the 1880's and 1890's Toynbee Hall residents also hoped to reform the character of East Enders by altering the physical conditions of the community. They shared the realization of an increasing number of social reformers during the period that residential areas were social units, not mere aggregates of dwellings and that the environment had a significant impact on the lives of

the people. In fact, many settlement residents believed that the environment produced the behavior patterns of the inhabitants of East London. Working-class attitudes and habits were negative reactions to residence in a deprived area. If East London were transformed into a copy of the orderly, quiet and spacious West End, its residents might well act like middle-class men.

The residents thus sought first to increase the amount of open space and the opportunities for instructive recreation in Whitechapel. Like many urban working-class areas, the district had developed with no planning or regulation. After the opening of the London docks in the early years of the nineteenth century, builders and speculators, who were oblivious to the social needs of the poor, filled in most of the space surrounding the original buildings with small cottage property and workshops. By the time of the founding of Toynbee Hall, Whitechapel consisted of an almost unbroken series of narrow, congested courts. Although two miles from the nearest public park, it contained no open spaces beyond a few churchyards and old burial grounds and no buildings reserved for recreation other than pubs and churches. In 1889 Charles Booth wrote that the inner ring of East London, which included Whitechapel, was "tightly packed with buildings and crowded with inhabitants, except where occupied by business premises. Space and air are everywhere at a premium ... Nearly all available space is used for
building, and almost every house is filled up with families."

Following the example of Octavia Hill, the settlement residents continually urged that more space should be set aside for the use of the working classes. The countryside surrounding East London could be converted into public parks and the most congested areas within the district dotted with small gardens and recreation areas. In addition, public libraries, museums and art galleries, supplying antidotes to the demoralizing influences of the streets, should be made accessible to all East Enders.

But it was not enough to provide the means of temporary escape. The whole environment must be transformed; Whitechapel was too noisy, too exciting, too disorderly. Booth wrote that each of the districts of the inner ring of East London has

some charm or other - a brightness not extinguished by, and even appertaining to, poverty and toil, to vice, and even to crime - a clash of contest, man against man, and man against fate - the absorbing interest of a battlefield - a rush of human life as fascinating to watch as the current of a river to which life is so often likened. ...

The feeling that I have just described - this excitement which can accept murder as a dramatic incident, and drunkenness as the buffonery of the stage - is especially characteristic of Whitechapel. And looked at in this way, what a drama it is! Whitechapel is a veritable Tom Tiddler's ground, the Eldorado of the last, a gathering together of poor fortune seekers; its streets are full of buying and selling, the poor living on the poor.  

Each Sunday the neighborhood of Petticoat Lane was "one of the wonders of London, a medley of strange sights, strange sounds, and strange smells." At the intersection of Slater Street and Brick Lane, a few blocks away, the streets were blocked by the stalls of a second market.

Through this crowd the seller of shell-fish pushed his barrow; on the outskirts of it are moveable shooting galleries, and patent Aunt Sallies, while some man standing up in a dog-cart will dispose of racing tips in sealed envelopes to the East End sportman.

Toynbee Hall residents seldom described these scenes with comparable warmth or affection. Although some may have been attracted initially by the exotic nature of East London, as residents they found little to praise in the vitality of the community. Their ideal was order and they saw the drama and romance of Whitechapel's streets only as the cause of the undisciplined working man they deplored. 'Excitement' was their strongest term of condemnation.

Most residents would have agreed with C.F.G. Masterman, a friend of Barnett and an admirer of the settlement, when he wrote in 1909:

Excitement, noise and a kind of forlorn and desperate ugliness are the spirits watching round the cradle of too many children of the town; whose work when fully accomplished has created the less reputable characteristics of

---

the city crowd. ... The city-bred people, we are confidently formed, will never go 'back to the land.' In part this may mean that they will never return to long hours of hopeless drudgery for shameful wages. In part it may point to a certain condition of 'nerves' excited by city upbringing: a real disease of the soul. Silence, solitariness, open spaces under a wide sky, appear thus intolerable to a people never content but in the shouts, the leagues of lights, and the roaring of the wheels.

The Toynbee Hall residents advocated that all markets should be carefully regulated, restricted to specific merchandise and contained in a small and well-defined area. Although a Sunday market might have a justifiable place in a Jewish neighborhood, the Petticoat Lane market brought "thousands of idle people from all parts of London ... seeking some excitement and the means of excitement are constantly increased."

Other demoralizing influences should also be eradicated. As Barnett wrote in 1888, private slaughter houses should be eliminated from Whitechapel because "the butchers with their blood stains are familiar among the street passengers, and sights are common which tend to brutalise ignorant natures." Rubbish collection should be made more efficient. The "untidiness of the streets tends to keep life low in East London," but a clean street would provide "an

32. Record, Vol. XII, No. 9 (June 1900), 126.
object lesson in order." Above all, the criminal element of the population which still inhabited some of the area in the immediate vicinity of Toynbee Hall should be evicted. Their region comprised, in the words of Barnett, "a plague spot." It infects the neighbourhood, and it tends to spread. The children seeing such sights as are common in the streets grow familiar with vice and find interest in its excitement." As a first step common lodging houses should be registered and inspected annually by public authorities. More radically, private philanthropists and local boards should continue the work begun by the East End Dwellings Company, demolishing the worst streets and buildings and rebuilding them for a more respectable group of citizens.

Although convinced that the transformation of East London's environment must precede almost any other social advance, the early settlement residents did not advocate new legislation to accomplish this goal. Instead, they looked to upper-class voluntary workers who could reveal to East Enders the ideal to which they should aspire. One way in which the residents themselves attempted to raise the level of East London's opinion was by serving as members of the Whitechapel Sanitary Aid Committee. Founded in 1883, this

organization met first at St. Jude's and after 1884 at Toynbee Hall. Although disbanded during the late 1880's, it was revived in 1892 and, under the presidency of Barnett, prospered until shortly after the turn of the century. Members of the Committee believed that by investigating tenement buildings to discover violations of sanitary regulations they could "enter into friendly relations" with East ENDERS and teach them to demand a higher standard of cleanliness for their community. The Toynbee Record stressed the significance of this work: "Law without the support of public opinion will never succeed and public opinion will only be made as those who have faith in cleanliness go in and out among the people."

The Children's Country Holidays Fund, a second and more important philanthropic organization with which Toynbee Hall residents worked, sought to minimize the deleterious effects of East London's environment on its inhabitants. The Fund originated in the Barnett's efforts during the 1870's to send a few children from St. Jude's to spend a fortnight's vacation in the country. In 1884 several local committees, many of which were modelled on the Barnett's early work, united to form the central society. That year it sent
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about 5,000 children to homes in the country for a fortnight.

By the turn of the century the Fund was prosperous enough to select about 33,000 children each year and by 1913 the number had risen to over 45,000.

Throughout the period the Fund was closely identified with Toynbee Hall. Barnett was chairman between 1884 and 1912 and president until a few months before his death in 1913. His letters to his brother, filled with details of business arrangements, attest to his continuous interest in every aspect of the Fund's work.

Four prominent settlement residents began their careers as secretaries of the Fund. Cyril Jackson held the position between 1888 and 1896, E.J. Urwick between 1898 and 1899, R.H. Tawney between 1903 and 1906 and W.R.L. Blakiston between 1907 and 1911. Other members of the council included H.W. Pyddoke, A.E.S. Hart, D.H.S. Nicholson and T.L. Rumbold. In addition, the Whitechapel
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and Stepney local committees, many of whose officers were Toynbee Hall residents, met at the settlement. Few men came to Toynbee Hall without becoming involved in the work of the Fund during at least some point during their terms of residence.

According to the settlement, the goal of the organization was "to arrest the deteriorating influences of city squalor by the deportation (sic) of the children by thousands into country air and country life." Although members of the Fund attempted to select children who were ailing, their aim was not limited to providing a change of air. Sharing the Victorian faith in the regenerative powers of the countryside, they stressed the moral as well as the physical benefits of a vacation in the country. In the city versus the country debate, they stood firmly on the side of the country.

C.F.G. Masterman, secretary of the Fund between 1899 and 1903, most eloquently stated their view:

Life with nature, in continual contact with the earth, resulted in old time in a stability and occasionally in an elevation of character which seems passing from the fickle, hasty, turbulent life of the modern city. Nor need it be impressed how sometimes in obscure and poor homestead and cottage unlearned and commonplace characters were consecrated by a real spiritual faith in which the trivial events of the daily existence became charged with external significance.46

44. Interview with Sir E.C. Bligh; Interview with D.E. Minnis; Record, Vol. XV, No. 10 (June, 1903), 120; Fifth Annual Report (1889), 14-15; Sixth Annual Report (1890), 33; Seventh Annual Report (1891), 40; Seventeenth Annual Report (1901), 12; Twenty-first Annual Report (1905), 16.
Barnett wrote in a similar vein to his brother: "Yesterday was a lovely day & as I hung abt. the [Rampstead] Heath I felt more than ever the power of the country. Vain is it for us to try to teach men new life if we keep them in the city, it is the country & only the country wh. can teach so as to be obeyed." Other leaders of the Fund emphasized the "gloomy cramped streets," "the monotonous houses of hideous aspect," "the sordid tragedy" of London's slums. The fortnight's holiday gave East End children "a taste of country life" and showed them "quieter pleasures than the excitement of the streets."

Thus, like many of the organizations associated with the settlement, the Fund ignored the possibilities inherent in the cities and looked back sentimentally to the order and simplicity of a former era. Similarly, the leaders of the Fund, hoping to re-establish the relations between the classes which they believed urbanization had destroyed, glorified the potentialities of the upper-class voluntary worker. They claimed, in fact, that their task could be accomplished only by private philanthropy. As the settlement wrote in 1886, "It is a work which, if the State were
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to touch, it would benumb; it must be personal — the fruit of sympathy and sacrifice." The operation of the association depended on a large corps of volunteers who selected the children, visited their homes and sent them to the country respectably attired. The first job was particularly important. Although the children of prosperous parents should be considered ineligible, the fund could not, in the words of Barnett, "import into the country village the dirt, squalor and low habits of the London slums." The Toynbee Record agreed: "It is too true that the very poor are often unfit to be sent to a decent home, and we must console ourselves with the remembrance than many of them go hopping and fruit-picking."

Local volunteers also visited the parents of the children, showing them the value of the holiday and persuading them to contribute a fair proportion of the cost. Finally, the volunteers ensured that the children were clean and well dressed when they departed:

"Insistence on this, by showing how low the standard of cleanliness was in many cases, has done much to raise it generally."

Founded by a vicar of the church in the 1870's, the Children's Country Holidays Fund thus remained a typical parochial activity.

The wife of W.R.L. Blakiston underlined this aspect of the organization
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when she recalled that Blakiston had been drawn to it largely as a result of his childhood in a country vicarage. R.H. Tawney, however, expressed the growing dissatisfaction of many other Toynbee Hall residents with this type of endeavor. Shortly before assuming the position of secretary to the Fund he confided to Beveridge:

"I find the literature on the subject somewhat heavy reading. It has a monotonously benevolent tone ... and is only endured in small doses at a time." Although he remained secretary for three years, a subsequent letter to Beveridge suggests that as he became more interested in economic problems and adult education he found his work for the Fund increasingly unrewarding.

The third major aim of Toynbee Hall's participation in the public affairs of East London before the turn of the century was to prevent the growth of pauperism. The residents worked toward this goal in connection with the Whitechapel Board of Guardians and the Charity Organisation Society. Barnett formed the primary link between the settlement and the Whitechapel Board, serving as a Guardian from 1874 to 1903 and as Chairman of the Board in 1892. Other early residents expressed their support of the Board in articles in The Toynbee Record. In addition, William Vallance, the Clerk of the Board and the man most closely identified with its work,
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was an associate of the settlement for many years. When he resigned from the Board in 1902, the Record praised him as "a model official, methodical and sympathetic, just and kind, firm and tender. ... There are few men who go to retirement with better works to follow them. He has left in East London not only something done, but a living spirit."

It has been seen that the policy of this Board was based on the belief that pauperism, rather than poverty, was the most serious social problem. Few early settlement residents questioned this assumption. Shortly before the Guardians' election in 1889, one prominent resident wrote in the Record: "In East London where, in three unions, out-door relief has been virtually abolished, an attempt will be made by some extremists to return Guardians pledged to revert to this old-fashioned means of relief." It would be dangerous to do so: "The stakes are the independence or pauperisation of the people." The corollary of this view was that private philanthropy should play the leading role in promoting social welfare. If moral failure was the primary cause of social distress, then the greatest need was for members of the upper classes to guide individual working men along the path of self-improvement.

The Whitechapel Board thus handed over much of its power to the local committee of the Charity Organisation Society. As the
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Guardians wrote in 1884, they "have been able to regard 'legal relief' and 'charitable aid' as distinctive - and not interchangeable, terms; to accept the responsibility of the former out of the rates and to set free the fountains of voluntary charity for the relief of the latter." The Board itself dealt only with the destitute, 'undeserving' poor who, denied all monetary relief, were automatically sent to the workhouse. The C.O.S. committee exerted far more discretion. It alone judged the merits of the 'deserving' applicants and decided on the form which their assistance should take.

After 1900, when the settlement ceased to consider pauperism a major problem, the residents gradually withdrew their interest from the work of the Whitechapel Board. Although a number of residents served as Guardians during this period, it is likely that they did so primarily because they felt that there were few other qualified men in East London. The majority of residents emphasized the need to reform the entire Poor Law system. Like an increasing number of other social reformers, they viewed all Boards of Guardians as out-modeled institutions, based on an obsolete social philosophy and concerned with irrelevant issues. As The Toynbee Record wrote in 1906, "the problem of unemployment was hardly present to the
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minds of those who framed the Poor Law. The law itself was a piece of very scientific machinery for 'dispauperisation'. " It had become clear to many residents that the complex problems of an urban society required remedies which went beyond the abolition of out-relief and which involved a new relationship between public and private philanthropy.

Toynbee Hall's relationship with the Charity Organisation Society followed a similar path of development. During the years in which the residents emphasized the need to prevent the increase of pauperism, the C.O.S., the most important philanthropic association at the time, naturally formed a center of the settlement's concern. In fact, there were strong affinities between the settlement and the society. Both viewed charity as a process of character regeneration achieved through personal interaction between rich and poor. C.O.S. leaders condemned indiscriminate alms-giving not only because thoughtless gifts demoralized the poor but also because the distribution of doles frequently served as a substitute for personal involvement with individual members of the working class. Above all, the poor needed a continuing personal commitment from the wealthy. Settlement residents and C.O.S. visitors thus assumed identical positions in working-class communities. Both saw themselves as friendly neighbors of the poor, reducing the tensions and
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misunderstandings between classes. Moreover, the settlement movement and the C.O.S. were outgrowths of the same tradition. The leaders of both looked to Edward Denison's residence in East London and to Octavia Hill's experiments with rent collecting for models of personal service. Like the founders and early residents of Toynbee Hall, C.S. Loch, the secretary and guiding spirit of the C.O.S. from 1875 to 1913, had been influenced by the philosophy of T.H. Green and the example of Arnold Toynbee while a student at Balliol. Barnett himself was the strongest tie between the settlement and charity organization movements. A leader of the C.O.S. in Marylebone, he came to St. Jude's determined to apply its principles to the administration of relief in Whitechapel. In his speech at St. John's College, Oxford, initiating the settlement movement, he stressed the need for university graduates to act as visitors for the C.O.S.

During the 1880's and 1890's the settlement residents were agreed on the importance of this work. They provided rooms at the settlement for the meetings of the Whitechapel committee of the C.O.S. and obtained leading positions in all three of the East End local committees. In The Toynbee Record they consistently praised

the various activities of the Society and the principles which underlay its work. Nevertheless, by the turn of the century, the majority of residents were influenced by the criticisms levelled at the Society. An increasing number of residents began to speak of the C.O.S. pronouncements on social problems as reactionary opinions rather than as unchallengeable dogma. Although Barnett's denunciation of the C.O.S. at a meeting of its council in 1895 did not immediately affect the relationship between the society and the settlement as a whole, three years later The Toynbee Record noted that the number of settlement workers participating in the activities of the Society had sharply declined. A clear break occurred in 1905 when the Record attacked the Society's unimaginativeness and inflexibility. Although its guidelines for the administration of relief in individual cases remained valid, its "negative attitude" toward many other questions of social importance had rightly destroyed its position of leadership in the field of social reform. Advocating "the inculcation of thrift" and a "stricter administration of the Poor Law" as solutions to all problems, members of the Society were "fiercely antagonistic" to any proposal for new social legislation.

Three months later, replying to the Society's defense of its views, the Record specified relief works for the unemployed, the feeding

of school children and old age pensions as the issues on which the
C.O.S. no longer provided informed opinion. From this date on, the
C.O.S. was frequently an object of censure in The Record.

After the turn of the century, when the majority of residents
looked to economic forces rather than to individual shortcomings
for the source of social distress, the direction of the settlement's
participation in East London's local affairs radically altered.
Although some residents continued to devote their time to private
philanthropy, many sought to reveal the need for governmental
action and to coordinate the activities of voluntary associations
and statutory agencies. The residents' work on behalf of the Stepney
Council of Public Welfare partly reflected these new concerns.

The Council was largely an attempt to replace the leadership
of the Charity Organisation Society in East London's philanthropic
and civic affairs. Founded in 1903, it comprised over seventy
clergymen by 1904. Barnett was chairman from 1903 to 1912 and
throughout the period Toynbee Hall residents occupied leading positions
on both the Council's various sub-committees and its executive
committee. Beveridge outlined the purpose of the organization in a
letter to his mother:
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This is a body of clergy, ministers & others in Stepney, created by Canon Barnett to watch all matters of civic interest in Stepney & take action where need be. I am 'municipal secretary,' which means that I have to furnish quarterly reports on the work at the Borough Council. Canon Barnett's idea ... is that these reports should be valuable enough to publish in the local papers and one or two special London papers ... - so as to produce informed public opinion on local government. All of which appears to me most desirable. But things have to go slowly at first; for one thing the 'Council of Public 'elfare' being composed mainly of clergy needs educating itself & needs to have its interest widened beyond its present ones of temperance & morality.69

In fact, his aims were only partly realized. Although the Council sought to attract leaders of all major social agencies 70 in Stepney, it continued to be dominated by clergymen. Even the staunchest supporter of the C.O.S. could have approved of many of their activities. Two sub-committees, responsible for registering charitable organizations and for supervising local work to control the spread of tuberculosis, worked in conjunction with a branch of the C.O.S. The Temperance and Morality Sub-Committee which had incurred Beveridge's censure remained important. In 1908 it organized a temperance crusade, directed by a Toynbee Hall resident.72

Most significantly, H.P.W. Burton, secretary of the Council between 1911 and 1914 later recalled that the Council's goals were "indefinite
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Nevertheless, following the reorganization of the Council in 1907, it did seek to broaden the scope of its concerns to some extent. In particular, it assumed a leading role in administering the new social legislation in East London. In 1907 its members helped to coordinate the work of the various local Care Committees established under the Education (Provision of Meals) Act of 1906. Two years later they sought to apply the provisions of the Trade Boards Act in the borough. In 1912 the Council formed a subcommittee to investigate the ways in which this legislation had actually affected the average East Enders, to publicize their demands and to prepare the way for farther reaching measures. In addition, the Council attempted to improve the quality of local government in East London by putting up its own candidates for the Stepney Borough Council and endorsing the most suitable candidates for the various Boards of Guardians. It is true that, because the Council refused to provide party political leadership, it did not support the Labour Party which could have allowed power to pass to the working

---

73. Burton, *Weavers of Webs*, 59. Burton also claimed that his experience as an official of the Council showed him "that most of the charitable work in the East End merely scratched the surface, was too patronizing in manner, and too much in the hands of well-meaning amateurs." (Ibid.)


classes; many of the Council's members undoubtedly hoped that the
Council would serve as an alternative to the formation of a local
socialist party. Nevertheless, the organization urged that the
proportion of working-class members on the Borough Council should
be increased and the time of its meetings changed from afternoon
to evening to permit workmen to attend. If the Stepney Council of
Public Welfare did not rigorously follow the path on which Beveridge
had hoped to set it, it did go farther than the Charity Organisation
Society in supplying the constructive leadership which settlement
residents found lacking in East London.

The Toynbee Hall residents also demonstrated their attitude
toward East Enders and toward the role of voluntary action after
the turn of the century by participating in the Poor Men's Lawyer
Movement. This movement began at Mansfield House Settlement in
1891 when a lawyer offered his services to those members of the
community who could not afford to pay a solicitor. Seven years
later Toynbee Hall followed the example of Mansfield House, hiring
a "poor man's lawyer" who was consulted by about nineteen applicants
77
each week. Although the majority of his clients required only
advise, the settlement also established a fund in 1903 to cover
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necessary litigation. Moreover, the East London Tenants Protection Committee, founded in 1899, was closely associated with Toynbee Hall. For a number of years Barnett served as its chairman and a second resident as its honorary secretary. It differed from the Poor Man's Lawyer in that it restricted its services to cases involving the relationship between landlord and tenant. As Barnett explained to his brother one month after its formation, "The Tenants Rights Commee is interesting - Man after man reveals the lawless conduct of landlords & our lawyer tells them how to resist & force them to use legal methods of eviction." In 1905, the Tenants Protection Committee and the Poor Man's Lawyer were amalgamated to form the East London Tenants and General Committee which subsequently supplied legal aid to about a thousand applicants a year.

In these efforts to increase legal services in the community, Toynbee Hall residents revealed a greater understanding of the realities of working-class life than they had formerly displayed. The settlement movement itself had been based on the assumption that members of the upper and lower classes could communicate on terms of equality. The Poor Man's Lawyer movement, on the other
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hand, implied a recognition of the fact that the poor were necessarily at a disadvantage in any relationship between the classes and were therefore constantly exploited by unscrupulous landlords, employers and tradesmen. The legal aid committees also differed in an even more significant respect from other private organizations with which Toynbee Hall was associated. The Sanitary Aid Committee, the Children's Country Holidays Fund and the Charity Organization Society shared a faith in the potentialities of personal influence. Despite minor differences of aim, they all sought primarily to improve the characters of the poor by supplying visitors to establish friendly relations with the recipients of their aid. Instead of taking advantage of the opportunities for a more structured form of social work provided by the growth of the metropolis, these associations glorified the personal service which they believed had characterized pre-industrial society. However, the committees established in conjunction with the Poor Man's Lawyer movement foreshadowed a new form of voluntary association which arose after 1918. Because they expected to provide only a professional service, they did not demand that the lawyers form more than purely formal relationships with their clients. Thus, although the settlement had emphasized the ways in which the work of the Children's Country Holidays Fund differed from that of a statutory agency, in 1913 The Toynbee Record expressed the hope that the government would assume at least partial res-
ponsibility for legal aid. Philanthropic organizations which did not exalt the relationship between voluntary workers and the poor could easily pave the way for action by the state.

The Mansion House Committee of 1903-04 was one of the last significant philanthropic organizations with which Toynbee Hall was involved before the First World War. It provides a clear example of the way in which a voluntary agency could lead to state intervention both by experimenting with new forms of social action and by revealing the inadequacy of philanthropy as a remedy for the problems of an industrial society.

The Committee was called together as the result of a letter which appeared in the press in November 1903, written by Canon Barnett and signed by other eminent Londoners. It warned that the coming winter was likely to be a period of exceptional distress and advocated the formation of farm labor colonies to employ men who were temporarily out of work. While the Lord Mayor raised a fund of £4,000 with which to implement the scheme, Barnett and Beveridge were active in publicizing its advantages. The administration of
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the relief fund, moreover, centered at Toynbee Hall. Beveridge and Henry Maynard served on the executive committee of the Mansion House Fund, the latter as honorary secretary; numerous other residents devoted their time to organizing the operations of the scheme in East London. In January 1904 Barnett was able to tell his brother that "the young men at Toynbee Hall have captured the Mansion House Fund."

Between 17 December 1903 and 24 March 1904 the committee obtained work for 467 men at the Salvation Army at Hadleigh Farm and on Osea Island, Essex and supported their families in London. Although the men were permitted to remain at the colonies for the duration of the program, only 247 chose to stay to the end. Their terms in fact varied from a few days to fourteen weeks. Beveridge found the colony at Osea Island "a sufficiently depressing place not to make the life of the unemployed too attractive." The men were forbidden any alcohol and were allowed home to visit their families or to search for work only at specified intervals. In addition, the rigorous nature of the work and the strict supervision
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were expected to serve as a "test of the industrial and moral qualities" of the men and as a means of discouraging "idlers and dependents" from applying. However, despite these precautions, it became necessary to adopt a careful process of selection. Although the committee accepted the first 160 men without investigating their backgrounds, it subsequently gave preference to applicants who could produce employers' references showing a record of continuous employment and who were considered likely to regain their former positions if prevented from "degenerating" while temporarily unemployed.

At the conclusion of the program, the leaders concluded that the Fund "gave very real assistance at a time of great distress to a considerable number of families, and maintained in a state of reasonable comfort many homes which would otherwise have broken up."

But Barnett believed that the program should not be considered an end in itself. Because it could provide aid for only a minor proportion of the unemployed, it should be seen primarily as a means of pioneering with a relatively new form of social action. Writing to Beveridge a month after the program began, he stressed this point:

Notices of the Unemployed in the press suggest that the matter is within compass. I am glad. The experiment will thus be able to be watched — valued etc. You, young people, own the future & the results of this experiment will have to be used in dealing with harder problems. ... I do hope you are keeping your mind on the need of writing a report later on.

In a letter to his brother a week later, Barnett again referred to the scheme as an "experiment." Beveridge likewise emphasized this aspect of the program. As he wrote to his father in March, "the Unemployed are ... coming to an end because the money is getting exhausted. Then I shall have to turn to and gather the scientific results."

A few months later Beveridge and Maynard interviewed all the men who had worked at the colonies in order to discover whether they had subsequently been able to obtain regular work. Beveridge then wrote a series of articles in The Toynbee Record analyzing the results of their survey. They found that, contrary to their expectations, only a small proportion of the men had been successful in securing permanent positions by the end of July. Moreover their ability to find jobs bore little relationship to their previous records of employment; regular and casual workers alike found themselves degenerating during the summer "by enforced idleness and demoralising poverty." Comparing his figures with the Board of
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Trade's statistics on unemployment, Beveridge concluded that the economic difficulties of the previous winter had been far more serious than he had originally assumed. The Mansion House Fund had been attempting to cope with unemployment caused not by seasonal factors but rather by a general downward tendency in trade. The depression had begun in 1900 and affected the country both in summer and in winter. The relief colonies had failed because their founders had underestimated the extent of the problem.

There were two corollaries to this conclusion. First, it was futile to preach thrift and sobriety to the poor as a complete solution to their difficulties. A large proportion of the working classes were unemployed as a result not of personal weakness but of a major fault in the industrial system. The most independent and self-reliant man earning no more than twenty-four shillings a week during good times could not possibly save enough to continue to support his family during a long period of enforced idleness. Second and more significantly, voluntary action alone should not be relied upon to deal with the problem of social distress. Most charitable funds were raised only at Christmas, but Toynbee Hall's survey had shown that the same resources were needed throughout the year. The great number of men who found themselves forced out of work by a long cyclical depression must be able to draw upon a source of relief which they could be certain would be both continuous
end adequate. The depth and complexity of the problem required a national program of state-supported relief.

Beveridge was aware that he was directly challenging a cardinal doctrine of the Charity Organisation Society. In November 1904 the Society's Special Committee on the Relief of Distress Due to Want of Employment issued a report which, reiterating the views of the Society, opposed any scheme of rate-supported relief. According to C.O.S. dogma, periods of unemployment could never be caused by large-scale social forces. In fact, such periods were most accurately called times of "exceptional distress," a term which suggested a problem of limited of duration and within the power of private philanthropy to remedy. The results of Beveridge's survey, however, pointed to a different conclusion: "The problem presented by recurring periods of unemployment is beyond the powers of charity and is wholly outside the scope of a Poor Law dealing with destitution in general."

Beveridge based his specific recommendations on an analysis of the process by which men became paupers. He discovered that the
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number of workhouse inmates increased about a year after a period of unemployment. In other words, men who lost their jobs did not subside into pauperism until after a considerable interval had elapsed. During this time "physical or moral deterioration sets in and the once efficient worker comes to the Poor Law, perhaps permanently enfeebled by privation and disease, perhaps a victim to drunkenness for which he is only half responsible, perhaps incurably habituated to the casual and loafing existence." The government's task should therefore be to preserve the efficiency of competent workers during long periods of enforced idleness.

Beveridge and Maynard outlined their proposals in an article in The Contemporary Review published in November 1904. They urged the government to establish three types of farm colonies, each of which would assist one group of the unemployed. Men who were classified as "unemployable", such as inmates of workhouses and casual wards, would be committed to compulsory labor colonies. Both the casual and regular worker who were temporarily unemployed would have an opportunity to reside at voluntary colonies where they would receive training in industrial and agricultural skills. However, men who could produce employers' references proving a previous record of continuous employment, would be admitted to

colonies where the work would be less strenuous and the standard of living more comfortable than those intended for casual laborers. Although compulsory colonies would be permanent institutions, the free ones would be established only during periods of unemployment.

The Mansion House Fund of 1903-04 led to governmental action in the field of unemployment in two ways. It has been seen that the results of his survey encouraged Beveridge to investigate the problems of unemployment and eventually to look beyond relief schemes for a solution. The Fund thus indirectly paved the way for labor exchanges and for unemployment insurance. More immediately, the Fund was itself the precursor of Walter Long's Unemployment Fund, established the following winter. As President of the Local Government Board, Long formed committees in the metropolitan boroughs of London, composed of Borough Councillors, Poor Law Guardians and social workers, and entrusted them with responsibility for providing relief work for the unemployed. According to Maynard, Long acknowledged that the "germs" of his scheme lay partly in the report issued by the Mansion House executive committee. In addition, Maynard was secretary of Long's central committee which co-ordinated the activities of the various local committees and operated a farm colony at Hollesley Bay; Beveridge served on the Stepney Joint Committee.

Committee, established under the scheme. Shortly after Long organized the program, Barnett told his brother: "The Bp of Stepney & I had a talk with Long - a conceited & not very intelligent person but caring to do his duty - "e gave him admirable advice!"

One month later he wrote: "One of our men Haynard is sec of Long's commee & so we are able to give some direction." Beveridge was equally confident of the settlement's power to influence Long's actions. In February 1905 he reported to his parents about a meeting at which he, Barnett, Haynard and Ernest Ayes, a former sub-warden of Toynbee Hall and a secretary of Long's committee, planned an unemployment bill to be presented to Long. Canon Barnett, he claimed "(through Maynard) will instil wisdom into Long."

It is true that the committees which Long founded did not embody the major recommendation of Beveridge and Haynard. Although they had stressed the necessity for all future relief schemes to be subsidized by the government and Long himself had agreed to accept funds at least from local authorities, the committees relied entirely on voluntary contributions. Nevertheless, the scheme in turn paved the way for the Unemployed Workmen Act of 1905 which did mark the beginning of governmental intervention in the field of unemployment. It required that every municipal borough and

110. S.A.B. to F.G.B., 3 December 1904.
111. W....B. to Henry Beveridge, 10 February 1905.
urban district with a population of fifty thousand or over establish a distress committee similar to those already operating in London. These committees also depended on charitable funds at first but the weight of the financial responsibility gradually shifted to the national government.

Toynbee hall residents did not overestimate the significance of this Act. It was a Conservative measure, enacted by men with no intention of changing radically the economic order. Like many other social reformers, the residents thus sought to reveal the Act's weaknesses and to demonstrate the need for more effective measures. Most agreed with Beveridge when he concluded in 1909 that the Act had made no "appreciable impression upon the problem. Its main service has been to demonstrate beyond question its own essential inadequacy and the inadequacy of all measures which, like itself, leave industrial disorganisation untouched and deal only with the resultant human suffering." Nevertheless, because the Act had endorsed the principle of governmental intervention in the field of unemployment, numerous past and current settlement residents felt a responsibility to participate in administering it. Members of the Central (Unemployed) Body for London included W.H. Beveridge, H.R. Maynard and T.E. Harvey. Other residents served on the Stepney

Distress Committee which was led by Cyril Jackson.

During the same period, many settlement residents attempted to work in harmony with the social legislation enacted by the Liberal Government. Although hesitant and tentative measures, these acts were significant because they reflected the change in social thought which had occurred since the 1880's and set a precedent for broader governmental control. It has been seen that many of the draftsmen and early administrators of the acts were former Toynbee Hall residents whose experience as philanthropists in East London had shown them the inability of voluntary action to deal with the problems of an urban community. Moreover, current settlement workers themselves assumed prominent roles in applying the acts in East London. Although some residents continued to devote their attention to private philanthropy, the majority believed that the primary goal of the settlement should be to promote the work of public authorities and to develop a new relationship between voluntary associations and statutory agencies.

Shortly after the passage of the Education (Provision of Meals) Act of 1906, the first significant measure enacted by the

Liberal Government, Toynbee Hall residents began to serve on the local Care Committees responsible for organizing the distribution of meals. When the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act was passed the following year, the scope of the Committees was broadened to include all matters relating to the health and after-care of the children. The settlement residents believed the Committees were important primarily as the means of establishing a pattern for the co-operation of voluntary workers and public authorities. As one resident wrote in 1909,

> It is incontestable that voluntary work, if it is to survive and be in any way fruitful, must be carried on in close connection with the activities of the State and of the municipality. The Care Committees, therefore, are not mere additions to the clamouring throng of philanthropic agencies. They are the first-fruits of the new ideals of philanthropy. ... The only chance for other agencies is to enter into a close alliance and to put their workers and their experience at the service of the State.\[115\]

Other residents served on the Juvenile Advisory Committee of the Stepney Labour Exchange, established under the provisions of the Labour Exchanges Act of 1909. In part, this Committee sought to further one of the aims of the early settlement residents. Like


the "old boys' clubs" which they had founded in the 1880's and 1890's, the Juvenile Advisory Committee offered guidance to boys who left the local elementary schools, steering them away from "blind alley" employments. While recognizing the Labour Exchanges Act as still another preliminary measure, The Toynbee Record expressed the belief that the labor exchanges could "do much to provide the framework for a complete national system for the guidance and training of adolescents in this country, and to prepare the way for legislation in the future."

Toynbee Hall assumed a position of far greater leadership in enforcing the provisions of the Trade Boards Act of 1909. This Act, which established boards responsible for determining a minimum wage in a few selected industries, was particularly important in East London where sweating was prevalent in the tailoring and box-making trades. As early as 1906 C.R. Attlee, E.F. Wise and T.E. Harvey assisted J.J. Mallon, an associate of the settlement and a leader in the movement which secured passage of the Act, investigated the conditions of the manufacture of clothing and paper boxes in the East End. Soon after the Act was passed, the residents directed their actions toward informing tailors and tailoresses of their new

116. Record, Vol. XXIII, No. 3 (December 1910), 43.
117. Attlee, As It Happened, 27; J.J. Mallon, "Introduction," in Pimlott, Toynbee Hall, II.
rights and of the steps they should take to secure them. This work was important because the home workers were among the most easily exploited groups in industry; the Act could be effective only if they understood its provisions. The settlement thus organized meetings at which the residents and members of the Board of Trade described the Act in considerable detail. Moreover, the Industrial Committee of the Stepney Council of Public Welfare, which sought to bring all violations of the Act to the attention of the inspectors and to disseminate information about the laws, was led by E.F. Wise and assisted by numerous other residents. E.F. Hitchcock was chairman of the Industrial Investigation Committee of the Council, responsible for conducting an enquiry into the actual effect of the Act on the trades concerned. In 1912 the settlement residents helped to organize an association for the protection of home workers which permitted the workers to formulate their own grievances and to take representative action on their own behalf.

118. Attlee, As It Happened, 28; Record, Vol. XXII, No. 5 (February 1910), 62; Record, Vol. XXII, No. 7 (April 1910), 98; Record, Vol. XXIV, No. 2 (November 1911), 18; Twenty-sixth Annual Report (1910), 21; Twenty-seventh Annual Report (1911), 17.
121. Mallon, "Introduction," in Pimlott. Toynbee Hall, x; Record, Vol. XXV, No. 5 (February 1912), 66; Record, Vol. XXVI, No. 7 (April 1914), 108.
By 1914 the residents had transformed the meaning and purpose of Toynbee Hall. During the 1880's and 1890's they had participated in private philanthropy as visitors for the Charity Organisation Society, the Sanitary Aid Committee and the Children's Country Holidays Fund and as directors of programs for pupil teachers. Exalting the potentialities of personal influence, they had seen themselves altering the standards, attitudes and even behavior of the recipients of their aid. When, after 1906, the residents devoted more of their attention to enforcing social legislation, their goals became less grandiose. This legislation had been based on the belief that an increase in the material welfare of the people must precede the regeneration of their characters and that personal service was unequal to the task of solving large-scale social and economic problems. As members of statutory agencies, the Toynbee Hall residents were often responsible merely for helping members of the working classes take advantage of rights to which they were entitled irrespective of individual worth.

As a consequence of this change of aim, settlement workers increasingly fulfilled a different function. Previously they had seen themselves as privileged men watching over the welfare of their less fortunate brethren and had assumed without question that their task could be accomplished only by representatives of the upper classes. Now, because faith in moral exhortation and personal
influence to effect social change had declined, they had less reason
to stress their own social background. Thus, although the residents
did not encourage their working-class neighbours to participate in
the work of the settlement at this time, they helped to pave the way
for the formation of community centers, one of the most significant
steps in the development of social work in Britain after 1918.
Settlements which were largely concerned with enforcing the provisions
of legislative acts had no need to restrict their residents to
members of the upper classes.

In the field of philanthropy, then, the residents were far
more successful than in any other field in adapting the settlement
to changing social demands. The founders of Toynbee Hall, idealizing
the social relationships of eighteenth-century rural society, had
seen the imposition of a residential leisured class as an adequate
solution to the problems of East London. But settlement workers
after the turn of the century were more conscious of the opportunities
of an urban industrial society and more aware of the dimensions of
its problems. They realized that upper-class voluntary workers
must henceforth play a subsidiary and circumscribed role in the
field of social service. As a result, the settlement continued to
have a position in the public affairs of East London long after it
had ceased to be important in either adult education or the labor
movement.
Appendix: Toynbee Hall Residents, 1884 - 1914


William Adams (Sept. 1886 - Dec. 1886).


1. This material has been taken from college registers, Who's Who, the Dictionary of National Biography, the Toynbee Record, the Toynbee Hall annual reports and the biographies and memoirs of Toynbee Hall residents. The dates in parenthesis indicate the period of residence at the settlement.


Maurice Birley (Nov. 1904 - March 1914; warden, 1911 - 1914) Educated, New College, Oxford. Chairman of the National Association for the Deaf.


Leonard Buckland Bluett (May 1913 - April 1914) Businessman.


William John Braithwaite (Nov. 1898 - Aug. 1903) Born 1875. Educated, Winchester, Oxford. Civil servant, largely responsible for drafting National Health Insurance Bill. Assistant Secretary, Board of Inland Revenue, 1910 - 12; Secretary, National Health Insurance Joint Committee, 1912; Commissioner for Special Purposes of Income Tax, 1913 - 36. Died 1936.


Alexander Lorriss Carr-Seavers (Sept. 1911 - May 1913; sub-warden, 1912 - 1913) Born 1886. Educated, Eton; Magdalen, Oxford. Charles Booth Professor of Social Science, Liverpool University 1923 - 37; Director of the London School of Economics, 1937 - 56.


Erskine A. Crossley (March 1910 - July 1910) Educated, Leighton Park, Reading; Clare, Cambridge.


Frederick Joseph Harvey Darton (Sept. 1903 - Oct. 1906; Feb. 1921 - Dec. 1922) Author and publisher.

Herbert Summersell Davis (Sept. 1902 - April 1903) Educated, Oxford. Inspector of Schools, South Africa and Burma.


Ronald Conway Davison (Jan. 1908 - July 1909) Born 1884. Educated, Charterhouse; Oriel, Oxford. Civil servant, Board of Trade and Ministry of Labour, 1912 - 28; retired to write and lecture on social questions, particularly unemployment.


William George de Bough (Jan. 1892 - April 1895) Educated, Winchester; Lerton, Oxford. Professor of Philosophy, University of Reading.


Francis Edward Douglas (April 1898 - Dec. 1909) Assistant Secretary, Board of Education.

Warwick Herbert Draper (Jan. 1897 - July 1897) Educated, University College, Oxford.


Ralph Roscoe Enfield (Jan. 1911 - May 1912) Born 1885. Educated, Christ Church, Oxford. Civil servant, Board of Trade, 1913 - 14; Ministry of Munitions, 1914 - 18; Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, 1919 - 52.

Walter Herbert Evans (June 1907 - March 1909) Educated, University of Manchester.


Sidney James Farrer (Jan. 1911 - July 1911) Born 1886. Educated, Eton; Balliol, Oxford. Landowner; Member of West Riding County Council.


Thory Gage Gardiner (Dec. 1884 - Aug. 1889; sub-warden, 1885 - 1889) Born 1857. Educated, Cheltenham; Brasenose, Oxford. Curate to Barnett at St. Jude's, 1881; Active member of C.O.S.; Poor Law Guardian; Member of Royal Commission on the Poor Laws, 1905 - 09; Residentiary Canon of Canterbury, 1917 - 37.

James Clerk Maxwell Garnett (April 1907 - Sept. 1907; March 1909 - Sept. 1909) Born 1880. Educated, St. Paul's; Trinity, Cambridge. Barrister; Examiner, Board of Education, 1904 - 12; Principal of the College of Technology and Dean of the Faculty of Technology, University of Manchester, 1912 - 20; Secretary, League of Nations Union, 1920 - 23.


Hilton Dewey Girdwood (Aug. 1901 - Sept. 1902)


Lionel Goodrich (March 1885 - June 1885) Clergyman.

Arthur Percival Grenfell (Feb. 1907 - Aug. 1907)


Henry Wilson Harris (Oct. 1908 - March 1909) Born 1883. Educated, Plymouth College; St. John's, Cambridge. Author and journalist. Successively News Editor, Leader Writer and Diplomatic Correspondent of Daily News; Editor of the Spectator; M.P.

Robert Ernest Sperling Hart (Oct. 1896 - April 1904) Educated, Merton, Oxford. Assistant Secretary, Board of Education.

Thomas Edmund Harvey (March 1900 - July 1900; Sept. 1904 - July 1911; warden, 1906 - 1911) Born 1875. Educated, Bootham School, York; Yorkshire College, Leeds; Christ Church, Oxford. Social reformer, politician and writer. Member of L.C.C., 1904 - 07; Member of Central (Unemployed) Body, 1906 - 10; M.P., West Leeds, 1910 - 18; Dewsbury, 1923 - 34, Combined English Universities, 1937 - 45; Active in war relief work for Society of Friends, 1914 - 20; Author of numerous books on religious and social subjects. Died 1955.


Basil Lucas Quixeno Henriques (Oct. 1913 - April 1914) Born 1890. Educated, Harrow; University College, Oxford. Founder and warden of Bernhard Baron St. George's Jewish Settlement.


Frank Russell Hoare (July 1913 - Nov. 1915)


George Ellsworth Hooker (May 1894 - Jan. 1895) Educated, Amherst College, Massachusetts. A clergymen and lawyer who became a resident of Hull House, Chicago; active in civic reform.
Harold Gibson Howitt (Dec. 1910 - Oct. 1911; Nov. 1919 - Feb. 1920)

Thomas Lloyd Humberstone (March 1902 - April 1906)


James Archibald Innes (Sept. 1912 - Jan. 1913) Born 1875. Officer in the Army.


Kingsbury Jameson (June 1890 - Sept. 1890; Oct. 1891 - April 1892)


George James Zacharias Jessel (Sept. 1908 - July 1909) Educated, University College, Oxford. Tuberculosis Officer, Lancashire District and County Borough of Wigan.

Ernest Sacheverell Wilberforce Johnson (Sept. 1889 - Oct. 1890)
Educated, Christ Church, Oxford.

Reginald Otto Kepp (Nov. 1914 - March 1915) Born 1885. Educated, University of Birmingham. Engineer; Professor of Electrical Engineering, University of London.

John Edward Kelsall (March 1886 - July 1886; Sept. 1886 - Feb. 1888)


George R. Layton (Sept. 1914 - Oct. 1915)


Charles Mostyn Lloyd (Oct. 1906 - April 1909) Born 1878. Educated, Oxford. Assistant Secretary to the National Committee for the Prevention of Destitution; Foreign Editor of the New Statesman; Head of Department of Social Science, L.S.E. Died 1946.


Theodore M. Lilting (Sept. 1885 - Nov. 1886)


James Archibald Murray Macdonald (Dec. 1884 - July 1885) Born 1854. Educated, Glasgow High School; Glasgow and Edinburgh Universities. Member of London School Board, 1897 - 1902; Liberal Member of Parliament.


Frank Herbert Matthews (March 1887 - June 1887) Born 1861. Educated, Dulwich College; Corpus Christi, Oxford. Head-master of grammar school.


William Robert Hill Merriman (June 1906 - Sept. 1907) Civil servant in Internal Revenue Office. Killed in First World War.


Samuel Ellison Minnis (April 1905 - June 1906) Born 1882. Educated, Queen's College, Galway; Royal University of Ireland. Assistant Secretary, Board of Inland Revenue.

Richard Edmund Mitcheson (Dec. 1884 - April 1886; Oct. 1886 - June 1888) Educated, Christ Church, Oxford. Assistant Secretary, Board of Education.


Jack Michael Myers (Sept. 1910 - Dec. 1911)


Thomas Hancock Nunn (Dec. 1884 - June 1891) Born 1859. Educated, University College, London; Christ's, Cambridge. Member of numerous social service organizations in London; Member of Royal Commission on the Poor Laws, 1905 - 09. Died 1937.

Gerald O'Donovan (March 1910 - Aug. 1911; sub-warden) A Catholic priest who left the Church shortly before coming to Toynbee Hall; subsequently a novelist.


Henry Duncan Pattinson (Sept. 1906 - Jan. 1907)


Werner Picht (Dec. 1911 - July 1912) Born 1887. Educated, Heidelberg University. Government Councillor in Prussian Ministry of Education; Founder and Director of German academic exchange service; head of University Section, League of Nations Institute for Intellectual Cooperation.


Henry George Watson (April 1885 - Aug. 1885; March 1888 - April 1890) Director of polytechnic in South Africa.

Henry Maunsell Richards (Jan. 1894 - April 1897) Born 1869. Educated, Merchant Taylors'; St. John's, Oxford. Inspector of Schools, Board of Education.


Charles Robert Robson (Jan. 1890 - Nov. 1890).

Arthur George Liddon Rogers (April 1888 - April 1889) Born 1864.
Educated, Westminster; Balliol, Oxford.

Civil servant.


Arthur Francis Macmillan Scott (Dec. 1888 - June 1889) Officer in the Army.

Edward Tyack Scott (Oct. 1903 - May 1904)


George Charles Simpson (March 1905 - Aug. 1905) Educated, Manchester University. Meteorologist.
John Sinclair (later Lord Pentland) (May 1888 - Oct. 1888) Born 1860. Educated, Edinburgh Academy; Wellington; Sandhurst. Officer in the Army, 1879 - 1887; Entered politics, 1886; Secretary of State for Scotland, 1905 - 12; Governor of Madras, 1912 - 19. Died 1926.

Hubert Llewellyn Smith (May 1888 - May 1889) Born 1864. Educated, Bristol Grammar School; Corpus Christi, Oxford. Entered Board of Trade, 1893; Member, Royal Commission on Secondary Education, 1894 - 95; Permanent Secretary, Board of Trade, 1907 - 19; Director, New Survey of London Life and Labour, 1923 - 35. Died 1945.

Sebastian Richard Eustace Snow (Sept. 1912 - April 1913)

Cear Ian Somning (Nov. 1908 - May 1910) Author of books on philosophy.


James Thornton (July 1897 - Nov. 1897)


Geoffrey E. Toulmin (Oct. 1914 - June 1915) Educated, the Leys School; King's, Cambridge. Civil servant who became a businessman.

Edward Johns Urwick (Oct. 1897 - Jan. 1904; sub-warden, 1901 - 03) Born 1867. Educated, Uppingham; Oxford. Director of London School of Sociology; Professor of Social Philosophy, University of London; Professor of Political Economy, University of Toronto.


Henry *ard (July 1886 - March 1916) Civil engineer; Member of L.C.C., 1892 - 1913.


Bernard Whishaw (Dec. 1884 - July 1885) Educated, Queen's, Oxford.

John Howard Whitehouse (Sept. 1905 - March 1908) Born 1873. Educated, Mason College. Liberal M.P., 1910 - 13; Parliamentary Private Secretary to Under-Secretary of State, Home Office, 1910 - 13, and to Chancellor of Exchequer, 1913 - 15; Founder and first warden of Denbridge School; President of Ruskin Society.

Ralph Follett Wigram (Sept. 1912 - June 1913) Secretary, British Embassy, Paris.
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