The social and political activity of the Cadbury family: A study in manipulative capitalism.

Dowd, Kevin William

The Social and Political Activity of the Cadbury Family:

A Study in Manipulative Capitalism

by
Kevin William Dowd

Ph.D. Thesis
The University of Wales, Swansea
Summer 2001

INDEX

ABBREVIATIONS II

ABSTRACT 1

The Social and Political Activity of the Cadbury Family:
A Study in Manipulative Capitalism 3

CHAPTER 1
THE LATE VICTORIAN QUAKER MOVEMENT:
Crisis of Non-identity Introduction 9

The Mid-Victorian S.O.F. the End of Isolationism
Internal Pressures: The Evangelical Quakers 10

External Pressure: The End of Isolationism and Political Quietism 15

The Nonconformist Movement 1884-1903:
Towards A More Cohesive Response 21

S.O.F. 1884-1903:
Quakerism Redefined 26

CHAPTER 2
REDEFINING PATERNALISTIC PHILANTHROPY:
Cadburys and The Political Arena
The Search for a Modern "Radical' Political/Social Framework 40

National Dimension 52

George Cadbury and the Political Role of the Nonconformist Movement 52

George Cadbury's Party Political Involvement 58

George Cadbury and the National Press 67

The Cadburys' Social Crusades 75

CHAPTER 3
THE CADBURYS AND THE HOUSING QUESTION:
Embracing a Higher Profile 85

The Bournville Village Trust 87

Bournville: a Model for the Nation 103

Extending New Paternalism Within Birmingham:
The Cadbury Influence Through Voluntary Agencies and Municipal Activism 123

CHAPTER 4
THE CADBURYS AND THE PROPAGATION OF SOCIAL DARWINISTIC IDEAS
Introduction 137

Towards Nurture and Nature 143

Raising the Profile of the 'Feeble-minded" Question 151

Towards Legistalion Change:
The Royal Commission and Its Aftermath 167

CHAPTER 5
THE CADBURYS AND EDUCATION
a) The Cadburys Education Initiatives:
A Response to the 'Social Question' 179

The Bournville Provision 182

A Note on Genderisation 190

The Impact of Cadbury's Bournville Education Schemes 195

b) The Widening Cadbury Educational Involvement:
Initial Steps - The Cadburys and the A.S. Movement 197

The Cadburys and the Severn Street Adult School Organisation 200

c) The Contemporary Adult School Message:
The Role of the Cadbury Educational Settlements 215

d) Increasing the Dissemination of Political Moderacy:
The Cadburys, Fircroft College and the W.E.A. - Fircroft College for Working Men & Women 231

The Cadburys, Fircroft and the W.E.A. 240

CONCLUSION 251

REFERENCES 257

BIBLIOGRAPHY 283

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 291

ABBREVIATIONS

The writer has used the following abbreviations in the course of this thesis:

AS	Adult School
ASU	Adult School Union
BHS	Birmingham Heredity Society
BIHS	Birmingham Infants' Health Society
BLU	Birmingham Ladies Union
BWS	Birmingham Women's Settlement
BDCS	Bournville Day Continuation School
BWG	Bournville Women's Guild
BVT	Bournville Village Trust
BSP	British Socialist Party
EES	Eugenics Education Society
FCC	Free Church Councils
FFDSA	Friends' First Day School Association
FSU	Friends' Social Union
GCA	Garden City Association
ILP	Independent Labour Party
LRC	Labour Representation Committee
MAS	Midland Adult School
MASU	Midland Adult School Union
NAF	National Association for the Feeble-minded
NASL	National Anti-Sweating League
NASU	National Adult School Union
NCOL	National Committee of Organised Labour for the Promotion of Old Age Pensions
NFCC	National Free Church Council
NHRC	National Housing Reform Council
NUWW	National Union of Working Women
SDF	Social Democratic Federation
SLP	Socialist Labour Party
SOF	Society of Friends'
SSCC	Summer School Continuation Committee
WEA	Worker's Educational Association

ABSTRACT

This study had its origins in my Master of Education dissertation analysing the role of the Cadbury family and their business, Cadbury Bros Ltd., in initiating and supporting post elementary educational schemes in the Bournville area of south Birmingham during the inter-war years, schemes which were implemented either as vocational training for their business work force, or which provided a more general schooling at the local authority's Bournville Day Continuation School, many of whose students were also Cadbury employees.

However, whilst undertaking this research it became evident that, although both the Cadbury family and business had exercised considerable influence in introducing and sustaining these schemes, this was nevertheless, neither the beginning nor the sum of their involvement in social policy and, indeed, social engineering: it was an involvement which embraced a much wider range of social provision and one which required a far more substantial consideration to reveal the full nature and extent of this Cadbury participation and influence.

Accordingly, this research project set out to explore the nature and extent of the social involvement of the Cadburys. It draws on late Victorian and early 20th Century material, including the Cadbury Papers held at Birmingham Central Library, together with contemporary documents at both the Selly Oak Colleges they founded and from many agencies with whom the Cadburys collaborated.

The central contention of this thesis is that, throughout this period, the Cadbury family and their close associates exercised a considerable influence on Britain's social and political life. This influence, traditionally either unacknowledged or portrayed as political altruism, had the effect, locally and nationally, of steering both the working class populace and the largest of the newly emerging left wing political parties away from seeking the most radical changes to the existing economic order, in favour of more moderate reforms which left this system not only essentially intact, but even more profitable for industrialists such as the Cadburys.

This programme included both establishing their own initiatives and supporting those of other who shared their social and political aims, and had a direct bearing on many areas of the urban populace's life, including education, housing, public health and recreation. This process was in turn facilitated by the desire of leading members of the Cadbury group to adopt a significantly more prominent public profile, as they accepted positions of power within local voluntary and municipal bodies, all of which promoted moderate political perspectives, encouraged belief in the apolitical nature of the state and frequently sought to amend working class behaviour and manipulate their financial insecurities in the interests of both the nation's industrial efficiency and industrialists.

Specifically, this programme was instigated to counter the ostensibly increasing physical and mental deterioration of Britain's working class (factory) populace and the apparent weakening of traditional mechanisms of social control, including religion, over this populace, two particularly prevalent perceptions and concerns shared by both the Cadburys and many contemporary social commentators and reformers.

Furthermore, this activism had a distinctly national dimension, the Cadbury initiatives being heralded as models for widespread emulation, whilst their financial patronage enabled the policies which formed the essence of their social philosophy to be more effectively pursued, this patronage being of considerable significance in the Liberal Party"s 1906 election victory.

Such overt and covert activism effectively established the Cadburys in the vanguard of contemporary social reformers. Indeed, this thesis illustrates the central role and impact of the Cadburys in responding to those developments they perceived as threatening their own and the nation's industrial and financial security, through the implementation of a coherent social programme, complemented and supplemented by the support they provided to a network of interrelated sympathetic politicians and activists.

THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF THE CADBURY FAMILY:

A Study in Manipulative Capitalism

This study, in essence covering the twenty five years leading to the outbreak of the First World War, involves an analysis of the consistently increasing social activism of leading members of the Cadbury family and their close associates, a group who will be collectively referred to as the Cadburys, and whose principal participants, including these family members, belonged to the Quaker religious faith, and its organisation, the Society of Friends (S.O.F.). Specifically the study seeks to critically analyse the group's role both as innovators and supporters of wide ranging initiatives in numerous areas of Britain's social and political life during this period. This is an involvement which the writer believes has attracted wholly insufficient attention, being either largely ignored or receiving an incomplete and inaccurate consideration, resulting in a significant underestimation of the role of the Cadburys throughout these years, and the concomitant influence they exerted both locally and nationally.

Consequently, this work seeks to redress this lacuna by challenging previously accepted interpretations of the group's activities, including those of Gardiner, 1923, Williams, 1931, and the more analytical Wagner, 1987, each of whom projected a spirit of civic responsibility and public benevolence as the essential motivation underpinning the social involvement of the Cadburys. The latter, for example, concluded that:

> *"It is pleasing to think that not only has chocolate itself given pleasure to millions, but the proceeds of its commercial success have been constructively used that countless others have benefited from the success of George Cadbury. . ."* [1]

It is the writer's thesis that these traditional, commonly accepted, interpretations have rested upon two substantially erroneous perceptions. Firstly, that this participation was a piecemeal and therefore ad hoc unplanned response to individual, almost discrete, problems and issues; and secondly, in attributing the Cadburys' motivation to their religious beliefs, commentators have in consequence concluded falsely that such actions were therefore solely characterised by an altruistic apolitical desire for 'social justice'.

In direct contrast to these assumptions, the writer's contention is that this Cadbury involvement was far from the almost accidental participation suggested by these traditional analyses. Rather, this was a conscious, widespread and sustained effort to limit the appeal of radical left wing solutions to social problems by advancing the cause of political moderation, and Liberalism in particular, especially amongst the working classes, whilst creating industrial and social conditions which were conducive to the best interests, primarily, of capitalism and capitalists.

Accordingly, this attempt was directed towards imposing their hidden social

agenda, specifically through producing a politically moderate, compliant and 'efficient' working populace receptive to the view the Cadburys propagated. Whilst such views included some deference to notions of social justice, their central intent was to encourage belief in the consensus capitalist model; i.e. encouraging the idea that industrial society operated for the mutual, almost equal, benefit of both employers and employees, and that such an economic structure correspondingly deserved the continuing support and approval of all who participated in it.

Furthermore, this was an exercise far removed from the egalitarian, democratic principles the Cadburys publicity advocated, in relying on and utilising the economic dependency of the working classes. More precisely, this was an exercise which included the founding of permanent mechanisms to promote and transmit this social philosophy; further, these were mechanisms whose operation involved the manipulation and exploitation of considerable numbers of this working class populace, requiring their adherence to particular Cadbury behavioural assumptions and expectations regarding, for example, the role of women, or the temperance issue, in order to qualify for certain material benefits.

The Cadburys' first involvement in the arena of social policy had began somewhat earlier, in the mid 19th Century, with George Cadbury's activities within Birmingham's Adult Schools and with their earliest efforts to influence working class behaviour, through their Model Parish Mission, established in 1849 and forming the basis for later Cadbury initiatives, in providing housing and facilities for schooling, in return for the expectation that their workers would abstain from both drinking and smoking.[2] However, these later undertakings, implemented and orchestrated from the 1890's, were of a far more comprehensive nature, consistently advancing the cause of political moderation, their ambition, scope, coherence and influence wholly deserving of analysis and consideration in themselves. Indeed, whilst these earlier schemes were the direct forerunners of the Cadbury social programme, they bore little resemblance to subsequent initiatives, initiatives whose origins and stimulus derived from a number of contemporary developments which in aggregate represented a considerable threat to the continued success of industrial capitalists such as the Cadburys.

Occurring against an internal background of increasing concerns over the 'social question' and the condition of the urban poor, alongside rising Imperialism and an increasing acceptance of Social Darwinism, these pressures were both national and international in nature. Domestically, those such as the Cadburys were confronted with the problem of convincing the increasingly enfranchised and politically organised working classes to retain an economic system which operated, in essence, against their own interests. Globally, the challenge was no less considerable, in ensuring that their (and Britain's) work force possessed the physical and mental capabilities to withstand

significantly more powerful international competition: a challenge which was somewhat misleadingly advanced under the politically attractive banner of 'national efficiency', and its corollary, the ostensibly more compassionate and socially conscious 'cult of the child'.

A further significant factor which encouraged this Cadbury participation and, indeed, enabled all of this social and political immersion to be undertaken, derived from late 19th century developments concerning them both as industrialists and as members of the S.O.F., a factor which consisted of two particularly pertinent aspects: firstly, the organisation's reinterpretation of its social role, undertaken as it sought to strengthen its fading influence: and secondly, following the removal of religious disabilities, the attempts of individual members of such as the Cadburys to provide by this reinterpretation and to gain and exert a political influence commensurate with their economic power and status.

Accordingly, the Cadbury reaction and solution to these numerous pressures, changed and possibilities, was dramatically increased by their social involvement with a programme directed at many areas of social policy, and including many different modes of action, within both the voluntary and state/municipal sectors. Broadly this activism included implementing and sustaining their own initiatives, a process which occurred, for example, in the educational arena, promoting and supporting causes similarly advocated by others, activity which involved either introducing new, additional, welfare or social services, such as with schools' medical inspection and treatment, or seeking to amend existing legislation, an objective the Cadburys pursued with regard to the issue of 'mental deficiency'.

Perhaps the clearest categorisation is one which views these efforts to implement a coherent welfare capitalism programme as being either supportive or innovative in nature, each of which may also be further subdivided. Those which may be regarded as essentially supportive, for example, included the Cadbury attempts to maintain the public profile of various groups working for specific social reforms, by, for instance, the continuing donation of significant financial contributions, consequently helping to secure the existence of groups lobbying for change. This patronage was, furthermore, also a particularly prevalent feature of the Cadburys' actions in influencing the magnitude and direction of social reforms by promoting and aiding the election of a Liberal government sympathetic to their own political perspectives, and one which subsequently enacted a number of specific legislative changes for which the Cadburys lobbied.

A second aspect of this supportive role was the Cadburys' willingness to adopt a higher public profile, indeed one involving the acceptance of public office, in the orchestration and pursuit of these objectives, the opportunities such positions offering being utilised as platforms for promoting Cadbury social agenda, and providing a further way in which their specific aims were both publicised and officially adopted by state agencies. Indeed many of the Cadburys accepted such positions of considerable status and power within a number and variety of influential bodies, including pressure groups

having a direct interest in these themes, such as the National Union of Working Women, for example, and the newly formed agents of the expanding state, such as local authorities, agents which were responsible for both implementing central government's legislative changes and in providing this government and other interested parties with 'factual' information and data regarding urban social conditions: information which because of its ostensibly neutral and disinterested source was both highly persuasive and of considerable influence on subsequent goverment social policy, both national and local, as Britain's welfare state began to be formulated.

Alongside these efforts to influence the levers and offices of legislation, the series Cadburys were also responsible for the introduction of a series of more overt initiatives: innovations which were largely concerned with the arenas of housing, industrial organisation and education, (both post-elementary and adult) and which shared a number of common characteristics, not the least of which was the Cadbury reaction of power and control over these varying schemes: initiatives whose utilisation often relied significantly, if not entirely, on the enormous power imbalance between the middle class bestowers of such 'benevolence' and their working class recipients.

Secondly, whilst the bodies which implemented and administered these initiatives were projected as apolitical entities whose messages were so reasonable as to be almost incontestable, in reality the perspectives they offered and perceptions they encouraged were of an extremely politicised nature. They were, for example, utilised for the propagation of the Cadbury consensus model, emphasising the mutually beneficial operation of capitalist democracy, without acknowledging the validity of alternative economic structures, or indeed the underlying assumptions of the structure they championed and its inherent implications, for example, in encouraging women to be primarily identified as mothers and carers, in furtherance of the 'cult of the child' and 'national efficiency'.

Thirdly, and perhaps of most importance, whilst these innovations operated purely within the confines of Bournville and nearby Birmingham, their significance was considerably greater, in influencing policy making on a much larger scale. Their housing initiative, the Bournville Village Trust, for example, was advocated as a model for widespread national adoption, whilst the Bournville Day Continuation School was utilised to increase the general pressures to extend education provision for adolescents, a strategy which was also employed with several of Cadburys' adult educational institutions, to buttress and supplement support for the national Workers' Educational Association and the moderate political perspectives it propounded and encouraged.

Clearly the operation of each of these initiatives, whether by supportive or innovative means, established and maintained the Cadburys in the vanguard of those pursuing a social and political agenda throughout what was a period of potentially extreme

change. Furthermore, this programme was of importance and significance not only for the individual initiatives implemented, but also for the themes and features which were common to each specific area and which helped maintain the programme's coherence, and which enhance an understanding and appreciation of the extent of this Cadbury influence.

Perhaps the most striking and original of these features is its scope, the Cadburys fusing their belief in the need for permanent mechanisms to administer any effective, coherent programme, with the acknowledgement that, in a modern industrial society, the state should adopt a directly interventionist role. Further, even at a time of increasing working class emancipation, rising socialism and threats of capitalism's future, this was a role which the Cadburys realised could be harnessed for the ultimate and almost covert benefit of industry and industrialists. In practice this perspective became manifested through actions which ostensibly assisted this working class populace, including its most disadvantaged and vulnerable members, in the pursuit of social justice and mutually beneficial ends, whilst enforcing policies whose greater concern lay in eliminating factors which contributed to industrial 'inefficiency', by producing a compliant and 'fit' work force.

In association was the recognition that the effective pursuit of such objectives required the propagation of vaguely, but favourably, defined beliefs such as 'citizenship', alongside the inculcation of certain behavioural patterns to eradicate 'deviants'. Consequently these themes were common to all the schemes with which the Cadburys were involved, in aggregate affecting all aspects of the populace's life, operating from the most formative years and placing particular emphasis on children, adolescents and women (thereby also encouraging the perpetuation of stereotyped gender roles).

Furthermore, to enhance their cause, the Cadburys frequently claimed that their policies were imbued and a moral correctness, and that, for example, the measures they sought and palliatives they offered the working classes were reasonable for all, consequently implying that any disagreement with their 'apolitical' social aims was, by definition, unreasonable and immoral, if not subversive, and unlike the Cadbury agenda, pursing the interests of one section of society at the expense of another.

In aggregate these various responses and themes represent what the writer has termed 'the Cadbury social philosophy', a coherent programme whose considerable influence and planning, it will be argued, underlay many significant social policy initiatives as Britain developed into a modern, industrialised nation, providing significant state social provision for its populace.

Broadly, since many of these schemes were concurrent developments, this study has a thematic, rather than chronological structure. Chapter 3 and 5 will examine the implementation, operation and impact of the innovative initiatives, in the respective areas of housing and education, whilst chapters 2 and 4 analyse their supportive, pressure

group roles, in the arenas of party political activism and with regard to the issue of racial deterioration.

An appropriate starting point to consider the pressure which led the S.O.F. and the wider Nonconformist movement to reinterpret their traditionally passive social and political role, a reinterpretation which in turn led the Cadburys to become more directly and overtly involved in political and social activism.

CHAPTER 1

THE LATE VICTORIAN QUAKER MOVEMENT:

A CRISIS OF NON-IDENTITY INTRODUCTION

The Quaker movement, has been frquently linked with a concern for social involvement, expressed in particular through the philanthropic activity of its S.O.F. and leading members of this group, including increasingly, the Cadburys. Ostensibly this association had continued throughout the 19th century in a largely traditional manner. However, such a view obscures the considerable conflicts and pressures acting on the movement which induced a radical readjustment of Quaker practices and whose expression produced a 20th century S.O.F. which differed significantly from its predecessors. This chapter will consider those tensions and their effects, after a brief explanatory note concerning this interest in social affairs.

The longevity of Quaker involvement in philanthropic/social activity is demonstrated by the founding, in 1675, of the movement's Meeting of Sufferings, an executive committee whose members were drawn from the Society's county branches and which spoke for the organisation as a whole[1] and which consequently operated as the organ articulating the collective conscience of the movement. Convening monthly, the Meeting for Sufferings considered the Society's position with regard to a number of social questions, through permanent sub-committees and occasional 'ad hoc' enquiries investigating matters specifically interesting and affecting the Quaker movement.

Isichei, (1970) has indicated the issues with which the 19th century S.O.F. became most readily identifiable, and which, for example, included those of Anti-Slavery, Free Trade, Temperance and Factory Legislation[2] an observation verified by the Society's 1895 Yearly Meeting[3] and which reflected the movement's involvement in areas of social activity, especially with regard to social reform.

However, this formal expression of social interest was not a linear progressive development; rather this was one dependent on external historical circumstance and with regard, for example, to the Free Trade question, on expediency. Equally pertinent was the Society's own definition of its role, a view deriving from the contemporary theological stance prevailing within the movement. Indeed, the theological redefinition which occurred in this early part of the 19th century did much to establish the nature of mid-Victorian Quakerism and is integral to an understanding of later Cadbury initiatives.

These development will be considered under two broad headings representing Victorian Quakerism pre and post 1884.

THE MID-VICTORIAN S.O.F. THE END OF ISOLATIONISM[1]

Internal Pressures: The Evangelical Quakers.

Throughout the 18th and early 19th centuries the dominant Quaker doctrine was that of Quietism, a traditional belief which views Friends as a 'peculiar' people, distinguished by particular forms of dress and language, and by an act of worship characterised by silence.[4] Furthermore, a central tenet of Quietism was that contact with non-Quakers would dissipate spiritual conviction[5] and undermine religious belief. This isolation was further reinforced by a moral disapproval of popular entertainment, a general outlook which distanced Friends from much of society, together with the state's exclusion of Dissenters from any aspect of of public life.

Within the movement itself there is evidence of an extreme reluctance to undertake corporate, or even organised, activity. In 1906 a prominent Quaker radical, John Wilhelm Rowntree, described how amongst 18th century Friends this reluctance manifested itself in a widespread indifference even towards the founding of a Friends' School,[6] an unimaginable response a century later.

However, in turn, each of these Quaker 'pillars' became subjected to internal and external scrutiny. The most fundamental of these, the pre-eminence of Quietism, came into question during and following the Beaconite faction of 1830, with the consequence that, particularly from 1850, the S.O.F. embraced a more evangelical outlook, one wholly incompatible with the retention of the separatist isolationist Quaker stance. Furthermore, this shift was parallelled and compounded over the next fifty years as Friends were slowly assimilated into British society by the gradual removal of religious disabilities which had previously both barred and dissuaded Quakers from wide social involvement.

Subsequently, these changed manifested themselves in two interrelated themes, the relaxation of Quaker religious dogma and an accompanying reinterpretation of Friends' role in society at large, a reinterpretation embracing evangelism and expressing itself in a burgeoning of philanthropic activity.

Payne, 1965, has suggested that this evangelical tendency awakened their social conscience and enabled the movement to embark on a far wider and more intense programme of social activity[7]. However, it is equally pertinent to attribute this shift to the concerns stridently raised by J.S.Rowntree's influential 'Quakerism Past and Present: An Inquiry Into The Causes Of Its Decline In Great Britain And Ireland'. Published in 1859, this study drew the Society's attention to the moribundity of its membership, and highlighted a number of factors Rowntree believed fundamentally hindered the development of the movement.

Specifically Rowntree criticised the Society's insistence on marriage within the movement as a prerequisite of continued membership and the essentially silent nature of

its acts of worship. He calculated that nearly a third of all Quakers had became 'disowned' through the continuance of this practice[8] and speculated how many others would have been attracted,

> *"if its terms of fellowship had been wider – if its religious services had been more varied their character . . . by the more decided encouragement of the gifts of preaching . . . by the assiduous cultivation of the habit of prayer, and, in short, by giving a less passive impress to all the Society's arrangements".*[9]

In this plea for a Quaker modernisation, Rowntree concluded with a question which was to resurface throughout this period of Friends' history, i.e.

> *"In the contemplation of these facts, the question necessarily presents, 'Has Quakerism a future?' – may it yet rise phoenix-like from its ashes, learn experience from the errors of the past, and enter on a brighter and happier course? or is it doomed?".*[10]

In hindsight some of this decline is attributable to the relative prestige afforded by the established church; Isichei has cited the example of 19th century Friends who experienced an increase in wealth without a concomitant rise in status and who, therefore, sought such recognition through membership of the Anglican Church. However, she also concurs with Rowntree's assessment, in noting the number of registrations attributable to perceptions of the movement as an anachronistic force, i.e. in highlighting the role of social factors such as the allurement of 'prohibited' popular entertainments and the attraction of more enlivened liturgical practices.[11]

Vipont, 1960, too, has emphasised the importance of this essay in suggesting that it,

> *"forced them to face the facts of the decline in membership, the loss of zeal, the poverty of the ministry, and the narrow interpretation of education and culture."*[12]

Certainly the presentation of the movement as one in a state of enervation and potential termination was one which drew an immediate response from the national leaders of the S.O.F.; in 1858, for example, the Yearly Meeting had taken a radical course of action in referring a Yorkshire Monthly Meeting request to amend the Society's marriage regulations to the Meeting for Sufferings for consideration.[13]

Within three years, however, this proposal, greeted with both alarm and indignation,[14] had been ratified by the movement, ending the traditional 'disownment' disqualification incurred by marriage to a non- Friend. The new regulations, attempting to stem the 'leakages' to which Rowntree had referred, permitted Quakers to marry those outside the Society but who,

> *"profess (ed) with Friends and attend our religious meetings".*[15]

This relaxation, concluded by 1873, amended the image of the Society as an exclusive body and immediately resulted in an upturn which continued throughout the century and which was almost exclusively attributable to the changed marriage regulations, the body's British membership rising from 13,756 in 1865,[16] to 15,380 in 1885,[17] and 16,476 a decade later.[18]

Clearly, however, whilst these measures might, at least temporarily, stem the Society's 'leakages', such amendments were not sufficiently radical for the scale of regeneration that Rowntree and others urged. Furthermore, the success of the evangelistic fervour holding sway within the wider Nonconformist movement reinforced Rowntree's description of a Society fossilised in the past.[19] In particular, the insistence on silent unprepared act of worship was wholly out of step with the dramatic nature of evangelical services, which, with their appeal of conversion, were proving particularly successful among the working classes.[20] Rowntree's demands, in calling for the ending of unpremeditated sermons, reliant on Divine Inspiration, and inclusion of some element of debate and discussion[21] therefore parallelled wider contemporary strategies in an attempt to renew the Quaker image.

Subsequently, some of these criticisms were assuaged by the adoption of a new book of Disciplines, in 1861, relaxing traditional codes of dress and speech during services,[22] although one of the more central of these comments, regarding the lack of trained Quaker ministry,[23] was largely unanswered until the turn of the century and the intervention of the Cadburys, (see chapter 5).

Nevertheless, Rowntree's essay was of considerable significance in providing the immediate impetus for a series of amendments designed to both revitalise and democratise the movement,[24] whilst, as part of a regenerative process, enabling and encouraging Friends to pursue a more active role in society at large. Of considerable importance in this process was the removal of barriers distancing the Quakers from the wider populace; symptomatic of this change was the erosion of the long established view of the arts and its attendant social intercourse[25] as dangerous and trivial diversions.[26] This process however, was not achieved in a harmonious manner, nor without recourse to moral infusion. In 1872, for example, Elizabeth Cadbury was warned of the hidden detrimental effects of popular entertainment upon employees.[27] Likewise, in 1880, the Quaker periodical, The Friend commented;

> *"The only thing that will save us from the evil effects of worldly literature is to bring our young people to the only real antidote for worldliness, which is the precious blood of Christ".*[28]

Nevertheless, the popular arts, and in particular, the reading of novels, not least for its educative effects, did gradually gain acceptance within the ranks of the Society.

This steady, if slow, erosion was parallelled by the loss of much of Quaker 'peculiarities', i.e. by the modification of regulations as regards marriage, dress, worship and speech[29] and was accompanied by a similarly fundamental reinterpretation of social involvement, including the need for contact and collaboration with non-Friends, as Quakers adopted a stance away.

"from legalistic self scrutiny to citizens concerned with the surrounding world".[30]

Furthermore, as the movement became increasingly aware of the unused potential among women Friends,[31] this strategy became inextricably linked with attempts to work with, and recruit from, the poorest classes. These efforts were particularly evident in the introduction of Mission Meetings and revivalist public gatherings,[32] both of which included the more evangelistic practice of hymn singing in an attempt to attract working class converts. In 1881 a permanent agency for such work, the Home Missions' Committee was established, to build up county Quarterly Meetings by founding Sunday (First Day) Schools, local Bands of Hope and distributing bibles amongst the general public.[33]

Whilst, however, these initiatives represented a force for considerable modernisation within the movement, their success was somewhat qualified. One particularly significant drawback was their instrumental role in revealing a source of latent class antipathy within the organisation, since the ministers appointed to conduct such work were often extreme evangelistic converts of working class origin who as such, were frequently treated as an anathema by other, more traditional, wealthier, conservative, Friends;[34] this was incidentally a source of tension which the most radical Quaker reformers, including the Cadburys, acknowledged and tried to counter as they sought to extend their effective influence over this group, (see later chapters).

Of all these myriad changes, however, perhaps the most important expression of this new stance was in the field of education. As a movement the S.O.F. had entered the educational arena relatively late, one consequence of the predominance of Quietism. Nevertheless, the formation, in 1804, of the British and Foreign Schools Society,[35] was indicative of an interest which Friends gradually expressed more fully during the second half of the century, as the willingness to enter into collaborative ventures with fellow Nonconformists and other became increasingly more prevalent.

This concern and involvement became evident in a number of initiatives during the mid-Victorian period, parallelling the founding of Quaker training colleges, e.g. Flounders Institute and Dalton Hall in 1848, and accompanied the growing number of Friends' schools displaying a less sheltered image, in admitting non-Friends and introducing subjects such as music and dancing.[36] Isichei, in noting the development of Friends' Adult Schools during this period, has observed that they were immediately identifiable as a branch of Quaker philanthropy, in catering not for their own members, or indeed for the

young, as did the early Sunday School Movement, but operating for the specific benefit of illiterate adults.[37]

Furthermore, the initial snobbery and inertia which had, at least partly, kept Quakers out of the education field, were both reduced by the prestige associated with teaching adults,[38] i.e. a task perceived as being more difficult and therefore more suited to the Quakers' relatively high level of education.

Nevertheless, it was not until the 1873 Yearly Meeting, (which also ratified the new marriage regulations), that the Friends First Day Association, established in Birmingham Twenty six years earlier, finally became officially sanctioned. Whilst the same meeting considered the subject to be one controversial enough to merit 'hot discussion'[39] the field of adult education was increasingly and more unquestionably seen as one of a particular concern to the Quakers, i.e.. what Isichei has termed a 'special calling,[40] and which led the movement to administer the National Adult School Union throughout the remainder of the century, (see later chapter 5).

Broadly, this development was illustrative of a commitment to the reshaping of the S.O.F. as a national organisation, geared to a more permanent long terms involvement with specific areas of philanthropic activity. An integral and concomitant process was that of centralisation, albeit undertaken in a piecemeal fashion, but which by the late 19th century, had clearly enabled the movement to, theoretically at least, participate more effectively in such areas, i.e. through the formation of the Friends' Central Education Board,[41] a body which supervised Quaker schools and participated in the national educational arena. Moreover, to facilitate these ends the Society had increased its salaried staff[42] to supplement the long established Meeting for Sufferings' Committee which viewed parliamentary proceedings with regard to the interests of the movement,[43] these late Victorian developments being complemented by the increasing number of Quaker M.P.s.[44]

Whilst this increase in participation was the consequence of internal tensions and pressures affecting the identity of the S.O.F., this involvement has been further considered with regard to the social disabilities acting upon the Quakers, and other Nonconformists, throughout much of the 19th century. Isichei has observed that the Victorian image of Friends was one of prosperity and benevolence,[45] the holding of wealth representing the highest available form of prestige, since others, including the holding of public office, were denied them.[46] Similarly, Payne has noted the role of contemporary literature, in largely ignoring the Nonconformist community,[47] in the non-recognition of Dissenting identity.

By these definitions, the Quakers, despite their evangelistic tendencies, and later political and social empowering, remained as outsiders, with very limited channels for effective public recognition. Consequently, for wealthier Friends, individual acts of philanthropy were doubly attractive, in being one of the more accessible of these channels, whilst providing a social esteem and credence otherwise denied them.

Isichei has added a further perspective to the collective character of the Quakers by viewing such participation as a means of satisfying a philanthropic zeal,[48] whilst assuaging any guilt complex arising as a consequence of their proportionally large involvement in commercial and trade activities.[49]

Certainly there exists, ostensibly, a clear connection between the business activities and the philanthropic actions of the prominent Quaker families of Fry, Grubb, Rowntree and Cadbury. Furthermore, as specific goals, such as that of Free Trade became realised, increasingly these actions became focussed upon and directed towards wider contemporary issues, such as the 'social question' and, of particular relevance here, the field of education, and especially adult education; indeed this was the area in which the Cadburys first exerted their influence in matters of social policy, an influence which rapidly expanded as their social and political involvement similarly burgeoned, (see later chapter).

A further significant factor in mid 19th century Quakerism was the recognition amongst the evangelical Friends of a commonly held ground with other dissenting groups, what Isichei, 1964, termed a move from sectarianism to denominationalism.[50] Furthermore, such changed occurred against a backdrop where increasingly the wider Nonconformist movement became politically and socially empowered and, correspondingly, sought to express that influence. This expression and its relationship to the S.O.F. will now be considered.

External Pressures: The End of Isolationism and Political Quietism

Parallelling the S.O.F.s internal reorientation was an increasing willingness and desire to enter into collaborative ventures with fellow Dissenters. This development was a recognition of a shared religious and social philanthropy held within the wider Non-conformist churches, the largest of whom later became more formally associated in the Free Church organisations.

Indeed, the reputation and tradition of the Nonconformist movement was closely aligned to that of the S.O.F., i.e. as an upholder of political liberty, freedom of thought, operating within British public life as a source of realism.[51]

Furthermore, its mid-late Victorian leaders echoed the high moral tone of the Quakers, i.e. one which emphasised the application of Christian principles and the importance of personal conduct in everyday life throughout society,[52] attempting to relate to life in much the same manner as Quaker contemporaries. Its appeal and similarity to the S.O.F. is further evident in Payne's description of the movement's essential characteristics, i.e. a basic seriousness and sense of responsibility, together with a desire

to serve and willingness to sacrifice.[53]

R. W. Dale, Birmingham's Congregationalist leader for much of the later Victorian era, equated these characteristics with a moral political obligation, in expressing,

> *"a grave and solemn conviction, which deepens year by year, that in a country like this, where the public business of the state is the private duty of every citizen, those who decline to use their political power are guilty of treachery both to God and to man".*[54]

This obligation found expression amongst certain sections of the S.O.F., in the rechannelling of the moral reprobation traditionally reserved for the increasingly accepted contemporary art forms into newer restrictions and concerns, many of which were shared by other Dissenting sects, e.g. the rigid exclusion of secular activities on Sundays.[55]

Thompson, 1980, has linked this change to the increasing social and political empowering of these sects, i.e. as Friends became wealthier and social disabilities were removed, their hostility towards authority similarly declined, the Quaker recalcitrance over public affairs being replaced by a, predominantly, middle class social conscience.[56] However, to translate these common interests into collaborative political action required a reinterpretation of the traditional Quaker non-interventionist stance, i.e. the Quietist tendency, which discouraged political associations on grounds of moral elitism and the belief that 'moral suasion' was both the most appropriate and effective Friends' response.

Within the wider Nonconformist movement, the erosion of this belief was a significant factor in the changing nature of Dissenting protest. Harrison, 1971, argues that in the new climate affecting the increasingly socially enfranchised, political quietism and moral elitism represented only two of a range of tendencies within the group. Given such empowerment, an increasingly necessary condition was not only that the movement,s demands be heard, but that these demands be adhered to and acted upon.[57] Harrison has described this change as representing a move from a psychology of persecution to one of dominance,[58] one consistent with a movement becoming increasingly positive and confident about realising its own expectations and objectives.

This condition was one which consequently questioned the suitability of retaining a defensive, passive, approach; rather such a stance required and justified a shift towards organised political agitation and schemes of social engineering.[59]

Horton Davis, 1963, has, however, attributed a more direct political effect to these developments, in suggesting that such Nonconformist involvement was of central importance in stimulating a 'silent social revolution', which averted the possibility of a more radical political revolution;[60] an observation that will be borne in mind in considering the Cadbury's increasing involvement in social issues.

Certainly, however, irrespective of its political hue, this predominance of a social

concern/conscience heralded an era of unprecedented Nonconformist (and Quaker) activity and success in pubic life. Furthermore, the series of campaigns which received their greatest attention was imbued with the moral infusion characteristic of Nonconformist activity, i.e. permeated by a flavour highlighting the deleterious effects of particular activities of individuals, families, and indeed upon whole sectors within the social fabric. Such campaigns, which included for example the movement for temperance, also strongly emphasised and promoted religious panaceas for the evils of the industrial revolution and the resultant loss of the 'spiritual nature of man'.

Alongside these campaigns of moral edification and concomitant to the realisation of religious similarities, was the more formal recognition of a common political allegiance, which became expressed in a number of loose alliances. Whilst the Quakers generally played a relatively minor part in political dissent, there were, nevertheless, a number of issues that attracted the interest of some Friends, who alongside other,

> *"Dissenters, believed that the natural consequence of Evangelical Christianity was that society should be reformed and grievances redressed".*[61]

Probably the most visible and overt politicised of these campaigns were those instigated in the mid 1850's, i.e. a national temperance movement, the United Kingdom Alliance (U.K.A.) and, representing a move towards political militancy, the Liberation Society. The stridency adopted by both groups in demanding pledges from parliamentary candidates [62] is further demonstration of Harrison's thesis, and what he has termed the 'secularising process',[65] whilst utilising a moral reform crusade as a diversion away from liturgical/ doctrinal controversies affecting the internal cohesiveness of certain sects,[64] - a factor certainly evident, within the late Victorian S.O.F., (see later).

A further illustration of the expanding aims of Dissent was the formation in Birmingham, in 1868, of the National Education League, an organisation which included some Non-conformists, and which championed the cause of free, unsectarian, universal primary education.[65]

During the first Gladstone administrations this impetus was given further momentum by a number of interrelated developments which served to increase the status of Dissenters, in officially recognising their political power and potential, i.e. by a further series of disbarring Acts and the appointment of the first Nonconformists to Cabinet posts, i.e. John Bright, in 1868, and, a decade later, Joseph Chamberlain.[66]

A further Nonconformist/Liberal collaboration, through the activities of the National Education League and the Birmingham Liberal Association, was the gaining of control, in 1873, of the Birmingham School Board, with Chamberlain, the city's Mayor, serving as Chairman.[67] His subsequent 1876 by-election success and formation of the National

Liberal Federation, based in Birmingham, were also indicative of the rising tide of Liberal Radicalism,[68] much of which was provincial in nature and strongly associated with a period of intense Nonconformist activism.

Such interventionism replaced the wider framework of the U.K.A. with municipal solutions as focal points for political activity,[69] and, in Birmingham, where those such as Chamberlain and George Cadbury were particularly involved, was perhaps the first indication of the changing nature of Nonconformist philanthropy.

This movement to a more public involvement, and one concerned with large scale permanent remedies, was enhanced by the increased development of Nonconformist newspapers, especially following the abolition of numerous duties in 1861. Indeed this particular factor has been perceived as a major reason for the rapid growth of this, predominately Liberal, largely provincial, press,[70] one which produced a national forum for Dissenting discussion and comment on contemporary issues, whilst reinforcing their image as a body of thoughtful, responsible, social reformers.

Nevertheless, whilst these developments would appear to suggest a period of unchallenged Nonconformist political, social and religious advancement, it was not one which passed without response from the non-Dissenting churches, nor indeed one perceived without concern by contemporary Nonconformists.

One reaction of the established church was, for example, from 1870, the adoption, through the Anglican Oxford movement, of a more intransigent stance, one laying more emphasis upon the importance of traditional ceremonies, (perceived as superstitious by Nonconformists) and often fiercely attacking evangelism.[71] This response was one mirrored by the actions of the Roman Catholic Church in renewing the struggle between 'Protestants and Ritualists'.[72] Moreover, in the wake of Darwinism, and the founding of organisations such as the Metaphysical Society, in 1869, the 'Evangelical Nonconformists' encountered yet further criticism of their unquestioning acceptance of biblical authenticity, and consequently moved to modify and indeed, disregard, much of their traditional dogma and practice,[73] a process which, within the S.O.F., became manifest in the theological reinterpretations of the 1880/90s.

Nor were relations with the Liberal Party without their tensions. Historically, education had received a high priority from the Nonconformists, being regarded as an essential tool in ensuring their survival.[74] Consequently, the Education Act of 1870, sharpening the position of the established church, was met by large scale Nonconformist disapproval, a reaction in no small way exacerbated by the 'father' of the Act, Forster, an ex-Quaker, disowned prior to the reformed marriage regulations.

Whilst this legislation placed a severe strain on the relationship between Gladstone and the Nonconformists, there was, in fact, no Quaker on the Tory benches until the Home Rule crisis.[75] Nevertheless, the resentment caused by the Act, stemming the rising tide of

Nonconformist influence, may well, given the new outlook prevalent within the S.O.F., have added further impetus to the abandonment of isolationism and the embracement of public office.

A parallelling threat to the Nonconformists came from within sections of the Anglican dominated Tory Party, who had begun to challenge the radical Liberal stronghold on social reform. This threat may, perhaps, be dated to 1848, with the founding of F. D. Maurice's Christian Socialists, representing what Beales (1969) termed the first 'upper class' attempt,

"to associate the Church with the aspirations of working men for social reform".[76]

Likewise, a generation later the formation of the National Union of Conservative and Constitutional Working Men's Association, and the National Education Union, (N.E.U.)[77] represented similar responses to the rival appeals of contemporary Liberals for state intervention in areas of social policy. Furthermore, the Manchester based N.E.U. represented a dramatic shift in Anglican attitudes to this question, one which led most Tory M.P.'s, together with the moderate Liberals, to provide the necessary support for Forster's Bill.[78]

The long term ramifications of this Act, in providing elementary education, posed further problems for the Nonconformists in, ostensibly, removing the rationale for their initiatives in the field. Furthermore, this situation was exacerbated by contemporary demographic factors which were perceived as weakening the Nonconformist urban influence, i.e. the movement of the richer elements of the population away from city centres to suburbs, revealing a more obvious class division and often resulting in Dessenting chaples becoming marooned following this loss of wealthy support.[79]

The Nonconformist response was frequently one of pragmatism, in attempts to broaden their appeal and to appear as less alienating forces, with the founding of numerous philanthropic organisation on permanent footings, such as with The Salvation Army.[80]

A further tendency was the attempt to reproduce the methods of early Wesleyans, through the organisation of massed, often open-air, acts of worship, reliant on the charismatic preaching of leading Nonconformist preachers such as R.W.Dale and H.P.Hughes,[81] and illustrated by the success, from 1875, of the Pleasant Sunday Afternoon movement;[82] this was a success which was especially pronounced in the midlands, and which gave particular encouragement to those such as the Cadburys as they introduced their numerous inner city educational and social initiatives in the closing years of the century, (see chapter 5).

Nevertheless, the Nonconformists, having actively entered the political and public arena, confronted an array of actual and potential opponents; moreover, this was a

position which intensified in the 1880's as sections of the working classes became politically empowered, and politically organised, with the formation of the Democratic Federation in 1881, and the Social Democratic Federation three years later,[83] a position necessitating a comparable, if not reciprocal, response, if the Nonconformist movement was to fully maximise its emerging political and social potential.

THE NONCONFORMIST MOVEMENT 1884-1903:

Towards a More Cohesive Response

The 'failure' of the Nonconformist message amongst the urban working classes was made more apparent by a number of developments in the early 1880's. Amongst the more prominent of these were the initiatives of secular socialist organisations who encroached upon this traditional Nonconformist theme. Simon, 1965, has commented that, operating through weekend and open air meetings,

> *"from 1884 onwards small groups of socialists began to come together in many parts of the country to launch educational and propaganda activities, often in the face of great hostility and difficulties".*[84]

These bodies, reviving a tradition of independent working class education, initiated the serious and systematic study of economics and politics.[85] Citing the particular success of the Bristol Sunday School, an organisation which increased its average attendance by 400%, to 1700, during the last part of the decade,[86] Simon notes that,

> *"activities of this kind, parallelled in other provincial cities, linked organised educational efforts with more general political activating".*[87]

Also influential was the work of the Fabians, like the S.D.F. and the Socialist League, formed in 1884, and which in1891 gave over 1400 lectures and issued cheap booklets and tracts concerned with municipal and other social matters.[88]

This challenge to Nonconformist influence was exacerbated by the results of a number of contemporary publications. The primary focus of the more influential of these revolved around the 'condition of the people' issue, given a national arena with the publication of Mearn's, 'The Bitter Cry of Outcast London', in 1883,[89] and especially with Booth's, 'In Darkest England', seven years later. The latter, in highlighting the 'submerged tenth', the social victims of profiteering and industrial laissez faire capitalism, was a clear signal that given such circumstances[90] the church's message was of limited pragmatic value and reinforced a desire to overturn the 'apparent failure of conventional evangelism'.[91]

This message of 'failure', both in converting the working class through evangelistic fervour, and of dereliction of social duty, was one of a number of real concerns the Quakers shared with other denominations. Consequently, these anxieties and perceptions manifested themselves in a recognition of the need for 'common evangelical action',[92] and, in contrast, for example, to relying on travelling ministers,[93] resulted in the more ambitious policy of establishing permanent vehicles for propagating the Nonconformist

message, particularly amongst the poorest sections of the community; this was also a strategy which the Cadburys had begun to utilise almost simultaneously, and one which became a significant and central feature of all their subsequent social involvements, (see later chapters).

Amongst the more influential of these were those prompted by H.P. Hughes, in founding the Methodist Times, in 1885, and the sympathetic Forward Movement. These organs, together with Hughes' 'Social Christianity', 1889, lamented the ineffectiveness of Nonconformist action amongst the working classes, highlighting, in particular, its lack of influence in public life, as a significant factor in this effectiveness.[94] In rejecting the old dogma that Methodists (a leading Nonconformist sect) should have 'no policies', i.e. in implicitly perpetuating the status quo, Hughes was also rejecting the belief that poverty was inevitably the consequence of sin; Hughes' concomitant belief that it was the duty of every Christian to seek and pursue ways of alleviating such conditions, made further appeals to the conscience of the rich,[95] in the Nonconformist tradition, whilst ostensibly, appearing as a radical politicised departure from that tradition, (see chapter 2).

Allied to this perspective was the continuing attempt of the Nonconformists to gain control of the sources of power and thereby impose their own standards on the rest of society. Kent, 1966, for example, has identified this process and, moreover, indicated the movement's considerable confidence and influence, in commenting that, by 1888,

> *"the Nonconformist type of evangelical pietism reached a point of self-assurance at which it was prepared to demand the social institutions should only be officered by the kind of men of which it approved".*[96]

Of particular pertinence here was the group's growing perception that the contemporary Liberal Party represented a prime mechanism through which their moral demands might be achieved,[97] a perception crucially shared by leading Cadburys and which was of particular important in the opening decade of the twentieth century, (see chapter 2).

Furthermore, the consequence of these changes for the Dissenting sects was to be considerably greater than merely establishing themselves more firmly within British society. Without doubt, the most important effect of these associated, cumulative, pressures and actions was the production of what was subsequently terms the 'Nonconformist Conscience', as these bodies, including the Quakers, embarked on a radical reinterpretation of their activities, a process which was to have considerable implications for their social and political involvement, pushing both the wider movement and the Cadburys into the vanguard of British social activism.

Moreover, the question confronting the Nonconformists was not only one of what

action to take, but whether any form of concerted activity would be appropriate and effective. This thrust was later expressed by George Cadbury,

> *"who lamented that Christians whose only serious disagreements were over church government should compete so wastefully when the spiritual darkness was so vast".*[98]

Fuelled by such perceptions, the Nonconformists response was one designed to strengthen their faltering and failing message, whilst safeguarding the future of their individual sects.

Of prominence in this response was the establishment within national denominational meetings, of specially appointed Social Questions' Committees,[99] rather than relying solely on the decisions of executive central bodies, or on the actions of individual campaigners.[100] Consequently, for example, the Congregationalist Union convened its inaugural Social Questions' Committee in 1891.[101] Indeed, this concern frequently underpinned the adoption of a more collaborative 1890's approach, with the formation of local committees of Free Church Councils.[102]

This latter development was welcomed by an increasingly dominant interdenominational faction within the S.O.F., some of whom were instrumental in such activity. In Birmingham, for example, prompted by a census revealing that fewer than 20% of the city's adults attended a place of worship, it was ultimately the influence of George Cadbury that persuaded the Free Churches to follow this course, with the further specific objective of securing the national organisation of such local bodies.[103]

Subsequently, at its first meeting, in January 1894, Cadbury, as inaugural President, gave an immediate impetus to this cause, inviting the 3rd Free Church 'National Congress to convene in the city.[104] This Cadbury initiative was of considerable importance to the movement, the subsequent meeting finally establishing the National Free Church Council,[105] whilst its immediate financial future was also secured by the actions of the Cadburys, with George and his brother, Richard, promising an annual donation of £6,000 over five years.[106]

George Cadbury was particularly enthusiastic about this collaborative venture, reiterating his support for the scheme in addressing the body's 1897 annual assembly, emphasising its value in attempting to avoid the extreme,

> *"waste of energy when Churches owning the same Lord work, not in unison, but in opposition".*[107]

This potentially large scale Dissenting pressure group, was to act as the social and theological conscience of the Nonconformist movement,[108] reflecting a common denominational desire to combat the,

"lamentable indifference on the part of thousands of families to any form of religion whatsoever".[109]

Further attempts to achieve a more cohesive and efficacious presence is evident in the activities of these Free Churches, i.e. in 1898, when the founding of the Nonconformist Parliamentary Committee[110] was another signal that the Dissenters had moved closer to the chambers of power. Similarly, the founding of bodies such as the National Brotherhood movement amongst the representatives of the Nonconformists declared their intent of permanent influence.[111]

However, the coordination of a collective Nonconformist voice did not, in reality, represent a positive or homogeneous acceptance of this direction. Indeed in some ways this may be viewed as a defensive measure to preserve the Dissenters' identity in the face of continuing pressures. In 1889, for instance, the London Quarterly Review commented:

"The Society of Friends, the Congregational Church, and Methodism in a still larger degree, are losing their wealthier members and the children of such members, who find their way into the Anglican communion".[112]

Furthermore, within the ranks of the Dissenters there was much division over the nature of the response to questions of formal political allegiance and activism, a division which was eventually to lead to the less politically active Federation Council of the Evangelical Free Churches.[113]

Whilst the debate regarding political activism produced a very divided voice, it is nevertheless significant that, other than Dr John Clifford, of the Baptist Union, the Nonconformist leaders expressed very little sympathy for the rise of the Labour Party. Indeed, their appeals to the conscience of the rich stand in sharp contrast to an adherence of state socialism,[114] or any embracement of egalitarianism, and are indicative of a moderate, reformist, body, which succeeded in imbuing the wealthier classes with a sense of duty and social obligation.[115]

Furthermore, this moderate response was one which was simultaneously meeting a theological challenge from developments in the natural and social sciences and in reputable academic criticisms of Biblical documents.[116] Attempts to modernise theological doctrine to accommodate radical criticisms from the scientific and socialist 'revolutionary hounds',[117] whilst retaining the traditional expression of their intrinsic Christian beliefs, had illustrated the irreconcilable demands of evangelism and social radicalism, i.e. the former emphasising the Christian's duty to reject the world, in contrast to embracing socialist, interventionist, theories.[118] Thus the resultant 'new social evangelism' was an attempt to come to terms with scientific and social developments, whilst holding true to their evangelistic affirmations.

This tendency towards moderacy, despite the Nonconformists' attempt to woe the working classes, perhaps explains the adoption of an ambivalent attitude towards the labour movement, and the T.U.C. in particular. In demonstrating very little support or sympathy for the cause of the London Dock Strike, in 1889, the Nonconformist leaders displayed their limited acceptance of organised labour, i.e. in adopting a role of antipathy towards New Unionism and in criticising the growing power and perceived materialism of a T.U.C. prepared to utilise the strike weapon, such leaders were inclined,

> *"to uphold the ideals of arbitration and conciliation with co-partnership as the long-term solution to industrial strife. Nonconformists rather complacently regarded Labour not as a separate political force but as a variant form of traditional radicalism, perhaps even an insurance that the Liberal Party would be compelled to remain radical".*[119]

This antipathy was perhaps illustrated by Keir Hardie's critical address to the Methodist Union, 1892, in which he attributed the apparent lack of church influence within the Labour Party to the church's ignoral of the labour movement.[120] The dangers inherent in such a course were indicated by the subsequent report of the (Baptist) British Weekly, warning the Nonconformists,

> *"that they were dangerously near a permanent cleavage with the leaders of the new democracy".*[121]

Nevertheless, the Nonconformists were not a monolithic entity, and whilst accepting that their role within the Liberal Party was such that it significantly helped to determine its response to radical politics and the question of organised labour in particular, there were those who advocated greater allegiance to organisations ostensibly representing the political left. (Furthermore consideration of the political role of the Quakers and, in particular, of the Cadburys, in this process, will be given in chapters 2 and 3).

Paradoxically therefore, as the Nonconformists became both more confident and involved in public affairs, and correspondingly aware of their potential influence, from 1884 in particular a plethora of viewpoints and developments had intensified and heightened existing pressures, and demanded a more radical and substantial response than had hitherto been undertaken.

Given this plethora, it is necessary to consider contemporary tensions and initiatives within the S.O.F., to detect how such themes were interpreted by the wider Quaker movement before, more pertinently here, considering the Cadburys' perception of these issues.

S.O.F. 1884-1903:

Quakerism Redifined

The Nonconformists' late Victorian perceptions of 'failure', particularly with regard to the working classes, were also evident within the S.O.F. An indication of this view, illustrating the inadequacy of philanthropic responses to poverty was given by the London Yearly Meeting in 1893. William Noble, likening the living condition of London's poor to those in dynastic China, and arguing that such inadequacy could only be reversed by Quakers actively visiting such areas, rather than following their traditional role of 'Chapel hosts'.[122]

Furthermore, within the S.O.F., this problem was compounded by a growing recognition that whilst it had responded to J. S. Rowntree's criticisms in ways that had reversed the mid 19th century decline, i.e. in the relaxation of its style of worship to reflect a more evangelistic tone, which included the introduction of hymns and prepared addresses,[123] nevertheless, even such radical changes only applied a thin veneer which did little to hide the frailty of the organisation.

This point was of considerable importance to the movement, as this frailty became increasingly exposed by the relatively weak appeal of the Quaker message to wider society, particularly when compared to the apparent success of other Nonconformist denominations, including those of a more evangelistic nature, such as the Pleasant Sunday Afternoon movement.[114]

Consequently, throughout the later years of the century, Friends' literature and thought frequently centred around two interrelated themes: the apparent weakness of the Quaker message, and the movement's attendant loss of identity.

Much of this debate was first crystallised by John Wilhelm Rowntree, who, from the early 1890's, was consistently advocating more radical reforms than previously undertaken by the Society, e.g. in calling for the Quaker message to be expressed in language more readily understood by the general populace.[125] In 1899 his editorial in the Friends' periodical, 'Present Day Papers'. drew attention to the imperilled state of the movement and the urgent need for a restatement of its quintessential and unique principles. In particular Rowntree suggested that a,

> *"small body like the Society of Friends, which has with almost drastic suddenness broken down its social barriers and mingled with the world after a century of aloofness, must have very clear convictions if it is not to lose its identity".*[126]

It was this desire and need for a fundamental review of the 'State of the Society', inevitably focussing on its religious foundation, which was to have the most resounding consequences for 20th century Quaker philanthropy. In essence Rowntree's criticisms

centred on the predominance of evangelism and its consequences as being directly responsible for both the failure/weakness of the Quaker message and the movement's identity. Isichei, in hindsight, agrees in suggesting that this circumstance was the product of Darwin's evolutionary theory and the popularisation of Biblical criticisms,

> *"which produced a consciousness of the difficulties and ambiguities inherent in the evangelical attitude to scripture".*[127]

The revolution of this dilemma was supplied by the proponents and the last significant theological affecting 19th century Quakers, the Liberal Theologians, a body which began to gain favour within the S.O.F. in the closing decades of the century. Whilst J. W. Rowntree in 1893, and , later, the work of Edward Grubb, are of particular pertinence to the developments analysed in this thesis, the essential tone of this body was first voiced by the anonymous publication of 'A Reasonable Faith', in 1884. The authors, in accepting only part of the Bible as authoritively unquestionable, provided a response which effectively answered Quaker critics, in adopting an optimistic view of man, and the need for, and possibly of, 'real righteousness'[128] rather than the evangelical reliance upon imputed righteousness, achieved through the acceptance of humility and the avoidance of the world.

This work laid the path for the development of Quakerism, in highlighting religious experience as the basis of faith, a belief easily integrated with the early Friends' doctrine of 'the Light Within',[129] and, furthermore, one which eased the way for a more active public role for Quaker operations.

This philosophical shift accompanied concerns over the perceived continuing detrimental effects of 'peculiarity'. i.e. the portrayal of Quakers as a mystical, unapproachable, and isolated group of religious fanatics. This problem was recognised by the 1895 Yearly Meeting which lamented the,

> *"comparable ignorance of misconceptions which exists around us as to the Society of Friends and the importance of concerted action in the endeavour to dissipate the mistaken view to some extent current. The absolute need of the Society making use of all legitimate modern methods for making known our distinguished views, and bringing ourselves as a Christian Church into contact with the people - embracing not only the poorer classes of the community, but the more cultured and educated portion of society - has been enforced".*[130]

Accordingly the Yearly Meeting, in considering both this statement and an invitation from the Lancashire and Cheshire Quarterly Meeting,[131] had ratified the organisation of a special autumn conference in Manchester, to discuss a spectrum of issues fundamentally concerned with the basis and practice of Quakerism. This meeting,

also significantly coincided with the formation, in London, of a National Education League of the Evangelical Free Churches,

> *"to protect against any reactionary schemes on education, and to encourage an stimulate the demand for the School Board System".*[132]

Consequently therefore this action may also be seen as a distancing of the S.O.F. from the wider Nonconformist movement, in an attempt to reformulate their separate and autonomous identity, whilst remaining in broad collaboration with other Dissenter.

This conference was unique in its scope and appeal to a Quaker and non-Quaker audience, i.e. in inviting a deputation from the Free Churches of Manchester,[133] in admitting journalists and, through the Central Press Agency, the issuing of summaries of proceedings to influential national newspapers.[134] Furthermore, these efforts were reinforced and concluded by the organisation of a public meeting discussing, 'The Message of Christianity to the World",[135] and clearly found an echo within the movement itself, the strength of which was indicated by daily audiences of over a thousand, from a national Quaker membership of only 16,500.[136]

Neither had the organisational committee shirked or missed the opportunity to provide a forum discussing matters of fundamental interest to the S.O.F. As such it was concerned with ensuring, perpetuating, strengthening and clarifying the Quaker's own perception of their identity, particularly with regard to social questions and involvement. Such an identity also covertly defined its political beliefs and values; crucially these were definitions which did much to determine the future direction of Quaker activism in philanthropic matters.

These threads are discernible in developments in the post 1895 era, and broadly coincide with the emergence of the social interventionist faction, Cadbury, Grubb and Rowntree, each of whom promoted greater social involvement amongst Friends, being undoubtedly considerably influenced by the breakdown of Quaker 'peculiarity', the erosion of isolationism and the resultant exposure to political activism displayed by other Nonconformist sects; importantly, this was also a promotion which was certainly accompanied by a concomitant increase in involvement by the Cadburys, and which will be specifically analysed later in this work.

An initial issue was to address the reasons for, and significance, of the weakness of the Quaker message, together with how such situation could be redressed. In debating the theme, 'Has Quakerism a Message to the World Today?', George Cadbury drew attention to the lack of effective Quaker representation in the vast majority of English towns and villages, and urged the absolute necessity of radically altering this position. In an overtly political statement he argued that his would enable Friends,

"to protest, for instance, against the attempt of the priestly class to take possession of the education of the church of our land".[137]

Less trenchantly, the subsequent Yearly Meeting acknowledged that some practical steps were needed to ensure the continued successful propagation of the world-wide Quaker message,[138] in describing this session as one which had brought th movement to,

"a quickened sense of responsibility as to the duty of the Society towards those around us".[139]

The response to this address indicated that the movement recognised, as Cadbury had advocated, the need for this message to be delivered in a manner relevant to contemporary life.[140] Furthermore, the speech also touched upon an issue Cadbury was to emphasise later in the conference, that of providing an appropriate training forum preparing Quakers for the 'effective presentation of spiritual truth'.[141] This theme, amongst others, was to consistently recur in the aftermath of this meeting, and is the first public airing of the developments which led to the founding of Woodbrooke College, Bournville, (see chapter 5).

Aside from the need for an adequate machinery to propagate their message, a second strand, overlapping with that of contemporary relevance, was the question of Quaker commitment to social involvement, and indeed the nature of that involvement. This subject was pursued by Joshua Rowntree, in suggesting that such duties were the responsibility of everyone,[142] and by Francis Thompson, who stressed the potential for change through grassroots and individualised efforts, in aguing that,

"Darwin's dictum, that those communities which included the greatest number of the most sympathetic members would flourish best, is a scientific fact".[143]

Similarly Edward Grubb also offered a pragmatic approach to this question, linking two potential roles that the Quakers might fulfil in mitigating the perceived alienation experienced by the urban poor, in the wake of the middle class embracement of suburbia.[144] In highlighting the duty of establishing working, friendly, relations with the poor, he stressed the importance of Adult School work in this process, specifically through,

"the opportunities it gives for this practical mingling of classes on a common footing".[145]

This opinion had initially been expressed by Henry Priestman, in suggesting that the Adult Schools' 27,000 students represented 'a not inconsiderable nucleus' with which

to reach the outside world,[146] a point which received further elaboration in Hannah Doncaster's concluding paper. Here she emphasised the desirability of extending Quaker social boundaries, with these schools representing the best available method for the 'promotion of practical brotherhood' e.g. through its potential generation of beneficial offshoots, such as Reading Circles.[147] Doncaster stressed that she did not think there were insufficient Friends expressing interest in this work, nor that there was a lack of either money or philanthropic activity. Rather, and echoing Grubb, her prime concern was for Friends to be more welcoming to those from the working classes, to offset the alienating growth of 'class exclusiveness' and 'social pride' resulting from Quakers' increased wealth and superior education.[148]

In an earlier article, in 1893, Edward Grubb had alluded to the role of Adult Schools in this process, in suggesting that they shared the same common purpose as that of the labour movement in seeking to raise human life to another level.[149]

An integral part of this process, Grubb argued, was the need to adopt a less materialistic and alienating lifestyle.[150] Furthermore, he suggested that it was the overriding duty of employers to compound this liaison by establishing 'human and friendly' relations with their work force.[151] Similarly, in 1898, and as a prelude to developments at Bournville Works, George Cadbury indicated his embracement of these sentiments. Specifically, he argued that,

> *"every large factory, where young men and woman are employed, should have in it some representative of the churches, who will induce those of the same age to become members of Clubs or Classes, as a preliminary to taking an interest in higher things. Then every street in a town ought to be under the care of some Christian man or woman, who will take note of newcomers and invite the adults to a place of worship, and the children to the Sunday School".*[152]

Indeed the Manchester Conference's opening address on this theme had laid out the Friends' agenda on this issue, in suggesting that such public duties necessitated the Society and its members playing their full part in the solution of political and social questions.[153] However, here the Quaker interpretation of social justice clearly equated with that of non-radical evolutionary socialism. In emphasising a 'citizenship duty' the speaker, Robert Watson, carefully distinguished between what he termed 'Christian' and 'State Socialism', the former being described as 'the highest voluntary association', one which had achieved much in social and religious fields and, being based on the rules of love not law, represented the true path forward.[154]

Furthermore, interlinked with these themes of 'duty' and 'citizenship' was the raising of the issue of socialism during the Quaker historian, Hodgkin's address, "The Attitude of Friends Towards Modern Thought'. Again, whilst expressing concern and indignation over the prevalence of poverty and desiring that life be made 'at least liveable'

for all, including the nation's poorest,[155] the speaker nevertheless expressed a clear wish to essentially maintain the economic and political status quo. In arguing that such victims of inequality undoubtedly deserved sympathy, for example, Hodgkin confined Friends' criticism of Britain's capitalist structure to mere,

> *"indignation against any who being possessed of great wealth, spend it all on themselves".*[156]

This covert repudiation of radical socialism clearly illustrated a view of the S.O.F. as a movement which propounded gradualist and above all, moderate, social and economic reform, a position to which the Cadburys also adhered, (see later chapters).

Such a perspective also indirectly reiterated a further central belief which became clearly evident in both the subsequent S.O.F. and Cadbury activism; essentially this was a belief which denied the political nature of much of the late Victorian 'social question', but which sought to resolve these problems by ostensibly apolitical means. This was, for example, evident in contemporary Quaker proposals which emphasised both the role of personal duty and the forces of tradition such as the Christian Church and Adult Schools, and, especially, the paternalistic ethic, in ameliorating the sharp divisions evident in the British social system,[157] and in a society increasingly experiencing 'disastrous' industrial conflicts.[158]

Furthermore, such a stance was evident at the Birmingham Summer School in 1899, as Grubb avoided conceding that the problems confronting both British Society at its reforms were essentially political. Rather, in "The Development of Christian Morality".

Morality, he argued that the greatest opponent facing the church was not one of challenging or emphasising religious doctrines, i.e. neither secularism nor socialism, but a 'deepening materialism'.[159]

Railing against societal conditions producing citizens condemned to lives of mental dullness and brainless toil, he expressed a somewhat vague sentiment in believing a day would come,

> *"when in all industrial, commercial and international relations the good of the many and not the interests of the few shall be the avowed and primary aim of life. How it is to come we may not see; but it will be brought nearer by every honest effort to live the Christian life".*[160]
> i.e. by a Christian rather than radical socialist initiative.

Such comments contain the germ of the Quaker reinterpretation of philanthropy, the identification of education as a principal socialisation agent, with the paternalistic employer, rather than the state, as the provider of welfare. (See chapters 3 and 5 for a

consideration of Cadburys' involvement in the provision of such welfare and educational schemes).

Furthermore, such a definition appealed to the Quaker sense of 'fairness', 'duty' and 'social responsibility', and was in correlation with Friends' hubristic sense of self as the, 'aristocracy of Dissent'[161] and offered an olive branch of appeasement to criticisms focusing on the anachronistic nature of the movement.

The catalyst for this interpretation, the Manchester Conference received favourable contemporary reviews, being reported sympathetically by the Sunday Times, for example which made reference to the 'proverbial' and 'active benevolence' displayed by Quakers throughout generations, and in George Cadbury's model industrial village, a tradition still being perpetuated, (see chapter 3). Nevertheless, the report perceptively commented the,

> *"holding of a conference on social questions seems to indicate that they see the need to bring themselves still more into line with other religious bodies who have been much exercised of late by 'the problem of the day'".*[162]

Within the Quaker movement, the response was particularly enthusiastic. The traditional and evangelical, "The Friend', for example described the meeting as stimulating fresh impulses for the Lord's service,[163] whilst the subsequent yearly assembly described it as one which had openly demonstrated a great deal of unity.[164] Such responses were greeted with support and pleasure by the liberals within the ranks of the S.O.F.[165]

Indeed, the conference demonstrated that within the Quaker movement, liberal theology had assumed the status of orthodoxy.[166] Equally pertinently, it had prepared the theoretical groundwork for the direction of 20th century Quakerism. The clarification of the Friends' stance on social questions, and the identification of the role of education, both within and outside the Society, in broadcasting the message, were issues which, what might be called the emerging triumvirate of Grubb, Rowntree and Cadbury, and their acolytes, were to rigorously pursue in the wake of the impetus created by the conference.

Vipont, (1960) has described these discussions as marking a turning point in Quaker history, in directly leading to, the Scarborough School, in 1897,[167] a meeting which was intended to 'bring Friends' into contact with 'modern thought', and in particular, to provide a crash course in the conclusions of modern biblical criticism".[168]

Furthermore, this momentum was sustained with a third Summer School, in Birmingham, two years later, a meeting which raised the issue of the need for a permanent educational Quaker settlement, a need ultimately satisfied by the founding of the Cadbury dominated Woodbrooke College, in1903 (see chapter 5).

Certainly the post-Manchester era was marked by a tumult of Quaker activity reinforcing and rigorously pursuing the main tenets of the conference. This process was aided by a parallel development with the S.O.F. which, from 1896, had accepted women

Friends onto 'Meetings for Sufferings' committees, and allowed them attendance at integrated Yearly Meetings.[169]

A direct consequence of this enhanced status was the Women Yearly Meeting's embracing of themes reflecting a more influential and increasingly political stance. This factor is particularly demonstrated by the selection of 'Special Subjects' for preparation at their annual assembly. Between 1899-1901 these considered issues of concern within the Quaker Movement, i.e. 1899,' How best to keep up the interest of our young people in our Society',[170] in 1900, "The Position of Women Friends during the Nineteenth Century'[171] and in 1901, 'The Responsibility of Membership in th Society of Friends'.[172]

This concern had been reflected during the 1900 Women's Year Meeting, which had emphasised the,

> *"need to uphold in our lives a high standard of purity, holiness and beauty, and not to shrink from taking our place in public work, and in the wide questions in which we can help humanity".*[173]

The papers presented in 1902 and 1903 indicate a much deeper and broader involvement with contemporary issues, and were indicative of, and redolent with, the virtues championed at the Manchester Conference. In 'Preparation for Effective Social Work' (1902), for example, whilst emphasis was placed on the need for full training, it was suggested later that this was more than readily available in the 'ordinary duties' of life[174] and therefore such a requirement did not make public service an unattainable or exclusive goal. Similarly in 1903, 'How We Can Best Contribute To The Solution To The Problem of Poverty' reiterated earlier calls for the adoption of a more simple lifestyle,[175] and the need for the study of the question,[176] whilst indicating the potentially wide-range roles suitable for women Friends', i.e.

> *"some of us are surely called to work in connection with the larger questions of legislation, women's unions, the land question, education, women's suffrage, guardian work. . . but if we are unable to take any great part in these. . . (we must) brighten by our personal influence the lives of those around us – to improve the conditions of life and to raise the standard of living and to encourage habits of self control and thrift".*[177]

However, the emphasis on the role of women as 'educators' in the field of social welfare is a concomitant to the narrow socialist definitions of Grubb. The identification of women as carers, domestically bound, was one which would be strongly emphasised in the educational programmes at the Bournville Works, (see chapter 5) and can be seen as contemporarily limited responses to the 'state/health of the nation' question which dominated the late Victorian era.

Furthermore, these themes were also echoed in the Quaker literature of the period.

Elizabeth Cadbury in the Friends' Quarterly Examiner, for example, illustrated this critical view of the movement in lamenting,

> *"is it not true that a very small proportion of the educated and leisured classes in our Society are willing to give up home and its pleasures for the foreign or home mission field?"*[178]

In accusing Friends of not living up to their hereditary character she stressed the need for Quakers to receive a 'Training for Citizenship", to enable them to fulfil their municipal duties; this was a theme re-emphasised in 1899, in an article suggesting that the S.O.F. was failing to provide an adequate level of training for the majority of its members, a failure which had debilitating effects on the effectiveness and progress of the movement.[179]

Furthermore, in 1903, in response to proposals to hold a symposium discussing problems affecting/afflicting the Society, she commented that the,

> *"very proposal to hold such a conference as is being framed for this autumn shows that there is a strong feeling that our ministry at the present time is not sufficiently effective".*[180]

Similarly, J. W. Rowntree, as editor of 'Present Day Papers', drew attention to the need to adjust the training, organisation and support of the ministry to equate it to modern conditions of life.[181] At the 1899 Yearly Meeting he criticised the lack of any direct means by which Quaker ministers could receive an education providing them with appropriated qualifications and equipment for their subsequent vocations.[182] Furthermore, several months later he attributed this 'diminution of power' to a lack of Bible study.[183]

It was from the need to redress this situation that Rowntree raised the issue of a permanent educational settlement, in December's 'Present Day Papers',[184] suggesting that such an institution might offer Biblical Study and both Quaker and general Church History.[185] This was also reported by 'The British Friends' in 1900, the journal explaining that Rowntree,

> *"believes it is necessary to meet the pressing need so generally felt by boldly facing the problems. . . He discourages the idea of establishing a 'Theological School', but advocates rather a kind of 'Wayside Inn' - a Friends' Bible School".*[186]

Furthermore, such sentiments were given greater stimulus with the publication of a census of church attendance, undertaken by George Cadbury's 'Daily News', and, in 1903, the gift of the Cadbury's former residence, Woodbrooke, for reading parties and larger gatherings on a regular basis.[187] The Friend' reported that Cadbury viewed the main purpose of Woodbrooke to be twofold: firstly in alleviating problems evident within the Quaker ministry, by providing a permanent training establishment for such ministers: and

secondly, in rekindling, particularly among young Friends, an interest in work undertaken by the Quakers.[188]

An associated problem was the interpretation the Society attached to the issue of social questions, i.e. whether to view it as a non-political Christian obligation to 'raise the tone of the community',[189] or whether to embrace this arena, by stressing the inherent parallels between socialism and Christianity.[190]

A related strand was that which drew attention to the changed circumstances of the 'peculiar' people, in suggesting that the Quaker recluse was no longer, and this exclusive sectarianism should be replaced by 'a generous Fellowship', offered to the wider municipal community.[191] In particular, J. W. Rowntree highlighted the potential role of Adult Schools in programmes of social, and spiritual regeneration.[192] Edward Grubb, too, alluded to this mechanism in 'The Christian Basis of Adult Schools', (1904), in attributing the success of the movement to its emphasis on interdenominational freedom, a sense of brotherhood, achieved through an active missionary spirit and broadly based education, awakening men's minds within a self-governing democratic environment.[193] Whilst suggesting that Adult Schools could be used to counter working-class atheism, he also indicated their potential role in inspiring a moral evolution, based on Spiritual Christianity rather than emphasising political, revolutionary, ideology. Furthermore, he argued that this philosophy, emphasising the work of the individual, within a society which allowed that worth to express itself, was the only social ideal that was not illusory.[194]

Similarly, Quaker historians have identified the 'transmission of spiritual values in daily life' as the ultimate aim of the Society's educational establishments.[195] Likewise, in 1911, Elizabeth Cadbury drew close parallels between the central features of Adult Schools and the principles of the Quaker movement, in commenting,

> *"It must never be forgotten that at the very centre of Adult School work, its reason for existence, is the development of the spiritual side of man. Its educational agencies stimulate the intellect; its doctrines of thrift and independence add to material wealth and comfort. Healthy exercise and legitimate sport aid physical development. But health, material comfort and increased intelligence would still leave the soul cold and unsatisfied. To have an intimate knowledge of Jesus Christ is the desire of the true Adult School member".*[196]

These central themes, comradeship, moral/spiritual betterment, the development of more amicable, peaceable relationships, of more 'responsible citizenship', are ones echoed throughout the annals of the S.O.F., in rationalising Adult School involvement, and, as such, appear particularly suited to a movement steeped in, and committed to, the closely associated ideals of co-operation and moral suasion.

Indeed, in 1904, Edward Grubb drew close parallels between the philosophies of the two movements in suggesting they shared certain fundamental beliefs. These central

themes included the resolution of disputes through arbitration processes, consistent with their basic philosophy of pacifism, the essential need for a society fostering a feel of brotherhood, promoting freedom of the individual, Grubb emphasising the paramount role of education in achieving these objectives.[197]

These comments are particularly pertinent for any analysis of Friends' social and political involvement, coming in the wake of the formation of the Socialist Quaker Society in 1898;[198] moreover these were comments which, when allied with Hodgkin's views expressed at the Manchester Conference, reveal the basic premise underlying the dominant Quaker interpretation of socialism, i.e. one holding an intrinsic belief in the agents and processes of democracy, arbitration and conciliation, and a non-acknowledgement of the intransigency of class barriers, or indeed, of conflicting class interests, an interpretation which the Cadburys fully endorsed and increasingly promoted, (see chapters 2 and 3).

Correspondingly, and in common with other influential Adult School leaders, including Richard and George Cadbury (see chapter 5), Grubb believed that these establishments were particularly positive and effective mechanism in countering working-class atheism,[199] in offering both as practical course in moral evolution,[200] whilst pursuing the objective of justice and the social ideal.[201] Consequently, he argued these institutions enabled their scholars to aspire to an outlook which appreciated,

> *"faith in the work of manhood, of the efficacy of love and justice. . . (leading to). . . peaceful, social and international evolution".*[202]

Alongside Adult School work, the emphasis upon a greater willingness to contact the working-class was reflected in the adoption of parish type organisations, a change also urged upon the Free Church movement,[203] as an attempt to facilitate the effective visiting of non churchgoers, a radical shift from the isolationist, elitist stance previously exhibited, at least within the S.O.F., all changes which the Cadburys willingly accepted and indeed promoted, (see later chapter).

Furthermore, Isichei has observed that,

> *"to many young Quakers much preoccupied with the magnitude and complexity of the 'social problem' traditional temperance advocacy seemed reactionary, a wilful refusal to think".*[204]

This observation is one which ably illustrates her phrase, 'the changing face of late Victorian philanthropy'.[205] This was an illustration that the movement's paternalism was both outmoded and increasingly unacceptable,[206] the recognition of this in the Society being attributable to the presence of a number of more adaptable Friends i.e. those open to theological developments being equally receptive to contemporary currents of thought, as with, for example, the issue of social questions.[207]

A third strand radically affecting the identity of the S.O.F. was that concerning its relationship with party politics and public life. As the Nonconformist movement had graduated towards the status of a more permanent pressure group, including in 1898, the formation of a Parliamentary Committee,[208] ensuring the representation of their views at Westminster, the S.O.F.'s response to such issues also reflected the end of political quietism, and the adoption of a more overtly politicised stance.

A specific concern of the movement centred on their perceptions of a government which sought to use education and its funding to promote their traditional religious allies, i.e. the Anglican Church. In 1897 this concern prompted the Society to contact both the Education Secretary, A. J. Balbour, and the national press, protesting,

> *"against the proposed additional endowment out of the public funds of schools conducted in the special interests of any religious body".*[209]

This belief, that each sectarian organisation should arrange and fund the teaching of their own view, was voiced with particular vehemence in their criticisms of Balfour's 1902 Education Bill. In April 1902, 'The Friend' gave a guarded assessment of this measure, in welcoming the attempt to introduce uniform national and local control, whilst concurring with J. W. Rowntree's view that it represented an expression of denominationalism, and was probably the beginning of the end of the Dissenters' voluntary system.[210] Three weeks later, however, the journal's position had considerably hardened, its editorial observing that the closer the Education Bill was scrutinised the more evident it became that its 'evils' outweighed its advantages.[211]

The Quaker's principal criticism centred on a proposal to place sectarian, (Anglican), religious teaching within the realm of public rates, irrespective of the religious doctrines prevalent within that community. The perception of this Bill as a grave injustice to Nonconformist communities was echoed by the Meeting of Sufferings' Committee, which further accused the Bill of proposing that sectarian (Anglican) managers would, in practice, control such schools, effectively disbarring Nonconformists from teaching appointments.[212]

The defeat, in July, of Chamberlain's optional clause, by which no local authority need adopt the Bill's proposals unless it so wished, further angered the Quakers.[213] On the Bill's passage, 'The Friend' voiced this anger, in accusing the Anglican contingent of forcing Balfour's hand through exorbitant demands, the resultant concessions to the established church aggravating an already 'bad' Education Bill.[214]

Similarly, Rendel Harris, later to become synonymous with Woodbrooke College, expressed his concern to the Nonconformists in Cambridge, in criticising the Bill as the most serious threat to their interests since the Restoration Penal Acts, having the intent of

removing Dissenters from public life and, indeed, national existence. Furthermore, he continued,

> *"the interests of education, which all thoughtful people perceive to be paramount at the present time, are being subordinated to the ambition of the clergy, especially of those who belong to the reactionary and ritualistic party".*[214]

Indeed, in July 1901, a joint meeting of Convocation had signalled the start of the Anglican campaign, the issuing of their central demands being the prelude to the bombardment of letters to Balfour and Morant. Moreover, the latter, as Permanent Secretary, had by December, stated his view that the passing of the Education Bill, would only be possible by the inclusion of a scheme aiding denominational schools - thereby ensuring the crucial political support of the Catholic and Anglican Churches.[215]

Pursuing the same theme, the Yearly Meeting, in 1903, reviewed 'with dismay', proposals, in the aftermath of Balfour's Act, to dismantle the London School Board, which is contended, had conducted admirable and valuable work in establishing systems of unsectarian instruction.[217] Declaring its desire to revive the previous year's 'earnest protest', the meeting dispatched a memorandum to the House of Commons, calling on Parliament to reject any such plans, on grounds of civil and religious liberty.[218]

Clearly the S.O.F. and indeed the Nonconformist movement, perceived such national 'reorganisation' of an organ they had always regarded as their lifeline with intense concern, and one which was, to some extent, evident in the intensification of their political activism in the subsequent 1906 general election.

For the S.O.F. given their particular circumstances, these developments represented yet another conspicuous threat to the perpetuation of both their identity and, indeed, their movement, and reinforced their perceptions of the need for a regenerative response.

A further factor of immediate relevance was the gradually extending arm of state education, which by 1899 had raised the school leaving age to 12,[219] and the potential consequences of this on the quantity and nature of educated provision in the Quaker influenced institutions. One indication of a future path of development was provided by the Adult Schools, who, after a decade of decline, from this date, and under the impetus established in the Leicestershire area,[220] began a resurgence that was to last until 1914.

Whilst the formal association of the Adult School movement and the S.O.F. ended in the early years of the century, these schools nevertheless pursued the promotion of contemporary issues with which the Quakers were similarly both interested and linked, including a concern with social problems and a belief in the role of education in promoting spiritual values and social harmony.[221] Offering a far broader education than previously,

embracing history, politics, literature and religion,[222] they were a prelude to the liberal humanists' initiatives of the Workers' Educational Association. As such these institutions indicated one way of renewing and indeed extending the effectiveness of voluntary educational agencies and were particularly utilised by the Cadburys in Birmingham as a mechanism for increasing both their contact with the working classes and their opportunities to disseminate aspects of their social philosophy, (see chapter 5).

Clearly these events and developments indicate that amongst an emerging element within the S.O.F. there existed an urgent desire to revitalise and extend the 'Quaker Message'.

This element, assisted and empowered by the triumph of Liberal Theology, and galvanised by the Manchester Conference, displayed denominational sympathies, and adopted a less insular attitude towards public/civic service, whilst seeking to clarify and modernise an autonomous Quaker identity and represented the emergence of a new Friends' philosophy.

Certainly the dominance of this new outlook was one which enabled those Friends eager to extend their activism and influence, such as Grubb and Rowntree and the Cadburys, to pursue their activities both with renewed confidence and the support of the national Quaker movement. As such, it created an impetus and provided an opportunity which the latter seized to establish themselves in the vanguard of late Victorian and Edwardian social reformers, both within the S.O.F. and the wider Nonconformist movement.

However, it is the writer's contention that the motivation underpinning this new and extensive Cadbury social activism was essentially one which sought to maintain and improve the operation of the existing capitalist structure, rather than achieving any greater political, economic, or social change. Furthermore, this period of prolonged Cadbury activism embraced numerous interrelated social issues and represented the pursuit of a coherent programme which sought to implement a variety of specific changes and initiatives, some of which were increasingly receiving considerable support within wider contemporary society. For such advocates one vitally important dimension was harnessing the power and opportunity provided by the developing organs of the state. The pursuit of this dimension and the exercise of the Cadburys' accompanying increasing political influence will be considered in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 2
REDEFINING PATERNALISTIC PHILANTHROPY:

CADBURYS AND THE POLITICAL ARENA

The Search for a Modern 'Radical" Political/Social Framework

In the early years of the 20th century the Cadburys displayed an increasingly prominent role in the national public domain, both as holders of 'political' office, and as patrons of particular social causes and movements. This chapter is concerned with the political perspectives which underpinned such prominence, especially in relation to the emergence of the organised labour movement. Furthermore, attention will be focussed on the mechanisms and agencies by which such philosophies were propagated and the individual social crusades with which the Cadburys became associated, aside from those which received their particular attention, namely the areas of housing and post elementary education which will be considered separately, in chapters 3 and 5 respectively.

A fundamental starting point is a consideration of how the Cadburys responded to contemporary definitions of the 'social questions' issue, i.e. the socio-political arguments they adhered to, and equally importantly, the resultant 'solutions' propounded.

Late 19th century interest in the 'social questions' issue was far from the exclusive prerogative of the Nonconformists[1] and indeed attracted sustained concern and comment across a wide political spectrum; furthermore, many of those expressing such sentiments began to question the traditional, passive, role of the state as both anachronistic and inadequate for the needs of contemporary society. Correspondingly, within such circles, belief in individualism and laissez faire was superseded by an expectation that the state should play a far greater role in society, by, in particular, legislating against specific social 'evils'.[2]

Although perceptions of the root cause of such 'evils' variously stressed religious, economic and political panaceas, central to all was the condition of the urban poor and, in particular, the physical condition of the urban young. Correspondingly, whilst contemporary attention frequently centred on educational solutions, increasingly the publications of social investigations such as those conducted by Booth and Rowntree highlighted the plight of up to a third of all town dwellers throughout the country,[3] and compounded the perceptions aroused by Mearns' "Bitter Cry of Oucast London' 1893, and the findings of Birmingham's 1892 religious census, conducted under the financial aegis of George Cadbury, indicating a city populace that was largely alienated from religion and religious influences.[4]

Accordingly, Charles Booth summarised these collective concerns in 1902, commenting that,

"the fact must be admitted that the great masses of the people remain apart from all forms of religious communion, apparently untouched by the Gospel that, with various differences of interpretation and application, is preached from every pulpit".[5]

Furthermore, such investigations revealed social problems affecting an alienated 'underclass' of a magnitude hitherto unsuspected or, at least, unrecognised, and generated further studies such as James Marchant and the National Social Purity Campaign's 1908 work, 'The Cleansing of the City', and the Federation of Working Girls' Clubs' 'The Perils in the City', the following year;[6] consequently these studies took as their central issue,

"the riddle of what England will do with her town populations, or perhaps more truly, what these town populations will do with her".[7]

Whilst Ashford, 1986, has suggested that the contemporary reform movement was essentially apolitical, i.e. in not arising from a particular election or as the result of any one organised pressure group,[8] nevertheless this consensus found expression through a number of political groupings and ideologies, some of which held particular attraction to Gladstonian Liberals such as George Cadbury, i.e. those philosophies which defined and redefined both the ideology and the resultant objectives/policies of the moderate left.

A brief consideration of the perceptions and responses of these political movements will therefore be given before any detailed analysis of the specific position and interpretation taken by Cadbury is undertaken.

Contemporary Liberalism appeared to be in sustained decline, the demoralising electoral defeats of 1895 and 1900 being compounded by internal divisions over the Boer War, parliamentary leadership, and, more fundamentally, the party's ideological basis. Central to this latter point was the perceived need for definition of this basis, a stance personified by Lord Rosebery, and exemplified by his 'Chesterfield speech' in December 1901. Addressing an audience containing many influencial and prominent Liberals, including the manufacturer Sir C. Furness, the leading Nonconformist parliamentarian, Robert Perks, and Lords Haldane and Grey,[9] Rosebery offered a complete rejection of the individualistic stance characteristic of Gladstonian Liberalism. Adopting a theme of 'efficiency', Rosebery argued that the preservation of Britain's national and international pre-eminence was dependant on a programme of regeneration, with the establishment of a modern administrative machinery at the core of such a programme.[10] This base would provide a regulatory organ enabling the government to exercise its responsibilities effectively, with regard, for example, to the stimulation of industry and commerce and to matters of social legislation specifically concerning education, temperance and housing.[11]

This speech, and its message, was to have enormous ramifications, as its underlying

principle, the acceptance by central government of legislative responsibility for its citizens' welfare, became a blueprint for the social enactments of subsequent Liberal administrations. Indeed, its importance was immediately recognised by Lloyd George, a major architect of much of the pre-1914 legislation, who, in giving his endorsement of these principles, spoke of the significance of both Asquith and Grey accepting Rosebery's doctrines.[12] Indeed, by late February 1902, both Asquith (later the Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer from 1905)[13] and Grey (Foreign Secretary in the same administration),[14] had become Vice Presidents of the Liberal League, promoting Liberal Imperialist ideas under Rosebery's leadership.[15]

In March, Grey, readily embracing these tenets, further expounded this new 'radicalism'. Explaining his overriding concerns in 'The National Physique: The Causes Which Tend to Its Deterioration', he emphasised the need for regeneration, diagnosing intemperance and overcrowded urban development as sapping communities' vigour and stamina, whilst simultaneously attributing economic inefficiency to restrictive Trade Union regulations[16] and advocating 'radical' innovative alternatives as a remedial measure, i.e. by the adoption of co-partnership principles to induce workers to increase their output from motives of self interest.[17]

This representation of a newly renovated Liberalism, was clearly far from as radical and left wing as it might have been. Nevertheless, in propounding a state led programme of national regeneration such Liberals contrasted sharply with contemporary perceptions of a Tory administration bereft of an adequately responsive philosophy and consequently, one displaying only flickering and intermittent legislative energy, i.e. one resembling a disinterested 'dying Parliament'.[18]

This new 'radicalism' also illustrated the growing allegiance between some leading Liberals and members of the Fabian Society. In November 1901, for example, the Fabian leader Sidney Webb had delivered an address to this group on the theme of 'Twentieth Century Politics: A Policy of National Efficiency'.[19]

The subsequent Fabian Tract 108, was accordingly severely critical of contemporary Liberalism, claiming that the mass of the community felt shamed by England's inability to resolve its social problem.[20] Arguing in favour of a 'National Minimum' in spheres of employment,[21] housing,[22] and education,[23] Webb suggested that this,

> *"sense of shame has yet to be transmitted into political action. The country is ripe for a domestic programme which shall breath new life into the administrative dry bones of our public bodies".*[24]

This article, together with G. B. Shaw's earlier tract, 'The Difficulties of Individualism', 1896, held obvious appeals for the Imperialistic Rosebery. Furthermore, in justifying aggressive state action as a means by which the nation could continue to

successfully compete in the 'race struggle',[25] Shaw utilised the language of Social Darwinism to develop a concept of social efficiency,[26] a concept which attracted many Fabians into eugenic societies, and which Scally, (1975) has claimed identified the Liberal Imperialists, rather than the Unionists, as modern social reformists.[27]

The contemporary appeal of such sentiments is readily apparent. As Radice, 1984, has argued, given the messages emanating from the late Victorian social investigators, the,

> *"quest for national efficiency was an attractive rallying call. The Darwinian controversy, the Paris Exhibition of 1867, the disasters of the Boer War, the threat from German industry, and the discussions over educational reform had brought out into the open the need to improve national standards. Social reformers like Haldane, educators like Llewellyn Smith, journalists like H. G. Wells were united in their belief that it was their duty to preach the gospel of national efficiency".*[28]

Shaw's tract, together with Webb's address and Fabian Tract provided the general basis underpinning such a policy,[29] much of which revolved around a belief in the 'cult of the expert', as a means of radically improving the administrative machinery of the nation; this was a belief to which George Cadbury also subscribed, later remarking that he attributed the inefficiency of Parliament to a prevalence of complete inexperience, advocating the holding of municipal office as invaluable preparation for discharging such duties responsibly.[30]

Crucially, this philosophy also signalled a significant break from traditional ad-hoc approaches, in advocating permanent social mechanisms, rather than the existing, unevenly spread private philanthropy, which, Stevenson, 1984, has observed,

> *"frequently could only offer palliatives rather than fundamental solutions to the problems it encountered".*[31]

These beliefs complemented and compounded Rosebery's interest in a Fabian Society fragmented by the Boer War, and which subsequently propounded far less radical and socialist policies than its earlier demands for social justice,[32] and which, through its concepts of 'permeation' and 'gradualism', upheld a belief in the parliamentary process.

Such mutual attractions culminated in the founding of the 'Co-efficients' Club' in November 1902, specifically with the object of discussing 'The Aims, Policy and Methods of Imperial Efficiency at Home and Abroad'.[33] With a membership that included the Fabians, Wells and Shaw, and the Liberals, Grey and Haldane,[34] the group formed a microcosm of those propounding the doctrine of 'national efficiency'.[35]

Whilst their political potential was effectively and almost immediately undermined

by a subsequent revival of confidence in traditional Liberal methods and values,[36] especially from 1902, following the ending of the South African war,[37] their message had important repercussions for later government actions, and played a prominent role in focussing public and parliamentary attention on 'the state of the nation'.

The actions of Fabians such as Webb, a Cadbury associate in Edwardian social reform, also had important and influential implications for the role of education, viewed as the cornerstone of any effective national policy of efficiency, i.e. specifically in advocating that the new universities should establish close contact with the world of commerce and politics, and introduce courses of a 'practical' nature within such disciplines;[38] one of the first of these initiatives was introduced at Birmingham University,[39] and which clearly shared a similar rationale to that underpinning the concurrent educational developments at Cadbury Bros.' Bournville Works, (see chapter 5).

Thompson, (1967) has observed that those under the broad umbrella of the left adopted very different stances on many late Victorian matters,[40] illustrated, for example, by the Independent Labour Party's opposition to Fabian support of the Boer War, the 1902 Education Bill, Tariff Reform and the issue of Imperialism.[41] However, with the possible exception of the Socialist Labour Party, (see later), each of the numerous organisations operating under this broad umbrella set their ambitions within the status quo, proposals for political, economic and social change falling far short of any fundamental restructuring and the class war arguments of Marx.[42]

Furthermore, it is perhaps questionable whether the newly active left could have successfully represented any more significant embracement of socialism, given the degree to which belief in capitalism was firmly entrenched and reinforced throughout society, a process to which the Cadburys contributed significantly, (see later). Indeed, as Thompson argues, the impetus for increased contemporary support for the Independent Labour Party/Labour Representation Committee, was a consequence of concern over the general human condition, particularly with regard to industrialised labour, rather than from support for socialist principles.[43]

Moreover, since both the Fabians and the I.L.P./L.R.C. embraced a belief in parliamentary legitimacy,[44] neither could be said to represent any radical political alternative to the more left wing element of the Liberal Party. Kean, 1990, has argued that of the numerous 'socialist' parties vying from the left's political highground, the main bodies of these, Hyndman's Social Democratic Federation, 1884, Social Democratic Party, 1908, and the British Socialist Party, 1911, all adopted an approach accepting the neutrality of the state apparatus,[45] a position mirroring both the Fabian permeation policy and the aspirations of the I.L.P./L.R.C., with the Socialist Labour Party as the only national political body to oppose and question this assumption.[46]

Consequently, this overriding belief in the state as a benign instrument,

> *"indicated a positive view of the possibility of achieving significant reforms within the state"*[47]

i.e. reflecting the belief that government intervention was, in itself, enough to resolve society's ills, without questioning any further purpose of that involvement, nor indeed the nature of the intervention itself.[48]

Thus, these arguments differed only marginally from viewpoints illustrated earlier, and, furthermore, as electoral issues, such stances were ones which could fairly readily be embraced under the Liberal/National efficiency/Fabian umbrella, and indicate the extent to which any fundamental socialist arguments were effectively excluded from the 'social questions' debate.

Alongside these political groupings were those stances adopted by various religious movements who, from the 1880's had increasingly embraced the 'social questions' issue. These approaches frequently identified the improvement of urban conditions and the development of personal conduct as pre-requisites to freedom from social bondage, stressing a moral dimension much favoured by many contemporary 'apolitical' social reformers, including those within the Free Churches. Emphasising personal conduct and individual responsibility as panaceas for the problem of urban aggregation, this perspective highlighted the potential of education in countering the ostensibly alienating effects of this aggregation, a process perceived as fragmenting the traditional nature of community life, both socially and culturally.[49]

This was a viewpoint which drew widespread and high profile support, being advocated by Fabians such as Arnold Freeman, in 'Boy Life and Labour', (1914),[50] and was epitomised by E. J. Urwick of the University of London. Urwick indeed also propounded a state led cure for such a problem, arguing that it was a prime responsibility of educationalists to enable male adolescents to adapt to new urban conditions;[51] this was a theme which had also been wholeheartedly endorsed by the Cadbuys somewhat earlier as they gave a practical expression to this perspective, in extensively expanding their Adult School activities in late Victorian Birmingham, (see chapter 5).

Despite extolling the urgent need for state intervention, Urwick viewed the interpretation of both the eugenicists and the socialists as offering only partial remedies.[52] He commented, for example, that, whilst he agreed with the arguments of those determined to combat destitution, it was not from a standpoint of 'efficiency', nor from a desire to make communities more 'successful',

"but because the kind of poverty and inherited weakness we see in them work like a poison against the better life of all, preventing men and women from realising that they are spiritual beings and not only human, blinding them to the true purposes of life. . . with no vision of the deliverance which might be within their grasp".[53]

In condemning conditions of extreme poverty, Urwick dismissed both 'bad mating' and the workings of the labour market as largely irrelevant,[54] perceiving the real panacea to be the awakening of a public duty amongst all citizens.[55] This emphasis on civic responsibility was similarly lauded by those within the Cadbury circle of associates, including the British Institute of Social Service, whose Provisional Committee included Earl Grey, George Cadbury, W. H. Lever and Percy Alden,[56] and which perceived such activities as a means of fostering both the moral growth of the nation and the evolution of 'civilisation'.[57]

Like Urwick, both George and Elizabeth Cadbury advocated the adoption of a strident moral tone as a pre-requisite to a programme of regeneration, the former supporting his argument by citing the success the 'Quaker virtues' of self-denial and abstinence had achieved in the business world.[68] Furthermore, Elizabeth Cadbury voiced an increasingly familiar Quaker/Nonconformist theme in suggesting that these attributes should, as a matter of Christian moral conscience, be employed for the 'common good' and disseminated as widely as possible.[69]

Indeed, such concerns had been aired by 'The Friends' Quarterley Examiner' in 1902. Discussing B. Seebohm Rowntree's 'Poverty; A Study of Town Life', the editorial review commented that the,

"problem of poverty is not one belonging only to large cities, it is as problem at our doors in ever urban centre - yet, in almost every rural centre too. And its solution is not wholly for 'legislators' or 'socialists' or any other set, or party or fashion of men. Its solution rests in measure with every good citizen - not today, nor yet tomorrow, but in long years of patient effort in various directions, affecting labour, land, housing, poor law, food, the public health and the public morals".[60]

Moreover, alongside the wider Nonconformist movement, the S.O.F. and, in particular its Meetings for Sufferings, whose national committee contained Elizabeth Cadbury from 1898 to 1906, and her nephew, Barrow, between 1901 and 1911,[61] increasingly displayed a greater readiness to enter the public arena, and to pronounce and act on questions of current national concern, in, for example protesting against the 'undemocratic' 1903 London Education Bill.[62]

However, a significant feature of this interest was the abandonment of their traditionally passive role, with the expectation that such bodies/personnel would actively engage, on an unprecedented scale, in collaborative undertakings to implement these

beliefs, i.e. displaying a preparation for involvement in public life, at both a national and municipal level, and one illustrated by the adoption of parish-style organisations to facilitate greater contact with the working classes.

Allied and central to these actions and indeed the entire programme with which the Cadburys became associated, was the Society's insistence that it represented an apolitical moral watchdog, whose principal purpose was the encouraging of Friends to undertake social service. Accordingly, such a representation led the Society to arrange a conference on 'Poverty' in 1903,[63] the following year conducting a social symposium which included contributions from B. Seebohm Rowntree on the 'The Social Worker'[64] on 'social morality' by Percy Alden[65] and 'Temperance' from Joseph Rowntree,[66] the former and latter themes similarly engaging the corresponding Women's Yearly meetings.[67]

Furthermore, following a Meeting For Sufferings' proposal,[68] the 1907 Yearly Meeting devoted part of its annual conference to a consideration of 'Social Problems and Social Service',[69] discussions which culminated in the formation of a committee to consider the Society's position on these concerns.[70] This was a committee whose 1909 report revealed Friends' overriding endorsement of social service, more than 1 in 25 accepting places on public bodies, a figure far in excess of that experienced by other contemporary religious groups.[71]

Unsurprisingly, such emphasis upon social service was echoed by the attention given by successive Friends' Yearly Meetings[72] throughout this period. However, within such discussions it is possible to detect a number of accompanying assumptions which tended towards upholding the existing economic structure, encouraged delineated gender roles, and discouraged any more radical models of society. In 1902, for example, Thomas Hodgkin expressed the view that new working class converts,

> *"may be able to make to their fellows an effectual 'appeal for a peaceable spirit', and to check the continued appeal to 'the strike' which is in social disputes what the sword is in disputes between nations".*[73]

Accordingly, such perspectives, being strictly confined to appeals to the 'moral goodness' of the nation, bore no recognition of any inherent inequalities in the capitalist structure. Furthermore, whilst in 1907 the Committee on Social Questions had claimed that the question of ameliorating the poor was a matter not of benevolence or charity, but one of social justice,[74] in practice it offered only a vague and limited conception of how this objective was to be achieved, i.e. by appeals to raising the awareness of spiritual values in industrial life, (see later and chapter 5).

This ostensibly apolitical theme was subsequently reiterated in 1907, T. E. Harvey arguing that Social Service Committee be extended to both Quarterly ad Monthly Meetings to.

"watch against evils threatening the community, and it should always be possible to bring the discussion of such subjects before a meeting on a plane far above that of ordinary party politics (though in due time we should have faith to believe that this distinction would tend to disappear by the infusing of the Christian spirit into civil and political life)".[75]

In 1908 the committee, in reporting to the Yearly Meeting, similarly announced that future Quarterly Meetings would receive visits from committee members to encourage, as a matter of special importance, the careful study of social questions, to emphasis the close connection between the social and the spiritual, to train and equip Quakers for service, and to, promote and raise the ideas of business and civic life, whilst strengthening the resources of home life,[76] another recurrent Friends' theme.

Attempts to inculcate these values were further enhanced by actions indicating the importance of the Cadburys in these developments, firstly in extending Friends' educational provision, (see chapter 5), and secondly through the work of the Society's Committee on Social Questions, a body containing Tom Bryan and Mary Pumphrey,[77] and the Committee of Friends' Social Union, to which George Shann and George Cadbury Jnr. both belonged;[78] these were committees which in 1910, jointly argued that the Society's principal role was to stimulate their members to 'sense of social responsibility'[79] and educate them accordingly to become skilled social workers.[80] Specifically, this was to be accomplished through the increased recruitment of the young adults and greater use of Social Study circles,[81] developments which would augment Woodbrooke College, the ostensibly apolitical training school for social reformers which the Cadburys already operated, (see chapter 5).

Furthermore, in recognising that political action, including that undertaken by the government, was increasingly embracing the field of social service, the committee argued that their prime role was as a moralistic watchdog, in ensuring that the holders of public office were those who consistently displayed a character of an exemplary nature,[82] a theme increasingly voiced by those within the ranks of the Nonconformists, (see later).

Alongside such activism, in the decade following the Manchester Conference the S.O.F.'s national membership had increased by almost 12.5%.[83] Moreover, this pattern was even more evident within the Warwick, Stafford and Leicester district, the corresponding figures of 25% rising to over 100% when 'Associate' members were included.[84]

However, despite these increases, the adoption of parish-style structures and the increasing attention paid to the 'social questions' issue, by 1906 the Society could only claim a membership of less than 20,000[85] a figure that caused Friends to doubt the effectiveness of these approaches. Indeed, in 1909, the Honourary Secretary of the Committee on Social Questions, Lucy Gardner, in exhorting Friends to work with like-

minded citizens where appropriate, nevertheless cited such criticisms, observing that:

> *"There seems to be too little sense that Quakerism has a message of Social responsibility".*[86]

Moreover these measures appeared even more inadequate and insufficient, given the contemporary political pressures being exerted upon the dissenting sects, by, for example, the 1902 Education Act. The Committee on Social Questions had, in fact, already recognised the potential in adopting a new, more interdenominational approach, in 1907, stating that there,

> *"may be great advantage in Meetings or Committees of Friends organising social efforts in conjunction with other citizens in their districts".*[87]

Indeed, the Society's move towards interdenominationalism,[88] involving an embracing of political action and a higher civic prominence, also witnessed an increased collaboration with a number of bodies and agencies seeking comparable social objectives. More specifically, Isichei, 1964, has commented,

> *"George Cadbury exemplified this outlook perfectly - he was an enthusiastic supporter of the Salvation Army, gave a plot of land for an Anglican Church and felt 'much unity of spirit' with Cardinal Newman".*[89]

Furthermore, Cadbury, in embracing contemporary concerns over social problems, gradually began exercising influence on the national political arena, an activism similarly mirrored by Elizabeth Cadbury, who expressed her interests through a number of voluntary organisations, (see below).

One particularly representative strand demonstrating this interest was her membership of the National Union of Working Women, (N.U.W.W.) a body to which a large number of sympathetic bodies became affiliated, including the Women's Council of Free Churches.[90]

As with other contemporary groups, the N.U.W.W. declared itself interested in the promotion of social, moral and material welfare, whilst distancing itself from overt political actions or entering into religious controversy.[91]

Cadbury had initially expressed her interest in this organisation during a conference of Yorkshire associates in 1889,[92] and, following the formation of the Birmingham branch, in 1899,[93] became increasingly prominent within the national governing body, the National Council of Women (N.C.W.) becoming President for two years from 1906.[94] Moreover, this was an opportunity to promote particular themes that

Cadbury fully utilised, her 1907 address, for example, being used to express and publicise her own personal social concerns. Reflecting much contemporary Quaker literature, Cadbury spoke of a nation divided by "The Riddle of Circumstance',[95] in 1912 reiterating this argument, suggesting that if it went unheeded it would result in a 'dwarfed crippled product'.[96]

Dame Elizabeth attributed the development of much of this philosophy to her husband's connection with voluntary educational agencies, in that his long association with Adult Schools had brought him into close and continued contact with the stark realities of urban deprivation and inequality. However, she observed, Cadbury's belief in the possibility of achieving 'social justice' and 'righteousness' meant that he did not regard such conditions as inevitable, nor indeed as irremovable.[97]

Ostensibly, Cadbury accepted the central tenet of each of the justifications for reform given earlier i.e. the need for the acceptance of a new rationale based on the extension of state powers in areas of social policy. This was a rationale to which Cadbury referred in explaining his interest in politics as being primarily concerned with the 'social questions' issue, and in particular, in securing a Parliament,

> *"specially returned to press forward legislation for ameliorating the condition of the poor".*[98]

In reality, however, this involvement was more attributable to a desire to further their own programme, both satisfying and utilising contemporary arguments regarding national efficiency and the need to preserve the race, in order to further their own specific economic and social agenda, (see later).

Equally, it would be correspondingly inaccurate to suggest that the Quakers, and the Cadbury family in particular, confined their involvement to matters of a parochial, voluntary, apolitical nature. Indeed the belief that such conditions were transient and could be removed through a programme of social reform led George Cadbury in particular to offer support, through a number of agencies, to various bodies seeking comparable aims. Furthermore, such an outlook, allied to the Quaker embracement of denominationalism, contemporary pressures upon the Nonconformist movement, and the organisation of the National Free Church Council (N.F.C.C.) increasingly led Friends, such as George Cadbury, to adopt a more prominent profile and to exert influence, covertly and overtly, upon the national political arena in pursuit of their social panaceas.

This influence became expressed through a number of forms, which may be classified as:

a) political allegiance of a national character, involving the use of particular Cadbury agencies in the pursuit of specific objectives

b) a more overt local and, frequently, municipal activism, involving the maintenance/ restructuring of existing vehicles, and the embracement of public office and a greater civic prominence, together with the establishment of permanent platforms for the expression of Cadbury social ideals, (see chapter 3).

THE NATIONAL DIMENSION

Whilst George Cadbury frequently claimed to place social principles above 'mere party purposes',[99] he exercised an increasingly active political influence in advancing the new cause of 'radical Liberalism' and in the promotion of and financial support of special 'ad hoc' social reforms. Central to this was Cadbury's work with the N.F.C.C., his relationship with anti-Tory political parties, and his ownership of the national 'Daily News'.

George Cadbury and the Political Role of the Nonconformist Movement

Publicly, George Cadbury agreed with the views of a leading Nonconformist, Dr Dale, who regarded the Free Church Councils (F.C.C.) an essentially religious, rather than political bodies,[100] a view point confirmed by a contemporary synopsis of the Birmingham F.C.C. which believed that its,

> *"work, so nobly and generously aided by Mr George Cadbury, has been spiritual from its first hour unto this day".*[101]

Nevertheless, Cadbury and other influential members within the Nonconformists were becoming increasingly prominent and active in the political domain and within the Free Church movement itself, George and Elizabeth both holding national posts within this organisation, as Joint Treasurer and President, respectively.[102] Indeed the forming of sectarian Social Question Committees from the early 1890's, alongside the organising of regional and national councils of the Free Churches, provided these bodies with a ready mechanism by which collective thought could be given to issues of social and theological conscience;[103] the latter body in particular, was far from a passive receptacle for such views, quickly becoming the bearer of the movement's national conscience,[104] whilst individual regional councils acted as the principal political arm of Nonconformity.[105]

The role of Birmingham, and in particular, George Cadbury, was integral to several initiatives undertaken by the movement during its earliest years. Indeed during the third Free Church Congress, held in Birmingham in March 1895, Thomas Law was invited to live in the city as national Organising Secretary, with the former General Secretary of the Birmingham Sunday School Union, and principal orchestrator of the 1892 religious census, John Rutherford, to act as his assistant.[106]

Furthermore, in the aftermath of this meeting, following consultations with the leading Nonconformist minister, Hugh Price Hughes, Cadbury promised to donate an annual sum enabling the movement to establish local councils throughout the country. Such a measure ensured that it was founded on a stable financial basis, and,

"secured the movement from degenerating into a mere paper organisation, impeded and crippled by lack of means".[107]

Citing the success of the parish style organisation within Birmingham, a structure which had subsequently resulted in over 4,000 annual visits,[108] and which had given the impetus to establishing the F.C.C.,[109] Cadbury clearly wished to fully capitalise on such benefits. Indeed he argued for the adoption of a similar system nationally,[110] thereby enabling local councils to successfully avoid duplicating and overlapping their activities, and thus conduct house to house visits more efficiently,[111] the widespread adoption of this more structured and more permanent form of organisation later being described as a 'striking feature' of most of these councils.[112]

Furthermore, the Free Church movement readily acknowledge the benefits this conferred, the West Midlands Federation, for example, attributing its burgeoning growth between 1896 and 1904 to the use of this system,[113] almost trebling its number of local councils from 21 to 61 during this period.[114]

George Cadbury again displayed his prominence in stimulating this process, in donating half the £10[115] the Federation granted to each Council pledged to visitations within a parish style framework.[116] This 'invaluable' support by George Cadbury was a significant factor for the West Midlands Federation, paying a third of its outstanding debts in 1903,[117] and between 1900 and 1906 annually contributing £100 of the £225 necessary for the organisation to continue functioning,[118] a contribution recognised in 1904, when he was granted life membership of the body's Executive Committee.[119]

Within the national Free Church movement, an already heightened interest in contemporary political developments had been translated into activism by the Nonconformist's indignation over the passing of the 1902 Education Act, legislation that was perceived as unjust both to Dissenters and to the nation as a whole, in reinforcing the 'tyranny' of the state church and as representing a policy which threatened educational 'efficiency' and democracy alike.[120]

This perspective, linking Nonconformity and democracy as imperiled, complementary, interests, was one which was to have important and far reaching consequences for the political development of Edwardian Britain,[121](see later).

Indeed, during the passage of the Bill, prominent Liberal M.P.'s, representative of their new 'radical' philosophy, keenly exhorted the Dissenters to embrace the political sphere, and actively endorse the sentiments expressed by this lobby. During the 3rd Reading of the 1902 Education Bill, Lord Rosebery declared that he believed the Nonconformists had 'of late' been oddly passive and indifferent to their old Liberal alliances.[122] He continued:

"What I said to the Nonconformists was that, if they desire to have justice done to them in the matter of education - which they certainly have not had done to them by this Bill - they must shake off this insidious sloth and resume the active political agitation which was in the old days the strength of the Liberal party".[123]

This call to activism was echoed by Lloyd George, who in May 1904, urged a meeting of Nonconformists to recognise the great opportunities facing contemporary Free Churchmen and called on them to take an active interest in politics.[124] This interest was, he subsequently explained, one of the real obligations of the church/chapel, expressing the believe that responsibility for the government of the people rested with members of religious organisations, in collaborating together in a co-operative and unified form, to work for the removal of social evils such as poverty.[125]

Lloyd George, whose personal political fortunes increasingly mirrored those of 'Radical Nonconformity',[126] had begun to stress the need for a co-ordinated Liberal/Non-conformist alliance with his efforts to fight the 1902 Education Act. Indeed this sentiment was similarly held by many within the Free Churches, Koss, 1975 arguing that this statute,

"transformed. . . the Nonconformist commitment to Liberalism from a vague sentiment into an active electoral alliance".[127]

The potential value of this alliance for the Liberals was almost immediately realised and acted upon, in July 1903, Lloyd George accordingly speaking of the need for young Nonconformist parliamentary candidates.[128] Indeed, this perception was mirrored within sections of the movement itself, the Quaker journal, 'The Friend' commenting in December, 1902, that the Free Church interdenominationalists were now ready for the coming political struggle, having realised both their strength and their duty to pursue this 'higher calling'.[129]

Moreover, the transformation of the Nonconformists into a political force was further galvanised by the London Education Act of 1903, which brought the London County Council under the terms of the 1902 Act,[130] and which Thomas Law, Organising Secretary of the F.C.C.S. observed,

"proved beyond about, if such a proof were necessary, that there was absolutely no hope of an alteration in the educational legislation from the present Government".[131]

Consequently, believing that such legislation threatened 'liberty and progress' and had proved even more iniquitous than feared at its inception, the N.F.C.C. maintained that, whilst it was not, and would not, become a political organisation, it had been forced into participatory role by the actions of the 'clerical' party and the Tory administration.[132]

Consequently, the body concluded that it was their duty to fight the next general election,[133] a decision also endorsed by the West Midland Federation in both November 1903[134] and October 1904.[135]

The first step in such a participatory role, i.e. a move towards an electoral alliance with the Liberals, was taken in August 1903, when a deputation from the National Council met Liberal leaders, including Lord Spencer, Asquith and Chief Whip, Herbert Gladstone, seeking their commitment to amend/appeal recent educational legislation as an immediate priority upon attaining office.[136]

Similarly, the organs of the Nonconformists, such as the Cadbury owned 'Daily News', railed against the 'injustices' of this legislation, giving its support to the deputation, arguing that the reform of these acts was the 'issue of the moment' amongst the general public,[137] (see later).

Subsequently, having received the assurance that the matter was of 'vital importance',[138] negotiations were begun to secure a number of Free Church parliamentary candidates, Law signalling their high expectations[139] in announcing that their aim was,

"to secure effective ascendancy in the Liberal Party".[140]

Whilst a figure of 100 candidates was desired within certain factions of the Nonconformists, to ensure a future educational settlement along 'acceptable' lines, by September 1903 a compromise had been reached; accordingly 25 such candidates would seek election, whilst Gladstone gave an assurance that an incoming Liberal government would immediately set to work on amending the Education Act.[141]

Bebbington, 1982, has argued, that from mid 1903, the Free Church movement was in a state of readiness for a general election,[142] and, indeed, in October, 1903, the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches published a pamphlet to such effect, George Hirst's 'Organising for the Election'.[143] Furthermore, in March, 1904, the N.F.C.C. unveiled their policy for national education, which included placing all schools under the control of popular elected representatives and ending the practice of sectarian teaching in elementary schools;[144] this latter resolution formed the cornerstone of the Nonconformist's 'Passive Resistance' activities against the 1902 legislation, additionally receiving the full support of the Cadbury influenced local organisations, being endorsed by the West Midlands Federation in May 1905.[145]

These clauses, together with demands for a single type of elementary school and the ending of religious tests for teachers, voiced concerns that held an appeal far beyond the confines of the Free Church movement.[146] Furthermore, Jordan, 1956, has claimed that this policy was a significant step in the adoption of an overt political stance, in that it again represented their position as incongruous within a 'democratic' state.[147]

This politicising tendency became even more pronounced when the National Executive decided to publicly renounce government policy and launched a Free Church Council Election Fund, a move which George Cadbury fully endorsed in promising £2,500,[148] a figure he subsequently increased to £3,500.[149]

Thomas Law, in the 1904 Federation Report, explained that these funds were to be spent in providing millions of free election leaflets, together with hundreds of 'efficient' speakers, and to reimburse the movement's election expenses incurred in securing the very best candidates.[150]

Throughout 1903 and 1904 the N.F.C.C. was, therefore, launching itself into the political arena, since, as Jordan has observed, the cumulative effect of these decisions and actions was that,

> *"the Council, while establishing no organic link with the Liberal Party, practically committed itself to work for a Liberal victory at the polls".*[151]

The subsequent Free Church activism included the securing of prospective candidates' pledges on educational reform, the organisation of motor tours, the distribution of political pamphlets, the preaching of party doctrine from the pulpit,[152] together with the issuing of a general election manifesto. This document embraced the earlier policy statement, in calling for a single national educational system, under democratic public control, immediate action on Temperance Reform, allied to demands to take effective action on the nation's serious social problems.[153]

Whilst it may be impossible to accurately quantify the magnitude of the F.C.C.S.' contribution to the subsequent Liberal victory, Jordan believes that this manifesto was a significant factor, in that it represented policies which many supported, both inside and outside the ranks of Nonconformity. Importantly, a central pillar of this was their policy for National Education, a policy directly opposing the thrust of the 1902/3 education legislation,[154] and which consequently found a ready response from those who believed that a Liberal government, rather than a Tory administration, would be far more competent and willing in dealing with issues such as the social problem.[155]

Furthermore, the National Council 9th Annual Report in April, 1905, voiced their belief that religious and social reform were interrelated, in observing that,

> *"a religious revival is the natural harbinger of social, moral, ethical and even political reforms. To quicken the nation's conscience is the surest, if not the swiftest way, to affect her laws and customs".*[156]

The Free Church leaders also extended their influence in actively courting the support of the labour movement. In his 1905 Presidential Address, Horton Davies

announced a special extraordinary meeting of the Council's General Committee with representatives of working men's organisations. Having expressed the hope that this would bring the churches into closer contact with the 'masses',[157] in November, 1905, the subsequent invitation to MacDonald sought to refute the accusation that the F.C.C. was merely a political agent of the Liberals, when Horton and Law wrote:

> *"We think it is wise to take this opportunity of correcting the statements which have appeared in certain Labour papers to the effect that there is an attempt on the part of the Free Churches to 'capture' the working man for the Churches or for a political party. This is a misapprehension. Social reform has a prominent place in the programme of the Free Churches. It is also one of the main aims of the Labour Movement. The question is how far the two bodies, having identical objects, can unite to secure the realisation of their social ideals".*[158]

Nevertheless, the chief political beneficiaries of this activism were, certainly in the short terms, the Liberals, their electoral success indicating the electorate's disillusionment with the Conservative Party, a disillusionment that the N.F.C.C. had articulated throughout the previous four years. Indeed, this activism represented the height of the N.F.C.C.'s political involvement,[159] the concomitant influence accompanying this more active profile, primarily in promoting the Liberal Party, being reflected by the significant rise in the number of Dissenting parliamentary candidates, the 1900 level of 171 increasing by over 30% to 219.[160]

An even more striking consequence of this activism lay in the success such candidates enjoyed, 185 Nonconformist M.P.'s being elected, an increase of 109 from the 1900 figures.[161]

Furthermore, the view that the Nonconformists were instrumental in this Liberal electoral success is compounded by an analysis of their candidates in these general elections, indicating a Dissenting movement largely committed to the broad umbrella of the left, i.e.

Year	Nonconformist Party Candidates[162] (M.P.'s returned, in brackets)		
	Cons/Unionist	Lib	I.L.P.
1900	35(28)	127(74)	7(5)
	Cons/Unionist	Lib	L.R.C.
1906	9(6)	191(157)	20(20)

One contemporary recognition of the effect of the Nonconformists' influence, expressing the view that the Liberals owed their victory, at least partly, to the agents of the

Free Churches, was that voiced by the newly elected Prime Minister, Campbell Bannerman.

In March 1906 he wrote to Free Church leaders,

> *"not for many years have you, both ministers and people, worked so heartily and unsparingly for Liberalism, and we well know how large a part of our success has been due to your efforts."*[163]

The Free Church movement, too, was clearly aware of its new-found potency, its new President J. Scott Lidgett, observing at its Annual Conference in Birmingham that he considered the National Council to be possibly the most coherent and powerful spiritual organisation in the country.[164]

Indeed Lidgett was delighted that the new House of Commons contained such a significant quota of Free Churchmen, forming a group capable of imposing a considerable influence on the nature of immediate and future social policy. However, he nevertheless somewhat tempered this celebratory tone, in commenting that he rejoiced,

> *"only on the understanding that they were going to stand shoulder to shoulder with the representatives of labour to make this Parliament the most memorable in the history of the kingdom for the wise and self-sacrificing facing of the great human problem to which attention has been called."*[165]

George Cadbury, too, could afford to be celebratory, having acted as a principal financial contributor to the Free Churches' cause. This was, however, by no means the full extent of his influence in the 1906 election, as Cadbury pursued and extended this interventionist role through his direct involvement with anti Tory parties, an involvement which will be considered in the next section.

George Cadbury's Party Political Involvement

Cadbury, whilst not seeking to deny any allegiance with the newly 'radical' Liberals, and their policies of 'New Liberalism' in particular, nevertheless preferred to adopt an almost covert profile in this support, remarking that his,

> *"tastes do not lie in the direction of politics, though I think they form a most important part of the work of Christian citizens".*[166]

i.e. a statement not inconsistent with his support of the political work of the N.F.C.C.

Cadbury preferred to define his interests as the pursuance of 'righteous laws',[167] whilst renouncing the Toryism of Joseph Chamberlain, which, he believed, would achieve nothing for,

"the happiness of men, but. . . will pander to vain glory and pride, not that which will raise the standard of comfort and happiness among the people of the country, but that which will increase the wealth of those already rich. Surely the eyes of workmen will in time be open to the folly of supporting a party with ideals such as these".[168]

Despite refusing the offer of a Liberal parliamentary career in 1892, and again three years later,[169] Cadbury did, nevertheless, subsequently adopt a more influencial role in contributing funds for party candidates and, from 1899, in providing the Liberal Chief Whip, T. E. Ellis, with a Chief Permanent Secretary, Jesse Herbert.[170] This arrangement, by which Cadbury paid half of Herbert's annual salary, on the express condition that he was employed to secure parliamentary candidates for the next election,[171] continued throughout the subsequent Tory administration.[172]

During the early part of this arrangement, Cadbury frequently displayed his annoyance with the factionist image, and policy stances, emanating from the Liberals. In particular his financial support, if not his commitment, was tested by the party schism over the Boer War, and the use of 'central funds' to assist Liberals endorsing this conflict.[173]

Indeed, to circumvent this possibility, Cadbury, in September 1900, wrote to the Chief Whip, stating his intention to contribute less to general election expenses than previously.[174] Furthermore, in response to Gladstone's reply, Cadbury explained that, whilst he was privately helping '7 or 8' 'Radical" candidates, he was not going to make any further contributions to their central funds.[175]

Moreover, this statement occurred against a backdrop of a substantial Cadbury donation to the I.L.P.,[176] (see later), both factors perhaps indicating the concern with which he viewed the state of the Liberal Party and the way in which he wished to exercise influence on official policy.

Subsequently, Cadbury's displeasure with the factionist, warring, image displayed by the Liberals, was replaced by a reaffirmation of his traditional allegiance, in the wake of the 1902 Education Act and the announcement of Chamberlain's Tariff Reform policy the following year, and manifested itself in efforts towards a Lib/Lab electoral pact, successfully concluded in August 1903.[177]

Indeed, this latter point illustrates the growing political interest of George Cadbury, in that his parliamentary sponseree, Jessie Herbert, played a central role in the 1906 general election, in promoting this pact within the highest echelons of the Liberal Party. In March 1903 Herbert evaluated the potential advantages to the Liberals of pursuing such a policy with the Labour Representation Committee, (I.R.C.). Writing to Gladstone, he observed:

"There are some members of the party in and out of Parliament who would be estranged thereby, but they are a few. Those employers of labour who remained with the Liberal party when the Whig seceders went out on the

Home Rule excuse, have (with few exception) sincere sympathy with many of the objects of the L.R.C. The severe Individualism of the party who are wholly out of sympathy with the principles of the L.R.C. are very few. The total loss of their financial aid would be inconsiderable. The gain to the party through a working arrangement would be great, and can be measured best by a comparison of the results of 'no arrangement' with those of 'arrangement.'"[178]

Herbert continued by estimating such gains as including the votes of over a 1,000,000 L.R.C. men, access to the Labour election fund of £l00,000 and, perhaps most persuasively, the consequent defeat of both parties in many constituencies if such a pact was not concluded.[179]

Whilst Herbert recommended that the L.R.C. be unopposed in 35 seats, the Chief Whip also displayed his enthusiasm for the scheme by raising this figure to 55.[180] Subsequently, in January 1906, when the arrangement led to 31 such L.R.C.'s candidates, 24 of whom were successful,[181] Herbert was unequivocal in his appraisal of the efficacy of the pact of the Liberals, in observing to Gladstone that:

"No avowed Socialist won. The sum of the matter is that in England and Wales, Liberals and Labour - men hold 367 seats out of 495 i.e. a majority of 239, and there are only two cases in which we have any ground for complaint against the Labour people and one case in which they have just ground of complaint against us. . . Was there ever such a justification of a policy by results?"[182]

Furthermore, in arguing for the continuance of such an arrangement, he remarked that the pact had greatly improved Liberal relations with Labour M.P.'s, with the consequence that they were 'strongly favourable' to the new administration, only 7 being wholly reconcilable, and that he saw no reason to anticipate any change in their overall co-operativeness.[183]

A further significant feature of Cadbury's contemporary relations with the Liberal Party was his endorsement and propounding of specific causes, attempting to steer policy, and policy initiatives, in appropriate directions (see later). Whilst these were frequently expressed rather unspecifically, in helping, for example, 'Britain's underpaid' and 'suffering millions'. [184] one of the more permanent and consistent of these efforts was that promoting relations, almost clandestinely, with the leaders of the newly formed and increasingly powerful L.R.C. In 1900, for example, Cadbury forwarded contributions to Keir Hardie's 'Labour Leader', in support of a number of pamphlets discussing the labour question, with the accompanying caveat that, for optimum effectiveness, such donations should be kept anonymous.[185] Cadbury's biographer and former editor of the Cadbury 'Daily News, A. G. Gardiner, (1923) later described this increasing political interest in such groups as one analogous to the gradualistic approach pursued by the Webbs, in that Cadbury,

"saw in the new movement which developed into the Labour Representative Committee a real instrument for permeating Parliament with the thought and influence of Labour, and convinced of its utility, he gave it all the support in his power".[186]

Accordingly, Cadbury also approved of the Lib/Lab pact, suggesting to Keir Hardie in March 1903, that such an arrangement would enable Liberals such as him to work in tandem with the L.R.C., for the specific purposes of securing better housing conditions and a national scheme of Old Age Pensions.[187]

Indeed, in working in the pact's implementation, he illustrated his considerable influence with local parliamentary consituencies, (see later), a factor that had been recognised by the Liberal leadership as early as 1899,[188] Cadbury here illustrating that influence in agreeing to pay the legal expenses of a Labour candidate to oppose Austin Chamberlain in East Worcestershire.[189]

Furthermore, he observed that Wilson, the Liberal M.P. for the region's northern constituency, was 'coming round' to accepting Cadbury's arguments in favour of the arrangement.[190]

Cadbury had initially demonstrated his support for the forces of Labour by a donation of £500 to the Independent Labour Party (I.L.P.) in 1900, a donation the 'I.L.P. News' attributed not only to its anti-Boer War attitude, but also,

"largely because of Mr Cadbury's sympathy with our social aims".[191]

As with Jesse Herbert, Cadbury exercised a considerable degree of financial patronage in the pursuit of these aims, employing a Liberal political adviser and agent, Robert Waite, the Hon Sec. of the North Worcs. Liberal Council,[192] to liaise with the I.L.P./L.R.C.. Gardiner later indicated the considerable political influence that such an arrangement afforded in that Cadbury,

"through Mr Waite, was represented at the Trade Union Congress, the I.L.P. Conference and other gatherings, the aim always being not only to promote Labour representation, but to create a spirit of cooperation between Liberalism and the new political force that was coming into being".[193]

More specifically, Waite was responsible for arranging a meeting between Cadbury and the L.R.C. leader, Ramsay Macdonald, prior to the 1902, L.R.C. Annual Conference,[194] and in subsequent years assisted in the formation of local bodies promoting 'Direct Labour Representation',[195] in addition to aiding Labour candidates in certain Birmingham constituencies. One of the first of these came in the wake of the establishment of the 1903 pact, Waite becoming involved in negotiations with Macdonald, to secure the selection of James Holmes as Labour candidate for East Birmingham.[196] Waite was indeed successful

in these negotiations, and whilst Holmes was subsequently defeated at the 1906 election, he illustrated the potential potency of such arrangement, in reducing the Conservative majority from over 2000 to one of less than 600.[197]

Furthermore, the reciprocal nature of this relationship, ostensibly promoting the labour movement, was perhaps demonstrated by the willingness of the L.R.C. to display advertisement for Cadbury Bros. Ltd in its Annual Conference reports.[198]

However, whilst, in 1900, George Cadbury also contributed to I.L.P. election funds,[199] such support was somewhat qualified, his ultimate loyalties remaining with the Liberal Party. In October 1900, feeling his political allegiance under question, Cadbury wrote to Herbert Gladstone seeking to clarify his relationship with the I.L.P. Consequently, Cadbury explained that he was,

> *"most anxious that in no place should the I.L.P. run candidates in opposition to the Liberals and the help that I have given has only been where that has not been the case and any influence that I may have in the future may be exercised in that direction:.*[200]

Cadbury reiterated this standpoint six days later and, subsequently, whilst continuing to contribute to I.L.P./L.R.C. funds, maintained this sentiment, in January 1905 donated £50 for educational purposes,

> *"on the understanding that no part of the money is spent on triangular contests".*[201]

Indeed, this was a perspective which Cadbury maintained, by December, 1905, being so determined to avoid such an occurrence that he refused to contribute to I.L.P/L.R.C. central funds.[202] Consequently, it is possible to view such a political marriage as one, primarily, of electoral convenience, especially for the forces of 'New Liberalism'; this was a faction to which Cadbury essentially belonged, for despite his adherence to efficiency arguments, he was careful to distance himself from the Liberal Imperialists, believing they would baulk on the issue of really effective legislation on labour questions.[203]

Further, such patronage may also be interpreted as endangering the independence of the I.L.P/L.R.C., whilst, as indeed Herbert later observed, seeking to encourage and inculcate a more moderate political stance, to the ultimate benefit of the Liberal Party.

The success of this strategy may also be illustrated by the 1906 L.R.C. election manifesto, which Brand, 1964, observed, called for government action on the problems of housing, underfed schoolchildren and unemployment, whilst demanding a greater Labour presence in Parliament;[204] consequently this was a manifesto that adopted a stance close

to that of the Liberals, concentrating on developing a common practical policy on current issues rather than reflecting socialist theory.

Cadbury, whilst recognising the difficulties of achieving an electoral alliance as perhaps the 'most difficult' question of the day,[205] nevertheless later expressed his desire that such agreements form a permanent feature of the political landscape, i.e. in 1918 he wrote to Gardiner,

> *"I have for years urged the Birmingham Liberal Association to close its doors, and to re-open with a new title of 'Progressives'. It would then be possible for labour and middle class progressives to work together. I infinitely prefer the title 'Progressive' to that of 'Labour'.*[206]

Such an interpretation, linking the fortunes and aspirations of the working and middle classes, was one which displayed Cadbury's fundamental allegiance to economic orthodoxy and the preservation of the existing capitalist economic structure. Whilst he argued that within that order ameliorative measures should be taken, on grounds of both humanitarianism and 'efficiency', nevertheless, the boundaries of Cadbury's 'socialism' were severely limited. In practice this perspective bore echoes of the moderate Fabian policy of permeation, in encouraging the chief organs of the labour movement, the I.L.P./ L.R.C., to express their reform initiatives in forms palatable to vested business interests, the Liberal Party and Parliament itself; indeed, Cadbury himself expressed precisely these sentiments to Keir Hardie in December, 1904.[207]

Furthermore, Cadbury's perceptions of social justice were expressed in terms which denied any fundamental conflict of interest and inherent inequality in the existing economic order. Rather, any interpretations to this effect were dismissed as the result of a lack of informed opinion on the part of left wing protagonists, and ultimately led to the founding of Fircroft College as a mechanism for eradicating such class war perceptions, (see chapter 5).

In January 1904, Cadbury revealed such a standpoint to Herbert Gladstone, in commenting:

> *"Some of the Labour men though good hearted, from a lack of education take a very narrow view of things, which makes the course of men like Burns and Crooks increasingly difficult; they are both doing noble service in the interests of the poor of the country".*[208]

Moreover, despite such an, ostensibly, close and reciprocal relationship with the labour movement, certain contemporary socialist circles perceived the limited definition of the 'Social Revolution' through policies of permeation, criticising both protagonists within the I.L.P./L.R.C. and those such as Cadbury, who fuelled such a course of action.

The Socialist Labour Party, (S.L.P.) formed at the instigation of the Lib/Lab pact in August 1903 and in disillusionment with the gradualist, moderate, stance of the existing labour movement, was one such faction, in taking,

> *"the line that the bureaucracies of the L.R.C. and I.L.P. were anti-Marxists who were opposed to class struggle and revolutionary mass action".*[209]

In August 1905 the national S.L.P. organiser, James Stewart, made a direct attack against the political vacuousness and malleability of prominent L.R.C. figures, and those involved in their manipulation. Referring to the M. P. John Burns, Stewart commented,

> *"Mr George Cadbury, of chocolate fame, who admires all labour leaders, invited 'honest' John to Bournville, his 'model village' to speak to the people. Will Crooks, the 'Woolwich Wonder' as the capitalist press call him, was also asked down, went and conquered. Who will be next? Perhaps the readers of "The Socialist' don't know we have 'Socialism' in Bournville according to Cadbury. 'Well', say the I.L.P., 'it is always a step', but then he gives donations to their Election Fund, so they must boom his tad".*[210]

Similarly, Barnsby, 1989, has observed that this appraisal of Cadbury and Lib/Lab associates such as George Shann (see later), was shared by Hyndman of the Social Democratic Federation, (S.D.F.), who criticised such palliative efforts, rather than advocating the measures which would ensure the 'extirpation' of the working classes' economic and social distress.[211]

This perception was illustrated in both 1904 and 1905, as the S.L.P. mounted a sustained campaign denouncing the moderate forces prevalent within Birmingham's labour movement. In October 1904 'The Socialist' contained an article from W. F. Holiday, Secretary of the S.L.P. Birmingham Branch, describing an open air meeting in the city centre, the culmination of a week's political activism, and one that illustrated the ideological schism affecting the city's left-wing factions. Holliday observed:

> *"At Saturday's meeting we had some opposition - from members of the I.L.P., who stated that they believed the nearest way to attain the goal of Socialism was by getting it by reforms. A Clarionite also objected strongly to us preaching the 'Class War', he sapiently maintaining that there is no 'Class War'".*[212]

The S.L.P.'s campaign was also aimed at the Labour caucus on Birmingham City Council, attempting, Stewart claimed,

> *"to expose the Freaks, Frauds and Fakirs of which Birmingham can boast many".*[213]

Indeed, in a subsequent debate with the Birmingham Temperance Society, Stewart told his audience that they lived in a completely divided society and that the problems caused by alcohol were insignificant in comparison to the 'robbery perpetrated by the master class'.[214]

These S.L.P. actions were a sustained denouncement both of 'social evils', which, in concentrating on issues such as temperance, denied the underlying inequitable basis of capitalist society, and the manipulative nature and purpose of those such as Cadbury who exhorted the labour movement to adopt gradualist policies and propounded palliative measures of 'social reform'.

Moreover, elements of such a critical perspective were also evident within representatives of more 'centre-left' bodies. Certainly, Frank Spires, Secretary of the Birmingham I.L.P. had considerable reservations regarding attempts by Cadbury and others to organise local electoral Lib/Lab agreements. In January 1903 Spires had written to Ramsay Macdonald expressing his belief in the expediency of adopting a more strident rather than conciliatory tone. Ascribing the strength of Unionism in Birmingham to the 'flabby' weakness of the Liberal Party, he commented that a,

> *"Liberal or Liberal Labour man doesn't stand a ghost of a chance; but a series of vigorous contests by Socialists and Independent Labour men would command results which would astonish most people".*[215]

Indeed, in May he advised Keir Hardie that the position of the I.L.P. in Birmingham had never been stronger,[216] a significant factor in his reluctance to enter into any electoral arrangement with the Liberals, specifically in Cadbury's political homeland of East Worcestershire. In fact, Cadbury had already conceded that the L.R.C. wished to contest this constituency independently, and given an assurance to Hardie that if a Liberal stood, he would not contribute towards their election expenses.[217] Instead, Cadbury pursued a familiar line, in attempting to steer L.R.C. actions, in offering his financial support in favour of the adoption of Belcher as 'Labour' candidate, believing that this selection would also find approval amongst other Liberals;[248] neither was this an isolated intervention by Cadbury, being repeated in North Worcestershire, where, in an attempt to avoid splitting the anti Tory vote, he advised the I.L.P./L.R.C. not to stand against Wilson, the Liberal incumbent.[219]

In East Worcestershire, however, Cadbury's intervention went someway further than merely offering such 'advice', seeking to utilise the rising influence of the Nonconformist lobby to secure the nominee he desired; Cadbury, for example, sought to impress Belcher's qualities upon Spires, in remarking that he believed a 'strong character' was necessary for such a task, and that whilst the final decision was at Spires, 'full discretion', nevertheless adding that,

"I hope he will be a Christian man who can have the full support of the Free Churches. . . I feel so very much depends upon the character of the 50 Labour men in the house".[220]

Spires, however, regarded Belcher as far from the best candidate, preferring the 'locally know' and 'respected' Bruce Glasier, an opinion communicated to Hardie later the same month.[221]

This incident reflects Spires' increasing concern over Cadbury's interventions and his continued efforts to conclude an electoral alliance. In June, Spires expressed these concerns to Ramsay Macdonald, initially requesting, for the benefit of the L.R.C. as a whole, if there were any reasons why a Labour candidate should not stand in East Worcestershire.[222] Three days later, on the 5th, he reiterated his disapproval of Cadbury's influence, in commenting that,

"I am afraid Mr C. is trying to work the Liberal and Labour alliance in East Worcestershire, and this may lead to us throwing the matter up".[223]

Later in the month Spires again voiced his disapproval of these actions, this time to Hardie, in condemning, and refusing to comply with, Cadbury's sustained attempts to form such a pact.[224]

Subsequently, following a series of 'unsatisfactory' and 'indefinite' letters, Spires concluded that Cadbury had retracted his initial offer,[225] a conclusion similarly reached by others within the Birmingham labour movement,[226] including S. D. Shallard , Secretary of the Birmingham Socialist Centre.[227]

Clearly a significant degree of suspicion and mistrust surrounded these negotiations, which were, after all, undertaken before the official signing of the Lib/Lab pact. However, they do indicate that, certainly locally, leaders of the labour movement were extremely wary of the motives of potential Liberal patrons such as Cadbury. Furthermore, such a tendency were still evident two years later, labour leaders remaining convinced of the necessity of avoiding too close an association with the forces of Liberalism. In 1905 the L.R.C. Assistant Secretary, J. Middleton, for example, refused to allow Liberals to speak on 'L.R.C. platforms' in East Birmingham, remarking that:

"We have been created for the purpose of making a Labour Movement with a permanent organisation and with distinct principles",[228]

rather than a transient pressure group to be courted, diluted and absorbed by the emerging 'New Liberalism'.

Indeed such suspicions resulted in both a failure to conclude a Lib/Lab agreement

in East Worcestershire, the 1906 general election, following Cadbury's retraction, being contested solely between Liberal and Conservative candidates.[229]

Clearly, nationally and locally, George Cadbury exercised considerable and direct political influence on both the I.L.P./L.R.C. and the Liberal Party. Frequently claiming to represent an almost apolitical stance against 'social evils', he scorned more radical interpretations as ill-educated, whilst steadfastly patronising those political groupings who pursued policies maintaining the status quo, and whose prime concern was in making the existing social and economic structure more 'efficient'.

Furthermore, his influence was also exercised through other channels, one of the most significant being the press, and in particular, the 'Daily News'.

George Cadbury and the National Press

Lee, in 1974, has highlighted the problems 'New Liberalism' faced in propogating its message to a significant audience, in suggesting that, not only had the rise of 'new journalism' and the popular press of Harmsworth and others discouraged the discussion of 'serious' political debate, the number of Liberal Radical journals was rapidly declining.[230] Lee explains:

> *"In 1899 there were only three London Liberal morning papers. The 'Daily News' since 1896 had been the spokesman of Liberal Imperialism, and in November the 'Daily Chronicle' also became Imperialist. . . This left only the half - half penny 'Morning Leader' to hold the Radical line. The picture was only a little brighter in the evening press and in the provinces".*[231]

George Cadbury, who had earlier acquired interests in newspapers in the Birmingham area, was, according to A. G. Gardiner, acutely concerned that an alternative political vision was made more widely available, particularly with regard to the government's involvement with the Boer War.[232] Consequently, Gardiner observed, Cadbury felt so strongly,

> *"that he thought it was his duty to take some action outside the Birmingham sphere. He was impressed by the fact that there was no morning paper between London and Sheffield that was not devoted to justifying a war and embittered feeling against the Boers. He had at this time no interest in any paper outside Birmingham, and no thought of acquiring one. But as a temporary expedient for a special emergency he arranged with the 'Morning Leader' to pay for a special train to the north so that a paper which presented the views he held might be delivered in such towns as Northampton, Birmingham, Leicester, Nottingham and Sheffield".*[233]

This action, together with the perceived need for an adequate organ enabling the radical press to regain Liberalism's lost momentum,[274] was the precursor to the expansion

of Cadbury's influence through the purchase of national newspapers. As Koss, 1984, observed, such involvement became an increasing trait of prominent contemporary Nonconformist Liberals and, furthermore, was particularly discernible amongst industrial and commercial loyalists, who exercised proprietal rights responsibilities as a concomitant to their philanthropic endeavours; Cadbury's fellow Quaker, Joseph Rowntree, for example, purchased the 'Northern Echo' in 1903 and formed the North of England Newspaper Company,[235] funded by the Rowntree Social Service Trust.[236] He subsequently acquired the 'Speaker' in 1906, having founded the 'Nation' in 1907,[237] expressing the view that:

> *"the greatest danger to our national life arises from the power of selfish and unscrupulous wealth which influences public life through the press".*[238]

Lee has drawn clear parallels between the involvement of Rowntree and Cadbury, arguing that they both believed in utilising the press as a 'weapon' in the cause of social reform.[239] Wagner (1987), concurred with regard to Cadbury, arguing that his principal aim in such newspaper involvement lay in attempting to raise moral standards in public life, and in bringing a more informed and critical approach to the discussion of public affairs.[240] Such sentiments are indeed readily identifiable in Cadbury's observation to 'Daily News' editor, Gardiner, in February 1904, that the,

> *"churches have not preached ethical christianity, and we must try to do it and bring them up to a higher standard".*[241]

However, whilst not denying that such a stance, 'on behalf of suffering millions',[242] was a central platform of the Cadbury press, clearly this analysis omits a significant political dimension, i.e. in failing to recognise the potential influence of these newspapers as instruments to achieve political, ideological, objectives. Indeed, following his assistance to the 'Morning Leader' Cadbury had been approached by Lloyd George, in an effort to forge a new relationship between the Liberals and the radical press - an offer holding obvious appeal. Subsequently, both Cadbury and J. P. Thomasson agreed to contribute £20,000 towards the purchase of the 'Daily News', in an attempt to reverse its dwindling circulation and support of the Boer War.[243] However, the resultant syndicate was soon beset by insummountable problems. Accordingly, by December 1901, Thomasson decided to withdraw his financial support, being in,

> *"such fundamental disagreement with his fellow directors on questions of policy apart from the war, that he could not continue his connection with the enterprise".*[244]

For, whilst Lloyd George had declared that, in future the paper would adopt a

neutral line on the war,[245] its new priority, social reform, exposed the frailty of this proprietal alliance, Cadbury's new 'radical' perspectives, sharply contrasting with Thomasson's 'old Liberalism'.[246]

Furthermore, such divisions were exacerbated by Rosebery's Chesterfield speech, Cadbury admonishing the paper's editor, David Edwards, for not accepting Rosebery's 'conciliatory lines',[247] and stating that in future

> *"we must do all that we can to support him, and this we can do without retracting anything that we have conscientiously said".*[248]

Despite this, and a similar reposte to Lloyd George, urging him to exercise his influence on his 'Caernarvon crony', Edwards,[249] initially the paper pursued its critism of Rosebery, three of its five directors supporting the editor against Cadbury.[250]

Such actions led Cadbury to the conclusion that, policy divisions being so pronounced, the only effective resolution appeared to be replacing the existing directors with a single owner.[251] Whilst none of the the directors were prepared to undertake this role, by late December, Cadbury, although expressing reluctance to do so, was led 'step by step' to accept the responsibility of upholding 'New Liberalism' in the national daily press,[252] the only other such newspaper presenting this perspective, the 'Manchester Guardian', being confined to the north of England.[253]

Crucially, this acceptance, alongside the implementation of complementary and parallelling social, housing and educational initiatives, (see chapters 3 and 5) represented a significant break from the traditional Nonconformist, Quaker, and Cadbury approach to paternalism and philanthropy; i.e. being a move away from one essentially ad hoc and transient in nature, to one characterised by the establishment of larger scale, permanent platforms and mechanisms for the propagation of their social philosophy.

Indeed Cadbury subsequently embraced this philosophy with increasing enthusiasm, extending his influence with the purchase of the 'Morning Leader' and the 'Star' in 1910, to prevent them falling into Conservative hands.[254] Considering such vehicles as consider- ably more effective than alternatives such as charity, Cadbury sought to consolidate this position with the creation in 1912 of the Daily News Trust, enabling Cadbury to surrender his interests to younger members of his family,[255] whilst ensuring the paper maintained policies of which he approved, including, as the Trust Deed stated, the promotion of,

> *"such legislation as would tend to improve the lot of the poor and lessen the opportunities for the accumulation of wealth in the few hands".*[256]

Gardiner, appointed editor of the 'Daily News' in 1902,[259] has observed that

Cadbury took no other part in the conduct of the paper.[258] However, such participation would appear unnecessary, having installed a journalistic team sympathetic to his standpoint on matters of social policy. Moreover, through the Chesterfield incident, Cadbury had already indicated the lines the newspaper's reporting and editorial comment should follow.

Furthermore, Cadbury, in praising Gardiner's political independence, also expressed his expectation of the paper, in June 1902, in observing to Herbert Gladstone, that:

> *"There are rather difficult times for the Liberal Party, and I think you will see that our effort in the 'Daily News' is to consolidate it as much as possible, so that Liberal Imperialists and Independent Labour men may work together to serve their country".*[259]

This stance was echoed by the paper's political correspondent, Henry Massingham, who observed that he, too, subscribed to the Fabian permeation policy, allied to the need to make the occasional 'firm stand' for a particular, specific, cause.[265]

Consequently, the 'Daily News' came to publicly proclaim many social, moral and political sentiments advocated by its owner. This tendency was evident almost immediately, when, in, March 1902, shortly after Cadbury had assumed sole proprietal interest, the paper announced an 'enlarged format', informing its readers that its policy would be to advocate 'Progress' and 'Liberty', and 'full' and 'thorough' discussion of issues relating to social reform and the religious and financial worlds.[261]

Subsequently, the earliest editions did indeed reflect these concerns, whilst specifically calling, in the name of 'social justice', for the state to accept and execute its responsibilities to provide 'average' working men with the opportunity to live in 'reasonable' health and comfort, i.e. in providing a land tenure programme.[262]

The newspaper continued to express similar sentiments, most noticeably in late 1902, as it gave it support to numerous campaigns, all broadly aligned to the Nonconformist/Liberal platform. The first of these, in December, 1902, were protests against the Education Bill[263] and the organisation of the London Religious census,[264] the result of which galvanised these Dissenters into adopting a higher public profile; indeed Koss has commented that these campaigns held a considerable significance as the 'Daily News' became radical Nonconformist's 'semi-official organ'.[265]

As a corollary, the paper made overtures to the working class, particularly through its calls for legislative enactments, (see later), and became the leading advocate of a Lib/Lab electoral pact,[266] on occasions being prepared to support L.R.C. candidates in opposition to 'suspect' Liberals of somewhat dubious allegiance to party policy. This, for example, occurred during the 1903 by-election at Barnard Castle in County Durham,[267]

where the Liberal candidate was the subject of some controversy regarding his commitment to Free Trade, whilst the L.R.C. candidate, Arthur Henderson, was comparatively attractive, having acted as agent to the previous incumbent, the Liberal M.P. Sir Joseph Pease.[268]

Cadbury fully concurred with each of these policies, correctly believing such a sagacious 'National Righteousness' stance would increase the paper's popular standing.[269] Gardiner, for example, later observed that, even under joint ownership, the adoption of new policy stances on, for example, war and employment conditions, had created a 'profound effect' in reviving the spirit of Liberalism in the country.[270] This revival became even more pronounced after the subsequent takeover, illustrated, in May 1902, by Cadbury's claim that the circulation had increased so dramatically that its permanent existence, under threat, three months previously, was now completely assured.[271]

Furthermore, Cadbury had no doubts regarding the influence of the 'Daily News', and its ability to serve the Liberal cause effectively, a sentiment he expressed to Herbert Gladstone in May, 1904;[272] it was also a reiteration of his remarks four months earlier, when Cadbury had commented:

> *"You will be glad to know that the 'Daily News' has made marvellous headway as to circulation, and I believe we can double the circulation of any 1d Liberal morning newspaper in the United Kingdom. The paper will undoubtedly be a powerful factor at the next election".*[273]

This evaluation was borne out by the active encouragement, mobilisation and support it provided during this election, representing the zenith of a five year campaign, the paper losing no opportunity to castigate the Tory administration, and urging a Lib/Lab alliance. Such an approach was evident as early as August 1903, when, during the Gladstone-MacDonald negotiations, the paper carried articles on 'The Betrayal of Labour: How the Tories Have Cheated on Labour Questions',[274] arguing that the Conservatives could no longer be looked on as friends of the working classes, and extolling the L.R.C. and the benefits of a Liberal Radical/Labour alliance.[275]

However, it is the actions of the 'Daily News' immediately prior to the 1906 election which witnessed the most fulsome and sustained manifestation of these sentiments. Throughout December 1905, the paper ran a series of articles highlighting the stark policy differences between the Liberals and Tories. Under the title, 'The Issue', the paper expressed these differences as a choice between Social Reform and Tariff Reform,[276] remarking, during the first of these, on the 11th of the month, that,

> *"The new Government confronts an England ripe for reform. The long years of Tory Government have been distinguished by a blindness to the forces of change . . .Today the problem of the race takes first place in the concern of the statesman.*

Large dreams of Imperial supremacy prove fantastic and empty when confronted with the procession of the unemployed, the physical deterioration of the children, the bleak old age of the poor. The party which definitely accepts the burden of Social Reform. . . and is prepared to drive through any vested interest in its determination to safeguard an Imperial race at home, is the party to whom the twentieth century belongs".[277]

Such support was compounded and complemented by the circulation of a 'vast' number of leaflets exhorting the Liberal cause, the 'Daily News' claiming to have sold 400,00 of these pamphlets,[278] an electoral device Cadbury believed to be far more effective than alternatives such as the holding of public meetings.[279]

The extent of the paper's campaign was further increased by the provision of free election leaflets to the I.L.P./ L.R.C.,[280] whilst also running a series of adverts for 'Daily News Loaves', claiming sales of these had reached '20,000' daily.[281] Quoting the Unionist M.P. Jesse Collings in predicting that the loaves would cost the Unionist thousands of votes, the adverts - 'To Win That Seat' claimed that,

"The 'Daily News' Pamphlets are the Liberal candidate's best ammunition for the coming General Election".[282]

Furthermore, the paper's commitment to this cause is underlined by the political activism displayed by its journalists. Emy, 1973, has remarked that this was a particularly observable outcome of the 1906 election, in that:

"Practically the whole of the Daily News team entered Parliament, Masterman, Belloc, Lehmann, Whitwell, Wilson and Chiozza Money, and they were accompanied by a considerable group of journalists and newspaper proprietors".[283]

Throughout January each 'Daily News' edition carried an election update, under the banner of 'Echoes from Constituencies; Liberal Candidates and their Prospects', before reporting, on the 20th, that the election was becoming a Liberal 'Tide of Triumph'.(284)

As with the N.F.C.C., the 'Daily News' activism had played no small part in imbuing Parliament with Liberal/Nonconformist ethics. Moreover, ostensibly at least the paper subsequently continued to offer its support to the labour movement. In February 1906 it reported favourably on the 6th L.R.C. Annual Conference, eulogising that its 'intelligent', 'hardy' and 'resolute' delegates represented a party that both knew its objectives and how to achieve them.[285]

However, the paper continued to emphasise the role of Liberalism, past and present, in sympathising and acting in working class interests. Also in February the 'Life and Labour - A Daily Record' column, reminded its readers of the 19th century legislative support the Liberal Party had given the Trade Union Movement.

Furthermore, whilst from the outset of Cadbury's ownership the 'Daily News' had propounded the Lib/Lab cause, the extent to which this represented political expediency, in furtherance of the Liberal Party, is one of interpretation.

In 1904 Cadbury commented that, to cement this pact and promote a mutuality of interests, the paper had introduced an 'educative' daily labour column.[286] In effect, this action was a continuation and extension of the paper's attempt to make direct appeals to the working classes. In December 1902 Cadbury wrote to L.R.C. M.P. John Burns:

> *"I should like you to come into touch with Mr. Henry Wm. Smith the Editor of the 'Labour Notes' columns in the 'Daily News'-. I think this column may be of greater service in the future than in the past to the cause of Labour".*[287]

However, the conciliatory and moderate tone of this column is indicated, for example, by its text three days later. Considering the theme of 'harmonious' working relationships, it commented extremely favourably on a scheme operating at Cadburys Bournville Works. The article remarked that the firm possessed the confidence of its employees towards the scheme whose,

> *"objects are to encourage suggestions from the work people for their own well being, and for the benefit of the business, and prizes are awarded half-yearly from £10 downwards, for such suggestions adopted".*[288]

Explaining that the company had accepted and implemented 280 of 466 ideas, during an initial six months period, the column created an impression of industrial harmony, social justice, benevolence and equality,commenting that:

> *"On the one hand, messers Cadbury considered that they have been well repaid, and on the other the work people regard the scheme, apart from the possible money advantage, as a means of improving their own condition and promoting good general feeling throughout the works".*[289]

However, these representations of a mutuality of interest between capital and labour and between the anti-Tory forces in particular, were not digested without criticism, even from within the gradualist Labour group. Indeed, during 1905 the relationship between the 'Daily News' and the I.L.P./L.R.C. became particularly acrimonious.

In June the L.R.C. Assistant Secretary wrote to Robert Waite complaining about the paper's failure to publicise a demonstration and march on London of the 'Leicester Unemployed', attributing such an attitude to personal spite.[290] This lack of action reveals a certain ambivalence by Gardiner and others to the independent aspirations of the working classes. This ambivalence, revealing an extremely uneasy allegiance, was displayed more overtly immediately prior to the Fulham by-election in October. On the eve of this election it had published a letter accusing the Labour candidate, Joseph Clark, of having Tory

associations and, in being persuaded to stand, amounting to, in effect, almost a second Tory candidate.[291]

Compounding such impressions of an anti-L.R.C. stance, the paper commented:

> *"Mr. Harold Spender, the Progressive Candidate is working very hard. The fact that there is a Labour candidate in the field makes the issue very doubtful".*[292]

These actions provoked an immediate and angry response, Clark calling the accusations 'monstrous', in entirely repudiating such claims.[293] Nevertheless, the 'Daily News' continued without apparent remorse, ignoring the L.R.C. candidate on the day of the election and blaming Clark's own political party for the subsequent Tory victory, i.e. in observing,

> *"it seems obvious that this three cornered fight should have been avoided. Throughout the affair Mr. Harold Spender the Progressive candidate acted with a sincere desire to promote peace. He consulted the Labour group from the beginning, and they ought in our judgement, to have declared their intentions in a frank and friendly letter".*[294]

This episode is also significant in revealing the fragility of this system of alliances, the L.R.C. secretary, Ramsay MacDonald, endorsing Clark's repudiation and criticising the 'Daily News' 'besmirching' treatment of him. MacDonald subsequently complained to Gardiner that the,

> *"accusation that whenever a Labour Candidate opposes a Liberal the former is only a marionette dancing to Tory prompting and financed by Tory money, is getting so common that some notice will have to be taken of it".*[295]

Furthermore, MacDonald continued to air his indignance, threatening legal action against both the author of the accusations, Holford Knight, and the 'Daily News', and commenting that,

> *"the 'Daily News' of course refuses to publish my letter. It is a canting, hypocritical paper and we cannot expect fair play from it . . . I should certainly include the 'Daily News' in the action because these newspapers that hold out the hand of fellowship in order that they may be near us to stab us in the back with a dagger held in the left hand should be exposed".*[296]

Such incidents brought into question the commitment of the 'Daily News' to the labour movement, and revealed the paper's ultimate loyalty to the Liberals. These perceptions were compounded by Cadbury's refusal, in 1906, to sell the paper to the L.R.C.,[297] a refusal that contributed to calls for a more committed Labour organ and which

eventually resulted, in 1911/12, in the appearance of the 'Daily Herald' as a national newspaper.[296]

The 'Daily News', was, therefore, instrumental in propounding the cause of 'New Liberalism' and policies of a gradualistic nature. Furthermore, the paper also exerted a considerable influence in moulding public opinion on social reform, serving an important and pivotal role in the various ad hoc reforms expounded by George and Elizabeth Cadbury, in particular, the more prominent of which will now be examined.

The Cadburys' Social Crusades

Disregarding the Cadburys' more ambitious and wide ranging initiatives in housing and education, (see chapters 3 and 5 respectively), in essence these social crusades can be regarded as two specific campaigns, namely for the introduction of minimum wages in those industries termed 'sweated trades' and the adoption of a state age old pensions' scheme.

George Cadbury had initially expressed his interest in this latter issue in early 1899, in proposing and financing the last of a series of lectures by Charles Booth.[299] In effect, the publicity and public approval these conferences aroused revived the issue of non-contributory pensions, an issue that, following the report of the Rothschild Committee, many political comment-ators thought was effectively dead.[300]

Three days before the Birmingham conference, the Colonial Secretary, Joseph Chamberlain, having declined Cadbury's invitation, nevertheless expressed an interest in the outcome, and, in acknowledging the momentum these meetings had created, announced the appointment of a Select Committee of the House Commons, to investigate the issue of the 'Aged Deserving Poor'.[301]

Whilst Chamberlain, in a letter to the conference organisers, observed that there were marked differences of opinion on how best to deal with what was commonly perceived as a social 'evil',[302] the meeting itself, held at the Severn Street Adult School,[303] an institute long associated with the Cadburys, (see chapter 5), followed the same course as the earlier gatherings at Newcastle,[304] and Bristol,[305]

"giving general and hearty support to the principles of Mr. Booth's scheme".[306]

Subsequently the National Committee of Organised Labour for the Promotion of Old Age Pensions, (N.C.O.L.), claimed that their work and these lectures had stimulated favourable public opinion across all divisions of class and politics, in January l900 issuing their manifesto, itself a reflection of Booth's main principles, proposing a universal non-contributory scheme, clearly distanced from the existing Poor Law agencies.[307]

In March 1900, Chamberlain's Select Committee Report was considered by a Parliamentary Departmental Committee. This report gave projected estimates of the national cost of a number of schemes, with retirement ages commencing at 65, 70 and 75, [308] whose projections of cost to the National Exchequer led Chamberlain to adopt a far less radical an inexpensive option than Booth had propounded. However, even this alternative was not pursued,[309] clearly signalling a Tory stalemate on this issue, a lack of activity which, particularly in the wake of the 1906 election, spurred the N.C.O.L. to further action in promoting its cause, and one actively embraced by members of the Cadbury group; this was, for example, reflected, in 1903, in the introduction of a scheme offering pensions, and death and sickness benefit at their 'Daily News'.[310]

Moreover, 'The Times' observed in September 1907, that George Cadbury, with the support of his eldest son, Edward, was the financial mainstay of the National Old Age Pensions League, and reported Cadbury's views on the type of scheme best adopted. They commented that, in calling for a great increase in the present government's labour legislation, he nevertheless,

> *"declared himself opposed to the contributory scheme of old-age pensions recently advanced in the Press. He objected on the grounds that it would shut out the hardest-worked class in the country, namely the wives of men of the labouring class".*[311]

Furthermore, campaigning under the banner of 'A Free State Pension of Five Shillings A Week', a somewhat diluted measure that became legislation in 1908, both Edward and Cadbury's political agent, Robert Waite, illustrated the involvement of the wider Cadbury group in this campaign, holding prominent offices in the League, acting as Treasurer and Honourary Secretary, respectivley.[312] Similarly, Elizabeth Cadbury also embraced this cause, taking the opportunity provided by her 1906 N.U.W.W. Presidential speech to do so publicly,[313] (see later).

An overall view was presented by George Cadbury in indicating his evaluation of the eventual legislation to his nephew, Barrow, in September 1909: he commented:

> *"The Balance Sheet of the Old Age Pensions may be of some little interest to put in the family book. It will be interesting as showing that members of the family had so large a share in passing perhaps the most beneficent Act that is on the Statute Book".*[314]

The importance of these donations, George and Edward contributing over £150 during 1908/9,[315] together with others from the Cadbury group, were indeed recognised within the league, and received acknowledgment from the Birmingham/Midland Counties Secretary, William Dalley, in his comments for its Final Annual Report, in 1909.[316]

Whilst, subsequently, the initial terms of the legislation were rather less embracing than the non-contributory New Zealand proposals sought by Booth in 1898,[317] the statute at least represented a total departure from the Poor Law and its deterrent principles.[318] For Cadbury this legislation also represented and illustrated his newly adopted social philosophy, i.e. the acceptance of the limitations of private benevolence and the concomitant need for state intervention in areas of social welfare. It was also indicative of his belief in the necessity of establishing permanent regulatory agencies to dispense welfare provision, a belief which became increasingly evident as the Cadburys expanded their participation in the social policy arena.

However, whilst, ostensibly, this campaign may be linked with improving the standard of living and ameliorating poverty amongst the working classes, it may also be interpreted as indicative of the extent to which Cadbury embraced the philosophy propounded by the Social Darwinist/'national efficiency' lobby, i.e. by those such as Lord Rosebery and the Fabian Society. Fabian Tract 108, for example, placed much emphasis on similar issues regarding the physical condition of the working classes, in calling for the abolition of the 'sweated trades', and for action over the 'Housing Question'.[319]

Moreover, such a campaign may be perceived as circumventing the arguments of certain socialists and trade unionists and,

> *"could be seen as one means of preventing the polarisation between capital and labour which appeared to be developing in Britain in the early years of the 20th century".*[320]

Hay, 1977, cites the activities of another Cadbury influenced organisation, the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, as being particularly noticeable in relation to both perspectives. The body, for example, containing Harrison Barrow, a close friend of the Cadburys, was perhaps one of the most consistent and active proponents of social welfare legislation. asserting that unemployed men represented a waste of the nation's assets.[321]

Furthermore, another member, W. J. Ashley, Professor of Commerce at Birmingham University, and also a close acquaintance of the Cadburys, argued that, since such legislation would almost certainly be enacted very shortly, it was in the 'public interest' that employers' views, even if biased, be consulted prior to, and during the passing of such laws.[322]

Another underlying motive of the N.C.O.L. lay in its overlap with 'national efficiency' arguments. Indeed, in March 1899, Sidney Webb spoke in favour of adopting a non-contributory scheme as a matter of social expediency, in remarking that,

> *"no amount of private charity could provide old age pensions for 500,000 persons".*[323]

Consequently, he argued that the government should embrace such principles, freeing the labouring classes from the false, short term, economies of thrift, declaring that,

> *"the first duty of a man and his wife was not to save but to spend for the benefit of the family which had to be kept in a state of efficiency".*[324]

Within the business community, the Cadburys were not alone in expressing interest in 'efficiency' arguments. Indeed their actions demonstrated a significant feature of the early 20th century Liberal Party, that of the widespread patronage provided by leading Nonconformist, (and Quaker), industrialists, including W. H. Lever, W. P. Hartley and Arnold Rowntree, in the pursuit of 'social reform'.[325] Moreover this programme was embraced both by those who subscribed to the newly aired doctrines of enlightened mass production, such as the 'heavy' industrialists Kitson and Furness, and within the group Emy, 1973, has termed as 'paternalists',[326] i.e. those such as Cadbury and Rowntree.

Indeed, Samuel's 1902 restatement of Liberal principles, advocating an ethical and positive use of the law by government, in removing iniquities from the labour/employment market and, as testament to the influence of the Webbs, arguing that an efficient industrial system required the incentive provided by rising wages,[327] was mirrored by beliefs held and practised at Bournville. A.G. Gardiner, for example, commented that Cadbury believed it was,

> *"not only bad ethics but bad business to economise on Labour. He held that it paid his firm to devote both attention and money to securing the safety, the wealth and even the pleasure of the workers employed".*[328]

Moreover, the philosophical link with Kitson, Furness and 'efficiency' arguments, is equally discernible in the 1920' rationalisation processes later undertaken at Bournville,[329] reflecting the twin axioms central to Cadbury Bros' business outlook, i.e.:

> *"Let wages be handsome, but save Labour whenever possible".*[330]

These standpoints are perhaps more easily observable in the campaign for the abolition of the 'sweated trades'. Concern over the payment in occupations such as tailoring, lace finishing, and chain making,[331] had been evident throughout the latter Victorian years, and had been the subject of Royal Commissions in 1898 and 1899,[332] reports which were somewhat ineffective, Sir Charles Dilke unsuccessfully introducing a Bill, annually from 1898, with the object of securing wage boards.[333]

Cadbury's 'Daily News' had, as with the other campaigns, entered this debate, arguing that the inactivity of the Tory government was 'directly responsible' for these

'shameless' conditions of employment;[334] indeed this was a concern which was evident across a wide spectrum of political opinion, and again may be connected to contemporary pre-occupations with 'national efficiency' and the eradication of 'wastage'. Bythell, 1978, for example, has suggested that,

> *"at a time of sharpening political differences, it offered one issue on which the tariff reformers, imperialists, social radicals, trade unionists, and socialists could work together both inside and outside Parliament. And with the advent of the Liberal government late in 1905, pressure for action built up immediately".*[335]

Specific Cadbury involvement with calls for minimum wage legislation and the abolition of such trades took two principal forms, both of which received the benefit of publicity engineered by the 'Daily News'.

Within a month of the Liberal victory, the paper had announced its intention to organise an exhibition exposing working conditions in the 'sweated trades'.[336] Citing as its inspiration a similar exhibition in Berlin in 1904, an event repeated in January 1906,[337] the paper declared its main objective as quickening and cultivating public opinion, to press for effective and 'speedy' parliamentary legislation.[338]

To facilitate this objective the 'Daily News' proprietors asked Richard Mudie-Smith to organise the event[339] and to liaise with the Exhibition Council. This body illustrates the considerable strength underlying this movement, including both George and Edward Cadbury, alongside their associate, George Shann, representatives from the newspaper itself, in addition to such high profile figures as Keir Hardie and Will Crooks from the L.R.C., G. B. Shaw and H. G. Wells from the Fabian Society, and the Reverend J. Scott Lidgett and Dr John Clifford from the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches.[340]

Furthermore, to complement the exhibition, the 'Daily News' announced measures enabling a sustained campaign to be mounted, by the formation and funding of a committee specifically to pursue the aim of abolishing the practice of 'sweating'.[341] The resultant National Anti-Sweating League, (N.A.S.L), again contained a significant number of associates from within the Cadburys' group. George acting as President, Gardiner chairing its Executive Committee, whilst Shann held the post of Honourary Secretary.[342]

With a membership that boasted the Fabians, Wells and the Webbs as Vice Presidents,[343] the League was prominent in organising exhibitions revealing the 'evil' conditions in such industries. Additionally this publicity was compounded by public addresses from such eminent national figures as G. B. Shaw, who spoke on 'The Social Principle of the Minimum Wage'.[344]

The exhibition, entirely funded by Cadbury, opened at the Queen's Hall, London, in May 1906, Gardiner explaining that its purpose,

"was not primarily an appeal to the sense of pity but to the sense of justice. The aim was to create such a public opinion that the evils would no longer be tolerated. They wanted the public to realise that sweating was not only an injustice to the individual but a menace to the State and a crime to society".[345]

The N.A.S.L. subsequently claimed that the exhibition had indeed aroused such opinion in this matter and declared its intention to continue these forms of propaganda in pursuance of its legislative objectives. Indeed, over the next three years the League's activities embraced public pronouncements, further exhibitions, and demonstrations seeking parliamentary action.

By April 1907 the League was anticipating victory in this campaign, its inaugural Annual Meeting claiming that the organisation had placed the whole question of a minimum wage at the forefront of public opinion, whilst establishing the argument on a firm scientific basis.[346]

This optimism was reiterated later the same month, when Herbert Raphael, M.P., predicted the imminent success of the campaign in suggesting that M.P.s,

"irrespective of party, would join in adopting a system of wage boards in the country".[347]

Privately Gardiner displayed this optimism to Herbert Gladstone in May 1907, commenting that he considered the exhibitions to have fully revealed the 'evils' within such occupations, the only question to be finalised being that of securing the most practical, effective, remedy.[348]

Following a further national demonstration on the eve of Parliament's reassembly, the League continued its efforts throughout 1908, its Annual Meeting in July being urged to press the government to pass their measure during the current session,[349] the matter being adopted as a Private Member's Bill by the M.P. George Moulin.[350]

Subsequently, the Report of the Select Committee in 1908, coinciding with Constance Smith's 'The Case for Wage Boards', added to this pressure, in advocating age fixing boards for the most degraded 'sweated trades'.[351] Under such mounting and widening support, much of which was mobilised by the N.A.S.L., this campaign was finally rewarded in 1909, with the the Trades Boards Bill, a measure which became operative the following January,[352] and which introduced a minimum wage for those employed in the wholesale tailoring, chain making, cardboard box making and machine lace industries;[353] this success was, however, considered rather guardedly by the League, which regarded such legislation as only a first step in abolishing these practices, consistently calling for the extension of this principle to other, appropriate, trades.[354]

Additionally, the N.A.S.L. implemented measures to enhance the effectiveness of such legislation, establishing funds to instruct workers regarding the work of Trades Boards,

in 1909,[355] and subsequently attempting to raise £1,000 annually for such purposes;[356] an amount later increased following the extension of the initial legislation during 1913/4.[357]

Furthermore, the League was also at pains to publicise their 'instrumental' role in passing legislation which they subsequently claimed had endowed hundreds and thousands of workers with a minimum wage.[318] Indeed, contemporary perceptions of the work of the N.A.S.L. substantiate their view of the importance of this issue. In 1907, 'The Friend' observed that a recent exhibition of children in the 'sweated trades' had reminded the public of the very great disadvantages under which they worked.[359]

Similarly, 'Reynold's Newspaper': 'The Organ of Democracy, Labour and Progress', observed that, in selecting Queen's Hall, in the West End of London, as its venue, the original 'Daily News' exhibition had been 'brilliantly inspired'[360] i.e. in contrasting such wealth with the conditions endured by the East-End 'sweated' workers.

Numerous voluntary agencies with which the Cadburys were closely associated also aired and endorsed the sentiments and activities of the N.A.S.L.. In 1906 during her N.U.W.W. Presidential Address, for example, Elizabeth Cadbury commented that this exhibition had 'dragged to life' the iniquities of the 'sweated' system.[361] Subsequently, another such organisation, the Bournville Women's Guild, (B.W.G.), illustrated a sympathetic stance regarding this issue, claiming that much,

> *"good had been done by the Sweated Industries Exhibition and by the recent Trades Boards Act . . . further legislation is urgently needed and it can only come by persistent effort on the part of all the women of the country".*[362]

Throughout, the N.A.S.L. established and retained a close affiliation to the official political organs of the labour movement. Keir Hardie, for example, served as a Vice President,[563] whilst the league also pursued regular contact with the L.R.C.'s leadership,[364] contacting Macdonald in June 1907 and offering to display a 'sweated' exhibition in the House of Commons.[365]

Indeed, the first Annual Meeting of the League claimed that this particular issue was receiving the cross-party support of Conservatives, Liberals, and, that,

> *"with the exception of one member, the Labour party was entirely with them".*[366]

In September 1907, as the government moved towards legislative action on this and the O.A.P. question, George Cadbury also signalled his approval of their general approach, in a statement which again reveals the conservative nature of his 'radicalism'. Whilst calling for further labour legislation, he nevertheless firmly defended the Liberal Party's record as being one of steady progress. This was, he argued, despite being,

"attacked on one hand by Conservative land owners and wealthy Jews, yet unfortunately virulently assailed on the other hand by extreme Socialists, who did not want gradual ameliorative measures, such as the Government was passing, but wanted things to go from bad to worse until there was a revolution".[367]

Cadbury's tone, advocating moderacy, and a conciliatory approach, was echoed by Dame Elizabeth Cadbury, who whilst arguing in favour of wages boards, nevertheless observed that the real panacea lay, not purely in economic/political change, manifested materialistically, but through 'union' and 'fellowship' in a resurgence of the individual's 'spiritual and mystical' capabilities.[368]

These sentiments were echoed by the S.O.F., their Committee on Social Questions arguing in 1910 that employers and their work people should be bound by ties of mutual responsibility; this was a duty that, for the former, entailed providing a living wage and 'reasonably permanent' employment conditions, as part of establishing and maintaining a human relationship between employer and employee[369] and, revealing, what they termed helping to break down 'false class barriers'.[370]

Indeed, as with the previous Cadbury involvements examined, the commitment to social reform was again confined within strictly defined and accepted economic parameters. Such definitions are identifiable even from the outset of this campaign, when Mudie Smith, the Organising Secretary of the Queen's Hall exhibition, explicitly communicated the sympathetic views of the Executive Council towards those 'often reluctant' manufacturers working within a system,

"which by its very nature involves suppression somewhere: where there is a war there must be suffering and death".[371]

Moreover, in explaining that the exhibition's purpose was to seek mitigation through regulation rather than abolish such 'evils',[372] he revealed a stance, which although critical of the commercial structure, nevertheless regarded it as an inviolable, permanent, feature of British economic organisation.

Such a viewpoint was further illustrated at its 1906 October Conference, by the League's refusal to hear a motion permitting the N.A.S.L.,

"to the full Socialist policy as a remedy for sweating".[373]

Furthermore, the same meeting displayed widespread support for Ben Tillett's arguments in favour of Arbitration Courts, and, perhaps more pertinently, for Pember-Reeve's opinion that there,

"was a better way of settling industrial disputes, than by the old-fashioned strikes".[374]

However, amongst the more radical left, the work of the N.A.S.L./'Daily News' collaboration was perceived as, at best futile, and more fundamentally, as a mere diversive distraction from the cause of egalitarian socialism. The 'Labour Leader', for example was highly critical of the 1906 exhibition, one significantly opened by Princess Henry of Battenberg.[375] Specifically, the journal argued that this exhibition achieved nothing new, in merely publicising 'long familiar' details, and in evaluation commented that,

> *"it is questionable whether a fashionable function adorned over by royalty will do anything to right the wrongs of the poor people".*[376]

Similarly, 'The Socialist' adopted an extremely critical line in arguing that such conditions remained irremediable under the existing class structure and these and similar exhibitions merely made their appeal to,

> *"philanthropic or sentimental members of the Bourgoisie . . . to feed their curiosity and love of sensation by gazing upon these victims of that system upon which they themselves are fattening. Here they may gratify their 'charitable' self-righteousness - expressing feelings of horror, with all the warmth permitted by good manners as they feast their eyes upon the pale faces and the deft fingers of the workers . . .*
> *As they settle down to a meal of a dozen courses these fashionable philanthropists may piously sigh over the horrors they have seen and murmur by way of 'grace before meat', the comfortable assurance of the 'Daily News', that No 'immediate remedy is possible'. "*[377]

Even within the ranks of the more moderate labour movement, concern was expressed over the panacea offered by the wage boards, both Ramsay Macdonald's expressing scepticism about this 'solution', Mrs Macdonald regarding this issue as secondary to the more fundamental problem of adult male unemployment.[378]

Indeed, perceptions of such legislation as 'middle-class alternatives to Socialism',[379] and as mere palliatives within the existing political and economic framework, are compounded by the messages emanating from the N.A.S.L. At their October 1906 Conference, Sidney Webb delivered an address on, 'The Economics of the Minimum Wage'. Espousing the arguments laid out in his 'national efficiency' programme, Webb suggested that the consequence of pursing this policy would be to force employers to select workers on the basis of their merits rather than their cheapness but,

> *"that all experience as well as all theory showed that the effect of a legal minimum wage would be to increase productivity".*[380]

Pertinently, this was a theme which also underlay much of the later Cadbury rationalisation programme, further evidence that the fully embraced this economic practice and philosophy, towards which their social reform was principally directed.

Accompanying this theme were other contemporary concerns which the Cadburys

embraced and which became central to the success of their economic aims; these were themes which included public health/hygiene, together with those of a more contentious nature. In 1905, for example, the N.U.W.W. Annual General meeting, with Elizabeth Cadbury President for its Birmingham Branch,[381] had devoted itself to 'many pressing subjects' of sanitary and social reform.[382] Indeed such emphasis on physical regeneration as a remedy for the nation's ills, parallelling the philosophy, if not the language, of the contemporary eugenicists, became increasingly evident in the voluntary and municipal work undertaken by Dame Elizabeth, (see chapter 4).

Ostensibly, the 1906 Parliament, the consequence of a coalescing of Free Church, Liberal and Labour views, represented a forum for the implementation of a 'common' ideological and moral conception of social reform. However, within influential Nonconformist/Liberal Party circles, including that of the Cadburys, programmes were being engineered to steer legislation towards the interest of welfare capitalism and social utility rather than adopting any more fundamental egalitarian representation.

Consequently, the Cadburys' political support for the Liberal 'Social Reform', both through direct personal involvement and vehicles such as the N.F.C.C., the 'Daily News', the N.C.O.L., the N.A.S.L., together with voluntary agencies such as the N.U.W.W., was a significant departure from Victorian paternalism. Linking gradualism, conciliation and 'national efficiency' arguments in support of their social philosophies, these actions represented the exertion of considerable political influence on both anti-Tory parties. Moreover, such actions demonstrated that those with newly acquired and realistic aspirations of accession to power redefined notions of social involvement and, indeed, the whole structure of social welfare, within strictly delineated, limited, parameters.

Furthermore, this acceptance of a more active, prominent, public profile, was complemented by similar developments within Birmingham. Such involvements were a further indication of the restructuring of paternalistic philanthropy, representing a substantial ideological shift in the structure and organisation of welfare provision, in that, rather than focusing upon ad hoc campaigns and solutions, they set in place permanent platforms to realise the 'efficiency' philosophy's objectives.

One of the earliest of these focused upon George Cadbury's preoccupation with the 'Housing Question'. In 1908, 'The Times' paraphrased his view that this issue was,

> *"more to the front than ever. A nation's greatness depended on the character of its people; and life in the back street and dreary suburb tended to lessen the vigour of children who were responsible for the nation's future".*[383]

Such beliefs had led to the founding of the Bournville Village Trust at the turn of the century. This development, together with the Cadburys' parallelling and complementary rise in civic involvement will be considered in chapter 3.

CHAPTER 3
THE CADBURYS AND THE POLITICAL ARENA:

EMBRACING A HIGHER PROFILE

By 1910, through the exercise of their, primarily, covert influence, including the bestowal of financial patronage, the Cadbury family, and George Cadbury in particular, had been successful in securing a number of specific political objectives, including the election of the Liberal Party in 1906, and certain subsequent legislative measures. Furthermore, whilst these measures may be regarded as, perhaps, in the case of Old Age Pensions, 'backward looking'[1] or, as with the implementation of trade boards, as piecemeal, partial stepping stones towards Webb's 'National Minimum', these measures may be regarded as broadly representing the Cadbury endorsement of state 'welfare philanthropy', and the desire to replace ad hoc mechanisms with permanent social agencies.

However, to obtain a more complete understanding of the Cadbury social, political, and economic philosophy, and the extent of their role and influence in the pursuit of particular social objectives, it is necessary to consider a further set of Cadbury responses to the 'social question', ones which, furthermore, contrasted sharply with the essentially covert involvement discussed earlier.

These responses, acting as a concomitant to and parallelling the measures already analysed, were characterised by a willingness to overtly embrace specific causes and, on occasion, political office, in the search for a coherent and consistent programme. These responses displayed the group's embracement of 'New Liberalism' with its reinterpretation of paternalism, whilst also illustrating the Cadburys' adoption of an increasingly higher political profile and were exemplified by Elizabeth Cadbury's municipal activism and membership of a number of influential voluntary agencies and pressure groups, (see later and chapter 4).

In aggregate the causes advocated both embraced and addressed the concerns raised by both earlier and contemporary social investigators such as Mearns and Booth, together with those of the wide political lobby clamouring for 'national efficiency'. Further substantiated by the increasing volume of 'scientific' evidence regarding these themes, including the findings of numerous Royal Commissions into the living conditions of the working classes, the resulting Cadbury panaceas displayed an outlook which contained a multi-faceted emphasis, embracing moral, religious and economic dimensions in the pursuit of 'social justice'.

Manifested through a plethora of social reforming agencies, the subsequent activities of the Cadburys were directed towards the 'problem of the urban poor', solutions for which, initially, became focussed on the interrelated panaceas of improve health and

living conditions. However, underpinning such a focus were perceptions and actions which increasingly priortised the role of parenthood and championed the 'cult of the child', the ramifications of such perspectives and their political interpretation and definition having direct consequences for the lives of the working class.

The sphere of operation of these schemes was, initially, confined to the Birmingham/East Worcestershire region, although, as with the causes discussed in chapter 2, this boundary was frequently extended to encompass the national arena, through collaboration with, or by stimulating the formation of, agencies espousing similar philosophies.

One of the earliest and most prominent of these was the development which, in 1900 became the Bournville Village Trust[2] (B.V.T.) a development which George Cadbury clearly felt represented a solution to the 'urban problem', one with which he was especially concerned. In 1906 Cadbury gave full expression to this concern, in commenting that he considered children raised in the 'back streets' of cities to be 'handicapped', spiritually, mentally and physically, and that consequently the one,

> *"great object of my life has been to improve the housing condition of the people of this country".*[3]

The role of the B.V.T. in pursuing this apparent prerequisite of effective social reform, together with the underlying philosophy it represented, and its influence upon similar national initiatives, is therefore an appropriate starting point for an analysis of the Cadbury response to the 'problem of the urban poor'.

THE BOURNVILLE VILLAGE TRUST

Whilst the purchase of land for housing development at Bournville was begun in the early 1890's[4] the Cadburys had revealed their interest in this area of social provision almost from the moment of resiting their factory in 1879, in erecting 24 workmen's cottages.[5] This initiative, which was later to form the 'nucleus' of the Bournville Village development, was accompanied by the acquisition of land in the nearby areas of Stirchley and Northfield,[6] actions indicative of expansionist intentions in such provision. Indeed, by 1891 Institutes had been constructed at both sites, providing 'harmless' social recreation, such as a skittle-alley at Northfield, together with arrangements for both adult and child education.[7]

As such, these early Cadbury initiatives in the sphere of building development closely resembled the character and ostensible purpose of Adult Schools, a movement with which the Cadbury family had been particularly associated in Birmingham throughout the latter part of the 19th century, (see chapter 5). Indeed, in 1909, Elizabeth Cadbury acknowledged the significance of this interelationship, in observing that her husband attributed his interest in housing reform to his understanding of living conditions in the city, a knowledge gained through fifty years of Adult School teaching.[8]

Furthermore, in 1906, George Cadbury, in a similar acknowledgement, highlighted his subsequent awareness of the lack of recreational facilities for such 'sober, Christian men', as being instrumental in his decision to pursue the Bournville development,[9] an observation with which his biographer, A. G. Gardiner, later concurred, in commenting that Cadbury's concerns had embraced the realms of both physical and moral health.[10]

Consequently, the development was one which sought to offer an 'alternative', integrated and coherent ameliorative to a number of interrelated social problems, an analysis exemplified by the 1936 Bournville Lantern Lecture's comment that Cadbury had come,

> *"to the conclusion that bad housing is at the root of more evils than any other disability from which the community suffers. Intemperance, crime and other associated habits, the stunting of moral, intellectual and physical growth, were all strands in a knot which, he believed, could most readily be disentangled through the betterment of housing conditions. Of what use were education, the advance of medical science, the improvements of social amenities, if great masses of people were hampered and harassed by the conditions in which they lived",*[11] *(see later and chapter 5).*

Consequently, priortising housing as the cornerstone of social reform, George Cadbury, in 1893, in an extension of the Northfield 'prototypes', began purchasing land for the development of Bournville,[12] building work beginning two years later.[13]

Initially Cadbury let land on leases of 999 years, arrangements being made to find mortgage capital, charged at rates accordingly to the buyer's deposit,[14] 2½% being charged for those who made an initial payment amounting to half of the purchase price, 3% being levied otherwise.[15] However, from its very inception Cadbury exerted considerable influence on the development, both through a contractual stipulation that no one person could erect more than 4 houses,[16] and in exercising strict control over the type of constructions permissible, through the issuing of compulsory building guidelines.[17] A. G. Gardiner observed, for example, that whilst Cadbury employed and consulted 'competent professional advice', his own influence nevertheless predominated, in retaining control over the main lies of its development, including the planning of roads, the grouping of trees, and determining the height of houses and width of pavements.[18]

Furthermore, each construction was required to meet the scrutiny and approval of the Estate Architect,[19] such close monitoring being largely undertaken by W. A. Harvey, formally until 1907 and thereafter on a consultative basis.[20] Accordingly, Harvey fulfilling his obligation as Cadbury's representative, laid great emphasis on sanitary and public health facilities, in aiming,

> *"to provide a sound structure of good materials, adequately provided with means of heating, water supplies, drainage and storage space".*[21]

Pursuing these aims, construction continued rapidly throughout the closing years of the decade, the annual number of houses being erected ranging from 2 to 50.[22] Indeed, by the turn of the century the development occupied 330 acres,[23] and constituted 420 houses and shops,[24] including 370 dwellings, with a population of 2000.[25]

However, whilst such a rapidly burgeoning development might demonstrate the Bournville public's favourable perception, and reception, of his ideals, George Cadbury became unconvinced that these regulations were stringent enough to secure his objectives on an effective permanent basis. Consequently, to safeguard these aims, and to provide an efficient bar to the possibility of property speculation,[26] in December 1900 the original scheme was amended.[27] Accordingly, Cadbury instigating a number of radical changes, including handing the estate over to a trust,[28] and replacing the opportunity to purchase property with a leasehold system.[29] Correspondingly, as the 1936 Lantern Lecture remarked, the Trust subsequently adopted a policy of,

> *"building to rent, and in this way the majority of the houses in the original village were built".*[30]

Under this newly instigated system of dual control, i.e. that of an officially sanctioned and supervised programme of rent-only dwellings, the estate maintained both

its development and its ostensible purpose, the subsequent Trust Deed reiterating the objective of alleviating the 'evils' arising from insanitary and insufficient working class living accommodation.[31]

Indeed, the formation of the Trust quickened the expansionist momentum, W. A. Harvey reporting in 1906 that the estate had increased to embrace over 450 acres, the number of houses having approximately doubled to nearly 600.[32]

Illustrating the continuing expanding influence of the Cadburys, this organisation was both the first and the central agency in a series of permanent bodies they established, facilitated and encouraged, to oversee and assist the development of Bournville. These concomitants to the Trust took the form of Public Utility Societies, which operated on co-partnership share issue principles,[33] and undertook the greater part of the resulting expansion.

The first of these 'satellites', Bournville Tenants Ltd., was founded in 1907,[34] and was later followed by Weoley Hill Ltd. in 1914, the Bournville Works Housing Society in 1919, and the Woodlands' Housing Society in 1922/3,[35] their apparent 'success' being illustrated by the rapid expansion of their scale of operations. By 1911, for example, the initial body, Bournville Tenants Ltd, through its shareholding membership of 261, had subscribed £8,850 and borrowed £20,680, towards the eventual construction of 145 houses;[36] moreover, this was a scale of construction which continued throughout the first third of the century when, in essence, the development was completed, by 1922, for example, the estate comprising 1,750 dwellings, covering an area of 900 acres.[37]

Moreover, far from diminishing George Cadbury's influence, the Trust Deed ensured that this became firmly and permanently entrenched, control of the estate remaining firmly vested in the hands of the family. The Deed, for example, named 12 family members, including George and Elizabeth, as 'Non-Official Trustees', managing and controlling the charity.[38] Although at its formation 4 of the Cadbury children, Henry Tyler, Laurence John, George Norman and Egbert, were too young to exercise this power, by 1914 this control was being wholly exercised, each having attained the age of majority and becoming fully fledged Trustees.[39]

Furthermore, this concentration of interest was secured in perpetuity by a clause stipulating that all subsequent trustees were to be elected by the existing and continuing ones, with the exception of the 2nd, 4th and 6th vacancies, who were to be appointed by the S.O.F. the Birmingham City Council and the District Council King's Norton and Northfield respectively,[40] the latter was subsequently replaced by the University of Birmingham, following the expansion of the city with the creation of Greater Birmingham, in 1909.[41]

Under this new arrangement, the body of Trustees administered the estate, being required to discharge a wide range of powers, including purchasing land, borrowing

money and making by-laws.[42] Furthermore, this supervision was one which ensured the continuance of Cadbury's initial principles, in that the Trust was additionally empowered and required to control, regulate, and sanction constructions which all tended,

> *"in the opinion of the Trustees to the health mental, moral and physical welfare of their tenants and the families of their tenants".*[43]

The Trust Deed identified such constructions as including not only domestic dwellings, but also embracing buildings used for recreational, educational and physiological functions such as libraries, halls, schools, baths, gymnasiums and hospitals.[44] Through this definition and interpretation therefore, and despite its declaration that the organisation was to be both unsectarian and non-political,[45] the formation of the Trust represented the establishment of a permanent platform for initiatives imbued with underlying social, political, moral, and religious purposes. Indeed, whilst the Deed itself carried the caveat that influences undermining these aims were to be 'rigidly excluded',[46] subsequent actions clearly indicated the developments, and the Trustees', role as a mechanism for inculcating a number of ideas central to Nonconformist and Quaker beliefs.

Moreover, such an influence was operative from the Trust's inception, with the S.O.F's acceptance of the role of future Trustee, in the pursuance of Cadbury's 'noble aims', in March 1901.[47] This interest rapidly became more overtly manifested, finding expression in the erection of a Friends' Meeting House in 1904, a construction which remained the developments sole religious centre throughout the formative years of the estate.[48] This official predominance of the Quaker faith remained unchallenged throughout this period, the Anglican parish of Bournville being formed as late as 1915, with its church finally consecrated ten years later.[49]

Such an influence was reinforced by the appointment of a Quaker, J. H. Barlow as the Trust's Secretary, a position he occupied for over twenty years,[50] in supervising the operation and expansion of the site. Additionally, the post required Barlow to act as the Trust's official representative with outside agencies, (see later), a role in which he demonstrated his close alignment with both the Cadbury reinterpretation of paternalism, and the necessary corollary of adopting a higher public profile in the sphere of social and religious service.

Within Birmingham, Barlow's acceptance of this higher profile was manifested through his gradually increasing activism, including holding office as the Secretary of the Birmingham Common Good Trust, and serving as a Justice of the Peace, with particular regard to the Children's Court,[51] a responsibility similar undertaken by George Cadbury's niece-in-law, Mrs. Barrow Cadbury, one of the first two female magistrates appointed in the city.[52] Moreover, mirroring a Cadbury trait discussed later in the chapter, Barlow's activism

also revealed a more ambitious and national dimension, as he steadily embraced the higher echelons of the Quaker movement, becoming Clerk of the Yearly Meetings between 1913-19 and chairing the All Friends' Conference in 1920.[53]

Central to this Cadbury/Barlow axis was their shared commitment to the Temperance movement,[54] a stance indicative of a perspective which underlay, and found expression in, the development of Bournville. Indeed, not only did the Trust prioritise the provision of amenities offering a complete contrast to the 'distractions' of the cities, and in particular, to the social 'evil' of intemperance, such a Nonconformist ideal was reinforced by general practice within the estate, i.e. by means of a Deed stipulation requiring the Trustees to observe Cadbury's desires in ensuring that,

> *"the sale, distribution or consumption of intoxicating liquor shall be entirely suppressed if such suppression does not in the opinion of the Trustees lead to greater evils".*[55]

Whilst this clause did not completely ban alcohol, its extremely restrictive nature certainly acted as considerable discouragement to its consumption. Moreover, his clause was reinforced by the additional requirements that any such commodity had to be unanimously endorsed, in writing, by all of the Trustees, and that, furthermore, any resulting profits were to be deployed in,

> *"securing for the village community recreation and counter-attractions to the liquor trade as ordinarily conducted".*[56]

Subsequently, as the temperance issue gained a higher political profile following the Conservative government's legislation easing licensing regulations, the Cadburys offered their own local resistance, reinforcing the B.V.T. stipulations for Bournville employees by pamphlets such as 'Suggested Rules of Health', distributed to every youth under 21.[57] Compiled by George Cadbury, these 'suggestions' exhorted workers to avoid tobacco and 'all drugs as far as possible', including alcoholic liquors.[58]

Similarly, the Trust's role as a mechanism for the dissemination and propagation of Cadbury ideals/principles also found practical expression through the estate's planning policy. Consistent with the founder's belief in a 'natural', 'unsullied' environment, the design of the dwellings was strictly controlled,[59] and consequently emphasised the provision of fresh air, light and the avoidance of overcrowding, features which both revealed and reflected an awareness of, and close alignment with, public health arguments being propounded by many others expressing interest in this field, (see later).

The B.V.T.'s formal commitment to these beliefs is illustrated by the official restrictions the body placed on the number of dwellings constructed per acre, initially limited to 7[60] and only slightly increased to 10 by 1921;[61] similarly Bournville Tenants Ltd.

only allowed 11 building per acre, a stark contrast to the 56 permissible under the statutory 'model' by-laws.[62]

Moreover, a concomitant principle, that of the provision of space within the estate, was reinforced through another of the Deed's conditions, guaranteeing, 'as far as possible'. 'ample gardens', in that no dwelling was to occupy more than a quarter of its total site,[63] with the entire development have areas designated for public parks and allotments.[64]

Indeed, this later provision was a manifestation of a related Cadbury belief, that of the benefits obtainable through horticulture and outdoor activities; the Trust Deed itself emphasised this point, in stressing Cadbury's desire that factory workers should receive opportunities for the ostensibly healthful and natural pursuit of cultivating the soil.[65]

However, these benefits, of an unquantifiable, spiritual nature, were not the only attributes claimed for this provision, subsequent analyses citing economic and physiological arguments in their praise of the scheme (see later).

With regard to the former, for example, the resulting garden produce quickly came to be regarded as of considerable financial value, one favourable analyst in 1901 claiming that on average such goods furnished 'at least" 2s.6d. each week, thereby substantially reducing the real rental of the cheapest properties to 3 shillings' whilst providing healthier and cheaper recreation than that obtainable in towns.[66]

In serving this two-fold purpose the 'garden produce' argument was, in part, a further reflection of Cadbury's new interpretation and expression of paternalism, in that represented a rejection of short term temporary amelioration, such as charitable contributions. Rather, new initiatives were required to be implemented and administered as commercially viable ventures, as the Secretary of the B.V.T. observed in 1922, Cadbury's intention being that such an organisation ought to 'be more than self supporting'.[67]

This perspective was emphasised by the Bournville Lantern Lecture in 1936, which stressed that the object of the scheme was far from merely philanthropic, Cadbury's aim being that the development should yield an annual return of 4% on the capital invested.[68] Indeed this was an approach which was operative from its outset, facilitating a rise in the Trust's net profits from £2,500 in 1901 to nearly £6,000 ten years later.[69]

Perhaps anticipating this 'success' and subsequent claims that the estate represented another experiment in capitalist landlordship, Cadbury had ensured, through the Deed, that all resulting profits were to be at the disposal of the Trust,[70] an arrangement which provided funds for the improvement and extension of the estate,[71] whilst ostensibly, pre-emptying accusations of personal gain (see later).

Unsurprisingly, J. H. Barlow subscribed to this argument, eulogising that the development remained free from direct capitalist interest; rather, it represented the direct opposite of a 'benevolent autocracy', in that residents were free to leave when and if they wished.[72]

Such an analysis, however, avoids the considerable covert influence Cadbury and his fellow Trustees exercised and encouraged through the Foundation Deed and the general principles which regulated the development. This influence is perhaps best exemplified by the Deed's declaration that the estate was to be 'non-political' in nature,[73] whilst in practice encouraging tenants to participate in a capitalist venture, and to regard themselves as holding both an individual and collective interest in the commercial success of the development, factors which clearly mitigated against such claims.

Whilst, for example, the Deed stated it was George Cadbury's wish to alleviate the 'evil' living conditions of 'large numbers of the working classes',[74] even from the estate's inception, Bournville's populace had been determined by the utilisation of a pragmatic tacit selection procedure to redefine this category. Indeed, such a practice was recognised in Elizabeth Cadbury's subsequent recollection that many of the estate's first inhabitants were members of her husband's Bristol Street Adult School.[75]

Moreover, the inherent selectivity of Bournville was reinforced by the very nature of the accommodation available and the accompanying financial stipulations, with the consequence that the initial tenants, as Atkins, 1989, has observed,

> *"would all have been described as thrifty working men, who could afford to take out a mortgage. . . the sort of resident Cadbury hoped to attract".*[76]

Indeed, such an agenda was apparent from the Trust's private census in 1901, which reported that 41.2% of the residents were Bournville Works' employees, and almost half of the households contained either skilled tradesmen, (36%) or white collar workers, (13.3%)[77] findings which were hardly consistent with George Cadbury's claim that the development was to benefit 'the working classes', including, by definition, the most socio-economic disadvantaged within such a categorisation.

Furthermore, this was no temporary circumstance, as the tendency to house Bournville Works' employees, despite the Trust's contrary protestations, was not only continued, but subsequently increased, by 1936, accounting for half of the estate's populace.[78]

Moreover, Birmingham's Medical Officer of Health, John Robertson, subsequently applauded the practicability of this selectivity. Robertson, for example, argued that schemes such as Bournville were inappropriate for all, and would by efficacious only be recognising, but effectively ignoring, the existence and plight of an inner city 'social residue', one beyond the reach of such ameliorative measures. Speaking in 1926, Robertson suggested, for example, that it,

> *"would be useless to take the careless slum dweller and put them in Bournville. . . The right thing to do is build Bournvilles and let the people*

come out into the Bournvilles themselves and you will find that, gradually, the self-respecting dwellers among the slums of Birmingham will come out in large numbers if you can produce Bournvilles for them".[79]

From its very inception then, the populace of Bournville was both largely well known to the founder and his principal Trustees, and, equally pertinently, exhibited empathetic behavioural patterns and political beliefs; equally, they were employed in full time, frequently upper-working class occupations, a significant number of whom worked within Cadbury Brothers' factory.

This group, typically already susceptible to such persuasion and possessing aspirations not fully realised by their existing circumstances, were encouraged through the organisational structure and the prevailing social mores of Bournville, to adopt a favourable, compliant and non-radical attitude towards the Cadbury' version of welfare capitalism, one which perceived their own 'success' as being directly related and aligned to the fortunes of the venture itself.

Furthermore, the impact of this model of social engineering had implications and repercussions far beyond the confines of the B.V.T. (see later). This was also readily evident within Birmingham, since the development's essential behavioural and moral tenets were replicated at practices at Cadbury Bros' Bournville Works; this was an impact which correspondingly increased as these tenets were disseminated to a considerably increased workforce, one which expanded from 300 in 1879, to almost ten times this number, 2,685, as it became a private limited company in 1899, and approximately 6,000 when public liability status was adopted in 1912.[80]

The consequent implementation of a structured and coherent programme, emphasising the health and well-being of the worker, has been favourably viewed as reflecting the paternalist's new interpretation of social duty; adherents of such a perception consequently argued that essentially this interpretation was one which required the employer to regard the,

"personal welfare of their workers to be inseparable from the most efficient utilisation of labour, and saw labour relations as being more than the buying and selling of a commodity called labour".[81]

For the Bournville workforce this belief manifested itself through the encouragement of physical training, the development and fostering of team spirit and the apparent exercise of self government through bodies such as Work Councils, (see chapter 5).

However, such an ostensibly altruistic philosophy, increasingly pursued by both Cadbury and other Liberal Party business philanthropists, including Lever and Rowntree, also held benefits for employers, i.e. in encouraging a physically fit, 'efficient' and dependant work-force, in receipt of 'beneficent' employment policies which tended to draw

such workers 'irretrievably' towards the firm and its perspectives.[82]

Indeed George Cadbury readily recognised the advantages to employers of pursuing such a philosophy, commenting that he believed that,

> *"nothing pays a manufacturer better than to do all he can to promote the health, mental and physical of his work people".*[83]

Such a perception, mirroring the national debate, increasingly led to an interest in factory "efficiency' and received further impetus in 1906, with the publication, of 'Women's Work and Wages'. The authors, who included George Cadbury's son Edward, and George Shann, expressed beliefs which were consistent with the latter's involvement in the 'sweated trades' debate (see chapter 1); i.e. propounding the adoption of a more radical, yet essentially capitalist, national economic strategy, requiring employees, through not necessarily the government, to recognise their moral responsibility for their workers.[84]

Consequently, for example, although the objectives they recommended included the more equitable distribution of both opportunity and wealth,[85] the writers, despite their involve-ment with the 'sweated trades' movement, remained unconvinced of the success of legislative palliatives such as the enforcement of a minimum wage.[86] Rather, the authors whilst acknowledging the wastefulness of the existing system of production for profit,[87] suggested that an effective social and industrial policy was which possessed some more obvious sense of mutual advantage. This, they believed, could be perhaps best achieved through the encouraging of trade union membership,[88] rather than embracing industrial unions and the far more fundamental and extensive changes suggested by the syndicalists and others of the more radical political left.

Furthermore, the writers sought to highlight the complementary relation between the economic efficiency of the industrial unit and the happiness and welfare of the worker.[89] In particular they stressed the importance of the provision of workers' clubs in this socialisation process,[90] and their role in rousing the 'sense of duty' necessary for efficiency,[91] and of course in effectively countering the claims of alternative economic systems. This interrelation, they argued for example, notwithstanding the requirements for a 'decent' living wage, provided the key to national economic success, for,

> *"if the two could be recognised as inseparable, factory discipline might become a potent educational instrument, and no mean factor in the raising and building up of a more efficient industrial class".*[92]

This discipline was reinforced by the messages disseminated through the educational programmes provided both by the Cadburys and those agents with which they were closely associated, such as the Birmingham Women's Settlement, mechanisms

which were particularly important in the socialisation of young women, (see chapter 5).

Moreover, such exercises in social engineering, both at the Bournville Works and within the B.V.T., were in accord with George Cadbury's gradualist perspective; this was a stance he had revealed in 1895, in arguing that the newly enfranchised middle classes should exercise a wider political responsibility when casting their votes,

> *"not for selfish ends, not for mere party purpose only but for the good of the community at large".*[93]

However, Cadbury's interpretation of this 'good' was one which was careful to uphold the dominant capitalist economic ideology, in arguing, for example, against 'undue haste' in nationalising industry.[94] Furthermore, such gradualist sentiments received general support from his Liberal Party audience, who praised Cadbury's actions in attempting to,

> *"break down the barriers of class and privilege".*[95]

Indeed, George Cadbury consistently promoted the believe that such 'barriers' were in fact false, being perpetuated and stirred through the antagonistic fostering of class feeling,[96] a perspective central to the Cadburys' social philosophy. Correspondingly, this argument, was one to which Elizabeth Cadbury also adhered, commenting in 1924, for example, that a continuation of such perceptions would result in the destruction of conceptions of 'Citizenship',[97] and, invoking a moralistic tone, were utterly against the spirit of Jesus Christ.[98]

Furthermore, she extended and developed such criticisms of those not sharing her own particular perspectives, in arguing that whilst political groupings were useful in many ways, they also presented a potential danger to society; specifically Cadbury commented that these groupings,

> *"can become harmful if they tend to accentuate unduly difference of opinion or to generate suspicion or bitterness in consequence of variety of occupation, or position in the social scale".*[99]

Ostensibly, the Bournville development was a reflection of these Fabianesque aims, the estate's architect specifically referring to the Trust Deed and its social objectives, in observing that,

> *"one the most prominent ideals in the scheme. . . is. . . 'that all classes may live in kindly neighbourliness' and the amalgamations of the factory-worker and the brain-worker in the same district is catered for as being expressly desirable".*[100]

However, this attempt at social cohesion was not one which received universal accord either within Birmingham or, indeed, Bournville itself. In 1902, for example, there were objections from existing leaseholders to the building of additional small cottages providing a further and greater influx from the city.[101] Moreover, whilst the Trustees rejected such objections, reiterating their intention to offer low rental accommodation for all classes, with weekly charges varying from 4s. 6d. to 12s.[102] even the B.V.T. retrospectively conceded that, in reality, this gradualist, conciliatory, and moderate aim was not attainable, such costs being rather higher than the 'average' working class family could afford.[103]

Indeed the image of an integrated, 'classless', socially cohesive unit, was further undermined by contemporary protests against the rental charges, and accompanying accusations in the local press. In particular, the 'Birmingham Daily Mail', expressed the view that the Trustees' motives were primarily commercial, suggesting that there was,

"more business than philanthropy at Bournville".[104]

Such an accusation that the development was of far less altruistic nature than might other-wise appear was later specifically repudiated by George Cadbury, both in public in 1907 and again, privately, in 1918, in writing to his future biographer A. G. Gardiner, Cadbury dismissing any accusations that the development had been undertaken with personal profit in mind.[105] Indeed, Cadbury was extremely sensitive to accusations of personal gain, in 1907 offering £1,000 to anyone who could prove that he or his family made any money from the B.V.T. Published in the 'Birmingham Daily Mail', under the title 'A Challenge to Slanderers', Cadbury strongly refuted these allegations, adopting an extremely moral and religious one in arguing that such a practice would render 'nugatory' his Christian social work and that, furthermore, he would prosecute any future perpetrators of similar rumours.[106]

Gardiner, himself was more circumspect, later conceding that the rental charges were, in part, a reflection of the developments dual purpose, in providing a viable industrial model for the nation's future, Consequently,he argued Cadbury's,

"*abstract desire to give an object lesson in housing, was therefore, reinforced by the immediate need of saving the industrial experiment from disaster".*[107]

More immediately, J. H. Barlow responded to the 'Birmingham Daily Mail's' allegations the following day, the 26th of February, 1902, reiterating that the organisation operated on a non-profit making basis, its accounts having to satisfy the annual scrutiny of the Charity Commissioners.[108]

However, the accompanying accusation, in suggesting that the majority of the properties were beyond the means of most working men,[109] evidently touched a nerve

amongst the local inhabitants, numerous subsequent correspondents in turn echoing and denouncing these claims over the following fortnight.

In essence, their disagreement revolved around two of the developments central claims, the validity of the economies provided by the garden produce, together with its appropriateness or otherwise as a model for further estates.

This first point was also addressed by Barlow, extolling the contribution such produce made towards the tenants' economic viability. Specifically he argued that some households earning as little as 20s. a week found that it was cheaper to pay 6s.6d. for such benefit, rather than 4s. for accommodation elsewhere without gardens,[110] an assertion that prompted two further Bournville inhabitants to enter the debate, in immediately and virulently rebuking such a perception.[111]

Whilst a subsequent meeting of the estate's villagers passed a resolution of 'unbounded thanks' to George Cadbury,[112] clearly there were some Bournville claims that were not universally endorsed. Further letters for example, stressed that a significant number of residents were employed within Birmingham and did not return home until seven in the evening, and consequently could not earn the £6 10s. Barlow claimed the gardens produced.[113]

Furthermore, several correspondents cast doubt on the efficacy of Bournville as a potential panacea for the nation's housing problem; the original letter, for example, prompted the comment that it,

> *"should do something to correct the erroneous ideas which have been so industriously circulated in all the newspapers for a long time past, to the effect that the conditions of life at Bournville offer a solution to the housing of the poor problem. House rent on the Bournville estate is perfectly prohibitive to the class of working people which housing problems seek to benefit. It is quite a delusion to suppose the house rent is particularly low . . . to speak of these conditions as affording a solution of the housing of the poor problem is the most preposterous rubbish, and after all that has been said on the subject, it is time some saner news were circulated'.*[114]

This point was reiterated by further correspondents, in turn arguing that the rent was in fact far higher than the 5s.6d. frequently cited, and that, consequently, the estate resident was more typically a small manufacturer or manager of works,[115] rather than an ex slum dweller from Birmingham; (1923) indeed, these were perceptions in accord with the previously mentioned findings, (see earlier), arguments which eventually led to Barlow conceding that only half the houses were let at rents of less than 7sh. a week.[116]

Furthermore, the provision of rented accommodation principally aimed at this sector of the working populace was a trend which the estate continued. By 1923, for example, of 440 houses let by the Trust, only 25 were at the lowest weekly rent of 6sh., another 120 being in the 6sh. to 7s. 6d. range, a further 122 priced between 7s. 6d. to

8s. 6d., whilst the remaining 173 were charged between 8s.6d. and 12s 6d.[117]

Viewed from this perspective, the Bournville development, both because of its emphasis upon viable capitalism and the typical resident it consequently encouraged, could hardly be said to be satisfying its proclaimed purpose of providing homes for those suffering the 'evils' of the inner city.

Moreover, whilst other interpretations have observed that Bournville developed in tandem with, rather then ahead of, the gradual extension of municipal activity within Birmingham, within a framework that represented a fusing of traditional philanthropic, charitable, measures and those of 20th century bureaucracy,[118] the estate's structure was one which, at least partly lends itself to Hopkins', (1989), explanation of the relatively high degree of class co-operation within the city. Contrasting the industrialisation process in Leeds, Manchester, Newcastle and Birmingham, Hopkins noted the comparative lack of conflict and antagonism in the latter,[119] attributing such a phenomena to processes of,

> *"social control practiced by the middle classes in such fields as those of education, religion and leisure (which) conditioned the working classes into an acceptance of the capitalist work ethic".*[120]

Certainly these factors were dominant in the Bournville social programme, and were reinforced by the rent-only arrangements which facilitated, controlled and managed this expression of new paternalism. Whilst George Cadbury distanced himself from the notion that he exercised any great influence over the Bournville inhabitants, in observing that half were not his employees, and were, consequently, independent from the firm,[121] this is an analysis which overlooks both the overt and covert behavioural codes expected within the estate, (see chapter 5) factors which ensured that whilst his,

> *"employees not only enjoyed his welfare, they had to suffer his prejudices. The chief of these were no married women, no drink and no betting".*[122]

Furthermore, Cadbury's 'radical' image was not universally endorsed by those of the political left. Whilst, as discussed in chapter 2, George Cadbury had courted the favour of the I.L.P. and the L.R.C., other perceptions from the left were wholly dismissive of his denial of class warfare, perceiving the Bournville development and its subsequent propaganda potential as politically, economically and socially divisive, (see later).

However, the Trust itself was neither reluctant nor slow to proclaim itself a successful and beneficent venture for the Bournville inhabitants. In 1904, for example, J. H. Barlow claimed that the development represented a concrete example of a housing decentralis-ation policy,[123] and highlighted its positive effect upon mortality rates. This was a particularly noteworthy feature of the estate, he argued, explaining that Bournville's death

rate, at 8.8 per 1,000 was far lower than that in the relatively wealthy and middle class areas of Edgbaston and Harborne, and less than half the inner city level of 19.9 within Birmingham.[124]

Two years later, J. A. Harvey further endorsed the estate he had helped develop with his appraisal that,

> *"it would be stating its claims at the lowest to say that it stands as an example of what a village of the future may be, a village of healthy homes amid pleasant surroundings, where fresh air is abundant and beauty present, and where are secured to its people by an administration cooperative in nature numerous benefits which under present conditions are denied them elsewhere.*[125]

Such claims were given greater substantiation as the development progressed and more detailed statistical evidence accrued. In 1910, the Trust published 'A Ten Year Record' of the B.V.T., a study in which Barlow used comparative data from Bournville, and both the urban district and inner city of Birmingham. Whilst concern was expressed over the relatively low birth rate within Bournville, 16.8 as opposed to 24.7 and 22.5 respectively, both the death and infant mortality rates were further indications of the 'success' of the estate in illustrating the 'exceptionally good health of its inhabitants'.[126]

Indeed, these figures offered incontrovertible evidence of the beneficial aspects attaching to the development, in that the death rate, at 5.6 per 1,000, was almost a third of that within the city, (16.1) and nearly half that of the urban district, (10.3) whilst the infant mortality rate bore a similarly favourable comparison, at 68.0, as against 121.4 and 92.0 respectively.[127] Moreover, the developments adherents claimed that this was not a temporary advance, the 1921 B.V.T. Council Year Book reported these trends as continuing throughout next decade, claiming such evidence provided an 'emphatic testimony' to the ideas underpinning the estate's development.[128]

This favourable analysis was continued and reinforced by Barlow, in alluding to the 'secondary' benefits of Bournville, measurement and medical inspection of the estate's school children indicating,

> *"conclusively the physical superiority of Bournville children to those living under less favourable conditions".*[129]

Such evidence, whilst ostensibly illustrating the 'success' of this housing experiment, in establishing a temperate, healthy, politically moderate, working class populace in Bournville, inculcated and imbued with values applauding the virtues of common interest capitalism, was, also a reflection of George Cadbury's wider political purpose in founding such a development. In particular, the estate demonstrated Cadbury's growing interest in and involvement with the contemporary 'national efficiency' debate;

indeed this was a point he had recognised even from the Trust's foundation,[130] and represented an objective which he reiterated in 1906, in observing that,

> *"it would be a lamentable mistake to herd people together in localities other than those they now occupy, thereby creating more slums . . . Our main object is to develop the physique of the nation. . ."*[131]

Moreover, Whitehouse, in 1901, in indicating Bournville's potential role as a model for housing reform, had summarised the widespread concern over this issue, in arguing that it was,

> *"daily becoming more widely recognised as one of the most urgent of the social problems now waiting to be solved. It is a question which directly affects our national well being, and it would be difficult to over-estimate its importance".*[132]

Furthermore, Cadbury had also observed that housing schemes such as Bournville were a crucial, though partial, pre-requisite of Britain's economic survival,[133] in forming part of a new, far wider and more coherent social programme, interlinking health, housing and education, one in which the newly established municipal authorities would play a significant part,(see chapter 4).

These perspectives were given even greater credence by perceptions of the nation's deteriorating health, contemporary revelations adding considerable impetus to the corollary that action be taken to arrest this decline. Perhaps the most sensational and alarmist of these, the 1901 reports concerning the 'calamitous' physical condition of volunteers for the Manchester Regiment, eventually resulted in the appointment of the Inter Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration, in September 1903.[134]

Their subsequent findings reinforced Cadbury's belief in the value of 'healthy' outdoor activity in redressing this apparent demise and, in Cadbury's words, enabling England,

> *"to maintain its position among the nations. . ."*[135]

Indeed, the report, in identifying overcrowding as one of the principal 'Evil Consequences of Urbanisation',[136] added further impetus to the arguments of housing reformers, especially in attributing the nation's apparent physical deterioration to environmental rather than pre-natal reasons.[137]

Moreover, this impetus was compounded by the report's conclusion that such a deterioration could, consequently, be reversed, in that there was,

> *"every reason to anticipate RAPID amelioration of physique, as soon as improvement occurs in external conditions, particularly as regards food, clothing,*

overcrowding, cleanliness, drunkenness, and the spread of common practical knowledge of home management. . ."[138]

The potential influence of the B.V.T. was considerably enhanced, not only by such contemporary perceptions, but also by the role Cadbury envisaged for the estate. This, and, moreover, the whole of Cadbury's social philosophy, was not confined to Bournville. Indeed, from its inception the organisation had indicated its intent to adopt an influential role in national regeneration, the Trust's Foundation Deed containing a clause stating that the body's object was the amelioration of working class living conditions, not just within Birmingham, but throughout Great Britain.[139]

Such a statement reveals Cadbury's wider political agenda in founding the development; allying utilitarian, social and patriotic arguments,[140] this political purpose is evident in a number of guises: most notably through the extensive and consistent projection of Bournville as a model for the rejuvenation of the nation, and in Cadbury's membership, patronage and promotion of sympathetic causes and organisations, such actions being reciprocated by these groups' endorsement of the development.

The nature and form of these actions, together with their impact in the national arena, will now be considered.

BOURNVILLE: A MODEL FOR THE NATION

Not surprisingly, given the prevailing political climate, the impact of the Bournville statistical data was both widespread and immediate. Indeed contemporary evidence indicates the extent to which the development was applauded by both those propounding 'national efficiency'/international competitiveness arguments and those representing the public health lobby, each seizing upon the information as a verification of their stance and, furthermore, as representing a panacea for the nation's regeneration.

Moreover, this endorsement was similarly undertaken both by ruralisation causes, such as George Haw's 'Back to the Land' movement, envisaging the superseding of overcrowded cities by a populace enjoying the benefits of "wholesome' country life,[141] and by Imperialists such as Sir John Gorst. Writing in the 'Daily News' in Sept. 1903, Gorst addressed the question of 'How to make an Imperial Race'. Aside from any eugenic implications, in stating that the essence of the solution lay in paying regard to children's health, Gorst eulogised over the positive influence the Bournville estate had exerted in this respect, in significantly changing the lives of former slum dwellers;[142] this was an analysis aired subsequently aired by George Cadbury himself, in promoting the development as a mechanism for realising the goals of economic imperialism, 'social justice' and 'national efficiency'. In 1918, for example, he suggested that few undertakings on the same small scale as Bournville had produced 'such large results',[143] whilst two years earlier Cadbury had employed the statistical evidence from the estate as verification of its success: here Cadbury had argued, in a manner reminiscent of Gorst, that a comparison of 850 children in Bournville educational institutions with school children from the east end of Birmingham had revealed that,

> *"our boys and girls were on the average 2 1/2" taller at 12 years of age than the children in the Birmingham school, and on average 3" better chest measurement".*[144]

The ramifications of this evidence were further reinforced by Cadbury's observation that such results were mirrored both in the Bournville influenced Garden City development of Letchworth, and in W. H. Lever's Port Sunlight scheme,[145] evidence which resulted in such developments being rapidly accepted and promoted by many of those expressing interest in the question of social reform. The Trust's Visitors' Book for 1901/2, for example, revealed that the estate had received representatives from the London Reform Union Party', the 'Municipal Reformer', the London Branch of the Christian Social Union and the National Housing Reform Council,[146] (N.H.R.C.) an organisation with which the Cadburys were particularly associated, (see later).

Furthermore, prominent figures with in the labour movement also added their endorsement, with Will Crooks,[147] John Burns and Keir Hardie,[148] all conferring their

apparent approval on the development, such favourable publicity being further fuelled by the Cadburys' 'Daily News'.[149]

Indeed, the latter was again instrumental in publicising Cadbury's social concerns and programmes, in Sept. 1902, for example, the paper reporting that its journalists had been 'very impressed' by their recent visit to the estate.[150] This praise was compounded two days later with the reprint of 'No Room To Live: A New Pamphlet on the Housing Question', arguing that this was the most far-reaching of all social questions, and should be approached from the perspectives held by the Bournville development.[151]

The 'Daily News' added further credence to this cause by supplementing these opinions with the views of various professional bodies, arguing for the extension of town planning, and for sanitary and architectural measures to be more widely implemented in housing programmes. On the 12th September, 1902, for example, it carried an article from the President of the Engineering and Architectural Section of the influential Sanitary and Health Conference, echoing both Haw and the Bournville proponents, in arguing for the 'ruralisation of industry'.[152]

This contemporary widespread concern and comment, both within and outside the Cadbury group, was summarised by the Bournville architect, W. A. Harvey, in 1906, in his observation that politicians, economists and sanitarians were all increasingly identifying with the model village movement.[153] The housing problem, he argued, was no longer being interpreted as the concern solely of the poor, following the realisation that a,

> *"far larger section of the people is affected,- a section which includes not only the labouring class, but also the skilled artisan, and even a class of people still more prosperous. In the light of present sanitary and hygienic conditions it is at last recognised that the housing conditions of the past will not suffice for the future".*[154]

Particularly active in pursuing these aims was the Sanitary Institute, an organisation with which the Cadburys collaborated at the turn of the century, both George and Richard being members of the Local General Committee for the body's Birmingham Congress, in Autumn, 1898,[155] a meeting at which Cadbury Bros. received an award acknowledging their efforts towards sanitary reform.[156] Indeed, the Institute consistently advanced this argument, Dr. Mary Sturge for example addressing their Birmingham Conference on 'The Claims of Childhood', calling, as a matter of extreme national urgency, for attention to be paid to the layout of suburbs. In particular she emphasised the vital importance of space and sunshine as factors in breeding a healthy future generation, whilst also enabling working men to reclaim their 'heritage of earth',[157] sentiments reiterated by the body's President at their subsequent August meeting.[158]

In consequence, Bournville and Lever's Port Sunlight, a development begun in 1888,[159] both received the plaudits of this and other associated bodies, conferring a

professional legitimisation on such developments. At their 1910 meeting, for example, G. W. Eustace eulogised over both the material and physical benefits attaching to these practical manifestations of the 'national efficiency' ideal.[160] Furthermore, he continued, at both of these 'great' commercial ventures,

> *"we have great business expansion and success growing side by side with the phenomenal prosperity of the worker, and at both places you will be told the same thing, 'We depend for our success, upon efficiency. The greater the physical, mental and moral health of our community (and you cannot assure these apart from perfect hygienic conditions of life and of work), the greater their efficiency. And the greater their efficiency, the greater our success'".*[161]

Furthermore, Lever and the Cadburys were not slow to take advantage of this approval in the promotion of their ideals to such professional bodies. At the 1910 Public Health Conference,, for example, W. H. Lever promoted his business' Port Sunlight development, [162] whilst three years later Elizabeth Cadbury took a rather wider perspective, illustrating the not inconsiderable aims of the Cadbury social programme, in using the same platform to advance the cause of housing reform on moral, health and economic grounds.[163] Calling for the eradication of city slums and drawing upon government evidence to substantiate her argument, Cadbury observed that the,

> *"Royal Commission which sat to enquire into Labour conditions asserted, 'upon the lowest average every workman or workwomen lost about twenty days in the year from simple exhaustion.' This low standard of health plays directly into the hands of immorality, intemperance, gambling, thriftlessness, and the other vices rampant in our slum areas".*[164]

Concurring with, and quoting Miss Anderson of the Women's Industrial Council, Cadbury concluded her resume of the nation's ills by commenting that the continued existence of the nation was dependent upon the health of the masses and that it was more than ever,

> *"necessary that the health and vigour of our race should be maintained at the highest possible attainable standard".*[165]

Similarly, the Cadburys expressed their interest in this issue through membership of voluntary agencies and pressure groups, the most prominent of which was the N.U.W.W.. Its 1905 conference in Birmingham, for example, featured papers on 'The Laying-Out of Towns' and the amendment existing by-laws, together with Elizabeth Cadbury's address on 'The National Physique and How to Improve it',[166] whilst the programme also included a visit to Bournville,[167] the overall philosophy of the meeting being directed towards the conspicuous featuring of philanthropic work;[168] Further, considering the praise the

meeting subsequently received, this was an objective that was ostensibly satisfied.[169]

Within Birmingham too there were specific examples of Cadbury attempting to promote the Bournville cause through the dissemination of propaganda advocating the extension of town planning schemes, perhaps the most influential and lasting through the alliance of Cadbury and Raymond Unwin, an architect who had demonstrated his adherence to Bournville's principles through articles such as 'Light and Air and the Housing Question', in 1901.[170] Accordingly, Unwin was employed by George Cadbury to further this cause by delivering an appropriate course of university lectures provided,

> *"out of B.V.T. funds, believing it to be a proper application or investment of those funds the object of which is to stimulate interest and imitation among manufacturers of the general Bournville idea".*[171]

Certainly, aside from Bournville's rather romantic visions regarding housing development, the possibility such a social engineering scheme presented for considerable expansion was one which influenced another Quaker industrialist, Joseph Rowntree, with the establishment, in 1904, of a trust similar to the B.V.T..[172] Initially receiving Cadbury's help and advice, Rowntree's New Earswick development clearly aspired to the same spiritual, mental and physical ends,[173] and was further related by the employment of Unwin as the estate's first architect.[174]

Nevertheless, Rowntree was keen to emphasise a significant distinction between the two developments, being extremely anxious to avoid any suggestion of paternalism, the subsequent Trust Deed correspondingly reflecting this aim, in encouraging the growth of 'civic responsibility' amongst the estate's populace, thereby pre-emptying the possibility of what he perceived as another 'cocoa works village'.[175]

However, whilst each of these initiatives and expressions of interest provides evidence that the Cadbury housing model held considerable appeal for industrialists, politicians and the various professional public health bodies alike, perhaps the development's principal contribution lay in its instrumental role in effecting permanent changes to the nation's perceptions and implementation of housing policy.

Indicative of the widening Cadbury contribution to the social debate, in essence these reforms were of a two-fold nature. Illustrating the pursuit of the paternalist's new welfare legislation, the second of these, promoting the N.H.R.C.'s attempts to extend the duties and activities of local authorities in the housing arena, only gathered significant momentum following the 1906 election success of the Liberals and their large Nonconformist contingent. The first, however, almost immediately succeeded the initial developments at Bournville, its adherents seizing upon the impetus it provided for the establishment of a national organisation offering a similar social philosophy as a panacea for the nation's ills.

Retrospectively, in 1936 the Bournville Lantern Lecture observed that the estate had been a pioneer scheme at a time when the housing question was receiving little constructive attention, and had subsequently successfully demonstrated that 'ugliness' and 'dirt' were not the inevitable corollaries of a factory environment.[176] Furthermore, the article indicated its further significance, in observing that the development had subsequently been replicated both by local authorities and others;[177] this was significance the Trust itself later emphasised in commenting that Bournville had successfully demonstrated the practicability of Garden Cities to leading member of the housing reform movement, including Ebenezer Howard and Ralph Neville,[178] the Chairman of the first Garden City Association Conference.[179]

Indeed, in 1898, in 'Tomorrow', later reprinted as 'Garden Cities of Tomorrow',[180] Ebenezer Howard concurred with Cadbury's support for municipal ownership of land, advocating its leasing to private developers, with subsequent profits being retained by the estate's community.[181] Furthermore, both shared an extremely romanticised view of the future city, heralding the opinion that,

> *"key to the urban problem was 'how to restore people to the land' and bring them once again into a redeeming contract with the countryside".*[182]

Both men also imbued this perspective with strains of practicability, such schemes serving not only to relieve congestion and economising on the use of land, but acting as a 'stepping stone' to a 'better' national industrial life,[183] emphasis being placed on patriotic and 'national efficiency' arguments in Cadbury's case, whilst the views of Howard exuded a distinct sense of utilitarianism.[184]

Certainly Howard's vision, which subsequently led to the developments at Letchworth and Welwyn, and eventually to post 1945 government housing policies,[185] was given considerable credence by the Bournville scheme. In 1906, for example, W. A. Harvey observed that the estate had provided a great practical impetus to this movement;[186] indeed this contribution was both recognised and reinforced by the development's selection as the venue for the first conference of the Garden City Association, (G.C.A.) in September, 1901,[187] a meeting favourably reviewed by the many economists, architects and parliamentarians attending.[188]

In particular, the conference succeeded in clearly establishing the chief aims to be propagated, i.e. the relocation of industrial concerns to more spacious, carefully planned sites, the organisation mirroring Bournville in that it was to be a 'non-profit making' commercial venture, any subsequent increase in the value of land being 'vested in the community'.[189]

Whilst Birmingham's Mayor, Alderman Edwards, in welcoming the Association, lamented the lack of parliamentary legislation in this regard,[190] perhaps a more revealing

statement of the organisation's motivation was given by the conference Chairman, Ralph Neville. Arguing that the housing and drink questions were largely interrelated, he highlighted concerns over the nation's ability to compete with its European rivals such as Germany, commenting that nothing,

> *"could prevent the ultimate destruction and decadence of the race if they did not see that the mass of the people led lives which were consistent with physical development".*[191]

Arguing that hygiene was ultimately the basis and barometer of the nation's life, and, of course, of its future prospects, he proposed a 'movement to concerted areas', an initiative that was seconded by 'Daily News' journalist T .P. Ritzema.[192]

Furthermore, during this initial conference this allegiance G.C.A. members with those political interventionists such as Cadbury and other proponents of 'national efficiency' was reinforced when the architect Raymond Unwin sought to harness the increasing power of the state to their cause, in proposing a motion that the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890 should be rigidly enforced, requiring local authorities to provide adequate housing.[193]

These were messages that clearly held a considerable appeal for those interested in the urban decline housing/reform question; accordingly the G.C.A. formed in 1899 with a membership of 13, experienced a substantial rise during the year 1901/2, from 530 to 180[194] an increase aided both by the favourable impressions created at this meeting, and by the organisation's educational programme, which similarly enlarged its activities, delivering 50 lectures in 1901 and 250 the following year.[195]
Nor was this the limit of the Associations ambitions. In August 1902 the organisation announced the launch of the Garden City Pioneer Company, with the objective of acquiring land to facilitate housing, social and industrial reform.[196]

This company was one which was dominated by Cadbury influence, with George Cadbury and many of his associates as directors,[197] including at various times, his brother Edward, W. H. Lever and T. P. Ritzema,[198] alongside Ebenezer Howard;[199] accordingly the body's actions reflected the increasing public profile of this group, as it undertook several pre-war development scheme, the first of which was implemented at Letchworth, in August, 1903, with the purchase of 4,000 acres of land for the building of a garden city.[200] Indeed this was a venture which fully demonstrated the extent of this Cadbury influence, George Cadbury investing £13,735 in the project, the resulting shares being held by the B.V.T.[201] and like Bournville, becoming financially viable almost immediately, paying profitable dividends by 1912,[202] housing 9000 by 1914.,[203]

Furthermore, it echoed other familiar Bournville themes, its advocates claiming that not only was it an example of a 'balanced' community, containing both the middle and

working classes, but that it also demonstrated,

> *"that superior living and working conditions could be provided for the lower paid, and that this could even be done profitably through private enterprise".*[204]

Subsequently, although the scheme was not widely copied it did, nevertheless, exert a considerable effect on Britain's housing policy, through encouraging a greater emphasis on street layout 'good' housing design and, perhaps most significantly, promoting the acceptance of local authority involvement in housing schemes.[205]

Consequently, this movement, which Elizabeth Cadbury later described as the 'grand-child' of the Adult School movement,[206] can be perceived, as has been claimed, more interested in 'social improvement' than in financial gain.[207]

The 'Queen' magazine in March, 1902, for example, suggested that the,

> *"work of the Garden City association is a work of the purest patriotism. It aims at maintaining the physique and efficiency of the workers on which the military and commercial power of the country rests".*[208]

There is, however, undoubtedly another, more critical, interpretation of a movement dominated by middle class industrialists. Indeed, some on the political left viewed such developments with alarm, perceiving them as an anathema to the aspirations of the independent labour movement, and rendering any realistic hopes of effective radical change redundant. 'The Socialist', for example, on the eve of the 1906 Liberal election victory, poured scorn on what it perceived as the labour movement's total compliance with industrialists such as Cadbury and others, arguing that its leaders exhibited the 'same meanness' and 'turpitude' that characterised the House of Lords;[209] indeed in December, 1905, the paper sarcastically suggested that so closely did the official labour leaders' policies resemble a continuation of the status quo, that they might as well have accepted peerages.[210]

Neither was the paper, and the political organ it represented, the S.L.P., alone in its criticisms of the Liberal administration, the S.D.F. adopting a similar stance at its 1907 conference. Arguing that it was the only party to have any real idea of 'social evils' and how they could be overcome, the conference Chairman, Ernest Lothian was virulent in his assessment of the government's inaction. Reserving his most stringent criticism for John Burns, Lothian suggested that the government,

> *"was evidently neither willing nor able to carry out its election pledges. Why anyone believed it said much for the shortness of memory of the British people, while the man they were told was a hostage for the good intentions of the Liberals towards the working class had shown himself, when a power, to be probably the most callous and reactionary President of the Local Government Board they had had for a generation".*[211]

Furthermore, the subsequent cooperation of labour leaders with the Liberal administration's actions has been propounded as a major contributory factor in the rise of the British Syndicalist movement, and the contemporary perceptions of the official left's loss of autonomy. Holton, 1976, for example, has argued that the,

> *"failure of the Labour Party to set out a viable alternative to welfare capitalism reflected a wider loss of radical momentum within the parliamentary arena. Although the 1906 general election successes had been greeted with genuine enthusiasm by many working class militants, the subsequent erosion of the Party's independent reforming zeal reflected a rapid process of political incorporation".*[212]

This interpretation of the moribundity of the parliamentary left, in lending its weight behind the Liberals, was also reflected in contemporary criticisms of the government's legislative programme. In August, 1908, for example, 'The Socialist' described plans such as their Small Holdings Bill as 'safety valve' mechanisms for defusing potential threats to the capitalist system, whilst other statutes were implemented purely to further capitalism's interests,[213] (see chapter2).

A further frequent criticism from the left was that directed against the adherents of 'national efficiency'. In 1908, for example, 'The Socialist' took issue against the government's legislative record, arguing that, far from representing the true claims of the working classes, was 'Socialism By Kind Permission', statutes enacted for the benefit of the country's capitalists,[214] one pertinent suggestion in that the article, for example, specifically related to educational legislation, measures which the Cadburys enthusiastically welcomed,[215] (see later).

Indeed, in hindsight, many of the Liberal welfare 'reforms', had been construed in this way, including measures such as the introduction of labour exchanges and the adoption of a national insurance scheme, both of which were embraced by those within the Cadburys' group.

The former, for example, was considered by Elizabeth Cadbury, as an initiative that, in time,

> *"ought to be extremely helpful in starting boys and girls in the right direction when they leave school and want to learn a trade".*[216]

This cause also received the active support of other Cadburys including, through the Birmingham Right to Work Committees, Barrow Cadbury,[217] in addition to Harrison Barrow, [218] a close friend and Quaker associate of George Cadbury. Barrow, for example, served on the Commercial Bills' Committee of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce,[219] which, in August 1906, informed the Board of Trade of its proposals favouring the establishment of a national system of labour exchanges,[220] proposals which were

extremely similar to the model subsequently implemented,[221] and an initiative which was also endorsed by Cadbury Bros.[222]

Furthermore, in 1907, the same committee, which Hay,(1977) has described as the nation's most active Chamber of Commerce in the promotion of social legislation,[223] passed a resolution advocating a scheme of national insurance, commenting that in Germany such a measure had shown itself to be the,

> *"greatest bulwark . . . against revolutionary Socialism".*[224]

Consequently, the committee did not envisage the system as anything other than encouraging industrial 'efficiency' and social discipline, in arguing that such an initiative should not cover,

> *"the thriftless, the work-shy and the loafing classes who are ready to take anything they can get for nothing".*[225]

Indeed, Hay has observed that these measures were introduced to stem the perceived polarisation developing between capital and labour,[226] an analysis with which Holton concurs, in suggesting that despite their 'progressive' label, the government implemented such 'welfare state' legislation to redress the problems of domestic 'inefficiency' and overseas competition.[227]

Moreover, he argued, these policies were also designed to meet the challenge of the increasingly powerful labour movement, in that, by,

> *"regulating unemployment benefit and the labour market, for example, it was hoped to protect the 'honest' working man 'willing to work' from demoralising contact with 'wastrels', or from critics of the capitalist system".*[228]

Such criticisms of the Liberal enactments are more specifically related to the Cadburys through the parallelling sentiments expressed by George Cadbury Jnr, in 'Town Planning' 1915, (see later), and through the question of the taxation of land, a measure which his father had long advocated in the interests of social justice, and which formed the substance of his address to the T.U.C. in 1905;[229] this was a measure he also promoted through his 'Daily News',[230] and similarly advocated by Elizabeth Cadbury,[231] and J. S. Nettlefold, Chairman of the Birmingham City Council Housing Committee[232] and a close collaborator with George Cadbury on the National Housing Reform Council, (N.H.R.G.) (see later).

Indeed, this issue is one which, immediately following the 1906 election victory, Elizabeth Cadbury identified as being 'one of the first planks in the Liberal platform' to

achieve domestic prosperity.[233] Furthermore, this was a perspective which clearly promoted the adoption of B.V.T. principles, the argument alongside that of the Garden City movement forming the basis of the Liberal Party housing policy, these two complementary strands suggesting,

> *"that the future of cities should be the construction of self-contained garden cities or garden suburbs built on cheap land, owned and run on co-operative principles. . ."*[234]

Subsequently, Cadbury's support both for this land measure and other reforms came under sustained criticism from those on the more radical political left. In July 1908, for example, a correspondent to the letters page of 'The Socialist' argued that moves to introduce the taxation of land values, ultimately only benefited the commercial/business community, at the expense of the landed, whilst the working class remained disempowered.[235]

These perspectives had initially been aired somewhat earlier, 'The Socialist', in July, 1906, criticising a parallel Cadbury/ Liberal initiative, in suggesting that the newly introduced national pension scheme would be of no benefit to working class people, and furthermore, that militant workers were aware of the motivation underlying such capitalist paternalism and would not hold out their hands,

> *"for beggars' doles of old age pensions, which the overwhelming majority will not live to enjoy".*[236]

These criticisms were also directed at the attempt to introduce the taxation of land values, the same article arguing that the overall effect of such a measure would be to save the capitalist money by reducing taxation and facilitating a reduction in wage rates.[237]

Such sentiments were most directly aired in December, 1906, with an article entitled 'Philanthropist On The Make', when the paper condemned the perpetrators of welfare capitalism as both divisive and diversionary, arguing, that,

> *"we believe the philanthropic capitalist to be the most dangerous kind: the brutal capitalist is an obvious enemy. With him the working class know where they are; but the Cadbury's and the Lever's link with their Bournvilles and Port Sunlight are able to pose as friends of labour and social reformers, while at the same time they are bringing their wage-slaves to a condition of serfdom, and by bribing them with a few miserable sops are reducing them to that most degraded of all conditions - contentment in slavery".*[238]

Even these virulent criticisms may, however, have perhaps underestimated the extent of this Cadbury/Lever influence, and their determination to direct national housing policy. Whilst, for example. the Cadbury interrelation with the G.C.A., manifested in the

blue print estate at Letchworth and the continued generation of favourable publicity for this cause, including, following Elizabeth Cadbury's intervention, the support of the 'Daily News',[239] George Cadbury's perception was that these developments, by themselves, fell someway short of substantially directly affecting the nation's health. Indeed, in recognition of this, throughout the first years of the century, George Cadbury and other members of this movement, such as Neville, continued to publicise the extent of this crisis, and the paramount need for embarking on an immediate and extensive planned housing programme. These sentiments were, for example, expressed in their respective addresses to the annual Bournville assembly in 1908[240] and, three years later, to the 12th G.C.A. Conference;[241] this latter gathering, was one traditionally fully sympathetic to these prospectives, having, in 1907, unanimously passed a motion in favour of conferring town planning powers upon local authorities, stressing the importance of such regulation in preventing the further spread of urban 'evils' and the consequent remedial expense that would entail.[242]

Indeed, in 1915 George Cadbury Jnr. pursued the same argument, in linking the questions of housing, city development and public health, he suggested that the movement towards what he termed 'Social Betterment',[243] also held an economic dimension, one which, if ignored, could pose a considerable threat for the future of Britain as a stable capitalist society.

Adopting the tone of conciliator and moderate political reformist, Cadbury attributed contemporary outbreaks of social unrest to working class demands for an improved way of life,[244] and, restating Bournville's 'mutual interest' argument, in particular he suggested that the eradication of the most extreme differences in living conditions between classes was in the best interests of all, in that the,

> *"whole community stands to gain from every provision which, directly or indirectly, make for the health and happiness among its members.*
> *To take one obvious illustration which appeals to the whole nation, because of its serious proportions, the loss to industry consequent upon the ill-health of its workers".*[245]

Elizabeth Cadbury had invoked similar sentiments in 1907, in attributing the prevalence of 'chronically under-fed and insufficiently clothed' children to the 'starvation wages' of the sweated trades industries (see chapter 2). Moreover, Cadbury warned that the futures of the existing economic system was at risk unless there was legislative action to eradicate this problem, and that, crucially, it,

> *"will be better for capitalists if this reform is the result of their sense of justice, and is brought about by their initiative, than if it is forced upon them, or is the result of an industrial revolution".*[246]

Furthermore, these calls for a more interventionist approach, ostensibly in the pursuit of 'social justice', were echoes of George Cadbury's support both for the 'national efficiency' lobby, together with legislation serving the economic status quo, and, consequently, for another influential pressure group in this arena, the N.H.R.C.. This was a body similarly open to these and the parallelling arguments of the G.C.A. which, for example, in August, 1909, organised a Town Planning Congress where Professor Adshead of

> *"moral and intellectual condition of the lower classes and, indeed of the middle classes, could not be greatly improved until legislation was directed to the home".* [247]

Established in 1900,[248] on 'non-party lines',[249] it was, nevertheless, embraced by a number who subsequently made significant contributions to the 1906 Liberal election success, with, perhaps most pertinently, George Cadbury sitting on its General Committee and W. H. Lever serving as its President,[250] whilst a further Bournville /Cadbury influence was exerted through the appointment of B.V.T. Secretary, J. H. Barlow to the N.H.R.C. General Committee.[251]

This Liberal/Nonconformist link was also evident in the organisation's Parliamentary Committee, which included B. Seebohm Rowntree,[252] and which pursued a state interventionist political philosophy, pressing, in particular, for a legislative extension of local authority housing duties.

In 1906 the organisation expounded its programme to a Co-operative Congress at Bournville, identifying its principle components as the establishment of 'Model Villages' on B.V.T. lines, the encouragement of better standards of planning and building, and the reform of the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890.[253]

Indeed, it was this third requirement which became the Council's most immediate objective, perceived as a measure by which effective town planning regulations might be most readily facilitated. This and related aims were similarly emphasised by George Cadbury, in meeting representatives of the British press in September, 1906. Substantiating his argument by reference to the death rate disparity between Bournville and the centre of Birmingham, Cadbury commented that he believed that the development scheme should, as in Germany, be officially sanctioned by a central authority.[254] Furthermore, he continued, schemes of municipal ownership might represent sound financial investments for local authorities, as, in a decade, the value of the Bournville estate had increased almost twentyfold.[255]

At the organisation's October 1906 conference on ' The Better Planning of New Housing Acts', the meeting's Chairman, John Nettlefold reiterated the vital importance of housing to the nation's prosperity and the strength of the Empire,[256] and the corresponding need for strictly regulated town planning.[257]

In pursuing this theme Nettlefold praised Birmingham's council, a body whose

Housing Committee he chaired,[258] for being the first to discuss this issue, in July, 1905 voting by a 2/3rds majority in favour of adopting a town planning programme;[259] this was a scheme subsequently described by Sir John Dickson Poynder of the N.H.R.C. Executive Committee, as illustrating,

> *"what an immense improvement in individual prosperity can be effected by a municipality dealing with each house under Part 2 of the Housing Act".*[260]

)

However, much of the conference was concerned with Nettlefold's perceptions of the inadequacies of the existing 'model by-laws';[261] this was a view similarly demonstrated by the meeting's members, including George Cadbury, in unanimously passing a motion to more fully empower local authorities in this regard, and instructing the national council to approach,

> *"Parliament, and ask them to give powers to municipalities and instructions to the Local Government Board which will enable us to carry out these powers when they are given".*[262]

Subsequently, in early November, a N.H.R.C. deputation, which included George Cadbury, met with both the Prime Minister and John Burns,[263] President of the Local Government Board and minister responsible for housing questions. The delegates urged the introduction of a series of measures affecting both rural and urban housing, their twelve point blue print centring on the introduction of legislation requiring local authorities to adopt a more active role, in, for example, providing smallholdings, cleaning and demolishing slum areas, and replacing them with 'model' suburbs, planned under the supervision and auspices of a town and village development committee.[264]

Additional N.H.R.C. demands further illustrate considerable parallels and consistency with the Bournville ethos and the arguments which Cadbury propounded; these included the reform of the taxation of land, supportive powers to compulsorily purchase land, a measure which he believed would help to redress the adverse comparison with their continental counterparts, and shake Britain's public bodies out of their apathy.[265]

This momentum was increased by efforts to publicise their cause undertaken by the N.H.R.C., the G.C.A. and the Birmingham and District Housing Reform Association. In 1907, for example, these bodies distributed Nettlefold's 'Slum Reform and Town Planning: The Garden City Idea Applied To Existing Cities And Their Suburbs', a work which promoted their common beliefs through illustrating the benefits of Bournville and Port Sunlight,[266] and the success of Birmingham's slum clearance scheme.[267]

Ostensibly, the council appeared to have been successful in appeal, the Prime Minister, in reply, promising a Housing Bill, and observing that their proposals perhaps represented,

"the greatest common measure of agreement in the opinion of well-intentioned men on this subject throughout the country".[268]

The movement gained even greater credence and influence four months later, when the Archbishop of Canterbury endorsed their cause, expressing the view that such measures were vital for the nation's social well-being, in that such planning gave an opportunity to produce a more integrated society, one which guarded against both the separation of classes and the isolation of individuals.[269]

Armed with such endorsements and, in expectation of the promised Bill, in early January 1908 the council's executive, reaffirmed their commitment to the twelve point plan, agreeing to hold further meetings to formulate their policies more definitively. In particular, the council expressed the hope that the new legislation would represent a watershed in housing policy, by giving the Local Government Board greater powers of initiative, and enabling local authorities to effectively implement town planning schemes, through the granting of new powers to acquire land, and the establishment of a new central housing department.[270]

However, the council's optimism in proposing these future meetings proved somewhat misplaced, the subsequent Bill hugely disappointing them, especially through its omission of the powers of compulsory purchase. Indeed George Cadbury felt compelled to communicate to Burns how wholly inadequate and ineffective he considered the Bill to be, regarding this clause to be 'infinitely more important' than any of the other provisions.[271]

Moreover, Cadbury hinted at the irony of this omission by a government which, to a considerable degree, owed its electoral success to the efforts of those such as himself and others within the N.H.R.C., in commenting that,

"I know by conversations with leading Conservatives that they are quite prepared to help an efficient measure on the German lines where municipal-cities have full control over the areas around them."[172]

Furthermore, expressing his characteristic desire to remain 'anonymously in the background', Cadbury reiterated his call for the establishment of a central Housing Board to overseas new developments, justifying his case by recourse to the 'national interest', in remarking that such,

"a Bill on patriot who cares for the people of England could possibly oppose, and it would have the support of military men in the House who know how the physique of the people of England who live in the dreary suburbs is being deteriorated".[273]

Whilst this disappointment with the perceived inadequacies of the proposed legislation was shared by others, such as the I.L.P.,[274] Burns' public responses to these

criticisms was to claim that the Bill would serve a two-fold purpose, in that not only would it further stimulate those councils already active in this field, it would also compel reluctant authorities to undertake their 'social duty'.[275]

Neither was Burns slow to acknowledge the role played by Garden Suburbs, and Bournville in particular, in advancing this cause. In May 1908, for example, he argued that if,

> *"they could reproduce that experiment a hundred or a thousand times all over the kingdom, it would not be unprofitable to the community, it would damnify the interests of nobody, and its effects on the individuals who benefited, would reflect itself in a distinct gain to the State".*[276]

Whilst Burns also claimed that the Bill did in fact enable town planning to be undertaken,[277] its provisions stopped someway short of the N.H.R.C. demands, in allowing, rather than requiring, these powers to be exercised,[278] a shortfall that W. H. Lever observed rendered any widespread scheme economically inoperative.[279] Indeed this perspective was one shared by George Cadbury, in subsequently arguing in favour of the compulsory purchase of both urban and rural land, the latter provision enabling the extensions of a smallholdings' scheme thereby reducing land wastage, whilst contributing significantly to the national exchequer.[280]

The official N.H.R.C. response, whilst urging Burns to include these measures, was to announce its intention to call a national congress on housing reform which five weeks of the Bill's introduction,[281] a meeting which was subsequently cancelled when the legislation, after making extremely slow progress through the Committee Stage,[282] was withdrawn in early December.[283]

Within months, however, the matter was back on the legislative agenda, Burns introducing his new Bill in mid February.[284] Whilst this measure would ultimately reach the statute book as the Housing and Town Planning Act,[285] it was again one of controversy, and one in which the N.H.R.C. was directly involved. Whilst the initial proposals reflected their demands and indeed bore testament to the success of their lobbying, subsequent amendments in the House of Lords removed these provisions and the prospect of a coherent framework to implement town planning schemes 'efficiently'.[286]

Having, in October, conveyed these sentiments to the Prime Minister,[287] the N.H.R.C. convened a meeting to protest against this 'mutilation' of the Bill, i.e. in eradicating its land purchasing clauses.[288] Whilst the meeting called for the implementation as passed by the House of Commons,[289] George Cadbury added his personal condemnation, in particular he argued that the modified legislation represented a threat to the continuing existence of the nation,[290] since a priority of the new regulations was that future developments were to reflect Bournville's low density, Garden Suburb/City

design, the lack of compulsory purchase powers[291] effectively disbarred the adoption of the German housing model Cadbury and others sought to emulate.

Despite this considerable setback, the organisation indicated its intention to further press for its aims, in renaming itself 'The National Housing and Town Planning Council' and announcing the launch of a scheme to raise £5,000 to pursue their cause through county conferences, leaflets and the formation of local housing reform councils.[292] These dissemination agents were to be supplemented by renewed attempts to persuade the Local Government Board to create a central town planning department, in addition to providing an increased number of health inspectors.[293]

Subsequently, in late November, and in the wake of the Commons acquiescing to all the Lords' amendments en bloc,[294] the proposals became law, to pursue Burns' optimistic prediction that they would, 'abolish, reconstruct and prevent slums'.[295] thereby securing,

> *"the home healthy, the house beautiful, the town pleasant, the city dignified, and the suburb salubrious".*[296]

The N.H.R.C. however, was more circumspect, in almost immediately indicating its intention to adopt a cautiously pragmatic response, in announcing, for example, a mid-December conference to discuss the practical implementation of the new Act.[297] Furthermore, this meeting is another indication of the influence exercised by the N.H.R.C., in attracting delegates representing many professional bodies directly interested in this legislation, including perhaps most notably, the British Medical Association and the Royal Institute of British Architects.[298] With the express proviso that local authorities were required to establish Town Planning Committees, aided by a number of appropriately qualified professionals, and guided by principles which adhered to the Bournville maxims regarding the provision of space and parks, the meeting gave the legislation its guarded approval.[299] Its Chairman Alderman Thompson, for example, observed that they,

> *"now had a measure which lent itself to useful experiments that would show the precise nature of the amendments which would be needed before they had obtained town planning in the fullest sense of the word".*[300]

This willingness to view the legislation as, at least partly, achieving their objectives, in allowing the gradual, albeit, piecemeal establishment of such developments, was further confirmed the following day, with the formation of a Town Planning Advisory Committee to advise on questions relating to specific schemes, and propagating the organisation's aims through the publication of regular information papers.[301]

Moreover, the council emphasised both an awareness of their influence and a resolute determination to achieve their aims with the proposal, 'if necessary' to appoint a

deputation to the Local Government Board, to ensure the legislation was being fully utilised.[302] Indeed, the view was expressed that this requirement was such a necessity, that the council should seek to enlist the support of non-elected 'leading citizens' in pursuing this end, and, in particular, in establishing the 'right civic spirit' from the outset, as developments during this first five years of the regulations would in all probability, dictate the general practice for the next thirty.[303]

Certainly, in retrospect, the legislation has been acknowledged as the first to recognise the importance of town planning.[304] However, it has equally been perceived as a 'masterpiece of obstruction'.[305] In particular, such critics have argued that, whilst it granted local authorities powers to initiate such schemes,[306] its scope was extremely limited, since,

> *"it addressed itself to the controlled development of new suburbs, yet it was not concerned with existing built-up areas, nor with towns taken as a whole".*[307]

Furthermore, in practice these powers were ultimately undermined by the accompanying mass of regulations, the subsequent decade resulting in less than 10,000 acres being developed under its auspices,[308] as the Act defused and deflected pressure for a further statute, in that at.

> *"the same time it blocked any real town planning legislation, advocates of which were told to wait and see how the Act Worked".*[309]

Even where the measure did have an impact, through municipal construction programmes, loans being sanctioned for the building of 6,780 houses between 1910 and 1914, these developments were more than cancelled out by the exercise of the new powers to close 'unfit dwellings', 7,427 habitations being so deemed during the same period.[310] Indeed, despite the legislation and activism of cities such as London, Liverpool and Birmingham, by 1914, 95% of the working class still lived in privately owned property.[311] Consequently, the net effect of the statute was that, whilst by 1915 permission had been granted for 110 local authority schemes, the larger part of the overcrowding problem remained as great as at the turn of the century[312] one contemporary commentator estimating that the housing shortfall was as large as 120,000.[313]

Against this background the G.C.A. also continued its propaganda and pressure for ensuring the widespread adoption of town planning and the general advancement of their housing philosophy, Neville, for example, declared at their 1911 Annual Conference that whilst their achievements during their first twelve years had outstripped all expectations, they should, nevertheless, guard against complacency and becoming

satisfied with the relatively minor application of their principles.[314]

Indeed Neville demonstrated the body's ambitious outlook, arguing that the application of these principles should not be confined to Great Britain and, that their propaganda should be accordingly international in nature,[315] an outlook subsequently illustrated by their delegations visit to the Krupps' village in Germany, during spring 1911, a visit reciprocated two months late.[316] This evidence of the organisation's increasing internationalism was further substantiated during its 1912 Annual Conference, Neville observing immediately prior to the meeting that he had received inquiries from Sydney, Johannesburg, Rome, Milan and Berlin;[317] indeed this was a trend which subsequently continued, the association receiving over 200 non British applications for advice between July and September 1913.[318]

Additionally, whilst, in October 1911, plans for a second Garden City had been deferred,[319] its sister, the Garden Suburb, continued to develop apace, 37 such estates being semi and fully completed by February 1912,[320] all offering further evidence of the increasing acceptance and influence of their argument; the most well known of these was that at Hampstead, as with Letchworth designed by Raymond Unwin and, as with Bournville, an estate which was a predominately middle class development, despite interpretations suggesting otherwise.[321]

Moreover, the whole question of town planning, whether as a municipal or private undertaking, was similarly gaining credence, by 1909, receiving support from numerous politically disparate groups. In October, 1909, for example, Sybella Gurney addressed the Sociological Society on 'Reconstruction and the Garden City movement',[322] whilst the following year the L.R.C. offered its endorsement by issuing a "Draft Municipal Programme' for discussion at local and national level.[323] Similarly, the Birmingham I.L.P. was also particularly supportive of this cause, organising a special conference to consider this matter and passing a resolution favouring the construction of such non profit making Garden City Housing Schemes.[324]

This newly established momentum and credence was reflected in the adoption of a new title, the National Housing and Town Planning Association,[325] a body which continued to receive the prominent support and patronage of those within the Cadbury circle. The B.V.T. Secretary, J. H. Barlow, for example, under the auspices of the N.H.R.C., issued a report of the National Advisory Town Planning Committee in 1913, arguing that further housing developments should contain many features of the Bournville estate, including regulations ensuring the strict limitation of the number of houses constructed per acre, and, in particular, the provision of cottages with gardens,[326] sentiments reiterated by George Cadbury Jnr, in his 'Town Planning" in 1915.

Once again the argument was imbued with the contribution this approach might make towards 'national efficiency', the view being expressed that continental rivals such as

Germany had, traditionally, been more fully aware of the potentially deleterious effects of the environment upon the physique of the town population,[327] whilst lamenting that town councils were still not empowered to compulsorily purchase land,[328] Cadbury nevertheless paid tribute to the new municipal activity in this regard, and in particular, to the town planning planning initiatives within Birmingham, the first area to utilise the new powers granted under the 1909 legislation.[329]

Indeed, whilst Cadbury and the G.C.A. considered that much remained to be done, the remarkable 'progress' that Neville had alluded to in 1911 were evidenced elsewhere, the 'Daily News' for example, reporting in August 1913, 'England's Superior Town Planning; Foreign Experts Arrive To Learn and Admire".[330] Describing a visit of professors, city architects and municipal delegates from a number of continental countries, including Germany, Spain and Denmark,[331] and organised by the International Garden City and Town Planning Association, the article claimed that England's town planning had become the model for the world to emulate.[332]

Observing that Germany, once itself 'the model', had been superseded by England,[333] the article reported that the tour would include visits to Chester, Port Sunlight, and the Liverpool municipal housing scheme, in addition to spending two days in Birmingham, a city which the writer remarked had developed town planning in a 'most complete' fashion.[334]

Indeed this scheme, relating to the districts of Harborne, Quinton and Edgbaston, and receiving the Local Government Board's approval in February 1911,[335] was similarly praised by the N.H.R.C., in May 1913, for example, this body applauded and recognised the significance of the lead the local council had taken in this area of social policy,[336] commenting that there,

> *"can be very little doubt that the experience at Birmingham is being of the greatest helped to other authorities."*[337]

There was, moreover, also very little doubt that the Cadburys and the associates were central figures in effecting such a scheme, Harrison Barrow representing the city's Town Planning Committee at a Liverpool meeting, in May 1913,[338] whilst George Cadbury Jnr. subsequently chaired Birmingham's sub-committee overseeing its development and implementation and acting as one of the city's representatives at the July National Planning Conference.[339]

Furthermore, such developments illustrate that whilst George Cadbury continued to exercise his political and social influence on a government he had considerably assisted in gaining power, in steering their legislation in the direction of permanent wide-ranging measures promoting welfare capitalism, other member of his family, together with some of

his associates, increasingly sought and embraced a higher public profile, both nationally and locally. Indeed, this latter trend reveals a further mechanism through which the Cadburys were instrumental in both affecting and effecting Birmingham's housing developments, namely through the holding and exercise of municipal office, Moreover, neither was this influence and participation confined to areas of housing policy, as increasingly the Cadburys became involved in developments and initiatives affecting social policy in general, both within Birmingham and in the wider national arena.

These developments and initiatives will now be considered.

EXTENDING NEW PATERNALISM WITHIN BIRMINGHAM:

The Cadbury Influence on Voluntary and Municipal Agencies

Parallelling their efforts to influence housing policy, further Cadbury attempts to inculcate the values of new paternalism, in essence the desire to create a politically compliant, physical fit, and therefore 'efficient' working class populace, were both orchestrated and encouraged by practices at the Bournville Works, whilst, additionally, being evident through their involvement with various local voluntary groups. Furthermore, these attempts were frequently complemented both by efforts designed to reinforce a sense of social cohesion and to 'improve' moral values and standards.

One particular mechanism though which these aims were pursued was the organisation of numerous clubs, at the Cadbury factory, including the male Youths' Club, formed in 1900, which subsequently developed to offer a variety of indoor and outdoor activities, embracing metalwork, natural history, drama and chess sections and a debating society.[340] Augmenting this body were two others, ostensibly indicative of the altruistic importance the Cadburys attached to their workers' physical fitness and recreation, the Men's Athletic Club, begun in 1896,[341] and the Bournville Girls' Athletic Club, founded three years later.[342]

However, each of these bodies also contributed to the wider Cadbury objective of raising 'national efficiency'; the former, for example, when later complemented by the Departmental Games Association, facilitated an atmosphere conducive to such an aim, in fostering 'common loyalty' and 'team spirit':[343] the latter being considered as an essential and integral part of attempts to increase girls' physical fitness, including, more specifically, their weight levels,[344] thereby raising industrial 'efficiency'.

Furthermore, allied to this emphasis on girls' athletic training, was the importance the Cadburys attached to this and similar clubs in inculcating 'orderly habits'. This was especially emphasised amongst women, by providing an alternative to the perceived social 'evils' of the slums, in aiming, as a Bournville Works publication later commented,

> *"at refining its members by offering opportunities for wholesome recreation and development. In most cases the primary object is to provide a counter-attraction to the streets, where many a girl at present find her sole recreation'.*[345]

In response to this perceived threat to the well being of the nation, in 1910 Elizabeth Cadbury elucidated her views on the imperative need to provide such alternatives, arguing in favour of the establishment of a network of small clubs, organised under the auspices of bodies such as churches and others prepared to cooperate towards this end.[346]

In particular, Cadbury highlighted the role that such clubs could play in arresting

the physical and moral 'wastage' occurring in all Britain's large cities;[347] specifically she suggested that,

> *"we might have prevented the demoralisation of this class if they had been taken at an earlier stage of their lives, and character forming influences brought to bear upon them while they were still impressionable and capable of responding".*[348]

Indeed, the Cadbury family had long been involved within the city in promoting and patronising organisations with this specific objective; one of the most prominent of these was the Birmingham and Midland Counties Vigilance Association, which, from 1888 had sought to repress 'Criminal Vice and Public Immorality', with the aim of engendering 'social purity'.[349]

Overlapping with the aims of similar organisations such AS N.U.W.W. and later the Eugenics Education Society (see chapter 4), this body had its origins in a local committee acting for the repeal of the Contagious Diseases (Women) statutes which permitted the enforced medical inspection of women in certain naval towns,[350] declaring its object to be,

> *"creating and sustaining a healthy public opinion on questions and social morals between the sexes, of promoting social purity, and of co-operating with similar institutions".*[351]

From its formation the Cadbury family adopted both a high profile within its structure and, through continued patronage, helped to ensure its perpetuation. Elizabeth Cadbury, for example, served on its initial Executive Committee,[352] Richard Cadbury was the organisation's Secretary between 1890 and 1894,[353] whilst George Cadbury was a regular annual subscriber, contributing £15.15.0 in 1888,[354] £25 the following year,[355] and in 1894.[356] Indeed, he was still making these donations in 1914,[357] whilst his brother similarly illustrated their interest in and influence within this body, being the organisation's President in 1897 and 1898.[358]

Certainly the Cadburys, with their Quaker background and beliefs, were extremely attracted to a movement which was dominated by an image of 'sober, ordered, respectability'.[359] Indeed these attributes were ones which Miss E. H. Cadbury wished the Association to encourage throughout wider society, demanding in 1891, for exmaple, that a high moral code be a compulsory prerequisite of those seeking public office.[360]

Moreover, the appointment of Richard Cadbury as President reflected the organisation's appreciation of the Cadbury influence and its consequently raised expectations; accordingly its publicity organ, the 'Vigilance Record' was especially enthusiastic, forecasting that the body would experience 'a new lease of life' as it sought to promote the 'purity of social life' and the eradication of practices which involved and

encouraged the degradation of women.[361]

Such involvement with an organisation which perceived sexual vice as a principal agent in national deterioration and degeneration, being responsible for increases in venereal disease and the declining birth-rate,[362] was compounded by continued attempts to highlight the dangers of the street and the prevalence of immorality resulting from alcoholic pursuits. Indeed, in 1907 a national investigation, concerned with 'Women and Children in Public Houses',[363] added further credence to the proponents of this particular moral crusade; specifically the Chief Constable of Birmingham, C. H. Rafter, corroborated the Associations perceptions in observing that the,

> *"practice amongst women of taking infants and young children into public houses at all hours from early morning until late at night is general and very extensive. . . In the lower quarters of Birmingham women resort to the public houses shortly after 10 o'clock in the morning in large numbers. . . (the) same thing occurs at night, especially on Saturday nights".*[364]

Moreover, such movements towards 'social improvement' were supplemented by the activities of a further Cadbury influenced organisation, the Birmingham Branch of the N.U.W.W.. This body, which appointed the Cadbury associate Mrs Walter Barrow as President in 1908[365] and Elizabeth Cadbury as Vice President from 1897,[366] operated initially through their Factory Helpers' Union, which from the 1890s had,

> *"visited factories in the dinner hour for a hymn, a bible reading and a friendly talk".*[367]

However, by the opening decade of the 20th century and the attendant changes in the political response to the question of national deterioration, such attempts at moral suasion had become replaced by more coercive measures towards factory workers' health. One initiative illustrating this new tendency was the suppression of alcohol in the workplace, and involved the formation of a 'federation' between employers and all women workers, and the 'mutual agreement' that the transgression of this regulation was a dismissable offense.[368]

Parallelling these initiatives was the development of the Women's Settlement movement, a body which became increasingly recognised both locally and nationally. Receiving the support and patronage of the Cadburys, with Elizabeth Cadbury as a Vice President,[369] the movement sought to promote similar aims to those propounded at the Bournville estate. This was, for example, demonstrated by Birmingham's Mayoress in announcing the body's impending establishment in 1898, highlighting the role she envisaged for the organisation in enabling women from different social and economic classes to meet.[370]

As with many other similar bodies, this movement became an agency and platform for the advance and dissemination of the paternalism/'national efficiency' argument, frequently acting alongside national bodies sharing these ideals. At the annual conference of the N.U.W.W. in 1907, for example, the Birmingham Women's Settlement's first Warden[371] and Mattheson, a co-author of the Bournville tract, 'Women, Work and Wages'. strongly urged physical and hygiene reform in the workplace, arguing that,

> *"cleanliness could be enforced must as well as punctuality or honesty".*[372]

Similar to the National Union's 'Health Visitors in the Home',[373] the Women's Settlement movement received the endorsement of professional bodies such as the Sanitary Institute, with its belief that all women should receive sanitary training, given their potential 'potent' role in educating their family, and thereby greatly influencing the 'physical and sanitary state of the next generation'.[374]

Furthermore, in particular, through its contact with the urban populace, the Women's Settlement movement was perceived as an instrument through which the,

> *"intelligent women of the working classes. . .(could). . . be made to realise the perils of the insanitary conditions under which they live and the absolute necessity for the improvement of the same".*[375]

Subsequently, in 1899, the Birmingham Women's Settlement (B.W.S) was founded.[376] with the specific aim of,

> *"improving the condition and raising the standard among a population that is heavily handicapped by its environment".*[374]

Operating as a centre for the study of social work and industrial conditions within the densely populated district of Hockley,[378] the organisation also began the social and economic 'education' of its working class clientele; this was undertaken by (for example) the provision of relief work for the sick, the operation of a 'Mothers' Club in 1902, and, in 1899, the founding of a 'Provident Society',[379] which, through its, 'Thrift Collectors', encouraged its members to save small sums of money for unanticipated expenses.(380)

Furthermore, this body closely resembled the Settlement movement of Canon Barnett, in urging the working class to adopt the 'respectable' mores/behaviour of its middle Christian members and offering such activists an opportunity to fulfil their desire for social action, by living, working (and exerting their influence) within an economically deprived urban environment.[381] Such bodies received plaudits from numerous contemporary moderate reformers, including the Fabians,[382] an organisation to which both

George Cadbury Jnr and his brother Edward paid annual subscriptions throughout the first two decades of the century.[383] This support was supplemented by the approval of those more overtly associated with the Cadburys, including the 'Daily News';[384] whilst such settlements were additionally subsequently praised for their role in stimulating local bodies, including town councils, to display a greater awareness of their social responsibility[385]

However, in essence this was somewhat limited, their mode of operation again reflecting a conservative interpretation of radicalism, in aiming to narrow rather than remove, class differences.[386] Indeed, in a related context, a similar conclusion can be reached in respect of the work undertaken by many of these agencies, in that whilst they purported to pursue the goal of social justice, in ameliorating the worst of urban conditions, they also contained a social engineering subtext; this was particularly evident through their efforts for women to adopt a more traditional, gender specific, role, at a time when many of their more strident middle class contemporaries sought a greater degree of occupational and political enfranchisement.

Indicative of this tendency was the Mayoress' opening address at the Sanitary Institute's Birmingham conference in 1898, when, in praising the increasing level of women's social work in the city, she suggested that such efforts might serve a further purpose if,

> *"some classes for girls on simple nursing and first-aid could be added to the programme for the many girls' clubs now established in Birmingham they would probably prove attractive and much useful knowledge might be instilled".*[387]

Subsequently these organisation, together with their more formal educational counterparts, became an important and extensive mechanism for the transmission of messages concerning the role of women within the modern social and welfare structure (see chapter 5) 53 such clubs operating within the city by 1911.[388]

Moreover, the initiatives of both these bodies and the Women's Settlement movement were complemented by attempts to inculcate the welfare paternalist philosophy amongst the middle classes, and especially amongst those women active in voluntary social service.

One particular such agency, was the Birmingham Women's Guild (B.W.G.) founded in 1906, under the Presidency of Elizabeth Cadbury,[389] a body in which Mrs George Shann was similarly active, becoming a Vice President in 1910,[390] the organisation declaring its object to be the promotion of 'educational religious and social purposes'.[391] Meeting on Wednesday afternoons,[392] thereby precluding the attendance of working women, and with an initial membership of 114,[393] this essentially middle class organisation immediately attracted numerous prominent and influential local speakers in pursuit of this aim; the Guild's speakers for its inaugural year included, for example, the Bournville

practitioner, Dr Robb,[394] and Mrs Tom Bryan,[395] of Cadbury's Woodbrooke College (see Chapter 5).

In 1908, George Shann indicated one of the body's aims, in illustrating the 'useful lines' through which Guild members might participate in social reform,[396] whilst practice the organisation principally operated as an organ for the publicising, through regular lectures, of themes of contemporary interest and concern, particularly within the sphere of hygiene and public health.

Indeed, its initial report was indicative of this aim, in recording that, of the 19 addresses given during its inaugural year, 4 were concerned with biology, 3 with Settlement work, 2 with the education of children, and 1 each with nursing, diet and alcohol.[397]

Similarly, subsequent lectures maintained this emphasis, the Spring 1907 programme embracing lectures on 'Diet and Disease',[398] and 'Physical Culture for Children'.[399] whilst the following year's subjects included an address on 'Consumption',[400] being the forerunner of a series of 4 'well attended. . . instructive and interesting', hygiene lectures delivered in 1908/9.[401]

Consequently, therefore, in operating through these educative measures, the Guild was yet another Cadbury influenced organisation which interlinked with, and supplemented the numerous voluntary bodes active in the area of social welfare.

Indeed, the influence of both George and Elizabeth Cadbury in promoting voluntary social work, both through organisations such as the B.W.G. and the founding of youths' clubs, was widely acknowledged, the President of the N.F.C.C. observing, in 1911, for example, that the,

> *"welfare of the girls in towns and villages had no more municifent supporter than Mr George Cadbury".*[402]

However, given renewed impetus by the Liberal government's social welfare legislation, including Bills enabling local education authorities to provide meals for necessitous children, and requiring pupils in their schools to be medically inspected and, where appropriate, receive remedial treatment,[403] increasingly the Cadburys began to acknowledge the potential of local government as an instrument in achieving their specific and general objectives.

In 1910, for example, Elizabeth Cadbury both revealed her support for this trend and acknowledged the potential role of these bodies in extending the work of voluntary agencies; specifically she observed that those,

> *"who are responsible. . . feel that the time has come for municipal authorities to unite in the work by taking steps to provide places where boys and girls can go for healthy recreation. . ."*[404]

Furthermore, not only was Cadbury convinced of the need for state intervention, regulation and supervision of matters bearing on the health of the nation's children, this was an interest that she, and other family members and associates, was prepared to pursue in the limelight of municipal office.

Consequently, even from the inception of Greater Birmingham in 1911, several of the Cadburys were prominent amongst those seeking to hold and exercise political power in the city. Indeed, during her 1907 Presidential Address to the N.U.W.W., Elizabeth Cadbury had linked such a desire to the future well being of the health and morals of a large part of the population; in particular she urged those, essentially male, employers who shared the Cadbury philosophy, to become involved in local government, arguing that the,

> *"Housing problem is at last arousing attention, but while the slums are being attacked and partially demolished in cities, fresh slums are springing up in the suburbs. What can employers do here? Are not Town Councils and District Councils largely composed of employers? If they are not able to provide decent homes themselves for their people, cannot they try to do so through municipal enterprise and forethought? How many employers care about these things? These problems can only be solved when they do care".*[405]

Nor was this the limit of Elizabeth Cadbury's ambitions in the public arena. With women becoming eligible for such positions in 1906,[406] she also enthusiastically welcomed and promoted their involvement in municipal affairs, serving on the initial General Committee of the Birmingham Society for Promoting the Election of Women on Local Bodies, formed in March, 1908;[407] this was, incidentally a body which illustrated the growing civic influence of the Cadburys, this General Committee also including Mrs Barrow Cadbury and Mrs Walter Cadbury alongside Harrison Barrow,[408] the latter becoming the organisation's President in 1913.[409]

Subsequently amending its name to 'The Birmingham Women's Local Government Society',[410] this 'non-political' body,[411] sought to promote the involvement of women, both elected and otherwise, in the work of the city council, its Annual Meeting's Chairman, Professor Ashley, Dean of the local university's Commerce Faculty,[412] suggesting that they would be of particular benefit in initiatives involving younger children and women, as

> *"much of the work of administration must be imperfectly performed without the assistance of that understanding of her sex which women alone could bring".*[413]

Whilst the promotion and indeed direction of such activism was continued by this and similar Cadbury associated voluntary agencies, including the B.W.G. and the Birmingham Women's Settlement, (B.W.S) (see chapter 5) this participation was accompanied by the efforts of this group of Cadbury personnel to expand their influence even further by becoming involved in municipal affairs; these were attempts which became

evident in Kings Norton in the period immediately before its 1911 inclusion with the Greater Birmingham boundary, J. H. Barlow, becoming a member of the area's Education Committee in 1906,[414] being joined by George Shann the following year.[415]

Subsequently, this involvement became both replicated and extended within Birmingham, as, almost immediately, the Cadburys came to represent an influential and significant element in those committees concerned with the health of the city's populace. By 1912, for example, George Cadbury Jnr was serving on the Town Planning Committee,[416] William A. Cadbury was a member of the Public Health and Housing Committee,[417] whilst the Education Committee contained Elizabeth Cadbury, George Cadbury Jnr, Mrs Walter Barrow and George Shann.[418]

This latter committee is particularly illustrative of where the Cadbury priorities and interests lay, for whilst George Cadbury Jnr, was a member of both the Central Care Sub-Committee,[419] with R. W. Ferguson of Bournville's Works' Education Department, worked on the Tecnnical Education and Evening Schools' Sub-Committee,[420] both Elizabeth Cadbury and George Shann held comparable posts from the inauguration of the Hygiene Sub-Committee in November 1911.[421]

Indeed, Shann, had already illustrated this interest through his work as a Councillor in King's Norton,[422] being nominated, for example, as a Children's Care Committee District Commissioner, charged with administering the Medical Treatment Act, 1909, for the,

> *"purpose of securing ameliorative measures in regard to defects revealed by Medical Inspection".*[423]

Whilst the formation of these bodies was later 'deferred' by the authority's annexation by Birmingham,[424] this interest was one which was clearly maintained. Both Shann and Elizabeth Cadbury, for example, subsequently served on the city's Medical Treatment Sub-Committee,[425] and further demonstrated this interest in representing the Hygiene Sub-Committee on a body which liaised with the local authority, employers and employees, in an attempt to regulate the 'social welfare' of juvenile workers.[426]

Moreover, as Chairman throughout this period to 1914,[427] Cadbury was in a particularly prominent and influential position both to implement and publicise measures the Hygiene Sub-Committee had initiated, in discharging their executive powers with regard to medical inspection and treatment.[428]

As with each of these committees, a further opportunity to reinforce their objectives was provided by invitations to the conferences of professionals in their respective fields. This, for instance, enabled delegates to both hear the contemporary ideas and experience of others, whilst offering a platform for the promotion and publicising of the initiatives

implemented in Birmingham. In 1912, for example, George Shann visited the Berlin Congress on Public Health,[429] whilst Elizabeth Cadbury accepted an invitation to represent the committee at the Royal Sanitary Institutes's Exeter meeting the following year.[430]

Furthermore, the same year she addressed a conference in Manchester on 'The Health of the Nation",[431] an opportunity that was utilised to expound many of the arguments of the Cadburys had reiterated throughout the housing debate. Requesting her audience to consider the conditions prevailing in the majority of both factories and domestic dwellings, Cadbury declared that health was,

> *"a very important factor in efficiency as regards good work, on which the prosperity of the nation depends; and on the making of happy homes and lives for the workers".*[432]

Directing her principal concern towards women and children at work,[433] Cadbury recognised that the more serious and 'important' physical defects were the result of a complex interrelation of social factors that might take years to both understand and remedy.[434] Nevertheless, she pointed to the valuable contribution of the work of the Board of Education in developing treatment facilities for children suffering less debilitating and permanent injury.[435] Observing that contemporary inquiries had revealed 'abundant evidence' of school leavers being rejected or dismissed from employment due to physical defects including tuberculosis, general debility and heart trouble,[436] Cadbury echoing 'national efficiency' arguments, suggested that such treatment was of paramount importance and, furthermore, that it,

> *"should be brought into direct application in relation to industry. The medical care of the school child properly exercised appropriately utilised is a proposition which is sound and economical in the best sense of the term - for it is nothing less than the physical equipment and preparation of the child for its industrial life".*[437]

Such a perception was echoed in Cadbury's views regarding the particular importance the health of women held for the future of the nation, and the consequent ramifications of this for working class women; indeed this outlook was reflected both in the policies pursued by the eugenic associated and affiliated bodies to which the Cadburys subscribed, (see chapter 4) and in the educational provision such women received, (see chapter 5) and was a perception again priortising the predominance of 'national efficiency' arguments and one mirrored by the political protagonists of these legislative enactments. George Newman, for example, later the first head of the Ministry of Health,[438] utilised this argument in 1907, whilst three years earlier the Liberal 'radical' reformer T. J. Macnamara had underlined this motivation, in apologising for any misunderstanding caused by his

proposals for children's care, explaining that whilst these may have appeared to resemble socialism, in reality they represented pragmatic imperialism.[439]

Subsequently, in 1916, in an article for 'The Child', Cadbury outlined the beginnings of this movement in Birmingham following the 1907 Education Act.[440] Furthermore, she argued, the need for such a movement was subsequently entirely justified by the results, in 1914, of the city's first comprehensive medical review of elementary school children, with over 18,000 'defects', discovered amongst the 33,193 pupils inspected;[441] accordingly this was a result which had at least partly led to the opening of a 'Central Clinic' the following year,[442] the authority operating 8 such bodies by January 1916.[443]

Similarly, in 1923, Miss Laurence Cadbury drew the attention of the National Council of Women to the importance of work of 'The Social Medical Service',[444] an address she partly utilised to outline the history and activities of this body within Birmingham.[445] Again employing long term economic arguments, in viewing the treatments available as investments to secure a healthy and, therefore, 'efficient' future workforce,[446] Cadbury also sought to publicise the efforts of the service for the more disadvantaged of their community; in particular she emphasised their actions in operating a Cripples' Residential School, and a Voluntary Cripples' Home and Hospital for 100 children,[447] together with the provision of two Open-air schools.[448]

This latter development was one with which Elizabeth Cadbury and George Shann were particularly associated, following in October 1911, the Report of the Physically Defective Enquiry Sub-Committee, a document which advised the Education Committee on the effect of various attempts to prevent the spread of tuberculosis.[449] The report set in motion a series of consultations between those council agencies most affected and interested in this matter, Elizabeth Cadbury and George Shan, for example, as the Hygiene Sub-Committee's designated representative, subsequently meeting with members of the Public Health and Housing Committee, to establish arrangements for countering this disease within the city.[450]

Whilst the resolution of the meeting was that these bodies, together with the Medical Officer of Health and the Schools' Medical Officer, were required to draw up joint proposals,[451] Elizabeth Cadbury additionally pursued an independent enquiry investigating the possibility of establishing an Open-air classroom at Cotteridge Infants' School;[452] indeed the Hygiene Sub-Committee representatives subsequently appointed to consider this matter with their Elementary Education counterparts were also particularly revealing, in including George Shann, Elizabeth Cadbury and her fellow municipal eugenicist Mrs Hume Pinsent[453] (see chapter 4).

Moreover, Cadbury was so enthusiastic about this proposal that she offered to raise or donate the money required to provide such a classroom;[454] providing a lead that

was followed two weeks later by the Education Committee, in approving recommendations to introduce, in April, 1913, experimental open air classes, together with regular medical examinations, at five of their schools.[455] Indeed, by the end of the year the authority had further demonstrated their acceptance of this argument, in opening Uffculme School, an Open-air establishment for up to 120 pupils.[456]

Whilst this remained the authority's only specific Open-air institution until the founding of Cropwood School in the early 1920's,[457] the Hygiene Sub-Committee continued its promotion of this measure to combat tuberculosis, in February 1913 requesting the School Medical Officer, Dr Auden, to submit a provisional scheme for the introduction of 'open air classrooms' throughout the region's schools.[458]

Furthermore, in November 1913, Elizabeth Cadbury gave a favourable appraisal of these establishments' effectiveness, commenting that during a recent visit with Auden she had observed that the,

> *"children looked so delicate and small, but seemed to be improving under the new system . . . Then we went on to Ward End, where there seems the chance of establishing another Open-Air School in time".*[459]

Indeed during these initial years, and under Cadbury's Chairmanship, the Hygiene Sub-Committee could justifiably claim to be in vanguard of those implementing and administer-ing the educational aspects of the Liberal's state welfare programme, having implemented, by 1912, for example, a scheme for the treatment of eye and teeth defects,[460] and, by 1913, administering medical inspections, with the object of preventing the spread of disease within schools, by identifying, excluding and treating those they subsequently classified as 'verminous children'.[461]

Furthermore, these measures operated alongside the authority's efforts to feed 'necessitous' children by implementing the Education Provision of Meals Act, 1906; by February, 1912, for example, the authority was distributing over 2,500 meal tickets at a monthly cost of £177.13.6d,[462] a provision which the council anticipated rising, in seeking the Board of Education's approval to increase their annual meals' budget to £5,500.[463]

Moreover, these efforts were supplemented by others which similarly reflected a commit-ment to the welfare programme of the Liberals, and the desire to promote and administer a coherent social system as widely as possible, including the dissemination of their political perspectives. Consequently, one particularly important aspect of this task was in persuading the working classes of the benefits of the authority's work, and the merits of their beliefs. This task illustrated by the arranging of talks to mothers on the 'uses and objects of medical inspection';[464] one such venture was, for example, organised in December, 1911, by the city's Hygiene Sub-Committee,[465] chaired by Elizabeth Cadbury.[466]

Moreover, the desire to implement a coherent and efficient system was also evident in practices which mirrored those introduced for the adult, predominately working class, populace, The Central Care Committee, for example, including Elizabeth Cadbury and George Shann,[467] recommended, in January 1912, that a compulsory condition of those under 17 seeking employment was that they apply through the Committee's Juvenile Employment Exchange,[468] thereby ensuring they underwent the same regulation and monitoring process as adults.

Through these widespread measures, therefore, the Birmingham City Council, and particularly those agencies with which the Cadburys were primarily associated, enacted initiatives which both reflected contemporary public health arguments, and the drive towards 'national efficiency'.

Mirroring the objectives of the B.V.T. and offering a largely environmentalist perspective, these municipal bodies frequently interlinked in encouraging Birmingham's working class populace to adopt and accept behavioural patterns and practices designed to 'improve' their physical health. Augmented by the activities of numerous voluntary groups, many of which received the support, patronage and leadership, of the Cadburys, these actions, whilst undoubtedly having a positive and beneficial effect on the lives and health of the working classes, nevertheless reflected an adherence to 'national efficiency' arguments, and the reinforcement of capitalist values when more radical alternatives might have appealed to an increasingly enfranchised and political aware populace.

Operating through agencies which sought to inculcate a specific sense of moral/civic duty amongst the middle classes, subsequent activists were encouraged to promote measures which enhanced both the working of capitalism, together with perceptions of the economic status quo as a system of mutual interest, whilst urging the working classes to adopt behavioural patterns and a political philosophy befitting 'respectable' citizens.

The Cadburys, having helped ensure the election of the Liberals, were, therefore, subsequently instrumental both in steering and effecting legislative change in the direction of welfare capitalism, and active in its implementation, especially in areas which enhanced national and industrial 'efficiency'.

Whilst Cross, (1963) has argued that these measures represented an ad hoc, 'fumble' towards the welfare state,[469] increasingly, the government came under pressure from the new paternalists, including the Cadburys, to implement these legislative 'reforms' as part of their 'efficiency' lead programme of state intervention.

Consequently, central to these aims was the acceptance of state mechanisms, supple-mented by sympathetic interest groups, as agents in the social policy arena. Dovetailing with the messages and effects of the B.V.T. and the N.H.R.C. with regard to housing policy, the role of the Cadburys in this process was through the propagation and

implementation of their new paternalist political/social philosophy, both through municipal activism and numerous voluntary groups.

Furthermore, these actions, reinforcing and complementing each other across major areas of social policy, effectively ensured the state adopted what both its adherents and critics perceived as the crucial roles of welfare paternalist and educational prescriber. In 1908, for example, 'The Socialist', argued that just as,

> *"temperance legislation provides better exploitable material in the shape of sober wage slaves for the capitalist class. . . the education of its future wage slaves is too important a matter to leave to the parents of the children they dare not leave it;"*[470]

Moreover, reinforcing and compounding these actions was a further, related, area of Cadbury interest and one more fully explored in chapter 4, that of the promotion of strictly delineated gender roles. Whilst this aim, together with the encouragement of middle class behaviour patterns and perspectives, was perpetrated throughout the social policy spectrum, perhaps its most fundamental and widespread influence and propagation was also in the area of education, and, in particular, schooling.

Coinciding with contemporary interest concerning the 'cult of the child', this area of involvement was also illustrative of a more negative aspect to the new paternalist/state interventionist argument; whilst, for instance, many of the initiatives undertaken by the Cadburys and the bodies with which they were associated were frequently characterised as representative of an environmentalist perspective, aspects of their thought and actions betrayed beliefs which, far from denying, actively embraced arguments propounding the importance of heredity for the health of the nation.

Indeed, one particular measure illustrating this concern parallelled the extension of Open-air provision within Birmingham, with the ceding of the control and management of Uffculme to the Special Schools' Sub-Committee.[471] Increasingly this body, which contained both George Shann and Mrs Hume Pinsent,[472] (see chapter 4) became involved in the question of 'feeble-mindedness', a question which was similarly exercising many contemporary social activists/theorists, including both the Eugenics Education Society and the N.U.W.W..

Furthermore, at the N.F.C.C.'s conference, in 1911, Elizabeth Cadbury expounded on the importance of social work amongst the urban poor in eradicating another perceived moral and social 'evil', that of homeless unmarried women. Expressing her desire that every large town should establish a hostel for such women,[473] Cadbury was touching upon a theme that was receiving much contemporary discussion, that of the contribution of the 'feeble-minded' to the deterioration of both morals, principally through prostitution, and the racial stock in general.

Indeed the following May, the Association of Municipal Corporations heard an address from Cadbury's associate, Mrs. Hume Pinsent, highlighting the prevalence of this group in such Rescue Homes, contemporary evidence revealing that up to a third of residents in these institutions fell within this classification.[474] Consequently, Pinsent argued, there was an urgent need for new legislation to review the formal assessment of feeble-mindedness, to facilitate greater powers of detention and segregation;[475] moreover, in so doing, Pinsent echoed calls emanating from a number of groups offering a solution to a seemingly deepening national crisis and one in which, locally, the Cadburys had been actively participating since the 1890's, with the founding of 'The Laundry and Homes of Industry', in 1892,[476] a body which later became the 'Agatha Stacey Homes'.[477]

Furthermore, in 1910, by lending its formal support to this campaign,[478] the organisation allied more closely to those groups concentrating their energies on the perceived importance of the qualities of motherhood, and its attendant preoccupation, the 'cult of the child'. Though not a new perception, either amongst the Cadburys or others expressing interest in these questions, it was, nevertheless, one which was gaining considerable credence, given the contemporary concern over the 'deterioration' of the nation.

The nature of the Cadburys' involvement both with this issue and its main protagonists, including Ellen Pinsent, and the ramifications of such beliefs, particularly women, will be considered in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4
THE CADBURYS AND THE PROPAGATION OF SOCIAL DARWINISTIC IDEAS

INTRODUCTION

In displaying their consistently increasing commitment to respond to the 'social question' issue throughout the twenty years following the 1895 Manchester Conference, the activism of the Cadburys found expression through a number of interrelated agencies and mechanisms, including both voluntary and municipal bodies, together with initiatives such as the B.V.T., over which they exercised a more direct supervisory and controlling role.

Whilst the Cadburys frequently cited the pursuit of 'social justice' as the motivation underpinning this involvement, such activism was, however, also significantly indicative of a determination to direct the liberal paternalist's newly credible and popular doctrine of state interventionism and its accompanying mechanisms towards the Cadbury ideal of a politically moderate, 'efficient' and compliant workforce, and, by extension, general populace.

More specifically, this determination became expressed through various attempts to influence a government which George Cadbury had particularly assisted in gaining office, a number of these taking the form of legislative campaigns, such as with the sweated trades and Old Age Pension issues, whilst the B.V.T. was utilised in a more propagandist/'educative' role, in being promoted as a model development for adoption on a much larger and wider scale.

As such these efforts represented part of a coherent social policy framework aimed at alleviating the 'worst', and most 'inefficient' aspects of industrial capitalism, whilst simultaneously averting political and social circumstances which might lead to the widespread working class rejection, and resultant breakdown, of the prevailing economic orthodoxy.

Consequently, these initiatives were complemented both by political efforts to appease the official labour movement, and, from 1906, the enthusiastic endorsement of the Liberal Party's state interventionist measures, including the enforcement of the government's social legislation programme, particularly where this programme focussed on the nation's young; this was an involvement which included the Cadbury participation on the City of Birmingham's Education Committee as it implemented initiatives directing financial resources to, and focussing public attention on, the region's working classes, and especially on their children i.e. paternalistic programmes and strategies at least partly pursued in the interests of middle class definitions of 'social justice', and under the umbrella of 'national efficiency', but which can, nevertheless, be more objectively viewed

as positive municipal interventionism, in that they conferred certain tangible, physiological, benefits on the subjects of these policies.

Moreover, whilst these and other educational initiatives, (see chapter 5), became perhaps the most overt and widespread of all the mechanisms disseminating the Cadbury social philosophy, such messages were additionally and initially expressed through numerous voluntary agencies considerably earlier than the Cadburys began to pursue a higher public profile.

As with both the B.V.T. and their educational involvement, a major aspect of this Cadbury participation was a desire to 'raise the ideals', of, primarily, Birmingham's working class populace, and in particular, modifying and moderating this sector's behavioural patterns through an overriding emphasis on the issue of temperance.

Consequently, to maximise its effect, this activism was pursued in collaboration with those who sought to impose a far more radical and reactionary framework in redefining the Edwardian social agenda. Frequently invoking notions of 'social purity', in promoting the adoption of their own particular values in the pursuit of the 'betterment' of the country, this agenda became manifest in a number of broadly related moralistic campaigns which commonly cited the urgent need to regenerate the race, and which were supplemented by the increasing utilisation of the apparent credence offered by social scientific enquiry.

Pertinently, much of this activity was conducted in the climate of extreme concern highlighted by the 'Manchester Regiment' publicity, and the subsequent appointment, in September 1903, of a Royal Commission to investigate the apparent physical deterioration of the race,[1] such beliefs manifesting both locally and nationally in a plethora of bodies with the central aim of raising 'social efficiency', and, conversely, halting and reversing this 'decline' of the racial stock.

The perception of this question as being of fundamental importance was, moreover, one adhered to by many contemporary social reformers, who, displaying a broad consensus, began to advocate heredity based arguments as a panacea for this apparent crisis.

Indeed, the widespread acceptance of this diagnosis in attempts to reverse the perceived decline has been identified as a feature shared by many such ostensibly disparate political groups, Ashford, 1986, for example, citing the Fabians, eugenicists and the Charity Organisation Society as amongst those expressing sympathy with this perspective.[2]

Moreover, within the Quaker and Cadbury journalistic circle approval of these perspectives and eugenic arguments was expressed with greater explicitness. In 1907, for example, in arguing that science now offered a remedy for both physical and social diseases, 'The Friends' Quarterly Examiner' welcomed the publication of what it termed the 'new library of medicine', a series which, whilst considering subjects such as nutrition and personal hygiene, also embraced the questions of infant mortality, alcoholism and heredity.[3]

A central thesis of this chapter is that, amidst such projections of impending national

calamity, and with particular relevance to their preoccupation with the 'cult of the child', the Cadburys expanded their social philosophy to accommodate and propagate such perceptions, a realignment evident from the early 1890's, but which gathered a greater intensification and public expression in this Edwardian social climate.

Consequently, whilst many of the initiatives undertaken by the bodies with which they were associated were representative of a generally environmentalist perspective, aspects of their thought and actions betrayed beliefs which, far from denying, actively embraced arguments propounding and emphasising the importance of heredity for the continued health, including economic health, of the nation.

In particular, such perspectives resulted in the Cadburys maintaining their adherence to traditional agencies arguing for temperance 'reform', in the interests of both 'social justice' and 'national efficiency', whilst the organisations championing this cause similarly signalled a broad acceptance and advocacy of eugenic principles, alongside the environmental arguments with which they are more usually associated.

Furthermore, the Cadbury involvement with the voluntary social sector also consistently illustrated this negative aspect of state interventionist ideology, as the experiences and perceptions of those working with the most underprivileged of the poor produced a reformulation of some elements of their new Liberalism/paternalistic ideal; especially as these experiences were interpreted as corroborating the rapidly growing 'external' claims and 'evidence' highlighting the apparently escalating crisis affecting the country's racial stock, and in particular the nation's urban communities.

Specifically, the Cadbury adherence to these beliefs became expressed through their involvement in a major social engineering strategy centring on a preoccupation with the 'quality of the race'; in particular it found expression in their determination to lobby/ persuade the government to sanction the right of parenthood only for those whose children were likely to bring monetary 'benefit' to the nation as a whole, by, conversely, withdrawing such a right from those whose offspring they anticipated to be a financial encumbrance to the state.

Accordingly, such concerns resulted in the orchestration of, perhaps, the most pertinent of all the campaigns to counter the perceived racial decline, one which ultimately resulted in the Liberal Government's 1913 'Mental Deficiency Act', legislation which considerably broadened the categories of those who could be legally institutionalised and, crucially, enabled such segregation, rather than ending at 16, to be indefinitely continued.

Woodhouse, (1982) has attributed the success of this campaign to the influence of the Eugenics Education Society, (E.E.S.) in that the parliamentary debates accompanying this measure were almost wholly reflective of the society's perspective;[4] indeed this was an interpretation which the organisation similar held, Kirby commenting in 1914/5 that the Act was,

"perhaps, the only piece of English social law extant, in which the influence of heredity has been treated as a practical factor in determining its provisions".[5]

Indeed, the E.E.S. is of particular importance in this process, in interacting with many other, primarily middle class, bodies of social activists,[7] and, furthermore, having crystallised heredity based arguments, becoming prominent in advocating their adoption, or at least their adaptation, by government policy makers.

This influence is indeed clearly evident, both during the parliamentary debates and the burgeoning degree of supportive publicity which preceded this measure, including the 'Report of the Royal Commission into the Care and Control of the Feeble-minded', (see later); however such an analysis takes no account of the activism of other groups who, frequently working alongside the E.E.S., and utilising the opportunity afforded by state interventionism's increasing credence, pressed for similar legislative change.

Specifically, whilst not seeking to understate the role of the E.E.S. in this campaign, the proposition postulated here seeks to redress this lack of recognition, in arguing that the activism orchestrated and conducted within organisations the Cadburys supported and promoted, played a significant, but, in hindsight, a largely unacknowledged part, in creating a climate conducive to such legislation; pertinently the contribution of the Birmingham areas 'Homes of Laundry and Industry' was of particular importance here, both in considerably predating the formation of the E.E.S. in 1907,[7] and in maintaining its activism over a twenty year period of continual Cadbury patronage.

The principal concern underlying this campaign related to the perceived widening disparity in the respective birth rates of the upper/middle and working classes, a perspective which underpinned the eugenic inspired attempts to encourage and stimulate the former, whilst tempering the latter, including measures to segregate the 'less useful' members of society, thereby ensuring their removal from the nation's procreating stock.

The widespread prevalence of this concern amongst the Cadburys became illustrated not only in the campaign for the extension of state powers of detention which ultimately resulted in the Mental Deficiency Act of 1913, but also by the formation, six months later, of the National Birth Rate Commission; pertinently again, this was a body which contained the 'Daily News' editor A. G. Gardiner,[8] as it received the remit of establishing the causes and effects of Britain's declining birth rate,[9] in order to accomplish the 'spiritual, moral and physical regeneration of the race'.[10]

Moreover, this commission, established under the auspices of the 'National Council of Public Morals',[11] an organisation which contained George Cadbury as a Vice-President and Elizabeth Cadbury on its 'Ladies' Advisory Council',[12] was one which, whilst acknowledging the importance of environmental causal factors in this perceived decline, commented that it did not,

"seek to deny the inheritance of both mental and physical characters, and it recognises that legislation which ignores the facts of variation and heredity must ultimately lead to national deterioration;"[13]

Furthermore, aspects of this perspective were similarly revealed by Elizabeth Cadbury during 1914/5, in contributing, for example, to the E.E.S. scheme for the establishment of a maternity home by the 'Professional Classes War Relief Council', to provide facilities for those of,

"a selected group, (who) may be expected to have offspring of more than average value to the nation."[14]

Moreover, this was far from the extent of the Cadburys' association with such perspectives and, indeed their collaboration with eugenic organisations. This embracing and espousing of heredity arguments was perhaps most overtly expressed during the inter war years, a period in which Birmingham received praise from the E.E.S. for its level of eugenic activity,[15] and when Mrs Barrow Cadbury and Elizabeth Cadbury, together with her sons Paul and Laurence all subscribed to this Society;[16] indeed the latter was elected to the body's Council during 1938/9,[17] becoming a Vice President twelve years later.[18]

Furthermore, this association coincided with the society renewing its pressure for eugenic legislation, the E.E.S Annual Report in 1930/1 describing the organisation's 'chief activity' for the year as attempting to persuade Parliament to authorise the voluntary sterilisation of 'mental defectives'.[19]

Indeed this campaign intensified the following year, with efforts to introduce the Society's 'Sterilisation Bill', an initiative which, although defeated,[20] was perhaps somewhat partially redeemed in January 1934 by the recommendations of the (Brock) Royal Commission; proposals which the E.E.S. reported as being a 'striking vindication' of their policy over this matter.[21]

Moreover, these calls were echoed by the N.U.W.W., for which Elizabeth Cadbury continued as a Vice President,[22] being accompanied on the Executive Committee by Mrs. William Cadbury,[23] the organisation's Annual Conference in both 1931 and 1933 calling on the government to implement such legislation;[24] even more indicative of the Cadbury involvement in this debate was the Birmingham branch's attempt in 1932 to supplement these calls, in moving a resolution stating that,

"the National Council of Women urge that the marriage of certified mental defectives shall be made illegal".[25]

However, the Cadbury association with these perspectives was not a new phenomenon, leading members of their contingent having long displayed an affinity

with these arguments. From 1910, for example, both Elizabeth Cadbury and Mrs William Cadbury, together with Mrs George Cadbury Jnr. subscribed to the Birmingham Heredity Society,[26] (B.H.S.) an organisation formed to pursue the 'Study of Heredity in its Bearings on the Human Race'.[27]

Whilst the resultant Birmingham Committee initially advised the Eugenic Council that, despite their, ostensibly, common purpose, they wished to operate as an autonomous entity,[28] the original impression of sympathy towards the national organisation was nevertheless rapidly affirmed, when, during its second year of operation, the B.H.S. submitted an application for formal affiliation,[29] an application that was both approved and 'warmly welcomed' by the parent body in October 1912.[30]

Whilst this involvement with both official and unofficial eugenic agencies will be considered in a more appropriate and specific context later in the chapter, it is pertinent to note here that this association is illustrative of a further significant feature of the Cadburys' involvement in national social policy, that of the close network within which this contingent operated in pursuit of their aims. Encompassing many who similarly embraced the arguments propounded by the E.E.S., (see later), as with their activism in other social policy areas this was of a two-fold nature and was an extremely important and persistent characteristic of this participation; as such it included and embraced extensive contact and collaboration with representatives from both the 'professional' lobby operating in this sphere, i.e. medical bodies, together with those from the voluntary 'social work' sector, in essence, middle class women.

However, whilst the contribution of the Cadbury associated agencies in this process will be considered later in this chapter, such a perspective, displaying an increasing adherence to, and propagation of, heredity based arguments, did not, however, cause the Cadburys to jettison their traditional beliefs and accompanying support for organisations with which they were more usually associated, as they became increasingly involved with the 'cult of the child'. Indeed, on the contrary, these organisations also witnessed the growing Cadbury activism and were, furthermore, an important initial and 'respectable' public platform for the twin acceptance of the hitherto apparently mutually exclusive heredity and environmental arguments.

TOWARDS NURTURE AND NATURE

Accordingly, central to both the earlier covert and, later, more overt, Cadbury involvement with issues of social policy, were concerns over the urban populace in general, and 'the child' in particular. Indeed, in 1907 Elizabeth Cadbury indicated her wholesale endorsement of this latter sentiment in particular, quoting Spraque's 'The Bitter Cry of the Children' during her Presidential Address to the N.U.W.W. in observing that, increasingly, scientific evidence demonstrated that,

> *"almost all the problems of physical, mental and moral degeneracy originate with the child".*[31]

Consequently, this perspective underpinned a number of the Cadburys' initiatives undertaken, primarily, within Birmingham. Appropriately, one of the more rigorously pursued of these attempted to influence national social policy, and, being directed through the temperance movement, corresponded with their traditional Quaker sentiments, whilst mirroring both the Cadbury social philosophy being advocated and encouraged elsewhere, including through the B.V.T., and their adoption of a more overt public profile.

In 1908, for example, the Annual Report of the Edgbaston Young British Women's Temperance Association, an organisation which included Mrs. Barrow Cadbury as one of its Vice Presidents,[32] included details of its study classes directed towards 'The Citizen of Tomorrow'; this was a programme which, in embracing such themes as 'Poverty', 'Housing', 'Unemployment', 'Gambling' and 'Drink',[33] indicated the body's perception of the wide ranging and interrelated nature of the 'social questions' issue, and the need for a coherent range of responses to combat these environmental causal factors.

Accordingly, the Association considered that during the previous year its 'most successful work',[34] had been the orchestration and collection of a petition containing over 4,000 signatures calling for 'The Exclusion of Children from Public-Houses and the Non-sale of Intoxicants to Young People'.[35] Subsequently the organisation attempted to utilise this petition to its maximum potential in securing the support of a local M.P., Ebenezer Parkes, to present their demand before Parliament, whilst copies of the resolution were delivered to both Asquith, the Prime Minister, and Herbert Gladstone, the Home Secretary.[36]

Furthermore, this measure, mirrored by the Edgbaston branch of the 'National British Women's Temperance Association',[37] (N.B.W.T.A.) a body to which Elizabeth Cadbury, together with Mrs. Barrow Cadbury and Mrs. William Cadbury, subscribed,[38] was an early and significant example of a practice that was to become a noticeable feature of the Cadburys' political strategy, that of the direct lobbying of government and policy makers.

Simultaneously, another avenue pursued by the Cadburys in furtherance of this cause was through the N.U.W.W. and its Special Sub Committee on the Licensing Bill; this was a body containing Elizabeth Cadbury,[39] and which, in April, 1908, invited their movement to welcome the proposed legislation,

> *"as an effort to deal with a very difficult social problem, specially affecting women and children".*[40]

Indeed, this campaign serves as a prime example of two interrelated social concepts; firstly it reveals a determination to counter the deleterious effects of alcohol, effects which, in 1901, the initial political exponent of 'efficiency', Rosebery, had described as resulting in 'degradation', racial degeneracy and financial waste;[41] and secondly it illustrates the accompanying preoccupation of many contemporary political lobbyists with the 'cult of the child'.

Specifically, such concerns assumed a high priority amongst the numerous religious groups supporting this measure, a perspective particularly expressed by the Free Church movement, an organisation to which George Cadbury continued his substantial contributions beyond the Liberals' 1906 election victory.[42] In 1908, for example, the body emphasised these arguments in unanimously approving the Bill,[43] the Rev. Thomas Nightingale echoing the sentiments of a growing number of commentators, in predicting that neglect of child life would result in England's 'ruin', the greatest danger to the nation lying, not from any outside competitor, but from within the country and, of particular pertinence for this argument,

> *"in the possibility of the growth of a corrupt and feeble minded class".*[44]

Furthermore, despite its eventual parliamentary failure, the Bill has been viewed as extremely important, both in hindsight and by contemporary bodies; Ensor, 1985, for example, described the measure as the government's principal social legislation proposal, [45] whilst the Free Church movement perceived it as representing a symbolic watershed against the 'evils' and malaise of urban Edwardian Britain, the organisation whilst 'deploring' its defeat,[46] nevertheless taking some consolation in the degree of nationwide agitation this 'great moral effort',[47] had attracted.

Subsequently, this and other bodies with which the Cadburys were actively involved continued to emphasise the importance they attached to the issue of drink. In 1912, for example, the 'Free Church Year Book' announced that it had conducted an active and concerted, 'crusade against the evil of intemperance,'[48] whilst Elizabeth Cadbury, in the role of President of the B.W.G.[50] and Vice President of the B.W.S,[50]

exerted a considerable and sustained local influence within two bodies which similarly maintained their pressure for a more abstemious society; the latter body, for example, in November 1908, received an address on the advances being made by their activists, particularly with regard to 'factory girls',[51] i.e. a category likely to comprise a significant portion of the city's future mothers.

Indeed, alongside such actions indicating the consensus over social concerns within a Birmingham voluntary sector dominated by organised religion and the middle classes, the Guild continued to express its interest in issues closely associated with the necessity of state intervention in the pursuit of social and national 'efficiency'. Such concerns were illustrated through the organisation's 'educative' lecture programme, which frequently featured themes such as the prevention and treatment of consumption,[52] the 'Rescue Work' of the Free Church Council,[53] and the detrimental effect of women's factory work on home life.[54]

Whilst a fuller analysis of the implications for women of this overriding concern with the 'cult of the child' will be considered in the next chapter, it is pertinent to note here the importance the organisation placed on the role of particular behavioural patterns in determining the nation's current and, more importantly, future, health; this perspective was clearly evident, for instance, when, in subsequently agreeing to consider extending their temperance activities in the Bournville area,[55] the body's Secretary further emphasised her commitment to this cause, in observing that she considered this question to be paramount in effecting any real degree of social reform.[56]

Similarly, the B.W.S., in common with many contemporary voluntary agencies involved in social work amongst the working classes, was dominated by middle class women striving to emphasise and impose their temperance, and related, beliefs. However, rather than the more theoretical, 'educational' stance which characterised much of the work of the Guild, the Settlement exerted a considerably greater influence, as it increasingly became viewed as an important co-ordination centre for active and practical social involvement within Birmingham.

Indeed, in 1908 the organisation acknowledged this strategic importance, in stating that it both worked with, and was represented on the committees of a wide and influential range of bodies, including the N.U.W.W., The Charity Organisation Society, the Birmingham Infant Health Association, the People's Free Kindergarten Association, and the Social Studies Department of the city's university,[57] whilst displaying a growing association with the 'feeble minded' question, (see later).

The B.W S. was, however, similarly attaching increased importance to the subject of drink and, accordingly, three years later, the list of groups with which it operated included the Factory Helper's Union, White Ribbon Bands and the Temperance Collegiate Association,[58] the latter being a body for which examination tuition was provided.[59]

As with the interventionist measures undertaken by Birmingham's Education Committee, this collaboration with the temperance lobby is indicative of efforts to implement social and individual 'betterment' policies amongst the urban poor. However, a rather less altruistic perspective, and one consistent with 'national efficiency'/heredity arguments, may also be presented as an explanation underlying the prioritisation of the drink question. Of pivotal importance here was the acceptance of an extension to their traditional environmental acceptance that certain behavioural patterns had a detrimental effect on the fitness of the working populace. Here, this extension accepted that not only did such practices incapacitate, they did so on a permanent basis, and, crucially, were capable of being genetically transmitted to future generations, i.e. expounding an argument which exemplified the hereditary lobby's beliefs.

Indeed, both aspects of this concern, manifested through what might be rather crudely termed positive and negative state interventionism are evident in the activities of one particular such agency with which the Cadburys were closely involved, the Birmingham and Warwickshire Union of the National British Women's Temperance Association. This body, to which five female members of the Cadbury family subscribed,[60] two of whom held influential positions on the organisation's committee,[61] is illustrative of their willingness to embrace both environmental and heredity based arguments as they continued their campaign for social 'efficiency', and in particular, against the ostensibly degenerative effects of alcohol.

In April, 1913, for example, their Annual Meeting was indicative of this former, more traditional approach, as it concentrated its leading address on the public costs of drink, in addition to its effect on 'Parentage, Motherhood and Home Life',[62] particular concerns which will be considered with regard to the Cadburys in the next chapter.

However, this body and others campaigners for social 'reform', including those within the wider temperance movement, were also expressing sentiments indicating their willingness to tolerate less standard arguments; in 1912, for example, the Association received a report on a contemporary sociological paper by Dr Saleeby,[63] a leading spokesperson for the E.E.S., and later a member of the National Birth Rate Commission.[64]

Consistent with the beliefs espoused by the E.E.S., Dr. Saleeby presented an argument emphasising the predominance of inherited characteristics in the human chain, and, in claiming that alcohol, 'feeble-mindedness' and national decline were inextricably linked, concluded with an appeal for the provision of greater care for the youngest of this group, i.e. the nation's prospective future parents, and in particular encouraging them to acquire habits of 'self-control' and 'restraint' towards alcohol.[65]

Equally pertinently, Saleeby predicted that prospects for the control of this 'problem' would considerably improve following the anticipated passing of the 'Mental Deficiency Bill', a measure he envisaged as enabling such young people to remain in Special Schools,

and therefore segregated from the rest of society, rather than the existing practice of,

> *"turning them adrift at the most critical time of their lives to become a scourge to themselves and to the race".*[66]

Clearly here this particular Cadbury social agency was one which was at least open to the ideas of the pressure group perhaps most associated with this particular issue, the E.E.S., a body whose fundamental premise held radical implications for the urban poor in particular. Deriving from the beliefs of Francis Galton, eulogistically described by M. Christabel Cadbury, in 1922, as a scientist, 'devoted to the advancement of truth',[67] this central thesis, she explained, was,

> *"that mental characters are inherited in the same manner and at the same rate as physical characters".*[68]

Additionally, as Mazumdar, (1992) has noted, the newly formed Society gained further support by its initial acceptance of perspectives offered by the nurturist lobby,[69] its 1909/10 'Eugenics Review' editorial commenting that whilst the organisation stressed the effects of heredity, nonetheless, it would not ignore the importance of environmental factors in this equation.[70]

However, whilst certain eugenicists were prepared to acknowledge the, at least, partial validity of some arguments propounded by other social 'reformers', an equally official eugenicist interpretation largely dismissed these views, adhering strongly to their central premise and concluding not such alternative explanations were, by themselves insufficient. In the same volume of 'The Eugenies Review', for example, Arnold White utilised this logic in praising the beneficial effects of the housing developments at Port Sunlight and Bournville. In particular White paid tribute to their role in creating a model which demonstrated the possibility of the country's regeneration, i.e. through an environment which reduced illhealth and crime, whilst fostering a populace exuding both physical and moral 'efficiency'[71] However, he nevertheless concluded that principal value of these estates lay in revealing the inadequacies of contemporary approaches, in postulating that,

> *"does it not point to the need for grappling with the race problem in its broadest spirit, and for concentrating national attention, charity and resources on the improvement of the breed by levelling up?"* [72]

Furthermore, in concentrating their efforts through this single, yet all embracing, causal factor, the Society held a vital advantage over other groupings of social activists;

importantly this was an advantage which directly resulted in its ability to, relatively effectively, pursue and achieve their aim, since, Mazumdar, (1992) argues, each of these other societies,

> *"had some specific pathology to suggest: alcoholism, venereal disease or ineducablity, all causes of pauperism that had been discussed for many years by social activists of the middle class. The Eugenics Education Society undercut them all by proposing the pauperism was biological and that a hereditary defect underlay all the rest".*[73]

Crucially here, being fundamentally concerned with this problem and the 'residuum' of population to which this economic circumstance perpetually attached,[74] such arguments held considerable appeal to the Cadburys; clearly, for example they offered a 'solution' for those who remained outside the influence of their various social policy initiatives, since developments such as the B.V.T. were, almost exclusively, aimed a those members of the working classes who were either relatively prosperous, or who were at least both young and flexible enough to adopt a lifestyle the Cadburys viewed as more conducive to the maximisation of social 'efficiency'.

In essence, the adherence of the Cadburys to such arguments stemmed, initially at least, from their awareness of the experiences of the young, especially, female, urban poor. Whilst inadequate housing was identified as a major factor affecting the life chances of this sector of society, the 'solutions' advocated for this particular strand of the social problem displayed a rather different analysis; furthermore, it was one that was given a socio-scientific credence by the increasing use and acceptance of Social Darwinistic/ eugenic language and thought, and, moreover, one offering a pragmatic framework for the reduction/eradication of such problems.

Consequently, therefore, the central tenets of the eugenic argument became accepted by the Cadburys, in so far as they related to those the group regarded as beyond the reach of their more overt practices, the development of such a perspective becoming reflected through an increasing association and patronage of a number of contemporary organisations and agencies utilising Social Darwinistic interpretations and advocating the adoption of measures tending to prioritise the 'quality of the race'.

Certainly, subscription to this framework was evident during the 1911 N.F.C.C. Conference, when Elizabeth Cadbury expounded on the importance of social work amongst the urban poor in eradicating another perceived moral and social evil, that attaching itself to homeless unmarried women. Whilst expressing her desire that every large town should establish a hostel for such women,[75] Cadbury was touching upon a theme that was receiving much contemporary discussion, that of the contribution of the 'feeble-minded' to the deterioration of both morals, principally through prostitution, and the racial stock in general.

More specifically, in an association unbroken until the the outbreak of the First World War, from the early 1890s the particular Cadbury contribution to the promotion of this eugenic aim was their involvement in a number of agencies vociferously campaigning in this debate. Whilst such support was often covert in nature, it was, nevertheless, far from negligible in the promotion of this cause, and is of further importance in indicating the general direction of Cadbury pressure in this acceptance and propagation of the heredity argument. Furthermore, whilst this group were not necessarily the prime movers of such changes, they were, nevertheless, prominent within these bodies, each of whom became considerably influential in securing the adoption of the common measures they propounded.

In essence the substantial importance and significance of this involvement lies in the bodies' furnishing and publication of regular statistical data; this was information which became widely disseminated in furtherance of a legislative 'solution' to combat the perceived racial decline; furthermore, this was a 'solution' which, whilst portrayed as philanthropic in nature, was distinctly eugenic in flavour.

Moreover, in directing such Social Darwinistic material both towards specific governmental policies, and in advance of the E.E.S., this activism had the effect of considerably increasing general public awareness and interest in this issue, one particularly significant effect being to raise the level of adherence to and credibility of early eugenic arguments.

Central to their actions was the desire to establish a contemporary relevant redefinition of those deemed 'efficient' and 'useful' members of society, in essence an extension of the legal definition of those classified as 'unfit' and 'inefficient', one embracing the 'feeble-minded'.

Whilst much of this argument interlinked with the Cadbury attempts to establish a coherent social programme discussed earlier, and was complemented by their involvement in similar efforts to eradicate perceived increasing associated pervasive social evils, such as intemperance and 'immorality', here the focus was directed towards those members of the populace considered permanently beyond the influence of such palliative measures.

As a consequence these concerns became focussed on preventing these individuals replicating and, indeed, perpetuating their hereditary 'inefficiencies', a 'problem' considerably exacerbated by perspectives emphasising the relatively high fertility rates of this section of society.

The Cadbury involvement in the pursuit of such measures was, in essence, of a pattern later replicated in their participation in other, parallelling social concerns, i.e. through the utilisation of localised Cadbury organisations/influence in the generation of favourable propaganda, whilst gradually extending and widening their sphere of operation to embrace the national arena.

Broadly, this pursuit of a legislative redefinition involved the utilisation of several interrelated agents and mechanisms operating during two overlapping stages of activity: firstly, to 1904, in raising the profile of the 'feeble-minded' question both in the eyes of the general public and social policy makers: and secondly, having achieved the appointment of a Royal Commission into this matter, from 1906, in persuading the Liberal government to implement the resultant recommendations, i.e. the extension and redefinition of those eligible for detention and segregation.

RAISING THE PROFILE OF THE 'FEEBLE-MINDED' QUESTION

The Cadbury involvement in this issue, mirroring their association with both the B.H.S. and the E.E.S, ultimately found expression through the opportunities afforded by the holding of both municipal power and executive office within the N.U.W.W.. Initially, however, this participation was concentrated principally through the interrelation of several voluntary sector bodies operating in Birmingham and its surrounding area. Of particular importance here were the 'Homes of Laundry and Industry' at Arrowheld Top and Enniskerry, together with the local N.U.W.W., as they orchestrated a dual and sustained campaign in pursuit of this legislative change.

Significantly, and in accord with their desire to establish a coherent programme towards 'social efficiency', the former of these institutions, the Laundry Homes, received the support of members of the Cadbury family from their inception. Accordingly Elizabeth Head Cadbury accepting a position on the bodies' inaugural organising committee,[76] whilst the accompanying financial patronage of both her brother, George Snr.,[77] and Dame Elizabeth,[78] became an important and revealing expression of their interest and involvement with this social policy initiative.

Furthermore, whilst this latter participation was undertaken in a somewhat covert manner and did not extend to executing a direct role in the formulation and administration of the Homes' practices, the regularity of these contributions, in securing the institutions' continuance, represented both the exercise of a sustained influence over these bodies, whilst indicating a condoning of their objectives, and, in particular, an unreserved endorsement of the organisations' policies in the pursuit of the Cadbury social ideal.

Throughout this involvement with both the municipal and voluntary social welfare sectors perhaps the most active and instrumental role undertaken by the Cadburys was that adopted by Elizabeth Cadbury; indeed this was evident from the earliest days of each of these particular organisations, and one which became most markedly expressed through the Birmingham N.U.W.W..

Elizabeth Cadbury, who from 1897 held an Vice Presidential position within this body,[79] had illustrated her interest in this movement throughout its formative years, in 1889 attending the first of a series of Annual Conferences to stimulate the formation of 'grassroot' regional unions;[80] this was a cause which aroused considerable and immediate local interest, the Birmingham Ladies' Union of Workers among Women and Children, (B.L.U.) arranging the second of these meetings in 1890, before becoming one of the first 15 members of the N.U.W.W. inaugurated five years later.[81]

This degree of support was subsequently replicated in the branch's initial membership, one which was bolstered by a number of organisations purporting to express sympathy towards the conditions endured by the city's young female populace. By 1891,

for example, middle class dominated bodies such as the Factory Helpers' Union and the Girls' Night Shelter claimed affiliation,[82] providing 'ameliorative' services and facilities in much the same way that the B.W.S. and other Cadbury agencies were to offer by the turn of the century.

However, each of these agencies, and indeed the alliance in general, was underpinned and motivated by a social philosophy heavily imbued with the moral perspectives and concerns of this membership; this was especially evident through the organising body's educative programme, and, in particular, was revealed almost immediately by its campaign to raise the profile of the 'feeble-minded' question in the consciousness of the Birmingham public; specifically this initiative sought to highlight and respond to the anxieties aroused by contemporary social investigators, whilst, perhaps more significantly, corroborating and compounding such findings, and thereby consequently adding to this issue's momentum.

Accordingly, in Sept. 1891, the second edition of the B.L.U.'s quarterly magazine, 'Women Workers', launched this campaign with an article from Agatha Stacey,[83] a woman who, alongside Elizabeth Cadbury and others, was to prove instrumental in promoting and achieving this particular cause.

Indeed, Stacey, a Workhouse Guardian for Edgbaston,[84] was one of many contemporary social 'reformers' who claimed that their experiences of 'assisting' the poorest classes gave them a particularly informed stance on such questions. In turn, these claims, given the consequent credence attributed to both their observations and the 'solutions' they advocated, frequently furnished these 'reformers' with a crucial concomitant, that of a position of considerable influence, i.e. as, ostensibly, politically 'neutral', informed, advisors to both local and national policy makers and legislators, a role particularly undertaken within Birmingham, and beyond, by the Cadbury associate Mrs. Ellen Pinsent, (see later).

Furthermore, and indicative of the subtlety and sophistication of these 'reformers' strategies, evident within Stacey's article was an approach the Birmingham campaigners frequently adopted during their earliest lobbying; this was an approach which, not surprisingly, despite its eugenic assumptions and implications, somewhat resembled the arguments of both those bodies affiliated to the B.L.U. and the new paternalists, in consistently stressing the benefits of increased state interventionist measures to the individuals concerned, rather than evoking any more sinister subtext.

Koven, (1993) for example, has observed that this tendency was replicated nationally, and constituted a significant and powerful middle class female pressure group, active in the voluntary arena and pursuing the object of 'improving' the health of the nation, in that:

> *"'Lady' social-welfare workers invariably represented the exercise of their authority as demonstrations of their motherly love for impoverished children and their sisterly solicitude for unfortunate or feckless working class women".*[85]

Indeed, the editors, anticipating that the subject, 'On the care of Feeble-minded Paupers',[86] would provoke general sympathy and interest from their membership, also reflected this tendency; the article for instance was prefaced with the observation, redolent of the organisation's perception of its moral superiority, that:

> *"Most of the workers of our 'Union' know too well the sad effects of this moral incapacity, and the apparent hopelessness of the cases which come under their notice. May we not hope for good results from the earnest consideration which thoughtful men and women are giving this painful subject".*[87]

Agatha Stacey's 1891 'Women Workers' article had professed similar concerns in its ostensible purpose to raise awareness of the 'feeble-minded' issue, especially amongst the 'informed', experienced and extremely influential amateurs of the policy arena. However, a less humanitarian motivation and an accompanying desire to further control and restrain this populace is revealed by her extensive references to a contemporary Poor Law Conference paper delivered by Miss Clifford,[88] a Workhouse Guardian from Barton Regis,[89] advocating the urgent need for widespread action, aimed in particular at preventing many workhouse adolescents of post school age from drifting 'into a moral sink.'[90]

Referring to Clifford's conclusions that, certainly within her region's workhouses, the population of 'weak-minded . . . morally imbecilic women',[91] was growing rapidly, indeed, 'in even a larger ratio than the increase of lunatics,'[92] i.e. the only category detainable beyond the age of 16 under the existing Lunacy Laws; importantly, however, Stacey was, nevertheless, keen to offer a readily available and attainable remedy.

Her proposition was that the problem should be approached by dividing the adolescents into two groups, the first of which, in consisting of the youngest, together with the relatively more 'innocent' youths, would be outside their ambit. Consequently, Stacey's primary concern lay with those among the second category, older girls, who, through their own 'weakness', had already endured enough sorrow and suffering to make them willingly accept the suggested provision of a Home, with its greater degree of 'shelter', 'love' and 'protection';[93] indeed these factors were also persuasive that they deflected concerns over the girls' subsequent loss of liberty and possible ensuing insecurity and dependency.

Accordingly, Stacey continued, such was the desire within Birmingham to provide an increased level of ameliorative, not to say supervisory, action for these adolescent, primarily workhouse, girls, that ladies from the Birmingham, King's Norton and West Bromwich workhouses, together with women from the Prison Gate Mission, the Girl's Night

Shelter and several other similar institutions, had formed a General Committee to initiate such an establishment in the form of a Home attached to a working laundry:[94] this was an extremely important development in that, by May 1892, this laundry had received sufficient endorsement and patronage to enable its establishment at 'Arrowfield Top', near Alvechurch in Worcestershire.[95]

Subsequently, the Home itself received a similarly enthusiastic response, housing its full complement of 10 residents the following spring,[96] fuelling a momentum further sustained with the purchase of additional premises extending its capacity to 17 by November 1893.[97]

This was complemented by the founding of a second establishment, 'Enniskerry', at Knowle in Warwickshire, the previous month,[98] their joint capacity rising to 45 by the turn of the century,[99] a period in which the Cadburys not only reaffirmed but extended their commitment to this initiative.

Indeed, the financial support the Cadbury family afforded these Homes was of particular pertinence throughout this period, payments which enabled the organisations to pursue their/these interrelated objectives. Consequently, whilst George Cadbury's initial donation, £10,[100] may, perhaps, be regarded as a somewhat insignificant contribution towards the £1,050 raised during the Homes' first year,[101] the subsequent history of the institutions reveals a more telling perspective of the level of Cadbury commitment and support.

This contribution, for example, was repeated in 1895,[102] and represented, along with four other donations, the highest individual payment;[103] this payment increased to £15 by 1897, when the total Cadbury contribution constituted almost a seventh of the money the Homes received,[104] an endorsement that had been compounded and, indeed, given more permanence two years earlier, with Elizabeth Cadbury's first annual subscription.[105]

Furthermore, whilst this membership was retained and renewed throughout the pre-war period, expressions of more widespread and general Cadbury approval of the Homes' work were revealed through the extension of support and patronage offered by family members. Indeed, this broadening of the Cadbury association with the Homes was a consistently recurring feature of the organisations' financial history. In 1898, for example, Mrs. Barrow Cadbury, became the first amongst the wider family to indicate this increasing support of the Cadburys for these institutions,[106] one which was further demonstrated by younger members of the family within six years, when both Mrs Edward and Mrs William Cadbury had began their subscriptions,[107] an undertaking also initiated by Mrs George Cadbury Jnr the following year.[108]

The expansion and broadening of this support continued over the ensuing years, these memberships being annually renewed throughout the next decade, whilst other family members responded in a similarly positive manner to the committee's plans to

secure the Homes' future. In 1910, for example, following the death of 'Arrowfield Top's' landlord and the subsequent proposed sale of the site,[109] the committee issued an appeal for funds enabling the purchase and refurbishment of alternative, permanent, premises at Rednal; this was an appeal with which the Cadbury family also concurred, their response, an £85 donation, including £50 from William and £10 from Edward,[110] demonstrating the Cadbury enthusiasm and commitment to this cause.

However, despite emphasising the beneficial effects of the Homes for their residents, in offering the retention of some degree of economic independence through the provision of employment appropriate for their 'limited capacities',[111] together with a degree of 'care and protection' beyond the girls' experience within wider society, from its very beginnings the Laundry Committee revealed a distinctly eugenic nature. In March, 1892, for example, the committee placed an advert in the 'Women Workers', which, whilst stating their intention to provide shelter for those 'not sufficiently imbecile to be saved by certification',[112] nevertheless significantly broadened its focus in invoking associated concerns which were increasingly being voiced; specifically, they requested support and patronage for a,

> *"simple and practical scheme on behalf of a class of young women and girls, who constitute a grave moral danger to the community while left uncared for. We refer to those who being feeble-minded are likely to drift into degradation or crime".*[113]

Moreover, in postulating the ramifications of inaction, the Laundry Committee broadened their perspective in a further significant and eugenic way, through mirroring and utilising increasingly voiced fears for the future of the British race. Accordingly, the committee urged the adoption of schemes which, they advocated, offered a pragmatic solution, and which would result in a,

> *"prospective benefit to the community (which) will at once be recognised. If we could keep even a few of these semi-imbecile young women happy and in our Homes, we should not only save them from falling into evil but prevent them from propagating it in the form of dangerous and undesirable offspring".*[114]

Indeed, whilst subsequently such concerns gradually became manifest in the Homes' increasing calls for the legislative segregation of the 'feeble-minded', this perspective was prominent amongst the Laundry Committee's initial objectives, and moreover, underpinned the siting of Enniskerry, the second of their Birmingham initiatives.

This institution purported to 'assist' and provide for 'Young women who have had a first fall, but who are not depraved',[115] i.e. unmarried mothers. However, a very alternative

rationale is illustrated by its geographical distancing from 'Arrowfield Top', and is indicative of the potential danger which the Laundry Committee believed their Worcestershire residents could pose, i.e. in that the two institutions were far enough from each other to eradicate the possibility of contact between their respective inhabitants.

Indeed, the committee, in considering the Homes to have residents of very different moral gradings,[116] viewed such segregation as of fundamental importance in avoiding the transmission of 'antisocial' values, and in preventing their Alvechurch residents becoming morally corrupted and contaminated through contact with their Knowle counterparts, and, therefore, subsequently representing an even greater threat to the nation.

Consequently, this belief had become a crucially determining factor in the decision to found two distinctly separate Homes, the committee initially considering having,

> *"the girls of different moral grades in separate Cottages, and to allow them to work together under strict supervision . . . But, on further consideration it was thought best to keep the innocent and simple minded girls entirely distinct from the others".*[117]

Subsequently, throughout this era of continuing Cadbury patronage and encouragement, these institutions maintained their gradually increasing scale of operations and local influence, expanding their joint capacity to 58 by 1911.[118]

However, the Laundry Committee also had a more ambitious agenda, that of creating a climate in which the granting of additional powers of state detention of the 'feeble-minded' would become politically acceptable, a task which required the sustained generation and propagation of favourable publicity. In this context the real significance of the Homes' operations was the extension of their influence to embrace the national arena; the institutions subsequently became and remained a constant weapon in the armoury of those pressing for more stringent legislation, providing statistical verification for such enhanced powers of detention, and, justifying their need whilst emphasising their effectiveness, stimulating the founding of similar establishments throughout the country.

Moreover, the organisations' continued operation is of further, and perhaps greater, significance for an analysis of those groups actively pressing to create a favourable climate for such legislative change, in revealing their close network of mutual association and collaboration. Of prime importance within this network, one which facilitated the exchange and promotion of propaganda validating the ideology of the 'heredity argument', was the extent of interrelation and interaction between the personnel of various particularly important and interested agencies in this field, and, more pertinently, principally through their N.U.W.W. connection, within the female middle class of Birmingham.

Indeed, this close network, one which included senior members of the Cadbury group and in particular Elizabeth Cadbury, will be revisited throughout this chapter, having

an important and direct influence on the nature of the social policy initiatives pursued both by the Birmingham municipal authority and the city's numerous voluntary social welfare agencies to which many of this group belonged, a mechanism through which this propaganda and pressure for legislative change was first exerted.

Encompassing both the B.W.S. and, later, the B.H.S., this faction became a powerful, unaccountable, and, to all intents and purposes, permanent force, promoting the adoption of policies and strategies having a direct bearing on the experiences and circumstances of many of the poorest amongst the city's female populace.

Whilst, as will be discussed later, this middle class power base within Birmingham facilitated and resulted in a number of B.H.S. members exercising a powerful influence on the city's municipal operations, by the earliest Edwardian years the B.W.S. had already established clear links with the 'feeble-minded' campaign. By 1902, for example, with Elizabeth Cadbury as a Vice President,[119] and a General Committee containing Mrs George Cadbury Jnr and Ellen Pinsent,[120] the Settlement was working alongside the newly formed Birmingham School Board After Care Committee,[121] in an association with this issue that became increasingly more pronounced. Consequently, this association subsequently led to the institution rapidly expanding its activities into this area of interest, in 1908 receiving recognition as a practical training school for Birmingham University's Social Study Diploma,[122] a course for future social workers which include instruction on the 'Care and Control of the Mentally Defective',[123] and which by 1915 had enabled 35 of their students to find appropriate professional employment.[124]

Indeed, these classes are another indication of the Birmingham network, being delivered by the municipal officials Dr Potts,[125] (see later), and Ellen Pinsent,[126] a woman closely associated with four further agencies with which Elizabeth Cadbury was similarly aligned. She was, for example, a contributor to the Laundry Homes' funds from 1895,[127] becoming both President of the local N.U.W.W. the following year,[128] and a member of the B.H.S. from l911,[129] and whose work within the city's Education Committee, alongside Cadbury, will be more thoroughly considered later.

Moreover, the Settlement and its officials increasingly readily aligned themselves to bodies with a declared interest in this social field; from 1911, for instance, several of its committee subscribed to the B.H.S.,[130] (see later), whilst the Settlement acknowledged the assistance it received from regular publicity in the 'Women Workers',[131] the organ of a Birmingham N.U.W.W., which in the same year overwhelmingly approved the notion that,

> *"Heredity is of more importance than Environment in the development both of physique and of character".*[132]

More specifically, two of the more instrumental organisations in this arena, the B.L.U. and the Laundry Homes, were particularly indicative of this 'network' tendency, their

personnel displaying a considerable overlap. Indeed, almost half of the Homes' Committee were leading officials of the Ladies Union,[133] with five of the latter's Council members, including Stacey, serving on the former's General Committee.[134] Moreover, reinforcing this interrelation, this second body also contained a further five B.L.U. members, among them Miss E.H Cadbury, representing numerous women's organisations active within Birmingham's voluntary 'moral welfare' arena, including associations for the Care of Friendless Girls, and a Home for Girls of Good Character.[135]

Compounded by the patronage other Union members supplied to the Homes,[136] this B.L.U. presence established a platform for the exercise of considerable influence from the committee's outset. Equally significant was its effect in providing the Homes with an important additional and national dimension aiding the propagation of their perspectives, by directly linking them to the N.U.W.W., an organisation which was increasingly in the vanguard of those pressing for further restrictive legislation regarding the 'feeble-minded', (see later).

In essence, the task undertaken by the B.L.U./Homes' collaboration was of a two-fold nature, in establishing amongst the general public the perception of the need for institutions such as the latter, whilst emphasising the widespread failure of those released from detention to subsequently lead independent and 'successful' lives.

Indeed, the substantial importance of the Homes lies in the generation of information supporting this proposition, the creation, collation and publicising of such beginning almost with their instigation. In 1895, for example, their Annual Report commented that throughout the first three years of their existence the number of applications for residence, 435, far exceeded their capacity, a continuing state of affairs which consequently illustrated and, indeed apparently proved, the necessity for further such institutions;[137] this was, accordingly, a claim reflected at the organisation's Annual Meeting in the demand for each county in England to have their own Home in order to cope with this problem effectively.[138]

Whilst this pattern continued, and even accelerated the following year, when 190 such submissions were made,[139] subsequently, this rate slackened slightly, 580 applications being made between 1900 and 1905;[140] however, this was a decline which the committee regarded as reaffirming rather than undermining this proposition, attributing the relative reduction to the growth of similar establishments throughout the country.[141]

Even by 1894 this movement had gained substantial momentum, the initial institution near Stroud becoming operative in 1891,[142] and being augmented the following year by two similar establishments, including 'Arrowfield Top'.[145] Indeed, during these three years, the number of such institutions doubled, being founded in several boroughs of London, in Bristol in the West Country, and in Liverpool in the north.[144]

Moreover, subsequent attempts by these initial bodies to raise the profile of this issue, one of the Laundry Homes' declared objectives,[145] were clearly rewarded. Their efforts were for example, instrumental in the founding of another twelve such institutions by 1899;[146] a total that was almost trebled over the following decade, twenty of which, including 'Arrowfield/ Enniskerry', were affiliated to the body co-ordinating many of the initiatives in this arena, the 'National Association promoting the welfare of the Feeble-minded'.[147] (N.A.F.M.)

Indeed, in 1900, in testimony to their own effectiveness, the Laundry Homes' Annual Report, in welcoming the foundation of another such establishment for the 'feeble-minded', the Lancashire and Cheshire Society, commented on the increasing public attention this subject was attracting and, by implication, on their contribution to the publicity stimulating this growth.[146]

Such perceptions did not, however, undermine the Homes' initial sense of urgency and purpose, their 1894 Annual Meeting, for instance, invoked the efficiency lobby's 'national interest' to justify not only these institutions, but also the extension of their authority, arguing that there was,

> "*every reason in morality, humanity, and public-policy, that these feeble-minded women should be under permanent and watchful guardianship, especially during the childbearing age*".[149]

Subsequently, perceptions confirming this perspective received further corroboration almost immediately; the Homes' third Annual Report, for example, carried an analysis conducted into their earliest residents, and observed that almost half, 21, of the first 46 inhabitants came from domestic circumstances where their parents were either unknown or were considered 'unsteady', whilst another 4 were illegitimate;[150] unsurprisingly all of these were factors which both the 'child' and efficiency lobbies construed as destabilising and threatening to the nation's future.

Moreover, this evidence was compounded by the report's conviction that a significant number of these girls, 8, owed their 'feeble-mindedness' to hereditary factors,[151] 'findings' that were complemented five years later when their report observed that 75% of their inhabitants had been referred by Boards of Guardians,[152] both sets of evidence therefore echoing and apparently confirming the sentiments expressed by both Miss Clifford and Miss Stacey in 1891.

Such efforts to overtly address one part of the country's ostensible birth rate 'crisis' i.e. the perceived higher fertility and transmission of mental deficiency amongst the 'feeble-minded' classes and, in particular, 'feeble-minded' women, were complemented by the committee's attempts to satisfy the second, related, part of this propaganda campaign, to achieve state regulation over parenthood to 'safeguard' the future 'quality' of the race;

accordingly, these efforts became expressed through the demand that institutional detention should be extended beyond the age of 16 and, indeed, in many instances should be considered as permanent; this was a campaign in which the Homes were again of significant importance in providing statistical information verifying and promoting this particular measure, the favourable publicity engendered by such evidence establishing a momentum that was utilised towards the state's acceptance and implementation of their programme at the earliest opportunity.

In 1905, for example, the Homes 13th Annual Report reiterated an argument first expressed in 1899,[153] in commenting that of the 60 girls leaving the Homes in the first six years of their operation, almost a third, 19, had either returned to a workhouse existence or were being detained in asylums; a further 7 were confined to their family's homes, 7 had subsequently died, whilst only 3 of the 53 traced were in permanent employment;[154] accordingly, this was evidence which the report interpreted as illustrating,

> *"very clearly that the girls do badly on leaving the homes; very rarely becoming self-supporting. The number of those who are lost sight of by their friends, or of whom no reply to enquiries can be obtained is distressingly large; for it is impossible to believe that they are doing well. . .*
> *This must not be considered as discouraging, but rather as emphasising the convictions with which we started Homes; viz: that for a certain proportion of this class of young woman permanent protection is needful whether in Voluntary homes such as ours, for those who are willing and suitable to remain in them, or in Institutions where compulsory detention can be enforced for life or for renewable periods".*[155]

These claims were further substantiated when the same report considered the respective figures for the 41 residents leaving between Sept. 1898 and April 1904, only 4 being in employment; again almost a third, 14, followed the 'drift' into asylum or workhouse life, whilst almost a fifth of the girls, 9, had proved untraceable.[156]

Accompanying this dissemination of contemporary material favourable to their ultimate aims, and collected under the guise of the increasingly respected investigative methods of social science, the Homes' messages received both further verification and impetus from the attention and plaudits offered by nationally experienced figures in this debate; this attention was evident even from the Homes' inception, and found expression both through addresses to their Annual Meetings, and in the pages of contemporary publications, including the regular and favourable coverage provided by the quarterly 'Women Workers'.

Indeed, establishing a precedent which was frequently followed, and indicating the high and national profile this organisation immediately attracted, the Homes' first Annual Meeting was addressed by both Miss Clifford, and Miss Grafton of the Girls' Friendly Society in Workhouses,[157] whilst in 1896 a Local Government Board Inspector, Murray

Browne, delivered his thoughts on this issue.[158]

Furthermore, not only was this practice maintained, but, reflecting the growing esteem in which the Homes were held, these meetings began to attract speakers of national eminence repute and influence; they included, for instance, Mary Dendy,[159] the co-founder, with Ellen Pinsent, of the N.A.F.M.,[160] and subsequently a prominent figure both in this sphere and in the E.E.S.,[161] illustrating a trend still evident after the investigations of the Royal Commission, (see later).

Accompanying and complementing such developments, and again furthering their reputation and influence, the Homes similarly gained rapid recognition amongst those contributing to the burgeoning published material surrounding the subject. By 1900, for example, the Homes' Vice President, Dr. Shuttleworth,[165] had favourably alluded to their work in a revised edition of his 'Mentally Deficient Children'.[163] Moreover, this was an approval which echoed that voiced in several national journals, their third Annual Report, for example, observing that both 'The Queen' and 'The Philanthropist' had reviewed their activities and concluded,

> *"that we are,' doing a work the value of which will be appreciated by succeeding generations even more than by people of our own time".*[164]

However, whilst this recognition clearly indicates the importance and influence of the Homes in raising the profile of this issue, these institutions were, nevertheless, becoming increasingly overshadowed by the complementary activities of other agencies receiving the support and participation of members of the Cadburys. Of particular importance here were the actions of both the Birmingham municipal authority, especially following its absorption of King's Norton in 1911, and on a local and national level, through the involvement of the N.U.W.W..

Indeed, both through its regular publicity and propaganda organ, the 'Women Workers' and its general direction of interest, this latter organisation became one of the foremost and major protagonists of this and other social campaigns, the movement claiming in 1911, for example, that it was,

> *"the most influential and representative body of women in the United Kingdom".*[165]

Certainly Elizabeth Cadbury had indicated her awareness the potential power yielded by this pressure group in 1903, calling, as President of the Birmingham N.U.W.W, for the organisation to more than treble its membership to 1,000 to maximise this influence, the cumulative effect of which, she predicted, being to inevitably change and influence the atmosphere and 'tone of the community'.[166]

Subsequently, this influence was one which became particularly important in the 'feeble-minded' debate, the organisation playing a crucial role in raising and maintaining the profile of this issue amongst the general public.

Consequently, just as the Laundry Homes were important as a platform for the generation and propagation of favourable 'evidence' for this cause, the Birmingham N.U.W.W. was similarly active in disseminating publicity about this issue, the most significant achievement of such activism being its contribution to the endorsement and adoption of this campaign by its national body, thereby providing a mechanism by which the Laundry homes' evidence could be taken a stage nearer to the policy makers and, indeed, legislators.

Potts, (n.d.) has recognised this latter point, in acknowledging the contribution of both Ellen Hume Pinsent in particular and the Birmingham N.U.W;W. in general in promoting and strengthening support for this cause. Furthermore, this was indeed important and influential support, in that it culminated in the Mental Deficiency Act of 1913,[167] legislation which, in permitting the state detention of the 'feeble-minded', secured the redefinition the campaigners sought.

In essence, this activism, most frequently manifested through the 'Women Workers', was realised in a number of forms, including the 'evidence' emanating from the Laundry Homes, the regular publication of articles from national proponents of increased detention, and motions and expressions of support to their national body.

Accordingly, the original manifestation of this campaign, the 1891 Stacey article, was followed not only by the publication of the Homes' Annual Meetings, but also by the regular discussion and presentation of material in pursuance of this cause. However, the demands accompanying these articles were frequently ones which shifted significantly from Agatha Stacey's original emphasis, in advocating a more co-ordinated national approach to this 'problem', and demanding the adoption of a more reactionary, state controlled, 'solution', a perspective evident even from the first of these, reprinted from the 'Local Government Chronicle', in December 1895.[168]

Consequently, whilst the article publicised a meeting, addressed by both Clifford and Stacey,[169] announcing the formation of the first countrywide pressure group in this sphere, the N.A.F.M.,[170] a rather different agenda was illustrated by the meeting's Chairman, i.e. in emphasising the potential imminent menace this group represented to the nation, and the resultant urgent need to provide for,

> *"the rapidly increasing class of the 'feeble-minded' now filling our workhouses and refuges, and who, if not looked after and protected, threaten to become a social danger".*[171]

Nor were these isolated or unrepresentative sentiments amongst the 'Women

Workers' and its national body; accordingly this invocation of the contemporary concerns over the birth rate and the 'quality of the race' was frequently exhibited by the collective N.U.W.W. which, stimulated and encouraged by the promptings of the Birmingham Union and others, began to increasingly utilise its Annual Meetings to focus on this subject and the necessity of raising its profile, both amongst the public generally and political policy makers in particular.

Furthermore, the widespread propagation of these perceptions amongst such middle class organs as the 'Women Workers' helped fuel and maintain an impetus for perspectives which would later find a more powerful and co-ordinated vocalisation through the E.E.S. and its affiliated bodies; specifically, such criticisms castigated the perpetuation of a working class whose lifestyle was both morally and physically debilitating, factors perceived as having a direct bearing on the economic health of the nation. Indeed, Woodhouse, (1982) has commented that this was a widely prevalent perspective, and one with significant ramifications, in that the,

> *"number of characteristics which eugenicists believed could be transmitted genetically was particularly all-embracing. They included not only such defects as insanity, mental deficiency and epilepsy, but also unemployment, alcoholism, pauperism and criminality.*
> *Therefore, by the eugenic definition, almost the entire urban poor could be classified as 'degenerate'."*[172]

This was a perception which increasingly attracted the attention and sympathy of members of the N.U.W.W., indicating their growing interest in this matter and foreshadowing the organisation's participation in the campaign for the Mental Deficiency Act of 1913, increasing restrictions on the 'feeble-minded' populace. The body's 1894 conference, for example, heard an address which drew particular attention to the major role of heredity in contributing to the 'Causes of Intemperance among Women'.[173] Moreover, this argument was reinforced three years later by a conference speech highlighting the ostensibly increasing evidence supporting the convictions of Workhouse Guardians, that such institutions contained many 'feeble-minded' outside the ambit of the Lunacy Laws, the speaker arguing for the consequent, concomitant, corollary of establishing permanent institutions such as the Birmingham Laundry Homes to deal with this problem effectively.[174]

Furthermore, the following year the Annual Conference' Birmingham delegate reported that, whilst the subject had often been publicised in the 'Women Workers', it was nevertheless imperative to note one particular view which had been expressed at this meeting, one carrying warnings about the dire consequences of the numbers of 'mentally deficient children' in inner city areas.[175]

Indeed, significantly, this conference paper was the first to express this more overt reactionary element of the 'Women Workers' campaign, and one illustrative of the tendency

later observed by Woodhouse, in arguing that the consequences of such an urban populace were so severe that they had alerted both philanthropists and educationalists, whose experience had led them to the conclusion that,

> *"these children go to swell the criminal ranks; the fact being that incapacity of mind and weakness of will lie at the root of much of the recklessness and wrong doing that abound".*[176]

Subsequently, the issue continued to receive a high profile within the movement, and one which illustrated its duality of purpose. In June 1902, for example, the 'Women Workers', in paying tribute to the 'noble work' conducted at the Birmingham Laundry Homes,[177] struck an optimistic note emphasising its overriding concern with the welfare of the 'feeble-minded', and drew attention to the opportunities for furthering this cause at the N.U.W.W.'s forthcoming Annual Meeting, expressing the hope that such attention would result in a co-ordinated national movement for the assistance of this 'most pitiful and unfortunate class'.[178]

However, despite these philanthropic claims and, pertinently, in the immediate aftermath of the widely publicised gloomy prognosis drawn from the 'Manchester Regiment' incident, the organisation subsequently again illustrated an alternative agenda reflecting a more stringent approach towards achieving both this aim and the eventual eradication of this 'problem'; moreover, this was an agenda in alignment with the arguments of both 'national efficiency' and Social Darwinism/eugenics, and expressed by Mary Dendy of the N.A.F.M. in the conference observation that a chain was no stronger than its weakest link, and that,

> *"the weakest link in our social life today was the mass of mentally feeble persons . . . a danger to themselves and to society, and perpetually propagating their species".*[179]

Furthermore, Dendy warned, not only did the magnitude of this 'evil' outweigh the capacity of existing institutions, but due to its hereditary nature, it was becoming a problem of 'increasing intensity',[180] and, crucially for social policy, one which on both scientific and moral grounds demonstrated the absolute necessity of implementing new preventative measures in the guest for a solution to the 'feeble-minded problem'.[181]

The essence of these measures, she argued, was the extension of legislative powers to sanction the permanent detention of this class, most of whom would become parents,(182) thereby curtailing their propensity to propagate.

These were sentiments with which the meeting's Chair, both concurred and viewed with optimism,[183] and which, moreover, were echoed at the Laundry Homes' Annual Meeting the following May.[184]

Moreover, increasingly, the activism of the N.U.W.W. in this arena was being matched by the initiatives of Birmingham's municipal authority. Specifically these were initiatives which particularly featured Dr. W. A. Potts and Ellen Pinsent, both of whom were part of the wider Cadbury group, being involved with agencies with which leading and senior members of this group directly participated, including the B.W.S. and the B.H.S., (see later).

Indeed, Mrs. Pinsent was instrumental in orchestrating this debate on a national platform, rapidly becoming a widely known and influential figure in the process, speaking, for example, at a special conference focussing on this issue at Leicester in March 1903,[185] whilst publicising the parallelling efforts of the City of Birmingham School Board.

This latter body, moreover, offers a further illustration of the active participation of the Cadburys in this campaign. However, whilst this involvement coincided with their embracement of a more overt public profile from 1911 onwards, the local authority and Cadbury agencies had been collaborating over this matter from the turn of the century, the efforts of the municipal authority, for example, receiving both approval and publicity through the Cadbury influenced B.L.U. and its 'Women Workers'.

In December 1901, for example, the journal featured an article from Mrs. Pinsent outlining the measures the authority's School Board had instigated for 'feeble-minded' children. Crediting Joseph Sturge, one of the founder figures in the city's Adult School movement,[186] with also initiating this 'service', Pinsent argued that whilst such classes, implemented in 1894, operated from five Special Centres and catered for 107 pupils,[187] this provision was deficient; further suggested that the problem 'becoming daily a more serious one', one necessitating the establishment of permanent Homes,[188] as a first and indispensable move towards a 'solution'. Furthermore, she argued, the true purpose of the present scheme lay, perhaps, beyond its immediate impact on these current pupils, in that, whilst,

> *"the attempt to educate such children in Special Classes has done much good, not only to the children themselves, but by bringing the facts to light, and by forcing the existence of this large class of mentally defective children on the attention of the public".*[189]

Subsequently, the perception that this problem was both widespread and rapidly escalating, i.e. the perspective propagated through the reports of the Laundry Homes and the various organs of the N.U.W.W., led to the formation, in May, 1901, of the authority's Special School's After-Care Sub Committee,[190] a body which expressed its reactionary perspective from the first, in pressing for the adoption of a 'radical' policy to curb the social ills of drunkenness, prostitution and criminality they attributed to this populace.[191] Correspondingly, one such 'radical' proposal was the Sub Committee's accompanying

suggestion to remove this group,s right of parenthood by segregating and detaining them in institutions euphemistically described as providing permanent 'care' for the majority of the 'feeble minded'.[192]

Furthermore, to enhance this cause, the following year the Sub Committee appointed a commission of inquiry to analyse the extent of this 'problem', in attempting to quantify the city's number of 'imbecile, idiot or feeble-minded' aged under forty,[195] i.e. amongst those women of child-bearing age. Moreover, this committee, in containing both Mrs. Pinsent and Dr. Potts,[194] indicates their instrumental role both in publicising the scale of such 'deficiencies' within Birmingham, and, significantly, in determining the detention of individuals deemed to fall within the appropriate classifications.

The subsequent Sub-Committee's report, adopted by the Birmingham School Board in March 1903,[195] predictably contained 'evidence' substantiating their familiar calls, and recommended the provision of both Boarding School and Colony segregation and supervision for adolescents and adults falling into these respective categories.[196] However it also marked a significant departure from their traditional approach, in containing a 'Memorial' to the Secretary of State for Home Affairs, 'praying',

> *'that a Royal Commission may be appointed to consider provision for these classes in relation to their present needs, viewed in the light of the now recognised demands of science and good administration, and to report and make recommendations'.*[197]

Indeed, this action, echoing Dendy's calls several months earlier,[198] is noteworthy in demonstrating the intensification of this argument, and one to which the government acceded in 1904,[199] indicating the success of the publicity campaign of those agencies with which the Cadburys had sustained an enduring association, such as the Laundry Homes and the Birmingham influenced N.U.W.W..

Moreover, this School Board demand for a interventionist response is of further particular significance, not only for its allusion to, and tacit advocation of, Social Darwinistic/ eugenic arguments, but also in bringing to a conclusion the campaigners' almost exclusive focus on raising the general public's awareness of this issue.

Indeed, in their subsequent activism these agencies continued to utilise this mechanism to further promote their legislative objective, whilst undertaking the second phase of this campaign, one which witnessed a more overt Cadbury presence, was one which also featured a strategy of directly approaching the, primarily, Liberal, government.

This was a strategy the Cadburys were similarly pursuing in other areas of social policy, and was indicative of the new paternalists'/'radical' reformists' increasing propensity to both lobby policymakers and intervene generally in the political process, and, furthermore, a strategy undertaken in the climate of expectation aroused by the Royal Commission's appointment.

TOWARDS LEGISLATIVE CHANGE:

The Royal Commission and its Aftermath

Throughout the earliest years of the century the sustained efforts of the Laundry Homes, the N.U.W.W. and, to a lesser extent, the Birmingham municipal authority, had, therefore, succeeded in establishing a prominent social and political profile for the movement to extend compulsory detention.

However, despite the evidence of the apparent success of their pressure, with the Royal Commission's appointment, these bodies continued their propagandist measures throughout the commission's investigation.

Indeed, alongside the perception that they were nearing their legislative goal, the continuance of such propaganda was considered to be a prerequisite of achieving their aim; this was a perspective reiterated at the 1906 Laundry Homes' Annual Meeting, where Miss Walton Evans of the Inspectorate for Boarded-out Children argued that, despite their efforts, a 'vast amount of ignorance' still existed regarding this question,[200] and that, consequently,

> *"there was a great deal of educating to be done before they would have the nation behind them, and no legislation would be secured until there was a strong public opinion".*[121]

Accordingly, these agencies therefore continued their efforts to publicise this issue, a strategy subsequently sustained throughout the next decade, with the 'Woman Workers' maintaining its pivotal role disseminating such material. In essence this role, however, was one which gradually widened in scope as its national movement increasingly embraced this cause.

Correspondingly, the magazine consistently publicised the growing motions of support emanating from individual branches, alongside the reports of associated papers presented at their Annual Conferences, together with those from the Homes' Annual Meetings.

Indeed the later, in attracting speakers of the very highest national profile, reflected the prominence of the Birmingham Laundry Homes in this issue, addresses being delivered, for example, by Mary Dendy, in 1905,[202] in 1910 by the former Secretary of the Royal Commission,[203] and, the following year, by Dr Potts of the City of Birmingham Education Committee.[204]

Furthermore, the first of these very clearly reiterated the perceptions of the 'reform' group, for, whilst the accompanying Annual Report commended both the publicity aroused by the Royal Commission's work,[205] and the support of the majority of Poor Law Inspectors for the compulsory detention movement,[206] i.e. in adding an official

corroboration to the Homes' campaign, this approval was tempered by the warnings emanating from Dendy's address and its emphasis on the ever increasing necessity for legislative action.[207]

Moreover, whilst congratulating the Homes' Committee on their achievements throughout their thirteen year existence,[208] Dendy also revealed a distinctly eugenic subtext, in highlighting the 'sad history' befalling those who had left the institutions over this period,[209] and in making considerable reference to what she alleged was the fecundity and, indeed, promiscuity, of these women, 16% of whom had become unmarried mothers, a category she considered as the 'most deplorable' of all.[210]

Underlying this sentiment were Dendy's views that such women would 'almost certainly' have large families,[211] and that 'weakness of intellect' was the most consistent factor throughout all aspects of the social problem;[212] such 'evidence', she argued, clearly established the consequent need for a system of permanent detention,[213] and a system in which the Laundry Homes would fit 'very naturally',[214] if only,

> *"we had the sense to see that a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit!".*[215]

Furthermore, these sentiments, arguing that this most hereditary of diseases, whilst not curable in the individual, was largely preventable in the race,[216] were being similarly expressed within the N.U.W.W.. In January, 1906, for example, their Executive Committee, chaired by Elizabeth Cadbury,[217] approved a motion proposing a special conference with the N.A.F.M. for the specific purpose of linking its Preventative and Rescue work to that of the Association.[218]

Indeed, illustrating this close collaboration, in October, 1907, Miss Kirby, Secretary of this latter body,[219] addressed the N.U.W.W. Annual Conference on the adoption of existing homes for segregation purposes.[220] Arguing for the need for a more preventative, rather than merely palliative, system,[221] and equating serious mental defect with an equal moral deficiency,[222] Kirby cited the work of Dr Potts,[223] in establishing that over a third of girls in Rescue Homes were 'feeble-minded',[224] a factor she considered as both one of the 'most weighty' arguments of permanent detention,[225] whilst proving a strategy for countering,

> *"one of the chief sources of pollution. . .(the) continuance of a generation of future prostitutes. . ."*[226]

Moreover, in questioning whether it could exert any greater influence on the government regarding this issue,[227] and, indeed, applauding the sentiment of detention for life,[228] the N.U.W.W. response to this implicit allusion to racial deterioration is a further

indication of the body's pursuance of a more overt stance in this arena, one which became increasingly voiced as the Edwardian era concluded.

Subsequently, in the wake of the Royal Commission's recommendations, advocates of these more stringent measures exuded an expectation of imminent success. In September, 1908, for example, the 'Woman Workers' reported the expression of such sentiments at the Laundry and Homes of Industry Annual Meeting. Here, the principal speaker, Miss Townshend, argued that whilst they still awaited the legislation necessary to achieve their aims, they should nevertheless be optimistic, having gained the vital support of the medical profession for their cause, whilst the commission's 'findings' themselves additionally encouraged proponents such as themselves to have 'great grounds for hope'.[229]

Accordingly, this expectation was mirrored within the more official heredity lobby, for, whilst the report had likewise supported the principle of segregation,[230] their overall conclusions were considerably more 'radical', in endorsing the view that 'feeble-mindedness' was genetically linked with alcoholism, crime and pauperism;[231] indeed these conclusions have been interpreted as the consequence of a significant eugenic influence operating throughout the investigations, with both commissioners and witnesses holding membership of the E.E.S.[232]

Furthermore, by 1911, both Burns, as head of the Local Government Board, and Churchill, as the Board of Trade President responsible for implementing the 'social justice'/ 'national efficiency' measures of labour exchanges and trade boards,[233] were indicating that such views held credence within the government; the former, for example, anticipated the intention to introduce legislation to deal with the number of 'feeble-minded' in work-houses,[234] whilst Churchill, who in 1912, alongside Mckenna, became a Vice President of the London Eugenic Congress,[235] consequently gave further impetus to the campaign to eradicate a problem described by Tredgold from the Royal Commission as representing a very considerable social danger.[236]

However, despite these sentiments and a greatly favourable political climate engendered by the campaigners' sustained propaganda, together with the Royal Commission's ostensibly overwhelming 'evidence' and the subsequent calls for the wholesale implementation of the report's recommendations, there were those who, regarding these arguments sceptically, remained unconvinced; not the least of these were several Local Government Board officials advocating caution towards and, at least, partial opposition to such a course of action.

In particular, these reservations concerned the report's evidence with regard to inherited mental degeneracy, reservations which would have particular pertinence in relation to the government's initial proposals regarding the marriage and procreation rights of 'defectives'. In September, 1910, for example, Dr Sir Arthur Newsolme, Chief Medical

Office at the Board,[237] questioned the neutrality of the investigations, in observing that reference to the report,

> *"brings out the astonishing fact that the conclusions of the Royal Commission as to the heredity character of feeble-mindedness are formed almost solely on a prior considerations, which are certainly open to doubt".*[238]

Moreover, this comment, in seriously questioning the validity of the justification behind the policies of permanent detention and sterilisation,[239] was compounded the following month by the remarks of another official, James Davy. Indeed, his observations are perhaps equally damning, in suggesting that the conclusions were the consequence of a less than rigorous analysis, in that the,

> *"evidence reveals a marked difference of opinion in regard to the relative importance to be assigned to heredity against what may be termed the influence of environment - but they sum up generally 'that feeble-mindedness tends to be inherited'".*[240]

Consequently, such reservations, at least partly, contributed to the government's inaction in the aftermath of the Royal Commission, a standpoint roundly criticised by both those in the vanguard of the detention movement, and within society generally, including amongst members of the wider Cadbury group. In June, 1909, for example, Chiozza Money, the Liberal M.P. and journalist, drew attention to this matter in the 'Daily News', arguing that the immediate segregation of the 'unfit' was imperative in avoiding imminent national decadence, and, in particular, to curb the,

> *"propagation of the feeble-minded, of epileptics, of deaf mutes, and even of the insane, (which) proceeds apace".*[241]

Concurrently, having contributed both to the increased profile of this question and the appointment of the Royal Commission, those agencies with which the Cadburys were associated in this arena were clearly determined to compound these 'developments'. through maximising the potential of their newly found and expressed political leverage.

More specifically, this leverage was employed in the pursuit of a number of strategies designed to achieve their desired objectives, and which included the further dissemination of propaganda, together with the direct lobbying of central government, alongside attempts to influence and shape both the required legislation and its implementation.

These latter tasks were largely undertaken as the new detention stipulations acquired statutory drafting, receiving, for example, the considered attention of the

N.U.W.W. and, in particular, a Legislation Committee which included Elizabeth Cadbury.[242] However, the mantle of orchestrating the most direct and overt of these strategies, the lobbying of the government, was adopted somewhat earlier, being given expression through Birmingham's municipal channels, and principally through its Education Committee and associated derivates.

Furthermore, this latter body increasingly reflected the middle class network alluded to earlier. Moreover, this was a network of particular prominence within the city's social welfare organisations, and, one over which the Cadbury's were beginning to exercise a consistent and coherent influence across many interrelated areas of social policy.

Of considerable significance was the extent to which leading members of the municipal body, including those from the Cadbury group, embraced a Social Darwinistic/eugenic perspective. This influence, first evident following the Birmingham School Board's inquiry in 1903, subsequently became manifest in a consistently displayed adherence to the principles of segregation and permanent detention. Accordingly, such an adherence had resulted, from 1901, in the supervision of 933 'mental deficients' in the eleven year history of the Special Schools' After-Care Sub Committee,[243] statistics which, moreover, the body interpreted as offering 'incontrovertible' evidence of the need for their services.[244]

Furthermore, given the new era of state interventionism, a particularly important factor for the direction of Birmingham's social welfare programme was the interrelation of the Cadbury group with other municipal officers, who as members of the B.H.S. similarly embraced the eugenic philosophy. Such a network encompassed members of the city's Education Committee, including Elizabeth Cadbury,[245] and her associate Mrs Walter Barrow,[246] together with Mr and Mrs Cary Gilson, both of the B.H.S. Committee.[247]

Moreover, this adherence was reinforced by the B.H.S. membership of many of the most powerful within Birmingham's social welfare structure, including Dr Robertson,[248] the city's Medical Office of Health,[249] Dr Auden,[250] the Schools' Medical Officer,[251] and both Mrs Hume Pinsent and Dr Potts;[252] further by 1912 both Auden and Pinsent were holding positions on the society's Executive Committee, an influence compounded by the latter's presence on the E.E.S. Council.[253]

Of especial significance was the interrelation of the Cadbury group with Ellen Pinsent, a woman who, alongside Elizabeth Cadbury, was particularly prominent within the authority's operations, the latter from 1911 chairing the city's Hygiene Sub Committee,[254] a body which also contained Potts, Pinsent and the Cadbury associate George Shann.[255] Furthermore, each of the latter three, together with Mrs Barrow Cadbury, reinforced this influence through their membership of the Special Schools' Sub Committee,[256]

a body which, under Pinsent's chairmanship,[257] increasingly undertook responsibility for those with physical and mental 'disabilities'. This body, for example, assumed control of Uffculme Open-air school in 1910,[258] and generally guiding the city's municipal policy in this sphere, perhaps most specifically with regard to those who became the targets of the eugenic influenced drive towards 'social efficiency'.

Indeed, Mrs Pinsent became of considerable local and national importance in this issue, being the first woman elected to the City Council,[259] one of two females to sit on the Royal Commission into the 'Care and Control of the Feeble-minded',[260] and the first non male member of the subsequent Board of Control established to implement the terms of the 1913 legislation.[261]

Locally, this prominence was especially significant, not only for the role she played within particular institutions, but also indicating the extent to which an overlapping of personnel occurred within the network of Birmingham's social welfare organisations, an interrelation which extended beyond municipal agencies to include voluntary bodies operated and influenced by the Cadburys. Pinsent, for example, with Elizabeth Cadbury, embraced the Birmingham Society for Promoting the Election of Women,[262] alongside, as stated earlier, delivering lectures encouraging segregation for the 'feeble-minded' to the Cadbury influenced B.W.S.[263]

Furthermore, this network, of significance and importance in disseminating and orchestrating support for Cadburys' social philosophy, was one which increasingly contained a eugenic inspired element, a perspective more overtly stated following the formation of the B.H.S. in 1910.[264] This was an organisation which similarly sought to promote this legislative aim, and which, compounding this cause within the Cadbury sphere of influence, attracted the support of, for example, Mrs Pinsent,[265] Mrs Beale,[266] the President of the B.W.S.,[267] and leading members of the Cadburys. These included, for instance, Elizabeth Cadbury,[268] and R. W. Ferguson,[269] the Bournville Works' Education Officer,[270] together with numerous associates from their social circle, such as Harrison Barrow,[271] and Mr and Mrs Walter Barrow.[272]

In essence this B.H.S. activism was of a two-fold nature, consisting of organising a series of lectures offering a platform for nationally prominent eugenicists, such as Dr Starr Jordan, an E.E.S. Vice President,[273] and Dr A. F. Tredgold (see earlier) a member of the Society's Council,[274] to speak directly to the local membership,[275] whilst the Birmingham Branch itself disseminated general eugenic principles and propaganda to various societies in the area. Moreover, many of these, including the Early Morning Adult Sunday School movement,[276] the Birmingham Workers' Education Association,[277] and the B.W.S.[278] were bodies with which the Cadburys were integrally linked, and whose work will be considered in the next chapter.

A significant and influential sector of Birmingham's voluntary and civic leadership was, therefore, consistently advocating policies which, whilst they might be regarded as tending to increase 'social/national efficiency', also contained a deeply ingrained eugenic content, an emphasis that was maintained throughout the pre-war years. Furthermore, this sector also worked in tandem with other local and national Cadbury agencies to achieve an increased public and political awareness and acceptance of their arguments, specifically in the pursuit of the legislative redefinition they desired, and indeed perceived as imperative for the nation's economic health and future.

Increasingly however, many such proponents within the City of Birmingham Education Committee were becoming disenchanted with the government's lack of action over this issue, a perspective which triggered the implementation of a more overt and interventionist strategy, that of the direct lobbying of the central authority. In June, 1910, for example, following the report of their Special Schools' After Care Sub Committee, a body containing Isabel Cadbury alongside both Pinsent and Potts,[279] the Education Committee forwarded a resolution to the Prime Minster, calling for the earliest possible wholesale implementation of the Royal Commission's recommendations,[280] to avert 'grave danger and injury to the national welfare'.[281]

Moreover, and echoing the Laundry Homes, pending any such legislative change, the Sub Committee continued the authority's more traditional strategy of providing statistical information in furtherance of their cause. In June 1911, for example, it argued that an analysis of their ex students' experiences clearly established the (statutory) need to compulsorily register all cases of 'mental defect',[282] since, almost without exception, they were unable to obtain and maintain employment enabling them to pursue fully independent lives.[283]

Parallelling this demand, the authority also sanctioned measures designed as a practical response, in advance of legislation, to the perceived 'problems' their investigations had revealed. In July, 1912, for example, the Sub Committee argued that this category, in accounting for 1.1% of the city's populace, required an immediately increased provision;[284] this was a perspective with which the Education Committee concurred, in raising its Special School accommodation by almost 10% from 830 places in 1913,[285] to 910 the following year.[286]

Moreover, this development was compounded and paralleled by the extension, under the committee's auspices, of Monyhull Colony, an institution instigated by the city's Joint Poor Law Commission in 1905.[287] Having opened three years later[288] the colony became a reflection of the increased civic acceptance of the detention argument, and in particular of the Special Schools' Sub Committee's claim that 14.7% of their children required the additional supervision afforded by residential schooling.[289] Indeed, this acceptance, operating perhaps in anticipation of, but certainly ahead of, legislative change, resulted in June, 1912, in the Colony Guardians being requested by the City Council to

provide accommodation for 180 of the Education Committee's 'mentally defective' children,[290] an arrangement which became operative eight months later.[291]

Furthermore, and consistent with the philosophy practiced by the Laundry Homes, in the pursuit of the twin goals of 'individual liberty' alongside 'proper discipline',[292] this institution required its residents to undertake, 'as much work as practicable',[293] a policy which also reveals the authority's concern with the economic costs of increasing levels of supervision.

However, a far greater financial concern underpinned calls for the extension of existing powers of detention, and related to the perceived ineffectiveness and waste of public funds resulting from the enforced cessation of supervision as the residents attained the age of 16.

Indeed, this harnessing of economic costs and social efficiency was a central platform of the detention lobby's argument, forming, for example, the basis of the Conference of After-Care Committees in Leicester, In October, 1909. Here both Pinsent and the meeting's President presented this argument, together with its corollary, that unless a statutory redefinition embraced this additional, and permanent, detention, their organisations would continue to produce 'discouraging results'.[294] Indeed this was a perception echoed two years later by the Birmingham Special Schools' Sub Committee, in the criticism that,

> *"much time and money are now being wasted. . . by attempting to train a large number of the mentally-defective to live as ordinary citizens. The After-Care Committees in various districts have proved conclusively that this is impossible".*[295]

Moreover, in arguing for a farm colony system as a suitable and economic alternative, they lamented that, alongside their current futile attempts, the efforts of the Lunacy Commissioners only affected half of those who required supervision, those outside the existing legal ambit frequently drifting into crime and producing children who would follow a similar path.[296]

However, despite this tone, the report, in January, 1912, sanctioned by an Education Committee which included George Shann, Mrs Walter Barrow, together with both Elizabeth Cadbury and George Cadbury Jnr,[297] represented a further stage in the authority's lobbying for this cause and for the implementation of the Royal Commission's recommendations. This was an important development in two respects, firstly in welcoming Asquith and McKenna's intimations that an appropriate Bill was imminent,[298] and, secondly reinforcing this sentiment, sending copies of this approval to the Home Secretary, all of the city's M.P.s, and to other local government authorities, the latter being urged to similarly endorse this measure.[299]

Furthermore, this strategy was one to which other major adherents of this cause subscribed; accordingly, N.U.W.W. activism towards this legislative aim also considerably intensified during the government's prevarication, for example, with the Birmingham branch, in 1910, forwarding a motion to this effect to its National Conference,[300] a resolution subsequently approved and passed,[301] and, in November, submitted by its Executive Committee to the Prime Minister.[302]

Indeed this course of action had also been utilised by the N.A.F.M. four months earlier, in delivering a memorandum to Downing St.; a memorandum which, in bearing over 1,000 signatures, induced Asquith to assure the accompanying deputation that it was,

> *"the earnest desire of the Government to contribute what they can towards the solution of this important and weighty problem".*[303]

During the ensuing months the administration did indeed accede to the campaigners' demands, an initiative, alongside a general change in public feeling over this issue, which Dr Potts attributed to the pioneering and sustained efforts of the Laundry Homes;[304] this sentiment was subsequently reiterated at the organisations' 1912 Annual Meeting, the speaker praising Birmingham's contribution at the forefront of the movement for this legislation,[305] whilst lamenting the continuing delay in introducing an appropriate measure.[306]

Furthermore, this perception of a lack of government commitment, despite its reassuring pronouncements, was echoed by the N.A.F.M. and led the organisation, in March, 1911, to collaborate with the E.E.S. in the preparation of a Private Member's Bill to secure the implementation of the Royal Commission's recommendations.[307] This collaboration culminated in May the following year with the introduction of the Feeble-minded Persons (Control) Bill,[308] an action similarly welcomed by a further active participant in this debate, the City of Birmingham Education Committee.[309]

Subsequently, this action provoked the government to respond with its own measure almost immediately, the Mental Deficiency Bill, introduced in June, 1912.[310] This was a measure which, whilst also containing administrative details, sought precisely the same provisions as the N.A.F.M/E.E.S. proposal, in including clauses directed towards the sterilisation and prevention of marriage amongst this section of the populace.[311]

Moreover and even more damning, this deeply eugenic measure was subsequently endorsed by Cadbury agencies such as the N.U.W.W. and, again, the Birmingham Education Committee.[312]

The former's Council, for example, in the same month, expressed its 'gratitude to the Government', for this action,[313] whilst it's Legislation Committee, a body whose purpose its longstanding member, Elizabeth Cadbury,[314] described as 'urging the passing

laws',[315] became the organisation's chief mechanism for its closer consideration of this matter; specifically it established a Sub Committee for this purpose,[316] a body which included Miss Kirby of the N.A.F.M. amongst its number,[317] and which further sought to exert its influence by inviting members of the Parliamentary Standing Committee to a special meeting to collaborate in this process.[318]

Subsequently, the cumulative effect of these initiatives was the endorsement by the organisation's Annual Conference, which expressed the hope that the proposal would 'become law as speedily as possible,'[319] its principal criticisms of the Bill being restricted to the anticipated lack of women on any committees formed to administer the measures,[320] rather than questioning its undoubted eugenic nature.

Likewise the City of Birmingham Education Committee was fully supportive of these proposals, in December, for example, following the withdrawl and postponement of the Bill, passing a resolution urging a reconsideration of this action, and seeking an early parliamentary reintroduction of the issue.[321] Indeed, this motion served to reassert the committee's position in the vanguard of those pursuing this cause, in being forwarded both to the Chairman of the Lunacy Commissioners,[322] and to 61 other local authorities;[323] Moreover, this resolution was of significance not only for its vitriolic condemnation of the postponement, describing the action as, 'little short of a national calamity',[314] but in being the first of over 20 such municipal motions similarly passed and submitted during the following two months.[325]

The N.U.W.W.'s Executive Committee also sustained its campaigning throughout this period, in January, 1913, whilst accepting that requesting the government to reconsider its decision was 'not practicable',[326] nevertheless continuing to lobby support for this measure; accordingly it ratified proposals to co-operate with other groups seeking this objective, and, to maintain the issue's high profile, authorising the publication of articles in the national press and the circulation within its local branches of material emphasising the imperative need for this legislation,[327]

Similarly, the E.E.S. retained its position of prominence within the general agitation urging the government to reassess the situation, again encouraging the lobbying of parliamentarians and ministers in the pursuit of this objective.[328] Indeed, the Society remained optimistic, arguing that the Bill had been blocked only by the opposition of a small minority, and that the essence of the measure had received approval,[329] an approval which, they anticipated, would ensure its future success.[330]

In Birmingham Dr Auden also subscribed to this perspective, in subsequently arguing that , whilst some action dealing with the marriage of the 'unfit' was 'urgently needed', nevertheless conceding that its omission from the Bill would ensure the measure's reintroduction was 'much simpler',[331] and would, consequently, prove successful.

Indeed, such an assessment proved well founded, the government, under the weight of such pressure and expectation, acceding to the reintroduction of the Bill during the following parliamentary session, a period in which these agencies subsumed their own particular agendas to the overriding objective of achieving the measure's passage. In June, 1913, for example, the N.U.W.W Legislation Committee ensured that their disagreements over the new proposal's minor details did not imperil the Bill's progress, in recommending that they introduce no further amendments, for 'fear of endangering its fate'.[332]

Subsequently, a Parliament which largely accepted the eugenic arguments of the various activists approved this second government measure; moreover this measure was one which, whilst indeed not containing its more controversial clauses regarding the procreation and marriage of 'mental defectives',[333] nevertheless granted the redefinition its advocates had been propounding, in the case of the N.U.W.W. and the Laundry Homes, for over twenty years.

Consequently, within Birmingham, those most prominent in the pursuit of this cause were correspondingly enthusiastic both about the Bill's success, and in anticipating the effect of the new legislation, the city's Special Schools' Sub Committee greeting the law with 'gratification',[334] and arguing that,

> *"the Act would remove some of the greatest difficulties in dealing with mentally-defective persons needing supervision and control".*[335]

Similarly the Laundry Homes' Annual Meeting reflected this optimism, the 1914 speaker suggesting that they should 'rejoice' at the passing of the measure,[336] one which ensured they could look forward to the 'dimunition' of this category,[337] and, by implication, a corresponding reduction in the danger to the nation's future.

Indeed, this action was greeted with widespread, almost universal, approval, both by Parliament and the public in general, 'The Socialist' standing alone among the political press in condemning the Bill in ignoring environmental effects upon the populace and, more specifically, for its social engineering subtext, in being,

> *"sufficiently vague to cover any person likely to be objectionable to the authorities . . . ",*[338]

In contrast, despite the dilution of the initial proposals, some of which, including restricting the marriage and procreation of 'feeble-minded', would subsequently be resurrected by, amongst others, the E.E.S. and the N.U.W.W., campaigners claimed this legislation as a significant milestone in the quest for 'social/national efficiency'.

Furthermore, the importance of the contribution of this latter body, together with the City of Birmingham Education Committee and the local Laundry Homes in the

achieving of this object was both significant and sustained, such participation being at least partly officially recognised when the Provisional Council established to confer with the government regarding the Act, contained two of the Homes' representatives,[339] one of whom was Mrs Pinsent.[340]

Neither should the, largely covert, role of the Cadburys in this process be underestimated, i.e. in sustaining an allegiance with these and other groups closely associated with promoting the principles of eugenics throughout a period spanning almost a quarter of a century.

Furthermore, the activism of these groups, in the orchestration of a prolonged publicity and lobbying campaign, was a significant contributory factor in raising and maintaining the profile of the 'feeble-minded' question and, indeed, in having their perception of this 'problem' widely accepted in the public and political domain.

Accordingly, whilst in the promotion of their social philosophy and the pursuance of an 'efficient', politically moderate populace, this Cadbury group had, through the B.V.T. and other agencies, embraced and championed the cause of temperance, the advocation of this particular 'solution' represented an acceptance and espousal of eugenic interpretations of contemporary, largely urban, problems, and marked a general and influential realignment towards the nurturist lobby and its perspectives concerning the 'quality of the race'.

Consequently, although a quantified evaluation of the subsequent effect of the 1913 legislation, together with their attempts to support the complementary but cancelled Inebriates Bill of 1914,[341] lies outside the ambit of this study, this Cadbury activism was nevertheless of considerable importance in the widespread national acceptance of these 'solutions'.

Furthermore, despite the eventual, diluted, version of the measures the Cadburys had propounded, amending proposals advocating the extreme restriction of this class' rights, one specific consequence of this pressure was the indefinite segregation and detention of large numbers of the urban populace, a policy which had the attendant effect of curtailing the group's procreation, in the 'national interest'.

However, whilst this measure had a significant effect upon a certain section of, primarily, the working classes, the Cadbury's espousal of the 'cult of the child' also had a somewhat wider focus; this was one which was most evident in the initiatives, including those at the Bournville Works, broadly described as 'educative' in nature, initiatives which formed a considerable part of the Cadbury participation in social welfare and policy, and which will be considered in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5
THE CADBURYS AND EDUCATION

a) THE CADBURYS EDUCATION INITIATIVES-

A Response to the 'Social Question

One increasingly prevalent perception of the late Victorian era was that of an urban populace that was rapidly deteriorating, both physically and morally, a populace which was, correspondingly, largely alienated by organised religion and its accompanying social mores, and, paradoxically, one in considerable danger of becoming socially marginalised as it inexorably neared its political emancipation.

Such a perception clearly raised the spectre of a potentially catastrophic future awaiting Britain's populace as a whole, an implication which, at least partly, explains the degree of concern and attention the 'social question' issue received amongst many sectors of the nation's political statesmen, theorists and strategists.

Elements of this perspective were, for example, voiced by influential contemporary social commentators and investigators such as Urwick, Booth and Rowntree,whose 'findings' in turn both contributed to and further fuelled this debate; moreover, these writers were consequently joined by those from both sides of the mainstream political divide, all of whom identified education as the panacea for the nation's economic and spiritual salvation.

Indeed, this belief united groups as apparently diverse as the eugenicists, the Fabians, on behalf of whom Sidney Webb advocated a 'national minimum' of state secondary education,[1] and the Imperialists, mobilised by Rosebery's 1901 'Chesterfield speech' in which he identified the necessity of achieving 'national efficiency' in many areas of national life, including that of education, as a fundamental factor in achieving this salvation.[2]

Furthermore, and more specifically for this study, similar concerns over the urban populace and its lack of receptiveness to their message had been a central theme of the Quaker's 1895 Manchester Conference. This meeting was of considerable consequence, formally focusing Friends' attention of the 'social question' issue, and reformulating much of the movement's traditional passive approach into one necessitating the adoption of a far higher public profile, a strategy the Cadburys subsequently embraced across many areas of social involvement.

However, despite these perfectly valid perceptions, such a perspective substantially understates the contemporary Cadbury response to these questions, in that it overlooks the extensive influence this group were already exercising among members of Birmingham's working classes. Whilst, for example, the conference heard two particular speakers advocating the value of Adult Schools as mechanisms for, respectively, reaching the 'outside world',[3] and promoting 'practical brotherhood',[4] the Cadburys had in fact been pursuing precisely these opportunities for a considerable time, as one of the numerous ways these problems might be pragmatically addressed.

Indeed throughout the latter part of the 19th century, presaging Edwardian developments in Bournville, the Cadburys had become particularly prominent in the voluntary arena, initially within Birmingham and later nationally, in implementing educational programmes for different sectors of the urban community, many of which were directed exclusively towards the working classes.

Operating principally through the Adult School (A.S.) movement, George Cadbury, together with his brother, Richard, became the group's major protagonist in this incipient involvement with social policy, through the founding, provision and promotion of a number of Birmingham based classes/Schools. Dovetailing with local bodies sharing similar social objectives, including those which bore considerable Cadbury influence, such as the B.W.S., this A.S. provision subsequently became a prominent and ostensibly politically neutral educational arena for the regular meeting of, and collaboration between, this group and considerable numbers of the city's urban populace, and one which, certainly with regard to this locality, seriously undermines if not completely invalidates the contemporary perception of a failing and defunct A.S. movement, (see later).

Indeed, as such this Birmingham network became one way in which the Cadburys exercised a continuing and steadily increasing influence on Birmingham's working class populace, this framework operating as, in effect, a permanent mechanism for the transmission and dissemination of their new paternalist social philosophy and, more specifically, their middle class perceptions of education, in seeking to inculcate the capitalist work ethic and its concomitant habits of obedience, subservience and submission amongst this population.

Furthermore, by the turn of the century this network became the springboard for the Cadburys' implementation of several interrelated educational initiatives, each with their own particular area/sphere of operation, but all imbued with the Cadbury social philosophy. Indeed, given their experience within this framework, the broadening of their social involvement and their increasingly more public profile, the latter illustrated, for example, by George Cadbury's election, in 1905, to the Friends' national body, the Central Education Committee,[5] this area of participation was one which presented itself as both the most logical and potentially effective area in which to pursue and extend their interest and activism in the contemporary concern over, and indeed, preoccupation with, the 'cult of the child'.

This extension was, in the early years of the 20th century, to result in the founding of the Bournville Works' Evening Continuation School, and, later, its Day School successor, together with the Selly Oak Colleges, each of these bodies serving as influential vehicles for the direct, conspicuous and widespread expression of the Cadburys' educational (and social) objectives.

Indeed, whilst these initiatives will be considered in greater depth later in the chapter, it is nevertheless appropriate here to note their considerable importance within the

Cadburys' overall educational involvement, such bodies becoming a central mechanism for the dissemination of their social philosophy and, consequently, for the encouragement, adoption and continued reinforcement of their underlying capitalist promoting socio-political assumptions and aims, including the heralding of vaguely, but favourably, defined subjective concepts such as 'citizenship' end 'brotherhood'.

Additionally, and consistent with this approach in other parallelling areas of social involvement, these aims were heavily imbued with the overriding necessity of providing for the 'needs' of the state's children, a perspective which held considerable implications for Bournville's female populace, and the consequent educational and socialisation programmes they subsequently underwent. In particular this viewpoint underpinned the general direction of a policy which closely adhered to and indeed, promoted, the perception of woman as 'carer', both in the domestic sphere and within voluntary sector employment, such objectives being propagated both through these and a number of complementary and interrelated Birmingham agencies seeking associated social ends.

Moreover, this Cadbury involvement also had a concerted and significant impact within the national arena, particularly within those bodies and agencies which sought to provide the increasingly politically emancipated working classes with a correspondingly 'appropriate' educational 'emancipation', i.e. an education which subsequently became characterised by its post-elementary, liberal, nature, and one which William Temple, Chairman of the influential Workers' Educational Association, (W.E.A.)[6] described as facilitating the social and political panacea of an 'educated democracy', (see later). Moreover, a simultaneous consequence of this 'emancipation' process was, as at Bournville, the securing of a work force imbued with ethics accepting the economic status quo, a necessary precondition for establishing the industrial harmony essential to withstand both politically inspired domestic challenges and the increasing international threats to Britain's fading manufacturing and trading pre-eminence.

In essence, therefore, this educational involvement became by far the most prioritised and pronounced of the Cadbury responses to the 'social question', and one which directly parallelled their support for contemporary schemes of state welfare provision designed to promote the social 'betterment' and moral 'enrichment' of the nation. Consequently, this standpoint is typically representative of the Cadbury social philosophy, in revealing both their adherence and general alignment to 'national efficiency' sentiments, rather than an outright membership of this lobby, whilst displaying a perspective consistent with their support for specific government initiatives towards such 'betterment', including those measures discussed in chapter 3 under the umbrella of 'public health', i.e. the provision of school meals, and the introduction of both the medical inspection and treatment of school children.

Consequently, therefore, this educational activism formed a natural and logical complement to the Cadburys' involvement across other areas of social policy and

characterised by the same desire to establish permanent mechanisms for this purpose, such efforts becoming increasingly pronounced throughout the later Victorian and Edwardian periods, i.e. especially between 1890 and 1914.

Furthermore, whilst this response was comparable to that of many of their contemporaries considering this issue, the central thesis of this chapter seeks to emphasise the particular effectiveness/'success' and, indeed, uniqueness of this Cadbury activism. More specifically, and especially with regard to the earliest of these schemes which operated throughout the final decades of the 19th century, such an assessment offers a very different analysis to those contemporary commentators who regarded the working classes as increasingly beyond the reach of middle class persuasion.

Moreover, and perhaps of even greater consequence, several of these initiatives/ programmes served either to facilitate the direct introduction of early models offering an element of post-elementary education for the working class populace, or to reinforce similar efforts implemented by others. Crucially, however, whilst these Cadbury efforts were lauded for their ostensibly enlightened non-vocational basis, they were considerably more reactionary in nature than is generally acknowledged, ultimately being designed to augment and even supplant the perceived failing moral power of organised religion, and to counter and indeed, forestall, the introduction of more radical versions of education and political and economic analysis in particular, i.e. as social engineering mechanisms specifically targeted towards the more 'efficient' workings of a capitalist democracy.

An appropriate starting point is to examine those schemes which most obviously pursued this objective, i.e. those initiated at Bournville and acting, principally, upon the Cadbury workforce.

The Bournville Provision

In common with many of their late Victorian contemporaries, the Cadburys were extremely concerned about problems they perceived as particularly affecting the young urban populace, problems whose urgent resolution they construed as being of paramount importance for the survival of their own and the nation's industrial and economic strategy. In the educational arena their response was and is of a two-fold relevance; firstly, in being essentially grounded in the belief in education as a social moderator and vehicle for the inculcation of particular social, cultural and political values, and secondly in implementing programmes which anticipated and predated numerous government reports, enquiries and policies undertaken during the opening two decades of the century. Indeed this latter point is of further significance, such schemes being subsequently utilised to create favourable perceptions of certain new initiatives, among workers, employers and officials

of the state, alongside offering practical advice about how such developments might be organised and introduced on a wider scale in the educational and industrial arena. In particular, for example, they pre-empted amongst others, Professor Michael Sadler's 1908 advocacy of a national Continuation School scheme,[7] and the following year's Board of Education Consultative Committee,[8] and indeed H.A.L Fisher's 1918 Education Act, which, in advocating the adoption of such a programme,[9] created the framework for a considerable expansion of post- elementary education for working class adolescents.

However, perhaps most revealing of all, this educational response also pre-dated the 1904 findings of the Inter- Departmental Report on Physical Deterioration,[10] produced in the aftermath of the Boer War, and whose principal effect was to crystallise apparently diffuse concerns regarding such adolescents,[11] and which is of particular importance in this debate, having had,

> *"a direct importance for educational developments in bringing older demands for physical training and domestic subjects, as well as newer demands for continuation education, to public and official notice: the teaching of hygiene and infant care in particular received a boost from this inquiry".*[12]

Whilst the Cadburys clearly subscribed to each of these beliefs and subsequently endorsed and promoted such demands, especially in collaboration with the City of Birmingham Education Committee, establishing courses drawn up with the assistance of both His Majesty's Inspectorate and the local Director of Education,[13] it is, nevertheless, pertinent to observe their pioneering role in such developments. In 1899, for example, ahead of each of these inquiries Messrs Cadburys had initiated a response among their own workforce, an initiative which later led to the introduction of the Bournville Works Education Department, both of these schemes being utilised to publicise this movement for continuing education, with a view to its further propagation.

Importantly, as in other areas of Cadbury social involvement, this Bournville Works-based provision was accompanied by complementary developments designed to coherently advance the cause of social and political conservatism and, conversely, to counter challenges to the existing (economic) order, developments which were similarly introduced ahead of official investigations. One particularly relevant example of this process, especially with regard to the contemporary potentially volatile social and industrial climate, was to initiate schemes such as pensions,[14] conferring relatively generous benefits on their employees, alongside granting their workforce an element of consultative involvement, together with a certain, limited, degree of self-control, thereby presenting the perception of workers' power operating within a capitalist, industrial, democracy. Accordingly, whilst the 1917 Whitley Report recommended the formation of a national system of industrial councils with corresponding district organisations and factory-based

works committees,[15] such a scheme had been operating at Bournville for a considerable period, its ostensible purpose being to promote the employees' welfare within an environment which enabled the worker to take an increased part in the control of the business,[16] alongside, of course, encouraging notions such as the existence of a common interest shared by both sides of industry.

This Cadbury educational response resulted in a provision which evolved gradually, but which, even by the end of the Edwardian years, clearly illustrated the potential benefits of such a system, especially one operated by a powerful industrial concern which viewed the government's political perspectives with sympathy, and one, moreover, with a degree of influence upon that government. Consequently, this also came to illustrate one way in which such a scheme might be organised on a large scale and, as such, also represented a model for national adoption and adaptation.

This process had begun in earnest in 1899, coinciding with the death of Richard Cadbury and the consequent assumption of his brother, George, to the head of the family. Indeed, it also coincided with a number of far reaching social policy initiatives, as the group began to embrace a more public profile, including, in the area of housing, the formation of the Bournville Village Trust and, with regard to the Adult School arena, Class XIV's Darwin St. experiment, (see later). In accord with each such involvement in matters of social policy, this educational response was reflective of the overall Cadbury philosophy, projecting the idea that social reforms were achievable without recourse to class conflict perspectives and that such an approach might even hamper this process. In 1924, for example, following her unsuccessful General Election campaign as Liberal candidate for King's Norton, Elizabeth Cadbury criticised her Labour Party opponent for precisely this reason, arguing that many,

> *"of the reforms for which both we and Labour stand are similar,*
> *but the antagonism and class feeling that are fostered throughout their ranks,*
> *the suspicion and distrust, . . . block the road to real progress".*[17]

Accordingly, the Cadbury educational programme was one which emphasised its paternal, consensual and mutually beneficial nature. In 1926, for example, George Cadbury Jnr suggested that the provision of education in industry beyond the school leaving age was the 'moral responsibility' of employers[18] and represented a course which the average caring and responsible parent would 'doubtless pursue' if he possibly could.[19]

Ten years earlier Elizabeth Cadbury had argued from a slightly different perspective in propounding education for adolescents as of right, and less paternally, as a matter of national necessity. Praising the implementation of a Day Continuation School programme in Munich as 'wisely progressive',[20] Cadbury suggested that:

"Another point that we shall have to look to with earnest attention is the continuation of Education beyond the age of 14. A greater number of Secondary Schools must be provided for capable children. Also those who are obliged to work for a livelihood. . . must for at least three years be able to continue their studies".[21]

Indeed in 1912 Edward Cadbury had pre-empted these comments, arguing that allowing children to end their schooling at 14 both a 'great national waste'.[22] and a grave personal disservice to the individual's concerned, who consequently missed the great opportunities education provided, including developing certain skills essential in modern industrial life, such as those of self-control, adoption and initiative.[23]

However, this portrayal of the Cadbury actions is rather simplistic and inaccurate, disguising the existence of far less disinterested and philanthropic motives which also underpinned this provision. The perception of the Cadburys as merely passive participants in providing this programme is, for example, very misleading. Whilst the Bournville Works Education Committee Secretary wrote, for instance, that one of their principal tasks was to 'encourage' attendance at evening continuation classes,[24] the firm were, in reality, much more insistent, not to say prescriptive, explaining to parents of prospective employees that with regard to securing both initial employment and future promotions, preference would be given to those undertaking such sessions.[25]

Indeed, the justifications for the Bournville provision were both numerous and varied, ranging from the encouragement of moderate political values, a common and recurring theme in Cadbury social initiatives, to more specific reasons, including several issues arousing considerable concern amongst the conservative business community. In 1926, for example, George Cadbury Jnr in the 'Why We Want Education in Industry', argued that the effect of such a provision was to generally raise an individual's level of intelligence, which in turn led to increases in both co-operation and efficiency.[26] The end result of such a programme, he suggested, should be the production of healthy, clean and alert adults, a self-reliant group of workers, reliable and responsible citizens.[27]

However, the real meaning of these rather vague sentiments becomes somewhat clearer when they are put in context, such objectives being accompanied by others which illustrated their underlying political stance and the general perspective he wished to promote and inculcate, Cadbury labelling the use of the working classes' most potent weapon, the strike, as 'barbaric',[28] i.e. thereby discrediting this action, and attempted to dissuade this group from exercising their right to collective dissent, whilst simultaneously dismissing such behaviour as reckless and unworthy of a civilised society. This perspective was, however, even more evident in his assertions which completely denied the existence or even the possibility of conflicting class interests, Cadbury maintaining that arguments between workers and employees were merely the consequence of a fundamental economic misunderstanding, claiming that;

"Industrial disputes are nearly always due to ignorance or suspicion - both bred of lack of education in its widest sense".[29]

i.e. a perspective with the tacit implication that the working classes were those who were ignored or unreasonably suspicious and therefore in need of 'education' to rectify these 'failings'.

Furthermore, at times these less altruistic motivations amounted to a near acceptance and heralding of reactionary jingoistic sentiments. This aspect of their outlook, was, for example, revealed by the Bournville Works Classes Committee, in explaining its belief that such a provision held numerous advantages, including making 'the best' of the employees' time, as a way of increasing 'efficiency' 'all round', and as a matter of necessity for the country, arguing that only through such a course of action could Britain,

"hope to keep our supremacy in the world, and take our lead among nations".[30]

Indeed it can be argued that this issue of national supremacy was one which in essence, underpinned this educational provision. Whilst, for instance, the initial introduction of this scheme, providing compulsory physical training during working hours, was hailed by a subsequent Bournville Head Teacher as a 'revolutionary step',[31] being ostensibly an altruistic measure illustrating Cadburys' concern for the well being of their employees, it is also open to an alternative interpretation; in essence this counter argument suggests that this response merely represented a practical and self-serving reaction to contemporary economic based concerns over the nations' health, an interpretation strengthened by George Cadbury Jnr's later comments that physical training had subsequently become recognised as a matter of vital consequence, being a 'pre-requisite of national efficiency'.[32]

Furthermore, this belief also served to demonstrate the group's general sub-scription to the supremacists, eugenic lobby, an association discussed in chapter 4, and which frequently resurfaced in this educational context, Cadbury arguing, in 1926, that one of the main objectives of education in industry was to,

"cultivate physical fitness. . . industry should not be allowed to produce weaklings or a C3 race".[33]

Certainly, the Bournville programme demonstrated a pre-occupation with outdoor and physical pursuits, this initial scheme being accompanied by the provision of two swimming baths to facilitate this process.[34] Indeed, this became the first expression of a theme which was constantly emphasised by the Cadburys and other proponents of 'national efficiency' throughout the late Victorian period, and which had similarly

underpinned Messrs Cadburys' actions in funding Athletic Clubs for their male employees in 1896,[35] and for their female counterparts three years later,[36] whilst in 1900 a Youths' club was instigated to organise and provide similar activities.[37]

Moreover, illustrating the importance the Cadburys attached this issue, these actions were mirrored by Elizabeth Cadbury's efforts to promote girls' clubs in the city, (see earlier) a belief which she again emphasised in 1922, arguing that such bodies were of considerable social value,[38] whilst also reaffirming her allegiance to the influence of physical training classes. In particular, she argued that the effect of such sessions on male employees had fully justified their introduction, being doubly beneficial, in promoting cleanliness, whilst simultaneously acting as a 'great stimulus' for the students' mental development.[39]

Furthermore, leading members of the fraternity had publicly and authoritively advocated this cause in 1906, when, in their study of Birmingham based industries, 'Women's Work and Wages', Edward Cadbury, with Cecile Mattheson and George Shann, had similarly testified to the positive effects of such clubs. Utilised to rouse young female employees to a 'sense of duty' and an appreciation of the necessity of 'efficiency',[40] they argued that offering such opportunities for 'wholesome recreation' had proved to be successful, and had resulted in most becoming 'quieter and more orderly',[41] and, of course, more compliant.

This initiative was, however, merely a first step in the Cadbury educational programme, and represented only a partial answer to the 'urban problem' and, accordingly, the politicians', and industrialists' desired 'solution', especially in a climate clamouring for 'national efficiency'. Consequently and subsequently, therefore, within Bournville this desire resulted, in 1906, in the Cadbury Board of Directors significantly extending their programme; furthermore, this was also an action which was to add to the general pressure for the Continuation School cause both subsequently and initially, co-inciding Professor Sadler's official investigation which ultimately recommended a similarly increased and organised provision of post-elementary education for the working classes.

This Bournville development was particularly significant, in requiring all young Cadbury employees to attend evening classes,[42] both increasing the opportunities offered to such workers, whilst simultaneously raising both the requirements the firm demanded and the degree of control it exercised over these employees. It was also of consid-erable further importance, in being the real forerunner of later schemes, ones which, within a decade of this extension, had resulted in the introduction of a compulsory Bournville Day Continuation School, (the B.D.C.S.) for both male and female adolescent employees.

To maximise and reinforce the effect of this 1906 expansion the firm developed and implemented a framework to supervise the new scheme. Accordingly, consolidating previous part time studies, Messrs Cadburys established a centralised co-ordinating body,

the Bournville Works Education Committee, to formulate their general educational policy,[43] whilst a parallelling body, the Works School Committee, under the wider jurisdiction and supervision of the Board of Education, was charged with the management of these classes.[44]

Indeed these initial bodies were a further illustration of the Cadbury prescience and influence in areas of industrial organisation. The composition of the former being particularly revealing, in containing five family members and Directors, with George Cadbury Jnr as Chairman, alongside six employees,[45] a structure whose co-operative nature was subsequently lauded as desirable, if not essential, by the Whitley recommendations for industry a decade later.

Within Bournville these and further, complementary, bodies, were of considerable importance in influencing and guiding the Cadbury Works' educational provision, one which, within a decade and a half had burgeoned into a vast array of classes which broadly fell into two distinct categories; in essence these classes comprised of those held at the B.D.C.S. and with which this study is primarily concerned, and those other schemes which operated at the Bournville factory.

By 1923, for example, this provision included the compulsory attendance of all junior workers at the B.D.C.S., an establishment composed almost entirely of Cadbury employees, whilst the wider educational programme embraced both recreational and outdoor pursuits, such as camps and Vacation Schools, alongside training and vocational development courses, the latter including classes which encouraged the entry of employees into the examinations of numerous professional bodies.[46]

This Bournville initiative, one which utilised the facilities of the City of Birmingham's Local Education Authority,[47] was originally organised in to five distinct categories, including compulsory evening classes, trade and miscellaneous classes and an apprenticeship scheme.[48] Nevertheless, the general flavour of this programme reflected a non-vocational declaring that the firm believed,

> *"all boys and girls in this country should have a very chance of continuing their education up to the age of 16 in the ordinary things useful in everyday life. Following this. . . a variety of courses will be open to them of which they can take their choice, according to whether they intend to take up a commercial, technical or general career".*[49]

i.e. in practice, a scheme of, primarily, liberal education; one which, whilst it came to satisfy municipal and central government requirements, also reflected the Cadbury fraternity's belief in such an approach, being demonstrated, for example, by Elizabeth Cadbury's 'Education for Leisure' in 1938,[50] and in George Cadbury Jnr's calls that such a programme should aim to provide a training of 'general cultural value'.[51]

Between 1906 and 1913 this scheme was compulsorily enforced upon young Cadbury employees,[52] initially to 16,[53] but within three years to 18,[54] and was one which became a major educational initiative, representing Birmingham's largest contemporary post-elementary programme for the working classes. Indeed this scale was immediately evident, embracing 430 compulsory and 156 voluntary scholars by the completion of its first year,[55] numbers which, by 1912, had significantly increased to 1737 and 213 respectively.[56]

However, as the Head of the Mixed School later observed, even this initial period of operation had revealed that the scheme possessed disadvantages which considerably detracted from the benefits its proponents claimed for it, specifically in proving extremely onerous and tiring for such young employees.[57] Consequently, in 1911, Cadbury Directors approached the City of Birmingham Council with a proposal for a compulsory day release programme for their young employees, utilising accommodation provided by the Local Education Authority,[58] a suggestion which became ratified and implemented in 1913,[59]

However, this extension of the Cadbury educational programme was far from a purely altruistic policy, as even the Principal of the subsequent centre later conceded, explaining that this action was not taken out of 'disinterested idealism', but because the initial schemes had demonstrated that the benefits of such a provision were conferred on both employees and Messrs Cadburys alike,[60] the contention of this study being that it was this latter group which was the prime beneficiary, especially when this question is considered from a long term perspective.

Accordingly, from 1913, the resultant establishment, originally entitled 'Day Classes for Young Employees',[61] provided schooling for such adolescents, even from its inception attracting a full complement of students, in receiving 311 girls and 19 boys,[62] figures which had risen to 373 and 202 respectively a month later.[63] Gradually this trend continued as the establishment's capacity similarly rose, reaching 423 and 387 the following October,[64] and a combined total of almost 2,000 by 1920[65] when the programme became part of Birmingham's proposed Continuation School programme, one submitted for approval by the Board of Education under Section 10 of Fisher's 1918 Education Act,[66] and which resulted in the scheme's subsequent, though short lived, operation, from January 1921.[67]

Whilst this 'success' is hardly surprising, given its compulsory nature, there are, nevertheless, other unrelated factors, which indicate the School's popularity and the successful inclusion of the Bournville ethos amongst these workers. In 1917, for example, the implementation of a voluntary half day session, widening the areas of study by the inclusion of such subjects as Art, Metalwork and Practical Science,[68] was greeted with considerable enthusiasm at the Girls' School, almost a third of its 600 students attending, a response echoed at the Boys' establishment,[69] developments which similarly tended to

increase the magnitude and effect of the Cadbury educational influence.

Notwithstanding these sessions, and as previously mentioned, in common with the programmes of parallelling agencies with which the Cadburys were closely linked, such as the W.E.A. (see later) this scheme was one which demonstrated a clear emphasis and priority on liberal non-vocational studies, one evident even through the vast proliferation of these and more specialised courses. Moreover, within this liberal umbrella, and complementing their numerous other social policy initiatives, there were further politicising features worthy of particular comment, not the least of which was the pursuit of highly delineated differences for boys and girls, a practice which will now be briefly considered.

A Note on Gender Policies

From their introduction, in 1907, the Bournville Village Evening Continuation School classes were divided into Industrial, Commercial and General courses,[70] each being followed on a twice weekly basis and including the study of both English and Arithmetic throughout three increasingly advanced stages.[71] However, the additional options available to boys and girls reveal that, overall, they underwent a very different educational process and experienced extremely different expectations. The former, for example, followed the mandatory study of Geography and History, supplemented by a more vocational element, such as Shorthand for those undertaking the Commercial course, whilst Drawing was considered as appropriate for those pursuing an alternative option.[72] However, rather than this vocational specialism, their female counterparts were offered a programme which became increasingly domestic in emphasis, irrespective of which broad course of study was pursued. The intermediate stage of each, for example, required the selection of at least one of the following, Cookery, Hygiene and Home Management, or Needlework, this last subject being included throughout, progressing from Plain Sewing/Cutting Out to Home Dressmaking.[73]

From 1913, this pattern was replicated by the four year scheme provided at the B.D.C.S., where the Girls' School displaying a similar emphasis. This perspective was clearly evident in its 1914/5 programme, half of the weekly 5.$^{1}/_{2}$ hour provision including subjects of a domestic nature, Hygiene and Dressmaking for the first two years, followed by Sick Nursing and Cookery and Laundry for those aged 16, and concluding with Infant Care and Housewifery,[74] the latter parallelling local municipal classes introduced in 1911,[75] in a scheme which had a considerable influence on Bournville's young female populace. By 1924, for example, over 1,500 girls had completed the School's programme,[76] when a Board of Education inspection favourably commented on Bournville developments, reporting that it commended the scheme for its thoroughness,[77] an approval echoed within the firm, one of its Directors, Dorothy Cadbury,[78] expressing the

view that such classes had a very valuable effect on such young employees, in particular in exerting a 'useful influence' upon them.[79]

Furthermore, this provision was commented upon by several within Bournville as if this gender delineation was the natural, just and unalterable course of events, Weedall, 1963, for instance, describing the classes as training for life,[80] i.e. viewing this programme as a pragmatic response satisfying 'national efficiency' demands, rather than recognising their inherently constraining nature, a perspective also evident within the Cadbury family itself. In 1912, for example, Edward Cadbury merely observed without deeper explanation that, as the girls neared the age of eighteen, their curriculum became of a greater domestic character.[81]

Indeed this sentiment was similarly expressed by Elizabeth Cadbury four years later,[82] in her judgement that one of the prime purposes of Continuation Schools, as with Girls' Clubs, was to help raise the general 'moral standard',[83] amongst adolescents of an extremely impressionable age.

Accordingly, therefore, these classes specifically addressed such concerns, encouraging young women to assess their worth as socially responsible mothers/carers and which Cadbury praised in 1922, for example, arguing that lessons such as Sick Nursing were of particular value in arousing the pupil's protective side.[84] Furthermore in the same article she similarly espoused as considerable the merits of Hygiene and Mothercraft lessons, in inculcating the beliefs that each individual's highest duty was to produce the 'strongest' and 'fittest' for the next generation,[85] a perspective placing a clear domestic, not to say eugenic onus on the nation's females.

Complementing and indeed compounding this view were the opinions Cadbury expressed in "The Gospel in Relation To Marriage', in 1926, an article in which she was even more explicit regarding this gender compartmentalisation, arguing that men lacked the perseverance and patience to 'successfully fulfil home duties'.[86] Moreover, these domestic tasks, thus firmly consigned exclusively to the female province, were, she continued, so numerous that they filled 'ones waking hours satisfactorily',[87] and were so responsible and demanding that,

> *"in a normal case I think a woman should consider married life as a profession and choose between it and other work".*[88]

These views and their practical manifestation throughout adolescence, both at the B.C.D.S. and the Bournville Works, held considerable implications and consequences for the future of these young women, primarily in maintaining the belief that their rightful role was one of domesticity, this being the highest task to which they could aspire, a belief reinforced by Messrs Cadburys' general rule of not employing married women.[89]

Indeed, in 1906, the Cadbury-led Birmingham based, social enquiry, "Women's Work and Wages", had lent considerable weight to arguments confining women to the home. This investigation, co-authored by Edward Cadbury, the Cadbury associate George Shann, and Cecile Mattheson, Warden of the B.W.S.,[90] had argued that their study of 6,000 women workers had revealed that, amongst the very poorest of this group, 62% of 'unoccupied' women's husbands were sober and hardworking, as opposed to 39% of those with wives in employment.[91] Accordingly, this was evidence which the writers interpreted as indicating that either,

> *"the women are compelled to work because the husbands are unsteady, drunken or idle, or the husbands develop bad habits because their wives remove the burden of responsibility from them".*[92]

This latter interpretation proved to be of particular importance in the potentially volatile Edwardian social climate, being seized upon by those concerned about maintaining the incentive to work amongst the male populace, and who consequently viewed situations in which women became the chief breadwinner as 'damaging to morale',[93] a 'social evil' similarly and more officially cited by a Select Committee in 1907.[94] Consequently, mirroring their efforts across the social policy spectrum, this inquiry came to represent a further example of the Cadburys contributing to pressures to restrict the degree of radical change, and thereby, in essence, preserving the status quo.

Furthermore, associated sentiments confirming women's activities to the domestic sphere were similarly propagated through a number of bodies which received the support of members of the Cadburys. Such bodies included, for example, the numerous post-maternity organisations founded in the city during the first decade of the century, Selly Oak School for Mothers, for instance, being established in 1905,[95] whilst the B.W.S. formed a similar institute three years later,[96] coinciding with the commencement of the Birmingham Infants' Health Society.(B.I.H.S.)[97]

Subsequently, the Cadburys continued this support being involved in the general promotion and administration of each of these bodies, the Selly Oak committee, for example, by 1915, containing Mrs Edward Cadbury, Mrs George Cadbury and Mrs George Shann, with R W Ferguson of the Bournville Works Education Department acting as Honourary Treasurer.[98] Equally, the Settlement enjoyed a considerable degree of Cadbury activism, as discussed in chapter 4, whilst in 1915, the B.I.H.S., with Joel Cadbury as Chairman,[99] and Mr and Mrs W A Cadbury as Vice-Presidents,[100] additionally accepted the donations of eight members of the Cadbury family.[101]

Almost immediately these agents became particularly prominent and recognised in this arena, by 1913 both of the latter two receiving financial assistance from local government,[102] subsidising their efforts in detecting what was ostensibly their principal

concern, that of combating the problem of infant mortality.[103] Specifically, bodies such as the B.I.H.S. aimed to achieve this by operating consultative, 'educative' post-natal advice/ supervisory sessions, essentially transmitted by middle class women to their working class counterparts, and which carried ill-disguised socialisation and genderisation messages, particularly through the promotion of subjects such as, for example, Home Nursing, The Care and Management of Infants and Children, and Personal Hygiene classes, alongside 'constant' home visits.[104] Indeed this latter, supervisory function, was of considerable significance for the organisation, 506 such inspections being undertaken during 1908/9,[105] whilst the Annual Report emphasised this importance in considering their value to be beyond estimation.[106]

The B.I.H.S. also utilised this initial report to outline its principal concerns, citing figures estimating that, annually in England and Wales, more than 120,000 infants died during their first year of life.[107] Moreover, they continued, this was a significant underestimation of the magnitude of this problem, being compounded by,

> *"a correspondingly large deterioration in health and physique on the part of many thousands who have had sufficient vitality to survive the dangerous period, but who have been under the influence of bad conditions in infancy".*[108]

For the B.I.H.S. these figures were especially pertinent and alarming, their own programme operating in an area described by the city's Medical Officer of Health in 1904 as facing great difficulties, being characterised by poverty and insanitary conditions.[109]

However, revealing as this diagnosis was, equally important was the 'solution' the B.I.H.S. propounded, one illustrated by a third aim which accompanied these anxieties regarding infant mortality, i.e. to 'raise the standard of Motherhood',[110] and specifically, to 'induce care in feeding and clothing',[111] the practical interpretation and application of which held considerable implications for the female population of the region.

This 1st B.I.H.S. Annual Report clearly established and illustrated their perspective on this issue, quoting Dr. Robertson, the Cadbury associate, and the Medical Officer of Health for Birmingham, who commented that:

> " *'It is certain that a very large number of the deaths and probably a good deal of the sickness is due to carelessness and ignorance, particularly in regard to the feeding and rearing, of young children...carelessness and ignorance exist to such an extent as to unnecessarily cause the death of probably over 1000 infants,' per annum".*[112]

Consequently, by this accusatory analysis, it was the working class mother who was at fault and therefore in need of 'education' such as that provided by agencies like the B.I.H.S.. Furthermore, even more accusatory and again using Robertson's figures as

verification, was the report's analysis that, within the city and over the three year period from 1904, it was,

> *"quite certain that it is amongst a particular class of infants, the artificially fed ones, that the unnecessary mortality occurs".*[113]

i.e. arguing that, because 731 of the 981 fatalities had been entirely bottle fed, and that whilst this practice was only pursued by a $^{1}/_{5}$ of Birmingham mothers, it was nevertheless responsible for $^{3}/_{4}$ of these infant deaths,[114] and that such evidence therefore justifiably condemned as culpable both this practice and those mothers who pursued it

Accordingly, whilst this report conceded that the greatest culprit was the deleterious effect of poverty upon the lactation process,[115] their central policy objective was to bring pressure to bear on women to avoid such 'artificial' feeding. The report, for example, utilised the B.I.H.S. statistical data to further this argument, in illustrating the comparative weight gains of breast, mixed and bottle fed babies,[116] concluding that the first group demonstrated a far 'superior physique',[117] and commenting that, accordingly, the organisation did everything in its power to forward this practice, including its promotion in their Health Talks,[118] and by insisting that mothers breast fed their infants if it was at all possible'.[119]

Consequently, these schemes, heavily grounding women in the domestic arena, with tasks which demanded the time of only the female populace, simultaneously satisfied the requirements of both those worried about the potential effects of low morale amongst the male workforce, as well as those whose prime concern was to produce an industrially 'efficient' (fit) nation. However, and increasing their importance and authority, they were also redolent of other contemporary anxieties. In 1908, for example, although poverty (and, arguably, social justice) had been identified as the prime cause of an inability to breast feed, the B.I.H.S. report also cited subsidiary contributory reasons, including ancestral intemperance and heredity;[120] indeed this latter perspective was reflected by its officials, its Vice-Presidents, for example,including, Lady Lodge and Mrs A D Steel-Maitland,[121] both of whose husbands were prominent in the local eugenic association, the B.H.S.,[122] an organisation to which Dr. Robertson also belonged,[123] alongside several of the Cadbury family, as discussed in chapter 4.

Consequently, these and similar programmes emphasising women's role, indeed duty, as one of domesticity, owed their origin, at least in part, to the climate of 'national efficiency' and the 'cult of the child',and correspondingly reflected this climate as education was utilised as a form of segregation by gender. Accordingly such new informal/semi-formal barriers replaced more traditional ones as the female adult populace became both enfranchised and generally more empowered, these schemes being particular importance

at this crucial time in Britain's history, in providing direct access to large numbers of working class women, one of the principal groups perceived as undermining efforts to propel the nation towards the goal of 'national efficiency'.

This is not to argue that the Cadburys and their associates held such women in cold disregard. Clearly and undeniably they possessed a deeply held concern for them, one which led them to exert this considerable expression of influence, in actions frequently described as demonstrations of motherly love. However, equally undeniable was the political nature of this concern, one which was both patronising in its treatment of working class women and extremely traditional in its interpretation of gender roles and, mirroring the Cadburys' approach to economic theory, one which regarded this interpretation as both faultless and unquestionable, and which, alongside all of the work conducted at the B.D.C.S., came to exercise a substantial and prolonged pressure, as it was propagated amongst a considerable portion of Bournville's population, male and female alike.

Some of the general effects of both these programmes and the overall educational provision at Bournville will be very briefly considered before undertaking an analysis of the influence of the other Cadbury initiatives in this area.

The Impact of Cadbury's Bournville Educational Schemes

These schemes, attendance at which was either compulsory, or at least heavily advisable, and which were deeply politicised, whatever contrary protestations were made, consequently affected a signiificant percentage of Birmingham's young populace during the earliest years of the century, a position of considerable power for the Cadburys as employers which continued throughout the inter-war period. Moreover, the expression of this power was not confined to the thousands of employees and others who were directly exposed to such messages. The B.D.C.S. programme, for example, whilst not the first of its type, was, however, the first to be made compulsory,[124] and therefore, the first to be imbued with the gravitas necessary for convincing (political) others of its merits for nation-wide adoption and extension, an objective which the Bournville Works Council similarly shared for itself.[125]

Furthermore, throughout its existence this provision received favourable comments from the Board of Education, initially in 1907 when an inspection reported that the classes were of 'great benefit'.[126] Indeed, throughout the early period of operation, when the Cadburys exercised a discernible influence on Asquith's party and government, (see chapter 2), these schemes were also similarly persuasive regarding the merits of such Day Continuation provision, and their emulation, the Bournville school being in the forefront of the Birmingham Day Continuation scheme which became operative in Jan 1921.[127] This importance was indicated even in the subsequent failure of this initiative,[128] the

Bournville establishment nevertheless being allowed to continue, albeit on a voluntary basis.[129] This unusual outcome was one which the Head of the Girls' School attributed to the influential intervention of the Board of Education Private Secretary, A H Kidd,[130] who, in expressing the hope that the Birmingham scheme would be curtailed rather than abandoned, revealed the esteem with which the establishment was regarded, in singling out for particular mention 'the most famous and successful Bournville schools'.[131]

Consequently, and of extreme importance here, the Cadbury perspective regarding the benefits of such schools had clearly been assimilated by those in positions of power and influence, a process which the Cadburys had assisted through the operation of the B.D.C.S. and the accompanying dissemination of publicity favourable to this cause. Perhaps most pertinent of all to this assimilation was the realisation of the potential power of such classes as an important influence in securing the triumph of industrial harmony over social unrest, a realisation subsequently emphasised by both senior educationalists such as A L Smith of Balliol College and H A L Fisher. Indeed, the latter, in June 1916, and several months before his appointment as Minister for Education, and a year prior to the introduction of his Bill extending part-time continuation education to the age of 18, remarked that the real value of such instruction lay in precisely this purpose, specifically in dispelling,

> *"the hideous clouds of class suspicion and softens the asperities of faction".*[132]

i.e. a purpose perceived as considerably important given the prevalent political climate and which, in harness with the genderisation policies and activities pursued and encouraged by the Cadburys, sought to provide a solution to several of the more widespread and urgent contemporary concerns.

However, influential though these policies and programmes were, they were not, by any means, the only way in which the Cadburys expressed their increased and extended social involvement in the educational arena, the earliest and perhaps most evident of this further participation occurring in what had been their traditional area of educational association, the Adult School (A.S.) movement.

b) THE WIDENING CADBURY EDUCATIONAL INVOLVEMENT:

Initial Steps - The Cadburys and the A.S. Movement

An appropriate starting point for an analysis of the more general, non- Bournville expansion and widening of the Cadburys' participation in this area, and their corresponding increasing influence, is to consider those voluntary agencies active in the educational arena during the latter part of the 19th century, and the Cadbury response to the contemporary pressures acting upon such agencies.

In essence this starting point involves a consideration of the A.S. movement, as was mentioned in Chapter 1, an organisation synonymous with the S.O.F., Isichei, 1970, likening the former organisation's work to a 'special calling' for Friends,[133] whilst the 1895 Manchester Conference witnessed a more contemporary accolade, the Schools' work being describe as extremely valuable in disseminating the Quaker message.[134]

Indeed, the two organisations were extremely closely and officially intertwined throughout this period, an association which continued until the reorganisation of the A.S. movement in 1909, following which the body's national Chairman, W C Braithwaite, paid tribute to the instrumental role played by the Quakers in promoting and supporting the work of his organisation.[135] In particular, Braithwaite acknowledged the importance of a Quaker body founded during a Birmingham conference in 1847,[136] the Friends' First Day School Association, (F.F.D.S.A.) in subsequently organising and supervising the A.S. movement throughout its initial years;[137] this was an interrelation so pronounced that it led to the isolation of non-Quaker Schools, a situation only gradually overcome by the official organisation of the A.S. movement during the latter part of the century,[138] and which included the formation, in 1884, of the Midland Adult School Union, (M.A.S.U.)[139] a body embracing both Warwickshire and Worcestershire,[140] in addition to the areas of Dudley, Severn Valley, Smethwick, Tipton, Walsall, West Bromwich and Wolverhampton.[141]

Nevertheless, despite this process, this historical interrelation and philosophical alignment was still extremely evident at the turn of the century, with 29,000 of its 45,000 national membership being affiliated to the F.F.D.S.A. in 1901;[142] indeed this connection was further emphasised by the composition of the A.S. National Council, inaugurated in 1899,[143] over half of its 24 members belonging to the Quaker movement.[144]

However, despite these considerable efforts to co-ordinate the A S. into a single and more effective national entity, the organisation was, nonetheless, frequently perceived as one not wholly fulfiling its potential as an agent of social 'improvement'. In 1890, for instance, Emma Cadbury illustrated this perspective in addressing the F.F.D.S.A. on the movement's failings to effectively transmit their Christian message, and the consequent need to bring the 'lowest class of working girl' under this influence.[145]

Even more disconcerting for the organisation was the perception that it was beset

with possibly insurmountable problems which threatened its continued, apparently limited, effectiveness, and, correspondingly, perhaps even its existence. Such a perspective viewed the A.S. movement in an anachronistic light, as other agencies, including the state, undertook its traditional functions and purpose. Furthermore, such an ostensible loss of role was compounded by the apparent alienation of an increasingly politicised working classes, a factor which threatened to completely undermine and destroy the base that this organisation had gradually and painstakingly established. Even more worrying for the organisation was the perceived prevalence of this tendency amongst the urban poor, a concern given considerable airing at the friends' 1895 Manchester Conference, and one frequently reiterated as these apparent 'failings' continued.

In 1901, for example, William Littleboy, Superintendent of the Severn Street organisation,[146] utilised a M.A.S.U. meeting to urge the movement to amend its traditional mode of operation, including updating its religious message, to retain/regain its credibility in a climate of 'extraordinary advances' in the contemporary science field.[147] Moreover, he claimed, this circumstance was accompanied by social changes so extensive that they required an immediate response.

More specifically, Littleboy identified the spread of education as exemplifying these changes, a phenomenon which, he suggested, was so powerful and influential that it necessitated the accompaniment of a 'corresponding moral development'.[148]
In particular, he argued that this climate was characterised by 'a revolt against authority, spiritual and intellectual, which affects, more or less, every section of society.[149]
This was, accordingly, Littleboy maintained, an upheaval which, whilst possessing the potential for 'immense good', similarly had the capacity to inflict overwhelming evil,[150] and consequently posed a considerable threat to the existing social fabric.

Nevertheless, despite this bleak analysis and even gloomier prognosis, by 1911 Elizabeth Cadbury was describing the national movement as being revitalised, having been 'born again' in 1899,[152] whilst both Simon, 1965, and Kelly, 1970, subsequently attested that the period immediately prior to the first world war was one of tremendous growth for the organisation, the total number of its scholars rising dramatically to over 100,000 by 1910.[153] Moreover, the strength of the movement was particularly reflected by developments within M.A.S.U., a body which by 1903 was controlling 84 adult male Schools, with a membership in excess of 12,000,[154] figures which by the end of the decade had increased dramatically to 207 and 20,130 respectively,[155]

Furthermore, this expansion was accompanied by a significant and fundamental change within many Schools, and entailed broadening their traditional range of involvement in the pursuit of a more active social role, with perhaps the most conspicuous effect of this process being the formation of a greatly increased number of Women's Schools, the M.A.S.U. membership in 1910 correspondingly including 59 such

establishments, containing 4,712 scholars,[156] (see later).

Moreover, as Kelly has observed, this response also took account of the specific political and social pressures confronting Edwardian Britain, and in particular the widespread and 'powerful demand' for an increased and more sophisticated educational provision for the working classes.[157] Indeed, this period of activism was one in which the study of (traditional/classical) economics and industrial history became included in many of the School's curriculum, illustrating the movement's response to the 'political evolution' of the working classes[158] and one which Simon argued was responsible for the organisation's new found buoyancy,[159] i.e. through the implementation of strategies which specifically took account of both the changing nature of the working classes and the A.S. movement's apparently waning influence.

However, the writer believes that the extreme rapidity with which the Manchester Conference/Littleboy prognosis was refuted considerably undermines this interpretation and correspondingly prompts questions regarding its accuracy and validity. Accordingly, the contention here is that, whilst this factor would undoubtedly lead to the general promotion and furtherance of the movement, nevertheless, the image of an organisation in decline, or, at best in temporary stagnation, is a considerable oversimplification. More specifically, it will be argued that certain areas including, most notably, Birmingham and its Severn Street organisation, and especially those Schools directly under the Cadburys' influence and leadership, did not experience the wavering of support which characterised perceptions of the late 19th century A.S. movement, and that this complete divergence from the national norm was a direct consequence of this influence and leadership.

Furthermore, whilst in hindsight these years represented the high water of A.S. support, the movement and its leadership retained a considerable but generally disregarded influence upon the working classes well beyond this period, the Cadburys in particular utilising the educational models developed in their Schools as responses to perceived wider and more sophisticated demands and as prototypes for the effective transmission of new paternalist and 'national efficiency' ideologies; i.e. in providing a contemporary and more overtly politicised programme.

A central tenet of this contention is, therefore, that the renewed buoyancy of the A.S. bodies was indeed, as Simon argues, attributable to the movement re-inventing and reinterpreting itself, but that this represents only a partial explanation for this resurgence, and fails to recognise that a significant element of the impetus and stimulus for such a 'modernisation' emanated from initiatives implemented within the Birmingham Schools, where the participation and leadership of the Cadburys was of paramount and sustained importance, the magnitude of this influence increasing almost seamlessly as the body responded to the demands of the changing social and economic climate.

In particular, several specific developments were fundamental to the success of this reinvention; firstly was the implementation of initiatives which allowed the Schools far greater access to the working classes, especially those ostensibly most susceptible to the claims of more radical, left-wing, political proponents; secondly, as part of a modernisation programme recognising the working class demands for a more politicised education, the traditional A.S. message was considerably broadened, a process which, nonetheless, also increased the movement's effectiveness as a vehicle for the transmission of capitalist-friendly ideology, including the promotion of the 'work ethic' and the encouragement of the further entrenchment of strictly delineated gender roles; and thirdly, illustrating the Cadburys' and Birmingham Schools' awareness of contemporary educational trends/ thought, the movement became willing to collaborate with newer initiatives in this arena, initiatives which, in sharing a similar agenda, ultimately ensured the continuance of the A.S. message, an interpretation requiring a more thorough analysis of these particular Schools.

The Cadburys and the Severn Street Adult School Organisation

Whilst throughout the late Victorian period the A.S. movement was commonly perceived to be in steep decline, the experiences of these Schools were consistently directly contrary to such perceptions. Accordingly, the body sustained levels of considerable growth even after the dramatic success of its initial impact, when membership rose from its 1846 level of 39,[160] to 251 a decade later,[161] and 786 in 1865,[162] before more than doubling to 1,885 at the founding of the Cadbury led Bristol St. branches in 1876;[163] indeed this unbroken expansionist trend lasted throughout the final quarter of the century, the Schools enjoying a corresponding increase rather than contraction of their influence.

Furthermore, whilst the rate of this expansion subsequently slowed, the organisation nevertheless continued to conform to this pattern, enjoying periods of sustained, steady and consolidating levels of support, interspersed with occasional rapid and appreciable increases of membership, one of which, for example, witnessed the body's numbers rise by over 40% in twelve months, from 2,372 in 1881 to just over 3,000 the following year.[164] Moreover, whilst the membership subsequently stabilised at this level, reaching only a further 151 by 1887,[165] such an analysis, in confining its statistics to the adult male population, considerably underestimates the organisation's position of power. Richard Cadbury's Class XV, for instance, also numbered 'about' 100 women as members of its morning School',[166] (see later), alongside the near 600 children being taught by members of that branch,[167] an important area of development highlighted by the

1891 Severn St. Annual Report, in claiming that almost 2,500 children belonged to its Schools,[168] as its adult figures underwent another dramatic surge, increasing to 3786,[169]

Consequently, therefore, the experiences of this body were some considerable way removed from the image of a movement in stagnation and even terminal decline as suggested by its own contemporary historians. In 1890, for example, it was exhibiting clear signs of being a well supported and established organisation, in operating 19 morning classes, together with a further 4 afternoon sessions,[170] the combined average attendance totalling 2,224 of its 3,299 members'.[171]

Furthermore, any questions regarding the body's overall effectiveness and contemporary relevance and, consequently, over its long term future, were banished by developments during the next twenty years, much of which, consistent with the national A.S. trend, occurred in the opening decade of the 20th century.

Within Birmingham, however, this period of rapid expansion was already in progress by the 1890's, the three years from 1899 experiencing a near 50% rise in average attendance, from 2,750 to 3,809,[172] a level close to doubling its 1889 figure of 2,224.[173] Subsequently, the organisation continued to increase its popularity, operating, for example, 28 classes in 1900,[174] against 51 ten years later,[175] whilst its membership similarly illustrated this momentum, its 1901 total, 4,445,[176] rising to 6,472 two years later,[177] a level which thereafter stabilised, measuring only 314 less by the end of the decade.[178]

Clearly this region was of considerable importance to the A S.movement, a state of affairs which continued until 1913,[179] this importance being further highlighted by the selector of this latter as the venue of the body's 1909 conference. Indeed, this meeting was doubly revealing, firstly in displaying the body's concern, alongside that of parallelling agencies, with themes of a distinctly contemporary nature, hearing addresses on 'Education and Democracy', and 'The Bible as an Educational Force', and holding discussions on both 'Fellowship' and 'Social Clubs';[180] furthermore the selection of this particular venue was also extremely pertinent, this being the first such conference following the amalgamation of the movement's erstwhile two controlling bodies, the F.F.D.S.A. and the National Council,[181] and consequently being viewed by those such as M.A.S.U. as the first real 'National Gathering' of the organisation.[182]

Certainly its Chairman, W .C. Braithwaite, utilised this occasion to emphasise the the appropriateness of choosing Birmingham to host this meeting, in arguing that the city still retained its place at the head of the movement,[183] and indeed in observing that it had,

"done nothing of higher value than its share in the Adult School Movement".[184]

This tribute to Birmingham's pre-eminent position within the organisation was also substantiated in and reinforced by the city providing 60 of the 400 conference delegates,[185]

whilst Barrow Cadbury exemplified both this and the prolonged Cadbury influence, in officiating as the movement's Honourary Treasurer from 1907-22.[186]

Such participation was originally initiated under the auspices of the S.O.F., the Birmingham organisation becoming centred around the Severn St. First Day School, a body which was the first to illustrate the Cadburys' position of predominance within the area's voluntary educational sector. This association had begun in 1859 when George Cadbury had joined the A.S. attached to this Friends' organisation,[187] an institution instigated fourteen years earlier by Joseph Sturge,[188] who, alongside William White, has been described as one of the founders of the local A.S. movement.[189]

Indeed, both came to be stalwarts in the organisation, the former later acting as the body's Secretary,[190] whilst Kelly identified White as particularly important in this context, specifically in being,

> *"greatly influential in persuading Quakers throughout the country to take an active part in the work of adult education".*[191]

Furthermore, all three became closely associated with the Severn Street School as the movement both began and maintained its widespread development throughout the city, George Cadbury's role in this expanding arena of social activity also proving correspondingly significant, a contribution described to the B.W.G. in 1912 as 'conspicuous'.[192]

Indeed, this latter association and alignment and its longstanding nature was recognised in 1911 by Elizabeth Cadbury, who observed that her husband had been both an 'enthusiastic' and 'regular' teacher within this organisation for half a century,[193] overseeing the instigation of a federation of classes in the surrounding districts of Northfield, Selly Oak and Stirchley, and encompassing an extensive part of south west Birmingham, including Redditch, Bromsgrove and Rubery.[194]

One particularly prominent aspect of both this specific influence and that of the Cadbury family in general was the considerable level of financial donations they consistently contributed throughout this period, their 1889 subscription, for example, in totalling £49,[195] accounting for over 20% of the £240 raised,[196] a level of commitment which was subsequently maintained; a decade later, for example, George and Richard Cadbury's payments alone amounted to £70 of the £315 total,[197] whilst by 1904 the importance of this patronage had become even more accentuated, their contribution of £94 7s[198] representing almost a third of the £308 19s. 6d raised.[199]

Furthermore, this was only one aspect of the Cadburys' financial support, being complemented by the provision of occasional larger sums for specific purposes, a practice exemplified by Richard Cadbury's actions as President of Class XV.[200] Having, in 1880,

moved the meetings to Moseley Road School and Highgate Hall, Cadbury subsequently oversaw a period of development so rapid that it rendered their existing premises wholly inadequate, and consequently commissioned the construction of Moseley Road Institute.[201] Consequently, by 1898, for a cost of £50,000 and containing 'numerous' committee and classrooms, alongside a reading room and basement housing both baths and a gymnasium,[202] together with a central hall accommodating 2,000,[203] this commission provided the School with a venue commensurate with its ambitious expansionist programme, and, one which had witnessed the branch's growth from 12 scholars at its 1878 inception, to over 1,500 at the turn of the century.[204]

Moreover, this willingness to take a leading and instrumental role in the development of Birmingham's Schools was similarly reflected in the official responsibilities the Cadbury family and their close associates undertook within the local body. By 1909, for example, this increasing dominance was illustrated by Edward Cadbury's Presidency of the Mid-Worcestershire Sub Union,[205] together with his Vice Presidency of M.A.S.U.,[206] whilst within the Severn Street organisation George Cadbury led Class XIV,[207] George Jnr. was Superintendent of the Juniors,[208] and Joel Cadbury fulfilled a similar role at the Floodgate Street branch.[209]

Likewise, female members of the group also displayed an interest in occupying positions of A.S. influence. Whilst the expression of this influence perhaps reached its zenith with their considerable membership of the M.A.S.U. Women's Committee, (see later), this trend had been instigated from the organisation's inception, Hannah Cadbury, for example, teaching at the Central Women's A.S. from its founding in 1848 until her death, fifty nine years later.[210]

Consequently, by 1909, for example, this trend was both well established and widespread amongst the Severn Street Women's Schools, Elizabeth Cadbury overseeing the Bristol Street class,[211] Caroline Cadbury supervising the College Road School,[212] whilst Mrs Tom Bryan operated the Raddlebarn Road branch;[213] the latter involvement is also important in illustrating the participation of the Cadburys' closest associates in A.S. work, a participation which became more evident and pronounced as the movement broadened its activities during the Edwardian years, with, for example, both Tom Bryan of Woodbrooke and George Shann providing lectures at the various Severn Street Schools,[214] (see later).

Significantly, even within an organisation enjoying a sustained period of considerable overall growth, this degree of commitment and involvement by the Cadburys produced particularly noticeable results, the most tangible being that those classes they directly oversaw experienced the greatest level of expansion. This trend had already become well established as early as 1889, with for example, Richard Cadbury's Class XV operating as the largest branch within the organisation, with 580 members and an average support of 369,[215] being followed by the George Cadbury led Class XIV, with comparable figures of 445 and 274 respectively.[216]

Subsequently, this former branch was claiming over 1,500 adult members before the end of the century,[217] whilst the latter Bristol Street School also boasted a four figure membership,[218] and came to embody the archetypal regenerated A.S., in offering several facilities to complement its traditional educational functions, including a Savings Fund, and societies providing sickness and death benefits.[219] Furthermore, as with the contemporary developments at the Bournville Works replicating this new model, such auxiliary welfare based services were augmented by the operation of bodies which placed an emphasis on health and leisure pursuits, and included numerous sports clubs alongside the classes' Social Club,[220] whilst the School also operated a half-yearly scheme offering prizes with the specific aim of rewarding regular attendance, especially among the very young.[221]

However, whilst these efforts represented an attempt to advocate and advance a common appreciation of outdoor/club pursuits, the principal significance of this particular increase in the Cadburys' social activism was somewhat more ambitious, reflecting a conscious decision to expand their contact with, and consequently their influence upon, the city's working classes; consequently perhaps most pertinently for the effectiveness of this objective, much of this expansion and development, at the instigation of George Cadbury's Class XIV, was undertaken amongst the poorest sectors of Birmingham's populace. Furthermore, these initiatives were carefully implemented in ways designed to maximise this effectiveness, the School, for example, attempting to reduce any working class perceptions of alienation by basing such a programme within this populace's own locality, and utilising venues and facilities with which they were already largely familiar.

This movement towards more overt contact with the working classes was initiated in 1899, with the formation of a branch in the Darwin Street district of the city,[222] one which was specifically targeted towards those the parent organisation considered, 'outside any influence for good',[223] and, implicitly, those most likely to embrace more radical political alternatives and, therefore, those most in 'need' of their attentions. Such a perspective was correspondingly evident in the subsequent activities and emphasis encouraged at Darwin Street This was a structure which bore echoes of both the Bristol Street Schools and Elizabeth Cadbury's work amongst Birmingham's young females, and which foreshadowed developments both at the Bournville Works and indeed throughout the national A.S. movement, with the formation of centres for 'healthy recreation',[224] having the specific purpose of counteracting,

> *"the seductive attractions which the publican and bookmaker hold out to them".*[225]

This initiative was immediately perceived as a considerable success, in attracting 55 students to its inaugural meeting,[226] and, by the following year, claiming a membership of 'well over' 100.[Z7] Indeed, almost equally quickly, the founding of this branch came to be

regarded as something of a watershed for the local organisation, the 1905 Severn Street Annual Report remarking that it was responsible for stimulating the development of a 'new movement' in Birmingham, more than 25 centres opening during its first six years of operation,[228] resulting in another 50% rise in its average attendance from 3,640 during 1899,[229] to 5,430 throughout March, 1905.[230]

This expansion took place alongside the general national A.S. resurgence briefly described earlier, one which, certainly initially, the movement's own documentors, Rowntree and Binns, attributed almost solely to the development of Womens' Schools,[231] a development was similarly recognised within Birmingham, the S.O.F. observing in 1903, that, following the formation of 5 new classes,15 centres were operating as Womens' Schools within the city,[232] an extension accompanied by an extremely encouraging increase in their average attendance, from 698 in 1899, to 1,144 three years later.[233]

Nevertheless, within the wider Midlands' Schools' organisation, this trend was far less evident during these opening years of this decade, the Union being described in 1906 as 'sadly deficient' in its number of Womens' Schools,[234] a circumstance which led directly to attempts to rectify this 'failing' and, specifically, the decision to both appoint a Standing Committee, 'especially to deal with Womens' work', and, moreover, to affiliate such bodies into its organisation.[235]

Consequently, in July, 1906, the Chairman of the Women's Schools' Committee, together with the M.A S.U. Secretary, issued a letter stating their express desire of extending the membership of their movement amongst the female populace;[236] this was a desire and appeal which, it was almost immediately apparent, held particular resonance for the region's women, Birmingham alone operating 24 such bodies by the following summer,[237] whilst a specially arranged Women's Conference, in June, 1907, further illustrated this degree of considerable enthusiasm, in attracting an attendance in excess of 1,600.[238]

Not surprisingly, given their overall commitment and pedigree in the arena of social policy, the Cadburys were as active in these developments as within the more traditional A.S. sphere, Elizabeth Cadbury reading a prayer at the above meeting,[239] whilst by 1908, Mrs Tom Bryan had joined Mrs Barrow Cadbury on the M.A.S.U. Womens' Committee,[240] whilst the Cadbury led Birmingham Womens' Schools flourished like their male counterparts.

In 1909, for example, the M.A.S.U. Annual Report recorded that several branches within the boundaries of Class XV and XIV had correspondingly healthy women's sections, meetings at Moseley Road attracting a membership of 156, with an weekly attendance of 109,[241] figures almost matched by Bristol Street's corresponding levels of 144 and 85,[242] whilst Mrs Bryan's Raddlebarn Road group, with respective figures of 260 and 150, surpassed both.[243]

Furthermore, this popularity of the A.S. movement was similarly evident amongst the city's younger population, the Bristol Street Junior's branch claiming a membership in

excess of 100,[244] a response echoed within Birmingham's poorer regions. In 1900, for example, the Darwin Street branch had first extended to embrace a children's meeting, one which had attracted a regular attendance of 'about' 130,[245] a response so enthusiastic that it necessitated the 'turning away' of a further 40 or 50 every Sunday, for 'lack of space'.[246]

This Darwin Street initiative was, therefore, one which experienced considerable approval from numerous sectors of the city's working classes. As such it was one which replicated the success of the parish style structure George Cadbury had similarly promoted and introduced in reorganising the Birmingham Free Churches, further illustrating one way in which a significant number of this section of the populace might be influenced.

However, the real importance of this programme for the A.S. Movement, alongside other Cadbury-led M.A.S.U. developments, was considerably wider and its potential impact consequently correspondingly greater, in that it offered a clear indication of how the contemporary organisation might succeed, not just in areas such as rural Leicestershire, but within an inner city environment ostensibly alien to their religious messages and moral perspectives, and, moreover, amongst a population dominated by,

> *"men of the lowest social strata and habitues of the neighbouring public house".*[247]

Indeed, the utilisation of this club style structure was perceived as one way in which the movement could successfully adapt to the changing demands and expectations of the latter Victorian populace. Rowntree and Binns commented in 1903, for example, that since they believed clubs had become a 'social necessity',[248] rather than conceding the initiative to the brewer,[249] the movement needed to form such bodies, by cultivating,

> *"the spirit which has driven the scholars of the Birmingham Schools to take old public houses in the slums and open them to the lowest and most degraded of men".*[250]

Alongside and complementing this more contemporary nature was a further important feature of both this particular initiative and the expanding Severn Street organisation in general, with the adoption of a more overt and reformist social agenda, one which illustrated the Cadburys' realisation of the propaganda potential of such a development and whose effect was primarily transmitted through its changing educational provision.

Accordingly this perspective was one which acknowledged the outmoded nature of some of their traditional A.S. activities, and in particular the 'writing hour', made anachronistic and, by the S.O.F.'s own admission, increasingly unattractive, by rising levels

of education.[251] Consequently, both in recognition of this factor and as an expression of this more overt and political stance, the range of studies pursued within the city's A.S. organisation began to expand to include themes of a more sophisticated nature.
In 1902, for example, following the formation of the Severn Street Council, the body arranged a series of lectures focussing on contemporary social science questions, including 'The Limits of Municipal Enterprise' and 'The Housing Problem'.[252] Indeed, such a course, which also included a further issue consistently exercising many Friends, 'Economics and Christianity',[253] (see later), was considered as a vital component of the restructured A.S.movement.

The 1902 Severn Street Annual Report encapsulated this perspective, in expressing the hope that such studies would become increasingly popular amongst its members, and commenting that.

> *"it is of great importance that such matters as these are brought before, and seriously considered! by all citizens;"*[254]

Moreover, the expansion of Severn Street activities into the realm of the 'social question', together with other themes commonly associated with the Quaker movement, and the Cadburys in particular, was similarly accompanied by interpretations and the advocation of particular 'solutions' that both groups frequently espoused.

In 1900, for instance, the Schools' Annual Report reaffirmed their embracement of the temperance cause, enthusiastically noting the commitment of the Darwin Street branch in particular to this aim, in recording that, during the year, 20 adults, together with 50 children, had signed the pledge renouncing alcohol.[255]

Moreover, as the decade progressed there was continuing evidence that an integral part of the continuingly popular Severn Street organisation was the provision of activities heavily imbued with perspectives generally associated with and proffered by the traditional Quaker and, indeed, Cadbury, religious and social philosophy. Common amongst these was the encouragement of sentiments which sought to uphold the social and economic status quo, to 'educate' within strictly limited parameters, and influence the populace to value the existing structure.

Interestingly the A.S. movement itself recognised the extremely limited nature of their purpose, the 1913 M.A.S.U. Year Book acknowledging as much, in declaring that the aims of the organisation included the advancement of equal opportunities, but only 'as far as may be',[256] i.e. implying a practical limit to this process.

Indeed, Hall,(1985), argues that the intention to create a vehicle propounding extremely moderate political views was evident from the very instigation of the A.S. National Council, its second meeting, in March 1900, in declining to adopt a more strident

and radical stance towards the government's Temperance Commission, effectively establishing a precedent, and determining the body's attitude towards future controversial questions.[257] In consequence, he suggests, the Council subsequently declined to pass resolutions or lobby government agencies regarding matters of 'public interest', preferring less contentiously, to merely encourage discussion between this national body and the individual local Schools,[258] a practice which ensured a far more cumbersome and ultimately less consolidated and powerful approach to these issues.[259]

Furthermore, such a limited aim and approach was accompanied and compounded by the invoking of subjective and extremely vague concepts as the organisation's general objectives, the 1913 M.A.S.U. Year Book, for instance, stating the organisation's desire:

> *"To bring together in 'helpful comradeship and active service' the different classes of society".*[260]

This recourse to the idea of a classless 'brotherhood' sharing a comradeship of common interest and benefit was one frequently invoked by A.S. leaders, both in attempts to disguise and even deny its covert political purpose, or indeed the existence of any overriding element of class warfare or conflict within British society. In 1908, for example, Edwin Gilbert, the organisation's National Secretary, described the movement as a 'non-sectarian, democratic brotherhood', terms echoed by parallelling agencies operated and patronised by the Cadburys, (see later), and whose objects included both the education of working men and women, and the rather more ambitious and impressive, cultivation of fellowship'.[261]

Moreover, alongside the pursuit of this somewhat nebulous concept, it is also pertinent to note, that whilst Gilbert welcomed the broadening of A.S. work to embrace social and humanitarian themes,[262] there was no corresponding recognition of the orthodoxy of the political direction and economic doctrine the organisation encouraged and the motivation underpinning these studies.

Likewise in July 1904 Edward Grubb delivered an address to A.S. teachers emphasising his opinion that the movement's greatest success was its achievement in getting men to regard all others as their brothers, despite the different labels encouraged by everyday life, including economic circumstance,[263] i.e. emphasising harmony, similarity and common purpose, not division and conflict, nor vested interest and private gain.

Moreover, the following year the Severn Street Annual Report sought to further buttress this notion of the A S.movement as a mechanism for overriding and eradicating societal inequalities, not to say gross injustices, by emphasising the moderate labour leader, Will Crooks' belief that the real value of the Schools lay in transmitting those

qualities which promised to bind society into a collective whole, benefiting all, whilst simultaneously offering their individual members 'something beyond price'.[264]

Certainly, through its emphasis on social harmony, encouraged within an, at least, quasi-religious environment which also sought to inculcate 'humility' and 'tolerance', the movement promoted the possibility of achieving a considerably improved existence within the existing economic structure. In so doing, however, the organisation was also tacitly encouraging acceptance of the political status quo, rather than the seeking of more radical alternatives to redress the desperate impecunity and paucity of opportunity attaching to their lives.

Indeed, during the 1910 General Election campaign, the movement sought to ignore the tacit messages emanating from within their Schools' classes, its 'One and All' magazine stressing the organisation's political neutrality, and, consequently, the absolute necessity for the body to avoid involvement in any such controversial issue, and especially any degree of rigorous political analysis and debate. In December, 1909, for example, its 'Election Notes' column specifically warned against any teacher or scholar introducing,

> *"any political question or do anything which might lead to party feeling being aroused in our Schools".*[265]

Moreover, this perspective was given further credence by its reiteration in the Chairman's 'New Year Letter', W C Braithwaite arguing that any other approach was one which might jeopardise the future of the movement.[266]

However, despite these concerted efforts, and perhaps as a consequence of a greater political awareness amongst its membership, especially within that section most recently recruited, this official stance nevertheless proved to be a highly contentious one; in January, 1910, for instance, it was criticised as implying that the organisation was unable to withstand rigorous political discussion,[267] and that, contrary to outward appearances, was, in essence, therefore, extremely fragile. Furthermore, the writer suggested, such an approach illustrated the movement's hypocrosy, in completely and directly contradicting its stated aims, especially with regard to stimulating public spirit and morality, and imparting a sense of British citizenship,[268] and, of course, its claims of political neutrality and tolerance.

Another critic, 'Onward', was equally scathing, suggesting that the organisation, in adopting an approach which suppressed any unorthodox views, was consequently presenting an image of a 'united front' that was 'exceedingly false and deceptive'.[269]

Subsequently, further indicating the division amongst the movement's members, if not its leadership, over this issue, these views in turn produced a diverse response from within the organisation, the following month's 'One and All' publishing a dozen letters on the subject, many of which were extremely virulent in their condemnation of one opinion or

the other,[270] an uncertainty concluded in the next issue, when the magazine closed the debate with its decision to refuse any further consideration of the matter.[271]

Having officially sealed this potential fizure, the body was again represented as an ostensibly apolitical entity, a representation broadcast publicly both within Britain and internationally. In 1914, for example, Barrow Cadbury, as the body's Honourary Treasurer,[272] informed the German Secretary of State, Dr Delbruck,[273] that the movement, by virtue of belonging to neither a political party or a 'particular church',[274] consequently held together all classes and Christian creeds,

> "*in a common bond of love of humanity and endeavour for the uplift of mankind to higher moral levels*".[275]

Moreover, alongside these extremely attractive attributes for the capitalist employer in search of a malleable non resistant, largely compliant workforce, this statement also highlighted a further official A.S. aim, that of stimulating and educating 'public spirit and morality',[276] a much vaunted objective again pursued without a corresponding explanation or debate clearly defining these concepts. In practice, as indicated earlier, they subsequently became interpreted and directed towards the issue of temperance and criticism of public houses, perhaps the only environment in which working class men could meet to discuss social, political and economic concerns without the overriding presence of the middle classes and particularly those displaying an ostensibly paternal interest in them.

By 1914, for example, the committee of the Severn Street Council had become active in this arena, in organising addresses publicising the 'social wrong and misery' resulting from betting and gambling,[277] a development augmented by efforts to establish a more permanent platform for the dissemination both of this perspective, and indeed the whole Cadbury philosophy. Specifically this involved the broadening of the education their Schools provided, several of their branches, for example, forming 'Classes for Social Study', enabling their members to investigate,

> " *more deeply into some of the great problems of modem life and industry*".[278]

Furthermore, this course of acton, directly parallelling other advocates of political and economic moderation in the educational arena, such as the W.E.A., (see later), was principally orchestrated and provided by a number of those prominent within the Cadburys' group. Two of the more active of these were Tom Bryan and George Shann, both of whom were closely associated with the Cadbury educational Settlements of Woodbrooke and Fircroft discussed later in this chapter, the latter being particularly instrumental in this process, his Selly Oak branch being perhaps the most indicative of this

trend towards the 'Social Question'. Described by the Severn Street Annual Report as both 'energetic' and 'thoroughly progressive in Adult School matters',[279] this body was clearly of considerable importance for these developments, its Social Study section under Shann's leadership receiving particular plaudits, as,

> *"an excellent means of broadening the outlook of the men, causing them to take an intelligent interest in social and moral questions".*[280]

Such a trend was also pursued within the region's Women Schools a 'broadening' which similarly did little or nothing to challenge the existing order; rather this development sought to buttress Britain's capitalism, although in a somewhat different manner. Moreover these Schools also mirrored the Cadbury initiatives at Bournville and the city's numerous Schools for Mothers which likewise received their support, in specifically encouraging women to eschew any calls for a radical reappraisal of their role in society, and to continue to consider that their principle contributions lay in the traditional and extremely limited capacity of domestic carer.

Indeed, this was immediately evident from their 1906 M.A.S.U. affiliation, a subsequent letter designed to encourage the formation of Women's Schools seeking to rely on the thoughts of the movement's retiring National Secretary, Dr George Newman, concerning the contemporary problems confronting Britain. Having identified housing as the most urgent of these, he argued that this consequently imposed a great duty on the nation's female populace, and that, correspondingly, the,

> *"ideal aim of Women's adult schools is to show that in the MAKING OF TRUE HOME LIFE with its mighty power of moulding the lives and destinies of coming generations, lies the greatness of woman's mission".*[281]

Furthermore, having recourse to both traditional and contemporary themes, the writers reinforced the necessity for the movement to continue its work towards eradicating the 'evils' of gambling and drinking amongst women,[282] whilst additionally seeking to educate mothers to counter the 'appaling increase' in infant mortality.[283] Consequently, they continued, it was,

> *"desirable to create a large number of Women's Schools, the members of which would in time, seek to reach the dense mass of untrained women at present not connected with any religious organisation".*[284]

Correspondingly, these desires were subsequently reflected in the 'Half-Hour Talks for Women' provided by M.A.S.U.'s Women's Committee, addresses which, whilst including the consideration of contemporary affairs and social legislation, were, nevertheless, heavily imbued with an emphasis on 'Home Life'.[285] Consequently, in 1908/9, of the 79 talks

advertised as being available, only 4 dealt with such themes, in considering Children's Courts, the Factory Acts and Old Age Pensions, a further 7 being concerned with Women's Suffrage and Trade Unions, whilst 16 were related to domestic 'duties', nursing and hygiene, complementing 6 which focussed on gambling and temperance;[286] these were talks which the Women's Schools Committee Secretaries observed were both highly relevant and increasingly prevalent within their organisation, many of their Schools,

> *"adding to their studies, subjects that will help them to understand life in its different phases".*[287]

This perspective was highly prominent even from the Schools' inception, being strongly emphasised at their inaugural 1907 conference, the 'Birmingham Daily Post' reporting its President, Mrs J H Lloyd as suggesting that whilst women,

> *"were both hoping for and working towards an increased sphere of influence, . . . they must never forget that their principal obligation was to make their homes better by their influence".*[288]

Alongside these efforts to reinforce messages which sought to constrain women firmly within the boundaries of domestic occupations, such developments also revealed a trend prevalent within the M.A.S.U. organisation as a whole, (and that of the S.O.F.) in attempting to secure a new and larger audience for these messages. Indeed, this objective was clearly a high priority, as this body immediately initiated a sustained attempt to widen this 'sphere of influence' in appropriate areas, and both exhorted and prepared its members for a greater involvement in the arena of 'social service', in 1907 forming a Central Committee to co-ordinate such work,[289] the following year Barrow Cadbury adding a further stimulus by granting the use of Uffculme for a conference to consider the issue of 'Adult Schools and Social Questions'.[290]

Subsequently, this momentum was maintained and even increased, as these efforts diversified, in 1910 individual branches being encouraged to form committees to arrange speakers on this particular theme,[291] whilst nationally the movement advanced its embracement of these topics by seeking greater collaboration with sympathetic parallelling organisations. In 1909, for example, a 'Special Committee' gave considerable attention to the perceived problem relating to the first half hour of study conducted in their Schools, recommending a wide range of subjects as appropriate for study, whilst also suggesting the more advanced make use of W.E.A. classes, University Extension lectures' and correspondence courses,

> *"conducted under the direction of Tom Bryan, the Warden of the newly opened Fircroft for Working Men in Birmingham".*[292]

Indeed, this collaboration was urged both generally within the A.S. movement and by the Cadburys in particular. In 1908, for instance, the M.A.S.U. Annual Report announced that, in connector with the W.E.A., they had organised a series of study classes,[293] and that whilst they had only been operating for several months, the scheme's success was already 'assured',[294] an evaluation corroborated the following year.[295] Furthermore, the scheme also received the benefit of public encouragement and endorsement from leading figures within these movements, in 1910, for example, the Chair of the M.A.S.U. Womens' Committee advising A.S. teachers at their Spring Conference to 'avail themselves' of these classes.[296]

Moreover, this organisation was already convinced that the potential benefits of such an arrangement went beyond even these considerable opportunities. In 1909, for instance, their Annual Report revealed its belief that this scheme represented a major way in which the A.S. organisation might perpetuate its message, these classes having,

> *"proved successful beyond the most sanguine expectations... and this department of work has assumed such proportions that arrangements are in course of being made whereby a Joint Committee of W.E.A. and M.A.S.U. members shall especially undertake the work of directing the Study Classes and Lectures".*[297]

Undoubtedly, the Cadburys clearly approved of such collaboration, having, indeed, encouraged it through the donation of premises such as Uffculme and Fircoft, the latter being placed at the disposal of the Womens' Committee of the National Council for an A.S. Summer School during July and August 1910.[298] However, for a considerable while, they had, nevertheless, regarded the existing and even modernised A.S. structure as providing only a partial answer to the 'social question' issue, one which required further and complementary bodies to fulfil the more ambitious of their objectives, paramount amongst which was the attempt to effectively propagate their own politically moderate panaceas at a time of potentially considerable social upheaval. Whilst, for instance, these classes offered a channel of relatively easy access to the urban populace, the perception prevalent amongst the Cadburys was that the potential of their influence upon this group was not being realised; consequently, they argued that its maximisation was dependent upon a more thorough and extensive educational provision, both for those teachers they prepared for A.S. work and similarly for selected members of the working classes with whom they maintained a substantial degree of direct contact.

The Cadbury 'solution' to such a problem was through the establishment of a number of medium to short term residential educational settlements, institutions which Arnold S. Rowntree called the logical and natural successor to the A.S. movement.[299] These initiatives, which later evolved into the Selly Oak Colleges, were implemented by the

Cadbury family in the early years of the 20th century, and were begun with the founding of Woodbrooke and Fircroft, institutions whose influence will be considered in the next section.

c) PROPAGATING THE CONTEMPORARY ADULT SCHOOL MESSAGE:

The Role of the Cadbury Educational Settlements

The Cadburys' involvement with the A.S. movement, continually displayed from the founding of the Severn Street organisation, was an unequivocal illustration of their longstanding and consistent commitment to this group's general aims; this was an involvement which ostensibly yielded increasing success following the 'modernisation' and reinterpretation of their traditional message, as this group continually sought to influence further sectors of the populace, the experiences of the Bristol Street Class XIV, for example, especially after 1899, clearly indicating one way in which members of the urban working classes, including the very poorest, might be so affected.

However, despite this, at times, burgeoning 'success', the group's leadership, (i.e. senior members of the Cadbury family) was also clearly aware that achieving the most effective propagation of their economic and social beliefs required a wider adoption of their model, one which, in addition to embracing this (partially) regenerated A.S. movement, would also include other members of the working classes seeking somewhat more advanced, extensive and concentrated forms of study.

Consequently, and representing a second major way in which the Cadburys attempted to disseminate this more contemporary A.S. message, in the earliest years of the century the group became instrumental in implementing initiatives designed to effect an influence upon this particular populace; this was an influence that was even more concerted and direct than that exerted within the Severn Street and similar organisations and which became expressed through the founding of several of England's earliest Educational Settlements, and, in particular, Woodbrooke and Fircroft, the first two of the institutions which later comprised the Selly Oak Colleges.

Whilst these establishments bore very different and specific ambits, nevertheless they may be considered, to some extent, together, since the founding of both represented a response to the 'social question' issue, and, crucially, occurred against a contemporary backdrop which included the possible educational autonomy of the increasingly empowered working classes, the apparent failings of those agencies traditionally providing adult education, and the unwillingness of the state to sanction any compulsory post-elementary educational provision.

Moreover, the two bodies shared important distinctive common features, characteristics further elaborated upon later in this chapter. In their establishment and subsequent operation, for example both were heavily dependent upon the financial contributions of leading members of the Cadburys, several of whom directly participated in the administration of these institutions. Such a role involved the exercise of a considerable

degree of influence, regulation and control, over the colleges and their sphere and mode of operation, including, crucially, the encouragement and pursuit of a common outlook and educational direction which displayed complementary and pragmatic facets of the Cadbury social philosophy.

Furthermore, this consequence was reinforced and enhanced by the bodies' promotion of a broadly shared wider agenda, and one manifested through their strong alignment and alliance with larger, national, bodies, both working in tandem with and parallel to the 'reborn' A.S. movement, Woodbrooke ostensibly serving the desired purposes of the Quaker S.O.F., whilst Fircroft followed more contemporary developments, principally through its association with the newly formed agent providing for more advanced working class study, the W.E.A..

Chronologically, the first of these initiatives was Woodbrooke College, an establishment which became operative in 1903,[300] developing in the immediate aftermath of the Quakers' 1895 Manchester Conference, and the accompanying climate prevalent within the S.O.F., one which widely perceived both this body and the almost synonymous A.S. movement as 'failing'.

Specifically, this period was characterised by the Quaker movement's publicly expressed desire to rapidly expand their social activism, a desire which necessitated a requisite dramatic increase in their provision of educational and social training. It was also one in which the role of the Cadburys was correspondingly fundamental as they increasingly sought to exert, both upon Friends and within wider society, a social and political influence commensurate with their economic power. Woodbrooke consequently became envisaged as one mechanism by which this latter desire might be satisfied, whilst also attempting to rectify this 'failing' in the transmission of the Quaker/A.S. message and simultaneously facilitating a way in which the movement might embrace the 'social question' problem.

An initial S.O.F. strategy in this process was implemented following their first Summer School, at Scarborough, in 1897, with the founding of the Summer School Continuation Committee,[301] (the S.S.C.C.). This body was charged with the responsibility for implementing a wide range of developments which included the organisation of further such annual meetings, together with the provision of more regular/permanent services enabling Quakers to 'more adequately' equip themselves for presenting their spiritual message,[302] i.e. through assistance in the organisation of local lectures, and the formation of Reading Circles, together with offering critical and informed evaluations of various Religious History publications.[303]

Moreover, this body illustrates the central and instrumental role played by the Cadburys and their traditional associates from this programme's earliest days; by 1902, for example, the former was represented by Elizabeth Cadbury,[304] alongside two of those

who later became very closely associated with Woodbrooke, J Rendel Harris and Joshua Rowntree,[305] whilst the interrelation of personnel with the A.S. movement is illustrated by the membership of their national Chairman, W C Braithwaite, together with J W Rowntree, Edward Grubb, William Littleboy and George Newman,[306] all of whom were extremely familiar to the Cadbury circle.

An initial task for this body was to sustain the impetus aroused by the 1897 meeting and, in particular, its calls for the founding of a permanent Settlement. Accordingly, the S.S.C.C. organised a further Summer School in Birmingham, two years later,[307] both conferences being subsequently applauded for addressing this problem and engendering a sense of the urgent need for developing a more extensive and contemporary approach to Biblical Study;[308] importantly, this was a perspective to which by 1902 the committee also adhered,[309] and which, correspondingly, presaged the establishment of Woodbrooke.

Throughout 1899 this momentum was maintained, as one of Woodbrooke's earliest proponents, J W Rowntree, continually endorsed this theme, arguing at the S.O.F. Yearly Meeting, for example, that their existing Ministers were largely underqualified and underprepared for the challenges currently confronting the movement, and that, consequently, a 'Wayside Inn', a 'Friends' Bible School' should be founded to counter such defect;[310] this was a call that was also compounded in the pages of Rowntree's 'Present Day Papers', such momentum culminating in December with his 'Plea for a Quaker Settlement',[311] This article was, in essence, a reiteration of a detailed account he had presented three months earlier, explaining why he believed the founding of such an establishment was imperative for the survival of the Quaker movement, in that a,

> " *small body like the Society of Friends, which has with almost dramatic suddenness broken down its social barriers and mingled with the world after a century of aloofness, must have very clear convictions if it is not to lose its identity . . . if there is to be a strong Ministry in our Church, a rich soil must be provided for its growth".*[312]

Consequently, he concluded, a permanent Summer/Bible School ought to be established, where students might investigate Bible Study, General Church History, alongside a more specific consideration and concentration on Quaker History.[313]

Further pursuing this objective, in an even more significant step, throughout August, 1901, a Settlement School was initiated, again in Scarborough.[314] Representing a far more extensive development, this meeting, in attracting residential students, differed significantly from the two earlier Schools,[315] such an arrangement being applauded for consequently producing the requisite increased opportunities for both social and personal intercourse, whilst engendering a general feeling of 'greater unity'.[316]

This initiative was compounded shortly after the second Settlement School, when the desire to replicate this atmosphere led George and Elizabeth Cadbury to offer the use of Woodbrooke as a Summer School during 1903.[317] Moreover, this offer went a considerable way further than this, being accompanied by a proposal which heralded the fruition of Rowntree's much publicised campaign, the committee's Secretary, Edward Grubb, commenting that the Cadburys,

> *"further desired that, for at least one year, the house and grounds should be opened as a Settlement for Students, who might reside there for a time for purposes of religious study under competent direction".*[318]

Consequently, this proposal effectively established the college as the permanent centre so desired, and one which the S.O.F. was quick to publicise. In February, 1903, for example, two months prior to the Settlement's opening, the movement's organ, the 'British Friend', carried an article by Grubb explaining Woodbrooke's intended purpose as facilitating the strengthening and deepening of religious life,[319] whilst also providing for those involved in business and who wished to participate in 'Christian service', but were deterred by their lack of training and experience in this arena.[320]

Furthermore, to maximise the body's impact from its inauguration, the Cadburys organised a Woodbrooke Conference, in April 1903, a meeting at which George Cadbury explained his perceptions regarding the institute's purpose.[321] Subsequently, in the 6th S.S.C.C. Annual Report, the committee further clarified this intent. explaining that the overriding motivation underpinning the centre was the promoters' belief that,

> *"in the face of the changed conditions of modern life it is essential that a better spiritual and intellectual equipment should be placed within the reach of all our members".*[322]

This perspective, therefore, was one which bestowed a very considerable responsibility on the institute, the establishment being viewed as a prerequisite in maintaining the Quaker method of worship, and indeed in resurrecting and increasing the contemporary effectiveness of the movement's message and, accordingly, the accompanying wider influence it exercised, one traditionally exerted almost wholly through its A.S. classes. Of crucial importance here, was the progressive interpretation of this perspective by Rendel Harris, a Woodbrooke lecturer from 1903,[323] and who, as the college's first Director of Studies,[324] organised the practical manifestation of this intention, i.e. in construing this work as having several purposes, including preparing future Quaker Ministers for a more informed and responsive role, whilst continuing to promote Adult/Sunday School activities, alongside more expansive and ambitious plans for participation in civic spheres.[325]

Furthermore, H G Wood, who succeeded Harris,[326] also concurred with this assessment, commenting in 1910, for example, that, in his view, Woodbrooke was,

> *"an attempt to see that the Society of Friends takes a fair share in this task. It is intended to give a chance of studying the facts of the social problem open-eyed in the atmosphere of devotion".*[327]

Consequently, illustrating the widening agenda of both the Quaker movement and the Cadburys, each of these proponents offered a perspective which perceived the college as providing a further associated purpose, that of giving scholars the opportunity to consider the challenges presented by contemporary urban social and political conditions; indeed, this was a notion which Elizabeth Cadbury, in her 1927 Woodbrooke Presidential Address, subsequently confirmed as an integral part of the establishment's original agenda,[328] and which became increasingly evident through the organisation's operation, and in particular, its 'extension' work, (see later).

Throughout both these initial years and beyond the Cadbury circle was extremely prominent in ensuring the establishment maximised its potential influence, this involvement being manifested in two main way, firstly, through active participation in the centre's work, and, secondly, through the Cadbury family's continuing financial contributions to Woodbrooke. The vital importance of these donations was subsequently acknowledged by the body's Council, their Annual Report for 1921/2 commenting that,

> *"without the material aid so generously given by George Cadbury, it is hard to see how (such) an Institution . . . could have come into being at all".*[329]

Indeed, these significant contributions were a longstanding Cadbury commitment, dating from the college's founding. In 1902, for example, only Joseph Rowntree's £15 subscription exceeded George Cadbury's £10,[330] their joint contributions totalling over a quarter of the £91 12s raised,[331] a degree of dependence upon the Cadbury and Rowntree families' benevolence still evident in 1914, the latter contributing more than £220,[332] whilst the Cadbury donation, in exceeding £130,[333] also formed a significant proportion of the £976 17s 9d. raised.[334]

Parallelling this monetary support was the exercise of a more direct Cadbury influence, as the group became closely involved in the administration, implementation and delivery of the institution's policies and programmes. More specifically, this involvement found particular expression through the group's dominance of the institution's decision making body, the Woodbrooke Executive, which, for example, by 1905 included George Cadbury, J H Barlow, Rendel Harris and fellow Quaker, William Littleboy, amongst its seven members.[335] As with their financial patronage, this degree of participation was one which

more than retained its level of influence as the centre expanded its operations and, correspondingly, underwent an administrative restructuring designed to manage these increasing activities more effectively. Accordingly, for example, in 1907 as the Woodbrooke Executive and the S.S.C.C. were replaced by, respectively, the institute's Settlement and Extension committees,[336] each contained members of this group, whilst in 1911 their new supervisory organ, the Woodbrooke Council, also boasted several leading members of the Cadbury family, including George and his sons Edward and George Jnr.[337]

Furthermore, both Edward and Elizabeth were part of the college's Settlement Committee,[338] a presence compounded by that of their Bournville and Quaker associate J H Barlow,[339] who also presided as the Council's Secretary,[340] whilst the establishment's Director, J Rendel Harris, appointed by the founders,[341] also sat alongside Elizabeth Cadbury on the Extension Committee,[342] organising external lectures and Study Circles.

This Cadbury influence was yet further strengthened by the utilisation of several within their circle as Woodbrooke lectures, a practice which dated from the institute's inception, with Tom Bryan, later of Fircroft, alongside both Rendel Harris and George Shann, teaching at the establishment from 1903.[343] Subsequent developments followed this initial pattern as the Cadburys consolidated their influence, a strengthening evident the following year, with the appointment to the staff of Robert S Franks and the college's future Director, H G Wood,[344] appointments which coincided with the S.S.C.C.'s assessment that the centre stood at the forefront of such religious establishments, its educational provision bearing extremely favourable comparison with 'any other institute of the kind'.[345]

Moreover, maintaining this increasing A.S./Cadbury dominance, by 1909 both Bryan and Wood were involved in 'extension' work such as lectures and Study Circles,[346] their presence being supplemented by several others from the Cadbury group, including Edward Grubb, William Littleboy and G Currie Martin,[347] all names synonymous with the A.S. movement.

Indeed, this latter connection assumed even greater importance as such extension work became an increasing feature of Woodbrooke's activities, and quickly became utilised as a barometer of the establishment's 'success'. In 1910, for example, eight years before he became the college's Director,[348] Wood was already attempting to evaluate the centre's effectiveness, commenting that whilst it had had some effect within foreign countries, it was 'too early' to judge its impact on the Ministry at home.[349] However, he continued, it was, nevertheless, clear that the institute had already,

> *"undoubtedly turned the thoughts of not a few towards social service, and prepared them for it. It has rallied a number of the younger generation to the task of reinterpreting and carrying forward the message of Quakerism".*[350]

Indeed this immediate effectiveness in rectifying what the movement had perceived as one of its most glaring deficiencies had been anticipated from the founding of

Woodbrooke, especially having regard to the Cadbury A.S. tradition in the Birmingham area. In April, 1903, for example, 'The Friend' had cited its close proximity to a lively centre of Quaker social work as making it particularly suitable as a settlement location,[351] whilst five months later the same journal, in advertising the institute's impending opening, had emphasised the 'special opportunities' the college would provide in precisely this area of activism, i.e. A S. and social work.[352]

Furthermore, such a response was entirely consistent with the earliest experiences of the S.S.C.C., each successive conference being hailed as evidence of an ever increasing triumph; the first Religious Settlement, at Scarborough in 1901, for example, in attracting a total of 280 students over its five week duration,[353] was heralded as an unqualified success,[354] yet one which was surpassed at both the next two annual meetings, which received 311,[355] and 359 scholars,[356] respectively, the last of these, incidentally being both held at Woodbrooke and heavily subsidised by George Cadbury.[357]

This message of optimism was similarly matched by the S.O.F.'s attitude towards Woodbrooke as it began to implement its programme, one which, in attracting a majority of female students, reflected the movement's desire to extend its influence through social and religious work, and which also mirrored a trend evident at these early Quaker educational Settlements. Whilst, for example, 78% of scholars at the 1901 gathering were female,[358] and 66% and 71% in the two succeeding years,[359] this pattern was subsequently very closely replicated in the two to one ratio exhibited amongst the 29 students resident at the college during its inaugural Spring term,[360] with, illustrating the realisation of the anticipated predominance of the Quaker ethic, 84% of such residents belonging to their Society.[361]

Gradually during its first few years of operation, and due to further Cadbury largesse, including, for example, the construction of new accommodation,[362] the college's capacity, whilst remaining on a relatively small scale, nevertheless increased; in 1910/1, for instance, it averaged about 40 students in residence,[363] with approximately a further 50 visiting the centre for a period of less than a week,[364] By 1912 this extension had gathered yet further momentum and resulted in a total attendance of 117 students,[365] whilst the students' period of study correspondingly also generally increased, with 47, almost two thirds of the centre's average attendance, attending for two terms,[366] 19 of whom stayed for a complete year.[367]

However, of greater pertinence than such absolute and rather limited figures is the disproportionate degree of influence wielded by the establishment, making it especially effective as a centre for the dissemination of a particular set of ideological values, a suitability at least partly attributed to the centre embracing a wider sphere of social service, and one which became apparent almost immediately. Following the completion of Woodbrooke's first year, for example, this factor was acknowledged by the S.S.C.C.'s Annual Report, which observed that, much to the appreciation of Birmingham Friends, many of the residents had already availed themselves of the 'special opportunities' the college offered for participation in

the religious and social work of the district,[368] an appraisal echoed in 1906 by the Warwick, Leicester and Stafford Triennial Report to the S.O.F..[369]

Moreover, such 'special opportunities' also reveal a further facet of the primary role the Cadburys exercised within the institute, that of financial overseers and benefactors, since the students' weekly fee of 25s, was one determined by the Cadburys;[370] indeed the issue of the fixing and waiving of fees was yet another indication of the degree to which the Cadburys' financially underpinned the college, and consequently retained and expressed a considerable influence over Woodbrooke. This was, for example, illustrated in 1904, when the S.S.C.C. Annual Report observed that, although this had been the amount decided upon, there was, nevertheless, a certain degree of flexibility with such an arrangement, since a,

> *"considerable number of Exhibitions were provided by the Founders and other Friends, so that the institution might be open, at the discretion of the Committee, to students who would profit by it, but who could not afford the fee".*[371]

Whilst the extent of this Cadbury financial support was subsequently continued, and indeed, for example in 1905, extended, with, to compliment this arrangement, the inauguration of George Cadbury's six £15 termly grants,[372] this structure of financial inducement/dependence was one which was nevertheless still perceived as inadequate and consequently attracted continuing criticism from within the movement; in 1912, for example, the 5th Woodbrooke Council Annual Report commented, that, 'notwithstanding the liberality of some Friends', this had, nonetheless, been a matter of anxiety within the Council for a while,[373] and that, consequently, a subcommittee had been appointed to place these processes on a 'more satisfactory basis',[374] one which, even in its subsequently more organised state, remained considerably indebted to this Cadbury/ Rowntree 'liberality'. Exemplified by efforts again initiated in 1912 and designed to further stimulate Woodbrooke's developing reputation as a centre for 'original research', this largesse included the establishment, 'through the kindness' of both the Joseph Rowntree Trust and George Cadbury, of two scholarships for this purpose;[375] moreover, in being designated for the specific study of Economics and Sociology, and Biblical and Oriental studies,[376] these awards clearly demonstrate the dual main concerns of the benefactors, and illustrate their perception of one principal way in which Woodbrooke was to be utilised.

Moreover, consistent with, and complementing Woodbrooke's intended purpose as a modernised, contemporary A.S. centre, throughout the development of this organism, the respective governing bodies had been keenly aware of the Quaker movement's desire to widen their sphere of operations in the direction of such work. In 1907, for example, the S.S.C.C. remarked that the study of social questions had always been a feature of their work, an interest that the Schools' students had reciprocated,[377] with the corresponding result that at,

"the close of the Birmingham Summer School in 1899 a sub-committee was appointed to have these matters under its special care, and endeavoured to promote social and economic study as a part of the Committee's work".[378]

Furthermore, two years later, following and consequent on lectures at another Scarborough Summer School, a Reading Circle in Economics was formed and became affiliated to the Christian Ethics dept.,[379] and was also instantly recognisable as one closely associated with the A.S. movement, the scheme echoing many of the organisation's most familiar subjects. In 1902, for example, its programme included Percy Alden's consideration of 'The Housing of the People',[380] and Joseph Rowntree's perspective on 'The Temperance Problem',[381] alongside Seebohm Rowntree's views on 'The Problem of Poverty',[382]

However, this initiative also included themes which indicated a somewhat more overt political stance than that traditionally displayed by those broadcasting the Quaker message. Indeed, this tendency was displayed very quickly, its inaugural year containing lectures which considered numerous contemporary themes, including 'Women and Industrial Questions',[383] alongside those ostensibly reflecting a purely religious outlook, such as 'The Christian Treatment of Weaker Races',[384] an address which nevertheless hinted at the latent eugenicism within the 'Cadbury circle', whilst perhaps most pertinent of all was the inclusion of the Edward Grubb's 'Modern Socialistic Theories in the Light of Christian Teaching',[385] encouraging the labour movement to adopt a conciliatory and moderate political outlook.

Moreover, this newer branch of activism quickly revealed its authority within the S.S.C.C., in almost immediately overwhelming its parent body, the Christian Ethics sub-committee being discharged the following year,[386] with a new organisation, the Union for Social Study assuming responsibility for this work,[387] which by 1903 had been taken up in five/six local regions, including Leeds, Bristol, and, most pertinently, Birmingham.[388]

Subsequently, this scale of development was maintained throughout the decade, necessitating, by 1907, the formation of another new supervisory and administrative body,[389] which became the Friends' Social Union, (F.S.U.), a body which again revealed the Quaker/A.S. interrelationship and, indeed, the power the Cadburys yielded within each of these organisations; its 1910 committee, for instance, contained Percy Alden as its Secretary,[390] alongside Edwin Gilbert, Seebohm Rowntree and George Newman,[391] all extremely renowned A.S. protagonists, with the Cadburys again prominently represented by the presence of George Shann and George Cadbury Jnr.[392]

Furthermore, this new body was yet more evidence of renewed and regenerated Quaker efforts to propagate their moderate social and economic philosophy and the corollary of harmony between classes, an outcome desired more keenly than ever given the advent of an organised, radical and potentially revolutionary inspiring political left, manifested through movements such as syndicalism, and bodies such as the British Socialist Party, and the rising tide of industrial division and dispute in the immediate post Edwardian years.

Such efforts were illustrated, for example, by a meeting, in December 1909, between the F.S.U. and the Quakers' 'Committee on Social Questions' directed towards both stimulating a sense of 'social responsibility amongst Friends',[393] and especially amongst the body's younger members,[394] and, through institutions such as Woodbrooke, providing the consequently necessary additional degree of education in social work.[395]

Ostensibly, therefore, the overall concern of the committees was to raise the amount of social work conducted within the Society. Correspondingly, this desire was manifested in a direct appeal to individual Quakers regarding their degree of commitment to this issue; i.e. in asking:

> *'What place do you give to personal service among the needy?*
> *Are you earnestly concerned to understand the causes of poverty,*
> *and to take your right share in the endeavour to remove them?"*[396]

However, further analysis of these minutes reveals that, whilst they generally adhered to this broad 'harmonisation' and 'brotherhood' theme, they may also be interpreted in an alternative manner, a perspective which leads to a very different conclusion regarding the motivation underpinning the Quaker desire to become embroiled in the 'war' against poverty and social degradation. Specifically, whilst the meeting called for, primarily, Quaker employers to avoid exploiting the labour market, and in particular exhorted them to guarantee a degree of financial security for their workers, by providing both 'a living wage' and 'reasonably permanent conditions of employment',[397] the meeting nevertheless also sought to deny the validity of any more radical diagnosis. i.e. whilst, for example, calling for the end of division between employers and their workers, it nonetheless argued against the Marxist perspective that class barriers irrevocably divided the two;[398] consequently this analysis, operating as the increasingly powerful working classes became a more organised and less passive social and political force, accordingly reveals a concern and desire amongst this Quaker and Cadburys to ameliorate the more extreme iniquities of the capitalist system, whilst leaving the basic structure fundamentally intact.

Indeed, here Woodbrooke was reflective of the Educational Settlement's movement as a whole, one which Read, (1979), has characterised as essentially conservative in nature and typified by Samuel Barnett's desire to narrow, rather than remove, class differences.[399] This sentiment was perhaps most vividly demonstrated at Woodbrooke in 1908, in the first of its Swarthmore Lectures, the Settlement's Warden, in acknowledging that the 'deepest cleavage' in contemporary Britain was that which divided rich and poor,[400] argued that the traditional remedial measures of charity and philanthropy, were, by themselves, insufficient to change any society, or, indeed, any industry, fostering iniquitous social conditions.[401]

Rather, he argued, the most effective cure for these ills was one partly outside the realm of economic theory, in requiring the spirit of love and brotherhood to permeate

employment relations, and the concentration not merely of wealth, 'but of ourselves to our good fellows',[402] i.e. an interpretation of a quasi-religious nature, and one which discouraged any radical political debate, a perspective further encouraged by the writer categorically dismissing the merits of adopting any alternative, 'cure-all' system, including socialism.[403]

Consistent with these sentiments, within the S.O.F. was the frequently voiced perspective that Britain's business community was guilty of a widespread transgression of 'Christian morality'. This perception was illustrated, for example, by the F.S.U., in March 1913, in arguing that this 'transgression' not only resulted in poor wages and conditions of employment, but undermined their efforts to reduce the proliferation of social evils.[404] Consequently, they maintained, the continued prevalence of such conditions imposed a 'momentous responsibility' on Friends to persuade the nation to re-examine the ways in which its income and financial security were obtained and secured;[405] in essence the F.S.U. was arguing for the adoption of the interventionist strategy towards industrial/social problems advocated by many contemporary official Quaker organs, and an approach which itself echoed the movement's 1912 'Christianity and Business Committee' and its calls for the Churches to mediate between the forces of capital and labour, in an attempt to reconcile their increasingly hostile relationship.[406]

Similar sentiments were repeated by the F.S.U. in 1914, alongside an accompanying comment which gave notice of both this new, more overt, Quaker public stance, confidence and influence, and their determination to lobby policymakers, politicians and industrialists in the pursuit of the implementation of their new paternalist philosophy; characteristically for a Cadbury influenced body, the committee explained the motivation underpinning this desire in ostensibly altruistic language, in that,

> *"by influencing public opinion and national action, we may play our part in creating a more enlightened social conscience and thereby help to bring in a better ordering of national life".*[407]

Furthermore, in 1915 the F.S.U. pre-empted the government by two years in producing its recommendations for the regeneration of a post war British industrial society. Prompted no doubt by an extreme concern to safeguard the continuing success and indeed existence of the apparently threatened economic and political status quo, the committee identified industry's desire for private profit as almost inevitably leading to 'strife and suspicion' between labour and capital,[408] and correspondingly called upon the latter to conduct their businesses, 'for the service of the community',[409] rather than their traditionally more narrow practices.

This emphasis on an apparently more equitable and ethical approach was subsequently reinforced by this body's utilisation of wartime preoccupations to further their argument; in particular this was manifested through their efforts to equate patriotism with a

determination to pay a living wage, 'whenever possible',[410] a concept also invoked in calling for businesses to display greater humanity in its operation; here, for example the F.S.U. offered the perspective that,

> *"in times of peace the annual toll of life sacrificed to our industries, the stunting of the higher faculties in monotonous employment, the hardships and even cruelties, suffered by women and children in our slums – these things, which are everyday incidents of our 'peace civilisation', bring shame upon our patriotism".*[411]

This determination to secure the new paternalist social philosophy in the vanguard of post war reconstruction, thereby ensuring that, whilst 'reforms' were indeed undertaken, they were of an extremely limited nature, is of particular relevance here for two specific reasons. Firstly, in illustrating that, amongst a section of the S.O.F. the Cadburys both fraternised with and exercised a degree of control over, there existed an influential expression of this desire to mould Britain's society and ensure its adherence to this philosophy; and secondly, in demonstrating the accompanying variety of activities undertaken and encouraged under the aegis of Woodbrooke, all of which tended towards the promotion and adoption of this general political perspective.

Subsequently, this particular utilisation continued, becoming a prominent feature of the establishment's functions, the college being selected, in 1918, as the venue for a conference of Friends' employers on the theme 'Quakerism and Industry': a four day meeting,[412] that, in effect, amounted to a quasi-official and therefore, authorative, gathering of the S.O.F., an interpretation reflected both in the specific representatives it attracted and the overall level of interest it aroused within the Quaker business community.

Within the former category, for instance, were several of the most influential in this group, including two of George Cadbury's sons, William Adlington and George Jnr,[413] alongside, in both Seebohm B Rowntree and Arnold S Rowntree, M.P.,[414] two further figures of considerable prominence within this body, whilst the conference elicited an enthusiastic response from an extremely powerful group, its delegates being drawn from 75 firms employing almost half the 100,000 Quaker workforce.[415]

Moreover, this meeting was of particular importance, in reaffirming the movement's general adherence to the earlier F.S.U. doctrine, the conference, having considered how their religious faith might find greater expression in business life,[416] reporting that,

> *"we believe that it is only so far as those engaged in industry are inspired by the true spirit which regards industry as a national service, to be carried on for the benefit of the community, that any general improvement in industrial relations is possible".*[417]

Such a statement further reinforced the importance of this Woodbrooke Conference, the S.O.F. choosing to adopt the spirit, if not the letter, of this pronouncement, in proclaiming

their 'Foundation Of A True Social Order', as adopted by their 1918 Yearly Meeting,[418] as defining their general employment policy. Correspondingly, this document illustrated many of these principles, in emphasising co-operation and goodwill as the basis for future business relations,[419] rather than recognising an extreme conflict of interest between the consequently rival economic forces of capital and labour.

This interpretation was also espoused by other official Quaker organs, 'The Friend', for example, extensively reported the conference and its emphasis on industrial 'harmony', exemplified by the meeting's Chairman, Arnold Rowntree, in calling for mutual confidence and co-operation to replace 'the old spirit' of distrust and suspicion between the different classes in society,[420] without any further or deeper analysis into this division.

Similar sentiments were also reiterated at the second such conference, in 1928,[421] a meeting which displayed several features which had also characterised the 1918 gathering, including, significantly, the considerable presence and influence of the Cadburys. Woodbrooke, for example, again hosted a meeting which aroused a widespread interest within Friends' circles, in attracting a 100 leading Quaker employers,[422] being opened by Edward Cadbury,[423] whilst including another six Cadburys as representatives of their family business,[424] alongside another of George Cadbury's sons, Henry, as a delegate of the Daily News Ltd.[425]

Consequently, these gatherings illustrate the importance of Woodbrooke to the S.O.F., in becoming the 'natural' venue for such policy making pronouncements from leading members of the movement. Moreover they also reveal the integral role of the Cadburys in this post war process, perhaps most notably in attempting to formulate a new industrial order against a backdrop of the working classes' increased expectations during a frequently unstable political, social and economic climate, attempts which received the substantial support of many influential Quaker employers.

Furthermore, the impact of these particular Woodbrooke initiatives was considerably more widespread, appreciation of such efforts to inculcate these perspectives being expressed by those directly wielding political power, including the Education Minister. In November 1918, for example, and echoing the approval he had expressed of the B.D.C.S., and indeed of the Cadbury social philosophy in general, 'The Friend' reported his public endorsement of such meetings, commenting that during a recent address,

> *"Mr. Fisher said he had read the report of the Woodbrooke Conference with much interest. He felt that the future of the country depended on the right relationship being established between Education and Industry, and he laid special stress on the value of the work initiated by Friends in the Adult School Movement".*[426]

These messages were also reflected in and reinforced by the statements of leading members of the Cadbury family, individuals closely associated with both Woodbrooke and

these conferences. In 1930, for example, George Cadbury Jnr illustrated this practice in the 'Friends' Intelligencer', arguing that industry should be regarded as a form of social service, and that, correspondingly, employers should treat their workers on 'humane lines':[427] this was a concept which Cadbury interpreted as justifying both the eradication of practices such as the sweated wage, and the introduction of 'labour saving' machinery together with its inevitable consequence, the shedding of 'excess labour',[428] and a comment which, therefore, also sought to justify his company's policy of 'rationalisation',[429] a programme which had resulted in the reduction of their workforce by a quarter during the preceding two years.[480]

Consequently, through this article and the activities of agencies including the F.S.U. and the Woodbrooke Conferences, the Cadburys, whilst pursuing such 'efficiency driven' policies, simultaneously sought to reduce potentially damaging perceptions of class conflict between capital and labour, encouraging employers to be viewed as financially disinterested businessmen and, in essence, dispensers of enlightened altruism.

Moreover, this projector of the Cadburys, and Quakers, as ultimately and, seemingly, equally concerned with the welfare of both their business(es) and employees, was an image similarly exploited/reinforced by further activism conducted at Woodbrooke, under the aegis of the S.S.C.C. and, later, the Woodbrooke Extension Committee; this activism, in encouraging such concepts as 'brotherhood' and 'citizenship', concepts likewise promoted by, for example, the M.A.S.U. and Severn Street organisations, again illustrated the close interrelation between the numerous Cadbury agencies; indeed this intention to become involved in similar areas of concern, including the 'social question' was announced even before the Settlement's opening, a special meeting being devoted to this subject during a Woodbrooke based conference in August 1903.[431]

Broadly this work, utilising the centre's premises, or lecturers, or both, encompassed initiatives designed to encourage the Quaker faith, alongside frequent efforts to forward the 'harmonisation of class interests' perspective considered above, such initiatives taking the form of either nationwide Lecture Schools, later extended to include Week-end Schools, and the generally more localised, Woodbrooke-based, Summer Schools.

One particularly pertinent example of the latter was a 1907 meeting at Cambridge, an event which, whilst being promoted by a local committee, nevertheless displayed evidence of a strong Woodbrooke influence, and included the centre's lecturer H G Wood,[432] together with the institution's Director, Rendel Harris, acting in his capacity as President of the National Council for Evangelical Free Churches;[433] this was a meeting, which in attracting 'about' 300 students, only a third of whom were Friends,[434] illustrated the Extension Committee's efforts and success in trying to strengthen and broaden the appeal of Quakerism; indeed these efforts also included embracing new geographical areas in the search for greater support, the committee organising its first Scotish Summer School in 1908,[435] whilst the following year witnessed a corresponding event in Ireland'.[436]

Similarly, a frequent aspect of this work was Woodbrooke's provision for teachers operating both exclusively within the Quaker organisation and under the auspices of the A.S. movement. In 1905, for instance, the centre held two particular meetings illustrating this first feature, in January, hosting the Annual Meeting of the Friends' Guild of Teachers,[437] and several months later, the Easter Conference of Teachers in Childrens' Schools under the aegis of the F.F.D.S.A.;[438] these two gatherings which, in attracting attendances of approximately 100 and 125,[439] again bear testimony to the effectiveness of Woodbrooke as the venue for the encouragement of the Quaker message, whilst during the previous summer a two week long meeting was organised for those working in connection with the F.F.D.S.A.,[440] the gathering having the specific purpose of studying 'the truth of Christianity'.[441]

This type of provision was to become, one of the most frequent and significant of Woodbrooke's contributions to A.S. work. A similar School for A.S. teachers was, for example, repeated the following August,[442] whilst by 1911, and under the 'care of the National Council of Adult School Unions',[443] this provision had been doubled,[444] and had succeeded in attracting an attendance of 230, in addition to a number of local visitors,[445] the 95, mainly male, residents being lodged at Fircroft College.[445] This gathering was subsequently described in the Extension Committee's report as 'a very delightful Summer School',[447] and, following a petition to the A.S. National Council 'signed by all the students' from this 1911 meeting,[448] one repeated the following year to a similar degree of acclaim.[449]

One factor which undoubtedly contributed to the 1911 meeting's 'unqualified success',[450] was, unquestionably, the importance the A.S. movement attached to it, an evaluation which consequently ensured that the School received the attentions services of its leading figures, including W C Braithwaite, William Littleboy and Tom Bryan.[451]

Moreover, these individuals were similarly active in the second major category of work undertaken by the centre, the provision of external Lecture Schools, a feature the first Woodbrooke Council Annual Report, in 1908, again attributed to demands from the A.S. movement;[452] these were gatherings which, as might be anticipated, concentrated on 'Biblical, religious and social' subjects,[453] and which are doubly noteworthy, in both demonstrating a major new development in disseminating these A S. ideals, the Schools becoming one particular mechanism which expanded extremely quickly, whilst also serving to illustrate the central role of the Cadbury circle within this Extension Committee programme.

Between January and December,1908, for example, 22 such Schools were organised,[454] attendances varying from 30 to 300,[455] whilst by September the following year the number of these gatherings, in rising to 47,[456] prompted the Council's report to observe that this element of the Committee's work was 'one of rapidly growing interest and importance',[457] an interpretation further validified by subsequent events, the Extension Committee organising 36 such Schools experienced in both 1910/1 and 1911/2.[458]

Prominent within this increasing sphere of operation was both the considerable presence of the Cadburys amongst this body's, largely, unpaid, lecturing staff, and the

utilisation of Cadbury owned premises either as venues for these Schools or as residential accomodation for such. The Council's 1909 Annual Report noted, for example, that 8 of these meetings had been held at premises either donated or controlled by the Cadburys, i.e. 5 at Uffculme and 3 at Fircroft,[459] (see later), with both Rendel Harris and George Cadbury Jnr each addressing 1 such gathering,[460] H G Wood teaching at 4,[461] whilst Tom Bryan played perhaps the most prominent and active part of all, in lecturing to 13 such Schools.[462]

Furthermore, this degree of Cadburys influence was subsequently maintained; both Uffculme and Fircroft were again utilised for this purpose the following year,[463] whilst, during the academic session 1911/2, for instance, alongside national A.S. leaders including Edward Grubb, Percy Alden and G Currie Martin,[464] Wood, Littleboy and Bryan all participated in Extension Committee lectures,[465] the latter again being the most involved of this Cadbury group.[466]

Through each of these channels therefore, Woodbrooke operated as an increasingly well established and powerful agent in propagating the Cadbury's social message, one which whilst being portrayed as a spiritual and religious vehicle, nevertheless also served the political purposes of this group. Moreover, the influence of this message was further augmented in the mid-Edwardian years by the founding of another Cadbury mechanism, one which shared a similar development to Woodbrooke, and espoused the same philosophy, but which was more ambitious in its appeal, Fircroft College.

d) FURTHER PROMOTION OF MODERATE POLITICAL PERSPECTIVES:

The Cadburys, Fircroft College and the W.E.A.
-Fircroft College For Working Men and Women

As with its complementary body, Woodbrooke, Fircroft College was, from its very inception, clearly associated with the Quaker movement, the latter's Schools being describe in 1911 as an 'indispensable stepping-stone, a worthy forerunner', for the centre.[467] This institution, providing post elementary education for working class adults, was, therefore, immediately identifiable as a mechanism for both the S.O.F. and other related Cadbury agencies, including, most obviously the wider A.S. movement, an association of aims and personnel which, whilst broadening in time, was to prove essentially enduring.

Indeed, the formation of the Settlement had derived directly from the desire of this body's leadership to extend their influence,[468] a concern which manifested at Scalby, in 1908, in a special meeting of the body's National Council devoted entirely to the subject of education,[469] a gathering which, having emphasised the educational aims of their movement and discussed various schemes to further this 'great cause',[470] also illustrated the central role of the Cadburys in this process, in referring the matter to the joint consideration of the Council's Committee of Officers and the Woodbrooke Extension Committee.[471]

Subsequent developments further revealed this group's considerable interest in, and significant influence upon, this matter, through the implementation of several initiatives which maintained this momentum and, within a few months, secured its immediate objective with the official opening of Fircroft College. Leighton,(1959), for example, has drawn attention to the fundamental role of George Cadbury in this process, highlighting his action, following the Scalby resolution, in calling together a small body for this purpose, one which established a pattern frequently replicated, in containing representatives from Woodbrooke, and from both traditional and newer agencies in this arena, namely the National Adult School Union, (N.A.S.U.) and the W.E.A., respectively.[472]

Furthermore, the A.S. movement's monthly journal ' One and All' concurred with this perception of Cadbury prominence, reporting in December 1908 that George Cadbury Jnr's scheme for the new Settlement had been both submitted and 'heartily approved', by the Woodbrooke and National Council committees,[473] a ratification paving the way for Fircroft's operation.

Indeed, preparations for this eventuality had been almost finalised the previous month, the prospective body having installed Tom Bryan as its first Warden,[474] and completed administative arrangements for the institution, in establishing two committees, the Executive and the General, the latter composed from those bodies instrumental in founding the college, i.e. containing representatives from the Woodbrooke Council, the N.A.S.U. and the W.E.A.[475] Moreover, this considerable impetus was further fuelled by the immediate activism of each of

these new Fircroft agents, on the 14th November the General instructing the Executive Committee, together with Bryan, to draft a curriculum, prepare a prospectus and compose an article for the 'One and All' publicising the college's imminent opening,[476]

Over the following months the rapid pace of these developments was maintained, and by early 1909, such preliminary preparations were completed, George Cadbury Jnr having secured premises suitable for the centre's purposes;[477] these were indeed substantial, being advertised as providing accomodation for 20 and including a Library, Lecture Hall, Common Room, Workshop, Gymnasium with shower/bathing facilities, and sufficient grounds to offer opportunities for open-air classes, recreation and gardening,[478] and which on the 12th January admitted its first scholars,[479] a total of 169 residential students subsequently attending during the college's inaugural year'.[480]

These actions revealing the George Cadbury Jnr's fundamental role in the founding of Fircroft were, as with this group's involvement with other educational and social agencies reinforced by the significant financial support that several within this group offered this establishment, together with the influential roles they assumed within the college's internal structure.

Whilst, for example, Fircroft had applied for a government grant in 1911,[481] this state assistance was not forthcoming until 1925,[482] leaving the institution and its students wholly reliant upon other forms of funding, including the benevolence of individuals. This was a dependency to which the Cadburys responded, George, together with his sons Edward and George Jnr, and alongside Arnold Rowntree, donating bursaries which effectively ensured the centre's functioning, in providing for the maintenance of all residential students.[483]

Further emphasising this considerable control was the acceptance of positions of influence on the college's governing organs, bodies which in turn consistently illustrated links with those educational agencies with which the Cadburys were synonymously associated. Whilst by 1949 this Cadbury influence was reflected in their dominance of the Fircroft College Trust, in occupying 3 of the 7 committee positions and including the younger George Cadbury as Chairman,[484] this trend had been established from the Settlement's founding. This was, for example, exemplified by the body's original structure, which, in containing George Cadbury as President,[485] also possessed a General Committee that included his sons Edward and, as Hon Secretary, George Jnr.[486] Moreover, between 1909 and 1914 the institution's Executive Committee, responsible for conducting the administration of the college, also included both brothers, the latter again undertaking the role of Secretary;[487] indeed this considerable influence was reinforced from December 1912 by their presence, together with that of their father, on centre's newly formed Central Committee.[488]

This latter body is of further importance in this process, as marking an attempt to 'bring in representatives of a wider community',[489] i.e. placing Fircroft within a coherent educational framework by emphasising its association with other social agencies which

shared their perceptions and motives, and specifically by the inclusion of representatives from bodies sharing the Cadbury social agenda. Indeed this initiative extended a trait which had been evident from the centre's inception, and one that had been reflected in the 1909 Committee by the presence of Rendel Harris and H G Wood,[490] illustrating, for instance, the overlap with its Woodbrooke neighbour, whilst the body also included J H Barlow of the Bournville Village Trust,[491] alongside his fellow Quaker and Clerk of the Friends' Yearly Meeting, Lloyd Wilson,[492] and the Cadbury associate Professor J H Muirhead of Birmingham University.[493]

However, whilst not discounting these links, of most prominence throughout these various committees was the involvement of leading A S. members. Edwin Gilbert, Secretary of the N.A.S.U., for example, sitting on both Fircroft's Executive and Central Committee,[494] a presence on this latter body reinforced by W C Braithwaite, the movement's Chairman, alongside Edward Grubb, Dr George Newman and Arnold S Rowntree,[495] as has been noted, all leading and renowned figures within this organisation.

Moreover, equally significant in indicating the intent and rationale underlying Fircroft, was the patronage, support and indeed presence on the centre's committees, of members of the recently formed W.E.A., with its West Midlands' Secretary, T W Price serving on the Executive,[496] whilst his national counterpart, Albert Mansbridge, acted as the body's representative on the Central Committee.[497] Whilst the Cadburys' relationship with the W.E.A. will be explored later in this chapter, it is nevertheless extremely relevant here to note that this was a further illustration of the widening Cadbury social and political activism and accompanying association with those sharing their agenda and perspectives; in this context., it was with a body which, whilst it sought social and economic reforms, was also, nevertheless, clearly an agent of conservatism, these changes consequently being of a very limited nature, being sought strictly within existing parameters. This was exemplified by the actions of the long serving Mansbridge, who consequently became synonymous with this movement, and who, Alfred, (1983), for example, criticised for fundamentally failing to question this social order and its motives.[498]

Fircroft, therefore, heavily if not totally reliant upon the support of the Cadburys, was an institution which sought to both collaborate with and enhance the work of other voluntary organisations operating in this rapidly expanding social policy arena, a role acknowledged by its 1909 publicity pamphlet, in explaining that it had been,

> *"founded to supplement the efforts of other educational associations and to meet a growing need for a Settlement where working men may reside for . . . systematic study".*[499]

Indeed, this mediation aspect has been described by Burch, (1917) as one which enabled the centre to act as an educational bridge between those bodies such as the A.S.

movement, which had traditionally received the allegiance of those such as the Cadburys, and their newly developing somewhat more sophisticated sister agencies, including the W.E.A.[500]

Correspondingly, this intent was one immediately evident in the college's outlook and operation, Thornton (1911) predicting that the A.S. movement would provide Fircroft with a ready made and fruitful 'recruiting ground'.[501] Furthermore, this, together with the views expressed above, were to become enduring perspectives, the body's 1957/8 Annual Report stating that the N.A.S.U. and the W.E.A., were amongst those bodies to which the centre remained affiliated and whose work it continued to 'actively support',[502] a similarity of purpose readily evident throughout the centre's operation and its consistent efforts to inculcate the attitudes and perspectives promoted by these two particular organisations.

Such sentiments were readily recognisable aims even prior to the college's opening. In December 1908, for example, the 'One and All' enthusiastically advertised this forthcoming event as one which would further facilitate the development of contemporary studies within the A.S. movement, with particular emphasis being placed upon considering the issues of 'social questions and citizenship',[503] whilst simultaneously also maintaining the 'strong feeling of fellowship' characteristic of the movement.[504]

This intention was reiterated in 'Fircroft', a pamphlet which the centre produced in 1909, and which clearly displayed the perspective the institution was to reflect, in quoting the political moderates Manzini and F D Maurice,[505] whilst emphasising the significance it attached to promoting an outlook propounding social harmony. Accordingly, the pamphlet stressed the importance of attaining a spirit of 'common life and fellowship' in training and stimulating both the intellect and the imagination, whilst also 'strengthening character',[506] the authors commending that the college's aim was not merely the acquisition of factual information, but to provide an opportunity for reflective thought and to,

"develop the capacity to appreciate what is valuable in life".[507]

Those within the Cadburys similarly shared the desire to disseminate this perspective, an expectation which, they claimed, was very quickly realised, within two weeks of the first students arriving the following January, for example, George Cadbury Jnr hailing the centre as an immediate success and one offering great encouragement to its proponents, in 'already' being pervaded by the same 'spirit of brotherhood' which generally characterised A.S. establishments.[508]

Similarly, Wood and Ball, (1922), the biographers of Fircroft's first Warden, Tom Bryan, equally identified these 'attributes' as characterising the centre, and argued that it epitomised liberal education in practice, in containing nothing of a technical nature, nor anything directed towards improving industrial efficiency,[509] whilst, of course, emphasising Bryan's personal

political sympathies and convictions and their importance in securing the centre's aims. These beliefs formed through his experiences as Vice-Warden at Browning Settlement in South London, where his undertaking of social work resulted in his selection as Mayor of Southwark in 1902,[510] also directly led to his invitation to Birmingham, not only to lecture at Woodbrooke, but to work and assist George Cadbury Jnr in developing housing and small holding projects, Bryan becoming the first Chairman of the Bournville Tenants' Ltd.[511] Indeed in 1908 this collaboration resulted in the production of 'The Land and the Landless', after which, Wood and Ball commented, Bryan was ready to deepen his involvement with social issues, being,

> *"eager to undertake some form of educational work which should be a real contribution to the solution of our national problems, both political and economic".*[512]

One direct consequence of these experiences, they continued, was the production of a perspective which they also endorsed, one which favoured the views of the moderate socialist William Morris rather than the more radical Hyndman;[513] consequently this placed particular importance on inculcating and engendering an essentially non-confrontational approach and the adoption of appropriate aims including the 'fostering' of 'common loyalty',[514] together with the concept of 'sacrifice for the common good',[515] rather than recognising the validity of any Marxist class war interpretation, a perspective wholly consistent with that propounded by the Cadburys.

Similar comments regarding the magnitude and significance of Bryan's contribution to Fircroft were made by George Cadbury Jnr in 1938, in arguing that throughout this service Bryan had strictly adhered to the principles of liberal education, believing that its students should not view this instruction as a means of 'climbing' further up the class structure, rather that they should appreciate this opportunity to,

> *"be so educated as to go back into their class and be leaders among their fellow workers".*[516]

However, this comment also revealed Fircroft's far more ambitious agenda, in operating as an instrument of political education, and, in particular, in encouraging the assimilation and application of moderate political values. In considering the question of the Settlement movement's functions, for example, Cadbury dismissed the argument that they were 'merely palliative', in finding something to do for those who otherwise had nothing to occupy them.[517] On the contrary, he argued, such institutions performed a far more purposeful and positive role, being particularly influential in shaping the contemporary political climate, and indeed contributed 'towards democracy itself' through the provision of trained

leaders,[518] an aspect of their work which he assessed as 'perhaps the greatest contribution' the movement could make'.[519]

Specifically, Cadbury's proposition was that, whilst their establishments educated only a relatively small number, this 'comparatively few' were particularly important, in invariably occupying positions of leadership within their organisations. Consequently, as such, they both exercised a disproportionately large influence, and performed an especially valuable service in widely disseminating the perspectives they favoured;[520] furthermore, he argued, these were actions which were particularly desirable, if not essential, amongst the nation's trade unions and throughout the country's workshops and social clubs;[521] i.e. mirroring the Cadburys' work within Birmingham's regenerated A.S. movement, such activism being undertaken in those arenas which were the province of the working classes. Indeed, this was a claim similarly echoed by both Wood and Ball,[522] and Pumphrey, (1952) the latter observing that Fircroft students often subsequently undertook posts which involved 'closer human contacts',[523] i.e. providing opportunities for a greater exercise of influence, a tendency she especially noted in respect of the 'large' number of the college's residents who, by 1912, had begun to undertake an extended, three term, period of study at Fircroft.[524]

Whilst Cadbury's 1938 comments relate to the perceived threat to (British) democracy from both ends of the political spectrum throughout 1930's Europe, they are nonetheless also pertinent to the periods preceding this era, in being a generally applicable acknowledgment that Fircroft and the wider Settlement movement to which it belonged were a considerable way removed from their ostensible position of political neutrality and disinterest; this distancing was exemplified by Fircroft's emphasis on inculcating perceptions of 'common interest' and and 'harmony' across very disparate economic circumstances, i.e. a perspective which denied differing class interests and which correspondingly specifically encouraged belief in and adherence to one particular political structure and continued respect and allegiance for the institutions which held this structure in place.

Indeed, this activism was of particular relevance given the increasing likelihood of the imminent political emancipation of the working classes in Edwardian Britain and the rise of political parties who questioned the values upheld and perpetuated by their mainstream counterparts, such involvement being of vital importance in diluting and highjacking the messages of the newer and potentially more radical agents of political change, including the Labour Party.

Certainly both the founders of Fircroft and its earliest biographer, Thornton, realised this considerable potential such centres possessed, the latter commenting in 1911, for instance, that an increase in the nation's Educational Settlements would produce an 'upward impulse . . . the effect of which would be seen in all our industrial, political and religious life'.[525] Similarly, the Cadburys, though couching their argument rather differently, also clearly shared

this perception, and indeed were keenly aware of how this objective might be achieved. In the same year, for example, George Cadbury Jnr unsuccessfully argued for the cancellation of the 'Dreadnought' and associated armament programmes, with the principal purpose of freeing sufficient public money to fund the implementation of a nationwide Educational Settlements scheme. Such a scheme was one which, he claimed, merely required 'a combined effort' from the increasingly empowered general public to reach fruition,[526] and would, of course, have resulted in the implementation of a programme of ostensibly non-political education, one which, potentially at least, would have been of significant importance and pertinence in countering the growing industrial unrest and potential of widespread political upheaval.

Whilst the attempt to implement this particular panacea failed, the existing Settlements nevertheless continued their dissemination of the Cadbury message, Fircroft contributing essentially through the direction and tone of its curriculum, firstly for its residential students, and secondly for those undertaking its Correspondence Class, traits that were clearly evident even prior to the college's inception. Whilst subsequently, for example, both of these programmes operated from 1909, the body's first prospectus had already indicated the centre's educational and political direction, in revealing that whilst the curriculum would feature work that was essentially physical and practical, such as Gardening, Gymnastics and Nature Study,[527] nevertheless, the overriding impression was that of Fircroft's extremely close resemblance to the more regenerated of the A.S. bodies, in embracing, for instance, both English Language and Literature, alongside the more traditional study of Bible History.[528]

This tendency consequently also led directly to the inclusion of subjects which can be broadly categorised as encompassing contemporary social issues, including that of the 'social question' and those studies deemed to be of particular familiarity and relevance to working men, including Political Economy and Industrial History and Modern Class Movements, such as Trade Unions and Co-operatives.[529] Alongside these was the study of the development of contemporary institutions, including Local Government and the Poor Law, together with 'special problems', such as Housing, Unemployment, and those specifically relating to rural life,[530] subjects which, in aggregate, were given far greater attention than that allocated to the fields of Science and Mathematics, areas represented merely by the inclusion of classes in Arithmetic and Account Keeping and Elements of Logic and Ethics.[531]

This clear bias and prioritising of liberal studies, consequently produced a curriculum which led the college in 1909 to describe it as being designed with the intention of 'uniting learning and labour' in self-reliance and 'worthy manhood',[532] and,

> *"to help students to a reasoned and clearer view of the great problems of human life; and to equip them better to discharge the duties and responsibilities which our social, political and industrial life imposes".*[533]

This perspective was later similarly employed by Wood and Ball, who, whilst commenting that the inclusion of economic studies was validated by the organisation of contemporary society,[534] nevertheless revealed the intrinsically restricted, conservative, nature of the political outlook they shared with Bryan, in severely limiting such an analysis, dismissively describing socialism, for example, as merely a 'narrow school',[535] rather than a morally just and economically credible alternative social structure.

Whilst, as the college subsequently claimed, as a residential centre Fircroft's influence far outweighed the mere numbers it endowed with such a philosophy, the centre was also nevertheless quick to initiate additional strategies to broaden and maximise its potential, a particular aspect of which involved the implementation of policies emanating from the A.S. leadership. One specific example of this tendency was the instigation of Correspondence Classes, a facility provided following a request by the movement's National Council for the centre to meet the demand from 'many' of their membership,[536] accordingly this was a factor which resulted in the scheme's provision correspondingly mirroring that offered in the more regenerated of the Adult Schools, including, for example, in addition to more traditional subjects, those such as Elementary Economics, Trade Unionism, Politics and Citizenship.[537]

Almost immediately the Warden's efforts in developing the course appeared rewarded, the scheme making a considerable and rapid impact, by October 1909 a total of 183 being subscribed to it,[538] a figure which 'soon rose' to almost 300.[539] This provision was one which reflected a fairly even balance between the traditional and the new, its most popular subjects being English Language and Literature, with 95 and 84 scholars respectively,[540] whilst similarly illustrating Fircroft's concern with social questions, 49 following an Industrial History course, with a further 44 pursuing studies in Public Health issues.[541]

Whilst these classes were concluded in 1912, being perceived as imposing too much pressure on the centre's lecturers,[542] their brief existence had, nevertheless, indicated one way in which the college could greatly increase its effect, and one which was subsequently replicated after the 1st World War by the instigation of the Fircroft Extension Scheme. Indeed, Wood and Ball argued that the implementation of this later scheme was absolutely imperative for the survival and continuance of democracy in Britain, attributing its introduction to the particular social, economic and political climate produced by Europe's experiences during the opening two decades of the century. In particular they argued that this measure was necessary, because the,

> *"economic recovery of the nation, the sound exercise of the new spirit of assertion among the rank and file, the proper use of their responsibilities by millions of new voters, all alike depend on there being a far wider body of intelligent public opinion after the war than before".*[543]

i.e. ensuring that, in a climate of greatly changing political awareness, expectation and expression, the production of a compliant and politically moderate populace would

continue unhindered: indeed this was a tacit aim of Fircroft, but one which was frequently disguised, Wood and Ball, for example, as chroniclers of the Cadbury group, describing such an objective in extremely vague language, i.e. as the pursuit of 'new standards of citizenship and a better social order'.[544]

Parallelling this scheme were a number of further developments all of which demonstrated the centre's increasing collaboration with other contemporary agencies and its growing role in attempting to secure shared moderate objectives. Perhaps the most prominent of these actions were those which revealed a greater overt emphasis on issues related to the 'social question', including changes in the settlement's curriculum to make it more closely resemble Edwardian English life,[545] together with initiatives designed to disseminate this message into further new avenues, principally through the organisation of Women's Schools.

This latter strand of development became evident in November, 1909, with the announcement of the Fircroft Committee's decision to ratify the use of the college premises for a series of six weekly Women's Summer Schools during the following July and August.[546] This was a course which again embraced traditional and contemporary educational themes, in containing, for example both Biblical History and Literature, alongside the newer disciplines of Biology, Physiology and Hygiene, and Sociology, with particular reference to 'Women's and Children's Problems',[547] and was a scheme which Leighton later described as part of Fircroft's growing provision for the 'wider public'.[548]

However, it is necessary to qualify such an assessment, the audience to which this programme was directed being highly specific. Whilst, for example, about 60 of the 200 attending were in various types of business,[549] and over half were married,[550] a third statistic, relating to A.S. membership, is the most pertinent common factor, in that over 40% of this audience occupied positions of authority and influence within these organisations, 26 being Secretaries and a further 55, Presidents, of such Schools;[551] furthermore, this was an association which was also reinforced by those who led these summer meetings, a number of whom were S.O.F. members and national figures within the A.S. movement, and who included Mrs J Fullwood, Anne Littleboy and Carol Newman, whose brother had been instrumental in founding the college.[552]

Subsequently, and with immediate effect, these gatherings became established as a regular and important feature of the centre and one which continued throughout the inter-war period,[553] Leighton commenting that they were a particularly successful aspect of Fircroft's activities being one of the 'most valuable' of the collaborative ventures between the college and the A.S. movement.[554]

Parallelling this important new area of development was the introduction, in the autumn of 1911, of a series of Monday evening lectures devoted to contemporary 'social question' issues: lectures subsequently reported as receiving an extremely enthusiastic

response from the local populace,[555] and which came to illustrate the common purpose within these Birmingham Educational Settlements, and in particular within those advancing the social philosophy to which the Cadburys adhered. This was evident through the choice of 'topical subjects' to be considered, subjects which engaged this contingent across many areas of social policy and which included 'Experiments in Factory Organisation', 'Women's Work and Wages', and 'Unemployment and the Insurance Bill'.[556]

Furthermore, this overlap of Cadbury agencies was similarly illustrated through the utilisation of lecturers from a number of related sources, including Woodbrooke, represented, for example, by George Shann and H G Wood,[557] members of the Cadbury family, such as Edward and George Jnr,[558] whilst, perhaps most pertinently here, being accompanied by those from a selection of wider and associated agencies and agents which notably embraced Albert Mansbridge and the W.E.A..[559]

Moreover, this latter connection had been established within a few months of Fircroft's opening, and had already been revealed by November, 1909, at the W.E.A./Birmingham University meeting announcing the college's decision to permit Women's Summer Schools.[560] Indeed, this Cadbury/Fircroft/ W.E.A. collaboration is worthy of a closer examination, for despite this burgeoning Fircroft activism, its impact was perhaps overshadowed by the effect of this association, which represented possibly the most significant educational way in which the Cadbury group sought to increase and widen the endorsement of their social philosophy.

The Cadburys, Fircroft and the W.E.A.

Of all the collaborative links the Birmingham Educational Settlements established in their extensive efforts to propagate the Cadbury social philosophy, none were more revealing and influential than those established between this Cadbury group, operating through the Fircroft Committee, and the W.E.A., founded in 1903,[561] and whose specified aim was 'To Promote the Higher Education of Working People primarily by the Extension of University Teaching.[562]

This body was one which from the outset was portrayed as following in the tradition of religious/voluntary groups undertaking some degree of social involvement, its 1905 Annual Report, for example, describing itself as a 'missionary organisation' operating in collaboration with both working class societies and local education authorities.[563] This image of zealous endeavour, one which, incidentally, also considerably underplayed its potential impact, was also echoed by Professor M E Sadler at the 1907 Co-operative Congress, in offering the view that the W.E.A. brought,

> *"together to a united work the isolated men and women who are ready to respond to the claims of education for social duty, and who wish to learn more in order that they may be more effective in the work of social reform".*[564]

These descriptions suggest an organisation of very limited, almost peripheral influence, motivated by purely altruistic sentiments. However, these suggestions give a far from accurate reflection of a movement which is of particular importance in this arena, being credited by Griffin, 1987, alongside another permanent structure, The University Extension Movement, with integrating the modern system of adult education.[565] Indeed, this was a body which shared the Cadburys' awareness of the considerable social engineering possibilities presented by such a system as well as, crucially, concurring with their central perspectives and political purpose. Of paramount importance here was the W.E.A.'s and Cadbury desire and concern to preserve the existing social order, rather than achieving any more fundamental, radical restructuring; this overlap was illustrated, for example, by the organisation's support for what became a prime cause in the Cadbury's efforts to inculcate moderate political sympathies, the adoption of a widespread system of Continuation Schools, a cause officially endorsed at the W.E.A.'s first national conference in 1905.[566]

Moreover, the body came to wield this considerable influence extremely quickly, being utilised by leading political figures from the earliest years of its existence. In 1910, for example, Ramsay Macdonald, as Chairman of Labour's Education Committee, wrote to the organisation's General Secretary, hoping to include the W.E.A.'s experiences in an effort to add further strength to his party's proposed Downing Street deputation demanding a Royal Commission into the nation's universities.[567] Indeed, the Secretary's response, in acceding to this request, was perhaps even more illuminating with regard to his expectations of the eventual influence exercised by the W.E.A., Mansbridge revealing that he anticipated the body's Tutorial Classes having 'very great power in the Labour movement',[568] a confidence based upon the body's dramatic rise and one fully justified by future developments.

Regionally, the organisation's success was also startlingly immediate, in 1906, the minutes of the Midland Section's 1st Annual Meeting observing that, alongside 53 individual members, the branch had already affiliated 56 societies, including 14 A.S's, and claiming that this was a widespread popularity, in that all classes, and especially the workers, had 'enthusiastically' accepted their Association'.[569]

Furthermore, this 'enthusiasm' was replicated within Birmingham, and whilst its 1906/7 Annual Report had been somewhat cautious, in observing that the impact of their social study lectures would not be easily quantified, it was also somewhat influenced by the national body's immediate successes, in nevertheless optimistically concluding that such a concentration upon these subjects would inevitably produce a 'favourable influence', especially with regard to both the growth and activities of working class organisations.[570]

Indeed, this optimism was very quickly justified, as the list of members grew from 40 a the end of its first year,[571] to 61 three years later,[572] a figure which the 1911 Birmingham Supplement reported as rising to 214.[573] This popularity was similarly illustrated by the affiliation of a large number of societies to the branch, a total which reached 71 in 1909,[574]

and included 20 A.S.s..[575] Likewise, this trend was also reflected in the popularity of their 6th Annual Report, 1500 being sold/circulated in 1909, alongside 2000 copies of 'The Highway'. and 1,800 of its 'Educational Handbook', in addition to 800 pamphlets it distributed to local working class organisations.[576]

As with each of the Cadbury promoted/supported agencies, there was a complete lack of reference to the political nature underpinning and permeating the operation of each such agency, tacitly encouraging the assumption that the bodies were of an entirely apolitical nature. Indeed, the body claimed a position of unrivalled pre-eminence in this arena, in that it possessed the 'entire confidence' of both all sections of labour and all types of educational establishments.[577] Further, whenever this apparently neutral stance was challenged, it was summarily dismissed as both ill-informed and insubstantial. In 1908, for example, the W.E.A.'s national Executive Committee, whilst acknowledging that their organisation's policies had been the subject of criticism by some 'adherents' of labour,[578] nevertheless claimed that such comments were based upon 'misconceptions', and had served only to strengthen the movement's position.[579]

As with other similar Cadbury agencies active under the "social question' umbrella, their interpretation of social reform was correspondingly one which even by a most generous reading could only be construed as moderately radical, and more critically be perceived as ultimately almost entirely serving the interests of the moneyed classes. More specifically, the organisation steadfastly refused to countenance any consideration of an alternative economic structure; indeed, in claiming that it was 'definitely non-sectarian and non-political',[580] the W.E.A. also refused to acknowledge that the meaning of the latter was not merely confined to actual affiliation to political parties and that, in promoting adherence to the social and economic perspectives and system they propounded, they were, on the contrary, acting in a directly political manner.

Moreover, by 1908, the W.E.A. had expanded its objects to include the necessity for the country to be 'governed by an educated democracy',[581] widening its description of itself to include the words 'and democratic',[582] an expression which further encouraged fallacious notions of its non-political nature, and accompanying perceptions of a politically neutral state, i.e. a 'benign state'.[583]

Furthermore, this action would subsequently serve to distance and sharply distinguish the body and its perspectives from its most radical critic and rival, the Central Labour College, one which had developed as a direct consequence of the 1908 strike at the workers' Ruskin College, where students receiving an education of an alleged 'non-partisan' character,[584] claimed that in reality this mostly resembled propaganda for the capitalist system, involving merely the 'inculcation of governing class ideas'.[585] Unsurprisingly, this distancing and mutual antipathy was also evident in the comments of the Fircroft chronicler, Leighton, (1952) in

disparagingly describing the body's successor, the National Central Labour College, as an organisation which, in the field of political science, substituted 'propaganda for learning',[586] a weakness which, he argued, this Birmingham Settlement had avoided through its pursuit of a liberal curriculum.[587]

However, this refusal to acknowledge its own political perspectives has itself been criticised, notably by Macintyre, (1980) who, quoting the inter-war Commissions into Industrial Unrest, argued that, far from being neutral, the organisation operated as 'the chief instrument of state policy' in the adult education arena during these years,[588] with the prime purpose of countering the influence of Marxist classes.[589] Macintyre described this process as one which attempted to persuade working class students to integrate into a 'national culture',[590] specifically through each individual student being encouraged to 'widen his narrow class horizons for a broader progressive conception of society'.[591]

This promotion of the adoption of consensus, 'common interest' perspectives and, of course, the concomitant denial of inevitable class conflict, was further evident through the W.E.A.'s approach to certain social questions, including the organisation and control of industry. This course, Macintyre suggested, was particularly revealing, being exemplified firstly by its utilisation of Clay's 'Economics; An Introduction for the General Reader', (1916) a text which, being merely descriptive, was consequently notable for its lack of critical analysis,[592] and, secondly, by the accompanying classes which, in so far as they considered economic theory at all, steadfastly refused to teach Marxist interpretations.[593]

Furthermore, these moderate tendencies were also reflected by the W.E.A.'s local and national leadership. The Midland Section Committee, for example, contained a number of high profile 'establishment' figures, including the academics Masterman and Muirhead, from Birmingham University, with the Right Reverend Charles Gore, as President.[594]
Indeed the body's General Secretary was perceived by the Liberal Party as sufficiently politically moderate to warrant an invitation to become one of their general election candidates,[595] an offer which Mansbridge rejected but nevertheless conceded he found to be of natural interest.[596]

This, therefore, was the general flavour of the W.E.A., a movement to which the Cadburys and Fircroft Committee were immediately attracted, their association being manifested through the usual channels of financial contribution and general affiliation and collaboration, including the utilisation of personnel for lecturing purposes, an affinity which Mansbridge himself displayed in agreeing to deliver the first of the George Cadbury Memorial Lectures at Woodbrooke in 1927.[597]

This Cadbury/ Fircroft/ W.E.A. interrelation had been established at the earliest opportunity, i.e. from the founding of the latter's Birmingham branch, in April,1906,[598] with George Cadbury among its first 40 members[599] This support was underlined in the following year's Annual Report which contained an Appendix listing Guarantors and Donors to its

Midland Office Fund which again included the Cadbury associate Professor Muirhead, together with W A Albright of the S.O.F.,[600] alongside George Cadbury and his sons George Jnr and Edward,[601] the latter also contributing to a W.E.A. Central Office Fund.[602]

Furthermore, whilst totalling only £36 by 1909,[603] as in other areas of Cadbury voluntary social involvement, these donations were of considerable significance, £30 of this amount being directed towards the Midland Office,[604] thereby assisting, and perhaps even enabling, the local W.E.A. operation to function.

Subsequently, the Cadburys continued to pledge this influential financial support, during 1909/10 W A Cadbury donated a £25 lump sum to the Association,[605] an amount exceeded by only seven of the 500 plus contributors.[606] Four years later this dependency was particularly illustrated even more clearly the contributions of six family members, £42. 7s. accounting for over 20% of the £99. 1s. 6d received as individual donations by the W.E.A.'s Midland District,[607] with two of this group, George and George Jnr also giving to the body's Central Fund.[608]

Similarly, this overlap was readily apparent throughout the early years of both this movement and the Settlement. In October,1909, for example, the official W.E.A. journal, 'The Highway' reported that a W.E.A. member, Cecil Leeson, had become one of Fircroft's first residential students.[609] Indeed twelve months earlier the Birmingham W.E.A.'s Executive Committee had also illustrated this affinity, in considering a number of this group sympathetic enough to their cause to offer hospitality to delegates for their forthcoming W.E.A. meeting, a group which included the Cadbury associates Walter Barrow and Joseph Sturge, alongside two of the most powerful and prominent within this fraternity, Woodbrooke's Director, Rendel Harris, and George Cadbury Jnr.[610]

Furthermore, 'The Highway' simultaneously revealed its approval of this collaboration, commending that it derived,

> *"great encouragement and satisfaction from the rapid and sound growth of Adult Schools in England. Upon them lies much of the responsibility for educational advance among the work people of the future . . .*
> *In connection with the A.S. movement a residential college has been established at Fircroft . . .*
> *We have been glad to approve the action of the General Secretary and of the Midland Secretary in assisting in the formation of the College, which was a necessary adjunct to the multifarious educational activities of Adult Schools".*[611]

Likewise, the list of bodies affiliated to the Birmingham W.E.A. bore similar testimony to this collaboration and mutual support, containing, for example, George Cadbury's Class XIV, the Woodbrooke Settlement, and Messrs Cadbury Bros,[612] the latter being replaced the following year by the Bournville Works Education Committee.[613]

The closeness of this interrelation was more publicly revealed in June, 1909, when the Fircroft College hosted the Midland W.E.A. Council Conference,[614] 'The Highway' giving

particular praise to Messrs Cadbury, and the Kings Norton W.E.A., for their assistance in securing the visitors' 'comfort and enjoyment'.[615] Indeed, this meeting was considered so successful that it was repeated the following year,[616] a gathering which attracted in excess of 300 delegates, and gave the Cadburys a further opportunity to cement these links, i.e. with Tom Bryan presiding, and whose lecturers included Professor Muirhead of Birmingham University, and George Shann and George Heath of Woodbrooke,[617] the latter, alongside H G Wood later addressing the Midland W.E.A. Summer School, in July ,1912 at this Cadbury venue.[618]

The School was organised as the Fircroft Committee sought to develop this co-operation more formally in the early months of 1912, with the initiation of a series of lectures to which W.E.A. members were specifically invited, a course of action considerably praised by the local movement's mouthpiece, i.e. the Birmingham Supplement of 'The Highway', which expressed the hope that a large number of their contingent would take advantage of this scheme, the ideals of the W.E.A. and Fircroft being 'closely akin'.[619]

Correspondingly, these lectures included George Cadbury's discourse on 'The Aim of Fircroft', whilst also considering many of those areas which characterised the Cadbury educational involvement, such as the 'social duty' of the individual to the wider community, a theme explored here by Mansbridge, the W.E.A. General Secretary.[620] However, this series went considerably further than merely advocating such sentiments, in demonstrating a philosophical outlook and radical connection of a far more reactionary nature, including those which were openly suggestive of eugenic sympathies. This was, for example, evident through Mrs Hume Pinsent's lecture, 'The Problem of the Defective Child',[621] an address which reinforced the W.E.A. Women's 'Heredity' lecture, held at the local university the previous December,[622] and whose sentiments were sympathetically received and indeed endorsed by those within the Cadbury group,(see earlier and chapter 4).

Furthermore, influential members of the W.E.A. aired similar views on both this issue and others of contemporary social relevance. Consequently, therefore, whilst this body claimed that it was purely a vehicle for working class liberation, the early W.E.A. was equally also very readily identifiable as, in essence, an Edwardian political vehicle. In 1914, for example, Arnold Freeman's pamphlet, 'An Introduction to the Study of Social Problems', clearly illustrated and reflected this facet of the body, arguing in favour of co-operation as a business structure,[623] and against the 'manufacture of inefficiency'.[624] Here the ideas expressed were redolent of the most ardent 'national efficiency' proponents, in addition to their considerable eugenic content. Freeman, for instance, supported the use of hard monotonous labour in Detention Colonies for those deemed to be societal 'failures',[625] the writer even suggesting that,

> *"we should make it impossible for feeble-minded and similarly degenerate men and women to have children at all".*[626]

By 1914 the importance of the support the Cadburys provided in sustaining the Birmingham W.E.A had become even more evident, as this body continued to both enjoy the allegiance of the Bournville Works Education Committee and to steadily increase its number of attached A.S.s to 31.[627] Furthermore, this body had expanded to become one of the organisation's strongest, accounting for over a tenth of the 11,430 national membership.[628] This strength was similarly shown by Birmingham's dominance of the W.E.A. Midland District, in contributing over a third, 87, of the body's 254 affiliated societies,[629] and, with 1,152, more than half the District's individual membership of 1,901.[630]

As would be anticipated, the work of the Birmingham W.E.A. was very closely aligned to that pursued within other bodies which received the support and patronage of the Cadburys. Prominent throughout this work, for example, was its co-operation with its local Social Study Committee, initiating, in 1908/9, a series of lectures on 'Famous Birmingham Men',[631] alongside conducting Evening Lectures and Debates and Workers' University classes.[632] However, perhaps of greater importance in attaining its objective of securing a wider working class audience, was the assistance the body offered to the local A.S.s and, in particular, through organising a number of Educational Half-hour addresses on various aspects of social study.[633] These included many familiar Cadbury themes, such as 'Public Health and Housing', 'Sweating', 'Industrial History', and 'Economics and Social Progress of the 19th Century',[634] thereby acting as yet a further vehicle for the dissemination of the group's perspectives.

Almost immediately this became a mechanism which the Birmingham W.E.A. itself perceived to be highly effective. Their 3rd Annual Report, for example, gave a double illustration of this importance, in not only commenting that such lectures had resulted in their students conveying the knowledge they themselves had gained from the University Classes to a much 'wider audience',[635] but also in indicating the considerable scale of this scheme; this collaboration resulted, for example, in the local W.E.A arranging 216 lectures for various A.S.s during 1908/9,[636] a number which almost reached 300 the following year,[637] when further developments cemented these links.

Integral to this process and development was the collaboration between M.A.S.U. and the W.E.A. in the formation of a Joint Committee to organise lectures and administer the educational programme recommended by the M.A.S. Council,[638] a body which immediately displayed its considerable power in securing the services of 50 lecturers.[639] Whilst these services were also available to other organisations affiliated to the W.E.A.,[640] this A.S. link remained paramount, and one reflected by the nature of the the scheme its Honourary Secretary subsequently arranged. Between Sept. and Dec., 1910, for example, a total of 170 such addresses were organised on issues of contemporary concern. Approximately half of these, for example, related to industrial/social organisation, in including 36 on the 'Needs of Democracy', a course which embraced consideration of 'Child Labour', the 'Housing of the

Working Classes', and 'The Saving of Infant Life', whilst a further 51 lectures were given under the umbrella of 'The Development of Democracy', a programme which maintained this general theme, in containing such addresses as 'Sweating', 'The Growth of Democratic Government' and 'How the City is Governed'.[641]

Parallelling these efforts were attempts to broaden the W.E.A.'s appeal, perhaps most noticeably through the formation of a Women's Section, an action approved by the Birmingham W.E.A.'s Annual General Meeting in Oct. 1910,[642] and one which the local supplement to 'The Highway' described as being designed to arouse and focus the working women's interest in education.[643] Indeed the Birmingham W.E.A. clearly regarded this scheme as possessing considerable merit, this local supplement commenting in 1911 that,

> *"Not less valuable is the section as a means of extending the influence of the W.E.A. among the female members of the community. It is extremely difficult for an executive composed almost entirely of males to successfully approach either women's organisations, or those women outside any organisation, such as factory girls, shop assistants, clerks, the unmarried girls who are engaged in domestic duties, and housewives. A women's section can do this, however, and as a result the number of lady members of the branch is rapidly increasing".*[644]

This body, therefore, also clearly served another, additional, purpose, in operating as a vehicle for the dissemination of the W.E.A.'s moderate aims to a further, new, set of the working classes, who were correspondingly 'directed' in accordance with this group's beliefs. Consequently, whilst this programme included a study of women writers, its principal emphasis reflected the group's preoccupation with both the 'social question' and the responsibilities of women in contemporary society, in including subjects relating to caring/ domestic roles, such as the 'History of the Kindergarten System' and various aspects of child study, in addition to embracing wider social issues.[645] Indeed this latter activism also further illustrated their utilisation of collaborative links, with, for instance, the Cadbury associate Cecile Mattheson, Warden of the Birmingham Women's Settlement,[646](see earlier) lecturing on 'The Industrial Condition of Women', and efforts being initiated to organise a course concerned with social and economic problems 'as they affect women'.[647]

However, in common with each of the educational initiatives with which the Cadburys became associated, and despite its more overt nature, this programme was described by its advocates in language which tended to by-pass its proponents' political purpose, in favour of emphasising their quasi- religious reformist zeal. In 1911, for example, the Birmingham Supplement to 'The Highway' gave just such an evaluation, in commenting that:

> *"The members of the section, however, have not lost sight of their function as educational missionaries, and, besides the holding of classes and lectures, it is proposed to arrange deputations to girls' clubs, women's co-operative guilds, women's adult schools, etc., and, where possible, to form classes . . . All the large business houses in Birmingham have been approached with a view to arousing the interest of the female employees".*[648]

Subsequently this trend continued as the section flourished, containing over 500 members within three years,[649] whilst perhaps the most important aspect of its activism, as with the Cadbury A.S.s and their educational settlements, was that conducted as extension work.

In 1913, for example, the supplement reported that 44 of these lectures had been arranged for various local women's organisations such as Mothers' Meetings, Co-operative Guilds, and Women's A.S.s,[650] on the usual variety of child study/health subjects, together with those held under the auspices of the Industrial Law Committee and, being based upon contemporary changes in the industrial workers' rights, were designed to assist and inform such women and which, for instance, included the themes of, 'Public Health' 'Law' and the 'Trades Boards Act'.[651]

Throughout these experiences as the Birmingham W.E.A. increased its operations, influence and impact, the body attempted to preserve its image of political neutrality, its 1908/9 Annual Report merely commenting, for instance, that,

> *"the past year has again demonstrated the need for such an organisation as the W.E.A.. The Association has enabled many working-men to realise the necessity for, and the advantage of systematic reading and serious study, and it has established too a centre where men may meet and discuss various problems, free from party influence".*[652]

i.e. the organisation refusing to acknowledge that such discussions took place in an inherently conservative atmosphere, and one consequently certainly free from the influence of more radical analyses and propositions, a sentiment readily and frequently echoed by members of the Cadburys. In 1926, for instance, in 'Why We Want Education in Industry', George Cadbury Jnr utilised this fallacious apolitical image in praising the work of Fircroft College in imparting a sense of the vital importance for co-operation and communal life,[653] an argument, as was illustrated earlier, which was simultaneously employed to categorise any alternative economic interpretation as one lacking in intellectual rigour, or the consequence of a fundamental misunderstanding, i.e. as essentially invalid.

Such calls for an ostensibly politically neutral, mutually beneficial, extensive and co-ordinated education system for those working in industry, and especially for the youngest of this group, were also alluded to in the W.E.A.'s own vehicles. In 1914, for instance, Freeman argued that the modern British state needed to utilise the apparently wasted years of adolescence for continual training, to avoid the process whereby the,

> *"neat industrious scholar becomes an untidy lounger, who develops in his or her turn into an inefficient worker".*[654]

Moreover, he also illustrated another theme embraced by the Cadbury/W.E.A. lobby, in propounding the view that this education should be specifically designed to meet

20th century demands, and that consequently should include provision for health and physical training, alongside education for the vote.[655] Furthermore, Freeman also touched upon an issue receiving increasing contemporary attention, especially by both the Cadburys (see earlier) and the wider 'national efficiency' lobby, that of education along strictly delineated gender lines, i.e. boys undergoing a training which concentrated on industrial tasks, whilst girls received instruction in motherhood and domestic duties.[656]

As such, therefore, this article serves to illustrate and emphasise the considerable educational consensus between each of these highly influential bodies. This consensus was especially evident in the collaboration between the Cadburys and the W.E.A., advocates of this interrelationship arguing that it was fundamentally and principally based on the belief in the necessity for providing further education for the working classes on a national scale.

Equally, however, this was also a perspective heavily imbued with a political agenda, one frequently obscured under the guise of altruism or the exercise of new paternalism, i.e. 20th century philanthropy. Indeed, this is an assessment which could be accurately applied to the Cadburys' social and educational initiatives in aggregate, ostensibly operating as a pioneering system of welfare capitalism, these programmes were, however, designed and implemented with the prime aim of producing a working class populace (and incipient electorate) which valued and would consequently preserve the existing social and economic fabric.

Furthermore, when confronted by circumstances which posed a considerable potential threat to the potency of their message, this group reacted accordingly, in adapting and modernising the mechanisms through which this message was transmitted, i.e. as evidenced by the wholescale changes undertaken by M.A.S.U. and, in particular, by the Darwin Street branch of Birmingham's Severn Street Schools.

Similarly, newer agencies such as the B.D.C.S. and the Woodbrooke and Fircroft Educational Settlements were founded, funded and, largely, administered by the Cadburys, to augment these efforts with regard to both the Bournville workforce and the wider Birmingham populace. In particular they operated to advance and inculcate certain ideological beliefs, whilst simultaneously meeting the demands of an Edwardian working class whose vastly increased expectations, aspirations and political potential made them, ostensibly at least, a less passive and captive audience than previously. This concern was equally and similarly expressed by others sharing this social agenda and who likewise founded agencies for the national propagation of this message, the most influential of which, the W.E.A., both worked in direct collaboration with the Cadburys and received their considerable and continued financial patronage.

The consequent result was a plethora of organisations operating under this umbrella of mechanisms and agencies promoting moderate political perspectives, many of which were correspondingly interrelated and collaborative, overlapping in both purpose and personnel.

Whilst it is impossible to quantify the effect of this Cadbury educational involvement, it is, nevertheless, extremely pertinent to recognise that, in aggregate, it was both significant and enduring. Furthermore, this activism was of a wide-ranging nature, enabling the Cadburys to exert an influence upon both national politicians and political strategists, and on those amongst the working classes, within Birmingham in particular, whom this group sought to affect most directly.

Equally, and finally, alongside other involvements, voluntary and municipal, local and national, in numerous initiatives across a variety of social policy areas, this Cadbury participation formed a complementary and coherent social engineering programme, the main features of which will be briefly summarised in the final part of this study.

CONCLUSION

During the late Victorian and Edwardian years the Cadburys began an extensive and wide-ranging series of influential interventions in Britain's social and political life, interventions that were maintained throughout this period as they consequently continued to exert a considerable influence upon both the country's working classes and the nation's policy makers and implementors.

This Cadbury willingness to engage in a consistently increasing social involvement was both a consequence of the 19th century political emancipation of Britain's Nonconformists and a reflection of the Cadbury desire to counter and combat the perceived increasing domestic and international pressures and challenges to the country's political and economic system. Specifically their interventions sought to produce and maintain a 'socially responsible' and 'efficient' urban work force who would both further the cause of this capitalist industrial structure whilst also accommodating and satisfying the complementary contemporary themes of 'national efficiency' end 'the cult of the child'.

Furthermore, this involvement was extremely effective and influential, establishing the Cadburys in the vanguard of contemporary social reform, its three key features being: firstly, the creation of institutions which they primarily operated and controlled: secondly, the provision of considerable support, both financial and administrative, to other complementary social agencies: and, thirdly, assisting the establishment of an informal network of association amongst many of the principal figures of these agencies: a network pursuing a common social and political agenda within those interrelated voluntary and municipal bodies.

A fundamental aspect of this success was in persuading the considerable numbers of the working classes to reject more radical left-wing social and political remedies in favour of the more moderate perspectives which the Cadburys propounded and promoted through this involvement. Of vital importance to this process was their instrumental role in a number of campaigns which conveyed these perspectives and philosophy, and which frequently operated as covert social engineering programmes encouraging particular patterns of behaviour and, conversely, eradicating those traits and patterns deemed not conducive to capitalist industrial 'efficiency'.

Central to this success was the Cadbury achievement in both supporting and directly establishing permanent agencies to implement and administer their programme's social schemes, an achievement which both acknowledged and harnessed the latent power of the state in furthering these ostensibly 'welfare' policies. This was, however, a purpose which the Cadburys assiduously disguised, preferring to encourage notions of a politically benign state, assisted by similarly neutral municipal authorities. Similarly they encouraged the perception of their own actions as mere apolitical interventions designed to secure an objective apolitical structure through which their new paternalism would dispense 'social justice' to and for

the beleaguered working classes; this was an interpretation which viewed these actions as a form of altruism rather than those of a significantly influential political power broker consistently pursuing and promoting policies whose prime aim was the more efficient operation of the existing economic order, specifically through the implementation of a coherent programme of social and public health policies whose impact and values were essentially conducive to this aim.

Reflecting the opportunities afforded by the general rise of political activism within the Nonconformist movement, especially after the Education Act of 1902, together with the Society of Friends' reinterpretation of its contemporary social role, this Cadbury involvement also illustrated a concomitant rise in political ambition, and included both direct and indirect participation in such issues; the former, for example, involved the implementation of initiatives which remained under their control, supervision and direction, whilst their indirect activity included the promotion of parallel schemes sympathetic to their general social philosophy, a crucial aspect of which was the frequently vital and considerable financial patronage they bestowed on numerous voluntary and political bodies pursuing these schemes.

Perhaps the most important of these campaigns was that which laid the foundation for many subsequent state social reforms, in helping to secure the Liberal Party's general election success in 1906; this campaign was undertaken publicly through the Cadburys" Daily News', and less overtly, both locally and nationally, through the exercise of significant political influence in steering the Independent Labour Party and the Labour Representation Committee away from socialist principles and towards the adoption and pursuit of more moderate and pragmatic policies. However, perhaps this involvement's greatest impact was through the sponsorship of Jesse Herbert as Chief Permanent Secretary to the Liberal Chief Whip Herbert Gladstone, the subsequent principal broker of the Lib./Lab. pact which was instrumental both in achieving this Liberal victory and in determining the nature of radicalism subsequently pursued within Parliament; moreover, this was a victory which consequently provided a platform for the enactment of aspects of the Cadbury agenda through the implementation of specific social reforms which the Cadburys both advocated and promoted, and which was accompanied and reinforced by the groups' increasingly overt politicisation, frequently expressed among leading Cadburys, by a rising public profile and desire for public office.

Accordingly, this agenda was pursued through two distinct channels: firstly by the promotion of specific campaigns which the Cadburys publicly and forcefully advanced, such as that against the practice of sweated trades, and that which advocated a state system of old age pensions: and secondly through the utilisation of influential positions both within municipal bodies and powerful pressure groups such as the National Council of Women. Significantly, as such, this was also a strategy which enabled the Cadburys to significantly affect the adoption and implementation of government policies, both local and national, including, for example, the introduction of the medical inspection and treatment of school children and, more contentiously, the Mental Deficiency Act of 1913, (see below).

However, whilst these issues were portrayed as being of undeniable benefit to the working classes, in attempting to impose an irrefutable, objective and apolitical form of 'social justice' through the political system, in reality these efforts contained a considerable subtext significantly underpinning this supposed intent; accordingly these efforts, in essence, being of a gradualist and palliative nature, were of principal benefit to middle class industrialists such as the Cadburys, through the wider dual purposes of both perpetuating the existing economic structure whilst establishing and maintaining a 'fit', 'efficient' and politically compliant, work force.

Similarly, the Cadburys' involvement in other specific causes was primarily motivated by this submerged, if not covert, agenda. Consequently, for example, their efforts to promote further temperance legislation were publicly advocated as a means by which individuals could significantly improve their physical health. However, these actions were more accurately attributable to a general Liberal desire to reverse earlier Tory statutes; furthermore, crucially, they also possessed this economic/'efficiency' dimension, alongside the more overt political purpose of discouraging the working classes from assembling in perhaps the one area where they were free to discuss political matters away from middle class supervision, direction and indeed surveillance.

This perspective also underlay the Cadbury support for institutions such as the Agatha Stacey Homes which, ostensibly, dispensed paternalism to, primarily, working class, 'feeble-minded' adults, (women rather than men); moreover, this was a 'paternalism' which was clearly eugenic in nature, and as such represented an attempt to avoid further 'deterioration' of the race, as the eugenicists perceived contemporary British trends, by isolating and removing this potentially fecund group from mainstream society, a condoning of practices which reveals the Cadburys as possessing a cynical and dismissive perception of their fellow Christians. Further, this perception was similarly expressed through the Cadburys' membership of and activism within bodies such as the Birmingham Heredity Society and the National Council of Women, bodies which consistently and influentially campaigned for the extension of restrictive legislation regarding these individuals, including the Mental Deficiency Act of 1913, whose effect was to substantially restrict the liberty of considerable numbers of the working classes.

This Cadbury programme was essentially coherent, utilising recurring and interrelated themes and implicit messages to reinforce its effectiveness throughout all aspects of the working classes' lives. Frequently, for example, their interventions were portrayed as efforts to recapture a lost morality and 'decency', encouraging and enforcing notions of acceptable behaviour, in return for some material benefit or comfort, including employment, education and housing, whilst offering 'professional' end 'informed' advice which manipulated and channelled working class behaviour patterns into those which conformed with those of the Cadbury group themselves.

This was illustrated in 1926, for example, when Elizabeth Cadbury utilised the 'Daily News' to evaluate the effects of the female emancipation movement extremely negatively,

in particular, equating such changes with a lamentable loss of self discipline, Cadbury sought to further locate women firmly within the domestic (and dependent) arena, in arguing that the majority had neither the capacity nor the inclination to become the family's principal wage earner.[1]

Correspondingly, this was a perspective which underlay numerous initiatives with which the Cadburys were associated, in confining the role of 'suitable' working class women to that of 'motherhood'; this was a perspective also encouraged by central and local state agencies, and, indeed, reinforced by voluntary bodies such as the Birmingham Women's Settlement, whilst efforts were made through the Agatha Stacey Homes and mental deficiency legislation to remove from mainstream society those working class women deemed 'unsuitable' for such a role, an effort complemented both by the Cadburys' temperance work and, probably of greatest effect, through their most direct social involvement, with the founding of their own initiatives in the arenas of housing and education.

Accordingly, boys and girls at the Bournville Works' compulsory classes, as well as pupils at the Bournville Day Continuation School, underwent this social engineering programme whilst the Bournville Village Trust encouraged the adoption of middle class aspirations and values, alongside their concomitant political judgements upholding the capitalist status quo. However, this was a programme which, nevertheless, projected the Cadburys as a wholly apolitical, if not altruistic, group pursuing the goal of social justice through the mechanisms of democracy, arbitration and self-government, whilst simultaneously inculcating their perspectives denying the existence of conflicting class interests; correspondingly, this was a perspective which was promoted through these initiatives, through, for example, their compulsory work based educational schemes or regulations imposed on the Bournville tenants, 'encouraging' this working class populace to embrace middle class political values and perspectives aspirations, with particular regard to Cadburys' own such beliefs, and which imposed extremely stringent regulations on its tenants and their social activities, as a way of modulating and manipulating working class behaviour, aspirations and beliefs,

Such efforts to uphold, perpetrate and 'improve' the existing structure were, nevertheless, promoted as a considerable if not extensive reform of Britain's social provision, establishing models and patterns for future public and private sector emulation, whilst dismissing as both undesirable and ignorant any more radical left wing economic arguments. Indeed, the attempt to encourage perceptions of a consensus/common interest between industrialists and workers, between middle class employers and their working class work force was a standard theme echoed in many of the bodies with which the Cadburys became associated, perhaps most notably through those agencies they directly controlled.

This increased profile is also of note for its interrelationship of personnel across many associated and inter-linking social areas and agencies, thereby consolidating the coherence

this wide ranging programme. This network of personnel was particularly involved in the delivery of public health 'educational' lectures to local voluntary sector bodies whose audiences were primarily women; these were lectures which correspondingly reinforced the Cadbury message amongst both its working class and middle class, social activist, recipients and which consequently represented its transmission on a sustained and extremely wide scale.

However, this facet of the Cadbury programme was perhaps most evident with regard to the educational activities undertaken by the Cadburys, especially with regard to Birmingham's Education Committee, where Elizabeth Cadbury's work brought her into frequent contact with many leading members of the local eugenic association, such as Ellen Hume Pinsent, the city's Medical Officer of Health, Dr Robertson, and fellow committee members Cary Gilson and Dr. Potts, an association replicated in other, more obviously less altruistic agencies, such as the Birmingham Heredity Society and the Agatha Stacey Homes. Indeed, with so many of the City of Birmingham Education Committee displaying this eugenic association, the municipal authority's 'welfare' policies were consequently being formulated and administered by those with a vested, though not necessarily financial, interest in their operation, i.e. as part of a policy of promoting a healthy urban population excluding numerous numbers of this populace by both segregating and institutionalising them.

A further related feature of this Cadbury social interventionism was its wider impact, its messages forming an agenda common to other bodies, both national and local, with whom the Cadburys collaborated in pursuit of this common agenda. This was, for example, evident in the association of the Cadburys with the National Housing Reform Council in their efforts to further the Garden City ideal, the Bournville Village Trust and its tenets being promoted as a model/prototype for widespread national emulation.

This process was, however, most observable in the Cadbury educational involvement, where, more than in any other area of social activity, the Cadburys openly displayed their social programme, and the extent of their desire for its fulfilment. This was an involvement which was of considerable significance even in its initial form, as, operating through organs such as the Adult School movement, principal members of the group influenced large numbers of Birmingham's working classes over an extensive period. However, as the Victorian era drew to a close this participation entered a new, more ambitious phase illustrating the Cadbury desire to effect social and educational changes on a wider scale, and their willingness to utilise and exploit a familiar arena in furtherance of both this and their social programme in general.

This phase, a response to concems regarding the perceived failure of the contemporary Adult School message, included the implementation of policies which displayed the Cadburys' new public assertiveness and which possessed two principal distinctive characteristics. Firstly, as part of a sustained attempt to gain the trust, support and

compliance of some of the poorest of Birmingham's working classes, (those potentially most susceptible to more radical solutions), by expanding this Adult School involvement, and, crucially, locating this expansion within this populace's most familiar surroundings. Secondly, to maximise the dissemination of their social message, this activism began to include a national dimension through liaison and collaboration with leading figures in this movement, such as Edwin Gilbert, Edward Grubb and G Currie Martin with the introduction and operation of Cadburys' own educational initiatives, the Settlements of Woodbrooke and Fircroft.

Accordingly, both this Adult School expansion and these Educational Settlements pursued policies and programmes designed to counter perceived defciencies within the Quaker and general working class adult education arena, improving the dissemination of the Cadbury social message, whilst reinforcing its effectiveness by liaising with and consequently supplementing the work of other moderate bodies in this social arena. Fircroft was particularly illustrative of this process, operating closely alongside the local and national Workers' Educational Association, an organisation which also received the support of the Cadburys, in encouraging ostensibly noble and politically neutral notions such as 'citizenship', but which in reality were entirely subjective and indeed heavily political in nature. These notions consequently served as a smokescreen for the propagation of a given (middle class) value system, denying the existance of conflicting class interests, and diverting attention away from more radical economic analyses of contemporary society, throughout the potentially volatile social and political climate of late Victorian and Edwardian Britain.

In summary, both in their educational involvement and indeed through each of their social and political interventions discussed in this thesis the Cadburys offer a diametric opposition to Eden and Cedar Paul's 1921 assertion that Adult School literature was characterised by a lack of direction,[2] and its logical corollary that both its teachers and messages were essentially apolitical. On the contrary, throughout this involvement the Cadburys were both extremely active and zealous in propounding their political beliefs and 'consensus' perspectives and, specifically, in proposing their models, disseminating these perpsectives, as a remedial solution for 20th century industrial Britain; indeed, these were models which, alongside the consistent support the Cadburys offered other, complementary, initiatives, formed a coherent programme through which they exerted a sustained degree of considerable influence on contemporary Britain's social and political development.

Moreover, this was a programme which successfully disguised the more overt and, indeed, sinister, political aspects of its message, whilst substantially achieving its numerous objectives, the greatest testimony to this success being the wide scale and largely unchallenged acceptance of many of its central 'apolitical' assumptions and statements, and the subsequent widespread development of many of the bodies and causes with which the Cadburys were associated, if not, indeed, synonymous.

REFERENCES

INTRODUCTION

1 Wagner (1987) p159

2 Williams (1931) p1920

CHAPTER 1

1 (1960) p99

2 (1) 1970 p219/20

3 Society of Friends (S.O.F.) Year Book 1895, p3/4, 21/2

4 Vipont op cit p141

5 Isichei op cit pXXI

6 J W Rowntree (1906) p66

7 Payne (1965) p94

8 J S Rowntree (1859) p185

9 Ibid p183/4

10 Ibid p185

11 Isichei op cit p142

12 Vipont op cit p222

13 S.O.F. Year Book 1858 p14

14 Chadwick (1966) p435

15 S.O.F. Year Book 1858 p14

16 op cit 1866 p7

17 op cit 1886 p8

18 op cit 1896 p13

19 Chadwick op cit p435

20 Ibid p435

21 J W Rowntree op cit p36

22 Vipont op cit p224

23 J W Rowntree op cit p36

24 Isichei op cit p75/84

25 Ibid p155

26 Ibid p154

27 Scott (1955) p22

28 The Friend 1880 p143

29 Vipont op cit p222/4

30 Koss (1975) p21

31 Isichei op cit p75

32 Ibid p73, p75

33 Ibid p99

34 Ibid p100

35 Ibid pXXI

36 Vipont op cit p224/5

37 Isichei op cit p258

38 Ibid p259

39 Ibid p263

40 Ibid p258

41 Vipont op cit p225

42 Isichei op cit p106

43 Ibid p190

44 Koss op cit p227/36

45 Isichei op cit p167

46 Ibid p281

47 Payne op cit p103

48 Isichei op cit pXIX

49 Ibid p214

50 Isichei (2) 1964

51 Thomson (1972) p16/7

52 Payne op cit p144

53 Ibid p149

54 Dale (1899) p250

55 Isichei (1) op cit p156

56 Thompson (1980) p33

57 Harrison (1977) p195

58 Ibid p195

59 Sellers (1977) p41

60 Davies (1963) p161

61 Routley (1960) p166

62 Beales (1969) p197

63 Sellers op cit p198

64 Ibid p42

65 Beales op cit p198

66 Ibid p225, p229

67 Ibid p245

68 Ensor (1988) p55

69 Sellers op cit p42

70 Beales op cit p198

71 Payne op cit p110

72 Koss op cit p20

73 Ibid p21

74 Ibid p24

75 Isichei op cit p201

76 Beales op cit p196

77 Ibid p246, p258

78 Ibid p258

79 Inglis (1) (1964) p63/4

80 Davies op cit p176

81 Routley op cit p168

82 Tudor Jones (1962) p317
83 Kean (x1990) p23
84 Simon (1965) p30
85 Ibid p31
86 Ibid p33
87 Ibid p33
88 Ibid p33
89 Inglis op cit p67
90 Payne op cit p117
91 Ibid p64
92 Ibid p66
93 Ibid p64
94 Inglis (2) in Past & Present, Vol No 13, April 1958, p74
95 Ibid p74
96 Kent in Bennett & Walsh (1966), p187
97 Ibid p204
98 Inglis (1) op cit p70
99 Ibid p69
100 Inglis (2) op cit p74
101 Ibid p73
102 Bebbington (1982) p65
103 Gardiner (1923) p177
104 Bebbington op cit p68
105 Gardiner op cit p179
106 Bebbington op cit p68
107 G Cadbury (1898) p14
108 Routley op cit p183
109 G Cadbury op cit p14
110 Koss op cit p35
111 Tudor Jones op cit p318
112 Inglis (2) op cit p73
113 Livingstone (1977) p201
114 Inglis (2) op cit p74
115 Payne op cit p108
116 Davies op cit p177
117 Ibid p184
118 Inglis (2) op cit p83
119 Sellers op cit p89/90
120 Inglis (2) op cit p78
121 Ibid p78
122 The British Friend 1893 p176
123 Isichei (1) op cit p12
124 Ibid p113
125 Vipont op cit p234
126 Present Day Papers, Vol 2, Sept 1899, p20
127 Isichei (1) op cit p33
128 Ibid p36
129 Ibid p35
130 S.O.F. Year Book 1895 p34
131 Ibid p55
132 The Times 15/11/95, p10
133 The Manchester Conference 1895: Report of the Proceedings of the Conference of Members of the Society of Friends (1896) pVII
134 Ibid pV
135 Ibid pVII
136 Ibid pIV
137 Ibid p151
138 S.O.F. Year Book 1896 p22
139 Ibid p22
140 Ibid p22
141 Ibid p23
142 Manchester Conference Report, op cit p147
143 Ibid p146
144 The British Friend 1895 p338
145 Ibid p339
146 Manchester Conference Report, op cit p171
147 Ibid p186
148 Ibid p186
149 Grubb(1) (1893) p10
150 The British Friend 1895 p338
151 Ibid p339/40
152 G Cadbury op cit p9
153 Manchester Conference Report, op cit p139
154 Ibid p138
155 The British Friend 1895 p344
156 Manchester Conference Report, op citp 206
157 S.O.F. Year Book 1896 p23
158 Ibid p23
159 Grubb in Birmingham Summer School Report (1899) p128
160 Ibid p129
161 Present Day Papers, Vol 2 1899 p22
162 The Sunday Times, 17/11/95 p8
163 The Friend 22/11/95 p749
164 S.O.F. Year Book 1896 p24
165 Isichei(1) up cit p41
166 Ibid p41
167 Vipont op cit p235
168 Isichei(1) op cit p41
169 S.O.F. Year BooK 1896 p35
170 op cit 1899 p87
171 op cit 1900 p89
172 op cit 1901 p75
173 op cit 1900 p89
174 op cit 1902 p92
175 op cit 1903 p88

176 Ibid p87
177 Ibid p87/8
178 S.O.F. Year Book 1896 p423
179 Elizabeth Cadbury in The Friends' Quarterley Examiner Vol XXXIII, 1899 p81
180 The Friends' Quarterley Examiner Vol XXXV11, 1903 p537/8
181 Present Day Papers Vol 2 1899 Jan p22
182 The British Friend 1900 p36
183 Present Day Papers Vol 2 1899 July p6
184 op cit 1899 Dec p3
185 Ibid p30
186 The British Friend 1900 p36
187 op cit 1903 p34
188 The Friend 1903 p261
189 Elizabeth Cadbury (1896 unpub) Ms 466/152/4 p4 Cadbury Papers Archives Dept Birmingham Central Library
191 Present Day Papers Vol 2 1899 Jan p22
192 Ibid p23
193 Grubb(3) in The Friends' Quarterley Examiner, Vol XXXVIII 1904 p473-5
194 Ibid p478/84
195 Vipont op cit p226
196 Eliz Cadbury in Muirhead (1911) p231
197 Grubb(3) op cit p 473
198 Isichei(1) op cit p256
199 Grubb(3) op cit p478
200 Ibid p481
201 Ibid p484
202 Ibid p486
203 G Cadbury op cit p6
204 Isichei(1) op cit p243
205 Ibid p256
206 Ibid p273
207 Ibid p42
208 Koss op cit p35
209 S.O.F. Year Book 1897 p121
210 The Friend 1902 p209
211 Ibid P257
212 S.O.F. Year Book 1902 p58/9
213 Ensor op cit p357
214 The Friend 1902 p789
215 op cit 1906 p250
216 Simon op cit p217/8
217 S.O.F. Year Book 1903 p18
218 Ibid p18/9
219 Simon op cit p290
220 Ibid p304
221 Ibid p304
222 Ibid p304

CHAPTER 2

1 Bebbington (1982) p58
2 Ibid p13
3 Stevenson in Pimlott (1984) p21
4 Peacock in Bryman (1975) p15
5 Booth (1902) p423
6 Reeder in Reeder (1977) p79
7 Ibid p79
8 Ashford (1986) p78
9 The Times 17/12/01 p10
10 Ibid p10
11 Ibid p10
12 A/10/1/42nd Lloyd George Papers House of Lord Library, London
13 Ensor (1985) p613
14 Ibid p613
15 Jenkins (1964) p132/3
16 Daily Mail 22/3/02 Ms 1536 Box 10 p1 Bournville Village Trust Archives, Archives Dept, Central Library, Birmingham
17 Ibid 22/3/02
18 Daily News 19/8/01 p2
19 The Fabian News Nov 1901 p33
20 Webb (1901) p7
21 Ibid p8
22 Ibid p9
23 Ibid p14
24 Ibid p7
25 Scally (1975) p50
26 Searle (1971) p61
27 Scally op cit p50/1
28 Radice (1984) p146
29 Scally op cit p51
30 1/8 30/7/18 A G Gardiner Papers, Archives Dept, London School of Economic and Political Science, London
31 Stevenson op cit (1984) p24
32 Scally op cit p36
33 Radice op cit p146
34 Ibid p146
35 Ibid p146
36 Searle op cit p141
37 Brennan in Brennan (ed) (1975) p9

38 Searle op cit p76

39 Ibid p76

40 Thompson (1967) p212/3

41 Ibid p212/3

42 Brennan op cit p13/4

43 Thompson op cit p223/4

44 Pelling (1976) p118

45 Kean (1990) p25/8

46 Ibid p33

47 Ibid p30

48 Ibid p25/7

49 Reeder op cit p79

50 Ibid p92

51 Ibid p92

52 Urwick (1912) p250

53 Ibid p250/1

54 Ibid p251

55 Ibid p266

56 The Christian World 23/6/04 Ms 1536 Box 10 p145 Bournville Village Trust Archives

57 Reeder op cit p79

58 The British Monthly May 1901 Friend's House Library Press Cuttings BB199 Friend's House Library, London

59 Elizabeth Cadbury (1)(1896 unpub) Ms 466/152/4 p4 Cadbury Papers Archive Dept Central Library Birmingham

60 The Friends' Quarterly Examiner vol XXXVI 1902 p3

61 S.O.F. Year Books 1898 p23 1906 p51 1901 p46 1911 p71

62 op cit 1903 p18/9

63 The Friends' Quarterly Examiner vol XXXVII 1903 p373-95

64 op cit vol XXXVIII 1904 p73

65 Ibid p110

66 Ibid p116

67 S.O.F. Year Books 1903 p87 1904 p96

68 op cit 1906 p55

69 op cit 1907 p68

70 Ibid p70

71 op cit 1909 p108

72 Ibid p114/5 op cit 1910 p156 for sample

73 Hodgkin in The Friends' Quarterly Examiner, vol XXXVI 1902 p 320

74 S.O.F. Year Book 1907 p69

75 Harvey in The Friends' Quarterly Examiner vol XXXXI 1907 p275/6

76 S.O.F. Year Book 1908 p96

77 Ibid p98

78 op cit 1910 p157

79 Ibid 156

80 Ibid p156

81 Ibid p156

82 Ibid p156

83 op cit 1896 p10 1906 p20

84 Ibid p13 Ibid p23 respectively

85 op cit 1906 p20

86 op cit 1909 p114

87 op cit 1907 p69

88 Isichei in The British Journal of Sociology vol 15 (1964) p207/8

89 Ibid p216

90 Birmingham N.U.W.W. Historical Notes, no page (Ms 841) Archives of the Birmingham N.U.W.W. Archives Dept. Central Library Birmingham

91 op cit Prelimary notes - no page

92 op cit 841/311 p1

93 op cit Prelimary notes - no page

94 Elizabeth Cadbury (2) 1906 unpub, (3) 1907 unpub Ms 466/152/10 Ms 466/152/11 Cadbury Papers

95 Elizabeth Cadbury (3) op cit p12

96 Elizabeth Cadbury (4) in The Women Teacher's World 6/3/12 p1, op cit Ms 466/152/15 (1912)

97 Elizabeth Cadbury (5)(1929 unpub) Ms 466/165/1 p10

98 Ad Ms VG 46058 ff120 Oct 1900 Herbert Gladstone Papers, Archives Dept. The British Library, London

99 The Weekly News 23/11/95 Ms 466/159/1 Cadbury Papers

100 The Free Churchman, Jan 1898 p4

101 Jordan (1956) p38

102 Ibid p247/8

103 Routley (1960) p183

104 Bebbington op cit p82

105 Ibid p73

106 Jordan op cit p49/51

107 Ibid p51

108 Ibid p37

109 Ibid p37

110 Ibid p51

111 Ibid p57

112 Ibid p57

113 West Midlands Federation of Evangelical Free Churches Council, Work and Notes No.2, March 1904 no page

114 Ibid no page

115 Jordan op cit p57

116 West Midlands Federation of Evangelical Free Churches Council, Work and Notes op cit No.4, March 1904 no page

117 op cit no.1 Nov 1903 p4

118 op cit no.2 March 1904 p10, no.5 Dec 1905 p4, no.6 July 1906 p4

119 op cit no.2 March 1904 p1

120 Hughes in British Journal of Educational Studies Vol.8 (1959) no.1 p120

121 See Bebbington op cit p76/8

122 Thompson op cit p250

123 Ibid p248

124 A/12/1/58nd Lloyd George Papers

125 Ibid B/4/2/24 nd

126 Koss (1) (1975) p48

127 Ibid p38

128 A/11/2/3 nd Lloyd George Papers

129 The Friend 5/12/02 p790

130 Simon (1965) p253

131 Free Church Year Book 1904 p208

132 Ibid p210

133 Ibid p209

134 West Midlands Federation of Evangelical Free Churches Council, Work and Notes No.1, Nov 1903 p8

135 West Midlands Federation of Evangelical Free Churches Council, 8th Annual Report 1904 p10

136 Free Church Year Book 1904 p209

137 Daily News 1/8/03 p7

138 Free Church Year Book 1904 p210

139 Bebbington op cit p77

140 Ibid p77

141 Ibid p77

142 Ibid p77

143 A/2/31 nd Lloyd George Papers

144 Jordan op cit p92

145 West Midlands Federation of Evangelical Free Churches Council, Work and Notes No.4, May 1905 p2

146 Jordan op cit p92

147 Ibid p93

148 Free Church Year Book 1904 p211

149 Lee in Morris (1974) p87

150 Free Church Year Book 1904 p210/1

151 Jordan op cit p93

152 Bebbington op cit p78

153 Jordan op cit p101

154 Ibid p92

155 Ibid p101

145 West Midlands Federation of Evangelical Free Churches Council, Work and Notes No.4, May 1905 p14

157 24/119 16/6/05 Labour Representation Committee Correspondence, Achives of the British labour Party, Central Library, Birmingham

158 op cit 27/107 7/11/05

159 Bebbington op cit p189

160 Koss (1) op cit p227/8

161 Ibid p227/8

162 Ibid p227/8

163 Daily News 3/3/06 p8

164 The Times 3/7/06 p10

165 op cit 8/3/06 p10

166 Gardiner (1923) p74/5

167 1/8 13/11/03 p2 AG Gardiner papers

168 op cit 1/8 11/2/04 p2

169 Gardiner op cit p74/5

170 Ibid p76

171 Ad Ms 46057 f173 31/5/99 H Gladstone Papers

172 op cit Ad Ms 46058 ff45 13/9/00
Ad Ms 46059 ff218 9/6/02
Ad Ms 46060 ff201 29/5/03
Ad Ms 46061 ff234 31/5/04
Ad Ms 46063 ff1 2/6/05

173 op cit Ad Ms 46058 ff45 13/9/00

174 Ibid 13/9/00

175 op cit Ad Ms 46058 ff87 25/9/00

176 I.L.P. News Oct 1900 p5

177 Adelman (1972) p108

178 Ibid p108

179 Ibid p108

180 Douglas (1971) p74

181 Ibid p75

182 Ad Ms 46026 F190/1 nd H Gladstone Papers

183 Ibid f190/1

184 op cit Ad Ms 46060 f201 29/5/03

185 1900/65 14/2/00, 1900/66 19/2/00 Francis Johnson Correspondence, Archives of the Independant Labour Party, Central Library, Birmingham

186 Gardiner op cit p78

187 1903/43 25/3/03 Francis Johnson Correspondence

188 Ad Ms 41215 f148 Campbell Bannerman Papers, British Library, London

189 1903/43 25/3/03 Francis Johnson Correspondence

190 Ibid p25/3/03

191 I.L.P. News Oct 1900

192 1900/65 14/2/00, 1900/66 19/2/00 Francis Johnson Correspondence

196 Ibid 11/482 9/11/03
11/481 4/11/03
11/485 26/11/03

197 Birmingham Daily Mail 18/1/06 p4

198 17/25 25/11/04 Labour Representation Committee Correspondence

199 1905/187 5/12/05 p1 Francis Johnson Correspondence

200 Ad Ms 46058 ff120 2/1/00 H Gladstone Papers

201 1905/1 2/1/05 Francis Johnson Correspondence

202 Ibid 2/1/05

203 op cit 1905/192 7/12/05

204 Brand (1964) p19

205 Ad Ms 46061 ff106 7/1/05
Ad Ms 46060 f201 29/5/03 H Gladstone Papers

206 1/7 30/12/18 A G Gardiner Papers

207 1904/62 20/12/04 Francis Johnson Correspondence

208 Ad Ms 46061ff106 7/1/05 H Gladstone Papers

209 Barnsby (1989) p368

210 The Socialist Aug 1905 p8

211 Barnsby op cit p382

212 The Socialist Oct 1904 p6

213 Barnsby op cit p371

214 Ibid p371

215 6/372 11/1/03 Labour Representation Committee Correspondence

216 1903/99 17/5/03 Francis Johnson Correspondence

217 op cit 1903/80 4/5/03

218 Ibid 4/5/03

219 op cit 1903/200 nd

220 op cit 1903/86 6/5/03

221 op cit 1903/99 17/5/03
1903/104 20/5/03

222 9/40 2/6/03 Labour Representation Committee Correspondence

223 op cit 9/415/6/03

224 1903/35 19/6/03 Francis Johnson Correspondence

225 9/46 5/7/03 Labour Representation Committee Correspondence

226 op cit 9/43 9/6/03

227 Ibid 9/6/03

228 op cit 28/5 16/12/05

229 Russell in (1973) Appendix J

230 Lee op cit p47

231 Ibid p47

232 Gardiner op cid p216/7

233 Ibid p216/7

234 Koss (2) (1981) p407

235 Koss (3) (1984) p42

236 Ibid p42

237 Lee op cit p53

238 Koss (3) op cit p42

239 Lee op cit p53

240 Wagner (1987) p73

241 1/7 11/2/04 p3 A G Gardiner Papers

242 Ibid 1/7 17/4/17 p1

243 Koss (3) op cid p398

244 Gardiner op cid p218

245 Koss (2) op cid p398

246 Ibid p402

247 Ibid p40

248 Ad Ms 46059 ff103 19/12/01
H Gladstone Papers

249 Koss (2) p401

250 Ibid p402

251 Ibid p403

252 Gardiner op cit p219

253 Ibid p218

254 Wagner op cit p77, p80

255 Ibid p82

256 Gardiner op cit p235

257 Koss (2) op cit p401

258 Gardiner op cit p221

259 Ad Ms 46059 ff218 9/6/02
H Gladstone Papers

260 1903/82 4/5/03 Francis Johnson Correspondence

261 Daily News 1/3/02 p4

262 Daily News op cit 3/3/02 p6

263 15/12/02 p6

264 18/12/02 p5

265 Koss (1) op cit p40

266 Douglas op cit p68

267 Ibid p68

268 Ibid p71

269 1/8 18/1/04 A G Gardiner Papers

270 Gardiner op cit p217

271 271 Ad Ms 46059 ff218 9/6/02
H Gladstone Papers, see also 1902/62 29/5/02 Francis Johnson Correspondence

272 Ad Ms 46061 ff234 31/5/04

273 op cit 46061 ff106 7/1/04

274 Daily News 5/8/03 p3

275 Ibid p6

276 op cit 11/12/05 p6

277 Ibid p6

278 op cit 28/12/05 p5

279 Ad Ms 46063 ff240 27/12/05
H Gladstone Papers

280 1905/192 7/12/05 Francis Johnson Correspondence

281 Daily News 18/12/05 p3, 20/12/05 p10, 26/12/05 p4

282 op cit 28/12/05 p5

283 Emy (1973) p101

284 Daily News 20/1/06 p7

285 op cit 16/2/06 p8

286 Ad Ms 46061 ff234 31/5/04 H Gladstone Papers

287 Ad Ms 46298 ff103 15/12/02 J Burns Papers, British Library, London

288 Daily News 18/12/02 p11

289 Ibid p11

290 24/2089 8/6/05 Labour Representation Committee Correspondence

291 Daily News 27/10/05 p12

292 Ibid p12

293 op cit 28/10/05 p7

294 op cit 30/10/05 p6

295 27/107 31/10/05 Labour Representation Committee Correspondence

296 op cit 27/109 2/11/05

297 Hopkins in Brown (1985) p116

298 Ibid p172

299 Birmingham Trades Council Minute Book 1899 1/4/99

300 Gilbert (1) (1970) p187

301 Ibid p190/1

302 The Times 27/3/99 p12

303 Birmingham Trades Council op cit 1/4/99

304 The Times 26/1/99 p12

305 op cit 13/3/99 p12

306 op cit 27/3/99 p12

307 25/1/00 p12

308 Halévy (1961) p236

309 Ibid p236

310 1903/92 11/5/03 Francis Johnson Correspondence

311 The Times 16/9/07 p8

312 National Committee for the Promotion of Old Age Pensions (NCOL) 10th Ann Rep. P3

313 Elizabeth Cadbury (2) op cit p1

314 op cit Ms 466/213/1 p1

315 NCOL op cit p22

316 Ibid p17

317 Gilbert (2) (1966) p188

318 Cross (1963) p68

319 Webb op cit p8/9

320 Hay in Social History Jan 1977 p443

321 Ibid p443/4

322 Birmingham Chamber of Commerce Year Book 1905 p19

323 The Times 6/3/99 p3

324 Ibid p3

325 Koss (1) op cit p241

326 Emy op cit p241

327 Ibid p113/4

328 Gardiner op cit p98

329 Williams (1931) p126/7

330 Gardiner op cit p99

331 Bythell (1978) p235

332 Ibid p235

333 Ibid p235

334 Daily News 25/12/02 p11

335 Bythell op cit p235

336 Daily News 2/5/06 p6

337 H W Smith in R Mudie-Smith (1906) p17

338 Daily News 23/2/06 p7

339 Mudie-Smith op cit p7

340 Ibid p2

341 Daily News 23/2/06 p7

342 8/6 nd General Corrspondence of the British Labour Party, Central Library, Birmingham

343 Ibid 8/6 nd

344 op cit 16/5 6/6/07

345 Daily News 3/5/06 p8

346 The Times 22/4/07 p15

347 Ibid 26/4/07 p10

348 Ad Ms 46064 ff187 22/5/07 H Gladstone Papers

349 The Times 22/7/08 p7

350 Bythell op cit p235

351 Ibid p234/5

352 Ibid p235

353 The Times 15/11/09 p8

354 op cit 23/07/09 p6
15/12/12 p12

355 op cit 15/11/09 p8

356 op cit 6/12/14 p10

357 Ibid p10

358 op cit 18/12/12 p12

359 The Friend 24/05/07 p335

360 Reynold's News 16/5/06 p1

361 Elizabeth Cadbury (2) op cit p4

362 Ms 1196/2 Bournville Women's Guild Diary 1910-32, Bournville Women's Guild Archives, Archive Dept, Central Library, Birmingham 13/11/12 no page

363 Bythell op cit p236

364 7/327 27/7/06 General Correspondence of the British Labour Party

365 op cit 16/6 11/6/07

366 The Times 22/4/07 p15
367 op cit 16/09/07 p8
368 Elizabeth Cadbury (2) op cit p4, p6
369 S.O.F. Yr Bk 1910 p159
370 Ibid p159
371 Smith op cit p7/8
372 Ibid p8
373 The Times 27/10/06 p3
374 Birmingham Daily Post 27/10/06 p14
375 Daily News 3/5/06 p7
376 Labour Leader 11/5/06 p744
377 The Socialist May 1906 p4
387 Bythell op cit p245
379 Ibid p245/6
380 The Times 25/10/06 p15
381 Women Workers, The Quarterly Journal of the Birmingham National Union of Working Women Vol XV June 1905 fly
382 The Friend 3/11/05 p725
383 The Times 10/2/08 p10

CHAPTER 3

1 Rimlinger (1971) p60
2 Bournville Village Trust Deed (1) 1900 p1 Central Library Birmingham
3 Ms 1536/Box 5 17/2/16 p1, BVT Achives, Archives Dept, Central Library,Birmingham
4 Atkins in Tilson (1989) p4
5 Harvey (1906) p9
6 Atkins op cit p35
7 Ibid p35 (1909)
8 Elizabeth Cadbury (1) (1909 unpub) Ms 466/152/12 p12/3 Cadbury Papers. Archive Dept, Central Library, Birmingham
9 National Housing Reform Council (1906) p17
10 Gardiner (1923) p95
11 Bournville - Lantern Lecture (1936) p5
12 Atkins op cit p37
13 Ibid p37
14 Harvey op cit p12
15 Ibid p12
16 Ibid p12
17 Atkins op cit p39
18 Gardiner op cit p143/4
19 Harvey op cit p12
20 BVT (1955) p3
21 Atkins op cit p41
22 Ibid p40
23 Whitehouse (1901) p162
24 G Wade in 'The Temple' 1900 Ms 1536, BVT Archives, Box 37
25 Whitehouse op cit p162
26 Harvey op cit p12
27 BVT op cit p1
28 BVT op cit p12
29 Lantern Lecture op cit p5
30 Ibid p5
31 Deed(1) op cit p1
32 Harvey op cit p12
33 BVT op cit p23
34 Birmingham News 28/10/22 p1 Ms 1536/37 p1, BVT Archives
35 Ibid p5/6
36 BVT op cit p23
37 Birmingham News 28/10/22 p2
38 Deed(1) op cit p1
39 Deed(2) 1950 p'note'
40 Deed(1) op cit p5
41 Deed(2) op cit p5
42 Deed(1) op cit p3
43 Ibid p3
44 Ibid p3
45 Ibid p8
46 Ibid p8
47 Minutes of the S.O.F. Meetings for Sufferings 29/3/01 p1 Ms 1536 Box 5, BVT Archives
48 BVT op cit p16
49 Ibid p16
50 Ms 1536/5/28/7C p1 BVT Archives
51 Ibid p1
52 Potts (nd) ACC 3613/06/10 p6 N.U.W.W. Archives, London County Library, London
53 Ms 1536/5/28/7C p1 BVT Archives
54 Ibid p1
55 Deed(2) op cit p8
56 Ibid p8
57 G Cadbury (1924) Suggested Rules of Health p4 Ms 1536/5 BVT Archives
58 Ibid p6
59 Atkins op cit p39
60 Lantern Lecture op cit p7
61 Bournville Village Council Yr Bk 1921 p3
62 Nettlefold 1907 p1
63 Whitehouse op cit p166
64 Lantern Lecture op cit p7

65 Deed(1) op cit p1

66 Whitehouse op cit p168

67 Birmingham Nerws 28/10/22 Ms 1536/37 BVT Archives

68 Lantern Lecture op cit p7

69 284 6/7/11 Oliver Lodge Papers Special Collection from Universityof Birmingham Library

70 Whitehouse op cit p162

71 Lantern Lecture op cit p6

72 Barlow (1)(1904) p12 Ms 1536/44 BVT Archives

73 Deed(1) op cit p8

74 Ibid p1

75 Ms 466/179/9 p1 Cadbury Papers

76 Atkins op cit p39

77 Harvey op cit p11

78 Lantern Lecture op cit p3

79 Robertson (1925) Ms 1536/44 p4 BVT Archives

80 Corbett (1966) p77

81 Emy (1973) p241

82 Ibid p241

83 New Age 2/1/02 Ms 1536/10/p1 BVT Archives

84 Edward Cadbury, Mattheson, Shann (1906) p305

85 Ibid p305

86 Ibid p301

87 Ibid p305

88 Ibid p264

89 Ibid p209

90 Ibid p278

91 Ibid p278

92 Ibid p209

93 Weekly News 23/11/95 Ms 466/159/1 Cadbury Papers

94 Ibid p209 23/11/95

95 Ibid p209 23/11/95

96 op cit Ms 466/157/1 p2

97 op cit Ms 466/152/33 p10

98 Ibid p10

99 Ibid p10

100 Harvey op cit p11

101 BVT op cit p18

102 Harvey op cit p11

103 Publication op cit p20

104 Birmingham Daily Mail 25/2/02 p2

105 1/8 23/4/18 p3 A G Gardiner Papers London School of Economic and Political Science London

106 Birmingham Daily Mail 25/3/07 p3

107 Gardiner op cit p142

108 Birmingham Daily Mail 26/2/02 p2

109 op cit 25/2/02 p2

110 op cit 26/2/02 p2

111 Ibid 26/2/02 p2 plus op cit 1/3/02 p4

112 op cit 5/3/02 p2

113 op cit 1/3/02 p4

114 op cit 26/2/02 p2

115 op cit 10/3/02 p4

116 op cit 1/3/02 p4

117 Gardiner op cit p146/7

118 Smith (1982) p241

119 Hopkins (1989) p125

120 Ibid p183

121 1/8 23/4/18 p3 A G Gardiner Papers

122 Barnsby (1989) p381

123 Barlow (1) op cit p12

124 Ibid p12

125 Harvey (1) op cit p15

126 Barlow (2) Ms 1536/37 A Ten Year Record, BVT Archives p19

127 Ibid p19

128 BVT Year Book 1921 p15

129 Barlow (2) op cit p19

130 Deed(1) op cit p1

131 Report of the Cooperative Congress visit to Bournville Village N.H.R.C. 6/6/06 p1 Ms 1536/37 BVT Archives

132 Whitehouse op cit p162

133 The Clarion 11/4/02 Ms 1536/10

134 Ford (1969) p287

135 Bournville Works Classes Committee Sundry Paper Sept 1906 - Dec 1912 001911 letter to parents of prospective employees nd

136 Pike (1972) p43

137 Ibid p41

138 Ibid p41

139 Deed(1) op cit p2

140 Pierson in Dyos Woolf (1973) p884

141 The Clarion 4/7/02 Ms 1536/10 p7 BVT Archives

142 Daily News 30/9/02 p12

143 1/8 13/6/18 A G Gardiner Papers

144 Ms 1536/5/56 A p2 BVT Archives

145 Ibid p2

146 op cit Ms 1536/57

147 Ms 466/179 p2 Cadbury Papers

148 The Socialist Aug 1905 p8

149 Daily News 10/9/02 p4

150 Ibid p4

151 op cit 12/9/02 p1

152 Ibid p10

153 Harvey op cit p1

154 Ibid p1

155 The Sanitary Institute: Catalogue of the 17th Exhibition of Sanitary Apparatus and Appliances 1898 p7

156 The Sanitary Institute Journal vol 19 1898/9 p468

157 op cit vol 20 1899/00 p96

158 The Times 30/8/99 p6

159 Read (1979)(1) p412

160 The Sanitary Institute Journal vol 31,1910 p391

161 Ibid p391

162 The Times 20/7/10 p5

163 Elizabeth Cadbury (2)(1913 unpub) 466/152/16 p33 Cadbury Papers

164 Ibid p11

165 Ibid p33

166 7/11/04 p2 N.U.W.W. Executive Comm Mins1904/8 London County Library, London

167 Ibid p40

168 Ibid p44

169 See for examples Ms 466/204 Cadbury Papers

170 Fabian News Nov 1901 p33

171 290 2/8/11 Oliver Lodge Papers

172 Wagner (1987) p71

173 Ibid p71

174 Ibid p71

175 Ibid p71

176 Lantern Lecture op cit p21

177 Ibid p21

178 BVT op cit p14

179 The Times 21/9/01 p2

180 BVT Year Book 1926 p51

181 Read op cit p413

182 Pierson op cit p886

183 Lampard in Dyos and Woolf op cit p31

184 Pierson op cit p884

185 Ibid p887

186 Harvey op cit p3

187 The Times 21/9/01 p12

188 Whitehouse op cit p172

189 The Times 21/9/01 p12

190 Ibid p12

191 Ibid p12

192 Ibid p12

193 Ibid p12

194 op cit 11/12/02 p5 (16/12/02)

195 Ibid p5

196 Daily News 2/8/02 Ms 1536/10 p12 BVT Archives

197 Ibid 2/8/02

198 First Garden City Prospectus 8/9/03 Ms 1536/44 p1 BVT Archives

199 First Garden City Ltd (Letchworth) Directors Report 22/1/08 p1 Ms 1536/44 BVT Archives

200 The Times 29/8/03 p4

201 BVT Year Book 1926 p53

202 The Times 6/12/12 p6

203 Read (1) op cit p413

204 Ibid p414

205 Ibid p414

206 Elizabeth Cadbury (1) op cit p15

207 Daily News 2/8/02 Ms 1536/10 p13 BVT Archives

208 Queen 22/3/02 Ms 1536/10 p16 BVT Archives

209 The Socialist Dec 1905 p2

210 Ibid p2

211 Birmingham Daily Mail 30/3/-7 p3 (30/3/07)

212 Holton (1976) p360

213 The Socialist Aug 1908 p3

214 op cit April 1908 p4

215 Ibid p4

216 Cadbury Family Journal Ms 466/431 1/11/10 p2 Cadbury Papers

217 Birmingham Right to Work Committee 4th Ann Rep 1908/9 p7/8

218 Hay in Social History Jan 1977 p443

219 Birmingham Chamber of Commerce Yr Bk 1905 p3

220 Birmingham Chamber of Commerce Journal Dec 1908 p181

221 Hay op cit p448

222 Cadbury Family Journal op cit 1/11/10 p2

223 Hay op cit p443

224 Birmingham Chamber of Commerce Yr Bk 1907 p154

225 Ibid p154

226 Hay op cit p443

227 Holton op cit p35

228 Ibid p35

229 Gardiner op cit p84

230 Daily News - see for example 28/2/05 p5 c 22/6/04 p3

231 Cadbury Family Journal op cit 20/2/06 p3

232 Nettlefold op cit 1907

233 Cadbury Family Journal op cit 20/2/06 p3

234 Thane (1) in Gourvish and O'Day (1988) p56
235 The Socialist 1908 p4
236 Ibid p4
237 Ibid p4
238 op cit Dec 1906 p5
239 1/7 25/7/? nd p4 6/7 A G Gardiner Papers
240 The Times 10/2/08 p10
241 op cit 9/2/11 p7
242 op cit 16/2/07 p4
243 G Cadbury Jnr (1915) pix
244 Ibid p136
245 Ibid p122
246 Elizabeth Cadbury (3) (1907 unpub) Ms 466/152/11 p9 Cadbury Papers
247 The Times 5/8/09 p5
248 Report of the Coperative Congress Visit to Bournville Village 6/6/06 Ms 1536/37 p5 BVT Archives
249 Ibid p5
250 Ibid p8
251 Ibid p8
252 Ibid p8
253 Ibid p8
254 The Times 25/9/06 p3
255 Ibid p3
256 National Housing Reform Council (1906) p3
257 Ibid p4
258 Nettlefold op cit p4
259 National Housing Reform Council op cit p5
260 Dickson-Poynder (1908) p8
261 National Housing Reform Council op cit p4
262 Ibid p25
263 The Times 7/11/06 p3
264 Ibid p4
265 Ibid p4
266 Nettlefold op cit p1
267 Ibid p1
268 BVT op cit p14
269 The Times 22/3/07 p6
270 op cit 9/1/08 p8
271 Ms 1536/5/56B 27/1/08 p1 BVT Archives
272 Ibid p1
273 op cit Ms 1536/5/56C 27/1/08 BVT Archives
274 The Times 29/1/08 p11
275 op cit 5/2/08 p12
276 op cit 13/5/08 p6
277 Ibid p6
278 op cit 30/3/08 p12
279 op cit 3/4/08 p9
280 Gardiner op cit p165/6
281 The Times 21/3/08 p5
282 op cit 23/10/08 p8
283 op cit 11/12/08 p9
284 op cit 18/12/09 p9
285 op cit 4/11/09 p10
286 op cit 26/10/09 p10
287 Ibid p10
288 op cit 4/11/09 p10
289 Ibid p10
290 Daily News 4/11/09 p7
291 Thane(2) (1983) p98
292 Daily News 5/11/09 p9
293 Ibid p9
294 The Times 26/11/09 p9
295 Read (1) op cit p414
296 Ibid p414
297 The Times 30/11/09 p9
298 op cit 15/12/09 p14
299 Ibid p14
300 Ibid p14
301 op cit 16/12/09 p7
302 Ibid p7
303 Ibid p7
304 Read (1) op cit p415
305 Ensor (1985) p518
306 Thane (2) op cit p98
307 Read (1) op cit p414
308 Ensor op cit p518
309 Ibid p518
310 Thane (2) op cit p97
311 Read (1) op cit p407
312 Thane (2) op cit p98
313 Read (1) op cit p407
314 The Times 9/2/11 p7
315 Ibid p7
316 op cit 13/4/11 p10
317 op cit 6/12/12 p6
318 op cit 5/9/13 p2
319 op cit 27/10/11 p8
320 op cit 6/2/12 p6
321 See Read (2) (1994) p405
322 The Times 28/10/09 p14
323 Birmingham I.L.P. Mins. 17/9/10 p1
324 Ibid p2
325 Daily News 5/11/09 p9
326 Barlow (3) 1913 p1 Ms 1536/1 BVT Archives

327 G Cadbury Jnr op cit p86

328 Ibid p86

329 Ibid p86

330 Daily News 18/8/13 p5

331 Ibid p5

332 Ibid p5

333 Ibid p5

334 Ibid p5

335 City of Birmingham Town Planning Comm Mins 1911-4 4/2/11 p2

336 Ibid p167 13/6/13

337 Ibid p187 11/7/13

338 Ibid p180/1

339 Ibid p180

340 Bournville Works Pamphlet 11/35 (1935) p26

341 Ibid p8

342 Ibid p16

344 Edward Cadbury, Mattheson, Shann, op cit p272

345 Ibid p272

346 Elizabeth Cadbury (4)(1910 unpub) Ms 466/152/14 p5 Cadbury Papers

347 Ibid p4

348 Ibid p4

349 Birmingham and Midland Vigilance Association Ann Rep 1888 p1

350 The Sanitary Institute Journal vol 19 1898/9 p436

351 Birmingham and Midland Vigilance Association Ann Rep 1888 p1

352 Ibid p1

353 Birmingham and Midland Vivilance Association Occasional Papers No7 p6, No11 p1

354 Birmingham and Midland Vigilance Association Ann Rep 1888 p15

355 op cit 1889 p13

356 Birmingham and Midland Vigilance Association Occasional Papers No 11 p7

357 Vigilance Record 1914 p52

358 op cit 1897 p7/8

359 Thane(2) op cit p185

360 Pike op cit p38

361 Vigilance Record 1897 p7

362 Bristow (1977) p140

363 Pike op cit p39

364 Ibid p38

365 NUWW Handbook 1908 p19

366 Potts(nd) ACC 3613/06/10 p2 NUWW Archives London, County Library London

367 Barnsby op cit p471

368 NUWW Handbook 1908 p94

369 Birmingham Warners Settlement Ann Rep 1901 p1

370 The Sanitary Institute Journal vol 19 1898/9 p436

371 Potts op cit p3

372 The Times 25/10/07 p9

373 Ibid p9

374 The Sanitary Institute Journal vol 20 1899/00 p85

375 op cit vol 19 1898/9 p436

376 Birmingham Women's Settlement 6th Ann Report 1905 front

377 Birmingham Women's Settlement (1911) p2

378 Ibid p2

379 Ibid p3

380 Ibid p3

381 Read (1) op cit p298

382 Fabian Records Cards Archive Dept The London School of Economic and Political Science

383 Daily News 18/7/10 p6

384 Read (1) op cit p298

385 Ibid p298

386 The Sanitary Institute Journal vol 19 1898/9 p437

387 Daily News 5/7/10 p3

388 Ibid p3

389 Bournville Women's Guild Minutes Book 1906/9 Ms 1196/1 Bournville Women's Guild Archives, Archives Dept, Central Library, Birmingham

390 Ibid p164

391 Ibid p164

392 Ibid p2

393 Ibid p40

394 Ibid p11

395 Ibid p14

396 Ibid p104

397 Ibid p40

398 Ibid p53

399 Ibid p60

400 Ibid p97

401 Ibid p146

402 Daily News 18/5/11 p5

403 Ensor op cit p397

404 Daily News 15/7/10 p3

405 Elizabeth Cadbury (3) op cit p11

406 Birmingham Society for Promoting the election of Women in Public Bodies Ms 841B/558 p6 Birmingham NUWW Archives

407 Ibid p8

408 Ibid p13

409 Ibid p179

410 Ibid p54

411 Ibid p6

412 Kelly's Directory of Birmingham 1907 p1081

413 Ms 841B/558 p60 Birmingham NUWW Archive

414 Kelly's Directory 1906 p1104

415 Ibid p1104

416 op cit 1912 p1139

417 Ibid p1137

418 Ibid p1180

419 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Mins 1911/2 p33

420 Ibid p94

421 City of Birmingham Hygiene Sub Comm Mins 1911/2 p1

422 King's Norton and Northfield UDC Ed Comm School of Hygiene Sub Comm Mins Dec 1909 - Nov 1911 p1

423 Ibid p8

424 King's Norton and Northfield UDC Ed Comm Mins 1910/1 24/10/11

425 City of Birmingham Hygiene Sub Comm Mins 1912/3 p4

426 op cit 1911/2 p14/5

427 Ibid p1 op cit 1912/3 p1,1913/4 p1

428 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Mins 1911/2 p9

429 City of Birmingham Hygiene Sub Comm Mins 1911/2 p434

430 op cir 1912/3 p14

431 Elizabeth Cadbury(1) op cit p1

432 Ibid p2

433 Ibid p1

434 Ibid p8

435 Ibid p6

436 Ibid p4/5

437 Ibid p4

438 Wohl in Dyos and Woolf op cit p612

439 Gilbert (1970) p125

440 Elizabeth Cadbury (5)(1916) Ms 466 152/23 p169 Cadbury Papers

441 Ibid p169

442 Ibid p174

443 Ibid p170

444 Miss Lawrence Cadbury (1923 unpub) op cit Ms 466/152/30

446 Ibid p2,3,4

446 Ibid p4

447 Ibid p3

448 Ibid p8

449 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Mins 1911/2 p122

450 City of Birmingham Hygiene Sub Comm Mins 1911/2 p72

451 Ibid p72

452 Ibid p103

453 op cit 1912/3 p20

454 op cit 1911/2 p103

455 City of Birmingham Ed Com Mins 1911/2 p366

456 Kelly's Directory 1913 p1204

457 op cit 1923 p1359

458 City of Birmingham Hygiene Sub Comm Mins 1912/3 p25

459 Cadbury Family Journal op cit 19/11/13 p1

460 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Mins 1911/2 p213

461 op cit 1912/3 p38

462 op cit 1911/2 p104

463 Ibid p107

464 City of Birmingham Hygiene Sub Comm Mins 1911/2 p7

465 Ibid p7

466 Ibid p1

467 Ibid p14

468 Ibid p16

469 Cross (1963) p142

470 The Socialist April 1908 p4

471 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Mins 1911/2 p10

472 Ibid p7

473 Daily News 18/5/11 p5

474 The Times 15/5/12 p4

475 Ibid p4

476 The Laundry and Homes of Industry Birmingham Ist Ann Rep 1893 p5

477 op cit (Agatha Stacey Homes) 18th Ann Rep 1910 front page

478 Ibid p3

CHAPTER 4

1 Ford (1969) p287
2 Ashford (1986) p72
3 The Friends' Quarterly Examiner Vol XXXI 1907 p1
4 Woodhouse in History of Education Vol II No 2 1982 p131
5 Eugenics Review Vol 6, 1914/5 p52/3
6 Mazumder (1992) p9
7 White in Eugenics Review Vol 1, 1909/10 p51
8 National Birth Rate Commission (1916) pVII
9 Ibid title page
10 Ibid pVI
11 Ibid pVII
12 Ibid backfly
13 Ibid p45
14 Eugenics Education Society (EES) 7th Ann Rep 1914/5 p12
15 Correspondence between the EES and the Birmingham EES, 26/2/28 C179 file, EES Archives, The Welcome Institute, London
16 List of EEC fellows and members 1936/7 p4 p5 SA/Eng A99 EES Archives
17 EES 31st Ann Rep 1938/9 fly
18 op cit 43rd Ann Rep 1950/1 fly
19 op cit 23rd Ann Rep 1930/1 p7
20 op cit 24th Ann Rep 1931/2 p6
21 op cit 26th Ann Rep 1933/4 p3
22 NCW Ann Conf notes 1932 15/8/32 p1 D135 Box 36 EES Archives
23 Ibid p1
24 op cit June 1931 p3 Oct 1933 p1
25 op cit 15/8/32 p1
26 Birmingham Hereditry Society (BHS) 2nd Ann Rep 1911/2 p11,15
27 op cit lst Ann Rep 1910/1 p1
28 EES Council Mins Oct 1909 - Dec 1912 p41 6/12/10 SA/Eug/L2 Box 69 EES Archives
29 BHS 2nd Ann Rep 1911/2 p2
30 Ibid p2
31 Elizabeth Cadbury (1907 unpub) Ms 466/152/11 p7 Cadbury Papers, Archives Dept, Central Library, Birmingham
32 Edgbaston Young British Women's Temperance Association Ann Rep 1907/8 front cover
33 Ibid p10
34 Ibid p9
35 Ibid p9
36 Ibid p9
37 National British Women's Temperance Association, Edgbaston Branch Ann Rep 1908/9 p7
38 Ibid p12
39 NUWW Executive Comm Mins 1904/8 p170 7/4/08 ACC 3613/01/001 NUWW Archive, London County Library, London
40 Ibid p170
41 The Times 17/12/01 p10
42 See for example The Times Free Church Year Book 1908 pXXI
43 Ibid p79
44 Ibid p79
45 Ensor (1985) p408/9
46 The Free Church Year Book 1909 p141
41 Ibid p141
48 op cit 1912 p212
49 Bournville Women's Guild (BWG) Minute Book 1906-9 P45,83,164 MS 1196/1 BWG Archive, Central Library, Birmingham
50 See for example The Birmingham Women's Settlement (BWS) 2nd Ann Rep 1901 p1
51 BWG op cit 18/11/08 p108
52 Ibid 15/4/08 p97
53 Ibid 21/9/10 p162
54 Ibid 15/1/08 p84
55 BWG (2) Diary 1910-4 MS 1196/2 20/11/12
56 Ibid 20/11/12
57 BWS 9th Ann Rep 1908 p28
58 op cit 12th Ann Rep 1911 p23
59 Ibid p13
60 Birmingham Warwickshire and Distrtict Union National British Women's Temperance Association, Ann Rep 1913/4 p42
61 Ibid p6
62 Ibid p10
63 op cit 1912/3 p12
64 See for example Saleeby (1904) and the National Birth Rate Commission op ci pVII
65 Birmingham Warwickshre and District Union National British Women's Temperance Association Ann Rep 1912/5 p12
66 Ibid p12
67 Christobel Cadbury in The Friends' Quarterly Examiner vol LVI 4th month 1922 p154

68 Ibid p154
69 Mazumdar op cit p10
70 Engenics Review vol 1 1909/10 p4
71 Whites op cit p110
72 Ibid p110
73 Mazumdar op cit p56
74 Ibid p10
75 Daily News 18/5/11 p5
76 The Laundry and Homes of Industry, Birmingham, Ist Ann Rep 1893 p2 (Laundry Homes)
77 Ibid p11
78 op cit 4th Ann Rep 1896 p14
79 Potts (nd) p2 ACC 3613/06/IU NUWW Archive
80 Birmingham NCW Historical Notes Ms841 B/311 p1, Birmingham NUWW Archive, Archives Dept, Central Library, Birmingham
81 op cit Ms 841B/307 p1
82 Women Workers vol 1 June 1891 p14/5
83 op cit vol 1 Sept 1891 p15
84 King's Norton Workhouse Union list of Guardians Committee Officer's 1894 p2
85 Koven in Koven & Michel (eds)(1993) p124
86 Women Workers vol 1 no 2 Sept 1891 p15
87 Ibid p15
88 Ibid p15
89 Laundry Homes Ist Ann Rep 1893 p2
90 Women Workers vol I no 1 Sept 1891 p16
91 Ibid p16
92 Ibid p16
93 Ibid p17
94 Ibid p17
95 Laundry Homes1st Ann Rep 1893 p5
96 Ibid p6
97 op cit 2nd Ann Rep 1894 p7
98 op cit 18th Ann Rep 1909 p10
99 op cit 8th Ann Rep 1900 p7
100 op cit Ist Ann Rep 1893 p11
101 Ibid p17
102 op cit 3rd Ann Rep 1895 p15
103 op cit 5th Ann Rep 1897 p16
104 Ibid p18
105 op cit 4th Ann Rep 1896 p14
106 op cit 7th Ann Rep 1899 p13
107 op cit 12th Ann Rep 1904 p17, Ann Rep p11
108 op cit 14th Ann Rep 1906 p11
109 Birmingham, Aston King's Norton Joint Poor Law Establishment Comm Mins 1905/12 p6 Min 439 26/5/10
110 Laundry Homes (Agatha Stacey) 20th Ann Rep 1911 p22/3
111 op cit 2nd Ann Rep 1894 p3
112 Women Workers vol 1 no 4 March 1892 p16
113 Ibid p16
114 Ibid p16
115 Laundry Homes (Agatha Stacey) 19th Ann Rep 1910 p5
116 op cit 1st Ann Rep 1893 p4
117 Ibid p4
118 op cit 20th Ann Rep 1911 p5
119 BWS Ann Rep 1902 p1
120 Ibid p1
121 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Mins 1911/2 p251
122 BWS Ann Rep 1908 p11
123 op cit Ann Rep 1913 p38
124 op cit Ann Rep 1915 p5-7
125 op cit Ann Rep 1913 p38
126 Ibid p23 op cit Ann Rep 1911 p25
127 Laundry Homes 3rd Ann Rep 1895 p17
128 List of Birmingham NCW Branch Officers Ms 841/303 Birmingham NUWW Archive
129 BHS 2nd A R 1911/2 p15
130 Ibid p3, p15/6
131 BWS Ann Rep 1908 p13
132 21/3/1910 Ms 841/B1 Birmingham NUWW Archive
133 Laundry Homes 1st Ann Rep 1893 p3 Women Workers vol no 1, June 1891 p14
134 Ibid p3, p14 respectively
135 Ibid p3, p14 respectively
136 Ibid p3, p14 respectively
137 Laundry Homes 3rd Ann Rep 1895 p9
138 Women Workers vol 4 no 1 June 1891 p21
139 Laundry Homes 4th Ann Rep 1896 p13
140 op cit 13th An Rep 1905 p8/9
141 Ibid p8/9
142 op cit 3rd Ann Rep 1895 p9
143 Ibid p9
144 op cit 2nd Ann Rep 1894 p26
145 op cit Ist Ann Rep 1893 p2
146 op cit 7th Ann Rep 1899 p7
147 op cit 17th Ann Rep 1908 p10
148 op cit 8th Ann Rep 1900 p11/2
149 Women Workers vol 4 no 1 June 1894 p18
150 Laundry Homes 3rd Ann Rep 1895 p13
151 Ibid p13
152 op cit 8th Ann Rep 1900 p7
153 op cit 7th Ann Rep 1899 p8

154 op cit 13th Ann Rep 1905 p13
155 Ibid p14
156 Ibid p15
157 Women Workers vol 3 no 1 June 1893 p7
158 op cit vol 6 no 1 June 1896 p18
159 op cit vol 15 no 2 sept 1905 p28
160 Mazunder op cit p22
161 Eugencis Review 1910/1 p159
162 Laundry Homes 8th Ann Rep 1900 p6
163 Ibid p11
164 op cit 3rd Ann Rep 1895 p11
165 NUWW Report of Conference of Rescue Workers 12/10/11 backfly ACC 3613/03/18 NUWW Archive
166 Women Workers vol 13 no 3 Dec 1903 p1
167 Potts op cit p5
168 Women Workers vol 5 no 3 Dec 1895 p18
169 Ibid p18
170 Ibid p18
171 Ibid p18
172 Woodhouse op cit p127
173 Women Workers vol 4 no 3 Dec 1894 p13
174 NUWW Ann Conf Report 1897 p22 Acc 3613/03/18 NUWW Archive
175 Women Workers vol 8 no 3 Dec 1898 p16/7
176 Ibid p17
177 op cit vol 12 no 1 June 1902 p2
178 Ibid p2
179 op cit vol 12 no 3 Dec 1902 p49
180 Ibid p50
181 Ibid p49
182 Ibid p50
183 Ibid p50
184 op cit vol 13 no 2 Sept 1903 p38
185 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Report Conference of After Care Commissioners 24/3/04 p35
186 Women Workers vol 11 no 3 Dec 1901 p48
187 Ibid p56
188 Ibid p56
189 Ibid p56
190 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Mins 1911/2 p251
191 Ibid p251
192 Ibid p251
193 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Report of work accomplished in the late School Board and Ed Comm during Year ended Nov 9th 1903 p73
194 Ibid p73
195 Ibid p71
196 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Report of the Special Schools Sub Com 1903 p7, p10
197 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Work Accomplished 1903 op cit p77
198 Women Workers vol 12 no 3 Dec 1902 p49/50
199 Ford op cit p291/2
200 Women Workers vol 16 no 1 June 1906 p10
201 Ibid p10
202 op cit vol 15 no 2 Sept 1905 p28
203 op cit vol 20 no 3 Dec 1910 p74
204 op cit vol 21 no 1 June 1911 p14
205 Laundry Homes 13th Ann Rep 1905 p7
206 Ibid p7
207 Women Workers vol 15 no 2 Sept 1905 p28
208 Ibid p28
209 Ibid p32
210 Ibid p30
211 Ibid p30
212 Ibid p31
213 Ibid p32
214 Ibid p29
215 Ibid p32
216 Ibid p29
217 NUWW Exec Comm Mins 1904/8 p69 30/1//06 ACC 3613/01/001 NUWW Archive
218 Ibid p72
219 NUWW Report of Conference of Rescue Workers 1907 p3 21/10/07 ACC 3613/03/18 NUWW Archive
220 Ibid p3
221 Ibid p3
222 Ibid p3
223 Ibid p5
224 Ibid p6
225 Ibid p10
226 Ibid p10
227 Ibid p14
228 Ibid p14
229 Women Workers vol 18 no 1 Sept 1908 p40
230 Whitehouse op cit p130
231 Ibid p130
232 Ibid p130
233 Seaman (1966) p27
234 Local Gov Board correspondence 15/3/12 MH 58/85 PRO
235 Daily News 6/4/12 EES Early Files SA/Eng BA EES Archive
236 Ponting in the Guardian 20/6/92 p23
237 Ensor op cit p518

238 Local Gov Board correspondence 22/9/10 MH58/85

239 Ibid 22/9/10

240 op cit 2/10/10

241 Daily News 8/6/09 EES Newscuttings Box 85 EES Archive

243 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Mins 1911/2 p251

244 Ibid p251

245 See for example Ibid p78

246 Ibid p78

247 BHS Ist Ann Rep 1910/1 p1

248 Ibid p1

249 City of Birmingham Hygiene Sub Comm Mins 1912/3 p25

250 BHS 2nd Ann Rep 1911/2 p15

251 City of Birmingham Hygiene Sub Comm Mins 1912/3 p25

252 See for example BHS 2nd Ann Rep 1911/2 p16, p13

253 EES 3rd Ann Rep 1910/1 fly

254 City of Birmingham Hygiene Sub Comm Mins 1911/2 p1

255 Ibid p1

256 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Mins 1911/2 p12

257 Ibid p25

258 Ibid p10

259 Potts op cit p3

260 Ford op cit p292

261 Potts op cit p5

262 Birmingham Society for Promoting the Election of Women on local Government Bodies 1907/21 p3 Ms 841B/558

263 See for example BWS Ann Rep 1911 p25, p26, Ann Rep 1913 p23

264 BHS Ist Ann Rep 1910/1 p4

265 Ibid p1

266 op cit 2nd Ann Rep 1911/2 p10

267 BWS Ann Rep 1901 p1

268 BHS 2nd Ann Rep 1911/2 p15

269 op cit 5th Ann Rep 1914/5 p28

270 Bournville Works Classes Comm Sundry Papers Sept 1906 - Dec 1912 001911 p295 Mins 616: Bournville Works Ed Classes Archive, Cadbury Bros Library, Cadbury Bors Ltd, Bournville, Birmingham

271 BHS 2nd Ann Rep 1911/2 p15

272 Ibid p10

273 Eugenics Review vol IV April 1912 fly

274 Ibid fly

275 EES 6th Ann Rep 1913/4 p38

276 BHS 3rd Ann Rep 1912/3 p5

277 EES 6th Ann Rep 1913/4 p38

278 BHS 3rd Ann Rep 1912/3 p4

279 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Mins 1909/10 p11

280 Ibid p148

281 Ibid p148

282 op cit 1910/1 Speical School's Sub Comm Report p364/5

283 Ibid 364/5

284 op cit 1911/1 Special School's Sub Comm Report p317

285 Kelly's Directory 1913 p1204

286 op cit 1914 p1222

287 Juckes (1921) p3

288 Ibid p4

289 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Mins 1911/2 p195

290 Juckes op cit p5

291 Ibid p7

292 Ibid p19

293 Ibid p19

294 King's Norton and Northfield UDC Ed Comm Mins April 1909 - April 1910 p76

295 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Mins 1911/2 p65

296 Ibid p65

297 Ibid p77

298 Ibid p63 - 6

299 Ibid p66

300 Potts op cit p5

301 Ibid p5

302 NUWW Exec Comm Mins 1908-12 p98, 22/11/10 NUWW Archive

303 EES Correspondence re: Feebleminded-ness nd Joint Letter EES/NA Feeblemind-edness SA Eng/B3/Box 2

304 Women Workers vol 21 no 1 June 1911 p14

305 op cit vol 22 no 2, 1912 p62

306 Ibid p62

307 Woodhouse op cit p131 and EES Council Mins Oct 1909 - Dec 1912, p53 1/3/11 SA/Eng/C2 Box 69 EES Archive

308 Woodhouse op cit p132

309 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Mins 1912/3 p113

310 Woodhouse op cit p132

311 Ibid p134

312 NUWW Exec Comm Mins 1908-12 p171 18/6/12 ACC 3613/1/2 NUWW Archive

313 Ibid p171

314 NUWW Legislation Comm Mins 22/2/06 27/10/11 Acc 36/3/01/70 NUWW Archive

315 NUWW Report of Conference of Rescue Workers 12/10/11 p3 ACC 3613/03/18 NUWW Archive

316 NUWW Legislation Comm Mins 4/7/12 ACC 3613/01/70 NUWW Archive

317 Ibid 4/7/12

318 NUWW Exec Comm Mins p173 18/6/12 ACC 3613/1/2 NUWW Archive

319 Women Workers vol 22 no 3 Dec 1912 p87

320 Ibid p87

321 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Report of the work accommplished by the Ed Comm for year ended Nov 9th 1913 p126

322 Correspondence from Ed Secretary City of Birmingham to Chairman of the Lunacy Commissioners 23/12/12 p1 MH 51/571 PRO

323 City of Birmingham Ed Comm Report 1913 op cit p126

324 Ibid p125

325 Correspondence from Local Education Authorities to Chairman of Lunacy Commissioners 24/12/12 - 10/2/13 MH 51/571 PRO

326 NUWW Legislation Comm Mins 27/1/13 ACC 3613/01/70 NUWW Archive

327 Ibid 27/1/13

328 EES 5th AR 1912/3 p22

329 Ibid p22

330 Ibid p22

331 Women Workers vol 23 no 2 Sept 1923 p53

332 NUWW Legislation Comm Mins 16/6/13 ACC 3613/01/70 NUWW Archive

333 Woodhouse op cit p134

334 City of Birmingham Ed Com Rep of Work accomplished by the Ed Comm during the Year ended Nov 9th 1914 p120

335 Ibid p120

336 Women Workers vol 24 no 1 June 1914 p10

337 Ibid p10

338 op cit vol 23 no 1 p78

339 Laundry Homes (Agatha Stacey) 22nd Ann Rep 1913 p8

340 Ibid p9

341 Searle (1976) p111

CHAPTER 5

1 Webb (1901) P14/5

2 The Times 17/12/01 p10

3 The Manchester Conference 1895 Report of the Proceedings of the Conference of members of the Society of Friends (1896) p171

4 Ibid p186

5 Society of Friends (SOF) Yr Bk 1905 p54

6 Leighton (1952) p14

7 Reeder in Reeder(1977) p92

8 Ibid p92

9 Weedall (1963) p16

10 Ford (1969) p287

11 Reeder op cit p94

12 Ibid p84

13 Bournville Works Classes Comm 1st Ann Rep 1907 Sunday Papers 1906-12 001911 Cadbury Bros Library, Bournville

14 Bournville Works Pamphlet (BWP) 1/26 (1926) p5

15 Mowat (1955) p37

16 BWP op cit p4/5

17 MS 466/157/1 p2 Cadbury Papers, Archives Dept, Central Library, Birningham

18 G Cadbury Jnr (1) 1926 p4

19 Ibid p5

20 Elizabeth Cadbury (1) (1916) MS 466/152/22 p5 Cadbury Papers

21 Ibid p5

22 Edward Cadbury (1912) p16

23 Ibid p16

24 Bournville Works Classes Comm op cit 1st Ann Rep p185

25 op cit letter to parents of prospective emplyees nd

26 G Cadbury (1) op cit p7

27 Ibid p6

28 Ibid p11

29 Ibid p11

30 Letter to parents of prospective employees, Bournville Work Class Comm op cit

31 Weedall op cit p4

32 G Cadbury Jnr (2) in BWP 26/38 (1938) p59

33 G Cadbury Jnr (1) op cit p5

34 Weedall op cit p4

35 BWP 11/35 (1935) p8

36 Ibid p18

37 Ibid p25

38 Elizabeth Cadbury (2) (unpub) MS 466/152/26 p6 Cadbury Papers

39 Ibid p5

40 Edward Cadbury, Matheson, Shann (1906) p278

41 Ibid p272

42 Weedall op cit p4

43 Edward Cadbury op cit p13/4

44 Ibid p14

45 Bournville Works Class Comm op cit Min 8, 7/06

46 Ferguson (1923) p11/2

47 Ferguson and Abbott (1935) p33

48 Edward Cadbury op cit p15

49 Letter to parents of prospective employees, Bournville Works Classes Comm op cit

50 See Elizabeth Cadbury (3) (1935)

51 G Cadbury (Jnr) (1) op cit p5

52 Ferguson and Abbott op cit p35

53 Edward Cadbury op cit p17

54 Ibid p2

55 Ibid p25

56 Ibid p25

57 Bews in Wray and Ferguson (1926) p57

58 Weedall op cit p4

59 Ibid p4

60 Ibid p4

61 Bournville Day Continuation School (BDCS) Ann Rep 1928/9 p1

62 City of Birmingham Report showing the work accomplished during the year ended Nov 9th 1914 p86

63 Ibid p88

64 Ibid p88

65 Report on the work of City of Birmingham Ed Comm 1914-24 p 161

66 Ibid p156

67 Ibid p157

68 Ferguson and Abbott (1935) p36 BWP 22/35

69 Caler in Wray and Ferguson (1926) p40

70 Bournville Evening Con School Comm 1906/7 nd Bournville Works Class Comm op cit

71 Ibid 1906/7

72 Ibid 1906/7

73 Ibid 1906/7

74 Caler op cit p41

75 Edward Cadbury op cit p23

76 Board of Ed Inspection of classes in mothercraft and allied subject Report 11/4 Feb 1924 Ed 75/67 PRO

77 Ibid p2

78 Ibid p1

79 Ibid p6

80 Weedall op cit p4

81 Edward Cadbury op cit p22

82 Eizabeth Cadbury (1) op cit p7 Cadbury Papers

83 Elizabeth Cadbury (4) (1922 unpub) MS466/152/29 p1 Cadbury Papers

84 Ibid p5

85 Ibid p5

86 Elizabeth Cadbury (5) (1926) MS466/152/49 p9 Cadbury Papers

87 Ibid p9

88 Ibid p9

89 BWP 26/38 (1938) p9

90 City of Birmingham Hygiene Sub Comm Mins 19011/2 p23

91 Lewis in Lewis (ed)(1973) p22

92 Edward Cadbury, Matheson, Shann, op cit p216

93 Lewis op cit p22

94 Ibid p22

95 Correspondence City of Birmingham to Local Gov Board re Prevention of infant and child mortality 24/1/13 p2 MH 48/183 PRO

96 Birmingham Women's Settlement (BWS) School for mothers 4th Ann Rep1912 (front page)

97 24/1/13 p2 Correspondence City of Birmingham to local Gov Board op cit

98 The Selly Oak and District School for Mothers and Babies Welcome 11th Ann Rep p1

99 Birmingham Infants' Health Society 8th Ann Rep 1915 p4

100 Ibid p3

101 Ibid p25

102 City of Birmingham Estimates for half fee ending 30/9/14 Maternity and Child Welfare 23/9/14 MH 48/183 Local Gov Board 132049 PRO

103 Birmingham Infants' Health Society 3rd Ann rep 1910 p7

104 op cit 5th Ann Rep 1912 p8

105 op cit Ist Ann Rep 1908 p18

106 Ibid p18

107 Ibid p4

108 Ibid p4

109 Ibid p8/9

110 op cit 3rd Ann Rep 1910 p7

111 op cit Ist Ann Rep 1908 p15

112 Ibid p4

113 Ibid p4

114 Ibid p4

115 Ibid p11

116 Ibid p12

117 Ibid p13
118 Ibid p16
119 Ibid p15
120 Ibid p11
121 op cit 4th Ann Rep 1911 p4
122 Eugenics Ed Soc 5th Ann Rep 1912/3 p60
123 Ibid p60
124 Weedall op cit p5
125 Elizabeth Cadbury (6)(1919 unpub) Ms466/152/25 p1 Cadbury Papers
126 Bournville Work Class Comm op cit 1st Ann Rep p167
127 City of Birmingham Continuation and Technical School Sub Comm Mins 1920/1 p78
128 Ferguson and Abbott op cit p8
129 Ibid p8
130 Our Link vol 1 no 2 Summer 1921 p7 (BDCS)
131 City of Birmingham Continuation and Technical School Sub Comm Mins 1920/1 p78
132 Simon (1965) p344
133 Isichei (1970) p258
134 Manchester Conference Report op cit p23
135 Braithwaite (1909) p4
136 Isichei op cit p263
137 Braithwaite op cit p4
138 Rowntree and Binns 1903 p39
139 Ibid pIV
140 Midland Adult School Union (MASU) Ann Rep 1920 p12/3
141 Ibid p15/6
142 Hall (1985) p9
143 Rowntree and Binns op cit pX
144 Ibid p40
145 Emma Cadbury (1891) pIV
146 Severn Street Adult School Yr Bk 1902 p3
147 Littleboy in The Friends' Quarterly Examiner Vol XXXVI 1902 p37
148 Ibid p37
149 Ibid p38
150 Ibid p39
151 Ibid p39
152 Elizabeth Cadbury in Muirhead (7) (1911) p218
153 Kelly (1970) p260
154 Rowntree and Binns op cit p39
155 MASU Ann Rep 1910 p18
156 Ibid p18
157 Kelly op cit p243
158 Ibid p243
159 Simon op cit p304
160 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1880 p3
161 Ibid p3
162 Ibid p3
163 Ibid p3
164 op cit Ann Rep 1882 p2
165 op cit Ann Rep 1887 p2
166 Ibid p3
167 Ibid p3
168 op cit Ann Rep 1891 p2
169 Ibid p2
170 op cit Ann Rep 1889 p2
171 Ibid p2
172 SOF A R 1903 p121
173 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1889 p2
174 op cit Ann Rep 1900 p2
175 op cit Ann Rep 1910 p4
176 op cit Ann Rep 1902 p4
177 op cit Ann Rep 1903 p4
178 op cit Ann Rep 1910 p4
179 Currie Martin (1924) p399
180 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1909 p6
181 MASU Ann Rep 1909 p11
182 Ibid p11
183 Ibid p3
184 Ibid p3
185 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1909 p6
186 Hall op cit p210
187 Gardiner (1923) p43
188 Ibid p41
189 Ibid p43
190 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1890 p7
191 Kelly op cit p154
192 Bournville Women's Guild (BWG) Diary 1910-32 18/9/12 MS 1196/2 BWG Archive, Archives Dept, Central Library, Birmingham
193 Elizabeth Cadbury (7) op cit p214
194 Elizabeth Cadbury (8)(1909 unpub) Ms 466/152/12 p14 Cadbury Papers
195 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1889 p7
196 Ibid p10
197 op cit Ann Rep 1899 p1
198 op cit Ann Rep 1904 p24
199 Ibid p25
200 op cit Ann Rep 1889 p2
201 Elizabeth Cadbury (7) op cit p210
202 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1898 p6
203 Rowntree and Binns op cit p45
204 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1899 p4

205 MASU Yr Bk 1909 p6
206 Ibid p1
207 Ibid p15
208 Ibid p15
209 Ibid p20
210 Elizabeth Cadbury (7) op cit p225
211 MASU Year Book Bh 1909 p16
212 Ibid p18
213 Ibid p32
214 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1904 p7, p22
215 op cit Ann Rep 1889 p2
216 op cit Ann Rep 1899 p2
217 Ibid p4
218 Ibid p4
219 Rules of Class X!V Severn St First Day Schools. Miscell File 272/11/42 p6
220 Ibid p6, p7
221 Ibid p6
222 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1899 p4
223 Ibid p4
224 op cit Ann Rep 1904 p6
225 Ibid p7
226 op cit Ann Rep 1899 p5
227 op cit Ann Rep 1900 p8
228 op cit Ann Rep 1905 p7
229 op cit Ann Rep 1900 p3
230 op cit Ann Rep 1905 p7
231 Rowntree and Binns op cit p43
232 SOF Ann Rep 1903 p121
233 Ibid p121 12/7/06 p1
234 MASU Women's Schools Comm Min Book 1906-11 12/7/06 p1 File 272/1/21
235 Ibid p1
236 Ibid front page
237 Ibid leaflet for 21/6/07
238 Ibid West Bromwich and Oldbury Chronicle 21/6/07
239 Ibid 21/6/07
240 Ibid Women's Schools Comm 1907/8 no pg no
241 MASU Yr Bk 1909 p30
242 Ibid p16
243 Ibid p32
244 Ibid p15
245 Severn St First Day Ann Rep 1900 p8 (Adult School from 1902)
246 Ibid p8
247 SOF Ann Rep 1903 p120
248 Rowntree and Binns op cit p74
249 Ibid p74
250 Ibid p76
251 SOF Ann Rep 1903 p120
252 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1902 p7
253 Ibid p7
254 Ibid p8
255 op cit Ann Rep 1900 p8
256 MASU Yr Bk 1913 back fly
257 Hall op cit p8
258 Ibid p8,9
259 Ibid p9
260 MASU Yr Bk 1913 back fly
261 Hall op cit p14
262 Ibid p14
263 Grubb in The Friends' Quarterly Examiner vol XXXVIII 1904 p474
264 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1905 p17
265 One and All Jan 1910 p24
266 Ibid p15
267 Ibid p24
268 Ibid p24
269 Ibid p24
270 op cit Feb 1910 p47/8
271 op cit March 1910 p72
272 Hall op cit p209
273 Bartlett (1960) p95
274 Ibid p96
275 Ibid p96
276 MASU Year Book 1913 back fly
277 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1904 p7
278 Ibid p7
279 Ibid p21
280 Ibid p22
281 MASU Women's Schools Comm Min Book op cit p1
282 Ibid p2
283 Ibid p2
284 Ibid p2
285 MASU Newsletter 1908/9 p2
286 MASU Half hour talks for Women's Schools 1908/9 p3 file 272/1/21
287 MASU Newsletter op cit p2
288 Birmingham Daily Post 17/6/07 p6
289 MASU Ann Rep 1908 p6
290 Ibid p6
291 Severn St Adult School Ann Rep 1910 p10
292 Hall op cit p14
293 MASU Ann Rep 1908 p12
294 Ibid p13

295 op cit Ann Rep 1909 p14
296 One and All Birmingham and District Supplement May 1910 p66
297 MASU Ann Rep 1909 p14
298 One and All Jan 1910 p8
299 Vipont (1960) p246
300 Summer School Continuation Committee (SSCC) 7th Ann Rep 1904 p3
301 op cit 10th Ann Rep 1907 p1
302 Ibid p1
303 Ibid p3
304 op cit 5th Ann Rep 1902 fly
305 Ibid fly
306 Ibid fly
307 Ibid p20
308 op cit 10th Ann Rep 1907 p1
309 op cit 5th Ann Rep 1902 p8
310 The British Friend Feb 1900 p36
311 Present Day Papers vol 2 Dec 1899 p3
312 Ibid p30
313 Ibid p30
314 SSCC 5th Ann Rep 1902 p1
315 Ibid p1
316 Ibid p1
317 op cit 6th Ann Rep 1903 p2/3
318 Ibid p3
319 The British Friend 1903 p34
320 IBid p34
321 The Friend 1903, 24/4/03 p261
322 SSCC 6th Ann Rep 1903 p4
323 Ibid p3
324 Rowntree (1923) p28
325 Ibid p29
326 Ibid p85
327 Wood in Old Woodbrookers no 13 Dec 1910 p7
328 Elizabeth Cadbury (9)(1927) p1
329 Woodbrooke Council 15th Ann Rep 1922 p8
330 SSCC 5th Ann Rep 1902 p11
331 Ibid p11
332 Woodbrooke Council 7th Ann Rep 1914 p27
333 Ibid p24
324 Ibid p28
335 SSCC 8th Ann Rep 1905 backfly
336 Woodbrooke Council 1st Ann Rep 1908 p1
337 op cit 4th Ann Rep 1911 fly
338 Ibid fly
339 Ibid fly
340 op cit Ist Ann Rep 1908 fly
341 SSCC 7th Ann Rep 1904 p2
342 Woodbrooke Council 4th Ann Rep 1911 fly
343 op cit 3rd Ann Rep 1910 p7
344 SSCC 8th Ann Rep 1905 p3
345 Ibid p3
346 Woodbrooke Council 2nd Ann Rep 1909 p6
347 op cit 3rd Ann Rep 1910 p6
348 Rowntree op cit p27
349 Wood op cit p7
350 Ibid p7
351 The Friend 1903 10/4/03 p235
352 Ibid 11/9/03 p613
353 SSCC 5th Ann Rep 1902 p1
354 op cit 6th Ann Rep 1903 p2
355 op cit 7th Ann Rep 1904 p2
356 Ibid p2
357 Ibid p2
358 op cit 5th Ann Rep 1902 p1
359 op cit 6th Ann Rep 1903 p2 7th Ann Rep 1902 p2
360 op cit 7th Ann Rep 1904 p3
361 Ibid p3
362 Ibid p4
363 Woodbroke Council 4th Ann Rep 1911 p9
364 Ibid p17
365 op cit 5th Ann Rep 1912 p8
366 Ibid p7
367 Ibid p7
368 SSCC 7th Ann Rep 1904 p3
369 SOF Ann Rep 1906 p122
370 SSCC 7th Ann Rep 1904 p3
371 Ibid p3
372 op cit 8th Ann Rep 1905 p3
373 Woodbrooke Council 5th Ann Rep 1912 p11
374 Ibid p11
375 Ibid p11
376 Ibid p11
377 SSCC 10th Ann Rep 1907 p5
378 Ibid p5
379 op cit 5th Ann Rep 1902 p7
380 Ibid p21
381 Ibid p24
382 Ibid p24
383 Ibid p21
384 Ibid p24
385 Ibid p22
386 op cit 6th Ann Rep 1903 p25
387 Ibid p25
388 Ibid p25

389 SOF Ann Rep 1907 p88
390 op cit Ann Rep 1910 p157
391 Ibid p157
392 Ibid p157
393 Ibid p156
394 Ibid p156
395 Ibid p156
396 Ibid p156
397 Ibid p159
398 Ibid 159
399 Read (1979) p29
400 Jones (1908) p35
401 Ibid p36
402 Ibid p36
403 Ibid p36
404 SOF Ann Rep 1913 p160
405 Ibid p159
406 op cit Ann Rep 1912 p91
407 op cit Ann Rep 1914 p73
408 op cit Ann Rep 1915 p141
409 Ibid p141
410 Ibid p141
411 Ibid p140
412 Quakerism and Industry Conference of Employers (1) (1918)
413 Ibid p126
414 Ibid p127
415 Ibid p129
416 Ibid p130
417 Ibid p131
418 Quakerism and Industry Conference of Employers (2) 1928) p97
419 Ibid p97
420 The Friend 19/4/18 p252 (see also 26/4/18 p266)
421 Quakerism and Industry (2) op cit p97
422 Ibid p93/5
423 Ibid p1
424 Ibid p93
425 Ibid p93
426 The Friend 1918 29/11/18 p706
427 G Cadbury (Jnr)(3) in Friends Intelligencer 28/6/30 p506
428 op cit 21/6/30 p489
429 Ibid p484
430 op cit 28/6/30 p505
431 SSCC 7th Ann Rep 1904 p1
432 Woodbrooke Council 1st Ann Rep 1908 p13
433 Ibid p13
434 Ibid p13
435 Ibid p15
436 op cit 2nd Ann Rep 1909 p13
437 SSCC 8th Ann Rep 1905 p3
438 Ibid p3
439 Ibid p3
440 op cit 7th Ann Rep 1904 p8
441 Ibid p8
442 op cit 8th Ann Rep 1905 p3
443 Woodbrooke Council 4th Ann Rep 1911 p16
444 Ibid p17
445 Ibid p17
446 Ibid p17
447 Ibid p16
448 Ibid p17
449 op cit 6th Ann Rep 1912 p14
450 op cit 4th Ann Rep 1911 p17
451 Ibid p17
452 op cit Ist Ann Rep 1908 p10
453 Ibid p10
454 op cit 2nd Ann Rep 1909 p14
455 op cit Ist An Rep 1908 p10
456 op cit 2nd Ann Rep 1909 p14
457 Ibid p14
458 op cit 4th Ann Rep 1911 p11 5th Ann Rep 1912, p16/7
459 op cit 2nd Ann Rep 1909 p15/6
460 Ibid p15
461 Ibid p15
462 Ibid 15/6
463 op cit 3rd Ann Rep 1910 p14
464 op cit 5th Ann Rep 1912 p16/7
465 Ibid p16/7
466 Ibid p16/7
467 Thornton (1911) p1
468 Hall op cit p14
469 One and All 1908 Dec p281
470 Ibid p281
471 Ibid p281
472 Leighton op cit p1/2
473 One and All 1908 Dec p281
474 Pumphrey 1952 p3
475 Ibid p3
476 Ibid p3
477 Ibid p3
478 Fircroft (Bournville Pamphlet) (1909) p4
479 Pumphrey op cit p4
480 Leighton op cit p7
481 Pumphrey op cit p13

482 Ibid p16
483 Leighton op cit p14
484 Fircroft Ann Rep 1948/9 fly
485 Fircroft Pamphlet op cit p2
486 Ibid p2
487 Leighton op cit p59
488 Ibid p59
489 Ibid p59
490 Fircroft Pamphlet op cit p2
491 Ibid p2
492 Ibid p2
493 Ibid p2
494 Leighton p59
495 Ibid p59
496 Ibid p59
497 Ibid p59
498 Alfred in Jarvis (1987) see p24/6
499 Fircroft Pamphlet op cit p4
500 Birch 1917 p7
501 Thornton op cit p3
502 Fircroft Ann Rep 1957/8 p281
503 One and All 1908 Dec p281
504 Ibid p281
505 Fircfroft pamphlet op cit p2
506 Ibid p6
507 Ibid p4
508 Pumphrey op cit p4
509 Wood and Ball (1922) p61
510 Thornton op cit p2
511 Wood and Ball op cit p42
512 Ibid p49
513 Ibid p68
514 Ibid p57
515 Ibid p58
516 The Fircroft Year 1938 p15/6
517 Ibid p15
518 Ibid p15
519 Ibid p16
520 Ibid p15
521 Ibid p16
522 Wood and Ball op cit p151
523 Pumphrey op cit p15
524 Ibid p13/5
525 Thornton op cit p4
526 The Fircroft Year 1958/9 p4
527 Pumphrey op cit p4
528 Ibid p4
529 Ibid p4
530 Ibid p4
531 Ibid p4
532 Fircroft pamphlet op cit p6
533 Ibid p6
534 Wood and Ball op cit p61
535 Ibid p62
536 Fircroft pamphlet op cit p8
537 Leighton op cit p10
538 Pumphrey op cit p9
539 Ibid p9
540 Ibid p9
541 Ibid p9
542 Ibid p9
543 Wood and Ball op cit p148
544 Ibid p147
545 Pumphrey op cit p13
546 Elizabeth Cadbury (8) op cit p20
547 Ibid p20/1
548 Leighton op cit p10
549 Pumphrey op cit p12
550 Ibid p12
551 Ibid p12
552 Leighton op cit p11
553 Ibid p11
554 Ibid p11
555 Ibid p10
556 Ibid p10
557 Ibid p10
558 Ib id p10
559 Pumphrey op cit p13
560 Elizabeth Cadbury (1) op cit p10
561 Worker's Educational Association (WEA) 3rd Ann Rep 1906 p1
562 26/10/06 62515 Mansbridge Papers, British Library, London
563 WEA 2nd Ann Rep 1905 p1
564 op cit 4th Ann Rep 1907 p3
565 Griffin (1987) p232
566 Simon op cit p308
567 29/6/10 65253/117 Mansbridge Papers
568 op cit 30/6/10 65253/118
569 op cit 26/6/10 62515
570 Birmingham Branch WEA 1st Ann Rep 1906/7 p4
571 Ibid p4
572 op cit 3rd Ann Rep 1908/9 p1
573 The Highway Birmingham Supplement 1911 p1
574 WEA 6th Ann Rep 1909 p25
575 Ibid p40

576 Birmingham Branch WEA 3rd Ann Rep and Balance Sheet 1908/9 p3
577 WEA 5th Ann Rep 1908 p4
578 Ibid p4
579 Ibid p4
580 op cit 2nd Ann Rep 1905 p1
581 Birmingham Branch WEA 2nd Ann Rep 1907/8 p1
582 WEA 5th Ann Rep 1908 p1
583 Kean (1990) p102
584 Miles in History Workshop 18 Wolverhampton (1984) p102
585 Simon op cit p319
586 Leighton op cit p18
587 Ibid p18
588 MacIntyre (1980) p89
589 Ibid p89
590 Ibid p89/90
591 Ibid p90
592 Ibid p90
593 Ibid p90
594 26/10/06 62515 Mansbridge Papers
595 op cit 2/11/27 65253/180
596 op cit 3/11/27 65253/181
597 See Mansbridge (1927)
598 WEA 3rd Ann Rep 1906 p10
599 Ibid p10
600 op cit 4th Ann Rep 1907 p43
601 Ibid p43
602 Ibid p43
603 op cit 6th Ann Rep 1909 p52
604 Ibid p52
605 op cit 7th Ann Rep 1910 p62
606 Ibid p61/9
607 op cit 11th Ann Rep 1914 p103
608 Ibid p92
609 The Highway Oct 1909 p2
610 Birmingham WEA Min Bk 1908 7/10/08
611 WEA 6th Ann Rep 1909 p15/6
612 Ibid p40
613 op cit 7th Ann Rep 1910 p38
614 The Highway Birmingham Supplement June 1909 p2
615 Ibid p3
616 op cit 1910 p2
617 Ibid p3
618 op cit 1912 p4
619 Ibid p2
620 Ibid p2
621 Ibid p2
622 Ibid p4
623 Freeman (1914) p18
624 Ibid p32
625 Ibid p37
626 Ibid p30
627 WEA 11th Ann Rep 1914 p62
628 op cit 12th Ann Rep 1915 p9
629 op cit IIth Ann Rep 1914 p62
630 Ibid p62
631 Birmingham WEA 3rd Ann Rep 1908/9 p1
632 Ibid p2
633 Ibid p2
634 Ibid p2
635 Ibid p2/3
636 Ibid p31
637 The Highway Birmingham Supplement 1911 nd p2
638 WEA 7th Ann Rep 1910 p9
639 The Highway Birmingham Supplement 1911 nd p2
640 Ibid p2
641 Ibid p2
642 Birmingham WEA Min Bk AGM 8/10/10
643 The Highway Birmingham Supplement 1911 nd p2
644 Ibid p3
645 Ibid p3
646 City of Birmingham Hygiene Sub Comm Mins 1911/2 p23
647 The Highway Birmingham Supplement 1911 nd p3
648 Ibid p3
649 op cit 1913 nd p2
650 Ibid p2
651 Ibid p2
652 Birmingham WEA 3rd Ann Rep and Balance Sheet 1908/9 p3
653 G Cadbury Jnr (1) op cit p11
654 Freeman op cit p32
655 Ibid p32
656 Ibid p32

REFERENCES CONCLUSION

1 Elizabeth Cabury in Daily News 13/8/26, Ms 466/152/49 Cadbury papers

2 Isichei (1970) P273

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Private Papers

J Burns Papers,The British Library, London.

The Cadbury Papers, the Central Library Birmingham.

H Campbell Bannerman Papers, The British Library London.

A G Gardiner Papers, London School of Economic and Political Science.

Viscount Gladstone Papers, The British Library London.

D Lloyd George Papers, The House of Lords Library London.

O Lodge Papers, The University of Birmingham.

A Mansbridge Papers, The British Library London.

Addtional Archive Collections

Archives of the Birmingham Branch of the NUWW, with the Birmingham Society Promoting the Election of Women on Local Government Bodies 1907-21, The Central Library Birmingham.

Archives of the Bournville Village Trust, The Central Library Birmingham.

Archives of the Bournville Women's Guild, the Central Library Birmingham.

Archives of the Bournville Works Classes Committee Sundry Papers, Cadbury Bros Library, Bournville, Birmingham.

Archives of the British Labour Party and Labour Representation Committee, Central Library Birmingham.

Archives of the Eugenics Education Society, The Welcome Institute London.

The Fabian Society Record Cards, The London School of Political and Economic Science.

The Friend's House Library Press Cuttings, The Friends' House Library London.

Archives of the ILP Francis Johnson Correspondence, the Central Library Birmingham.

Archives of the NUWW, The London County Library London.

Public Record Office Files ED76/61, ED75/67, MH48/183, 48/184, 51/571 51/842, 58/85, 80/55

Unpublished Speeches and Addresses From Ms 466 (The Cadbury Papers)

Elizabeth Cadbury

MS 466/152/ 4 Our influence as neighbours 1896
10 NUWW Presidential Add 1906
11 NUWW Presidential Add 1907 (The Riddle of Circumstance)
12 Address to the Worker's Educational Association, University of Birmingham, 1909
13 Speech at Parents' National Education Union Conference, Birmingham 1909
14 Youth Club 1910
15 See 'The Women Teacher's World' 1912, 6/3/1912
16 The Health of the National Speech at Public Health meeting 1913
22 Address for the 'Cathedral Magazine' 1916
23 See The Child Jan 1916
25 Meeting of ex Day Continuation School Girls 1919
27 Continuation School nd
28 Continuation School 1922
29 Continuation School 1922
33 Citizenship Speech to NCW 1924
43 Parish Address 1925
49 The Gospel in Relation to Marriage 1926
50 See 'Daily News' 13/8/26

Ms 466/165/ 1 Paper read at 50th anniversary of move to Bournville 1929, Miss Lawrence Cadbury, i.e. only the last document relates to Miss Lawrence Cadbury.

Ms 466/152/ 30 The School Medical Service Speech at Meeting of NCW Conf. 1923.

Annual Reports, Year Books and Local Authority Records

Birmingham Aston and King's Norton Poor Law Establishment Committee Mins.

Birmingham Chamber of Commerce Year Books.

Birmingham Heredity Society Ann Reps.

Birmingham Infants' Health Society Ann Reps.

Birmingham Independent Labour Party Fed Year Book Mins.

Birmingham and Midland Vigilance Ass Reports.

Birmingham and Midland Vigilance Ass Occasional Papers.

Birmingham Right to Work Comm Ann Report.

Birmingham Trades Council Mins Book

Birmingham Warwickshire and District Union National British Women's Temperance Ass Ann Reps

Birmingham Women's Settlement Ann Reps

Birmingham Women's Settlement School for Mothers Ann Reps.

Bournville Works Classes Comm Mins and Ann Reps

Bournville Day Continuation School Ann Reps

Bournville Village Trust Year Books.

Bournville Women's Guild Min Book 1906-9

Bournville Women's Guild Diary 1910-32

City of Birmingham Council
- Continuation and Technical School Sub Committees
- Education Comm Mins
- Hygiene Sub/Comm Mins
- Health and Housing Comm Mins
- Public Health
- Special School Sub/Comm Mins and After Care Sub/Comm Reports
- Town Planning Comm Mins and Min Bk

City of Birmingham Education Comm Conference of After Care Commissioners 24/3/04

Report showing Work Accomplished by the late School Board and the Ed Comm during the year ended 9th Nov 1903.

Report on the Work of the City of Birmingham Ed Comm 1914-24

Reports showing the Work Accomplished by the Ed Comm during the year ended 9th Nov 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914.

City of Birmingham Health Dept Report on the Industrial Employment of married Women and Infant Mortality 1910.

Report on Conference of Special Schools Union held in Birmingham 7 + 10/10/10.

Report of Special S/Comm of Enquiry concerning Physically Defective Adults and Children - presented to Birmingham Ed Comm 27/10/11

Class XV Severn St, First Day Schools Ann Reps

Edgbaston Young British Women's Temperance Ass Ann Reps.

Eugenics Ed Soc Ann Rep

Eugenics Ed Soc Council Mins (and list of Fellows 1936/7)

Fircroft Ann Reps.

The Fircroft Year.

The Free Church Year Book

Kelly's Directory of Birmingham Year Books

King's Norton and Northfield Urban Dist Council Ed Comm Mins.

King's Norton and Northfield Urban Dist Council Hygiene Sub/Comm Mins.

King's Norton Workhouse Union list of Guardians, Committees and Officers 1894 and 1903.

The Laundry and Homes of Industry (Birmingham) Ann Reps. (The Agatha Stacey Homes Ann Reps from 1909).

Midland Adult School Union Ann Reps.

Midland Adult School Union Newsletters.

Midland Adult School Union Women's School Comm Mins.

Midland Adult School Union Year Books.

National British Women's Temperance Ass, Edgbaston Branch Ann Reps.

National Commitee of Organised Labour for the Promotion of Old Age Pensions 10th Ann Rep 1908/9.

National Union of Working Women Exec Comm Mins.

National Union of Working Women Legislation Committee Mins

National Union of Working Women Reports on Ann Confs

National Union of Working Women Reports of Conferences of Rescue Workers 1897, 1907.

National Union of Working Women Handbook 1908.

National Union of Working Women Conference 9-13/10/11.

National Vigilance Association Exec Comm Mins 1909/14 (with Vigilance Record).

The Selly Oak and District School for Mothers and Babies' Welcome Ann Reps.

Severn St First Day/Adult School Ann Reps.

Severn St First Day/Adult School Year Books.

Society of Friends Year Books.

Summer School Continuation Comm Ann Reps.

West Midlands Federation of Evangelical Free Church Council Ann Rep.

West Midlands Federation of Evangelical Free Church Council Events - Work and Notes.

Woodbrooke Council Ann Reps.

Workers' Educational Association Ann Reps.

Workers' Educational Association Speeches delivered at the Seventh Ann Meeting Oct 1910.

Workers' Educational Association (Birmingham Branch) Ann Reps and balance sheets.

Workers' Educational Association (Birmingham Branch) Min Bk.

MISCELLANEOUS

Addresses and Speeches

Braithwaite W C: Foreword in the First National Conference of Adult Schools, Birmingham 1909. Headley Bros London

Burch F: An Educational Fellowship for Christian Fellowship, delivered to the Bournville Brotherhood and Fircroft Adult Schools 1917

Cadbury Elizabeth: Education for Pleasure, Presidential Address 40th Ann Meeting of the Union of Educational Institutions 1935

Cadbury Elizabeth: Woodbrooke Presidential Address 1027: Pub by the Woodbrooke Extension Committee

Cadbury Emma: How can we teach the lowest class of Working Girls and bring them under the influence of Christian Teaching? Friends' First Day Ass. Conf. Friends' First day School Teachers Birmingham 13-15/10/90

Cadbury George: Free Churches Parishes paper read before the National Free Church Council, Bristol 1898: Issued by the National Council of the Evangelical Free Church 1898

Cadbury George: The Adult School Movement paper read at the National Free Church Ann Meeting 10/3/04, The News Office Birmingham

Cadbury George Jnr: Why We Want Education in Industry, Pres Address to 8th Ann Conf of the Assoc. for Education in Industry & Commerce 1926

Cadbury George Jnr: Forward in Education and Industry, Bournville Works pamphlet 26/38, 1938

Dickson Poynder J: The Housing Question Address to the National Liberal Club 23/10/08 Pub by the Political Committee of the National Liberal Club

Grubb E: The Development of Christain Morality, in The Birmingham Summer School 1899. Headley Bros, London 1899.

Jones R: Quakerism: A Religion of Life, Swarthmore Lecture 1908. Pub by the Woodbrooke Extension Committee

Mansbridge A: George Cadbury; Adult School and Education, First George Cadbury Memorial Lecture 28/10/27. Pub by the Selly Oak College 1927

Other Reports

Birmingham Independent Labour party: Special Conference; (Housing) 17/9/10

Bournville Lantern Lecture 1936, Lantern Lecture Bureau Cadbury Bros, Bournville Works 1936

Evangelical Free Churches: Third National Congress; Birmingham March 1895

The Manchester Conference of 1895. Report of the Proceedings of the Conference of Members of the Society of Friends. Headley Bros. London 1896

The National Birth Rate Commission: The Declining Birth Rate; Its Causes and Effects, Chapman & Hall Ltd, London 1916

The National Housing Reform Council: Midland Conference on The Better Planning of New Housing Areas. 27/10/06. Hudson and Son Printers, Birmingham 1906

Quakerism and Industry: Being The Full Record of the Conference of Employers, Chiefly members of the Society of Friends, 11-14/4/18, held at Woodbrooke. Darlington: The North of England Newspaper Co Ltd, Priestgate

Quakerism and Industry: Being The Full Record of the Conference of Employers, Chiefly members of the Society of Friends, 12-14/4/18, held at Woodbrooke. Pub by the Quaker Employers' Conference

The Sanitary Institute 17th Congress Birmingham 1898. Daily Programme

The Sanitary Institute: Catalogue of the Seventeenth Health Exhibition of Sanitary Apparatus Appliances, Kell & Co Printers, London 1898

Bournville Village Trust Material in Archive MS 1536

Barlow J H: The Village of Bournville 1904

Barlow J H: Report of the National Advisory Town Planning Commission 1913

Barlow J H: A Ten Year Record; The BVT 1900/10

Bournville Village Trust, Deed of Foundation 1900

Bournville Village Trust, Deed of Foundation 1950

Bournville 1900/55 BVT 1956

First Garden City Ltd (Letchworth), Directors' Report 22/1/08

First Garden City Ltd (Letchworth), Prospectus 8/9/03

Cadbury G: Suggested Rules of Health and Other Information for Youths at Bournville, Youths Commission 1924

National Housing Reform Council: Report of the Co-operative Congress Visit to Bournville 1906 6/6.06

Robertson J: The Effect of the Bournville Experiment on Health and Housing 19/9/25

JOURNALS, PERIODICALS & NEWSPAPERS

The Birmingham Daily Mail
The Birmingham Daily Post
The Birmingham News
The British Friend
The British Monthly
The Child
The Christian World
The Clarian
Daily Mail
Daily News
The Eugenics Review
The Fabian News
The Free Church Chronicle
The Free Churchman
The Friend
The Friends' Quarterly Examiner
The Highway
The Highway Birmingham & District Supplement
The I.L.P. News
The Labour Leader
One and All
One and All, Birmingham & District Supplement
Our Link
Present Day Papers
Queen
Reynold's News
The Sanitary Institute Journal
The Socialist
The Studio
The Sunday Times
The Temple
The Times
The Weekly News
The West Bromwich & Oldbury Chronicle
The Woman Teacher's World
Women Workers

SECONDARY MATERIAL:

Printed Books

Adelman P; The Rise of the Labour Party, Longman, Harlow, 1972

Ashford D E; The Emergence of the Welfare State, Basil Blackman Ltd, Oxford, 1986

Barnsby G; Birmingham Working People, Integrated Publishing Services, Wolverhampton 1989

Bartlett P W; Barrow Cadbury: A Memoir, Bannisdale Press, London, 1960

Beales D; From Castlereagh to Gladstone 1815/85, Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd, London, 1969

Bebbington D W; The Non-Conformist Conscience; Chapel and Politics, 1870-1914, George Allen & Unwin (Publishers) Ltd, London, 1982

Booth C; Life and Labour of the People in London, MacMillan & Co Ltd, London, 1902

Brand C F; The British Labour Party; A Short History, Oxford University Press, London, 1964

Bristow E J; Vice and Vigilance; Purity Movements in Britain since 1700, Gill & MacMillan Ltd, Dublin, 1977

Bythell D; The Sweated Trades, B T Batsford Ltd, London, 1978

Cadbury Edward; Experiments in Industrial Organisation, Longmans Green & Co, London, 1912

Cadbury Edward, Mattheson C, Shann G; Women's Work & Wages; A Phase of Life in a Industrial City, T Fisher Unwin, London, 1906

Cadbury G Jnr; Town Planning, Longmans Green & Co, London, 1915

Chadwick O; The Victorian Church, A & C Black Ltd, London, 1966

Corbett J; The Birmingham Trades Council 1866-1966, Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1966

Cross C; The Liberals in Power 1905-14, Barrie & Rockliff (Barnes Books Ltd), London, 1963

Currie Martin G; The Adult School Movement: Its Origin and Development, NASU, 1924

Dale A W W; Life of R W Dale of Birmingham, Hodden & Stoughton, London 1899

Davies H; The English Free Churches, Oxford University Press, London 1963

Douglas R; History of the Liberal Party 1895-1970, Sidgwick & Jackson, London, 1971

Emy H V; Liberals, Radicals and Social Politics 1892-1914, Cambridge University Press, London, 1973

Ensor R; England 1870-1914, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1985

Ferguson R W; Education in the Factory; An Account of the Educational Schemes and Facilities, Bournville Works Pubs Dept, 1923

Ferguson R W and Abbott A (eds); Day Continuation Schools, Bournville Works Pubs Dept, 1935, 22/35 BWP

Ford P &G; A Breviate of Parliamentory Papers 1900-16, Irish University Press, Shannon, 1969

Freeman A; An Introduction to the Study of Social Problems, Pub WEA, London, 1914

Gardiner A G: Life of George Cadbury, Cassell & Company Ltd, London, 1923

Gilbert B B; The Evolution of National Insurance In Great Britain, Michael Joseph, London, 1966

Gilbert B B; British Social Policy 1914-39, B T Batsford, London, 1970

Griffin C; Adult Education as Social Policy, Croom Helm Beckenham, Kent, 1987

Halévy E; History of the English People in the 19th Century Vol V, Ernest Benn Ltd, London, 1961

Hali A; The Adult School Movement in the Tentieth Century, Dept of Adult Education University of Nottingham, 1985

Harrison B; Drink and the Victorians; The Temperance Question in England 1815-72, Faber & Faber Ltd, London, 1971

Harvey W A; The Model Village and its Cottages; Bournville, B T Batsford, London, 1906

Holton B; British Syndicalism 1900-14, Pluto Press Ltd, London, 1976

Hopkins E; Birmingham; The First Manufacturing Town in the World 1760-1840, Weidesfeld & Nicolson Ltd, London, 1989

Inglis K S; Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1964.

Isichei E; Victorian Quakers Oxford Univ Press, Lodon 1970

Jenkins R; Asquith, Collins, London 1964

Jordon E K H; Free Church Unity, History of the Free Council Movement 1896-1941, The Lutterworth Press, London 1956

Kean H; Challenging the State? The Socialist and Feminist Educational Experience 1900-30, The Falmer Press, London 1990

Kelly T; A History of Adult Education in Gt Britain, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool 1970

Koss S; Nonconformist in Modern British Politics, B T Batsford Ltd, London 1975

Koss S; The Rise and Fall of the Political Press in Britain, vol 1, Hamish Hamilton Ltd, London 1981

Koss S; The Rise and Fall of the Political Press in Britain, vol 2, Hamish Hamilton Ltd, London 1984

Leighton W H; Fircroft 1909-59, Fircroft College Trust 1959

Livingstone E A; The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Christian Churches, Oxford Press, Oxford 1977

Lowndes G A N (ed); The Silent Social Revolution, Oxford Univ Press, London 1937

MacIntyre S; A Proletarian Science, Marxism in Britain 1917-33, Cambridge Univ Press, Cambridge 1980

Mazumdar P; Eugenics, Human Genetics and Human Failings, Routledge, London 1992

Millar J; the Labour College Movement NCLC Publishing Society, London 1979

Mowat C; Britian between the Wars 1918-40, Methuen & Co, London 1955

Nettlefold J; Slum Reform and Town Planning: The Garden City Idea App to Existing Cities and Their Suburbs, GC Ass. London and Hudson & Son Printers Ltd, Birmingham, 1907.

Payne E A; The Free Church Tradition in the life of England, Hodder & Stoughton, London 1965

Pelling H; A Short history of the Labour Party, The MacMillan Press Ltd, London 1976

Pike E R; Human Documents of the Lloyd George Era, Allen & Unwin, London 1972

Pumphrey M; Recollections of Fircroft, Fircoft College Trust, 1952

Radice L; Beatrice and Sidney Webb, Fabian Socialists, The MacMillan Press Ltd, London 1984

Read D; England 1868-1914, The Age of Urban Democracy, Longman Group Ltd, London 1979

Read D; England 1868-19, The Age of Urban Democracy, Longman Group Ltd, London 1994

Rimlinger G V; Welfare Policy and Industrialization in Europe America and Russia, John Wiley & Sons Inc, London/New York 1971

Routley E; English Religious Dissent, Cambridge Univ Press, London 1960

Rowntree A; Woodbrooke; Its History and Aims Published for the Woodbrooke Ext Comm by Robert Davis, Birmingham 1923

Rowntree J S R; Quakerism; Past and Present, being An Inquiry into the Cause of its Decline in Great Britain and Ireland, Smith Elder & Co, London 1859

Rowntree J W; Essays and Addresses, Headley Bros Ltd, London 1906

Rowntree J W R and Binns H B; History of Adult Schools, Headey Bros, London 1903

Russell A K; Liberal Landslide, The General Election of 1906, David Charles, Newton Abbott 1973

Saleeby C W; Parenthood and Race Culture, Cassell & Co Ltd, London 1909

Scally R J; The Origins of the Lloyd George Coalition, The Politics of Social Imperialism 1900-18, Princetown Univ Press, Princetown and London 1975

Scott R; Elizabeth Cadbury 1856-1951, George G Harrap & Co Ltd, London 1955

Seaman L C B; Post-Victorian Britain 1902-51, Methuen & Co Ltd, London 1966

Searle G R; The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought 1899-1914, Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1971

Searle G R; Eugenics and Politics in Britain 1900-14, Leyden Noordhott Int Pub 1976

Sellers I; Nineteenth Century Nonconformity, Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd, London 1977

Simon B; Education and the Labour Movement 1870-1920, The Camelot Press, London 1965

Smith D; Conflict and Compromise; Class Formation in English Society 1830-1912, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1982

Thane P: The Foundation of the Welfare State, Longman Group Ltd, Harlow Eng 1983

Thompson E P; The Making of the English Working Class, Victor Gollancz Ltd, London 1980

Thompson P; Socialists Liberals and Labour: The Struggle for London 1885-1914, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London 1967

Thomson D M; Nonconformity in the Nineteenth Century, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London 1972

Thornton J S; Fircroft: The First People's High School in England, Francis Hodgson, London 1911

Tudor Jones R; Congregationalism in England 1662-1962, Independent Press Ltd 1962

Urwick E; A Philosophy of Social Progress, Methuen & Co Ltd, London 1912

Vipont E; The Story of Quakerism Through Three Centuries, Bannisdale Press, London 1960

Wagner G; The Chocolate Conscience, Chatto & Windus, London 1987

Webb S; Twentieth Century Politics: A Policy of National Efficiency, Fabian Tract 108, Fabian Society 1901

Weedall A; Further Education For All: The Story of a Day Continuation College 1913-53, Cadbury Bros Ltd, Publication Dept, Bournville 1963

Williams I O; The Firm of Cadbury 1831-1931, Constable & Co Ltd, London 1931

Wood H G and Ball A E; Tom Bryan, First Warden of Fircroft, George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London 1922

ARTICLES

Cadbury Christabel; 'The Galtons' in The Friends' Quarterly Examiner, vol LV1 1922

Cadbury Elizabeth; The Importance of Training in 'The Friends' Quarterly Examiner vol XXXIII 1899

Cadbury Elizabeth; 'The Care of Defective School Children in Birmingham in The Child Jan 1916

Cadbury Elizabeth; 'The Necessity of Fostering and Cultivating the Spiritual Instinct', in 'The Woman Teachers World 6/3/12

Cadbury Elizabeth; Marriage in 2026; Woman's Place in Family Life in the Daily News 13/8/26

Cadbury George Jnr; the Quaker Employer in Britain in the 'Friends Intelligencer' 21/6/30 and 28/6/30

Grubb E; The Christian Basis of Adult Schol Work in 'The Friends' Quarterly Examiner, Oct 1904 vol XXXVIII

Harvey T E; What is Our Duty as Friends in Regard to Social Problems and Service? The Friends' Quarterly Examiner, vol XLI

Hay R; Employers and Social Policy in Britain; the Evolution of Welfare Legislation1905-14, in Social History 4 Jan 1977

Hodgkin T; National Character in The Friends' Quarterly Examiner, 1902 vol XXXVI

Hughes K M; A Political Party and Education; Reflections on the Liberal Party's Education Policies 1867-1902 in British Journal of Edu Studies vol 8 no 1 Nov 1959

Ingliss; English Nonconformist City and Social Reform in Past and Present, April 1958, no 13

Isichei E; From Sect to Denomination in English Quarterism with special reference to the nineteenth century; in The British Journal of Sociology, vol 15 1964

Miles A; Workers' Education; The Communist Party and the Plebs League in the 1920's, in History Workshop issue 18, Ant 1984 vol /

Ponting C; Chruchill's Plan for Racial Purity in The Guardian 20/6/92

Wade G; Model Villages in The Temple 1900

White A; Eugenics and National Efficiency in the Eugenics Review, vol 1 1909/10

Whitehouse J H; Bournville: A Study of Housing Reform in The Studio 1901

Wood HG; The Meaning of Woodbrooke in Old Woodbrookers Magazine, no 13 1910

Woodhouse J; Eugenics and the funded: The Primary debate of 1912-14, Hist of Education 1982 vol 11 no 2

CONTRIBUTION TO PRINTED WORKS

Alfred D; 'Albert Mansbridge' in Twentieth Century Thinkers in Adult Education, Jarvis P (ed) Croom Helm Beckenham, Kent 1987

Atkins P; The Architecture of Bournville, 1879-1914 in Made in Birmingham, Tilson B(ed), K A F Brewin Books, Studley, Warwickshire, 1989.

Bews C J; A Day Continuation School for Boys in A Day Continuation School at Work; Wroy W R and Ferguson (ed) Longman & Green & Co. Ltd 1926

Brennan E J T; A Functional Theory of Education in Education for National Efficiency; The Contribution of Sidney and Beatrice Webb Brennan E J T; (ed) The Athlone Press of the Univ of London 1975

Cadbury Elizabeth; Adult Schools in Birmingham Institutions, Muirhead J D (ed) Cornish Bros Ltd, Birmingham 1911

Cadbury G Jnr; Foreword in Education in Industry; Bournville Works Publication 26/38, Bournville Publications Dept 1938

Cater A E; A Day Continuation School for Girls in A Day Continuation School at Work; Wray W R and Ferguson R (eds) Longmans Green & Co Ltd 1926

Hopkins D; The Labour Party Press in The First Labour Party, Brown K D (ed) Croom Helm Ltd, Beckenhem Kent 1985

Kent J; Hugh Price Hughes and the Nonconformist Conscience in Essays in Modern English Church History, Bennett G V and Walsh J D (eds) Black London 1966.

Koven S: Women, Voluntary Action and Child Welfare in Britain 1840-1914, in Mothers of a New World, Maternalist Politics and the Origins of the Welfare State, Koven S & Michel S (eds), Routledge London 1993

Lampard E E: The Urbanizing World in The Victorian City Images and Reality, vol 1 Dyos H J and Woolf M, (eds) Routledge & Kegan Paul, London 1993

Lee A J: The Radical Press in Edwardian Radicalism; Some aspects of British Radicalism, Morris A J A (eds), Routledge & Kegan 1974

Lewis J: Dealing with Dependency; State Practices and Social Realties in Womens Welfare, Women's Rights, Lewis J (ed), Croom Helm Bechenham Kent 1983

Mudie-Smith R: Introduction in Sweated Industries; Being a Handbook of the 'Daily News' Exhibition, Compiled by Mudie-Smith R, Printed by Bradbury, Agnew & Co Ltd, London & Tonbridge 1906

Peacock R: The 1892 Religious Census, in Religion in the Birmingham Area; Essays in the Sociology of Reigion, Bryman A (ed), University of Birmingham 1975

Pierson S: The Way Out, in The Victorian City, Images and Realities vol 2, Dyos H J and Woolf M (eds), Routledge & Kegan Paul London 1993

Reeder D: Predicaments of City Children; late Victorian and Edwardian Perspectives on Education and Urban Society in Urban Education in the Nineteeth Century; Proceedings of the History of Education Conference 1976, Reeder D (ed), Taylor & Francis Ltd, London 1977

Smith H W: The German Home-Work Exhibition in Sweated Industries; Being a Handbook of the 'Daily News' Exhibition; complied by Mudie-Smith R, Printed by Bradbury, Agnew and Co Ltd, London 7 Tonbridge 1906

Stevenson J: from Philanthropy to Faianism in Fabian Essays in Socialist Thought, Pimlott B (ed), Heinemann Educational Books Ltd, London 1084

Thane P: Late Victorian Women, in Problems in History; Later Victorian Britain 1867-1900, Gourvish T R and O'Day A, The MacMillan Press, Basingstoke and London 1988

Wohl A S: Unfit for Human Habitation in the Victorian City Images and Realities vol 2, Dyos H J and Woolf M (eds), Routledge & Kegan Paul, London 1993

PAMPHLETS 1890-1950

Birmingham Women's Settlement: Come and Help Us. Hudson & Sons Printers, Birmingham, 1911

Bournville Works Pamphlet: 1/26, A Works Council in Being, Publications Dept. Bournville, 1926

Bournville Works Pamphlet: 11/35, The Factory and Recreation, Publication Dept. Bournville, 1935

Bournville Works Pamphlet: 26/38, Education in Industry, Publication Dept. Bournville, 1938

Grubbs E: Adult Schools and the Labour Movement, The Kentish Town Adult School 1893

Fircroft College: Fircroft, Bournville 1909

Juckes F: The History of Monyhull Colony, Printed by Frank Juckes, Birmingham 1921

Nettlefold J: Slum Reforms and Town Planning, The Garden City Idea , Applied to Existing Cities and their Suburbs, Hudson & Sons Printers, Birmingham 1907

Potts Mrs W A: Pioneering Days of the NCW in Birmingham, in NUWW Archive File 3613/06/10 nd

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to thank the following for their contributions towards the completion of this work:

The staff of Central Library, Birmingham, and particularly those in the Local Studies and Archives Departments.

Professor Roy Lowe of the University of Wales, Swansea, for his unstinting encouragement and unfailingly constructive advice.

My wife Karen, for the numerous aspects of her assistance, including her enduring patience, support and tolerance throughout this considerable period. It is much appreciated.

Thank you.