

EX LIBRIS



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

PHILANTHROPY
AND THE STATE;
OR
SOCIAL POLITICS

BY

B. KIRKMAN GRAY,

Author of "A History of English Philanthropy,"

Edited by

ELEANOR KIRKMAN GRAY

AND

B. L. HUTCHINS.

LIBRARY OF
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

LONDON :

P. S. KING & SON
ORCHARD HOUSE
WESTMINSTER

1908

HV245
.G85

“ Man is civilised when the whole body of society comes to live with a life worthy to be called human, and corresponding to man’s true aspirations and powers.”

MATTHEW ARNOLD.

323706

70 WIND
AUSTRIAN

EDITORS' PREFACE.

I.

My husband's MS. from which the present volume has been edited was, at the time of his sudden death, not only unrevised but in some sections and in several details incomplete. It was at once obvious that the preparation of it for publication would call for a knowledge of economics and sociology, and experience in investigation such as I did not myself possess. I was enabled to produce the work by the generous offer of Miss B. L. Hutchins to undertake the editing of it. Miss Hutchins had become a friend of ours during the last two years of my husband's life, and he had often discussed with her the subjects in which both were interested. I entrusted the work to her, knowing that it would be sympathetically handled, and my own share in the editing has been confined to occasional elucidation of the MS. and purely verbal alterations. The principles which have been followed by the editors are explained by Miss Hutchins in the preface which follows, and it only remains for me to express (though it is impossible for me to do so adequately) my gratitude to her both for the very considerable time and labour which she devoted to this work, and also for her wish that my name should appear as co-editor, although, as I have explained, my share in the editorial work has been so much less than hers. My thanks are due to Dr. G. Buchanan Gray for his great kindness in giving us advice on several difficult points and also for reading the final revision of the proofs. Of others whose help I gratefully recall, I would especially mention Dr. McCleary and Dr. Lionel Tayler, who have each been good enough to read certain portions in proof and make suggestions for notes, amendments, etc., and the Rev. W. Reason who has read the whole of the proofs.

ELEANOR KIRKMAN GRAY.

II.

THE book sketched out by Mr. Kirkman Gray in his note book, which lies before me, was intended to be considerably longer than the work now published. The notes for the unwritten chapters include a sketch of "Newspaper Relief Funds" (end of Part I.), chapters on "Cripples," "Epileptics," "The Feeble-minded," "The Unemployed," and on "The Relation of the State to the Weaker Classes." Part III. was to have discussed "The Private Citizen," under the threefold aspect of "The Agitator" (included in Appendix I.), "The Pioneer," and "The Administrator." Part IV. was to be called "The Goal," and to include a chapter on "The Reservoir of Power," a few notes for which are given in Appendix II. *infra*. The titles of these missing chapters may serve as an indication of the line of thought on which the Author's mind was working. I am told that when, some years ago, he began planning this book, he intended to call it "The Failure of Philanthropy," his experience on a mission in one of the poorest slums in London having convinced him of the utter ineffectiveness of philanthropy as a cure for the social wastage of the present time. But with the pursuit of historical study, this adverse judgment became in some degree modified. Private enterprise and voluntary effort were indeed powerless to save the race from physical deterioration under unregulated competition and the extreme inequality of wealth characteristic of our present social condition, but the importance of the philanthropic movement in the agitation for reform, in the trial of experiments, and in the infusion of zeal and enthusiasm into the practical

work of administration, impressed him more and more. The philanthropist could not himself do what was needed, but he could help to set forces in motion that were mightier for good than any he, unaided, could wield.

Although the gaps in the work are a sad loss to its form and achievement, what remains, is, I think, sufficiently developed to tell its own story. It is obvious that the work does not pretend to historical completeness. Almost any of the subjects treated in the several chapters might from the historical point of view form the subject of a monograph quite as long as the entire work. The voluminous notes collected by the Author, as well as the scope and form of his earlier book, are a testimony that detailed historical research was congenial work, which he was well equipped to perform. For this, his second book, however, he adopted a more comprehensive scheme, which involved considerable restraint in the use of materials, and the subordination of each separate subject to the larger whole, and it was fortunate, to my thinking, that he planned this study on these broad lines. Its importance, in my view, is synthetic rather than analytic. It is quite easy at the present time, to find competent students who will turn out conscientious studies of social and economic questions, with careful research from original materials and a collection of facts and statistics. Such spade-work is necessary and valuable, but relatively speaking there are a considerable number who can do it. What is not so common, is the philosophic insight that will find the connecting link, interpret the inner relations, and bring the many facts and details together so that they may have a meaning and purpose that will be fruitful for the souls of men. It is as an aid to the understanding of that strangely complex, little known, and most fascinating subject, the social history of the 19th century, that Mr. Gray's book appears to me to be valuable.

No one can be more conscious than myself how great is the loss of the revision and final touches that only an author himself can properly give to his own work. The loss is especially great in the case of a work like the present, which appears to have been written with extreme condensation, the thought often indicated rather than expressed, and probably intended to be amplified and more fully illustrated in course of revision. But Mrs. Gray and I have done our best to render the rough draft clear and readable. We have confined our revision strictly to the removal of obvious roughness or inaccuracies in the style, and occasionally of obscure sentences or clauses, to the verifying of references, and to the introduction of illustrative matter where the text appeared bald and incomplete. In some cases these illustrations have been taken from the Author's own notes, in others, from sources indicated by marginal notes in the MS., in others, from original materials used at our own discretion. But no theoretical or controversial matter has been imported, and the Author's opinions are left to speak for themselves.

In some instances, I fear, with all our efforts, the text will still appear rough and somewhat obscure, of the nature of notes rather than finished work. Such is especially the case with portions of Chap. II., Chap. III., the conclusion of Chap. VIII., and Chap. IX. In these cases, however, it has seemed to us that the passages in question, though defective, contained ideas that were helpful to the argument, and would be valued by a sympathetic reader, even in their present imperfect condition. We have preferred to make some sacrifice of form and style, where necessary, rather than delete anything that could contribute to the significance of the whole.

B. LEIGH HUTCHINS.

CONTENTS.

PREFACE.

PART I.

THE TRANSITION IN THOUGHT.

| CHAP. | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. PHILANTHROPISTS AND POLITICIANS | 1 |
| II. SOCIAL FORCES | 14 |
| III. AMATEUR OR PROFESSIONAL | 29 |
| IV. THE TOWN, 1833-44 | 41 |
| V. THE CITY, OR THE GROWTH OF CIVIC CON- SCIOUSNESS | 56 |
| VI. PHILANTHROPISTS IN OFFICE | 75 |
| VII. THE POOR LAW | 87 |
| VIII. THE CHARITY ORGANISATION SOCIETY | 111 |

PART II.

THE INTERVENTION OF THE STATE.

| | |
|---|-----|
| IX. TYPES OF STATE INTERVENTION | 127 |
| X. ANNEXATION (EDUCATION, &c.) | 134 |
| XI. CO-OPERATION (PRISONERS' AID) | 146 |
| XII. SUPERVISION (REFORMATORIES) | 166 |
| XIII. INEBRIATE HOMES | 190 |
| XIV. CRUELTY TO CHILDREN | 211 |
| XV. HOSPITALS | 222 |
| XVI. TUBERCULOSIS | 242 |
| XVII. PUBLIC HEALTH | 256 |
| XVIII. WIDOWS AND ORPHANS | 274 |
| XIX. OLD PEOPLE AND CHILDREN | 289 |

APPENDIX.

| | |
|--|-----|
| i. AGITATION | 302 |
| ii. LEAVES FROM THE AUTHOR'S NOTE BOOK | 316 |
| INDEX | 327 |

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

A CENTURY ago philanthropy was regarded as having what would now be called a socio-political function. The conception was a possible one, so long as the extent of the problem was not recognised. But as knowledge of social facts became more complete and precise, so it began to appear that private corporations could not adequately deal with difficulties which result not from personal but from public causes, and which are as extensive as society itself.

This appeared in the first place rather as feeling than as thought, and arose as a sense of need for national assistance in private charitable work. It was left to experience to demonstrate that a State which assists cannot refrain from exercising control. The change from philanthropy to social politics has been great, and the present volume seeks to illustrate the process. There has been some development in thought, but as yet we have no consistent doctrine of the relation of the State *to the weaker classes* of society (social pathology), and ^{thus} the work of assistance to these classes suffers in consequence. In the following pages I give illustrations of the bad practical results of this lack of a clear and consistent theory of society.

The subject matter of my book is to be found in that range of activities which a century ago were

supposed to belong to philanthropy. Some of them have already become part of the ordinary work of the State; some remain entirely a philanthropic interest; others are now left to an ill-defined co-operation or competition between the private citizen and the State. I maintain the thesis that:—private philanthropy cannot provide a remedy for wide-spread want which results from broad and general social causes; that it ought not to be expected to do so; that the provision of such remedies is the proper responsibility of the State and should be accepted as such.

It does not necessarily follow that the action taken to discharge this responsibility must be left entirely in the hand of State (including municipal) officials. The charge is a public one, and the policy should be that of a public authority. But it may be desirable (to utilise the co-operation of the private citizen in the carrying out of the task,) and in the third section of the book I consider under what circumstances this is possible, and what share the private citizen should take. \ That trenches on the larger consideration: What is the right attitude of the members of society to the State which is or should be the instrument for social action?

In a concluding section I raise the further question whether the work of assistance to the weaker classes which used to be regarded as philanthropic is, as a matter of fact, necessary work at all; whether, or how far, these needs are permanent needs.

Part I.



THE TRANSITION IN THOUGHT.



PHILANTHROPY AND THE
STATE,
OR SOCIAL POLITICS.

CHAPTER I.

PHILANTHROPISTS AND POLITICIANS.

PHILANTHROPIC institutions are much more numerous in the opening years of the twentieth century than they were at the beginning of the nineteenth century, but their social importance is incalculably less. For this fact several reasons may be assigned. A century ago it was generally supposed that charitable action was the right and sufficient response to the wants of the distressed classes of society. It was thought to be *right* because at that time the mind of the nation had not grasped the possibility of any more thorough remedy, and the conscience of the nation was satisfied by this timid recognition of social responsibility. At the present time such an assumption is untenable, and as a matter of fact much which was then left to philanthropy is now an accepted part of State administration.

It was thought to be *sufficient* because the extent of social distress was unknown, and in the absence of statistical knowledge this ignorance was unavoidable. But the lack of knowledge was not the only cause of the prevalent misconception of the evil and its cure. We must add to this source of error a second. Social philosophy was in a rudimentary condition, and its improvement was retarded by the notion that poverty, and the diseases now known to be consequent on poverty, were usually the result of personal misdemeanour on the part of the sufferer. It

2 PHILANTHROPY AND SOCIAL POLITICS.

is now generally recognised that in addition to such want as results to the ill-doer from his own ill-doing there is a vast amount of suffering which comes from general social causes; and for which the sufferer is responsible either remotely or not at all. For such distress society is responsible, and it is bound to alleviate or remove it. The work which was left to philanthropy is coming to be accepted as an integral part of social politics.

And thus we are brought to the truth that philanthropic institutions, although much more numerous, are likewise of much less social significance. A century ago the alleviation of distress had to be carried out by charitable means at the risk of being entirely neglected. At the present time that is not the alternative. If Philanthropy does not care or is unable to discharge its remedial function, the work will not be left undone, but will be effected by public action. There is not yet any consensus of opinion which of these agencies, philanthropy or the State, is the better fitted for the task, and the attempt will be made in the following pages to produce evidence which shall help to decide the question. But while we have no accepted theory of the respective limits of private and public work in this sphere of meliorative action, it may be pointed out that in the course of the last two generations the State has been forced again and again to take over tasks for which private philanthropy had found its resources insufficient.

Yet another ground should be assigned for the gradual encroachment of the State upon the province which had previously been considered philanthropic. The aims of benevolence have become much wider. Whereas charity confined itself for the most part to efforts for alleviation, the social politics of to-day regards prevention as primary, and passes on to consider how the value of life may be positively enhanced.

In these earlier chapters of my book I wish to show that the larger practical ends which we are seeking to-day depend on a change in thought and an alteration in the structure of society itself. (It will be seen that I maintain

my thesis only for an evolved society, namely, one marked by coherent heterogeneity.) The development of the social idea is still very incomplete, and will inevitably increase the range of State action very considerably in the coming years. In the present chapter I confine myself to sketching some of the ideas which animated both philanthropists and politicians at a period (say before 1835 A.D.), when the assumption that the alleviation of distress belonged to charity and not to the State was accepted by all the comfortable classes.¹

At the period which we are now considering we are able to trace a two-fold relationship between the leaders in the world of benevolence and the leaders in politics. The aim of the State had been the maintenance of power by means of the maximum of revenue; its efforts were now directed to the production of the greatest possible wealth in the hands of the commercial classes. It had not yet accepted as its task the furthering of the welfare of the whole body of citizens. So far as this was appreciated as an end of social action, it was left for the most part to private people to secure it. Even at an early date this neglect was animadverted upon by William Allen, who regretted the tardy penetration of philanthropy in Parliament. He noted too "several very pleasing indications recently exhibited by the House of Commons, of the growing influence of the civilisation of the age in improving the views of that assembly."² Distinguished philanthropists had seats in that assembly, but for the most part the Government of the day showed little disposition to meddle with works of charity.

Nor did the philanthropists themselves really desire the assistance, not to say the control, of the State. Some appeals for financial help there had certainly been,³ and

¹ Poor Law relief had existed side by side with soup kitchens, but the Poor Law itself was regarded as a quasi-charitable institution. "The sharp distinction that has since been drawn between public and private action was not felt in the 16th century. The Poor Law, *e.g.*, was as much an act of charity as was a gift of bread or an almshouse" ("History of Philanthropy," p. 31, n.).

² "The Philanthropist," vol. vi., 24.

³ See "Hist. of English Philanthropy" p. 161.

4. PHILANTHROPY AND SOCIAL POLITICS.

at times a sense of exhaustion appears when the arduousness of the task was brought prosaically home to a treasurer's breast by the difficulty of obtaining subscriptions. The rule, however, on such occasions was not, as at the later Reformatory school period, to dip into the public purse. Funds were supposed to be wanting because of the narrow sympathies of brother philanthropists. Some "are absorbed in missions to the Jews; others in deputations to the South Seas; and there are not wanting partizans who can see no objects of instruction, among the eight hundred millions of mankind, except a few hundred children on the coasts of Newfoundland."

But in spite of such mutual bickerings the philanthropists did not really think ill of one another. They firmly believed that it was theirs to heal the hurts of the people, and they came only by degrees to doubt their ability to do so. They were ready at any moment and without previous training to run the longest race. It is only necessary to refer to the movement for a cheap system of national education; and to compare this light-hearted temper with the heavy groans recently called forth by the intolerable burden of defraying even a small percentage of the cost of elementary instruction out of voluntary funds. Private individuals were confident of their power to discharge a public function, and the government was willing to have it so. It was left to experience to determine that the work was ill done and was by no means equal to the need.

The distinction between the proper work of the philanthropist and the politician was tolerably complete and sharply defined; but it was not absolute. There was a debatable ground. The State had been forced to accept responsibility for feeding its prisoners. There was lack of agreement on the subject of its duty in regard to lunatics. Indeed if we look into the subject at almost any period of the nineteenth century, we shall find a certain pressure being exerted on the State to assist or to take over the charge of charitable work. Nevertheless, there was a

general agreement over the broad field of philanthropic effort that such work belonged to private persons and not to the public authority. The State maintained power and removed obstacles to the concentration of wealth "in the hands of a few." Charitable members of the governing classes endeavoured to mend some of the mischances of life, and even to increase the enjoyment of those who were not in distress.

But while the distinction of function was fairly clear, the intercourse between persons was intimate and varied. The middle classes were coming into political power. As I have shown in a former book, associated philanthropy was a middle class device.¹ For a time successive governments, Tory or Whig, were constituted chiefly from members of the landed aristocracy. But these governments were after 1832 directly dependent on middle class votes, and even previous to the Reform Bill the indirect influence of the bourgeoisie was very great. There was a motive of self-preservation urging the members of governments to uphold friendly relations with the middle ranks of society generally, and with the leaders of philanthropy in particular. This interested motive was reinforced by the fact that cabinet ministers could not well be less philanthropic than their constituents or those who would become their constituents on the passing of the Reform Bill.

Philanthropy was a real concern with many individuals, as the mention of such names as Wilberforce, Owen, Allen and Mrs. Fry suffices to remind us. It also commanded a wide range of popular sympathy. This may have been rather shallow and quite uninstructed, but it was real. Large numbers of well-to-do people (£10 householders), were touched by genuine pity. Perhaps a still wider circle was attracted by the opportunity of participating at a small cost in so praiseworthy a pursuit. If we would judge of the extent of the movement we must glance at the list of 150 or so associated philanthropic institutions

¹ See "History of Philanthropy," pp. 81 and 266, for the early efforts of associated philanthropy and co-operation of earnest workers and "Guinea Subscribers."

6 PHILANTHROPY AND SOCIAL POLITICS.

founded in or for Londoners between 1800 and 1830, and reflect that in this space of time these institutions were doubled in number. We mention the charities for the deaf and dumb as characteristic of this period, and we instantly think of the name of the Scotch school master, Thomas Braidwood. But charities of which he has been termed the "father" depended for their support on a subscription list. Thus it is that the whole body of subscribers to the hundreds of charitable societies in London and throughout the country must be taken into account in order to understand the amount of interest manifested by the middle classes in the wants of the destitute or the poor. The class which was coming to political power prided itself on its benevolence: the sentiment was shared by those who wielded power and patronage; it is easy therefore to understand why the philanthropists should seek out the ministers and why the ministers should be complaisant to their visitors. The pages of the memoirs of the period contain much amusing illustration of this habit. Thus Allen after an interview with Lord Sidmouth, noted for the narrow rigour of his administration, remarks, "I shall think of him more highly than ever."¹

Mrs. Fry, in course of trying to obtain libraries for coast guard stations, writes: "I had to see men in authority, who received me in a way that was surprising to myself; at the Custom House by Lord Althorp, as Chancellor of the Exchequer; also about the District Society concerns at Brighton, by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

. . . These things might probably exalt, had I not deep inward humiliation."² On another occasion, whilst preparing to visit gaols in Ireland, she "received a highly gratifying communication" from the Home Office, assuring her that "Lord Melbourne was fully sensible of the good which had been done by herself and the ladies connected with her in many of the prisons; of the great benefits derived from their exertions by the female trans-

¹ Life of W. Allen, i., p. 174.

² Memoirs of Mrs. Fry, ii., 189-90.

ports; and that his Lordship was anxious that as far as it could be done, the Visiting Magistrates should favourably entertain and second her benevolent intentions.”¹ Mrs. Fry’s position is admirably hit off by her daughter, who of course did not fully apprehend the influence of political changes. “Few persons ever possessed so little speculativeness of character, combined with such extraordinary quickness of perception as Mrs. Fry. She perceived that whereas the greater part of persons had hitherto been content to take no heed of passing circumstances, and to allow abuses to continue, scarcely recognising their existence, the time was come when the rights of humanity would make themselves heard. Men of reflection had begun to investigate the causes; and the probable results, of the facts around them. . . . Mrs. Fry perceived that the light had dawned, she was persuaded that it could never again be extinguished. . . . She also saw a growing sympathy between all ranks and conditions of men, which while it trenched not on the powers that be, nor touched that beautiful order providentially arranged in their divine ranks and position, yet breathed a spirit of tenderness and consideration towards those in the humbler sphere, of respect, and fitting reserve towards those in the higher.”²

The Autobiography of Miss Sewell, an aged authoress not long deceased, tells how at the time of the Reform Bill “attempts” were “made from time to time to bring all classes together, sometimes on the plea of a charitable object, and at others with a political purpose which naturally followed upon the extinction of close boroughs and the efforts of Parliamentary candidates to become popular” (p. 142).

The visitors’ book at Owen’s Mills in New Lanark reminds us that it was not only philanthropists who sought out distinguished persons. “Princes John and Maximilian of Austria, Foreign Ambassadors—many Bishops and clergy innumerable—almost all our own nobility—learned men of all professions from all countries—and

¹ *Ibid.* ii., p. 147.

² *Ibid.* i., 401-2.

8 PHILANTHROPY AND SOCIAL POLITICS.

wealthy travellers for pleasure or knowledge of every description" were, as Owen tells us, among those who were attracted by the fame of his schemes for Welfare Management. There was, in fact, a very wide-spread interest in "our friends the poor," and wherever any scheme for their improvement was in hand there people of all kinds would flock. It is hardly necessary to observe that in this matter some of the interest excited is hardly to be approved, though it affords amusement to our sense of humour. Benevolence was fashionable. It became a society craze. The fame of Mrs. Fry's work at Newgate drew the "dwellers in palaces and lordly halls" to converse with women condemned to death, exactly as at an earlier period idle people had flocked to see the lunatics of Bedlam, or would resort a little later in such crowds to the ragged schools as to interrupt the instruction, and destroy all sense of discipline. This seems to be part of the necessary price paid for an idle class in society. A good deal of the charity of the day was in the nature of a whim.

It represented, however, a very genuine growth of humane feeling. "The three Dukes showed themselves real men of business and feeling."¹ The emphasis lies too much on having secured "three dukes" at once for a British school meeting. Personally I am convinced by my own studies that the ills of society never can be removed by private and arbitrary efforts, and am not enamoured of any movement which so largely depends for its success on the attractive influence of personages of high rank. But we must not omit to notice the strong and genuine movement which was going forward in this and other countries. Thus the Czar (at that time the Grand Duke) Nicholas sought to entice Owen to settle in Russia, and inasmuch as economists in England regarded our population as redundant, he asked him to bring with him two million of the people of these islands.² Various schemes were set on foot in Germany, France, and Switzerland, which, if not so highly patronized,

¹ Allen's Life, i., p. 168.

² Podmore's Life of Owen, p. 173.

yet indicated a very real concern for the problems of distress which were common to all the peoples. The charitable movements were marked by breadth rather than by depth. They did not really effect much, but they were widely distributed, and a catalogue of them would have an imposing appearance. Rather than attempt the compilation of such a list I will merely remark on one common feature. They represented a forefeeling of the need for International action, and a recognition that the problem of distress was an international problem. But before that recognition could lead to fruitful results a long development of thought must intervene. It was not possible to spring from private local association to a concerted policy among peoples marked by widely different habits of mind and life. It would be necessary first of all to understand the problems as national, and to deal with them on that basis. But the magnificence of the dream need not be denied because in the nature of things the early tentative policy was a failure. I go so far as to suggest that we have in these naive records of foreign visits and in the consequent interchange of ideas, one illustration of the deep-rooted demand of the modern mind for a larger unity than any merely national one. But as I have said, the national movement must intervene, and I hope to indicate how the increased action of the State in philanthropic affairs is part of this racial movement, as the racial idea in its turn is a stage in the world movement for an Union of the peoples.

From such speculations it is necessary now to return to humbler themes. We have remarked on the general acceptance of the notion that philanthropy should properly be left in private hands, although in some sense its function was not private but public. The idea was to erect within the limits of society a comprehensive social political force which should yet be distinct from the State authority. For general purposes of government the State; for this special purpose an independent organisation. The idea was faulty; but whether we should condemn the Philanthropists who did something, or society

which shirked, or whether it is worth while to condemn at all I do not decide. It is now time to offer some sketch of the actual practical ends which were pursued.

In the first place, the movement was entirely and nervously anti-revolutionary. Lord Melbourne is said to have introduced Lord Ashley to Queen Victoria as "the greatest Jacobin in your Majesty's dominion."¹ He could hardly have permitted himself to joke on such a subject earlier in the century. Philanthropic people were for the most part themselves uninfluenced by subversive opinions, and looked with undisguised affection on the "beautiful order of different ranks of society." Much admiration was excited by the success of Owen's infant schools, but the feature which seemed most praiseworthy was the apparent proof that the experiment was not injurious to those who furnished the capital.² Some of the efforts made to improve the character and ameliorate the condition of the poor did indeed incur the suspicion of being prompted by radical if not by seditious motives, and among these we may notice the early savings banks and the mechanics' institutes. These movements are certainly chiefly due to men who belonged to the reform party, but reform at that time did not include the idea of throwing power into the hands of the workers. A leading motive in these as in all other benevolent devices of the period was to be found in the desire for patronage. It may be that many of the philanthropists really thought less about and cared less for the swelling sense of their own worth which this exercise of patronage gave them, than they did for the social stability which they imagined would result from the feelings of dependence when that sentiment was mingled with gratitude.³

¹ Dicey, "Law in Relation to Public Opinion," p. 227.

² Allen's Memoirs, i., 182.

³ Yet for the ugliest aspect of the love of patronage, see Chalmers' "Christian and Civic Economy." "Out of the simple elements of attention, and advice, and civility, and good will, conveyed through the tenements of poor, by men a little more elevated in rank than themselves, a far more purifying and even gracious operation can be made to descend upon them, than ever will be achieved by any other of the ministrations of charity." 127. "There is a substantial tho'

Something must be said also about the Society for superseding the necessity of climbing boys,¹ because this society presents us with two interesting suggestions which have been adopted at a later period. The society was founded in 1803 on the "anonymous summons of a humble individual," and one of its earliest actions was to offer a prize of £200 for the best sweeping machine, which should obviate the necessity for sending children up the chimneys. The society wished to demonstrate that a practice which was certainly inhumane, and on that ground alone ought to be abolished, was also unnecessary, and therefore without inconvenience might be done away with. In this attempt they were not successful, inasmuch as "humanity is a modern invention, and there are many chimneys in old houses," especially the mansions of the peers, which could not be cleansed by the machine.² Then they promoted a Bill which passed the Commons and was rejected in the Lords, and, in short, nothing effective was done until 1875. Of the two efforts which anticipate later developments one was of the greatest social value. The society appointed their own private inspectors to watch the conduct of master sweepers. These officials had, of course, no authority, but even so the knowledge of their being on the prowl must have had some influence, and they managed to collect much detailed information which was to be utilised at a later day. We have to consider the social effect of inspection in a later

unnoticed, charm in the visit of a superior. There is a felt compliment in his attentions, which raises an emotion in the breast, the very opposite of that disdainful sentiment towards the higher orders of society, that is now of such alarming prevalence amongst our operative population." ii., 37. "Benevolence meets with much to damp and to discourage her, and, more especially, in a certain hardness and unthankfulness among its objects, which it is the direct tendency of the reigning system to engender. That the good will of the one party be kept in vigorous play, it would require to be met by the gratitude of the other—but how often is this utterly put to flight among the people, by the shrewd imagination, that all that is done for them by the rich, is only done to lessen the burden of the poor rate." ii., 256.

¹ See "A Short Account of the Society for Superseding the Work of Climbing Boys," 1816.

² Sydney Smith's Essay "On Climbing Boys," "Edinburgh Review," October, 1819. Reprinted in his collected essays.

chapter; it is sufficient here to draw attention to a private experiment which was to have such an immense effect. The second experiment is rather curious than important, and is an interesting anticipation of what has been more recently attempted. The Society drew up a White list of those employers who used the sweeping machine.¹ Its effect was slight as I believe the direct effect of all subsequent white lists has been, but the indirect influence has been considerable. These lists have appealed to a number of people, and have driven some to see the necessity for further action if the ends proposed are to be attained. The Society also adopted the device of themselves purchasing machines, which they let out to small masters at 1s. 6d. a week.²

There is only one other subject which need detain us. A review of this period brings home to us a conviction of the tremendous need for vehemence in all agitation for reform. For some years before the advent of Mrs. Fry there had been in existence a society for the reform of prison discipline. Its members were capable, serious, pertinacious, but their attack lacked verve and dash. But Mrs. Fry's onset was irresistible. We should describe it as passionate, only that word is hardly applicable to the calm of her outward demeanour, and while passion was in her soul, her motives were so deeply rooted in an overmastering sense of religious obligation, that to describe them as passionate fails to do justice to their intensity and power. In matters of prison reform popular thought leaps from Howard to Elizabeth Fry: historically this judgment is incorrect. In a sense, however, it is true. After Howard, the next great impulse was given by Mrs. Fry, and the fierceness of her activity did achieve much more, and more quickly, than the efforts of the Society for the reform of prison discipline had done.

We are able to discern the beginnings of a movement which was bound ultimately to issue in a reversal of the notion that philanthropy, though a quasi public function,

Report of the Society for superseding the work of Climbing Boys, 1818. Cf. 10th Report, 1821, p. 7.

² *Ibid.*

could be entrusted to private corporations or individuals. The distinction between the State and philanthropy was still, however, as we have seen, tolerably complete, and some sentences of Kropotkin's introduce us to the explanation. His remarks are only partly true for his own time, but they are entirely applicable to this earlier period. "The very religion of the pulpit is a religion of individualism, slightly mitigated by more or less charitable relations to our neighbours, chiefly on Sundays. 'Practical' men and theorists, men of science and religious preachers, lawyers and politicians, all agree upon one thing—that individualism may be more or less softened in its harshest effects by charity, but that it is the only secure basis for the maintenance of society and its ulterior progress." 1

The whole of the movement which we are about to trace, the movement which I describe as a transition from philanthropy to social politics, rests on the breaking down of the simple old doctrine of individualism. What social faith is to be substituted is yet undetermined, and that hesitation explains the confusion which still exists as to the proper spheres of philanthropy and social politics respectively.

1 "Mutual Aid," p. 228.

CHAPTER II.

SOCIAL FORCES.

I. STATISTICS.

MERE knowledge, which informs the mind without stirring the emotions, is not likely to have much result in action. But knowledge is never "mere" knowledge, and the knowledge which is able to touch the springs of conduct is indispensable to right conduct. This is pre-eminently true in regard to a subject matter so complicated and laws so recondite as those of social affairs. The first instrument for discovering the facts of society and discerning its causes is that of statistics. It may seem to be far removed from actual measures of reform, and it was unnecessary so long as persons were content to put forth remedial effort without thorough study of the work to be done. At the present time we are no longer satisfied with doing something; we want assurance that the means will match the end. The change of mood in relation to the problem of distress is very largely the result of the introduction of the statistical method.¹

But before proceeding to illustrate this effect of statistics we may consider briefly that the adoption of the method itself depends on a mood of deeper enquiry. The London Statistical Society gives a bronze medal, called after the name of Howard, and the words in which

¹ See the Author's article in "International Journal of Ethics," "The Ethical Problem in an Industrial Community," January, 1907, p. 226: "It is difficult to over-estimate the importance of the sociological study which, before Comte's time, and increasingly since then, has yielded so much information as to conditions of social life. The net result has been to translate the economic fact of solidarity into one of the most potent regulative moments of consciousness. Physical inter-dependence is shewn to involve social responsibility."

Howard describes the motive of his book may be fitly taken as an ideal of all statistical research. It was his resolution to collect information, the authenticity of which could not be disputed. The mention of Howard serves to remind us that from an early period one principal aim of statistics was directed towards the removal of social abuses. This fact is strikingly elucidated when we fix our attention on the period in which this new social instrument may be said to have been fully forged and fashioned.

The first of the English Statistical Societies was formed in 1833 at Manchester, and the members at once set to work to procure information on the most important matters connected with the moral and physical condition of the population in their own immediate neighbourhood. Their enquiry into the existing facilities for elementary education may be referred to as an example.¹ The London society began work in the following year² and was followed in 1836 by one at Bristol, whose energies were at first almost entirely absorbed by an enquiry into the state of the working classes in Bristol.³ These researches were a result of that altered tone of thought to which I have just referred. The attempt to ameliorate the condition of the poor was not a new one, but the impulse which had driven people to so praiseworthy an effort had revealed a difficulty. Little was known in regard to the condition of the poor, while a still ampler ignorance prevailed as to the causes of distress. I attribute the introduction of statistical methods as a help in the diagnosis of social disease in part to the already existing desire to find a remedy. But the effect of statistics concerns us still more nearly. Not only did it define the problem but it helped to determine the attitude of men to the problem.

“The word statistics is of German origin, and is derived from the word *staat* signifying the same as our English word state, or a body of men existing in social union.” This definition, taken from the first page of the

¹ Report of Manchester Statistical Society on Education at Bury (1835).

² See Appendix at end of this chapter.

³ Journal of the Statistical Society, vol. 1. p. 48-9.

Statistical Journal, is good evidence of the meaning then attached to the word, and suggests the new social thought which has since received such great development. From Germany (and from Germany's most popular philosopher, Hegel), had come the idea of society as something more than a simple collection of individuals. Persons where they exist in society (and we know them in no other medium), are something more than individuals, they are members one of another, and parts of a social whole. How important an influence this social whole exerts in the lives of men has only been gradually discerned, as a result partly of a process of philosophic and poetic thought, but partly also of statistical knowledge. The want which philanthropists felt for secure knowledge of causes, and the nascent perception that society is more than an aggregation of units, gave the impulse in thought out of which statistics sprang.¹

But while this is true and in itself well worth developing, and will be developed in the second section of this chapter, our immediate purpose is to show that this accumulating weight of social knowledge was itself an active force in bringing about the change which has taken place in our conception of the function and worth of philanthropy. Philanthropy is a pre-scientific attempt to do a thing which in some way needs to be done. The nation has not yet succeeded in doing it, and has therefore no right to sit in judgment on philanthropists; when it has succeeded it will not wish to do so.

We turn then to consider how this change in our mode of viewing the problem has been brought about. It was necessary to go behind the naive misconception, "I have been young and now am old, yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken nor his seed begging bread." There were other causes besides personal misdemeanour which

¹ "Statistics, therefore, may be said, in the words of the prospectus of this Society, to be the ascertaining and bringing together of those 'facts which are calculated to illustrate the condition and prospects of society'; and the object of statistical science is to consider the results which they produce, with the view to determine those principles upon which the well-being of society depends." Journ. Stat. Soc., vol. iv., 1.

led to poverty. Some of these lay in the nature of the environment. The quest was shifted therefore from the character of the individual to the circumstances under which he suffered, in order that from the study of circumstances men might rise to more adequate understanding of the springs of character.

Three recent investigations have exercised a very striking influence on the public mind.¹ They have provided us with a great collection of valuable information, and if they had not done this their effect would have been less or at least might have been different. They are constantly quoted and appealed to because they contain the results of pertinacious enquiry into the facts of industrial life, and because, though in a less degree, they offer explanations or even suggest remedies. But their influence is by no means confined to those who are familiar with the contents of these twenty-two volumes. On the contrary it might be argued that the most far-reaching results of these publications have been achieved among those who have never studied them. It is known, *e.g.*, that the author of "Life and Labour" is an advocate of Old Age pensions, and multitudes of people who would never master either Mr. Booth's figures or his argument are deeply impressed. It might be shown by reference to other subjects that in many ways these three works have gained a symbolical meaning. Life and Labour, Town Poverty, Physical Deterioration are phrases which represent vague dreads and hopes. The facts percolate through the strata of society from those who have a real understanding of the issues involved down to those who have absorbed, it may be, one or two of their most picturesque results. Some isolated phenomena, some subsidiary cause taken as primary, these are the distorted images in many minds. But the social value of this refracted light is incalculable. Such books as these create a predisposition towards concerted social action. The effect to which I allude has been quick and obvious in

¹ "Life and Labour in London," Charles Booth; "York: A study of town poverty," Seebohm Rowntree. "Report of Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration."

action in one instance, the rapidity perhaps without precedent. The Report on Physical Deterioration has, I imagine, been studied in more church and chapel reading circles than any similar Blue Book. But we may throw back from this instance to earlier ones, and it will help to an understanding of the kind of social force exercised by statistics if we consider how far the governmental and other enquiries of the nineteenth century have produced an effect of this general kind. They have created a wide-spread uneasiness in the public mind, and have prepared opinion to accept the necessity for unfamiliar remedies. The momentum of knowledge has been felt far beyond the limits which the knowledge itself has reached. The stone sinks plumb into the lake where it is cast, but the surface of the water undulates in ever broadening circles. But the stone must be at the centre and the statistics are indispensable. From a review of the statistical work of the nineteenth century the philanthropist or the social politician rises with the conviction that knowledge is a mighty instrument of reform.

The first Census of 1801 begins a series. It has been followed at ten-year intervals by a report similar in character, but constantly becoming more full and complete. The separate Census reports therefore afford an outline picture of where and how the people lived and laboured at any given time. The eleven reports taken as a whole are a wonderful history of the century which has been described as the century of change. A generation elapsed after the first Census before the issue of the first report of the Registrar-General of Births, Marriages and Deaths. In 1839 Dr. Farr began that annually repeated attempt to present in statistical form the facts connected with what must always be the three great crises in the life of the individual. Comparatively few people read such reports, but some of their more obvious results are promulgated through the newspapers, and people have become gradually permeated with the inmost lesson the Registrar-General has to teach, *viz.*: that birth, marriage, death, which are so intimately and seem so exclusively per-

sonal concerns, represent also a national interest of the highest moment. Thus the sociological idea penetrates the central shrine of private life, and discovers the unheeded implication of the old truth that no man liveth or dieth unto himself.

In addition to these, there are the occasional reports of Parliamentary Committees and Royal Commissions and numerous periodical publications of statistics. The first report of Inspectors of Factories was presented in 1835, and that of the Inspector of Prisons in 1836. These reports and those of the numerous inspectors since appointed to superintend the most varied activities of the people are a further valuable source of statistical information, and have, as we shall see in the next section, proved statistics to be in a striking manner a social force. Before leaving this part of my subject it may be as well to remark that government enquiries have not always been directed to the discovery of truth: frequently they have been devices for the delay of legislation, and the superfluous accumulation of often ill-digested evidence has sometimes acted as a hindrance to social knowledge. But on the whole the practical result has been great and cumulative.

It only remains to refer briefly to one or two of the leading sociological conceptions which emerge from statistical investigation. Such investigation serves in the first place to discover the nature and extent of distress and reveal this distress as dependent on general causes, as, *e.g.*, that physical and moral evils necessarily afflict a town population which suffers from defective drainage and sewerage, from inadequate water, air and light, and from faulty construction of dwelling houses. The assertion that ethics and sanitation are co-ordinates was indeed a startling novelty, and later on the Christian Socialists were on that account accused of substituting a gospel of drains for the gospel of salvation.

And secondly, statistical enquiry discovers a far more intricate social inter-dependence than had been suspected. Men are less able to stand alone and more bound one to

another than they thought they were. Then came the further discovery that this inter-dependence is a progressive phenomenon, so that with the lapse of time and the evolution of capitalistic industry the members of society are linked together by continually fresh ties. . . .

Statistics prepare the material for sociology. "It is in their influence on human beings, their lives and characters, their health, emotions, and thoughts, that all these particulars possess their most pungent instructiveness. The Census is not only, perhaps not mainly, for the economist, just as industry is not or should not be, mainly for commodities. The Census is an account of men and women.

. . . A man's powers are furthered or curbed, his possibility is conditioned, by the environment in which he lives, and the work in which he is engaged. . . . In order to use these external factors of life, we must master them; and before we can expect to master them, it is necessary to understand them. The study of sociology, of the complex facts of human existence, is requisite as a basis from which the ideals may be appealed to and set free." 1

2. SOCIAL IMAGINATION.

SOCIAL imagination was at a low ebb during the Eighteenth Century. And this was partly because imagination itself was distrusted and repressed, partly also because men had not yet become aware of the group of problems which it became the fashion in the Nineteenth Century to express by the term, "social organism." It was not perceived that such a thing as a Community existed in any other sense than as an aggregation of independent separate individuals; if the fact had

1 Article by B. Kirkman Gray, in the "Inquirer," December 24th, 1904. The author had a strong conviction that the knowledge of social relations gained by the study of the Census and the Registrar-General's Reports, in such facts as the number of widows working, the number of children dependent on them, the increased proportion of dwellers in towns, the proportion living in one-roomed tenements, infant mortality, etc., had been the most powerful influence in destroying belief in the doctrines of *laissez faire*, and non-interference. See articles on "The People of England and Wales," in the "Inquirer," December 17th and 24th, 1904, and "International Journal of Ethics," January, 1907. (Ed.).

been admitted no need would have been felt for an imaginative interpretation as apart from a logical explanation. In other words there was no sociology. We must refer to some of the influences which were to make the new study possible, because when once a sociology is formulated, it is bound to affect the attitude of thinkers towards private philanthropy.

We have already noticed the influence of statistics; that of the imagination is not less. Under the conditions of Eighteenth Century knowledge, imagination would not have been applied to social science for the very good reason that no social science existed. Had the age been an imaginative one its direction would hardly have been a social one. But it was not an age gifted with enthusiasm and insight, or caring for interpretation of the hidden meaning of familiar things. On the contrary all this force of the human mind had been dammed back; there had been no demand for it in the age of Pope, Walpole and Paley. For the man of vision there had been no call. Yet the mystic, or if you will, the orgiastic qualities, though neglected, were there in many individuals. A time came when the dull flats of prudence must be inundated by the torrent rush of the fiercer emotions. The Methodist Revival was the first striking expression of this need to shake off prudence in morals and the slumber of dogma. Still more to our purpose is the poetic revival. It would be difficult, I think, to over-rate the influence of Wordsworth even on the limited sphere of sociology,¹ at any rate it has been very much undervalued as might be shown were it necessary. But Wordsworth's work was chiefly done by helping men to perceive how "far more subtly interfused" all created things really were than had been supposed. In addition to the influence slowly exerted by him on the generation next to his own, he had a profound and immediate effect on his brother poet Coleridge. Coleridge endeavoured to apply to the doctrine of society the same imaginative insight which he found to underlie all Wordsworth's best poetical work.

¹ See a remarkable article on Wordsworth in Allen's "Philanthropist."

Two thinkers more dissimilar than J. Stuart Mill and F. D. Maurice it would be hard to find. Both of them have exerted decisive influence. It is no accident that they both owe and acknowledge a profound indebtedness to Coleridge (and on Mill's part at least to Wordsworth).¹ Through Mill the authors of the Lyrical Ballads have rescued Political Economy from being exclusively concerned with the figment of an 'economic man.' Political Economy itself has been restored to its proper place, "not as a thing by itself but as a fragment of a greater whole; a branch of social Philosophy, so interlinked with all the other branches, that its conclusions, even in its own peculiar province, are only true conditionally, subject to interference and counteraction from causes not directly within its scope."²

The influence of Wordsworth and Coleridge has also through Maurice and the Christian Socialist Movement, made itself felt as the highest expression of mere philanthropy within the century.³ Maurice, too, had a doctrine of society—a theological conception founded on the belief in a divine incarnation in society, but also a sociological thought, since, through the incarnation, redeemed society was regarded as possessed of an unity more deep than its apparent differences.

The same thought—the far more subtle interfusion of the social elements—is prominent in the writings of two other men who represent two of the numerous modes in which the hidden connections and interdependencies of human society have revealed themselves. We refer to Bagehot and Cliffe Leslie. The former of the two presents us with the application of natural science to society, or perhaps it would be more correct to say that in *Physics and Politics* we find the great imaginative ideal of natural science applied to social science. Cliffe Leslie again illustrates the working of the same time spirit in another form, for

¹ Mill's Autobiography, p. 147.

² *Ibid.* p. 236.

³ Leslie Stephen, writing on Maurice in the Dictionary of National Biography, says that he was among the first of the clergy to perceive the full significance of the great social movement of his time.

Leslie may fairly be taken as the most prominent representative of the historic method applied to political economy. He was of course largely influenced by Sir H. Maine and the influence of the latter is not only prior, but perhaps more massive. But Leslie better illustrates the particular point.

A third couple of influential names includes St. Simon and Comte. Comte is interesting even if what is true is largely drawn from his master St. Simon, and if what is most original is often fantastic. With him the new study of sociology comes to full self-consciousness, because the deeper conception of a Social Whole had become clear and regulative. The mention of St. Simon reminds us of another element which enters into the social imagination, *viz.* sympathy. By their efforts to give expression to their sympathy with the distressed, the philanthropists did much to strengthen the sympathy itself. And the existence of social sympathy is one of the forces which turned the rising tide of thought, steeped in imagination, towards the subject of society. Philanthropy thus helps to prepare its own transformation into social politics.

There remains yet one name which must by no means be overlooked, that of Robert Owen. Owen was entirely lacking in humour, which is an essential element of social imagination. He was hardly an imaginative man. Yet he ascended Pisgah, even if he did not thence behold the whole land unto the western sea. The study of Owen's lost communities is essential to any understanding of the transition in thought which divides the philanthropy of 1800 from the social politics of 1905. In the striving of those lost communities we see as in the action of the stage the thought woven equally of poetry and philosophy which we have traced in Maurice and in Mill. Those communities are the first onset of a new force. They are the uprush of a long down-crushed yearning in the common people for life in community. They are a laughable and blundering, yet admirably passionate, protest against the absurdity of supposing men to be either equal or inde-

pendent. Their very incompleteness, their reliance on one another, their dependence on one another, does but emphasise the need for union. This is the dim spirit of the age. It affects partially, and variously, such leaders of thought as Mill and Maurice, as Bagehot and Leslie. It gleams from the pages of those men who are characteristic of the new age. It finds itself in words of incomparable eloquence in John Ruskin. But I find the poetry and the philosophy of the movement still more impressive, more tremendous, even if less coherent and articulate, in the deeds of the men who made, if they afterwards shattered, the dream of communal life.

A re-assertion of the power of customary life, of the habits and prejudice of the human mind, was inevitable. No *New Harmony* was possible, nor could any such institution have offered a remedy for the ills of a nation which was being too rapidly industrialised. But if this remedy was no real remedy, yet it did bring into prominence one fact which would not be ignored, this, *viz.*, that men desire to be intertwined. Statistics have discovered how thoroughly they *are* intertwined. The movement of knowledge which reveals what is, and the movement of imagination which reveals what should be, *i.e.*, what men desire, are not two movements, but one. They result from a new reading of human nature and a deeper conception of society. But the thought from which they proceed is an only half-understood thought. It is more to the point to notice that they conduce to a new reading of human nature and a new conception of Society. The thought to which these movements lead becomes more clear and more comprehensive. Man is not an individual but a member of a social whole. Within this social whole there is an intimate relationship and inter-connection of all institutions, so much so that, however indifferent they may appear, they cannot be thought in separation.

This conception of a social whole gives rise to a sociology. But at first the sociological idea is incomplete. Only by degrees will it become manifest how subtly inter-fused the elements of the social structure really are. Among

other results we shall have to notice this: Philanthropy cannot remain a private concern. Philanthropy as it had existed cannot continue, indeed, though it has been a means of mitigating those results of competition for which society has not made itself responsible. But if, as the sociological idea asserts, the Social Whole does in fact enter into and give validity to every personal existence, what follows? None of the ills of the individual are entirely individual ills. The social tissue is too tightly woven for that. It is a social concern, in other words it is a State concern to cure the distresses incident to social and industrial life—to cure, *i.e.*, to abolish if it can, but at any rate to recognise, to diagnose, and to alleviate. Of course it does not follow that the State must itself discharge all or any of the functions of philanthropy by its own direct official administration. It may tacitly or explicitly delegate this work or any part of it to individuals or corporations. (How far it should do this we must consider presently). It is enough for the moment that even though society need not by its own immediate instrument of the State do this remedial work, it must be and is responsible for its being done, and for the way in which it is done.

From this assertion of social responsibility many deductions follow, and I do not expect to carry the assent of all my readers to all my inferences. I shall propose to achieve by direct State administration much that others would leave in the hands of corporations. But the premiss ought to command a more widespread agreement that *the necessary provision for the weaker classes of society is a social concern*, and if so, it can hardly be disputed that *the State should consider the remedy and (in some form or other) should control its application*. That proposition seems to follow inevitably from any conception of social solidarity, and it is, I believe, the thought which suffices to explain the actual history of the intervention of the State on the field of philanthropy. In other words, I believe such a doctrine as this is necessary if we are to justify the action of the State. But it is one thing to pursue a

course of action which involves a thought, and another clearly to think the thought. And when I say that I am here stating a thought on which society has acted, I admit that in formulating it the terms gain a certain preciseness of meaning which cannot be found in our public action in respect of, let us say, the feeding of school children.

So far we have arrived at a new social conception as the result of the application to society of statistical method and imaginative insight, but so far only in general terms. It becomes necessary now to show in some further detail how the transition in thought was brought about, or rather to trace some stages of the process by which it came about. That will occupy us in the remainder of this first part (Chap. III.-VIII.). In succeeding chapters, IX.-XVII., we shall illustrate the process as it works itself out in institutions. But although there is thus a general distinction the two things do in fact run into one another. Every thought will find an institution, and every institution is in its turn a thought.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER II.

THE ORIGIN OF THE ROYAL STATISTICAL SOCIETY.

THE Statistical Society of London was founded in 1834. It is believed that an earlier society had existed a few years previously, but little record of its proceedings has survived. In 1832 the statistical section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science was founded. In the following year the Association, then in its third year of existence, met at Cambridge, and appointed a committee of the section, including Hallam, Malthus, Empson, Richard Jones, and M. Quetelet, among its members, and Babbage as Chairman. The inquiries of this section were restricted "to facts relating to communities of men which are capable of being expressed by numbers, and which promise when sufficiently multiplied to indicate general laws." M. Quetelet considered this definition too narrow, and suggested to Babbage the formation of a Statistical Society of London. There appears to have been considerable difference of opinion between Quetelet and Whewell, the celebrated Master of Trinity, who doubted

whether statistics could properly be included as a science at all, and viewed with some misgiving the institution of the new section. He was President of the Association the year of the Cambridge meeting, and in his address laid it down that science must be understood as the consideration of all subjects capable of being reduced to measurement and calculation. "All things comprehended under the categories of space, time, and number properly belong to our investigations; and all phenomena capable of being brought under the semblance of a law are legitimate objects of our enquiries. But there are many important subjects of human contemplation which come under none of these heads, being separated from them by new elements, for they bear upon the passions, affections and feelings of our nature . . . they enter not among the objects of our Association. The sciences of morals and politics are elevated far above the speculations of our philosophy. Can these statistical inquiries be made compatible with our objects, and taken into the bosom of our Society? I think they unquestionably may, *so far as they have to do with matters of fact, with mere abstractions and with numerical results.*" (Italics added). He deprecated carrying statistical inquiry into regions where they would touch on the mainsprings of feeling and passion, lest it should open a door of communication into the dreary world of politics, and admit the "foul Dæmon of discord" into the Eden of philosophy. Such a view of the traits and functions of statistics was not accepted by Quetelet, and opposition to it, doubtless, helped on the formation of the Statistical Society, nevertheless respect for Whewell's opinion so far dominated the society that all mere opinions were excluded from its transactions and publications, and its attention was supposed to be rigidly confined to facts, and as far as possible to facts which could be stated numerically and arranged in tables. For purposes of work, the subject of statistics was divided into four classes: 1, Educational Statistics; 2, Political; 3, Medical; 4, Moral and Intellectual. In spite of the society's self-imposed restriction, it is evident that a keen interest was taken in social questions and the condition of the people. The following papers all appeared in the first volume of the Journal:—

Moral Statistics of a Section of the City of Norwich, by W. Felkin, F.S.S.; State of Poor Families in Miles Platting, Manchester; State of Poor Families in Bristol, by the Statistical Society of Bristol; On the Poorest Class of Operatives in Glasgow.

Many papers on similar subjects occur in later years. A few may be specified.

28 PHILANTHROPY AND SOCIAL POLITICS.

1848. Report of a Committee of the Council of the Statistical Society . . . to investigate the State of the inhabitants and their dwellings in Church Lane, St. Giles.
1851. Sanitary Statistics of the Metropolis. R. Jopling.
1858. Present State of the Administration of the Relief to the Poor in the Metropolis. W. Lumley.
1859. The Provision of Country Dwellings for Town Labourers. J. Dawson.
1866. Mortality of Children in the Principal States of Europe. W. Farr.
1876. The Physical Requirements of Factory Children. C. Roberts.
1886. The Occupation of the People. C. Booth.
1895. Wages in the United Kingdom. A. Bowley.
1898. The Extent and Effects of the Industrial Employment of Women. Miss C. Collet.
1902. Factory Legislation in reference to its Effects on the Wages of Operatives. G. H. Wood.

[Ed.]

C H A P T E R I I I .

AMATEUR OR PROFESSIONAL.

INSPECTION has become one of the characteristic features of modern government. The street lamp and the inspectors' reports are different symbols of one political faith, *viz.* : that lighted streets will do away with crime, and inspectors' visits will ensure obedience to the law. If this is not entirely true, yet no one disputes the con-
verse, that if the city is left in darkness you certainly will have disorder, just as surely as that in the absence of inspection, the law will be evaded. The incipient reliance on this new device sprang from the homely but meritorious desire to have things done thoroughly if they were done at all. Such a desire does not by itself carry us very far, since it apparently leaves untouched the substantial question as to what it is purposed to do. But the resolve to do things, and not to be content with making believe to do them, was in effect founded on some half perception that new and larger powers would need to be set in working. Be that as it may, the institution of inspectors, who reported on the way in which things were done or neglected, has undoubtedly been important, not only in enforcing existing laws, but also in preparing the way for fresh legislation.

We need but to reflect on the function of the inspectors of factories, of prisons, of mines, of schools, of reformatories, of canal boats, of inebriate homes, of boarded-out children; or of the inspectors for checking cruelty to animals or children, of the medical, dental and anthropometrical inspection of the pupils in elementary schools; of the immense extension given to the scope of the Public Health Acts by the appointment of women sanitary inspectors, or health visitors. Every street or other place

where men congregate is subject to the guardian inquisition of public authority. Into every factory or workshop (as defined by the Act) where men work, comes the representative of a government which unrestingly extends its sphere of action. The inspector is also the instrument by means of which the State asserts its interest in and control over the ministrations of philanthropic people. In a word the Inspector is the outward and visible sign of the sub-conscious conviction that no single private interest of human life is merely private, but that it has also social implications, inasmuch as when men exist in community there are between them innumerable ties of filiation. Such is the thought which now rules our social politics; such emphatically was *not* the thought of the men who were responsible for the appointment of the first inspectors. The first appointment of Inspectors was an assertion of the rights of the State on the part of men whose political theory limited State functions to what is now perceived to be an absurdly restricted range. So far the new policy was a contradiction of the faith of those who initiated it. But while the Liberals of 1833 were in a sense nihilists, they were also strongly influenced by the Benthamite doctrine of utility, and by the subsidiary ideal of efficient administration. Efficiency was incompatible with the negative doctrine of the State.¹ It was not at first recognised to be so, but it is only necessary to review the work done by the inspectors to see that it really was so. To some extent there must have been a transition of thought before the appointments were made, and this transition was in the form of the permeation of politics by philanthropy. But the reaction of the appointments themselves upon public opinion is very much more significant.

The inspector was intended in the first instance to be an organ of efficiency, and as such he was imperiously needed. British administration was much behind the age. Whether we regard the national or the local

¹ See Dicey, "Law in Relation to Public Opinion," pp. 302, 309.

government we behold everywhere set up for our admiration the cracked-clay-footed image of "Muddle through." And if we are sometimes inclined to be impatient with the faulty administration of our charities, we need only remind ourselves that at the period when the philanthropic tradition became fixed the nation was actually proud of the inefficiency of its Constitution.

The inspector was intended to secure efficiency and in the course of time he has in some measure achieved it; but perhaps a further result of his work, if less foreseen, is even more considerable. He comes before us as a collector of sociological material. Let one instance suffice at present: the point will receive abundant illustration in the further course of this and later chapters. The outstanding fact of the factory law of 1833 was the creation of inspectors. This Act "was in that respect superior to the Bills it displaced. In the measure of protection it afforded it was somewhat less generous. Its significance lies chiefly in its having prepared the way for the Act of 1844, and it is remarkable to notice how much it (the 1844 Act) owes to the inspectors' advice and initiation, the most important sections being due to their suggestion."¹

In tracing the idea which creates inspectors we have three leading thoughts to keep in mind; we may regard them as instruments of administration, or as avenues of knowledge, they also represent the growing determination of society to guide and control the intercourse of its members. But this is not the place to unfold the whole reach of this philosophic idea, still less to relate the history of the work of the inspectors. We can here only consider some points in which the institution of the inspectorate bears upon the institution of philanthropy, or is the result of some philanthropic impetus.

In regard to this last point it is interesting to note that the official adoption of this characteristically modern instru-

¹ Hutchins and Harrison, "History of Factory Legislation," pp. 40 and 85.

ment of rule was preceded by some tentative essays in the philanthropic world. We can thus watch philanthropy engaged in what is one most important branch of its legitimate activity in a modern state, *viz.*: that of initiating social experiments. So long ago as 1785 Jonas Hanway had foreseen the need for a "proper officer or two" if the law regarding chimney sweeps was to be carried out. This he tells us in his *Sentimental History*. As a matter of fact when on the "Anonymous summons of a humble individual" a society for superseding climbing boys was formed in 1803, the society did proceed to appoint its own inspectors. They had no legal status and no power; their actual influence in meliorating the lot of the climbing boys was entirely negligible; but their perception of the need was unerringly true.¹ They would have had State inspectors if they could have got them. Another thirty years was to elapse before that became possible, but meanwhile the need of inspection was felt in other directions. Thus in 1815 we find a citizen of Bristol calling for a "committee composed of philanthropic and respectable men" to overlook the behaviour of Turnkeys and Gaolers.²

We are brought at once to the work of Mrs. Fry, who enters in her diary this note for evidence she was to give before a House of Lords' Committee in 1835,—“Great need of Government Inspectors.” Now Mrs. Fry's own visitation of prisons was far superior to anything that "philanthropic and respectable men" had done, superior, it is probable, to anything that government officials would do. But Mrs. Fry was an exceptional woman, and no useful comparison can be drawn between her and officials as a class. Most inspectors, like the majority of members of any other class, are ordinary enough individuals. The first prison inspectors, H. Crawford and Whitworth Russell, were not quite average men and

¹ "A Short Account of the Proceedings of the Society for Superseding the Necessity for Climbing Boys," 1816, p. 13. Compare the action of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in the appointment of Inspectors, "Objects and Address," 1824, p. 1.

² "The Gaol of the City of Bristol" (1815).

they had a large influence both on penal methods and on legislation. They were pretty strongly imbued with the ideas—or what those of us who do not share them would now call the prejudices—of their age, and at a later time Mrs. Fry herself was destined to come in conflict with the whole penal system [for which they were largely responsible. Charles Reade, too, held their theory up to scorn in *Never too Late to Mend*. It is always necessary to scrutinise ideals, and for criticism of this kind the irresponsible and exceptional genius of a philanthropist is usually better fitted than the pertinacious investigation of the official.

The appointment of prison inspectors was in large measure due to the influence of Mrs. Fry, and the circumstance lends piquancy to the severe strictures which the inspectors in their first report directed, not indeed against Mrs. Fry herself, but against a section of the work which sprang from her initiation. The incident serves to bring out the strength and the weakness both of official inspection and of philanthropy. Full recognition is accorded of the female prisoners in Newgate, and to the courage to the influence of the Ladies' Association on the state which had been needed and displayed in the early stages when Mrs. Fry had intrepidly gone into the wards which hitherto it had not been considered safe for one person to enter unguarded. "Whatever may be our opinion as to the propriety and advantage of such associations and of the expediency of encouraging generally the visits of ladies to well regulated gaols no one can for a moment doubt that in a miserable prison like Newgate the visits of the Ladies' Committee have greatly contributed to lessen the depravity of the place. . . . But while we do no more than justice to our own feelings as well as to . . . the Ladies' Committee, it is our duty to point out those parts of their proceedings which appear to us inexpedient and injudicious, and to interfere materially with the laudable objects they themselves have in view." Among the complaints are the following—"We think the introduction of the visitors, who now

attend on Fridays the readings to the women, highly improper." The inspectors then relate how on one Friday twenty-three visitors had been present so that the women prisoners were crowded out, also that it appeared from the visitors book that "several gentlemen" were among them. As a matter of fact, Newgate had become a fashionable attraction to the hangers-on of the philanthropic world. The metropolitan gaol had acquired for them a sentimental notoriety. The inspectors proceed to comment adversely on the regulations adopted by the ladies of Mrs. Fry's Association. The ladies, we learn, appointed some of the prisoners wards-women, and attempted a classification of the prisoners. One of the wards-women acted as school-mistress and was paid by the Association one shilling a week; a wards-woman also kept a register book containing the name, age, and offence of every woman committed. In a word, an unofficial attempt was being made to introduce some first elements of orderly administration. That it was left to private ladies to do this is a scathing reflection on the remissness of governments. Yet the official soul of the inspectors is chiefly disturbed on another account—"However desirable it is to have registers of every kind, yet such a book should always be kept by an officer . . . highly improper that such a book . . . should be kept without proper authority."

Now it may be admitted at once that no British Ladies' Association could have introduced order into the chaos of our penal system: it cannot be disputed that the inspectors did introduce order. But those who are at all familiar with the rigid and ignorant methods actually adopted after 1836 will read in some of the sentences from this first report the interpretation thereof. The writers question the expediency of "encouraging generally the visits of ladies to well regulated gaols"; they are horrified at a right thing being done except by "proper authority." They are already on the way to become

1 First Report of Inspectors of Prisons, 1836, pp. 14-17.

slaves to formulæ, and the outward decorum which they shortly introduced into the prison cells was dearly bought. The administration became quite scientific—also quite inhuman, so much so that it may be questioned if the clean quiet Pentonville of later years was not as debasing as were the fever-clogged dens that Mrs. Fry visited. If we consider the relative merits of philanthropy and officialdom we must sum it up somewhat as follows. It was not possible for philanthropic committees to govern prisons. These chance bands of kind-hearted people were lacking in the persistency of purpose which was needed, and were subject to gusts of sentimental preference and curiosity. The official ideals were narrow, and have left a deep unshapely dint upon the record, but such as was their aim they carried it into execution. Day by day and year after year the work was continued without cessation, and a system was evolved and administered. For the doing of such work the professional is required. But if work is to be broadly conceived the amateur is also needed. And it is noteworthy that Mrs. Fry laboured hard to maintain a humane standard of prison method. Of this let one instance represent the whole. She set herself from the first against the solitary system.

I have referred to this incident at some length because it introduces most of the thoughts which need emphasising in connection with the issue, *Professional v. Amateur*. The factory and the prison inspectors were but a beginning, and were soon to be followed by inspectors of things and persons in ever-increasing numbers.

But of course the establishment of this fresh and potent organ of government was not allowed to take place without protest. It was absolutely contrary to the spirit of *laissez faire*, and was the assertion, often in an annoying form, of the claim of society over the individual. It is part of the irony of history that the idea of inspection received its most considerable practical development at the hands of the very man who has been regarded as a high priest of individualism and was the prime mover of the Poor

Law Amendment Act. But Edwin Chadwick, from the time at least when he took up the question of sanitation, cared more about improving the conditions of life than even about the empty dogma of liberalism. He was caught away into the world of new ideas which was beginning to move the men of the constructive classes of society—men among whom, as will appear in the next chapter, the doctors held a foremost place. In this way he was brought into co-operation with classes who loathed the Poor Law and its authors. The philanthropists or some of them trusted inspection because it exposed abuses; Chadwick advocated it because it detected shams.

Those who flourished on abuses and shams quite naturally offered a bitter opposition to the work of the inspectors, and the new pauper infirmaries, and not they only, but also those who remained satisfied with the philosophic radical notions, and who had not learnt from intercourse with life how rapidly and profoundly society was changing in character. And beyond these again was a great army of muddled-headed philanthropists. A pamphlet by *A Lambeth Guardian* is interesting. He was angry because the Poor Law inspectors had compelled his parish to build an infirmary and spend money in remedying its previous shocking neglect of duty, and he reminds us of a speech in which Sir William Harcourt condoled with the ratepayers, bidding them "resist the creature now devastating the country. He did not know what entomologists called it, but he called it Inspector Vastator." For many years the storm of opprobrium rolled on, and a late echo of it is found in the House of Lords, where Lord Wemyss in 1884 informed an indifferent public that "the inspector in this country was becoming a nuisance." It is true that the occasion was one well fitted to provoke a protest from so firm and unchanging a mind, for it was proposed to enter into the innermost shrine of the home.¹

The factory inspectors and the prison inspectors were an outcome of philanthropic pressure; the benevolent

¹ Hansard, July 31st, 1884. The subject under discussion was the registration and inspection of Canal Boats by the Sanitary Authorities.

persons who started Reformatory and Industrial schools can hardly be said to have craved for inspection, but they accepted it without demur, perhaps because that was the only terms on which they could get public money. But at any rate they did accept it, with the result that these schools, though started as philanthropic institutions, have practically become to a large extent a department of the State. There are instances in which a strong opposition was directed against the State inspection of charitable institutions. In some instances the resistance was futile; in others it is still successful. Of the first class are the elementary schools. The building grant of 1839 was coupled with a condition. Where government paid, there government would inspect. And the inspectors report, "Every new step, however, disclosed the poverty of the resources of the existing system. During the feverish excitement of controversy it was possible by great exertions to procure considerable funds but with the termination of the conflict the tendency to personal sacrifices was exhausted."¹ In short, the school societies wanted funds and the government insisted on seeing how their money was spent. As a result, in spite of considerable opposition, inspection was extended over the schools both of the British and the National Societies. Though they hated inspection, they could not exist without money. This temper is well reflected in a speech by Lord Shaftesbury (then Lord Ashley), in the Parliamentary debate, June 14th, 1839.² The societies were fighting for their existence. The schools have benefitted: the societies have suffered. The British Society has gone under. The National Society survives, but the control of the schools passes away from the Church to the State. There can be little doubt as to the part played by inspection in producing the change. The Church and the Nonconformists had attempted to solve a national problem, but their re-

¹ Kay Shuttleworth's "Four Periods," p. 473.

² *Ib.* 457-70. Cf. "Correspondence of the National Society," 1839, especially Letter 36.

resources were inadequate. From the period when society resolved to know what was done and what was wanted in elementary education, from the time, that is to say, when it nationalised the question, it was bound also sooner or later to nationalise the provision. That is an instance in which opposition to State control as typified by the State inspector was unsuccessful and the failure was due to the imperative need for funds. Education was costly.

In another instance charitable people have endeavoured to screen their work from the public eye and have unfortunately been too successful. I refer to the institution laundries. The different results are due to the fact that, while education is costly, orphanages with laundries attached are cheap—cheap, that is to say, for the managers and their philanthropic public. Some evidence contained in a recent report of the Factory Inspectors will suggest that the orphan and other children bear the cost.¹

In the former case philanthropists demanded inspection, and submitted to it; in this case they reject it, and under the deceptive guise of a name they escape it. It is hardly possible that this glaring exception to the rule of factory inspection should continue much longer. Why has it survived so long? Partly no doubt because governments have a natural dislike to disturbing hornets' nests; but also because there is still a lingering belief that anything called charitable or religious is of private concern and not rightly subject to the control of the State. The fact of the failure to inspect charitable laundries is evidence that the old individualist notion is not dead; at the same time the fact that the exception is everywhere regarded as an anomaly is evidence that the notion is obsolescent. It is not suggested that all of these laundries are objectionable. Many are well managed, and of these some welcome inspection. But the Report is sufficient evidence that some are ill-managed, and that all should be effectively open to inspection.

It remains to notice an extension of the principle in

¹ See Report for 1905, p. 256, for account of unofficial inspection and admission refused, and note at end of this chapter.

another direction, and one which shows how essentially the conception of society has been modified or revolutionised. It is one thing to enter the workshop or the school, it is another to invade the privacy of the home, yet this has been done, and done mainly as a consequence of philanthropic pressure. The incursions¹ of the school visitor or the sanitary inspector into the penetralia of the (working class) family have been occasioned by the discovery of particular mischiefs which have demanded remedy. The easiest way out of the difficulty seemed to be to send an inspector into the house. There were protests as we have seen. But the process went on, and very few found themselves at leisure to ask whither these things would lead, or to suspect how essentially the exigencies of philanthropic feeling were destroying their old political convictions. The result is startling. A co-partnership has been established over the (working class) home. The partners are the parents and the State. The latter of these becomes ever more active and masterful. This is a result which is calculated to give satisfaction to the socialist, but it was brought about by philanthropic individualists. Consider in illustration the Canal Boat Acts, 1877 and 1884. It may be said the circumstances are so peculiar that these do not count for much. Perhaps not; the number of children affected was certainly not large, but the essential point is the assertion of the State's right to enter into the home, not because a crime or misdemeanour has been committed, but because the interests of the children and therewith the welfare of the State may require it. The boarded-out children's order goes in the same direction, although here it is only the homes of the peasants who take in foster-children for pay which are invaded. In the case of the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children power of search is only given on proof or suspicion of a wrong having

¹ "All this needs care in statement: the result is not a breaking up, but a consolidation of home. The incursion is really not the incursion of a stranger, but the entrance of a member. The hearth is empty, but the representative of society is found there." *Author's MS. note.*

been done.¹ Society denies the right of the parent to ill-use his own child.

The most considerable extension of this idea of joint responsibility is found when we consider the recent appointments of women sanitary inspectors, or lady health visitors under the powers of the Public Health Acts.²

The result may be briefly stated. An immense evolution of thought has taken place, for which the inspectors are largely responsible. There is no fact of human life without social implications. Wherever knowledge penetrates intervention comes. It is a curious fact that most of our inspectors have been individualists, yet it is they who have rendered collectivism inevitable. Philanthropy has striven to deal with the misfortunes of individuals and is pressed on by the force of its own unconscious principle until the State itself shall become what J. S. Mill spoke of as a "National Benefit Society."

¹ See Appendix to chapter xiv.

² See chap. xvii.

The Factory and Workshops Amendment Act (1907) brings under the law relating to factories and workshops all laundries in which persons are employed for wages and which are carried on for purposes of trade, and under Government inspection laundries connected with charitable institutions. The conditions attached to inspection were criticized in the debates on the Bill on the ground that they would prevent the inspection being thorough and successful. (Ed.)

CHAPTER IV.

THE TOWN. A.D. 1833-44.

“ We now know better.”

As it is difficult to determine which is the main stream of those lowland rivers which divide into branches, intersecting the meadows in every direction, and only reach the sea by many tortuous windings, so it is not easy to trace the course of a tendency in thought which meanders through a century. Such is the case with our philanthropic-political idea. Fortunately it is possible to obtain a sufficiently correct view of the century if we consider a little more closely this smaller time space of eleven years.

I.

A Royal Commission known as the Municipal Corporations Commission was appointed in 1833. A Royal Commission was appointed in 1844 to enquire into the State of Large Towns. The first of these was the creation of Brougham and Lord John Russell, was composed of lawyers, and had for its business to present a case for a foregone conclusion. Its object was to prepare the way for the political abolition of the honest freeman and the ennoblement of the Ten Pound Householder. “Honest freeman,” and “Ten Pound Householder” were the battle cries of parties.

The second Commission was dominated by doctors, was intended to discover facts and causes, and became the most decisive event in the history of sanitary reform in the Nineteenth Century. The object in the one case was

merely electoral, and the motive is to be found in that class war in which the middle classes were protagonists. The object in the second case was to prepare the way for constructive social legislation. It may be said that the evil to be removed being different, the method of procedure was naturally different also, that in 1833 the work to be done was work for lawyers, and in 1844 was work of a constructive nature, such as that of surveyors, engineers, architects, and doctors. But it is also true that if the personnel of the Municipal Corporations Commission had been more varied, its report might have been of more substantial value, though perhaps less brilliantly successful as a party pamphlet. The interesting feature is that in 1833 political leaders had their vision directed to formal and legal changes; they wanted what the barrister could give. In 1844 all this was changed. The different method may be attributed to a difference in the object sought, but this again must be referred to a deeper perception of the complexity of social causes, and a larger grasp of the tremendous part which environment plays in the preservation of health as well as in the formation of character. This is the difference which I shall try to elucidate in this chapter, and before we go further it may be thrown out as a suggestion that in this matter of sanitation we owe much to Owen. He is not usually classed in the ranks of the health missionaries. But he had done a great deal indirectly by his doctrine, "character is made for us, not by us," a doctrine which as he enunciated it was something less than half a truth—but which had exposed the error of setting up man in a fancied independence alike of his world and his fellows. The Royal Commission of 1844 dealt with such topics as ventilation, drainage, water supply, the interment of the dead at a distance from the crowded haunts of the living, the removal of refuse, the cleansing of the city, the provision of open spaces. The health and well-being of the people was seen to depend most intimately on freeing them from noxious influences and bringing them into touch with the pure powers of the earth.

II.

But we must distinguish what was implicit from what was fully recognised in the thought of the time. Very few even of those who advocated sanitary reform were conscious how widely they were departing from the philosophy in which they had been brought up. To refer to one point only, the higher estimation of open space, the object of a public park was quite utilitarian, as practical in its intention as the earlier mania for enclosing every open land and cutting men off from the earth. It had been discovered, thanks largely to Dr. Southwood Smith, that fever fled when the air blew fresh and dry over the bare ground. It was not foreseen that the early experiments in introducing the country into the town would grow to such large dimensions, would create a habit of mind in the town dwellers, and would at certain seasons send them to the hop-garden, the moor, or the seaside promenade. These men did not know what they were doing or whither they were leading the way. They did know that the death-rate was an alarming one and must be reduced. They recognised that this could only be done by collective action and authority. They had caught hold of the modern thought that the administration of the affairs of the modern community is the first and absorbing concern of the community itself, or at least they had grasped the idea out of which this modern thought is developing.

But men of farsight and foresight were not many. The country herself was not roused, and although she did arouse herself a few years later, it was chiefly in order to oppose the movement, because public health appeared to be inimical to private interests. But even in 1844 any keen interest in the subject was mainly confined to the members of the *Health of Towns Association*, and before that date political indifference to the question was extreme. It was true that the Report of the Registrar General had exposed the unnecessary mortality from insanitary conditions, that the Poor

Law Commissioners had issued a terrible document to prove the same point, and that a select Committee also had investigated and reported. In the face of these proceedings Hansard's brief entry is eloquent enough:—

“August 4th, 1840. Mr. Mackinnon rose to call the attention of the House to the report of the Select Committee on the Health of Towns, when—
House counted out.”

And this probably represents fairly well the attitude of the middle class as a whole. The group of men who had set themselves to this task was a small one. Few in numbers, they were great in ability, and above all in resolution. Moreover they derived some assistance from the circumstances of the time. This may account for the rapidity with which they rushed the question to the front, as the indifference of the public explains the long delay in securing effective reform. Some account of these men and circumstances must prepare the way for an explanation of what they achieved.

III.

The effect of the cholera in frightening the nation into sanitary reform has been often dwelt upon, and is indeed sufficiently plain.¹ “The disease in its successive visitations so obviously sought out the spots of ground most befouled with excremental and other filth as to bring home to every one the dangers of the casual disposal of town refuse.” The deadly epidemic of 1831-2 led to the formation of a Board of Health with local Boards in infected areas. When such local boards were formed it became the duty of medical men to notify diseases which were “highly dangerous to the health of his Majesty's subjects.” Patients were to be kept in a well ventilated apartment of their own house, or failing that, were if possible to be persuaded to remove to a temporary hospital. But the Central Board “strongly deprecates all measures of coercion, which when tried upon the continent have

¹ See, e.g., Creighton's “History of Epidemics,” vol. ii., 833, *et passim*.

invariably been productive of evil.”¹ Even before the cholera there were some men, fully alive to the danger, who had toiled hard not only to mitigate the results but to remove the causes of fevers and other infections. In a former work² I have touched on the services rendered by the medical men of Manchester in the eighteenth century and especially on the work of Dr. Percival. Percival did not lack followers, and the tradition of sanitation came down through Sir Thomas Bernard and others, to be taken up by Southwood Smith, physician to the London Fever Hospital, Edwin Chadwick, and the rest of the sanitary enthusiasts. The tradition was not dead, but perhaps a little languid, and the cholera of 1831-2 gave it fresh vigour.

One of those who did much to reinstate it was the Rev. Charles Girdlestone, vicar of Sedgely. Girdlestone, who lived in one of the districts where the scourge fell the heaviest, was set by this experience to consider deeply the condition of the people. He was one of those clergymen who arise from time to time with an outlook broader than that of their church, whose parish is humanity. Not that he was not strongly a Churchman; on the contrary the Bible and the Sacraments afforded a motive for some of his numerous publications, and he believed in his own sermons sufficiently to print many of them. But chiefly his pen was wielded in conflict with the social distress of the land, its riots, epidemic diseases and endemic poverty. Of this he would expose the cause, for this would find the cure. Not content to combat evil, he reached beyond, resolved also to further the good, and accordingly his *Cause and Cure of Abject Poverty* is matched by his *Nature and Value of Good Government*. Girdlestone was a member of the Health of Towns Association, and earned the thanks of his colleagues by publishing at his own expense excellent

¹ See “Malignant Cholera, Sanitary Regulations by the Board of Health,” 1832, and “Official Papers Relating to Cholera,” 1831-2, printed by order of the Central Board of Health. These volumes are numbered 7560 c. 18, and 777k. 19, in the British Museum Library.

² “A History of English Philanthropy,” pp. 140-52.

digests of various official publications on insanitary conditions, and by providing his digests with illustrations. But the Association was not founded till 1839, and Girdlestone's work in the cause was earlier and may be connected with his *Seven Sermons* preached during the cholera.

Another man who was a forerunner of the new evangel¹ was Dr. J. R. Lynch. He may also be regarded as a martyr for the cause, and the fact that he was so regarded may have a great deal to do with the penetration of the health idea into the popular mind. Dr. Lynch was one of the poor law doctors of the city of London. His duties carried him into the unventilated dens of the poor, over the filth-soaked ground of the back ways of the town and among the stagnant green-slime pools and marshes where typhus had its snug lurking places. He did not limit himself to his official duties, but devoted his own time to the work of exposing the vile conditions of the poor quarters of the town. Beyond this he sought and obtained election as a Common Councillor, about the last office a humane and instructed man would have enjoyed at that time. The City authorities had, or expressed, a conviction that "for health the city could not be surpassed." Dr. Lynch entered the Council Chamber to disprove this easy optimism, and what with his efforts there and his unrelenting toil in the infected places of London he caught the fever and died, still almost a young man, of typhus fever. A widow and children were left unprovided for. Sympathy for them conspired with admiration for him to provoke those who had known his work to raise a public subscription for their support. But sympathy and admiration were not the only motive. Here was an opportunity of striking a blow not only for Mrs. Lynch, but against those interests and those prejudices which stood in the way of sanitary reform. Accordingly a meeting was held at the London Coffee House to promote a subscription on behalf of the widow and children of Dr. J. R. Lynch, "who died of fever in the course of exertions to alleviate the suffering of

¹ Note the taunt against Kingsley, that he substituted a gospel of drains for the gospel of salvation. (*Author.*)

the poor and to promote the cause of sanitary improvement of the Metropolis." He is further described as falling a "sacrifice to his exertions for the poor in those noisome and poisoned dens in which they allow vast masses of the people to reside."¹

These two personal cases illustrate the nature of the new movement. It was a movement of those who knew how the poor lived, or at least who knew the conditions under which they lived, and who felt that these conditions were intolerable. The population was crowding into the towns, and the health of towns was therefore become a much more pressing public concern. But the movement had its beginning in the minds of individuals, and these reformers belonged for the most part to the professional classes. Most of them were not politicians but philanthropists, but they did not follow any philanthropic short cut. In this matter society must move altogether if it moved at all. The Health of Towns Association might have cleaned a few dirty courts, it chose rather to stimulate and aggravate a stolid and reluctant nation.

This Association was a gathering together of men who had been already seized by the idea that the health of the country was the most tremendous and imperative task they could set before themselves. It was formed for the purpose of persuading the country and coercing Parliament. Among its original membership we find the Marquis of Normanby, R. A. Slaney, M.P. and philanthropist, Dr. Southwood Smith, Dr. Guy, Mr. Grainger, and Mr. Toynbee, F.R.S., the famous surgeon. The work they set themselves being two-fold, they adapted their methods to their ends. To coerce Parliament they must have ponderous blue books, an appearance of exhaustive treatment, and the prestige of a Royal Commission. It is no small tribute to their success that in five years they secured as much. If anyone will take the trouble to compare the names which appear in the reports of the

¹ "Report of Speeches . . . on behalf of the widow and children of Dr. Lynch, and Sanitary Condition of the City of London," published by the Health of Towns Association.

Association with the names of Commissioners and the list of witnesses who appeared before the Commissioners, he will be at once impressed with the close correspondence of the two. It would not be a very gross exaggeration to say that the Health of Towns Association appointed the Commission. Some inaccuracies convey much of the inner truth of a situation.

IV.

Among the witnesses before the State of Towns Commission was Dr. W. A. Guy. The evidence he offered was based on researches made by him as to the effect of occupation on disease, and the results which he gave in more or less conversational form were also submitted to the Statistical Society in several papers printed in the early numbers of its Journal. It is not asserted that his evidence is more important than that of several other witnesses, nor is any kind of summary of that evidence here attempted. My present concern is simply to show the nature of the change which thought was undergoing, and, it may be, to illustrate the way in which the unthinking majority were lured on to a change in sentiment, which comes to the same thing. There is one passage in Dr. Guy's evidence which is very apt for our purpose. He had been narrating the case of a gilder afflicted with trembling paralysis caused by mercury fumes; he had suggested to the employer an easy method of getting rid of the fumes, and the employer had agreed. "I called after a few days and found that he contemplated some alteration in his premises in two or three months' time, that he thought of a plan which seemed to him preferable, and would then adopt it. Though evidently a humane and intelligent man, he seemed to think as little of delay as if the health and life of a fellow creature were not in question. Thus it is with all classes. They form a low estimate of the value of life and health. A man dies and another replaces him without cost to the employer Even the educated classes are rendered in some degree indifferent to human life by a false theory which I

believe originated with a religious and humane man, or if not is certainly entertained by many such men, *viz.*—that plagues and consumptions were intended by Providence to keep down a redundant population. We now know better.”¹ The issue is joined. A few years earlier it was left to men like Sadler who was a Tory, and was accused of being reactionary and obscurantist, to enter a protest against the doctrine. The poor who were married were advised by enlightened people not to have children, and married or unmarried, to clear out of the country. Prudential checks and emigration were a panacea for social distress. So long as the conflict was between Radical and Tory separated by a Whig buffer it would not have much result. But now a new force was entering the arena. In a sense it was the force of philanthropy, but whereas philanthropy and politics had hitherto been content to act side by side, not much interfering with one another, a change has now taken place. The philanthropist wields the weapon of statistics. He comes along with imperturbable insouciance and says, “We now know better.” “We” are not theorists, but men of science; we know all the ills that flesh is heir to, we have diagnosed them, treated them and cured them; we have not recoiled before the deadly miasmata, and standing forlorn but constant at our post have watched the victims die. In the conflict we have learned the causes and we propound the remedy. Plagues and consumptions are not sent by Providence, and however they may be sent it is our business to banish them. If you are afraid of a “redundant population”—obviously people can die without your assistance, but if you are persuaded by us that the strength of nations lies in a healthy populace then have done with administrative nihilism. Co-ordinate your sanitary authorities, purge your cities, let clean air blow, fresh water enter, and let the people live. We have striven, some of us have perished in the service of alleviation,—now it is yours, O State, to organise the service of prevention.”

¹ 1st Report of Health of Towns Commission (1844), p. 348.

Such is the doctor's wager of battle. He is no politician. We do not know, nor need we care, to what party Dr. Guy belonged. The doctor appears not as politician, but as sociologist and philanthropist.

V.

The first task of the Health of Towns Association was to agitate the country. For this purpose many of its members went about delivering lectures, most of which had a general family resemblance, so that a summary description of one will serve as a specimen of all. The lecturers drew largely on the reports of the Registrar General, and sought to popularise his figures; they read extracts from the various Committees and the Commissioners' reports, and they supplemented a record of almost incredible filth and neglect by illustrations drawn from their own experience. They did not fail to draw attention to the loss of life among clergy and doctors engaged in the slums. In this way were reached the unimaginative but kindly hearts of those who could make nothing of 'death rates,' and on whom, indeed, the deaths of an unknown crowd of poor people made but a feeble impression. But audiences thrilled with sympathy when men of like humanity with their own fell victims to typhus. This, and the pity of it, they could understand, and accordingly branches of the Health of Towns Association were formed in many places. Here is a specimen of the way in which a clever lecturer after pelting his audience with facts and pathetic incidents sums up the argument. It is perhaps hardly necessary to premise that in 1847 audiences were open to flattery, and willingly thought of themselves and their government as a very intelligent set of people. "Let us suppose that an enlightened government and a people willing to help themselves, have by means already pointed out in the course of the evening, *viz.*: effective drainage, sewerage, street and house cleansing, the suppression of cesspools, the removal of nuisances and noxious

trades and manufactories, and by an abundant supply of water—removed these causes of disease and death (mark how the conclusion comes as a surprise), there would still remain much to do in the way of ventilation.”¹ It was Howard’s old method again, “facts the authenticity of which could not be disputed.” Only in seventy years the agitator had gained greater skill in presenting a case, and far more adroitness was needed if a hearing was to be gained from a public which in the course of two generations had had to respond to so many appeals.

Moreover the authenticity of their facts was disputed. They were accused of having put forth “in support of this bill (*i.e.*, the Public Health Bill, 1845) calumnies the most vile, statements the most unfounded, language the most unseemly—propositions the most absurd.”² There is a fervour in Mr. Urquhart’s language which may be taken as evidence of his sincerity, but the counter-agitation was not always genuine. It proceeded from superfluous officials who feared the loss of office, and from owners of insanitary property, and from many clever men who were found to voice their sentiments. To meet such opponents it was necessary to resort to the expedient of a royal commission. But the Association knew that its first chief business lay in the country. It must gain public opinion, *i.e.*, it must arouse the sentiments of selfish fear and generous sympathy. For this end it used the lecture.

But it went further and for some months it issued at the price of one halfpenny a “*Weekly Sheet of Facts and Figures*,” cut up in some ten or a dozen telling paragraphs containing tit-bits from speeches, lectures, reports. The editor of this weekly sheet showed a genius for journalism, and if instead of printing what he wanted people to be interested in he had served up in the same style what they *were* interested in, he would have made a fortune and been known as a pioneer in Fleet Street.

The Association carried on a very active propaganda and stirred up the fiercest opposition. They may however

¹ “Unhealthiness of London,” by Hector Gavin,” M.D., p. 54.

² Hansard, vol. 98, col. 716, speech of Mr. Urquhart.

be described as "extreme advocates of moderate measures," although they were accused of all kinds of wicked designs; but the accusation was really unmerited; they were philanthropists, not revolutionists, and one of the objects of their union was stated to be "To remove groundless apprehension as to interference with existing pecuniary interests."¹

VI.

So much for the campaign in the country. The real issue had to be tried in Parliament. There had been a Select Committee in 1840, but no action had ensued. The heavier artillery of a Royal Commission must be employed. From the evidence given before that Commission a terrible picture may be drawn of the squalor and neglect which characterised the towns. The Report is among other things a biting satire on that earlier commission of lawyers, and on the authors of the Municipal Corporations Act. Even down to 1845 the greatest of all the mischief connected with Local Administration was left almost entirely uncorrected. It is true that the Act of 1835 had empowered Boroughs to light their own streets, where no private company was doing it for them,² but the system of overlapping and competing authorities remained unaltered, and under this system several companies or corporate bodies did or pretended to do the same thing in the same area, and managed among them all to leave the essential things undone. The extraordinary survival of antiquated methods continued. Liverpool had seven independent and clashing authorities for the professed intention of keeping the town clean and healthy, with the actual result of keeping it in quite the reverse condition.³

¹ Report of Health of Towns Association, cf. Weekly Sheet of Facts and Figures.

² 5 and 6 Will. IV., c. 76, sec. lxxxvii.

³ First Report Health of Towns Commission; 2nd Report, Appendix, p. 83 f. James Aspinall, giving evidence on Liverpool, before the health of Towns Commission, mentions a Highway Board, a Scavenging Board, a Parish Board, a Cleansing Board, a Sewerage Board, a Watch Board, and a Health Committee. Mr. Aspinall admitted that the town was not

But Liverpool did not stand alone. For nearly a century Leeds had a Workhouse Board, so called (appointed by the open Vestry) to which was always elected a majority of members opposed in politics to the town Councillors.¹ And all this time and with all these authorities the Ten Pound householder still (himself or his servant) swept before his door daily, or neglected so to sweep, in either case oblivious that the world he lived in was a changed world and required larger brooms than he could wield.

The exposure of abuses was incalculably important in 1844, because they were live abuses; in 1906 those particular ones have been removed and we need not linger over them. The student who wishes to understand the change which public opinion underwent after the middle of the century should consult the Health of Towns' Commissioners' Reports.

It is more immediate to our present purpose to take a bird's-eye view of the persons engaged in this enquiry, and especially of the Commissioners. First of all we have four politicians, one at least of whom had long been given to benevolent exertions to ameliorate the condition of the poor, namely, R. A. Slaney, M.P. With him were the Duke of Buccleuch, the Earl of Lincoln, and H. P. Pelham-Clinton.

Then comes the dominating group, David Boswell Reid, M.D., Lyon Playfair, M.D., Richard Owen, Hunterian Professor of the College of Surgeons, and James Ranald Martin, surgeon. In addition to these are the distinguished geologist Sir T. H. de la Bêche, and four engineers. The qualifications of the sixty-five witnesses are not less instructive.² None are medical men. There are six

sufficiently sewered, and the Health Committee had no funds to carry out its recommendations. "The expense of cleansing the town properly would be enormous, and how it could be carried out I do not see." Second Report, 1845, p. 78. The witness also deposed that his committee had no power to appoint a regular scavenger to clear away the filth and refuse in the courts, and that the occupier would sometimes remove rather than bear the expense. *Ibid.*, p. 80. Thought that, "in a dense population some of the streets are so extremely narrow and so small and low that it is quite impossible to sewer them at all," p. 82.

¹ Webb, "The Parish and the County," pp. 94-98.

² See First Report.

architects; nine engineers; an installer of Water Works, who was also inventor of the modern system of supply; a drainage expert; an expert in ventilation; fourteen surveyors, constructors or commissioners of sewers; ten registrars or poor law officials, etc. Of these witnesses a considerable proportion were members of the Health of Towns Association. The list of names and professions is full of significance. All these men were individuals; all respected, perhaps too reverentially, the rights of property. They were engaged in pushing what appeared to them a pressing and practical reform. Not one of them probably dreamed that he was doing more to revolutionise political thought than ever Hegel or any other Philosopher could do in England. If there was one man in this movement who foresaw what he was doing, it was Edwin Chadwick, and he has been admired as the foremost fighter for individualism. But probably not even Chadwick realised what a far-reaching change must result from his favourite device of giving power to local government by making central inspection and control a reality.

The report of the Commissioners however was not based entirely on oral evidence. They or several of them visited altogether fifty large towns, one taking some towns and one others. Thus Dr. Kay, who inspected Clifton as well as some other places, sums up his impressions derived from an examination of its courts and alleys. "What avail public generosity and private benevolence, our hospitals and dispensaries, if their funds are to be expended, and their wards are to be peopled with the inmates of these dens and hovels of infection? It is sacrificing the charity of the many to the cupidity and recklessness of the few, it is catering for the victims of a sordid and unprincipled speculation."¹

The evidence was not confined to exposure of evils, but included proposals for improvement. That is no more than was to be expected from the quality

¹ If the impression of one who had lived in these courts where Dr. Kay merely visited is wanted, the evidence of Mr. Bayley, the City missionary, may be consulted. Second Report, Appendix, 226.

of the witnesses. Some of the proposals were what, as one architect expresses it, "might now be stated as novelties." This was in 1844. They have long since ceased to be novelties in Germany. It was absolutely necessary, Mr. Cresy told the Commission, to have open avenues from the centre out to the country, but "supposing a good street is carried away from the town for a certain distance," yet there is no power to hinder anyone from building "right across the end of the street," and so impeding the current of air. Another witness being asked what width of street was necessary pointed out that that depended on the direction in which it lay; if it ran North and South twenty-five to thirty feet might suffice, because the sun would shine through it all the best part of the day, but if from East to West it should be at least forty feet, for one storied houses. We reflect what a different urban England we should now have if these very moderate proposals for town building plans had been earlier embodied in a housing law.

Of course they were not acted upon. When it came to action a delicate *equipoise* had to be preserved between the health and interest of the nation on the one hand and the claims of property and "vested interests" on the other. The reformers had certainly gained a *succès d'estime*, but for the time being they had not gained much more; the material results were to follow later. Parliament, reflecting no doubt the sense of the electorate, was not in a hurry to do anything thorough. What it did decide to do was to put the philanthropists into office. How they fared when they got there must be left to the next chapter. So far the net result we have to chronicle is, that philanthropy had become sociological in its method and had been installed in a government department. It had become committed to a species of state socialism destined to be not less exasperating because the authors thereof were themselves ignorant of the trend and tendency of their policy.

CHAPTER V.
THE GROWTH OF THE CITY.
(OR THE CIVIC CONSCIOUSNESS).

WE are very far from having drawn from this short period of eleven years all the instruction which it is capable of affording, and although the range of the present chapter is a large one, whether judged by the space, the time, or the ideas it should handle, we shall not entirely lose sight of the illustration suggested by the preceding chapter. For it was in those years between 1833-1844 that the forces which had long been preparing, and which are found to be simultaneously working far beyond the limits of a single country, began powerfully and directly to modify the course of our own social history. It was then that the city or the civic self-consciousness began to awake to a new life, turning to mind its own business and grasp its own destinies. So soon as a city begins to do this it perceives the possibility and propriety of doing many things by common action which had previously been neglected or left either to the enterprise of individuals (as philanthropists) or the management of particular bodies such as paving or lighting commissioners. There is no question at present whether a town is likely to be better paved by a town council than by several *ad hoc* authorities.

What concerns us now is not the matter of practical efficiency or material economy, but a deeper-lying consideration in the realm of thought. The long list of powers which a borough can exercise at the present day affords a strong contrast to the meagre activities of two genera-

tions past.¹ The large and the small catechism of the citizens' capacity and obligation are however only symbols of the change which the civic consciousness has undergone. Corporations may be remiss in the discharge of their duties, but they do not recoil from the enhancing of their dignity, and it was a moment of tremendous significance when the city began to feel itself an unity and to act as such. For immediate practical convenience the resulting action is the more important, but in the long run it is the vigour and precision of the perception which tells most.

The particular aspect of the revolutionary thought which I hope to bring out in the present chapter is a partial one. I do not propose to write the history of the 19th century city or even expound the philosophy of the civic idea. Instructive and fascinating as such a task might be we must not be tempted so far from our own proper enquiry. For my purpose a brief sketch will be sufficient, and that will be directed, not so much to show the fact which is obvious, as to lay bare its significance, and to show that the

¹ The Municipal Corporations Act, 1835, was almost entirely taken up with the structure and machinery of Town Councils. The powers it conferred upon those bodies amounted to very little. Section 75 provided that the powers already vested in trustees for paving, lighting, cleansing, watching, regulating, supplying with water, and improving certain Boroughs might be transferred to the Councils if the Trustees thought well. Secs. 76 to 86 provided for Watch Committees and constabulary powers. Sec. 87 gave power to light the streets if no local Act for the purpose was already in force. Sec. 90 empowered Councils to make bye-laws for the keeping of order and prevention of nuisances. Secs. 114 and 115 conferred certain powers in regard to Houses of Correction. The powers enjoyed by Town Councils at the present day would run into a list of several pages, merely to enumerate. The following are, perhaps, the more important. Generally, urban and rural sanitary authorities have powers and duties in regard to sewerage and drainage, provision of water supply, inspection and prevention of nuisances, inspection and regulation of lodging-houses and cellar dwellings, the registration and inspection of workshops and domestic factories, including bakehouses and laundries, the collection and removal of house refuse, the provision of hospitals, mortuaries, cemeteries, and crematoria, regulations in regard to infectious disease, the inspection of food, the inspection of dairies, regulations as to the conduct of offensive trades, provision of houses for the working classes, provision of open spaces, the regulation of buildings, and means of lighting. Urban sanitary authorities have also powers in regard to the cleansing and scavenging of streets, the provision of baths and wash-houses, and town improvements. See P. Ashley, "English Local Government," 1905, p. 98.

re-emergence of the city presents us with a possibility and an instrument for social politics which did not exist at the beginning of the century.¹ The citizens have become capable of doing much which they had no authority to do before. Modern city development is a result of the new powers entrusted to the city, but the power in its turn could come only to those whose consciousness and will were aroused to desire it. The city acting in its corporate capacity becomes eligible for fresh responsibility and especially *the* citizen acting as citizen can replace *some* citizens acting as philanthropists.

I.

The Civic Impulse. There are many subsidiary causes which help to explain the increasing functions of the English town, and to these we shall presently return. If we contemplate merely the narrowness of the avowed aims of the reformers and the circumscribed powers delegated to the boroughs these subsidiary causes might appear to be the only ones at work.² But to think so would seriously vitiate our judgment. The danger will be best avoided if we begin by directing attention to a large and powerful motive which might escape notice if we looked only at the actual towns of 1840 or 1907, but which comes into clear relief when we consider the connection of the movement here with a similar movement in Europe, and the identity of the towns improvement crusade with the impulse towards community founding which we have studied in the second chapter. We shall gain a further and deeper insight into the nature of this large and powerful motive if we bear in mind the contemporary tendency to re-value and appreciate the middle ages, and if, to limit ourselves a little in that great subject, we remember the filiation of the modern city with the city-state of Italy or Germany or

¹ Even this brief sketch will seem to go wide of any practical matter of philanthropy. The critical importance of the City as the modern instrument of social politics must justify what otherwise would be a digression.

² The present effectiveness of the city depends on the working of a civic idea, but the present incomplete institutions do not fully embody the idea.

indeed of our own country in the days before the birth of the Modern State.

Holding these thoughts in mind we have no difficulty in finding the real motive towards the development of the modern town in the growing consciousness of social solidarity. Side by side with the impulse towards town improvement the strong tide of popular thought flowed away from the old individualistic doctrine of life, towards the founding of communities. I suggest that these impulses are not two but one. One thought moves along divergent lines. In 1833 the Royal Commission on Municipal Corporations was appointed; in the same year an account was published of a co-operative village in Turkey in which the idea of communal life was forcibly illustrated.¹ In 1839 the Health of Towns Association was established; the same year witnessed the founding of Queenwood, the communistic settlement in Hampshire, which was the most considerable of the Owenite colonies in this country.

This precise coincidence of dates need not be pressed except so far as to indicate that the two movements were contemporary. The movements themselves were different and did not clash; it is doubtful if they even influenced one another. It is almost certain that the Royal Commissioners on the State of Large Towns and Populous Districts (1844) would have viewed New Harmony or Orbiston with contemptuous pity if their well-regulated minds had ever been turned to these abortive communistic settlements, peopled for the most part by ill-educated enthusiasts. On the other hand it is easy to imagine the incredulity of the Queenwood settlers, who in 1844 were suffering from a lack of potatoes, if they had been told that the Royal Commission was laying the foundation on which the edifice of their dreams would one day be erected. The difference between community building and city making is immense. The community depends on having people of "one heart and mind"; the city must co-ordinate innumerable clashing wills. The one is arbitrary and can hardly

¹Urquhart's "Turkey and its Resources," see the quotations in "Holyoake's "History of Co-operation," pp. 167-9.

outlive the impulse which gave it birth; the other is legal-administrative and depends on the hard truth, that

“Tasks in hours of insight willed
Can be through hours of gloom fulfilled.”

Community is a short cut to happiness, what William Blake might have called a “little moony space,” or a Beulah in which it is sought to cheat reality. The city problem is to make with the firmness of a Roman road such a course to an ample and ordered social life that “wayfaring men though fools shall not err therein.” It is hard for the bureaucrat and the enthusiast to understand one another. But the impulse to community and to town improvement had a single motive, which was to escape the misery of mental and material chaos, and to disprove the false assumption that man was born to independence of his fellows. The goal also was the same; to secure the well being that is involved in a conscious solidarity, and to prove the amplitude and the power of life tempered to unity by the spirit of mutual service.

A study of communities, then, is the first step towards understanding the municipal history of the century.¹ The city was eventually driven, as we shall see, to take up the problem of the community builders: how to give a positive value and joy to the life of the poor and humble toilers. But it may be admitted at once that the men of the Health of Towns Association, of the Royal Commission, or even of the Board of Health,² were unconscious of the full meaning of what they were doing. Their work would have little interest for us now had it not been much larger than they themselves could perceive. The best in our achievement is always beyond our ken.

Nor need we pause to consider how far these men were influenced by, or aware of, the contemporary trend of thought in Europe. Professor Seeley has remarked on the fact that he could only find one reference to Stein and his German city ordinance in the debates on our Municipal

¹ For a critical and irreproachable account see F. Podmore's "Life of Owen": or the more sympathetic (?) description in Lloyd Jones, "The Life, Times and Labours of Robert Owen."

² See next Chapter.

Corporations Act.¹ I confess that the one reference had impressed me differently, and led me to imagine a good deal of influence of the German minister on the English politician. However that may be, the mere fact that a single problem—that of the City and its function in the State—did preoccupy the minds of statesmen in countries so dissimilar as France, Germany and Great Britain, in the course of a single generation, does sufficiently indicate how critical the problem had become in the politics of a modern nation. It is closely connected with the trend of thought which sets up social politics, the progressive well-being of the people, as co-ordinate in importance with the High Politics of State. The need for a reconstruction of Local Authority proceeds from the desire for attaining more commodious conditions of life for the crowd. The statesman is working on the task which the philanthropist had indicated. The rôle of the town was a very restricted one in the 18th century, and such little local autonomy as existed was seriously impaired by the French Revolution and the Napoleonic legislation. But more dignified days were coming for the cities. “Towards the 18th century a notable change was apparent in the spiritual life of the German cities Citizenship (*das Bürgertum*) began to wake up.” Stein’s ordinance, which gave form to the new spirit and also greatly increased its power, became the basis of the more recent development of the German city.²

The same transition may be observed in France, the very home of centralization as an idea and a dogma of government: “It is only in 1837 that local life comes to a rebirth,”³ “To revive the commune has been one of the true tasks of the 19th century” as M. Bratsch assures us.⁴ The surest means of establishing liberty in practical life is to organise self-government within the State. But within the State it is precisely the commune which is the organ of self-government.

¹ “Life and Times of Stein,” vol. ii., p. 229.

² R. Wutte, in “Die Deutsche Staate,” p. xiv.

³ P. Mercier, “Les Exploitations Municipales,” p. 20.

⁴ Quoted in P. Mercier *op. cit.* pp. 304-5.

The time had come when it was essential to forge a new and stronger instrument if the modern consciousness was to stamp its own impress on the external conditions of life. This is discovered in the town, the material focus of local life; in the city,¹ or the consciousness of mutual obligation and enfranchisement.

The liberty of the city is in one important respect to be distinguished from mere political liberty. The latter was regarded as an end in itself while the former looked clearly to another end beyond itself. The city ideal is not so much self-government as good self-government. It is more possible to have an ethic of the "town pump" than of the Treaty of Paris.

We shall obtain a deeper insight into our problem if we briefly recall the relation of the mediæval city-state to the modern city within the State. The city's business has become limited in extent, and the city is no longer obliged to take up arms and defend its position among and against other city-states. But that is only one side of the question. Its own proper business becomes circumscribed, but it is also increasingly complex. The art of civic administration alone has grown more arduous and difficult than the art of managing and defending the simpler city-state. Yet this difference, however important in practice, ought not to obscure the identity of the real civic task of providing commodious conditions of life for the citizens.

The modern city does not possess and is not likely to recover the proud independence, and, let us add, the weak isolation of the mediæval city. But the prosperity of the one as of the other depends on the keenness and sensitiveness of the civic consciousness; it must be a commonwealth. Now the rise of the modern city has been accompanied by a more penetrating study of the middle ages. The civic consciousness is not yet very fully

¹ "The true sense of this word is almost entirely effaced among the moderns; most of them take a town for a city, and a townsman for a citizen. They are not aware that the houses make the town, but the citizens make the city." J. J. Rousseau, quoted by B. Bosanquet, "Philosophical Theory of the State," p. 92.

grown in modern times, but such as it is its growth is only to be understood as part of that movement which has had for its aim to recover for modern use the corporate energy of the epoch of the city-states. That again is one branch of a larger influence which was slowly changing the thoughts of men and was destined to revolutionise their institutions. We have already remarked on the coincidence of town improvement and community building; we have now to add to these the similar motives which were at work during these years in the Catholic Revival of Cardinal Newman; and it is impossible to think of that revival without being reminded of kindred tendencies in Art and Architecture.

The actual achievements of the town improver may seem sordid and trivial in comparison with the lofty cause we have assigned. The clear policy of these men had little conscious resemblance to religious enthusiasm, world-wide problems, or communal fantasy. They found the death-rate appallingly heavy, and they wanted to clean the towns. The discrepancy between the dull routine of drainage and the ideal of a *New Moral World* is striking enough, as at every point is the contrast between the actual and the ideal. The method was different because the tasks were not the same. It is much easier to found a community which may perish in a night than a city which must outlive the generations. He whose ambition reaches to this long lasting work the lowliest burdens on himself must lay.

II.

In returning now to the subsidiary causes which explain the policy of town improvement we pass at once from broad philosophical thought to more prosaic considerations.

1. *The rush to the towns.* This shifting of the population may be studied in the successive census reports, or in such brief bitter chronicles as those which tell of the cartloads of pauper children from southern parishes who were hauled off to northern spinning mills. The houses

over-flowed, the cellars were crowded in the towns, yet the country districts were not emptying as they are to-day, because the total population was multiplying with unprecedented rapidity. But the towns which were filling up so rapidly were unable to cope with the difficult urban problems, which arose from the migration of "hands" into the ill ventilated and undrained "wynds" and "narrows" and courts. The towns were ill suited for the new population, partly because all physical convenience was wanting, and partly because there was no adequate civic authority, no vital tradition of city life, and no body of knowledge as to what needed to be done. All this had to be created. The necessity became terribly pressing because of the rush of population to the towns, or perhaps it would be better to say the rush to the mills. Our towns are so largely accidents, 10,000, 20,000, 100,000 people crowd round a group of factories. It was only when driven by the goad of experience that statesmen began to discover that 10,000 people are not 10,000 units, but an urban community. The goad was pointed by endemic fever in the noisome ways among the horde of dwellings.

2. *The convenience of the middle class* was involved in remedying the grosser and more obvious drawbacks to life in the towns. They were frightened by the dangers of infection so vividly portrayed by Southwood Smith, Lynch, and the rest of the sanitary crusaders. Their business was interfered with by the sickness and the dissoluteness of the hands. Some affront to the shallow optimism of their class was implied in the frequent exposures of social strata where disease and destitution were the habitual concomitants of life. Beyond these reasons and such as these, it is necessary to look to others of a different order. An interest in statistics was becoming fashionable, and the middle class had taken over at least enough of the sense of feudal responsibility to be genuinely concerned for the morals of the poor.¹

¹ See for instance "Moral Statistics of a Section of the City of Norwich." Communicated by W. Felkin, Esq., F.S.S. Journ. Stat. Soc. Vol. i., p. 540-1. "The district contains 330 families, 1275 inhabitants and 7 houses

The numerous missions which were started during these years are a further indication of the serious inroad made on the optimism of the day by the revelations of low life. Evidence from all sides concurred to prove how intolerable were the conditions of the towns.¹

3. *The pride of the middle class.* As the manufacturing people and shopkeepers grew in wealth and self-esteem they became naturally more chagrined by their comparatively mean position in public life. They had made their own business and they meant to make their town. Certainly it must be done on a basis of strict economy, but, however grudging of expense they might be, it became intolerable that what had to be contributed should be spent for them and not by them. The famous battle cry, "No taxation without representation," played its part in the development of the civic consciousness although the larger interests of the cities were sacrificed to the mistaken addition to the old creed, "and very little

of ill-fame. 14 families were without the Scriptures; 220 adults could not read; 27 adults professed Christianity openly; 35 professed to be infidels; 465 children were under 12, 204 attend schools; and there were 606 persons above 5 years exclusive of the sick and aged who never attend any place of worship.

"These people are employed generally in weaving; and by working 12 hours a day, they may earn 10/- a week each. As the whole of the children old enough to work are employed, the families may average, during 9 months in the year, 20/- a week; during 3 months in each year, however, the looms are standing still from one cause or another, which produces much distress. They drink beer to a great extent, and are not very provident; nevertheless they help one another very freely, and if any are afflicted, a little purse is often made up by women collecting for the case. There are benefit clubs established among these weavers generally. Infidelity and republicanism have made considerable inroads among them, and there is a shop in the district where the writings of Paine, Carlile, Voltaire, and Volney, as well as many periodical publications of a deleterious kind, are sold, and which are very extensively read. The depression of the trade of this city during the last two years, has reduced the more careful and sober work people to a condition of considerable suffering; and it has been painful to witness them parting with one piece of good furniture after another, to enable them to buy bread. Their feelings have been soured, and their principles undermined, in many instances, by these heartrending circumstances."

¹ Grays Yard Ragged Church was started in 1835; London City Mission, 1835; London Domestic Mission, 1835; and these had been preceded and were quickly followed by similar missions under the influence of Dr. Tuckermann in several large provincial centres; Country Towns Mission, 1837; see "Charities Register" (published by the C.O.S.), and Burdett's "Hospital Annual."

taxation with representation." One reason for the squalid appearance of most English towns is to be found here. In their mean ugliness our streets still testify to the old error of the philosophic radical. He often was rich and spent lavishly not always on himself alone but on his charities. Still that was personal expenditure and might be lavish. He was cheeseparing on principle in all matters of public expenditure. His descendants have been driven by the dialectic of society to draw up municipal budgets which he would have viewed as criminal. That is an inevitable result of his determination to modify the worst abuses of urban life. When once the worst is gone the second best becomes intolerable. Thus it is that we spend more on the items familiar to our grandfathers, and are constantly discovering fresh headings of expenditure.

The last of the subsidiary causes to be touched upon is rather hypothetical, and if pressed far enough would bring us back into the world of thought described in the last section. I suspect that underlying the impulse towards town improvement there was a half-consciousness of the insufficiency of mere political enfranchisement to yield the reality of self-government. Moreover the tradition of local initiative and administration inherited from the 14th century had never been entirely lost, and men were learning that the substance of freedom was to be found in the free discharge of the affairs of the city. This would be reinforced by the repugnance generally felt to any active compulsion exerted by the central government of the state. To a consideration of this which we may call the Paradox of the City, we must return immediately. At present we have reached so much in a doctrine of the city as this:—for the making of a city there is required the presence of a civic consciousness and the power of self-control.

III.

The paradox of the modern city. The English town in the 19th century has been extremely jealous of State

interference.' This feeling of resentment may be explained by the fact that when local life again began to stir it naturally recurred to the antique spirit of the great days of the city. At the same time the possibilities of the modern city do not include the power of going back to the isolation of the 15th century. Then its rights and its prosperity were secured and developed *against* the State; now they can only be maintained *through* the State. And that is because the state itself is much more powerful. But there is a more essential reason than that. The mediæval city was largely a self-contained life, and the modern city is not. It cannot become strong through antagonism to the State but only by reliance upon it. The liberties and rights of the City-State were held in opposition to or in lieu of the Nation-State; those of the modern city are held within the supreme control of the modern state. Nevertheless the change is not entirely or chiefly on the part of the city.

Historically considered the state has existed over against its subjects; not that it has necessarily been opposed to their welfare, but its own interests have been paramount over their individual welfare. But the city has always been theoretically at least *for* the citizens; it is the expression of the "General Will" of the people. The State might realise its end of inexpugnable might against other powers although the subjects paid dearly in the process. The city has utterly failed of its ideal except in so far as it has enhanced the vital power and wellbeing of the citizens. The meaning of the City cannot change: it ceases to be a city if it fails to enrich the lives of men. But the aim of the State has changed. Side by side with the end of external power there emerges the conception of State action for internal prosperity, or

1 The *English* town especially; in Germany the State has not appeared as an interloper, partly because the cities have been conscious of the assistance rendered by the State, partly because it really has intervened with more genuine concern for the prosperity of the town. In France the people seem to acquiesce in a highly centralised control of municipal institutions.

the State has consciously acquired the motive of the city. The fact is somewhat obscured by the want of a word which will express the relation of State and individual corresponding to that which is indicated between town community and individual in the word citizen.

State absolutism is disappearing, and the philanthropic intention is becoming clearer. The State has trampled on its subjects for "ends of State"; it has neglected them; it is beginning to act consciously for them. Until this change came about the city could not fulfil its purpose. Acting in isolation it was too easily turned to narrow class purposes and away from its real civic function.¹ So far as a central government recognises what I call its philanthropic function, every increase in its efficiency and the increasing persistence and penetration of its control is to be welcomed.

The due of the modern city is therefore freedom within the activity of State control. It becomes no longer a force *against* the State and *for* the citizens, but an instrument of the State for realising the highest life of individuals. The city appears as a member of the State. That is to say the city *is* the State because the State, by virtue of its philanthropic function, is *in* the city.

The State tends to become philanthropic through seeking to promote the welfare of its members, and where it cannot prevent, aiming at the least to alleviate their "ilth" (to borrow Ruskin's word). Considered in this broad sense the city has been by its very nature philanthropic, and it can remain free, and yet express and obey the purpose of the state, so far as that purpose also becomes a philanthropic one.

Thus the city can fulfil this philanthropic work more thoroughly than philanthropy itself can possibly do. For the city is an integral member of the one great social purpose, whereas philanthropists can fulfil only their own personal sentiment of pity or justice. The philanthropists were unable to escape the disability of their arbitrary self-appointment. All honour is due to them for first

¹ On this point see Mrs. Green's "Town Life in the 15th Century."

discovering fresh social needs, and for the reckless sincerity with which many of them set themselves with scanty resources to heal the wounds of the body politic. Theirs is the distinction of the pioneer.

But the progressive enrichment of human life and the remedy of its ills is not a private affair. It is a public charge. Indeed it is the one and noblest field of corporate action. The perception of that truth gives rise to the new art of social politics and we shall see how essentially this is the case if we consider the proper sphere of action of either the mediæval or the modern city.

IV.

The work of the city. The work of the city is twofold, namely, to provide good life conditions, and to impress itself on the mind of the citizens. For the fullest recognition of this second ambition we might be obliged to recur in thought to Florence or one of the sister cities of the middle ages. The strength of modern municipal reformers has been taxed to overtake the more utilitarian business of town management. Reasons which are partly discussed in the previous chapter sufficiently explain this hard necessity. The discovery of the problem fell upon men with appalling force about 1840, but the rapidity with which the problem presented itself was almost equalled by the fierce rush to the towns, that disorderly migration which itself constituted the worst elements of the problem.

Turn now for a moment from the office of the city surveyor to the great Hall where the history of Manchester is portrayed in the frescoes of Ford Madox Brown. There we have the city playing its part in the consciousness of the citizens, and that not the less, perhaps, because the interpretation of "Manchester" is a grandiose one, and phases of world history are forced into the narrow local framework. It is true that the building is so dark as to diminish seriously the pleasure of beholding this pageant of historical progress in the fair light of day. That fact

perhaps serves as homely illustration of the difficulty we (denizens as we are of a dear land of gloom) find in adapting ourselves and the environment to the Grand Style in public thought. But the Grand Style is there. The city has greatly conceived its position and prerogative, and reminds us of the higher reaches of possibility which would unfold before the community which dared to beautify (and dignify) its common life.

Perhaps there is no simple method of understanding the multifarious minutiae of municipal administration. Nothing but participation in the work itself could do that. But since not many of us can be Councillors some sort of short cut must be discovered to an elementary perception of what is involved. I do not know any more instructive page of information than the entries in the *Index to the Statutes in Force*, which relate to municipal powers. If the reader cares to turn to the cross-references there given, he will receive a vivid and, so far as it goes, a true impression of the bewildering muddle which still characterises our system of local government.

To one of the numerous currents of thought thus suggested we must now entrust ourselves. The modern town is possessed of certain powers of providing for the recreation of the people. These are hardly more than a shadow of the powers exercised by the mediæval city, but it should be remembered that the city of the middle ages did what it would, and the modern city does (or refrains from doing) only what it is permitted to do. Another essential part of the work of the city was concerned with the guidance and guardianship of youth, that is to say, of the apprenticed youth. We may not discuss the benefits of the system here, but ought to point out some of its modern equivalents.¹ The Polytechnic and the Trade School² seek to impart and train in skill, and to some extent they fulfil the more difficult branch of guardianship. By creat-

¹ Hardly equivalent, because the boy and girl are still left too much to the disposal of their own immature judgments.

² See "Consular Report on Art Trade Schools in Germany."

ing a sense of *esprit de corps* among the students they succeed in some small measure in fostering a sense of social responsibility, and so far set the boy or girl free from the soul-destructive isolation of those who have to drag themselves up to manhood by themselves. Similar work is done in Lads' Clubs and kindred institutions.¹

The city provides gardens and parks for the health and amenity of life. In each of these and in many other respects it intrenches on work previously suggested and attempted by private persons. The idea of the modern Polytechnic is due to Mr. Quintin Hogg, and, long before his day, to the Mechanics' Institutes which owed so much to the advocacy of Lord Brougham; indeed an earlier writer traces the movement to the *Birmingham Brotherly Society* of 1796, and that in its turn to the Sunday School of 1770.²

In this matter of the training and guardianship of the youth it is possible to detect three stages. First we find the duty formally recognised in the apprenticeship system; then, with the gradual disuse of apprenticeship, we find the philanthropist intervening to palliate the worst mischiefs of social nihilism, and at length the city, stimulated by some of its private individuals, again begins to take up the neglected task.

This threefold movement is not confined to this single instance, but affords a framework into which a great deal of our social history can be fitted. From the moment when the civic consciousness has reconstituted the city we are presented with a new and capable instrument of socio-political action.³ From that moment there is an end to our necessary reliance on philanthropic associations for the discharge of large public responsibilities. Hitherto it had been philanthropy or nothing; now the city becomes capable of doing all that some voluntary sub-

¹ P. Neumann, "The Boys' Club,"—a severe criticism of the actual working of such clubs.

² Chas. Baker in the first publication of the "Central Society" pp. 214-55.

³ Capable only; for British cities are not yet in practice entirely efficient.

scribers had done, and we might add, more than these had ever been able to attempt.

This then is the tremendous and critical value of the city. Reliance may continue to be placed for a long time to come on the charity of the voluntary subscriber. But society is not left in utter dependence upon him. It can mind its own business whenever it chooses to do so. To refer to a single question which is becoming practical or even pressing. We can if we wish go on trusting to private resources for the support of the hospitals. On the other hand, if the difficulty of getting funds becomes acute, or if the community (say of a large town) decides on other grounds to manage its hospitals as municipal institutions, *it is quite capable of administering them.* Whether it would be well advised in doing so is another question, but the possibility introduces a fresh force into the whole of our philanthropic or socio-political problems.

This re-emergence of the city is, as we have seen, no isolated event, but rather is inextricably inter-twined with other phenomena which however as I have suggested, all spring from the one motive of social solidarity. Before quitting the subject a final comparison may not be without interest.

I have elsewhere pointed out the coincidence of the rise of philanthropic association with the growth of joint stock business. In the 17th century men were impressed with the untold possibilities of success to follow from the pooling of resources for the enhancement of profit; they were impressed equally with the increased power of alleviating distress which would be attained if the activity of the few could be supported by the passive subscriptions of the many.

This great period of philanthropic association was the period also *par excellence* of the *ad hoc* local authority. How numerous and how characteristic of the 18th century these illogically distributed bodies really were we shall not know until Mr. and Mrs. Webb's volume dealing with the subject is published.¹ But even a superficial

¹ English Local Government, by S. and B. Webb. Three volumes only of this important work have been issued, and the one referred to above is still (1908) in preparation.—(Ed.)

knowledge of 18th century local history is convincing enough as to the fact.

The joint stock company, the philanthropic society and the *ad hoc* authority have several features in common. They all do homage to the principal of association, but they are all isolated groups acting in comparative ignorance of their problem. For any proper knowledge of their task they would need to be fully acquainted with what their rivals were doing. In the case of the business company this information was jealously refused although (or because) every business man would gladly have been instructed in all the secrets of his competitors' affairs. The doings of philanthropic societies were certainly published, but for a very long time the philanthropists did not trouble themselves much to find out what others were doing, or even if they did, it was hardly possible for them as private persons to co-ordinate the work.

Even at the present time the largest proportion of benevolent schemes are started not so much because they are needed as because someone else is starting them. If it were possible to find a district of London not already over provided with Mothers' Meetings an instructive proof might be gained. Start one, and others spring up immediately; in fact, Chapel A must do as much as Chapel B is doing or it will fall behind, and it is much easier simply to imitate what our neighbour is doing than to strike out fresh lines for ourselves. As to the *ad hoc* authorities, they did not always endeavour to thwart one another, they may in exceptional cases have tried to co-operate, but for the most part they merely ignored one another. Their powers overlapped and their work was often left undone.

These groups are competing groups, and experience has demonstrated their weakness. The whole tendency of modern business is towards some form or other of the combine—the competitive group, like the competitive individual, goes to the wall. The *ad hoc* body is doomed because of the stronger homogeneity of administration obtained when one local authority replaces several overlapping independent authorities. And in strict accordance

with these results we witness an attempt to organise charity. The day of the little society, proud of its subscription list and its own annual report, is passing. Private monopoly is possible in business: I do not believe that an organised charity is feasible. The *ad hoc* authority already falls before the growth of civic consciousness. These three competitive groups belong to a phase of political philosophy which is passing away. The city is one of the most fascinating expressions and can yield one of the most effective instruments of the newer social philosophy, some of the broad features of which I have traced in the chapter entitled Social Forces.

Before the awakening of the city remedial work had to be philanthropy; but this is no longer the case. It is no longer a choice of philanthropy or nothing, but between private charity and public responsibility, because an instrument has been forged by which this responsibility can be discharged.

CHAPTER VI.

PHILANTHROPIST IN OFFICE.

THE Public Health Act of 1848 was passed because the electorate and Parliament felt that something must be done. The effect of the agitation referred to in the fourth chapter had been to silence for the moment the cry of the threatened interests and the protest of those whose political theory was opposed to State interference. A condition of affairs so gross and menacing had been unveiled that it was no longer possible to ignore it. Peers and Politicians had been personally conducted through the slum districts of the metropolis and what they had seen and smelled there convinced them that the complaints of the sanitary reformers were in no way exaggerated.¹ There was a general consent that something must be done, but Parliament did not know how much it was doing in the establishment of the General Board of Health.

I.

1. *The Office.* The establishment of this Board was the chief result of the Act of 1848.² It is important in several ways especially for its personnel; Lord Shaftesbury, Edwin Chadwick, Dr. Southwood Smith. Its bearing on the development of democratic government and local autonomy is also very interesting, since it was a repetition of the policy pursued in the formation of the Poor Law Board, an attempt that is to say to work out a true theory of the best kind of relationship between the central executive and the local

¹ See "Southwood Smith, a Retrospect," by Mrs. C. L. Lewes, pp. 69, 70, and "Life of Shaftesbury," *passim*.

² 11 and 12 Vic. c. 63.

administrative authorities. That is a point the full discussion of which falls outside the scope of the present treatise, but which has such intimate connection with our immediate subject as to oblige us to return to it presently.

For the moment we will tarry over a third element in the importance of this Board of Health. "The Board was to all intents and purposes an independent body in the State, administering matters of the greatest public importance, but not under the control of any department of the Executive Government . . . nor represented by any responsible organ in Parliament."† In a word the Government of 1848 had not ventured to accept responsibility for the Health of the People as an integral part of its own general responsibility. It is a little difficult at the present day to understand this reluctance. We are still familiar with evasion and temporising: parties still dispute the wisdom of this or that method of carrying Public Health Acts into effect. We are still satisfied with passing sanitary laws which we do not expect to be obeyed, and which we show we do not very much want to have obeyed, inasmuch as we affix non-deterrent penalties to their infraction. But on the theory of the matter everybody, or almost everybody, is agreed. The State should maintain healthy conditions, and if healthy conditions are really to be maintained, the State *must* do the work. This is exactly the conclusion which was so startling a novelty to the ruling bourgeois class of 1848. Accordingly that happened which often does take place when people do not know what they are doing; they did a great deal more than was intended.

Parliament, accurately reflecting public opinion, was not prepared to form a department of the executive government to carry out the Act. It was unwilling to do so much. But what it did do was in one sense less, in another sense and very effectually, more. Supposing a State department had been formed, it must according to precedent have been placed under a politician, who might

† Speech by Lord Palmerston, Hansard, vol. 135, col. 973.

indeed have known and cared a good deal about sanitation, although on the other hand it is quite likely he would have been selected almost entirely without reference to such a qualification. The men who were expected to understand sanitation would have been the permanent officials. These officials would have had executive functions, and would not, theoretically at least, have been expected to decide on policy. The head of the new department would have had at least one eye on the interests of his party, and most of the time his other eye would have been devoted to such organs of public opinion as the leader columns of the newspapers. The Board of Health would have set about its task with leisurely decorum, but the State responsibility would have been definitely admitted, and in such a manner that there could have been no drawing back.

Now what did happen? The Board of Health had it is true something less than the authority of, say, the Home Office, but on the other hand it was composed of philanthropists instead of politicians. Its members had both eyes fixed on the object which passionately engaged their attention, and had no thought to spare for public opinion or party convenience. No sooner were they appointed than they began to set the pace. They had Board Meetings every day. They worked every day, and as it appears, often late into the night. They worked as men who had been entrusted with the task of making England clean and healthy in five years, whereas it was really intended that the task should be spread over a century or so.

They made inquisition here, there and everywhere. They were quite undeterred by the fact that at Oxford "the greatest unwillingness exists . . . to be driven into expenses for sanitary purposes,"¹ and that in this matter it was not a lost cause to which Oxford was showing its loyalty. Then they printed their reports—reports on the cholera, on extra-mural interment, on Water Supply, the Removal of Nuisances, (reckless of the

¹ See a Report of the Sub-Committees of the Health of Towns Association, 1848.

rights of property inhering in nuisances), the drainage of lands, utilisation of town sewage for the manuring of farms, and many similar topics. They had the effrontery to expect that these reports would be read, and instead of printing a modest 1,000 for official purposes they circulated 5,000 or 6,000 in all parts of the country, by which means they at least secured their being written and talked about in newspapers, and wherever men congregated. Take one instance out of the many that show their inconsiderate zeal, the matter of intra-mural interment. The picture of sextons wandering about the city graveyard with an iron-shod pointed rod, piercing into graves to find out if the coffin-wood was sufficiently decayed to enable them to dig up that grave for repeated use, is a shocking one. Any reader who wishes to understand how things stood 50 years ago can read these reports for himself. No one would have complained of the Board of Health for reprobating the indecent and disease-propagating state of the graveyards. Everybody did reprobate it, but it was a very different thing to proceed at once to alter it. There were numerous people who had 'fair and legitimate' business interests which would suffer from any abrupt change. But the Commissioners not only *said*: "this state of things is filthy and intolerable"; they asked for immediate power to abolish it. And what they did in this case they did in every matter which came before them, and although they did not really achieve very much, in comparison, that is, with what was waiting to be done, they attempted many things and offended powerful interests.¹

The natural thing happened. The country found itself able to tolerate insanitary conditions for an indefinite length of time, but within 6 years quite unwilling to tolerate the Commissioners of the Board of Health. The Board had in effect said: "if we remain these abuses must

¹ See e.g. "Life of Shaftesbury," by Hodder, Vol. ii., *passim*. and Lord Seymour's speech in House of Commons, July 31st, 1854. Cf. Charles Bray's "Phases of Opinions and Experience," p. 84. "Lord Carlisle . . . said no one could tell, till he tried to effect sanitary reforms, how strong the vested interests in stinks were!"

be removed immediately," and the House of Commons had replied, "then in that case you yourselves had better go." Perhaps nothing better illustrates the incompatible points of view held by the Commissioners and the public respectively than the Report of its work issued by the General Board of Health in 1854. This publication was intended to be a sort of *apologia pro vita sua*, for it was written under a sense of impending dissolution. One of its pages is given up to a tabular record of the Board's achievement and turning to this test we find the entry "Letters dispatched, 114,400." This was their boast, that they had been industrious; this was also in the eyes of the country their sufficient condemnation.

II.

The Commissioners. The three Commissioners, whose 114,000 letters and other doings had so alarmed the country, were men who had for a long period of time been engaged in the work of social betterment, and two at least of them—the Earl of Shaftesbury, then Lord Ashley, and Edwin Chadwick—had been prominently before the public eye. The third Commissioner was Dr. Southwood Smith. Among those who knew, his fame was not less than theirs. He too had given evidence before Select Committee and Royal Commission, and had been entrusted with the task of preparing reports, but he had not been a politician like the others, and his name was therefore not so familiar in public prints and private conversation. Yet his work as physician to the Fever Hospital, and still more his book (published as long ago as 1830) entitled a "Treatise on Fever," had established his position as a leading authority on the subject. The idea of sanitation, hygiene, preventive medicine, was so speak in the air, (one might almost imagine that the typhus bacillus itself was propagating and disseminating it), and it is never quite correct to attribute a discovery of

† Division in H.C., July 31st, 1854.

the kind to a single man. But so far as the sanitary idea is the outcome of a single mind, that mind is Southwood Smith's. His treatise appeared in 1830, but five years earlier the main outlines of his doctrine had been laid down in the first number of the *Westminster Review*.¹ From that time onwards a thought which would not have been denied but certainly had been ignored at an earlier period became a vital and operative conception in the minds of men, and proved its hardihood by exfoliating in the innutritious soil of the world political. Disease is a natural result of natural causes, the causes are removable and therefore so is the result. It is surely a truism, but it became the starting point of a revolutionary epoch, as indeed every extension of the sphere in which causes can be traced and described, has proved to be revolutionary.

Southwood Smith had never learnt the meaning of compromise. At the age of nineteen, as a student for the Baptist ministry, the impossibility of the Calvinistic scheme of the Universe burst upon him, and he threw away the prospects which lay open before him. He gave up the old creed; he held fast by the old mood. He had not, as a young man, learnt prudence, for no sooner had he relinquished the obvious means of livelihood than he married. In a brief space he became at once a widower and a medical student. The story of his life is told charmingly by his grand-daughter, Mrs. Lewes, in such a fashion as to make us acquainted with a man of great intellectual vigour, a mind not subtle but robust, keen, pertinacious, simple, one who saw far and moved resolutely towards the goal, gifted with faith and patience, but unable by temperament and conscientiously unwilling to deviate from the path he had marked out for himself. Such was the first of the Commissioners.

Edwin Chadwick (shortly to become Sir Edwin) was already well known at the time when he was appointed to the Board of Health. He was first an Assistant Com-

¹ "Dr. Southwood Smith; A Retrospect" p. 17.

missioner, then the most influential because the most masterful of the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the Poor Laws in 1834. After the passing of the Poor Law Reform Act he was made Secretary of the Poor Law Board. Here he acted as a lightning conductor, attracting to himself the coruscation of popular anger due not less to his colleagues than himself. This was of the essence of the man. Wherever hard blows were going there Chadwick's head was to be found, but if being smitten on one cheek he never turned the other, it was only the better to deliver his own counter hit. He was the last man in the country calculated to commend the Board of Health to his fellow countrymen. To begin with he was gifted with a sovereign intolerance of stupidity, moreover, it is necessary to add, disagreement with his own view always appeared to him to be stupid. He did not see two sides of a question. He might have admitted that there were two sides—one right, the other wrong—but the other side did not interest him. His method was not to persuade his opponents, but to confute them and incidentally to show them how false and baseless their opinions were. He had not the knack of conciliating people, a knack which he never desired to attain, and the lack of which he never regretted. So much for his manner.

If we consider his guiding principle we shall see that this was no more likely to commend him. His motto was thorough. Once before an English statesman had adopted this device and had had his head cut off for his pains. Chadwick was treated less roughly in the style of his execution. He was granted a pension of £1,000 a year. The result, however, was the same; he was removed from office. Chadwick was unpliant. He did no lip homage to the creed that half a roll is better than no bread. He believed, on the contrary, that so small a fragment might at times be no good at all.

But there is a third cause for the impossibility of Sir Edwin Chadwick as a Civil Servant. In the middle of the last century a warfare was being waged—a kind of

guerilla warfare—between the advocates and the opponents of Centralization. Hostility to the word and what it implied was hearty and general; its friends were few and dubious. It played very much the part then that the term Socialism does now. It was regarded as a foreign importation suitable perhaps to foreigners who were accustomed to subservience, but not fit for free born Englishmen. Central control was in fact spreading everywhere, with the growth of Factory Acts, Mines Acts, Education grants, and Sir William Harcourt's *Inspector Vastator*. But very few English politicians loved the idea. Even while they extended the principle they argued quite sincerely in favour of what they called the liberty of the subject. Now Chadwick not only advocated Centralization, but believed in it with all his heart and mind and strength. Substantially he gained his end. Obviously however it was a source of weakness to the Board of Health to be represented by a man holding this view, and undoubtedly Chadwick did to the public represent the Board beyond either of his colleagues. Having regard to his genius for report writing we need not hesitate to attribute most of the documents put forth from the office to his pen,¹ and the hostility manifested to the Board, which ultimately led to its downfall, was concentrated on Chadwick's head. He again was at the storm centre.

Lord Shaftesbury laid himself open to another form of reproach. Against him no such faults of manner could be successfully urged. There was in him no offensive contempt of the stupid; there was nothing un-English about him. On the contrary he was on two grounds dear to the public mind. He was heir to an English peerage (to which he succeeded in 1851, after twenty years in the House of Commons), and when he was not present in Parliament he was taking the chair at a philanthropic meeting. Lord Shaftesbury however was no less stiff than Chadwick or Smith in his adherence to the principle

¹ See B. W. Richardson, "Health of Nations," Vol. ii., *passim*.

of sanitary reform. His high position would have saved the Board if anything could have done so. His rank, combined with his undoubted philanthropy, endeared him to the people. His vindication of the poor, his attacks on privilege did not rest on an idea. There was nothing doctrinaire about him. With his plea for the distressed, and his exposures of abuses, men of both parties largely agreed in principle: they were only opposed in detail.¹ That is to say, they would if possible prevent his achieving what he was bent on doing, but they would also at the same time admire him and glow in sympathy with his motives. The middle class Englishman of the Great Exhibition period was philanthropic; he was also practical. It was always possible while doing homage to Lord Shaftesbury's philanthropy to insinuate doubts about his character as a practical man. Practical in politics means always in the first place, doing half the task in a leisurely fashion, and secondly, leaving the other half undone. On the second point Shaftesbury was "practical"; but not on the first. What he wished to do might not be all that needed doing, but what he did do he would have done quickly.

Dr. Southwood Smith, Sir Edwin Chadwick, and Lord Shaftesbury were as well qualified as any three men in the Kingdom, if it had been intended to proceed rapidly and to take into consideration all the elements of the problem. It was however inevitable that these Commissioners should come into conflict with public opinion, since opinion—at any rate law-making opinion—was a delicate equipoise between property interests and vital welfare.

¹ See attack on the Board by Lord Seymour and speeches by Shaftesbury and Seymour, Hansard, July 6, 14, 31, and Aug. 1, 1854. Seymour said (on July 31) that he approved a Board of Health but "The Public Health Act and the Nuisances Removal Act, together permitted an interference with every trade and every occupation of most arbitrary and stringent character. Inspectors might enter any house they pleased, order what improvements they chose, and mulct the owners of cost. These were great powers. The Board of Health had exercised them to a very large extent without either judgment, or caution or forbearance."

III.

Philanthropists in Disgrace. If we ask what social significance attaches to the abrupt dismissal of the philanthropist from office, we find it to be an event susceptible of more interpretations than one. On the surface it was a set-back to the party of social reform, but if we look a little more closely into the matter we shall see reason to believe that there is a sense in which this rebuff to philanthropy was really a progressive measure.

For the time being beyond a doubt, it was a set-back. The vote in the House of Commons on July 31st, 1854, was an emphatic protest on the part of common sense against being expected to do anything in a hurry or to do very much at all. The Commissioners were appointed because the nation had been in a state of alarm at the revelations of unhealthy conditions; and because its sentiment of sympathy had been touched by the picture of the horrible tribute which the poorer classes were paying in the shape of premature death and endemic disease. But popular sympathy is a gusty thing. The attempt to alter the foul conditions proved to be attended with many inconveniences to undertakers, Parliamentary lawyers, and others, and the sentiment of pity yielded to the instinct of self-defence. That was the superficial difference between 1848 and 1854.

There is more to be said. The Board of Health was not an integral part of the Executive Government of the Country. The Commissioners were the best qualified men for their task, but they were not appointed so much on that ground as because they were philanthropists. There was "the noble Earl whose many acts of charity for the physical and moral improvement of the labouring classes were so well known." "At the root of Mr. Chadwick's knowledge there was an amount of charitable interest for the poor" while "Dr. Southwood Smith . . . a very benevolent man . . . had laboured very much in the metropolis in visit-

ing the sick poor.”¹ The Board, being composed of philanthropists, was a quasi-philanthropic Board, and the government of the day did not take full responsibility for its actions. Its position was an anomalous one. It was as Lord Palmerston said, in words already quoted, “not under the control of any department of the executive government . . . nor represented by any responsible organ in Parliament,” and he continues, “This I think was a mistake. I think it was a mistake so to place a Board having various and important functions . . . in some degree thwarting the views and projects of a large class of persons.” The object of the Bill he was moving was, as he explains, “to connect the Board with the office of the Home department; so that it may be a branch of that establishment. . . . The result will be that the Home Secretary will be . . . answerable.” That particular bill was one which the House of Commons rejected. The Board as a Board of philanthropists disappeared. But the Public Health Act did not; nor was the administration of it overthrown. What was done was that a check was put on the pace. That was serious enough, but the retardation is a matter of congratulation or regret according to our point of view.

The significant point is that the work, though carried forward with less rapidity, was from henceforth to become part of the ordinary inevitable routine of the government of the country. In its essence it was to be also one of those non-party issues which the force of events will bring more and more to the front. It might be interesting to speculate what the outcome would have been if the philanthropists had been permanently installed in office. Whether in the long run of half a century they would have achieved more than has been achieved must remain doubtful. But from a constitutional point of view we must admit that it was a gain that health administration should be definitely and fully recognised as a government function. The vital interests of the nation appear as the

¹ The Bishop of London, House of Lords, July 14th, 1854.

proper concern of the State. In a formal sense that is all that is either required or possible. All that was left was to decide what the vital needs of the nation were and how the remedy was to be applied. Substantially that was an immense undertaking and it has not yet been fully discharged. "What" and "how" are matters of political controversy. Yet controversy rages only over a "more or less." Underneath the disagreement is an agreement, and the most definite step towards securing this consensus was taken when the health of the people from having been a quasi-philanthropic function became an integral part of the business of the State.

CHAPTER VII.

THE POOR LAW.¹

UP to this point the process of thought which we are considering has been regarded as moving steadily in one direction towards a doctrine of social responsibility. The process however as we have seen had not become a self-conscious one, and on a priori grounds we might be pretty sure that a movement, the leaders of which understand neither the principle from which they act, nor the goal towards which they advance, will prove on examination to be full of inconsistencies. In this case the inconsistencies are to be found in the tentative efforts after Collectivism which we have passed in review. The political philosophy of the day was much more in accordance with the Poor Law Amendment Act. This Act, 4 and 5 William IV. c. 75, is indeed an accurate expression of the idea of social responsibility dominant in 1834.

But the Act of 1834, though framed by logical enthusiasts, is itself shot through with inconsistency. It endeavours to combine two discrepant principles. The one, *viz.*: the limitation and ultimately the abolition

¹ The Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 has been made the subject of unnecessary and not very discriminating eulogy during the last 70 years. This chapter is written in sharp opposition to the eulogists of the law, but my criticism of the law itself goes no further than I explicitly state. There are radical defects which I point out and there are merits to which I likewise draw attention. What I challenge is not so much the Act itself as the attitude of mind which gave rise to it. The chapter therefore must rightly come under the section of Transition of Thought. The noteworthy development of thought on the subject of the Poor Law is as follows: The idea of Relief of Destitution passes over into that of Maintaining the Standard of Life. What Society had relegated to the Poor Law as to a quasi-charity it takes up as an integral State function; *e.g.* Old Age Pensions are to be given not because the people are very poor, but because they are old servants of society whose period of active service is competed. (*From Author's MS. notes.*)

of Poor Law Relief, finds its most complete assertion in Dr. Chalmers.¹ He however is by no means the originator of this doctrine of social irresponsibility, political radicalism, nihilism or anarchism, call it what we will. Individualism, the notion of *laissez faire*, was the ruling conception of the great commercial classes which were pushing their way to power. Dr. Chalmers was in one respect not quite representative of this hard-headed unimaginative generation, because he did recognise a doctrine of personal responsibility towards the poor. That was a matter of temperament. In theory he went to the extreme length of propounding the paradox that (poverty only exists because of the efforts made to relieve it.)

The second principle enshrined in the Act, or perhaps we had better say, in the Reports of the Poor Law Commission, is due to Edwin Chadwick. Chadwick accepted to the full the brutal optimism of Chalmers. But his real enthusiasm was for Centralisation, for drawing tight and tighter the control of a government department over the administration of the country. He scorned the amateur and was regardless of local prejudices. He had faith in the expert and he was a born bureaucrat. Life could offer him no keener enjoyment than to control the writing of 114,000 letters.² The machinery of the Poor Law Commission of which Chadwick became a secretary, was devised in order to abolish out-relief and generally to restrict the operation of a Poor Law. That was the immediate intention, and it was entirely in harmony with the faith of Dr. Chalmers. But such a central office as Chadwick's is a kind of Frankenstein's monster (a veritable King Stork). Give four able and ambitious men almost unlimited power of imposing their will on obstinate and reluctant elected or self-elected persons, and the very lust of empire will compel them. The weapon thus fashioned to gain the victory for administrative nihilism was bound to recoil on the men who used it, and in fact it has recoiled. It prepared the way for an immense

¹ Christian and Civic Economy, chap. x.

² See chap. vi.

extension of the principle of State control, or what followers of Herbert Spencer would call government interference.

Such is the fundamental inconsistency of the Poor Law Amendment Act. It will be necessary to point out further instances of confusion of thought in the course of this chapter. Our discussion falls into four sections. We have to consider what really were the defects of the old poor law, and what was the intention of the Reformers of 1834. Then further we must trace the gradual modifications introduced as a result of the emergence of the philanthropic principle, and lastly the proposals for a thorough reconstruction of the law which result from the evolution of socio-political ideas.

I.

The Old Poor Law. It is hardly necessary to elaborate the defects of the old Poor Law, which are likely to be fairly well known to those who will read these pages. The old Poor Law was not always inhumane, but it was almost always inefficient. The ill-devised allowance system, introduced towards the end of the 18th century, and frequently stigmatised as a rate in aid of wages, really took the form of a rate in aid of the employers, as will be shown further on in this chapter, and had the effect of continually depressing wages. The administration of the law had fallen into a state of complete chaos, mainly owing to the absence of central control, which left the local bodies to go their own way without hindrance or supervision, becoming in many cases corrupt and venal, the prey of unscrupulous and dishonest tradesmen. The idle and impudent got alms, while the sick, the aged and the children were too often grossly neglected.

II.

The idea underlying the Reformed Poor Law. The movement which resulted in the Poor Law Commission, and then, before its investigations were fully published, in

the Poor Law Amendment Act, rested on a great delusion. The locus classicus for this extraordinary confusion is found in the Commissioners' Report. "The general superiority of the conduct and condition of the non-parishioners, the unsettled labourers . . . pervades the whole country . . . (These labourers make no complaints of their having no right to partial relief, *and we have not met with an instance of their having suffered from the want of it.*"¹ The theory appears to have been that the unsettled poor were superior in conduct and condition; they had no right to relief and they did not need it.)

Now how did the Commission arrive at this conclusion? The investigations on which the Report was supposed to be founded were carried out by a corps of Assistant Commissioners who were deputed to go on a roving expedition through the country.² These gentlemen started their work having already made up their minds on the superiority of the unsettled poor, and they succeeded in getting the opinion confirmed by a certain number of those in the country who gave them information. In some places some persons who had no right to relief were more prosperous than some other persons who had a legal claim. That is about all that the evidence would justify. But as a matter of fact the Report was not entirely dependent on the evidence. An authority of greater weight was that of Dr. Chalmers, and had he not said, "That beautiful law of our nature, whereby a busy, spontaneous, and internal operation is upheld throughout every aggregate of human beings, is only weakened in England by the operation of the poor rate, and not destroyed. . . We have heard it more particularly affirmed of those who have no legal right in the town or parish of their residence, yet who rather choose to remain than be removed to the place of their settlement. These form a pretty numerous class in large towns; and, among the other virtues of industry and carefulness and

¹ First Report of the Poor Law Commissioners, 1834, p. 146. Italics mine.

² For list of Assistant Commissioners see Mackay "Hist. of the English Poor Law," p. 53.

good management which are ascribed to them in a superior degree, have we also heard of their mutual liberality as one striking characteristic which belongs to them.”¹ (The suggestion that labourers are always prosperous if they have no right to parish relief, and the assumption that all labourers would be prosperous if distress were never relieved is untrue,) as I will show presently. Just at present it is worth our while to watch this delusion in its growth, as we may do if we turn to the evidence taken before Mr. Sturges-Bourne’s Committee. “Q. Do you think the fear of removal operates to prevent their asking for relief, when if they were parishioners they would ask for it? A. Certainly they would ask for it if they were parishioners. Q. Therefore under that check they exert themselves more than they would if they had the means of calling upon the poor rates? A. I think they do. Q. Then it strikes you, they are a more industrious class of persons, than persons settled in your parish who have no such check? A. No, I do not think that, we have some very good labourers in our parish, I think quite as good as those.”²

Here Mr. James Tillyer sees the trap and refuses to walk into it. But a whole generation of men had been engaged in the quest for evidence of the proposition; “all unsettled labourers are prosperous; all settled poor are idle.” Now that was not the case. Large numbers of the poor both those who were “settled” and those who were “unsettled” fell into distress. Of course the former class yielded a larger proportion of paupers, especially if we include as paupers all those whose employer’s wage bill was paid by the poor rate. But the relief was in effect given not to the worker but to his master. The condition of the settled poor was certainly very bad, but it is doubtful if the lot of the unsettled poor was any better.

Who were these unsettled labourers who were supposed to be such models of character and success? Simply men

¹ Christian and Civic Economy ii., 244-5.

² Committee of the House of Commons on the Poor Laws, 1817, p. 116; Mr. James Tillyer examined; the Right Hon. W. Sturges-Bourne in the chair.

residing in a parish, who, under the complicated and iniquitous Law of Settlement,¹ had no right of relief except in some distant parish. If they asked for, let us say, medical relief, they were liable to be deported from the place where they might have lived for twenty years to another where they had been born or served the apprenticeship. If they did seek relief what was their fate? "Miserable Creatures, sick and destitute, far distant from or without settlement, are bandy'd about, and drove from Door to Door, till at last they are starved in a barn or found dead in the street."² This was written in 1752. It may be very properly said that this is no evidence as to 1823 or 1833, and that the state of the unsettled poor may have improved and have been at the latter period as idyllic as it appeared to the muse of Dr. Chalmers. But P. Colquhoun, the London magistrate, writing in 1806, speaks of "those unfortunate individuals who are denominated the casual poor,"³ which indicates that the condition of those poor who were far from their parochial settlements, was in no sort bettered thereby.

Or we might refer to the numerous charities, the orphanages, the benevolent societies, and the rest, which were explicitly founded for the benefit of the unsettled poor, because in a world in which the lot of all the poor was a bitter one, theirs was so to an aggravated degree. Among such societies it is only necessary to instance a few, as *e.g.* the Asylum partly founded by Fielding the novelist in 1763, the Society of Universal Goodwill at Norwich 1771, and The Society of Friends of Foreigners in Distress of 1807. Then in 1826 a pamphlet appeared entitled *Protestant Sisters of Charity*, a proposal for district nurses on the ground, among others, that the poor without settlement are left unaided in their sickness. To mention only one instance; about 1823 a dispensary was founded at Southam in Warwickshire. Mr. H. L. Smith, who writes the account, tells us that the poor man who had no settle-

¹ 12 Chas. ii. c. 12.

² T. Alcock's "Observations on the Defects of the Poor Laws," 1752, p. 12.

³ "Police of the Metropolis," 7th ed., 1806, p. 352.

ment in the parish, and who was unlucky enough to fall ill had to rely on the mercy of heaven to send him the good Samaritan and the Ladies Bountiful. Mr. Smith knew that neither of these were very reliable, and that his dispensary would be a great advantage to the casual poor. About thirty of these casual poor joined it. Till then they had had absolutely no resource in sickness except the precarious assistance of Ladies Bountiful.¹

In face of such facts as these, the Poor Law Commissioners assured Parliament and the middle class that "we have not met with an instance" of the unsettled poor having "suffered from the want" of relief.

* * * * *

The movement which resulted in the Poor Law Amendment Act was based upon a faulty reading of the evils of the old poor law; and upon a dogma which there has been no opportunity of bringing to the test of experience. This dogma assumes that poor relief in itself is an evil, and that the absence of any legal system for the alleviation of poverty is a positive force tending to beget prosperity. So far as it was possible to test this assumption, the evidence does not support it. If England be compared with other countries where there was no right to parochial relief, it does not appear that the English poor were more, but rather less miserable and oppressed. It used to be argued that in the event of the Poor Law being abolished, the resources of private and ecclesiastical charity would give all the needed assistance, and in a better way, Dr. Chalmers' work in Glasgow being quoted as an example.² The plan was to divide the city into districts under visitors and committees, and to reduce the giving of relief to a minimum (a device in which the Church of Scotland had not been unsuccessful). The small sums of money were to derive an extensive value from the attention and patronage with which they were disbursed. Thus the poor were

¹ Second Report of Southam Dispensary, by H. L. Smith (1825), p. 11.

² For a description of that system, see his "Christian and Civic Economy," Vol. ii., chap. x., etc.

to be lifted to the higher moral status of gratitude. "There is a substantial, though unnoticed, charm in the visit of a superior. There is a felt compliment in his attentions which raises an emotion in the breast, the very opposite of that disdainful sentiment towards the higher orders of society that is now of such alarming prevalence amongst our operative population."¹ How far success attended the efforts to foster this "emotion in the breast" of the Glasgow poor, we are not aware. It is claimed that the system led to a "dispauperisation." But nothing is told us as to what happened to the poor who were not "paupers," *i.e.* who did not receive with a becoming submissiveness the visits and the alms of their "superiors." It is claimed that the system resulted in a "greatly more satisfied population."² In individual instances, much good must have been done. But the death rate was rising, which does not suggest that any general improvement in the conditions of life resulted from Dr. Chalmers' well meant labours.³

A keen contemporary critic of this theory of the advantage of private charity over legal and reliable relief, is W. P. Alison, M.D. "The idea that the sensibilities of the rich to the miseries of the poor are weakened by a system of poor laws, is a mere speculative delusion, and the very reverse of the fact. The fact is that when the poor are left in a complex state of society to voluntary charity, they are miserably neglected; great numbers of them sink into abject destitution, the rich have constantly before their eyes examples of poverty and wretchedness, such as are almost unknown in a country where the poor are really under the protection of the law. This sight gradually becomes habitual to them; they comfort themselves with the reflection that many beggars are impostors, and too often indulge in unhallowed pleasantries in the sacred presence of misery. It is *thus* that sensibility is deadened."⁴

¹ *Ibid.* ii., pp. 36, 37.

² *Ibid.* Vol. ii., p. 357 n.

³ See "Interdepartmental Report on Phys. Deterioration," iii., 24, for expectation of life at different ages in 1821-7 and 1832-41.

⁴ "On the Management of the Poor," by W. P. Alison, p. 102.

This reference to the Chalmers incident is somewhat in the nature of a digression and must not be pursued farther in detail. I will only in passing urge any who may be unacquainted with Alison's book to compare it with the Glasgow experiment, which, it will be remembered, used to be appealed to as proof that legal poor relief was unnecessary and mischievous; unnecessary, because charity (so it was said) would do the work better, at least so much as needed to be done; mischievous because, were it not for a Poor Law, there would be little distress remaining. The relief of the poor is alleged to be a relic of mediæval communism which prevents the poor from recognising the "attraction of the rival system of private ownership and free contract."¹ We should rather have supposed the growing enmity to "private ownership and free contract" to proceed from other incidents of the system, but that may be allowed to pass.

III.

The Achievements of 1834. The Poor Law Amendment Act was a compromise. Its intellectual begetters would have preferred to abolish it, but that was not practical politics. They did what they could to restrict its operations. From what has already been said it will be evident that I have no exaggerated admiration for the Act, and that my point of view is entirely opposed to that of its authors. But the Act undoubtedly introduced two principles of cardinal importance. At the time of its passing, there was a very large number of merely nominal paupers, *i.e.* of labourers who received part of their wages from their employers and the balance from the parish. It was a bad system. In the first place it was iniquitous. Some only of the parishioners were employers of labour, but all the parishioners through the rates had to contribute to the support of the half-paid labourers. Secondly, this subvention to farmers and landlords was very costly.

¹ Mackay, "English Poor Law," p. 484.

Thirdly, it had a bad effect on the labourers. They appeared to themselves, as well as to the ratepayers, to be in receipt of a parish donation. They did not perceive, and no economist pointed out to them, that they were earning it all. Thus a false sense of dependence was fostered. The workers were supposed to be dependent on the ratepayers; as a matter of fact, the employers were defrauding at once the labourers and the rates.

The Act of 1834 did, to some extent at any rate, do away with this state of things. It was achieved with a good deal of harshness: probably the end could not have been reached without "rough means." The apparatus for forcing farmers to pay their own wage bill took the form of refusing out-relief to able-bodied men. Perhaps that was the only way, certainly it was the shortest way, of preventing men working for a private employer and drawing half their wage from the parish overseer. The change left the labourer in a miserable condition, earning far less than an efficiency wage, and unable to maintain any standard of comfort. This was nothing new. The agricultural labourer had never been used to a standard of comfort. He had only been receiving a bare subsistence wage and somehow or other he continued to receive that: the farmer had to pay a few shillings a week more. It was a horrible fate for the men on whose skill, industry and endurance the greatest industry of the country depended. But such as it was, so it is to-day. The agricultural labourer still earns not more than a subsistence wage and often a great deal less.¹

The Act did away with the rate in aid of the farmers wage bill. Full credit must be rendered for that achievement, none the less because its authors were in dense confusion of mind as to what they were doing. They thought they were "dispauperising" the labourers; they were really dispauperising a section of the employers.

¹ See Mr. Wilson Fox's Reports on "Wages and Earnings of Agricultural Labourers," 1900, c. 346, and 1905, c. 2376.

The second capital achievement of the Act is the provision of a Central Board of Commissioners. Estimates of the particular work done by this Board between 1834 and 1847 when it was dissolved, will vary. Quite apart, however, from our judgment on this or that which was done, lies the constitutional importance of setting up such a Central body at all.

It is impossible here to go into any, even the briefest, account of English local government. It has been suggested that Mr. Chadwick, who, though not a Commissioner, was the intellectual director of the Commission, was opposed to local government. He certainly detested inefficient local government, and apparently he did not care much for the principal of local autonomy. For all that, the Municipalities of the country owe a great debt to Chadwick, partly because of his services to town sanitation; yet even more considerably because the formation of a strong central control was an essential preliminary to a strong local administration. The balance between the two has not been yet adjusted. In 1834 the chief defect of local authorities was their inefficiency. Some of them are still neglectful of their duty and need to be kept up to their work. Perhaps on the whole, at the present day the organs of local government require chiefly more freedom of initiative. If that is the case, it is largely because the pressure of central control has long ago goaded many of them to a high pitch of enterprise. In any case the organ of central control is due to the Poor Law Amendment Act so far as it can be ascribed to any single act or impulse.

In these two respects we owe a great deal to the first Poor Law Commissioners. It is time to point out how the confusion out of which the Act arose reproduces itself in the carrying out of the new law. And this must now be done in respect of three ideas. The Act was supposed to have resulted in a general dispauperisation, and in the consequent improvement of the character of the poor. The relief of "destitution only" was supposed to be essential to the abolition of the grants in aid of wages and to be a sound policy in itself. And pauperism was supposed

to be a disgrace. To dispose of the last point first: pauperism is a disgrace, let us agree; most often, however, the stigma should be affixed, not on the pauper, but on the society which creates and perpetuates poverty among its working class.

As to the second point, it is unnecessary to say anything at present. We shall see presently that as soon as a more constructive view of social relations began to prevail, this principle began to be undermined. The words "destitution only" are still nominally accepted as the qualification for relief; in practice this idea has long been abandoned so far as the young, the sick, and the aged are concerned, and if we exclude the children, the veterans and the sick, there are very few paupers left.¹ One remark, however, must be made here. The bare relief of destitution was in no sense necessary to the fundamental purpose, which I take to have been to prevent those who could maintain themselves from coming on the rates. On the other hand, "destitution only" is an extravagant cry. To give relief that shall be adequate, but no more than adequate, for the necessities of the destitute, is to invite further destitution.

Again, the character of the working man was supposed to have improved as a result of the Act. The theory was

¹ The total number of paupers relieved on the 1st January, 1906, was 926, 741, or 27 per 1000 of population. Of these 27 per 1000, 6 were classed as able-bodied, (excluding casuals) and 19 (from age or infirmity) were non-able-bodied. The following table was published by the Local Government Board at the instance of Mr. Burt in 1903, and shews that a large proportion of paupers are either too old or too young to work.

Total Paupers Relieved in England and Wales during the 12 months ended Lady Day, 1902:—

| | Males | Females. | Total. | P.C. of Total. |
|--------------|---------|----------|-----------|----------------|
| 65 and over | 163,630 | 238,274 | 401,904 | 25·5 |
| 16 to 65 ... | 276,387 | 341,196 | 617,583 | 39·3 |
| Under 16 ... | — | — | 553,587 | 35·2 |
| All Ages ... | — | — | 1,573,074 | 100·0 |

Thus it appears that less than 4 out of every 10 paupers are at the ages usually deemed capable of earning a living, and from these a heavy deduction—it is not precisely known how many—must be made for sickness.—Ed.

that under the old law, labourers were shiftless and thriftless, because there was a poor law for them to rely on; under the new law they were industrious, at least some of them were. Others, it was true, had been so deeply tainted with the virus, that not even the refusal of out-relief could make them men. But some were improved, and improved, it was said, through the new law. Thus, in some few districts, allotments, or small holdings, were made available. These holdings were quickly taken up and utilised, and many more would have found capable and willing cultivators. This alacrity was then attributed to the stimulating effect of the New Poor Law. A Mr. Robert Trotter, J.P., chairman of the Cuckfield Union, had some 14 or 15 allotments, and found the men more industrious, and "Mr. Allen, of Lindfield, also informs me that he finds the men eager for small pieces of land, who formerly were indifferent about it, saying, "The vestry will not relieve us if we have a piece of land." But if Mr. Allen, of Lindfield really intended to suggest that it was a new thing to find men quick to hold and to cultivate land when they had the chance, he must have forgotten his own experiment at Lindfield, 10 years earlier; he must have forgotten his review of the book *A Rood of Land, the Labourers' best Friend*; must have overlooked the earlier experiments, such as those of the Earl of Winchelsea in Rutlandshire; finally, he must have ignored the Reports of Sir Thomas Bernard and the evidence given before the Select Committee in 1817. We there read of 32 allotments being started in Wiltshire at Bishops Cannings with "highly beneficial" effect. Directly there were holdings on which they could toil, men resorted to them and were "enabled to relinquish the parochial relief to which the maintenance of large families had obliged them to have recourse." All this was under the old law. The fault was not in the poor, but in the "poor makers." Wherever the opportunity offered, there labourers were prompt to seize, and

1 Mackay *op. cit.* 208.

patient to improve it, equally under the new law, and the old.¹

The fundamental error of the economists who were responsible for the new legislation, resolves itself into a belief that the old poor law had so undermined the manhood of the poor, that they would not take the trouble to thrive, whereas in fact the system was such, both before and after 1834, that they were not able to thrive, however strenuously they strove to do so. But both before and after, whenever a chance of even the modified thriving incidental to an allotment garden offered itself, they were not slow to avail themselves of it.

The theory that poverty was the result of the defective character of the poor man, is very attractive to a certain type of mind; it has, moreover, a certain plausibility about it. But very often quite estimable people are poor, just as many rich merit dis-esteem. Experience was soon to show that the causes of distress are complex, and the direction of affairs was to fall into the hands of men less doctrinaire and more sympathetic than those who made the new Poor Law.

IV.

The Administration of the Act. From the first there was a powerful opposition. This opposition, however, was a heterogeneous force, and unable therefore greatly to influence the course of administration. There was the ordinary hostility of party warfare; there was the sullen hatred of the landed interests; there was the powerful, if diffuse, criticism of men like Sadler. This counter philosophy challenged the whole theory of society on which Lord Brougham relied, but the time was not opportune for such a reasoned reaction. The age was much more disposed to listen to Macaulay than to Sadler, even if Sadler's oratory had not been tedious, and

¹ Select Committee, 1817, Appendix p. 165; "Lindfield Reporter," pp. 17-21, 58. Cf. Thorold Roger's story of two labourers, who saved out of their allowances to buy land, "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," p. 502; and Sadler's "Memoirs," p. 532.

Macaulay not a brilliant political gladiator. On philosophical grounds the day of the humanitarians had not come, in spite of the Factory Act of 1833.¹ The opponents of the radicals could only attack their policy through their administration and on matters of detail. For such guerilla warfare there was a good opening. It might not be entirely fair, but it was very easy to fasten responsibility on the central Commissioners for the abuses of local relief bodies. Not quite fair, and yet not very unfair. The Commissioners were not inhumane in intention; they did genuinely try to improve administration. But one rises from an examination of their early reports, with the feeling that there would have been fewer scandals if they had cared as much about the comfort of the pauper as they did about the suppression of out-relief. Not only did they not care as much, but they were not able consistently to care at all, for if the pauper were comfortable, he would be better off than the non-pauper. The Reports of the Commissioners and Parliamentary inquiries revealed a sequence of scandals which may be regarded as culminating in the notorious Andover case. That the condition of the paupers there was worse than elsewhere, does not appear. On the contrary, the Commissioners endeavoured to show that it was a nice healthy place of residence.² It happened that the paupers were employed in grinding up bones for manure. Some of these were marrow bones; to some, fragments of flesh and gristle still adhered. Such bones the paupers sucked and gnawed. Yes, but only such fresh sweet bones as we should not mind sucking ourselves, was the official defence. "Putrid bones," declared the popular accusation. It seems impossible at this distance of time to decide as to the quality and freshness of the bones. The incident of the Andover marrow-bones gave occasion to an important enquiry and prolonged

¹ The Act, properly understood, helps to illustrate the weakness of the Sadler party. Its provisions were rather less favourable than those of the Bill it superseded, except that it set up an Inspectorate. The exception was altogether the most important factor in the situation; but that was not then realized.

² Andover Committee, Appx., p. 1385.

controversy, and proved before long fatal to the first Poor Law Triumvirate.

The battle of the bones had all the elements of a popular success in it. Another fact which came out in the same enquiry attracted much less notice, but possessed far greater importance. In 1836 the Commissioners had sent the guardians six specimen dietaries from which they were to choose one. They did so, and were supposed to be adhering to it 10 years later. (No new dish for 10 years!) But they had not observed it rigidly. For one thing, when there had been a good supply of vegetables in the garden, these had been used, whether they were in the diet table or not. That seems a small affair. The guardians had deviated in a more important matter. "No milk is specified in the diet table, and yet it appears from the quarterly abstracts . . . that there has been consumption of milk for the children amounting to upwards of 2,000 quarts in the year." The Commissioners do not seem to have reflected that this fact is a condemnation of themselves. They had sent out a specimen diet for children with no milk in it. But all they said was that as the milk was not in the dietary, therefore, it ought not to have been given until the dietary had been altered.²

The model dietary may have left out milk by an oversight. The Commissioners did not know much about children—not much more than did James Mill or Jeremy Bentham. Probably, however, it was not an oversight. The lowest independent labourer found it difficult in many parts of the country to procure milk for his children, and the pauper's lot must on no account be more eligible than his. It is not certain that this was the reason, but if so, it was quite in accord with the motives which animated them in a similar case to which we shall come in a moment.

We turn now to the attitude of the Commissioners towards medical relief. It will serve admirably to illus-

¹ For the Andover case, see Report of Select Committee, House of Commons, 1846, and cf. Report of Commissioners (1847) on the death of a Marylebone pauper from starvation.

² Andover Report, App., p. 1384-5.

trate the difference between the present and the past. We shall see also that the different conception of the scope of medical science began to make itself felt immediately on the dissolution of the Triumvirate. It is not necessary to adduce details of the gross defects of the Poor Law medical system. But reference may be made to the case of the Nacton infirm ward with its sick pauper corded down to his bed and its "perfectly imbecile" nurse.¹ Or take this from the second Report of the Select Committee. "Your Committee are of opinion that there was irregularity on the part of the Medical Officer of the Kensington Union. . . but your Committee are not prepared to say that the Poor Law Commissioners exercised an unsound discretion in not making further enquiry into the case of Henry Osman." This non-committal conclusion was only arrived at as an amendment to a more uncompromising resolution that "a more searching enquiry on the part of the Poor Law Commissioners would have been of great public advantage."²

The Commissioners' defence against the suspicions here indicated is contained in the evidence given before this same committee by G. Cornwall Lewis,³ from which it appears that the Commissioners had not neglected this part of their business. They had made enquiries and had written letters, had exerted pressure, and compelled recalcitrant guardians to pay the medical officers more adequately. Other things allowing they would willingly have seen sick paupers skilfully and adequately treated and fully restored to health; but in their judgment there were considerations which told against the advisability of this course.

Their case is excellently put in a report. "We deem it right to remark that although we entertain no doubt of our being able ultimately, and at no distant period to establish a complete and effective system of medical relief for all paupers, yet its very completeness and effectiveness,

¹ Select Committee on Medical Relief, House of Commons, 1844, pp. 6, 12, 22.

² Second Report, pp. iii., iv.

³ Third Report, p. 3, ff.

however beneficial to those who are its objects, may have an influence, which ought not to be disregarded, on other classes of society. If the pauper is always promptly attended by a skilful and well qualified medical practitioner . . . if the patient is furnished with all the cordials and stimulants which may promote his recovery . . . this superiority of the pauper . . . will encourage a resort to the poor rates for medical relief."¹

In short there is a contradiction between the two ideas. I say nothing here as to which is the more humane in its total effect on society. But if it be desired to restrict to its utmost limits the relief of the sick poor, then obviously administration must be harsh. The Commissioners did desire thus to restrict relief, (they would have willingly abolished relief altogether if they could), and they were not anxious to improve the medical service and so extend the sphere of its operation. But by 1844 public opinion would not tolerate sacrificing the sick to the ideals of 1834. Before leaving this subject we may glance at the evidence of Dr. Farr before this same Committee. The cost of relief of sick paupers in the Metropolis, *i.e.* for all drugs, appliances, and attendance, is given at $1/5\frac{1}{2}d$ per case, as compared with a cost for drugs only of $2/1\frac{1}{2}d$ at the dispensaries, and of $3/7d$ at nine county Hospitals.² Clearly the poor law doctor had to economise in the quantity of his drugs. †

In 1847 the Poor Law Commission was abolished, and the Poor Law Board took its place. The change was similar to that which was afterwards made in the case of the Board of Health. The new board (which has since been merged in the Local Government Board), had as its president a Minister in Parliament, and became an integral part of the government of the day. The change does not indicate any considerable or sharply marked transition in thought, but it certainly rendered Poor Law administration more susceptible to public opinion. The feeling of the country, apart from the

¹ Annual Report Poor Law Commission, 1841, p. 11

² Select Committee on Medical Relief, 1844, p. 220.

opinions of economists, had never been very favourable to the harsh surgery of the Triumvirate; but the Commission, not being in Parliament, was shielded from the effect of popular sentiment, or at least was certainly more sheltered than the Parliamentary Board which succeeded it. The country (a vague but sufficiently real entity) desired a reduced rate; but it would not deliberately stint the sick poor to secure the reduction. For a time after 1847 things moved in the direction of a more adequate medical service. Another Select Committee in 1854 shows how fast and far the movement went, for one of its propositions was that the poor might receive medical relief "without being placed on the list of paupers." One of the witnesses before this Commission, we may note, was the Rev. Charles Kingsley, Rector of Eversley.

The day of neglect of the sick poor was certainly not yet over. It is only necessary to recite the exposures of the Lancet Commissioners of 1865-6. The report speaks of the "scandalous inequality in our treatment of two classes of sick poor" those, *viz.*, who go to hospitals and to workhouses respectively. "We have allowed a number of establishments to grow up in the external semblance of hospitals for paupers, but in truth the whole business is a sham, a mere simulacrum of real hospital accommodation. Our voluntary hospitals can but lightly touch the surface of the wide fields of London misery."¹ The conception of public communal hospitals was a new one, and can hardly be said to be fully accepted in practice to-day. But an important step forwards was taken in 1867, largely as a result of the agitation of the Lancet. An Act² was passed by which provision was made for poor law infirmaries absolutely separate from the workhouse, and in no sort of way subject to the workhouse master. The chief was to be a doctor. So far as the hint contained in this act is developed (and it has been greatly developed), we

¹ See "Report of Lancet Sanitary Commission for Investigating the State of the Infirmaries of Workhouses," reprinted from the Lancet, p. 10. Mr. Ernest Hart, Dr. Anstie, and Dr. Hart were the Commissioners.

² 30 Vic. c. 6.

have come a long way from the deterrent ideal of 1834, the notion of the barest relief of destitution. The beginning of a national hospital service is here.

We notice exactly the same phenomena in the case of children, as in that of the sick. The earlier Commissioners were enthusiasts. Their task was to restrict pauperism. They believed that incidentally they would reduce distress also, but in any case they would lessen the numbers of paupers. To that end, the paupers' lot must somehow or other be made less desirable than that of the semi-starved worker, than, let us say, the hand loom weavers or the Sheffield cutlers.¹ We need not assume any special indifference to the welfare of children. But the work which the Commissioners had set themselves, was a different one, and the fact remains, that whether from lack of opportunity or disposition, little was done on behalf of those whom Sir John Gorst has called the "children of the state." The defects of the Andover dietary are sufficient to indicate that the nature of the child did not interest the Commissioners.

When the Poor Law Board was set up, a change took place. The lot of the pauper was still in theory to be less desirable, *i.e.* felt to be less desirable, than that of the lowest independent labourer and his family. That is probably still the theory of the Local Government Board. The theory was, however, coming to be more and more restricted in its application. It had been departed from in the case of the sick, it was departed from in respect to the child. A new note is struck in the First Report of the Poor Law Board. The Board was actively engaged in conjunction with the Committee of Council on Education in endeavouring to improve the education of the children in the several workhouses, and to raise the standard of qualification of the schoolmaster and schoolmistress, and it goes on to explain the best method of bringing this improvement about. If education was to be really good, Unions must combine to form District Schools as they

¹ Cunningham, "Growth of English Industry and Commerce" (1892). II., 635-40.

might do under 11 and 12 Vic. c. 32, and as some few Unions had already done.¹

District schools, or barrack schools, as they are invidiously called, are not now the last word of progress. They have been subjected to very warm abuse, and some quite pertinent criticism.² But compared with the old system of dumping children on to the workhouse, the separate school was a great advance. As to the earlier condition of the children, it is sufficient perhaps to refer to the Marylebone workhouse of 1847³ and then to the District schools wherein the children are comparatively well trained. In effect, the Report of 1848 indicates the beginning of a movement for removing children altogether from the taint of the Poor Law. The child was no longer to be a victim of that curious system commingled of a grudging charity and a penal motive. The negative policy of the bare relief of destitution had to be given up so far as the young are concerned, and in its place the positive, or constructive idea of raising life to its highest value began to develop. Through the Poor Law school on the one hand, through the later School Board on the other, an advance was being made to a new synthesis of thought. It has not yet arrived. But these two movements are movements towards a new doctrine of social responsibility for education.

It is unnecessary to follow further developments either of the boarding-out of the children with cottagers, or in the modern form of "Cottage" Homes.⁴ It is contended that they are better for the children than the District School. That is not a question on which I can enter. The advocates of the District School, as against the free and more humane method of treatment, are for the most part to be found among those who adhere to the early Victorian doctrine of deterrence, and are fond of a "strict, if not a

¹ First Report of the Poor Law Board, 1848, p. 7.

² The story is excellently told by Sir W. Chance in "Children and the Poor Law," where all that can be said for the big school, is said.

³ Report of the Poor Law Commissioners on Marylebone Workhouse, 1847.

⁴ See Report of Local Government Board for 1905-6, for one of the recent schemes.

harsh Poor Law administration." But they defend the School because in their judgment, it gives good results for the child. The child is no longer a pawn in the game: his interests are not subsidiary to a scheme of dispauperisation. If the sole and complete control of the training of boys and girl falls on the State, then the State has to make the most and best of them.

It was not until much later that a third great section of the "pauper" population, began to be freed from the Poor Law conception of 1834. The sick and the young are no longer dealt with on the lines of bare relief of destitution. The same may be said in a less decisive fashion of the aged. But the sick and the young began to escape from Bumbledom in the middle of the century, whereas the aged were held in the coarse influence of the workhouse atmosphere until nearly its close. Whereas the young and the sick were released almost without a struggle, and in the heyday of Liberalism, the aged have offered a position round which fierce contentions have waged at a period when, according to a cynical politician "we are all socialists." Whereas the escape of the sick and the young though not complete, has been clearly marked, an escape in one case into a good hospital, and in the other into a good school, the aged are still in the workhouse, where nothing has happened except that the atmosphere has become a little less choking.

The keenness of the conflict may be due to the emergence in 1869 of the Charity Organisation Society, and the definite formulation of the ideas which were proclaimed in the 'seventies, by an extraordinarily able group of men to an admiring country, and to complacent ministers, such as Mr. (afterwards Lord) Goschen, and Mr. (afterwards Sir James) Stansfeld. The times have changed, but not the men. To them, and for their principles, this question of the aged poor is of vital importance. The old sick ward of a workhouse served by pauper and sometimes by imbecile nurses, gives place to such an infirmary as the one at Halifax with its modern appliances, and magnificent circular wards, the latest word

in hospital construction.¹ The change indicates the probability that sooner or later the hospital and perhaps the whole medical service, will be nationalized or municipalized. It is a step in that direction. If that part of the taint of pauperism which is artificial, were removed from the relief of the aged poor, and if the hard mechanical regimen of even the best of modern workhouses gave place to a free human administration to the happiness of the inmates, the same result would follow as in the case of the sick. But the direction is not one in which individualists desire to travel. The individualist still hopes for the time when all social support for the aged will be abolished. His hope may be destined to falsification, but that has nothing to do with it. He still hopes, and accordingly, opposes every relaxation of rules. He would retain an unbecoming uniform dress on visiting days, not because it wounds the soul of old women, but because it may help to keep other old women off the rates.²

The change in social attitude may be summed up something in this fashion. Seventy years ago, reformers dreamed of getting rid of the Poor Law, and determined, in the meantime, to make its administration as unpleasant as possible, and to restrict its operation to the utmost. Now there is talk indeed, of getting rid of the present Poor Law, but no one for a moment imagines that the care of the old, the young, and the sick will cease to be a social charge. So far as children and invalids are concerned, there is no longer even a claim that they shall be as uncomfortable as is necessary to deter others from seeking relief of their sickness or culture of childhood. The question is not yet decided as to the old people, but there can be little doubt of the ultimate solution.

These changes are often described as socialistic, although it would be difficult if not impossible to discover any single socialist who would be satisfied with our present

¹ The Bradford Poor Law Union during 1905 was authorised by the Local Government Board to expend over £30,000 in buildings and improvements in connection with the workhouse infirmaries and homes for aged poor. See Report of Local Government Board for 1905-6, p. 599.

² "C.O.S. Review," 1892, p. 392.

treatment of the three classes, or would assent to the theories on which this treatment is based. In fact there is no coherent theory. The changes have taken place, not in obedience to any consistent thought of any thinker or body of thinkers; they have resulted from the pressure of popular feeling, and have been urged and secured by philanthropic appeal. Almost all the men—in this instance as in some Acts of Parliament, man must imply woman, for the exertions of women have had much to do with the humaner treatment of the poor—almost all the men who have been responsible for the various modifications introduced have adhered or thought they adhered to the old individualist position, and yet the changes taken in their total effect have resulted in what is little less than a revolution. The *Poor Law* has not altered very materially since 1834; *Poor Law administration* is a totally different thing.

Therefore there is some ground for the charge of socialistic influence, although no socialist could possibly admit that the *Poor Law* is socialism or any part of socialism. But it has been moving in that direction, and inasmuch as it is theoretically based on a most pronounced and consistent doctrine, not of socialism, but of social nihilism, it is riddled with contradictions, is susceptible of no reasoned defence, and therefore, holds a very strong position in the country.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHARITY ORGANISATION.

THE COUNTER CURRENT.

I.

THE organisation of charity seems so inevitably right and necessary as to lay any critic of the conception open to a charge of over ingenuity, if not perversity. Did not Arnold Toynbee say, and does not everybody now repeat, "to make benevolence scientific is the great problem of the present day"? And how is that to be done unless you organise charity?

This unanimity of praise for organised charity springs however, as is usually the case with unanimity, from the dominance of an uncriticised thought. Certain obvious mischiefs are seen to result from casual unorganised charity, and the hasty assumption follows that the evil lies in the fact of its being unorganised. One object of the present volume is to suggest the need for looking much deeper for the explanation of the failure of charity, and I shall ask the reader to join me in an enquiry whether organised charity is really the thing we want. The second part of the subject matter of this chapter discusses whether the organisation of charity is the correct method for scientific benevolence to adopt. Before coming to this enquiry we must first notice how indissolubly the concept of charity organisation is linked in the public mind with a society which has for its official designation the slightly cumbrous title, *Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Suppressing Mendicity*, is otherwise known as the C.O.S. (Charity Organisation Society), and is referred to in the slums where its operations are most felt, by

the familiar if not affectionate soubriquet "the Organisation." Why is it impossible to think of charity organisation without thinking of a particular society? The able and cultivated group of men and women who constitute "the organisation" would be the last to claim for their society any monopoly in the conception of charity as a permanent organised social force, but they are the most distinguished representatives of this view, and although the C.O.S. may be open to severe criticism, it does not necessarily follow that the notion of organising charity is a mistaken one. Neither need the C.O.S. be a fundamentally unsound institution even if charity were not a thing to be organised; it might proceed from a false conception and yet do excellent work. As a matter of fact it does do excellent work. It issues annually a very valuable Charities Register, from the study of which a young philanthropist will deduce two successive lessons. From his first bewilderment as he turns its pages he crystallises a conviction of the almost boundless fertility of philanthropic enterprise. No possible case of human distress, so it would seem, can fail to find in one or other of these institutions its quick and appropriate remedy. Then follows the second lesson. None of these societies meets every case, and frequently the difficulty of finding a remedy is in proportion to the need of the case for assistance. There are innumerable orphanages. They do not exist for orphans as such, but for orphans with a qualification, that namely of being able to command influences and votes. Again, the country is full of convalescent Homes. In order to gain admission it is not sufficient to have been sick, you must be able directly or indirectly to get at someone who possesses letters of admission. One estimable feature of the C.O.S. is that it has set its face entirely against votes.¹

The relief work of this Society is usually very thorough. Ministers and district visitors know this, and send on their difficult cases. The local committee considers them

¹ See speech by Sir Charles Trevelyan in C.O.S. pamphlet, "Voting Charities," 1872.

at its meetings, writes endless letters about them, and not infrequently succeeds where the poor almoner had been perishing for lack of knowledge. Local committees vary, and the Committee with which the present writer is most familiar has been described in Mr. Booth's "Life and Labour in London: Religious Influences," as "rather soft-hearted." But there cannot be many districts where visitors and social workers do not as a last resource "try the C.O.S." The original object of this Society was not exactly to become an additional and considerable relieving agency, and the undoubted success which attends much of this relief work (in spite of the inordinate length of the case papers) is not the part of its activity in which the society takes most pride. Some of the delay ensues from the want of telephones, the absence of which labour-saving device is often a serious inconvenience in the Society's offices.

So again reference may be made to the Pension branch which enables many poor old people to end their life in some comfort. The figures indicate a good deal of distress relieved.¹ Incidentally they demonstrate the narrow limits within which children and grandchildren are able to contribute to the support of parents and grand-parents. In the glimpses they afford into the effect of a pension as the economic basis of honourable old age, they serve to give validity to the argument for universal old age pensions. But this again is not the exact effect which the society wishes to achieve.

Everybody approves the anti-mendicity work of the society. It has made the way of begging letter writers hard; and it has eased the conscience of those whose bank balances are heavy and whose hearts are not very soft. It has become useless to date an appeal from a work-house or

¹ The pensioners on the list were:

| | |
|---------|------|
| In 1895 | 1005 |
| 1899 | 1229 |
| 1905 | 1343 |
| 1906 | 1426 |

The expenditure for the year 1905-6 on Pensions was £19,157; on "other special cases," £18,790.

a Salvation Army shelter, in the hope of covering up the nature of the writer's domicile by the device of calling it number —, — street. It would be very useful to know if the writing of begging letters has been materially checked, or if the average earnings of the professional epistolary mendicant have been much reduced, but I am afraid there is no means of finding this out. One thing, however, we may say without hesitation. The begging letter writer of to-day requires to be better equipped for his trade in consequence of the detective zeal of the C.O.S. He has had to face the struggle for existence, and if he has succeeded he must be better for the conflict, and must illustrate the rule of the survival of the fittest.

But one must hesitate to praise the Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Suppressing Mendicity either for the acumen of its anti-mendicity work, or for its thoroughness as a relief agency. It is not much good to expose impostors while there are persons with superfluous possessions quite content to be imposed on. Relief is not in itself an end. In fact what is mostly wanted is not relief at all but charity, and in almost every case it is more important to make the poor person something better than to give him something—a reflection which however did not occur to Gideon when he gave the vagrant angel dinner. For the society the chief value of a pension seems to reside in the opportunity of keeping a friendly surveillance over the pensioner. The object is not to be a relief agency but to organise existing agencies. In other words what appears as a scientific theory of charity is in reality an attempt to formulate a doctrine of human nature. If that doctrine be a true one very likely the maxims of charity organisation will follow as a corollary from it. We have therefore to consider what the dogmatic basis of the Charity Organisation Society really is, and to decide whether it is true or false. We are likely to be able to take one side or other because the doctrine is a very consistent one, and accordingly, if it be true it will have very little error mixed with it, and if false, very little truth.

II.

The story of its origin throws a good deal of light on our first enquiry, namely what its doctrine is.¹

* * * *

III.

The fundamental error of the Charity Organisation Society consists in a false antithesis between character and circumstance. "There can hardly" writes Mr. Galton,² "be a better evidence of a person being adapted to his circumstances than that afforded by success." That in itself seems an unexceptional statement, especially when Mr. Galton adds that "changes are necessary to adapt circumstances to race and race to circumstances," thus leaving it undecided as regards any particular set of circumstances whether they are such as we wish to accept or to modify. The C.O.S. however assume throughout that the conditions of our social and industrial system are satisfactory enough, and that when failure occurs the fault is to be found not in the circumstances but in the character of the person who fails. "Speaking broadly and after all due deductions made, one may say that character is the key to circumstances, he therefore that would permanently mend circumstances must aim at character. All that can be done externally to remove obstacles and improve circumstances should be done, but there will be no lasting betterment without the internal change."³

The doctrine is plausible, if not convincing, until it is

¹ The author had collected a number of notes for this section, which, however had not been written out by him. In order to complete the chapter, an account of the origin has been compiled, partly from the author's notes, partly from articles in the "C.O.S. Review," 1892, and will be found below, as the Appendix to this chapter.—Ed.

² "Human Faculty," pp. 224 and 234.

³ 23rd Report C.O.S. (1891) p. 9, cf. the following, from the 26th Report (1894) p.9. "Amongst people at large fear of want has probably a stronger influence for good than we are usually ready to admit. And if it is necessarily blunted by the fact that there is a Poor-law system open to all, still it remains as one important element among many that keep alive a sense of personal responsibility. To tamper with this responsibility by relief is to pauperise."

analysed. A large number of those who are worsted in the struggle are found to exhibit well-marked infirmities of character. They are examined as under a powerful microscopic lens by the keen eyes of an almoner long trained to detect imposture. One wonders whether the character of those who do not fail would come any better through such an ordeal. If a man is in want he is judged according to whether he has saved money or spent it, and if he has spent it he is undeserving. Yet how many of those who succeed, do so, not because they practised "thrift," but because they were not afraid to spend.

Many distressed people are imperfect characters, and in these cases it may be that the character must be improved. The theory we are considering however ignores the fact that very often the character is one which under less harsh industrial pressure would not be unattractive. The mere removal of stress in itself does set some natures free to be better. It will also therefore be necessary to ask in a particular case, is the unhappy circumstance the result of bad character, or is the character one which in less untoward circumstances would not appear so faulty? At the present time and under present industrial conditions there is no presumption that the man who is in want is so from his own fault. Even if there were such a presumption, it would still be doubtful whether it is a good thing to have a band of leisured comfortable people devoting their lives to picking holes in the record of another class of men and women. But there is no such presumption. Men fail from all kinds of mischances over which they have no control and for which they often are not responsible. Their health is undermined by their occupation; their vitality is depressed by the noisome dwelling where for the profit of a slum landlord they must sleep; they are thrown out of work from some vicissitude of trade, evicted from their house for a political opinion, or are found "too old at forty," because children who should be at school compete with them in the labour market.¹ These are instances of the

¹ The competition is indirect but not the less real. The child of 14 rarely does the work of the grown man, but does do that which the youth of 17 should be doing.

chances of the industrial world. Beyond these are its standard cruelties and injustices which make 10 per cent. of the people hardly able to gain the barest subsistence wage. In all these cases the *first* thing necessary is not a change of character, but of circumstances. Even when the victims of underpaid labour are faulty and erring persons, what is first of all required is to provide the possibility of life. But it is a heartless and ignorant libel on the class to assume as a rule that the character is markedly faulty. Most often it is of that average type which is the most common in every walk of life. It is often quite outstandingly good. On the whole the character is above the circumstance. It has been not truly but falsely said that "to attempt to raise the position of a class without elevating its character, is the work of a charlatan."¹

As one who has known intimately many of those who are always on the edge of the abyss, I am prepared to deny the aspersions thrown upon them. My own conclusion is that they are not below but above the average in point of moral worth. This is a matter on which no statistical proof is available or possible, and as to which we must rely on experience which is partial, and judgments which may be biassed. If strict accuracy is beyond our reach and we are thrown back on impressions, still "I would rather trust and be deceived than suspect and be mistaken."

The C.O.S. are afflicted with a complacent and quite incurable optimism which distorts their perception of the facts. The official report tells us in one place that "charity is not the business of the upper classes only, nor even of *that two thirds of the population which many group as belonging to other than the working classes.*"² Probably no more astounding statement than this is to be found in the whole series of the Reports. The population of England and Wales at the last Census was about 32,000,000, of these 24,000,000 are to be grouped as

¹ "Charity and Food," published by the C.O.S., p. 19.

² 27th Report 1895, p. 43. The italics are mine.

belonging to other than the working classes! And yet only 11 per cent. enjoy incomes of £160 a year and over. 89 per cent. are below that limit. 25 per cent. of male workers earn less than £1 a week, 60 per cent. from 20s. to 30s.¹ What can be the motive of this gigantic *suggestio falsi*?

But even so there is a third of the population left and among these may be some who are not very well off. The society will not commit "itself to the proposition that all have adequate opportunity of making provision for the future"; but though they do not assert that all have superfluous wealth they suggest it, for is it not notorious "that during a strike working men are willing for long periods together to live on a mere fractional part of their normal rate of wages,"² and if so why should they not always do so, and save the balance for an old age which they may be lucky enough to escape?

The most extreme instance of this optimism is to be found in the Report of 1899. The society would alter the way in which these people and their wants are commonly considered. They would not have them counted as a class called the poor; but as individual members of the community who are in distress. Strictly speaking they would say there is no class "poor," any more than there is any class "sick."³ But there is a class "poor." It is impossible to read any of the numerous recent enquiries into the extent and nature of poverty without perceiving this, and Mr. Seebohm Rowntree has rendered good service by his analysis of poverty, and by the very useful distinction he has drawn between "primary" and "secondary" poverty.

The conviction held, no doubt quite honestly, by the society as to the small amount of poverty and the generally favourable nature of the environment of dwellers

¹ Dictionary of Political Economy, Vol. iii., p. 643 (1899). The estimate is for 38 selected occupations, not including the building trades and railway workers. Sir R. Giffen estimated the average annual earnings of male workers in the latter class as £60, or a little over.—Ed.

² 30th Report, 1898, p. 15-16.

³ 31st Report, p. 3.

in the slums, sufficiently explains its negative attitude to all constructive measures of reform. Most other reformers are alive to the serious lack of good housing as one of the most serious symptoms of social disease. The C.O.S. complaint is reserved not for the house, nor for inordinately high rents, but for "cheapened rentals by the municipality." In discussing the one-room tenement question, Mrs. Bosanquet writes: "Space is of course an important element in our relations to one another; and to determine the exact amount of space best suited to the play of those relations of family life would be a difficult problem. Certainly it would seem that . . . it is possible that too much space may be almost as adverse to the play of true family relations as too little. . . . If the narrow home makes family life impossible, it is because the family life is already weak; where the deeper relations are strong, they find a way either to ignore or to control difficulties arising from want of space." Later on, however, Mrs. Bosanquet admits that "separation into two or three rooms is not the dissolution of the family."

The same applies to unemployment. While others endeavour to deal on broad lines with this mischief, the society is chiefly concerned to prove that distress is not exceptional and can therefore be ignored. This conclusion is entirely erroneous. It ought not to be but possibly it is necessary to remark that the negative attitude taken up does not proceed from any callous disregard to distress. It is a little difficult to reconcile the do-nothing attitude with a genuine human sympathy, but only because of the immense change in thought and emotional perceptiveness which has come about in recent years. The men who filled Parliament and ruled Press, Church, and School when we of this generation first began to think, were all brought

¹ 30th Report, 1898, p. 3.

² "Strength of the People," p. 201-2. Cf. Mr. Loch's evidence, Committee on Physical Deterioration, q. 10150-3, which tends towards condonation of the one room home in the cases where "a man and his wife and child—quite a young child—are in one room." But see also, for a working class view of the harm of such close association, Francis Place's Autobiography, quoted in Webb's "Industrial Democracy," p. 542.

up in the faith in "do nothing," "Let it alone," *laissez faire, laissez passer*. They believed unreservedly in "every man for himself and devil take the hindmost," because they themselves were so far towards the front as to have persuaded themselves that there need not be any hindmost. That doctrine is undoubtedly a comfortable one, and its extreme attractiveness is well illustrated when we reflect on the hold it once possessed, not only for the gentlemen who opened Mechanics' Institutes, but even for the men who trained themselves there to be Trade Union leaders of the Old Junta type.¹ "A complete intellectual acceptance of the Doctrine of Supply and Demand has much the same results upon the attitude of Trade Unionism as it has upon commercial life, and . . . it throws up as leaders, much the same type of character in the one case as in the other . . . the same strong, self-reliant and pugnacious spirit; the same impatience of sentiment, philanthropy and idealism: the same self-complacency at their own success in the fight and the same contempt for those who have failed; above all, the same conception of the social order, based on the axiom that 'to him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.'"²

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VIII.

THE ORIGIN OF THE C.O.S.

THE latter part of the year 1860 was a time of much poverty and distress, and therewith of sundry letters to the *Times*, indicating a growing dissatisfaction with existing charitable methods in the public mind, and leading to the formation of the Society for the Relief of Distress. This Society aimed at

¹ See article on Mechanics' Institutes, by Charles Baker, in "First Publication of the Central Society of Education" (1837), "Memoirs of Michael Sadler," p. 331; "These 80 years," Solly, ii. 161. ff.

² Webb, "Industrial Democracy," p. 581. "Between 1843 and 1880 the Doctrine of Supply and Demand . . . occupied a dominant place in the minds of most of the teachers of Trade Union thought."

establishing a more personal relation between the almoner and the recipient, and a more careful administration of charity. In 1861, Mr. S. M. Hicks, a member of this society, became dissatisfied with its methods, and drew up a plan for the appointment of almoners and co-operation with the Poor Law. A sub-committee was appointed to consider Mr. Hicks' plans, but there is no evidence of any practical result having ensued. In August, 1867, Mr. Hicks wrote to the *Standard*, animadverting on the ordinary practice of the clergy in administering relief. In March, 1868, he wrote to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, advocating the establishment of a central Board of Charities to classify existing charities, make plans for analyzing and comparing accounts, and present an annual report, which would enable the public to judge as to the comparative economy and efficiency of the various institutions.

In June, 1868, the Rev. Henry Solly read a paper at the Society of Arts, called "How to Deal with the Unemployed Poor of London, and with its Rough and Criminal Classes." Bishop Tait was in the Chair. A committee was subsequently formed, and after some negotiation and discussion, a society, called "The Association for the Prevention of Pauperism and Crime" was founded, Mr. Solly being appointed Hon. Sec. There was considerable controversy before a prospectus could be agreed upon, some of the members, Mr. Webster and Mr. F. Fuller, desiring to include the employment of waste labour on waste lands as one of the objects of the Association, which others regarded as hopelessly impracticable. Mr. Solly saw that work for the unemployed was an enterprise requiring capital and could not, with the best will in the world, be combined with the idea formulated by other members of the Association, which was to form a central organisation for the exchange of information, suggestion and advice, and mutual co-operation in charitable work. Mr. Solly "insisted on the new society restricting itself to discussion and propagandism, leaving actual experiments to agencies specially created and equipped. He would not have had the society take any part, even in the administration of relief. . . The part of the society was to "endeavour, as a matter admitting of no delay, to promote that mutual understanding and combined action between the managers and distributors of charitable relief both official and private, for want of which there is at present not only wonderful and most lamentable waste of resources, but an amount of organised imposture and hypocrisy, side by side with neglected misery, alike shameful and distressing.'" The writer in the *C.O.S. Review* adds that "This clear limitation of the new society to propagandist and organising work is the more remarkable because of Mr. Solly's evident sympathy with most, if not of all,

of the experiments advocated by his colleagues.¹” In December it was determined that the Council should turn its attention to the establishment of an industrial farm for 300 boys in Surrey. Circumstances, however, prevented any further move in this direction. On December 17 a meeting of the Association at the Society of Arts was presided over by Lord Shaftesbury, and Dr. Hawksley read a paper (later on issued as a pamphlet), entitled “The Charities of London, and some errors of their administration, with suggestions for an improved system of private and official charitable relief.” Dr. Hawksley opened with an elaborate analysis of expenditure in London by public departments and voluntary charity, (whether by institutions or individuals), upon the repression of crime, the relief of distress, education, and social and moral improvement. He estimated the total at over seven millions, *viz*:—The London Charities at £4,079,262; the Poor Law rates at £1,500,000; Charity collections and promiscuous alms at £1,500,000. In his opinion, however, little good was being done by these large sums, owing to the prevalence of erroneous methods. Neither Poor Law nor Charity aimed at *preventing* poverty; many things combined to cause poverty; air and water were impure, necessaries dear, facilities for drink numerous. There was a want of organisation and need for a reformed Poor Law which would increase the comfort and well being of the sick and aged, compel the able-bodied to pay by labour for their maintenance, and educate and train the young. Reform in charity was also required. In every district there should be an office through which alone the Charities should accept claimants for relief, and there should be a Central Office to co-ordinate the districts, and registry offices to “verify” all applications. He also emphasised the need for improved dwellings. This paper is marked throughout by a recognition of social responsibility for crime and poverty, and by certain constructive ideas which were repudiated in later years by the C.O.S.

“It may surprise some readers,” continues the writer already quoted, “to learn that Hawksley, who took an active part in originating the C.O.S., was an uncompromising opponent of the Reformed Poor Law. He devoted two pages of his pamphlet to a vigorous denunciation of “an uniform system of relief, which was to be so ingeniously balanced that, on the one hand, its recipients might be prevented dying of starvation or want of shelter, but on the other hand, that the kind and mode of the relief should be so hard, painful, and humiliating, that none but the very helpless and hard pressed should seek for it. The system was to be a test, and the idea was that if you drive away poverty out of your sight you would cure it, as if the charnel

1 “C.O.S. Review,” 1892, p. 363.

house could be changed by screening it with a whited sepulchre. The system did not contemplate visiting the fatherless and widow in their affliction, but it set itself up in the broad way of misery and destitution, and to every applicant, as a rule, it refused the recognition of any domesticities; it treated with contempt the humanising influences of hearth and home, and with stern voice pointing the way to the dreary portal of "the house," it said: "Enter, or depart without aid." The result has been the creation of an abject, miserable race.' On the other hand, the industrial provisions of the 14th and 18th of Elizabeth were commended by Hawksley as 'infinitely more Christian and wiser.'

Dr. Hawksley's recommendations were that a modification of the Poor Law system should be introduced, on the following lines: adequate out-relief to the aged, infirm, and sick, unless for medical reasons they would be better treated in the infirmary; assistance for the able-bodied in the form of work; industrial schools for neglected children; uniformity of poor rates throughout the Metropolis. Dr. Hawksley also advocated co-ordination of charities, with a central office for general control, and for the general audit of charity, and for inspection of the annual reports of the same, and he asked for a large staff of voluntary district visitors, to carry out the necessary investigation of cases and applications. In these suggestions Dr. Hawksley was of course in harmony with the main lines since laid down and followed by the C.O.S.; but as the writer in the *Review* already quoted remarks, his proposals in regard to the Poor Law "appears to us to-day (1892) to be reactionary."

Hawksley's paper indeed called forth much impatience, even at this time, and the representatives of charities would not hear of organisation, for evidence of which see paper read at a "Conference of London Charities," Society of Arts, February, 1867, p. 9.

This Conference recommended that the Association for the prevention of Pauperism and Crime should endeavour to obtain legislation to promote communication between the various London Charities, an official register of all applicants, and an audit of accounts. The representatives of charities disliked these recommendations, while the Association was disappointed that they did not go further. The result of the division in the camp was that in April, 1869, took place the first meeting of the "Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity," and about the same time an "Industrial Employment Association" was started by a section of the old Association.

The C.O.S. meeting was mainly taken up by a discussion on

"C.O.S. Review," *loc. cit.*, p. 367.

the restriction of the objects of the Society to the new programme alone. When this was carried, one of the "oldest and most prominent Members" (Mr. Webster) resigned his office in the Council and published a letter in the *Daily News* condemning the policy of the Society in leaving out the main features of the original scheme.¹

The Society thus had its origin partly in a controversy; it also owed a good deal to the efforts of the members of the Society for the Relief of Distress, who heartily co-operated with the new movement. Edward Denison, whose devoted work among the poor has made his name a household word, served upon some of the earliest committees, and took an active interest in the undertaking. That the movement was viewed with sympathy in Ministerial circles, appears from the fact that a Minute issued by the Poor Law Board in the same year (1869) that the C.O.S. was founded, embodied some of the recommendations which have been the strongest planks in the Society's platform. This document, after alluding to the waste and uselessness of indiscriminate charity, strongly urged that Boards of Guardians and charitable agencies should as far as possible have a mutual understanding as to their respective fields of operation; that the almoners of charities should refrain from giving food or money to cases relieved by the Guardians, but should concentrate their efforts on assisting non-poor law cases, or in giving the kind of assistance the Guardians may not legally give. Every agency, official or private, engaged in the relief of the poor, should be able to know the details of work performed by all similarly engaged. The Poor Law Board had no funds which could be applied to the establishment of a register of metropolitan relief, but, if such a scheme could be undertaken by others, would do all in its power to facilitate co-operation and mutual understanding. This Minute was signed G. J. Goschen, and certainly indicates a remarkable degree of sympathy with the aims of the newly-formed C.O.S.


Lord Lichfield in a letter to Dr. Hawksley records his recollection that the scheme of the Society was many times amended and reprinted, that he himself did not approve of the ideas of certain Members in regard to finding work for the unemployed, and "was responsible for striking out paragraph after paragraph, until nothing remained but the plan for organising charitable relief through district committees co-operating with the Poor Law. . . . The idea of inducing all charitable agencies in a district to work together was the basis upon which our Society contemplated the establishment of a powerful central organisation through the representations of committees thus formed."¹ [Ed.]

¹ Contribution to the History of the origin of the C.O.S., W. W. Wilkinson.

Part II.

THE INTERVENTION OF THE STATE.

“Deformities of mind and body will sometimes occur. Some voluntary castaways there will always be, whom no fostering kindness and no parental care can preserve from self-destruction; but if any are lost from want of care and culture, there is a sin of omission in the society to which they belong.”—Southey’s Colloquies on the Progress of Society, I., 110.



CHAPTER IX.

TYPES OF STATE ACTION.

As we have seen in previous chapters, the last century has witnessed a process of change in the social structure, and a change which has been in the direction of growing complexity. An increasing amount of work has been thrown on the State as the instrument of social action for common ends, although the political theory inherited from the Eighteenth Century and continued throughout the Nineteenth, has been far from offering any explanation or justification for this tendency. On the contrary, the idea of the age has been to leave everything so far as possible to the control of private enterprise. Yet in spite of the drag of a laggard philosophy, nothing is more noticeable in the history of the last two generations than the repeated extension of State action into spheres which had been regarded as properly outside of its interference, if not of its cognisance. This applies to all kinds of social interests. In the following chapters, however, our attention will be confined to the incursions of the public authority into the realm of philanthropy, or into regions where the humanitarian impulse forced it to enter.

The intervention of the state gradually changes in character, partly in response to forces which compel government action, partly by the necessity of the extended action itself. But the change in character is not always equal to the change in function. The demand for State action often rests on foresight of what the State will become.

But side by side with a process of increasing complexity in the social structure has come also a deeper view of society. The economic development has made society more complicated at the same time that the development of thought has prepared men to understand the complexity.

I.

The Municipality as possible instrument. We must remember that the instrument of social action has also become more pliable. State action is by no means so exclusively action of a central *executive* as it used to be. In this connection the work done by Chadwick is of the first importance. It was animated by a massive contempt for local autonomy as well as for the existing ineffective forms of local government. It was not intended to increase the efficiency of local life, but it has had that effect. For as experience has shewn, centralization was a necessary stage in the development of the general effectiveness of local administration. It has served to counteract the tendency which may be observed more particularly in the smaller local bodies, to be satisfied with poor or scandalously bad administration. And it is doubtful if even the great municipalities of to-day could have become so powerful without the preparatory development of central control. At the present time, indeed the relation between the town and the Local Government Board is twofold. Where there is a keen and instructed civic conscience the Local Government Board acts as a drag, and there are many laws which are hindered by its action. Part III. of the Housing Act is an instance; the Unemployed Act is another. But on the other hand the Board stirs up slothful or recalcitrant corporations, as for instance, when it stands between the Medical Officers and local hostility. The Board's own standard is mediocre, but the Progressive bodies raise theirs higher and higher. The Local Government Board is not itself up to their level, but it helps to bring up the backward ones. Taking it broadly, the fact of the gradual evolution and the rapid construction of local governing bodies is one of the outstanding features of the period. They provide a means whereby the people can manage their own affairs, and with the power to do this we find inevitably a disposition to bring more and more work under the control of the local public authority.¹

¹ *The local authority, we say advisedly, for the tendency is unmistakably to get rid of anomalous ad hoc bodies and make the one popularly representative corporation the depository of all governing powers.*

We find also that the municipality ceases to be regarded merely as an instrument for doing what private effort cannot do. Thus in 1870 the School Board was intended to be simply subsidiary to the efforts of private subscribers. In 1902 and afterwards the County and Borough Education authority stood forth as the standard provider of elementary instruction. The private school is now the exception, just as a generation earlier the Board or Public School had been.

The creation of this vigorous instrument of public administration has resulted in a large and varied demand for municipalisation, for municipal trading (with which we are not concerned), and for municipal medical service, which we shall have to consider closely.¹

The development of civic activity may be regarded in another light. It is not only a matter of the community managing its own affairs. The city is also a centre round which enthusiasm rallies. This is not a thing open to statistical treatment, nor does the mood of loyal response characterise by any means all the citizens. Yet it is a sociological force which it would be folly to overlook. Where this enthusiasm is evoked it prepares the way for a new attitude towards all those problems which used to be regarded as philanthropic. The range of civic action tends to grow wider until by degrees it comes to include an implicit theory of communal obligation towards the weaker classes. The case of Brighton, with its municipal provision for consumptive patients is instructive. This is indeed a daring departure from the older theory of limited social responsibility, and it is not a little remarkable to find it endorsed in a publication so devoted to the doctrine of Individualism as the *Register* of the C.O.S., in the pages of which Dr. Kelynack declares that "the interesting experiment of Dr. Arthur Newsholme at Brighton, of a municipal educative sanatorium, merits imitation."² It has already found an imitator in the strenuous health department of the county borough of Leicester.

¹ *Infra*, chap. xvii.

² "Charities Register," (1905) p. cciii.

This is a process which is bound to acquire an accelerating momentum. The best local authorities are becoming increasingly capable; they are proud with a pride which often goes even beyond their merits. They do not mistrust themselves or their ability to undertake new duties. This preparedness is matched by an increasing disposition to use this instrument for all it is worth. People come to doubt the power of private benevolence to deal with large and complicated evils, such as sickness, bodily or mental defectiveness, unemployability, and the other forms into which the one disease of exorbitant penury breaks forth. Where they mistrust the private purse and the fluctuating efforts of charity, they put confidence in the power of the community, and in the possibility of a transfigured Department of Health.

These are among the forces which are driving the State to extend its sphere, whether through Central Government or Local Authority.

II.

When we consider the matter more closely we find that the Intervention of the State does not take place all at once, nor does it follow any single type. We may indeed distinguish several types. Perhaps for the purpose of a preliminary analysis it will be sufficient to indicate six main forms into which one or other kind of State intervention will pass.

*Annexation.*¹ This is the simplest type and probably the one which would immediately occur to most people. It is indeed quite possible that some think of this and nothing else when they hear of State intervention. The public authority simply steps in to do what had been done previously by private persons, if indeed it had been done at all. Illustrations may be found in the cases of Lunatic Asylums and of Elementary Education. It is unnecessary to say more about them here as they will meet us again in the following chapter. Neither of these is so absolute a case of annexation as was that of the telegraph,

¹ See chapter x.

to turn to another sphere, that of commercial interests. The State says, "I will send telegrams and no one else shall compete." That is annexation in its most complete form.

Partition. Before the intervention begins the whole realm is occupied by private enterprise, so far, that is, as it is occupied at all. In time voluntary action appears inadequate to the task, usually of course because the work is seen to be greater than was supposed. Voluntary action is left to act in one part of the field,—State action is resorted to in another part. The most considerable instance of what I call partition is found in connection with the relief of sickness. In 1842 the state refused subvention to a fever hospital; in 1906 society is responsible for all (notified) infectious disease, and through its Poor Law Infirmaries for the great bulk of non-infectious disease, leaving to private benevolence only a minor share in the whole work.¹ The partition here is almost as complete as that of Poland, and the destruction of empire as clear as in Polish Russia and Polish Germany.

Co-operation. The relation becomes more subtle. The State takes account of the whole territory, but it utilises the assistance of "philanthropic associations or benevolent persons." Obviously in such a case the dominant power will be official and public, and the position of the individuals will be restricted and subordinate. One good instance of this third type is to be found in connection with the prisons.² Government has, though only recently, assumed full responsibility for all prisoners, while they are in prison; but it avails itself of Prisoners' Aid Associations, unofficial visitors, lecturers, etc. One feature of our elementary school system would bring it under this head of co-operation, that, namely, which concerns the appointment of voluntary school managers.

Supervision. This type has features in common with the last. The State controls voluntary work, sets the task, and determines the conditions. But the individuals are left with a larger amount of freedom. Certain conditions

¹ See below chapter xv.

² See chapter xi.

must be complied with, and the State employs Inspectors to ensure at least a minimum of compliance. The Voluntary and Denominational School was an instance of this type up to the time of the Education Act of 1902. The Reformatory movement is also a case in point. The actual executive body is composed of private citizens acting under the supervision of the public official. It is hardly necessary to point out that nothing but the need for financial subsidies would reconcile free-born Englishmen to submit to so much expert direction and control of their beneficent activity.

Co-ordination. This is a particularly interesting type and indicates the complexity of some of our modern problems. The instance in which it has been most thoroughly worked out is that of the Inebriate Homes. Here philanthropy does something and the State does something. So far we have a resemblance to the previous type which we called partition, which should be distinguished also from co-operative subordination. In that case, there was no interdependence. Voluntary hospitals do their work much as if no State hospital existed, and the State in its turn acts pretty much as if there were no Hospital Funds and Hospital Collections. It is not so with inebriate homes. There are three kinds, each intended for a particular class of patients. One of them depends on private, two of them on public, action. But each of them is regarded as essential in order that any of them may function successfully. The scheme is interesting and provides the framework for a really valuable work, the scheme, I say, because as everybody knows, the actual treatment of inebriates needs still much extension and improvement.¹

Delegation. This is the sixth and last type. The State so far recognises the claims of humanity as to delegate its function. That it regards the work as properly its own is shown by its nominating private citizens to discharge the duty, though for some reason or other the State is here

¹ See chap. xiii. and cf. the Annual Reports of the Inspector under the Inebriates Acts.

unwilling to be its own executive, it may be, from a lurking remnant of the older philosophy which would restrict State action within the narrowest limits. The most typical illustration of delegation is that of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.¹ The Society enjoys a Royal Charter, and is deputed to do work which is properly a State responsibility. It steps in to do the evaded duty, and enjoys a modified sanction for its work. It thus occupies an ambiguous position between a public and a private body.

The Society pleads that inasmuch as it is doing public work at an increasing cost it should receive a more thorough recognition, and should not be left to an anxious quest for subscriptions. It seems impossible to question the propriety of its claim.

¹ See chapter xiv.

CHAPTER X.

ANNEXATION.

CARE OF LUNATICS.—ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

The State Minimum Becomes Greater than the Philanthropic Maximum.

My principal object in this Chapter is not to prove that State intervention has taken place, for the fact is sufficiently obvious and hardly requires any proof. But while the illustrations about to be adduced are brought forward chiefly on other grounds, they do incidentally serve to show, and in an impressive manner, how considerable and varied the action of the State has been. If I had wished to throw the emphasis on the fact of intervention, it would have been appropriate to deal at length with those instances in which it has been most complete, whereas I propose to dismiss these cases rather summarily in the present chapter, in order to arrive more quickly at those other instances which are the more instructive, just because in them the process of change from private and public control is still going on.

There are two principal features which interest me personally in the history I am to describe in this and succeeding chapters. It is the story of a growing awareness of distress, and of a slowly deepening perception of its causes. But beyond this, the gradual increase of State function in the field of philanthropy has taken place in obedience to the irresistible pressure of events. It has not been in response to any clear thought which might justify it; on the contrary it has proceeded in the face of an opposing philosophy, which would on reasoned grounds restrict the State functions within their narrowest limit. The movement of thought and the movement of policy have been

independent if not incompatible. That being so, it follows that so far as State intervention is realized, it is likely to be not a very coherent process so far as it proceeds from an idea, that idea is obscure, and has not arrived at self-consciousness. The idea on which the process is based is the idea of an inchoate collectivism. Our history then is the history of a confused idea, and as such seems to hold out fascinating prospects, whether we seek the humour of things or the philosophy of life.

It is time to ask some questions which have not yet been asked, or not asked with sufficient pertinacity, such as: Why ought the *State* to do this work? *What* is the work the State ought to do? In the description of what the State has done, it is not necessary, and indeed it would be wearisome, to put these questions categorically at every turn. For the next 100 pages we are concerned mainly with what has been, what is, or what obviously is on the point of becoming. But behind the account of what is, lurks always the question of "ought" and "why." This description should serve as necessary material towards an answer, and when we have traversed these 100 pages we shall again take up the questions in the discussion on the relation of the State to the weaker classes.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century three separate spheres which the State has now annexed were left to the unchecked impulse of a naked law of supply and demand. Lunatics were universally neglected except in those few cases which were dealt with in private institutions; elementary education rested entirely in the hands of benevolent individuals; the protection of women, children, and incidentally of men in factories lay remote from the care of public law. In all these cases, the intervention of the State has been of the tolerably simple and complete type of annexation. In the first of these the State was compelled by philanthropists themselves to take over work which had been philanthropic work. In the second the State stepped in, not at the invitation, but rather in spite of the jealousy of the societies which had been making such immense but inadequate efforts to organise the

elementary school system of the country. The case of the factories is a different one. Here the intervention was in response to humanitarian demands, but the incursion itself was not into the philanthropic sphere. Richard Oastler, Sadler, Lord Ashley and others did one thing in order to compel the government to do another. They exposed the appalling conditions of labour, in order that the executive might be forced into extending protection to classes whom the philanthropist had not protected and never could protect. Lunatic Asylums and schools illustrate the extension of the philanthropic function of the State. Factory inspection shows us the changed conception of the political function of the State.

1. *Lunatic Asylums.*¹ In the year 1851 our earliest Asylum, that Bethlehem Hospital which had already a history of nearly six centuries, required rebuilding. The cost of the undertaking was over £122,000 and the managers were at their wits' end how to pay the bills. They appealed to Parliament and obtained grants to the amounts of £72,819 1s. 6d. This early and modest grant may be regarded as the origin of the present system and expenditure. It is not likely that either managers or Ministers had at the time any forefeeling how far-reaching their action would be. The State was forced to take a share in philanthropic work, not with any clear justification in thought, but by the pressure of the people's need. Having once begun to act, the State cannot rest content with inefficiency, and has to go forward until by some means or other it has fulfilled the task. For a time however there was little change.² The few existing institutions

¹ See Hack Tuke's "History of the Insane"; Aikin's "Thoughts on Hospitals"; Mrs. Fry's "Memoirs," *passim*; Hodder's "Life of Shaftesbury," *passim*; "Proceedings of Lincoln Lunatic Asylum" (1844), "State of Lincoln Lunatic Asylum," . . . 1846. "Total Abolition of Personal Restraint," R. G. Hill; "Society for Improving Condition of the Insane" (1862); speech by Lord Ashley, Hansard, July 23rd, 1844. "Report of Bethlem Building Committee," 1818.

² Even before this, in 1808, the magistrates had been empowered by 48 G. iii., c. 96, to erect an Asylum in each county; but in 1827 only 9 counties had availed themselves of the permission, and it was not till 1845 that the law was made compulsory. 8 and 9 Vict., c. 100 and c. 126.

continued to do their work, and Bethlehem received a few criminal lunatics for whom the government paid. But the provision was trivial, and almost everywhere the insane either suffered (and wandered) at large, or their condition assimilated to the instance described by Mrs. Fry. "No one knew who he was or whence he came; but having had the misfortune to frequent the premises of some gentleman in the neighbourhood and to injure his garden seats, and being considered mischievous, he was confined to this abominable dungeon, where he had been at the date of our visit, in unvaried solitary confinement for eighteen months." One is not sure that the state of things in Bethlehem was much better than in the provincial prison, for a writer in 1827 tells us that "it is little better than when in fact it formed one of the lions of the metropolis, and the patients as wild beasts were shown at sixpence for each person admitted."¹

Bedlam was a fashionable resort. But this morbid interest in the insane was accompanied by a more worthy concern for them. The work of Philippe Pinel in Paris and of the York Retreat at home² was exercising its influence. Men's minds were being turned towards the problem, and the result was seen when in 1828 the lunacy powers which had nominally belonged to the College of Surgeons were transferred to a Board of 15 Commissioners.³ In the following year Lord Ashley became Chairman of this body, an office which he retained until his death more than half a century later.

Two things in connection with this subject must not be left unnoticed. County and other Asylums for the poor were opened in rapid succession, Hanwell in 1831 leading the way. For a time even the poorest were to some extent provided for by charity; to some extent indeed are so provided for still, but the extent is comparatively so small as to have no appreciable bearing on the question. But we should not overlook the assistance rendered to the cause of

¹ Quoted by Hack Tuke, *op. cit.* p. 166.

² Hist. of English Philanthropy, p. 140.

³ 9 Geo. iv. c. 40.

humanity by the doctors and other managers of the Lincoln Asylum. It is an instance of the value of the philanthropist as experimenter. The modern treatment of the insane has benefited much from the labours of Charlesworth and Gardiner Hill at Lincoln, as well as from those of Conolly at Hanwell. Their system, the policy of non-restraint, was very successful and was quickly imitated. So much so that, as the Lunacy Commissioners tell us, by 1854 nearly all public asylums, as well as the best private ones had adopted it.

When the State began to act, Philanthropy quite properly gave up its impossible attempt, and the insane poor were recognised as a public charge. The insane of the middle and upper classes still continued to be a charge on charitable funds. And when we look down any list of charitable institutions we find several for this class of patient. Yet what was done was by no means sufficient, and by 1861 the "startling fact had become apparent that the lower classes, in cases of mental affliction, were in a greatly better position than the middle classes." The matter was taken up by the *Lancet* and "much enthusiasm was shown," but "nothing came of it." In 1864 Mr. Thomas Holloway communicated to Lord Shaftesbury his desire to be a philanthropist. However 21 years were to elapse before the opening of the palatial sanatorium for the middle and upper classes at Virginia Water.¹

An issue of some moment is raised. The State makes general average provision for common average needs. It is hardly possible out of public funds to discriminate in favour of small classes. So far as the middle classes are not content with the general treatment they tend to be left out in the cold. And so long as this quite natural class-sentiment continues there would seem to be scope for the beneficence of wealthy members of the middle and upper class. The need and the difficulty are both illustrated in that amusing book "The Benefactor."

2. *Elementary Education*. Nothing in the nature of a history of educational development is possible or necessary

¹ Shaftesbury's Life, iii., pp. 122-3.

here. It has been told again and again in the last few years with opposing and perhaps mutually corrective polemical bias.¹ There are two features however to which we must devote some consideration. The first of these may be described as of constitutional importance. Not until the year 1902 did the State intervene in the blunt decisive form of annexation, and during the previous two generations it had taken up successively two positions, those namely of Supervision and of Partition. Before 1833 its official attitude to the system of voluntary school enterprise had been one of indifference. Not that the individuals who composed Governments or filled the "respectable" ranks of Society were all of them indifferent. That was far from being the case, as witness the donations of Kings and Royal Dukes. Ministers such as Brougham were active in promoting infant schools, while the British and Foreign Society (founded 1808), and the National Society (1811), enlisted the warm support of dissenters and churchmen respectively. Mr. Lancaster and Dr. Bell were hailed as national benefactors. Nor must the influence of the smiling Mrs. Trimmer be overlooked, who provided pictures for the children in the schools² and a topic of conversation for the ladies and gentlemen of the Court. In this period the philanthropic function of society was by common consent left to private persons. Education was still supposed to be a matter of philanthropy. So far as education is concerned this first stage came to an end in 1833. Since those days there has been a double change of view. Interests which were regarded as philanthropic have come to be considered in their more public significance, and there is less reluctance

¹ For the history of elementary education see Report of Royal Commission, 1861, vol. xxi., pt. 1; Report of Royal Commission, 1888, vol. xxxv., c. 5485; "Popular Education in England and Wales," by Rowland Hamilton, Journ. Stat. Soc., 1883; "Schools for the People," by G. T. Bartley, 1871. A readable and simple account is to be found in Craik's "State in Relation to Education," 1896.

² See her "Description of a Set of Prints of Ancient History" and "Description of Prints from the New Testament," etc.

to employ the resources of the State in what many people still regard as charitable work.¹

In 1833 the first small breach was made in the old theory of Philanthropy as an independent socio-political force—a kind of *imperium in imperio*—acting co-ordinately with the public government of the country. Henceforth philanthropy was to be brought into subordination. Roebuck, with the support of Grote and Hume, moved a resolution in favour of a national system of education. But this being opposed by Lord Althorp was withdrawn; in its place a vote of £20,000 for building school-houses was granted. This inadequate sum by 1846 had increased to £100,000, and was destined to increase into all kinds of grants for various purposes, and assume gigantic proportions. But the small grant of 1833 implied the new principle. The funds of the nation were granted: the control of the public official would certainly make itself felt.² Government pressure first appeared as insistence on public inspection. Both the Church and the Nonconformists were strongly opposed to such an attack on pure voluntarism: as the National Society expresses it, they were “constrained by a deep sense of the inconvenience which would arise from admitting into the National Schools an official inspection not derived from or connected with the Authorities of the National Church.”³ The Government stood firm, and although it made some rather elusive concession to the rival societies, it upheld its inspectors.⁴ From a constitutional point of view the interest of the period 1833-70 may be summed up as follows. The State increased its grants and extended its supervision. The schools grudgingly submitted to control because they

¹ The Education Bill (Feeding of Children) 1906 is a case in point. Probably most of its supporters still regard school dinners as charitable: only they feel the necessity for some more adequate machinery. It is only the little group of opponents and a minority of the advocates of the bill who see that this is a step toward a new theory of the State.

² Hansard, 1833, vol. xx., 139, 733.

³ Kay Shuttleworth, “Four Periods,” p. 500. This volume gives a full account of the various grants up to 1854.

⁴ Correspondence of the National Society, 1830, cf. Lord Ashley in debate, House of Commons, 14th June, 1839, on “this hideous chimaera of an educational committee of the Privy Council.”

could not exist without funds. These funds they could by no means raise themselves. Yet a strange thing ensued. The more the State granted in aid, the heavier the burden on the private subscribers became. The difficulty was that the State, if it did anything, could not rest content with the ineffective miserable provision of the philanthropists; on the other hand, did the philanthropists ever so much they could not rise above inefficiency. The philanthropic maximum was less than the State minimum.

The situation was clearly impossible. Even with the assistance of national funds private philanthropy could not by any means solve a large problem of public administration. Accordingly in 1870 came the School Board Act. Supervision of voluntary schools of course continued. But a new relationship was introduced. Before 1833 the State had left the philanthropists alone; then it proceeded first to give them doles and next to bully them; now it stepped in and through its local organisations undertook to do one part of the work, while continuing to help and to inspect the other part. We arrive at a delimitation of territory which however could not be permanently satisfactory to either party. That "honest rivalry of Churchmen and Dissenter"¹ in which our forefathers took so strange a pleasure, was abolished in favour of what, to the Churchman, appeared an entirely unfair rivalry.

Opposition to rate-supported education however was fostered less as an affair of Churches than of classes. When it was proposed in 1858 to make use of the rates, Mr. Cowper threatened a rising in arms of the middle class against it,² asking, why they were to pay rates for an education to be given to the poor, better than they gave their own children? The trend was too obviously in the direction of that abomination known as "free" education. Ancient peoples might have educated children at the public expense, but "in a free country and in the improved state of commerce this practice does not admit of being adopted." The Act of 1870 was accepted with much

¹ This phrase of Sir James Graham was adopted by the British and Foreign Society.

² Hansard, vol. 148, col. 1232.

doleful foreboding.¹ Its operation, however, was extraordinarily rapid. The experiment of delimitation of sphere of influence continued for a short generation, only to give place to the more drastic policy of annexation which was adopted in 1902. Whether this may be taken as a normal instance or not is doubtful. But it does suggest a probability that when once the State begins to assume fresh responsibility, it is likely, before very long, to take full control and direct administration. This becomes the more probable with the increasing vigour of the local instruments of State action.

The complete administrative control of the State is not incompatible with a great deal of private work in the State sphere, as may be seen in the case of the voluntary school managers. But this raises questions which can be most conveniently studied in a later chapter.²

In one other direction we may learn a good deal which will assist our study of the principles of State intervention. I have spoken of the conflict between the State and the school societies as largely one of efficiency. Government was peremptory in its demand that what they did teach should really be taught, but the Philanthropists above all wanted to do the thing cheaply.³ To this end they set children to teach children, had an insufficient supply of books, and went on using volumes which were "in tatters." They really did in many cases do the work very badly. On the other hand, efficiency in the minds of the Victorian Statesmen, was a very mechanical conception. The fruitless addiction to machine-made children who should become mechanical machine-minders finds its most perfect expression in Mr. Lowe, of whose policy it has been

¹ See "Report of the National Education Union" (Northern Non-conformists), and Shaftesbury's Life, iii., p. 266.

² Probably a chapter called "the Administrator," which was included in the scheme of this book, but not written.—Ed.

³ "It is not proposed that the children of the poor be educated in an expensive manner, or even taught to write and to cypher. Utopian schemes for the universal diffusion of general knowledge, would soon . . . confound that distinction of ranks and classes of society, on which the general welfare hinges. . . . It may suffice to teach the generality on an economical plan to read their Bible and understand the doctrine of our holy religion." Bell, "Experiment," 2nd ed., p. 62.

said, "Code after Code, each more absurd than its predecessor. The history of Codes is in truth a pitiful and discreditable story; but it is also amusing."¹

The official position was that the children must be taught reading, writing and arithmetic. The schools were not very successful in doing so. Many of the Managers were not really convinced of the necessity for a mastery even of the three r's. They undervalued intellectual proficiency just as the governments overvalued *mere* intellectual alertness. In this respect the schools did less than they should have aimed at, and less than Inspectors of "results" demanded.

In other directions the philanthropists took a deeper view of education than did the official department. They wanted to make men and women, although their notions of the proper qualities of men and women in the lower classes were often marked by ignorant class prejudice. Thus the "sole object" of the National Society is defined as the communication to the poor by a summary mode of education of such knowledge and habits as are sufficient to guide them through life in *their proper stations*.² The British Society is more definite, and to modern modes of thought more repulsive, when it explains that the middle class are very dependent for their comforts on the poor. "We have a deep interest in the state of their morals; for as in every country they are numerous, it involves our personal security; we are obliged upon innumerable occasions to entrust them with our property; and what is of greater importance, the minds of our children may be materially influenced by the good or bad qualities of the servants in whose care they frequently spend so much time. The higher ranks are then deeply interested in providing a moral and religious education for the whole of the poor; as these are enabled to rise in the scale of civilization, they will feel more repugnance to the degradation of parish relief and enormous sums extracted from the industrious part of the community be saved."³ It was not desired,

¹ S. S. Laurie, "Decentralising Policy of the Board of Education," 1902.

² First Report, p. 18.

³ Manual of the British and Foreign School Society, 1816, p. vii.

as we have seen, in any way to confound "that distinction of ranks and classes of society on which the general welfare hinges."

This may be described as the official philanthropic position. Education was in some sense a measure of police, and subscriptions were in the nature of an insurance against sedition. But one cannot read these reports and tracts, still less the letters and diaries of the time, without seeing that more was involved. The influence of Gray's Elogy was considerable, and the quest for the "mute inglorious" was general.¹ In any case, and even where semi-feudal notions of servitude and proper position of the poor held sway, there was a desire that within these limits the children should become men and women. There was devotion to the idea of a humane education. While the schools were not very keen on that accuracy in spelling which the Inspectors demanded, they did in some ways take a truer view than the Committee of Council. They did so because they were in touch with children and gained from them an inkling of what the child mind was. They were not uninfluenced by De Fellenbourg and Pestalozzi.²

At the best, schools such as Owen's at New Lanark and societies such as the *Central Society*, were true pioneers, and to them we owe a great deal of such progress as we have made towards a true scheme of education. Owen's school of dancing and other exercises is well known.³ We may add an extract from a less familiar early theorist which shows the influence of Rousseau and his followers. *The First Publication of the Central Society* protests against long school hours, would send the

¹ For instance, at a meeting of the B. & F. Schools Society, Nov. 25, 1815, Mr. Shuttleworth spoke of the children's attainments and exercises as "a prelude of a brighter æra—as the day-spring of intellect, which at some future time would shine out . . . when the energies and capacity of man will be called into action." Report of the B. & F. Society, 1815, p. 80.

² The methods were sometimes comical as witness this from "Religious Arithmetic," by Rev. J. C. Wigram. "The children of Israel were sadly given to idolatry; notwithstanding all they knew of God, Moses was obliged to have 3,000 of them put to death for this grievous sin. What digits must you use to express this number?"

³ E.g., Podmore's *Life of Owen*, chapter vii.

youngsters forth to the green plot covered with flowers of their own planting, would teach them under the shadow of trees, and exhorts teachers to "speak of Nature with her page wide spread before you."¹

In a word, if we regard chiefly sound administration, we shall incline to side with government against philanthropist. But on the other hand, we may well retain a kindly feeling for these men who tried to do the nation's work at a time when the nation herself neglected it, and who, although they failed to provide a national system themselves, did contribute pregnant hints and valuable suggestions, and at last goaded a slothful people into minding their own business.²

¹ First Publication of the "Central Society of Education," 1837, pp. 38-9.

² The third section of this chapter (on Factory Inspection: see p. 128-9) does not appear to have been written.

CHAPTER XI.

CO-OPERATION.

PRISONERS' AID.

THE regular administration of our penal system¹ at the present time rests entirely in the hands of the State, as represented in the first place by the Prison Commissioners and the Secretary of State for Home Affairs. This system is a recent one. Previously to the enactment of the prison code the maintenance of gaols and the charge of local prisoners had fallen on the Justices, with such control and supervision as had gradually been evolved since the appointment of the first Inspectors in 1835. Earlier still we find a period when, except for a few State gaols such as Millbank, the central government with complete indifference left the whole thing to arrange itself as it might. Those were the days when Howard began his momentous enquiry into the State of Prisons. Before 1771 the prisoner was frequently dependent on charity, failing which he went supperless and blanketless to his floor-bed. Now whatever bed or other clothes he wears and such unappetising food as he eats are provided for him by the official regulations. In a word, the evolution of the prison system during the last one hundred and seventy years constitutes an important section in the history of the intervention of the State, an enlargement of public action so thorough as almost to constitute an instance of what we have called annexation. We shall not, however, linger over the record, because the responsibility in question theoretically was never denied, or at least

¹ A Bill at present (Sept. '08) before Parliament and entitled "a Bill to make provision for the prevention of crime, and for that purpose to provide for the reformation of young offenders and the prolonged detention of habitual criminals, and for other purposes incidental hereto" deals with some of the defects in our present system which are pointed out in the following discussion, but not entirely along the lines suggested by the author.—(Ed.).

certainly not within the last three generations; in practice there has of course been a great change, from all but total neglect, to a definite system.

While any discussion of the prison system as a whole would carry us too far into the history and theory of Statecraft, there are several subsidiary features which will abundantly repay our attention. The State has accepted the most complete responsibility for the prisoner while he is in prison. It determines absolutely the conditions, discomforts, and privileges of the inmates. Not only the formulation or making, but the carrying out of rules, is official. The size, temperature, light and accoutrement of the cell; the quantity, quality, and cooking of food, the duration, intensity and kind of labour, all these are fixed and purveyed for by upper and subordinate State servants, and no outside advice or interference is brooked or asked for. There are other matters relating to prisons, however, which are certainly not unimportant and perhaps of even more vital interest for the common weal than those already mentioned, in regard to which, while the State calls the tune, it does not in the words of the old adage, "pay the piper." It invites the co-operation of philanthropists in such matters as relate to the moral life of the convict in the prison, and further relies on such extraneous assistance in tiding over the official difficulties of the period of discharge from prison.

Philanthropy goes further, and concerns itself both with the future career of criminals, and the lot of their families during their incarceration. What is done in the first direction is not much, what is done in the second is almost negligible, but the questions raised by the attempt are very instructive, and lead up to the most pertinent enquiry of all, *viz.*: whether national responsibility does in fact begin when the turnkey locks a man in, or ends when he locks him out, and whether, when for approved ends of social defence we have broken up the unity of the family, the public responsibility does not really embrace the whole home group as well as the single convicted person.

I have spoken of those aspects of penology in which the philanthropist is concerned as subsidiary. The description is accurate as regards the present system, the leading idea of which is thus stated by Sir Godfrey Lushington. "The essential characteristics of prison administration seem to me to be first, that it is a vast and complex machine operating uniformly on a large number of persons, with the primary, if not the sole, object of inflicting and enforcing punishment as imposed by the law. Secondly, prison administration embraces the entire life, day and night, all the week, month and year round of the prisoners, who are of various ages, characters, and physiques, but who one and all have the status of the most passive submission, and thirdly, though there is no intention of concealment, and though there are certain safeguards, the operation of the prison machine is necessarily withdrawn from the public eye. Prisons are and must be dark places."¹

These sentences serve at once to indicate the intention of our penal code, and its failure to satisfy those who are concerned to render punishment as little inhumane to the criminal and as slightly harmful to society as possible. We might fitly write a lengthy comment on them, but for the moment confine ourselves to noticing that the three ideals are no longer accepted. We are not satisfied with a "vast complex machine"; our primary, certainly our sole object is not punitive; and recent developments of co-operation between the prison staff and prisoners' aid societies are doing something to render prisons not dark, but at worst twilight places.

The aspects which were subsidiary are becoming primary. This partly results from the fact that the reformers of 1860-80 have succeeded in their task. They cared for three things: "uniformity, discipline, and economy." The first two they achieved in what is now known to be an excessive degree. As to economy, something was gained, and the present generation does not attach so tremendous an importance to cheeseparing as did the last. But aspects which were subsidiary are becoming primary for

¹ Report of Departmental Committee on Prisons (1895), q. 11,396.

another reason. There has been to some extent a growth of public conscience, and this has been accompanied by a very considerable development of a science of social pathology. It would be the simplest thing to prove this change of attitude from the words of reformers and critics; but these are a heady race and often lead where commonsense refuses to follow. It does not, however, need much reflection to discover strong forces of public opinion at work to draw from a Departmental Committee such a confession of failure as the following: "The great, and as we consider, the proved danger of this highly centralised system has been and is that while much attention has been given to organisation, finance, order, health of the prisoners, and prison statistics, the prisoners have been treated too much as a hopeless or worthless element of the community, and the moral as well as the legal responsibility of the prison authorities has been held to cease when they pass outside the prison gates. The satisfactory sanitary conditions, the unbroken orderliness of prison life, economy and high organisation, are held, and justly held, to prove good administration. But the moral condition in which a large number of prisoners leave prison, and the serious number of recommitments, have led us to think that there is ample cause for a searching inquiry into the main features of prison life."¹

The earlier problem was to confine prisoners in an orderly, uniform, and economic manner. The modern problem is to reduce to a minimum the moral mischief to the individual, and the social damage to the nation, which have been the main result of every system of imprisonment yet adopted in this country.

The chief questions which I wish to discuss in the

¹ Departmental Committee's Report, 1895, p. 7. Cf. Sir G. Lushington's evidence, q. 11,482. "I regard as unfavourable to reformation the status of a prisoner throughout his whole career; the crushing of self-respect, the starving of all moral instinct he may possess; the absence of all opportunity to do or receive a kindness; the continual association with none but criminals . . . ; the forced labour and the denial of liberty. I believe the true mode of reforming a man or restoring him to society is exactly in the opposite direction of all these. But of course this is a mere idea. It is quite impracticable in a prison."

present chapter are concerned with (1) the treatment of juvenile offenders, (2) the work of prisoners' aid societies both during and after the period of incarceration, (3) the need for a deeper consideration of the needs of families of prisoners. These will lead us to ask (4) whether the prison problem so far as it is also a philanthropic problem is not largely an unnecessary one; *i.e.*, a study in criminology, social pathology or criminal sociology. Here it will become clear that "prisoners" are neither worthless nor hopeless *as a class*, simply because prisoners fall not into one class, but into several.

I. CARE FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS.

The most interesting recent action in regard to young criminals is undoubtedly that known as the Borstal system, a system the inauguration of which is immediately due to the disquiet occasioned by the publication of the *Judicial Statistics* of 1895 and 1899. The officials, and to some extent the country, are aware in a practical fashion of the serious social menace involved in the fact that the most criminal period of a man's life is in the five years before he legally becomes a man. Between sixteen and twenty-one our professional criminals matriculate and graduate in crime.

The fact is an ironical comment on a long history of desultory efforts to deal with this precise problem. So long ago as the ninth decade of the century before last (circ. 1788) a certain *Philanthropic Society* was founded with the express object of making provision for the criminal youth of the Metropolis. The need which called this society into existence had been noted half a century earlier still by Robert Nelson who had called attention to a class of boys "called the Blackguard."¹ The Philanthropic Society served to ventilate the question if at first it did little more, and was destined later on to develop that Farm School at Redhill, modelled on the plan of the French settlement at

¹ "History of English Philanthropy," p. 166.

Mettray, which became the premier and remains among the most successful of the Reformatories of this country.¹ This farm school, however, is not a prison.

The question of the juvenile offender has continued to occupy the country at intervals since it was first raised by the founder of the Philanthropic Society. In a report of the Prison Discipline Society of 1818, we find a proposal for a prison for six hundred boys who were each to have a separate dormitory, while the various groups into which the lads were to be classified would be provided with their own distinct dining rooms, work-shops, and "airing-grounds." The proposal was brought before Lord Sidmouth, who "was impressed with the propriety of adopting some steps to attain this end," and then shelved the difficulty by doing nothing.² At the same time George Holford, M.P., one of the managers of the Millbank Penitentiary, was making gallant efforts to break down official indifference. He would have had a separate prison for juveniles, which should not as he says, "much differ from a school."³

Nothing came of this agitation. The country could not understand that boys *are* boys, whether or no they "will be." The time for the application of psychology to State action was not yet come. Previous to any official recognition of this elementary truth of human nature, Captain Brenton had to found his Children's Friend Society, and Mr. Sergeant Adams, Chairman of the Middlesex Magistrates, listen to such stories as this:—There were in the cells of Millbank three little girls varying in age from seven to ten years. One child of seven and a half was in solitary confinement and would remain there for two years. Yet only after prolonged correspondence was the great Lord John Russell "convinced that the solitary dwellings

¹ "Collection of Papers . . . on Reformatories," edited by Jelinger Symons, see the paper by Rev. S. Turner and cf. Trevarthen's evidence before Prison Committee, 1895, q. 2,736, ff.

² Report of the Prison Discipline Society, 1818, p. 20-1.

³ "Thoughts on the Criminal Prisons" (1821), and "A Short Vindication of the Millbank Penitentiary, with a Few Remarks on the Punishment of Juvenile Offenders," (1822), pp. 29-35.

in the penitentiary were not exactly suited to children of tender years."¹

Then came the Young Offenders' Act of 1838 (cap. 82) of which the preamble runs: "Whereas it may be of great public advantage that a prison be provided in which young offenders may be detained and corrected and receive such instruction and be subject to such discipline as shall appear most conducive to their reformation." Parkhurst, in the Isle of Wight, was the site chosen for carrying out the experiment. Governor, surgeon, chaplain and matron were duly appointed, and any non-infectious young offender might be committed to their charge. The experiment, such as it was, came to an end in 1863² and its demise is scarcely to be lamented. It never had any prospect of success, if we may judge from a description of it given by Miss Carpenter. Neither governments nor officials had yet learned to understand either the nature of the boy or the causes of his crime.

By 1863 this doctrinaire fidelity to a theory of efficiency was reaching its apogee. This was the period of extreme centralisation, and of utmost confusion between the human and any other machine, as witness the Prison Consolidation Acts of 1865 and 1877, or Robert Lowe's payment by results in education. This habit of seeing everything in the guise of machinery was not without its reward. The country became the world's smoky factory, and if she wanted something to admire there was Mr. Babbage's calculating machine.

The middle of the 19th century was however marked by one promising development in the Reformatory movement which will be discussed in a later chapter, and even within the strict limits of the prison was not entirely fruitless. The idea may have been a narrow one, the efficiency attained was not of a good type, but it was something to introduce any kind of efficiency into any branch of public administration. Improvements in detail were initiated, as in the better classification of prisoners,

¹ Memoir of Captain Brenton, by Sir J. Brenton, pp. 178-82.

² Report of Prison Committee (1895), p. 460.

but we need not linger over these, since the facts to which we must now direct ourselves are ample proof that the problem of the juvenile offender, if not insoluble, was certainly still unsolved.

“Of 43,835 persons convicted, 17,902 or 41 per cent. were under twenty-one years of age; and of 30,902 convicted of larceny, 14,064 or 45 per cent. were under that age.” Let us turn it about in another way. The proportion of persons convicted of indictable crimes were as follows:—

| | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----------------|
| 12-16 | 261 | per | 100,000 |
| 16-21 | 321 | .. | .. |
| 21-30 | 245 | .. | .. |
| 40-50 | 143 | .. | .. |
| 50-60 | 92 | .. | .. ¹ |

We are face to face with an appalling state of things. Children under sixteen yield a larger proportion of criminals than any later age period *except* that from 16-21! If the five years of youth are the University period, the years of childhood itself suffice for Elementary Education in professional crime. One may be pardoned the hardly exaggerated remark that this is the branch of education in which the country is most successful.

In face of such an exposure of failure as this something must obviously be done. And the result is seen in the rule made in 1901, setting apart Borstal prison for the reception of the so-called juvenile-adult prisoners. Those who are concerned in carrying out the scheme are well satisfied that it promises success. But before proceeding, space must be found for one remark. The “Borstal System” is an official undertaking, as everything must be in our penal system. It relies not a little for its utility on the co-operation of philanthropic individuals, but in its main lines it is initiated and carried through by the expert. In this state of things we should observe that the ground had been prepared and sown by the labours of private workers long before. They had agitated; at last the State began to act. The success

¹ Judicial Statistics for 1893, Parl. Papers, 1895, cviii., p. 18; cf. the same for 1899, Parl. Papers, 1901, lxxxix., p. 57.

was longer in coming, the campaign had been less fiercely fought, yet it is in its way analogous to that early enterprise of Oglethorpe and Howard, related in my previous volume. The moral to be drawn is this:—The proper duty of the philanthropist is to force society to do its duty.

The end to be achieved by the Borstal scheme is accurately described by the Commissioners of Prisons.¹ "It may be said to be established by experience that the professional criminal of later years known in France as the *cheval de retour* is only the later development of the juvenile offender. . . . An example of this is furnished by some statistics that we have recently obtained with regard to fifty professional criminals who have lately been discharged from convict prisons. Of these fifty, eleven were under fifteen years of age on first conviction and twenty-three others were under twenty-one. No less than thirty-four out of this lot of fifty professional criminals began their criminal career at an age when, according to our belief the application of a special form of treatment such as we are about to set up at Borstal might have saved them."

The general lines of the new scheme of discipline for juvenile-adults are sufficiently known. The lads are employed in association in workshops on the farm; they undergo daily physical drill. Special attention is given to their education, whether of the elementary code type or in those larger aspects which can be treated in lectures and moral addresses. One obvious drawback is found in the shortness of the sentences, for it must be remembered that Borstal is a prison, not a Reformatory, and although the boys are said soon to fall into the habits of cleanliness and order, all the officials concerned are emphatic as to the need for longer detention. "The lads would then be able thoroughly to learn a trade," and again, "from the medical standpoint in its broadest aspects as well as the moral, I should be glad to see the period of reformatory

¹ Report for 1900-1, p. 13, (Parl. Papers, 1902, xlv.) and cf. subsequent Reports.

detention greatly extended.”¹ So far the chaplain and the doctor. The Commissioners themselves reiterate the argument in the Report of 1905 where they refer to a criticism made by the Borstal Association, and add “these are grave words and we have for some years been considering how under the existing law this reproach can be modified greater good could be done if there were an alteration of the law.”

But if power is to be given for longer detention the pretence that this is a prison should be more frankly abandoned. Of course discipline must be firm and work strenuous as it is at present. The boys or some of them are already allowed to play dominoes and other games. The recreative side seems to need developing, and the tone of the establishment more explicitly assimilated to that of a school. Then a larger measure of success might be anticipated, although the results already achieved are not small. “The change in these young prisoners after only a few months’ detention here has been very marked pure air good food and labour produce a strikingly favourable effect on their physical and mental conditions.”

Strange that unless a boy go to prison he cannot have pure air, good food, instruction in a trade, intellectual or moral education. Yet such is the case. The rapidity of response to healthful influences is striking even in the case of these youths who have grown up in a semi-criminal class unskilled in trade, neglected and uncared for. Give them a chance, even the modified chance of a prison life, and they seize it. The fact confirms an impression which has been borne in on me by experience in many slum districts, that there is a great reservoir of power and capacity even in the most hopeless classes. It is less the human being than the opportunity which is wanting. If this be so it seems to follow that these lads ought to have *had their chance* before they found their way to prison. It is bad policy only to begin to try and make

¹ Report of Commissioners of Prisons for 1902-3, pp. 80, 82, (“Parl. Papers,” 1904, xxxv.).

a man after the boy has gone to prison, though it is better to make the effort than not to make it at all. But that raises far-reaching issues which would involve us in a discussion of the shortcomings of our educational and industrial world.

We have referred to the official Borstal system. There is another aspect of the new policy to recognise. It relies for its success on the co-operation of philanthropic workers, and the Borstal Association is an integral part of the work. All the prisoners on their discharge are assisted by it, but the work of the Association begins earlier. Its members are admitted to the prison, they visit the lads and encourage them to speak freely on their "hopes and prospects." Then comes the day of discharge. The prisoners come out so much altered morally and physically, that more than half of them are willing and able to engage in regular honest employment if they could get it.

"To give them that chance is the business of the Association. On his arrival from prison, unless the lad has a suitable home to go to, lodgings are found for him; as soon as possible he is set to work; in some cases it is ready for him as the result of arrangements made by us . . . in yet others there is a period of waiting, especially in periods of bad trade. If our work is to have any permanent value, the lad must be visited often during the time of danger which follows on his sudden change from prison to complete liberty. . . . To this work our Agent, Mr. Aitken, devotes all his time."

Such, in outline, is the new enterprise which on its personal side needs no comment since it speaks for itself. Its interest as bearing on a type of State interest is also near the surface. The State invites or welcomes the co-operation of the private citizen for the discharge of a part of the work it had engrossed to itself in the prison, and as a supplement to that work out of the prison.¹

¹ I may add a further illustration of this policy re juveniles. "The number of juveniles received into Birmingham prison shows a remarkable decrease to 50 as against 166 for last year. In the opinion of the Governor this reduction is entirely due to the opening of the Children's Court last year." Report of Commissioners of Prisons, (1905-6), p. 15.

II. PRISONERS' AID.

In dealing with the work of prisoners' aid societies we shall consider first their operation in the prisons. This is becoming more important, and has reached its present position only through hard vicissitudes. We must again go back to the period of Mrs. Fry, when the moral and physical welfare of prisoners was still almost entirely neglected by the government. The difference made by ninety years is very sharply emphasised by reciting the object of the Association for the Improvement of Female Prisoners in Newgate, founded in 1817. This object is defined as follows:—
“To provide for the clothing, the instruction, and the employment of the women; to introduce them to a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and to form in them as much as possible, habits of order, sobriety, and industry.”¹
All this was left to private enterprise!

Mrs. Fry's work is so well known that it need not here be repeated, for it is a part of all that is most impressive and heroic in the annals of philanthropy. Her work is known, but she was not alone in it, and we may allow her to remind us of her fellow-workers, *e.g.*, of that “white-headed old man, who might be seen at those times in frequent attendance upon those poor captives; having for years devoted much time and attention to unostentatious but invaluable visits.”² Or we may recall Thomas Wright who after being “engaged all day long in a small establishment acting as foreman, covered with oil and grease and everything else,” spent his leisure in visiting the prisons.³ The neglect of the Government was only matched by the complacency with which it allowed almost anybody to do almost anything anywhere. Some of this visiting in the prisons was bad: much of it was good, but all of it was casual, unregulated, incalculable. We do not wonder that the orderly soul of the first inspector revolted against it.⁴

¹ Life of Mrs. Fry, i. 266.

² *Ibid.* i., 312.

³ Life of Shaftesbury, by E. Hodder, ii., 376.

⁴ First Annual Report of Inspectors of Prisons, 1836.

This first period of unlicensed activity was followed by a tolerably complete exclusion of independent visitors. So much so was this the case that by the year 1851 Miss Carpenter had to complain that she was prevented obeying the gospel precept of visiting prisoners. "It was the privilege of Mrs. Fry to visit the most degraded in their prisons; those who would follow in her footsteps are sternly repulsed from the Bristol Gaol."¹

In recent years the prison authorities again encourage private people to visit the prisons. But now the action of the visitor is regulated. He co-operates in a narrowly defined sphere with the prison staff, notably the chaplain, and the work probably gains from being regulated; at least it is assured that if done at all it shall not fall below a certain pitch of efficiency. The visiting is most developed on the female side. Thus in 1904, "13,686 women were seen and in some way dealt with by lady visitors." At Manchester and Holloway classes in Swedish drill were conducted by Miss Sharman for the younger women, while in twenty-four prisons lectures on nursing, cooking, thrift and cognate subjects were delivered by fifty-four ladies.²

The Church Army and the Salvation Army conduct frequent missions in different prisons with results which receive official approval. At these times the missionary has private interviews with the prisoners. Many other Aid Societies also are permitted to send their representatives into the prisons to confer with prisoners who are anticipating their release.

The most familiar part of the work of the Aid Societies affects the ex-prisoners. Some societies do find work for some prisoners, and so far do good work. But much of the work consists in giving cups of coffee to short term prisoners, a kindly act which cannot do the man or woman much harm. "In connection with one Discharged Prisoners Aid Society there is a working party which last year made ninety-four shirts and sundry

¹ "Reformatory Schools," p. 272.

² Report of Prison Commissioners for 1904-5, p. 19.

pairs of socks.”¹ We need not scoff at these ninety-four shirts which have doubtless before this covered ninety-four backs and so far have been of such service as ninety-four shirts may be to shirtless men. It is not that these things are not good so far as they go, but they do not go nearly far enough. Take the prison gate work of the St. Giles Christian Mission for a single year. Three hundred and eight people were emigrated; three hundred and thirteen sent to friends. In these six hundred cases at least something tangible was achieved. Then we find 8,408 cases helped in money or kind, and by far the largest number, 17,160, provided only with a breakfast. Man or woman leaving prison wants an appetising meal undoubtedly, though it might be better given before leaving than afterwards.²

The gist of the matter is stated by Mr. Roscoe when he says that the Aid Societies have done good work, but are altogether inadequate.³ The Aid Societies are at the present time more numerous and better equipped than a generation ago. They have been brought into a closer co-operation with the gaol chaplains and they certainly have not ceased to do good work.⁴ But it still remains true, as was pointed out by Mr. Roscoe, that the principle of State Aid should be followed. Under the present system the societies are able to earn subsidies from the government for their work, but the subvention is dependent on the amount of private subscriptions, whereas it should be determined only by the nature and requirements of the work to be done. We admit to the full the activity of many of these societies, even while we urge that the problem is too big a one for their resources. We welcome the better relations between them and the prison authorities since Mr. Merrick's report, yet none the less

¹ “Report of Prison Commissioners for 1902-3,” p. 64, (from the chaplain's report).

² “Thirty Years' Toil in St. Giles,” 1890, p. 71.

³ “State Aid to Discharged Prisoners,” (1875), pp. 8, 20.

⁴ See Report of Departmental Committee on Prisons, 1895, Rev. G. P. Merrick's evidence, q. 1542-44, 1561-66, and the Commissioners' Annual Reports.

is it necessary to face the fact that the problem is being treated on wrong lines. The question what is to be done with a discharged prisoner is a grave one, and it may be that the resources of our civilisation are not equal to answering it. At present we are really evading it. It is not a matter for the slender resources of private associations even when backed up by the splendid fidelity of particular individuals. As a simple matter of public policy, and it may be added of public justice, the community which has broken in upon a man's life and prospects by putting him in prison ought not to cast him heedlessly out to a last state which will be worse than his first. If that is the best it can do it had better not let him out at all, for he is only too likely to return after the briefest interval.

Many of the Aid Societies avail themselves of the Church Army Labour Colonies, through which many men undoubtedly return to the world of moderate honesty known as keeping within the law. I am not in a position to criticise the management of these Colonies; I accept them at their face value, and believe them to be admirable institutions. But they are not nearly adequate to the need. The problem of the discharged prisoner is still being evaded by the country in spite of the service done by the existing Aid Societies. Whether the problem can be solved so long as prison remains what it is is another matter.

III. FAMILIES OF PRISONERS.

Something, though not nearly enough, is actually being done for the prisoners both in and out of prison, something, I mean, beyond the primary intention of keeping them in safe custody with the maximum of discomfort to their feelings and the minimum injury to their health. But we have not exhausted the subject. When we shut up a man, we *destroy the integrity of a family* and incur a direct responsibility by so doing. At present we are doing almost nothing to discharge this responsibility, beyond providing a few mangles. Many a priest, district

visitor, and missionary in the slums gives a grocery ticket, an order for milk, or a gift from the old clothes cupboard to the woman whose husband is in prison. But the resources of priest and missionary are limited. They do not suffice to maintain the family for the week or two or the month while the normal, or at least the nominal, breadwinner is away.

Many of these families of course come on the poor law, and receive a grudging and inadequate relief, but for the most part the State deliberately destroys the integrity of a home and recklessly refuses to make good the damage. This is very like the policy adopted towards the prisoners themselves before the days of Howard. A new Howard is needed who will expose the mischief resulting from State neglect of the wives and children of prisoners. Whenever an individual is sentenced, then immediately the enquiry should follow: Is there a group of dependents on this individual? If so, provision ought to be made so that the group shall not be injured by the action of the State in removing the individual. That is elementary justice, and it would probably prove to be very sound economy.

IV. IS THE PRISON PROBLEM AN UNNECESSARY ONE?

I come now to a proposition which will give us a fresh standpoint from which to view most of the elements of the difficulty with which the nation stands face to face. I suggest, *i.e.*, that the whole prison problem *so far as it concerns philanthropy* is largely an unnecessary problem. And before going further we may enquire what is the extent of the problem. In the year 1904, 197,967 persons were convicted of offences. Excluding sentences of death or penal servitude, of the remainder 148,081 were males, 48,942 were females. No less than 107,555 of these were imprisoned in default of paying a fine.¹ The great bulk of these people

¹ In 1906, 183,726 persons were convicted of offences, of whom 97,382 were imprisoned in default of paying a fine.—Ed.

were unable to pay. Some, of course, were obstinate and would not pay, but as a rule if you have the money you pay it rather than go to prison; more than that, you usually raise it among your friends if you can, rather than suffer incarceration. That is to say, about half of all the cases of imprisonment are the direct result of poverty of the people. We should halve the problem at once if we insured a minimum living wage to every worker. I am not now suggesting that the possession of a weekly income will improve the character of people. The man who earns a steady two pounds a week might still get drunk as freely and assault his neighbours as often as before, but he *would pay his fine*. It is certainly undesirable that he should get drunk, but it is far more deleterious to himself and to society that he should go to prison. It would perhaps be too much to claim a minimum wage for all on the ground that it would enable people to pay their fines when they break the law, nor does the argument for a re-distribution of incomes require such a support. I only mention the matter here as showing one of the smaller beneficial effects of improving the economic status of the people: it would have many good results and among them this—it would cut the prison problem in half.

If anyone imagines that people would generally refuse to pay or would find the money penalty undeterrent, he knows nothing of human nature, for with every increase in economic stability the dread of the prison stigma increases, and the more money you have the less you like to be forcibly deprived of it.

The prison problem, in another way, is seen to be a direct result of the poverty of the people. Ninety thousand convictions were without the option of a fine, and of these *more than one-third* fall into two groups, in both of which the primal significant offence is poverty and nothing else: 23,669 convictions without option of a fine were for begging or sleeping out; and 8,001 were offences against the poor law, such as tearing up work-

house clothes or failing to maintain a family.¹ Here again some of the offences were no doubt committed by people who had means, although even in the case of failure to maintain, the cause is far more frequently inability than deliberate unwillingness.² If we take the 7,000 cases of sleeping out, they are all cases of destitution, for it is only an offence to sleep out in the open air if you are penniless.³

We come then to the startling conclusion that two-thirds of the prison problem might disappear if only the poverty of the people were remedied.

There is a residue of some 60,000 cases, which will include most of the longer sentences. Is the problem even in this reduced proportion a necessary one? And by that question I do not mean, Might not people be better than they are, but even while they remain so bad, is it necessary to have these 60,000 cases of imprisonment every year?

It is not by any means necessary. So far as crime assimilates to insanity the problem is not a prison, but an asylum problem. That may seem to be a mere verbal distinction, but it is not so. Much crime is, or is akin to, mental disease, and is therefore not a subject of punishment, but of treatment and possibly of cure. The drunkard is the most prominent instance. Many criminals might with advantage to themselves as well as to society be permanently "segregated" under freer and more humane conditions than exist in prison. In saying this we recognise the serious evils entailed in segregating men or women, and preventing their having offspring. But while "segregation" is not entirely a nice thing, it cannot be worse than the lot of the criminal class at the present time.

There is also a class of professional criminals who may be regarded as quite sane, but who are certainly anti-

¹ Judicial Statistics (Criminal) for 1904, pp. 153-6.

² The man may have means which in the judgment of the guardians are sufficient, yet in that of the man are insufficient. Frequently to a dispassionate spectator they seem insufficient.

³ In 3,193 cases of begging and 536 of sleeping out, the criminals were old people over sixty years.

social in their instincts.¹ These persons should not be in and out, but always in. Here again the idea of punishment should be frankly abandoned. They are not to be penalised because they are wicked, but restrained because they are a nuisance, and on the one condition that they be kept from doing harm every effort should be made to render their lives as pleasant as possible, so departing altogether from the present policy of making them as painful as possible.

It is not possible to arrive at any exact numerical conclusion on this matter, but evidently our residue of 60,000 cases has to be very considerably reduced. I think we may take it as certainly less than 50,000 and the number would be further and largely reduced as soon as we begin to cut off the sources of crime. To mention but one method—the detention of the feeble-minded. The chief defect in the present system is the failure to recognise that certain discharged prisoners are constitutionally unable to manage their own lives under the competitive system.

It may be impossible always to recognise cases of this kind at once, but when there is any doubt the individual should be kept under control and observation for a time (not with any punitive intention), and highly skilled officials are needed to decide on these cases.²

* * * * *

Our hope lies in such directions as these rather than in prison gate missions. The work which waits to be done

¹ The Bill at present before Parliament, which has been cited above (p. 146), provides (Part ii., cl. 8) as follows: "When a person is convicted on indictment of a crime whether committed before or after the passing of this Act, and subsequently the offender admits that he is, or is found by a jury to be, an habitual criminal, and the court passes a sentence of penal servitude, the court, if of opinion that by reason of his criminal habits and mode of life it is expedient for the protection of the public that the offender should be kept in detention for a lengthened period of years, may pass a further sentence ordering that on the determination of the period of penal servitude he be detained during His Majesty's pleasure, and such detention is hereinbefore referred to as prisoners' detention."—Ed.

² This subject was intended to be further amplified, with a section on occasional offenders.—Ed.

is work which the Howard Association exists to do, *viz.*, "the promotion of the best methods of the treatment and prevention of crime, pauperism, etc." The Society has perhaps specialised too much on problems of treatment, and has done valuable work in this direction. But it does not forget its wider object, and indeed the solution of the problem is not to be separated from the larger issue of social distress.

That is one direction in which the prison philanthropy of the future must move. Another task which it must take up is the systematic study of Criminology, social pathology, or morbid sociology, and assistance in the study is to hand in the excellent volumes of the Criminological Series edited by Mr. Douglas Morrison. The bewildering extent of the subject may be realised by reference to the American White Book, "*Abnormal Man*," by Arthur MacDonald, the bibliography of which alone reaches to over 200 pages.

The administration of prisons is carried through with admirable efficiency, and, as we have seen, the best recent development is due to the Prison Commissioners. Nevertheless, it should not be left to their initiative, for what Sir Godfrey Lushington affirmed twelve years ago is still true and pertinent: "Prison Commissioners can pursue their bent with a peculiar exemption from public or even official interference. I certainly attach much importance to any means that can be devised for bringing outside feeling to bear on their work. I believe that all prison reforms in the direction of the amelioration of the lot of prisoners are really inspired by the feeling outside the prison."

There is in fine an urgent call for an instructed humanitarianism to concern itself with the problem of prisoners, discharged prisoners, and prisoners' families, even while it is true that the prison problem itself is to an incalculably large extent an unnecessary problem.

CHAPTER XII.

REFORMATORIES AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.

By a somewhat anomalous system, juvenile-adult offenders aged 16 to 21 are treated by the most centralised administration in the country, *viz.*, the Prison Commissioners, while juvenile offenders aged 12 to 19 are relegated to the care of self appointed philanthropists. To explain the inconsistency, or at least to describe the origin of private-venture treatment of juveniles, is one of the objects of this chapter.

When we look for the explanation we are confronted with a still more curious anomaly, and one which serves to illustrate what seems to us to-day the extraordinary confusion of mind in which the reformers of sixty years ago were doomed to act. If it is permissible to recur to a novelist for a phrase, I would say that the story of the Reformatories presents us with one of the most enigmatical of History's Little Ironies. It was one of the latest attempts on a large scale to elevate the idol of "Voluntaryism" into a leading principle of politics; among its pioneers it numbered the most fervid mistrusters of the State, who nevertheless were driven to demand State assistance on quite a heroic scale. The Reformatory promoters were individualists; they dreaded any extension of State action even as the State itself (or its organ—Government) dreaded it. They inherited a tradition of Voluntary action; they had an excessive faith in the value of private committees; they had boundless energy and fertility. They would work, and let the nation pay! "Yes," said the nation, "but we will see *how* you do it." The resulting combination of Subsidy and Inspection comes very near to being one of the

most effective methods of State control. But it is an entire reversal of the normal relation, in which Government, which is poor in idea but efficient in administration, looks on and speeds up philanthropy, which is fertile in expedients but feeble in execution. That is the irony of circumstances. It is the second feature of interest which I will try to clear up, in the early or historical sections of this chapter. We shall then be in a better position to understand the present state of the Reformatory movement, a discussion of which will occupy our second section. This will lead on to the final consideration as to whether the problem of criminal adolescence is a necessary one, and will suggest the sociological importance of a deeper social valuation of the normal life processes of adolescence.

I.

“He told me that they robbed the rich for the poor.” It is Miss Carpenter who relates the story of the child who horrified her by telling this as the moral drawn by its father from the histories of Dick Turpin and Jack Sheppard. That father must have been something of an idealist to cover the sordid detail of the highwayman’s life with such a cloak of romance. In any case no such altruistic motive can be assigned to the boys and girls who made up the sorry army of the children’s crusade against property. They turned to shoplifting, pilfering and petty larceny from the harsh necessity of supporting themselves before they reached their teens, or perhaps from fear of the blows they would receive if they did not do their part in replenishing the family coffers.

Society, so far as it thought at all of the question, was afraid of these childish depredators. Judges, Chairmen of Quarter Sessions, and other philanthropists did not fail to play upon this self-regarding instinct. By titillating the nervous mood of insecurity they were able to secure sufficient popular support for their own schemes. They too were afraid, for they shared in the natural timidity of the class to which they belonged. But it

was not chiefly fear which prompted them. They were animated very largely by a sense of duty towards God, which took the shape of a sense of responsibility to the outcast classes.

It is not necessary to describe in detail the steps by which this conviction of social responsibility developed into the Reformatory movement. Reference has been made to the school of the Philanthropic Society. The people who constituted themselves into the Central Society, about the year 1837, had recognised the necessity of providing for juvenile delinquents something less demoralising than prison life. Lady Noel Byron and others had founded homes for destitute children, and the question had been agitated in charges to Grand Juries.¹ Thus the ground was prepared for the simultaneous and independent starting of several Reformatories in the year 1852, including the one at Hardewicke established by Mr. Barwick Baker. This was preceded by the Birmingham Conference in 1852 which gave the immediate impulse to the whole movement.

The first institutions served to fix the mind of politicians and the philanthropic public on the question in a way which previous discussions had been unable to do, and in 1854 an Act was passed enabling young criminals to be sent to the Reformatories for periods up to five years, after serving a prison sentence of not less than a fortnight.²

In the following year some twenty of the more active workers in the Reformatory movement were invited by Mr. Baker to form a house party at Hardewicke Court, "It was a memorable time both to host and guests who were enabled to confer upon plans and exchange experiences, and formed by the mutual interests thus generated

¹ See "First Publication of the Central Society" (1837): "A Collection of papers . . . on Reformatories," Jelinger Symons; "Reformatory Schools," by Mary Carpenter; cf. "Life of Mary Carpenter," by Estlin Carpenter.

² See 17 and 18 Vict., c. 86., cf. the Consolidating Act, 29 and 30 Vict. c. 117, and the Amending Acts, specially that of 1893, 56 and 57 Vict. c. 18, and 1899, 62 and 63 Vict., c. 12. Under this last Act preliminary imprisonment for youthful offenders was abolished.

a compact and united body long afterwards known as the Reformatory Brotherhood." I believe this "Brotherhood" never had any other than an ideal existence. For administrative purposes it became very shortly the National Reformatory Union,¹ but we ought to think less of the machinery than of the spiritual bond, if we wish to appreciate the rapidity and force of the movement. The workers were welded into a solidarity; they brought to bear upon their task something of the efficiency of the expert and all the zest of the reformer. We are prepared therefore to find that while in 1854 the admissions were only 29, they had advanced in 1857 to the total of 1303, and that in the latter year there were already 54 such schools certified.²

We may pass rapidly over the early history of Industrial Schools. The movers were the same as in the case of the Reformatories; the class to be provided for was essentially the same, and the rapidity with which these junior schools sprang up was even more striking. The Industrial Schools Act of 1857 (20 and 21 Vict. c. 48) provides that the Committee of Education may on request of the managers inspect and certify any Industrial School in which children are fed and taught, the inspection to be annual. A child apprehended on a charge of vagrancy may be sent to any such school, with the consent of the managers, for a period necessary for its education, but may not be detained beyond the age of fifteen. If the parent makes demand and offers sufficient security, the child must be discharged. A parent who is able may be compelled to pay up to three shillings a week. Guardians also may contract with the managers for the maintenance of pauper children. The Act of 1861 provides for Treasury grants and places them under the Home Office. In 1866 was passed the Consolidating Act, 29 and 30 Vict. c. 118. It was after the passing of this Act that the great upward move in numbers took place.

¹ Life of Mary Carpenter, p. 220; "Report of First Provincial Meeting of the National Reformatory Union at Bristol," (1856).

² First Report of Reformatory and Refuge Union, p. 19, and Report of Inspector of Reformatories, 1837-58.

I I.

I have spoken of the early Reformatory movement as the last considerable triumph of the principle of philanthropic Voluntaryism in the sphere of socio-political action: it would be almost as instructive to regard it as the first striking instance of the opposite principle, for although in the eyes of the contemporary actors "Voluntaryism" seemed to win, yet looking back after the experience of half a century we can discern something very illusory in the show of victory. The resources of the State which were called upon to supplement the gifts of private benevolence before long supplied practically the whole of the necessary income, and as the reformatories become more and more dependent on public money, they necessarily became also more subject to the control of the Government Inspector.

The middle of the 19th century was characterized by an excessive¹ distrust of governmental action, which was not confined to enthusiastic reformers, but was shared by the official and governing classes themselves. The leading actors in the Reformatory movement had inherited a long tradition of private activity, or as we should now say of public negligence. Their childhood went back into the earlier period described in the first chapter, when there was an almost absolute distinction between politics and social-politics: the latter word was not even in use. Politics was the business of the ruling families which supplied the alternating ministries of the day. Social-politics, then confused with general benevolence, was the affair of private committees and voluntary subscribers.

Now the imprisonment of offenders had already been accepted as a government function, and the State had nominally committed itself to the further task of reforming young criminals when it set up the Parkhurst prison. It was little more than lip homage however, for the extremely narrow construction everywhere placed on the

¹ Perhaps not excessive as directed to the mid-century governmental action.

character of the State reacted on all it did. We are reminded of the proverb, "Give a dog a bad name." The State had a bad name. Such action as was allowed it was chiefly of a restrictive character, its main business being to leave things alone; any positive contribution to the constructive service of society seemed for the most part to be outside its scope. Yet this idea of substituting a "school" for a prison was an instance of positive control. For the State frankly to have accepted it would have implied an immense extension of its proper sphere; such an enlargement namely as would include the fashioning of the minds and lives of the citizens. For the recognition of such a task the State was not prepared, the fashioning of the minds of men being the business of the individuals themselves, with the aid of the churches and Exeter Hall. It was emphatically not the business of the State.

Accordingly the dispute between those who desired State action and those who would rely on personal effort, was complicated by this other contention as to whether the treatment of young criminals should be vindictive in regard to their guilt, or reformatory and educative for the sake of themselves. These two discrepant theories were struggling against each other at the Conference at Birmingham in 1852. On the one hand were the upholders of the rigid rule of Retribution on the child. But there were others who questioned this theory altogether and clearly discerned that it could have no place in the treatment of children. A few years earlier (1849) a volume, "The Cry of the Children," by A. N. Caird, had appeared, in which the life history of a seven-year old house-breaker is recorded. This is quoted by Miss Carpenter with the comment, "thus was tried and found wanting the society of which that child was an outcast." The guilt was the guilt of the nation. The child claimed not retribution but reparation. So the opposing theory developed into a doctrine of Reformation. That was an advance on the brutal notion of punishing these victims of social neglect, and a step towards the further

position, which will be one of prevention by striking at the personal and economic causes of juvenile (and other) crime, but in itself it was incomplete and has left the whole position in an unfortunate confusion. The end to seek was never Retribution; reformation was always to be aimed at. But it did not follow that because retribution was always wrong, reformation was necessarily possible. The Rousseau influence was still strong, and with it a simple faith in the indefinite improvability of every human nature. There are some diseases of moral personality so deep as to respond to no cure.

But that is not all. Those who advocated the building of Parkhursts all over the country were apparently urging an extension of the government's powers, but they were in reality standing for the restriction of its function. While the warder's bayonet gleamed over the manacled gang of juvenile-adults it possessed a twofold power of symbolism, speaking to the young convict of force armed against his depredations, and standing in the eyes of the British Public for the policeman theory of society.¹

State institutions would necessarily have followed on the Parkhurst model; the military element would have predominated. Had the reformatories been under the government there would in all probability have been for the time at least, a much slighter development of the educational ideal than was actually the case. I am far from imagining that the partizans of punishment—"vindictive" punishment as the reformers asserted—were aware that they were defending a venerable individualism, but in effect this is what they were doing. The advocates of State action were at the same time advocates of the restriction of State function. There would have been more power to punish but less authority to reform.

¹ See generally the very instructive discussion on Jelinger Symons' paper at the Society of Arts, given in his Collection, pp. 102-31. This together with the debate in the House of Commons, Aug. 1st, 1853, Mar. 14 and May 16, 1854, are invaluable for their view of the conflicting ideas of the time. The system of industrial training was regarded as one of the most perfect in England, but great exception was taken by some philanthropists to the military side of the discipline.

The irony of the situation is not less if we turn now to consider the aims of the partizans of voluntary effort. They were opposed to officialism and wished to limit the action of the State, because they desired to substitute the school for the prison. They were moreover themselves possessed of boundless energy, always fertile in initiative, and in some instances equipped for the long years of drudgery by which alone a generous idea can fulfil itself in action. They had also fallen into the mischievous if generous illusion, so besetting in philanthropists, of measuring the zeal of their public by their own. Thus it happened that they launched a new enterprise which was soon to prove too cumbersome for them. They began by extending private and restricting State action, but they had set going a force of a new kind. Philanthropy alone could not carry out this task, and before long the State would be required to play an increasing and eventually a commanding part, so that in the long run it would prove that the advocates of Voluntaryism had given an impetus to the enlargement of State function. While the management of our Reformatories after fifty years is still nominally in private hands it is not much more than nominally so, and the time has obviously come for the transference of the schools to the County and other educational authorities.¹

Here again we need not suppose that the actors knew what they were doing. People rarely do realise all that is involved in their doing, and that is one reason why the study of history is so fascinating; what was hid from men of action is revealed to historians. Is there not also a reflex piquancy when we pause to think of our own affairs and of those students, yet unborn, who toward the year 2000 will understand what we have had to content ourselves with doing?

No, the Brotherhood was quite single-minded as well as whole-hearted in its pursuit of the double end—schools which should be free from the blight of officialism and animated, not by the idea of retribution but by that of

¹ See T. Holmes, "Reform of Reformatories," (Fabian Tract).

reformation. It had been proposed to entrust the conduct of the schools to municipal and other councils, but "however powerful town councils and corporations may be, however wise in the management of pecuniary matters . . . it is almost impossible that public bodies in their corporate capacity should have that comprehension of this particular work and that individual interest in it which alone can secure success." Miss Carpenter and the educationalists favoured the *private* school both for criminals (reformatory), and potential criminals (industrial), because in both cases they wished for a mode of treatment which was not then regarded as within the province of the State to afford. Symons, the ablest—or at least the most vocal—representative of the other theory wished for public prisons (penal establishments) for criminals, in which punishment would be the primary end; for non-criminals he too favoured the private industrial school, because in the last he also recognised the educational motive as paramount.

I I I.

For our present purpose the two kinds of school, Reformatory and Industrial may be treated together. There are certainly differences, and not unimportant differences, between them, but having drawn attention to these we may safely pass on to treat the common features, which are those with which we are most concerned.

The Reformatories are intended for children who have been convicted of offences against the law, and are therefore, in popular phraseology, criminals; they are places of incarceration for children of 14 years and upwards, only exceptionally for children as young as 12 years, and they are available for youths up to 21. The Industrial Schools on the other hand are for children only up to their 16th completed year, who have not been convicted,

* Miss Carpenter in Symons' "Collection," p. 136. There were some, e.g., Dr. Waddilove, who advocated *both* State Reformatories and a humane educative treatment. But for the most part we find the broad distinction: Public Penal or Private Educative Institutions.

but are likely to come within reach of the criminal law.¹

Now these differences are important, and would require attention if our purpose were a criticism of particular institutions. But since the class from which the convicted members of the one type of school and the unconvicted members of the other are drawn is very largely the same, and since further the mere accident of a conviction is not of much moment, we may rightly consider the two groups together. Indeed we ought to do so, inasmuch as they are really one group. The problem before us is the existence and significance of delinquency at or about the time of puberty and during the time of adolescence.

Yet it is important to note that the Report for 1903 shows that the considerable number of 79 children under 12 are in Reformatories, and the larger number of 854 children under 10 are in Industrial Schools. There are two distinct problems: the Child and the Youth.

At this time the numbers of schools and inmates were:

| | Schools | Boys | Girls | Total |
|--------------------|---------|--------------------|------------------|--------|
| Reformatory ... | 45 | 4,984 ² | 638 ² | 5,622 |
| Industrial .. | 139 | 13,513 | 4,281 | 17,794 |
| Truant ... | 14 | 1,179 | — | 1,179 |
| " | — | 3,278 on license | — | 3,278 |
| Day Industrial ... | 24 | 2,470 | 926 | 3,396 |
| " | — | 272 on license | — | 272 |

This gives a total of 31,541. In 1906 the total was 29,478. But this of course is very far from indicating the real extent of the evil. Very large numbers of children residing in homes provided by private charity belong

¹ "In reformatory schools children under 10 years of age are associated with youths of 18 and 20. In industrial schools infants under 6 are sometimes mixed up with boys of 15 and 16. Except in schools such as the institution at Redhill, where the inmates live in different houses, it is impossible to deal with children varying so much in age in a satisfactory manner. Even at some of the best conducted institutions it will be observed that the time-table for the boy of 12 is exactly the same as the time-table for the boy of 18. Both boys, though differing so much in age, have to rise at the same time in the morning and retire at the same time in the evening to rest. Both boys are allotted the same time for work, food and recreation. . . . According to the teaching of physiology, not to mention the teaching of commonsense . . . the younger boy requires more sleep and rest, more play, games and exercises, and he should have less school and industrial work imposed upon him." Morrison, "Juvenile Offenders," p. 300-1.

² Includes 899 boys on license, and 45 absconded or in prison; 37 girls on license, and 5 absconded.

to this same category. They either are delinquents or in imminent peril of becoming so.¹

Admission to Dr. Barnardo's Homes is free without condition to the destitute; there are also the Homes for Little Boys (Farningham and Swanley), for homeless and destitute children in danger of falling into crime; to these must be added the Incorporated Society for Waifs and Strays with its homes and its income devoted to rescuing from vicious surroundings orphans and destitute children. The numbers to be allowed for these and a host of other institutions cannot be easily reckoned. What is still less simple is to decide what proportion of the 246 homes and the £805,000 devoted to London young men, young women, children and servants, are dealing with those who would otherwise be in or *be eligible for* industrial schools and reformatories.²

Even when this further undetermined number is added we have not by any means arrived at the extent of the problem to be considered. We know only those who by reason of destitution, neglect and crime, are confined in voluntary or State-supported institutions, but we do not know how many more are outside of them. The 30,000 and more children who compose the reformatory and industrial population are an index of a much more considerable number.

Next as to the management of these schools. They are scattered widely throughout Great Britain. Each school is under the management of a Committee (representative of the subscribers, if there are any), and it is administered by a professional staff consisting normally of Master, Matron, Schoolmaster or Mistress, Labour Master and Assistants. The conduct of the Schools is subject to the inspection and report of the Home Office. This inspection is good; the private committee, men and women, frequently evince a great and real interest in the schools and scholars.

¹ Morrison, "Juvenile Offenders," p. 13.

² See "Charities Register," published by the C.O.S.

All the Reformatory schools are subject to private committees, but a few of the Industrial schools and all the Truant schools are provided by the Educational Authorities of the County or other Councils. The receipts for English Reformatories amounted in 1903 to £111,690 of which £95,810 came from rates and taxes, while the subscriptions and legacies amounted only to £4,552. The total receipts for English Industrial schools amounted to £329,617 4s. 10d., of which only £20,119 7s. 5d. came from legacies and subscriptions.¹ From the outset the need for State *assistance* was recognised, but during the early years of the movement and while the first flush of enthusiasm lasted, the charitable public contributed some appreciable proportion of the cost, and it was not for a dozen years that the subscriptions to Reformatories began to crumble away. What the falling off eventually became can be seen in the following comparison :

| Great Britain | Total Expenditure | Subscriptions |
|---------------|-------------------|---------------|
| 1897 | £110,108 | £12,236 |
| 1903 | £133,002 | £ 6,041 |
| 1904 | £127,287 | £ 2,964 |
| 1905 | £128,779 | £ 3,644 |

This falling off of the voluntary subscriptions is not a thing to be regretted. The work is a proper public work and should be a public charge; only in that case it should be recognised as such. The anomalous position of institutions which in name are private but in fact are public, is not without practical objections.

I have spoken of the Inspection as good. The present Chief Inspector is indeed gifted with special qualifications of a high order. But the effect of the skilled oversight and suggestion from without is largely nullified. Of course the Government grant could be withheld, and there are some instances, though not many, mentioned in Mr. Legge's report, in which this should be done. Equally of course the Councils who use the schools and pay from the rates for the children they send might refuse

¹ The figures for Scotland in 1903 were:—

| Reformatory Schools | | Industrial Schools |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| Total Receipts | ... £17,690 | £82774 |
| Subscriptions, Legacies | £689 | £7157 |

to send them; but if they did they would be obliged to provide other accommodation. So it comes to pass that while some of the schools are admirable, others are ill-managed, or, which is the more frequent case, insanitary and ill-equipped. The representative of the State cannot instruct but is reduced to implore. "The general remarks made in previous reports still apply. It is desirable that the buildings should be brought up to the modern standard of efficiency, and that the objectionable practice of street collection by the children should be definitely stopped. The devoted staff. . . . have well earned a special word of praise."¹

It is in the power of the managers to obstruct the path of improvement, and sometimes they do so. This obstructive power would disappear if the small and frequently quite negligible pretence of voluntary support were done away with. The extra cost thrown on the community would be something more than the present amount of subscriptions, because many of the schools are starved. We need not regret the tenuity of the voluntary contributions; we may rejoice in the early prospect of bringing the schools openly and entirely into the educational administration of the country.²

Another difficulty arises from the present theory of voluntary support. So long as the managers largely paid the cost of their work themselves, and were making social experiments, it was reasonable that they should decide whether or not they would accept any boy or girl into their home. The subscriptions are almost gone, but the right to pick and choose is unabated. Unfortunately the official reports, which contain so much valuable information, are silent on this point. Yet "when a magistrate in the exercise of his discretion decides that a child coming before him is to be detained for a certain specified period in an industrial school, it is imperative that he as well as the general public should know what exactly does become of that child. As far as the general public

¹ Report of Inspector of Reformatories, (1904), part i., p. 395.

² They are at present controlled by the Home Office.

are concerned it is certain that at the present moment they do not possess the information."¹

These are serious words, and disclose a serious and unsatisfactory state of affairs. Let it be decided that a child for his own sake and for that of the community ought to be sent to one of these boarding schools, yet before he can be admitted some private committee must be found willing to receive him. How many boys, how many girls are rejected is uncertain, but obviously they will include the more difficult cases, which it is most essential to treat and care for. This power to refuse admission ought not to continue, and would naturally cease if the rather confusing notion of private support were abandoned.

If this were done the natural authorities would be the Educational. But even if the responsibility for maintenance were thus transferred, it does not follow that the present philanthropic committees of management need be or should be done away with. That is a question which it will be necessary to discuss in a later chapter, when we deal with the co-opted members of what the Germans think of more euphoniously as the *Ehrenamt*. There remains however an enquiry which strictly belongs to this account of the present system; *viz.*, into the success or effectiveness of the training.

The object of the schools is to fit the boys and girls for a life of industry which will be widely different from the career of vice and crime into which they might otherwise have fallen. That fact must govern our judgment. On admission to the schools they were in imminent peril. One cannot assert that, apart from the school, they would have become criminals, but the likelihood was very considerable in a society such as our own. There is therefore a *presumption* of success whenever the children do well after leaving. But after all, the schools were not started in order that some might stand, but out of a desire that none might fall. From this point of view we must estimate the extent of failure.

¹ Morrison, "Juvenile Offenders," p. 90-1.

The number identified in prison by the Prison Commissioners as having been previously in Reformatory Schools (1903) was 617 male and 20 female, total 637, in England; 255 male and 7 female, total 262, in Scotland.

| | Protestant. | Roman Catholic. |
|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| English Boys—discharged | 2,402 | 620 |
| reconvicted | 241, or 10 per cent. | 94, or 16 per cent. |
| English Girls—discharged | 300 | 138 |
| reconvicted | 13, or 4 per cent. | 1, or 1 per cent. |
| Scotch Boys—discharged | 333 | 181 |
| reconvicted | 49, or 15 per cent. | 55, or 31 per cent. ¹ |

None of the small number of Scotch girls were reconvicted.

These figures give the *minimum amount of failure*, and all we can say is that in 53 cases or 11 per cent, there was not even the beginning of success. This is not necessarily the fault of the managers; they *may* have done the best possible. The inference is that there is a class who ought never to be set free or abandoned. It ought not to be beyond our skill to detect this in many if not all of these cases, *before* the boys are discharged. If we turn to the figures of the Industrial School discharges we find 5 per cent. of reconvictions among the boys and 1 per cent. among the girls.

Now I freely admit, or rather should wish to emphasise the fact that but for the work done in these schools the number of these youths who become criminals would be very much larger, and at this point we should turn from the schools to consider the society which places too exclusive a reliance on their agency. If some of the schools were better managed they might show better results, but many of them are admirable. The conclusion to be drawn from the figures is not therefore that the institutions do their work amiss, but rather that a community which sends these boys and girls² out into the world to fight for their own hand, deserves to bear all the cost their future crime entails, and is guilty of all

¹ Report of Inspector of Reformatories for 1903, App. iii. D., and iv. D. Cf. Morrison, *op. cit.* p. 285-6.

² Girls are more "looked after," but evidently "looking after" is only a part of what is needed.

the lives which its negligence corrupts and squanders. But before we are ready to criticise the actual method of disposing of this Reformatory population we may as well ask whether its existence is necessary.

NOTE.—Of the remainder of this chapter only a paragraph or two was written, but there were indications that the subject would have been treated along the lines of a paper read by the author to a society some time ago. The MS. of this paper was almost complete. The following appendix to this chapter contains the little that remains of what would have been the 4th section of this chapter, and the greater part of the paper just mentioned. On account of the difference in style and in the scale on which the subject is treated in the paper. it has seemed more suitable to leave this chapter obviously, as it is actually incomplete, and to give the paper, which has so intimate a bearing on the subject of the chapter, in a form which marks its different origin.—Ed.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER. XII.

The Social Value of Adolescence. There are over 30,000 young people in reformatories, etc., with an indefinite number more in philanthropic institutions and a still larger number outside. What are the common characteristics or, to put the same thing in another phrase, the general causes which give rise to this class? I cannot do better than refer to the analysis of Mr. Morrison, who makes the classification.

1.—Density of population. 2.—Physical defects, as shown by the high death rate, the small stature, etc.; mental defects. 3.—Parental condition, as loss of one or both parents. 4.—The economic condition in which the children drag themselves up.

Is the problem a necessary one?

The social and moral damage wrought in and through the comparatively small numbers of the reformatory and industrial school population, is not a thing by itself and so long as it is regarded by itself it will not yield to our timid ameliorative efforts. Boys and girls become eligible for these institutions largely because of social neglect; they relapse after their discharge from the schools from exactly the same cause. They are allowed to feel and left to bear a pressure of injustice which they cannot withstand. Now this pressure is not confined to the small number of children who have been in reformatories and other institutions, but extends to the great majority of children in the country at large. We treat it as a matter of course that children shall be pitched out of industrial schools into the world of industrial competition, because on the broader field we have grown so used to leave the child

alone when he leaves the elementary school. We regard the years between 13 and 18 as a matter of private concern for the child and his parents. We know perfectly well that many children are earning several shillings a week by the time they are sixteen, and are therefore in a state of quasi-economic independence of the parents. Those of us who know the conditions of slum life know of course that very often the boy or girl breaks away from all restraint. But we do not interfere.

In treating to-day of the boy worker we ought to remember that he is a survival. He has all along had to struggle with a devitalising and dehumanising environment. The conditions through which he has come are disease conditions. Many perish; those who live, live only with impaired powers. The boy worker is a survival, but he himself bears in his body the marks of poverty. He does not come to the critical years of 13 and 18 as the more fortunate of us come through 13 years of careful nurture, years in which we were shielded very largely from the cruel stress. Of the children of the poor we find it true:

The tender little ones must stand
In the thickest of the fight.

Even before they arrive at the years which are the subject of our immediate study they furnish us with two incomplete types:—the boy who is a worker although he is primarily at school, and that anomalous creature hardly to be specified as *homo*, but known as half-timer.

It is sometimes urged that the teaching in the schools is onesided, and that even from the educational point of view the child ought to be at work. Work, it is said, supplies the lack of the school. The argument seems to be largely insincere. It is no doubt more important to know things than merely the names of things. There is much to be said for "Spell winder. Go and clean it."¹ The method sounds plausible. The schoolmaster is suspect. But let us be quite frank. When it is proposed to employ children the reason is not humane regard for the child's welfare. The child is an instrument of production just as much as the broom with which he sweeps the street or the band which moves the spinning wheel. The child is here a means and not an end.

"It is good for a child to be employed." Certainly, if the employment is good. But then you must employ the child for the sake of the child, not for the sake of profit. The remedy for the evils of child labour is difficult to find in a society which is penetrated through and through with the idea of the many whose business it is to serve the ends of a few.

¹ Mr. Squeers, in "Nicholas Nickleby."

Mr. Frazer, in his *Golden Bough* tells us of a strange regimen which obtains in some savage tribes. Youths who are approaching puberty are secluded and submitted to a jealous guardianship. In certain instances the children are hidden away in shelters in high trees to protect them from the evil spirits of earth and heaven alike. Our civilised plan is the reverse of this. The half-timer is subjected to all the injurious effects of instruction inflicted on overtired brains, and to the slightly modified effects of a factory system which is barely tolerable for adults. At one period half-time was the only device for securing any schooling for factory children; half-school was supposed to be better than no school. The system was in the line of progress, though not in the direct line. In 1891 there were 107,040 such children; in 1901 only 74,468. But these are massed in a few centres. Thus at Halifax the half-timers were 17.8 per cent. of the children aged 10-13, Burnley 15.6 per cent., Blackburn 15.2 per cent.¹

The factory half-time system, however, is the smallest part of the mischief of child labour. A few children reach puberty thus handicapped; a vast multitude suffer by employment out of school hours. The effect is that it interferes very seriously with the free development of the child into the man.

I come now to the more central aspects of our problem—the boy worker from 13 to 18. I say 18, because that is the upper limit of age fixed by law in the definition of the "young person." It should not be forgotten however that in certain industrial processes the boy loses much of the protection of the Factory Act at 16 or even 14, and is permitted under "special exceptions" to work at night or work overtime, not much more restricted than a man.² What an instance is this of the double dealing of the national conscience! In the army they want men. Do they take them as such at 16? And as regards citizenship the boy is an infant until 21.

I take 18 because as I understand by that age most boys have completed the rapid critical process from childhood to young manhood. It is at or about 18 that the great transition takes place. By then the errand boy must find a man's job—or fail to do so. Whether or not, he must lose his boy's

¹ The Registrar-General comments on these figures as follows:—"A remarkable fact in connection with the excessive amount of child labour in some of the towns . . . notably Burnley, Oldham, Blackburn, and Bury—is that the proportions of occupied males at ages over 55 are exceptionally low. Whether this indicates an actual substitution of young boys for men beyond middle age, or whether it is capable of less serious explanation, the Census statistics give no means of determining." But probably we need not hesitate in accepting the more serious explanation as at least highly probable. Census General Report, 1901, p. 80.

² See Redgrave's "Factory Acts" for conditions of employment of male young persons in glass works, blast furnaces, etc.

occupation. I wish to trace some of the external influences of this five year period and to refer to some of the spiritual processes for which they form the right and often the only opportunity. I name 13, but in fact a boy may leave school at 12, and even that age is only recently become the limit. We have made some progress. In many towns the age has been practically raised to 13 by the Education Authorities, while in London it now stands at 14.

What are the conditions of the thirteen-year old boy? How do they comport with the proper human business he has to transact before he is 18? Our study falls into two parts.

Some trades are regulated, and some are not.

There is at present almost no protection for the child of the lower grade labourer. His power of self-defence is least, his needs are greatest, and therefore he is left most utterly alone. The first mischief to notice here is in the need of the family for the speediest and largest earnings. There is little difficulty in obtaining immediate occupation and wage for a boy when he leaves school, if his future welfare is sacrificed to present gains. Parents are sometimes callous, though less often, I believe, than is commonly supposed. They are faced by a stern economic need, for the increased food and clothing which the growing boy must have. The only remedy for this using up of child life is an adequate wage for adults. Wages boards should be appointed and a minimum wage paid. Till society increases the earnings of the man it cannot prevent the exploitation of the child.

As instances of undesirable occupations of boys I may give two which have come much under my notice—the washing of beer bottles and the hanging on by a rope to the tail of a railway van. In neither does the boy gain much skill for life. Neither is good for him. The van is often at a standstill for hours, perhaps in Billingsgate. It is an excellent schooling in casual loafing. Bottle washing also is well calculated to leave the idle mind a prey to ignoble thoughts. These employments and many others like them do not fit, they positively unfit boys for manhood, its work and its other higher functions. For these boys the economic crisis is not when they leave school at 13, but at 18 when they graduate in manhood. From such classes of boys the adult unemployable are largely recruited; big hobbledehoys who spend half the day in the streets, looking for work, as they euphemistically call it. They often do look for work, though they often loaf. But they are worth no man's money. The Society which has allowed them to be misemployed as children is responsible for their being unemployed as men. But after all most of them do find work of sorts. *Of sorts.* They toil at casual, unskilled unintelligent occupations. Some of them indeed are originally

so true and sturdy that they come through the ordeal. But the ordeal is not therefore shown to be good, and it is proved to be evil by the many who are spoilt in the process. The tendency of unregulated promiscuous child labour may be summed up as follows:—The youth lacks proper training for man's work. He comes to that work with impaired intelligence and faulty discipline.

The middle class boy is under control and training till 17 or 18 at least. It matters not whether our present secondary education is ideal or even good. The point is this: we ought to have a good system of secondary training for every adolescent boy in the country. It may be by way of industrial occupation. But of whatever nature it be, the boy must be under training. The essential human business from 13 to 18 is to make men. When a man is a worker, as a worker he is an instrument. That seems to be in the nature of things. With the boy this ought not to be the case. When the nation is convinced of that, the evil of unregulated boy labour will cease.

And now, how does it hold of the regulated trades? In a sentence, the regulations are so inadequate as to be almost worthless. They indicate how much more horrible things might be, and until recently have been, but they do not proceed on any true understanding of the nature of the boy, and they do not leave him free for the highest self-development. Take a few instances from our latest factory legislation (1 Ed. VII. c. 22, 1901). A child must work as a half-timer until 14 unless at 13 he is proficient in the three R's, or has gone to school regularly. The exceptions have nothing to do with the case. The question is one of age. Is a child of 13 physically or mentally fit for factory labour, its monotonous, unending, exhausting movements? Or what shall we say of the child of 14? The Act says "A male young person." As if the phrase mattered! A male young person of 14 may not work in a textile factory more than 55 hours a week; in a non-textile factory for more than 60. Or we may put it in another way; he shall work so long. That is, far too long.

Amongst other occupations is that of glassworks. I believe a good deal of this labour is more than commonly arduous, and it is subject to special regulation. The legislature, however, is not concerned with the welfare of the boy so much as with the convenience of the employer. A male young person of 14 years may work according to the accustomed hours (*i.e.*, by day or night) but never for more than 14 hours, and he must have half an hour for meals at intervals of not more than five hours. What need is there for comment? It is clear that consideration of the boy, his nature, his powers, his needs, did not go to the making of this law. Hitherto laws have enacted the minimum restriction needed, the amount

which employers would consent to grant. We have to alter the whole conception, and consider what the nature of the boy requires.

There is another provision of the Factory Act, 1901, which may prove to be of the highest social value. It is little enough in itself, but if its implicit intention should be carried out on a large scale it should lead us from the present conception of the boy working as means, to the thought of the working boy as an end in himself. I refer to the appointment of certifying surgeons. No child can be employed in a factory (at present the law is thus timidly restricted) under twelve years, and between twelve and sixteen only on a medical certificate of fitness for use in a particular factory. In practice the surgeons discriminate still more closely as, *e.g.*, this boy shall not work in the soap-powder filling room, but he may go into the packing room.¹ Some of the surgeons are disposed to use their powers to the full, others are more perfunctory. They are in most cases in private practice, their remuneration being paid by the employer. On the whole the system is of value more for its possibility of development than for its present effect. But it does mark an important advance on the factory inspector. This latter examines the external conditions, and secures something approaching to compliance with the law as to safety and air and cleanliness. The certifying surgeon deals with persons. The inspector determines: this factory is a fit place for work to be done in; the surgeon asks, is this boy fit to do the work? This is a stage towards the position for which I contend—the ruling consideration is “this boy.” The certifying surgeons serve a useful purpose also in the collection of knowledge as to life and labour. Let me illustrate from some of the witnesses before the Physical Deterioration Committee.

“The character of employment has a profound effect on development, as it covers a considerable period of the growing age.” “Occupations have a powerfully selective effect, the strongest following the calling where their physical powers will have the maximum advantage in wage-earning (*e.g.*, navvies, pig-iron carriers, blast furnace-men) and the weaker drifting to those where their lack of vigour will tell least against them” (tailors, barbers, shop assistants).² Dr. Young, President of the Association of Certifying Surgeons, gave valuable information on this point (for Liverpool); at the top are the engineers, shipbuilders, joiners; next, the saw mill sawyers, lower in mind and physique; below this again the men weeded out or excluded from other trades are found in soap-boiling and pit

¹ Report on Physical Deterioration, Evidence, q. 2030.

² *Ibid.*, q. 1933-4.

works.¹ There are about 2,000 of these certifying surgeons, and they possess and exercise certain limited powers in certain specified occupational processes. They can say, this boy shall not do this work. They cannot say, this boy is fit only for such and such work, or this boy is not fit for industrial life. At least if they said it, it would only be a private opinion, it would have no validity. In fact a boy prevented, say, because of a tuberculous tendency from work in a dusty factory process, may simply turn to an equally injurious or a more deleterious task outside. The evidence before the Commission is sufficient to confirm what is matter of common knowledge, that young boys are constantly employed in tasks for which they are unfit. And except in the sphere of factory work we have scarcely begun to put any check on this reckless consumption of the life of growing boys.

One further citation from the evidence of Dr. Scott introduces us to the last topic of consideration. "That boy is brought to my ward in the Royal Infirmary in Glasgow, suffering from chronic rheumatoid arthritis, just as if he were an old man. It was a most interesting case, but, to the day of his death that boy will never be better, and that is owing to his physical development having been arrested by premature employment."² Compare that with Dr. Wilson's evidence. The character of employment has profound effect on development. We leave to the experts the decision as to what industrial work is fit for adolescent boys. What seems to me in the first place necessary is a more adequate and sympathetic study of the adolescent boy himself. Industrial work is secondary. The boy may make soap by the way—*i.e.*, if he is to be allowed to make it at all. But far more momentous is the work set him by the Great Taskmaster. This in some fashion or other he surely does and must do. Some sort of self he has got to make himself. My contention is this, that the normal incidents of industrial life throw such an undue strain on him, that he is prevented from doing his proper business in a satisfactory way. And what is his proper task between thirteen and eighteen? The boy is passing through rapid and critical changes, physiological and psychological, the result of which will determine his whole future. Other perils lurk in later life, but if he succumbs here he will never recover. In these years the boy enters into the tragic mystery of self and sex and social consciousness. He has been taught the ten commandments, but he has yet to discern the inner springs of the moral law. He has been a child, he is becoming a man. Shall it be with perverted sex instincts and atrophied social consciousness, untaught in the world of thought, untouched

¹ *Ibid.*, q. 2054 and ff.

² *Ibid.*, q. 1668.

by the realm of beauty? Or shall his development be free and humane, into the larger responsibilities, the deeper sorrows, and the more haunting charm of the world of vigorous youth? In reality it will often be into a world of compromise betwixt the two. But our system tends to the former. We should so regard, so educate, so protect and stimulate and guide the boy as to help him into the world of the ideal.

If he is to arrive in growing numbers at the fulness of manhood, we must arrange our scheme of life so as to assist him to do so. Is he helped to it by fourteen hours per day in a glass works, by sixty hours per week in a non-textile factory, or even by fifty-five hours in a textile factory? We must recognise this process of adolescence as socially valuable work, the perversion of it as a folly and a crime.

Of course the boy must be kept occupied and fully interested. Idleness is as dangerous as fatigue. But occupation must be for the boy's sake, *i.e.*, for the man's sake, *i.e.*, for the common-wealth. There are some sentences which will clinch my argument. They are taken from the most important recent sociological work I have come across, viz.: Dr. Starbuck's *Psychology of Religion*.

"The rapid formation of new nerve connections in early adolescence may be the cause of the physiological unrest and mental distress that intensifies into what we have called the sense of incompleteness which precedes conversion, the mind becomes a ferment of half-formed ideas, as the brain is a mesh of poorly organised parts . . . It is the very opposite of the pleasure of self-expression such as that of the young animal. . . . In its biological significance the sense of imperfection is the price we have to pay for the massive, and at first unwieldy, enlargement at the top end of the spinal cord, which, when mastered and brought into requisition, becomes such a tremendous tool and organ of spiritual insight. The person is restless to be born into a larger world. Finally, through wholesome suggestions, normal development, helped on perhaps by some emotional stress or shock, harmony is struck, life becomes a unity, and the person is born into a larger world of spirit." (p. 152-3).

I do not complain because the occupation of the boys of the poor are not entirely adapted to assist this tremendous transcendental growth. Actual conditions are never ideal or perfect ones. But surely we may complain—rather should we not reflect with all astonishment that society—we and our fellows—has not yet even recognised the necessity for so controlling external arrangements as to further rather than to hinder this internal evolution of the spirit? We have had much study of factories and industrial processes. We value the gains of industry. We have yet, we, I mean as a corporate

community, have yet to consider the human aspect of these things, to direct our attention and our public action to the nature of the man and of the boy.

I am persuaded that there is power in the boys of to-day beyond what is seen. They are waiting to be men, and as children we so treat them as to send them into manhood twisted and awry. The deepest need of the human soul is a great loyalty, and we doom the lads to a life in which too often no object worth allegiance is before their eyes. We cause the little ones to stumble, and it behoves us before we condemn them, to take the stones which strew their path, and cast them into the depths of history.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO CHAPTER XII.

PARTICULARS of 100 Male Prisoners, aged 16 to 18 years old, in Wandsworth Prison between the 14th and 20th June, 1894, taken from the Report of the Departmental Committee on Prisons, 1895. Appendix iii., p. 537.

Parental condition and occupation previous to confinement:—

| HOMES | | | OCCUPATIONS | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-----------|
| Living at Home ¹ | Living in Lodgings | One or both Parents Dead | Skilled | Unskilled |
| 54 | 46 | 32 | 23 | 77 |

HEIGHT.

| Age last Birthday | Average Height in inches | | | Percentage of Prisoners above or below average Height of General Population and of Town Artisans | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-----------|--|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | General Population | Town Artisans | Prisoners | Below Gen. Population | Above Gen. Population | Below Town Artisans | Above Town Artisans |
| 16 | 64·31 | 62·85 | 62·25 | 92·30 | 7·70 | 53·85 | 46·15 |
| 17 | 66·24 | 64·70 | 62·50 | 94·74 | 5·26 | 76·32 | 23·63 |
| 18 | 66·76 | 65·60 | 63·08 | 89·80 | 10·20 | 77·55 | 22·45 |

WEIGHT.

| Age last Birthday | Average Weight in lbs. | | | Percentage below or above same classes | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|--|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | General Population | Town Artisans | Prisoners | Below Gen. Population | Above Gen. Population | Below Town Artisans | Above Town Artisans |
| 16 | 119·0 | 112·2 | 111·4 | 69·23 | 30·77 | 53·84 | 46·16 |
| 17 | 130·9 | 121·5 | 113·7 | 89·47 | 10·53 | 68·42 | 31·58 |
| 18 | 137·4 | 129·3 | 122·0 | 91·84 | 8·16 | 73·47 | 26·53 |

¹ Living at home means living with parents or relations of some kind.

CHAPTER XIII.

INEBRIATE HOMES (CO-ORDINATION).

THE reformatory problem and the inebriate problem are in reality the same. They are both of them residual problems, *i.e.*, the first is not equivalent to the question of juvenile misdemeanants, nor the second to that of alcoholics. We have to deal only with those who become inmates of, or eligible for our quasi-penal institutions.

The problems are alike in another respect. While they emerge as new facts of consciousness, the one in the middle, the other towards the end of the 19th century, they are far from being new facts in the order of phenomena. The reformatory movement took shape because the discovery had been made that age was an essential part of the problem.¹ *The juvenile* criminal cannot be properly classed under *criminal*. The inebriate home is founded on a response to a perception that the nature of the alcoholic dement is obscured when he is spoken of as a drunkard, since by that word we mean a wilful drinker, and the inmate of a retreat is frequently one in whom some deeper demoniacal forces of heredity or temperament have crushed and deformed the will. The juvenile criminal is too young to have acquired that rather indeterminate quality we call moral responsibility: the inebriate also lacks it, whether from the decree of prenatal fate, or the working of circumstances.

In both cases a class is detached from the mass of individuals of whom it is imagined that "every one is to count for one," and that because they bear a common class name they are in every respect alike even as the interchangeable parts of a machine. "One law for the

¹ If Blake's prophetic books had been studied, the discovery would not have been so long delayed.

lion and the ox is oppression."¹ As it comes to perceive these aspects, the world gradually escapes from the great delusion of individualism which regards all men as equal.

And once again there is this resemblance between the two problems, that in the one case as in the other, they were perceived first by the philanthropists.

It will be necessary to return to this comparison in order to point out that while the problems are so similar, the methods adopted are significantly different, owing it may be to the generation which separated them in time. But before pursuing this subject we may look a little more closely into the inebriate home movement for its own sake, the more especially as it illustrates a fresh type of State action.

I.

The temperance crusade of the last 70 years can only be likened to some of the greater religious revivals in its depth, its passion, its unselfishness, and the bitter sincerity of its onslaught. The teetotal idea claims its apostles by the million and is distinguished from all other large moral movements in that every adherent is an apostle.² It has witnessed, and in its turn has given rise to a stupendous upheaval of the national conscience.

Side by side with this strong tide of propaganda has flowed in unabated or increasing volume the evil which it was organised to abate. Father Mathew signed the pledge in 1838, and though that was not the beginning of the movement, it is permissible in so foreshortened a description as this to seize the advantage of a single hour and a fascinating personality. That pledge administered to the Catholic Mathew by the Quaker Martin was the opening event in a campaign which for *verve*, *élan*, and success recalls the famous first descent on Italy of the

¹ Blake, "Marriage of Heaven and Hell," p. 35 (Venetian series).

² This again emphasises the affinity with religious awakenings. The teetotaler is probably more aggressive than the Christian of the second century (see Tertullian), and as pertinacious as the Social Democrat of to-day.

First Consul Napoleon. Millions of people signed the pledge, and millions have signed repeatedly since. "But the extraordinary fact remains that *the per capita consumption of alcohol in the United Kingdom is greater than it was in 1840*, when the temperance movement was in its infancy."

| | Gallons of proof spirit | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------|
| 1840 per capita consumption | ... | 3'89 |
| 1899 " " | ... | 4'30 |

"The number of the non-drinking class (*i.e.*, teetotalers and practical abstainers) in the United Kingdom above the age of 15 is at least three millions."

After this date there has been a slight falling off to 1906 inclusive, when the figure reached 3.78.

It would carry us too far to attempt to discuss why so great a movement for so good an end has been so strikingly a failure.² It has been directed to two chief objects: *i.e.* to persuade people by an exercise of their will not to drink, and to remove the facility or the possibility of obtaining drink. In the result, opportunities obtrude

¹ "The Temperance Problem," Rowntree and Sherwell, pp. 2-3, 5.

² Note, however, that according to Dr. Sullivan, an increase of drunkenness or of *per capita* consumption of liquors is "no indication of a true increase in alcoholism; they may be merely due to a greater amount of convivial drinking, such as usually accompanies good times. . . . The increase in the mortality from alcoholism . . . must be regarded as in great part merely apparent . . . and . . . in all probability due to a transfer of deaths from "the category of cirrhosis of the liver to alcoholism." If "due allowance be made for these qualifying considerations, it will appear that the increase of alcoholism in England in the last 30 years will be reduced to such moderate proportions that in view of the other changes that have occurred in the same period, and which were eminently of a kind to promote intemperance, it may be looked on as equivalent to a relative decrease. For during these years in which the exodus from the country to the towns has been at its height, there has been a large transfer of labour from the temperate occupations of husbandry to the urban trades, where industrial drinking is most rife. . . . Under these circumstances a very marked rise in the amount of alcoholism might naturally have been looked for, and the fact that on the contrary, there has been at most only a very moderate increase would seem therefore to indicate that during this period there must have been a considerable abatement in industrial drinking. And this . . . is also the general impression of intelligent observers amongst the workers themselves. On the whole . . . the present evolution of industrial conditions in England is tending to bring about a decided decrease in the prevalence of alcoholism." W. C. Sullivan, "Alcoholism," pp. 130-2.

Note by Editor.—The recent figure has been filled in since the author's death, and is somewhat more encouraging than those he had before him.

themselves at every turn and the amount consumed is not diminished.

The early temperance movement was indiscriminating, as is usually the case when the emotions are aroused, though if they are not aroused there is likely to be no movement at all. Then came reflection. Half a century of failure called into being the Society for the Study of Inebriety. Several conclusions have been arrived at. It is impossible to abolish opportunities for drinking, a position which has been not only established as a fact but demonstrated to the public mind, by the writings of Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell.

There are some people who cannot abstain from drinking if they have the chance. This may result from the inheritance of what Dr. A. Reid calls the "alcohol diathesis," or in other words, some are born with an irresistible impulse towards intoxication. Others by the circumstances of their industrial or social environment have arrived by a long apprenticeship at a condition of chronic alcoholism accompanied by the acute symptoms of frequent drunkenness.¹ These people if they ever possessed the power of choice have lost the prerogative of keeping sober.

The horror of the thing does not require to be re-described. The bestial state of the industrial drinker is set forth by Dr. Sullivan, and for the condition of the police court recidivist reference may be made to Dr. Braithwaite's *Annual Reports of the Inspector under the Inebriate Acts*. These publications are only too faithful a representation in words of the facts of slum life.

The temperance problem which had seemed a simple one is thus discovered to be complicated. It begins to be broken up into its elements, and one large class of drunkards is recognised as possessing only a modified moral responsibility.² For these a new method of treatment is devised. It is impossible

¹ Reid "Alcoholism and Heredity" p. 80; W. Sullivan, "Alcoholism."

² Report of Inspector under the Inebriates Acts for 1904, p. 11.

to put drink out of their reach; they are as incapable of observing a pledge as they are often obliging in signing one, and the threat or the infliction of fine or imprisonment has no deterrent effect. If they are to be brought under any treatment possessing even a chance of success they must be put out of the reach of drink. Moreover the idea of penal treatment must be abandoned. In some cases a cure is possible, and wherever that is the case cure is to be aimed at. In other cases cure is impossible. That is a conclusion which philanthropists find it hard to accept, for we like to think of every diseased and ruined body as the possible temple of a hero soul. But it is not so. A recognition of this fact is at the root of modern methods, and distinguishes them from the mental attitude of those earlier workers who "believed because it was impossible." It does not follow that nothing can be done for these incurable inebriates. They may at least be kept clean and sober, living in healthy conditions, eating suitable food, and performing some measure of useful work, but they cannot be restored to the power of managing their own lives, and they must be treated by Society for Society's own protection.

Cure of the individual if cure can be possible, but in any case defence of Society against his noxious freedom, are the essential elements of the modern doctrine as to the treatment of inebriety. Out of the sphere of intemperance, our consideration is to be confined to this single part of the whole. For this end philanthropic institutions have been founded and State institutions have been devised. What then has been done by the one or the other power? How are their respective spheres of action distinguished? Where, if anywhere, should the line of delimitation be drawn?

I I.

1.—The history of the treatment of inebriety is a short one, but nevertheless it falls into several clearly marked

periods. In the first of these the work is entirely of a private character, and the neglect of the State to deal with the specific problem is absolute and complete. This first period, (before 1879), may in a sense be regarded as an instance of that type of State action which will be considered in later chapters, and which will then be seen to be very near akin to neglect—that type which I have described as Partition.¹ The State did indeed concern itself with the people whom a scientific philanthropy or philanthropic science was coming to regard less as drunkards than as inebriates, alcoholic dements, victims of forces beyond their own control. But of this truer diagnosis the State knew nothing. When it touched them at all it treated them not as the abnormal individuals they were, but as though they belonged to a category of responsible persons. In vindication of the moral law it wreaked retribution on them with results disastrous to themselves and to society. So much for its action.

Turning to the world of thought we find the Lunacy Commission declaring that inebriety was a disease to be studied.² That was an epoch-marking thought, destined to be taken up by one and another medical man, and reiterated again and again. This together with the first modern inebriate asylum in America (founded 1840) gave an impetus to the movement, and Dr. Dalrymple³, Chairman of the Select Committee on Habitual Drunkards (1872), visited America on a tour of inspection of work for the care and control of inebriates. Owing in great measure to his influence, in 1877 a *Society for the Promotion of Legislation for the Control and Care of Habitual Drunkards* was founded. This society introduced a Bill which was unfortunately watered down into the Act of 1879,⁴ an act which presents as striking an instance as can be found of our national habit of making a show of doing what

¹ Ante, p. 131.

² Report of the Metropolitan Commission on Lunacy, 1844.

³ After whom the Dalrymple Home, founded in 1884, was named.

⁴ 42 and 43 Vict., c. 19. An Act to facilitate the control and cure of habitual drunkards.

we are too timid to do thoroughly, and too cowardly to refuse to do at all.¹

The object of the Society's Bill and the compromise as embodied in the Habitual Drunkards Act are thus clearly described by Dr. Braithwaite: "Although many previous attempts had been made to obtain legislation for the control of inebriates, this was the first which had succeeded. The measure when presented as a bill to Parliament contained two main provisions, one governing procedure for the voluntary application and admission of patients to institutions, the other for the compulsory committal thereto, under proper safeguards, of any person proved to be an inebriate within the meaning of the Act The 'compulsory' division was provided to meet the case of such persons who . . . refused to be placed out of reach of liquor, or declined to take advantage of any means calculated to exercise restraint over their habits. But opinion in the country was not ripe for such a far-reaching measure, and so the Act, when it entered the Statute Book was shorn of an important feature—the power to commit an inebriate to suitable care and control when such a course proved to be necessary in the interest of the patient's family or the community at large. The Act as it became law consisted of the voluntary section only, the compulsory being entirely eliminated."²

The compulsory idea was too repellent for a generation which had hardly begun to criticise the doctrine of the "liberty of the subject," or to consider what was to be done when the "liberty" of all at once was unattainable. Men were not ready for the truth, that apparent social restraint may really cause greater individual freedom as well as greater social security. However, imperfect as the Act has since been found to be, it ends the first period of State neglect and introduces us to the second.

¹ "The Norman Kerr Memorial Lecture," see "Brit. Journal of Inebriety," January, 1906.

² Report of the Inebriate Acts for 1901, (Cd. 1381 of 1902), p. 7. This report gives a good summary of the existing legislation on the subject.

2.—We can sum up the history of Inebriate Retreats from 1879 to 1898, by saying that before 1879 there had been voluntary action ignored by the State; afterwards this gave place to voluntary action with State sanction. During this twenty years a few homes were started, chiefly, of course, for paying patients of the wealthier classes. The cost of maintaining homes for the poor was prohibitive, because for some reason or other these never succeeded in appealing to the "charitable public." So much money was wanted to deal with only a few cases, and charity loves quantity rather than quality. The Retreats did indeed enable students of inebriety to collect much valuable data, and, as laboratory experiments, were not without their value, but so far as coping with the evil was concerned they were pathetically inadequate. Those who most required to be confined would not consent to be deprived of their liberty, and without their consent nothing could be done. Only those could be maintained in the institutions whose means might have sufficed to maintain them outside. Compulsory power of detention and public financial support were essential to success. With the securing of these we enter on the third and latest phase.

3.—In the Act of 1898 an attempt was made to regard the whole problem in one comprehensive view and to deal with it by concerted action.¹ The method chosen was a form, and a very instructive form of co-ordination of function between the State and Voluntary effort. These two forces ceased to be independent and ineffective: they moved to the same end and their path of advance was carefully calculated. In form the method was a good one and represented the highest kind of mutual relationship between the State and individuals yet

¹ Section 1 of the Act of 1898, "by rendering possible the special treatment of a morbid condition which causes crime, approves a most important principle. It recognises that . . . the offending person is only in a modified degree responsible for his criminal action and that the force which impelled him to its commission is only partly if at all under his control. It acknowledges that the crime is the result of the condition." Report Inebriate Acts for 1904, p. 11.

arrived at. It was not entirely a stable compact, it is true, but that cannot be helped. The place left to "Voluntaryism" was a small one and the result of even a few years' experience has been to make it smaller, though not necessarily less important.

The Act provides two classes of Home; the Reformatory, which as its name indicates, must be a State Institution, and is under the centralised control of the Prison Commissioners, and the Certified Reformatory which may be founded by philanthropic persons, or by County or Borough Councils. In all cases, however, these certified reformatories are, as they ought to be, maintained out of public monies, whether in the shape of Treasury grants or of payments per head out of the local rates. In all probability they will in future be increasingly established and managed, as well as supported, by public authorities; but at present the older type persists, and it would seem with some advantages in the case of Homes for Roman Catholic patients.

The large Bentry Reformatory with its 200 patients and its expenditure of £10,000 a year has still the rather illusory appearance of a private establishment.¹ There are one or two voluntary paying inmates; otherwise, with the exception of the value of the patients' work, the income is entirely derived from the Government and from the payments of about 30 local authorities which send patients. Bentry, although "originally started as a philanthropic enterprise has now become to all intents and purposes a municipal undertaking. Certain Local Authorities have contributed towards its establishment, and by so doing have acquired a permanent interest in the institution, a right to send inmates thereto from courts within their jurisdiction, and a right of representation upon the Board of Management."²

There is one convenience in this arrangement of a central committee of management dependent on the support, and therefore under the control, of the public. Each

¹ Report of Inebriate Acts for 1904, p. 67.

² Report Inebriate Acts for 1901, p. 48.

Local Authority does not require its own separate Retreat but it does need a share in several Retreats. It may not have enough patients to fill a whole institution, but the number will certainly include patients, who, if they are to be duly classified, should be distributed in different establishments. But inasmuch as the local authorities have power to combine, and several councils may have one or several Homes, and inasmuch as the self-consciousness of the Municipalities is growing, it seems probable that the certified reformatories will tend to become in name what in reality they are, public institutions; in fact this is already taking place.

“By having totally different places for the detention of different classes of inmates, reformable cases are absolutely separated from the irreformable, and each institution can be specially designed for the type of inmate it is meant to receive The group of Reformatories which illustrates this method is the one which includes Lewes, Ackworth, Chesterfield, and the Eastern Counties Reformatory. Lewes serves as the chief reception and sorting place for inmates Every inmate received into Lewes is retained there for a sufficient time to satisfy the managers as to character and reformability. Should any person prove too refractory for detention in a certified Reformatory, transfer is effected direct from Lewes to a State Reformatory. Should an inmate prove amenable and probably reformable, transfer to Ackworth follows If at Ackworth improvement still continues and an inmate gives signs of probable good results, she is transferred finally to Chesterfield. There has been one defect in the scheme. . . . We have been called upon to deal with some aged, feeble-minded, epileptic, phthisical and diseased persons who require special treatment, and whose presence in either of the regular reformatories has proved undesirable. These will be removed in future to the new Eastern Counties Reformatory for separate treatment and better care.”¹

¹ Report of Inebriate Acts for 1903, quoted in Report for 1904, p. 98.

It will be seen that the local authorities with the counsel of the experienced Inspector to guide them, are capable of setting up a system flexible enough for the work to be done, and they will probably elect to take this course. Yet in the early experimental stage the intermediate type of a privately founded and managed, publicly supported and controlled institute has had considerable value. The numbers dealt with are still very small, the committals only amounting in 1904 to 380 females and 38 males.¹ The numbers as yet sent to State Inebriate Reformatories under the Inebriates Act 1898 are much smaller still. "During the first two years of the working of the Act, no State Reformatory was in existence; consequently all cases committed under both sections had to be received into certified Reformatories."² These State Reformatories were intended by the legislature, and are supposed by the judges to be for habitual drunkards who have gravely offended against the law and been convicted on indictment. The certified reformatories on the contrary are destined to receive those less seriously guilty persons summarily convicted. For the small sinner the milder discipline of the certified, for the great criminal, the stern treatment of the State Institution. However, power is vested in the Home Secretary to transfer inmates from the one to the other, and out of a total of 234 admissions up to March 31st, 1906, as many as 218 had been thus transferred because they proved unmanageable in the certified reformatory.³ The theory of more or less guilt has had to yield to experience, and in fact it is the lesser criminals, the "ins and outs," and police court recidivists, who need the stricter treatment, not those who have committed the graver criminal offences.⁴

The function of the State Reformatory in this co-ordinate scheme is to receive those who are too refractory to be kept at Lewes or elsewhere, and *to act as a check on*

¹ Report Inebriate Acts for 1904, p. 47.

² Report Inebriate Acts for 1902, p. 115.

³ Report of Commissioners of Prisons, 1905-6, p. 64.

⁴ Report Inebriate Acts for 1904, p. 20, pp. 98, 99

misconduct, since it is known that the State Reformatory at Aylesbury or Warwick is the penalty in reserve.

At one point only do the private Retreats come into the scheme, and the part they play is unimportant. In order to be confined to a Retreat in the first instance the patient must consent to his or her own confinement. That is the *raison d'être* of the Retreats. They may also be used for a further treatment of a freer and more friendly character than is possible in the certified or State Reformatory, and they might perhaps be made of more use in this respect as an intermediate stage towards being released on license. If this should be the case the cost will obviously have to be defrayed by the public. Unless thus knit up into the co-ordinate system they are likely to dwindle, as indeed they already show signs of doing.¹

But if the private Retreats are largely outside the co-ordinate plan, there is another form of voluntary activity which constitutes an essential feature of the system. I refer to the "Inebriate Reformatories and After Care Association." This society, which is a branch of the Reformatories and Refuge Union, was the result of a conference held at the Home Office in 1901, presided over by Sir Kenelm Digby and attended by representatives from the Church of England Temperance Society, the Police Court Mission, the Church Army, Salvation Army, Discharged Prisoners Aid Societies, etc.²

The problem of "After Care" had become a pressing one. Various experiments have been made as to the length of time which must elapse after sentence before the patient is allowed out on license. At first licenses were given at the end of 9 months, and immediate relapses were numerous. Nine months treatment was, speaking broadly, of no use; it is now held by managers of reformatories, and the opinion is confirmed by Dr. Braithwaite, that save in very exceptional cases, less than 18 months is useless. After that period it is safe to allow the patient out on

¹ Report for 1904, p. 102.

² Reports of Inebriate Acts for 1901, p. 60; 1904, p. 23; "Charities Register," 1906, p. ccxviii.

license if suitable supervision can be maintained. The license may be revoked at any time within the limit of the original sentence, but if the discharged person can be helped and guided he is frequently able to keep sober. Hence the need for the "After Care Association" which now employs agents and correspondents in most of the populous places in England.

Here then is the scheme of co-ordination. First the State Reformatory, then certified Reformatories which may be private, but tend to be public, then private Retreats (the utility of which in the scheme is of the slightest), and lastly the "After Care Association," which carries on a voluntary, private, but essential work. On the face of it this is a well thought out contrivance, and beyond a doubt it has achieved some very good results. Yet it is marked by some serious defects. It is also characterised by failures for which, not the remedial device, but the nature of the diseased material is responsible.

In addition to these failures which are necessary there are defects which might be removed. In the first place the co-ordination is not as complete as it appears, and secondly the exact nature of the problem is not even yet understood.

III.

Imperfect Co-ordination. The Retreats are not really worked into the system. They are intended for persons who have not been convicted and sentenced in a court of law. Now it is beyond a doubt that there is a large number of alcoholics who do not come within the reach of the present law, and who will not of their own will be committed to a Retreat, who ought nevertheless to be confined, for their own sake, for that of their families, or for the common weal. People who choose their own home for the debauches are secure from interference except under one condition. If there are children, and if it can be shown that through drink the parent has grossly neglected or

ill-treated them, it is possible under the Act of 1898 to get them committed. As a matter of fact, a large number of the scanty convictions obtained are for this cause and at the instance of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.¹

But some of the saddest cases of homes ruined through drink are those in which there are no children, or none who can be thus proved to have suffered. What is required is a frank recognition of the right and duty of dealing with such cases, and this might be attained by compulsory committal to Retreats. Possibly something in the nature of the family courts of the Chinese is necessary; almost certainly something other than our present courts is desirable, but in any case a further power of removing dangerous alcoholics from any position of being able to work mischief is required. If this further use of the Retreats is to be made, they cannot be left to the support of voluntary subscribers, but will need public support, and in that case, on the analogy of the Reformatories, they will almost certainly develop into municipal institutions. At the present time numerous cases which require to be treated are ineligible for either State or Certified Reformatory.

The amount of provision for men is clearly inadequate. It may be more difficult to obtain convictions against men than against women, because a drunken woman is almost invariably obstreperous, while the man makes great efforts to convey himself quickly if surlily home.²

Amendment is also needed to make the provision of Reformatories obligatory on the local authorities. The law is only a permissive one and there are districts with a total population of 6,400,015 which have not (1905) made any provision.³

The problem of the Inebriate Home movement is as we have seen identical with that of the earlier Reformatory movement. The methods adopted have developed on

¹ See Mr. Waugh's letter in Report of Inebriate Acts, 1905, p. 22.

² Report Inebriate Acts for 1901, quoted in Rep. for 1904, p. 100.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

widely different lines, so much so, that while the earlier institutions after a lapse of 50 years still appear in the guise of private philanthropic foundations, the more recent Homes for drunkards are already within 10 years falling into the general local government of the country.

The difference may be accounted for when we reflect that the movements are separated from each other by the lapse of a generation. In the earlier period we find a "Reformatory Brotherhood," in the latter, a Society for the Study of Inebriety; in the former a Reformatory and Refuge Union, in the latter again the Society for the Study of Inebriety. That is to say in 1850-60 there was practical work and strongly marked emotional attitude; in 1890-1900, a determination to understand, and to force the State to do its own business. There was reason for thankfulness over the method of 1850-60, for voluntary management was then the essential condition of reformatory in place of vindictive action. In 1890-1900 the nation itself became prepared, owing in a measure to the work of the Reformatory Brotherhood, to accept the more humane as well as the more scientific position. It was now possible therefore for those who 40 years earlier must have wasted their strength in founding Inebriate Homes, to spend it in investigating causes and laying down principles of action.

We may regard the difference as a twofold one, a change of mood and a change of fact.

The change of mood needs little explanation; whether we regret it or rejoice, we can all see the contrast. Then men mistrusted the State and placed implicit confidence in private initiative enterprise and management. Now men trust State action, *i.e.* the organised discharge of the community's business by the constituted authorities. This may be good or bad. Then only a minority of the people had any voice or power over the doings of the governing classes. Now the majority, not of the people, but of adult males have, or which is the same thing, think they have control. The State no longer appears as the instrument of a class against a nation; theoretically

it is the instrument of the Nation, and the people are proud to make use of it.

This is the new mood, but what is the new fact? In the middle of the 19th century it was difficult to extend the range of the State, because it was not provided with any reliable and flexible instrument. The State reduced itself in practice to a Central Board. Even if people had wanted to extend the influence of the State (which they did not), they would have found it difficult to do so. The variety, amplitude and comparative efficiency of local administration as it exists now would have been impossible then. There were no County Councils, London had not even started its Board of Works, and the Town Councils had had little experience of their new and still limited powers, and were not characterised by any civic ambition or idealism. Baron Haussman was only beginning to re-edify Paris, (1853), and twenty years were to elapse before (1875) Birmingham was to begin the task of renewing itself into the boast of being the best governed city in Europe.

I have spoken of present-day local government as being comparatively efficient and although that modified commendation needs to be further qualified so as to exclude some of the more unintelligent Councils, it is yet true in the main, while on many of the larger more populous areas the judgment "efficient" may be passed without so much hesitation as is implied in the use of the adjective modified.

It is possible now to entrust many things to local authorities which a generation ago had to be undertaken by philanthropists if they were to be done at all, and, where it is possible it is usually desirable to involve the city or the county in its rightful responsibility. Moreover the great corporations are not unwilling, for they are conscious of their power and proud of their future. This being so, it is easy to understand why the rate and the Council should replace the private Committee and the subscription list.

If we compare the Prison Reformatory with the Inebriate Reformatory, we find that :

1.—In the Prisons we have a Central Administration. Here inspection is perfunctory; inspectors are subordinate. The policy of prison administration is open to no continuous skilled criticism.

2.—In the Reformatories the management is by private committee which is able to frustrate the policy which is recommended by the public inspector. But the inspection is good, and enables the public to know the merits and defects of Reformatory management and policy, though there is no ready method of enforcing improvements.

3.—The Certified Inebriate Reformatories are managed (or tend to be managed) by the public local authorities and representatives of the people and amenable to them. They are subject to skilled continuous inspection (amounting to control?) by the central government. It is possible to know both the merits and defects of management and policy, and also there is a ready constitutional means of improvement.

Wherever possible this third type seems the best. Whether it is applicable to prisons is doubtful. Local prisons have been tried and failed; but local government was then much less developed. It will be worth while to watch the working of the Inebriate Acts with a view to determining whether by a similar co-operation between Councils it may not become possible again to remove the Prisons from the administration of a Central Board. It would have the advantage that inspection would again become a reality. We should have the skilled judgment of the expert on prison management and policy. The criticism would no longer be that of an inferior on his chief, but of the higher authority over the lower.

Whatever may be the case with prisons the Reformatories might with great advantage be transferred to the local authorities. We should lose nothing and gain much.

IV.

There is a tendency to fancy that because Inebriate Acts have been passed and Reformatories opened that therefore the problem of alcoholics has been settled, when in fact all that has been done is to make a most imperfect beginning. It is not possible to estimate the number of habitual drunkards, or even the number of deaths due to this cause. And this leads us to remark on a circumstance which at first sight does not appear to have much to do with the immediate question.

The present system of registering causes of death throws too great an obstacle in the way of arriving at the truth. Medical men certify to the friends of the deceased, and naturally they are chary of entering on the certificate the terrible word, Alcoholism, since if they do so they are likely, as one of them has expressed it, to cease to be medical practitioners. The certificate of cause of death ought to be a true one, and to be made to the Registrar-General. The result of the present system is that the ugly fact is covered up by a more euphonious or less uncompromising expression. Amongst the poor, people do die of "alcoholism," and there are exceptional cases among the well-to-do. But among the more wealthy the inebriates more usually die of "cirrhosis of the liver." The figures as to deaths from alcoholism are therefore notoriously incomplete and need to be raised by an unknown but large number of deaths returned as due to other causes.

For what they are worth they are as follows:—

| | | Males | Females |
|--------------------------------|-----|-------|---------|
| Deaths from Alcoholism in 1901 | ... | 1778 | 1353 |
| " " 1905 | ... | 1297 | 914 |

These three or two thousand deaths indicate of course a very much larger number of persons living who are qualifying to die in some future year. Alcoholism kills rather slowly, the maximum frequency of death being at 25-45.

In comparison with these figures, which merely suggest and do not measure the extent of chronic alcoholism, we

find the following small numbers committed to Reformatories :—

| | | |
|---------------|------------------|------------|
| State ... | Males 25 | Females 50 |
| Certified ... | " 38 | " 380 |
| Total ... | 493 ¹ | |

There is barely 1/5th of the deaths due to alcoholism and *returned as such* which averaged 2,370 per annum from 1903 to 1905.

We may arrive at the impression of inadequacy by another method. Seventy-five persons were sent to State Reformatories and of these twenty-six had been previously convicted of drunkenness *twenty-one times or more*. But alcoholics are not eligible for Reformatory treatment unless they are habitual drunkards and have been convicted previously *three times within the year*.

From all which we conclude, the number under treatment is far too small; even those who are committed are sent far too late for there to be much hope from curative treatment. These defects are partly due to the defect of the law, which can, however, be amended; partly also to the lack of provision over a considerable portion of the country, but in a much larger measure they are to be attributed to our obscurantist judiciary. "A short time ago a woman known to be a heavy drinker appeared at a police court charged with drunk and disorderly behaviour. She still retained enough self-respect to appear in court clean and tidy, and there was no history of immorality against her. The magistrates therefore agreed that she was 'not bad enough' to be sent to a Reformatory, and committed her for a month to prison. It was her seventeenth conviction, five having occurred during the previous twelve months."²

This one instance must suffice for many which indicate a similar unwillingness on the part of judges and magistrates to apply the law. The question whether she was "bad enough" is entirely irrelevant. Everybody, even the most rusticated Justice Shallow, knows that a month in

¹ Report of Prisons Commission for 1905-6, p. 95, and Rep. Inebriates Acts for 1905, p. 50-53.

² Report for 1905, p. 10.

gaol will do no good to prisoner or community. Reformatory treatment does do good in some cases, and is fairly likely to be successful if the period of treatment be long enough, and the case be taken early enough. In any case if no good result to the patient, protection is gained for Society for two or three years. This is not only 24 or 36 times as long as one month, because one month is usually not protective at all, that is to say there is a strong presumption that a woman may not break out during that period even if at liberty. Of course the limit of three years should be removed and provision be made for an indeterminate sentence.

The conclusion I suggest is this—if the Inebriate Acts are to be administered, and if the many difficult problems of modern industrialism are to be efficiently dealt with, then we shall need officials other than lawyers. The modern criminological problem turns on questions of Cure and Protection. The judiciary has been trained in worn-out theories of Penal Justice and Retribution. Accordingly we have not infrequently the spectacle of elderly men of the world in a mediæval costume, delivering homilies on sin and retribution to the prisoner in the dock. A judge is a peculiarly unsuitable person to administer the law dealing with inebriates. He is a member of the least liberal of the professions, and successful practice is admirably calculated to vitiate any original tendency he may have possessed to take large views of men and things. He may know law, but there is nothing in his training to give him a perception of the intricacies of social structure and the intimate secrets of the human body. He *may* have this broader wisdom; but if so, it is in spite of his education and professional work. So long as the old penal notion survived, the judge may have been a fairly satisfactory person for weighing out doses of punishment. The time has come however when the formal acuteness of the lawyer needs to be supplemented by the more concrete knowledge of men skilled to understand both the body and soul of man, and the laws of existence of the social whole.

I have gone somewhat beyond my subject, and touched a subject of fascinating interest which I may not hold for more than a moment. It may even seem to be too far a cry from philanthropy and social politics to a consideration of the need to supplant the lawyer as the one dispenser of "justice." As a matter of fact the connexion is close and essential. The lawyer represents the legal view of the world and throws a one-sided emphasis on Rights, just as theology does on Duty. Now Philanthropy in spite of all its errors has brought into prominence another thought, that namely, of Human Need, of the things which are required if life is to be of worth. Social politics takes over this conception of the Good as the end of life, and is an attempt to work out the laws of its realisation in society.

CHAPTER XIV.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY. (DELEGATION).

THE prevalence of cruelty has not failed to trouble the public conscience. The evil must, it is felt, in some fashion or other be controlled, yet the State will not move, and in declining the enterprise it only too faithfully reflects the inconsistency of public opinion. We should all wish the matter to be taken in hand, if we could avoid responsibility. This is a tolerably familiar attitude in our history, and there are various methods of blurring its insincerity, the most approved of which is the passage of laws which are not effective and are not even intended to be so. In the case of cruelty to children another plan has been adopted, a device which I describe as the delegation of responsibility. I shall draw my main illustration from the circumstances of the society (founded by Mr. Waugh) for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, but there are some earlier instances which help to explain this mood of "we will and yet we will not," and as the mood is an important if not a noble one, I will in the first place draw attention to one or two of these earlier experiments.

I.

The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was founded in 1824. At that time there was practically no law for the protection of animals, since there was no machinery for enforcing such laws as had been passed. The methods adopted by the Society included gratuitous or cheap publications, discourses from the pulpit, appeals through the press, and the employment of Inspectors in markets and streets.

But the Society and the country (*i.e.*, the wealthier class, for at that time the working classes did not count) were caught in a dilemma, which was how to protect the horse without protecting the deer, how to prevent the cruelty of the drover without checking that of the sportsman. Two years before the founding of the Society an Act, spoken of as Martin's Act, had been passed "to prevent cruel and improper treatment of cattle." From the protection of this Act the bull and the dog had been excluded. That suited the temper of the country, but failed to satisfy the Society, which accordingly put in front of its programme the obtaining of amendments to the law, and with such success as to secure an amending Act in 1835. The bull, dog and lamb were now recognised as "cattle," and the baiting or fighting of dogs, bulls, bears, badgers, and fighting cocks was prohibited.¹

Men had not however escaped from the dilemma which perplexed a meeting of the Society in 1832. The difficulty is expressed by the Chairman who pointed out how hard it would be to draw up an "Act which while it punished cruelty did not give too much power to the magistrates to infringe the rights and liberties of the subject. . . . If they made a general law that any cruelty to any animal with life was an offence, then room was given for an arbitrary power which might even be extended to a man fishing or fox-hunting."²

It is only necessary to mention the Act of 1876 for exempting vivisection from the category of cruelty, which is curiously entitled "an Act to extend the law for preventing cruelty." We pass on to the later enactment of 63-4 Vic. c. 33 (1900) which includes wild animals in its protection, and thus is made to apply to all animals in captivity, but not under all circumstances, not that is to say to animals being killed for food, nor to those vivisected according to the Act of 1876, nor to tame animals

¹ 3 Geo., iv. c. 71. 5-6 Gul. iv. c. 59; Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Objects and Address, (1824).

² Report of an extraordinary meeting of the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 1832.

turned out to be coursed or hunted, unless they had previously been mutilated to facilitate their recapture.

Thus in halting fashion the law was enacted on a basis of compromise, perhaps of necessary compromise. I do not here propose to discuss the ethics of the question, either as regards killing for food, mutilating for knowledge, or hunting for amusement. The carnivorous appetite, the extension of science, the providing fun and exercise for an idle class, any or all of these may be regarded as causes weighty enough to justify the exception recognised by the law of the land. The point to be emphasised here is that the machinery for carrying the law into effect was left in the hands of individuals. The State though so far accepting responsibility as to enact, yet declines to enforce the law, so that the requisite constables or inspectors had to be servants of a private society.

If we look into the history of the chimney-climbing boys and the long record of ineffectual laws which for nearly a century preceded the Act of 1875, we observe a similar dilemma and the same evasion. The dilemma was how to lessen the "physical and moral evils inflicted upon numerous helpless children," without inconveniencing Lord Clancarty and others by obliging them to reconstruct their chimneys.² The evasion was the same as in the previous instance. The enforcement of the law, in other words, the substantial protection of the boys, was left to the philanthropists. They tried badgering the fire insurance offices and persuading them to adopt the approved sweeping machine. The Society for climbing boys did what it could extra-legally, but it quickly found out how woefully

¹ The need of legal interference was recognised in the preamble to 28 G. iii., c. 48 (1788). "Whereas the laws now in being respecting masters and apprentices do not provide sufficient regulations, so as to prevent various complicated miseries, to which boys employed in climbing and cleansing of chimneys are liable, beyond any other employment whatever, in which boys of tender years are employed," etc.

² See a speech by Lord Shaftesbury, Hansard, 12th May, 1853, col. 199; the Earl of Clancarty was not alone in being incommoded, but the case of Ireland was one of peculiar hardship in his judgment, because peat smoke was different from coal smoke, and the chimnies were more inconveniently constructed, and could not be cleaned by machinery.

limited were its powers in this direction. It also appointed Inspectors to apply the law. They, however, were only private venture officials possessed of no authority and little power, and for all that philanthropy could do the boys continued to suffer, until at last the State took real as distinct from simulated action.

II.

The difficulties we have pointed out were serious enough to the men of 1798-1875. To some extent they are still real. When the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children was started the difficulty was already less, because the dogma of individual rights had already been in some degree weakened, and there really was a more genuine and more widespread care for children at the end of the century than for animals at the beginning. At the same time the difficulty of protecting the child without violating the sanctity of the "Englishman's Castle" has quite perceptibly added to the obstacles in the way of saving children from barbarous ill-usage. It is pleasant to read of the doings of Front-de-boeuf on Isaac the Jew in the castle dungeon of Scott's historic imagination. The torture chamber is not a thing of the past, and the law makes it unduly hard suddenly to break its doors and release the child.¹ It is only fair to add that at the time of the Society's foundation, the general public was incredulous, because ignorant, of the real extent of the evil.²

The "liberty of the subject" however, was not allowed entirely to obstruct the way of progress, partly because the older, absolute, unreflecting form of the doctrine was less robust than aforesaid; chiefly because society sincerely did desire the child to be protected from ill-usage. At the same time society as represented, and

¹ The law recognises the necessity for powers of search, however, for which see appendix to this chapter. The chief difficulty is probably to put the law in motion, save in cases notoriously urgent.

² See Report of the N.S.P.C.C., for 1906-7, p. 16.

faithfully represented, by the State, would not itself effectively protect him. Our national attitude is still one of evasion tempered by sympathy. The nation so far recognises the claim of humanity as to delegate its responsibility. But even this modified recognition is startlingly recent. Not till 1891 did "Cruelty to Children" first appear as an offence in the criminal statistics of the country.¹

Some years earlier societies for the prevention of cruelty had been formed. The present incorporated national association was founded in 1884, and a kindred society at Liverpool² in the previous year. These were purely private voluntary societies, indistinguishable in prestige from innumerable others, until 1895, when the London society received its Royal Charter. It was thus recognised, singled out, set apart as it were for the work, and has rapidly assumed in popular estimation the prerogative of enforcing the popular will. The Royal Charter is the official sanction of what public opinion had approved, and with a charter or without, the society has done great work.

"There has been a steady growth in the number of cases dealt with each year. In 1884-5, with only one Inspector, the cases were 95; in 1906-7, with 202 Inspectors, there were 40,433 cases. The proportionate increase has been most noteworthy in the years when additional Inspectors were appointed. This bears out the contention that child-suffering exists everywhere. Its discovery follows the advent of the officer. In 1888 there were 10 Inspectors, who dealt with 737 cases. The following year came incorporation as a National Society, and with 29 Inspectors the cases rose to 3,947." . . . The value of the work is also seen in the "remarkable decrease in the cases of extreme brutality and violence. Parents had too long held the view that they could do what they liked with their own, and the percentage of cases of violence was very heavy in the early days. For the first

¹ See Criminal Statistics for 1899, Parl. Papers, 1901, vol. lxxxix., p. 43.

² Chamber's Encyclopædia, vol. iii., 177.

five years the figure was 45.9 per 100 cases. Gradually the knowledge of the Society's existence was spread, and a marked improvement resulted. From 1889 the proportion of brutal cases declined, and . . . the statistical tables at the end of the Report (for 1906-7) show that . . . the number has fallen to 8.2 per hundred cases.

"In another direction also there is ground for encouragement. This is shown in the steady decline in the necessity for prosecutions. Of course the fall in the class of cases just referred to has had something to do with this. It is noteworthy, however, that even bad cases of neglect are becoming more susceptible to the kindly treatment of a sympathetic officer. Possibly also the effect of earlier prosecutions has done much to create a healthy fear in the minds of people, who are now prepared to make every attempt to remedy the conditions complained of rather than be called upon to appear before the magistrates. . . . It is a progressive step from the decline in the number of prosecutions to consider the growth of confidence in the Courts of the land, as shown by the decisions in them. In the first five years the dismissals were 11.8 per 100 cases; the figures for this year are 2.1 per 100. The principle governing a prosecution is not the mere wish to record a conviction, nor, indeed, is it a vindictive desire to bring an erring parent to justice, it is rather to establish the rights of children to proper treatment at the hands of those who are responsible for them." Warnings are becoming more effective and unfounded complaints are rare.¹

At the same time the national attitude is one of evasion of duty. The incorporated society occupies an ambiguous position between a private venture and a public department. It is a species of private police. For an analogy to such a mode of procedure on a scale so vast, we must go back to the not entirely creditable history of the first societies for the reformation

¹ "From Strength to Strength": Report of the N.S.P.C.C. for 1906-7.

of manners in the reign of William and Mary.¹ The theory of modified responsibility seems to be briefly this: Let an incorporated society act within the ordinary law; let any obloquy which may attend its operation fall on these private persons, rather than that the nation itself shall be obliged to do what the nation half-heartedly declares to be its will.

Individuals responded far beyond the nation's desert, simply because there was a general resolve to save the children, and we have such a record of a year's work as this:—

| | 1906—7. | | |
|--------------------|---------|------------|-------------|
| Cases Investigated | Warned | Prosecuted | Convictions |
| 40,433 | 33,935 | 2,253 | 2,207 |

These cases involve over 115,002 children. The work entails an expenditure of £64,483 and the co-operation of 1,137 local committees. This work is national work, but it is left to the goodwill of an overburdened society, overburdened it is true not so much with the work itself as with the necessity of securing its finances.²

The time has come when the State ought to reconsider its share in this undertaking, and in suggesting what that share should be, I need go little beyond the argument contained in a little book "The Queen's Reign for Children," by W. C. Hall, with an introduction by Benjamin Waugh. The Society has been largely instrumental in obtaining the enactment of the various laws for the protection of children, especially the Acts of 1889, 1894, and 1904,³ and further amendment must be expected. For the moment, however, I am not concerned with the law but with its enforcement. This should rightly be entrusted, not to a private (even royally incorporated) society, but to established public authority. It has become imperative that the State should consider what its position and responsibility in the matter really is. There should be, Mr. Hall tells us, a Department of State for

¹ "Hist. of Eng. Philanthropy," cf. Webb, "History of Liquor Licensing in England," 1903, p. 50, and appendix.

² W. C. Hall, "Queen's Reign for Children," chap. xiv.

³ 52-3 Vic. c. 44; 57-8 Vic., c. 27 and c. 41, 4 Ed., vii., c. 15.

all institutions for children. Such a Department could sanction and control the prosecutions of the Society. If the Public Prosecutor or the police fail in a prosecution, there is an end of it. But if the Society fail, it incurs obloquy, which should be obviated by the Society's Directors of Prosecutions being appointed subject to the approval of the Department, and by a government grant given conditionally on the efficiency of the work done.¹

This is necessary, in the interests of the nation, for though the work of the Society is well done it is precarious, resting on the life of one man. Constitutionally, too, the position is anomalous: hence some judicial objections. There is a difficulty in holding local Committees together; the risk of schism would be done away if government gave that permanency to the system which no private society can possess. The present position is a public danger, and "The mistake made is in blaming the society for occupying a position into which it has been forced by the exigencies of the case, instead of blaming the State which has done nothing to ameliorate that position, or in any way to remedy the great evils with which the Society has been chartered to deal."²

¹ Compare Report of N.S.P.C.C. for 1906-07, p. 26.

² Hall, *op. cit.* p. 186.

It may also be pointed out that only nationalisation of the work can effectively provide those remedial and educational influences which are quite as necessary and important as judicial pursuit of crime. A month's hard labour for a cruel or neglectful parent may be useful as a deterrent; but it does not meet the problem of the neglected child, (who *may* be even worse neglected while the sentence is being served) neither does it do anything to make the defaulters wiser, gentler, and more efficient as a parent afterwards. In a very sad case that came within the present writer's knowledge, a poor mother was (quite rightly) convicted of neglect that amounted to cruelty, but which did in fact arise not from a cruel, but from a singularly indolent and apathetic nature and incapacity for home duties. In such a case as this it is conceivable that sympathetic educational influences might be brought to bear with very good results; such influence for instance, as the best of our Health Visitors and women inspectors often successfully bring to bear on the ignorant young mothers of industrial districts. The Society does a great deal of excellent work both in the care of children whose parent or parents have been convicted of cruelty, and in bringing educational influence to bear; but it is obvious that a private society is under great disadvantages in this matter, and that it would be immensely strengthened if it were recognised as part of a public department, and co-ordinated with other authorities having control of children's lives. There is already a certain

In comparison with the question as to whether the State is to do this thing, the enquiry as to which department is to be entrusted with it is a small one; yet not on that account trivial. There is at the present time an Office, the work of which is closely connected with that which we are considering, namely the Ministry of Education, itself no more than keystone of an arch which reaches across the country in the shape of local educational authorities. These authorities do already go into the homes of children of school age for various purposes. They look up truants everywhere. In some places the school nurse visits the parents of ailing children. We have already medical inspectors of schools in some towns, and expect shortly to see such officers everywhere,¹ and when that is brought about the medical treatment of scholars may be expected to follow. Provisions, still inadequate but constantly increasing in range and in official character, exist for the feeding of children at school. We are in short rapidly creating a huge staff of men and women who, in the service of education, are becoming concerned with every interest of the child's life. Such an organisation seems to be the fitting authority for administering the laws for the prevention of cruelty.

Such a course may indeed give an unfamiliar extension to the notion of elementary education, but that is hardly an argument against it at a period when we are in every direction engaged in stretching old words to fit new meanings, for the sake of disguising from ourselves the fact that the old political philosophy of the 18-19th century is gone. We are engaged in piecing together a new philosophy of the 19-20th century, which may fill the

amount of voluntary co-operation with Boards of Guardians and Education Authorities (see the Society's Report for 1905-6, p. 15), and a good deal of educational work is done by the Society's Inspectors in "warning" slothful and neglectful parents, and as far as possible educating them to a sense of responsibility. But all this work needs strengthening, and would gain greatly by co-ordination and nationalisation.—(Ed.)

¹ See the remarkable Memorandum issued by the Board of Education in Nov. 1907, (Circular 676), dealing with the medical inspection of children in public elementary schools under Section 13 of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act, 1907.

vacant place and explain the phenomena of our modern world. We are shifting our thought from "elementary education" as Robert Lowe conceived it, to the more comprehensive ideal of a ministry of childhood. That, however, suggests purely constitutional questions which do not concern us now, and a valuation of The Child which must be deferred to a later chapter.

Sooner or later the protection of children will have to become a public task. There would be something eminently congruous in a department of the ministry of education with Mr. Waugh as its first official chief.¹

* * * * *

In all the types of State action so far examined—Annexation, Co-operation, Supervision, Co-ordination and Delegation—the State has *taken cognisance* of Philanthropy. In one way or another the sphere of the State has been enlarged, it has begun to discharge or at least to watch new duties, and has gained or discovered fresh rights. Its approach is found always to include an element of compulsion. Work left to ordinary philanthropy may be done to-day, half done to-morrow and undone the day after. Work over which the State has assumed control must be done all the time.

¹ Written before the lamented death of Rev. Benjamin Waugh.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER XIV.

EXTRACTS FROM PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO CHILDREN ACT, 1904 (57 and 58 Vict. c. 41).

Section 3, Sub-section (2). A Secretary of State may assign to any inspector appointed under section sixty-seven of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1878, specially and in addition to any other usual duties, the duty of seeing whether the restrictions and conditions of any license under this section are complied with, and any such inspector shall have the same power to enter,

inspect and examine any place of public entertainment at which the employment of a child is for the time being licensed under this section as an inspector has to enter, inspect and examine a factory or workshop under section sixty-eight of the same Act.

10 (1) If it appears to any stipendiary magistrate or to any two justices of the peace, on information made before him or them on oath by any person who, in the opinion of the magistrate or justices, is *bona fide* acting in the interests of a child under the age of sixteen years, that there is reasonable cause to suspect that such a child has been or is being assaulted, ill-treated or neglected in any place within the jurisdiction of such magistrate or justices in a manner likely to cause the child unnecessary suffering or to be injurious to its health, or that any offence mentioned in the schedule to this Act has been or is being committed in respect of such a child, such magistrate or justices may issue a warrant authorising any person named therein to search for such child, and if it is found to have been or to be assaulted, ill-treated or neglected in manner aforesaid, or that any such offence as aforesaid has been or is being committed in respect of the child, to take it and detain it in a place of safety, until it can be brought before a court of summary jurisdiction, or authorising any person to remove the child with or without search to a place of safety and detain it there until it can be brought before a court of summary jurisdiction; and the court before whom the child is brought may cause it to be dealt with in the manner provided by section five of this Act:

Provided that—

(a) the powers hereinbefore conferred on any two justices may be exercised by any one justice, if upon the information it appears to him to be a case of urgency. . . .

(3) Any person authorised by warrant under this section to search for any child, or to remove any child with or without search, may enter (if need be by force) any house, building or other place specified in the warrant, and may remove the child therefrom.

(4) Every warrant issued under this section shall be addressed to and executed by some superintendent, inspector or other superior officer of police, who shall be accompanied by the person making the information, if such person so desire, unless the person by whom the warrant is issued otherwise direct, and may also, if the persons by whom the warrant is issued so direct, be accompanied by a registered medical practitioner.

(5) It shall not be necessary in any information or warrant under this section to name the child.

CHAPTER XV.

HOSPITALS (PARTITION).

I.

DIVISION OF LABOUR BETWEEN THE STATE AND PHILANTHROPY.

WHEN the humane feeling of the country first organised itself into bodies of voluntary subscribers with the object of removing the various distresses which affected the nation, two causes chiefly engaged its energies, *viz.*, the provision of elementary education for the minds of children, and the cure of the bodies of the sick poor.¹ From the first of these, as from too arduous an enterprise, philanthropy has fallen back after a history of fluctuating zeal lasting through two centuries.

Our private hospitals lack yet some years of their bicentenary, but they are still beyond a doubt the most popular of our private charities. Their appeal is so direct as to be suited to the resources of annual pulpit oratory. The need of the sick strikes the public imagination, which is peculiarly open to the impression of the large numbers of out-patients. The appeal to the crowd of healthy people is in this case so immediate and is so pertinaciously urged by the clergy² and the press that it is little wonder if the current impression as to the work done by philanthropy runs somewhat ahead of the facts.

During the 18th century the supply of hospital accommodation for the sick was left almost entirely to the charge of private individuals. I have told elsewhere the story of how our ancestors tried to discharge the task, and it is no reflection on them to confess that they failed to meet the need. It was not the fault of those who did

¹ First charity schools founded 1690-1700; first Hospital founded by voluntary subscriptions, 1719.

² Hospital Sunday Funds exist in some 70 towns in England and Wales, see "Burdett's Hospital Annual" (1906), 124-5.

their utmost that there was nevertheless a serious lack of hospitals at the beginning of the 19th century, though blame may be due to others for leaving the whole supply of beds for the sick to casual private beneficence. But putting the question of blame aside, the fact remains that at the beginning of the 19th century the hospitals were all private; at the close two-thirds of them were already maintained and provided by the public authorities, and out of the public funds.

This is in no sense because the private hospitals do less or worse than previously. On the contrary they do much more and better. The change results from no failure of zeal on the part of the philanthropist but from a higher conception of duty or, shall we say, self-preservation, on the part of the nation. The decisive fact is not that philanthropy fails in the old task, but that society sets new ones.

The 19th century, and especially the first half of it, has witnessed many new large general hospitals both in the Metropolis and in other towns. Sometimes they have appealed for grants from the Treasury,¹ but much more frequently have been contented with what they could extract from individuals. That they are often and hardly handicapped for want of funds is obvious from the frequency and urgency of their appeals. If more liberally supported they would have achieved more, where in actual fact they have achieved much. As it is, the hospital population amounts nearly to 40,000.²

¹ Among others the Seamen's Hospital, founded 1821; Royal Free Hospital, 1828; University College Hospital, 1833; King's College Hospital, 1839; St. Mary's Hospital, 1851; Great Northern Hospital, 1856. The first of these affords almost the first and one of the very few instances of State assistance to the Voluntary Hospital. The Government granted to the Committee of the Seamen's Hospital a fifty-gun warship, the Grampus, and the old hulk moored off Greenwich became the hospital building; but when in 1841 the Royal Free Hospital appealed for a Parliamentary grant it was refused, and there was no consolation but such as could be derived from a protest. . . . "In many countries hospitals for the sick are State institutions . . . The Royal Free Hospital . . . on equally free principles with any continental hospitals, cannot work for want of funds," 17th Annual Report of the Royal Free Hospital, 1845, p. 9.

² Census (1901) General Report, p. 160; but the figures include Convalescent Homes.

If we turn now from quantity to quality the progress gained during a century is still more striking. The science of hygiene is a recent one, and nowhere has it been more influential on practice than in the hospitals. The very large amount of rebuilding which has recently taken place witnesses to the fact how much the sanitary standard has been raised since the 18th century, and although many of the old buildings remain, their continued use is only possible as a result of serious internal alterations. The wonder is that in the earlier hospitals any patient recovered, or in the modern one, that any should die, so fresh, so clean, and so perfectly equipped are they. But while both in amount and quality the work of the modern voluntary hospital is thus greater and better than that of its predecessors, the fact remains that whereas a century ago voluntaryism attempted to do all, two-thirds of the work has been ceded to the State.

According to the Census return (1901) the number of patients in the London voluntary hospitals amounted to 8399. The number at the same time in the Metropolitan Asylums Board was 2276, and in the Poor Law Infirmeries about 12,000 odd. According to the Charities Register, 1908, the numbers are:—voluntary hospitals, 10,600 beds; rate-supported fever hospitals, 10,200 beds; Poor Law Infirmeries 17,193. This last figure is an under-statement since one union, Hampstead, has no separate infirmary.

If we allow for the union not included in these figures, and add the patients of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, we have, in 1901, nearly twice as many patients in the public hospitals, as in the private hospitals, but at the later date, nearly three times as many. The officially published returns do not enable us to give the figures for the whole country, since outside London and some of the large towns, there is still a provision for the sick poor entirely separate and distinct from the general workhouse, but where comparison is possible it justifies us in estimating that for every sick inmate of a voluntary hospital two or more are treated in the State establishments.

Had not the burden on private finances been thus eased, the voluntary system must have broken down long ago. Or to put the same thing in other words, if the State had not been moved to discharge this part of its duty, individuals would have attempted it and would have found the work beyond their powers. But the reproach would have been due to the nation, not to them.

In both branches of the State hospital work, the way was prepared by philanthropy, and as the process was rather different in the two cases we must consider them separately. It is a matter of some doubt whether the system of voluntary hospitals would have arisen in its present form if two centuries ago there had been any true understanding of the need for skilled medical treatment of the sick poor. The neglect of the State proved here as in so many instances the opportunity of the philanthropist. Be that as it may, the State did not until after the middle of the 19th century begin to discharge this duty, although it was implicit in the very idea of the English Poor Law. The condition of the workhouse was grievous enough for the little children and the aged people whom misfortune doomed to confinement there; but it was most especially unfit for the sick. There was no sort of separate and proper provision for them, and they were not as now under the care of a medical man, but were subject to the discipline of an ignorant workhouse master.

Such was the state of affairs when the *Lancet* appointed its special commissioners, Mr. Ernest Hart, Dr. Ainstie, and Dr. Carr. These investigators exposed the shocking neglect of the sick in the workhouses, and comparing their state with the existing conditions in voluntary hospitals, drew indignant attention to the "scandalous inequality in our treatment of two classes of sick poor." They were aware, however, even so long as 40 years ago, that the voluntary hospitals, good as they might be, were only able "lightly to touch the surface of the wide field of London misery." The infirm wards of the poorhouse were and must increasingly be the "real hospitals of the

land." It was the more disastrous that while the country had "allowed a number of establishments to grow up in the external semblance of hospitals for paupers" yet "in truth the whole business is a sham, a mere *simulacrum* of real hospital accommodation."¹

Such an exposure by the leading medical journal could not be neglected, and it had a large share in bringing about the reforms which were to follow the Act of 1867², which enabled the guardians to classify and treat the sick in infirmaries "kept distinct from the rest of the work-house." These new infirmaries were to be presided over by a resident medical superintendent, and thus began to acquire a title to be regarded as in fact the real hospitals of the land. And since a large amount of the increased cost was charged on the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, the guardians had an adequate inducement to adopt the new method.

Of course much yet remained to be done. The nursing was most primitive and imperfect. Indeed that criticism is not even yet inapplicable to many infirm wards. But things have been put on the right lines. A resident medical man is professionally committed not to let his patients die, or even to suffer their recovery to be retarded by a cheese-paring policy. The instinct of the expert is on the side of improvement. The vast improvement that has actually taken place is evident when we visit some of our most recent poor-law hospitals. Halifax, for instance, now has an establishment which can venture to challenge comparison with any hospital in the land. At the best the infirmaries are not unworthy of the wealth of the country. Of course some remain near the worst, and it may be a matter of doubt whether under the Poor Law Guardians of the various unions they are likely to undergo the development they need.

The modern Poor Law Hospital is thus seen to be the result of philanthropic and scientific pressure, under which the State was reluctantly forced to take up the work.

¹ Report of the Lancet Commission, 1865, pp. 9-10.

² 30 and 31 Vict., c. 6.

The process was rather different in the case of hospitals for infectious diseases. Here philanthropy tried to do the work itself and not unnaturally it failed. There were the several fever hospitals of the latter years of the 18th century, which served to show how important such institutions were. But it required the sharper stimulus of repeated epidemics of cholera and of other hardly less terrible diseases, to persuade the country that zymotics really were dangerous and costly, not only to the poor who mainly filled the death roll,¹ but also to the interests of all classes of the community. Not till 1867 did the public authorities begin to obtain powers to make any effective provision against infectious diseases. In that year the Metropolitan Asylums Board was created as a central authority to relieve Poor Law Guardians of the care and treatment of paupers suffering from fever and small pox, who could not properly be treated in work-houses. Then gradually, by one amending Act and another its powers were enlarged. At first its duties were strictly confined to sufferers of the pauper class, and patients were admitted only on order issued by the relieving officers, and even if not paupers already, they became so on admission. In 1879, however, the Vestries and District Boards were authorised to enter into contracts with the Board for the reception and treatment of infectious sick who were not paupers, thus partly depauperising the fever hospitals. In 1882 the progress of opinion was shewn by the Report of the Royal Commission on Fever and Small-pox Hospitals, which stated that for the safety of the public it was desirable to make the hospitals as little unattractive as possible, and with

¹ In 1802 the Parish Committee of the Liverpool Vestry took steps to organise a fever hospital, on the ground that "there will be a considerable saving to the Parish by the proposed establishment, and it will also tend to the decrease of fever in the town. . . . Your Committee cannot be insensible to the personal interest which every housekeeper in the town must feel in having in times like the present, when disease so fatally prevails, the objects of that disease removed from his neighbourhood—perhaps from his own house. Humanity united with self-interest induces your Committee to press upon the Vestry the necessity of completing the work." "Liverpool Vestry Minutes," quoted in Webb's "English Local Government," Vol. i., p. 139-40.

that end to take away the pauper characters of the establishments, and abolish the distinction between paupers and non-paupers. The utility of isolation hospitals was amply demonstrated in the small-pox epidemic of 1884-5, and in other epidemics later on. Dr. Buchanan, Chief Medical Officer to the Local Government Board, wrote in 1892: "In regard to some infectious cases, notably those of scarlet fever and diphtheria, there are no means at all to be compared to isolation in hospital for preventing the spread of a limited number of cases into a formidable epidemic."¹

Over a large part of the country, though not everywhere, isolation hospitals are maintained in readiness for any epidemical outbreak. In 1900 there were already more than 500 of these hospitals in the towns and districts of England and Wales, large ones in populous centres; small ones in less densely peopled districts. And the number is materially increased every year.² The pretence of charity and the stigma of pauperism have fallen into the background, the conception of Public Health has come to the front.

Such then is the threefold hospital system prevailing at the present moment. It amounts to a complete partition of responsibility. In the case of infectious diseases it is felt that the work must be done, and moreover that the public must have a guarantee that on occasion it will be done, and accordingly the State acting through the organ of local government does it itself. In the case of the sick pauper it is not possible deliberately to refuse him the best chance of recovery, and therefore the process of converting our infirmaries into really well-equipped modern hospitals goes on unceasingly if slowly, and the patient who is a pauper (qualified *i.e.* for this technical denotative, not connotative term) cannot be neglected. The third cate-

¹ See Jephson, "Sanitary Evolution of London," pp. 210, 283, 318, 386-7.

² Burdett's "Hospital Annual," 1906, see the list of such hospitals, pp. 483-500. According to Dr. Buchanan there were in 1871 only 570 beds for fever patients outside of London, see "Eng. Hospitals in their Sanitary Aspects," p. 23-4.

gory is that of the voluntary hospital. The country has not yet made up its mind within what limits this ought to be or must be made available, and accordingly the size and number of our private hospitals is determined, not by the extent of the need, for that is unknown, but by the possibility of securing donations, subscriptions, and the profits on bazaars. We are faced by the almost invariable distinction between private charity and public administration. In the former case you ask how much money can be obtained and then make it go as far as possible; in the second you get an estimate of the work requiring to be done and then provide the necessary funds.

It may accidentally happen that the work possible under the exigencies of the former, the voluntary system, will be adequate, but it will only be so by a chance coincidence, because the work is always done in the dark, as it were, without full knowledge of the ground to be covered.

We put on one side for the moment the two thirds of the hospital work of the country done already by the State, and confine ourselves to the one third for which private agency is relied on; it would be more than a third, by the way, if done completely. We shall not ask whether this voluntary work is well done, but assume that point. What we must ask is, whether the resources of the system are equal to the work that needs doing.

II.

IS THE VOLUNTARY HOSPITAL EQUAL TO THE BURDEN?

Our answer to the question is briefly as follows:—the funds are insufficient for the task imposed on them and there is no prospect of their becoming more adequate.

1.—*The Hospital Accommodation is Inadequate.* We may probably take it as an axiom not in dispute that the supply has never been excessive, since there has always been a pressure on existing hospitals, and their committees have always looked forward to doing more rather

than less. This being recognised, how are we to interpret the disconcerting fact that the supply does not keep pace with the increase of population? In 1881 the hospital population of London was 7,375, or 1 to 518 of the general population; in 1891 the number had risen to 7,542, but the ratio had fallen to 1 in 558; in 1901 both the total and the ratio were higher than in 1891, namely, 8,399 or 1 in 539. But the ratio is still lower than it was twenty years earlier.

In the great industrial centres the numbers rise both absolutely and in proportion to the population and the ratios are,

| | 1881 | 1891 | 1901 |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| West Midland Counties ... | 1 in 1,303 | 1 in 1,023 | 1 in 864 |
| Cheshire and Lancashire ... | 1 in 1,699 | 1 in 1,179 | 1 in 821 |
| Yorkshire | 1 in 1,725 | 1 in 1,389 | 1 in 1,074 |

But the provision is still very much less than in London.¹

Or we may look at the question from another side. Sir Henry Burdett in 1893 gives the ratio of beds to population as 1.91 per 1,000 for London, which as we have seen is higher than prevails in the country at large, though slightly lower than is to be found in one or two of the large towns. At the same date the provision in Berlin was 3.85 per 1,000, and since then the hospital supply has been largely increased. The Germans may have many national defects, but extravagance is not among them, while they are pre-eminent in matters of statistical knowledge and of administration. It would be quite safe to infer that the city really required at least all the provision it had,—even if Berlin had proved to be the town most fully supplied with beds for the sick. But exactly the opposite is the case, and Berlin in this respect ranks among the lowest of the great German towns. Yet Germany's lowest is twice as much as our Metropolitan figure, far more than twice as much as our average.²

In England these general hospitals are private, in Germany they are mainly public institutions.

¹ See Census Reports.

² "Hospitals and Asylums of the World," iii., 309.

But even if the hospital beds of London were sufficient in number for the sick poor of London, the supply might still be defective, on account of the beds being in one district and the people in another. And this is the case. When an appeal was made for funds for St. Mary's Hospital it was urged on the ground both of "the lamentable inadequacy of hospital accommodation in London as compared with that of other European capitals, and the lamentable inadequacy of hospital accommodation in this quarter as compared with that of other quarters of London."

These were spoken of as "painful and almost appalling topics."¹

During the last half century the hospital supply has continued to preponderate in the centre, while the population has poured in ever increasing numbers towards a vanishing circumference. The serious inconvenience caused by the fact of stationary hospitals and migrating population was referred to a generation later, before the Lords' Committee (1892). Within one mile of Middlesex Hospital there were said to be 8 general and 26 special hospitals; with a few exceptions all the London hospitals were within an area of two miles square. West of Blackfriars there were 51 and east only 15 (excluding in both cases minor special hospitals). The conclusion of the committee is that even if the hospitals were sufficient, they were ill distributed.² The difficulty of course has become more acute in the last few years. There are unfortunately whole great areas with no supply, or an obviously scanty one, as *e.g.* the great stretches of North London, served only by the rather small Great Northern Hospital, an institution which ought not to be, but is in urgent need of a financial support it does not receive.

A reason for the lack of large general hospitals outside the central area was given to the Lords' Committee. If they were placed or removed to where the masses of the

¹ St. Mary's Hospital, Paddington, "Statement and Appeal," 1851, p. 19.

² Lords' Committee on Hospitals, 3rd Report, p. xlv.

people lived, they would doubtless be more serviceable to the poor. But distinguished doctors could not be expected to go out to them; nor would business men so readily serve on their committees, reasons which if they are indeed operative, afford a strong argument in favour of municipalisation.¹

2.—*The question of finance.* We touch here on the real reason why the supply of hospitals is unequal to the demand. The first impression caused by a contemplation of the funds at the disposal of the hospitals is of their munificence and apparently indefinite elasticity. Year after year the newspapers refer with pride to the amount of the London Hospital Sunday Fund; the sum contributed by the Saturday fund is smaller, but still considerable. And these sources of revenue which have been in existence long enough to become familiar have recently been supplemented by the newer King's Fund with its income reaching to about £100,000 per annum. What is done in these ways in London is done more or less in many of the other big towns.

These renewed efforts are a result in the first place of a growing consciousness of the inadequacy of existing indoor hospital accommodation, and secondly spring from a definite desire to stave off the advent of municipal subsidies and public administration. Nevertheless the difficulty of maintaining the necessary income is considerable and increasing. This is possibly less the case in the metropolis where the totals are so large as to touch the imagination, and where the movement enjoys the prestige of royal patronage. But in some provincial towns the pressure is already extreme. The changing habits of the people render it more and more difficult to keep the Sunday collections up to standard, and this is accentuated by the fact that many more people are beginning to question the policy of eleemosynary payment for what is coming to be regarded as a public responsibility.

In some towns it has become necessary to resort to a house-to-house collection when there is an underlying ex-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. xlvi.

pectation that the annual donation will be in proportion to the size of the house. There is in fact an approach to a voluntary rate. But a voluntary tax is not a reliable permanent instrument of finance.

In working class centres also where the workshop collection is in force, the opinion, so we are told, is gaining ground that since the proletariat finds the funds, its representatives should call the tune, and we are warned that if we would avoid rate-supported hospitals the well-to-do classes must bear a larger share of the burden.¹ There is in short that general anticipation of coming change which goes so far to bring the change about; so much is this the case that the very expectation of rate-support is likely before long to affect adversely the voluntary treasury. Even to-day the main question is whether the resources of charity will be able to keep up the establishment to its present strength, in relation to a growing population, and perhaps bring the more backward parts of the country towards the mark of the better supplied. Behind these questions looms the larger one of how the supply can be rendered adequate to the need, not merely of this or that hospital, but the whole country.

I have not referred to one possible economy which is often advocated, that namely of reducing the work done in the out-patient department. It is not necessary to enter on the discussion of the so-called "abuse" of the out-patient department, since even if there be "abuse," little result can be expected of the "reform" movement. To a large extent the force of popular appeal depends on the very large numbers of patients benefited. The public to whom appeal is made is in this matter very like a child and takes things at their face value. The hospitals in the county of London benefit over one and three quarter millions a year. That is broad, simple, satisfactory. But out of the total 1,648,353 are out-patients, leaving only

¹ I have been unable to find this reference. The more general argument is that free medical relief is "pauperising," and that the people should be taught independence. But this view seems to be gradually yielding to the perception that untended sickness may be more "pauperising" than relief.—(Ed.).

112,287 in-patients. A *reduction* of a quarter of a million out patients would affect the impressiveness of the total and therefore of the appeal much more than an *increase* of 20,000 among the in-patients. Such a diminution as a quarter of a million would suggest to many people in many parts that the hospitals were doing less work, with the result that they would receive much less support. The hospitals, while they depend for their support on a knowledge of popular psychology, cannot afford to check the out-patient work.

Nor is much to be gained by such a reduction, since while the out-patients swell the numbers, the in-patients are out of all proportion the heavier tax on funds. If the voluntary system depends on economy of resources it rests on a very precarious foundation.

It is no doubt difficult to find the money, but it is beyond all doubt that more and more will be required, and as everybody knows, if the voluntary finance should break down, the public funds can supply the deficiency. In this matter of common knowledge lies one great danger to the present system.

3.—*The Nursing Staff.* One of the glories of the hospitals is to be found in the impetus given towards the middle of the 19th century to a system of skilled nursing by highly trained and often educated women. The old style nurse has been so fittingly typified for this generation in Mrs. Gamp as to render it quite superfluous to labour that point, and one quotation shall suffice: "I enquired from Dr. . . . about the character of the nurses, and he says they always engage them without any character, as no respectable person would undertake so disagreeable an office . . . The only conditions that are made on engaging nurses are that they are not Irish, and that they are not confirmed drunkards." They were mostly charwoman by occupation.¹

The contrast with the modern nurse, in her costume at once becoming and symbolical, is sufficiently clear. The beginning of the transition may be referred to the arrange-

¹ Hospitals and Sisterhoods (1854), p. 21.

ment made between King's College Hospital, then a recent institution, and the St. John's House Society, whereby the trained sisters and nurses of the latter took charge of the nursing in the hospital wards.

The first educated nurses were women conscious of a vocation, and something of this idea of consecration still lends dignity to the work. It was, however, inevitable that to their successors the work should become a profession. It was arduous, monotonous, perpetual; the requisite staff was large, far too large to be recruited from the scant numbers of those who felt a vocation, and at the same time possessed an independent income. The profession must be a regularly salaried one, and this was a source of expense bound to increase with the advance of medical ideals and surgical knowledge.

One of the economies which our hospitals have striven after has always been in this matter of the nursing staff, and it is by common consent one of the least worthy economies practised. It is partly explained, though in no sense excused, by a fact to which reference has been made. The Lords' Committee on Hospitals was partly occasioned by several complaints of ill treatment of nurses, (particular complaints which the committee regarded as unfounded), and the report, dealing with the whole subject, notes with a naïve intonation of surprise, that "the demand for an increase in the nursing staff is in fact made rather in the interest of the nurses themselves, in the interest of shorter hours of duty and longer holidays, than of the patients . . . abundant testimony was forthcoming of the admirable care and attention bestowed on them and of the spirit of self-sacrificing zeal which animated the nurses." There are times when self-sacrificing zeal is demanded and all honour to those who then devote or lose themselves in service. That is only one side of it. The need of sacrifice is always a reflection on the men or circumstances calling for it. In this case the need arises simply from a false economy, and in such a cause self-sacrifice ought not to be

asked from women who may expect to practise their profession for a quarter of a century or more, if they be not broken down earlier.

Here let a medical judgment speak for me. Mr. Lionel Tayler in his *Aspects of Social Evolution* deals with the mischief resulting to women from excessive work and particularly from over-prolonged standing, and adds "Not the least shameful in this respect are our hospital authorities" (p. 222-3). There is no reason to charge these authorities with intentional wrongdoing. Partly they are misled by regarding as a vocation simply what is also and primarily a profession; a more considerable reason is to be found in the nature of womanhood which tends to put up with almost anything; but the chief explanation is to be found in the prosaic necessity of making both ends meet. The nurses are not sacrificed to the needs of the sick, for were there more nurses the sick might be cared for without risk and damage to the health of the attendant. The nurses are sacrificed to the exigencies of voluntary finance.

We are assuming for all hospitals in all cases what is true for most hospitals in most cases, namely that while the patient is under treatment everything is done for him which humanity, skill and the available resources will permit. That has been true throughout the history, but it has only been half the truth. The pressure on accommodation has always rendered it impossible for the hospital to see its cases through to a perfect cure. Indeed the modern hospital is not fitted for that end, its function is to treat acute illness. Now in some instances patients are discharged too soon, earlier, that is, than they would be discharged if medical opinion of what is desirable were the only factor. But of course it is far from being the only factor. There is *e.g.* the consideration of the possibility of the more pressing necessity of some other patient who will be able to occupy the bed when it becomes vacant. That is only part of the general question of the lack of hospitals.

But the hospital is too often regarded as a whole when it is only part. The transition from hospital to home and

work should not as a rule be immediate. This would be true even were the working class home much more commodious, and the working class home diet more adequate, and varied, than is actually the case. A patient suffering from grave illness, such as demands hospital treatment, is restored to full health only through a period of convalescence. A few of our hospitals have convalescent homes connected with them to which patients (*i.e.* some patients, for no convalescent branch is so large as the medical staff would desire) can be transferred. The majority of hospitals, however, have no convalescent home attached.

Many of the patients from the second and larger class may however go to convalescent homes, and some of them go straight from hospital. Others go home, begin to flag and after a longer or shorter interval are enabled by some district visitor or missionary to go with a letter to a Home. There they stay two, three weeks, and often return in good health, but often also the mischief done in the interval between leaving the city hospital and going to the seaside home is not repaired. Thus for lack of co-ordination the two periods of treatment which should have been continuous from the one to the other, and which would then have resulted in health, are separated in time and result in invalidism, with all that obscured invalidism involves of disaster in a proletarian home.

Some hospitals have the two branches co-ordinated, and the others would have them if they could. Why then are hospitals without this necessary supplement, and why are almost all convalescent homes out of touch with the hospitals? One set of people are keen to support hospitals, another impressed with the need of convalescent homes; or the same people are interested in both, but they think them separately, not together. This may be explained by history. The perception of the need for hospitals and for convalescent homes arose at different times. The managers of hospitals get what money they can and do as much good as possible; the managers of convalescent funds get as much as *they* can and also do as much good as

possible. If the two could be co-ordinated, better results might be obtained; but this is not practicable so long as the system is based less on the need of the sick poor than on the imaginative sensibility of the charitable.

III.

The Natural Hospital Authority. The hospital work of the country is as we have seen partitioned out between private enterprise and the State, but the division is not a simple twofold one, since the part of the work which falls to the share of the nation is again split up into two and relegated to distinct and unco-ordinated authorities—the guardians of the poor, and the municipal or other health departments. The only connection between them is found in their subordination to one central power, the Local Government Board. The work of the voluntary hospitals again lacks even this unifying influence, being administered by distinct and independent committees responsible only to local bodies of subscribers.

There does not seem to be any such radical difference in the work of these three groups of unco-ordinated authorities as to necessitate the triple system. If it is desired to co-ordinate the work there is not much choice as to the means to be adopted. The work cannot all be left to voluntary enterprise, for this would be unequal to the task; it cannot all be discharged by the Poor Law Guardians, because the patients are not all eligible for the taint of pauperism, or even for the suspicion which lingers round everything connected with the Poor Law administration. The work might all be carried out by the local governing bodies, and in fact would be most conveniently relegated to their care.

They are already the most important health authorities in the country. The most imperative, and as it happens by far the most difficult branch of hospital work is already in their hands, namely the hospitals for infectious diseases. This is obviously as it should be. The Health Committee is responsible for measures of hygiene which

lessen the risk and incidence of the zymotics, and dealing thus with the preventive side of medicine should deal also with the curative aspects, for prevention and cure are very near to one another, and indeed tend to be mutually indistinguishable, on the margin.¹

But the preventive work of the Health Committee is by no means confined to infectious disease, but includes every circumstance inimical to the health of the community. In some school areas we already have school medical officers as well as school nurses, and though their function is inspection rather than cure, it is difficult to draw a hard and fast line between the two. School medical officers will be appointed in increasing numbers, and the curative aspect of their work is equally sure to become more prominent.

The medical certificate under the Factory Act brings large numbers of boys and girls after they have left school under the cognisance of a public health officer. The appointments of women sanitary inspectors with the duties of health visitors brings the public health authority into the homes of the people.

There are thus seen to be numerous opportunities for the local health authority to come officially into touch with the ailments of the people, and it would require a comparatively small extension of the present system to bring both the voluntary hospitals and the Poor Law authorities under the same control as now suffices for the fever hospitals.

When this takes place it cannot fail to have some effect on the nature and composition of the committee which at present are responsible for the private hospitals. But it does not by any means involve or suggest throwing away the large amount of work at present rendered by the more active members of these committees. On the contrary the services of such men and women may be retained for the community, under altered circumstances, it is true, but with a heightened prestige. But the discussion of this point will be more conveniently taken in

¹ See chapter xvii., "Public Health."

a later chapter when we have to consider the place of the private citizen in public work.¹

IV.

The Medical Staff.—The private hospitals enjoy the honorary service of most of the more distinguished physicians and surgeons of the day. These men, we are told, would not give the same service to municipal institutions. I do not believe that, but even if it were so we might refer for reassurance to so prominent an authority in hospital affairs as Sir Henry Burdett, who says: "Many intelligent philanthropists have long held that the only way to ensure simplicity and efficiency with economy in hospital administration is to insist upon adequate payment of all hospital officials . . . from the senior physician to the humblest scrubber. The payment of such medical officers as now hold honorary appointments . . . may come up for discussion at no distant date. There are some who think its effect would be to drive away men of the highest scientific ability from the voluntary hospitals. So far from this being the case it is highly probable that the very opposite would be the result. . . . If hospitals were prepared to pay even very moderate salaries for their working physicians and surgeons they would have the choice of the very best men in the whole medical profession."² Even if the honorary staff cease to be available, the ordinary working staff in municipal hospitals would probably include more picked men than at present are to be found in the voluntary ones.

But, as I have already said, I question whether the services of the honorary staff would be lost so long as the community cared to retain them. It is difficult for a layman to dogmatise on this point, but, as compared with other professions, medical men are not deficient in public spirit, and that among other motives would lead to continued service. There is the further question of

¹ A fragment of the chapter referred to will be found at p. 316.

² "Hospitals and Asylums of the World," iii., 315.

prestige. Our leading practitioners give a great deal of unpaid and valuable work, which is not all a gift, for on the other side must be reckoned the repute and esteem accorded to the consultant physician and surgeon, esteem which, while not always representing a cash value, sets its object in the enviable position of professional leadership. And a third reflection may be added. The honorary medical officer gains much in experience and scientific knowledge. Every patient, besides being a person to be cured, is also to the doctor so much material for observation.

One condition is doubtless essential. An honorary staff will demand representation on the governing body, thus sharing in the direction of work which it does without cash reward. The claim is a reasonable one, and its concession would be not more in the interests of the staff than of the hospital.

CHAPTER XVI.

TUBERCULOSIS.

THE wandering tinker and the potter with his wheel are symbolic of an old world industry. They remind us of the early conquests of human ingenuity over the rude obstacle of matter, and there is a fascination in their craft such as no child can resist. The vagabondage of the one appeals irresistibly to all who have retained something of the spirit of vagabondage; the deft handling of the other reminds us of the primal impulse to touch the thing of mere utility into an object of delight. The itinerant knife grinder still plies his trade by the roadside, though he is becoming something of a relic of the past, and the toil of the potter is now become a branch of the "great industry" carried on in factory or workshop.

It is surely the decree of some mocking force of irony which inflicts the most malignant and distressful mischief of modern life upon the worker of little metal blades and the fashioner of earthen pots. There is one disease pre-eminent in its attack wherever evil conditions of occupation or of residence invite its onset and, with one exception, there is no trade practised by men which yields a longer tale of victims to phthisis than the cutlers and the potters of the land. The one exception is that of tin mining. For every 82 farm labourers who die of phthisis, 277 potters, 516 cutlers, and no less than 838 tin miners, perish of the same disease. The figures are significant enough in themselves, and become more serious when we discover them to be not isolated instances of a few deadly trades, but to be almost matched in many others, such as printers 290, musicians

301, glass manufacturers 269, hairdressers 253, chimney sweeps 263, shoemakers 256, saddlers 213. In all of these the death rate is considerably more than doubled by the unhealthy circumstances of the calling, and these are but a selection.¹ The Registrar-General divides them into two groups according as the damage is caused by some noxious dust resulting from the operation itself, or from the foul and poisoned air of the places where the work is carried on.

But the serious import of the figures is only to be grasped when we notice how very large a proportion of the total deaths are due to this single cause.

| | 1901 | Total Deaths | Phthisis | Other Tuberculous Diseases |
|---------|------|----------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| Males | ... | 285,618 | 23,654 | 9,427 |
| Females | ... | 265,967 | 17,770 | 8,279 |
| | | <u>551,585</u> | <u>41,424</u> | <u>17,706</u> |

More than 1 in 10 of all deaths are due to this type of disease; the single sub-division phthisis causes more than 1 death in every 14.

People must die of something, and perhaps from the social as opposed to the individual point of view it does not much matter how, but it certainly does matter when. We may consider these 40,000 deaths from the economic or from any other standpoint, but however regarded, we find that they occur so as to occasion the maximum of loss and distress. It is sad when children die: yet the wound left by their passing does usually cease to rankle. Friends mourn perhaps even more bitterly when those who are aged leave them, but these are known to be near to the inevitable bourn, and the event is not charged with being untimely. More aggravated is the case when young men and women who have just stepped on the proud upland of life, and those on whom young children depend, are snatched away. The foe to be feared in the first flush of manhood and womanhood is phthisis.

¹ Report of Registrar-General; Decennial Supplement, 1891-1900, Part ii. 1908, c. 2619. The figures are for the years 1900-2.—Ed.

| Deaths at the age periods | | 20-25 | 25-35 | 35-45 |
|---------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Phthisis | Male | 2,457 | 5,371 | 5,603 |
| | Female | 2,133 | 4,551 | 3,848 |
| Total | | 4,680 | 9,922 | 9,451 |
| Other causes | Male | 6,918 | 15,555 | 20,545 |
| | Female | 6,325 | 14,767 | 18,073 |
| Total | | 13,243 | 30,322 | 38,618 |

More than one third of all who die between 20 and 35 die from phthisis. Against disease in general this 15 years period is the most resistant; only $1/13$ th of the deaths affect people of this age. But to phthisis this same 15 years period is most fatally liable, and about 35 per cent. of all deaths from this cause occur within it.

Several valuable conclusions seem to follow when we take this figure in connection with the accepted fact that phthisis is very largely a disease which may be prevented. It is a disease of industrial conditions, which conditions may be greatly and indefinitely modified; it is a disease of close and unwholesome houses, courts, streets. The bacillus flees the sunshine. Unfortunately we in England cannot control the clouds, though we can often and quite practicably control the smoke with which as by an artificial substitute we banish the brightness. But even a comparatively sunless day with an air which is dull and damp, so long as it be fresh and clean, is inimical to this germ. Phthisis is to an unusual degree within our social influence. When we seriously engage in the battle, and begin to win leading positions in this field, we shall affect the general death-rate in a very striking way, and we shall not only reduce the whole tale of dead, but shall gain that abatement precisely from the deaths which are most costly and mischievous.

One other statistical enquiry ought to be faced before we arrive at the specific topic of our chapter, namely, the treatment of the disease by various private or public ameliorative forces. Phthisis takes its time. It does not strike to kill, but to disable, and death lingers long. So much is matter of common knowledge. More precise indications of the length of the disease are obtainable, and

we may refer to remarks on this subject by the Medical Officer of Health for Manchester.

From a comparison of the number of cases notified under the voluntary notification scheme with the proportion of cases which his experience leads him to believe remain unnotified, Mr. Niven deduces that there are about 3,000 phthisical patients in Manchester. The deaths from the same cause being 1,005 we arrive at the conclusion "the average duration of illness in the artizan class approaches three years."¹

If it is permissible to assume a similar duration for the country generally, we arrive at a final figure of about 120,000 patients suffering from phthisis at the present time, and in so far as many phthisical patients finally die, not from phthisis but from some other cause, the number is really larger.

As we have seen, deaths from this cause occasion the maximum of distress, affecting as they so largely do the heads of young families. In addition, owing to the inordinate length of the preceding period of impaired or destroyed powers, the disease, apart from the deaths, causes the maximum of burden during its course. We have also seen and may repeat in Mr. Niven's words "Tuberculosis is eminently amenable to preventive measures, provided there is a general desire to adopt them, and a determination to face the requisite expenditure."²

In face of these conditions we have now to follow up two considerations; firstly, as to the actual measures adopted to alleviate the pressure, and secondly of the necessity for recognising here one of the leading problems of social politics.

II.

We find in regard to phthisis the same unco-ordinated scheme, the same unconsidered partition of responsibility that we observed in the case of the hospitals

¹ Report on the Health of the City of Manchester, for 1905, by James Niven, p. 172-3.

² *op. cit.* 160-1.

generally. The disease is dealt with by private associations and by some poor law guardians, while a few of the more enterprising local authorities have so far stretched or re-interpreted their powers under the Public Health Acts as to provide municipal hospitals.

Of these the last-mentioned expedient is a thing of yesterday; the second, of the day before. In this, as in so many respects, it was left to philanthropy to show the way. The first of these special hospitals indeed has already a history of nearly a century,¹ and 1841, the date of the Brompton Hospital, is worth noting.

The statistical societies had by that time been founded, and one of the questions to which they first addressed themselves was that of the influence of the Factory system in the development of pulmonary consumption. The question was being hotly debated, and doctors were not wanting to lend sanction to the preposterous conclusion of Dr. Ure that factory labour is protective from scrofulous diseases and conduces to good health. The writer in the *Statistical Journal* held it to be, on the contrary, most prejudicial to a sound condition of body and adds "but then such also, I am satisfied, is the case with a vast proportion of the occupations and habits of individuals of all classes."²

The founding of the Brompton Hospital thus coincides with the growth of a more penetrating investigation of the social aetiology of consumption and indeed of all infectious or non-infectious disease. Dr. Southwood Smith's *Treatise on Fever* was eight years old, and young Dr. Guy was making his painstaking studies of the effect of industrial occupation on mortality. In a word, the medical man was coming to his rightful post of authority as a public functionary entrusted with a public charge of the first and last significance. The *Wealth of Nations* was coming into recognition as not independent of, but truly subordinate to the *Health of Nations*, but seven years were yet to elapse

¹ Royal Hospital for Diseases of the Chest, established 1814.

² See "The Influence of the Factory System in the Development of Pulmonary Consumption," by D. Noble, *Journ. Stat. Soc.* v. p. 274. Cf. Ure, "Philosophy of Manufactures," Book ii., chap. 2.

before the Public Health Act of 1848, and the appointment of Medical Officers of Health.

Little of this thought went to the making of Brompton Hospital, but it is often instructive to seize the unconscious meaning of an age from the seeming coincidences of its phenomena. We are arriving at a recognition of the hospital as merely one rivet in the armoury which must protect society against disease.

The foundations grew in number and *size*, but they are still entirely inadequate to the need. A quotation from a work so pledged to the strait doctrine of individualism as the Charities Register of the C.O.S. (1906 p. cxcvii.), shows how general a concurrence there is on this point. "The problem is one altogether beyond the capacity of private philanthropy to solve and must sooner or later be faced by the State." "The problem may have fundamentally a medical bearing, but it has educational, economic, and ethical aspects, which are of the utmost importance. It is, in short, no mere puzzle in pathology to be dealt with by experts in hygiene and specialists in sanitation, but a great national question which must be viewed and dealt with as a part of the greater "Social Error" which is the product of individual and national sins and ignorances of omission and commission." "One eleventh of all the pauperism, costing in England and Wales £10,500,000 a year, arises from consumption." The number of patients is estimated at 120,000.¹

Two bad conditions mar and tend to annul the splendid quality of the restorative treatment accorded to the sick while they are in the hospital. They are received too late, and they are discharged too quickly. In evidence of the first point, patients are almost universally required to produce a subscriber's letter. This is sometimes a lengthy and troublesome process. The institution is apt to issue many more letters than they have rooms for patients. The sick person may be in the employ of someone who has these letters; more often he will only

¹ Charities Register, 1907, p. ccvi; Burdett's Hospital Annual, 1906.

be known to some intermediate person who will beg a letter from a well-to-do acquaintance. Or the patient may get a list of subscribers, and call upon them in succession till he obtains the desired letter. As a rule there has been already some delay, and very often the disease has gone too far to allow much hope of amendment. But this is only the beginning. The letter must be endorsed by the medical adviser of the institution.¹ Then if the patient is passed as eligible for and likely to benefit by hospital treatment he is not certainly admitted at once, but his name is put on a waiting list and his turn will come in a period which may commonly be reckoned in months. By that time the patient may be dead or too far gone to go into hospital at all.²

Of course the authorities have no desire to put people off until their case is hopeless. They are bound, not only by humanity but by professional instinct and interests, to prefer patients whom they can cure. They would wish always to achieve what often they do achieve, *i.e.* an arrest or a removal of the disease. But while the accommodation is so inadequate it is difficult to devise a better system than the existing one of "first come first served," and late come is consequently late served. The fault is not in the existing hospitals, but in their inadequate numbers and accommodation.

For the same reason patients are discharged too soon. A letter lasts for a given period, say six weeks. If a further letter can be found a lengthened stay may be allowed, but if so it is necessarily to the detriment of some in the crowd of those waiting for vacant beds. With the limited funds at their command the short period may be the best possible. It is a choice between numbers and duration, and the point is one which a layman finds it difficult to decide or at

¹ From information kindly given by an official of the C.O.S., I learn that the letter system is being gradually dropped at some of the leading hospitals, and that in urgent cases the doctor's decision overrides formalities, and secures the admission of the patient. The author's view is thus *pro tanto* supported by the practice of the profession.—(Ed.).

² A fact of personal knowledge. Cf. Lords' Committee on Hospitals, (1890), Evidence, q. 1522.

least unwise to dogmatize upon. But there is no doubt at all on one point. In itself the stay in hospital is too short to give the best result to each patient treated. Dr. Killick Millard, the Leicester Medical Officer of Health, says the period of six weeks is too short even for cases taken in the earliest stages.¹

The experience of the German Workmen's Insurance Hospitals is here very much to the point. The immediate point is one of finance. Suppose a man to have been ill and incapacitated six months. Either he must be pensioned or cured. Which is cheaper? The attempt to cure may be true economy if it be *carried on to completion*.²

One other reflection follows. The time when a patient may be advantageously discharged depends on the surroundings into which he is sent and the occupation in which he is to be engaged after leaving hospital. He must not as a rule return to the old habits "but must secure some suitable outdoor occupation" (Dr. K. Millard).³ "In my experience, the majority of consumptives are the better for some occupation, but this occupation must be suitable to their several conditions under conditions which lower general strength and vitality there is grave risk."⁴ This again entirely agrees with Germany's experience, for there also the question has been raised how to fit the work to the power of the man. And inasmuch as the Insurance office has a financial interest in solving the problem we may look with some hope for a solution. Obviously private philanthropy cannot undertake so immense a task as that of providing healthy and useful work for those in whom the disease has been stayed, and who, *given suitable circumstances*, may remain free from its ravages for an indefinite period, may in fact be so far cured as to live to die of something else.

The second form of meliorative action is that for which the guardians are responsible, though probably the moving spirit is the medical officer rather than the guardians.

¹ Report on the Health of Leicester for 1905, pp. 84-5.

² Deutsche Arbeiterversicherung, 1905, p. 109-112.

³ Report on Leicester for 1905, p. 86.

⁴ Bardswell, "The Consumptive Working Man," p. 182.

The poor law authority must make provision for the destitute. In practice it has been driven along a path which the earlier Poor Law Commissioners disapproved. It has had to give *more* than the barest modicum of medical treatment to its sick poor. As we saw in the last chapter, the more progressive bodies do care for the sick pauper as zealously as the best private hospitals tend the non-pauper sick. They have recognised that pauper and non-pauper are merely misleading terms as applied to the sick. They interpret their business to mean, giving frankly the best consideration to their patients—no longer grudgingly the least.

This general principle has been applied to the particular problem of tuberculosis. It has no doubt been reinforced by the professional and scientific interests of the medical officers, with the result of providing in different places open air sanatoria which embody the most perfect results of modern knowledge. In this matter we recognise an equality between the *damaged* poor and the rich. Perhaps when further steps towards an equality of opportunities and conditions for the undamaged have been taken, less extensive curative institutions will become necessary.

"The question has been raised whether sickness should be associated at all with pauperism. There can in any case be little doubt that cases of Phthisis should not be treated in Union Hospitals, but in a separate Home or Sanatorium, preferably under the management of the Sanitary Authority."

This judgment of Mr. Niven's is expressed timidly, as befits an Official Report, but it is so thoroughly in harmony with the best thought of the day as to suffice in its unargued brevity to dismiss the question. Good as some (not all) poor law sanatoria are, they still bear the taint of degradation. The Poor Law Guardians can never become the nation's representatives in the field of the conflict with tuberculosis.

If then we are to have a co-ordinated scheme, and if this is not possible to private enterprise (as confessedly

1 Niven, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

it is not), and if further the poor law is out of the question, we have to seek some other authority under which all branches of the work might be brought into harmony. The obvious or rather, the only authority, is the local governing authority of the country.

It is interesting to trace the way in which some municipalities have already been experimenting in this direction. The credit of this ingenious extension of municipal enterprise is due to Brighton and its medical officer, Dr. Arthur Newsholme.¹ The idea was to have an educative sanatorium planned less to cure than to instruct its patient in the laws of health, so that after his somewhat brief sojourn therein, he should become an anti-tuberculosis missionary.² Mark the curious discrepancy of practice between one locality and another. At Brighton "a workman having incipient phthisis is received into the municipal phthisis sanatorium, taught how to live, and discharged, all without the stigma of pauperism. *At Bradford exactly the same kind of institution, treating the same disease in the same way, and receiving largely the same class of patients is maintained by the Board of guardians out of the poor rate.* At Bradford, as at Brighton, the workman with incipient phthisis is sought out and urged, in the public interest, to come in and be treated at the public expense. At Bradford he becomes technically a pauper by so doing, at Brighton he does not."³

The policy has received valuable illustration in Leicester. Leicester has many beds usually waiting empty for small pox patients. Some of these wards therefore have been utilised for phthisical people. Many of the cases were received in a late stage, nevertheless the majority improved very noticeably, and 85 per cent. gained in weight. Dr. Millard's conclusions however are: If consumption is to be cured, *i.e.*, permanently arrested, the case must be taken early; must have the benefit of long treatment; the patient

¹ Dr. Kelynack in "Charities Register" 1906, p. ccii.; cf. Report on the Health of Brighton for 1906, by Dr. Newsholme, p. 76.

² Cf. Bardswell, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

³ Webb, "Paupers and Old Age Pensions," 1907, pp. 8-9.

must thereafter secure some suitable outdoor occupation.' These conclusions may perhaps form the basis of a new municipal health policy in no very distant future.

I do not propose to give any exhaustive account of this new work; and the municipal ideal which it suggests will come up again presently; but reference must be made to the full and pregnant teaching contained in Mr. Niven's Report to the Health Committee of Manchester.

Given 3,000 cases of the disease, required to determine what amount of hospital accommodation is available and what is required. There are 552 beds available, but mostly in the workhouse. In regard to the need, it is shewn that "a very large number cannot be properly treated at home and are unable to work;" for these patients 100 beds would do valuable work and 200 would go far to meet the need. But the patient rarely leaves the sanatorium cured. "If he resumes his former occupation, which is often beyond his strength and not infrequently is directly injurious, he goes back rapidly." The problem is not easy, but if "taken up with a determination to succeed" is not insoluble.

"The second difficulty is to secure adequate support for his wife and family while the breadwinner is disabled. If we are to arrest tuberculosis within a reasonable period this will have to be reconsidered. Privation powerfully assists the progress of tubercular infection. "Attention to this most pressing need would greatly aid in the diminution of disease, which fastens on neglected and ill-nourished children." "A fund for the sustenance of families invaded by phthisis might usually be raised by the Public Authority."²

The doctrine of civic responsibility and of common concerted action is here pressed home very closely, and the city has not yet risen to the height of the argument. She too has opened wards for consumptives in empty small pox hospitals, and she countenances, (I know not how far she

¹ Report Leicester for 1905, pp. 85-6; cf. introductory chapter by Sir William Broadbent, in "The Consumptive Working Man," by Dr. Bardswell, 1906.

² Niven, *op. cit.* pp. 10, 164, 168-173. Cf. Bardswell, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

heads) a public official who tells her so clearly and coolly of the tasks which she ought to be discharging. We have in the report a most instructive conspectus of the work to be done. Should Manchester decide to respond to the appeal it would not be the first time she has given a lead in matters for institutions promoting public and private health. Some day her industrial and climatic condition may be as deserving of high commendation as was the remedial work of Dr. Percival four generations ago, or that of others who have served the city in later years.

I I I.

These three types of action are quite inco-ordinate. There lies the essential fault of our present arrangements. The problem is one of the gravest national significance: it is in the widest sense a national calamity, and it is to a preponderant degree a social product. Imagine that once in an exceptional way 41,000 persons were thus swept off—800 people a week, 300 young men and women in the flower of their age, dying every week for one stricken year of panic—the country, dazed for an instant by the suddenness of the blow, would yet recoil in horror from the levy of this exorbitant tax of its most precious members, as if swept off by bashibazouks of disease.

But it happens every year, and is therefore taken as a matter of course.

This perennial mischief must be opposed by a public power if opposition is to be successful. What proportion of the 120,000 need hospital treatment and for how long a time? The answer will determine fairly precisely what hospital building we ought to undertake. It will not be beyond the skill of our statisticians to discover what family support is needed. To what end have we Statesmen except that we may ask them at our need such a question as this—what work can these people do with safety? Should not the Statesman indeed, when we have found him, reply to us; your question is idle because it is too narrow; the real question is this, how to match work's stint to man's power?

The question is too narrow so long as it applies only to those who are fallen. Find right work for the partly restored consumptive; let his conditions be conditions of Health, and his wage one upon which he can live. "To cure a consumptive with disease only in its earlier stages, it is necessary for the individual to live at the highest possible level of physiological fitness for a very long time; how long it is difficult to say; but 12 months is certainly within the mark." "No employment, however healthy and open-air its character is suitable, unless the income a man can earn at it brings him in a sufficient sum for his proper maintenance."¹

But it is still more fitting to seek right work and healthy conditions before the man has sickened. Thus the study of the one issue involved in a single disease brings us back to the largest prophetic hope of the age. To match work's stint to man's power is really the large hope of democracy implied in all social struggle and movement.²

In our present ill-organized world of industry this idea is not prominent. The man must match the job or take the consequences. That is inevitable in so far as this generation of men must prove equal to its social task. But the progress of civilization has given us the possibility if we choose to use it of taking forethought and so securing some suitability of the youth for his life's work. We do not use the power much; boys and girls too for that matter are mostly left to take their chance.

There are however indications of a more wisely ordered future. We have officials known as Certifying Surgeons. They have rather elastic though not very wide powers to refuse a child a certificate for a trade peculiarly unfitted to it. The power does not last long, nor as I say reach far, but it is capable of indefinite extension, and might become applicable to the question now under discussion.

¹ Bardswell, *op. cit.*, p. 140-1.

² Dr. Bardswell's experience of the difficulty of obtaining employment sufficiently healthy and well-paid for the consumptive in the open labour market, has caused him to give favourable consideration to the possibility of farm colonies for this class, worked somewhat on the lines of Hadleigh, and providing useful work on a non-commercial basis. See *op. cit.* p. 150.

To sum up :—consumption, we have seen, results from the unnecessarily evil conditions of an industry, as of the tin miner. Sometimes the craft itself is perhaps essentially dangerous, as of the potter. In that case, if the trade is deemed a socially necessary one, two principles ought to regulate it. It must be rendered as innocuous as possible, and it must be prohibited to those who are specially predisposed to suffer from its effects. Those who tend towards phthisis ought not to be allowed in certain trades. These same persons who die thus prematurely might under healthy conditions not only live, but live sound and healthy lives.

This principle is susceptible of very wide application and its adoption as a working rule of life would seem to require much more perfectly organised industrial society than the existing one. But I have already tracked this question to the point where it is reaching the broad highway of social philosophy, and must leave it there. It is impossible to begin at inebriety or tuberculosis or any other of these deleterious poisons of our social body corporate, without reaching in the end the profoundest quest of all—the search for the Social Good.

Note.—In connection with the subject discussed in the last two pages, the following may be interesting :—

“After a discussion on fatigue at the International Congress of Hygiene, Berlin, Sept., 1907, the following resolution was passed: Since the capability for work varies not only individually according to the constitution, age, sex, and mode of life, but also in the same individual at different periods of life, a permanent skilled control must be kept in all manual or intellectual industries, including business occupations, and also occupations in which workmen are exposed to special dangers: this should be carried out in such a way that a proper allowance would be made for the individual capacity for work.” (Oliver, “Diseases of Occupation,” 1907, p. 12. n.)—Ed.

CHAPTER XVII.

PUBLIC HEALTH.

WE have studied the origin of the General Board of Health in an earlier chapter, and have there seen that while it was a Department of State its *personnel* was entirely constituted of persons appointed as philanthropists. In this form, as the working of philanthropy within the State, it was unstable and passed away, but only to become recognised for what it really was—a new and integral part of social politics. On this question of origin it is not necessary to linger any longer. Although the story of the evolution of the Health Department is full of instruction I shall pass it rapidly by, because what is of the first concern for us now is to discuss its present function, and especially an enlargement of its scope of action which is continuously going forward, and which might at any time become so rapid and radical as to attract general attention. The argument of the present chapter is that Public Hygiene is a much more comprehensive conception than is popularly understood. Here again the State only carried to its logical conclusion a truth long since proclaimed by philanthropy. The health of the individual is a social concern and responsibility.

A brief account of the relation of the present chapter to the last but one, will serve to define the range of the present discussion. In the chapter on the Hospital we reached our conclusion through an analysis of the facts of the social environment of hospital service. Here we are to proceed by an analysis of a concept, that of Public Health, and we have to enquire what services are involved in the idea of a public department for the promotion of

social hygiene. We concluded in favour of corporate responsibility for the hospitals as a matter of practical convenience and efficiency. We are now concerned with a matter of social logic, and the question we have to answer is, whether, when the idea of Public Health has once been established, it is possible to maintain the distinction between public and private medicine. The function of the Public Health Department is primarily preventive. But is there any rigid distinction between prevention and cure? Or will it not rather prove to be the case that "treatment," cure, private medicine, is a real and essential even if subordinate branch of public or preventive hygiene?

I.

That the best way to improve the health of the individual is to improve the hygienic condition of his surroundings is a momentous discovery, and one without which the modern great town would have been an impossibility. It can hardly be described as a modern discovery, because the principle was known to the ancients and affected both habits and legislation. Of this fact we are impressively reminded if we contemplate the relics or the records of the baths and water supply of the Moors of Spain, or the remains of the sewers, the *thermae*, and the aqueducts of Ancient Rome. But if not a modern discovery, it must certainly be admitted to be a recent re-discovery. During the centuries in which the barbarians were making modern Europe they had no time or energy to keep either themselves or their dwellings clean.¹ It was not indeed until the 18th Century was well advanced that thought was turned to the elements of modern sanitation, and even when the modern science had begun to attract attention the early experiments were surprisingly naive. Thus for example the York Charitable Society in 1807 expended £2 13s. 9d. on whitewash. "£2 13s. 9d. for white-wash-

¹ See Sir John Simon's "English Sanitary Institutions" for a most interesting account of the lapse of the sanitary idea during the Middle Ages, and its revival after the Renaissance.

ing a cathedral city speaks of no very high ideal and accounts for no very vigorous practice. The gratuitous provision of a few pails of white-wash may seem an anticlimax Nevertheless the most significant discovery was implicit in this first dim recognition that the care of the sick remains idle until unnecessary causes of disease have been cut off The discovery of whitewash is the most hopeful fact in the philanthropic history of the (18th) century, just because it points to future methods of a constructive corporate organisation of health."¹

That discovery is at the root of our whole modern science and practice of public hygiene, and the far reaching nature of its effects may be set forth in a very homely illustration. Conditions affect practice and that in virtue of the French sociologists law of Imitation, a law which in the special instance of the "bell wether" may be regarded as belonging less to sociology than to proverbial wisdom.²

It would be a very interesting statistical enquiry to discover how many windows out of 1,000 are open (a) in summer days and (b) in winter nights, then how much open they were, how nearly they approximate to the carefully calculated "crack at the top" or to the reckless "wide open" of the sanitary crank. Knowledge of the number of yards which in a mile of windows are open at a given time would give us a priceless insight into the habits and characters of the people. If the results of this investigation could next be compared with the number of yards which in a mile of windows were open a generation ago we should have a delicate test of the thoroughness with which the sanitary idea is affecting "common sense." Unfortunately no such statistics have been collected, and in practice the enquiry would need to be much more complicated. We should need to watch several miles of windows in all sorts of weathers, and the result might be to reveal a true class distinction of some sociological importance. But even in

¹ See "History of English Philanthropy," pp. 151-2.

² A friend once offered a preacher the following as a text "God shut the door Noah opened the window," Genesis, chaps. vii. and viii.

the absence of precise numerical data everybody knows that more windows in Liverpool were open on the 1st January, 1907, than on the 1st January, 1857.¹

The change is largely due to the power of imitation, and is also to be explained from the growing understanding of the influence of conditions (fresh air) on character (cheerful temper). We contrast the beautiful airiness of the modern hospital with the stuffiness of earlier institutions and quite rightly. Our fathers did not understand how the mere increase of numbers alters the problem, so that what holds good for two is futile for one hundred patients; the difference between a sick room and a ward is only revealed by experience. But they did try to get "alternate windows" open and so obtain ventilation. To open hospital windows (or their equivalents) is good, but the full value is only gained when the open window is worked into the patient's mind, and as a consequence the windows of the house are also opened. And the same thing is true throughout.

The value of the discovery that healthy conditions are the prime requisite for health is incalculably great. It leads in the first place to obvious measures of public hygiene: but that is not half of its real effect, for by degrees the habit of the new conditions forms a basis for new ideas, desires and resolves. The first function is the more direct and has been most studied: the less immediate influence is still more considerable. The public health department to which we owe in the first place better drainage and ventilation, a purer and ampler water supply and other goods of this order, is found in the long run to be not only an institution but a preacher of health.²

¹ Mr. Rowntree had 2,480 houses in York observed in the middle of a September night, the outside temperature being 50 Fahr. Only the fronts of houses were inspected. Of the best class of houses, 10 per cent. had a window or windows open. Of the second class, only 5 per cent., of the poorest class only 3 per cent. "Poverty," by Seebohm Rowntree, p. 175.

² A study of the public health department is incomplete if it does not include a chapter on "The Bureau as Agitator." See the Reports of the Medical Officers of the more progressive cities, such as Liverpool, Leicester, Manchester, etc.

I I.

We must now examine more closely the nature of the modern re-discovery of the importance of hygiene.

The science of public health is a result of the perception that the cure of the sick must remain an idle practice until unnecessary causes of disease have been cut off. But there is a complementary truth which has not been sufficiently recognised, namely that among these unnecessary causes, one of the most prolific is the actual and untended disease of individuals. In the single instance of zymotics the truth of course is acted upon. A case of infectious fever is a menace to a whole neighbourhood, and accordingly public provision is made for the treatment and isolation of scarlet fever. The notifiable diseases are considered less as private inconveniences than as public perils, and the social mischief resulting from a single neglected case is only too bitterly understood. What we all know in general, and what sanitary authorities are familiar with in detail, is strikingly illustrated for the student by such reports as those of "two nests of fatal cases" with their accompanying maps by Mr. James Niven.¹

In diseases of this class it is found impossible to observe a rigid distinction between prevention and cure. That fact is the basis of our official practice, and explains the Isolation and Fever Hospital Acts, and the Notification of Diseases Acts. Now what is so obviously true in these instances is a truth of a very much wider application. The difference between prevention and cure, or let us say between public and private medicine, is sufficiently broad until we begin to analyse it. But the moment we subject the apparent distinction to examination it will appear to be not by any means so important as we had supposed. There is a limit at which the two are indistinguishable. Public hygiene is at every point concerned with the fate of private individuals, and the private practitioner is a necessary member of the staff of public health officials.

¹ Report of the Health of the City of Manchester for 1905, pp. 153. ff.

Prevention and cure cannot be separated, because cure is also a means of prevention; and the supreme health authority of any community is incompletely equipped until it is enabled to take cognisance of cases of disease as well as of conditions of health. This does not necessarily imply that all private practice ought to be under the immediate direction and control of the Medical Officer of Health of the City, but it does emphasise the *public function* of the medical practitioners and suggests the necessity for a closer co-ordination of the "private" doctor with the public health department. This necessity is already much more fully recognised by the medical profession than by the general public.

We have referred to the notifiable diseases. Now this notification is carried beyond the legal bond by voluntary agreement between several of the health authorities and the medical men within their area. This applies chiefly to phthisis, but could easily be extended to other and indeed all diseases. Local authorities can, with the consent of the Local Government Board, extend the list of notifiable diseases. In various places it has been made to include measles, whooping cough, chicken pox, and in Dover for a time, influenza. Voluntary notification might well be extended to summer diarrhoea.

At the same time it must be remembered that "voluntary" notification is only a second best. Its value lies in the recognition on the part of medical men for a great extension of the sphere of public health work. But if it is good it ought to be firmly and officially organised.

There is one serious limit to the utility of notification as at present understood. Certain diseases a doctor must notify, and others by voluntary arrangement some doctors do notify. But they can only do this when they have been called in to a case. No machinery¹ exists whereby disease can be detected until the friends of the patient have summoned a doctor to treat him. This is a grave fault in our system of public hygiene. *The undetected and untended sickness of private persons is a dangerous menace to the*

¹ Unless the health visitors interpret their duty to include such action.

public safety. The mischief may be traced along two main lines. (I) That of economic dislocation. In the case of a breadwinner there is a temporary and indeed frequently permanent abatement in his "breadwinning" capacity. If the patient is child or mother a fresh burden is thrown on the wage worker's resources. In either case the ratio between earnings and necessary expenditure is altered adversely to the family interests. Before the outset of the disease it was hard to make both ends meet and afterwards it becomes impossible. We may distinguish several types differing in their intensity. (1) A doctor is called in who orders nourishing diet. But nourishing diet is a costly and unattainable luxury. The patient takes his medicine but goes without the extra quantity or quality of food which would assist his convalescence. He gets better, well enough that is to be about his work again, but he does not recover his former tone, power and resisting capacity. This briefly is the history of innumerable weakened lives.

But (2) there is a worse case. The impaired family earnings do not suffice even to pay the modest fee of the poor man's doctor. The patient lacks both invalid diet and skilled advice. He must drag himself back to health or as near it as he can. A great deal of nonsense has been written about the "abuse of the out patient department" as though working class people were in the habit of rushing off to the hospital on next to no pretext as it were for the fun of the thing. A small percentage of cases no doubt could afford to pay a doctor, and a few others may be ill in imagination only. But everyone who knows anything about a poor district is aware that a much more serious evil is that people generally do not apply to doctor, dispensary, or hospital until they are obliged, but that on the contrary they are apt to delay it "as long as they possibly can—too often until they are no longer able to continue at work."¹

This is no fancy danger. There is always looming up Seebohm Rowntree's 10 per cent. of primary poverty. Some of this class go to the out-patient department (if, as is

¹ Millard, Report on . . . Leicester for 1905, p. 86.

not always the case, there is one within reach); much larger numbers simply try to rub along without any medical assistance whatever. The low stamina of a multitude of the poorer classes is due to this habit, which has a serious reaction on the public safety. *In some form or other society must bear the cost.* The patient may become dependent on charity or on the poor law. Or the evil may be less obvious and direct. Low stamina means poor work. The most serious type of this reaction is to be found in the home. We allow the physique of the mother to be impaired by disease, and then marvel that her house is less clean and neat than another where a house-parlourmaid is kept. There is much reason to suppose that a low state of health favours the spread of epidemics, and this causes untold suffering and waste of life and energy.¹

Social inefficiency has for one of its most potent causes neglected disease. There are no statistics on this point so far as I am aware, and it would be difficult to obtain such. It is only possible to appeal to common knowledge and observation.

Dr. Southwood Smith wrote in 1844 that "the ability of the labouring classes to maintain themselves is very materially diminished by the disease and weakness generated by the conditions in which they live." He pointed out that their moral character and energy were lessened in consequence of suffering from fever, etc. "The poison generated in these neglected districts produces depressing effects both on body and mind."² Sir Sydney Waterlow has stated his opinion that "in sickness it is far better to help the working man than to compel him, by making him pay for medical relief, the sooner to drift on the parish. Any difficulty that was placed in the way of enabling the poorer and working people to obtain medical relief promptly would result in their putting it off"; and they might "drift into a condition in which it would be very difficult to restore them to a state in which they could continue their

¹ See Dr. Niven's Report on Manchester for 1905, p. 120, and his quotation from Dr. Ballard, p. 111.

² First Report Health of Towns Commission, 1844, pp. 10-12.

work."¹ *The department of public health is incomplete until it includes some power of preventing the unfitness which results from untended disease.*

2. We have now to study a second series of facts which are if anything more serious in their menace to the public safety. They are also rather obscure and outside of our available statistical knowledge.

It is known generally that people begin to go under as a result of the illness of their parents. It is not necessary to enter into any vexed question of heredity. Quite apart from inherited disease children suffer enormously from the previous illness of their parents. This illness may belong to the period of the child's lifetime or may go back into the early years of the parents' youth.

Thus, *e.g.*, we are told that "many disorders, particularly those that run a chronic course produce a series of changes in the body which result from the activity of existing disease. The individual during the whole period of the continuance of the disorder is not in a healthy reacting state, and consequently does not respond to the surrounding environment in a manner similar to other individuals who are not so suffering. . . . The more carefully the influence of disease on any individual organism is studied, the more certain must be the conclusion of the investigator as to the permanently modified state of that individual organism as a result of that disease. Most acute fevers protect more or less completely the individual throughout life from further attacks, therefore some changes in the individual's tissues must have resulted, otherwise no protection would have been secured."²

We put aside such questions as for instance whether a parent will or will not be likely to transmit rickets to his or her offspring. However that may be, a woman with a diathesis of rickets will quite certainly to that extent be a less efficient mother. Every lingering trace of an imperfectly cured disease impairs the powers of shielding

¹ Lords' Committee on Hospitals, 1891, Minutes of Evidence.

² Lionel Taylor, "Aspects of Social Evolution," pp. 101-2 and 114.

the offspring from adverse influence, and therefore increases the likelihood of the child contracting actual and acute illness. Cure of disease is said to be a matter of private medicine, but the prompt and effectual cure of the individual of one generation acts as prevention of the spread of disease among the individuals of the succeeding generation. Cure and prevention, private and public hygiene cannot be separated.

It was a great discovery when men learnt that the best means of saving the individual was to modify his environment. But important as is this truth it is only a partial one and needs to be supplemented. An essential part of the task of preventing future disease consists in the due treatment of actual ailments. This is most obviously the case with infectious diseases, but the social peril of non-infectious disease is also a real and serious one. Dr. Bardswell has pointed out the unsoundness of the argument that tuberculosis can be attacked better by means of sanitary improvements for prevention of disease than by sanatoria for its cure. "The truth is, we need both these weapons to cope successfully with tuberculosis, *viz.* : sanitary science mainly as a means of prevention, and sanatoria chiefly for the treatment of the individual consumptive, though these at the same time are no small aids to prevention," the patients being carefully instructed in such hygienic and self-controlled habits as will hinder the spread of their complaint.¹

It is practically impossible, as physicians in the public service are continually finding out, to distinguish between prevention and curative work, *e.g.*, even the most definitely "preventive" work, such as the removal of refuse from the neighbourhood of human habitations, while it undoubtedly tends to "prevent" healthy persons falling sick, is also a most material aid towards the "cure" of those who are diseased. On the other hand, the "cure," or successful treatment of ill-health, tends to "prevent" further disease in the patient, and, in the case of communicable diseases, in other persons also.

¹ Bardswell, *op. cit.* p. 174.

In the case of certain diseases, if the condition is recognised early, and the patient induced to submit to suitable treatment, the symptoms that really constitute ill-health may be held in abeyance for a considerable period. The really distinctive feature of the medical work of the sanitary authority is not that it is preventive as opposed to curative, but that it is educational.

III.

If then there is no rational distinction between Public and Private medicine, it is equally true that in practice the distinction is breaking down. And obviously the process must be such that the functions of private practice will continue to be drawn into the sphere of public administration. Obviously, we say, because there can be no question of ceding any territory once annexed by social hygiene. There is indeed a political element in all private practice. It has been largely overlooked and neglected, but it begins to assert itself not only as an element but as the decisive one. The process is certainly due much more to the logic of events than to the logic of thought. Public health comes to include private practice not because of any such clear-cut theory as would be held suspect, but owing to considerations of practical convenience. The Medical Officer of Health finds it impossible to discharge his statutory obligations without trenching on a sphere which used to be left to the medical practitioner and the philanthropist.

Some instances of this process will serve to confirm the theoretical judgment obtained in the earlier part of this chapter. They will also illustrate some very far-reaching changes which our social structure is undergoing, the significance of which is perhaps not generally appreciated. It would be easy so to arrange the evidence as to suggest that this quiet revolution has gone much further than is really the case. The measures which we are now to consider cover a good deal of ground, but they are for the most part experiments which have been

initiated only in a few of the more progressive boroughs, and have not been generally adopted throughout the country. They are in the nature of extensions of the Public Health Acts. So far from being compulsory they can hardly be described as optional enactments. They rather bear the character of ingenious enlargements of the law. Not that I would suggest that any of them are illegal; but some of them undoubtedly go beyond the thoughts of the authors of the Acts under which they are administered.

We have traced in an earlier chapter the growth of the Inspectorate. Now inspection is undergoing an interesting development which may be described as a movement from the inspection of *things* to the inspection of *persons*. We have long been accustomed to the inspection of factories; but the examination of children and young people by the Certifying Surgeon is more modern. The inspection of houses has a history behind it; the examination of babies is still a scarcely recognised extension of the right of public authority to enter the private dwelling-house.

Curiously enough this substitution of the infant for the house as the object of interest coincides pretty closely with the appointment of female sanitary officials. Women are generally credited with a greater aptitude than men for appreciating the individual instances and the personal aspect of things; to enter a room and ignore the existence of the baby is perfectly easy to the man, but quite unnatural for the woman. It is permissible therefore to suggest that the growing influence of women in public work and their indirect personal influence as C.O.S. workers, district visitors, infirmary visitors, etc., has a great deal to do with this shifting of interest from the thing to the person. But it must also be observed that there is another side to this. We have long recognised the political importance of houses, we are coming to understand the political meaning of the child.

“A good deal of the time of the (female) Inspectors has been occupied in visiting houses where births have occurred, the total number of such visits being no less than 23,391.”

“ Another important branch of the work is the visitation of school children suffering from ringworm . . . and such like ailments. . . The Inspector calls at the house and sees the child, and gives such advice as may appear to be necessary, and in most cases tries to induce the parent to obtain medical assistance when necessary.”¹

The introduction of medical inspection of school children represents exactly the same change, and results from a perception of the same truth. It is idle to inspect places, and ensure the ventilation of buildings, unless you do something more. The school-house ought to be hygienic for the sake of the school-children, and the most perfect drainage is wasted if the children are unhealthy. Accordingly we have a more or less sufficient medical staff for some of our schools. This is an extension of the earlier conception of public hygiene, but is seen to be inevitably involved in it. A healthy school is naught without healthy scholars.²

But just as inspection of places was incomplete without inspection of persons, so also *mere inspection* of persons is of little worth. We would add that if the inspector be a woman such a restriction is almost impossible. When the Female Sanitary Inspector goes to a house she gives such advice as “ may appear to be necessary,” and she does so both because she is a woman and because it is her official business to do so. This giving of advice represents a new function the importance of which may easily be overlooked, but can hardly be exaggerated. At first there is only an inspector of *things* empowered to demand the observance of certain rules. Action in regard to things is limited in extent, and it might be possible for the legislator to foresee all that should need to be done. But action in regard to persons is illimitable in range and infinitely delicate. It would be absurd to limit the function of the

¹ Report of Medical Officer for Liverpool for 1905, p. 88 and p. 89, cf. the work of the Health Visitors in Manchester and other places, as well as that of the Female Sanitary Inspectors now working in many towns, and in parts of the county of Warwickshire, etc.

² For the organisation of medical inspection of school children see “ Report on Medical Inspection and Feeding of Children ” (C. 2779, 1905), pp. 1-32.

inspectors of infants to any statutory schedule. Two women and a baby are beyond the philosophy of the Parliamentary draftsman. The real business is not so much to tell the mother what she *must* do as to advise her as to what she *can* and *should* do.

But the public authority as adviser is usurping the most useful function of the private physician, and even a cursory study of public health administration startles us by the amount of advice to persons which it is coming to include in the more progressive towns. It may be advice by public proclamation as against the evils of alcohol, or spitting in the streets; or by printed health leaflets distributed in the homes; or by health teaching in Mothers' Meetings or schools; or it may take the more specialised form of oral teaching from Inspector to mother. But when we put all these together we discover an ideal towards which our best Medical Officers of Health are approximating. The Health Department is on the way to become the chief *consulting physician to the community*.

The best modern Health Departments go beyond general advice to the special and precise instruction which is embodied in "the prescription." The Certifying Surgeon is giving something very like a prescription when he tells the boy he cannot go to the factory till he is bigger and stronger, and when he adds a parting word, "use dumb-bells." But we need not stop at any use of the word so loose as this. The phthisical patient at Brighton receives precise instructions how to act, sleep, live and behave so as not to be a nuisance to his friends and to himself. The mothers who use the Municipal Milk Depot receive instruction how to use the milk. In fact the mere form of bottle in which it is sold is a prescription. "The milk is supplied in baskets of 9, 7 or 6 bottles, each bottle containing sufficient for one feed, according to the age of the child."¹ These are elementary instances of powers which are becoming more complex and considerable

¹ For further particulars and some account of the history of these depots see Report by Dr. Millard, M.O.H. for Leicester, 1904, and cf. G. F. McCleary, "Infant Milk Depots," and F. Lawson Dodd, "Problem of the Milk Supply."

every day. The sanitary authorities carry on the treatment of disease in (1) Fever Hospitals; (2) Lunatic Asylums; (3) Sanatoria for tuberculosis; (4) Municipal Accident Wards (*viz.* at Barry and Widnes); (5) many authorities supply anti-toxin free to doctors; (6) under the Cleansing of Persons Act, 1897, they undertake the treatment of persons suffering from pediculosis and scabies. The Croydon Education Authority treats ringworm in school-children. The Metropolitan Asylums Board treats ringworm and ophthalmia. In Manchester and some other towns, anti-diarrhoea medicine is supplied in the hot summer months.

The further we proceed in our analysis of the conception of public health which is being formulated piecemeal to meet needs as they occur, by the leaders of public hygiene, the more intimate we find the relation becomes between public authority and private person. So much so that at this point we may fairly introduce a new term and one which will bring out more clearly the large extent of private practice which is involved in public hygiene. We have to deal now with the relation of the Medical Officer of Health to his patients.

A considerable amount of medical *treatment* is given under the health authority. And this is not primarily for the sake of the individual; but results from the discovery that cure may be the truest prevention. To this thought we owe the very valuable new practice initiated by Dr. Newsholme at Brighton whereby phthisical patients are treated in the borough hospital.¹ By the co-operation of district nursing associations it has been possible for medical officers to secure the services of skilled nurses in the homes of patients. These measures are quite outside the poor law. There is no suspicion or taint of "Charity" about them. They proceed from a truer understanding of the nature of social life and of the political element latent even in the most private affairs. Treatment in a fever isolation hospital, or advice given by the health visitor to a young mother, does not "pauperise." The

¹ See above, chapter xvi. (Tuberculosis).

essential character of these and other services rendered by the health authority is that they are rendered in the interest of the community rather than in that of the particular individual; thus a healthy sense of social obligation is set up, not to create nuisances, not to cause injury to others, etc., which results in better habits of life altogether.

Some earlier and more definitely legal illustrations of this inability of public health action to steer clear of private treatment are afforded by the Vaccination Acts and the measures for disinfection of clothes and houses.

So much for actual experiments. Inspection without advice is idle; advice without prescription is incomplete; prescription without treatment is a mockery. And now we come to the critical problem of social economics. We have seen that to a quite limited extent the community does in a perfectly honourable fashion support consumptive patients in hospital, with board and lodging as well as with medical treatment. And that is as far I believe as our actual practice goes; but it is by no means far enough. We might at this point rely on an argument derived from the first principles of politics. Unfortunately my countrymen are shy of first principles, and it will be more serviceable to show how very pressing is the practical problem of the support of the families of those who are sick. Mr. James Niven discusses this question in a recent report. "A fund for the sustenance of families invaded by phthisis might usefully be raised by the public authority . . . the sums now expended for this vital need are inadequate for the purpose aimed at, and require to be greatly increased."

Such a suggestion as this is very far-reaching, and we may be sure it does not find its way into an official report without the most urgent reasons. What is here said of phthisis holds good of many other forms of disease. One of the best methods of preventing its spread is to cure actual sufferers. But it is foolish to cure the one sick member of a family unless you also guard against the spread of ill-health among the family at large.

Public Health beginning with things and places has

been driven to consider and deal with persons and is coming to regard families. It is bound to do this at peril of neglecting the vital interests of the community at large.

IV.

We are thus brought by two lines of enquiry to a single conclusion. There is no logical dividing line between public and private medicine, because public health is not something which can exist apart from healthy individuals. The two cannot in practice be kept apart, and accordingly public administration is increasingly concerned with the conditions of individual persons.

The urgent problem of public health at the present time is to ensure the prompt and thorough treatment of all disease. Sickness and accident must no longer be allowed to break down the integrity of family and social life. The needs of the case are not met by the free play of competition. We ought not any longer to leave these matters to adjust themselves as between medical practitioners who live by what they can get, and patients who often die for lack of means to secure proper treatment, or who, as is more frequently the case, linger on in impaired health.

In some way or other society should place adequate medical treatment within the reach of every individual. It would carry us too far to discuss the particular methods which might be adopted. It is evident that they must not be "deterrent," on the lines of the present Poor Law. They might approximate to the sick insurance laws of the German Empire or they might frankly nationalise the whole medical service so that every medical man would be recognised for what he really is—a public functionary.

But whatever the method the end is clear enough,—medical advice and treatment together with the requisite nursing and nourishment should be within reach of all. When once that provision were made, the State might fairly insist that people should avail themselves of these means of restoration to health. The necessity for compulsion might sometimes arise, but as a

rule the provision of the means would suffice, because most people do not wish to remain uncured. Whether they wish it or not, however, uncured individuals are a menace to public health which society cannot safely tolerate. We are coming more and more to recognise that, as an almost forgotten writer told us about 60 years ago, "the Sanitary principle of anticipating the development of disease—of preventing those permanent lesions which result from neglected casualty and of quickly restoring the sufferer to his previous condition of capability for work—is proved to be wholly irreconcilable with the Poor Law principle of withholding relief except in cases of destitution." "Who would not rejoice to escape from the Stygian regions of pauperism and disease? 'superasque evadere ad auras,' into the upper air and fresh breezes of Hygeia There are much higher functions of a preventive nature than those of a mere "public informer" which the district medical officer ought to perform. He should become the sanitary adviser of the poor in their dwellings he [should] be in a peculiar sense, the Missionary of Health in his own parish or district—instructing the working classes in personal and domestic hygiene—and practically proving to the helpless and debased, the disheartened and disaffected, that the State cares for them—a fact of which, until of late, they have seen but little evidence."

† Rumsey, "Essays in State Medicine," (1856), pp. 190, 277, 282.

CHAPTER XVIII.

WIDOW AND ORPHAN.

THIS and the following chapter will be found to strain against the extreme limits set by the plan of the present book. We have hitherto been engaged almost entirely with abnormal groups, and have avoided the vexed economic questions which affect the standing army of labour in its constant and typical interests. It is doubtful whether the position of widow and orphan ought to be described as abnormal, although it is certainly one full of anomalies in our present social system. On that account therefore, and in order to expose this anomalous condition, it has to be included in our discussion. Further, the "widow and orphan" have historically provided one of the leading motives of christian charity, and they still raise a warm philanthropic interest. Moreover they are the subject of a great deal of quasi-philanthropic care on the part of the State.

This quasi-philanthropy is singularly inappropriate in their case, and discussion of the confusion of thought upon which it rests will afford strong support for our principal argument, namely that the public treatment of distress is not in reality a matter of charity at all, but is a proper political function. In arriving at this result we shall not be able to avoid trenching on some important questions as to industrial structure generally, and shall accordingly be enabled to illustrate the close connection between the goal of philanthropy and the starting point of social politics.

I.

Society is based on the theory of a family-wage earner. There are many men who are unable to secure such a

wage. But the adult male worker is supposed to be earning enough to support the family group. If he fails to do so it is admitted that something is wrong. The defect may be sought in the man, or in the order of society, or it may be attributed to the impossibility of exact adjustment of supply and demand, or the question may be burked by an appeal to the perfect results which will issue "in the long run." Certain maladjustments do exist, however beautiful our present system may be supposed to be. So much is conceded even by the school of "wilful optimists."

The Socialist views the same facts in a different light, and urges that the disharmonies are so intense and are matters of such every day frequency, as to prove a thorough-going condemnation of the capitalistic organisation of industry.

That is a controversy which we may here pass by. It is not necessary at present, at any rate, to enquire whether the industrial world is radically at fault in respect of adult male labour.¹ The theory that the adult male ought to earn and can earn a family wage is certainly subject to grave qualifications, but if it be untrue, then the society which is based upon it is unjust. I leave on one side any consideration as to how far the theory corresponds to the facts. *If* the sober and industrious adult male can always and everywhere gain by his labour such subsistence for a family as suffices for its needs, then *so far as the adult male is concerned*, there does not seem to be ground for flagrant complaint or revolutionary change.

So much for the man. Now as to the woman we encounter a different doctrine. Broadly speaking woman's wage is never a family wage, but a wage for individual subsistence only. Here again there is a question which goes to the root of our social theory, and concerns the economic position of the standing army of female labour. There are so many *single* women that employers of labour are able to secure the services of women at the customary price of the spinster.

¹ Radically at fault our classical economists have certainly been in overlooking, as they practically have done, the fact that the social structure rests so largely on the toil of women and children.

The number of single women is large enough to ensure this disastrous result, because of the still larger crowd of married women, who being married are content to earn a *supplementary* wage. I put aside the economic question whether as a matter of fact the price of the spinster is large enough to sustain the unattached woman in a manner which is tolerable to society. And I put it aside not because of any doubt as to the answer, or because the response would present any difficulty. To mention but a few of the many recent publications on this subject is to recall the most terrible exposure of privation, and to demonstrate the reckless manner in which womanhood is being squandered in the labour market.¹ This consideration of the adequacy of women's wages to the support of single women is put aside here simply because it is immaterial to the argument. It may be admitted for purposes of argument that 7/- to 10/- a week for a factory girl, or 1d. to 2d. an hour for a home worker is enough for a single worker to live on as women ought to be able to live.

I offer then no proof that the wage of the male adult is insufficient as a family wage, or that the price of a woman will not buy enough tea and bread and millinery for a single woman. The theory is that the male can earn enough for a family, and the female enough for herself. But this theory, even if we accept it as correct, makes no allowance for the fact that every eighth woman is a widow.² Here then is the bitter anomaly for the widow's position in the economic sphere. As head of a family she ought to be able to earn a family wage; as woman she can only gain the customary price of individual subsistence.

In any system of competition among the owners of Capital for surplus value, and among workers for the privilege of toil, this anomalous situation of the widow will continue. It may be retorted that any system which

¹ e.g., "Women's Work in Birmingham," by Cadbury, Matheson and Shann; "Women in the Printing Trades," ed. by J. R. Macdonald; Pearson, Huggins and Company, Ltd., v. The Amalgamated Society of Tailors and Tailoresses; "Sweated Industry," by C. Black.

² Of Women over 20 there are, Unmarried, 2,931,733; Married, 5,692,145; Widowed, 1,246,316; total, 9,870,194. See Census Report, 1901.

provides for the adequate support of the widows and the orphans will be a virtual overthrow of our present social system. Perhaps it will be, but that in itself is not a fact which need trouble us. If the cure of the mischances of one order of society involves the adoption of a new social doctrine, all that that proves is that the faults of the old must be very serious.

So long as the anomaly continues, what attitude ought the State to adopt towards those who are the first sufferers? How ought it to bear itself towards these million and a quarter of widows and the children who are dependent on them? At the outset observe how completely the political aspect of this problem has been neglected. We have seen that the first step in the recognition of social responsibility is the assumption of the responsibility of knowing the facts. That is the meaning of statistics. Now the number of widows is known; the number of orphans is unknown. In regard to one of the most serious problems of modern civilization, *i.e.* the anomalous position of the widow and orphan, the State is so careless of its significance that it does not even afford us any information as to the extent of the problem. For we must not forget that just as the widow does not fit in to social theory, so neither does the orphan. The child is normally a dependent on some male family wage earner. But the child who has no support but a widowed mother must rely on one who, as the head of a family ought to earn a family wage, but who because she is a woman can only gain an individual customary subsistence. How many children are there dependent on this million and a quarter of widows? To that question there is no answer. Until the answer is forthcoming the extent of the widow and orphan problem is unknown, and until the data are forthcoming there is little likelihood of any adequate solution being adopted.

But society while far from recognising either the gravity or the nature of the case, has not entirely neglected the more obvious symptoms of distress, has indeed done something to alleviate the mischief. This social action divides

itself into two main branches. Society has pursued its philanthropic purpose by private activity, as in the orphanages, or by State action, through the Poor law. Something must be said under both of these headings, but it is well to observe that both the poor law and the benevolent misconceive the problem. Poor relief is granted, not in support of economic insecurity, but in relief of destitution. Charitable institutions minister to those who can command influence, or if they sweep in all with an equal humanity they are unable to prevent abuse of their charity. No remedy will satisfy the conditions unless it begins by recognising that widowhood and orphanhood are an anomalous circumstance in the world of competitive industry and commerce. It is not so much with the destitute widow and orphan as with the concept of the suffix "hood" that the Statesman has to deal. There is something in *widowhood* and *orphanhood* which tends to economic distress, and this tendency must be counteracted by a force really equal to the task which theoretically the dead husband and father had been expected to discharge. The man is the economic support of the normal family while he is alive, but once he is dead, the State ignores this, the theoretic basis of society, as entirely as if the man had had no economic function in the family at all. When the husband and father is removed the family is no longer a unit. It is broken up. From the side of private affection its unity cannot be restored by any public action. But as regards the economic aspect of the group—widow and orphans—it is quite possible to prevent disastrous results from the dislocation caused by death. At any rate social action ought to be directed towards securing their economic stability. We shall follow up this question when we have referred to the present provision made for widows and orphans, and seen how far these measures of private benevolence and quasi-charitable poor relief are from adequately meeting the needs of the case.

There are very few societies expressly for the relief of widows simply as such. The "Widows' Friend Society,"

founded 1808, has for its object "To assist widows endeavouring to help themselves, to obtain means to permanently support themselves and families. Grants made towards purchasing sewing machines, mangles, material, or goods for sale, or clothing to enable applicants to take situations, etc. In connection is a pension fund for 200 Christian widows of £6 each per annum."

The income of this society was in 1905 £2,245, the beneficiaries numbered 140.

Compare the Society for the Relief of Distressed Widows (1823), which has for its object the relief of widows of character within a certain radius of its office. Its income in 1905 was £930; numbers assisted 286.

There are of course a vast number of Societies which include the relief of widows and orphans with other objects, and of these funds it would be obviously impossible to estimate how much goes to these special classes.

The "Charities Register" (1907) says that many applicants for charitable relief belong to no clubs, but that the membership of friendly Societies is on the increase. Insurance for funeral expenses is gradually being superseded by insurance for some reasonable amount, such as £100 payable at death or after lapse of a certain period, as an "endowment." "Provision is thus made for widows." (Sec. xxxi). A large but unknown amount of assistance is no doubt obtained from missions during the early weeks of widowhood. Mr. Booth says¹ that a Poor Law medical officer complained to him of the little value of voluntary charity, which he found generally spasmodic and inadequate, and usually bestowed far too short a time to be of real Service. He instanced the case of widows with young children. "Churches, chapels, and the like intervene, and give a little help, and the widow struggles on for a time, receiving something one week and nothing the next. She and her children become gradually weaker (both morally and physically), through want of proper or sufficient food; and ultimately, broken down in health and destitute, she comes upon the parish. It would have been better had she

¹ "Religious Influences," Vol. VII., p. 412.

come at first." In another place, Mr. Booth further discusses the widow's position.

"Even now, most men's lives are insured to some extent; the immediately forlorn position of the wife and children they will leave behind readily fills their imagination. A distinct tendency towards the increase of this provision is shown by the readiness to join temporary 'sharing-out' Societies, as well as, and often in addition to, the permanent friendly societies and by the increase of insurance for small sums in the Prudential and other Companies. But whatever the amount be, it comes in a lump, and is in danger of being rapidly disbursed, so that the woman is destitute before she has had time to re-arrange her life. It would be far better if, beyond the actual sum needed for funeral and mourning, which is generally much less than is actually spent, the money should be made payable in weekly instalments spread over 12 months."¹

The Charities Register (1907 p. cxi.) deprecates insufficient casual charity to widows, and the attitude of the C.O.S. seems to be "that the best way of helping a widow and preventing pauperism in the rising generation is by taking some of her children off her hands, leaving her with only as many as she can properly support."² There appears here to be some degree of inconsistency with the Society's strong view in other connections of the harm and danger of "breaking up the home." Their policy is to give help in the direction of training the widow to be an efficient earner, and in many cases they favour and promote migration.³

The Benevolent Societies with their annuities and almshouses are chiefly for the relicts of the middle class—whose lot is not less trying—though also for some manual workers. These Societies have a higher social value than mere charity; they rest on a recognition of what is due from the prosperous to the unprosperous members of a professional solidarity.

¹ "Life and Labour," Final Volume (XVII.), p. 148-9.

² See A. M. Humphrey, "How to Help Widows," published by the C.O.S., p. 6.

³ See "Migration of Widows," by N. M., published by the C.O.S.

There are about 110 Benevolent Societies on the Charities' Register with say 10-15,000 beneficiaries.

There is, *e.g.* the Corn Exchange Benevolent Society for the relief of those who have been established as principals or clerks not less than 5 years in the corn, seed, oil-cake, hop, malt and flour trades and who have fallen into decay, their widows (during widowhood), fatherless children, and such other relations as are actually dependent. Membership £1 1s., Pensioners 57.

The London Coffee and Eating House Association (1837) grants "pensions to distressed aged members of the trade and their widows; also temporary relief to other persons of the trade, widows, orphans or families in distress. Subscriptions 10/6, Pensions 32. The London General Porters' Benevolent has 326 Pensions at 6/-, 8/-, or 10/-.

Orphans. There are many excellent schools where children are maintained and educated. One deduction must be made from the utility of these institutions. They are mostly voting charities, and accordingly orphanhood or want is not in itself a qualification for admission. The power of winning a contested election must be added. The voting system is discredited but still survives. It is therefore not wholly superfluous to recapitulate the arguments against a wasteful, foolish, and even cruel method. The benefits of an institution admission to which depends on votes, are not obtained by the most helpless and the most in need, but by those who have the largest number of influential friends. It has been observed that "the most in want are those who don't succeed, for they are the friendless." The expense, fatigue and anxiety consequent upon a contested election, still more so upon a succession of elections, is a cruel tax upon a necessitous invalid, or the distressed mother of fatherless children. People have been known "to walk their shoes off, almost, to obtain votes." Another evil is the deplorable waste of money and time on the part of the benevolent, who instead of combining

1 See "Voting Charities," published by the C.O.S. 1872. "The real evil at the root is not the Voting (bad as that is), but the existence of these rejected ones (say 9 out of 10, in 1872) for whom there is no help." (Author's MS. note.)

together for the good of the poor compete with one another that their especial poor may win and others lose.

However, when once the child is admitted to the orphanage the training is usually good and approximates to the ideals and prejudices which characterise the social class to which the children belonged. Such for instance are the Clergy Orphan Corporation, the Drapers Company's Schools, Wellington College for the sons of deceased officers in the Army, and many others.

Work is done for a poorer class by the Barnardo Homes. 1,206 boys were benefited by the Leopold Home in 1905, 723 by the Home for Working and Destitute Lads, and there are others. In the same year the Church of England Waifs and Strays Society had nearly 12,000 children in about a hundred homes. The voting system is not adopted by this Society. The 15-16,000 children provided for by these Societies include a large number of orphans but is not confined to them. We might probably guess the numbers thus provided for at 30-40,000 for the country. The Charities Register for 1907 p. cccxvi., estimates that the Homes for Children and Training Homes for Servants available for Londoners represent an income of 768,000, which includes many, but not all the provincial homes.

II.—More provision is made by the State through the poor law with its 100,000 or so of orphans in district schools, cottage and scattered homes, boarded out or in training ships and on out relief. Of this too it may be said that the work is excellent. The vicious old ideal of "relief and destitution" has given place to the more positive policy of developing the vital powers of the children.

As a new development, "a summer camp was arranged for the children chargeable to the West Derby Union and a site was formed near Formby. . . . One hundred girls and two hundred boys were under canvas for five weeks, and thoroughly enjoyed themselves. A great deal of freedom was given to the children, the country round offering many facilities for distant rambles, but the liberty was not abused."

¹ Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1905-6, p. 502.

But the number for whom adequate provision is made is much smaller than would appear from the total number relieved, namely, 239,903.

It is necessary to scrutinise this figure. Indoor relief accounts for 70,000, outdoor for 170,000.¹ Of the indoor children 40,775 are orphans or children relieved without their parents. To these must be added 8,781 boarded out children who belong to the same category, though they are classified as receiving out-relief.

These 49,556 children are properly provided for to this extent that they receive such training, care and nurture as the country wishes them to have. At its best the lot of these children is really good.

To this must be added 96,804 children of able-bodied widows and 10,345 orphans, etc., together with some fatherless children entered as of able or not able-bodied parents.

It is to be observed that by far the larger part of the poor law work for children is for orphans—about 50,000 provided for, and 107,000 on out-relief, as to whom society shirks its responsibility and compounds for its neglect by a grudging pittance or loaf of bread.

The 107,000 orphans in receipt of out-relief are a standing testimony to the social neglect of the problem, because the out-relief is rarely adequate to the proper maintenance of the child.

If to the indoor total we add the inmates of orphanages, we shall get a total of a good deal under 100,000 orphans maintained, together with rather more than another 100,000 children whose mothers, the able-bodied widows,² receive some weekly dole from the relieving officer. Now even if we regard these out-relieved orphans as being adequately assisted it is quite certain that the 200,000 are only a small part of the total orphaned children of the country, who by their orphanhood require a special social support. How many orphans depend on the million and a quarter widows we have no means of knowing; and

¹ *Ib.*, p. cxxxi.

² This only means widows between 16-65 years. They may be temporary or chronic invalids for all the official statistician cares.

therefore it is still less possible to tell what number are afflicted with severe economic damage during their childhood.

But although we cannot estimate the *extent*, we can deduce the *existence* of this class, and in such a way as to bring out something of the financial and moral cost which the country has to pay for its neglect.

III.

Since reliable statistical information is not available it will be necessary to resort to an indirect enquiry, and it would be difficult to devise a better method than that adopted by the Rev. W. D. Morrison¹ to bring out *the large proportion of fatherless children in Industrial Schools*. Of these children 20 per cent. are fatherless; 15 per cent. motherless; 4 per cent. orphans.² The Reformatory returns do not enable us to distinguish so closely, but in 1887-91 "the number of Juveniles committed to reformatories who were partially or entirely orphaned or had been deserted, or had criminals for parents amounted to 53 per cent." as against 51 per cent. in Industrial Schools.

The figures for Industrial Schools for 1903 are:—

| | Boys | Girls | Total |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Illegitimate | 158 | 81 | 239 |
| Both parents dead | 85 | 25 | 110 |
| Father dead | 398 | 104 | 502 |
| Mother dead | 385 | 102 | 487 |
| Deserted by both parents | 133 | 56 | 189 |
| One or both parents destitute or criminal | 183 | 80 | 263 |
| Both parents alive and able to take care of children | 1468 | 231 | 1699 |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| | 2810 | 679 | 3489 |

"In other words, more than one-half of the population of Industrial Schools are in an abnormal parental condition . . . and almost exactly the same state of things exists among the population of reformatory schools."³

¹ See *Juvenile Offenders*, pp. 134-47.

² The proportion of orphans would probably be much larger but for fact that many of these children are shielded from danger in institutions.

³ Morrison, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

But the general result is the same. A large number of boys and girls are started on a career of crime every year because society refuses or neglects to recognise the serious effects of orphanhood.

But these figures after all are no more than an index to the unknown multitude of those who are not caught in our institutions either for Waifs and Strays or for juvenile offenders. Some of them are found later in the prisons, and Mr. Morrison from an enquiry made at Wandsworth found that out of 100 male prisoners aged 16 to 18 years—

32 per cent. had lost 1 or both parents,

54 per cent. were living at home,

46 per cent. (including the 32 per cent. above) were living in lodgings,¹ *i.e.*, virtually orphans.

Probably if a census of vagrants or of the "unemployable" could be taken so as to discover their parental condition it would appear that these too are unduly recruited from the children whom death has robbed of parents and for whom society has refused its care. In this sense truly the nation can have as many paupers as it wants.

We have already seen how largely the social neglect of the feeble-minded² is a cause of most of our social evils. It is now necessary to add the neglect of orphans. To some extent these classes may overlap, but between them they must account for a very large percentage of the vicious or criminal poor. When the State chooses to provide for these unfortunate people who in any case cannot provide for themselves, the result will at once be apparent in the reduced number of admissions to Industrial School, Reformatory, Workhouse, Certified Inebriate Home,³ State Inebriate Reformatory, Prison for Juvenile Adults, Local Prison, Convict Prison, and all those places where the miserable failures of life are segregated in dishonour because their human need has first been neglected by society.

¹ Departmental Committee on Prisons, 1895, Minutes of Evidence, q. 3107, quoted in Morrison, "Juvenile Offenders," p. 162.

² Referring to a chapter which was planned, but alas, not written.—Ed.

³ In practice the number sent to Inebriate Homes might still increase, because the State has only just begun to segregate "alcoholics."

IV.

So far we have examined the anomalous position of the widow and orphan in a competitive society, have glanced at the palliatives adopted on their behalf by private persons or by the poor law, and have discovered that these timid and superficial remedies are very far from meeting the necessities of the case. It is hardly possible to avoid the question whether under a competitive system of private capital these mischiefs are remediable. Perhaps it might be advisable to turn the question another way as thus:—Whether when due social provision is made for orphan and widow a very real departure will not have been taken from the competitive system?

For it is time to recall the position we reached some time ago: in relation to capitalism, widowhood (and therewith orphanhood) is anomalous, but it is *perfectly and inevitably normal* in human society.

Perhaps the technical difficulty of extending social maintenance and guardianship to *all* orphans and ignoring *all* widows might not be insuperable. Under such a scheme the widow relieved or deprived of her children could be left to take her economic chances with the spinsters. Financially the childless widow need not be at a disadvantage in the struggle, and if the "labour market" is good enough for the $3\frac{1}{2}$ million who are unmarried it must be good enough for the $1\frac{1}{4}$ million who are widowed. The purely technical difficulties might be surmounted, but the country will quite certainly not consciously endorse such a scheme. Not "consciously," we say advisedly, because as a matter of fact this is precisely the effect of the working of our present poor law. The man dies. The woman cannot support herself and her children. The Guardians in effect say: give us the children and we will send them to our District School. Go you and scramble for casual employment in charing, needlework, or some other trade. Even that is too favourable an account; as a rule the Guardians leave the mother one or two of the children

as if they intended to weigh her down in the struggle.¹

I suggest that there is no great technical difficulty, because the thing is already being done on a considerable scale, and it has become so familiar and commonplace that we do not recognise how horrible it is. Some method needs to be devised by which it will be possible without depriving the mother of her children yet to relieve her of the unendurable economic burden of their support. Now there are many phases of this question but I doubt if there is more than one way of radical cure.

The Mother as such is a social servant,² discharging a State function. But in saying so much we have necessarily removed the question from its narrower concern with widows and orphans, to its broader concern with Mothers and children. And that is all to the good. One of the fatal consequences of the exaggerated patriarchal doctrine of society now dominant is to fix attention too exclusively on a feature which is not the essential one. We miss the whole sociological importance of the case when we insist on the term "widow."

From a private point of view that fact may be poignant enough, and we cannot here pause in order to ask how often the loss of a husband makes a deep and lasting wound in a woman's emotional nature. With that we have nothing to do. But the loss of a husband does as a rule inflict a severe and permanent economic injury on the surviving mother and *this* injury is unnecessary. Society can if it chooses to do so, prevent the dislocation of the economic group widow and orphan.

And it is the more likely to do so if it begins to understand that in the sociological view "widow" is comparatively unessential. The true formula is (widowed) Mother and (orphaned) Children. If we have advanced so far it

¹ See tract by A. M. Humphrey, "How to Help Widows" (C.O.S. Occasional Papers, No. 2, 3rd Series), in which the policy of taking some of the children from the mother is supported. One reason given (p. 5) is that a woman is not strong enough to "administer well-deserved chastisement" to boys!

² There may seem something forced in this term, but it is exactly analogous to the familiar "Civil servant," and it is high time to bring the wider term into equal prominence.

will not surprise us to learn that this is a particular instance of Mother and Children. Personally I doubt whether we shall reach a satisfactory solution of the narrower problem until we are prepared to accept and consider the broader one.

How it ought then to be dealt with in detail does not at the present concern us. All that it was required to do in this chapter is now accomplished. I have shown the data of the problem in the anomalous position of the widow who is a normal constituent of human society, but who has not a secure place in the "labour market." Certain charitable and quasi-charitable palliatives have been seen to be insufficient, inasmuch as the economic status of a large class of women and children is found still to be insufferably bad. We are arrived at some explanation of why this is so by discovering that the real question does not move in the sphere of philanthropy at all, but in that of social obligation. And we have been assisted to our conclusion by drawing out a distinction which is too often slurred over; that namely between personal affection the loss of which "all the King's men" cannot repair, and economic damage which it is entirely within the power of the State to prevent. Into the feelings of the widow, into the heart-ache of the orphan we may not penetrate. "The heart knoweth his own grief." But for the economic security of the Mother and the Child the State is under a solemn obligation to provide.

CHAPTER XIX.

OLD PEOPLE AND CHILDREN.

READERS who will refresh their memories by referring to chapters 18 and 19 of the ninth book of *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy* will find there chapter headings, but no explanatory letter press. It would perhaps be inconvenient to set the title of this chapter aside in quite so summary a manner, but practically set aside it must be, because any real treatment of the subject would be impossible within the limits of this volume. The young and the aged are normal groups, and so far as their economic position is an unsatisfactory one, it is a condemnation of the industrial system which fails to support them. Consequently, an adequate discussion would involve an answer to the enquiry, why the "rewards of industry" are insufficient for the fit maintenance of human life, both during the working period and outside of its limits. For life is necessarily longer than this working period. There is the age before the power of labour is acquired, and the years after it has been lost.

With regard to the period of childhood, experiments have been ventured upon, some in old times, directed to the curtailing of childhood and the hastening of little things of five years into the factories; while others have for their object, to prolong the period before the child becomes a wage-earner. This "age of innocence," be it longer or shorter, must be provided for. Under the competitive system, the wage of the worker must be sufficient to maintain children in some manner or other. Not certainly all the children, or this or that child, but some children, enough children, that is, to provide the future labour-power of the country. The system itself, therefore, will arrange for the bringing of this potential instrument of industry up to the

standard of producing value in exchange for an employer. The children of one generation must become the more or less efficient "hands" of the next. So much an intelligent wage system would ensure. But since the directors of the system are not always intelligent, it becomes obligatory on society to supplement wages by eleemosynary assistance. Society has been compelled to interfere for another reason. The factory must have "hands," but the country insists with a greater or less urgency on having men and women. That which is a matter of indifference to capitalism, is the chief concern of humanity, but curiously enough, the humane education of children has, until recently, been left to the vague entity known as philanthropy.

But when we turn from children to old people, a new and disconcerting factor is discovered. A sufficient number of children, it is admitted, must be reared to supply the labour power of the near future. In a society organised for the production of value-in-exchange or of "wealth in the hands of a few," old age is superfluous. This is largely the case also in savage societies, but it becomes less and less the case with the progressive civilisation of barbarous tribes. For the full welfare of a community there are indispensable qualities in old age. But in a society which predominantly exists for the production of wealth, the old man is still something of a superfluity. By some means or other the working period of life must be sustained, together with a supply of children sufficient to keep up the labour power of the future. There is no such economic necessity to keep old people alive. Accordingly we have witnessed the growth of that social rubbish heap known as the Poor Law, and the grudging humanity of the nation has kept its worn-out workers in "the house" or on out-relief in the shape of parish bread. The humane sentiment of some individuals of the comfortable classes has gone farther than this, as witness the numerous almshouses, pension funds, Aged Pilgrims' Friend Societies, and such like associations of people whose sentiment of pity is stronger than their power of economic analysis.

Childhood and old age are certainly normal constituents of any human society, but the child and the old person do, nevertheless, occupy an anomalous position in an industrial system like our own, which has treated value-in-exchange as the reality of which value-in-use is only the index. The exchange value of the little child and the old man is not great. They cannot be bought and sold at a profit. Or rather, since the civilized world does not purchase persons, their labour has not much exchange value. It is as bearers of something possessing value-in-exchange that persons fit into the present commercial régime. So far as it is desired to seize, conserve, and heighten the intrinsic worth of youth and age, a task is proposed which will demand other motives than those of capitalistic commerce. And this is brought out in the paradox that while childhood and age are normal, the child—some children¹—and old persons occupy an anomalous position. They are in short superfluous persons.

My reason for setting aside the subject of this chapter will now be clear. The subject could not be discussed except as a part of a general examination of capitalistic society, and to undertake so much would overweight my argument. It would have a more serious effect still, because it would tend to obscure the distinct issue raised in the present volume. In the present state of society and in any which we can foresee as imminent, there are and will be groups of people who by virtue of physical, mental, or moral defects, are incapable of managing their own affairs. Consideration of these abnormal groups is of sufficient importance to justify separate treatment, and that being admitted, it is advisable to keep this particular problem as distinct as possible.

But although the full discussion of childhood and old age cannot be brought within our present scope, they are both of them favourite pre-occupations of philanthropic persons, and they have recently, as quasi-philanthropic subjects of discussion been brought into the political arena. On both

¹ *i. e.*, the children who are not wage-earners.—Ed.

these grounds we may allow ourselves to glance at the at the subject.

I.

Children's school dinners. An illustration of the socio-political concern in childhood is afforded by the provision of school dinners, especially if we bear in mind the present position of this question. What has been done in this respect has been performed hitherto by private and voluntary associations. But there is some danger lest these philanthropic workers should receive less than justice. They stand, indeed, between two fires. On the one hand there is the attack of the Charity Organisation Society with its description of free dinners as an "insufficient and pauperising system of relief."¹ This society not only opposed the giving of meals, but has proposed as an alternative the sale of food, because "the success of any commercial undertaking is itself a proof that it supplies a want."² To do them justice, it should be observed that the Schools' Dinners Association have treated these criticisms with a good deal of indifference, and have contrived to raise funds for the feeding of hungry children very much as if they had never read these reports.

On the other side, the current of public opinion has begun to have less reliance on the irresponsible action of charity, and to demand official control of these school meals. That opinion has so far produced nothing beyond the feeble Act of 1906, which has been well described as providing for everything except feeding the children.

On what does the demand for State recognition depend, and what modification does the old philanthropic idea undergo in becoming a political policy which would replace the private feeding of some hungry children by the State provision of meals for all?

It rests in the first instance on the distinction between the demand of industry for "hands," and the call of the

¹ 25th Report, p. 12 (1893).

² Charity and Food, published by the C.O.S., 1887, p. 9. This report contains some interesting particulars of early experience in school feeding.

country for citizens. The force of the future citizen must not be impaired by the underfeeding or malnutrition of childhood. But although large funds have been subscribed to private feeding associations, they are very far from being adequate. That is one reason why it is proposed to supersede "private charity" by public support. The philanthropists have taught the country the importance of doing a work which private funds cannot discharge.

The subject of school dinners is rather closely connected with the subject of the last chapter. There it appeared that an undue burden is thrown on the mother who is also a widow,¹ and that the State must share the responsibility if the mother is to discharge her part of the work with success. In exactly the same way the burden which is thrown on the working-class mother who is not a widow, is an undue and intolerable strain. It is not right that one woman should be expected to feed and clothe and manage the household affairs of a whole household. She does it, and often with an unconscious heroism, but she pays the penalty in stunted intelligence, chronic ill health, and premature old age.

The working-class mother requires what the middle-class critic usually enjoys. She requires to be freed from some part of that "tangle of rudimentary industries," which, to quote Mrs. Stetson's phrase, constitutes the work of the house. In the interests of the woman at home, for the sake of motherhood and the home, some part of the burden must be shared. Every newborn infant is the offspring of parents, but it is also a child of the State. We hear too much of the responsibility of parents, and too little of the obligation of society.

¹ This fact is faced by the C.O.S. tract already quoted. "We must look the poor woman's troubles in the face. . . She has to do the work of two people; she has to be the bread-winner and go out to work, and she must also be the housekeeper. She has to wash, clean, and cook, make and mend clothes, care for and train her children. Can one pair of hands manage all this? And, secondly, when she goes out to work our poor widow will probably only earn low wages . . . about 10s. a week, and she will certainly not be able to support herself and her family on that." "How to Help Widows," by A. M. Humphrey, p. 1.

I have known many working-class mothers, and I have never ceased to marvel at the persistence with which they bend to the drudgery of their lives. Were they men, they would rebel; being women, they only seek relaxation by attending Mothers' Meetings. Were we men, we should not tolerate the wrong we are inflicting on the mothers of the race. The school dinner is a first step towards freeing the woman from habitual overtoil.

But the State feeding of school children is called for in the interests of the children themselves. Sir John Gorst tells us that: "Children are ill fed not only in town but in the country" their food being "insufficient in quantity and unsuitable in quality. . . . I do not know that I need say a word about the enormous mischief of teaching children when they are underfed. It is like working an underfed horse; it produces exhaustion of the brain and the muscles which the child may never be able to get over."¹

The facts of the case are so familiar that it is quite unnecessary to reiterate them. At Edinburgh, at York, in London, wherever and whenever either Royal Commissioner, Committee, or private investigation lifts the veil which covers the life of the poor, the same phenomenon is seen in the same lurid light. The children of the nation go unfed to school, and their ill-nourished brains are forced to intellectual toil for which they are entirely unfit. A cruel necessity is imposed upon the nation to feed its children, because an unknown, but ominously large number of them are hungry, if not with the hunger of a beleaguered city, yet with the hunger which expresses itself in dulled perceptions, lessened power of resistance, and inability to seize the good hazard of life.

That is the negative reason. But the argument for school dinners rests on a more positive idea. Children who are hungry must be fed; but in any case it is good for them to be fed at school. The school dinner is an education in citizenship. Without a word being said, the child

¹ See Report of Committee on Physical Deterioration, 1904, Mins. of Evid., q. 11824-6.

gradually absorbs a knowledge of its own dependence on and place in the social life. He finds himself a guest at the common table of the nation.

Such are the new thoughts which stir in the minds of men, and which render this new agitation one of the most critical importance. First come School Dinner Associations, with their endeavour to lessen some of the more obvious suffering incident to the distribution of wealth under the present industrial system. Then follows the discovery of the revolutionary tendency of this philanthropic action.

Strangely enough it was not left to the revolutionary socialist to lead the way. He has always treated "charity" a trifle too cavalierly. The first to perceive the germ of a new order were the defenders of the old. Even charitable meals were felt to weaken the reverent reliance upon the doctrines of *laissez faire*, and accordingly they were, as we have seen, consistently opposed by the Liberal individualist. If that is the case with meals given by charity, meals on which no claim for their continuance can be built up, the case will be much worse (or much better) when the State extends its recognition to the policy. The Act of 1906 did not achieve a great deal, but it made one important implication. Whether by voluntary or public provision, school meals have become a permanent institution, and consequently, the theory of a competitive society is still further entrenched upon.

School dinners might be defended on the ground that they are unavoidable, owing to the actual and unhappy circumstances of poverty. But when to this argument is added the assertion that such public provision is in itself a good thing, a fundamental change of opinion is clearly in process of taking place. If that claim is to be justified it can only be through the emergence of a new doctrine of society.

I I.

Old age pensions. When we come to consider the provision of maintenance for the aged in their declining years,

when they can no longer support themselves by their labour, we are on one of the great routes of charity, a road which stretches across the ages. It would indeed be difficult to find any period of organised benevolence when some assistance of this kind was not rendered. Certainly it can be traced far back into the history of English Philanthropy, and is met with in the records of the monasteries in pre-reformation days. This type of mutual aid was continued under Protestantism, and whether in almshouses or in their own homes, old people have continued to subsist on the bequests of the dead or on the subscriptions of the living.

The need for pensions and gifts to enable the decayed members of industrial society to draw out the number of their years, has always been felt and responded to. But in the early part of the 19th century a more than usual activity may be detected, as a glance at the long list in the *Charities Digest and Register* well demonstrate. Some of these pension societies are large, as *e.g.* the National Benevolent (1812), and the United Kingdom Beneficent (1863), with their several hundreds of pensioners; others are small as *e.g.*, Heather's Pensions for six widows of decayed tradesmen. The total number thus provided for is considerable, and is being increased. Excellent work in this direction is due in recent years to the Charity Organisation Society.

Several of the Friendly Societies have an old age benefit, either specifically under that title or virtually in permanent payment during sickness (or senile decay). It is worthy of note that this particular form of "thrift" has been subsidised by the State. The form of subsidy is the most undesirable one that could have been selected, being connected with the Poor Law. That is to say, the Guardians are called on to ignore any income up to 5/- a week, which the applicant for relief may be drawing from a Friendly Society.

But the reader is probably feeling that all this description is superfluous, because it deals with an antiquated system which is already passing away. So far as political

thought is concerned, the casual action of private charity is found wanting. Nor does the work of friendly societies suffice to meet the case. At the present day, people are less impressed with the large number of aged people who are assisted in one way or the other, than with the very much greater number for whom no honourable provision is made. In other words, the problem of the aged has been nationalised.

This has taken place well within the lifetime of the present generation, and is inseparably connected with the name of Mr. Charles Booth. The socio-political aspect of the problem has come to the front. In the first place the demand for old age pensions rests on the hard privation in which old people often linger after their life's task is accomplished. Pensions are proposed in order to supplement the defects of the industrial system. But the public discussion to which the proposals have been subjected has had the effect of carrying us far beyond the mere claim of sympathy.

Old age is normal in human society, but, as we have seen, it is an anomaly in the world of competitive commerce. The working of the law of supply and demand ignores the superannuated man. The market does not want him, and therefore need not pay for him. Apart from State intervention his lot is a hopeless one. For the aims of Capitalism, old age appears as a burden. But the new thought regarding the ends of human society refuses to consider elderly people from this standpoint. Old age is seen to have its own worth, however far Walt Whitman's lines may be from representing public opinion on the subject.

“ Youth, large, lusty, loving youth full of grace, force, fascination,

Do you know that Old Age may come after you with equal grace, force, fascination? ”

Modern social thought however agrees with the poet in regarding old age from the point of view of the old person, and it demands for the aged as integral members of society, the economic support which will enable the closing

years of life to be lived in freedom from economic cares. But the claim rests on a recognition of the services which old persons have in their earlier years rendered to society. All necessary work is a social service. That doctrine explains the claim for old age pensions, and it also explains the curiously antique flavour of every mention of philanthropic old age pensions. The notion that an annuity for aged workers should be a "gift of pleasure" from some prosperous or kindly individuals is felt to pertain to a world of thought which is worn out.

The old age pension is a debt due from society to the veterans who have spent their strength in industrial or any other species of social service. And in addition, it is the expression of a national resolve to keep the value of human life at its highest pitch until the inevitable passing into the silence beyond. In saying that the old age pension implies these things, I am of course speaking, not of the actual world of practice, but of the world of thought. For at present old age pensions are only matters of that endless talk which sometimes prepares but often delays the course of social action.*

It is instructive to consider the bearing of these new policies upon traditional thought on the subject of philanthropy. The State feeding of school children and pensions for the aged are proposed, not as matters of charity, but of public policy. The proposal is, I believe, the most serious attack yet delivered on the old theory under which philanthropy was called on to discharge important political functions. So soon as these two reforms shall have been carried out, the existence of an arbitrary, if generous, philanthropy, will begin to shrink as ominously as Balzac's Wild Ass's Skin.

These subjects form the battle-ground of an old and a new political philosophy. They do so because childhood and old age have a double face, making their appeal to charity, but also appearing in greater clearness, as

* In the summer of 1908 Parliament has passed a first instalment of legislation for Old Age Pensions.—Ed.

possessed of political importance. Some reference to them was therefore necessary here, although a full discussion of them would carry us beyond our subject, which is the unfolding of philanthropy into social politics, or the evolution of private charity into public policy.

APPENDIX.

- I. AGITATION.
- II. LEAVES FROM THE AUTHOR'S NOTE BOOK,

APPENDIX I.

AGITATION.

I.—THE PERFECT AGITATOR.

To recognise the quality of agitation as an indispensable function in social politics is to justify the distinctive action of incalculable personalities on the progressive improvement of the democratic State. And if I am able to show, as I hope to do in this chapter, first of all that the work of the agitator holds beyond all question the primacy in reform, and also that in the discharge of this effort the philanthropist has proved himself preeminently successful, it will be of comparatively small importance if other functions which he has also discharged may appear to be not properly his function at all. His own contribution to the amelioration of social existence will remain a thing unique and beyond cavil. It is his to discover those larger ends of common welfare which reach beyond the moral perceptiveness of ordinary men in their ordinary moods. He is as it were an explorer in the unmapped world of the ideal life, from whence he brings back news of an unreachèd good, such tidings as sound like "travellers' tales" in our ears, but which haunt the minds of men until they seek to verify the story by a practical policy calculated to transform the actual. Only it must be observed that the most daring speculator cannot move very far from his base, and the wildest Utopia is determined by the conditions of its year of publication.

The perfect agitator is one who popularises ideas and stimulates to action. Without him it is hard to see how progress is to be gained in a modern democracy. For the new life must be a power in the common mind before it becomes an institution in the common wealth. If the old problem of enthroning the philosophic King has never yet been resolved, the modern problem is more stubborn still, for it is nothing less than how to create the philosophic populace. Improvements are not to be imposed from above but must be realised, if at all, from within the body of the citizens. This is inevitable since the coming to power of public opinion.

Now it must be conceded at the outset that the method of the agitator is not and cannot be the best for the strictly philosophic business of criticising and perfecting a new idea.

But there is no method so successful as his in fastening a new social thought in the minds of the many. A second reservation will be necessary. The method of the agitator is also unsuited to carrying out the reforms he initiates. As it is the work of the thinker to discern, so it lies with the administrator to work out the implications of a new thought in the institutions of society. Such a working out of the idea is a long and tedious process, and requires both the continuous action and the adequate force which the State alone possesses. These three functions of thought, of agitation, and of execution, are distinct from one another but are alike indispensable, if the institutions of society are to match with its ideal.

Of political philosophy as such I have at present nothing more to add. The intervention of the State has already been our theme through 150 pages and it is time to face a criticism which is commonly brought against its capacity for effective control of the conditions of human life, a complaint which however irrelevant is an entirely true one. I will not, however, couch it in the language of any modern writer, though Herbert Spencer's *Social Statics* might yield trenchant expressions of the charge. It interests me more to borrow an analogy from Plato, inasmuch as his Socrates cannot be suspected of being an ignorant despiser of the State. Yet this State is "if I may use a ludicrous figure of speech . . . like a great and noble steed who is tardy in his motions owing to his very size, and requires to be stirred into life. I am that gadfly which God has given the State, and all day long and in all places am always fastening upon you, arousing and persuading and reproaching you."

This "ludicrous figure of speech" exactly describes the action of the agitator. The strong State is impossible without its cohort of troublesome men. The positive contribution of the agitator is, we said, twofold, to popularise ideas and to stimulate action. Now historically considered, the philanthropist will be seen to possess one of the qualities most valuable for the perfect agitator. He is fertile in expedients and quick to discern new wants. If we recur for a moment to the measures of reform which have come before us in the earlier chapters, we are impressed by the regularity with which some philanthropic individuals were needed, and ultimately were forthcoming, to point the way into the new paths. Almost every humane law in the statute book was forced upon the legislature by the disconcerting zeal of a few enthusiasts. The successive enactments which have been prepared by their labours have usually proved to be inadequate, and needed to be amended and enlarged. We marvel at the slight concessions to humanity which satisfied them; we should rather admire the

originality which led them to denounce cruel and oppressive conditions which had satisfied the legislature, and against which even their victims had not always turned.¹

In another direction also the contribution of the troublesome person is important. Not only does he force new laws into existence, but pungently criticises the administration of old ones. The agitator has warm sympathies, as well as ingenuity, and he grasps the human element in affairs which the mere official comfortably ignores. We might instance the agitation against the uniform dress worn by old ladies from the workhouse when they go to visit their friends.²

If it should be supposed that in thus emphasizing the need for the gadfly I am detracting from the value of that State intervention which I have advocated, it may be pointed out in reply that the substitution of the professional for the amateur as the executive agent is to be welcomed, because it leaves the rest of us more free to be troublesome persons.

It will be necessary to deal more freely with the second function, namely, that of stimulating to action. But before proceeding to illustrate that, a word should be added on the differing function of the agitating private citizen and the State. The agitator proposes ends of common welfare, but these are realised by corporate action. The State is superior in execution to the enthusiast, and should therefore determine and carry out the policy resolved on. On the other hand, the State and its agents are feebler in conception, and need, therefore, to be themselves determined by the ideals of the agitator. It is his to perceive the end. But the means attaining it ought to be in the hands of the ultimate power, *i.e.*, the State as the expression of the General Will.

II.—TYPES OF AGITATORS.

We have studied the perfect agitator, the being who fulfils the idea, and is, therefore, perhaps impossible, except in the perfect society where he would not be so obviously needed as in our actual world. We have seen on general grounds that the enthusiast must disturb the public conscience if the new thought is to be rivetted in the mind of the people, and that only so can reforms become effective in a democracy. It is time now to indicate the precise part played in the national life

¹ See "Unhealthiness of London," by Hector Gavin, M.D., 1847, p. 9.
 "I greatly fear that to the low estimate which is entertained of the value of human life, must be ascribed the apathy and indifference with which the rich and middle classes regard the sufferings and frightful devastation of human life which are proved to be constantly going on" (*i.e.*, caused by insanitary conditions).

² C.O.S. Review, 1892, p. 392.

by those incalculable personalities which have not been wanting to disturb the complacency of the 19th century. But it would be tedious to enumerate all the men and women agitators, although it would also result in an impressive view of the immense range and potency of their action, and might incline us to regard the Age of Steam as still more characteristically the era of the agitator. We must restrict ourselves to some illustrative and typical instances, or, in other words, must submit to the duller process of repeating well-known names.

Yet no mere attention to the philanthropic agitator of the grand style will enable us to estimate the force and persistency with which this social instrument is worked, unless we remind ourselves of the little agitators, men who combated for one end and fought in obscure places. Take, for example, that Thomas Wright who "was engaged all day long in a small establishment acting as foreman, covered with oil and grease and everything else." At night he visited the prisoners. Their pitiable state had seized his imagination. His fascinating expression, his appearance, like unto that of the "most venerable doctor of divinity," was a constant dissolvent in the indifference of his neighbours. The big men would do little had not the little men done much. Yet Thomas Wright appears in history, in Lord Shaftesbury's diary, mainly owing to the accident that, "We asked him to dinner."¹

In every cause of humanity or freedom it was the same. The hard service and the poetry of the little agitator's life are nowhere more convincingly commemorated than by Mr. Holyoake. "In thus making themselves so far the Providence of others, the most generous of them had no time left to be a Providence to themselves. . . . They travelled from street to street, or from village to village on Sundays. . . . They gave more than they could afford to support periodicals which never paid. For themselves they reaped in after-days dismay and disregard at their own firesides, for their disinterested and too ardent preference for others' interests. Some were worn out prematurely, and died unattended in obscure lodgings. . . . Not a few of them . . . spent months and years in the indignity of prison, and at last died on a workhouse bed and were laid in a pauper's grave. . . . Though the distant footfall of the coming triumph of their order never reached their ears, they believed not less in its march."² In each cause of agitation the memory of these "forgotten workers" must give pathos to the study of types which lies before us. Nor must we forget these "noisy adherents who infest every movement," whom Mr. Holyoake also recalls to our minds.

¹ Hodder, *Life of Shaftesbury*, ii., p. 376.

² Holyoake, "*History of Co-operation*," p. 255, 2nd Edition.

With this recognition of the struggles of the obscure agitator to suggest something of stress also in the hearts of the famous men who stand as representatives in the movements of the century, we will turn to our task of marking out the leading types of the agitator's art.

(1) *Shaftesbury or the Evangelic type.* This fitly heads our series, because the name of the philanthropic Earl dominates the mind when deeds of beneficence are being commemorated. And naturally so, because, as we have been told, when he was not in Parliament he was taking the chair at a meeting, while the mere list of the benevolent religious societies to which he belonged would cumber many pages. There is another advantage in setting this name in the forefront. First, among many, it clearly suggests itself as one, but not the only type; and it is necessary to escape the fallacy of supposing that there is only one philanthropic tradition in the 19th century. It may also be remarked that Lord Shaftesbury himself belongs almost as fitly to the "Booth"¹ class as to his own, or would do so if the agitator's work in modifying institutions were comparable in importance to his effect on the public imagination. To single out the best-known activities of his life is to cite the Factory movement and the agitation for better houses. In other words, Lord Shaftesbury's most important work was directed, not to the improvement of person, but of environment. His housing work is twofold. He built "models," and in this respect his achievement was inconsiderable. He also pegged away at public opinion until he forced the passage of a housing Act. In this matter he was doing the proper agitator's work, "acting mediately on social abuses by acting directly on a social conscience."² Incidentally, we may note that, although the true principle embodied in the Shaftesbury Act (1851) was contradicted by the absurdities of the Cross and Torrens Act (1868, 1875, 1879), it came towards the front again in the Housing of the Working Classes Acts, 1885, 1890.³

But the distinctive and most influential work of the agitator lies in the appeal he makes to the public imagination, and there is truth in Professor Dicey's description of Shaftesbury as the born representative of the evangelical and benevolent middle-class.

"In spirit Lord Shaftesbury always 'wore a coronet'; he was, in the words of an American observer, the 'complete beau-ideal of aristocracy.' He inherited, together with the virtues, at least one of the faults often belonging to high lineage, he lacked all play of intellect or of fancy; he possessed neither subtlety nor versatility. . . . One singularity of his career

¹ See below.

² See "History of English Philanthropy," p. 172.

³ G. Haw, "Britain's Homes," pp. 62-69.

. . . . is that his defects, no less than his virtues, contributed to the success, and still more to the wide-reaching results of his work. Lord Shaftesbury formed no social theories. He never consciously advocated any measures which in his eyes savoured of socialism. . . . At the same time he did not understand, as did Macaulay, the grounds on which factory legislation might be defended by men who distrusted all socialistic experiments. . . . Lord Shaftesbury, in short, was in practice, though not in theory, the apostle of governmental interference, and this, in part at least, because his intellectual limitations prevented him from realising the difficulty of reconciling paternal government with respect for individual freedom. Here we see how his very deficiencies increased his influence.

. . . His position and his defects enlisted for him the support of members of the middle-class, who would never have followed a demagogue or a democrat. He was born heir to an English peerage—he became an English peer; he was a rigid Tory—he was not a theorist; he was a Low Churchman, he was the friend of Dissenters; he detested Roman Catholicism, Republicanism, socialism, and infidelity. How could any good and benevolent man belonging to the middle-class fail in the middle of the 19th century to feel that his lordship was the safest of guides? Here and there a cold-blooded critic might note that the principles on which Lord Shaftesbury unconsciously acted were of wider application than the philanthropist perceived. A story is told . . . that Lord Melbourne introduced Lord Ashley—as he then was—to the young Queen as ‘the greatest Jacobin in your Majesty’s dominions.’ . . . But not one of Lord Shaftesbury’s middle-class followers would have seen the true point of the joke. ‘No one goes so far as the man who doesn’t know where he is going.’¹

Probably the most popular representative of this type after Shaftesbury himself is Mrs. Fry. Her name and her work are so well-known as to dispense us from any need of lingering over them. But a word should be said of Mary Carpenter, who more truly represents the mobilising of a new and uncontrollable force for agitation. Mrs. Fry was a Quaker, and in the Society of Friends there has been no tradition of the subordination of women: their ministry, including speaking, was equally open to both sexes. Mrs. Fry may have had to overcome a sense of strangeness in those whom she worked among. She may have had some sentiment of reserve in her own breast to break down, but it could never have occurred to her as improper to take part in public life. It was otherwise with Miss Carpenter, who belonged to a religious society which has always compensated for its rashness in thought by its observance of social

¹ Dicey, *Law in Relation to Public Opinion*, p. 227.

conventions. Thus it was that Mary Carpenter could only do her Reformatory work at the cost of inward conflict. "She took no part," writes her biographer, "in the discussions; to have lifted up her voice in an assembly of gentlemen would have been, as she then felt, tantamount to unsexing herself."¹ And she herself records (1873): "With respect to my future course of action I feel sure that my work is to be done not by attempting myself any public action, for which my woman's nature quite unfits me," and again, "I was asked to take the chair. This, of course, I declined to do, as I always keep within my own womanly sphere."²

The really distinctive and original contribution of Miss Carpenter would seem to proceed from this inward struggle. She vindicated the right of woman to be troublesome. In doing so the ranks of agitation were doubled, and no numerical coefficient describes the increased élan of the attack. But the immediate object of Miss Carpenter's activity was not the mobilising of the Amazons of thought. Her specific work was for the criminal and neglected children of the country. She, too, was concerned largely with environment, although the direct action on the individual was more obvious than in the case of the Housing or the Factory movement.

A third representative of this class is to hand in Father Mathew, who was born at Thomastown, in Tipperary, October 10th, 1790. He studied at Kilkenny and Maynooth, took priest's orders in 1814, and devoted himself to work among the poor at Cork, where his observation of the terrible evils caused by over-drinking impelled him to devote himself heart and soul to the temperance cause. He began his crusade in 1838, and travelled not only in Ireland, but in England, Scotland, and America, preaching total abstinence, and persuading his converts to take the pledge. "His success had something of the marvellous in its character." He was regarded with the greatest reverence by the poor Irish, among whom his ministrations mostly lay, and was believed by them to receive miraculous assistance from Heaven.

The temperance campaign began with an appeal to the individual will, only to be driven towards State action on the environment, first of all in the negative form of restricting a bad propensity by removing a seductive opportunity (Prohibition, Sunday closing, etc.), and then more tentatively in a positive policy. This may be of the nature of education, as, for instance, in the teaching of hygiene in public schools, or of "counter attractions," such as parks, bands, and skittles without beer. But, and this is the point to emphasise, the attempt

¹ Life of Mary Carpenter, by J. E. Carpenter, p. 158.

² *Ibid.* pp. 165 and 405.

to modify institutions became possible only through agitation, the crusade of the new idea.

One feature these several movements have in common. They are urged on by a feeling for individuals; they act largely on conditions, but their aim is far less the discovery and removal of causes than the alleviation of abuses.

(2) *The Chadwick type.* Edwin Chadwick's large personality confronts us at every turn when we investigate the socio-political history of the 19th century. We have already had occasion to trace his influence on more than one important policy,¹ and any adequate biography of him, did such exist, would of necessity be also an ample account of the emergence of social politics. Great as the temptation is to describe, or at least to estimate, the force of his character upon his times, the impulse must be resisted. But I do not know whether there could well be any more convincing evidence of his trenchant gifts and commanding power than the impossibility which the student will at once recognise, of finding any title for this section other than his name. Two alternatives have occurred to me, only, however, to set aside, and the mention of them will serve to indicate the quality of the man.

The "aggravating type" might have described him, but every agitator is aggravating, and to say that Chadwick was capable of irritating his contemporaries more exasperatingly than any other agitator of the period is little more than to assert his position as a prince among them. Chadwick possessed what most philanthropists conspicuously lack, the faculty of knowing exactly what he wanted, and of letting his meaning lose nothing in his expression of it.

He gave his agitations the appearance of merciless logic. In that respect he did not change, and he had to pay the penalty. People willingly forgive a man much if, as they say, his heart rules his head. It is always pardonable to advocate a reform if you do not do so of malice aforethought. Now no one suspected Chadwick of having a heart. When he had outgrown the hardness of youth, we may detect the growth of a warmer humanity than he possessed in 1833. And in the occupation of his later official life he found an object (*vis.*, sanitation) more suited to his temperament than poor law administration. It is not an inadequate description of a leaking drain to say that it is leaky, but a faulty man is always so much more than faulty. Chadwick never worked in half lights, he was contemptuous of stupidity; he was avaricious of work; he was eternally restless. It was given to him to discern distant social ends to which he might advance by ruthless toil and the exercise of a

¹ *Ante*, chaps. vi. and vii.

stubborn will. He was, in fact, a prince of agitators. And yet there was so little of the typical agitator about him as to deceive those who must have their heroes always heroic, their villains ever malignant. He was an agitator to compare with Garibaldi, but he wore no red shirt.

On the contrary, he was a paid official. The second title which I discarded was the "bureaucrat as agitator." It is too paradoxical. We do not look for the enthusiast in the "circumlocution office," and in Chadwick's day the delusion of supposing all Government servants were inefficient and slow was at its full height. That is not true, but may have some kernel of truth in it. The official person does for the most part keep up his *incognito*, for there is a decorum of official life according to which a permanent secretary should be neither seen nor heard. His power is great on condition of being unobtrusive. But it was the nature of Chadwick to be conspicuous. The reader will not have forgotten the 114,000 letters. Interesting as it would be to include the officials of the Local Government Board among the agitators, it cannot be done. The bureaucrat rests on tradition. Chadwick wanted to *make* traditions, and his only error lay in supposing it possible to have traditions without prejudices. There is no class of "bureaucrat as agitator," or, rather, there is a class, but it consists of one man, Edwin Chadwick. His claim to distinction consists in having proved that official reports can be made as disturbing as the rankest platform oratory.

And if we enquire further as to his specific achievement it appears that, while other agitators work their will on individuals, he goaded corporations. His ideal of centralisation¹ set him in opposition to the dearest faith of Englishmen, the belief in *laissez faire*. Shaftesbury also opposed it in the matter of the climbing boys, and for other "causes." But the principle was set aside only because a higher cause of humanity made it necessary. He, too, had to meet opposition because he, too, was combating interests. But then he was a peer, and "his heart ruled." With Chadwick it was different. Chimney sweepers might excite commiseration, but humane sentiment was much less easily evoked by the absence of a system for the disposal of sewage. Yet even here the man might have gained adherents if he had apologised for his proposal of central control by appealing to a latent sentiment of pity for those who died of fever. But he offered no such apology. He desired to strengthen the central control less for the sake of drainage or of health than for the sake of a strong administration. This was the height of his offending, and this drove him from office. But before he went he had shaken the old edifice of leave-it-alone to its foundation.

¹ *Ante*, p. 82.

(3) *Socialist Type.* Socialism concerns us here simply in its one aspect. It would carry us altogether beyond our limits to discuss the relationship of one school to another, or to consider the law of its development; still less need we undertake any examination of its economic doctrines. The single point which we must indicate is its bearing on the tendency of philanthropy to become social politics, to lose, *i.e.*, its character of private benevolence and assume a public function in the life of the corporate community. And even in this matter we need study only one form in which its influence is exerted. Much modern legislation is condemned by its opponents as socialistic, and although socialists would not admit the description, we may recognise a semi-socialistic quality in, *e.g.*, old age pensions. The socialist movement has modified institutions, but with that we have here nothing to do. For us it is sufficient that the outward form of social institutions belongs still to the system of capitalistic industry and class government.¹ We have to do then not with socialism as a constructive doctrine, but as a critical and revolutionary movement of thought. That is to say, we have to enquire into its nature as agitation.

What now has been achieved of this sort? The present society has been forced to discover the implications of humane conduct contained in its own political system. By the discovery of these the world moves, though not very directly, towards socialism. In other words, the presence of socialism as a criticism brings to light socialistic elements in the social mind, by reason of which we judge that there is not an irrevocable antithesis between the two social forms, but that the one is capable of evolving into the other. The agitation of socialism has assisted this discovery. Not, however, immediately, but by way of reaction. This quality, which separates socialistic agitation so sharply from other types, is no more than might have been expected. Those other types start from within the present social order. However drastic the reforms proposed, and however far-reaching the ideals, the agitators of our first three groups are alike in accepting the general scheme. The socialistic agitation proceeds from without; it is a claim of right, not of benevolence; it claims neither concession, nor modification, but reconstruction.

It is unnecessary to do much more than refer to Professor Foxwell's introduction to Anton Menger's *Right to the Whole Produce of Labour* for an account of the early English socialists, and to Werner's Sombart *Socialismus und Soziale Bewegung*, for an outline of the movement in the chief industrial countries of the world. To illustrate this agitating power of socialism no influence is more important than that of Marx,

¹ This is obscured in England by the low franchise.

and that not because of his economic theory or his analysis of existing society, but owing to the fact that in him socialism became a world movement. Industrial civilisation as a whole was brought by him before the bar of the modern social conscience. He founded the *International*: his was the watchword, "Workmen of all lands, unite." These things were full of meanings not yet exhausted. But Marx's unique contribution did not rest on these. For an understanding of Marx perhaps no more instructive comparison can be made than with Darwin. *Das Kapital* has forced a non-socialist society to propound a constructive view of human life. Whether this alternative theory will not find itself urged by its own logic or by external forces to become as socialistic as, and indeed much more socialistic than, Marx himself, is for the future to decide.

The one essential quality of a good agitation is very clearly marked in socialism, more so perhaps than in the movements directed to remove a particular abuse, or achieve some detail of improvement. The element of universality in these partial and narrow agitations is frequently obscured; in socialism it is brilliant in the light of day. Socialism obviously derives its strength from an idea, and "it is impossible to exterminate an idea. It must live its course, grow, flourish, die. Be it wise or foolish, orthodox or heterodox, let it but have some new aspect of truth in it; let it but be fresh, profound, and striking, let it be truly and verily an idea: it will live its life before it dies its natural death."¹

(4). *Statistical Type*. I have already suggested that the Right Hon. Charles Booth is the finest representative of this class, and in doing so am quite conscious that to a superficial view he may not seem to deserve the name of agitator. To consider, however, his influence in provoking other similar enquiries.²

* * * *

There are, of course, earlier instances of this method, the method, *viz.*, of collecting accurate information. the most notable predecessor being Howard. The first impression produced by "Life and Labour" may be to frighten people off from action by the immensity of the task discovered. What happens is that people try to do a little more on the old lines, but a new standard is set before them, they cannot so entirely ignore the relation of their work to the whole need. Accordingly a subtle change goes on in their mental attitude to the work,

¹ Mary Robinson, "End of the Middle Ages," p. 33.

² No notes have been discovered for this section, which is the more unfortunate, as the author had the warmest admiration and appreciation of Mr. Booth's work.—Ed.

and then by slow degrees (or sudden transition) the work itself becomes new in response to the larger consciousness.

That is the most valuable effect of agitation by statistics: it discovers new problems and sets people on the quest for more adequate solutions. That is to say, the tendency to regard things merely in their personal aspects and as they enter into one's own narrow experience is broken down. In place of "these boys" (to recur to the former illustration) it substitutes a "population at the age of 14-19." What is achieved for the particular case of the "Lads' Club" is strictly within the limits of the territory which belonged to philanthropy and is passing over to social politics. But statistics, of course, carry us beyond any single problem away from population at an age group to the whole community, and in doing so introduce us to questions more and more remote from the former interests of philanthropy. The mind is driven forward, to social politics in the more comprehensive sense; nor can it rest until it includes all the social and all the political sciences.

The process by which this is accomplished is more than an agitation; it is, *e.g.*, the natural endeavour of every branch of study to become complete. But that is not to say that it is not an instance of agitation. There *is* action on social abuse through action on the social conscience, only what gives its character to this form of agitation is the presence in a peculiarly neat aspect of the intellectual element.²

Having thus brought out the inner nature of statistical knowledge, one remark remains to add. We have chosen a modern name to describe the type because the large use of the instrument in this shape is recent. But it is no new discovery and the classic instance will always be John Howard. Another illustration is provided by a less famous enquiry undertaken in the year 1874, and it possesses considerable interest because it is connected with one of the humane movements of which our age is most proud. At a meeting of the English Branch of the order of St. John of Jerusalem a sub-committee was appointed to report on the best method of organising district nursing in the Metropolis. That was a quite practical reference, but the significance of this committee in the history of the agitation is derived from the sense in which the reference was interpreted. "Before deciding what to do," they pronounced "it is necessary to *learn what is already being done.*" That was a momentous decision, for it was a tacit recognition of the public, indeed of the political quality of charity. Acting then on this original insight, they presented an elaborate report on the state of nursing in London, accompanied by a map.

¹ I have been unable to discover this reference.—Ed.

² See article by the author, in *International Journal of Ethics*, Jan. 1907.

This map showed no single district nurse other than Bible women on the south of the Thames. There was a striking fact easy to grasp, easy to expound, and in this case the statistical method provided a keen weapon for the agitator.

One is tempted to treat rather freely the extensive use of agitation by the scientific enquirers of the last half generation. But the mention of three out of many societies must suffice. There is a British Society for the Study of Inebriety; there is the Women's Industrial Council, which clearly and deliberately abstains from action in order to provoke public authorities and public opinion; and there is the British Institute for Social Service. The humorous man is stirred to mirth by this last Society. It seems to render the doing of one's duty so comically indirect. A wishes to do something to B; he enquires of the British Institute how to do it. Then, in the first place, A must be informed if it is already being done, in which case he may be referred to Society X; he joins Society X. Local investigation brings out the fact that B does not fall entirely within its scope of relief, and A may be referred again to Society Y, or to some local organisation Y. If A is very determined he will ultimately achieve something for poor B, if only to give him or her the address of the relieving officer. And now the reader laughs at the British Institute; but he is wrong. The Institute did not create the multitude of overlapping charities, which, however much they hustle one another in their sympathetic labours, fail so frequently to meet the actual need of those perverse human beings who will not shape their distress to a predetermined pattern. What the British Institute should accomplish—I do not know if that is its conscious aim—is to disturb the minds of those who enquire of it by showing them that the means of relief though innumerable are disparate with the need, so that the ills of individuals which depend on the wrongs of society cannot be cured by "charities." Thus on another line we are brought back to the former conclusion—the contribution of statistics as an agitating force consists in its power of universalising the problem.

(5) *Literary Type.*¹ * * * *

It is worth suggesting a speculation how far an exploiting of social sympathy by the literary man for literary effect has a contrary effect, hard disregard in real life 'alancing the not unpleasant emotions of distress called forth by the novelist's art.

¹This section exists only as a few notes, which show that the Literary type of Agitators was to have been described and illustrated by the names of Dickens, Reade, Kingsley, Southey, Besant, Wells, etc.

III.

This study of types of agitation leads to a recognition of the philanthropist as sociologist, a *rapprochement* which marks clearly the distinction between the philanthropy which the 19th century inherited from the 18th, and the social politics which it has transmitted to the 20th. I have already pointed out how much more numerous benevolent associations have become during the period under review. Many present-day societies continue to work in isolation, ignorant of what others are doing and regardless of the public implication of their own enterprise.¹ That was characteristic of the 18th century when societies had almost the proud separation of Leibnitzian monads. It is familiar still, but it is not characteristic. A great advance was made in the effort to organise charity. However faulty the first theory of organisation may be, it is a recognition of the public nature of problems of distress.

Philanthropy pressed far enough must by its own inherent nature become a doctrine of society, and the philanthropist a sociologist.

We are then led on to discern a neglected element in Sociology. Exactly in proportion as he becomes an agitator does the philanthropist universalise his problem. His subject matter ceases to be "these boys" and becomes "this society." It is not possible for the philanthropist or the agitator, still less for the man who combines the two characters, to proceed in the cool and unconcerned manner of the mere observer. Far as he may banish action from him, it was a practical end which first impelled him to think, and even his most recondite studies will be touched with something of that social enthusiasm which first called him to sociological enquiries.

Let us put this development from philanthropist to sociologist in another form, for it is worth some trouble to understand. The early philanthropist attacked particular abuses, and failed to remedy them because he treated them as particular; the modern sociological agitator regards every abuse in its relation to the whole range of social life, that is to say he adopts the method of science. But at the same time scientific method is given practical driving force by the infusion of the philanthropic mood.

Method and mood do not always exist in the same mind. That is a misfortune, but, as we shall see when we come to

¹ E.g., the Twentieth Century League was already in existence when Sir Lauder Brunton started the National League of Physical Education with a similar aim, unaware of the existence of the former society. "Not a little curious," is the comment of the Committee on Physical Deterioration, Report, sec. 377.

study "the agitated mass," it is not a fatal defect. When they do co-exist we have the perfect agitator, who fully and adequately expresses the philanthropic ideal. Philanthropy's highest distinction is to produce a perfect agitator.

Let it be admitted that when we have found him he will not be a good politician. It is not his to do, but what is much more difficult, a very labour of Hercules, to insist on the end for which action is to be undertaken. If that is true of the perfect agitator, it is much more applicable to the actual embodiments of him with whom we are familiar. The philanthropist must conquer the last infirmity of trying to be practical. He will be in the world of action and therefore not "academic," but not of that world and therefore no politician. He should combine the detachment of the recluse with the aggressiveness of the demagogue.

APPENDIX II.

LEAVES FROM THE AUTHOR'S NOTE-BOOK.

Work for the Private Citizen. We have reached a point in our discussion at which, if we are not wary, we shall suffer much embarrassment. This risk is due to the circumstance that we are tracing the growth of an idea, and of one which is passing through a very rapid series of changes. And the difficulty is none the less because we might have foreseen it from afar. That glance which we threw on the relations of philanthropists and politicians in the first chapter should have been warning enough, so obviously impossible was it to keep their respective spheres apart. They were bound to coincide, and to be sure there was a timid movement towards including philanthropy in politics in that tendency of which Professor Cunningham and the Fabians make so much as "Tory philanthropy." But there was little prospect of success on these lines because the function of the two interests was merely mechanical and not vital. The movement of thought at the present day is in the opposite direction. In place of the attempt to introduce philanthropy into politics we are busy in making philanthropy itself political, and that suggests philanthropic politics in place of philanthropy in politics.

This interesting phase of thought was implicit in those discussions by which a century ago men sought to work out the connections between philanthropy and police,¹ or in other words to demonstrate philanthropy as an integral branch of the art of government. If we follow out the suggestions of these earlier thinkers we are obliged to contest the notion of philanthropy as a private concern and to recognise in it a public function. But for this public function there was, a century ago, no appropriate organ. It is difficult to see how before 1835 (Municipal Corporations Act), or 1848 (Public Health Act), any better compromise could have been arrived at than that described in the first chapter. Then, as we saw, the philanthropic and political problems were held to be distinct although they formed the pre-occupation of the same people. So long as people were taken in by this delusive appearance of separateness the embarrassment to which I have referred did not arise. And even at the present time there are many benevolent per-

¹ See "History of English Philanthropy," chap. viii.

sons who continue to ignore the public and political character of all work in practical philanthropy. Nevertheless the distinction is grown threadbare. We find at every point that the characteristic philanthropies of the day are becoming more and more political. This being so it is time to mark the change by some corresponding addition to our vocabulary. I have accordingly chosen for the title of this part of my book the term Private Citizen.

It is not entirely appropriate, but that is not my fault. "Citizen" refers us back to the City-state which has ceased to be; there is no corresponding word to describe the member of the modern Nation-state, and until we have so firmly grasped the concept of "member of the Nation-state" as to strike out a single descriptive word to carry the new thought, we must be content to stretch the meaning of the good old word citizen. In the following discussion therefore I shall use as equivalent to "member of the Nation-state" the title borrowed from the smaller but more vitally organised City-state. And this term "citizen" will be used as so nearly synonymous with philanthropist as to be interchangeable with it. But there are philanthropists and philanthropists. Some of them are specialists and in that case may be regarded as social politicians. Others are not specialists. I will not use so opprobrious a designation for them as that of "general philanthropist," for that would suggest the busy-body. The philanthropist as "citizen" recognises the public aspect of work and is prepared to take his share in it, whether by the payment of his taxes, or service on an elected authority, or by service in what we call, coarsely, co-option, and the Germans, with more delicacy of sentiment, an honour-office. The philanthropist as social politician devotes much time either in "practical" work or in discharging another function which is to form the subject of the next chapter. When I use the title philanthropist the context must determine whether "as social politician" or "as citizen" is to be added. It would seem to follow that philanthropy "in itself" is disappearing from our ken. And this is exactly what is in process of happening in the world of affairs, for its functions belong on the one hand to the social politician and on the other to the good citizen.

Philanthropy is no true function of a healthy society. But to say this is not a condemnation of the philanthropist. He has endeavoured to perform two tasks, because those to whom they properly belong had neglected them. Philanthropy has played a prominent rôle because politicians did not understand their craft, nor citizens discharge their duty. I shall resent a charge of speaking ill of philanthropists because I point out their weakness in matters of routine, since I, at the same time,

assert their influence in re-making citizenship and re-constructing politics.

The Relation of the State to the Weaker Classes. Those who cannot earn enough to support themselves are and must be a charge on others; at present they are so, partly on the poor, or those who are least able to bear it, partly on philanthropy, which is not able to discharge it.

The simplest and only adequate form of insurance against risk is through taxation. The present cost of providing for the weak is excessive as well as inadequate.

Query; whether State action would not be economical, in comparison with present cost for very inadequate result?

When the cost is thrown obviously on Society there will be a strong inducement to reduce the cost by eliminating the risks and causes of disease. Thus by comprehensive provision for the weaker classes a National minimum will be secured.

General Argument. The State must take cognisance, which implies responsibility for what is done. It is not *necessary* for it to replace private venture and *do everything*. But there will be a healthy tendency for this to happen.

Philanthropy. Note the reflex action of the exaggeration of philanthropy on control and administration.

England became wealthy long before the growth of any adequate theory of social life in an industrial community. Thence result two characteristics: (1) the perception of extremes, with an excess of sentiment over knowledge, (2) a lack of thoroughness. Public ameliorative action still continues to be philanthropic, and perpetuates these two characteristics—seeing only startling symptoms, and therefore dealing only superficially with the mischief.

Note on Newspaper Relief Funds. One of the Philanthropic forces to be reckoned with is the incalculable response of the naive crowd to immediate distress: it may create as much misery as it relieves. But it sets a limit to the extent to which *laissez faire* can be carried. It is a shallow and uninstructed recognition of solidarity.

Scientific Benevolence. "To make benevolence scientific is the great problem of the present day," which becomes in practice the problem, how to organise charity. Now organised charity rests on a false theory of society, and is itself a contradictory term.

Charity as an institution attempts to do work which is a public political charge, because its tradition was formed in a period when social theory was crude, when, *i.e.*, (1) the facts of social interdependence were not recognised, and (2) interdependence was not nearly so close as at present.

We have to ask: (1) Whether these works which Philanthropy attempts are necessary (a) under present conditions, (b) under

conditions which can be foreseen, *e.g.*, if a living wage should become customary. (2) Whether, if necessary, they are works for Philanthropy or for the Community.

Take a list of good works, *e.g.*, Consumptive (or general) Hospitals. What is needed? What are the causes of need? How can the need be diminished? How best supplied? For lack of answer to such questions the body politic is distressed. And we lack answers because we have no sound social theory.

We have in effect to delimit boundaries: showing, first, the present confusion, and this involves some description of origin of the double agency (which again rests on the incompatibility of 19th century humanitarian and political thought). To show the confusion and on what the confusion rests.

There are two principles to guide: (1) There are groups of people who cannot support themselves or manage their own lives. These are (a) natural groups, as children who can do neither, or old persons who cannot (when old) do the first. Or (b) artificial groups, as epileptics, *i.e.*, groups which we cannot, or certainly do not, wish to diminish, and groups which we both wish to and can lessen. An analysis of these groups, especially the latter ones, shows that, while they exist, they must be maintained. To avoid the cost of supporting these, whether by Philanthropy or Community, we must abolish the groups. You can't make an epileptic a healthy epileptic. (2) Groups which are a burden, but need not be: thus you can make an ill-paid into a well-paid labourer (or let him stand revealed as not independent).

Philanthropy. I treat Philanthropy seriously because of what it implies; its professors have commonly not been very efficacious. But throughout we may trace an intention (sub-conscious) which is important:—

A second communal ideal, existing side by side with the first, which has successively been (a) Power (against other Powers); (b) Wealth regarded as (1) National Dividend; or (2) amplitude for the governing classes. The Philanthropic ideal is concerned not with National Power or Wealth, but National Well-being, especially of the feeble and poor. The Philanthropist has kept this idea from perishing. (It was the work of the Church. But the corporate work of the Church fell to the State as supreme in the new established Church; its corporate function obviously could not be fulfilled by voluntary religious societies even after they were recognised. The modern State includes the Church idea of Commonwealth).

Note for Chapter on the Unemployed. "Surplus Labour." 12. viii., '03. Consider the theory that the poor are naturally independent, not only while able-bodied, but from infancy to death.

The assumption is that all relief acts as an aid-to-wages,

and therefore depresses wages; further, that but for the degrading influence the worker's wage would enable him to be self-supporting. It is clear that somehow the labourer must gain a subsistence during his working period, or the work will not be done. So far the assumption is correct; if there are no aids-to-wages, their wage must equal bare subsistence for the worker while he lives.

But the theory ignores the existence of "surplus labour." The employer can use up labour power, and then discard the man and take on another. The assumption would contain a further element of truth if employers were intelligent and regarded the future supply of labour as equally important with the present. Their wages must be equal to the subsistence, not only of workers, but of enough children to take their places. But there is no economic necessity for wage to equal subsistence after the working period. At the present time it does not do so either in the case of general labour or most women's labour. In fact, the general labour wage does not equal subsistence for a family even during the working period. It may be replied that, given a stronger moral sense which would compel the worker to refuse nourishment for himself better than he could give his family, wages would rise. The argument is very doubtful. It would be a perversion of the moral sense to put provision for an uncertain old age on an equality with a present certain need for sustenance.

In the poorest class, the care of sickness is the same. There is no economic necessity to make the wage equal to subsistence, ill or well, while there is surplus labour to replace the worker who falls ill.

23. viii. '03. *Fallacy in the Workhouse, or Charity School Ideal.* It was assumed that the great obstacle to prosperity of the poor was their lazy reluctance to work; but the real cause of distress lay in the fact that as society was organised the making of the maximum profit required large classes to be underpaid and some to be unemployed.

Setting children of four and five to work is no remedy for the poverty of families.

Note for the Theory of State Intervention. In the course of the previous chapters we have had occasion to trace this intervention of the State taking place as a fact in one sphere after another of social action. The degree in which the State as instrument of the collective will has succeeded in penetrating philanthropy has varied indefinitely. Here, as in elementary education, the process had been one of annexation; there again, as in regard to widows, we discern no more than a shadow of responsibility. But however far the process may have gone, it is in every instance incomplete, shifting and unstable, because

nowhere does it rest on any coherent doctrine of society. It has been all along a hand to mouth policy.

There is not wanting a teaching which would give theoretic justification to a more thorough-going intervention of the State than has actually taken place. But curiously enough, while the intervention is normal for these who hold socialist views of society, and is an anomaly for those who dispute such views, the actual intervention studied here has been brought about by men quite guiltless of socialist intention. It may be that the increasing depth of the philanthropic conception of the State was from the first determined by an element of inchoate and unconscious socialism in philanthropy itself. And certainly no conscious and reasoned socialist standard can be satisfied with the remedial measures which we have been considering. Socialism attacks the central citadel of our present society, and traces social distress to radical defects in the industrial structure itself. It is concerned with an intrinsic injustice which it discovers in the relations between the *normal* groups of which society is composed. It denies the validity or the righteousness of a system which perpetuates the distinction of rich and poor.

Philanthropy on the other hand is concerned chiefly if not exclusively with *abnormal* groups. The philanthropic intervention of the State has been on behalf of its *weaker classes*, and especially of those classes when their distress results from some special and *incalculable disability*. In doing so much it has been driven to overstep the limits prescribed by the rigid teaching of self-help. I hardly know whether it has been helped or hindered by its lack of clear understanding of what it has been doing. Probably on the whole the confused thought of philanthropy has been an assistance because there is a strong sympathy for humane conduct so long as it be not of malice aforethought.

The main object of the present chapter is to sketch some leading outlines of the purpose or the implicit thought involved in the philanthropic movements of recent times, and to consider how far these movements may be expected to continue on their present lines. Briefly, the problem of philanthropy is *the problem of insurance against risks*. Or, as J. S. Mill puts it, "A State ought to be considered a great benefit society or mutual insurance company for helping (under the necessary regulations for preventing abuse) that large proportion of its members who cannot help themselves."¹

The millionaire. Note (1) his claim on social esteem, just for being a millionaire, (2) he is justified by his benefactions; (3) reject the former and criticise the latter, *i.e.*, *qua* million-

¹ J. S. Mill (on Coleridge) Dissertations, I. 454.

aire, he is not a social element of value (but a pest); if all millionaires were benefactors (which they are not) it is doubtful if even their benefaction is socially valuable: (a) it depends on a whim and may be unintelligent, (b) it is incalculable, and therefore demoralising.

Mary Carpenter. Miss C. quotes a story of a child of seven found housebreaking, and comments "thus was tried and found wanting the society of which that child was an outcast."

In face of this what a misunderstanding is shewn in the following remark by Miss Carpenter on the real good of ragged school work. "The rich and titled have felt their human sympathies awakened by coming into actual contact with the wanderers of the highways and byeways; and high-born children have been pleased to serve the tables of the lowest in the land." (*Reformatory Schools*, p. 147).

Thus they conceal from themselves their guilt. This is the office of philanthropy.

To Analyse Philanthropic Sentiment. It tends to dwell on what is done, rather than on what is left undone . . . it is well to remember the one, not to forget the many. Even as to the one, the feeling of the philanthropist is often relieved before the need of the recipient.

The idea of social reform has become very active, but it proceeds on wrong lines—the notion of a people needing tutelage. A common fallacy is to suppose that the working classes are like children, e.g., the clerical view of the pastor and his flock; the grandmotherly visitor.

"They do not so much need something more as to be made something better; if they are helped to improve themselves they will not fall into want. Give personal service to uplifting the poor and they won't want half-crowns" (you have less half crowns than you want to keep and more leisure than you know what to do with).

There are many abnormally weak or vicious members; but to attempt to hold a class in leading strings is absurd.

The working class must be left to live its own life free from "home missions," and the whole apparatus of reform directed by a superior class. And indeed this 30 millions of British folk is full of strength, and it is among them we must look for a truer social morality.

Morality. If it is superfluous to doubt the power, how about the morality of the coming race? Assuredly it will not satisfy the ideal of the Sunday School story-book or of the grandmotherly visitor. In one respect however a study of the working classes shows a reservoir of morality as well as of power. The people have absorbed and suffered from the teaching of Smiles: the immoral individualism of some centuries of Protestantism (in religion and politics) has seared the soul of the

people. But the workers still retain some ethos: specially so in (homogeneous) groups. They ask a "living wage"; they would not "best" their fellows. This communistic consciousness of solidarity is very noticeable in the Russian village community, and will re-act on Western Europe.

In virtue of this characteristic which has resisted the teaching of Political Economy and the Church, the (working class) proletariat is still a social solidarity guided by moral considerations.

Note for Part III. 10. iv. '06. Philanthropy as an institution has acquired inertia. It becomes a socio-political entity, and is often in opposition to more complete corporate forms. It accepts itself as permanent, whereas it is relative to a rudimentary or diseased social form.

Further, Philanthropy having become institutional, creates a particular class psychology and a conviction of its own invaluable-ness. This is partly the natural jealousy of being superseded. Partly also an hereditary tendency to regard its own action is "good." Now, good action is essential to society, but not necessarily . . . this good action. In such ways Philanthropy, arguing, first: "this is good"—then: "this is only good," becomes an obstacle to progress. At the beginning of the 19th century many things could not be done at all except by Philanthropy; now some of them can be better done otherwise. But the Philanthropic consciousness has not changed equally with circumstance.

The State is the Social Instrument for attaining the ends of common welfare; *i.e.* it is so ideally; but in 1800 it was not a means by which the people sought their well-being, but a weapon to keep them in subjection. To some extent it is so still.

Note for Part IV. The Political Question: Philanthropy or Social Politics. A resolute treatment of social distress on a National scale would in a short time do away with much of it. Want, *i.e.*, is largely not permanent, if you give up organising charity and organise society. Most infants are born healthy; there is no degenerate class.

There would remain some who are unfit in mind or body, and these are properly the charge of Society, not as a matter of charity, but of mutual aid. For the Social Unit is Society.

Most of the distress results from inadequate "estate," and would disappear with a just distribution of wealth. Consider the corrupting influence of great wealth on its owners and on the community.

Just as philanthropy would not give up its task and was driven to State for relief of distress, so unless it now abandons the task it will be driven to State action for the prevention of distress—to State action for securing the means to satisfy an increasingly high standard of life.

Neither Philanthropy nor Politics is immediately concerned with life, but with life conditions. The final end set by philanthropy and which Society alone through the State can secure, is: to bring the means of life and livelihood within reach of all, or to secure a progressive minimum; the aim being, not to compel equality, but to set a limit below which inequality shall not go. (See Menger, *Staatslehre*, Buch I. K. 11).

It is argued that if the State provided for all wants, we should all be selfish: and that

“Pity would be no more

 | If we did not keep somebody poor.” |

But it is hardly worth while to keep one-third of the population in penury for the sake of affording to some highly gifted individuals the opportunity of sympathising with their distress.

Note for The Reservoir of Power. Neither Philanthropy nor the State is immediately concerned with life, but with life-conditions; and if only the conditions are wrong, not the life wanting, this is sufficient.

There is no lack of power. The common men will live strongly given the chance. That is not to say, “Nothing lacks but circumstance.”

Life may be strong, yet ideals of life faulty, and education for life imperfect. The fitting complement to the present study of life conditions is a study of education as influenced by social ideals.

We have heard too much of *l'homme sensuel moyen*, and have failed to recognise that, in Walt Whitman's fine phrase the common man is “eligible for the best.”¹

We have heard too much of restraint and have conceived liberty too narrowly.

“Let My people go that they may serve Me.”

¹ See B. Bosanquet's discussion of State as mere hinderer of Hindrance. “Philosophic Theory of the State,” pp. 192-3.

INDEX.

ACTS OF PARLIAMENT:—

Canal Boats Acts, 1877-1884, 39
 Chimney Sweepers Act, 1788,
 213 *note*
 Cleansing of Persons Act, 1897,
 270
 Cruel Treatment of Cattle Act,
 1822, 212
 Cruelty to Animals Act, 1835, 212
 Cruelty to Children Acts, 1889,
 1894, 1904, 217, 220
 Factory Acts, 1833, 1844, 1901,
 and 1907, 31, 40, 185, 186
 Habitual Drunkards Act, 1879,
 195
 Industrial Schools Acts, 1857,
 1861 and 1866, 169
 Inebriate Acts, 1879 and 1898,
 195, 197
 Isolation and Fever Hospital
 Acts, 260
 Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867,
 226
 Municipal Corporations Act,
 1835, 52, 60, 317
 Notification of Diseases Acts,
 260
 Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834,
 87, 93, 100
 Prison Consolidation Acts, 1865,
 and 1877, 152
 Public Health Acts, 85, 267,
 317
 School Board Act, 1870, 141
 Vaccination Acts, 271
 Young Offenders Acts, 1838 and
 1901, 152, 168
Ad hoc Local Authorities, notes on,
 72, 73, 128, *note*
 Adams, Mr. Sergeant, 151
 "After Care Association," 201, 202
 "Aged Pilgrims Friend Society,"
 290
 Aged Poor, *see* Old Age Pensions—
 Old People
 Agitation—"The Perfect Agitator,"
 302, *et. seq.*,
 Agricultural Labourers' rate-aided
 Wages, Abolition of, 95
 Ainstie, Dr., 225
 "Alcohol Diathesis," 193

Alcoholism *see* Inebriety
 Alison, W. P., "Management of the
 Poor," 94
 Allen, William, 3, 5, 6, 10 *note*.
 Allotments, Effects of Poor Law
 Amendment Act, 1834, on, 99
 Allowance System, Evils of, 89
 Almshouses, 290
 Althorp, Lord, 6, 140
 Andover Workhouse Scandal, 101
 Animals, Society for Prevention of
 Cruelty to, 211
 Annexation considered as a form of
 State Action, 130, 134
 Apprenticeship System replaced by
 Training in Institutions, 71
 Ashley, Lord, *see* Shaftesbury, Earl
 of
 Ashley, P., "English Local Govern-
 ment," 57 *note*
 Asylums, Lunatic, *see* Bethlehem—
 Hanwell—Lunatics.
 BAGEHOT, WALTER, 22
 Baker, Barwick, 168
 Baker, Charles, 71 *note*, 120 *note*
 Bardswell, Dr., 252 *note*, 254 *note*
 Barnardo's Homes, 176, 282
 Barrack Schools for Pauper Children,
 107
 Barry Municipal Accident Wards, 270
 Bêche, Sir T. H. de la, 53
 Begging Letters, Charity Organisa-
 tion Society's anti-mendicity work,
 113
 Bell, Dr., 139
 Benevolent Societies assisting
 Widows, 280, 281
 Bentham, Jeremy, 102
 Bernard, Sir Thomas, 45, 99
 Bethelhem Hospital:
 Exhibition of Patients, 1827, 137
 Rebuilding of, 136
 "Birmingham Brotherly Society,"
 1796, 71
 Birmingham Children's Court, 156
 Birmingham Conference on Children,
 1852, 168, 171
 Births, Deaths, and Marriages Sta-
 tistics, Social Effects of promulga-
 tion, 18

- Black, Clementina, 276 *note*
 Blake, William, 60
 Blind, Charities for, 6
 Board of Health, *see* Health
 Boarded-out Children, 107, 282
 Booth, Rt. Hon. Charles, 17, 113, 279, 289, 297
 Statistical Type of Agitator, 312
 Borstal System for Juvenile Offenders, 150, 153, 156
 Bosanquet, Bernard, 62 *note*, 324
 Bosanquet, Helen, 119
 Bourne, W. Sturges, 91
 Boys' Clubs, 71
 Bradford:
 Consumption Sanatorium, 251
 Poor Law Union Improvements, 109 *note*
 Braidwood, Thomas, 6
 Braithwaite, Dr., 193, 196, 201
 Bratsch, M., 61
 Bray, Charles, "Phases of Opinion," 78 *note*
 Brenton, Captain, 151, 152 *note*
 Bentry Inebriate Reformatory, 198
 Brighton Municipal Sanatorium, 129, 251, 269
 Bristol Statistical Society, 15
 British Institute of Social Service, 314
 British and Foreign Schools Society, 1808, 37, 139, 143
 Broadbent, Sir William, 252 *note*
 Brompton Hospital, 246, 247
 Brougham, Lord, 41, 71, 139
 Brunton, Sir Lauder, 315 *note*
 Buccleuch, Duke of, 53
 Buchanan, Dr., 228
 Burdett, Sir Henry, 65 *note*, 222 *note*, 228 *note*, 230
 Bury, Educational Report on, 1835, 15 *note*
 Byron, Lady Noel, 168
- CADBURY, MATHESON, & SHANN,"
 "Women's Work in Birmingham," 276 *note*
 Caird, A. N., "Cry of the Children," 171
 Canal Boats Acts, 1877 and 1884, 39
 Carpenter, Mary, 152, 158, 167, 168 *note*, 171, 174, 322
 Evangelical Type of Agitator, 307
 Carr, Dr., 225
 Census Statistics—Social Effects of their promulgation, 18
 Central Society of Education, 144
 Centralisation principle in Administration, 82, 88, 128, 310
 Certified Inebriate Reformatories, 198
 Chadwick, Sir Edwin, 45, 84
 Agitator, "Chadwick" Type, 309
 Board of Health, Member of, 75, 79, 80
 Centralisation advocated by, 82, 88, 128, 310
 Characteristics of, 81
 Health of Towns Commission, Chadwick's influence upon, 54
 Inspection advocated by, 36
 Local Autonomy, Objections to, 97, 128
 Poor Law Board Secretary, 81, 88
 Poor Law Commissioner, 1834, 81
 Chalmers, Dr., 10, 88, 92, 93
 Chance, Sir William, "Children and the Poor Law," 107
 Charitable Institutions Inspection, Opposition to, 37
 Charity Organisation, General Considerations of, 111
 Charity Organisation Society:
 Begging Letters—Society's anti-mendicity Work, 113
 Character Test Criticised, 115, 116
 Charities Register, 172, 247
 Establishment of, 108
 Housing, Society's Views on, 119
 Origin of, 115 *note*, 120
 Pensions, 296
 Poverty, Optimistic Views as to, 117
 Scope and Activities, 111
 Charity School Ideal, Fallacy in, Note 320
 Child Labour, Conditions and Results of, 183, 289
 Children:
 Adolescence, Social Value of, 181
 Birmingham Children's Court, 156
 Boarded-out, 107, 282
 Cruelty to, *see* that Title
 Destitute, Homes for, 176
 Economic Position of Childhood, 183, 189, 289
 Juvenile Offenders, *see* that Title
 Orphans, *see* Widow and Orphan

Children—*continued.*

- Pauper Children, Treatment of, 106, 107
- School Children, *see* Elementary Schools
- Workhouses, Condition of Children in, 106
- "Children's Friend Society," 151
- Chimney Sweeps, *see* Climbing Boys
- Cholera Epidemics 1831-32, leading to notification of infectious diseases, 44
- Christian Socialist Movement, 19, 22
- Church Army Labour Colonies, assisting Discharged Prisoners, 160
- Church Army Missions in Prisons, 158
- Church Schools, Position of, under School Board Act, 1870, 141
- Cities:
 - Administration, Powers of, 70
 - "Citizen," Substitute for, in "Nation-State," 317
 - Civic Action, increasing range of, 129
 - Civic Consciousness, 56, 62, 66, 71, 74
 - Civic Impulse in Europe, 58
 - Corporate Action replacing Individual Philanthropy, 58
 - Community Building and City Making, Distinction Between, 59
 - Functions of, in the State, 61
 - Growth of the City, 56
 - Improvements, Causes Leading to, 63 *et. seq.*
 - Liberty of the City, 62
 - Philanthropic Association, Municipalities replacing Work of, 7
 - Problems of City and Community, 60
 - Rush to the Towns, Effects of, 63, 69
 - State Control in the Modern City, 67
 - Work of Cities, 69
 - See also* Health of Towns
- Cleansing of Persons Act, 1897, 270
- Clergy Orphanage Corporation, 282
- Climbing Boys:
 - Chimney Sweepers Act, 1788, 213 *note*
 - Inspector Appointed, 32
 - Legal Interference, 213 *note*
 - Sidney Smith on, 11 *note*

Climbing Boys—*continued.*

- "Society for Superseding the Climbing Boys," Work of, 11
- Sweeping Machine Introduced, 11
- White List of Employers using Machines, 12
- Coastguard Stations, Libraries for, 6
- Coleridge, S. T., 21
- Colquhoun, P., 92
- Communitistic Settlements Founded by Robert Owen, 59, 60 *note*
- Comte, Auguste, 23
- "Consulting Physician to the Community," 269
- Consumption, *see* Tuberculosis
- Convalescent Homes for Hospital Patients, Position of, 237
- Co-operation considered as Type of State Action, 131, 146
- Co-ordination considered as Type of State Action, 132, 190, 202
- Corn Exchange Benevolent Society, 281
- Cottage Homes for Pauper Children, 107, 282
- Country Exodus Resulting From Open Spaces in Towns, 43
- "Country Towns Mission, 1837," origin of, 65 *note*
- Cowper, Mr., 141
- Crawford, H., 32
- Creighton's "History of Epidemics," 44 *note*
- Crime, *see* Prisons
- Criminology, Study of, necessary for Prison Philanthropy, 165
- Cruel Treatment of Cattle Act, 1822, 212
- Cruelty to Animals Act, 1835, 212
- Cruelty to Animals, Society for Prevention of, 211
- Cruelty to Children:
 - Acts of Parliament, 1889, 1894 and 1904, 217, 220
 - Climbing Boys, *see* that Title
 - Criminal Statistics, 1891 — Cruelty designated an "Offence" by, 215
- Cruelty to Children, Society for Prevention of:
 - Ambiguous Position, 216
 - Delegation of State Action—Example of, 133
 - Financial Position, 217
 - General Account of, 211
 - Inebriate Parents, Convictions Against, 203

- Cruelty to Children, Society for Prevention of—*continued*.
 Inspection by, 29, 39
 Nationalisation of Society's Work Suggested, 218
 Powers of Search for Cases, 214 *note*
 Protection of Child v. Liberty of Subject, 214
 Royal Charter received by, 215
 Cunningham's "Growth of English Industry and Commerce," 106 *note*
 Czar Nicholas' Interest in Robert Owen's Work, 8
- DALRYMPLE, DR., 195
 Dangerous Trades, 242
 Deaf and Dumb, Charities for, 6
 Deaths:
 Alcoholism, inadequate registration of Deaths from, 207
 Births, Deaths, etc., Statistics, Effects of Promulgation of, 18
 Death-rate, heavy, before Town Improvements made, 43, 63
 Delegation Considered as a Type of State Action, 132
 Denison, Edward, 124
 Dicey, Prof., A. V. 10 *note*, 30 *note*, 360
 Dietaries in Workhouses, 1836, 102
 Digby, Kenelm, 201
 "Discharged Prisoners Aid Society," Work of, 158
 Dispauperisation of Agricultural Labourers, 96
 Distress, *see* Social Distress
 District Nurses, 92, 270, 313
 District Schools for Pauper Children, 106, 107
 Dodd, F. Lawson, 269 *note*
 Drainage, *see* Sanitation
 Drapers Company's Schools, 282
 Drink, *see* Inebriate Homes—Inebriety
- EDUCATION:
 British and Foreign Society, 1808, 37, 139, 143
 Central Society, 144
 County and Borough Authorities, Work of, 129
 Cruelty to Children, Education Department suggested to deal with, 219
 (Efficient v. "Cheap" Education, 142
- Education—*continued*.
 Elementary Schools, *see* that Title
 National Society, 37, 139, 140 *note*, 142, 143
 National System of, Movement in favour of, 140
 School Board Act, 1870, 141
 Education Bill (Feeding of Children) Act, 1906, 140 *note*
 Elementary Schools:
 Church Schools, position of, 37, 141
 Grants, result of, 140
 History of, 139 *note*
 Feeding of School Children, 140 *note*, 292
 Inspection of, 29, 37
 Medical Inspection, 219 *note*
 State Schools, 139
 Enfranchisement, Political, insufficient as a means towards Municipal Self-government, 66
 Environment and Heredity as Influences upon Disease, 264
 "Ethical Problem in an Industrial Community," 14 *note*
 Evangelical Type of Agitator, 307
- FARNINGHAM Homes for Little Boys, 176
 Farr, Dr., 18, 104
 Factories and Workshops:
 Child Labour, Condition and Results of, 183
 Consumption, Influence of Factories in developing, 246
 Factory Acts, 1833, 1844, 1901, and 1907, 31, 40, 185, 186
 Inspectors, General considerations of their Work, 29
 Reports, Social effects of promulgating, 19
 Feeble-minded, Detention in Prison, Notes on, 164
 Felkin, W., 64
 Fever, Southwood Smith's Treatise on, 79
 Fielding's Asylum, 92
 Fox, Wilson, 96 *note*
 Foxwell, Professor, 311
 France, Development of City Life in, 61
 Friendly Societies:
 Pensions and Sick Pay, 296
 Widows and Orphans assisted by, 280
 "Friends of Foreigners in Distress Society," 1807, 92

- Fry, Elizabeth, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 32, 33, 35, 137, 157
Evangelical Type of Agitator, 307
- GARDENS & PARKS Provision, 71
Gavin, Hector, 51 *note*, 304 *note*
Germany:
Hospitals, Provision for, 230, 249
Stein's Ordinance influencing Development of Cities, 60, 61
Workmen's Insurance Hospitals, 230, 249
Giffen, Sir R., 118 *note*
Girdlestone, Rev. Charles, 45
Glasgow Poor Relief, Dr. Chalmers' Work, 93
Gorst, Sir John, 106, 294
Goschen, Lord, 108
Grainger, Mr., 47
Gray's Yard Ragged Church, Origin of, 1835, 65 *note*
Great Northern Hospital, 223 *note*
Green, Mrs. "Town Life in 15th Century," 68
- HABITUAL DRUNKARDS:
Act of Parliament, 1879, 195
Compulsory Detention, failure of, 196
Select Committee, 1872, 195
"Society for Control and Care of," 1877, 195
- Halifax Union Infirmary, 108, 226
Hall, W.C., "Queen's Reign for Children," 217
Hanway, Jonas, 32
Hanwell County Asylum, 137
Harcourt, Sir William, on Work of Inspectors, 36
Hardwick Reformatory Movement, 1852, History of, 168
Hart, Ernest, 225
Haw, George, "Britain's Homes," 306 *note*
Hawksley, Dr., 122
Health Visitors, General Considerations of their Work, 29
Health, Board of, 1848-54, 60
Commissioners, Characteristics of, 79
Dissolution, Cause and Effects of, 78, 84
Establishment of, 44, 75, 256
Final Report, 1854, 79
House of Commons Debate, 1854, Proposals made, 84
- Health, Board of—*continued*.
Philanthropists, Commissioners appointed as, 84
Reaction against its Policy, 78
Reports, 77
Work of, General Review, 85
Health of Towns Association, 1839, 43
Establishment of, 59
Lectures by, 50
Original Members of, 47
"Weekly Sheet," published by, 51 *note*
Health of Towns Commission, 1844-45, 52
Names of Commissioners, 53 ...
Proposals of, 55
Reports, 263 *note*
Witnesses, List of, 54
Heather's Pensions for Widows, 296
Heredity and Environment as Influences upon Disease, 264
Hicks, S. M., 121
"History of Philanthropy," 3 *note*, 5 *note*
Hogg, Quintin, 71
Holford, George, 151
Holmes, T., 173 *note*
Holloway Gaol, Classes for Prisoners in, 158
Holloway, Thomas, 138
Holyoake, George Jacob, 305
Home—Causes leading to Inspection of the Home, 39
Hospitals:
Consumption Hospitals, 246
Convalescent Homes in connection with, 237
Financial Difficulties, 223, 232
General Account of, 222, *et. seq.*
German Workmen's Insurance Hospitals, 230, 249
Health Committee—the Nafural Hospital Authority, 238
Inadequate Accommodation, 229
Infectious Diseases, Hospitals for, 227
Infirmarys, *see* that Title
Isolation, 228
"Lancet" Commission Report, 1865-66, Notes on Hospitals, 105, 225
Medical Staff, 240
Municipal Hospitals anticipated, 73, 233
Number of Patients in 1901, 224
Nursing Staff, 234

Hospitals—continued.

- Out-Patient Department, alleged "abuse" of, 233, 262
- Payment of Officials, 240
- Sanitary Standard, Rise in, 224
- Stationary Hospitals and a migrating population, Problem of, 231
- Voluntary Subscription Hospital, first founded, 222 *note*
- Housing, Charity Organisation Society's Views on, 119
- Howard Association, 164
- Howard, John, 12, 312, 313
- Humphrey, A. M., 280 *note*, 287, 293
- Hutchins and Harrison, "History of Factory Legislation," 31 *note*
- Hygiene, Importance of, to Public Health, 257, 260

IMAGINATION in Social Politics, Influence of, 20

"Index to the Statutes in Force," 70

Industrial Schools, *see* Reformatories and Industrial Schools

Inebriate Homes and Reformatories: Certified and State Reformatories, 198, 200

Combination of Reformatories, 199

Compulsory Committal to, 203

Co-ordination—Inebriate Homes an example of, 132, 197

General Account of, 190

Local Authorities' Obligatory Provision proposal, 203

Prison Reformatories compared with, 206

Voluntary Retreats, 197, 201

"Inebriate Reformatories and After Care Association," 201

Inebriety:

British Society for the Study of, 204, 314

Deaths from, inadequate registration of, 207

Habitual Drunkards, *see* that Title

History and Treatment of, 194

Inebriates' Act, 1898, 195

Justices' Unwillingness to apply Law against, 208

Lawyers, unsuitable administrators of Inebriate Law, 209

Patients beyond reach of Law, 202

Infectious Diseases:

Hospitals for, 227

Notification, early Attempts, 44

Infirmaries in Workhouses:

Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, 226

Reforms in, 226

Separate Provision for, 105

State Administration, Causes leading to, 225, 226, 227

See also Hospitals—Medical Relief

Insane *see* Lunatics

Inspectors:

Function and Work of, 29, 31,

Homes, Inspection of, 39

Medical, and Health Visitors, 267, 268

Official and Amateur, relative Merits of, 35

Original Intentions of Appointments, 30

Opposition to, 36

See also Elementary Schools—Factories—Prison Inspectors

JEPHSON "Sanitary Evolution of London," 228 *note*

Joint Stock Companies and Philanthropic Association, connection between, 72, 73

Juvenile Offenders:

Adolescence, Social Value of, 181

Borstal System, 150, 153, 156

Depredations by, 167, 171

Treatment of, 150

KAY, Dr., 54

Kay-Shuttleworth, 37 *note*, 140 *note* 144

Kelynack, Dr., 129, 251 *note*

King's College Hospital, 223 *note*

Kingsley, Charles, 105

Kropotkin, Prince, on distinction between State and Philanthropy, 13

LABOUR Power of Childhood and Old Age, 289

Laissez-faire Doctrine upheld by early Philanthropists, 120

"Lambeth Guardian," Pamphlet by, 36

Lancaster, Mr., 139

"Lancet" Commission, Report, 1865-66, 105, 225

- Laundries, Institutional, not open to Inspection, 38
- Laurie, S. S., "Decentralising Education Policy, 143 *note*
- Law of Settlement, 92
- Leeds Workhouse Board, 53
- Leicester :
 Health Department, 129
 Tuberculosis Treatment, 251
- Leopold Home, 282
- Leslie, Cliffe, 22
- Lewes, Mrs. C.-L., "Southwood Smith, a Retrospect," 75 *note*, 80
- Lewis, C., Cornwall, 103
- Libraries for Coastguard Stations, 6
- Lichfield, Lord, 124
- Lincoln Asylum, 138
- Lincoln, Earl of, 53
- Liverpool :
 Condition of, Health of Towns Commission, 52
 Cruelty to Children Prevention, Liverpool Society, 215
 Fever Hospital, 1892, 227 *note*
 Medical Officer of Health's Report, 1905, 268 *note*
- Local Authorities :
Ad hoc Bodies, Notes on, 72, 73, 128 *note*
 Range of Action, widening of, 129, 130
- Local Government, Extension and Varieties of Powers, 205
- Local Government Board in relation to Local Authority, 128
- Loch, C. S., 119 *note*
- "London City Mission," Origin of, 1835, 65 *note*
- London Coffee and Eating House Association, 281
- "London Domestic Mission," Origin of, 1835, 65 *note*
- Lowe, Robert, 152
- Lunatics :
 Asylums Boards, formation of, 137
 Care of, 135 *et. seq.*
 Crime and Lunacy, Connection between, 163
 Feeble-minded, Detention in Prisons, 164
 Metropolitan Asylums Board, 224, 227, 270
- Lushington, Sir Godfrey, 148, 149, 165
- Lynch, A., 64
- MACDONALD, ARTHUR, 165
- Mackay, Thomas, "History of English Poor Law," 90 *note*
- McCleary, G. F., 269 *note*
- Maine, Sir H., 23
- Manchester :
 City Hall, exemplifying City's Position, 69
 Phthysical Conditions in, 245
 Statistical Society, 15
- Martin, James Ranald, 53
- Martx, Karl, Type of Socialist Agitator, 311
- Matheson, Cadbury and Shann, "Women's Work in Birmingham," 276 *note*
- Mathew, Father, 191
 Evangelical Type of Agitator, 308
- Maurice, F. D., 22, 23
- Meals for School Children, 292
- Mechanics' Institutes, 71, 120
- Mediaeval City-State and Modern Cities compared 62
- Medical Inspection of School Children, 219 *note*
- Medical Officers of Health :
 "Consulting Physician to Community," 269
 Functions of, 270
 "Missionary of Health," 273
See also Health, Board of—
 Public Health
- Medical Relief of the Poor :
 Cost of, 1844, 104
 Poor Law Board's Administration, 105
 Poor Law Commission, 1834, 102
 Select Committee, 1844, Reports of, 103
- Melbourne, Lord, 6, 10
- Menger, Anton, 311
- Mercier, P., "Exploitations Municipales," 61 *note*
- Merrick, Rev. G. P., 159
- Metropolitan Asylums Board, 224, 227, 270
- Middle Classes, influence of on Town Improvements, 64
- Milk, Municipal Depôts, 269
- Mill, James, 102
- Mill, John Stuart, 22, 23, 40, 321
- Millard, Dr. Killick, 249, 269 *note*
- Missions :
 Poor Relief in Towns, 65
 Widows Assisted by, 279
 Prisons, 158
- Morality of Coming Race, Note on, 322

Morrison, Douglas, 165, 175
 Municipal Administration:
 Instrument of State, 128
 Powers, Variety of, 70
 Municipal Corporations Act, 1835, 52,
 60, 317
 Municipal Corporations Commission,
 1833, 41, 59

NATION-STATE, *see* State
 National Benevolent Society, 1812,
 296
 National League of Physical Educa-
 tion, 315 *note*
 National Reformatory Union, 169
 National Society, 37, 139, 140 *note*,
 143
 National Society for Prevention of
 Cruelty to Children, *see* Cruelty
 Nelson, Robert, 150
 Neuman, P., "The Boy's Club," 71
note
 New Harmony Settlement, 59
 New Lanark, Owen's School at,
 144
 Newgate Prison, Ladies' Visiting
 Committee, Inspectors' Criticism
 of, 1836, 33, 157
 Newsholme, Dr. Arthur, 129, 251,
 270
 Newspaper Relief Funds, Note on,
 318
 Nihilism, Administrative, 88
 Niven, Dr. James, 245, 250, 252, 260,
 271
 Normanby, Marquis of, 47
 Norwich Society of Universal Good-
 will, 1771, 92
 Norwich Weavers, Condition of, 1835,
 65 *note*
 Notifiable Diseases, 261
 Notification of Diseases Acts, 260
 Nurses:
 District Nursing Associations, 92,
 270, 313
 Hospital Nursing Staff, 234
 Infirmary Nurses, 226

OLD-AGE PENSIONS:

Charity Organisation Society,
 Pension Branch, 113
 General Account of Movement,
 295
 Nationalisation of Problem, 297
 298 *note*
 Note on, 86 *note*
 Philanthropic Pension Funds, 290

Old People:

Aged Poor, Changes in Adminis-
 tration for, 108
 Economic Position of, 296
 Open Spaces, provision of, 71
 Open Windows, Effect on Public
 Health, 258
 Orbiston Settlement, 59
 Organised Charity, *see* Charity Or-
 ganisation
 Orphans, *see* Widow and Orphan
 Owen, Richard, 53
 Owen, Robert, 5, 7, 8
 Czar Nicholas' Interest in, 8
 Infant Schools, Success of, 10
 New Lanark School, 144
 Queenwood and other Communis-
 tic Settlements, 59, 60 *note*
 Sanitary Reform indirectly in-
 fluenced by, 42
 Sociological Ideas of, 23
 Welfare Management Schemes,
 8
 Oxford, Sanitary Condition of,
 Board of Health Inquiry, 77

PALMERSTON, LORD, 76 *note*, 85
 Parkhurst Prison, 152, 170, 172
 Parks and Gardens, Provision, 71
 Partition Considered as Type of
 State Action, 131
 Pelham-Clinton, H. P., 53
 Pensions:
 Old-Age, *see* that Title
 Widows', 279, 281
 "People of England and Wales,"
 Article in *Inquirer*, 1904, 20 *note*
 Percival, Dr., 45, 253
 "Philanthropic Society" for Care of
 Juvenile Offenders, 150
 "Philanthropy, History of," 3 *note*,
 5 *note*

Philanthropy:

Associated—a middle-class de-
 vice, 5
 Decreased Importance of Philan-
 thropic Institutions, 1
 Educational, State Action super-
 seding, 140
 Health of Towns Commission,
 effect on Philanthropy of, 55
 Inspectors, Appointment of,
 effect on Philanthropy, 31
 Joint Stock Business and Philan-
 thropic Association, Connection
 between, 72
 Municipal Action replacing Work
 of, 71
 Note on, 210

Philanthropy—*continued.*

- Official Ideals and Philanthropy, relative merits, 35
- Politicians and Philanthropists, early Functions of, 4
- Prison Reforms, Philanthropic Co-operation with State, 146
- Private *versus* State Control of, 25
- Reformatory School Movement's effects on, 170
- Sentiment—Analysis of Philanthropic Sentiment, 322
- Social Experiments initiated by, 32
- Sociology and Philanthropy, *rapprochement* between, 315
- Tendencies in Development, Note, 323
- State Philanthropy, changing Relations of, 2-3, 13, 25
- Phthisis, *see* Tuberculosis
- Physical Deterioration, Report of Committee, 17 *note*, 18, 186, 294
- Pinel, Philippe, 137
- Place, Francis, 119 *note*
- Playfair, Lyon, 53
- "Policeman Theory of Society," 172
- Polytechnics and Trade Schools, 70
- "Poor Makers," 99
- Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834 :
 - Administration of, 93, 100
 - General Results of, 93
 - Inconsistencies in, 87
- Poor Law Board, 1847-70, Establishment and Work of, 104
- Poor Law Commissioners, 1834-47 :
 - Unsettled Poor, Views on, 90
 - Work of, 97
- Poor Relief :
 - Boarding-out and Cottage Homes, 282
 - Charitable Institution, 3 *note*
 - Charity Organisation Society, *see* that Title
 - Defects of old Law, 98
 - Destitute Qualification, 98
 - Modifications, Hawkesley's suggestions, 122, 123
 - Insane Poor Recognised as Public Charge, 138
 - Medical Relief, 1834, 102
 - Tables of Relief, 98 *note*
 - Widows and Orphans, 278
- Population, shifting from Country to Town, cause of Town Improvements, 63
- Power Reservoir of, Note, 324

- "Prison Reform," Society, 12
- Prisoners' Aid Societies, Objects and Results of, 131, 147, 157, 158
- Prison Consolidation Acts, 1865 and 1867, 152
- "Prison Discipline" Society, 1818, Report on Juvenile Offenders, 151
- Prison Inspectors :
 - Bristol Citizen's Demand for, 1815, 32
 - First Inspectors, 32
 - General Consideration of their Work, 29
 - Orderly Administration introduced by, 34
 - Newgate, Ladies' Visiting Committee Criticised by, 33, 157
 - Reports, Social effects of promulgating, 19
- Prisons :
 - Characteristics of Penal Code, 148
 - Commissioners' Reports, 1902-03, 155 *note*
 - Crime and Lunacy, connection between, 163
 - Departmental Committee, Report, 1895, 148 *note*, 149, 152 *note*, 285 *note*
 - Evolution of Modern System, 146
 - Families of Prisoners, Support of, 160
 - Feeble-minded, Detention of, Notes on, 164
 - Ideals of Prison Life, 1860-80, 148
 - Inebriate and Prison Reformatories, compared, 206
 - Inspectors *see* above
 - Juvenile Offenders *see* that Title
 - Lectures and Classes for Prisoners, 158
 - Missions in Prisons, 158
 - Poverty, Prison Problem resulting from, 161
 - Segregation of Criminals, Notes on, 163
 - State Aid for Discharged Prisoners, 159
 - Tables relating to Condition of Prisoners, 1894, 189
 - Visiting in Prisons, 157, 158
 - "Protestant Sisters of Charity," Pamphlet, 1826, 92
- Public Health :
 - "Advice-giving," New Function of Public Health Authority, 268, 269

Public Health—*continued.*

- Certifying Surgeons, 267, 268
 Heredity and Environment, 264
 Hospitals *see* that Title
 Hygiene, Importance of, 257, 260
 Inspectors, Notes on, 267
 Neglected Disease, a cause of Social Inefficiency, 263
 Present Functions of Department, 256
 Prevention and Cure non-separable, 265
 Private Practice Co-ordinating with Public Administration, 266, 272
 Public Function of Doctors, 261
 School Children, Medical Inspection of, 268
 Sick Insurance, Suggestion for, 272
 Special Diseases Treated by Sanitary Authorities, List of, 270
 Public Health Act, 1848, 15, 85, 267, 317
 QUEENWOOD, Hants, Communistic Settlement at, 59
 READE, CHARLES, 33
 Recreation of the People, Powers of modern City concerning, 70
 Redhill Farm School, 150
 Reform Bill, 5, 7
 Reformatories and Industrial Schools:
 Charity Schools, Foundation of, 222 *note*
 Difference Between, 174
 Early Types, 151, 152
 Fatherless Children in Industrial Schools, Statistics of, 284
 Financial Provision for, 177
 General Account of, 166
 Industrial Schools Acts, 1857, 1861 and 1866, 169
 Inspectors, Notes on, 177
 Local Authorities, Proposed Control by, 179
 Management of Industrial Schools, 176
 Modern Schemes, 154
 Numbers of Schools and Inmates, 1903, Table, 175
 Obstructions by Managers, 178
 Training, Effectiveness of, discussed, 180
 Voluntary Support, Difficulties of, 178
 "Reformatories and Refuge Union," 201
 "Reformatory Brotherhood," 204
 Refuse Removal, *see* Sanitation
 Reid, A., 193
 Reid, David Boswell, 53
 Relief of the Poor, *see* Poor Relief
 Removal of the Poor, *see* Settlement and Removal
 Retreats for Inebriates, *see* Inebriate Homes
 Richardson, B. W., "Health of Nations," 82
 Robinson, Mary, 312 *note*
 Rogers, Thorold, 100 *note*
 Roscoe, Mr., 159
 Rousseau, J. J., 62 *note*
 Royal Statistical Society:
 Formation of, 15, 26
 Howard Research Medal, 14
 Publications on Sociological Subjects, 28
 Rowntree, Seebohm, 17 *note*, 118, 259 *note*, 262
 Rowntree and Sherwell, "Temperance Problem," 192, 193
 Royal Free Hospital, 223 *note*
 Royal Hospital for Diseases of Chest, 216 *note*
 Ruskin, John, 24
 Russell, Lord John, 41, 151
 Russell, Whitworth, 32
 SADLER, M., 100, 120 *note*
 St. Giles Christian Mission, Prison Gate Work of, 159
 St. Mary's Hospital, 223 *note*
 St. Simon, 23
 Salvation Army Missions in Prisons, 158
 Sanatoria for Tuberculosis Patients, 129, 250
 Sanitary Inspectors, General Considerations of their Work, 29
 Sanitation:
 Cholera of 1831-32 affecting Sanitary Reforms, 44
 Girdlestone, Charles, and J. R. Lynch, Special Work of, 45, 46
 Public Health Improved by, 257
 State of Large Towns Commission, 1844, Reforms originated by, 41
 Ventilation, Refuse Removal, Open Spaces, etc., 42, 43
 School Board Act, 1870, 141
 School Dinners Associations, 292, 295
 Schools, *see* Elementary—Reformatories and Industrial Schools

- Scientific Benevolence, Note on, 318
 Scott, Dr., 187
 Seamen's Hospital, 223 *note*
 Seeley, Professor, 60
 Segregation of Criminals, Notes on, 163
 Servants Training Homes, 282
 Settlement and Removal:
 Charities for Unsettled Poor, 92
 Poor Law Commission, 1834,
 Views on, 90
 Sewell, Miss, 7
 Seymour, Lord, 83 *note*
 Shaftesbury, Earl of, 10, 37, 75,
 78 *note*, 122, 213, 305
 Characteristics of, 82
 Evangelical Type of Agitator,
 306
 Sidmouth, Lord, 6, 151
 Simon, Sir John, 257
 Slaney, R. A., 47, 53
 Small Holdings, effects of Poor Law
 Amendment Act upon, 99
 Smith, H. L., 92, 93 *note*
 Social Distress:
 Cause and Cure, Misconceptions
 of, 1
 International Problem, 9
 Responsibilities of Society To-
 wards, 2
 Statistics, Value of, and Methods
 considered, 14, 19
 Social Imagination, Influence of, 20
 Social Politics, City as an Instrument
 of, 58
 Social Responsibility in 1834, 80
 Social Science *see* Sociology
 Socialist Type of Agitator, 371
 Sociology:
 Inspectors as Collectors of Socio-
 logical Material, 31
 Philanthropy and Sociology,
 rapprochement between, 315
 Social Whole, Conception of, 24
 Statistics, Sociological effect of,
 18, 19
 Wordsworth's Influence upon, 21
 Solly, Rev. Henry, 121
 Sombart, Werner, 311
 Southam Dispensary, 1823, 92, 93 *note*
 Southwood Smith, 43, 45, 47, 64, 75,
 84, 246, 263
 Treatise on Fever, 79
 Spencer, Herbert, 89
 Stansfield, Sir James, 108
 Starbuck, Dr., "Psychology of Re-
 ligion," 188
- State:
 Administrative Nihilism, leading
 to State Control, 88
 City, State's Philanthropic Func-
 tion in, 61, 68
 "National Benefit Society," (J. S.
 Mill), 40
 Intervention Theory, Note on,
 320
 Philanthropy and its Relation to
 State Action; ix., x., 2-9, 13,
 25
 Social Instrument for Common
 Welfare, 323
 Weaker Classes, State in Rela-
 tion to, 318
 Types of State Action, 127
 See also Elementary Schools—
 Inebriety—Inspectors—Prisons—
 Widow and Orphan
 State Inebriate Reformatories, 198,
 200
 Statistical Societies:
 Bristol, 15
 London, *see* Royal Statistical
 Society
 Manchester, 15
 Statistical Type of Agitator, 312
 Statistics:
 Influence of Statistical Investi-
 gation on Public Mind, 17
 Origin of Word, 15
 Sociological Effects of, 18, 19
 Value of and Methods considered,
 14
 Statutes *see* Acts of Parliament
 Stein's German City Ordinance, 60,
 61 *note*
 Stephen, Leslie, 22 *note*
 Stetson, Mrs., 293
 "Stinks, Vested Interests in,"
 78 *note*
 Sullivan, Dr., 192 *note*, 193
 Summer Camp for Children at
 Formby, 282
 Sunday Schools, 71
 Supervision Considered as Type of
 State Action, 131
 Swanley Homes for Little Boys, 176
 Sweeps *see* Climbing Boys
 Symons, Jelinger, 151 *note*, 168 *note*,
 172 *note*, 174
- TAYLER, LIONEL, "Aspects of Social
 Evolution," 236, 264 *note*
 Technical Institutes, 70, 71, 120
 Temperance Crusade, Value of, 191
 "Ten Pound Householder," 41

- Town Councils, Powers Conferred by
Municipal Corporations Act, 1835,
57 *note*
- Towns:
Health of Towns Association, 43
State of Large Towns Commis-
sion, 1844, 41, 42, 59
See also Cities—Health of
Towns
- Toynbee, Arnold, 47, 111
- Trade Schools, 70, 71
- Trevelyan, Sir Charles, 112 *note*
- Trimmer, Mrs., 139
- Trotter, Robert, 99
- Tuberculosis:
Civic Responsibility Towards,
252
Deaths from, 244
Factory Labour influencing
Development of, 246
Local Authorities' Responsibility
for Treatment of, 246
Municipal Experiments, 251
Remedies and Course of Action,
Suggested, 253
Sanatoria, 250
Subscribers' Letter System,
Evils of, 247
Support of Families of Patients,
252, 271
Trades and Professions Conduc-
ing to, 242
- Tuckermann, Dr., 65 *note*
- Turner, Rev. S., 151
- Turkey, Co-operative Village in, 59
- Twentieth Century League, 315 *note*
- UNEMPLOYMENT:
Charity Organisation Society's
Views, 119
Note on, 319
"United Kingdom Beneficent So-
ciety," 1863, 296
University College Hospital, 223 *note*
- Ure, Dr., 246
- Urquhart's "Turkey and its Re-
sources," 59 *note*
- VACCINATION ACTS, 271
- Ventilation, *see* Sanitation
- "Vested Interests in Stinks,"
78 *note*
- Virginia Water Lunacy Sanatorium,
138
- Voluntarism, Philanthropic, *see*
Philanthropy
- Voting System for Orphanages,
Evils of, 281
- WAGES:
Agricultural Labourers', Rate in
Aid abolished, 95
Men and Women's Wages, Notes
on, 274, 275
- Waifs and Strays, Incorporated
Society for, 176, 282
- Wandsworth Prison, Tables Relating
to Prisoners, 1894, 189
- Water Supply, *see* Sanitation
- Waterlow, Sir Sidney, 263
- Waugh, Benjamin, 211, 217, 220
- Weavers in Norwich, Condition of,
1835, 65 *note*
- Webb, Sidney:
"Parish and the County,"
53 *note*
- Webb, Sidney and Beatrice:
"Industrial Democracy," 119
note, 120 *note*
Local Government," 72 *note*
"Paupers and Old Age Pen-
sions," 251 *note*
- Welfare Management, Robert
Owen's Schemes, 7
- Wellington College, 282
- Wemyss, Lord, 36
- Widnes Municipal Accident Wards,
270
- Widows and Orphans:
Assistance, Various Sources of,
279
Charity Organisation Society,
Views on Maintenance Prob-
lem, 279, 280
Economic Security of, State's Re-
sponsibilities, 286, 297
Friendly and Sharing-out Socie-
ties for, 280
Heather's Pensions, 296
Industrial Schools, Fatherless
Children in, Statistics, 284
Insurance for, 280
Mother—Economic Function of,
287
Orphanages, Notes on, 281
Poor Relief, 278
Quasi Philanthropic Care of, 274
Wages of Widows Insufficient as
Family Wage, 275, 276
"Widows' Friend Society," 278
"Widows, Distressed," Society for
Relief of, 279
- Wilberforce, William, 5
- Wilson, Dr., 187
- Winchelsea, Earl of, 99
- Windows, Open, Value of to Pub-
lic Health, 258

Women :

- Female Labour, Economic Position of, 275
- Guardians, introduce Humaner Treatment of Poor, 110
- Inspectors, Scope of Public Health Acts Extended by appointing, 29
- Nurses, *see* that Title
- Sanitary Inspectors and Health Visitors, Effective Work of, 40, 267
- Unmarried, Married and Widows, Census Return, 1901, 276 *note*
- Women's Industrial Council, 314
- Wordsworth, William, Influence on Sociology, 21
- Work for the Private Citizen, 316

Workhouses :

- Children in, Condition of, 106
- Dietaries, 1836, 102
- Infirmaries, *see* that Title
- Workhouse School Ideal, Fallacy in, 320
- Working and Destitute Lads' Home, 282
- Wright, Thomas, 157, 305
- Wutte, R., "Die Deutsche Staate," 61 *note*
- YORK CHARITABLE SOCIETY'S Expenditure on Whitewash, 1807, 257
- Young, Dr., 186
- Young Offenders' Act, 1838 and 1901, 152, 168
- York Retreat, 137

A HISTORY OF
— ENGLISH —
PHILANTHROPY

BY
B. KIRKMAN GRAY.

Demy 8vo, Cloth. 320 pp.
7s. 6d. net.

The Author having drawn his information on a subject of deep interest and practical importance from the original sources, is able to present a vivid and detailed account of the methods by which the philanthropists of successive generations have sought to relieve the persistent evil of social distress. We have here a history of manners and customs, of modes of thought and action, in general of the life of a people and the reaction upon one another of the various social classes. The book is based on the belief that a description of the experience of the past cannot fail to throw light on the problems of the present.

London :
P. S. KING & SON,
Orchard House, WESTMINSTER.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below,
or on the date to which renewed. Renewals only:

Tel. No. 642-3405

Renewals may be made 4 days prior to date due.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

REC'D LD FEB 7 72 -6 PM 5 6

NOV 20 1975

REC. CIR. MAY 20 '75

JUL 11 1979

REC. CIR. JAN 21 1979

DEC 01 1987

AUTO. DISC.

OCT 11 1987


LD21A-40m-8,'71
(P6572s10)476-A-32

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

REC'D LD

LD 21-100m-8,'71
MAR 6 '65-12

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C004076725

323706

HV245

G85.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

