

Improving the public house in Britain 1920-1940: Sir Sydney Nevile and ‘social work’

Abstract

The ‘improved public house’ movement in the inter-war years was a central part of the shift towards retailing by the brewing industry. An important part of the reform movement was the alliance between certain brewers, notably Whitbread, and ‘social workers’, particularly those associated with the University settlement movement in London. Using the papers of Sydney Nevile, the importance of a particular social milieu is outlined, calling into question attempts to align the movement to improve public houses with transatlantic Progressivism. Rather, this alliance drew upon longstanding English traditions of public service and religious affiliation amongst a fraction of the gentry.

Keywords: public houses; brewing; Whitbread.

Introduction

Sir Sydney Nevile (1873-1969) is widely acknowledged to have been one of the most influential figures in the shaping of the British brewing industry in the middle years of the twentieth century.¹ Managing director of Whitbread from 1919 to 1949 (and a

director up to 1969), Nevile was particularly associated with an increasing focus on retailing within the industry. He played a significant role in trade organization, acting as chairman of the Brewers' Society from 1939 to 1940 and representing the trade in many public arenas. He sought to reform the trade from the inside, particularly through the medium of the 'Improved Public House' movement. This movement saw the reconstruction of public houses in an effort to widen their appeal and to win a degree of respectability. In his extensive survey of this movement, David Gutzke locates Nevile, together with the Birmingham brewer William Waters Butler, as a central figure. He in turn links the movement to transatlantic manifestations of Progressivism, locating both Nevile and Butler as 'upwardly mobile middle-class professionals' on the margins of the aristocratic leadership of the industry and so open to new ideas.² In this article I present an alternative characterisation of Nevile and his background, one which calls into question the association with Progressivism.³ Rather, I seek to link Nevile's work to a long standing tradition of 'social work', the concern of largely upper class figures with the social conditions of the poor. Nevile's unmarried sisters Florence and Blanche, had just such careers, in nursing and education respectively, significant enough to merit obituaries in the *Times*.⁴ This connection will be seen in the work of Nevile, work which had a significant influence of the public image of the trade and on the nature of the improved public house. Nevile was able to make such connections, it will be argued, because of his social position as a member of the downwardly mobile gentry. He was indeed a socially marginal figure in the class and status system of inter-war Britain, but one clinging to the edges of the 'establishment' rather than seeking to climb into it.

Why might this biography matter for business history? It is because of the way in which businesses interpret and interact with their environments. This was a matter of prime concern for companies in the brewing industry during this period because of the all too real threat of legislative restrictions on the very existence of their businesses. Not only could they watch the imposition of Prohibition across the Atlantic, but they had recent experience of considerable restrictions during the war.⁵ Ostensibly in the name of the war effort, it was all too easy to see behind these restrictions the hand of temperance advocates. These restrictions had gone so far as to entail the state confiscation of assets in a number of districts, notably around Carlisle, confiscation which continued in operation. Even if such threats to the very existence of the brewing industry moderated over time, regulatory impositions provided real barriers to the implementation of more operational business concerns. In the years before the First World War, the Liverpool and Warrington brewers Peter Walker & Son had attempted to expand their sphere of interest by moving into the London market. Establishing a warehouse and buying a number of London pubs, they sought to export their highly successful 'managerial system' into their new estate. However, London magistrates remained firmly wedded to the tenancy model which had characterized the running of pubs in the capital and they refused to allow an application by a company manager to assume the licence of the de Beauvoir arms in Hackney in 1911.⁶ So this was an industry in which matters of business strategy and operation were strongly conditioned by regulatory pressures which called for an active response on the part of senior managers.

We can also seek more positive reasons for a scrutiny of the networks within which senior managers operated. Work in the 'new institutionalist' tradition of organizational analysis, influenced by the 'Carnegie school' of decision making, suggests that attention is the scarce resource in organizations and that schema are a key means by which such attention is organized.⁷ Organizations, that is, operate with a 'dominant logic' which conditions which features of the world they pay attention to.⁸ Thus in the academic publishing industry in the USA there was a shift in the 1970s from an editorial logic to a marketing logic with consequences at all levels of the business.⁹ Such shifts are partly conditioned by organizational history and partly by the activities of senior decision makers. The way in which organizations operate as 'interpretation systems' is not just a matter of using schema to interpret and react to an external environment.¹⁰ For some organizations there is an active process of constructing such schema through interactions with the world. For new institutionalists there is particular significance in such efforts at the level of the field.¹¹ This is where organizations interact with trade bodies and other opinion formers to shape and redefine the logics which characterize the field. In such engagements, the activities of senior decision makers are particularly important, as their biographies shape the resources available to them. Such biographies are likely to have been of particular importance in the era of 'personal capitalism' which characterized British industry in the inter-war years.¹² Whitbread was a business dominated by members and relatives of the founding family and as such one embedded in particular networks. An exploration, therefore, of the biography and connections of an extremely important and influential figure within the company's management yields much of relevance to the activities of the company at both strategic and operational levels.

In order to provide context for these claims and for Nevile's activities, I first outline the conservative nature of the brewing trade in the years before the First World War and, in particular, its attachment to the tenancy model. This led it to neglect retailing activities much to Nevile's frustration. However, there was an alternative tradition of 'disinterested management', seized upon by part of the temperance movement. The development of this is outlined and then linked to the important University Settlement movement. At its peak before the First World War, this saw large numbers of mainly upper class men and women spend time in buildings located in some of the poorest districts of London. One settlement in particular, the Mary Ward Settlement in St Pancras, will be of special significance. Finally, I outline something of Nevile's family background. I show that it is somewhat more complex, and with more ties to the gentry, than Gutzke allows.¹³ This then forms the background to a consideration of the ties between Nevile and the settlement movement through an examination of the evidence left in his papers. This account concentrates on two concerns: the management by Whitbread of public houses on behalf of the Restaurant Public House Association, and the learning that this brought for the company's involvement in the broader improved public house movement; and the scheme for recruitment and training of bar staff from the 'distressed' areas of the North of England. In both cases Nevile had a detailed engagement with the 'social work' movement, one which brought tangible benefits to the trade in the form of respectability, especially as exhibited in the involvement of an important social worker, Edith Nevile, in the Royal Commission on Licensing in 1931. This focus might also have shaped the somewhat Olympian nature of the buildings supplied by the improved public house

movement. It was the connection with a long established tradition of social concern as shaped by Victorian Evangelicalism, rather than associations with Progressivism, that were significant in Nevile's activities.¹⁴

The industry

The brewing trade in the years before the First World War was both conservative and contested. It was contested because of the strength of the temperance movement, which we consider further below. The expenditure of energy in fighting off the temperance challenge led to a defensive and embattled attitude which saw the industry clinging to many traditional patterns of organization. This was reinforced by the rural nature of much of the industry and the ease with which industry leaders moved into aristocratic modes of living.¹⁵ While much brewing was conducted in urban areas, there were strong connections to the rural economy through the sourcing of raw materials, connections which loomed large in patterns of organizing.¹⁶ Based on the large sums made through success in the industry, industry leaders often acquired rural estates in which they engaged in practices of stock rearing and farming which may have contributed to the predominant use of the tenant to run their estates of public houses. This practice gelled well with prevailing economic conventions which favoured independent business people.

This preference, which manifested itself in the form of the 'free house', that is, the landlord in charge of their own premises and free to source their products from any supplier, came under increasing challenge during the nineteenth century with the

development of the ‘tied’ house.¹⁷ This development, in which brewers came to have significant stakes in the distribution networks for their products, took two very different forms. In most of England and Wales brewers came to own property directly, letting pubs to nominally independent tenants tied to take the products of the brewery.¹⁸ In Scotland and, of particular interest in our context, London, the tie took the form of loans secured on the property rather than direct ownership.¹⁹ As Samuel Whitbread declared in a Parliamentary debate in 1872,

There the brewers were not the owners, and he believed that that was the most healthy form of trade; and for this reason - that in the London trade the licensed victualler was obliged to embark a large share of his property and only get a loan from his brewer. Both parties under such a system had a great interest in the good conduct of the house.²⁰

This commitment to an arms-length form of ownership was typical of many London brewers, with Whitbread in particular being slow to join the scramble for property which characterized the last years of the nineteenth century. This scramble led to many companies overpaying for properties and led some major players, such as Samuel Allsopp & Sons, into financial difficulties. What is interesting here is the response to a third way of running public houses, placing them under direct management. In 1903 the directors’ minute book of Allsopps records:

The Manager reported as to the Houses under Management for the six months ended 31st December 1902; the loss as appearing in the Balance Sheet for that period being £2879 and the number of Houses then under management having been reduced to 23, which was considered satisfactory.²¹

This was the use of managers as a temporary stop gap, rather than as a deliberate strategy. Magistrates in London joined with the majority of brewers in frowning on the notion of having pubs in the capital under direct management. In practice, house management was practiced implicitly, as some of the most substantial publicans owned several pubs. At the Crown in Peckham in 1900, for example

Mr Jewers is the manager, and this astute and energetic gentleman has for many years conducted houses for Mr Henderson. He is a smart business man, is perfectly sociable with the customers, and a favourite with all. Miss Henderson represents "dad" in the saloon bar, and is as active with her calculations as she is nimble and graceful in action, and there is quite a number of barmen to conduct the extensive business in the house. Mr W Henderson takes an active part in the affairs outside finance in seeing that his customers are royally entertained at the Crown. He is to be found on "the other side of the bar," and has many friends who persistently drop in for a chat.²²

In the same year, the *Licensed Victuallers' Gazette* also provided a profile of Mr. W. Chapman, who, after a career managing six pubs, bought his last pub from his employer

and in his profile owned three pubs.²³ So the practice of house management existed but in a somewhat subterranean fashion. As we have seen, Hackney magistrates rejected the application by Peter Walker & Son to run a pub using a manager. Their objection was that he 'is not, and would not, have any personal interest in the licence or in the premises, or in the profits of the trade, but is, and would be, a salaried servant of the brewery company, for whose benefit the retail trade would be carried on.'²⁴ This was a very different attitude from that displayed by magistrates in Birmingham and Liverpool.

In Liverpool around three-quarters of pubs were managed by the onset of the First World War.²⁵ This was not the temporary use of managers to fill in between tenancies, but a fully fledged system with an apparatus of house inspectors and area managers. Under such a system house managers were obliged to carry out all the instructions of their employers. The system originated with Peter Walker & Son in the middle of the nineteenth century, but spread to all the other companies operating in the city.²⁶ Its use was later in Birmingham, but its adoption by Mitchells and Butlers and Ansells met with the approval of local magistrates, who were keen to encourage a policy of 'fewer and better'.²⁷ It was the control inherent in a managed system that attracted the attention of temperance advocates.

Temperance and disinterested management

The strength of the temperance movement in nineteenth century Britain, especially with the institutional support of Nonconformity and Liberalism, was been well explored.²⁸

Within the movement there were clear differences between those who advocated complete abstention and those who sought some form of rapprochement with the industry, seeking to ameliorate its worst effects.²⁹ For the latter, the influence of the ‘Gothenburg System’ was of particular significance.³⁰ In the Swedish system public houses were taken into municipal ownership and run by salaried managers under strict instructions about what could and could not be sold. At the heart of this was the notion of ‘disinterested management’. This referred to the person of the manager themselves as having no financial stake in the success of the pub. This was a position thus diametrically opposed to that promulgated by Whitbread, although with considerable parallels with the commercial practice of Liverpool and Birmingham companies. It was thus derided by most brewers, although some were to see aspects of it as a model for retailing, most notably in the emphasis placed on the supply of food.

There were a number of initiatives under the broad heading of disinterested management, but the most successful was the Trust House Movement.³¹ This was an umbrella movement where local trusts were set up to purchase and operate public houses, with the aim being to make a profit which could be ploughed back into more outlets. Pubs were designed to be alternative attractions, modelled on the pub but selling food and hot beverages as well as beer. Salaried managers were to be encouraged to sell food: ‘The resident licensed Managers are paid a fixed salary, and obtain no profit on alcoholic sales.... Managers are given a substantial interest in the sale of food and non-intoxicants, and are bound by their Agreement to supply these when asked for’.³² By 1912 there were

some 300 pubs being run on trust lines, with a Central Public House Trust Association for information and guidance.

The composition of the governing body of the Peoples Refreshment House Association, one of the most successful of the constituent bodies, gives a good flavour of its social standing. Under the presidency of the Bishop of Chester were seven vice presidents, including another bishop, a cardinal, two earls, two lords and a knight. Their pubs were heavily concentrated in rural areas. The first pub at Sparkford, Somerset, acquired in 1897 was 'exactly the type of house contemplated by the founders of the Association as best fitted for the initial experiment; i.e., a country inn, supplying the wants of the local farmers and labourers, with no competitor in the village'.³³ This led to the cynical response from the brewing trade that the movement was simply cherry picking the best locations and criticism from concerned temperance advocates that the movement was shirking the real challenge of the urban areas. These criticisms were to bear fruit after the First World War, but the importance of the Trust House movement was in its practical demonstration of the efficacy of direct management as a model. It also showed the feasibility of an alternative conception of the pub, one which broadened its appeal from being a simple distributor of beer. The transformation of this experience into urban settings, especially in London, was to owe much to developments in the University Settlement movement.

Settlements and social work

The University Settlement movement was an avowedly religious response to the urban problems thrown up by rapid industrialization.³⁴ It was informed in particular by the revelations about the lack of religious attachment on the part of the poor of London's East End. Particular impetus was given by the Oxford Movement, that movement which sought to revitalize the Church of England by reviving ancient rituals and traditions. In a move to revive the parish systems which had clearly broken down through the sheer weight of population, scholars and students from Oxford sought to establish buildings in the poorer parts of the capital from the 1880s. Their role was to be the practical face of Tractarian belief, attracting converts by a concern with the everyday circumstances of the local population. Students were to experience this at first hand by living in the middle of the population. Whilst started in Oxford, Cambridge was to follow and then many of the public schools. Initially an Anglican movement with a distinct leaning towards its Anglo-Catholic wing, other denominations were to follow suit.

A key concern for many settlements was the impact of drink on their local populations. Thus, Scotland's overview repeatedly points to settlements hosting temperance societies and Bands of Hope. For example

'The Corpus Christi Mission established a similar range of activities and clubs as their fellow Cambridge Missions but found that alcoholic drink 'is a major problem in our area' causing 'a very large proportion of our poverty, disease and crime'. In an attempt to counteract the problem Amos established a Total Abstinence Society and a Band of Hope. Trinity College Mission also found drink

to be the root cause of social and domestic problems in their district. In consequence in January 1887 their Executive Committee proposed that the Men's Club be conducted on Temperance principles.³⁵

However, there was an important distinction that comes out in the observation by the ritualist Anglican Darrell Tupper-Carey of Trinity Mission, Stratford. Whilst he conformed to the view that drink was a prime cause of poverty and was a staunch supporter of the Church of England Temperance Society, 'He felt however that the more rigid Teetotallers were inclined to be self-righteous'.³⁶ This Anglican impulse, fuelled by both competition with Nonconformity and a traditional view of rural life was, as we have seen, part of the motive behind the Trust House movement. It was also an indication of shifts which were to occur later on.

In these shifts an important part was to be played by those associated with the most unconventional of the settlements, the Passmore Edwards (later Mary Ward) settlement in St Pancras. Mary Ward, publishing under her married name of Mrs Humphrey Ward, was a best selling novelist whose work included, *Robert Elsmere*, which was a considerable success in its charting of the spiritual doubts of its clergyman hero. In 1890 she founded University Hall in St Pancras with the view of spreading liberal theological ideas amongst the working class. Its first Warden was the Unitarian economist and minister Philip Wicksteed and the new foundation received considerable financial support from Unitarians, but it was distinctive in not pursuing a sectarian theological agenda. In 1897 the settlement moved into new premises in Tavistock Place with considerable support

from the philanthropist Passmore Edwards, whose name the settlement adopted. The settlement developed considerable expertise in the education of children, especially those with disabilities. Renamed as the Mary Ward Settlement in 1921, this focus on education was one of the reasons for the survival of the settlement when many others disappeared, as their functions were taken up by an expanding welfare state. For our purposes the Mary Ward Settlement is significant as supplying the organizational base for a number of key figures who took a very different perspective on drink and pubs to the conventional stance of the settlements. They were to be some of the key allies of Nevile in his attempts to diffuse revised notions of the pub. Our remaining contextual factor is thus the background of Nevile himself.

Sydney Nevile and the crisis of the gentry

Sydney Nevile was born in 1873, 5th son and 10th child of the Reverend Christopher Nevile of Thorney, Nottinghamshire.³⁷ Thorney is an isolated estate hamlet on the borders with Lincolnshire dominated by an extraordinary Victorian Anglo-Norman church.³⁸ This gives us some insight into the complex nature of Nevile's father and some potential influences. For the church was constructed in the late 1840s at a time when the overwhelming trend in new church construction was towards versions of Decorated architecture under the influence of Pugin.³⁹ To commission an architect to build a church in this style suggests a degree of contrariness which can be linked to Nevile's complex intellectual stance. We have noted above the influence of the Oxford Movement and Anglo-Catholicism on the settlement movement. This was something which Nevile

fought against from his own time at Oxford, producing his *On Romanism* in 1839.⁴⁰

Nevile was able to express his faith in built form thanks not only to his own landholdings but also thanks to his wife's wealth. Gertrude Hotham was from a long-established Yorkshire family with a remarkable record of service either in the Navy (numbering several Admirals) or in the Church of England. Their faith in some respects therefore mirrored the tradition of the Church of England as the church of the landowning class.

Nevile, however, was not content to simply dominate his own estate and improve its own agriculture. He was a serial controversialist, seeking to intervene in a number of debates with a series of books. Some of these were to do with religious matters, in which he took an increasingly hostile view to aspects of the established liturgy.⁴¹ Some were the conventional views one would expect of a rural landowner, with a vigorous opposition to tenant right.⁴² However, some were rather less in character, for Nevile fancied himself as something of a political economist, at a time when those words were virtually synonymous with the interests and concerns of urban industrialists. He was in favour of free trade and the abolition of the corn laws and wrote in defence of the New Poor Law.⁴³ His propagation of his ideas brought him into contact with politicians such as Gladstone, although whether his ideas had much wider impact is open to some doubt; their publication may certainly have used up some of his inherited wealth and the income from his estates, not to speak of attention to their management.⁴⁴

A bigger drain would be the size of his family. He married three times, having a total of 15 children.⁴⁵ His elder sons George and Edward attended Eton but the expenditure on

land and churches, plus the demands of an ever increasing family, meant that there were no such opportunities for those further down the family. By the time Nevile came to make his will, bearing in mind commitments already made, he had to recognize ‘the limited provision I am able to make for my younger children’.⁴⁶ How much Sydney was aware of his father, given that at his birth his father was sixty-seven and that he died when Sydney was just four is doubtful. However, the consequence of his extensive family and the maintenance of an aristocratic lifestyle on the produce of a small rural estate was that Sydney and his mother were left in a condition of genteel poverty. The oldest brother inherited the estate (with the hall being leased out) and the widow and her family moved to Brighton. Sydney was apprenticed to E Robins & Sons brewery of Hove.⁴⁷ He moved two years later to Brandon’s of Putney, becoming head brewer at the age of 22. He quickly became critical of the defensive aspect of the trade and keen to learn from new developments, such as the employment of house management by the trust house movement. In 1912 he gave a series of lectures at the John Cass Institute on ‘The Retail Management of Beverages’ in which he stressed the need for better training of staff.⁴⁸ This marked the work to shift the trade to a greater focus on the customer and a broader conception of the public house, something which was to flower when he joined Whitbread. In those endeavours he was to be considerably influenced by his participation in the state management scheme at Carlisle. However, before considering this it is also worth considering the place of Nevile in the social structure of the time.

Nevile confesses in his autobiography

Without a public school and university background I made none of those friendships and formed none of those contacts which make life so much easier and so much more agreeable in after years. I have sometimes wondered if this circumstance was not the cause of that sense of inadequacy which from time to time has beset me, and my occasional lack of self-confidence.⁴⁹

He was to feel this particularly when he joined the board at Whitbread. The three Whitbreads and Cecil Lubbock had all attended Eton and had a gentlemanly approach to management.⁵⁰ They believed that ‘a classical education was the only foundation for a cultivated judgment in the larger affairs of life’.⁵¹ However, while Nevile brought a much more professional approach to management with him, he was not entirely distant from this world. We have seen that his own elder brothers had attended Eton and there was a distant connection through marriage to the Lubbocks.⁵² He notes that such connections enabled him to participate in the London season and provided valuable introductions.⁵³ So Nevile was a marginal figure in this world, but one with connections and habits of thought and action which were to be significant in his involvement in the movement to improve public houses.

The Improved Public House and social work in London 1920-1940

To recap the discussion so far, we have seen a number of mutually informed trends at work before the First World War. The temperance movement, tiring of long years of

fruitless campaigning for total abstinence and abolition of the trade in alcoholic drink, was open, at least from a significant and influential minority, to ideas which would subvert the public house from within. The success of the Trust House movement with its use of 'disinterested management' provided an alternative model, one which influenced at least some of the more open thinkers within the brewing trade itself. However it remained largely a movement of the countryside, influenced strongly by traditional Anglican views which saw the pub as part of a harmonious whole. In this it could be seen as echoing other movements such as the foundation of the National Trust to protect the countryside. However, it had not yet really taken root in urban areas, although there were indications of a possible favourable response within elements of the university settlement movement. However, in London in particular such trends would come up against the implacable opposition of the licensing magistrates, committed as they were to the tenancy model. They managed to hold at bay the commercial use of the direct management of public houses, as had come to dominate Liverpool and Birmingham over the period. This adoption of management in two different contexts was, however, an influence on Sydney Nevile, whose relatively marginal position led him to challenge some of the traditional practices and attitudes of the brewing trade from the inside. The catalyst which was to crystallize all these trends, both for Nevile personally and for the more progressive sections of the industry generally, was the state management scheme in Carlisle and district in the First World War.⁵⁴

The Carlisle district was a major centre of munitions work and so central to the British war effort. The perceived adverse impact of drinking on productivity led to the

government taking the breweries and pubs of the area into public ownership in January 1916. William Waters Butler of the Birmingham brewers Mitchells and Butlers (one of the prime users of direct house management) and Sydney Nevile joined the Control Board. The pubs in the district were converted to direct management. Large numbers were shut down and the remaining outlets were radically revamped. Under direct management there was an emphasis on food and on curbing drinking. The impact of this on drinking habits was contested, but what was important was the demonstration effect that the scheme had. It meant that in the years following the war, a number of companies took up the notion that pubs needed to change. They needed to offer a greater range of beverages and to improve their food, and to do so in surroundings which would make the pub respectable. These efforts were to issue in the improved public house movement. This is particularly associated with the construction of large outlets in the new suburban estates, both private and council run, that developed around the emerging road network. There are clearly several strands in this movement, of which developments in London were just one. But it was Sydney Nevile, in his new position as managing director of Whitbread from 1919 and as an activist in national trade affairs, who was to be of particular significance. His relationships with the social workers shaped by the settlement movement were influential both in the broader movement and in the way Whitbread learned about the way the pub could be changed. These relationships have tended to be underplayed but they can be traced in the papers that Nevile left behind, coupled with other sources.

It is important to recognize that the movement was not just a product of Nevile as an individual or Whitbread as a company. Indeed, it was another London brewer, Barclay Perkins, which took the lead in the immediate post-war years. They set up a separate subsidiary, Anchor Taverns, run by Alexander Part, who had been a successful manager of Trust Houses and who authored *The Art and Practice of Innkeeping*.⁵⁵ Under his leadership the company began to rebuild some of their pubs in London, seeking to offer more food and to employ managers in order to obtain a consistent offering. Their efforts ran up against the conservatism of the London magistrates. In 1924, for example, the company sought the transfer of the licence of the *Lord High Admiral* in Marylebone to a manager but this was opposed by the local Licensed Victuallers' Association and turned down by the magistrates.⁵⁶ On appeal to the quarter sessions the transfer was upheld, leading the *Brewers' Journal* to speculate that London magistrates might now allow managers in 'improved' houses, if not in the normal run of London pubs.⁵⁷ However, the next month they reported on yet another appeal by Barclay Perkins, this time from the Newington justices. The argument of the justices was that the manager was so tied by his agreement as to be not properly in control of the pub.⁵⁸ Again, this appeal was upheld, but the licensing magistrates were a major stumbling block to changes in the pub.

That this problem persisted is testified to by Nevile's complaint that

It can be proved, ad nauseum, that although a considerable change has taken place in the mind of licensing authorities, especially with regard to new public-houses in new districts, that the course of public-house improvement is being discounted

and held up partly through opposition on the part of the Magistrates, partly through improvements being rendered unnecessarily expensive, and partly through interference with the due control of management of a licensed house which must be necessary to efficiency.⁵⁹

The challenge of getting the improved public house to work, therefore, was not just one of rebuilding houses and devising managerial systems. It was crucially concerned with legitimacy and it was to this end that Nevile became involved with social work advocates. Soon after joining Whitbread he had persuaded the board to establish the Improved Public House Company as an autonomous unit. The first pub to be converted was the *Railway Hotel*, Caterham. The furniture and carpets were in poor condition and the catering was minimal: ‘anything that had to be done, even a few Teas, was done through the adjoining Baker's Shop.’⁶⁰ The name was promptly changed on refurbishment to the *Caterham Valley Hotel*, but there is an interesting observation that places the pub, and efforts to improve it, firmly in its social context: ‘This house is patronized by all classes and so far the steps taken to keep the various elements separate have been most successfully dealt with.’⁶¹ This was far from the cross-class appeal that was to be the goal of making the improved public house respectable and indicates just what a task lay ahead. This was, of course, a more rural pub, but efforts were made to secure suitable urban outlets. For example, experience with the *Kings Head* in Chiswell Street, next to the brewery, was disappointing, with high wages, low volumes of drink trade and no Sunday trade.

the previous tenant paid £300 a year rental is no criterion as to the amount of business done in recent years. No doubt before the war when the percentage of profit in Licensed Houses was considerably higher, this rent was justified, but I believe it is a fact that Mr Taylor the late tenant regarded the house during the last few years of his tenancy more as an office for his outside City business, and as a place where he could sleep and live when desiring to be in London. The place was run by a Manager and Manageress, and so little regard was taken of the profits, that I believe I am right in stating that stock was only taken once every six months.⁶²

By 1923 the IPHC had given up with the *Valley Hotel*, passing it on to Trust Houses for their management.⁶³ The realization was that very little could be done with existing outlets. As was reported somewhat despairingly

The class of House which we run at present does not afford much facility for showing what a really Improved Public House would be like. All our premises are small & there is no room for expansion so that whatever we have done we have been obliged to stick to the stereotyped idea of "Saloon Bar" "Public Bar" etc. I should like to have a house where we could experiment with one large Hall only - provided the district was suitable, with no drinking at the counter, and with service from separate counters for food and drink. A house which would combine the facilities of a Public House with the comforts of a cheap Restaurant.⁶⁴

Of course, such ambitions then brought the company right up against the reluctance of many licensing magistrates to sanction an increase in area, equating this with increasing consumption of alcohol. There was thus the need to make the case for a changed public house in which the provision of food would justify an increase of area. This was just the agenda of the Restaurant Public Houses Association founded in 1923 by Edith Neville and Louise Sotham.

Edith Neville was the daughter of a judge and the warden of the Mary Ward Settlement from 1920 to 1924.⁶⁵ Educated at Newnham College, Cambridge, she was also the chair for 14 years of the St Pancras Housing Society, of which more below. Louise Sotham lived at Bisley near Stroud with her husband, Major Ernest Sotham, but came up to London for the season.⁶⁶ She had family connections to the Earls of Shrewsbury and the Talbot family, members of which were to be found in the ranks of the governing body of the new association, with Bishop Edward Talbot as a vice-president. Sotham became the organizer and Neville a member of the Council. This counted four representatives of settlements among its 18 members: Miss Bruce (Warden St Hilda's Settlement, Bethnal Green); Rev J B L Jellicoe (Magdalen College Mission); Hon Eleanor Plumer (Warden, Mary Ward Settlement); and Miss Wragge (Warden, Maurice Women's Hostel, Hoxton).⁶⁷ The aim of the association was to take some of the learning from the Trust House movement and apply it in the urban context. With a particular focus on food, there was a recognition that the pub was a central institution of working class life and so reform was a more realistic approach to tackling the connection between drink and poverty. However, they also came up against the opposition of licensing magistrates to

changes in the running of pubs, as Edith Neville complained in a letter to Sydney Nevile in January 1925:

We have reached a difficult point in connection with what is so misleadingly called "disinterested management".

On the face of it the appointment of a salaried Manager with no pecuniary interest in the sale of intoxicants seems the most secure way of promoting the sale of food. Further it has undoubtedly caught the popular imagination & appeals to the ordinary moderate citizen, & would secure the support of most of the moderate Temperance reformers as nothing else will. On the other hand there is the difficulty that it is the direct opposite of the policy hitherto supported by the Licensing Justices & so would require a complete change of system, taking much longer to bring about than securing permission for structural alterations to enable food to be supplied.⁶⁸

Nevile's view was that public opinion needed to be won over by practical examples rather than to strive for legislative changes and out of this exchange grew a relationship of mutual support in which Whitbread provided premises and management expertise but let the Association take the credit. Behind the scenes, Nevile was also using these relationships to seek to persuade other brewers to adopt a more progressive approach. As he wrote to Percy Gates MP of the East End brewers Hoare & Co

Up to now, as you know, all political parties have accepted the teetotal vote as the only voice making for social benefit, and if a healthy opinion amongst social workers on the enclosed lines can be cultivated, it seems to me it will be a valuable help in torpedoing the policy of confiscation, etc., hitherto being advocated by temperance thought.⁶⁹

In 1925 Whitbread handed over control of the *King's Head* in Cumberland Market in Camden, North London to the Association with the IPHC supplying working capital and keeping accounts. The report on the first year concluded that 'The management is satisfactory from the Improved public House Company's point of view, and it would appear probable that the house can be carried on under its existing management at a moderate profit' and the *Tavistock* on Stibington Street in nearby Somers Town followed.⁷⁰ Somers Town was an area of poor housing sandwiched between the stations and goods yards of Euston and Kings Cross. It was the location of the St Pancras Housing Society, creation of the charismatic Anglo-Catholic warden of the Magdalen Mission, Father Basil Jellicoe.⁷¹ Jellicoe, son of a rural clergyman (who was a cousin of Admiral Jellicoe), was an enthusiastic and dynamic character who devoted his short life (he died aged 37 of pneumonia) to the improvement of living conditions in the poorest districts of central London.⁷² While he was an abstainer from alcohol, he had a belief that communities needed social facilities and that pubs were an important contributor to this. As he wrote,

Our first duty, therefore, would seem to be to raise the whole status of the publican and to make his profession a great, a noble and an honourable one. What is wanted, I believe, is a great college of publicans to which only those who realize that they are called to provide recreation for God's children will be admitted. They would be trained, first, as social workers, and secondly as first-class publicans, and if only this could be accomplished, the whole atmosphere of drinking would be permeated and changed by the Holy Spirit.⁷³

Through his contact with Edith Nevile, who was the chair of the Housing Society for fourteen years, and the example of the *Tavistock*, he sought to enlist Whitbread's help in reshaping another Somers Town pub, the *Anchor*.

When Jellicoe contacted Nevile about the possibility of Whitbread releasing a house, Nevile responded with copies of lectures he had given about the need for change in the public house, observing that 'They point to something like your own conclusions and are interesting as showing how the arguments of a purely commercial mind can sometimes approximate to the ideals of social workers.'⁷⁴ From this point the relationship developed, with Jellicoe benefiting from advice about management and Whitbread from Jellicoe's talent for publicity. In 1930 *The Times* reported on a visit by Prince George to Somers Town in which the *Tavistock* and the *Anchor* played prominent parts. 'The Anchor,' reported the paper, 'is a model house where standing bars have been partly succeeded by pleasant rooms with tables and chairs, and with every facility for cheap meals.'⁷⁵ The report did mention Whitbread in connection with the *Tavistock*, but got some key details

wrong. However, Nevile was content that Whitbread should get indirect credit, for he was playing for longer-term return. As he wrote to Jellicoe on the pub's re-opening,

we think it would be much better not to advertise our name in connection with the scheme. Of course we are quite glad that people should know that we have helped you in your work; on the other hand, we think it would be a bad thing, and we in fact would rather dislike it, if any kind of impression was created that our action in the matter was instigated by wish for advertisement, so the less published about us the better.⁷⁶

Two years later he was able to observe that the refurbished pub had been a modest commercial success for Whitbread, with profit on rent and the supply of beer of £850 in 1930, compared to an average £646 before rebuilding. However, this had to be set against rebuilding and associated costs of nearly £11,000. As Nevile observed

Although this is hardly a commercial enterprise as such, you must not read into this any note of dissatisfaction. We regard it in the nature of experimental or research work, the results of which can be applied in other directions, and as an experiment it is a good deal less expensive than some others we had done. ... In addition, we have the advantage of a property of which we can be proud and one which we may reasonably hope will have a longer life than if the property had remained unimproved.⁷⁷

The learning from these projects confirmed what the experience with the IPHC had suggested: that smaller pubs which lacked room for rearrangement of function were unlikely to pay. By 1932 Nevile was writing to Major Arnett of the RPHA that 'I may say at once that there are a considerable number of houses that are not very suitable to be run under management and it seems to me the "Tavistock Arms" is one of them'.⁷⁸ By 1934 the cumulated loss on the three pubs stood at £1771.⁷⁹ The *Tavistock* returned to tenancy and the *Anchor* was given up by the St Pancras Housing Improvement Society, being run by the RPHA: 'The unique character of the management would be abandoned. It would become just a well-run but ordinary public-house'.⁸⁰ The lack of commercial success led to a greater focus on the construction of 'super houses'. Reflecting on these later Nevile felt that the public would be better served by several rather more modest pubs than one large establishment but 'at that time spectacular houses appeared to be one method of attracting attention to the new movement'.⁸¹ They also fitted well with the broader reforming agenda, for the most important return on Whitbread's investment was the respectability gained by the connection with the moderate temperance reformers. As Nevile wrote to Edith Neville,

It is obvious that from time to time the opinion of social workers voiced by the Association will not coincide with the view of those who see the problem from the trade side; but to those of us who take a long view, it is desirable that we should have an opportunity of receiving intelligent criticism and advice from those who view the matter from a different angle⁸²

The full impact of their collaborative relationship can be seen in the 1931 Royal Commission on Licensing.⁸³ Edith Neville served as a commissioner, where she worked alongside Francis Whitbread who represented brewing interests. Three members of the RPHA – Louise Sotham, Major Arnett and Cecil Chapman (the chairman) – gave evidence, as did Sydney Nevile and Cecil Lubbock from Whitbread. Although the Commission took evidence from a wide range of witnesses, this London nexus was extremely significant in setting the tone. While the final report recommended the establishment of a National Licensing Commission and further experiments in public ownership along the lines of the Carlisle scheme, both of which could be seen as supporting a temperance agenda, it was hedged with reservations. There were three minority reports (including one from Whitbread who, unsurprisingly, opposed the central recommendations) and six reservations from those who signed the majority report, including the following from Neville:

I disagree with the opinion expressed in Chapter XII, paragraph 416, that public ownership is theoretically sound. Neither do I think that the public are so likely to receive the most satisfactory kind of service under that system as under a system of private ownership with the control suggested in the Report.⁸⁴

This level of disagreement, together with the parlous broader economic conditions, meant that the Report was never taken any further. What was significant was the endorsement given to the broad thrust of public house improvement. ‘We attach much importance’, stated the majority report, ‘to the possibilities of a policy of public house improvement,

the development of which, in spite of steadily progressive effort and experiment in recent years, is really only in its infancy.’⁸⁵ The focus on this, and on the importance of training of staff, gave considerable support to Nevile’s efforts to shift the trade towards a more constructive engagement with retailing. The collaboration with the RPHA was significant in producing this outcome.

However, this was far from the end of the relationship. It now moved on to terrain which was close to Nevile’s heart, that of training for the industry. The initiative came from the RPHA and particularly from Louise Sotham, who suggested that a school be set up, under the auspices of the Association, ‘To train prospective tenants or managers, barmen and cooks in all subjects connected with the various departments of Improved Public Houses’.⁸⁶ Nevile was initially sceptical, responding that,

I am quite sure of one thing - that the starting of a "school for prospective tenants or managers" would create so much opposition from the retail trade that it would be bound to fail. First of all it would be felt that it was a scheme to substitute managers for tenants, and in the second place, existing tenants would consider it a reflection upon them. In my view the only chance of success would be if you, through the Association, were to secure a supply of people who wished to work in public-houses as barmen or barmaids, of the right kind, such as you were able to secure for canteens. Even then we have to convince the brewing trade of the value of the enterprise sufficiently to put up a considerable sum of money.⁸⁷

This then shifted the focus to a scheme to relocate the unemployed from the ‘distressed’ areas of the North, offering them retraining as bar staff. By 1934 the scheme was established, taking men aged 21 to 26 initially from the South Shields area. These were to be selected by the Association from names supplied by the Ministry of Labour and given eight weeks of training in the houses of supporting companies. There were 60 applicants for the first wave of the scheme, although 25% were rejected on medical grounds. In the event 28 were placed in eight different companies. Whitbread only took one of these candidates, with Barclay Perkins taking eight.⁸⁸ From Nevile’s perspective the scheme was disappointing as

it does not do as much as I should have hoped to visualise the licensed trade as a highly skilled calling owing to the very short period of training, but this under existing circumstances cannot be helped. It is really a machine for finding employment for workers from distressed areas and as such certainly should receive a continuance of Governmental support.⁸⁹

Nevile’s eye was always on his own vision for the industry, one which involved a much greater shift towards a retailing orientation. In realizing this vision, the relationships which he engaged in with reformers who shared a similar social background were of considerable importance, even if at times they clashed with purely commercial imperatives. Nevile could access these relationships because of his own social status, one which is consistent with his background in the gentry.

Conclusion: upwardly mobile middle class professional or downwardly mobile gentry?

As Gourvish and Wilson note, it is difficult to assess the impact of the improved public house movement on the commercial fortunes of the brewing industry.⁹⁰ The limited data on capital investment suggest that much of the industry was slow to follow the lead of the well-publicised pioneers. Consumption data is also hard to come by, but consumer resistance to some of the larger pubs was manifest in their dogged adherence to ‘perpendicular’ drinking at the bar. However, the business impact might be seen as broader than this. On behalf of the trade as a whole, the movement succeeded in detaching a portion of ‘social work’ opinion away from opposition to the pub and as such helped secure the continuing legitimacy of the trade. It also furthered the agenda of more progressive sections of the trade of shifting the emphasis towards retailing and customer service. This tendency would manifest itself more fully in the post-war years but the widespread adoption of direct management of outlets rested a good deal on the learning gained from inter-war experiments. However, the learning was in turn shaped by the way the improved public house was framed, framing which was conditioned by Nevile’s social background and which in turn shaped operational business decisions. This was seen in particular in the construction of large show pubs which were beyond the capital resources of all but the most substantial of tenants and so fostered a move towards direct management and its associated systems.

Of course, in assessing the likely impact of Nevile’s social position, much depends on how we approach the definition of class and status. We need to consider this from both

the 'objective' position of Nevile in relation to the social structure and from the perceptions of the time. In terms of objective position, Nevile was clearly not 'of' the gentry in that he inherited no land from his father and had to make his own way in the world (albeit with the significant start of an apprenticeship). However, in status terms Nevile retained strong connections to a gentry world, connections which were very different to those of the provincial brewer William Waters Butler. Butler's credentials to be 'middle' class, given his accession to his father's fortune, are also more in terms of status than class, but he was much more marginal to the 'establishment' than Nevile. Nevile was descended from a gentry family. While that family subsided on the death of their father to the status of gentlemen farmers, female members of the family were married into the landed classes.⁹¹ Whilst several of his sisters remained unmarried, perhaps because they carried no attractive dowry with them, they inherited that tradition of public service which was associated with a fraction of the ruling class, especially that associated with the Settlement movement.

A flavour of the connections that this social background brought with it is contained in the message Louise Sotham left for Nevile on a card in 1934:

Dear Mr Nevile

We all missed you very much today! I want to know if you will please help us by arranging to have four men trained by various of yr managers? You will find that after the first trial the managers tumble over each other to get trainees!⁹²

This suggests a degree of easy familiarity. If we look at the social backgrounds of those whom Nevile interacted with in his dealings with the ‘social workers’ of London – Edith Neville, Louise Sotham, Father Basil Jellicoe – we find that they shared much of the Anglican and rural background that typifies the gentry. And Nevile was also of course part of the aristocratic firm of Whitbread, with its family control and proud history of liberal metropolitanism. This brought another form of access. In the Nevile Papers is a telling memo of 1928 from Frank Whitbread on headed paper from Brooks club. It covers a similarly headed message from Lord Southborough noting that Louse Sotham had been urging him to initiate a discussion of disinterested management in the House of Lords. Southborough notes ‘I cannot sponsor anything, but I am prepared to help if it is any good’. He notes further that ‘I thought you would like to know privately what was going on - all depends on 'staff work' & how it is done.’ – the ‘staff work’ being no doubt that which Nevile was involved in.⁹³ Given that Southborough was the head of a ‘Committee on the Disinterested Management of Public Houses’ the previous year we see some of the networks of relations that were an important part of the growing respectability of the public house.

Of course, these connections were only a part of the improved public house movement. Other London brewers, notably Barclay Perkins were also involved, and the movement was probably at its strongest in the west Midlands. However, the drive to respectability resulted in, as we have seen, the production of show pubs which reflected a somewhat Olympian attitude to the drinking public.⁹⁴ The rather cosier worlds of the *Anchor* and the *Tavistock* proved to be something of a blind alley, although the more modest improved

public house would re-emerge after the Second World War. However, their significance was in splitting the temperance movement and winning its more moderate adherents over to the side of improvement. In this endeavour, Nevile's social connections were important ones. This article has argued that in his case the label of Progressivism is a misleading and unnecessary one. Rather, Nevile is to be seen in the context of a British tradition of Evangelicalism and a commitment to 'social work' by fractions of the upper class, specifically those from a landed background. He notes in the introduction to his autobiography

the family tradition early instilled into me by some of my older relatives; that the pursuit of riches and power should not be the sole objective of a man's life, and that when the time comes to look back on one's life-work an awareness of public service conscientiously performed is more rewarding than the attainment of material wealth.⁹⁵

The consequences and limitations of such an approach are open to debate, as are the ways in which they articulated with other reform currents, such as Progressivism, but the two should not be conflated.

References

Anon. *Brief Remarks on the Justification of the New Poor Law, by the Rev. Christopher Nevile, an Ex-Officio Guardian of the Lincoln Union : Wherein is Given the Opinion of John M'Culloch, Esq, on the Principles of the Same Law by One of the Thompson family,* Newcastle: Currie and Bowman, 1838.

Barclay, Irene. *People Need Roots: The Story of the St Pancras Housing Association,* London: Bedford Square Press, 1976.

Beauman, Katharine. *Women and the Settlement Movement,* London: The Radcliffe Press, 1996.

Chandler, Alfred, *Scale and Scope: the Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism,* Cambridge, MA: , Harvard University Press, 1990

Daft, Richard and Weick, Karl 'Toward a model of organizations as interpretation systems.' *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), (1984), 284-295.

Elwall, Robert. *Bricks & Beer: English Pub Architecture 1830-1939,* London: British Architectural Library, 1983.

Girouard, Mark. *Victorian Pubs,* London: Studio Vista, 1975.

Gourvish, Terence 'The business of alcohol in the US and the UK: UK regulation and drinking habits, 1914-39', *Business and Economic History*, 26(2), 609-616

Gourvish, Terry and Wilson, Richard. *The British Brewing Industry 1830-1980,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Greenaway, John, 'The "Improved" Public House, 1870-1950: the key to civilized drinking or the primrose path to drunkenness', *Addiction*, 93(2), (1998), 173-181.

Gutzke, David 'The Social Status of Landed Brewers in Britain since 1840', *Histoire Sociale - Social History*, XVII (33) (1984) 93-113.

----. *Protecting the Pub: Brewers and Publicans Against Temperance*, Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1989.

---- *Pubs and Progressives: Reinventing the Public House in England 1896-1960*, DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2006.

Harrison, Brian. *Drink and the Victorians: The Temperance Question in England 1815-1872*, Keele: Keele University Press, 1994.

Hill, Rosemary. *God's Architect : Pugin and the Building of Romantic Britain*, London: Allen Lane, 2007.

Ingram, Kenneth. *Basil Jellicoe*, London: The Centenary Press, 1936.

Jennings, Paul. *The Local: A history of the English pub*, Stroud: Tempus, 2007.

Mathias, Peter. *The Brewing Industry in England 1700-1830*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Mutch, Alistair. 'Managing managers: an early 20th century service industry information system', *Management Decision*, 40(3) (2002) 288-296.

---- 'Magistrates and Public House Managers, 1840-1914: Another Case of Liverpool Exceptionalism?', *Northern History*, 40(2) (2003) 325-342.

---- 'Public houses as multiple retailing: Peter Walker & Son 1846-1914', *Business History*, 48(1) (2006) 1-19.

---- 'C Howard Tripp and the development of service sector management', *Management and Organizational History*, 3(2) (2008) 161-175.

Myles, Janet L. N. *Cottingham 1787-1847: Architect of the Gothic Revival*, London: Lund Humphries 1996.

Nevile, Christopher. *A Review of Mr. Newman's Lectures on Romanism [Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church] with General Observations on the Oxford Tracts*, London: James Ridgway, 1839.

---- *The New Tariff*, London: James Ridgway, 1842.

---- *Corn and currency. By Christopher Nevile in a letter to A. Alison, Esq*, London: James Ridgway, 1846.

---- *The Justice and Expediency of Tenant-Right Legislation Considered in a Letter to Philip Pusey, Esq*, London: James Ridgway, 1848.

---- *A Letter to Lord Ebury, on the Present State of the Church*, London: James Ridgway, 1861.

---- *A Few Words on the Clamour for a Revision of the Liturgy, a Letter*, London: James Ridgway, 1861.

---- *A Letter to the Right Hon. W.E. Gladstone, M.P, on the Present State of the Church Question*, London: Arthur Miall, 1863.

---- *Religion and Politics*, London: Arthur Miall, 1864.

Nevile, Sydney. *Seventy Rolling Years*, London: Faber and Faber, 1958.

Part, Alexander. *The Art and Practice of Innkeeping*, London: William Heinemann, 1922.

Peoples Refreshment House Association. *Public House Reform*, Westminster: PRHA, 1912.

Powell, Walter and DiMaggio Paul, *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Prahalad, C K and Bettis, Richard, 'The dominant logic', *Strategic Management Journal*, 7, (1986), 485-501.

Prochaska, Frank. *Christianity and Social Service in Modern Britain: the disinherited spirit*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Ritchie, Berry. *An Uncommon Brewer: The Story of Whitbread 1742-1992*, London: James & James, 1992.

Scotland, Nigel. *Squires in the Slums: Settlements and Missions in Late-Victorian London*, London: I. B. Tauris, 2007.

Scott, Richard, *Institutions and Organizations*, London: Sage, 2001.

Thornton, Patricia, *Markets From Culture: Institutional Logics and Organizational Decisions in Higher Education Publishing*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.

White, Jerry. *London in the 20th Century: A City and its People*, London: Vintage, 2007.

¹ Gourvish and Wilson, *The British Brewing Industry 1830-1980*.

² Gutzke, *Pubs and Progressives*, 119.

³ I am not concerned here with a detailed discussion of the class position of Butler, but despite his humble origins (he was born at the pub his father was then running) I would argue that as the son of one of the largest brewers in Birmingham, to characterize him as ‘upwardly mobile’ is dubious. Rather, it is his social marginality that is of importance – but then the same might be said of other figures who innovated at an earlier stage, such as Andrew Barclay Walker.

⁴ Florence Ethel Nevile, *The Times*, 3 January 1953; Blanche Nevile, *The Times* 17 February 1962

⁵ Gourvish, “The business of alcohol in the US and the UK: UK regulation and drinking habits, 1914-39”.

⁶ “Manager v. Tenant”, *Brewers’ Journal*, October 1911, 545.

⁷ Powell and DiMaggio, *New Institutionalism*

⁸ Prahalad and Bettis, “The dominant logic”.

⁹ Thornton, *Markets from culture*.

¹⁰ Daft and Weick, “Organizations as interpretation systems”.

-
- ¹¹ Scott, *Institutions and Organizations*.
- ¹² Chandler, *Scale and Scope*.
- ¹³ It was certainly far from the ‘plebian background’ which Gutzke ascribes to him! Gutzke, *Pubs and Progressives*, 114.
- ¹⁴ Prochaska, *Christianity and social service in modern Britain*.
- ¹⁵ Gutzke, “The Social Status of Landed Brewers in Britain since 1840”.
- ¹⁶ Mutch, “C Howard Tripp and the development of service sector management”.
- ¹⁷ Mathias, *The Brewing Industry in England 1700-1830*; Gutzke, *Protecting the Pub*.
- ¹⁸ Jennings, *The Local*.
- ¹⁹ Girouard, *Victorian Pubs*. This book is largely about the London pub, although from the perspective of an architectural historian. The London pub still waits a proper social history which takes into account business strategies. There is remarkably sketchy coverage in the otherwise comprehensive and most recent history of London in the period, White, *London in the 20th century*.
- ²⁰ House of Commons debates, 7 August 1872, 656.
- ²¹ National Museum of Brewing, Burton on Trent, Allsopp's Minute Book no 6 Dec 1901 - June 1904, 17 February 1903.
- ²² The Crown, Peckham, *Licensed Victuallers' Gazette*, 5 January 1900, 15.
- ²³ Popular Publicans' Mr W P Chapman, *Licensed Victuallers' Gazette*, 12 January 1900, 31.
- ²⁴ 'Manager v. Tenant', *Brewers' Journal*, 15 October 1911, 545.
- ²⁵ Mutch, “Magistrates and Public House Managers, 1840-1914”
- ²⁶ Mutch, “Public houses as multiple retailing: Peter Walker & Son 1846-1914”.
- ²⁷ Mutch, “Managing managers: an early 20th century information system”; Gutzke, *Pubs and Progressives*.
- ²⁸ Harrison, *Drink and the Victorians*.
- ²⁹ Greenaway, ‘Improved Public House’
- ³⁰ Goadby, Edwin, “England and the Gothenburg Licensing System”, *Fortnightly Review*, 57, 1895, 165-178
- ³¹ Gutzke, *Pubs and Progressives*.

-
- ³² Peoples Refreshment House Association, *Public House Reform*, PRHA, Westminster, 1912, p.5.
- ³³ PRHA, *Public House Reform*, 15.
- ³⁴ Beauman, *Women and the Settlement Movement*; Nigel Scotland, *Squires in the slums*.
- ³⁵ Scotland, *Squires*, 94.
- ³⁶ Scotland, *Squires*, 77.
- ³⁷ Family details from *Burkes Landed Gentry* 1900.
- ³⁸ Myles, L. N. *Cottingham 1787-1847: Architect of the Gothic Revival*.
- ³⁹ Hill, *God's architect : Pugin and the building of romantic Britain*.
- ⁴⁰ Nevile, *A review of Mr. Newman's lectures*.
- ⁴¹ Nevile, *Religion and politics; A few words on the clamour for a revision of the liturgy; A letter to Lord Ebury, on the present state of the Church; A letter to the Right Hon. W.E. Gladstone, M.P., on the present state of the Church question*.
- ⁴² Nevile, *The Justice and Expediency of Tenant-Right Legislation*.
- ⁴³ Anon, *Brief remarks on the justification of the new poor law*; Nevile, *The New Tariff*; *Corn and currency*.
- ⁴⁴ On Gladstone's visits to Thorney, see Nevile, *Seventy Rolling Years*, 19. Nevile himself seems to have been unaware of his father's publishing career: 95.
- ⁴⁵ *Burkes Landed Gentry*, 1900.
- ⁴⁶ Nottinghamshire Archives, 157DD/N Nevile of Thorney, Will of Christopher Nevile clerk in holy orders,
- ⁴⁷ Nevile, *Seventy Rolling Years*.
- ⁴⁸ "The Retail Management of Beverages", *Brewers' Journal*, April 1912, 291-2
- ⁴⁹ Nevile, *Seventy Rolling Years*, 24.
- ⁵⁰ Ritchie, *An Uncommon Brewer*.
- ⁵¹ Nevile, *Seventy Rolling Years*, 146.
- ⁵² Christopher Nevile's first wife's sister, Harriet Hotham was married to Sir John William Lubbock, banker and grandfather of Cecil Lubbock. A distant connection, it is true, but in a society acutely aware of some connections, nonetheless a significant one. Nevile notes that he was invited to visit the Whitbread brewery in 1892 thanks to this connection: *Seventy Rolling Years*, 19.

⁵³ Nevile, *Seventy Rolling Years*, 41, especially of a connection through marriage of his half-sister Annie.

⁵⁴ Gutzke, *Pubs and Progressives*.

⁵⁵ *The Art and Practice of Innkeeping*.

⁵⁶ "Reformed " Houses: Objection to Managers Sustained. *Brewers Journal*, November 1924, 585.

⁵⁷ *Brewers Journal*, December 1924, 627

⁵⁸ "Reformed" Houses: Objection to Managers - Successful Appeal', *Brewers' Journal*, December 1924, 645-6.

⁵⁹ London Metropolitan Archive (hereafter LMA) Nevile Papers, Restaurant Public House Association (RPHA) Nevile to Arnett, 17 April 1928.

⁶⁰ LMA, W/40/34, Improved Public House Company, , 8 August 1921.

⁶¹ LMA, W/40/34, 11 July 1921.

⁶² LMA, W/40/34 30 August 1921

⁶³ LMA, W/40/34 19 March 1923

⁶⁴ LMA, W/40/34 19 March 1923

⁶⁵ Beauman, *Women and the Settlement Movement*, 148.

⁶⁶ *The Times* 1 May 1950; 24 May 1934; 8 August 1961.

⁶⁷ LMA, RPHA 2 August 1927 Adams to Lady Sykes

⁶⁸ LMA, RPHA 17 January 1925 Edith Neville to Nevile, 'confidential'

⁶⁹ LMA, RPHA 27 October 1926, Nevile to Percy Gates. See also 5 November 1928, Nevile to C. E. W. Charrington.

⁷⁰ LMA, RPHA 20 Oct 1926 memo on Kings Head

⁷¹ Barclay, *People Need Roots*. It is interesting to note that Nevile's maternal uncle, Arthur Tooth, was a noted Anglo-Catholic who was briefly imprisoned for his adherence to particular rituals. Nevile attended his funeral. He does not discuss his own beliefs, except to note regular attendance at church, but the impression is that he was sympathetic to this wing of Anglicanism. Nevile, *Seventy Rolling Years*, 19-20, 41, 106, 183.

⁷² Ingram, *Basil Jellicoe*.

⁷³ Ingram, *Jellicoe*, 74.

-
- ⁷⁴ LMA, RPHA 20 Dec 1926 Nevile to Father Jellicoe.
- ⁷⁵ ‘Prince George at Somers Town. Tour of publichouses and dwellings’, *The Times*, 24 April 1930, 14.
- ⁷⁶ LMA, RPHA, 9 May 1929 Nevile to Father Jellicoe.
- ⁷⁷ LMA, RPHA, 9 July 1931 Nevile to Father Jellicoe.
- ⁷⁸ LMA, RPHA, 14 Oct 1932 Nevile to Arnett
- ⁷⁹ LMA, RPHA, 18 June 1934 Arnett to Nevile.
- ⁸⁰ Ingram, *Jellicoe*, 122.
- ⁸¹ Nevile, *Seventy Rolling Years*, 171.
- ⁸² LMA, RPHA, 20 December 1934, Nevile to Edith Neville.
- ⁸³ PP 1931-2 Cmd 3988 Royal Commission on Licensing (England and Wales) 1929-31, *Report*, 1932.
- ⁸⁴ RC Licensing , 195
- ⁸⁵ RC Licensing, 45.
- ⁸⁶ LMA, RPHA, Sotham to Nevile, 7 May 1930
- ⁸⁷ LMA, RPHA, 22 May 1930 Nevile to Sotham
- ⁸⁸ LMA, RPHA, 31 July 1934 RPHA training scheme memorandum
- ⁸⁹ LMA, RPHA, 20 Dec 1934 Nevile to Edith Neville.
- ⁹⁰ Gourvish and Wilson, *British brewing*, 422-34.
- ⁹¹ Notably his half-sister Annie’s marriage to Sir Charles Strickland; Nevile, *Seventy Rolling Years*, 41.
- ⁹² LMA, RPHA, Card from Louise Sotham, 20 Sussex Mansions, 22 May 1934
- ⁹³ LMA, RPHA 5 Feb 1928 Southborough to [Frank] Whitbread
- ⁹⁴ Elwall, *Bricks & Beer*.
- ⁹⁵ Nevile, *Seventy Rolling Years*, 12.