Dissertations

1977

From Friendly Visitor to Professional: The Development of University-Based Social Work Education in Great Britain (1880 to 1930)

Rosemarie Bridget Bogal
Loyola University Chicago

FROM FRIENDLY VISITOR TO PROFESSIONAL: THE DEVELOPMENT

OF UNIVERSITY-BASED SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION IN

GREAT BRITAIN (1880 TO 1930)

by

Rosemarie Bridget Bogal

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

June

1977

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

VITA

The author, Rosemarie Bridget Bogal, is the daughter of Edward Henry Bogal and Mary (Pac) Bogal. She was born March 4, 1951, in Chicago, Illinois.

Her elementary education was obtained at St. Joseph Elementary School in Chicago, Illinois, and secondary education at Maria High School, in Chicago, Illinois, where she graduated in 1969.

In September, 1969, she entered Loyola University of Chicago and in June, 1972, received the degree of Bachelor of Arts, Magna Cum Laude, with a major in Political Science. While attending Loyola University, she was a member of the Honors Program and was elected a member of Phi Sigma Tau and Circumference in 1971.

In 1972, she was awarded a National Institute of Mental Health Traineeship in Psychiatric Social Work and entered the School of Social Work at Loyola University of Chicago. While attending the School of Social Work, she was elected a member of Alpha Sigma Nu (National Jesuit Honor Society). In June, 1974, she was awarded the degree of Master of Social Work.

In September, 1974, she entered the Ph.D. Program in the Department of Educational Foundations of Loyola University. In September, 1975, she was granted an assistantship and in September, 1976, was awarded an Arthur J. Schmitt Doctoral Fellowship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS FOR APPENDIX

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

British social work, like social work in general,
is a field plagued by ambiguity. The term social worker
has, at various times, been used to describe an individ-
ual engaged in the distribution of bread and coal, a Poor
Law authority, a school manager, a member of the Charity
Organisation Society, a hospital almoner, a settlement
worker, a social reformer, an untrained "friendly visitor"
and a university-trained social work practitioner. While
each of these individuals had little in common with one
another, their tasks of social work or social service were
in large part, determined by the society in which they re-
sided. As society became more complex, the definition of
social worker and social services expanded. An early
eighteenth-century society which had defined "social serv-
ices" strictly in terms of charity (money and aid-in-kind)
and deterrence (the workhouse provision of the Poor Law)
made way for a mid-eighteenth-century society that saw
"benevolent" advice as an essential (and oftentimes only)
tool of the social worker. Societal pressures, however,
especially demands for equality by members of the working-
class, made both definitions inadequate for late-nineteenth-
century Great Britain. The social legislation demanded

1

during the last two decades of the nineteenth century was not passed until the beginning of the twentieth century, but its presence had tremendous implications for the field of social work. The charity supplied by early social workers was being supplanted by assistance delivered by systematic and continuous programs sponsored by the government. The "wise" advice, the only basis of which had been a greater degree of education on the part of the adviser, was questioned by workingclass and lowerclass individuals who were themselves beginning to feel the benefits of an expanding system of education. Social service "clients" were demanding not only the basic necessities of life, but also the benefits (such as higher education) which had so long been the property of the upperclasses alone.

The field of social work had not been oblivious to the fact that its task was becoming increasingly complicated; agencies which took their responsibility for social service seriously attempted to train their workers, but training for social service, like social service itself, lacked a widely-accepted definition. Members of the Charity Organisation Society were better-educated than most of their clients and were well-versed in agency policy as well as the techniques of interviewing and record-keeping, but their affiliation with institutions of higher

education (and consequently, with the new disciplines
which were studying the society which social workers
wished to mend) was minimal. The ancient universities of
Oxford and Cambridge were unreceptive to so ill-defined a
field as social work, but even the modern universities
needed a reason for cooperating in the process of edu-
cating social workers. Teacher education, for example,
took place in teacher training colleges; why should social
work, another female-dominated occupation, seek and be
granted education within the university?

It appears that social work had both a need for
university-based education and a means of entree into the
university system. An increasingly complex society mani-
fested new needs, but also prompted the development of
disciplines such as sociology, economics and political
science, which analyzed these needs. With the development
of these disciplines, social service finally had a scien-
tific base from which to expand; but it still needed a
stable relationship to keep this base and the field united.
The important point, however, was that now a legitimate
claim to university affiliation could be made, and the
university could work to foster the stability of the new
relationship between the scientific base and the field of
social work.

The field of social work also had a more legitimate

claim to university affiliation. The university settle-
ment movement was a university-based response to social
problems; workers had come _from_ the universities to the
settlement in an attempt to foster communication (through
education) among members of the workingclass and the
middle and upperclass. When these workers found that
their understanding of workingclass society was inadequate
or their tasks needed redirection, it was logical that
they should seek assistance from that institution which
had prepared them initially.

The majority of social workers who practiced during
the first three decades of the twentieth century were not
university educated, but the number of individuals re-
ceiving such an education as well as the number of
university-based programs continued to grow. While the
needs of society shaped the development of the social
services, the university-based programs of social work
education which developed were products of society as well
as the university system generally and individual uni-
versities specifically. This study will attempt to trace
the evolution of university-based social work education
during the period 1880 (when the need for social work
education was verbalized but not realized) to 1930 (when
twelve British universities had programs of social work
education), placing it within the context of the develop-

ment of social services, as well as the general and
institution-specific development of university education.

The following section will briefly examine the con-
cept of "social services" and social work education as
defined by society.

British Social Services and University-
Based Social Work Education:
Societal Definitions

In 1931, the population of England, Scotland and
Wales (Great Britain) stood at 44,795,357. Of this number,
232,290 were being supported in institutions by local au-
thorities; 1,356,293 were receiving outdoor relief; 632,234
received contributory old age pensions; 873,292 widows and
orphans were given allowances; 18,144,200 were entitled to
national health insurance benefits; 1,202,274 received un-
employment benefits; 1,187,000 had war pensions; and
461,794 disabled workmen were receiving compensation.[1] In
other words, a minimum of 24,089,377 individuals, more than
one-half of the population, were receiving or were eligible
to receive government aid. Only thirty years earlier, only
814,578 individuals (out of a population of 36,999,946)
were eligible for such assistance. In 1900, the Poor Law's
provision of ₤3,166,000 for outdoor relief accounted for

---

[1]A. H. Halsey, ed., Trends in British Society Since
1900 (London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1972), pp. 31, 383,
400-401.

97.6 percent of the government's expenditure on assistance; while this figure rose to Ŀ15,616,000 in 1930, it represented only 6.0 percent of the total. Unemployment insurance accounted for 38.9 percent (Ŀ101,594,000) of government expenditure on assistance, while war pensions made up 18.7 percent (Ŀ49,205,000.)[2]

These statistics point to two facts: (1) by 1930, the British government had committed itself to provide for the financial needs of those citizens unable to provide for themselves; and (2) this commitment was made outside of the framework of the Poor Law, legislation which equated destitution with needs and which sought to deter rather than help applicants. Viewed in isolation, these figures represented an almost unbelievable increase in the amount of funding which the government was willing to spend on its citizens. When put in proper framework, however, the expenditure was merely symbolic of the actual change which had occurred in British society. The legislation, such as the Old Age Pensions Act of 1908 and the National Insurance Act of 1911, which permitted such expenditure, was in much the same way symbolic. Expenditures which were becoming increasingly large and legislation which was becoming increasingly permissive were, in fact, products of an evolving

---

2Ibid., pp. 402-403.

economic, social and political philosophy which had its roots not in the twentieth century, but in the nineteenth century.

Opposition to Britain's predominant laissez-faire philosophy had existed prior to this time, but it was the late-nineteenth century that saw such opposition take an organized form. The Fabian Society, for example, led by Sidney and Beatrice Webb and George Bernard Shaw, sought to foster economic equality by a means acceptable to society, that is, legislation. Since society had already been receptive to the idea of public services, such as lighting, sanitation, recreation areas, educational facilities and transportation, used by all citizens as a right, the Fabian Socialists sought to broaden this concept of "service" to include better working conditions, guaranteed assistance in time of need, and more educational opportunities.

British social services eventually incorporated many of the suggestions of the Fabian Socialists, but new services were included not because they were proposed by a particular group, but because they were acceptable, at least in part, to the dominant social, economic and political forces of the time. Social service, particularly that form of service which was to be financed by the government, could be no more than society wished it to be.

Voluntary social service did not rely on government

financing, and as a result, was not accountable to any one body; it was, however, also a product of society. The same society which viewed the Poor Law as the sole source of government assistance to those in need allowed and even encouraged the development of a multitude of voluntary "agencies" (sometimes a single individual) dedicated to the task of providing assistance (frequently narrowly defined, for example, coal, clothing or food) to a specific group of individuals. Such charity oftentimes brought greater reward to the benefactor than the recipient, but was accepted as a legitimate part of the system of social service. When agencies such as the Charity Organisation Society sought to coordinate this vast array of charities, their attempts were met by silence on the part of society. Voluntary social services were given a free hand in defining societal needs as well as the ways in which these needs should be met. The precedent for this freedom had been set when the major concern was one of "masking" poverty (by using tangible goods such as clothing or food) rather than alleviating it or preventing it. While the autonomy of voluntary social services led to overlapping as well as inadequacies in the assistance provided, it also allowed for "experiments" in new types of service. Octavia Hill's rent-collecting scheme, which advocated decent housing and client responsibility was one such experiment. Perhaps the

most "radical" plan, however, was proposed by Samuel Barnett; the 1884 opening of Toynbee Hall, the first university settlement, marked the beginning of a new attitude in social service, and established education as a factor which could unite the upperclass worker and the lowerclass client. While these factors were in themselves, important, the university settlement would play a role for which it is seldom given credit. As a <u>university-based response</u> to a social problem, it would set the precedent for <u>university involvement</u> in social work, and would, at the beginning of the twentieth century, serve as one of the strongest advocates of <u>university-based social work education</u>.

While social service must be studied within the context of society, university-based social work education must be studied within a double context; it is as much a part of the university system in which it resides as of the social service system which employs its expertise. It must work to meet whatever this system and society perceive as needs, but its commitment to residence within the structure of university education, as well as the framework of a particular university, define its direction as well as specific courses of study. Just as social service can be no more than society allows it to be, university-based social work education can be no more than the uni-

versity will allow it to be. While a number of studies have acknowledged the first factor, few have even touched on the second.

Review of the Literature

Several individuals have written works which deal with social work education. The earliest work of this type was done by Elizabeth Macadam, a faculty member of the University of Liverpool School of Training for Social Work, in 1925. In The Equipment of the Social Worker,[3] Miss Macadam gives a brief description of the university-based social work education programs which had developed up to that time. She views the first thirty years of the social work training movement as experimental, but felt that three general aims had developed:

"(1) Professional training for those preparing for social administration or in administrative work which has a social bearing.

"(2) Instruction for the general public on political, economic, industrial, and social questions which concern every citizen, and advanced courses for those already engaged in responsible work.

"(3) Research into social and industrial phenomena."[4]

Unfortunately, however, Miss Macadam fails to give a

---

[3]Elizabeth Macadam, The Equipment of the Social Worker (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1925).

[4]Ibid., p. 49.

rationale for this particular type of development, or in-
stances of specific university orientation.

The major portion of her book deals with specific
phases of social work education, such as practical work,
specialization, and extension courses, and although Miss
Macadam believes that the social work--university relation-
ship had faced and would continue to face opposition, she
viewed the relationship as viable.

While Miss Macadam's work was well-written and pre-
sented the first comprehensive look at university-based
social work education, it failed to give a rationale for
the timing of this development. The reader begins with the
development of the first formal program but is given little
insight into what prior training consisted of, or why the
time was right for formal training.

In 1945, Miss Macadam published a second book dealing
with social work education. The Social Servant in the
Making: A Review of the Provisions of Training for the
Social Services[5] restated some of the material presented
in the 1925 volume, but concentrated mainly on training as
it existed shortly before 1945, and is, as a consequence,
outside the time period covered by this study.

---

[5]Elizabeth Macadam, The Social Servant in the Making:
A Review of the Provisions of Training for the Social
Services (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1945).

Social work education in Great Britain was, in part, the subject of a text written by Alice Salomon, and published in 1937. Education for Social Work,[6] an international survey on Schools of Social Work, included a section on British Schools of Social Work. The strong point of this study appeared to be its focus on the compilation of factual materials. Information included the school's object, the length of the program, admission criteria, provisions for field work, curriculum, and "special characteristics." Although the data presented was for 1935, a check with other sources indicates that much of the information was valid five years earlier. While Miss Salomon makes some attempt to "classify" programs (according to specialization tendencies), the rationale for such classification remains vague; too little attention is paid to the university as a "host" agent for the social work program. And once again, as with Miss Macadam's first work, the program is studied only from the time it became formalized; early attempts at "education" are ignored.

Marjorie J. Smith's volume, Professional Education for Social Work,[7] first published in pamphlet form in 1953,

---

[6]Alice Salomon, Education for Social Work (Zürich: Verlag für Recht und Gesellschaft A.-G., 1937).

[7]Marjorie J. Smith, Professional Education for Social Work in Britain (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1965).

was initially intended to study the origins of social
casework in Great Britain within the framework of the
Charity Organisation Society. In her Foreword, Professor
Smith states that she was diverted to a study of the
history of social work education. This diversion appears
to account for the book's strength as well as its weakness.
While the work acknowledges the existence of other
"training schemes" such as those of Octavia Hill's rent
collectors and the university settlement leaders, the
Charity Organisation Society is given almost full credit
for the development of the School of Sociology. The work
is entitled Professional Education for Social Work in
Britain, and yet the reader is given an account (albeit a
well-researched and excellently written account) of only
one such program. In addition, Professor Smith's work does
not place the development of this program within either a
social or an educational context. The reader is told how
the program developed, but receives few, if any, clues as
to why its development followed a particular path.

British Social Work in the Nineteenth Century,[8]
written by A. F. Young and E. T. Ashton, examines the
methods and scope of personal services aimed at the poor

---

[8]A. F. Young and E. T. Ashton, British Social Work
in the Nineteenth Century (London: Routledge and Kegan
Paul, Ltd., 1956).

of nineteenth-century Great Britain, and attempts to link evolving social, economic and political thought with developing social services. Training for social work, however, is touched on only briefly, and outside of the context of education in general.

The final work which appears to consider, to some degree, the issues covered by this study, is From Charity to Social Work,[9] written by Kathleen Woodroofe, and published in 1962. While Professor Woodroofe begins with a discussion of social work as it existed during the Victorian period, and continues with the development of social casework by the Charity Organisation Society, and social group work and community organization by other agencies, little attention is paid to the educational process which prepared these workers for their tasks. The major part of the book consists of a comparison of the British beginnings of social work with the American results; that is, the reader learns of the ways in which the American system molded a "foreign" system of social work, some parts of which were unacceptable to American society.

While each of these studies is valuable in its attempt to present some aspect of early British social work

----

[9]Kathleen Woodroofe, From Charity to Social Work (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1962).

or social work education, none has viewed the evolution of social work education from a system of non-education (based on good intentions alone) to a university-based system of social work education, within a "total" framework. This framework views British social services as a response to the needs of the time and education for social work as a product of this response, but within the context of the educational system.

In order to establish such a framework, the author relied on the vast amount of literature which examines British society as well as British education during this period. The task of placing social work education within this social-educational context, however, proved to be more difficult. The secondary sources available on British social work and social work education make use of a number of primary sources, but do not always make specific reference to them. Smith, Salomom, and Young and Ashton do not include bibliographies in their volumes. Invaluable initial bibliographies, however, came from two sources: Bibliography of Education, written by G. Stanley Hall and John M. Mansfield and published in 1886, and A London Bibliography of the Social Sciences, published in 1931. The latter contained the titles of material available at the Royal Anthropological Institute, the University College Library, Goldsmith's Library, the National Institute of

Industrial Psychology, the Royal Statistical Society and
the University of London Library, as well as the Library
of the London School of Economics. Although much of the
material published by the Charity Organisation Society is
available in the United States, a great number of primary
sources, which consist mainly of pamphlets and some per-
sonal papers, are available only in Great Britain. As a
result, much of the material used in this study was com-
piled during the author's visit to England during the
summer and autumn of 1976.

The condition of the material available on the
history of social work education is rather poor; while
some materials have been lost, the remainder have not been
systematically organized. Several meetings with the ar-
chivist of the London School of Economics and Political
Science illustrated the first problem: the only piece of
information from the School of Sociology which survives
(at least to the University's knowledge) is a salary sched-
ule for Professor Urwick. Information on this period can
only be sketched from the writings of early social workers.
This leads to another problem encountered when researching
this particular field: while numerous pamphlets were
written by social workers, much of this material consisted
of personal impressions of practical work. Few social
workers, including those who taught in the universities,

wrote about university-based education. Those individuals from other disciplines who taught in university-based social work programs and did publish, usually limited their writings to their primary discipline, and included little on social work.

Working within these limitations, the author has attempted to present the development of university-based social work education as a product of the social services which responded to the needs of the times, and education, especially university education, which also received its peculiar character from British society of that period. The following chapter serves as a review of society and "social services" as they existed prior to the period studied.

CHAPTER II

AN OVERVIEW OF BRITISH SOCIAL SERVICES TO 1880

Ruling England of 1800 admitted the existence of a

"poverty level" population within British society; the

upperclasses generally accepted this admission as fact, and

a number of intense but short-lived demonstrations by seg-

ments of the poor population kept this fact from becoming

obscured, but it is at this point, that is, recognition of

the existence of a poverty population, that agreement

ceased to exist. There was a great deal of disagreement

as to who the poor were, and what was the best means of

bettering their condition. The first major difficulty in

seeking a solution stemmed from the fact that the poor as

a group were not easily defined. In Life and Labour of the

People in London, Charles Booth attempted to divide London's

population into eight categories. He used the following

classification:

    "A. The lowest class of occasional labourers, loafers,
    and semi-criminals.

    "B. Casual earnings--'very poor'

    "C. Intermittent earnings ⎫
                          ⎬ together the 'poor'
    "D. Small regular earnings ⎭

    "E. Regular standard earnings--above the poverty line.

    "F. Higher class labour

"G. Lower middle class

"H. Upper middle class"[1].

Even Booth, however, found the definition of poverty to be

an arbitrary one:

> The divisions indicated here by "poor" and "very poor" are necessarily arbitrary. By the word "poor" I mean to describe those who have a sufficiently regular though bare income, such as 18s to 21s per week for a moderate family, and by "very poor" those whose means are insufficient for this according to the usual standards of life in this country. My "poor" may be described as living under a struggle to obtain the necessaries of life and make both ends meet; while the "very poor" live in a state of chronic want.[2]

While a definition of the "poor" was difficult to formulate,

it was even more difficult to arrive at a solution for the

alleviation of their condition. This difficulty stemmed,

in part, from the fact that there existed a number of the-

ories as to why these people were poor in the first place,

as well as a number of definitions of solution (for ex-

ample, solutions ranged from keeping the poor at a bare

level of existence to making their lives reasonably liv-

able.) In addition, the "ameliorative agents" were never

defined--the result being a side-by-side, but uncoor-

dinated growth of literally hundreds of helpers. Although

individual helpers emphasized their particular uniqueness in

---

[1]Charles Booth, Life and Labour of the People in London (1889-1903), quoted in Peter Keating, ed., Into Unknown England 1866-1913 (London: Fontana, 1976), p. 113.

[2]Ibid.

pursuing this task (which resulted in competition for benefactors) helping agencies during the nineteenth century can be divided into three types: (a) those linked with the government (basically the "programs" which came out of the Poor Law legislation); (b) those initiated by members of the upper and middleclasses (the widest category, which included everything from soup kitchens to institutional care); and (c) those which were basically self-help movements, initiated by members of the lowerclass for their own benefit (a successful example being the "friendly societies.") This chapter will examine the development of these three types of helping agencies as they existed prior to 1880, using examples which show the wide range of their activities. It will conclude with an examination of the Charity Organisation Society which attempted to coordinate the efforts of all three types of agencies.

"Social service" in England prior to 1800 was virtually synonymous with poor relief. Poor relief, in turn, provided a system of indoor and outdoor relief which frequently stood as the only alternative to starvation for the poor. Prior to the Reformation, relief was administered by the Catholic Church; the poor depended upon clerics who were expected to identify the poor and provide for their basic needs. The break from Rome and the disbandment of the religious orders, however, left England with a large

body of people with neither a viable means of support nor an agency responsible for or capable of, providing food, clothing and shelter or a job through which these needs could be met. The state assumed the responsibility of caring for the poor, but rather than follow the "handout" approach used by the clerics, opted to provide the poor, of all ages, with employment. The Statute of Apprentices of 1563 required every able-bodied youth to serve a seven-year apprenticeship. Further, it forced every "willfully" unemployed man under age thirty to accept employment, and stated that every man under sixty living in the countryside could be made to work during harvesting time. Yearly wages were guaranteed, but their rate was fixed; employers were fined for dismissing laborers; laborers were jailed for leaving their jobs; hours were fixed and strikes were for-bidden.[3] Although the Statute made poverty a fact of life for the workingman by keeping wages low while prices rose, its provisions formed the basis of the English Poor Law legislation which followed. The Poor Law of 1601 was the first piece of English legislation which acknowledged the responsibility of the state in dealing with its poor popu-lation. The justices of the peace (political officials

---

[3]Will Durant and Ariel Durant, The Story of Civi-lization, vol. 7: The Age of Reason Begins (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961), p. 47.

sanctioned to try minor offenses and dispense justice)
were to appoint overseers from each parish (originally an
ecclesiastical unit which later functioned as an organ of
civil government); the overseers were either church-
wardens or wealthy householders (the total group of over-
seers being composed of both). They were charged with a
number of duties:

"(a) with the advice of the justices to set children
to work whose parents cannot support them;

"(b) to set adults to work who have no means of sup-
port;

"(c) to raise weekly by taxation of every inhabitant
such sums as are necessary to

"(1) obtain material for providing work;
"(2) relieve the lame, impotent, blind, and
others unable to work;
"(3) place out children as apprentices"[4]

In addition, the legislation empowered the justices to
levy taxes from adjoining parishes when the parish in
question was unable to provide support for its poor; the
overseers were empowered to bind out boys as apprentices
until the age of twenty-four and girls until the age of
twenty-one or marriage; workhouses were established; and
legal responsibility for the provision of basic needs for
parents, children and grandchildren was established.[5] Al-

---

[4]Robert Cloutman Dexter, <u>Social Adjustment</u> (New
York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927), p. 50.

[5]Ibid.

though the Poor Law of 1601 did have a workhouse pro-
vision, indoor relief, that is, provision for the needs
of the poor within the workhouse, did not predominate.
Workers were deprived of rights (rights here being under-
stood not in terms of broad rights such as education and
the franchise, for these rights were denied the majority
of the population until the late-nineteenth and early-
twentieth centuries, but rather, the right to leave a
place of employment regardless of working conditions or
wages), but many remained outside of the workhouse. An
outsider might perceive of England during this period as
providing for its poor within a framework which did not
necessarily confine the indigent to the workhouse, yet
"confinement" did exist. Indeed, it was perceived by some
as being more degrading and restrictive than its prede-
cessor, serfdom. The poor laboring classes in the fac-
tories which rose during the Industrial Revolution neither
reaped the benefits of industry nor were provided with the
stability of serfdom. Some writers went so far as to sug-
gest that "industrial serfdom" was a more humane alter-
native:

> . . . the tendency of great manufactories is to degrade
> the working classes; the proprietors having no interest
> in the people beyond their mere labour; and although
> many of the great firms in England have been at the
> expense of chaplains to administer spiritual instruc-
> tion to the people; let us beware of the exercise of
> such functions. Government has at length put an end
> to the suttleries annexed to great factories, which

were established ostensibly for the people's good, but were a source of evil; and more must be done to prevent the poor labourers being deprived of all substantial freedom. Now it is, they are free to engage and to depart,--subject to be cast off at a moment, to find a home, and food and raiment, where they best can. Perhaps it was preferable to be corporally the property of a rich manufacturer, than be doomed to irremediable labour without due compensation.[6]

During the mid-eighteenth century, England as well as much of Europe was going through a period of fundamental change; the agricultural revolution together with the industrial revolution led to the perpetuation of a class system. Although the aristocracy was a creation of the Middle Ages, favorable legislation as well as historical events (notably wars) provided continuous support for a rigidly controlled class system. The yeoman class (small-landed farmers) had been virtually destroyed in the War of the League of Augsburg (1689-1697) and the War of the Spanish Succession (1702-1714); their land was incorporated into the great estates. There was a new enclosure movement[7] which did away with the remainder of the strip system of farming, turning the arable land into fields subject to intensive

---

[6]Excerpts from a Letter Containing Practical Hints on the Means of Improving the Condition of the Labouring and Industrious Poor (Edinburgh: R. Wallace and Co., 1830), pp. 6-7.

[7]The original enclosure movement, begun in 1558, rearranged open fields into smaller, consolidated units; the commons were similarly arranged. The rich, both rural and urban, benefited from this movement: while the aristocracy built their great estates, the capitalists used the tracts of land to provide the raw materials needed in industry.

cultivation, and using the rest as pasturage. Finally, land was rented out to tenants, but the tenants were to work as one labour force in the cultivation of one vast estate, rather than as individual workers on small plots of land. Class legislation supported the system of great estates; it was not until the electoral reforms of the 1880s that the rural upperclass lost some of its power.

The Industrial Revolution might be viewed as creating a new power base in English society. Its development was due, in part, to the circumstances of the time; the period 1760 to 1870 found England with an abundance of inventors and inventions; the English banking system was sufficiently developed so that capital could be provided for the development of inventions; and there existed an employable population--a large percentage of the population sought employment in the factory system. The great estates of the countryside had a corresponding urban power figure, the great factory system. While there might have been some incompatibility between the two power structures, they were united in one concept, their dominance over the lowerclass; this dominance was viewed as a right of the upperclasses. This right, however, also had consequences; since the upperclasses had such total control over the lives of the workers, they also had the responsibility for dealing with their problems, including poverty. Although the Poor Law of 1601

placed the responsibility for dealing with the poor on the government, the government was comprised of members of the upperclass. It is not surprising, therefore, that the upperclass came to share in the responsibility of providing for England's poor.

Social Services Initiated by the Government to 1880

As stated previously, the Poor Law of 1601 was the first legislation passed for the purpose of dealing with England's poverty population. Like all other legislation, however, its success at any particular moment was dependent on national stability, determined by international relations and internal conditions. It is for this reason that the Poor Law provisions nationally enforced in the "patriarchal" seventeenth century became local concerns during the eighteenth century.[8] Although many local officials were quite capable, they found themselves struggling to provide for the needs of a growing poor population. The unemployed, however, were not their only concern. In 1795, the Berkshire justices gave the name "Speenhamland system" to the already

---

[8]Sir Robert Walpole's appointment as Lord of the Treasury by George I signaled the beginning of the transformation of the British monarchy from a position of power to a nominal institution. Walpole's government turned its attention to increasing trade and protecting Great Britain's position as the greatest overseas empire and left much domestic policy to local officials.

somewhat prevalent practice of supplementing the wages of laborers through outdoor relief. The justices sought to provide each family with a minimum income based on number of dependents and price of bread, but in reality, brought about a subsidization of low wages from poor rate funds.[9]

Poor rates, in addition to putting an increasing financial burden on farmers and the middleclass, were viewed as ineffective in dealing with poverty. Demands for the gradual decrease of funds expended were made at least seventeen years prior to the actual reform of 1834:

> The plan which has been recommended by some high authorities--of limiting the amount to be expended on the poor in each parish, and diminishing that amount to a certain extent year by year,--would necessarily involve the consideration of character and desert, and would essentially assist in restoring us to the government of those salutory laws from which we have departed.[10]

Help was viewed as having its proper origin in schools, savings banks, friendly societies and similar organizations which placed more responsibility on the poor. Growing criticism of the existing relief system as well as the pressures of a political-economic philosophy which demanded a free labor market led to the creation of a Commission to

[9]John F. C. Harrison, The Birth and Growth of Industrial England 1714-1867 (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1973), p. 98.

[10]J. E. Bicheno, An Inquiry Into the Nature of Benevolence, Chiefly With a View to Elucidate the Principles of the Poor Laws, and Show Their Immoral Tendency (London: Rowland Hunter, 1817), p. 142.

study the Poor Law system, and then, in 1834, to an actual reform of the Law itself. The Poor Law of 1834 was as restrictive as the Speenhamland system had been generous. The new law provided for the relief of every "needy" person, but the process of granting relief was governed by strict regulations:

> First, outdoor relief was to be abolished and all recipients made to enter the workhouse. Second, conditions in the workhouse were made "less eligible" (that is, more miserable) than the condition of the lowest paid worker outside. A rigorous workhouse test was thus applied to all applicants for relief, the intention being to deter all but the really "deserving" (that is, desperate) cases.[11]

The "machinery" set up by the Poor Law Commission included a centralized administration: a board of three commissioners aided by regional assistant commissioners. "Unions" were formed by grouping parishes and a workhouse was established for each union. Rate payers in each union elected boards of guardians who were responsible for enforcing the Poor Law legislation.

The workhouse was not a creation of the 1834 Poor Law for it had existed prior to that time, but it was not until 1834 that the workingclass as well as the poor were subjected to its cruelties. While members of the workingclass could provide for their basic needs, any type of problem such as illness or death frequently pushed them

---

[11]Harrison, The Birth and Growth of Industrial England 1714-1867, p. 99.

over the poverty line. At a time when help was most
needed they were faced with one alternative, entering the
workhouse. The red-brick buildings resembled prisons, and
the regulations inside helped support this picture. Fam-
ilies who entered were separated; they would reunite only
when and if they left the workhouse. Meals were plain and
until 1842, eaten in silence. A special workhouse dress
was worn and visitors were discouraged. Economy rather
than humaneness was the aim of workhouse personnel.[12]

Poor Law reform in the direction of less aid under
more controlled conditions complemented the predominant
laissez-faire political-economic philosophy which held that
government intervention in business was unacceptable. Un-
like other national institutions, including Parliament,
courts of justice and the army, poor relief was not con-
sidered a necessary part of society. In fact, it was
deemed "unnatural" for people to look to the state for
subsistence. Within such a framework of thought the new
Poor Law was praised:

> In February 1834 was published perhaps the most
> remarkable and startling document to be found in the
> whole range of English, perhaps, indeed, of all, social
> history. It was the Report upon the administration
> and practical operation of the Poor Laws by the Com-
> missioners who had been appointed to investigate the
> subject. . . . It was their rare good fortune not only
> to lay bare the existence of abuses and trace them to

---

[12]Ibid., p. 101.

> their roots, but also to propound and enforce the
> remedies by which they might be cured. It is seldom
> indeed, that the conditions of so vast and sweeping a
> reform are found co-existing.[13]

If one were to view the Poor Law reform from a purely

statistical point of view, its effectiveness was indeed

impressive. While the actual expenditure increased, the

amount spent per pauper and the percentage of paupers in

the general population decreased (see table 1). In ad-

dition, an increasing number of people were receiving in-

door rather than outdoor relief, and while the number of

able-bodied individuals receiving relief decreased, the

number of lunatics and vagrants receiving relief increased

(see table 2). Both a decrease in the number of people

receiving outdoor relief and any increase in those re-

ceiving indoor relief were viewed as evidence of the ef-

fectiveness of the new Poor Law. While any increase in

outdoor relief was attributed to careless administration,

increases in indoor relief were viewed as the result of

better service rendered to the poor population.

Although the new system looked effective on paper,

its ability to deal with actual poor _people_ was questioned.

Workhouses made little discrimination in the type of

"clients" accepted, resulting in the side-by-side habita-

tion of young children, the elderly, married couples and

---

[13]T. W. Fowle, _The Poor Law_ (London: Macmillan and
Co., 1881), p. 75.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF PAUPERS AND PAUPER EXPENDITURE 1834 TO 1880

Year	Population	Expenditure	Per head s.	d.	Paupers	% of Pop.
1834	14,372,000	£6,317,255	8	$9\frac{1}{2}$	---	---
1841	15,911,757	4,760,929	5	$11\frac{3}{4}$	1,299,048	7.5
1851	17,927,609	4,962,704	5	$6\frac{1}{2}$	941,315	5.3
1861	20,066,224	5,778,943	5	9	883,921	4.4
1871	22,712,266	7,886,724	6	$11\frac{1}{4}$	1,037,360	4.6
1880	25,323,000	8,015,010	6	4	808,030	3.2

SOURCE: T. W. Fowle, The Poor Law (London: Macmillan and Co., 1881): 75.

TABLE 2

MEAN NUMBER OF INDOOR, OUTDOOR AND ABLE-BODIED
PAUPERS, 1841 TO 1880

Year	Indoor	Outdoor	Able-bodied	Lunatics	Vagrants
1841	192,106	1,109,642	---	---	---
1851	114,367	826,948	163,124	14,346	3,390
1861	125,866	758,055	145,776	32,887	1,941
1871	156,430	880,930	172,460	48,334	3,735
1880	180,817	627,213	115,785	61,295	5,914

SOURCE: T. W. Fowle, The Poor Law (London: Macmillan and Co., 1881): 157.

single people. Individuals of "questionable" character found few, if any, restrictions placed on their dealings with impressionable children. Much effort was made to make the lives of workhouse occupants as miserable as possible and, yet, all viable escape routes were virtually blocked.

Dissatisfaction with Poor Law legislation made the system the subject of criticism as well as comparison. In one such comparison, Andrew Doyle, an English Poor Law Inspector, studied the system of poor relief adopted in 1853 at Elberfeld in Saxony.[14] Prior to 1853, poor relief at Elberfeld was considered to be the responsibility of existing religious bodies. Since these religious bodies, however, demonstrated neither interest nor expertise in providing for the poor, the municipality opted to revise the existing system. The new system included an administrative body consisting of a President, four members of the Municipal Council and four citizens, selected from among the most wealthy and distinguished of the community; expiration of terms was placed on a rotating basis so that the administrative body was never composed of entirely new members. The administrative body was responsible for supervising the visitors and overseers; both types of position were unpaid and compulsory, but the detailed selection process lent an air of dignity to the offices.

---

[14]Andrew Doyle, The Poor Law System of Elberfeld (London: Knight and Co., 1871).

Since the Elberfeld system of poor relief was based almost totally on outdoor relief, the entire community, rather than a few workhouses, was viewed as a potential client base. Each visitor was responsible for a particular section of the town and each overseer supervised approximately fourteen visitors. In addition to receiving advice from the overseer, each group of visitors met every two weeks to discuss their cases. Each application for relief brought to the attention of a visitor was subjected to careful examination. While the visitor could give immediate temporary relief, the decision as to whether or not the client could be granted "permanent" relief was decided by a majority vote taken at the fortnightly meetings. The individuals considered for relief included those who were destitute and unsuccessful in obtaining work, and those individuals not relieved by private charity. Persons earning less than the amount needed for the "absolute necessaries" of life were subsidized through grants of money, food, clothing, schooling, medical care and the cost of a funeral.

While the Elberfeld system might appear to have been more strict than the system set up by the English Poor Law, it possessed one important component which was missing in England: the presence of a group of interested and well-educated administrators and visitors. The human element,

almost entirely lacking in the English system, was a crucial factor in the success at Elberfeld:

> If it be thought that the conditions of obtaining relief are harsh and oppressively rigorous, it is but just to bear in mind not only the instructions that are given to the visitors, but how these instructions are practically observed. Repeatedly throughout the regulations are found injunctions to deal with the poor mercifully, and, if the provisions of the law be unavoidably hard, to administer it at least in a spirit of kindness and Christian forbearance. The visitor is rejoined to "hear the prayers of the poor with love and heart," to impress upon the father the duty that he owes to his child and upon the child the reverence that is due to the parents; he is to be, in short, the friend and advisor of the poor who apply to him for legal relief.[15]

Doyle's discussion of the Elberfeld system views its beginnings as similar to those of the English system; in like manner, the administrative bodies were similarly organized, but it is at this point that similarity ceases to exist. The relieving officers of the English system, unlike the visitors of Elberfeld, were salaried employees. They were paid less than skilled laborers and were expected to supervise the relief of between 400 and 1,000 paupers. The volunteers at Elberfeld each handled approximately four cases. Many English relieving officers had only very basic skills in reading, writing and keeping accounts; the volunteers of Elberfeld were usually the most educated members of the community. Proponents of a _laissez-faire_ philosophy might oppose a system such as the one at Elberfeld on the

---

[15]Ibid., p. xx.

grounds that it took away the "freedom" of the poor by making them the subject of careful study as a prerequisite for receiving relief, but Doyle felt that opposition would come from another area: ". . . in England it might be less difficult to reconcile the poor to such a system than it would be to find amongst the well-to-do classes fit and willing agents for its administration."[16]

The search for fit and willing agents for the administration of poor relief was not solely the concern of individuals such as Doyle who studied foreign systems of poor relief. Although outdoor relief was discouraged by the Poor Law of 1834, it continued to exist. The question was no longer one of whether the State had an obligation to relieve the indigent; rather, the questions to be asked were: what type of relief was to be administered, and what qualifications were necessary for this task. Since outdoor relief appeared to be impossible to abolish totally, it became necessary to seek out those individuals most capable of administering such a system of relief. In an examination of poor relief in the union of Atcham, Shropshire, Sir Baldwyn Leighton presented three principles which he felt to be at the root of a successful system of poor relief:

"(1) The systematic adoption of strict and sound principles in giving out-door relief: the chief one being

---

[16]Ibid., p. xxi.

an attempt to set a premium on thrift and a discount
on improvidence, as far as the present Poor Law will
allow.

"(2) Personal devotion to the work--a constant and un-
remitting energy on the part of one or two guardians,
acting and re-acting on the officials. It is unneces-
sary to remind an audience of practical men that this
minute individual service is the secret and the soul
of success in carrying out any such intricate matters
as the administration of a Poor Law; and that without
such living spirit even the soundest principles become
deadened and inoperative.

"(3) Sanitary precautions to mitigate as far as may be
that fruitful cause of pauperism, illness from bad
drainage, and bad ventilation."[17]

The third principle involved physical change, that is, a

better system of sanitation, the first attempted to induce

thrift, but the second principle made a much more difficult

demand, for it viewed personal commitment as a prerequisite

to better Poor Law administration.

Personal commitment to working with the poor and prop-

er training for this task were issues which remained a con-

cern of Poor Law administrators into the twentieth century,

but these issues also had to be faced by those individuals

who established programs to replace or supplement Poor Law

programs. Private philanthropy, regardless of philosophy,

was forced to answer two questions: (1) how were the poor

to be helped, and (2) what qualifications were necessary

for the persons who assumed this task. The following sec-

---

[17]Sir Baldwyn Leighton, Pauperization: Cause and Cure
(Shrewsbury: Messrs. Sandford, 1871), p. 4.

tion will examine these two questions as answered by various forms of private philanthropy.

Private Philanthropy to 1880

The Poor Law's failure was due in part to poor administration; poorly educated and unskilled relieving officers were unable to cope with an increasingly complicated problem. Much criticism of Poor Law legislation, however, came at a more fundamental level, for it questioned the legitimacy of the entire system, not merely its administrative framework:

> It is, no doubt, disappointing to find that so costly and elaborate a machinery as ours is incompetent to prevent a very considerable number of deaths every year, and a certainly large, although imponderable, amount of suffering which only stops short of death. It would be satisfactory to be able to lay the fault of the breakdown on the machinery; but this may not be done, for the fault is in the system itself. To say that the mechanism with which it is worked is defective, is to ascribe another fault to the Poor Law, for it has at its disposal all those resources with which the system of local government is able to acquit itself fairly well in other departments.[18]

Although Edwards' criticism of the Poor Law system itself and the suggestion in a later part of his paper that voluntary charity was its only logical successor might have appeared to be somewhat radical, neither idea was new. The Poor Law had found itself the subject of criticism since

---

[18]Rev. W. Walter Edwards, The Poor Law: A Proposal for its Abolition (Shrewsbury: Bunny and Evans, 1875), pp. 6-7.

its inception in 1601, and voluntary charity was always viewed as being a viable part of the system of poor relief, if not an alternative to it.

Although private philanthropy was initially a purely individual effort, that is, almsgiving on the part of wealthy citizens, groups soon formed around various ideas about how voluntary charity should be utilized. The programs appeared to be as numerous as their benefactors. In a 1861 survey,[19] Sampson Low Jr. estimated that London alone had 640 charitable institutions, 279 founded between 1800 and 1850 and 144 in the following ten-year period. They included: the Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association; the Strangers' Friend Society; the Society for the Suppression of Mendicity; Mr. Carter's South London Refuge and Mission; East End Relief and Mission Fund; large coal and bread clubs; soup kitchens; visiting and Bible societies; Parochial Mission Women's Funds; hospitals; and charitable dispensaries. Although some were easily identifiable, others had vague titles and equally vague purposes. It was the latter that such individuals as Octavia Hill and Bernard Bosanquet criticized and the Charity Organisation Society attempted to either coordinate or discourage.

---

[19]Sampson Low, Jr., The Charities of London in 1861 (London, 1862).

One key concern of voluntary charity focused on the religious status of the groups, that is, should private philanthropy be solely the domain of organized religious groups, or were others equally capable of performing this task? This question was especially crucial when volunteer workers were being recruited. A religious sisterhood, for example, would alleviate some of the difficulties of recruitment, since the women would have a bond that extended beyond charity. Caroline Emelia Stephen, an advocate of the religious sisterhood, held that there existed a definite difference between a religious sisterhood and an association established solely for the purpose of charity work. She viewed a religiously-based association as an organization which saw works of charity, including teaching, almsgiving and the care of the sick, as a means to an end: ". . . that end being the spiritual benefit of the performer or of the object of such works."[20] Secular associations, on the other hand, viewed works of charity as ultimate ends. Stephen felt that secular associations were capable of looking after physical needs, but spiritual welfare was the concern solely of religious sisterhoods. Although few sisterhoods were established (notably in the

---

[20]Caroline Emelia Stephen, The Service of the Poor: Being an Inquiry into the Reasons For and Against the Establishment of Religious Sisterhoods for Charitable Purposes (London: Macmillan and Co., 1871), p. 2.

field of nursing) and secular groups assumed a major
portion of the charity work, a rather strong religious
influence remained at the base of private philanthropy.
It was within this religious framework that much of pri-
vate philanthropy could dispense soup at one corner of the
room and the Bible at the opposite corner. It was within
such a framework that private philanthropy became the ob-
ject of criticism.

Early philanthropists did not attempt to cloak their
religious or moral motives when they engaged in charity
work. Like many who followed, they wanted prevention of,
rather than a remedy for, destitution, but unlike their suc-
cessors, they attacked neither environment nor bad luck; they
blamed the victim for his lot in life. In attempting to
bring about change, organizations such as the Society for
Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the
Poor in the Town and the Neighbourhood of Liverpool, estab-
lished in 1809, viewed religion as crucial to this process:

> It is hoped that by a due encouragement of in-
> dustry, and good moral conduct, early education, and
> timely instruction in the duties of religion, such
> habits of prudence, economy, and piety may be formed,
> and in time be established and confirmed, as to pre-
> vent the poverty and misery which are always attendant
> upon the improvident, the dissolute, and the idle.[21]

---

[21]Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing
the Comforts of the Poor in the Town and the Neighbourhood
of Liverpool, The First Report (Liverpool: Society for
Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the
Poor in the Town and the Neighbourhood of Liverpool, 1809),
p. iii.

It should be noted, however, that emphasis was placed on
instructing the poor in the art of better living. Such
instruction depended on the willingness of individuals to
give of their time, but such individuals were difficult to
find: ". . . the generality of persons are willing to give
their money, but they will not give their time to the
Poor."[22] The Society emphasized the fact that choice of
workers could not be left to chance. The workers would be
successful only if they were able to communicate with the
poor; they had to empathize without giving into the de-
mands of the poor and enforce restrictions without be-
coming overly harsh. Although the only "training" avail-
able was actual work with the Society, a precedent had been
set. Early organizations such as the Society acknowledged
the needs for skilled visitors; it remained the task of its
successors, however, to define more clearly the role of
the visitor and to formulate a training program.

Religious affiliation was not the only issue to be
decided by voluntary charity associations. Each association
had to decide how it could best help the poor. The sug-
gestions were many, stemming from basics such as better
housing to "privileges" such as better education. Octavia
Hill opted for the former alternative. Like many of the
charity workers who came after her, Hill's initial inter-

---

[22]Ibid., p. viii.

est in the poor stemmed from reading articles written on the subject, as well as first-hand experience with the poor. At the age of eighteen, Miss Hill appeared to be focusing on some of the concerns which would later shape her own charity program. A letter written to a friend in 1856 focused on the treatment of children in ragged schools:[23]

> I went to a meeting about Ragged Schools. Oh to hear how people talk of others, and think they are treating them as Christians! I'd rather be a table than a Ragged School child. Not an attempt made to show how the teaching influences the children themselves, plenty of statistics about numbers of Bibles given away, &c. I should like to know, Mary, what you think about classes in society, rank, station, work; how far you approve of intercourse between classes, how far you would do work which is usually done by a lower class, if it were useful, but not necessary. Oh, what a power for good anyone has, who does go among people as if he was one of them, entering into all their thoughts.[24]

Hill was representative of a group of private philanthropists, appalled by surrounding conditions, eager to engage in a solution, but unsure as to the proper course and extent of the "treatment." Working on the assumption that better housing and a sense of community were viable alter-

---

[23]The ragged school movement, begun in the 1840s and formalized by Lord Shaftesbury's creation of the Ragged School Union in 1844, was an attempt to educate and shelter vagrant children. It was funded through donations and staffed by voluntary teachers. The rise of board schools in the 1870s led to a decrease in the number of ragged schools.

[24]Emily S. Maurice, ed., _Octavia Hill: Early Ideals; From Letters_ (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1928), p. 36.

natives to slums and isolation, Hill began her housing work in 1860. In her rent collecting plan, Hill proposed to assume the management of tenement houses, repair them and then rent them to poor people. She would remain in touch with her tenants by visiting them and collecting their rents. In her search for suitable dwellings in London, however, she found that her criteria for choosing a house along with the landlords' reluctance to participate in a previously untried scheme made buildings almost impossible to acquire. Her sister, an associate of Hill's rent collecting plan recalled the difficulties faced:

> When Octavia was searching for a suitable house to turn into tenements for the poor,--she was most anxious to find one with a garden. We spent many days looking at empty houses, and seeing landlords and agents; but, whenever the purpose for which the house was required was understood, difficulties were at once raised.[25]

It was not until 1864 that Hill was able to acquire suitable dwellings--three tenement houses in London. Although she initially visited each of her groups of tenants, the task became increasingly difficult as the number of dwellings rose, for she considered her duty to be more than merely rent collecting. She felt herself to be a direct influence on the people she visited; she did not offer them money--handouts were viewed as factors contributing to their present condition--but offered her advice and friend-

---

[25]C. Edmund Maurice, ed., _Life of Octavia Hill as Told in Her Letters_ (London: Macmillan and Co., 1912), p. 190.

ship. She viewed her clients not as passive recipients
of alms, but as active participants in the helping process.
While she had the responsibility of securing dwellings and
offering advice to her charges, she considered them re-
sponsible for keeping up their houses and not falling vic-
tim to the easy handouts which abounded.

As she acquired more tenements, Hill sought help from
those around her, notably her sister and close friends. She
viewed the task of rent collecting as a difficult one, for
it assumed none of the glamour or good feelings of alms-
giving. Instead, it demanded continuous effort on the part
of the worker. By 1879, the rent collectors controlled
blocks of housing in London and were well on their way to
setting up the scheme in Liverpool, Manchester and Dublin.
Hill was encouraged by the expansion of her work, but con-
tinued to be faced with the problem of finding workers to
manage the courts:

> Everybody is building and buying, but I was appalled
> to find, on my return, how few were doing anything
> towards training volunteers. And yet, if you think of
> it, all the technical work is new to the very ladies
> whose spirit is needed for the conduct of these houses
> when built and bought; and it is no use to have the
> right spirit if the technical matters, all the sanitary
> and financial arrangements, are in a mess. Beware of
> well meant feelings.[26]

The structure of the rent collecting scheme demanded work-

---

[26]Octavia Hill, Letter to My Fellow Workers: to Which
is Added an Account of Donations Received for Work Among
the Poor During 1879 (London, 1879), p. 8.

ers well-versed in managing property. While Hill's volun-
teers were initially novices in this field, she expected
them to acquire expertise in their task--a willingness to
serve was important but inadequate. Octavia Hill's con-
cept of training which became more specific after 1880 and
will be further examined in Chapter IV represented a new
attitude on the part of private philanthropists; good in-
tentions might alleviate some of the symptoms of poverty,
but they were insufficient to remedy its causes.

As long as charity organizations remained small, in-
struction could be given verbally. With an increase in the
number of workers, however, it became necessary for other
means of communication to be developed. Charles Bosanquet's
A Handy-Book for Visitors of the Poor in London represented
this new thrust--the arrival of "how-to" books containing
hints for charity workers. Reacting to the inequalities
of a rigid class system, Bosanquet conceived of the charity
worker as a friend rather than a teacher of the poor. The
visitors were instructed to become familiar with the neigh-
borhood they served, for the community played a role in
every client's life. Bosanquet provided the visitors with
thirty-three suggestions, ranging from refraining from
making notes in the presence of clients, to lending them
suitable books, to "combining patience and courtesy with dis-

crimination and firmness."[27]

Thus far we have seen two sources of help offered to the poor prior to 1880--public programs enacted by Poor Law legislation and private philanthropic experiments conducted by a number of agents and ranging from one-time gifts of bread, clothing, coal or money to organized programs such as Octavia Hill's rent collecting plan which sought long-term results and required trained workers. The poor, however, had another resource on which to rely for help--their own ingenuity.

Self-help Movements to 1880

The Poor Law program and private philanthropy alone or in combination failed to meet the needs of a great number of poor people. The group which suffered the most, however, were those who were poor but not dramatically destitute; they did not wish to submit to the degradation of the Poor Law, but failed to attract the attention of private philanthropists:

> . . . in spite of these laws, [the Poor Laws] if not in consequence of them, much misery prevails at all times, and especially in the circumstances that have been noticed as incident to the conditions of the labourer.
> So convinced are the working classes themselves of this fact, that, notwithstanding the protection held out by the Poor-laws, a very large proportion of them prefer finding it in their own efforts, and willingly

---

[27]Charles B. P. Bosanquet, A Handy-Book for Visitors of the Poor in London (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1874), pp. 15-25.

make a sacrifice of present indulgence to obtain secu-
rity against future want.[28]

This group did quite well in providing for their basic

needs, but were frequently unable to cope with added ex-

penses due to illness, job loss or death. Friendly socie-

ties were viewed as the logical answer for meeting these

needs. Early societies ran into a number of difficulties,

the primary one being miscalculation--they promised to pay

more than they raised through subscriptions, and conse-

quently, ended up bankrupt. The individuals who first suf-

fered a misfortune received the benefits promised to them;

their fellow contributors received nothing. Since the so-

cieties were recognized as being potentially beneficial to

the lowerclass as well as the nation, however, steps were

taken to make them more stable. For example, they were

legally defined:

> The object of the Society must be to raise a
> fund by subscription, contribution or donation, for the
> mutual relief and maintenance of the members, their
> wives, children or relations in sickness, infancy, ad-
> vanced age, widowhood, or any other natural state or
> contingency whereof the occurrence is susceptible of
> calculation by way of average.[29]

Like the trade unions, which formed around specific occu-

---

[28]James Cleghorn, Thoughts on the Expediency of a
General Provident Institution, for the Benefit of the
Working Classes (Edinburgh: John Hutchinson, 1824), p. 5.

[29]John Tidd Pratt, The Law Relating to Friendly So-
cieties, Comprising the Statute 10 Geo. IV. Cap. 56
(London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown and Green, 1829),
p. viii.

pations, the friendly societies chose to limit their membership. The Liverpool Plumbers' Friendly Society, for example, limited its membership to plumbers between the ages of 18 and 45 years. After being examined and declared fit by a surgeon employed by the society, the applicant paid an entry fee. The Society's major purpose was the provision of funeral money; if a deceased member had belonged to the Society for a minimum of six months, his widow would receive ₤5. The plumbers were not alone in their attempt to cater to their own group. There also existed societies for clay potters, pearl button makers, kilnsmen, coppersmiths, and packing case makers, to name just a few.

While the friendly societies aided the laborers in time of distress, other societies were formed which attempted to raise the workers' standard of living. The cooperative societies sought to provide the laborer with a portion of the profit previously held by the factory owners. Although organizations resembling the cooperative societies were in existence in the 1820s, it was not until 1844 that the movement gained momentum. At Leeds, members of the workingclass felt that they were being forced to pay too high a price for poor quality flour. Determined to provide their own flour, they raised ₤3000 by selling shares in their venture at 21s per share. They used the money for a down

payment on a mill and began producing a high quality flour for less than the millers charged. As a result, the millers were forced to lower their prices in order to remain in competition with the cooperative's mill. Although cooperative members and the general public were allowed to purchase flour at the same price, at the end of the year members divided the profits, first equally based on the share which each had purchased and then proportionately on the amount of flour each had purchased. Through this system, the cost of retailing was reduced by 50 percent and the cost of grinding by 40 percent. Yearly profits averaged 25 percent.[30]

Another successful experiment took place in Rochdale. Instead of a mill, however, members set up a cooperative store, selling only groceries at first, but later expanding to meats and clothing; a mill was added twenty years later. Members were allowed to purchase up to 100 shares, but profits were divided in the same manner as at Leeds:

> Up to that time, most of the stores had pursued the plan of paying their dividends on the capital invested. This gave the benefits of the system to the investors and not to the purchasers. The Rochdale Pioneers took up the plan of paying merely current interest to the shareholders, and of dividing the profits with the purchasers.[31]

Two-and-one-half percent of the profits were reserved for

---

[30]Henry Fawcett, Co-operative Societies: Their Social and Economical Aspect (London, 1871), pp. 436-437.

[31]Robert Archey Woods, English Social Movements (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1892), p. 32.

the "mutual improvement" of members, which included a
reading room and a library. Although the cooperative so-
cieties were initiated for the purpose of obtaining better
goods at lower prices and providing an alternative to con-
trol by the few, theirs was not a purely financial en-
deavor. Like a few individuals who came before them and
the settlement workers who were to follow, the cooperators
sought to permanently improve the life of the laborers.
They viewed cooperative societies and stores not merely as
business establishments, but as centers of social life and
education.

The preceding pages have shown how the government,
private philanthropists and self-help movements viewed their
responsibility to the poor. While their efforts were many,
however, their methods were haphazard and their successes
few. The harshness of the Poor Law made it a court of last
resort; private philanthropy which offered soup and a shil-
ling overshadowed admirable plans such as Octavia Hill's
rent collecting scheme; the friendly societies and cooper-
ative societies assumed that the individual had some money
which could be used for other than bare necessities. In-
stead of complementing one another, the three forms of aid
clashed, creating a relief system that resembled a sieve
with very large holes; while some individuals received help
from multiple sources, others fell through--helpless. Crit-

ics of this system felt that change from within was impossible. They sought an agent of reform that would be neutral by virtue of its separation from any of the aforementioned ameliorative agents, and found a solution in the group which would eventually come to be known as the Charity Organisation Society.

The Charity Organisation Society

Although The Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity, later to be known as the Charity Organisation Society, did not formally exist as such until 1869, it resembled, to some degree, the Society for the Relief of Distress established c.1860, which attempted to establish a more personal relationship between client and almoner, and work for a more careful administration of charity. Early members of the Charity Organisation Society denied any actual link, but were vague as to the relationship between the two societies. In an 1875 publication entitled Philanthropic Tailoring and Historical Cobbling, an attempt was made to explain some of the events which took place, through the use of the correspondence of early members. In a letter to the Parochial Critic dated December 8, 1870, Dr. Thomas Hawksley pointed to the fact that Lord Lichfield had stated that certain proposed but unadopted rules of the Society for the Relief of Distress were identical to those of the C.O.S. Hawksley felt that such a re-

lationship did not exist; while he viewed Lichfield a key

figure in the C.O.S.'s birth, he credited the work of

Rev. Henry Solly. A paper delivered by Solly at the 1868

meeting of the Society of Arts prompted the creation of the

Association for the Prevention of Pauperism and Crime.

Hawksley continued:

> After reviewing the great extent of the field covered
> by the title, the Committee resolved itself into sec-
> tions, each undertaking the investigation of some spe-
> cial feature of the subject. One of these sections had
> for its inquiry "The means now in operation for the
> Prevention of Pauperism," and a paper connected with it,
> entitled "The Charities of London, and Some Errors in
> their Administration, with Suggestions for an Improved
> System of Private and Official Charitable Relief" was
> read at the Society of Arts on December 17th, 1868,
> under the presidency of Lord Shaftesbury. After the
> reading of the paper, Lord Lichfield, who previously
> had declined to act with the Association, signified
> his willingness to do so, provided the Association
> would, for the present at least, relinquish all the
> other projects, and devote themselves to carrying out
> the scheme in the pamphlet for the "Organisation and
> Better Administration of Charity." This proposal was
> accepted by the Association, together with other ar-
> rangements suggested by his lordship. After this pub-
> lic conferences were held, the Rev. Martyn Hart's plan
> of distributing tickets to be given to beggars, instead
> of doles was added to the other plans; and, at a later
> period, the Association's title was changed to that of
> "Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing
> Mendicity;" but the original association was never dis-
> solved, nor have its original principles and modes of
> action been changed.[32]

Lichfield agreed with most of Hawksley's ideas about the

creation of the C.O.S., but insisted that the basis for the

---

[32]Thomas Hawksley, "Origin of the Charity Organisation
Society," Parochial Critic (London), 8 December 1870,
quoted in Philanthropic Tailoring and Historical Cobbling
(London: Williams and Co., 1875), p. 6.

C.O.S. and the Society for the Relief of Distress were virtually identical. Although specific details about the origin of the C.O.S. might remain vague, its purpose did not. It sought to combat pauperism and the illegitimate use of funds, both public and private, by coordinating the diverse charitable organizations at work in London. To this end, it directed its attack towards the evils which created this situation:

> . . . the demoralisation of the poor by indiscriminate charity; the increasing separation between the richer and poorer classes, the rich becoming richer and the poor poorer; and the bad social and sanitary arrangements, which leave masses of the people in a condition worse than that of beasts, because it is accompanied by the conscious degradation of human beings.[33]

The greatest evil, however, was considered to be the "mistaken charity" dispensed by a variety of local organizations. Sir Charles Trevelyan cited an example, the "Bedford Institute" in London's East-end:

> . . . at which from 150 to 200 grown-up men are fed upon bread and butter and coffee, every Sunday morning, besides occasional "breakfast meetings" on other days, after which they sing a hymn and join in other religious exercises. There is also a liberal distribution of tickets for tea, bread, coals, etc., besides large issues of nourishing foods of various kinds from the "Invalid Kitchen," and daily dinners of soup or pudding for the children. This is only a single example of the concentration of misdirected charity from many and

---

[33]Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity, General Objects of the Society (London: Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity, 1870), p. 1.

various quarters on this unfortunate district of
London. The Report of the Bedford Institute complains
that "a large portion of the East of London is in a
state of chronic pauperism." With such treatment how
can it be otherwise?[34]

Although Trevelyan's words made sense to those who favored

an organization such as the Charity Organisation Society,

they were viewed by members of local charity societies as

an attack upon the very programs in which they had so

deeply invested themselves. Since the C.O.S., to be suc-

cessful, had to persuade these charities to cooperate, it

was necessary to allow them some degree of autonomy. The

question of cooperation vs. autonomy, however, was one

which would not be resolved for several decades.

Unlike the charity societies which it sought to co-

ordinate, the C.O.S. considered itself to be an organization

based upon the principles of applied science, that is, it

was to study the problems of British society and apply this

knowledge to reach a solution. Within this "scientific"

framework, the C.O.S. did not leave the investigation of

cases up to the individual's discretion, but set up uniform

guidelines for inquiry:

"The usual practice of the Committee as to in-
quiry is as follows:

"(1) The applicant's own statement is taken down at the
Office by the Charity Agent.

---

[34]Sir Charles Trevelyan, Seven Articles on London
Pauperism and its Relations with the Labour Market (London:
Bell and Doldy, 1870), pp. 40-41.

"(2) The Office form is sent or taken to the Relieving Officer of the Board of Guardians of the Poor Law.

"(3) The persons of whom it may be requisite to make inquiries regarding the applicant are seen or written to.

"(4) The Charity Agent, or other competent person, visits the house of the applicant to verify his statements, and communicate with his referees.

"(5) The statement of the case is sent to any local Charity within whose province the case seems to come, with a request that the way the case may be disposed of be communicated to the Office."[35]

It was believed that if these guidelines were followed and charity societies cooperated, equitable relief would result. Without a sufficient number of workers, however, the system would inevitably fail. In attempting to cope with the manpower problem, Rev. H. Solly stressed that charity organization needed to be the task of certain well-equipped individuals; if it were left to the responsibility of everyone, it would be no one's responsibility.[36] While Solly gave no specifics for a training program, his realization that effective charity was based on more than good intentions added another voice to the small, but growing, group

---

[35]Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity, Manual of the Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity (London: Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity, 1870), p. 16.

[36]Rev. Henry Solly, "Social Science and Organized Philanthropy," (Rough Draft--Unpublished Manuscript), 1868.

that viewed charity work as a full-time occupation; and while his support of paid workers appeared radical at the time, paid workers would eventually be accepted.

Soon after its initial introduction in 1869, the C.O.S. became the subject of both praise and criticism from all quarters. Many private philanthropists resented C.O.S. interference into their charitable organizations. The poor found in the C.O.S. an organization which would deny them the simultaneous benevolence of a variety of handouts. Supporters, however, were almost as numerous as critics. The government eyed with interest this society which promised reform, something which Poor Law administrators had failed to achieve. Highly regarded charity workers, such as Octavia Hill, not only found their endeavors compatible with C.O.S. ideals, but joined the growing ranks of C.O.S. workers. Those who supported the idea of a society designed not to give charity but to organize it, valued the C.O.S. for two reasons: first, it offered to examine all candidates for relief and to share the findings on their finances as well as character with all charitable institutions, and second, it was willing to give an opinion on the case of an applicant. In this way, applicants could be given appropriate help.

The Charity Organisation Society in 1880 stood as only a shadow of what would follow. Its staff was small

and sometimes divided; its level of acceptance by private charity was low; little evidence existed to prove that it could accomplish what it proposed to accomplish. Yet, its program was unprecedented, for it sought to bring a semblance of order to a previously chaotic field. In doing so, it committed itself to another revolutionary idea held by only a few other philanthropists; it admitted that good intentions alone did not make good charity--a program of theoretical and practical training (not yet formulated) was necessary.

If one defined "social services" prior to 1880 in terms acceptable to the majority, the definition would be synonymous with poor relief, that is, monetary aid or aid-in-kind. The Poor Law administration and private philanthropy traveled a vicious circle, with Poor Law benefits increasingly smaller because private philanthropy provided help, and private endeavors continuing because Poor Law benefits decreased. Programs such as Octavia Hill's rent collecting scheme which demanded skilled workers and responsible clients were exceptions to the rules of the day. The Charity Organisation Society was in its infancy as a coordinating body. Despite all of these negative forces, however, the seed which would develop into social work training in the twentieth century had been planted, perhaps in desperation for the delivery of service was no easy task,

but planted nevertheless. The following chapter will examine the development of social services during the period 1880 to 1903--services which went beyond poor relief, and which would necessitate the development of a better-defined and efficient system of social work education.

CHAPTER III

THE EMERGENCE OF SOCIAL WORK SERVICES AS A
RESPONSE TO THE NEEDS OF THE TIMES
1880 TO 1903

The period 1880 to 1903 was characterized by the "actualization" of the paper legislation which was passed prior to that time. The decade 1870 to 1880 had brought forth a number of acts, including: the Forster Education Act (1870) which provided the framework for free, universal compulsory education at the elementary level; the Trade Union Act (1875) which provided the unions with protection from legal prosecution; the Public Health Act (1875) which committed the state to provide for better sanitation; the Food and Drug Act (1875) which provided for government supervision of the production of food and drugs; and the Artisan Dwellings Act (1875) which granted government subsidization for housing for the poor. These are only a few of the acts which were passed, in part, to raise the quality of life of each person, regardless of social class; and yet, while the legislation addressed itself to problems of the time, it could not deal with practicalities. The Forster Education Act, for example, could not be enforced for there were not enough school buildings in existence. Actually, however, the legislation of the 1870s came closer

to being enforced as the nineteenth century drew to a close. The government, which had assumed a growing responsibility for the welfare of its citizens had little choice but to increase its commitment. The growing middle-class as well as the increasingly verbal workingclass demanded the vote, better education, and more equality in terms of housing, jobs, and health care. Many people were no longer content with being charges of the benevolent upperclass whose charity was based in part on religious teachings, but rather, wanted government assistance in bettering their own condition. In addition, social reformers of this period were not content with removing the symptoms of social problems; they wanted to attack the causes of these problems.

The development of charity paralleled the movement of society in general. More emphasis was placed on assistance as a right, rather than as aid coming from a gracious benefactor. The charity which did exist was becoming more organized; the Charity Organisation Society stressed careful record keeping as well as cooperation between charitable societies. This did not mean that the soup kitchen and Bible type of charity no longer existed; the Salvation Army started by General William Booth in 1878 and formally named in 1880 was to attract many volunteers as well as contributors, but this type of charity came under

increasing criticism.

The social services which developed during this
period focused on the basic issues of the time: education,
employment, housing and health, and came from a position
which viewed society responsible to, as well as responsible
for, all of its members. This chapter will examine this
philosophy as manifested in Fabian Socialism, the societal
needs which were being verbalized by increasing degrees, and
the social services which responded to both the philosophy
and the needs.

Fabian Socialism

Unlike a _laissez-faire_ philosophy which emphasized
individual initiative and rejected government intervention
which it regarded as interference, the Fabian Socialists[1]
emphasized the fact that all individuals were interdepen-
dent. The labor of one individual affected the lives of
people at all corners of the earth, and in this way, workers
were placed in unconscious partnership with one another.

---

[1]In 1883, Thomas Davidson, a former lecturer at the
Concord School of Philosophy, began a discussion group
whose topic was the "moral and social duties of the present
time." The group split into two factions, one which focused
on the need for an application of ethics to personal life,
and the other which felt that personal ethics could only
develop through service to mankind; social ethics were of
prime importance. The first group became the New Fellow-
ship and the other was called the Fabian Society. Robert
Archey Woods, English Social Movements (London: Swan
Sonnenschein and Co., 1892), pp. 45-51.

Sidney Webb, one of the key figures in the Fabian Society viewed socialism as one of the unforeseen results of the industrial revolution. At that time, the labor of the individual became subordinate to the monetary control held by the factory owner. According to Webb, socialism was checked by a number of forces, but its triumph was inevitable:

> Socialism arose as soon as rent and interest became important factors; it began with our own century: in its birthplace in England it was, however, . . . beaten back for a time by the hasty misunderstandings of Malthus, followed by the "acute outbreak of individualism" unchecked by the old restraints, and invested with almost a religious sanction by a "certain soulless school of writers," from which . . . England [has suffered] for the last century.[2]

Webb felt that this socialism, so long misunderstood was, in fact, not an elaborate plan of society, but a principle of social action. There was to be no physical revolution but rather, ". . . a slowly dawning conviction in the minds of men."[3] This mental revolution would succeed when men would change their ideas about what constituted a just society, and what was necessary to achieve such a society. While the Socialist conceived of himself as more than a social reformer, he did not reject social reform:

> While repudiating as unscientific, the idea that any mere palliative of existing evils can effect a cure of

---

[2]Sidney Webb, What Socialism Means: A Call to the Unconverted (London: The Leaflet Press, 1888), p. 3.

[3]Ibid., p. 2.

them, he [the Socialist] is constantly urging the adoption of every practical measure of immediate relief. It is in his principles rather than in his practical politics that the Socialist differs from the mere "social reformer." But principles are the only lasting spring of action.[4]

The Fabian Socialists held that a reorganization of society should be based on the emancipation of land and capital from individuals, and their subsequent reinvestment in the community. In this way, the benefits of the nation would be shared by all, instead of a select few. In their promotion of the mental revolution which would achieve this end, the activities of the Fabians were directed toward discussion and meetings--verbal indoctrination rather than physical violence was their method. In a pamphlet published by the Society in 1889, the following activities were viewed as the Society's _modus operandi_:

"(1) Meetings for the discussion of questions connected with Socialism.

"(2) Meetings of a more public character, for the promulgation of Socialist opinions.

"(3) The further investigation of economic problems, and the collection of facts contributing to their elucidation.

"(4) The publication of pamphlets containing information on social questions, or arguments relating to Socialism.

"(5) The promotion of Socialist lectures and debates in other Societies.

"(6) The representation of the Society in public conferences and discussions on social questions.

---

[4]_Ibid._, p. 6.

"(7) The organisation of conferences of Social reformers, with a view to common action."[5]

Although the Society's activities were basically intellectual, they were intended to appeal to a variety of people; the Society sought recruits from all ranks of life. In addition, the Fabian Socialists felt that numbers were more important than "totality" of conviction. Webb stated that social prophets such as Owen, Fourier and St. Simon had demanded total faith in their ideas and had succeeded in creating only "isolated communities" rather than influencing all of society.[6] He viewed them as attempting to use static ideas in a dynamic society. Webb's wife Beatrice, however, placed more emphasis on Owen's early work, stating that the "co-operative idea" (which she considered to be purely British in origin) was directly linked to Socialism. This link consisted of the ideal towards which both groups were striving:

> . . . a state of society in which all citizens will serve the community with wholeheartedness, the community remunerating them, in return, according to the personal expenditure needful to the full and free use of their mental and physical faculties.[7]

---

[5]The Fabian Society, The Fabian Society (London: The Fabian Society, [1889]), pp. 1-2.

[6]Sidney Webb, Socialism in England (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1890), pp. 4-5.

[7]Beatrice Potter Webb, The Co-operative Movement in Great Britain (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1891), p. 224.

While Owen's group was smaller than the Fabian sympathizers, both offered a form of the same change--the replacement of selfish individualism with a sense of community.

Although Webb had concluded that the Socialists would probably never exercise political power, concentrating instead on influencing the government in power, the Fabian Election Manifesto of 1892 called for the formation of a workingclass party, supported by workingclass money, and free from any connections with either the Liberals or the Conservatives.[8] The Manifesto outlined the problems of establishing a workingclass party (formed as the Independent Labour Party in 1893); it stressed that apathy on the part of workingclass members was the most difficult problem to overcome. The Society viewed itself as a catalyst in this process, but refused to take full responsibility. Its workers were too few and the task too large:

> The Society, like other Societies of the same kind, has done what it could during the term of the expiring parliament to make the facts pleasanter; but the little handfuls of men who are here and there devoting themselves to the political interests of Labor, cannot change the condition of fourteen million wage workers who will do practically nothing for themselves.[9]

---

[8]Prior to this time, many members of the workingclass associated themselves with the Liberal Party, but only a few party members such as Herbert Samuel and Charles Trevelyan took any active interest in this group.

[9]The Fabian Society, The Fabian Election Manifesto (London: The Fabian Society, 1892), p. 15.

Although membership in the Fabian Society was relatively small (approximately 1,000), its ideas were modified and then promoted by other individuals interested in bettering societal conditions. While "social service" for the Fabian Socialist implied the development of a welfare state, other early "social workers" sought something less drastic but more attainable.

In a volume entitled Practicable Socialism, Samuel Barnett, founder of Toynbee Hall, the first university settlement, put together a number of essays he had written during the fifteen-year period he had resided in East London. He felt that although some advance had been made during this period (the organization of dock labor, the opening of free baths, open spaces and libraries, and the development of university settlements) poverty continued to be a reality:

> Poverty in London is increasing both relatively and actually. Relative poverty may be lightly considered, but it breeds trouble as rapidly as actual poverty. The family which has an income sufficient to support life on oatmeal will not grow in good-will when they know that daily meat and holidays are spoken of as "necessaries" for other workers and children. Education and the spread of literature have raised the standard of living and they who cannot provide boots for their children nor sufficient fresh air, nor clean clothes, nor means of pleasure, feel themselves to be poor, and have the hopelessness which is the curse of poverty as selfishness is the curse of wealth.[10]

Barnett saw education as the factor which had raised the

---

[10]Samuel Augustus Barnett, Practicable Socialism: Essays on Social Reform (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1895), p. 71.

standard of living, and at the same time, had raised the awareness of those individuals whose lives did not meet this standard. He saw education as the means through which the rich and poor would _eventually_ be able to meet on common ground. While the Fabian Socialists were demanding "equality" through common property, Barnett sought equality through the common property of education. This vehicle of equality was to be the university settlement:

> I am afraid that it is long before we can expect the rich and poor again to live as neighbours; for good or evil they have been divided, and other means must, for the present, be found for making common the property of knowledge. One such means is the University Settlement.[11]

It is interesting to note that Barnett as well as other promoters of the university settlement saw education as a vehicle for the unity of rich and poor, for it is in the area of education that great disparities traditionally existed. The following section will examine these differences and will include an examination of the university settlements' efforts to correct this injustice.

Education: A Source of Class Division vs. The Basis of Equality

Traditionally, English education was a privilege of the upperclass. Even the Elementary Education Act of 1870 made only a _promise_ of elementary education for each child; sec-

---

[11]Ibid., p. 113.

ondary and higher education was not even considered. The
children of workhouse paupers suffered the most. Between
1834 when the Poor Law expanded the workhouse system and
1861 when the study of workhouse schools began, pauper
children received little, if any, education. In 1863,
pauper education was placed under the jurisdiction of the
Poor Law Board instead of the education department. The
Poor Law Board, however, appeared to be even less able to
deal with pauper children than with their parents. The
Board was unable to secure and retain competent teachers,
and the teachers who were found were faced with children
who knew little of the world as it existed outside of the
workhouse. A number of alternatives were tried; these in-
cluded the use of district and separate schools (where
supervision was in the hands of trained outsiders rather
than workhouse masters), the cottage homes system (where
children were placed with foster parents), the isolated
homes system in which pauper children were grouped in houses
rented by Guardians and attended Board schools, the use of
public elementary schools, the boarding-out system where
children were boarded out in the country, certified schools
(industrial training schools and institutions for the deaf,
dumb and blind), institutions which were not certified,
training ships (on which boys were trained for sea service),
and the little-used practice of sending children to schools

in other unions.[12] Regardless of structure, however, the schools had one basic purpose: to make respectable, self-supporting citizens out of pauper children. This system of education assumed no intercourse between classes. If chance placed a poor child at a better school, his placement was usually accepted, but there was no effort made to increase interaction among classes.

In 1884, education, which had frequently been used as a barrier between classes was to be used as a link. It was in this year that Samuel Barnett, influenced by Edward Denison's work in East London, established the first of a number of university settlements, Toynbee Hall. Barnett criticized convential means used to help people:

> Societies which helped the poor by gifts have made paupers, churches which would have saved them by preaching have made hypocrites, and the outcome of scientific charity is the working man too thrifty to pet his children and too respectable to be happy.[13]

He felt that there had to be individual involvement in order for assistance to be effective. Such involvement could be found, in part, in College Missions inaugurated by well-known clergymen. A clergyman would visit a college, talk to the students about their responsibility to help the poor, rouse their sympathy and then set up committees for such

---

[12]Sir William Chance, _Children Under the Poor Law_ (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1897), pp. 46-254.

[13]Barnett, _Practicable Socialism_, p. 165.

endeavors as district visiting and Mothers' meetings.
Ideally, the students would assume these responsibilities,
but in reality, the burden usually fell on the clergyman.
The responsibility assumed by the students was a purely
financial one, and very limited at that. Barnett wished
to use the basic idea of a College Mission, but wanted to
prevent the actual responsibility from becoming purely
financial. To this end, he set up four criteria for es-
tablishing a settlement: (1) the place of the settlement
had to be fixed (in a poor area); (2) one individual was
to be chosen as the chief of the settlement; (3) the chief
must receive a salary and must make his home at the settle-
ment; and (4) "He must have taken a good degree, be quali-
fied to teach, and be endowed with the enthusiasm of hu-
manity."[14] The settlement's residents would ideally in-
clude individuals from all walks of life. Some would be
permanent residents, while others would live at the settle-
ment during vacation periods. Barnett envisioned the
settlement as the first successful attempt to unite all
classes of men in a common endeavor--education within the
framework of companionship.

Although Barnett established the first university
settlement, Toynbee Hall was not an isolated endeavor.

---

[14]Ibid., p. 169.

Within eight years it was joined by Oxford House in Bethnal Green, Mansfield House in Canning Town, the Bermondsey Settlement, the Women's University Settlement at Southwark and University Hall in Bloomsbury; by 1898 there were twelve men's and twelve women's settlements in London. Settlements also grew in Bristol, Ipswich, Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield, Edinburgh and Glasgow. While affiliation with a particular religious sect was common, each settlement placed more emphasis on carrying on their efforts in a Christian atmosphere rather than within a particular sectarian framework. Education, interpreted in the broadest sense, was the key concern of all of the settlements, but specific programs resulted from the uniqueness of each settlement group. Toynbee Hall, for example, was fortunate to have a large number of teachers in its program, enabling it to provide a wide variety of educational opportunities:

> There are classes in the literature of classical (including Hebrew) and modern languages, in languages themselves; in different branches of natural science; in history; in economics; in ethics; in such technical subjects as shorthand, book-keeping, friendly society finance, drawing, ambulance, nursing, swimming, etc. There are also . . . afternoon classes for girls in subjects ranging from domestic economy to hygiene, through ordinary class subjects to such things as musical drill, wood-carving and swimming.[15]

Other settlements, however, were unable to offer as wide a

---

[15]Will Reason, ed., University and Social Settlements (London: Methuen and Co., 1898), p. 52.

formal education program. Instead, they concentrated on preparing individuals for better jobs, or held discussions on important issues of the day. This power of flexibility, however, extended even further, making the university settlement a rather unique change agent. Unlike any of the organizations examined thus far, the university settlement was neither a purely philanthropic nor a self-help movement, but rather a joint effort on the part of members of all classes. Since each member was unique, he automatically had something to offer the other members. His individuality, combined with a specific skill that he might possess, made him valuable to the settlement, regardless of his social class. The university settlement was perhaps the first social movement in which a give-and-take existed between members of different social classes.

The university settlement was also unique in relation to the educational system. Prior to the development of Toynbee Hall in 1884, an adult education movement already existed. The University Extension Movement begun under the auspices of Cambridge in 1873,[16] was a response to two

---

[16]The term, University Extension, had been used as early as 1840, but it was equated with an increase in the number of facilities available for full-time university study. Part-time university study was later included, but did not take precedence until 1873. For a more detailed study of this movement, see Thomas Kelly, A History of Adult Education in Great Britain (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1970), pp. 216-219.

demands: (1) university education for working men, and (2) university aid in the cause of higher education for women. At the same time, however, it served to bring the workingclass in contact with members of the upperclass as well as the universities.

Although the education offered by the settlements tended more toward the practical, some writers felt that the settlements were capable of playing a role in extending university education to those individuals served by the University Extension Movement as well as the university settlements:

> In the movement to develop a real teaching University for London out of existing material, there is no reason why University Settlements should not bear a useful, though humble part. In the endeavor to make a complete ladder from the Board School to the University the need of kindly hands to help the student up the rungs must not be forgotten, and it is to offer these that the Settlements exist.[17]

By helping parents and future parents to better themselves through education, settlement workers felt that the children of these parents would almost inevitably benefit.

Aside from its rather unique attempt to use education as a bridge to cross class lines, the university settlement movement represented one area in which men and women were organizing on equal footing. The first women's settlement, the Women's University Settlement at Southwark,

---

[17]Reason, <u>University and Social Settlements</u>, p. 53.

was established in 1887, only three years after Toynbee
Hall. It was followed by the Women Workers at Canning
Town in 1891 and the Bermondsey Settlement (the Women's
House at Rotherhithe) in 1892. Some settlements, such as
the University Settlement at Higher Ardwick, Manchester,
established in 1896 included both men and women, although
residences were separate.[18] Activities of the settle-
ments varied only slightly. The majority took part in
school management, boys' and girls' clubs, the local Char-
ity Organisation Society Committee and educational programs.
In short, settlements cooperated with those charity organi-
zations already in existence, but added a new perspective
to the relationship between worker and client. While other
helping efforts had accepted the fact that the relation-
ship between worker and client was one of mutual responsi-
bility, the concept of equality, as it existed in the
university settlement, was absent.

Thus far, we have examined two efforts to bring
about change in society; Fabian socialism proposed a re-
structuring of society based on the laborers' rights to
all of the profit from their labor. The university settle-
ment movement sought to bring about change by using edu-
cation as a common meeting ground for all classes. Both

---

[18]Margaret A. Sewell and E. G. Powell, "Women's
Settlements in England," in Reason, ed. University and
Social Settlements, pp. 89-91.

movements were influential in late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century England, but their noble efforts also made each the subject of criticism. While the importance of education was acknowledged, it was not included in the three "necessaries" of life: food, clothing, and shelter. For this reason, the university settlements could be accused of not dealing with basic issues. Fabian socialism, on the other hand, dealt with issues perhaps too basic for the average well-to-do Englishman; it attacked the very system through which he had accumulated much of his wealth.

While the development of social services during the period 1880 to 1903 was moving away from the concept of almsgiving and towards one of change in society, it must be remembered that radical change was a threat to the established classes. It is for this reason that a plan such as Octavia Hill's rent collecting plan, begun in the 1860s could still be functioning and supported in the late-nineteenth century. Hill was successful in providing many poor with a basic necessity of life, housing, without making the wealthy feel that they were being undermined in some way. And yet, at the same time, Hill's standards for delivering her type of social service did not stoop to the low level of some types of private philanthropy. The following section will examine Octavia Hill's rent collecting

scheme as it existed during the period 1880 to 1903.

Octavia Hill's Rent Collecting Scheme
1880 to 1903: A Continuation of
a Proven Plan

Like the settlement workers, Octavia Hill's rent
collectors lived in close proximity to those individuals
whom they served, but unlike the settlers, the rent col-
lectors met their clients as charges rather than equals.
Although they realized that poverty also meant being hun-
gry and wearing rags, the rent collectors sought to pro-
vide the poor with a basic necessity previously ignored,
decent housing. In 1883, an anonymous pamphlet entitled
The Bitter Cry of Outcast London, An Enquiry into the
Condition of the Abject Poor, took up as part of its sub-
ject matter, a description of the housing conditions which
faced the rent collectors as well as other agents of char-
ity. The pamphlet described a "typical" slum district:

> Turning out of one of these streets you enter a
> narrow passage, about ten yards long and three feet
> wide. This leads into a court eighteen yards long and
> nine yards wide. Here are twelve houses of three rooms
> each, and containing altogether 36 families. The sani-
> tary condition of the place is indescribable. A large
> dust-bin charged with all manner of filth and putrid
> matter stands at one end of the court, and four water-
> closets at the other. In this confined area all of the
> washing of these 36 families is done, and the smell of
> the place is intolerable. Entering a doorway you go
> up six or seven steps into a long passage, so dark that
> you have to grope your way by the clammy, dirt-
> encrusted wall, and then you find a wooden stair, some
> of the steps of which are broken through. Ascending
> as best you can, you gain admission to one of the rooms.
> You find that although the front and back of the house

are of brick, the rooms are separated only by par-
titions of boards, some of which are an inch apart.
There are no locks on the doors, and it would seem
that they can only be fastened on the outside by pad-
lock. In this room to which we have come an old bed,
on which are some evil-smelling rags, is, with the ex-
ception of a broken chair, the only article of furni-
ture. . . . Rooms such as this are let furnished (!)
at 3s 6d and 4s a week, or 8d a night, and we are told
that the owner is getting 50 to 60 percent upon his
money.[19]

Although a description as wretched as this might have been

thought by some to be farfetched, its legitimacy was ac-

cepted by both those who had the power to change the situ-

ation, that is, the government, and those individuals such

as Octavia Hill who had been deeply involved for years in

the problem of housing. In 1884, the Royal Commission on

Housing, which included the Prince of Wales, Cardinal

Manning, and Lord Salisbury, attempted to first study the

situation and then propose a remedy. "Relocation" pro-

grams, however, were frequently far from successful; slum

residents were uprooted but the government provided only

land for housing, not actual houses. The poor were once

again dependent upon benevolent individuals who were willing

to invest money in poverty level housing. Overcrowding as

well as a lack of sanitation, water, air and sun were com-

mon conditions despite government efforts. It remained the

task of individuals such as Octavia Hill to make slum

---

[19]The Bitter Cry of Outcast London, An Enquiry into
the Condition of the Abject Poor (1883) quoted in Peter
Keating, ed., Into Unknown England 1866-1913 (London:
Fontana, 1976), pp. 109-110.

dwellings somewhat more fit for human habitation.

As stated previously, Hill's idea which consisted of rehabilitating tenements and renting them to the poor, was based on the belief that the human contact present in the process of collecting rents and visiting with the poor was vital to the "social service" which sought to affect the lives of the poor. Through the recruitment of friends and relatives, and later willing strangers, Hill was able to establish a number of improved tenements as well as a system of rent collecting and visiting. In 1903 she and her workers acquired a twenty-two acre area in South London. The site contained between 500 and 600 houses inhabited by tenants totally unknown to the workers. In order to make the transition somewhat easier, the group of fourteen had their rent books as well as the tenants' books prepared, had opened a bank account, set up an office and had divided the area up among themselves; it remained their task, however, to get the tenants to recognize the workers' authority and pay the rent. Hill and her workers were met with suspicion, for the only interest shown by previous rent collectors had been for the few shillings which the tenants paid as rent. Hill and the rent collectors persisted, however, and considered their project successful. Hill felt that continued success was dependent upon the number of volunteers recruited; while she was willing to train paid

workers for the position as manager for new rent collecting

endeavors outside of London, she felt that there were few

openings for paid workers in London itself. The following

makes this clear:

> Surely we may hope for more volunteers ready to
> work, heart and soul, side by side with us, and form
> part of the great company who are sharing our labour,
> our joy, and who are feeling the steady progress which
> their generosity is securing in one [housing] court or
> another. I here refer to volunteer work. We have en-
> larged our staff as much as we intend to do, so that
> applications for paid work are useless. But Miss
> Lumsden and I are each able, and would be willing to
> give six months' training to any really promising can-
> didate who would like to train for a chance of profe-
> sional work opening out. I have had three applications
> for paid managers in London during the past year,
> which I have been unable to fill, owing to all our
> trained and even partially trained helpers being ab-
> sorbed by our own extended area, and there are openings
> in provincial towns from time to time; but it should
> be borne in mind that such would only be open to those
> capable of taking the whole responsibility of manage-
> ment. They are far more difficult posts than those
> side by side with us as leaders.[20]

Octavia Hill's rent collecting plan, based on the belief

that client and worker were responsible to one another, and

staffed almost entirely by volunteers, was one of the first

systems of social service which attempted to supply a ne-

cessity of life, decent housing, without resorting to the

handout system. Other housing programs which followed ap-

peared to be somewhat more ambitious. Charles Booth, for

example, began with new methods of acquiring housing. He

---

[20]Octavia Hill, Letter to My Fellow Workers: to
Which is Added an Account of Donations Received for Work
Among the Poor During 1903 (London: 1904), pp. 8-9.

saw these methods as: (1) acquisition of vacant land for the construction of housing, and (2) promotion of inexpensive and swift means of access to districts where building land was available.[21] While Hill's plan sought to provide the poor with better housing, Booth envisioned dispersed housing connected by a system of overhead and underground transportation; Booth began with an issue centered on the poor (slum housing) but developed a solution which he felt would benefit the entire urban population.

In 1880, housing, employment and education were only a few of the needs which demanded the attention of such individuals as the Webbs, the Barnetts, Hill and Booth. As in the preceding period, however, the "services" which were offered in response to the demand varied widely. The handout programs prevalent throughout the nineteenth century were joined by better-organized but limited programs such as Octavia Hill's rent collecting plan; larger programs which sought not charity but a joint endeavor between classes (the educational settlements); and philosophically-based movements which stated that individual reforms were not bad, but were insufficient since society could only benefit from mass change. The presence of the Poor Law

[21]Charles Booth, Improved Means of Locomotion as a Cure for the Housing Difficulties of London (London, 1901), p. 5.

administration and the Charity Organisation Society was felt throughout. The following section will examine social services which unlike those mentioned thus far, did not focus on one particular need but rather developed in response to the general condition of the times; education, housing and employment were grouped together and viewed as one large concern.

Social Service Agencies 1880 to 1903
Multiple Attempts to Correct
an Undefined Problem

The existence of a large number of philanthropic societies prior to 1880 suggests that the question of whether or not the poor should be given some form of relief had been answered in their favor. It remained the task of the last two decades of the nineteenth century, however, to arrive at a definition of "adequate relief." This question concerned Poor Law administrators as well as private philanthropists, and it became one of the issues considered by the Charity Organisation Society. Since different individuals had a variety of needs as well as varied abilities in budgeting and meeting these needs, it was impossible to define adequate relief in concrete terms; what was adequate for one individual was insufficient for another. Some writers felt that it was necessary to first define the proper recipients of relief, and then define adequate relief based on their needs. In Social Wreckage: A Review

of the Laws of England as they Affect the Poor, Francis

Peek took this approach:

> They [the proper recipients of relief] are, without
> doubt, all those who, from misfortune, or even from
> past faults, have fallen into such a condition of help-
> lessness as prevents them from providing sustenance for
> themselves or those dependent on them. Among these are
> orphan or deserted children, men or women who have been
> rendered destitute by sickness or accident, artizans
> out of work or compelled by necessity to dispose of the
> instruments of their trade, men and women who have lost
> their character, and with it employment: in a word, all
> the individuals of that vast mass of suffering poverty,
> not actually resulting from present wrongdoing which
> swells and surges around us, are more or less proper
> objects of relief. And if we accept this definition,
> then the meaning of the term "adequate relief" may be
> very easily understood. It is such assistance as will
> place a person, when fallen, in a position to rise
> again; if with lost character, in a position to re-
> trieve it, and in the future honourably and honestly to
> support himself and his family.[22]

In this sense, relief was viewed as being temporary rather

than permanent; its goal was to make the individual self-

supporting. Charity delivered to achieve this end was

more than the Christian virtue which pitied the individual

and sought to deliver him from his misery; it included

"economical science" which pointed to the danger of making

him totally dependent. Reforms that sought to provide a

minimum income were viewed as encouraging rather than dis-

couraging dependence; it was thought that the individual

would be less willing to attempt to support himself if he

_____

[22]Francis Peek, Social Wreckage: A Review of the Laws
of England as they Affect the Poor (London: Wm. Isbister,
Ltd., 1883), pp. 179-180.

knew that his needs would be provided for regardless of his own efforts:

> All sound charity, whether dispensed by the State or the individual, must take account of the essential elements of human nature, and one of these is that no great mass of human beings will work hard, and deny themselves present enjoyment for the sake of distant advantage if they are guaranteed against the consequences of their own idleness and folly.[23]

This early attempt to encourage the poor to defer gratification was hampered by the fact that many had an income which was insufficient to provide for even bare necessities; the pauper saw little evidence to suggest that his condition would change regardless of any effort on his part.

In an attempt to make unemployment a more manageable problem, a number of cities set up commissions to define the term "unemployment" and to propose appropriate solutions based on this definition. The commissions were usually successful in defining the term but were less successful in determining a solution. In Liverpool, for example, a Commission Report of 1894 divided the unemployed into two classes. Class A consisted of those ". . . steady and capable men and women who could and would really do work if they could find it."[24] This type of unemployment was viewed

---

[23]Samuel Smith, The Economics of Charity (Liverpool: Turner, Routledge and Co., 1888), p. 9.

[24]Commission of Inquiry, Full Report into the Subject of the Unemployed in the City of Liverpool (Liverpool, 1894), p. x.

as a purely economic problem largely dependent on the
economic condition of the country. However, Class B,
". . . those who, from one cause and another, are in-
capable of doing or refuse to do steady work up to the
average standard in quality and quantity,"[25] presented a
moral problem. Any amount of inducement to work was usu-
ally insufficient to get this "class" of individual to
leave the bread line and to seek employment.

Although the adult pauper class was viewed as hope-
lessly bound to the gin palace, gambling hall and bawdy
theater, some felt that the children were salvageable:

> The English pauper class is an hereditary one, and is
> of far larger dimensions than that of any other civi-
> lised country. I estimate it at two or three mil-
> lions, counting all who rely on charity, public and
> private. It will not be extinguished without drastic
> reforms, and the chief of these is the improved ed-
> ucation of the young. I use education in its broadest
> sense as involving discipline of morals as well as
> minds, as covering industrial training as well as
> mental, and carrying oversight and control till the
> age of childhood is past.[26]

In this perspective which conceived of the pauper class as
hereditary, education of the children would be viewed as
the only form of adequate relief. While monetary relief
and aid-in-kind were appropriate during times of national
disaster, especially economic depression, such relief given
on a regular basis to the pauper class was viewed as con-
tributing to, rather than preventing, poverty.

---

[25]Ibid.   [26]Ibid., pp. 24-25.

Although it was generally acknowledged that "adequate relief" was that type of relief which led to self-sufficiency, the means by which such relief was to be given were not agreed upon. Employment usually contributed to self-sufficiency, but the number of jobs did not correspond with the number of individuals eligible to work. In an attempt to compensate for this disparity, the Mansion House Fund Conference held in 1887 and 1888 created the Mansion House Fund. This fund (approximately £50,000) was raised by subscription and used to pay workers employed not because their services were needed but because they needed a job. Although the fund equipped itself with all the "essentials" of good relief work (committees, volunteers, and written objectives) it was considered to be a failure. It fluctuated between providing work for all types of laborers and casual dock laborers, was unable to find a sufficient number of qualified individuals willing to work, and spent most of its funds for the administration of the program. The work actually undertaken ended up costing fifty percent more than if it had been carried out under normal conditions.[27] The failure of this private endeavor however, did not mean that unemployment presented no problem. Charles Loch estimated in 1893 that 500,000 people

---

[27]Helen Bosanquet, Past Experience in Relief Works (London, 1903), p. 2.

in London alone were either unemployed or belonged to
families in which the breadwinner was unemployed. Echoing
critics of the Mansion House Fund, Loch felt that although
unemployment was severe, jobs created by either individ-
uals or the state for the purpose of relief were not the
answer; it remained the responsibility of the Poor Law to
deal with these people:

> Employment as a method of relief has a very limited
> value; and the State should not, except under the
> closest restrictions, be the employer of the destitute
> unemployed. The maintenance of the individual should
> as a rule be left to the individual. We want no so-
> cial experiment in this direction. . . . The Poor Law
> should be trusted, and if necessary, its administration
> reformed and improved. It should bear the brunt of the
> difficulty whatever it be; and if Poor Law guardians
> have not proper means for dealing with the unemployed,
> they should without delay, equip themselves for the
> task.[28]

Loch's suggestion that the Poor Law Administration equip
itself for the task of dealing with the unemployed however,
was easy to agree with but difficult to carry out. Reform
of the Poor Law had been demanded almost as soon as the Law
came into effect in 1834, but critics disagreed about
whether it was the Law itself, the machinery which it set
up, or the individuals who administered it, who were in
need of reform.

In a series of lectures designed to explain this con-

---

[28]Charles Loch, The State and the Unemployed (London:
Charity Organisation Society, 1893), pp. 17-18.

troversial legislation, Sophia Lonsdale enumerated the

three great principles which she viewed as underlying the

English Poor Law:

"(1) That it is the good of the community at large,
and not the rights of the individual, which is the
proper reason for legal provision for the destitute.

"(2) The condition of the pauper, the person relieved
by the State, must not be made better or as good as the
condition of the independent labourer.

"(3) The Poor Law should improve the condition of the
Poor by teaching and training the young for work and
self-dependence, by teaching morality, and by pro-
moting industry, cleanliness, and temperance."[29]

These principles, in turn, fostered three ameliorative

measures: relief measures to support the destitute, re-

pressive measures to discourage the abuses inherent in a

system of state relief, and remedial measures to prevent

these abuses. In short, emphasis was placed not on making

sure that the needs of the poor were met, but rather, on

seeing that they received not a shilling more than the

amount to which they were entitled. Although some critics

of the Poor Law approached it from an humanitarian point of

view, they were by no means in the majority. The major

point of contention seemed to remain a question of whether

outdoor relief was more efficient and appropriate than in-

door relief, or vice versa. The advocates of outdoor re-

---

[29]Sophia Lonsdale, The English Poor Laws: Their
History, Principles and Administration: Three Lectures
(London: P. S. King and Son, 1897), pp. 4-9.

lief argued that it cost three times more to keep a pauper in the workhouse than out of it. In addition, indoor relief was viewed as responsible for the dissolution of family ties. Supporters of indoor relief, however, responded to these charges:

> They say: (1) though it is true that it costs more to keep an individual pauper inside than outside the Workhouse, yet Indoor relief is far cheaper than Out-door for this very simple reason--experience shows that Indoor relief is nearly always refused, while Out-door relief is eagerly accepted.[30]

The workhouse test, that process through which an individual's eligibility for relief was determined, was viewed by some as the only successful restraint on rampant poor relief. Individuals such as Sir William Chance felt paupers were, in fact, receiving relief by their own choice; they were free to enter the workhouse if they were destitute, but they were not forced to enter the workhouse. Chance did not comment on the fact that the real choice faced by the destitute was one of giving up their freedom and pride to enter the workhouse versus slowly starving and frequently dying to avoid such degradation. He was willing to allow some outdoor relief, but only under the strictest administration; he viewed pauperism as being entirely dependent upon overly generous administrators.[31]

---

[30]Ibid., pp. 71-72.

[31]Sir William Chance, An Appeal to the Guardians of the Poor (London, [1889]), p. 1.

Reform of the Poor Law, and its ability or inability to distribute adequate charitable relief continued to be debated until 1905 when a Royal Commission was formed to study this issue. The Commission, however, brought no real resolution; the Majority and Minority Reports which it presented both favored reform, but while the Minority Report advocated the abolition of the Poor Law and the redistribution of its duties, the Majority Report acknowledged the fact that the ideas and machinery of the Poor Law were out of date but did not favor a total transformation of the system. While the Poor Law administration's attempt to define adequate charitable relief was made more difficult by demands that the Law as well as the Administration be reformed, individuals involved in private philanthropic endeavors found the definition of adequate relief to be equally difficult. In an attempt to define adequate relief, it was thought that a poverty line (which would make a sharp division between those who were poor and those who were not poor) could be established and then used as a reference point; adequate relief would be that relief required to bring the individual to a position above the poverty line. The approach was unsuccessful however, for poverty line was as difficult to define as adequate charitable relief:

> The doctrine of the "Poverty Line" shows itself peculiarly elusive to examination, because of the difficulty of ascertaining exactly what is meant by it and

> where it runs. It has a false air of definiteness
> which is difficult to question, until one finds that,
> like the ray of light thrown by the moon across the
> sea, it shifts its position to meet the eye of the
> observer wherever he happens to place it.[32]

Such a nondefinition of poverty line, however, was fa-

vorable to a wide variety of philanthropic organizations

for each could justify its endeavor on the grounds that it

did cater to those individuals below the poverty line, and

in doing so, provided adequate charitable relief.

One organization which received a great deal of praise

but also came under attack for its methods of charity was

the Salvation Army. Founded in 1878 by Rev. William Booth,

and formally named in 1880, the Salvation Army began as a

religious campaign. Booth, however, held that this reli-

gious endeavor to "win souls" could be combined with efforts

to alleviate poverty. With the publication in 1890 of In

Darkest England and the Way Out, Booth presented his plan

for change; he compared England to "Darkest Africa," com-

plete with disease and destitution. The English condition,

however, was more desperate, for England considered itself

a "civilized" nation. Booth viewed himself as speaking in

behalf of those individuals who did not reap the benefits

of this civilization:

> The denizens in Darkest England for whom I appeal, are
> (1) those who, having no capital or income of their own,

---

[32]Helen Bosanquet, The "Poverty Line" (London,
[1903]), pp. 1-2.

would in a month be dead from sheer starvation were
they exclusively dependent upon the money earned by
their own work; and (2) those who by their utmost exer-
tions are unable to attain the regulation allowance of
food which the law prescribes as indispensable even for
the worst criminals in our gaols.[33]

These individuals, he stated, could not hope for the food,
clothing and shelter of common criminals; their standard
of living did not even meet that of the London Cab Horse.
The horse was given food and shelter; if he "stumbled" and
fell, no one attempted to find a reason for his condition,
but rather helped him in his struggle to stand up again.
The pauper was assured of neither food nor shelter, and if
he "fell," his predicament became a point of discussion be-
fore any help was rendered.

"Darkest England," however, like all of the terms
created to make the problem of poverty more understandable
was, in fact, ambiguous. While deploring the lack of a
scientific study of poverty, Booth's definition was based
on emotion:

Darkest England may be described as consisting broadly
of three circles, one within the other. The outer and
widest circle is inhabited by the starving and the
homeless, but honest, Poor. The second by those who
live by Vice; and the third and innermost region at the
center is peopled by those who exist by Crime. The
whole of the three circles is sodden with Drink.[34]

---

[33]Rev. William Booth, In Darkest England and the Way
Out (1890), quoted in Keating, ed., Into Unknown England
1866-1913, p. 153.

[34]Ibid., p. 159.

Booth sought to help these individuals, relying on a scheme of immediate assistance followed by employment. His lesser scheme, to be carried out at once, included: cheap food depots, shelters in large cities, workshops in cities, labor bureaus, a household salvage brigade, farm colonies and overseas colonies. A larger scheme, to be carried out in the future, included: "Slum Sisters" (who would find employment for the poor), travelling hospitals, prison gate brigades (homes for first-time offenders released from prison), inebriate homes, rescue homes, preventive homes, an enquiry office for lost people, day homes for children of the streets, industrial schools, asylums for "moral" lunatics, lodgings for single and married people, model suburban villages, poor man's banks, poor man's legal advice, an Intelligence Department which would collect and collate ideas concerning social economy, a matrimonial bureau (a training home for housewifery) and "Whitechapel-by-the-Sea," a vacation resort for poor people.[35] In short, Booth sought to provide virtually every type of aid imaginable; it was this diversity in part which made Booth and his scheme the subject of criticism.

Octavia Hill viewed Booth as offering society a panacea in return for thousands of pounds and total control of

---

[35]Charles Loch, An Examination of "General" Booth's Social Scheme (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1890), pp. 16-30.

the Salvation Army. She viewed his organization as too

large to be successfully controlled and too money-oriented

to be effective. Donations and reform could not be equated:

> . . . no spiritual army, however pure and powerful, no
> system of organisation, however perfect, however well
> administered, can remove the canker from the social
> life of a country, the citizens of which hope to con-
> tract by donations, however liberal, for its reform.[36]

Hill found Booth's program to be too regimented to provide

an example for the average citizen and too impersonal to

provide care for those who had fallen by the wayside but

were good candidates for a productive life.

Another critic, Charles Loch, saw Booth as attempting

to distribute neither adequate nor appropriate charity,

but rather, grasping at cases, fitting clients to charity

instead of charity to clients. Other critics of Booth,

however, were even more severe, for they attacked his meth-

od of recruitment and treatment of workers as well as his

distribution of charity:

> . . . he has his cattle [his workers] well in hand, and
> not only can drive them where he pleases, but flick them
> smartly on any part with his long-reaching whips. He
> subjects them absolutely to his personal despotism.
> Every part of his soldiers' lives is regulated. They
> must court and marry within the ranks. . . . The General
> wishes to breed Salvationists. He tells them what to
> eat and what to wear. . . . When the General wants his
> soldiers to vote or act politically, he will issue a
> manifesto and every one of them is expected to "act in

---

[36]Octavia Hill, Miss Octavia Hill on the Charity
Organisation Society (London: Charity Organisation Society,
[1891]), p. 3.

harmony with the rules and regulations laid down for him by his superior officers." These superior officers, who take their orders from General Booth, must be perfectly obeyed, for "they have the Spirit of God, and will only command what is right."[37]

Booth was viewed as a good organizer, but a despot; his scheme for social salvation remained entirely in his control. At a time when the Charity Organisation Society was emphasizing cooperation among charitable institutions, and calling for the training of workers, Booth's scheme stood as a formidable obstacle; cooperation for Booth occurred within the Army and not between the Army and other organizations, and training amounted to little more than indoctrination.

Like the Salvation Army which responded to the needs of the times as it saw fit, other philanthropic organizations continued to make individual rather than unified responses. A compilation of religious and philanthropic institutions in Liverpool in 1898 listed twenty-two separate organizations:

"(1) The Liverpool Boys' and Girls' Religious Services and Ragged School Union;

"(2) Church of England Temperance Society;

"(3) Church of England Incorporated Society for Providing Homes for Waifs and Strays;

---

[37]C. W. Foote, Salvation Syrup or Light on Darkest England, 2nd ed. (London: Progressive Publishing Co., 1891), p. 7.

"(4) The Evangelization Society for Liverpool and Neighbourhood;

"(5) Liverpool Sabbath Morning Free Breakfast Mission;

"(6) Homes for English and American Women and Children in Paris;

"(7) The Howard Association for the Promotion of the Best Methods of the Treatment and Prevention of Crime, Pauperism, &c.;

"(8) Liverpool Juvenile Reformatory Association;

"(9) The Kirkdale Child Society;

"(10) The Ladies' Parochial, Bible, and Domestic Mission;

"(11) Liverpool Certified Industrial Schools;

"(12) Liverpool Central Young Men's Christian Association;

"(13) Liverpool Young Women's Christian Association;

"(14) New Brighton Y.M.C.A. and Christian Mission;

"(15) North Liverpool Young Men's Christian Association, Technical Institute and Gymnasium;

"(16) The Railway Mission;

"(17) Royal Naval Scripture Reader's Society;

"(18) St. John's Ambulance Association;

"(19) Liverpool Seamen's Friend Society and Bethel Union;

"(20) Seamen and Boatmen's Friend Society;

"(21) The Stranger's Rest;

"(22) The Liverpool Wesleyan Mission."[38]

---

[38]William Grisewood, comp., Liverpool Religious and Philanthropic Institutions: Their Work and Needs (Liverpool: J. R. Williams and Co., 1898), pp. 1-24.

As numerous as these organizations were, however, they represented only a fraction of the total number of organizations existing in London as well as the rest of the country. Each had its own objective, clientele and staff. Each defined the needs of society differently, and patterned its services after its perception. Each had its own method (or lack of method) of training. Each found itself in competition for funds with a variety of organizations ranging from reputable charities to temporary endeavors such as soup kitchens and bread lines. And yet, many found "unity" in the fact that services were patterned after needs, objectives were stated rather than assumed, and staff members were trained rather than left to their own resources.

Unlike the majority of fragmented efforts which preceded it, charity during the period 1880 to 1903 showed some potential for moving from a nonsystem of haphazard relief in opposition to the Poor Law, to a system of semi-organized relief which functioned not in opposition to, but in spite of, the Poor Law. Organizations which had a somewhat permanent staff and were willing to produce a financial report were attractive to potential benefactors; this sense of permanency did not exist in the typical "handout" charities. Although the organizations were becoming more sophisticated with regard to their own internal structure,

they made few attempts to coordinate their efforts. While
several organizations did join forces, they showed little
interest in cooperating with other agencies. Each viewed
itself as serving the poor in a unique way, this unique-
ness being based either on the religious sect to which mem-
bers were committed, or the need viewed as most crucial to
the poor; the legitimacy of each organization was decided
by its members and benefactors. For this reason, organi-
zations which dealt with the financial needs of button-
makers, the educational needs of pauper children, and the
religious needs of inebriates were all viewed as valid so-
cial service agencies. The same specificity which char-
acterized each social service agency, however, made the
distribution of charity a most difficult task. While
clever individuals might receive aid from a number of agen-
cies, persons who were equally needy but less knowledgeable
might end up being relieved by the Poor Law alone. Al-
though this inequality was quite visible, it was ignored
by virtually every social service agency; it became the
task of the Charity Organisation Society to attempt to make
the distribution of charity more equitable.

Unlike the social service agencies which preceded it,
the Charity Organisation Society sought not to dispense
money, food or other forms of charity, but rather to co-
ordinate that charity already in existence. The C.O.S. was

as concerned with those individuals receiving too much assistance as with those receiving no assistance. In the words of Charles Loch, a key figure in the C.O.S., self-dependence was the goal:

> As a rule, no work of charity is complete which does not place the person benefited in self-dependence. Obviously if this principle is true, the administration of most of our charitable institutions must be altered; many must be reorganised. All gifts and all forms of relief should be but parts of a treatment having self-dependence and recovery from distress as its end. Relief given practically to all comers, without reference to the whole of the circumstances of the individual, is given at haphazard, and is injurious. Charity should abandon such relief and become a partner, as it were, in the work of thrift. "There is now no such partnership." Convenience and opportunities and possibilities for thrift and saving exist, but charity does not use them. There is no organised relation between the two.[39]

Loch divided the distressed into two groups: (1) the indigent, habitually in want, and (2) the curable, who could be saved from indigence. He viewed the first group as a hopeless object of charity; they would never change and, for this reason, should be left to the resources of State charity. He stated that the curable alone should be the proper focus of private charity. Loch's approach to the distribution of charity was new, for rather than ignoring the Poor Law and classifying charity according to a particular type of aid, he included Poor Law provisions in his

---

[39]Sir Charles S. Loch, How to Help Cases of Distress: A Handy Reference Book for Almoners and Others, 4th ed. (London: Charity Organisation Society, 1890), p. viii.

discussion of charity and classified charity on the basis

of client type. He saw the C.O.S. faced with a difficult

task; it was to reconcile the independent, fervent and im-

pulsive traits of charity with the sobriety, temperance and

balance which characterized the concept of organization.

In order to achieve this end, the C.O.S. adopted three

methods:

> It promotes a division of labor between charity and the
> Poor Law. It promotes co-operation between charities
> and private almsgivers. It helps forward the training
> of voluntary almoners.[40]

In order to be successful in these tasks, however, the

C.O.S. needed to develop an administrative framework;

workers' efforts would need to be coordinated before they

attempted to coordinate other charities. To this end,

London was divided into thirty-nine districts; each district

formed a committee headed by a secretary. The committees,

composed of individuals "serviceable" for charity work and

active in such organizations as the Invalid Children's Aid

Association, the Society for the Relief of Distress, and

the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants,

were responsible for dealing with local cases. Together,

the secretaries of each district comprised the Council of

the C.O.S.; the Council was responsible for improving meth-

---

[40]Sir Charles S. Loch, Charity Organisation (London:
Charity Organisation Society, 1893), p. 1.

ods of organization as well as charity, supervising district committees, and supplying assistance in emigration. While secretaries could be either honorary or paid, the majority of work was done by volunteers. It was felt that the chief role of paid officers was to aid volunteers in better fulfilling their task.[41] This task consisted of interviewing aid applicants and then referring them to the proper agencies of relief. In addition, it was hoped that the C.O.S.'s decision about a client's eligibility for assistance would be accepted by various charitable societies. In this way, one thorough investigation could be substituted for individual investigation by each agency. The C.O.S.'s suggestion, however, met with opposition; private charities viewed the C.O.S. plan as an intrusion into their privacy. Private charities had functioned without the aid of the C.O.S. and saw little reason to change. Aid recipients and their spokesmen viewed the C.O.S. as being unduly harsh in its decisions about who was to receive help. The C.O.S., however, persisted in its belief that the curable could be brought back to self-dependence with adequate assistance, while all other efforts were wasted on the indigent. Despite the criticisms directed at it, the C.O.S. provided charity reformers with a platform from which plans for adequate charity, given in a systematic manner, on

---

[41]Ibid., pp. 2-3.

an individual basis, and by a group of "trained" individuals, could be presented.

Social service during the period 1880 to 1903 provided only a glimpse of the services to be offered by the future "welfare state," but the legislation passed during this period was indicative of the fact that social service was no longer merely equated with poor relief, but included such variables as education, housing and employment. While some handout charities still existed, they were outnumbered by agencies which met a particular need and viewed themselves as "experts" in meeting this need. These societies viewed the Charity Organisation Society's attempts at coordination of charity as an intrusion, but would eventually become more receptive to an organized effort which promised systematic charity. What is more important, however, they gave increasing recognition to the belief that the work of charity, like any other endeavor, required training. Since the societies were not united, their training "programs" varied, but their goals were similar; they wanted workers who had expertise in the field of dispensing charity--good intentions were insufficient. The following chapter will examine the concept of training as it existed during this period.

CHAPTER IV

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SYSTEM OF
SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION
1880 TO 1903

Social work education, in the broadest sense of the term, was not a product of the twentieth century. Although it remained outside of a formal framework until that time, and was perceived as a voluntary rather than a paid occupation, education for the social services was increasingly becoming a definable field. While the key issue discussed during the early nineteenth century was the role of good intentions, that is, were good intentions a sufficient resource for engaging in charitable work, the social workers of the late-nineteenth century viewed this issue as irrelevant. They assumed that most social workers entered the field with good intentions and a desire to learn more about their clients as well as the techniques developed to aid them in working with these clients. The ranks of social work were still filled primarily by volunteers whose "methods" included a variety of suggestions for dealing with the client as he existed on paper rather than for dealing with him as a living human being. However, a system of social work training was developing in a way that was similar to preparation for the other helping fields of

medicine, nursing and education. This chapter will ex-
amine this training system as it developed during the
period 1880 to 1903; it will focus on three important
issues: (1) the rationale for setting up an education
program for social workers; (2) the evolution of this pro-
gram as reflected in the writings of early social workers;
and (3) the reasons for the great variations which existed
among training programs during this period.

Social Work Training 1880 to 1903:
A Rationale

The early social workers, who viewed training as a
prerequisite for a "working" system of social service, be-
lieved this system depended on two criteria: (1) efficiency
and (2) sensitivity. Social service was considered to be
efficient when its main concern was the organization of a
system of charitable relief, and its goal the distribution
of a "proper" amount and type of relief to deserving in-
dividuals. Sensitivity, on the other hand, required the
social service worker to become familiar with each of his
clients as individuals; their class position, the neighbor-
hood in which they resided and their personal history, as
well as the effect that each of these factors had on the
other had to be considered before the client could be

helped.[1] While efficiency and sensitivity were infre-
quently thought to be of equal importance by various social
service agencies, they were not incompatible. A smaller
number of clients, for example, would allow workers to de-
vote a greater amount of time to each client. Advocates
of either approach however, were most strongly united on
one point: an untrained worker, no matter how well-
intentioned, would produce more bad than good results. In
a paper entitled Why I Joined the Charity Organisation
Society: A Chapter from a Lady's Autobiography, one such
untrained worker wrote about her early experience in char-
ity work:

> I was a very young girl when I first began to visit in
> Westminster. I had no experience, and no one to ad-
> vise me; I knew nothing about the Poor Laws, and had
> not enough experience to be a good judge of character.
> I saw want, and I did as my fellow-workers did--gave
> money, food, and firing--and yet it seemed to me strange
> that the need never grew less; the grocery ticket, given
> one week, was asked for again the following week. On
> looking back, I can remember no one family that I
> helped so effectually that they ceased to require my
> doles.
>   After a time I went into a richer part of London.
> In my district there I expected to find no poverty, the
> little houses looked outwardly so prosperous and well
> cared for; but unfortunately my predecessor had al-
> ways given away soup, grocery, meat, and coal tickets,
> and I found these apparently well-to-do people much

---

[1]Although the growth of psychology and psychiatry
which would play an important role in social work education
after 1930 had not yet begun, there existed an increasing
recognition of the fact that the individual was shaped by
many factors--he was more than a mere product of society,
but society played a role in his development.

disgusted if I did not leave a ticket of some kind with them on every visit. I was known as the "relieving lady," and my friendly attempts at conversation were generally interrupted by "Have you a grocers' ticket today, Miss?" or of stories of the "kind lady" who used to visit, and "never left without giving something."[2]

Realizing that her method was not working, the volunteer began to work in Octavia Hill's rent collecting scheme. Within this system she found herself collecting money from the poor, rather than doling it out to them, and discovered that service separated from relief encouraged a stronger relationship between worker and client. She joined the Charity Organisation Society on the grounds that some sort of learning process was necessary for effective social service. In doing so, one more voice was added to the growing group which emphasized the futility of attempting to provide for the needs of the poor without receiving proper training:

I cannot think why training is thought necessary for all other kinds of woman's work--nursing, teaching, needlework--but the knowledge of wise means of helping our poor is supposed to come to women naturally; and strongly do I feel how fatal have been the results of the error in the past. A woman studies before she touches the physical wounds of the poor. Ought she to do less before she attempts the healing of their moral sores? Is it wonderful that, coming all unprepared to

---

[2]Mrs. Malkin, Why I Joined the Charity Organisation Society: A Chapter From a Lady's Autobiography, in Occasional Papers of the Charity Organisation Society, ed. Charity Organisation Society (London: Charity Organisation Society, 1896), p. 9.

her work, her tenderness, patience, wisdom and courage so often fail?[3]

The "effective charity" for which such training was necessary was a chief concern of the Charity Organisation Society. The C.O.S. viewed this effectiveness as being dependent on the internal working of the organization as well as its expertise in dispensing charity. One need only to look at the Charity Organisation Society's title to see that the organization of diverse charities was considered essential to a system of effective relief. Such organization, however, was overshadowed by the C.O.S.'s other function: "thorough" assistance for every poor person who "needed" assistance.[4] Unlike other societies, the C.O.S. did not base "need" on the poor person's request alone, for this system was largely responsible for the chaotic charity which the C.O.S. was attempting to alleviate. Rather, it viewed a thorough investigation of the potential recipient as a prerequisite for receiving relief; the concept of investigation was not a new one--it had been used at Elberfeld, by the St. Vincent de Paul Society and by various members of the clergy. A successful investigation, however, could only be carried out by an individual who had some idea of exactly what he was looking for. It was insufficient to

---

[3]Ibid., pp. 9-10.

[4]Octavia Hill, The Charity Organisation Society (London: Charity Organisation Society, 1889), p. 1.

train only C.O.S. leaders and office workers; the field workers needed as much, if not more, training. This need was explained by early social work lecturers:

> . . . for the improvement of the general condition of the poor we do not want to produce only enough trained workers to carry on our own office work, but to make all work in our different districts efficient. Trained workers are needed to serve as Guardians; to visit the workhouse and infirmary; to act as school managers; to take part in the management of School Banks and Collecting Banks; to visit in connection with the many Reformatory and Rescue and other Societies; to work under the clergy and ministers; to act as visitors to the hospitals, and as workers for Evening Clubs for boys and girls, for Sanitary Aid Committees, and for many other purposes.[5]

Even such lists of potential "placements" as the one given above, however, did not address themselves to what training actually encompassed. The skill of investigation was certainly high on the list, but some concepts of training for investigation amounted to little more than memorizing a list of questions to be asked a client.

The realization that the charity which "meant well" which had existed prior to this period, had to be replaced with the charity that "does well" was not a concern solely of the Charity Organisation Society. Other reformers such as Helen Bosanquet advocated a charity that had set ideals but was in a sense, "scientific"--it had to be realized that certain actions brought certain results--charitable

---

[5]Mrs. Dunn Gardner, <u>The Training of Volunteers</u> (London, 1895), p. 197.

actions were not inevitably creatures of chance. Bosanquet proposed that charity workers had to first ask themselves what it was that they wanted to accomplish; did they want to cure poverty? Bosanquet maintained that the "Lady Bountiful" spirit so prevalent during the early-nineteenth century and still present during the late-nineteenth century was, in fact, an attempt to perpetuate the dependence of the lowerclass on the upperclass:

> To a certain extent, and especially in those parts of our large towns where the rich have played with them, it is true that the poor are like children; but this is largely because they are treated as such and prevented in every way from developing the manly qualities which spring from independence.[6]

To be a "true" social worker, the individual had to become less conscious of what involvement in charity work would mean for him, and more conscious of what the poor individual could do to free himself from this restrictive benevolence. In this sense, the charity work which had previously demanded "good intentions" alone and rewarded one with grateful expressions of the "good children" it helped, now demanded a total reexamination of the worker's motives as well as his qualifications for service. Although it may be argued that such charity which prompted "independence" was more concerned with efficiency than sensitivity--the major question was still one of how the group known as the

---

[6]Helen Bosanquet, Rich and Poor (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1896), p. 140.

deserving poor could be decreased and their needs met with
the least amount of financing--there was a greater recog-
nition of the fact that clients were people and should be
treated as such. Groups such as the Humanitarian League
attacked charities which had not recognized this fact, and
consequently, had been ineffective in meeting the needs of
the poor:

> . . . the League seeks to express the newer and more
> advanced humanitarian feeling of the present day--an
> altogether different thing to the old-fashioned "phi-
> lanthropy" on the one hand, or "kindness to animals"
> on the other, which is now perceptibly on the wane.
> This older humanitarianism was a form of benevolence
> which regarded the objects of its compassion, whether
> the "lower orders" or the "lower animals," with a
> charitable and merciful eye, but from a rather superior
> standpoint of unapproachable respectability. It lopped
> assiduously at the branches of the tree of human suf-
> fering, but had no real insight into the underlying
> economic causes; nor did it even consider the vast
> ethical vistas opened out by the new phase into which
> the animal question, no less than the human social
> question, has been carried by the modern democratic
> ideal and the discoveries of evolutionary science.[7]

To be effective, the social worker had to be open to the
needs of the individual, and at the same time, had to
come to terms with the social forces which determined, to
some extent, the degree to which these needs could be met.
In addition, some knowledge of "office procedure," note
taking and case reporting was necessary to insure some
uniformity of service standards, as well as continuity;
the system had to be dependent on certain positions that

---

[7]Henry S. Salt, ed., Cruelties of Civilization: A Pro-
gram of Humane Reform (London: William Reeves, 1897), p. vi.

could be filled with any trained individual, rather than one particular person.

An ability to empathize with the individual, knowledge of social reform and expertise in organization and management, all essential to the provision of social work service, might be learned to some extent, after many years of service with a social work agency, but neither the needs of the time nor a social philosophy which expected immediate results, allowed such a luxury. The only alternative was a system of training, and yet this training supported in theory was slow to become a reality. The following section will examine the evolution of social work training as presented by social workers of the period.

The Evolution of Social Work Training 1880 to 1903 as Reflected in the Writings of Social Work Educators

One of the earliest advocates of social work training was Octavia Hill, founder of the rent collecting scheme. Although Hill's workers were expected to gain some expertise in the field of housing management, they were also trained in the techniques of "visiting." Unlike those visitors who preceded them however, Hill's visitors were cautioned to disregard neither the theory nor the practice which when united formed the basis for successful visiting. The "leisurely, generalising thinkers," and the "loving, individualising doers" needed to join forces. "Each has

knowledge the other requires; separated, they are power-

less; combined, they may do much."[8]

None of Hill's visitors were paid and few devoted all

of their time to charity. Consequently, they were less

likely to become discouraged by the poverty and misery

which surrounded their task; and, at the same time, they

did not develop a vested interest in keeping the system

alive for the sake of employment. "If we establish a sys-

tem of professed workers, amateur or paid, we shall quickly

begin to hug our system, and perhaps to want to perpetuate

it even to the extent of making work for it."[9] Hill's

separation of paid and voluntary workers, and her pref-

erence for the latter, shaped the type of training which

would be given to each group. Since she believed that her

system of rent collecting and the work done by the Charity

Organisation Society were compatible, she saw little dif-

ference in the guidelines needed to assist each group of

workers. Her plan for the delivery of social services was

based on three principles:

> (1) . . . if the poor are to be raised to a permanently
> better condition, they must be dealt with as individuals
> and by individuals; (2) that for this hundreds of
> workers are necessary; and (3) that this multitude of

---

[8] Octavia Hill, "District Visiting," in Our Common Land
and Other Short Essays (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd.,
1877), pp. 22-23.

[9] Ibid., pp. 26-27.

helpers is to be found amongst volunteers. . . . [10]
Hill felt that a system of social service should be almost
entirely dependent on volunteers rather than paid workers,
but she wanted these volunteers to be organized and trained.
Hill saw record keeping as an important part of organization;
written records were to include a general statement about
the family (knowledge gained from the initial investigation)
as well as a monthly update on the family's activities.
Even at this early stage, confidentiality was an important
issue--only visitor and referee (supervisor) were to have
access to the record book and visitors were instructed to
exclude anything of a private nature from the record.

Training came chiefly from a sort of "apprenticeship
system." Rather than dividing up their districts, visitors
were requested to assume the responsibility for training
a young volunteer who would then help the visitor with her
work. The trainee's education was to be practical rather
than theoretical (it appears that workers were expected
to use theory but were not allowed to help formulate it);
she was to perform some of the more routine tasks, leaving
the visitor free to see her clients. A typical job descrip-
tion included the following:

> She is too young to visit alone, or to judge what is
> wise in difficult cases, but she will write your monthly

---

[10]Octavia Hill, Homes of the London Poor, new ed.
(London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1883), p. 56.

reports, will be a friendly messenger to pay pensions,
will call to ask if children are at school and report
to the School Board, will collect savings and keep
accounts of them, will write about admissions to Con-
valescent Homes or Industrial Schools, will give notice
of classes and entertainments, and register the window
plants before our flower shows. In short, she will
form a friendly link between you and the people, will
save your time, and be herself trained to take the lead
hereafter.[11]

Hill wanted her volunteers to be trained, but viewed

training in practical terms. On the surface, one might as-

sume that in doing so she neglected their need for an edu-

cation (as opposed to training), but in reality, she as-

sumed that they were educated prior to their training.

Hill's volunteers were largely members of the upper and

upper-middleclasses--individuals who did not need employ-

ment for survival. As members of these classes, they were

also the individuals most likely to be educated. Although

most volunteers were women,[12] and their education in-

cluded as much or more training in "women's" tasks such as

sewing, child care, and the budgeting of household expenses,

as in the basic skills of reading, writing and arithmetic,

they possessed the very skills which many members of the

lowerclass lacked. Their ability to transmit these skills

was compatible with the concept of social service of the

time.

---

[11]Ibid., p. 65.

[12]While a number of men were active in the field of
social work, they were in the minority. This position has
not changed significantly in the last ninety years.

Octavia Hill's desire that her volunteers be able to transmit practical knowledge to their clients was also expressed by other early social workers. Mrs. Barnett, wife of Samuel Barnett, in discussing the role of the visitor of the Association for Befriending Young Servants, stated that she must attempt to "win the girl's heart," but must also be able to gain information about the girl's daily routine, encourage her to open a savings account, and advise her about proper and attractive clothing and appropriate amusements.[13] The approach taken by Hill and Barnett assumed that volunteers would enter the "field" with a basic education; this education would then be supplemented through practical training gained under an apprenticeship system. Initially, this practical approach was viewed as the best possible system for educating social workers. Its acceptance, however, was due perhaps as much to the fact that there existed no viable challenger as to the fact that the system actually worked. A formal system of education needed a place of "residence" as well as a body of established theory. The ancient universities regarded social work as unworthy of university affiliation, and the bodies of knowledge (social economics, sociology) which social work

---

[13]Dame Henrietta Octavia Barnett, The Work of the Lady Visitors: Written for the Council of the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants (London: The Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants, 1881), p. 5.

would later draw on were infant disciplines. It is for reasons such as these that early social work educators grasped at bits of information, attempted to weave these bits into something vaguely resembling a curriculum, and established educational programs for social workers in a variety of locations.

Since Charity Organisation Society members were insistent on the fact that charity, in order to be successful, had to be well-organized, it is understandable that they were among the first to stress the need for a system of education which sought to combine practical experience with theoretical knowledge. In an 1890 publication entitled How to Help Cases of Distress: A Handy Reference Book for Almoners and Others, Sir Charles Loch stressed the fact that the individual involved in charity work assumed a responsibility. Only a well-trained worker was entitled to make an enquiry into a client's situation, and training implied the acquisition of two types of knowledge:

> . . . a knowledge of the social life of the class of which the person in distress is a member. . . and a general knowledge of character--a discernment of the value of evidence, combined with a knowledge of the modes and possibilities of charitable assistance. . . .[14]

Unlike many of the social workers who preceded him, Loch rejected the idea that anyone with good intentions could be

---

[14]Sir Charles S. Loch, How to Help Cases of Distress: A Handy Reference Book for Almoners and Others, 4th ed. (London: Charity Organisation Society, 1890), p. ix.

trained for social service. He remarked:

> Many have no aptitude for almoner's work; none can do it to good purpose without study and training. Doctors have to be registered and certificated. Charity is the work of the social physician. It is the interest of the community that it should not be entrusted to novices or to dilettanti, or to quacks.[15]

Although he regarded inquiry (the initial process of interviewing a client and gathering information to determine his eligibility for assistance) as difficult, he regarded visiting as even more difficult; if done improperly it amounted to nothing more than a waste of time. It involved the ability to transmit practical information and guidance divested of any sort of religious teaching, and although the visitor was to share her expertise with the client, the relationship was to assume the quality of friendship:

> To be competent to visit the poor, the visitor should be able to show them how to economise, how to prepare and where to buy cheap and nutritious food, where to put their savings. She ought to be an authority in domestic business, able to do before them what she wishes to teach them. She ought to know what are the requirements of sanitation. She ought to have that combination of authority and gentleness which wins respect and friendship and can stimulate to duty without giving offence. "Friendly love perfecteth man." She should not be an almsgiver, but a friend.[16]

Since the visitor was to be an informed friend (her well-intentioned but ignorant advice would serve only to discourage the client) she needed to know a few basics: an elementary knowledge of the history and administration of the Poor Law and poor relief as well as its relation to social

---

[15]Ibid.   [16]Ibid., p. xv.

life and social economics. While domestic skills might be
learned during her own education, the worker usually needed
some assistance in gaining specific knowledge of poor re-
lief. It was expected that a portion of the knowledge
should come from her own reading, as well as practice. In
a paper entitled The Cost of Good Work, J. W. Pennyman pre-
sented a number of questions, the answers to which he felt
the visitors responsible for discovering:

> The problems of the causes of distress and how to meet
> them are so complex that if we want to solve them we
> ought to equip ourselves for the fight with every ad-
> vantage we can lay hold of. Probably most of us have
> worked amongst the poor, and gained the personal ex-
> perience that is one great desideratum. But how much
> do we read on the subject? [italics mine] How many of
> us could give any account of the principal schemes that
> have been tried, and of the measure of success or fail-
> ure that they have met with? I have heard people with
> funds in their hands to administer come out with some
> bright idea, some plan that will solve every difficulty,
> in perfect ignorance of the fact that similar plans
> have been tried again and again and always failed. On
> the other hand, how many of us have read, to give an
> instance, the evidence given before the Parliamentary
> Committee on the Unemployed? . . . Now, surely, if we
> read such things as these, and think them out in the
> light of our own work, we shall be all the better
> equipped next time there is severe distress to meet.
> Again, the publications of the London Society touch on
> most of the difficult problems of charity.[17]

The "publications of the London Society" mentioned by
Pennyman referred to the large number of penny pamphlets
published by the London Charity Organisation Society. These,
together with pamphlets and a few books written by individ-

---

[17]J. W. Pennyman, The Cost of Good Work (London:
Charity Organisation Society, 1895), p. 7.

uals not formally connected with the C.O.S., provided
social workers with a fairly large body of literature from
which to draw theoretical as well as practical information.
A paper published in 1895 entitled How to Take Down a Case,
for example, cautioned the worker to guard against both
ambiguity and minuteness of detail. The worker had to be
made to realize that being interviewed by a stranger was
difficult in itself; when the client was expected to bare
his soul during the first interview, the situation became
almost intolerable:

> When people tell their troubles to a stranger
> whom they see for the first time, it is far from easy
> for them to make a full disclosure of their affairs.
> Many causes combine to make them reticent, and due al-
> lowance must be made for each. Perhaps a man has come
> down in the world, or has been cast off by relatives
> more fortunate than himself. If so, pride may induce
> him to suppress facts which may be of great use when a
> scheme for helping him has to be devised. Or a woman
> may be naturally shy and reserved, so that she will not
> tell her story fully, save to one of her own sex, and
> not then, unless she receives much encouragement. The
> fear of giving trouble often prevents an applicant of
> this type from naming the persons most likely and
> willing to render assistance. Others again may be so
> ignorant or mentally deficient that they cannot give a
> coherent account of themselves and merely echo what is
> said to them. Such persons, if plied with leading
> questions, will, probably, make a statement quite at
> variance with the real facts. Once more, a feeling of
> shame may deter some from disclosing their own or
> others' misdoings, and thus an important factor in the
> causation of distress may remain unknown.[18]

The worker was expected to put the client at ease, obtain
key information and finally, summarize his findings--a

---

[18] W. G. Martley, How to Take Down a Case (London:
Charity Organisation Society, 1895), p. 1.

formidable task for someone whose only education was to come from observation and self-selected readings.

In addition to learning how to deal with the client, accompanying paperwork and office procedure, the worker was expected to "pick up" additional information. Along with the functions of the Poor Law, mentioned previously, the worker was to learn about the School Board, the County Council and the Vestry, as well as the various voluntary charitable agencies--hospitals, homes and institutions-- which were in operation. She was to have knowledge of self-help movements--the friendly societies and the trade societies, preventive work--done in connection with schools, house management, clubs and savings societies, and general economic information, such as the wages and prices of the time.

Those individuals who favored a system of social work education were met with a dilemma. On the one hand, they had to "justify" the system to those forces which considered charity work too simple to require training. On the other hand, they had to formulate a more precise training program. While the legitimacy of social work training was questioned into the twentieth century, the need to formulate a definite training program seemed to pose a greater problem. The need for theoretical study as well as practical work was recognized; proposals for new li-

braries of social work publications, located in C.O.S. offices, were eagerly accepted; there was even recognition of the fact that some workers were better suited to particular types of social work than others (an early movement towards specialization), and yet one important factor was missing--there existed no single unifying force which could link the theoretical and the practical into a viable educational program.

While the Charity Organisation Society preached the linking of theory and practice, and cited the need for trained workers, it appears that the university settlements assumed a greater portion of responsibility for the actual task of training workers. In an article published in 1898, Margaret Sewell and E. G. Powell, members of the Women's University Settlement at Southwark, claimed this responsibility:

> The question of training is an important one.
> Both resident and non-resident workers can hardly avoid
> becoming trained in a greater or less degree, if they
> stay long enough, by the mere process of steadily
> doing a bit of work until they see what it means, what
> is behind it, or what it might lead to, how it is only
> part of much larger schemes, how little, and at the
> same time, how important, it is as a link in the whole.
> But this is very partial, and for "professional"
> workers, as they may be called, much more regular
> teaching is desirable and possible. In this way Set-
> tlements may, if they will, do much for the further-
> ance of their objects by definitely setting before them-
> selves, as one of their main objects, the education of

<u>the workers of the future</u>. (Italics mine.)[19]

Sewell and Powell viewed this assumption of the educational process as a privilege of both men's and women's settlements; both groups were capable of serving in this female-dominated task, but only if they were properly educated for their "profession."[20] Some supporters of social work training within the university settlements pursued the question even further. Bernard Bosanquet, for example, looked to the settlements to provide a general training program instead of concentrating on individual endeavors:

> In this settlement, indeed, I know how skillfully and resolutely a curriculum of practice and theory is planned and executed. I believe that conferences occasionally take place at least among the women's settlements. Could not this question of a definite training for workers be brought up at such a conference, the practice of different settlements be compared, and some attempt be made to arrive at a clearness as to the methods and objects of settlement work?[21]

Bosanquet's goal of uniformity was gradually to become a reality. The training program at the Women's University Settlement, which consisted of ten lectures by the Warden,

---

[19]Margaret A. Sewell and E. G. Powell, "Women's Settlements in England," in <u>University and Social Settlements</u>, ed. Will Reason (London: Methuen and Co., 1898), p. 100.

[20]While social work's claim to professional status remains in question even at the present time, Sewell's reference to "professional" workers appears to be one of the first claims to the title.

[21]Bernard Bosanquet, ed., <u>Aspects of the Social Problem</u> (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1895), p. 25.

on the subject of existing local agencies, four lectures
by Bernard Bosanquet and five conferences in 1892, became
more carefully planned and executed each year. In a paper
written by Margaret Sewell, the Settlement's plans for
1894 were presented:

> . . . each year's experience has shown the need of a
> more definite course of reading and more carefully
> planned and supervised practice. The Committee hope,
> therefore, to provide this year a definite and or-
> ganized course of training, both for those who come to
> work in Southwark and those who wish to prepare for
> work elsewhere. During three terms in the year they
> hope to arrange for lectures upon such subjects as the
> following: Economics, Poor Law, Local Government, Edu-
> cation, Sanitation, Principles of Organization and Re-
> lief, Thrift, etc. Courses of reading will be pre-
> scribed and students will be asked to write papers.
> Alongside of the book-work will be practice under ex-
> perienced workers.[22]

Two scholarships had already been offered in 1893 for two
women unable to afford social work training without assist-
ance, and in the same year, the Settlement published a pro-
gram of lectures to be given. A year later, the Settle-
ment's work was communicated throughout England; leaflets
and lectures were used to explain the program as well as to
suggest the possibility of its expansion into other areas
of the country. In the same year, the Settlement received
a £2,000 bequest for the establishment of a scholarship
fund. The Settlement continued full courses of lectures

---

[22]Margaret Sewell, "The Beginnings of Social Training,
1890-1903," in The Equipment of the Social Worker, ed.
Elizabeth Macadam (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.,
1925), p. 28.

until 1897 and the lectures were received with increasing enthusiasm. Only one factor presented a problem: Southwark was not centrally located, and only a central location could make training accessible for a large number of workers. To this end, the Settlement, the Charity Organisation Society and the National Union of Women Workers united to form the "Joint Lectures Committee." The Committee was charged with the task of arranging courses of lectures to be given in Central London. Several years later, a paid lecturer who traveled throughout the provinces delivering lectures, was added to the staff. In 1901, the Joint Lectures Committee was replaced by the "Committee for Social Education," a subcommittee of the Charity Organisation Society, but it continued to be controlled by the same group of individuals.[23]

Although the system of training for social work was in its infancy, its supporters had achieved a great deal in a short period of time. They had attempted to design a curriculum, choose an appropriate faculty and select and to some degree, support a student body. Their next goal, university affiliation, would be achieved in a few years. The training program initiated by the settlement workers had been unlike any which preceded it. The following section will examine the reasons for the variations in training pro-

---

[23]Ibid., pp. 29-32.

grams during the period, and attempt to show why the university settlement possessed the ability to link theory and practice, and consequently to establish a viable, well-defined educational program for social workers.

Variations Among Social Work Training Programs 1880 to 1903: Logical Differences

After considering a number of groups dedicated to some charitable task, it appears that the Charity Organisation Society and the university settlements were most persistent in the belief that successful workers were the product of a combination of good intentions and some form of training. Both groups struggled to pinpoint exactly what this training was to be. The Charity Organisation Society was initially a coordinating effort; it attempted to foster cooperation among already existing charities, by acting as a clearinghouse for the distribution of charity. In addition, it worked for the delivery of appropriate charity:

> The Charity Organisation Society . . . has two functions: one is to bring together all the charitable agencies of a district, and get them to act in concert, so that there shall be no overlapping of almsgiving; the second is to induce the donors in a given neighborhood to consider every case of poverty so thoroughly as to decide in what way, if any, the poor person can be thoroughly helped. The first of these two functions is one mainly of good will and of organisation, but the second is a very difficult business, and calls for the best powers of heart, and soul, and head.[24]

While the C.O.S. had to depend on existing charities to

---

[24]Hill, The Charity Organisation Society, p. 1.

achieve cooperation, the delivery of appropriate charity could be achieved largely by C.O.S. personnel. This task, however, required a competent staff, as well as offices in which the staff could operate. Unlike other organizations, the C.O.S. utilized a number of paid employees; an Inquiry Officer (an individual usually of lowerclass rank and experienced in the "ways" of the poor) and a Secretary (someone capable of coordinating office routine as well as other workers) were frequently employed in C.O.S. offices. Volunteers predominated, but paid workers were given a key task: the selection and training of new volunteers.[25]   Since paid workers were vastly outnumbered by part-time volunteers, they were faced with a formidable task. The fact that many volunteers were part-time meant that they were already devoting themselves to other occupations (raising a family and running a household); they were willing to offer their services as visitors, but hesitated to spend additional time in training. C.O.S. leadership recognized the importance of training, but circumstances did not always yield to logic:

> From its earliest days the London Society has laid great
> stress upon the need for trained workers, and it has had
> no small share in influencing public opinion in this
> direction. The difficulties, however, are still very
> great--first, of persuading the workers that any train-

---

[25]Pennyman, The Cost of Good Work, p. 6.

ing is essential, and then, of enabling them to obtain it.[26]

Although many C.O.S. members were educated, they were infrequently associated with formal educational agencies, that is, universities. In short, the C.O.S. was faced with a dilemma: on the one hand, training was viewed as crucial-- its absence gave charity work the haphazard quality which the C.O.S. had so long condemned; on the other hand, the C.O.S. found it difficult to establish a basis for systematic training--many volunteers were unreceptive to the idea of training, and even if they had desired training, the number of paid workers responsible for this task was minute compared to the number of volunteers to be trained. It appears that the C.O.S. had no set framework in which to place its training program; it remained the task of another group, the university settlements, to establish this needed framework.

The university settlements, first established in 1884, had as their main goal, the development of communication between classes; this communication, through which the problems of society could at least be partially alleviated, was to be based on a system of education. The settlements maintained a strong link with the universities; members were re-

---

[26]H. V. Toynbee, The Employment of Volunteers (London: Charity Organisation Society, 1893), p. 1.

cruited from Oxford and Cambridge; courses offered at the settlements were, in many instances, extension courses. Settlement recruits were not only full-time workers; many were residents of the settlement. Consequently, their association was natural--they did not have to make special provisions for periodic meetings. Workers were in constant contact with one another, a luxury not afforded Charity Organisation Society volunteers. This close proximity along with meeting rooms found in each settlement house made the delivery of lectures on topics of charity work easier.

Despite the fact that the Charity Organisation Society recognized the importance of training and had existed for fifteen years before the first settlement house opened, it was the settlement and not the C.O.S. which was responsible for the first formal training program. The C.O.S. was staffed by competent individuals, capable of continuing a training program (this was proven when the C.O.S. subcommittee, The Committee for Social Education, replaced the Joint Lectures Committee in 1901), but these same individuals appeared unable to start such a program. After considering all variables, such as type of membership and facilities, the one factor which differed between the two was the concept of education. The development of settlements was a university-based response to a social problem;

it followed, therefore, that preparation for such a program might be gotten within a pseudo-university system, if not the university itself. Such a system assumed that workers were well-versed in areas other than "charity work"--workers were not merely trained, they were educated. The C.O.S., on the other hand, was not a product of the universities; volunteers came from all walks of life. While the C.O.S. recognized some responsibility for training workers, it did not offer an educational program.

One might argue that the C.O.S. did in fact successfully maneuver social work into the university system--The Committee for Social Education led to the creation of the London-based School of Sociology in 1903--but this success is questioned by the precarious status which social work clung to during the decades which followed. Perhaps the settlements might have provided the impetus for the acceptance of social work education on the university level, but the power and practicality of the C.O.S. served to perpetuate the struggle between social work training and social work education.[27]

---

[27]A comparable situation existed in the United States. Samuel McCune Lindsay, a political science professor at Columbia University and director of the New York School of Philanthropy from 1907 to 1912 favored the creation of a university-based school of social work near Columbia, but was overruled by the C.O.S.'s Committee on Philanthropic Education which opted for a more limited, less academic program. See Roy Lubove, The Professional Altruist (New York: Atheneum, 1972), pp. 144-145.

During the period 1880 to 1903, social work re-
ceived increasing recognition as a field which required
some form of preparation; good intentions were not suffi-
cient qualifications. Responses to this need, however,
varied widely; variations were usually the product of the
organization's main goal combined with the type of workers
which it attracted. When agreement was finally reached on
the types of information necessary for social work--know-
ledge of the Poor Law, Public Health Laws, case recording
and interviewing--methods for presenting this information
remained in question. Lectures, observation, and practice
under supervision were the generally accepted methods, but
organizations could not agree on the relative importance of
each. Even the two organizations most instrumental in the
development of systematic preparation for social work, the
Charity Organisation Society and the university settlements,
found agreement subordinate to personal preference. Despite
all of these drawbacks, however, social work education as
it existed in 1903 was significantly different than the pre-
paration which had preceded it. The majority of social
workers continued to be trained by agencies,[28] but social
work education had found a place, however precarious, in the

_____

[28]Agency training continues to play a large role in
social work education in Great Britain--the demands of so-
ciety outweigh the number of workers that can be educated
in the universities.

university system.

The following chapter will examine the social services which developed in response to the needs of society during the period 1904 to 1930 and which, in turn, shaped social work education of that period.

CHAPTER V

THE EMERGENCE OF SOCIAL WORK SERVICES

AS A RESPONSE TO THE NEEDS OF

THE TIMES 1904 TO 1930

While the period 1880 to 1903 was characterized by the actualization of the paper legislation which preceded it, the period 1904 to 1930 brought forth legislation which expanded the concept of social service as well as the population to which this service was directed. The poor as well as the workingclass were becoming increasingly articulate; they were no longer willing to place their fate in the hands of the benevolent rich. Rather, these individuals looked to the state for the legislation they viewed as a right. According to historian Walter Arnstein:

> There was an increasingly widespread acceptance of the idea that poverty, unemployment, and ignorance were neither crimes nor necessarily the personal fault of the victims but rather the evil products of an ill-educated society which demanded the attention of the leaders of government.[1]

Parliament met the challenge by passing a number of pieces of legislation. The Old Age Pensions Act of 1908 and the National Insurance Act of 1911, for example, are viewed by some as the basis of the present welfare state. And

---

[1] Walter L. Arnstein, Britain Yesterday and Today: 1803 to the Present, 3rd ed. (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1976), p. 178.

yet, workers, represented by the Labour movement which had evolved from trade clubs to separate unions to a social-political movement, were not appeased. Dissatisfaction was shown in a variety of ways: an apparent lack of interest in the workingclass, by both Liberals and Conservatives, led to the formation of the Labour Party in 1900.[2] Union leaders were also more inclined to call strikes--the mass labor strikes of 1911 and 1912 posed a threat to the entire economy of the country, but were only a prelude to the strikes of 1919 to 1921. Likewise, better educational opportunities were demanded by members of this previously neglected population. Such conditions in themselves were difficult to deal with, but the country faced additional perils: the two most devastating being the loss of approximately one million men in World War I (an additional two million were wounded), and a depression which kept the unemployment rate at 11 percent between 1923 and 1928 and raised it considerably in 1929. Control of the government was held by each of the three major political parties: Conservative, Liberal and Labour, at various times, but changes in government appeared to be based more on dissatis-

---

[2]The Fabian Election Manifesto of 1892 called for the formation of a workingclass party. While the Independent Labour Party was formed the following year, it remained more a socialist-propaganda organization than an actual political party. The Labour Party, formed in 1900 and named in 1906, won only twenty-nine seats in Parliament in 1906, but continued to gain support.

faction with the party in power than on the belief that any
of the parties were more capable of arriving at a solution
to the country's many problems. This chapter will briefly
then examine some of the major events of the time and the
legislation which these events precipitated; it will also
investigate the social services which were shaped by the
needs that the country manifested and the field of social
work sought to meet.

British Social Problems 1904 to 1930:
An Overview

When Queen Victoria, who had ruled for sixty-four
years, died on January 22, 1901, an era ended. Although
the workingclass and the poor had made demands during her
reign (in most instances, not directly but through such
organizations as the Fabian Society), her death seemed al-
most symbolic; the moralistic monarch who had met the needs
of her subjects as she saw fit, was replaced by her less
rigid and less adept son, King Edward VII (he had been vir-
tually excluded from participation in government until
Victoria's death.) Open protest began to be viewed as a
legitimate means of communicating dissatisfaction with
society rather than as a conspiracy. At the same time it
became more obvious that Edwardian prosperity was, in fact,
prosperity limited to the upper and middleclasses. Ac-
cording to Arnstein:

The most paradoxical aspect of Edwardian pros-
perity was that unlike the middle and later years of
Victoria's reign, wages only barely kept pace with
rising prices and that real wages for a majority of
English workingmen did not rise at all.[3]

Such prosperity which raised middleclass profit, while

keeping workingmen's wages low, served only to convince

further the lowerclass that power, not dependence on bene-

volence, was the route to happiness.

While private philanthropy had directed its energies

at the problems of the poor, it had left the workingman

largely to his own efforts. The Fabian Socialists were not

workingclass members, but felt that their programs would

benefit all strata of society, including the workingclass.

Unlike Marxist Socialists, they believed in nonviolent

methods, and considered government machinery capable of

using legislation to achieve economic equality. In at-

tempting to show that socialism was, in fact, already exis-

tent in British society, Sidney Webb produced the following

example:

The practical man, oblivious or contemptuous of any
theory of the general principles of social organization,
has been forced, by the necessities of the time, into
an ever-deepening collective channel. Socialism, of
course, he still rejects or despises. The individualist
town councillor will walk along the municipal pavement,
lit by municipal lights and cleansed by municipal
brooms with municipal water, and seeing, by the munici-
pal clock in the municipal market, that he is too early
to meet his children coming home from the municipal

---

[3]Arnstein, <u>Britain Yesterday and Today: 1830 to the</u>
<u>Present</u>, p. 197.

school, hard by the county lunatic asylum and the municipal hospital, will use the national telegraph system to tell them not to walk through the municipal park, but to come by the municipal tramway, to meet him in the municipal reading-room, by the municipal museum, art gallery, and library, where he intends to consult some of the national publications in order to prepare his next speech in the municipal town hall in favour of the nationalization of canals and the increase of Government control over the railway system. "Socialism, sir," he will say "don't waste the time of a practical man by your fantastic absurdities. Self-help, Sir, individual self-help, that's what had made our city what it is."[4]

Although the Fabian Socialists had a small number of formal followers, their belief that government could compensate for some of society's inequities increased in popularity. The attractiveness of this philosophy to the workingclass did not go unnoticed by political parties. While the Labour Party had been formed in 1900, it was not strong during the election of 1906. The Liberals still continued to attract many workingclass votes. Support, however, was dependent not on promises, but rather, on what the Liberals could actually deliver. The two most significant pieces of legislation passed during the final period of Liberal control[5] were the Old Age Pensions Act of 1908 and the

---

[4]Sidney Webb (1889), quoted in Arnstein, _Britain Yesterday and Today: 1830 to the Present_, p. 186.

[5]The Liberals held power from December 1905 until May 1915. Coalition governments headed by Liberal H. H. Asquith (until December 1916) and Liberal David Lloyd George (until 1917) were replaced with alternating periods of control by the Conservatives and the Labour Party. The Liberals never regained power.

National Insurance Act of 1911. A pension for the elderly
had been proposed by Charles Booth as early as 1891. A
report issued in 1885 by the Liberal government's Royal
Commission on the Aged Poor outlined the evils of not pro-
viding a pension, but failed to arrive at a definite plan
for providing one. It was not until 1908, three elections
later, that the plan was actually put into effect. A sum
of ₤1,200,000 was set aside for the purpose of providing
a pension of one to five shillings per week for every in-
dividual over the age of seventy years who had an annual
income of less than ₤31 per year. In 1910, approximately
607,000 individuals were receiving these non-contributory
old age pensions; the figure rose to 785,833 in 1920 and
1,373,331 in 1930.[6]

The National Insurance Act of 1911 was established
on a contributory basis; incorporating the friendly socie-
ties into a national scheme, the government attempted to
provide sickness and death benefits for all workers earning
less than ₤160 per year. Weekly contributions consisted
of twopence by the National government, threepence by the
employer and fourpence by the employee. The Act was much
broader than the Old Age Pensions Act had been; it covered
approximately fourteen million people (one-third of the pop-

---

[6]A. H. Halsey, ed., Trends in British Society Since
1900 (London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1972), p. 400.

ulation), and would form the basis for the National Health

Service established in 1948. In addition, the Act pro-

vided approximately 2.5 million workers in the construction,

engineering, shipbuilding and vehicle-building industries

with minimal unemployment insurance (seven shillings per

week for up to fifteen weeks.)[7] The National Insurance

Act was only a shadow of what it would become, but its

potential was recognized by individuals in the field of so-

cial service. A comment made by Charles Loch prior to the

bill's acceptance demonstrates this realization:

> The National Insurance Bill, if it is passed,
> will affect the social interests of the people as a
> whole more--far more, probably--than any act of the
> last hundred years. Other Acts have introduced far-
> reaching reforms in the industrial conditions of large
> classes; and the Poor Law Act of 1834 enabled the na-
> tion to free itself from the burden of an overwhelming
> pauperism. But this Bill introduces a new system of
> medical provision that, under the form of insurance,
> places in the category of recipients of State help
> practically all those who are not income-tax payers.
> It does not limit its intervention to those who have
> hitherto been considered the poor or the poorer classes.
> It entails a reorganisation of the Friendly Societies
> and may profoundly affect the development of the Trade
> Unions.[8]

Loch viewed the Act as a death warrant for the friendly

societies as well as for the sense of responsibility which

had brought these societies into existence. In addition,

---

[7]Arnstein, <u>Britain Yesterday and Today: 1830 to the Present</u>, p. 216.

[8]Charles Loch, <u>The National Insurance Bill: A Paper</u> (London: Charity Organisation Society, 1911), p. 1.

such legislation redefined social service as well as social service worker; the worker was expected to look to the government for standards. Loch described this government-domination in the following way:

> . . . the spirit of enterprise in social matters has passed from the people to the State, and the people's enterprise, as must naturally follow, becomes . . . the enterprise of a sub-service. What the Government has established, be it rightly or wrongly, assumes such large proportions and involves so many interests that the people, or those interested in any branch of relevant work, have, by a kind of social compulsion, to arrive at a conclusion that they must make an effort to back the Government venture and do their best to make it work well. I notice, too, with some interest, that the most recent proposals for charitable progress are, in the main, proposals to link charity or social work locally to municipal bodies and generally to Government Departments. Thus the entrepreneurs of charity are running to shelter, like creatures out in a storm. The status of Government alliance gives them protection and a certain sense of dignity.[9]

Loch felt that such government-affiliation robbed the social worker of an opportunity to risk himself for the sake of the client; mass programs, on the other hand, held that individual efforts aimed at meeting individual needs might fail, therefore, it was best to refrain from such experimentation. While Loch had always assumed that the State would play a role in taking care of the poor, he objected to State intervention in areas which had traditionally been the domain of private philanthropy.

-----

[9]Charles S. Loch, "The Spirit of Enterprise" (1913) in A Great Ideal and its Champion: Papers and Addresses, with a Preface by Arthur Clay (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1923), p. 212.

Such legislation as the Old Age Pensions Act and the
National Insurance Act alone could have significantly al-
tered the type of social service offered as well as the
training for these services, and yet, other factors were
to come into play. The Poor Law of 1834 had been the sub-
ject of opposition from one front or another since its in-
ception. In an attempt to bring the nineteenth-century
Poor Law in line with twentieth-century thought, the govern-
ment formed the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws in 1905.
The Commission studied the problem of the poor until 1909,
but failed to arrive at a unified conclusion. Instead, it
produced two separate reports, a Majority Report and a
Minority Report; neither report was embodied in legislation.
The Majority Report centered on the principle of deterrence,
seeking to make it difficult for the poor to get relief save
within the framework of the Councils of Voluntary Aid, or-
ganizations similar to the Charity Organisation Society.
The Minority Report held that Poor Law machinery should be
abolished, and responsibility transferred to already ex-
isting agencies capable of dealing with specific problems;
for example, dependent children dealt with by the educa-
tional authorities, the dependent insane and feeble-minded
by lunacy authorities, and the unemployed by unemployment
commissions.[10] It condemned workhouses, outdoor relief

---

[10]Robert Cloutman Dexter, Social Adjustment (New York:
Alfred A. Knopf, 1927), pp. 54-55.

which it considered only sufficient for people to starve on, and poor treatment of the sick.

As might be expected, Loch supported the Majority Report:

> In this question of poor relief two statements of objects might be made. One would express that of the Minority report. It would be that everyone who wants relief should get it without difficulty. The other statement, that of the Majority, might be set down thus: that everyone who is in distress and cannot, by his own exertions, or with the aid of others, meet the wants from which he suffers, should be assisted in such a way that he may regain his independence.[11]

His approach seemed the most reasonable, until one looks at the writings of equally concerned, but totally opposed, individuals. Beatrice Webb, a contributor to the Minority Report, for example, viewed the program as capable of dealing with the poor on a more humane level. Individual expertise combined with a preventive approach could offer effective services to the poor:

> Instead of the officer, or voluntary worker, concerned with the destitution of the whole family, and not coming until destitution has set in, we shall have the officer, or voluntary worker, of the Education authority, the Public Health authority, or the Unemployment authority, who will come into the home at a much earlier stage, with a specific purpose and with specific experience in respect to that purpose. We believe that such a person will be more capable of thinking out the problem of the family as a whole than a mere relieving officer, or a mere charity worker, who at present arrives at the eleventh hour, with no specific knowledge or experience, to relieve the destitution which has overtaken the family

---

[11]Charles Loch, The Reports of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and Relief of Distress (London: Charity Organisation Society, 1909), p. 1.

for lack of the earlier preventive measures that we
advocate.[12]

While the supporters of each report were far apart ideo-
logically as well as in the programs which they sought to
establish, they could agree on one issue: the legitimacy of
volunteers in a system of social service. Loch's organiza-
tion had always relied on a large number of volunteers. He
viewed volunteer workers as a viable part of any system of
social service, but continued to separate clientele into
two groups: those served by "public assistance" and those
supported by private charity. Minority Report supporters
also recognized the need for volunteers. This need was ex-
pressed by Bishop Wakefield:

> Indeed, our whole scheme, if it is to be successfully
> carried through, will require a very great deal of vol-
> untary service and is based upon the idea of that serv-
> ice being readily forthcoming.[13]

Like Loch, Wakefield did not want volunteers utilized for
tasks which were State responsibilities (basic financial
assistance), but instead of dividing clientele into two
groups--those to be dealt with by the government and those
helped by private charity--Wakefield viewed the destitute
as a single group, eligible for assistance from both bodies.

----

[12]Beatrice Potter Webb, A Crusade Against Destitution
(London, 1909), p. 2.

[13]Henry Russell Wakefield, Bishop of Birmingham, The
Sphere of Voluntary Agencies Under the Minority Report
(London: The National Committee to Promote the Break-up of
the Poor Law, 1910), p. 3.

Both the Minority and Majority Reports generated a great deal of discussion upon their release, the former being accused of Socialist tendencies, the latter of being unresponsive to a changing society. Within a few years, however, the issues had not been resolved, and attention was turned to the imminent war. A fundamental change did not occur until 1929 when Prime Minister Neville Arthur Chamberlain's Local Government Act abolished the Poor Law unions and delegated their powers to county borough councils, while funding was supplied by the federal government.

Thus far we have examined two forces which shaped social services during the period 1904 to 1930. National legislation provided assistance to groups previously neglected by both State aid and voluntary charity; assistance was given not because the individual conformed to certain moral standards, but because he met specific financial criteria. Such legislation not only greatly expanded the group to which assistance was to be given, but also perceived social service as a right. The introduction of national programs, which when taken together would form the basis for the welfare state, created the need for new workers to administer these programs. Whether recruited from voluntary agencies or hired without previous experience, these workers needed some form of training, preferably one which helped to develop an attitude compatible with serv-

ice delivered as a right rather than service based on personal whim.

While the government passed legislation which supported the individual's right to have various needs met, citizens from the lowerclass, as well as some of their upperclass spokesmen, demanded more equality and were not willing to apologize for their "rude" behavior. According to some writers, these individuals were merely following the example shown by the rest of society:

> People talk at large some times about the greed and avarice of the working classes--their unwillingness to give service without payment and their exorbitant demands in respect of wages and hours. I have never been able to accept such a point of view at all, for it seems to me all the old bad rules which govern our industrial relationships are inherent in the system. What I mean is that, given a society where men and women are expected to compete and scramble for a living, it is inevitable that cheating and meanness should follow.[14]

While the lowerclass had provided much of the human fuel for English industry, they had reaped few benefits. For example, it was not until 1918 that all property qualifications for male voters over the age of twenty-one were eliminated; laborers were least likely to own property. The most obvious imbalance, however, existed in the educational system. Theoretically all individuals had a right to an education, but education was, in reality, classlinked:

---

[14]George Lansbury, Your Part in Poverty (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1916), p. 37.

Education, usually a solvent, produced in England, a
further hardening of class lines. Education for All
was an obvious democratic slogan, and in one sense a
successful one. After 1918 all children received full-
time education to the age of 14. An increasing though
still small, proportion continued their education in
adolescence, and an increasing, though very small, pro-
portion went to universities. This was, however, not
achieved by opening the existing educational doors
wider and wider until they admitted everyone. It was
done by developing a different and mainly inferior,
education for those who had previously received none.
Thus class differences were not only maintained. They
were made clearer and more effective than before.[15]

While upperclass children went to boarding schools, lower-

class children went to free day schools. There was a par-

allel at the secondary level: upperclass children attended

the "Public" schools, while only a minority of lowerclass

children attended free secondary day schools. Grammar

schools attracted mainly upper and middleclass students.

At the university level, Oxford and Cambridge were re-

served largely for the upperclass, while lowerclass stu-

dents (fortunate enough to reach a university level of edu-

cation) attended new universities in large towns. A dual

system of education persisted from the elementary through

the secondary and into the university level. And yet, edu-

cation, which was obvious in its inequality, was regarded

by some as a viable, and perhaps the only, method by which

members of society could achieve equality or at least the

freedom to seek equality.

---

[15]A. J. P. Taylor, English History 1914-1945 (London:
Oxford University Press, 1965), pp. 170-171.

Proposals for the use of education as an agent for a better society came from a number of individuals, institutions and organizations. The Workers' Educational Association (established as the Association for the Higher Education of Working Men in 1903, and renamed in 1905), attempted to bring a semblance of organization to the demands for education made by members of the workingclass. The W.E.A. sought to utilize the University Extension movement already in existence, and set up additional evening classes for workers, but requests were also made of the universities. In a 1907 paper entitled <u>What Work-people Want Oxford to Do</u>, Walter Nield, President of the North-Western Co-operative Education Committees' Association, presented the following suggestions:

> We hold that what is wanted in Oxford is a real living acquaintance with working-class conditions, and that this must come from a union of labour and learning in the University itself. We are of the opinion it can best be brought about in two ways:
> 1. By securing that the best sons of workmen proceed to Oxford easily—men who will go there for definite work, and not as idlers.
> 2. To make it possible for these men to come I believe there should be facilities given through the primary and secondary schools, the due provision of scholarships with maintenance allowances.[16]

Nield viewed such education as essential: workers were destined to play a role in the country's future and would

---

[16]Walter Nield, <u>What Workpeople Want Oxford to Do</u> (London: The Workers' Educational Association, 1907), p. 4.

do so <u>with or without</u> the benefits of education. They recognized their shortcomings in this area, but they were not totally responsible for their fate:

> We workpeople are prepared to admit our educational shortcomings. We fully realise that we should be better equipped if we possessed a wider culture. Still, the fault is not altogether the fault of the workers. Great numbers of them have lived up to their opportunities, and considering how meagre those opportunities have been, they have achieved a fair measure of success.[17]

University representatives, such as Sidney Ball, Tutor at St. John's College, Oxford, agreed that workingmen had not been properly prepared to profit from a university education. He acknowledged the close relationship between education and social reform, as well as the universities' responsibility for directing this reform, but seemed to be thinking in less equalitarian terms then Nield:

> This . . . is one thing that Oxford can do for working men; it can (in co-operation with other Universities) put itself at the head of a national movement for "liberalising" the education of the working classes from the beginning. I will go further; it is as much the interest as the duty of Universities to co-operate in the "removal of hindrances" to what some at any rate of the new Universities have declared to be their ideal--the ideal of a "University education for all." Not indeed that it is necessary to conceive Universities, still less any single University, as charged with the education of all; but rather as giving stimulus and guidance to all educational agencies. But this they cannot do without realising the inseparability of educational and social reform. We are often <u>told that the social problem is an educational problem; but the converse is equally true. If the Universities are interested in educational, they must</u>

---

[17]Ibid., p. 5.

by consequence be interested in social reform.
(Italics mine.)[18]

Although Ball's concept of solution did not correspond
with Nield's, it was significant in that it supported the
idea that universities had a responsibility for social re-
form.[19]

While the demands of the workingclass for a more
equitable system of education were met to varying degrees,
for example, adult education became a permanent part of the
educational system while workingclass children continued
at a disadvantage, a new attitude had been established.
Workers were now defining their educational needs as well
as the ways of meeting these needs. As the workingclass
became more organized and more articulate, the need for
such organizations as the university settlements diminished.
The settlements, faced with the alternatives of change or
extinction, were not alone. Although private philanthrop-
ic organizations continued to exist during the period 1904
to 1930, they were faced with a rather harsh reality; they
could either continue in their old ways, oblivious to the
social legislation which dubbed their efforts as piece-
meal, or they could redirect their efforts, changing their

---

[18]Sidney Ball, What Oxford Can Do For Workpeople
(London: The Workers' Educational Association, 1907), p. 11.

[19]While university responsibility had been empha-
sized by the settlement workers, the Labour movement and
social legislation expanded the universities' client base
as well as their tasks.

methods, their clientele and perhaps even their philoso-
phy. The following section will examine the attempt by
social service organization leaders to redefine social
service as provided by private organizations.

Voluntary vs. Paid Social Service 1904 to 1930: A Need for Definition

While the social legislation of the period demon-
strated that the piecemeal efforts of private charities
were inferior to an organized approach, and pseudo-
Socialist ideology and social reform spoke of rights and
"equality," neither effort aided in the formation of a
generally-accepted definition of social service or social
worker. There continued to be discussions of what the so-
cial worker was not supposed to do. In an article written
in 1908 and entitled "The Function of Visitors," for ex-
ample, Samuel Barnett emphasized the belief that visitors
had to justify their place in modern society: ". . . old
days of personal relationship are gone, and the new days
of organisation and individual independence have begun."[20]
Visitors were expected to have an object for their visits
and to "prepare" themselves, using such materials as the
handbook in which Barnett's article appeared, but areas of
potential employment were regarded as almost unlimited.

---

[20]Samuel A. Barnett, "The Function of Visitors," in
Social Service--A Handbook for Workers and Visitors in
London and Other Large Towns, ed. G. M. Bell (London:
Longmans, Green and Co., 1908), p. 1.

While such an attitude might have done much to demonstrate the "flexibility" of social work, it did little to help the worker define the limits of her job; she could easily step beyond the bounds of her expertise, because the boundaries were never clearly defined.

While Barnett attributed such a "nonsystem" of social service to the absence of a unifying force or social movement, writers such as W. Edward Chadwick raised an issue which had confronted British social work since Octavia Hill had used a small number of workers in the mid 1800s: what was to be the relationship between paid workers and voluntary workers? The workers themselves seemed unwilling to establish a relationship on a cooperative basis:

> To-day we often hear voluntary work described as "amateur," and paid work as "professional," and both words are apt to be pronounced in a somewhat sneering tone. It is assumed that voluntary work must be more or less inefficient, and that paid work must be done simply for the purpose of making a living. Neither of these assumptions need be true, and neither is justifiable . . . .
> But, unfortunately, we do find very often the voluntary and the paid worker acting independently of each other. The one is apt to take little or no account of what the other is doing. The expert paid worker is apt to ignore, sometimes to look down upon, the efforts of the voluntary worker. On the other hand, the voluntary worker often pursues his self-appointed task oblivious to what the paid worker is doing.[21]

While both types of workers might have entered the field out of similar convictions, their belief that there existed

---

[21]W. Edward Chadwick, Social Work (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1909), pp. 116-117.

a difference between them, made the similarities diffi-
cult to discover.

The Social Worker's Guide, written by Rev. J. B.
Haldane in 1911, divided social work into three categories:
public, professional and institutional work, and volun-
tary work.   While public service was concerned basically
with Poor Law administration and inspection, professional
and voluntary work covered a variety of categories.   A
brief definition of both types follows:

> PROFESSIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL WORK: of various
> kinds, for which training is required, full-time is
> necessary, and for which a salary or its equivalent is
> given.

> VOLUNTARY: Part-time occupations, principally
> falling under (a) Secretarial and organising, (b) vis-
> iting and research, (c) education.[22]

Virtually every type of social service organization em-
ployed both types of workers; some volunteers were per-
forming tasks defined as more appropriate to paid, that is,
trained, workers, and vice-versa.   Written definitions did
not in themselves guarantee that these categories would be
honored.   While there existed a theoretical differentiation
between paid workers and voluntary workers, and each group
was inclined to underrate the other, they were in fact, fre-
quently involved in similar duties.   It is not surprising,
therefore, that the public might confuse the two types of

---

[22]Rev. J. B. Haldane, The Social Worker's Guide
(London: Sir Issac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1911), p. 465.

workers. In such confusion, it was even more difficult to
comprehend the importance of social work education as ob-
tained in a formal educational setting. While such work-
ers did exist, their numbers were few and they continued
to be overshadowed by "trained" as well as untrained work-
ers.

The search for a definition of "social worker" was
undertaken in a number of arenas. The National Adult School
Union, for example, began by considering the social worker
in terms of ideological context. Purity of ideology was
obviously not one of its criteria:

> Before we come to consider in particular what kind of
> social service is called for at the present time and
> what kind of service we can render, there are some gen-
> eral considerations which must not be wholly forgotten.
> In the first place, he who would render useful and
> constructive service must not be anxious to define him-
> self too exactly, either as Socialist or as Individ-
> ualist. The fact is that both the possibility of, and
> the occasion for, exact differentiation on this issue
> is not now as manifest as it was a generation ago. We
> are all Socialists nowadays in many ways and on many
> subjects; and yet, in other ways, we are Individual-
> ists.[23]

The social worker was to be mindful of the State's role in
the individual's life--it was a reality and could not be
ignored. In fact, the State's growth was a specific concern
of the social worker (in this instance, the voluntary work-
er.) In defining the sphere of the social worker, the Union

---

[23]National Adult School Union, Adult School Social
Service Handbook (London: National Adult School Union, 1914),
p. 7.

asked and then answered two questions:

> What, exactly, is his business? Where and how may he make his contribution? The answer to this question is . . . two-fold: It is his business to help build the State. This is the Service of Citizenship. It is also his business to help in the amelioration of suffering. This is the Service of Compassion.[24]

While this "definition" added little to the explanation of what compassion-in-operation constituted, it supported the idea that the social worker was not functioning in opposition to or in spite of the State, but rather, in some sort of harmony with it. Such harmony had not been possible when the State's only offering to the field of social service had been the harsh provisions of the Poor Law. And yet, the State's new benevolence was not sufficient in itself to replace the social worker, paid or voluntary. In an article entitled The Problem of Private Benevolence in the Modern State, Rev. Hensley Henson, Lord Bishop of Durham, stressed the continued need for the social worker:

> Human needs are almost infinitely various, and no general scheme of meeting them, such as the State must necessarily apply, can ever provide an adequate satisfaction. If along with the public assistance, there went ever the exercise of private charity, administered with intimate knowledge in the privacy of a friendship gained by patient personal effort, the relief of poverty would be both more adequate and less morally perilous.[25]

While the State would provide financial assistance, it re-

---

[24]Ibid., p. 11.

[25]Rt. Rev. Dr. Hensley Henson, Lord Bishop of Durham, The Problem of Private Benevolence in the Modern State (London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1927), pp. 28-29.

mained the duty of the social worker to provide individual attention and assistance to its clientele.

Instead of becoming an easily definable concept, the term social worker became increasingly obscure. Depending on the user's perspective, it could refer to the university-educated worker, the agency-trained worker, the trained or untrained volunteer, or the well-intentioned individual who worked outside of any formal agency and met the needs of society as he saw fit. While some agencies attracted university-educated individuals, other agencies had neither the "appeal" nor the finances to attract these elite of the social work profession. Although social work education within the universities continued to grow,[26] such students represented only a small portion of the total number of workers in the field. Their influence, however, did not go unnoticed; initially they might have possessed less practical knowledge than agency-trained personnel, but they were well-versed in material which "trained" social workers studied sporadically, if at all. University-educated social workers studied the background of all types of social service which had been attempted up to this time. They were as knowledgeable about the social conditions, economic theory and political philosophy which shaped these move-

---

[26]By 1920, there were Departments of Social Science and Administration at the Universities of London, Bristol, Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool, Edinburgh and Glasgow.

ments as they were of the actual agencies which had developed. Consequently, they were better prepared to evaluate current agencies as well as the types of service delivered by these agencies. In addition, their source of information was not one-sided; their teachers included historians, economists, political scientists, sociologists, and educators, as well as social work practitioners.

Social work, oftentimes criticized as unsystematic and based in feeling rather than fact, was making a slow but concrete move towards a new status, a status which would eventually seek to adopt the term "profession." While a social work agency might be using the services of only one university-educated social worker, the worker would come in contact with virtually every other worker at that agency. Staff meetings devoted to in-service training potentially could, and in many instances did, utilize the university-educated social worker as a lecturer. While university training was available for only a relatively small number of individuals, its ideas were semi-formally communicated to a much larger number of workers. The following section will examine the development of specific social service agencies during the period 1904 to 1930, placing emphasis on the skills which these agencies demanded of their workers.

The Evolution of Social Service Agencies 1904 to 1930: A Continuing Statement of Purpose

While national legislation had broadened the concept of social service to include government-supported insurances and pensions, and the Labour movement had demanded "rights" rather than benevolence from society, individual social service agencies tended to group themselves into three basic categories: (1) those whose goal was the organization of charity; (2) those who were attempting to meet a specific need; and (3) those who sponsored a number of activities, but envisioned a broad concept of social reform. While the first two types employed "social work methods," the third sought a broader knowledge base upon which its program was to be formulated.

Perhaps the best example of an agency dedicated to the concept of organization and coordination was the Charity Organisation Society. In a book entitled Charity and Social Life: A Short Study of Religious and Social Thought in Relation to Charitable Methods and Institutions, Charles Loch again stressed this importance:

> The springs of charity lie in sympathy and religion, and, one would now add, in science. To organize it is to give it the "ordered nature" of an organic whole, to give it a definite social purpose, and to associate the members of the community with it for the fulfilment of that purpose. This in turn depends on the recognition of common principles, the adoption of a common method,

self-discipline and training, and co-operation.[27]

The desire for organization necessitated the development

of a rather well-defined bureaucratic structure. Within

this structure, provisions were made for the process of

applying for relief, as well as dispensing charity:

> All new cases of distress must be notified in the
> first place to the Central Office, to be visited from
> there and a preliminary enquiry made. The case papers
> are then sent to the Friendly Visitor in charge of the
> section in which the family reside. The Friendly Vis-
> itor calls on the family, as soon as possible, but no
> relief should be given until seven days after the date
> when the family may have received relief from the
> Central Office. Further papers, replies from employers,
> etc., are sent on to the Friendly Visitor, who care-
> fully notes the same, and attaches them to the other
> case papers. General instructions and books con-
> taining relief cheques are supplied to the Visitors,
> who may give relief if necessary, pending the next
> meeting of the District Committee, and subject to the
> rules and regulations of the Society.[28]

While the visitor was charged with the responsibility of

gathering information, according to a procedure carefully

outlined by the C.O.S., the District Committee made the

final decision on the client's eligibility for relief, as

well as the agency deemed most appropriate to dispense this

relief. The administration, rather than the worker, was

---

[27]Charles Loch, Charity and Social Life: A Short
Study of Religious and Social Thought in Relation to Char-
itable Methods and Institutions (London: Macmillan and Co.,
Ltd., 1910), p. 396.

[28]Liverpool Central Relief and Charity Organisation
Society, Manual of Instruction for the Friendly Visitor of
the Liverpool Central Relief and Charity Organisation So-
ciety (Liverpool: Liverpool Central Relief and Charity
Organisation Society, 1906), p. 7.

entrusted with the task of judging individual cases. Visitors were encouraged to attend lectures sponsored by the University of Liverpool School of Social Work, but no mention was made of full-time training of any sort. It appears that the chief source of enlightenment was the Society's administrative body, not the university.

To some of its critics, the C.O.S. was a "heartless" organization, intent on keeping the morally unfit destitute. To its supporters, its longevity[29] as well as the growth of other "organizing" agencies proved its effectiveness. The British Institute and National Council of Social Service, founded in 1918, for example, sought to first classify and then coordinate the many voluntary charities in existence. Their task was formidable: a 1926 report by the Charity Commissioners[30] stated that no less than 45,348 charities acknowledged their existence; it was esti-

---

[29]The Charity Organisation Society, renamed the Family Welfare Association shortly after World War II, sought to provide long-term counseling for family units experiencing problems.

[30]The Charity Commissioners, first appointed in 1853, were given the power to ". . . enquire into the administration of charities, receive and audit their accounts, receive property left to charity into safe custody and see to its due investment, and, finally, to form schemes to adapt the use of charities to altered circumstances according to the principle of cy-pres [if money given to charity could not be used for the exact purpose for which it was intended, it was to be used for the most similar purpose]". M. Penelope Hall, The Social Services of Modern England, 6th ed. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1963), p. 347.

mated that less than half of the charities sent in reports, raising the actual number of charity agencies to over 100,000.[31] The Council, which stressed the importance of voluntary charity, divided these efforts into five categories:

> Charities are numerous and diverse. Taken as a whole they form a network of voluntary effort throughout the country, constituting an important department of national service. Their scope may be indicated by the following summary:--(a) Health: Hospitals, convalescent homes, district nursing associations, societies for the care of invalid children, maternity and infant welfare associations, institutions and societies for the blind, for the deaf and dumb, and for the mentally defective. (b) Distress due to poverty: General relief societies, homes for the aged, homes for children, pension funds. (c) Character: Police court missions, societies for aiding prisoners, homes for police court cases, rescue and preventive societies and homes, societies for prevention of cruelty to children, reformatory and industrial schools. (d) Social improvement: Clubs (for boys, girls, adults), educational charities (other than schools), holiday and camping societies, settlements, etc., and (e) local representative councils of charities, and civic societies for friendly visiting and personal service.[32]

While the classification of voluntary efforts was relatively simple, it was much more difficult to coordinate these efforts. The Council realized that some sort of central advisory committee would make voluntary charity

[31]Frederic D'Aeth, Social Administration (Liverpool: Henry Young and Sons, Ltd., 1928), pp. 20-21.

[32]British Institute and National Council of Social Service, Report on the Registration of Charities with Appendices (London: National Council of Social Service, 1921), p. 3.

more efficient, but the voluntary charities were offered little incentive for giving up their autonomy.

Another example of a coordinating effort was the Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid formed in 1909. According to its constitution, the L.C.V.A. had five goals:

> (a) to form a centre of communications between approved charitable and benevolent institutions working in the City, and also between them and the Poor Law and other public authorities; (b) to make all help given as effective as possible; (c) to prevent overlapping and imposition; (d) to consider matters of common interest; and (e) to take such action as may be decided upon.[33]

Each charity institution was entitled to membership in the Council, but membership was voluntary.

Like the National Council of Social Service, the L.C.V.A. categorized its membership; in 1911 there were six divisions: (1) medical charities, (2) homes and other institutions for the aged and afflicted, (3) relief in the homes of the poor, (4) children's institutions and homes, (5) reformatory agencies, and (6) social improvement and education agencies.[34] By 1926 the divisions had changed and increased as follows: (1) medical charities, (2) institutions for physical and mental infirmity, (3) relief institutions,

---

[33]Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, Constitution Approved at a Meeting of Representatives of the Leading Liverpool Charities held at the Town Hall on November 5th, 1909 (Liverpool: Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1910), p. 14.

[34]Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, Annual Reports 1910-1915; 1926-1930 (Liverpool: Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1910-1930).

(4) children's institutions, (5) reformatory agencies,
(6) social welfare, (7) the register committee, (8) the
Maternity and Child Welfare Council, and (9) the Juvenile
Organisations Committee.[35] The growth of these classifi-
cations pointed to the fact that the delivery of social
service was becoming more complex. Such complexity called
for more intense study.

University-based education, represented first by
Elizabeth Macadam as a member of the social improvement and
education committee, and then by Professor A. M. Carr
Saunders, a member of the social welfare committee, played
an active role in the L.C.V.A.s work, later using the Coun-
cil as a field placement for several students. While indi-
vidual volunteers were educated in the traditional manner,
that is, they were agency-trained, the L.C.V.A. had, since
its beginning, recognized the need for university input.

While coordinating efforts such as the Charity Or-
ganisation Society, the National Council of Social Service
and the Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, could attempt
to work for cooperation among voluntary agencies, they
could be no more effective than were the groups which they
sought to coordinate. The era of social service defined in
terms of service to the destitute alone had ended, but the
poor were not ignored, nor was virtually any other group.

_____

[35]Ibid.

Children became a new concern of social services; while they had previously been considered only as the faceless members of a socioeconomic group, they were now regarded as individuals deserving of attention regardless of social status. In 1900, the infant mortality rate for England and Wales was 154 deaths per 1,000 live births. Approximately 90 of those deaths were attributed to common infectious diseases (10.0), tuberculous diseases (7.92), diarrhea and enteritis (27.05), and congenital, developmental and wasting diseases (44.4). By 1930, the infant mortality rate had dropped to 60.[36] While child labor had come under attack, the Parliamentary Committee of 1903 reported that 200,000 children were employed before and after school hours; approximately 38,600 were between the ages of six and ten.[37] Three-hundred thousand children were provided for by the Poor Law. The Standing Joint Committee of the Independent Labour Party and the Fabian Society sought to change these conditions by demanding for _every_ child the right ". . . to be decently born, decently nurtured, and decently educated."[38] This goal was to be accomplished through a six point program which called for assistance

---

[36]Halsey, _Trends in British Society Since 1900_, pp. 338-340.

[37]C. M. Lloyd, _The New Children's Charter_ (London: The Standing Joint Committee of the Independent Labour Party and the Fabian Society, 1912), p. 8.

[38]Ibid., p. 12.

from all quarters. The recommendations were:

"(1) The removal of all children from the Poor Law.

"(2) The securing through the Public Health Authorities of a fitting nurture for all infants under school age.

"(3) The securing through the Education Authorities of adequate food for all children of school age.

"(4) The prevention and cure of disease in the school children by the Education Authorities by means of School Clinics, Open-Air Schools, etc.

"(5) The prevention of child labour by amendment of the Factory Acts, prohibition of Street Trading, etc.

"(6) The better education of the children by the raising of the school age, the establishment of day Continuation Classes, and the increase of facilities for Higher Education."[39]

The Committee's demands covered virtually every vestige of the child's well-being, but one can hardly argue that these demands were unattainable or unreasonable. Nor was the Committee the only spokesman for children. The National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, based on the legislation of the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act of 1904 and the Children Act of 1908, sought to protect children from physical and moral neglect or abuse. Its duties were educational as well as protective, for the source of "cruelty" was frequently ignorance. While the Standing Joint Committee's Children's Charter and The National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children took different approaches to the problems which

[39]Ibid., p. 20.

confronted children, they were united on one important
point--the services provided were the right of every
child, regardless of social class.

Groups such as the National Association of Boys'
Clubs were concerned not with the provision of physical
necessities, but rather, with social development. School-
leavers faced a difficult period of transition:

> The change from school to industry is ruthlessly
> complete. From a sheltered world, adapted to his im-
> maturity, he emerges abruptly into the open. His
> working hours go up with a jump from five-and-a-half
> to eight, nine or more. From work graded to his ca-
> pacity and intelligence he passes to tasks regulated
> by adult standards, in which he may be subject to
> rushes of work or spells of idleness, to severe phys-
> ical strain or the stupefying monotony of tending
> automatic machines. He may work in an atmosphere of
> perpetual noise, heat or smell, and be governed by a
> discipline which, whether it be strict or lax, nearly
> always seems arbitrary and capricious.[48]

Since only about ten percent of the male population had
an opportunity for schooling beyond the age of fifteen,
the difficulties which the transition presented were com-
mon to a majority of adolescent males. If the individual
club lived up to the ideals of the N.A.B.C., it would pro-
vide adolescent boys with an opportunity for recreation,
but athletic activities would be overshadowed by goals of
fitness for manhood, citizenship and work.

Social service, as envisioned by the N.A.B.C., did

---

[40]The National Association of Boys' Clubs, Princi-
ples and Aims of the Boys' Club Movement (London: The
National Association of Boys' Clubs, 1930), p. 5.

not seek to rescue hopeless members of society; rather, it sought to develop the potential of those individuals capable of contributing to society. A final example of the new social services can be found in a book published by the Student Christian Movement, and entitled Social Service: A Survey of Opportunities. The volume included an appendix which listed 173 London-based social service agencies with which the social service student could associate himself. Perhaps the most interesting section of the book, however, was the chapter entitled "Helping Normal People." The author, Wilfrid Rowland, defined social service in terms which had seldom been used previously:

> The first thought of service for others is usually directed towards those in most obvious need--for the destitute and debauched, the disabled and disinherited. Yet there is also a field of service on behalf of ordinary people whose need of help is neither so plain nor so pressing.[41]

Such preventive services included everything from nutrition education to child care classes, to the training of effective Boy Scout and Girl Guide leaders.

Rowland's approach did not revolutionize the field of social service, but it did serve to restate the belief that service consisted of more than drastic emergency efforts; if individuals were reached "early enough" and "educated for survival," later rescue attempts would be less

---

[41]Wilfrid T. Rowland, Social Service: A Survey of Opportunities (London: Student Christian Movement, 1928), p. 65.

necessary and far less frequent. The final section of
this chapter will examine the university settlement, a
social service agency which had opted for education over
rescue before such a position became popular.

The university settlement had developed in a frame-
work of "communication through education;" it acknow-
ledged the inequality present in the class system and fo-
cused attention on individuals who had suffered because of
this class system. Its clients were not those persons
provided for by the Poor Law and private philanthropists,
but rather, they were the workers who had, for a long time,
received little attention from society. Although the
Workers' Educational Association (1903) attempted to as-
sume much of the responsibility for worker education held
previously by the settlements, the university settlements
did not become extinct; their activities were varied and
their concept of education flexible. New settlements de-
veloped: the University Settlement Bristol, established in
1911 provided a good example. Hilda Cashmore, the main
promoter and first Warden of the Settlement had, for seven
years, held a position as history tutor at the Day Training
College for Women (Teachers) in Bristol. In promoting the
new Settlement, she emphasized its close relationship to
the university, a relationship which had persisted since
1884. According to Hilda Jennings, Cashmore set up two
basic goals for the Settlement:

"(i) To promote the general welfare of the neighbourhood in which it is situated; and

"(ii) To provide a center for the systematic study of social and industrial problems."[42]

While one of its predecessors, the Women's University Settlement at Southwark, had earlier sought social work education affiliated with the university, University Settlement Bristol advocated an even closer link:

The Settlement Committee drew up a training syllabus and pressed the University to provide the theoretical basis and establish a Testamun Course in social study. Miss Cashmore was appointed by the University as tutor in practical work and the Settlement became the recognised training centre.[43]

The Settlement had not forsaken a traditional link with education, nor had it abandoned the community. Instead, it envisioned itself as providing the practical training for such work, but in conjunction with a university-based program of theoretical study.

While settlements continued to engage in community-oriented activities, the link between the settlements and social work education continued to grow. In a 1921 article entitled What Educational Settlements are Doing, the Educational Settlements' Association viewed this relationship in the following way:

---

[42]Hilda Jennings, University Settlement Bristol--Sixty Years of Change 1911-1971 (Bristol: University Settlement Bristol Community Association, 1971), pp. 7-8.

[43]Ibid., p. 8.

> The training of social workers has become a characteristic function of Settlement work. In this, of course, the older residential settlements have been the pioneers. Most of the Universities now have Schools of Social Science. The Victoria Settlement, Liverpool, is a recognised centre for students who are working for their diploma. . . . The relationships between the Social Science department of the University of Liverpool and the Beachcroft Settlement have become very close. . . . Woodbrooke has a year's residential course in the theoretical side of social science and is a recognised school of Birmingham University for this purpose.[44]

Although it might be argued that the settlements turned to the education of social workers because the educational tasks previously performed had been assumed by other agencies, such a statement ignores a basic issue: the settlements had begun with a goal of communication through education. They used their resources, human as well as financial, in ways most appropriate to the times. In 1884, Samuel Barnett responded to workingclass needs for education. By the end of the nineteenth century, these needs were being met, to some degree, by other agencies. Instead of decreasing, however, the number of settlements increased, for the settlements had not defined education strictly in terms of workingclass education. Rather, their broad definition of education was a flexible one which included all members of the settlements. Released from the responsibility for worker education, the settlements could

---

[44]Educational Settlements' Association, What Educational Settlements are Doing (London: Educational Settlements' Association, 1921), pp. 15-16.

turn their attention to those individuals who had joined the settlements, already privileged to have attended the universities, but untrained for the tasks presented them by this new environment. The settlements did not disassociate themselves from workingclass education, but sought to educate individuals who could facilitate communication between the worker and the university.

The educational settlements, coordinating bodies and individual agencies, which developed during the period 1904 to 1930, were products of their time. While they might have been initiated earlier, they had little choice but to recognize and react to the legislation, social philosophy and political realities presented to them by British society. The era of social service defined in terms of money and aid-in-kind was virtually forgotten. Its successor, financial help combined with "wise advice," was viewed as unrealistic and outmoded. Financial assistance was now based on the rights of the individual, rather than his moral condition. Helpers were admonished to seek training or to remain outside of the field of social work. The field continued to be flooded with numerous volunteer workers, who although well-meaning and oftentimes "trained," frequently obscured the social worker's role and expertise from public view. Attempts at educating social workers, however, gained momentum. While

the settlements had previously served as educational agencies for the workingclass, they now became field placements for social workers educated at the universities. Social work needed more than training in techniques for the delivery of services; it had an obligation to "understand" the society as well as the individuals it served. Such understanding implied a knowledge of that society's history, its political system, economic system and social system, as well as the ways in which these factors shaped its citizens. In addition, social work had to be cognizant of its own beginning, development, successes and failures. The university appeared to be the most logical source for such an education. The following chapter will examine the development of university-based social work education during the period 1904 to 1930.

CHAPTER VI

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A UNIVERSITY-BASED
SYSTEM OF SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION
1904 TO 1930

While the social services available during the period
1904 to 1930 bore little resemblance to the provisions of
the stigmatizing Poor Law or patronizing private philan-
thropy of the nineteenth century, these services were
similar in one important respect: both were products of
the society in which they developed. Each system was fash-
ioned as a response to the particular needs, demands and
prejudices of the time. Since needs changed, demands be-
came more forceful and prejudices were verbalized, the sys-
tem for social services, as well as their delivery, could
not remain static. The demands of the period 1904 to 1930
were not for alms, nor were they for a friend. Assistance
during a time of need (for example, death, illness or un-
employment) was viewed as a right. For many, however, this
right did not have to be preceded by a crisis. The Labour
movement, for example, viewed better education as the right
of those individuals previously ignored.

This more systematic and expanded type of social
service demanded social workers capable of responding to
these new needs. While capability had been previously de-

fined in terms of good intent, it became apparent that good intentions alone were not enough. Workers had to know how to determine and then deal with their clients' needs. "How-to" books and short courses were provided by agencies, such as the Charity Organisation Society, which employed these workers; but these aids proved to be insufficient. The worker, frequently a member of the middle or upperclass, went into the field with a moderate amount of practical knowledge (basically, some information on interviewing techniques, more on record keeping, and a good deal of information on how he fit into the bureaucratic structure of the agency). Moreover, the worker had little knowledge of the current legislation affecting his clients and virtually no knowledge of the economic, political and social factors which shaped the social service system, and brought him his clients. While a number of agencies attempted to fill these knowledge gaps, they possessed neither the expertise nor the personnel to do so. They could provide good practical training (and a number did), but they were incapable of providing theoretical knowledge.

In their search for this second type of knowledge, a number of social workers looked to the institution most capable of providing political, economic, historical and social information, which could be integrated with practical knowledge, and applied to individual problems; this institution was the university. While the precedent for uni-

versity affiliation with social work had been set during the late-nineteenth century (the settlements represented a university response to social problems), it was not until the early-twentieth century that universities developed formal programs for the education of social workers. While these programs stood as a milestone in the history of social work as well as social work education, university affiliation had an essential, although perhaps seldom acknowledged, implication: social work education was, in part, a product of the educational system in which it developed. For this reason, it is important to comprehend not only the development of programs for educating social workers, but also the state of the university system in which these programs developed. This chapter will present a brief overview of the development of the modern universities in Great Britain, a general description of social work education programs which developed during the period 1904 to 1930, and a closer look at some of the specific programs formulated by a number of universities.

The Development of the Modern University in Great Britain from 1825 to 1930: A Brief Overview

Until 1825, the "ancient" universities, Oxford and Cambridge, were the only English universities in existence. In 1825, there developed a movement for the founding of the University of London, an institution aimed at education for

the middleclass--nonresidential and with moderate fees.
Such a broad-based institution was the only means through
which many diverse groups--the Liberals, the Non-
Conformists, Roman Catholics, Jews, and those who supported
the scientific and secularist movements and were excluded
from Oxford and Cambridge--could be satisfied. This insti-
tution, which was to be secular, provoked much opposition
as well as the title of "that godless institution in Gower
St." In addition, it prompted the proposal of opening a
second institution which included religious instruction.
King's College, chartered in 1829, opened in 1831, sup-
ported by the Tories and the established Church, was the
result. London College, supported by the Whigs and the
Non-Conformists, also opened, but it was not chartered un-
til 1836 (as University College.) Neither college, how-
ever, had the power of granting academic degrees. The
University of London, on the other hand, was merely an or-
ganization for examining candidates and conferring degrees.
It was not a teaching body, and affiliated colleges had
little relationship with the University. The preceding
events contributed to the state of unrest in English higher
education. The Faculty of Medicine, for example, was met
with a dilemma: many hospitals in London were capable of
providing practical training in medicine and surgery, but
could not provide equally effective training in general
science. The majority of medical students were unable to

read for a university degree in medicine.[1] The contro-
versy as to whether the University of London was an ex-
amining body or a teaching university continued. The
Association for Promoting a Teaching University for London,
established in 1884, suggested that two universities be
created--one for teaching and one as an examining body.
The problem was not settled until 1900, however, when new
statutes were written, with a large number of institutions
eventually becoming schools of the University.

The development of modern universities followed a
rather typical pattern:

> . . . first the foundation through the generosity of
> one or more private persons, of a College designed to
> teach chiefly scientific and technical subjects to the
> population of a great industrial town; then its ex-
> pansion by the addition of a medical school, "facul-
> ties" (departments of study) in the humane subjects,
> and a department for the training of teachers, and
> finally the securing of a Royal Charter, constituting
> the College (or a group of Colleges) a University
> entitled to grant its own degrees.[2]

This process saw the development of the Universities of
Wales, Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds, Liverpool, Sheffield,
Bristol and Reading by the year 1926. These universities

---

[1] This situation parallels, to some degree, the di-
lemma faced by social workers at the end of the nineteenth
century; they were receiving good practical training, but
lacked the theoretical knowledge obtainable in the univer-
sity system. While university degrees did not necessarily
assure competence, they did give formal confirmation of
an individual's expertise.

[2] J. E. Hales, British Education (London: Longmans,
Green and Co., 1940), pp. 40-41.

lacked the prestige of Oxford and Cambridge but were capable of providing a university education of a variety unobtainable at either ancient university. First, the modern universities did not discriminate against women; while the University of London granted degrees to women as early as 1878, it was not until 1920 that Oxford did so. Cambridge, however, continued to confer only "titles" of degrees on women.[3] Second, many of the modern universities were situated in industrial cities, cities which demanded of its workers a high degree of technical knowledge. While technical instruction fit quite easily into the still pliable curriculum of modern universities, it could not find a place in the curriculum of either Oxford or Cambridge. Third, it was less costly for students to attend the modern universities; aside from the fact that fees were lower, the situation of these universities in high-population areas made it more feasible for students to cut expenses by living at home. Each of these factors was favorable to the development of university-based social work education; the majority of social workers were middleclass women working in what had always been a very practice-oriented field. While each of these factors virtually eliminated the possibility of social workers being educated at either of the

---

[3]The woman might be judged as meeting the standard required for a degree, but could not consider herself a graduate.

ancient universities, they did little to prevent access to the modern university system. This did _not_ mean that the majority of social workers were to be university-educated; their number was minute compared to that of agency-trained workers. Nor did it mean that social work education programs would lead automatically to a degree.[4] What it _did_ signify, however, was that social work education _could_ be a valid part of the university system. The following section will take a closer look at social work's position within the system of university education.

Social Work Education Programs Within the Universities 1904 to 1930

The evolution of social services, from the punishment and philanthropy of the early-eighteenth century to the increasingly comprehensive government programs and private "preventive" programs of the twentieth century, was not a smooth one. Individuals such as Octavia Hill, the Webbs, the Barnetts, the Bosanquets, and Charles Loch, who attempted to reform various aspects of the social service system, found themselves in opposition to those

---

[4]Although social work education drew from disciplines which, when taken separately, formed the basis for degree programs, education for social work like education for teaching, was considered to be technical rather than academic. In line with this trend of thought, certificates and diplomas, rather than degrees, were awarded. It was later assumed, however, that many students would earn degrees _before_ entering a social work program.

segments of society which felt that reform was either un-
necessary or impossible. Despite such opposition, how-
ever, these reformers continued in their efforts and, in
some instances, were eventually joined by the clients who
were the subjects of these reforms. The evolution of so-
cial work education faced similar types of opposition.
If, as many believed, social service stood for little more
than providing alms or friendly advice, education for such
service was unnecessary. Social work education, however,
found itself in an even more precarious position than the
field of social service; for, in many instances, education
for social work was opposed by social workers as well as
the public. When formal social work education programs
were established at the beginning of the twentieth century,
opposition had lessened somewhat; and in the words of
E. J. Urwick, Director of the School of Sociology, the need
for such education was finally beginning to be realized:

> It is always gratifying when an unpopular theory
> in which one happens to believe begins to find its way
> into the fold of orthodox doctrine. There are signs
> that this is the case with a theory which, for more
> than a generation, has been held in opposition to the
> cheerful sentimentality of the age, I mean the theory
> that the impulse to do good may, if untrained, lead
> straight to evil doing; that the good heart, unschooled
> by the good head, will probably fall into dangerous
> paths--in a word, that training is as essential for so-
> cial service as for other kinds of service. Those who
> have fought, with faithful pertinacity, to establish
> this doctrine may at last congratulate themselves that
> the end of the struggle is in sight. Sensible people,
> even the people who write in newspapers, are beginning
> to accept it as a commonplace that some experience and

some knowledge are useful adjuncts to the equipment of the reformer and social worker.[5]

Although pleased with social work education's new-found acceptance, Urwick felt that contentment with initial efforts would lead to static education for a dynamic field. Workers and students alike were evaluated in three essential areas: (1) their ability to formulate a proper attitude, that is, to regard clients as people; (2) their ability to estimate social values, especially, the relative importance of character and comfort; and (3) their ability to understand societal conditions, particularly of the district in which they worked. Urwick continues:

> To these essentials have been added some knowledge of the recent history of methods of relief and administration; some acquaintance with the self-guided efforts of the working classes to raise themselves above the common vicissitudes of poverty; and some familiarity with the agencies at work at the present day.[6]

He did not deny that this information was important, but called it "practical training of a practical age." Society, however, had become complex; it remained the task of social work to meet this complexity. Urwick saw the solution, in part, in social work's relationship to the

---

[5]Edward Johns Urwick, "A School of Sociology," in Methods of Social Advance: Short Studies in Social Practice by Various Authors, ed. Sir Charles S. Loch (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1904); p. 180.

[6]Ibid., p. 181.

newly developed discipline of Sociology.[7] This "science of social life" examined a number of relationships within society, but its students were theoreticians; if social work became content with being a theoretical discipline, it would be as one-dimensional as the practical training it sought to improve. Sociological information, however, could be valuable if the student <u>applied</u> it to the field of social work. Urwick opted for a curriculum which would concern itself with both, the theoretical and the practical:

> Passing by the advantages which would certainly result from a fuller and more widespread understanding among educated people, of the science of social life, we will side with the practical in insisting that there shall be no divorce between practice and theory. The chief value of social education, from our point of view, depends upon its close connection with experience and practical work. The laboratory must be joined to the study; the knowledge of principles which is to illuminate our practice must itself be brought to the test of experience by the learner. In other words, it will not be enough to establish a course of teaching on the lines of a University curriculum leading up to a degree. This is one side, but only one, of the necessary training. In close connection with it must be the practical education, the laboratory work, in so far as the analogy can be applied to work in which, while all our efforts are experimental, wilful experiment is the last thing to be allowed. The student must study the concrete material to be found in existing social conditions. It is doubtful whether this can be done by simple observation; at any rate, it will be done better, and without danger, if he is set to work in some of the simplest and most natural ways un-

---

[7]It is interesting to note that the program affiliated with the London School of Economics was, for nine years, called the School of <u>Sociology</u>, not Social Work or Social Administration.

der the guidance of an experienced administrator or
social worker.[8]

Urwick was not a lone crusader in his attempt to formulate

a social work education program which included the theo-

retical as well as the practical; a number of individuals

had come to the same conclusion. It is questionable, how-

ever, whether or not such a program of social work edu-

cation could have become a reality if the modern universi-

ties had not developed along similar lines. If modern uni-

versities had developed along the same lines as the ancient

universities, social work education, as well as any type of

education which emphasized the application of theory, would

almost inevitably have been viewed as unworthy of universi-

ty affiliation.

The relationship between education and social work

seemed to be present at an even more fundamental level.

In a book entitled Social Work, W. Edward Chadwick charac-

terized social work as ". . . something more than even the

sum of the efforts to deal in detail with the aggregate of

social imperfections."[9] He placed emphasis on the role of

education within the field of social work. Education was

essential for the worker as well as the client:

The education upon which I would here lay stress

[8]Urwick, "A School of Sociology," pp. 187-188.

[9]W. Edward Chadwick, Social Work (London: Longmans,
Green and Co., 1909), p. 10.

must be directed towards supplying two very pressing
needs: first, the very general want of education or
training in the workers themselves, which prevents
them from doing much more useful social work than they
may be doing at the present time; secondly, the want
of education among those for whom the work is being
done.[10]

The worker, however, could not "educate" his clients unless

he himself had been educated for his duties:

> To-day among both amateur and voluntary social
> workers we hear frequent expressions of disappointment
> with the results of their work; they feel they have ex-
> pended their strength in vain and to no purpose. The
> most usual causes of this want of success and conse-
> quent disappointment are: (1) a want of knowledge of the
> conditions--of the complexity, and so of the difficulty
> --of the problem they are attempting to solve; and
> (2) a want of skill--arising from want of training--in
> expending their energy to the best possible effect. It
> is no exaggeration when we say that a social worker
> without some knowledge of the laws of social welfare
> and of the conditions of social progress might be
> likened to a man who, without a scientific knowledge of
> physical and mechanical laws and forces, should attempt
> to construct a mountain railway. Until recently it was
> doubtless very difficult to acquire either the know-
> ledge or the training requisite for useful social serv-
> ices. But that is no longer so. The opportunities for
> obtaining both are, or should be, easily available.
> Where they are not so, it is the fault of those respon-
> sible for supplying themselves and others with them.
> There is certainly no lack of excellent material.[11]

University-based education for social work was <u>one</u> of the

opportunities available to at least a portion of the work-

ers who were now told that they had a responsibility to be

educated for their profession.

One might assume that the link between social work

and education, and the development of a number of university-

---

[10]Ibid.   [11]Ibid., pp. 10-11.

based social work education programs would automatically
lead to the acceptance of such programs as the norm for
educating all social workers. Such an assumption, however,
would occur only if one almost totally disregarded the
nature of English education, especially university educa-
tion. While the need for training was recognized, there
existed as many, or perhaps more, reasons for limiting
university-affiliation for social work education as for
expanding this relationship.

The number of university-based programs might be
used as proof for the legitimacy of such an affiliation.
In 1903, the School of Sociology, headed by Professor E. J.
Urwick, was established in London. This School was to be-
come, in 1912, the Department of Social Science of the
London School of Economics. The following year, the School
of Social Science was established at the University of
Liverpool. In 1908, the University of Birmingham regis-
tered "social students" and granted diplomas to successful
students. It was followed by the University of Bristol
which established a testamur course[12] in Social Study, and
the University of Leeds which offered a diploma in Social

---

[12]A university course after which the student re-
ceived a certificate from the examiners stating that they
are satisfied with the student's work. See The Compact
Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary (1971), s.v.
"Testamur."

Organisation and Public Service. In 1911, the Edinburgh School of Cookery and Domestic Economy inaugurated a course in social study, and in 1912, the Glasgow School for Social Study was established. Although the programs had a similar goal, that is, the education of social workers, they approached their task in a variety of ways, ways determined by the idiosyncrasies of the parent university. At the University of Bristol, for example, training for social work was incorporated into the Department of Education. Elizabeth Macadam, apparently the first individual to systematically study social work education, presented the reasoning behind this decision:

> In a statement by Professor Leonard, it is explained that if a chair of public administration or of some similar subject had existed in Bristol this would naturally have been chosen, but in the absence of such a chair the most convenient department on the whole seemed to be that of Education. The Professor of Education therefore became responsible to the Senate for the social study testamur, and the Warden of the University Settlement became a member of the staff of the Department of Education.[13]

At Glasgow, on the other hand, the School was headed by the Lecturer in Social Economics.

While this lack of uniformity might be attributed to formal social work education's "youth," university-based social work education showed little numerical advancement. In the fifteen-year period between 1903 and 1918, only 269

---

[13]Elizabeth Macadam, The Equipment of the Social Worker (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1925), p. 39.

students had qualified for diplomas or certificates in social work; thirty-one of the students were men.[14] Based on such figures alone, university-based social work education was a failure, but one must turn to general statistics on university enrollment before making such an assumption. In the academic year 1919-1920, 17.8 percent (2,243) of the 12,602 women enrolled in some form of higher education were in programs which awarded diplomas.[15] Since many diplomas took two years to earn, one might assume that approximately 1,100 women received diplomas in 1920. This figure, however, included all teachers trained in diploma programs. While the exact number of social workers educated in university-based programs in 1920 has not been established, such programs usually produced two or three students in each university during its first few years, the number increasing as each department became more established. One might safely assume that the majority of this figure of 269 were graduated at the end of the fifteen-year period. In summary, although the figure was small, it is indicative of the general state of university education of the period; university-based social work education reflected the British educational system's attitude regarding the desir-

---

[14]Ibid., p. 36.

[15]A. H. Halsey, ed., Trends in British Society Since 1900 (London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1972), p. 222.

ability of easy access to a university education.

While the growth of university-based social work edu-

cation was slow, the effort was not abandoned. Advocates

of such a training program, however, faced a number of

formidable obstacles:

> The practical bodies had genuine and not alto-
> gether ill-founded fears that the universities were not
> in a position to supply the experience which they con-
> sidered essential. They feared that classroom study
> would "choke out the real thing," the human approach;
> they feared that training removed from the centres of
> activity to the cloistered atmosphere of the university
> would inevitably become less applied and realist in its
> bearings. Employing bodies . . . looked for solid
> qualities such as capacity for hard work, technical ef-
> ficiency, tact, a sense of vocation or missionary spirit
> (an essential quality especially in the eyes of those
> who offered very small salaries), which are not neces-
> sarily the product of the lecture room. Religious or-
> ganizations, more narrowly segregated than at the pres-
> ent time, dreaded secular contacts and feared that the
> religious motive might be stifled by free discussion
> and a scientific outlook on social problems.
> On the other hand the universities, especially
> the older universities, while accepting the responsi-
> bility of education for well established professions--
> law, medicine, the Church, and education--were reluc-
> tant to admit the claims of an unfamiliar hybrid occu-
> pation even when it cloaked its humble origin under the
> dignified title of public or social administration.
> Even the younger civic universities, which opened their
> doors to students of architecture, town planning, engi-
> neering, dentistry, agriculture, looked with misgivings
> on the inclusion of a form of training for so multi-
> farious and ill-defined a career.[16]

While university-based social work education was opposed by

a variety of individuals, for a number of reasons, programs

---

[16]Elizabeth Macadam, The Social Servant in the Making:
A Review of the Provisions of Training for the Social Serv-
ices (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1945), pp. 32-33.

continued to grow. But, more important, there was an attempt made to coordinate the programs already in existence. Early efforts included a 1910 conference held at the School of Sociology in London, during which the possibilities for a uniform curriculum and methods of practical work were discussed; a similar conference held at the Woodbrooke Settlement in Birmingham in 1911; and a conference held in 1918 by the Association for the Education of Women in Oxford. Perhaps the most significant event, however, was the establishment of the Joint University Council for Social Studies in 1918. This Council patterned itself after the Joint Social Studies Committee for London, which was first constituted in 1916. The Committee's functions were as follows:

> . . . to ensure "that there shall be provided adequate courses of instruction, including practical experience, for voluntary social workers; to review the provision actually made by any of the constituent colleges of the University of London and by other organizations, and if these are not sufficient, to take steps to secure any fresh provision that may be necessary.[17]

Membership on the Committee was held by a number of independent social workers as well as faculty members of the London School of Economics (including Professor E. J. Urwick and Sidney Webb) and King's College for Women. Sir Cooper

---

[17]The Joint Social Studies Committee for London, Part-Time Social Study Courses for Social Workers and Adult Students (London: P. S. King and Sons, Ltd., 1918), p. 4.

Perry was Chairman while Elizabeth Macadam served as Secretary. Although the Committee was dissolved in 1918 (committee membership lists point to the fact that some individuals were holding positions on the Committee as well as the Council), it published a report on part-time social studies programs in London. And even though its specific concern was part-time programs, the Committee insisted that such courses follow the general format of full-time programs; that is, there was to be a balance of academic instruction and practical work. Academic instruction was to include courses in economic history, industrial history, social economics, social organization and social philosophy. Practical work was to consist of two parts:

"(1) Actual work in connexion with various Organizations for Social Welfare under Direction.--In order that the student should understand working-class life in all its aspects the practical work was selected from the following five divisions. In every case, however, his previous experience was taken into consideration.

"(a) Adult life approached through normal standards, through Workers' Educational Association, Co-operative Guilds, Friendly Societies, Labour Organizations, Welfare Work in Factories, etc.

"(b) Problems of Childhood and Adolescence, through Care Committees, Juvenile Advisory and Skilled Employment Committees.

"(c) Health and Disease, through Care Committees (medical), Health Visiting, Invalid Children's Aid Association, Schools for Mothers.

"(d) Organization of Social Welfare and Relief of Distress, as Charity Organisation Society, Guilds of Help, etc.

"(e) Problems of Disablement arising out of the War.

"(2) Visits to Institutions of Social Interest.--These are a necessary corollary to the lectures on social organization, and form a link between the theoretical and practical. They include institutions connected with:

"(a) Municipal Government.

"(b) Administration of Justice, Police Courts, Children's Courts.

"(c) Conditions of Factory Life, Industrial Law, Trade Unions.

"(d) School Life--Elementary, Continuation, and Industrial.

"(e) Poor Law.

"(f) Hospitals, Sanitaria, etc.

"(g) Employment Exchanges.

"(h) Housing."[18]

While the Committee concerned itself initially with voluntary workers, with a limited amount of time for study, war conditions increased the number of social workers, salaried as well as voluntary, who were in need of formal training. The war generated new needs, but it also appeared to be responsible for a more receptive attitude towards social work. The Committee attributed this interest to: (1) a new concern for the future and the changes which this future would bring, and (2) the passage of the Representation of the People Act, which extended the franchise to some women, and ". . . greatly stimulated the sense of responsibility for

---

[18]Ibid., pp. 6-7.

the future that the war had already awakened among women."[19]
While the Committee felt that such an attitude would result
in an increase in the number of men and women entering
formal programs of social work education, it stressed that
University departments of Social Study should be fully uti-
lized before "extension centres" were expanded.[20] A "Uni-
versity atmosphere," a better selection of courses, more
heterogenous mix of students, and inducement to extended
study, were the reasons given by the Committee, for this
position. The Committee did not reject education schemes
sponsored by various organizations, but felt that it was
vital for effective programs to be linked up with the Uni-
versity in some way.

During the period 1916 to 1918, the Committee found
that ninety students took the courses offered by the Uni-
versity and Battersea Polytechnic. Of this total, however,
only twenty-two presented themselves for examinations;
twenty students passed. Although the Committee felt that
the students, all adults and little-experienced in the
examination process, could not always be fairly rated by
examinations, such examinations (written as well as oral)
were deemed necessary to give the part-time programs the

---

[19]Ibid., p. 9.

[20]Wartime demands for social workers trained in
dealing with war pension recipients had prompted the estab-
lishment of a part-time course of study at Battersea Poly-
technic.

same academic legitimacy sought by full-time programs.

The life of the Committee was short, but its work was carried on and expanded by the Joint University Council for Social Studies, which first met on April 27, 1918. Like the Committee, the Council sought to organize and bring a sense of unity to the university-based social work programs already in existence. Its first publication, Social Study and Training in the Universities (1918) presented an outline of the Council's position. Its major points were summarized as follows:

"(1) Social Study should in some way be associated with a University.

"(2) The subjects of a Social Study course should include:--
"(a) The historical account of the origin of existing social and economic conditions, with particular stress on the more recent stages of their evolution.
"(b) A description of present day social and economic life.
"(c) The analysis of economic facts, together with an introduction to methods of investigation.
"(d) The discussion of the principles and methods of social administration, including industrial law, the functions and organs of local government and the working of voluntary agencies.
"(e) A philosophical statement and examination of social principles, aims and ideals.

"(3) Practical experience in different forms of social work should be clearly related to the lectures and should include opportunities of contact with normal working-class life.

"(4) The teaching should be given as far as possible by persons who have themselves experience of social administration.

"(5) Provision should be made for post-graduate courses as well as courses for non-graduate students.

"(6) General all round instruction and practical experience should in every case precede any form of specialisation both for graduates and non-graduates.

"(7) Such schemes of social study should be utilised for those desiring to enter the public social services."[21]

This report provided perhaps the first proposal for a unified system of social work education. It sought to offer an integrated course of academic and practical work to a student body which included salaried as well as voluntary workers, and degreed as well as non-degreed students; at the same time, it recognized the fact that a social study course of this type was not a substitute for a degree program. Students usually fell into three categories: (1) degree program graduates, (2) experienced workers with little or no previous academic training, and (3) students seeking a career for which a university degree was not necessary. Furthermore, it recognized specialization as valid, but only after the student had undertaken a general course, which included practical experience in a variety of settings. (In most instances, the student spent the first year in a general course and the second year in a special area.) By advocating practical experience in a variety of settings, the Council appeared to be attempting to guard against one of the problems of agency-sponsored training programs, that

---

[21]The Joint University Council for Social Studies, Survey of Work During the Years 1918-1935 (London: The Joint University Council for Social Studies, 1935), pp. 5-7.

is, over-specialization which left the worker with little knowledge of, or ability to work in, other settings.

Although university-based education continued to face a number of problems, for example, the superiority of the degree versus the diploma and certificate, the number of university-based programs grew. In 1919, Oxford established a certificate course in social studies, in conjunction with its diploma program in Economics and Political Science. During the same year, the Social Studies Department was opened at Bedford College (University of London). In 1920, the Dundee School of Social Study and Training was begun under the auspices of the University of St. Andrews; the program had both day and evening sessions and awarded diplomas and certificates. When the Council issued another training report in 1921, the following thirteen universities were represented: Belfast, Birmingham, Bristol, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Leeds, Liverpool, London (King's College, Bedford College and the London School of Economics), Manchester, Oxford, St. Andrews, Aberystwyth College of the University of Wales and the University College of South Wales (Cardiff). In essence, it seems as if university-based social work education, with its emphasis on general skills followed by specialization, promised to bring to social work at least a degree of the unity so obviously lacking in the field.

While social work in general continued in the struggle to define its boundaries, social work educators seemed most willing to lead this struggle.[22] These educators saw the transition from a variety of short courses to "similar" university-based education as, of necessity, gradual but essential. In the words of Elizabeth Macadam, social work education in 1925 possessed the potential to move in this direction:

> The aim of the social study movement is to prevent innumerable ad hoc training schemes for each separate aspect of social administration. The social services, higher or lower, have far too much in common for this. . . . The association with the university gives the safest guarantee that the training will produce in the future worker that wide, liberal, and philosophic outlook which we regard as essential to every branch of social service. There is good reason, however, to hope that the proposed provision of less advanced and shortened courses would be only a temporary expedient. Many departments of social service are still in a state of comparative uncertainty. As they crystallize into recognized professions with more assured prospects, there can be little doubt that standards of training will rise and that students will refuse to be content with the second best forms of preparation for their future career.[23]

---

[22]Early social work came from a tradition of diverse agencies, each with specific objectives and different definitions of "social work." The result was a large body of individuals who, in many instances, had little in common with one another. Similarly, although the agencies oftentimes recognized the need for training, their individual differences took preference over any cooperation for education. The membership in a general organization, possession of a common type of expertise and acceptance of a certain type of education, which lent a sense of unity to virtually every other type of "profession" was all but absent from the field of social work; the university provided the common bond.

[23]Macadam, The Equipment of the Social Worker, pp. 74-75.

Although university-based social work education assumed that <u>some</u> information was to be common to all social workers, it did not reject the idea of specialization. Movements such as the Child Guidance Movement, which was introduced to Great Britain from the United States in 1927, wanted specialized social workers who were familiar with the body of theory and practice developed by those medical and psychological specialists who worked with "disturbed" children. The London School of Economics was the first university to respond to this specialized need.

Another special need for which workers were to be trained was welfare work. Although "welfare workers" were employed prior to the war, the influx of women into the factories, especially munitions factories, between the years 1914 and 1918 greatly increased the demand for these individuals.[24] Adequately trained women, however, were difficult to find. In 1917, two conferences were held in order that a solution might be worked out. The first conference was convened by the Joint Social Studies Committee for London and directed towards representatives of university departments of social work, the second was convened by the Home Office, and attended by University rep-

---

[24]In evidence given in 1892 before the Royal Commission on Labour, it was urged that factories which employed a number of women were also to employ a woman in a position of "authority" who would handle the women workers' questions or complaints about discipline, health and sanitation.

resentatives and others interested in the Government's stance on this issue. Although the same war conditions which created the problem also disrupted the solution (the placement of welfare work specialization into university departments of social work), the Welfare Workers' Institute, formally constituted as a professional association in 1919, insisted that members possess a certificate or diploma from an "approved" training institution.[25] In most instances, the university was considered to be the most logical agent. In a 1921 report issued by the Joint University Council for Social Studies, welfare work curriculum was one of the topics discussed:

> We are in agreement with the view that candidates for welfare work should receive the regular training for social workers, with certain options in the second year, and consider that in the first year there should be as little specialisation as possible.[26]

Specialization in the second year included courses in Industrial Law, Business Organization, and Industrial Problems; practical work in the second year was to be under the tuition of an individual who had an extensive amount of welfare experience.

While "specialization" had always been a trait of social work (even the very early charities were set up to

---

[25]Joint University Council for Social Studies, University Training for Welfare Work in Industry and Commerce (London: P. S. King and Sons, Ltd., 1921), pp. 4-5.

[26]Ibid., p. 10.

meet specific needs or serve certain groups of people),
the universities gave a sense of legitimacy to this con-
cept. University-based social work education honored the
British tradition of specialized social services, but de-
manded a common base of knowledge from its students. In
this sense, social workers were specialized _first_ in the
type of skills they possessed, _and then_ with regard to the
type of client they served.

While the university-based social work education
system of 1930 continued to be viewed with some distrust
from virtually every quarter, it had become a permanent
part of the university. Loose definitions of "social
study" would prompt departments of social science to pro-
vide courses for various sectors of the British population,
and turns in the economy would threaten programs, but the
commitment to social work education within the university
system had been made. The following section will examine
the adoption (and adaptation) of social work education by
several universities.

Specific University Responses to the Educational Needs of Social Workers

The first British university to "formally" associate
itself with social work was the University of Liverpool.
Edward Gonner, Professor of Economics at Liverpool, repre-
sentatives of the Victoria Settlement for Women, and the

Liverpool Central Relief and Charity Organisation Society
joined together in the establishment of the School of Social
Science in 1904. According to Elizabeth Macadam, an early
faculty member, the relationship was "questionable," to say
the least:

> It must be admitted that the connection of the School
> with the University in those early years was rather
> that of a poor and uninteresting relation than an hon-
> oured member of the University family group. The School
> had its own executive committee, it arranged its cur-
> riculum and conducted its examinations independently of
> University control; it raised its own funds, with con-
> siderable difficulty; its students were not registered
> students of the University, and the lectures given by
> members of the staff were entirely voluntary on their
> part.[27]

While social work might not have entered the university at
the status level which social workers had aspired to, the
university did appear to make an effort to "present" the
program which did exist. In the 1905 Calendar, the pro-
gram's purpose was defined:

> The School of Training for Social Work in con-
> nexion with the University has been established with the
> object of providing an opportunity of systematic study
> and training for those already engaged, or anxious to
> engage in, any of the many forms of social and chari-
> table work.[28]

Five individuals were listed as faculty members, and each
dealt with a specific subject area (three of the members
were from other departments). They were as follows:

---

[27]Macadam, The Equipment of the Social Worker, p. 34.

[28]The University of Liverpool, Calendar 1904-1905
(Liverpool: The University of Liverpool, 1904), p. 336.

Social Ethics--Professor J. MacCunn (Philosophy)
Practice of Charity--Rev. C. J. Rogers
Civic Administration--Miss Eleanor Rathbone
History of Administration--Ramsay Muir (Modern History)
Social Economics--Prof. E. C. K. Gonner (Economic
       Science)[29]

The complete course, which cost Ł1 1s for two terms, con-
sisted of lectures, classes and expeditions, and practical
work. Lectures and classes, however, were open to any
person willing to pay 5s per term. The program for that
year consisted of ten lectures by Prof. Gonner on "Society
and its Economic Functions," ten lectures by Rev. Rogers on
"Poverty and its Remedies," five lectures by Miss Rathbone
on "The Corporate Life of a Great City," and five lectures
by Prof. MacCunn on "Social Obligations." Special evening
lectures on "Needs of Social Work," "Thrift," and "German
and American Systems of Poor Relief" were also sponsored.
Most practical work was undertaken at the Liverpool Central
Relief and Charity Organisation Society.

While the program continued to provide for the needs
of social workers, the obligation to also meet the needs of
other residents of Liverpool seemed to be taken seriously
by the University.[30] In line with this responsibility, the
School of Training for Social Work provided a series of

---

[29]Ibid.

[30]Professor Ramsay Muir, who lectured in the School
of Training for Social Work, was responsible for the estab-
lishment of a University Extension Society at Liverpool in
1899.

lectures which it felt would be beneficial to those individuals involved in friendly societies, cooperative societies and thrift societies. Courses of lectures continued to be open to individuals other than those enrolled in the entire program (which had soon established a certificate for students successfully completing the one-year course).

Although the university participated in the adult education movement, one would find little reason to state that social work education had suffered as a result. In fact, it appears to have prospered. By 1910, the School was offering a two-year course of study. The program continued to consist of lectures, classes and practical work, but the pace of the work appeared to intensify, and the social work faculty grew. In 1912, there were nine class categories (Social Ethics, Social Economics, Social and Industrial History, Aspects of the Social Problem, Poor Law History and Administration, Local Administration, The State and Education, Social Psychology and The Town and its Problems) and nine faculty members. A diploma, rather than a certificate, was granted to students who successfully completed the program.

While the School was initially concerned with a basic education for social work, the move towards specialization was not ignored. According to a statement in the Calendar of 1915-1916:

This specialised training must of necessity vary according to the type of work to be undertaken subsequently. The School, being in close touch with social movements and practical work of different kinds, is able to offer opportunities of combined academic study and practical experience suited to the varying needs of the students.[31]

The School appeared to be well-suited to provide training for social workers who wished to work in the health field; special courses were undertaken with the School of Hygiene, and medical social work was to be an end result.

The first decade of the twentieth century saw the expansion of the School's program of social work education, but the end of the second decade proved to be even more significant to social work education's acceptance as an _internal_ part of the University. In 1917, the School was fully incorporated into the University, and the following actions resulted:

> . . . A University Board of Social Studies was constituted with the following members: the Vice-Chancellor, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Professors of Bacteriology, Hygiene, Philosophy, Civic Design, Economics, Education, Geography, Mediaeval and Modern History, Lecturer in Methods and Practice of Social Work, with the Wardens of the University Settlements and other persons of appropriate knowledge and experience, not exceeding one-third of the total number of the members of the Board. The composition of this Board is stated in full because it bore evidence to the realization of the fact not fully grasped previously that "social studies" embraced widely different aspects of university teaching. Under the new arrangement the diploma hitherto issued by the committee of the School became a diploma of the University open to students of graduate

---

[31]University of Liverpool, _Calendar 1915-1916_ (Liverpool: University of Liverpool, 1915), p. 266.

standing [italics mine] and the appointment of teach-
ers and other matters connected with the School became
subject to the confirmation of the Senate. In addi-
tion to the diploma, the University offered a certif-
icate course for non-graduates.[32]

Without relinquishing its responsibility to individuals

other than social workers who wanted a "social education,"

the University had placed social work education in a "re-

spectable" position.[33] Courses and lectures were joined

by at least three hours per week of tutorial instruction,

and written as well as oral examinations and observation,

were used as criteria for successful course completion.

By 1926, the Department had once again expanded to a

School, but not for the reasons of status which had pre-

viously kept it separate:

> The Liverpool School of Social Sciences and Administra-
> tion comprises four departments of the Faculty of Arts
> --Economics, Commerce, Geography and Social Science.
> These departments retain their independence, but have
> been grouped together under a Common Board to achieve
> closer cooperation between essentially cognate sub-
> jects.[34]

Programs in the School included: a Certificate in Social

Science, a Diploma in Commerce, Geography or Social Science,

a B.A. (Ordinary Degree) in Economics, Geography or Social

---

[32]Macadam, The Equipment of the Social Worker, p. 40.

[33]The desire that diploma course students be uni-
versity graduates ended to some degree, the tendency to
characterize social work students as individuals who were
either too lazy or too dull to pursue a degree.

[34]University of Liverpool, Calendar 1926-1927
(Liverpool: University of Liverpool, 1926), p. 214.

Science, a B.A. (Honours) in Economics, Geography or Social Science, and a M.A. in the same subjects. In addition, agencies could request that the University present a course of lectures to the agency's workers. In summary, it appears that the University of Liverpool recognized the need for well-educated social workers, but was unable to do so without ignoring the needs of the community which had played a large role in its growth.

Another of the early attempts at formal social work education was begun at the University of Birmingham. In 1905, an executive committee of the University fashioned an evening course in social work. Consisting of twenty-five lectures, the course offered neither a certificate nor a degree; no practical experience was included. In 1908, the course became a day course and students were able to attend some of the lectures attended by degree students. "Visits of observation" were added, and students who successfully completed the year's work were awarded a diploma. Two years later, the Social Study Committee, consisting of professors as well as settlement leaders, was instituted. Practical work was extended and oral examinations in this area were used. Like Liverpool, Birmingham responded to the call for specialization; in 1917 a set of special lectures was arranged for those students who wished to become welfare

workers.[35]

In 1920, the program opted for a two-year, full-time course of study. Several years later, it joined with the Commerce Department to become the Faculty of Commerce and Social Science. Course work, however, respected the suggestions made by the Joint University Council for Social Studies, and courses were, in fact, quite similar to those offered in Liverpool.

While it appears that the majority of university-based social work programs were, from the beginning, legitimate social work programs, this was not always the case. Bedford College's Department of Social Studies rose from the ashes of the Hygiene Program. This program, which had originally been instituted for the purpose of training workers in the Department of Public Health, failed to attract more than twelve students a year.[36] While the Department of Hygiene was replaced by the Department of Social Studies, hygiene remained the College's specialty; Bedford College concentrated on training Health Visitors. Certificates were awarded to students who successfully com-

[35]Winifred E. Cavenagh, Four Decades of Students in Social Work (Birmingham: Research Board, Faculty of Commerce and Social Science, University of Birmingham, 1950), pp. 1-2.

[36]Margaret Tuke, A History of Bedford College for Women 1849-1937 (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), pp. 232-233.

pleted the course.[37]

The final example which will be examined is the social work program established at the London School of Economics of the University of London. The School of Sociology, as stated previously, was an outgrowth of the C.O.S. Committee for Social Education, which was in turn the descendant of the Joint Lectures Committee (a team effort on the part of the Women's University Settlement at Southwark, the Charity Organisation Society and the National Union of Women Workers). Its director, Mr. E. J. Urwick, took a sociological approach to social work. Although one can merely speculate about this choice, and the degree to which it was followed,[38] such a position would make the School attractive to the founders of the London School of Economics. The Fabian Socialists were in obvious opposition to the haphazard type of social work which existed during the nineteenth century. If social workers could be "properly" educated, they would work for societal change, rather than continuing with a patchwork approach. On the surface, the

---

[37]Since Bedford College had been established in part as a teacher training institution and had also trained public health workers, little precedent had been set for the awarding of degrees.

[38]After a thorough search of the materials held by the London School of Economics, the archivist of that School concluded that the material has either been misplaced or destroyed. Marjorie Smith encountered the same difficulty in 1952. It is also interesting to note that the School is not mentioned in the Calendar until 1912.

L.S.E. Department of Social Science and Administration, financed until 1923 by the Ratan Tata Foundation, had a purpose stated in terms similar to those of any other university-based social work program, that is, prospective social workers were to be trained in a program which united theoretical and practical knowledge, but L.S.E. seemed to place a greater degree of emphasis on potential social change. Courses of lectures given in 1912 included: "Types of State Assistance," "Recent Social Movements," "Recent Social Reform," and "Working Class Life."[39] Students were also advised to take courses in economics, economic history, statistics, law, politics, public administration, and sociology. Students who successfully completed a year's work were awarded a certificate. While certificates lacked the status of degrees, the number of certificates awarded by the Department during the years 1912 to 1932 rose steadily. During this period, a total of 708 Social Science Certificates were awarded; this accounted for approximately one-third of the total number of degrees, diplomas and certificates awarded during this period.[40] Percentages of social work students at other uni-

---

[39]The London School of Economics and Political Science of the University of London, Calendar 1912-1913 (London: The London School of Economics and Political Science of the University of London, 1912), p. 83.

[40]The London School of Economics and Political Science, Register 1895-1932 (London: The London School of Economics and Political Science, 1934), p. xv.

versities did not even come close to meeting this figure.

Although the Department did not dilute its approach to the study of society, it did not fail to respond to the need for "special" knowledge. By 1930, it had instituted a "Course for Social Workers in Mental Health." While this move lagged behind the acceptance of psychiatry by other nations, notably the United States, it is symbolic of the flexibility which characterized British university-based social work education. While virtually every university that instituted such a program brought a greater degree of realization to the late-nineteenth-century desire for the amalgamation of theory and practice, and the Joint University Council for Social Studies brought unity to those university-based programs, each program was, in large part, a product of the particular university system in which it resided. Universities such as Liverpool, which were intensely involved in adult education, provided education for social workers, but in no way excluded workingclass citizens interested in "social study." Schools such as Bedford College reshaped but did not abandon, a program which had fallen into obsolescence. The London School of Economics, on the other hand, saw the Department of Social Science and Administration as a practical experiment in peaceful, but substantial, social change.

To dismiss the advances made by social work education during the period 1904 to 1930 as minimal, is to take them

out of the context of education in general. Within a period of twenty-six years, social work had moved from a system of haphazard agency-based education to university-based education. The modern universities, which had been comparatively favorable to the entrance of social work into the formal educational system had, through their own idiosyncrasies, placed restrictions on the type of social work education that could develop. A study which ignored the first factor would have a difficult time accounting for the appearance of a rather large number of social work programs within a short period of time. On the other hand, a study which ignored the second factor would be unable to account for social work's continued insistence on specialization.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

This historical study has examined the development of university-based social work education in Great Britain between the years 1880 and 1930. University-based social work education in Great Britain was peculiarly British; although British social work had "exported" many of its agencies, such as the Charity Organisation Society and the settlements, and would import American and Canadian concepts of casework, education for social work was a product of more than social agencies. Just as the social agencies were responses to the needs of society at a particular point in time, social work education was a response to the needs of the workers within these agencies. An additional factor, however, came into play: the development of social work education was determined, in part, by the educational system in which it resided. University-based social work education became a reality because society "demanded" it and the educational system encouraged its development. Any study which disregards either of these factors will arrive at distorted conclusions about how and why university-based social work education began, grew, and became a permanent part of university education.

A study of social service prior to 1800 reveals a

relatively simple structure. An individual in distress could seek outside help from two sources: the government and members of the upperclass. The government <u>might</u> supply him with indoor or outdoor relief, governed by the provisions of the Poor Law of 1601. Private citizens, on the other hand, <u>might</u> give him money or aid-in-kind such as clothing, food or shelter; the "pattern" of such assistance, however, was determined entirely by the benefactor's sense of obligation as well as his estimation of the recipient's merit. The indigent were locked into this non-system of assistance; society had created it, and allowed the client no means of escape--even if educational aspirations existed, the educational system did not allow for their fulfillment.

A study of social services after 1800, on the other hand, becomes increasingly complex with each decade studied. The government response to the needs of the poor became less liberal; the Elizabethan Poor Law was replaced by the Poor Law of 1834 which virtually forced the destitute to choose between the dehumanizing workhouse and starvation. The harsh nature of the Poor Law was criticized by its "victims" but attempts at compensation came from a number of areas. Some members of the upperclass continued to appease the poor (and in some instances, their own consciences) with sporadic gifts of money and aid-in-kind, but

a new type of assistance was also being given. Working on
the assumption that monetary aid and aid-in-kind served only
to mask, not alleviate poverty, members of the upperclass
began to offer the poor "wise" advice, ranging from lessons
in nutrition and hygiene to guides for socially-acceptable
behavior. Although this system of social service main-
tained that the poor needed more than financial help, it
continued in a tradition that accepted, as a matter of
fact, benefactor superiority and client inferiority. The
beginning of the nineteenth century, however, also saw the
formalization of a new type of assistance: self-help move-
ments. Although an element of self help had been present
in lowerclass British society prior to this time, it was
not until the 1830s that friendly societies were organized;
they were followed by the development of cooperative so-
cieties in the 1840s. This development was significant in
at least two ways: (1) the poorer members of society proved
themselves capable of organizing to provide for some of
their own needs--they were not totally dependent on the
upperclass; and (2) the benefactors were shown that life
which was one step above starvation was not to be gra-
ciously embraced by the poor.

In the 1860s, the Poor Law and self-help movements
continued in the tradition in which they had begun. Volun-
tary social service, however, developed in a variety of

directions. Private philanthropy, that is, monetary aid
and aid-in-kind, was in no way abandoned. Nor did "wise"
advisers give up their mission to teach the poor, but they
were joined by individuals who felt that financial as-
sistance and advice were insufficient. One such group led
by Octavia Hill viewed decent housing, cared for and paid
for by the poor (under the supervision of Hill's visi-
tors) as the key to assistance. Although Hill's plan was
an important initiative to remedy the problem of poor
housing (the government did not take any action until 1884
when the Royal Commission on Housing was formed), it also
assumed that the visitors who were to staff the plan would
be trained.

Training was also the concern of another segment of
the system of voluntary social work--the Charity Organisa-
tion Society. Formed in 1869, the C.O.S. envisioned it-
self as a body which would bring some semblance of organi-
zation to the wide array of charities in existence at the
time. It assumed that clients should receive assistance
which was appropriate to their needs as well as their abil-
ity to provide for these needs. This determination of ap-
propriateness, however, could be made only after a thor-
ough investigation of the client. Investigation could
only be undertaken by a trained investigator; if the C.O.S.
was to achieve its objective, it had to be staffed by

trained investigators.

While Hill and the C.O.S. added to voluntary social work's scope (in terms of the type of service rendered), they made a commitment to some form of social work training. It appears at the present time that neither the wide range of services offered nor this commitment to training have been disregarded.

Hill's housing scheme and the C.O.S. continued to develop, but they were joined by other social service efforts, efforts which were the result of societal changes. The workingclass, which had begun in the early-nineteenth century to meet its own needs through self-help movements, began demanding help from society. A large percentage of this assistance was defined in educational terms. Although the government responded with such measures as the Forster Education Act of 1870 which made the promise of universal elementary education, and the University Extension Movement begun in 1873 made university education at least a remote possibility for members of the workingclass and women, neither social service clients nor their representatives were satisfied. Groups such as the Fabian Society wanted a non-revolutionary redistribution of the rewards of society. The fact that all citizens of British society had similar needs was beginning to be verbalized.

The growth of the Fabian Society did not stand as an

isolated effort to right societal wrongs. A response also came from the universities. Toynbee Hall, begun in 1884 by Samuel Barnett, was the first in a long line of settlements which brought the university face-to-face with a troubled society. This response was made possible, in part, because the modern universities were situated in industrial cities; they could not escape the problems which surrounded them. The involvement of the university settlements gave social service an even broader definition and presumed a different type of relationship between worker and client. A settlement approach, based on education through companionship, viewed all parties on a somewhat equal footing; that is, each possessed a uniqueness which could be communicated to the other. In addition, the settlement worker's university education had presented him with a theoretical view of society; work in the settlement "actualized" the economic, sociological, political and historical information which he had acquired. In an attempt to integrate these two types of information, the settlements established lecture programs for its workers. The first such program was established in 1892 by the Women's University Settlement at Southwark. Other organizations such as the C.O.S., which also stressed training, joined with the Settlement--the result being the creation of the Joint Lectures Committee in 1897 and the Committee for Social Edu-

cation in 1901.

The settlements initially intended to extend education opportunities to the lowerclass. Their efforts, however, were being surpassed by groups such as the Workers' Educational Association. While lowerclass children were finally beginning to benefit from legislation affecting elementary education, their parents were utilizing the existing agencies of adult education and organizing educational programs which would best meet their needs. The settlements did not abandon their educational work within the community, but turned a greater portion of their attention to the education of social workers.

The first decade of the twentieth century saw the growth of social service. The government established the Royal Commission to study poor relief in 1905--although the Commission's Reports did not foster legislation, they did point to the fact that the system of poor relief created by the Poor Law of 1834 was totally ineffective in twentieth-century Great Britain. Legislation such as the Old Age Pensions Act of 1908 and the National Insurance Act of 1911 demonstrated the commitment of the government to meeting the basic financial needs of its citizens. While such legislation merely foreshadowed the measures which would eventually lead to Great Britain's welfare state status, this legislation did a great deal to shape the development of

social work as well as social work education. Social
workers could be helpful to the client if they were aware
of what the client was entitled to by virtue of his British
citizenship, and what additional needs the client mani-
fested, which were not being met by government programs.

Early social workers had demonstrated that needs
could be defined in a number of ways. This point of view
led to the creation of a number of social work specialties.
While some of the "specialization" bordered on the ridicu-
lous, such specialization as hygiene and hospital social
work and work with factory laborers attracted a large num-
ber of potential social workers. This new specialization,
however, demanded a broader knowledge base. Early hospital
almoners, for example, were initially expected to determine
the patient's ability to pay for his hospital care. Medical
social workers, on the other hand, were expected to master
the techniques of social work as well as a knowledge of
hospital administration and basic problems encountered by
patients who entered the hospital.

The most obvious agent of such an education was the
university; while it possessed the ability to provide the
social work student with a general knowledge of society, it
was also responsible for the education of those profes-
sionals who would be in frequent contact with the social
worker. Unlike the ancient universities of Oxford and

Cambridge, the modern universities were willing to define education in broad terms. The university settlement workers had made a commitment to the field of social work education, and university faculties were willing to assume this commitment. University settlements, which had at one time been a primary source of training for social work, were to become key field placements for the practical aspect of social work education. By 1930, twelve universities had established programs for the education of social workers. Although these programs had a common identity (each belonged to the Joint University Council for Social Studies and Public Administration, and as a result, was committed to a similar core program for general social work prescribed by the Council) each was shaped by the university in which it resided. Programs such as the one at the London School of Economics followed the School's research orientation and social perspective, and took an approach which emphasized social administration and policymaking. Other programs, such as the one at Bedford College, followed in the footsteps of another department, in this particular case the Hygiene Department. Programs located in the universities of industrial cities such as Liverpool responded to the needs of factory workers, a primary concern of the university.

By 1930, British universities had committed them-

selves to the education of <u>some</u> social workers. Although
the number of programs would continue to increase, many
social workers would continue to be agency trained. A
recent article in <u>The Times Higher Education Supplement</u>[1]
stated that <u>half</u> of all social workers would hold profes-
sional qualifications by the 1980s. Although such quali-
fications were not equated with a university degree, they
did presume a university certificate or diploma obtained
after a two-year course of study (reduced to one year if
the student had a degree in the social sciences.)

British social work, in response to an increasingly
socially-oriented society, had expanded to an almost unbe-
lievable degree between the years 1880 and 1930. While the
government of late-nineteenth-century Great Britain set up
programs to deal with specific social problems such as
housing and unemployment, government programs during the
first three decades of the twentieth century focused on ad-
ditional but less problematic needs; the welfare state as
such was not yet created, but its foundation was laid.
Great Britain might have rejected an out-and-out embrace of
socialism, but its leaders instituted the first of many pro-
grams designed to meet virtually <u>all</u> of its citizens' needs,
from health care to holidays. These massive government-

---

[1]"Half of Social Workers to be Qualified by 1980s,"
<u>The Times Higher Education Supplement</u> (London), 6 August
1976, p. 20.

sponsored programs joined with the numerous private pro-
grams already in existence to form the most encompassing
social service program in a country which still accepts the
idea of private property.

Such programs demanded financing and manpower--in
order to function effectively, workers had to have some
knowledge of the political-economic rationale of the gen-
eral scheme (since such high expenditure met with demands
for an explanation), as well as the workings of their
specific program. The worker needed a qualified source for
such information; this source was found in the university.
The nature of British education, especially university edu-
cation, did not allow for as rapid an increase in university-
based social work education programs, but an increase in
the number of programs designed for this task demonstrated
the university's commitment to social work education.

While British social work and social work education
are "peculiarly" British, a study of their development has
implications for the study of social work and social work
education systems of other countries. The British system
began with a unique combination of factors: a very early
government commitment to deal with the problem of poverty
(the Poor Law of 1601); a diverse assortment of private
charities supported by the upperclass; rather early and in-
creasingly better-organized attempts at self help (first

the friendly and cooperative societies and later, the
Labour Movement); a shift from a _laissez-faire_ to a semi-
socialist philosophy (both within the framework of a mon-
archy); an educational system which evolved from an upper-
class privilege to a classless demand (although its actual
equality remains in question); and a university system
which included degree courses at Oxford and Cambridge,
degree, certificate and diploma courses at the modern uni-
versities and non-credit courses from a variety of sources.
And yet, it was the _combination_ of these factors, not one
factor alone, which made British social work unique.
Prussia had begun with a much more comprehensive system of
government programs; Canada and Australia had adopted many
of Britain's private charity measures; the United States
rejected the concept of welfare state, but embraced the pro-
grams which implied the title. Each of the factors was
present in at least one country besides Great Britain, but
only Great Britain felt the presence of all. The pressure
created by the interaction of these factors could not be
ignored--if the response had not come from a feeling of com-
mitment to humanity, it would have come out of fear (the
workingclass, for example, could virtually immobilize
British society by striking). British leadership (political,
social and educational) had opted to meet _all_ basic needs,
plus additional, non-essential needs; its definition of

social service had to be equally broad.

While each country defines its needs differently it must in the end, define these needs as well as ways of meeting them; it must design its own system of social work. In a socialist country, for example, needs are frequently defined by government leadership alone; citizen demands are viewed as threats, and individual needs are nonentities. Such a system of social work needs administrators, not caseworkers; an education for such social work focuses on administration. In countries such as Canada and the United States, on the other hand, needs are divided into two categories: social and individual. Social needs are usually met by broad programs, staffed by administrators (who might be social workers). Individual needs, on the other hand, are dealt with on a one-to-one basis by social workers. While training programs are available for administrators, the majority of social workers are trained to meet individual needs.

The country might borrow from another nation, but it cannot adopt a social service system without in some way adapting it. The settlement, for example, was adopted by the United States, but then adapted to meet the needs of American society; the immigrant, not the indigenous workingman, was the primary focus of the American settlement.

In much the same way, systems of social work educa-

tion set up to meet the needs of social workers must adapt to the educational system in which they seek residence. The British and American systems provide an example. While the British university system permitted an earlier entry of social work education (under the influence of the university settlements), such education was not at a degree level. The social work student earned a diploma or a certificate, and was not expected to take a degree prior to social work study. While the social work student of the present usually completes a degree before entering a certificate or diploma program, this is not always the case. The American university system, however, had adopted the German graduate school; while early social work education was unsuccessful in (and perhaps not desirous of) university affiliation, present-day programs are established in universities as graduate schools of social work. Undergraduate programs are an important aspect of social work education, but the Master of Social Work degree is demanded for many positions.

Taking these factors into consideration, countries designing systems of social work and social work education, as well as foreign "experts" undertaking this task, must examine the historical development of a definition of societal needs, the forces which meet these needs and the educational system's willingness to educate these agents

of change. This task is especially crucial in newly inde-
pendent countries, countries which previously have had so-
cial service systems and educational programs imposed on
them. Independence usually creates new needs, but also
calls for deciding budget priorities. A country with a
limited income would probably meet those needs most cru-
cial to its survival; social service defined in terms of
sophisticated services such as comprehensive health care
(including psychiatric help) is not a priority. Further,
in a country where elementary education is limited, uni-
versity education is usually unobtainable for all but key
government leaders. Disagreements with former rulers
might even decrease the university-access enjoyed previous-
ly. In such a system, social work education is virtually
nonexistent in the country; if it is obtained outside of the
country, it is frequently inappropriate (there is virtu-
ally no evidence to suggest that schools of social work
make any effort to teach about the social service systems
of other countries).

The field of the history of social work education
is vastly underdeveloped. Social workers are trained to
look to the future; they are rarely encouraged to remember
the past. And yet, whether one studies British, American,
Canadian, or any other system of social work, it becomes
apparent that the basis for each system was set long before

any formal program developed. Urban renewal, a definition of "poverty line" and government-created jobs are among the many "new" ideas which were present during the nineteenth century--they are not twentieth-century creations (although they are frequently regarded as such). Solutions to social problems are rarely new; rather, they are reworded and restructured to conform to contemporary society--they remain, however, historical products.

In much the same way, social work education programs are products of history as well as the educational system. In Great Britain's case, social work education was promoted long before it was formalized--the modern universities accepted it, but made it conform to the requirements of British university education.

A lack of interest in social work education by social workers as well as educators presented the author with a limitation: the literature dealing with the history of social work education is minimal. Most universities possess little more than academic calendars which include an outline of social work programs; while we know how programs were formally set up, the individuals most capable of providing further information, have failed to publish (and perhaps even write) their accounts. While authors seeking to examine the history of social work education in other countries will most likely be faced by this same problem,

such studies might be the only link which will allow us to move toward the future without repeating the mistakes of the past out of ignorance of these same mistakes.

SELECTED REFERENCES

PRIMARY SOURCES

Books:

Acland, Arthur H., and Jones, Benjamin. Working Men Co-
     operators. Manchester: Co-operative Union, Ltd.,
     1897.

Attlee, Clement R. The Social Worker. London: G. Bell and
     Sons, Ltd., 1920.

Barnett, Henrietta. The Ethics of the Poor Law. London:
     Bemrose and Sons, Ltd., 1907.

Barnett, Samuel Augustus, and Barnett, Henrietta. Prac-
     ticable Socialism: Essays on Social Reform, new ed.
     London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1895.

_____, and _____. Towards Social Reform. London:
     T. Fisher Unwin, 1909.

Bedford College for Women of the University of London.
     Calendar 1910-1911--1930-1931. London: Bedford Col-
     lege for Women of the University of London, 1910-
     1930.

Bell, G. M., ed. Social Service--A Handbook for Workers
     and Visitors in London and Other Large Towns.
     London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1908.

Bibby, M. E.; Colles, E. G.; Petty, F.; and Sykes, Dr.
     The Pudding Lady--A New Departure in Social Work.
     London: The St. Pancras School for Mothers, 1910.

Booth, Charles. Poor Law Reform. London: Macmillan and
     Co., Ltd., 1910.

Bosanquet, Bernard, ed. Aspects of the Social Problem.
     London: Macmillan and Co., 1895.

Bosanquet, Charles B. P. A Handy-Book for Visitors of the
     Poor in London. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1874.

Bosanquet, Helen. Bernard Bosanquet: A Short Account of His
     Life. London: Macmillan and Co., 1924.

_____. The Family. London: Macmillan and Co., 1906.

_____. The Poor Law Report of 1909: A Summary Explaining the Defects of the Present System, and the Principal Recommendations.of the Commission so far as Relates to England and Wales. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1909.

_____. Rich and Poor. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1896.

_____. Social Work in London, 1869 to 1912: A History of the Charity Organisation Society. London: John Murray, 1914.

_____. The Standard of Life and Other Studies. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1898.

_____. The Strength of the People: A Study in Social Economics. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1902.

Boyle, V. A., ed. Perils of Wealth and Poverty. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1920.

Burdett, Henry Charles, and Loch, Charles Stewart. The Problem of the Poor: the Attitude of the Charity Organisation Society Towards the Mansion House Friendly Workers Scheme: Correspondence. London, 1895.

Cannon, Ida M. Social Work in Hospitals. New York: Survey Associates, Inc., 1923.

Carpenter, Edward; Thomson, J. Arthur; Morrison, W. Douglas; and Bramwell, J. Milne. Humane Science Lectures. London: George Bell and Sons, 1897.

Chadwick, W. Edward. Social Work. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1909.

Coit, Stanton. Neighbourhood Guilds. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1891.

D'Aeth, Frederic. Liverpool Social Workers' Handbook, 2nd ed. Liverpool: Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1916.

_____. Social Administration. Liverpool: Henry Young and Sons, Ltd., 1928.

Devine, Edward T. The Spirit of Social Work. New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1911.

Dexter, Robert Cloutman. Social Adjustment. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.

Drake, Barbara, and Cole, Margaret, eds. Our Partnership. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1948.

Exley, C. H. The Guide to Poor Relief, 2nd ed. Liverpool: Meek, Thomas and Co., Ltd., 1932.

Fawcett, Henry. Pauperism: Its Causes and Remedies. London: Macmillan and Co., 1871.

Foss, William, and West, Julius. The Social Worker and Modern Charity. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1914.

Fowle, T. W. The Poor Law. London: Macmillan and Co., 1881.

Freeman, Arnold. Education Through Settlements. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1920.

Gardner, Mrs. Dunn. The Training of Volunteers. London, 1895.

George, W. L. Engines of Social Progress. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1907.

Gibbs, Mrs. Philip. First Notions of Social Service--Catholic Studies in Social Reform. London: P. S. King and Son, 1913.

Gray, B. Kirkman. Philanthropy and the State. London: P. S. King and Son, 1908.

Green, George H. I Serve: A Handbook of Personal Service. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1915.

Guthrie, Thomas. Seed-Time and Harvest of Ragged Schools--Three Pleas for Ragged Schools. London, 1860; reprint ed., Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1973.

Haldane, Rev. J. B. The Social Workers' Guide. London: Sir Issac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1911.

Hill, Octavia. Homes of the London Poor. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1883.

_____. House Property and its Management: Some Papers on the Methods of Management. London, 1921.

_____. Our Common and Other Short Essays. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1877.

Hopkins, Elice. Work Among the Lost. London: William Macintosh, 1870.

Jevons, W. Stanley. The State in Relation to Labour. London: Macmillan and Co., 1882.

Kelso, Robert W. The Science of Public Welfare. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1928.

Lansbury, George. Your Part in Poverty. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1916.

Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid. Liverpool and the Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid--A Record of 21 Years. Liverpool: Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid Inc., 1931.

Loch, Charles Stewart. The Better Way of Assisting School Children: A Report on Experiments in the Organisation of Charity for the Better Assistance of School Children. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1893.

_____. Charity Organisation, 2nd ed. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1892.

_____. A Great Ideal and its Champion: Papers and Addresses. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1923.

_____. How to Help Cases of Distress: A Handy Reference Book for Almoners and Others, 4th ed. London: Charity Organisation Society, 1890.

_____. Methods of Social Advance: Short Studies in Social Practice by Various Authors. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1904.

_____. A Short Study of Religious and Social Thought in Relation to Charitable Methods and Institutions. London: Macmillan and Co., 1910.

The London School of Economics and Political Science. Calendar 1903-1904--1930-1931. London: The London School of Economics and Political Science, 1903-1930.

_____. Register 1895-1932. London: The London School of Economics and Political Science, 1934.

_____. Review of the Activities and Development of the London School of Economics and Political Science During the Period 1923-1937. London: The London School of Economics and Political Science, 1938.

Lonsdale, Sophia. The English Poor Laws: Their History, Principles and Administration: Three Lectures. London: P. S. King and Sons, 1897.

Macadam, Elizabeth. The Equipment of the Social Worker. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1925.

_____. The Social Servant in the Making: A Review of the Provision of Training for the Social Services. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1945.

MacCunn, John. Liverpool Addresses on Ethics of Social Work. Liverpool: The University Press, 1911.

Maurice, C. Edmund, ed. Life of Octavia Hill as Told in Her Letters. London: Macmillan and Co., 1913.

Maurice, Emily S. Octavia Hill: Early Ideals: From Letters. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1928.

Muirhead, J. H., ed. Bernard Bosanquet and His Friends: Letters Illustrating the Sources and the Development of His Philosophical Opinions. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1935.

Peek, Francis. Social Wreckage: A Review of the Laws of England as they Affect the Poor. London: William Isbister, Ltd., 1883.

Post, Louis. Social Service. New York: A. Wessels, 1909.

Reason, Will. University and Social Settlements. London: Methuen and Co., 1898.

Rowland, Wilfrid T. Social Service: A Survey of Opportunities. London: Student Charities Movement, 1928.

Salt, Henry S., ed. Cruelties of Civilization: A Program of Humane Reform. London: William Reeves, 1897.

Trevelyan, Charles. Seven Articles on London Pauperism and its Relations with the Labour Market. London: Bell and Doldy, 1870.

The University of Leeds. Calendar 1880-1881--1930-1931.
    Leeds: The University of Leeds, 1880-1930.

The University of Liverpool. Calendar 1902-1903--1930-1931.
    Liverpool: The University of Liverpool, 1902-1930.

Urwick, Edward Johns. Luxury and Waste of Life. London:
    J. M. Dent and Co., 1908.

_____. A Philosophy of Social Progress. London: Methuen
    and Co., Ltd., 1912.

_____. The Social Good. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd.,
    1927.

Vesselitsky, V. de. The Homeworker and Her Outlook. London:
    G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1916.

Webb, Beatrice Potter. The Cooperative Movement in Great
    Britain. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1891.

_____. My Apprenticeship. London: Longmans, Green and
    Co., 1926.

Webb, Sidney, and Webb, Beatrice. English Poor Law Policy.
    London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1910.

_____, and _____. Methods of Social Study. London:
    Longmans, Green and Co., 1932.

Woods, Robert Archey. English Social Movements. London:
    Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1892.

Younghusband, Eileen. Report on the Employment and Training
    of Social Workers. Edinburgh: Constable, 1947.

_____. Social Work in Britain--A Supplementary Report on
    the Employment and Training of Social Workers.

Pamphlets:

Agenda Club. An Open Letter to English Gentlemen. London:
    Williams and Norgate, 1910.

Ball, Sidney. What Oxford Can do for Workpeople. London:
    The Workers' Educational Association, 1907.

Barnett, Henrietta. The Work of the Lady Visitors: Written
    for the Council of the Metropolitan Association for
    Befriending Young Servants. London, 1881.

Bicheno, J. E. An Inquiry into the Nature of Benevolence,
    Chiefly with a View to Elucidate the Principles of
    the Poor Laws, and to Show Their Immoral Tendency.
    London: Rowland Hunter, 1817.

Booth, Charles. Comments on Proposals for the Reform of the
    Poor Law. London, 1911.

_____. Improved Means of Locomotion as a Cure for the
    Housing Difficulties of London. London, 1901.

Bosanquet, Bernard. The Social Criterion: or, How to Judge
    of Proposed Social Reform. Edinburgh: Blackwell, 1907.

Bosanquet, Helen. The Administration of Charitable Relief.
    London: The National Council of Women of Great
    Britain, 1898.

_____. Outdoor Medical Relief and the Recommendations of
    the Majority Report. London: National Poor Law Reform
    Association, [1910].

_____. Past Experience in Relief Works. London, 1903.

_____. The "Poverty Line." London: Charity Organisation
    Society, [1903].

_____. Prevention and Cure. London: National Poor Law
    Reform Association, [1910].

British Institute of Adult Education. Interim Report of a
    Commission Appointed to Inquire into the Educational
    Functions of Settlements. London: British Institute
    of Adult Education, 1922.

British Institute and National Council of Social Service.
    Report on the Registration of Charities. London:
    British Institute and National Council of Social Serv-
    ice, 1921.

Carpenter, Mary. What Shall We Do with Our Pauper Chil-
    dren? London: Longman, Brown and Co., 1861.

Cashmore, Hilda. The Possibilities of Industrial Welfare
    Work as a New Profession for Women. Bristol, 1917.

_____. A Statement and a Program. London: The British Association of Residential Settlements, 1929.

Catholic Truth Society. Social Work for Catholic Layfolk. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1908.

Cecil, Henry; Davies, Henry; Dodson, Fred E.; Freeman, Arnold; Lewis, Eben; and Pinner, J. S. Brightest England and the Way In. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1919.

Chance, William. An Appeal to the Guardians of the Poor. London, [1899].

_____. The Better Administration of the Poor Law. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1895.

_____. Children Under the Poor Law. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1897.

_____. Our Treatment of the Poor. London: P. S. King and Son, 1899.

_____. Principles and Practice of the English Poor Law. London, [1902].

Charity Organisation Society. The Feeble-Minded Child and Adult. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1893.

_____. How to Take Down a Case. London: Charity Organisation Society, 1895.

_____. Last Year's Unemployable. London: Charity Organisation Society, 1906.

_____. Principles of Decision. London: Charity Organisation Society, 1914.

_____. A Short Explanation of the Charity Organisation Society. London: Charity Organisation Society, 1904.

Clements, Richard, and Taunton, Agnes. Social Service in Birmingham, 2nd ed. Birmingham: Birmingham Citizens' Society, 1925.

Commission on Inquiry. Full Report into the Subject of the Unemployed in the City of Liverpool. Liverpool, 1894.

Dendy, Miss H. Thorough Charity--A Paper Read at the First Meeting of the Charity Organisation Society Conferences, London, May 15, 1893. London: Spottiswoode and Co., 1893.

Doyle, Andrew. The Poor Law System of Elberfeld. London: Knight and Co., 1871.

Educational Settlements Association. What Educational Settlements are Doing. London: Educational Settlements Association, 1921.

Edwards, Rev. W. Walter. The Poor Law: A Proposal for its Abolition. Shrewsbury: Bunny and Evans, 1875.

The Fabian Society, The Fabian Election Manifesto. London: The Fabian Society, 1892.

_____. The Fabian Society. London: The Fabian Society, 1889.

_____. List of Members of the Fabian Society. London: The Fabian Society, 1906.

Fawcett, Henry. Co-operative Societies: Their Social and Economical Aspects. London, 1871.

Fawcett, Millicent G. The Use of Higher Education to Women. London, 1886.

Foote, C. W. Salvation Syrup or Light on Darkest England, 2nd ed. London: Progressive Publishing Co., 1891.

Gonner, E. C. K. The Socialist State--Its Nature, Aims, and Conditions: Being an Introduction to the Study of Socialism. London: Walter Scott, Ltd., 1895.

Grisewood, William, comp. Liverpool Religious and Philanthropic Institutions: Their Work and Needs. Liverpool: J. R. Williams and Co., 1898.

_____. The Poor of Liverpool: Notes on Their Condition, Based on an Inquiry Made by the Liverpool Central Relief and Charity Organisation Society. Liverpool: Liverpool Central Relief and Charity Organisation Society, 1897.

Henson, Hensley. The Problems of Private Benevolence in the Modern State. London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1926.

Hill, Florence. Children of the State--The Training of Juvenile Paupers. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1868.

Hill, Octavia. The Charity Organisation Society. London: Charity Organisation Society, [1889].

_____. Letter to My Fellow Workers: To Which is Added an Account of Donations Received for Work Among the Poor During 1879. London, 1879.

_____. Letter to My Fellow Workers: To Which is Added an Account of Donations Received for Work Among the Poor During 1904. London, 1904.

_____. Miss Octavia Hill on the Charity Organisation Society. London: Charity Organisation Society, [1891].

Hopkins, Elice. Work Among Working Men, 3rd ed. London: Strahan and Co., Ltd., 1879.

Horn, Margaret. The Work of Health Societies. London: Charity Organisation Society, 1909.

The Joint Social Studies Committee for London. Part-Time Social Study Courses for Social Workers and Adult Students. London: P. S. King and Sons, Ltd., 1918.

The Joint University Council for Social Studies and Public Administration. A Survey of Work During the Years 1918-1935. London: The Joint University Council for Social Studies and Public Administration, 1935.

_____. University Courses in Social Study and Public Administration. London: William H. Taylor and Sons, 1938.

_____. University Training for Labour Management and Industrial Welfare: A Report. London: The Joint University Council for Social Studies and Public Administration, 1932.

_____. University Training for Welfare Work in Industries and Commerce: A Report. London: P. S. King and Sons, 1921.

Lansbury, George. The Development of the Humane Administration of the Poor Law Under the Popular Board of Guardians. Woolwich: Labour Representation Printing Co., 1906.

_____. _Socialism for the Poor: the End of Pauperism_. London: Clarion Press, 1909.

Lawrance, K. L. _The Importance of Good Casework_. London: Charity Organisation Society, 1912.

Leighton, Baldwyn. _Pauperization: Cause and Cure_, 4th ed. Shrewsbury: Messrs. Sandford, 1871.

Leonard, George Hare. _Education and the Social Problem_. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912.

Liverpool Central Relief and Charity Organisation Society. _Manual of Instruction for the Friendly Visitors of the Liverpool Central Relief and Charity Organisation Society_. Liverpool: Liverpool Central Relief and Charity Organisation Society, 1906.

Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid. _Annual Reports 1910-1915, 1926-1930_. Liverpool: Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1910-1930.

_____. _Constitution_. Liverpool: Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1910.

_____. _Liverpool Social Workers' Yearbook 1928_. Liverpool: Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1928.

_____. _Liverpool Social Workers' Yearbook 1929_. Liverpool: Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1929.

_____. _Report on the Clothing Charities of Liverpool_. Liverpool: Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1912.

_____. _Report on Juvenile Organisations in Liverpool_. Liverpool: Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1917.

_____. _Rescue Work in Liverpool_. Liverpool: Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1915.

_____. _Social Reconstruction in Liverpool_. Liverpool: Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid, 1919.

Liverpool Plumbers' Friendly Society. _Rules of the Liverpool Plumbers' Friendly Society_. Liverpool: Edward Rivenall, 1862.

Lloyd, C. M. _The New Children's Charter_. London: The Standing Joint Committee of the Independent Labour Party and the Fabian Society, 1912.

Loch, Charles Stewart. Approved Societies Under the
     National Insurance Act. London: Family Welfare As-
     sociation, 1911.

_____. The Development of Charity Organisation. London,
     1903.

_____. An Examination of "General" Booth's Social
     Scheme. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1890.

_____. The National Insurance Bill: A Paper. London:
     Charity Organisation Society, 1911.

_____. A New Chapter in Charity Organisation. London,
     1885.

_____. The Reports of the Royal Commission on the Poor
     Laws and Relief of Distress. London, 1909.

_____. The State and the Unemployed. London: Family
     Welfare Association, 1893.

The London School of Economics and Political Science.
     Memorandum and Articles of Association of The Incor-
     porated London School of Economics and Political
     Science, June 12, 1901. London: The London School of
     Economics and Political Science, 1901.

_____. The Working Constitution of The London School of
     Economics and Political Science, 1937. London: The
     London School of Economics and Political Science,
     1937.

Lyon, Miss. The Art of Helping. London: Charity Organisation
     Society, 1908.

Minor, Sartor. Philanthropic Tailoring and Historical Cob-
     bling. London: Williams and Co., 1875.

Morison, D. C. State and Private Aid--Cambridge 1922.
     Cambridge: "Daily News" Printing Works, 1924.

National Adult School Union. Adult School Social Service
     Handbook. London: National Adult School Union, 1914.

The National Association of Boys' Clubs. Principles and
     Aims of the Boys' Club Movement. London: The National
     Association of Boys' Clubs, 1930.

National Association for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. What the Society Is. London: National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, [1910].

_____. What the Society Is Not. London: National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, [1910].

Nield, Walter. What Workpeople Want Oxford to Do. London: The Workers' Educational Association, 1907.

Pennyman, J. W. The Cost of Good Work. London: Charity Organisation Society, 1895.

Plunkett, Horace. The Neglect of Country Life: A Plan and a Policy. Dublin: Plunkett House, 1909.

Pratt, John Tidd. The Law Relating to Friendly Societies Comprising the Statute 10 Geo. IV. Cap. 56. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown and Green, 1829.

Pringle, J. C. Can London Climb Out of the Slough of Despond? London: Charity Organisation Society, 1927.

Sewell, Margaret. District Visiting: A Paper Read Before the Parochial Clergy Sisters and District Visitors of Westminster. London: Women's Printing Society, 1893.

Smith, Samuel. The Economics of Charity. Liverpool: Turner Routledge and Co., 1888.

Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor in the Town and the Neighbourhood of Liverpool. The First Report. Liverpool: Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor in the Town and the Neighbourhood of Liverpool, 1809.

Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity. General Objects of the Society. London: Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity, 1870.

_____. Manual of the Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity. London: Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity, 1870.

Spencer, Malcolm. Students and the Regeneration of Society. London: Student Christian Movement, 1914.

Stephen, Caroline Emelia. The Service of the Poor; Being
an Inquiry into the Reasons for and Against the
Establishment of Religious Sisterhoods for Chari-
table Purposes. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd.,
1871.

Tillyard, Frank. Hints for District Visitors--Legal Diffi-
culties of the Poor. London: The National Union of
Women Workers of Great Britain and Ireland, 1898.

The Times Book Club. The Swing of the Pendulum. London:
The Times Book Club, [1910].

The University of Liverpool. The Liverpool School of So-
cial Sciences and Administration--Prospectus of
Courses Session 1927-1928. Liverpool: University of
Liverpool, 1927.

Wakefield, Henry Russell, Bishop of Birmingham. The Sphere
of Voluntary Agencies under the Minority Report.
London: The National Committee to Promote the Break-
up of the Poor Law, 1910.

Ward, Mary Augusta. The Future of University Hall. London:
Smith, Elder and Co., 1892.

_____. University Hall--Opening Address. London: Smith,
Elder and Co., 1891.

Webb, Beatrice Potter. A Crusade Against Destitution.
London, 1909.

_____. The English Poor Law: Will it Endure? London:
Oxford University Press, 1928.

_____. The New Crusade Against Destitution: Being an Ex-
position of the Minority Report of the Poor Law Com-
mission. Manchester: National Labour Press, 1910.

_____. Syllabus of a Course of Lectures on the Co-
operative Movement in Great Britain. London: University
Hall, 1891.

Webb, Sidney. The Reform of London. London, 1892.

_____. The Reform of the Poor Law. London, 1890.

_____. Socialism in England. London: Swan Sonnenschein
and Co., 1890.

_____. What Socialism Means; A Call to the Unconverted. London: The Leaflet Press, 1888.

_____, and Webb, Beatrice Potter. The Prevention of Destitution. London, 1911.

Woollcombe, H. L. Enquiry and Office Work. London: Charity Organisation Society, 1893.

Workers' Educational Association. Adult Education--Recommendations of the Workers' Educational Association. London: Workers' Educational Association, [1920].

Younghusband, Eileen. Basic Training for Casework: Its Place in the School Curriculum. Slough: Association of Social Workers of Great Britain, 1952.

Unpublished Materials:

London. The London School of Economics and Political Science. Octavia Hill to Henrietta Barnett and Canon Samuel Barnett, 1873-1906.

London. The London School of Economics and Political Science. Rev. Henry Solly Papers.

London. The London School of Economics and Political Science. Reminiscences of Former Students, Members of Staff and Governors with Other Material Relating to the History of the School, 1922-1947.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Adamson, John W. English Education 1789-1902. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Armfelt, Roger. The Structure of English Education. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955.

Armytage, W. H. G. Four Hundred Years of English Education, rev. ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Arnstein, Walter L. Britain Yesterday and Today--1830 to the Present, 3rd ed. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1976.

Barnard, H. C. A Short History of English Education from 1760. London: University of London Press, 1961.

Baron, George. Society, Schools and Progress in England. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1965.

Bernbaum, Gerald. Social Change and the Schools: 1918-1944. Atlantic Heights, New Jersey: Humanities Press, Inc., 1967.

Bessell, Robert. Introduction to Social Work. London: B. T. Batsford, 1970.

Beveridge, Janet. An Epic of Clare Market--Birth and Early Days of the London School of Economics. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1960.

Bishop, A. S. Rise of a Central Authority for English Education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971

Bremner, R. H. "An Iron Scepter Twined with Roses: the Octavia Hill System of Housing Management." Social Service Review 39 (No. 2 1965): 222-231.

Caine, Sidney. British Universities--Purpose and Prospects. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

Cavenagh, Winifred E. Four Decades of Students in Social Work. Birmingham, England: Research Board, Faculty of Commerce and Social Science, University of Birmingham, 1950.

Colquhoun, Patrick. A New and Appropriate System of Education for the Labouring People. Scranton, Pa.: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1971.

Curtis, Stanley J. Education in Britain Since 1900. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1952.

_____. History of Education in Great Britain, 3rd ed. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1971.

Dent, H. C. Education in Transition. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1948.

_____. The Educational System of England and Wales. London: University of London Press, 1961.

Donnison, D. V. The Development of Social Administration. London: The London School of Economics and Political Science, 1962.

Dunsheath, Percy, and Miller, Margaret. Convocation in the University of London: The First Hundred Years. Atlantic Heights, New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1958.

Eaglesham, Eric J. Foundations of Twentieth Century Education in England. New York: Humanities Press, 1967.

Elder, W. "Speenhamland Revisited." Social Service Review 38 (No. 3 1964): 294-302.

Ensor, Robert. England 1870-1914. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936.

Hales, J. E. British Education. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1940.

Halsey, A. H., ed. Trends in British Society Since 1900. London: The Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1972.

_____, and Trow, M. A. The British Academics. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Harrison, John F. C. The Birth and Growth of Industrial England 1714-1867. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1973.

International Labor Office. International Survey of Social Services, 1933. London: P. S. King and Sons, Ltd., 1936.

Jarman, T. L. Landmarks in the History of Education. Levittown, New York: Transatlantic Arts, Inc., 1973.

Jennings, Hilda. University Settlement Bristol: Sixty Years of Change, 1911-1971. Bristol, England: University Settlement Bristol, 1973.

Kay, Joseph. Social Condition and Education of the People in England. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1864.

Keating, Peter, ed. Into Unknown England--1866-1913. London: Fontana, 1976.

Kelly, Thomas. A History of Adult Education in Great Britain. Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 1970.

Kohs, S. C. The Roots of Social Work. New York: Association Press, 1966.

Lamb, G. F. The English at School. Norwood, Pa.: Norwood Editions, 1950.

Lawson, John, and Silver, Harold. A Social History of Education in England. London: Methuen, 1973.

Leach, Arthur F. Educational Charters and Documents. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1911.

The London School of Economics and Political Science, Department of Social Science and Administration. Jubilee 1912-1962. London: The London School of Economics and Political Science, 1962.

Lowndes, George Alfred Norman. The English Educational System. London: Hutchinson University Library, 1960.

_____. The Silent Social Revolution, 2nd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Lubove, Roy. The Professional Altruist. New York: Atheneum, 1972.

MacDonald, D. F. The Age of Transition. London: Macmillan and Co., 1967.

Mackie, J. D. The University of Glasgow. Glasgow: Jackson, Son and Co., 1954.

Maclure, J. Stewart. Educational Documents, England and Wales, 1816-1968, 2nd ed. Scranton, Pa.: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1968.

_____. One Hundred Years of London Education 1870-1970. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin, 1970.

Manning, Cardinal Henry Edward. National Education. London: Burns and Oakes, Ltd., 1889.

Midwinter, Eric C. Nineteenth Century Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Musgrave, P. W. Society and Education in England Since 1800. London: Methuen, 1968.

Musgrove, Frank. Patterns of Power and Authority in English Education. London: Methuen, 1971.

Norwood, Cyril. The English Educational System. Norwood, Pa.: Norwood Editions, 1928.

_____. The English Tradition of Education. London: John Murray, 1929.

Parkinson, Michael. The Labour Party and the Organization of Secondary Education 1918-1965. Boston, Mass.: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.

Parry, J. P. Provision of Education in England and Wales. Mystic, Conn.: Lawrence Verry, Inc., 1971.

Poole, H. R. The Liverpool Council of Social Service 1909-1959. Liverpool: The Liverpool Council of Social Service, Inc., 1960.

Salomon, Alice. Education for Social Work. Zürich: Verlag für Recht und Gesellschaft, 1937.

Shimmin, A. N. The University of Leeds--The First Half-Century. Cambridge: The University Press, 1954.

Simon, Brian. Education and the Labour Movement, 1870-1920. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1965.

_____. The Politics of Educational Reform, 1920-1940. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1974.

_____. Studies in the History of Education, 1780-1870. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1960.

Simon, Joan. The Social Origins of English Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.

Skeets, Herbert. Popular Education in England. Clifton, New Jersey: Kelley, 1861.

Smith, Marjorie J. Professional Education for Social Work in Britain. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1965.

Smith, William O. Education in Great Britain, 5th ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Stansky, Peter. England Since 1867: Continuity and Change. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1973.

Tuke, Margaret. A History of Bedford College for Women 1849-1937. London: Oxford University Press, 1939.

The University of Liverpool. The University of Liverpool 1903-1953. Liverpool: The University of Liverpool, 1954.

Vaughan, Michalina, and Archer, Margaret. Social Conflict
     and Educational Change in England and France, 1789-
     1848. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Wardle, David. English Popular Education, 1780-1970.
     Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

West, Edwin G. Education and the Industrial Revolution.
     New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1974.

Whiteley, Winifred. Uneducated England. London: Methuen,
     1969.

Woodroofe, Kathleen. From Charity to Social Work. London:
     Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

Young, A. F., and Ashton, E. T. British Social Work in the
     Nineteenth Century. London: Routledge and Kegan
     Paul, Ltd., 1956.

Younghusband, Eileen L. Social Work and Social Change.
     London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1964.

_____. Social Work in Britain. Edinburgh: T. A. Constable,
     Ltd., 1951.

APPENDIX

DAME HENRIETTA OCTAVIA WESTON BARNETT--(1851-1936)

Social reformer--An early interest in the poor and experience gained in Octavia Hill's rent collecting scheme along with her marriage to Samuel Barnett, a curate in a local parish, guided Henrietta Barnett in the direction of a life-long dedication to social work. Her work with children was especially notable--she served as manager of Forest Gate district school from 1875 to 1897, was instrumental in the formation of the State Children's Association in 1896, served as honorary secretary of the Whitechapel branch of the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants from 1876 to 1898, and founded the London Pupil Teacher's Association in 1884.

While Mrs. Barnett assisted her husband in his work at Toynbee Hall, she was instrumental in the transfer of the settlement to the United States. In 1920, she was elected as honorary president of the American Federation of Settlements.

Although Mrs. Barnett co-authored a number of works with her husband, her major work was <u>Canon Barnett, His Life, Work and Friends</u>, a two-volume account of her husband's life, published in 1918.

Source: <u>Dictionary of National Biography 1931-1940</u>, s.v. "Barnett, Dame Henrietta Octavia Weston," by L. F. Ellis.

SAMUEL AUGUSTUS BARNETT--(1844-1913)

Clergyman and social reformer--Born into a rather well-to-do family, Mr. Barnett was educated at Wadham College, Oxford. In December 1867, he became curate at St. Mary's, Bryanston Square, London. In 1873, after his marriage to Henrietta, he was appointed to St. Jude's, Whitechapel, said to be the worst parish in the diocese. Although Rev. Barnett was made a canon of Bristol in 1894, his association with Whitechapel was a life-long commitment.

Working on the premise that education, to be effective, had to be preceded by improved material conditions, Rev. Barnett advocated better housing, more efficient poor relief and universal pensions. His greatest achievement, however, was the founding of Toynbee Hall, the first university settlement, in 1884. Barnett's initial effort to bring university men in contact with the harsh realities of the city was reshaped by his followers, but university settlements flourished throughout Great Britain.

Although Rev. Barnett published a number of volumes, his most famous were <u>Practicable Socialism</u> (1888), <u>Worship and Work</u> (1913) and <u>Vision and Service</u> (1917).

Source: <u>Dictionary of National Biography--Twentieth Century 1912-1921</u>, s.v. "Barnett, Samuel Augustus."

CHARLES BOOTH--(1840-1916)

Social commentator--While much of Booth's early life was devoted to the management of his shipping business, in middle age, he turned his attention to social issues. Using the census figures of the period 1841 to 1881, Booth attempted first to portray the life of the worker in Great Britain and Ireland. Finding this population to be too broad, he turned his attention to the city of London. In 1887 he published The Tower Hamlets, the first part of a sixteen-year study in which Booth would study the social condition and occupations of the people of London. The entire work, entitled Life and Labour of the People in London, included four volumes on "Poverty," five on "Industry," seven on "Religious Influences," and a one-volume conclusion; it appeared between 1891 and 1903. Booth's work coincided with an increasing effort to combat poverty, and formed the basis for a number of programs of social reform.

While Booth's primary concern of Life and Labour of the People in London was to portray social conditions rather than suggest specific social reform, he publicly advocated the establishment of a system of old age pensions in 1891. His plan was partially carried out with the passage of the Old Age Pensions Act in 1908.

Source: Dictionary of National Biography--Twentieth Century 1912-1921, s.v. "Booth, Charles."

BERNARD BOSANQUET--(1848-1923)

Philosopher--Educated at Balliol College, Oxford, Bosanquet spent his early years as a fellow of University College. In 1881, Bosanquet gave up his fellowship and took up residence in London, with intentions of devoting more time to philosophical writing and the practice of social work. His membership in the London Ethical Society and the London School of Ethics and Social Philosophy aided him in the attainment of his former goal, while his second goal was achieved in connection with the Charity Organisation Society. Bosanquet became affiliated with the C.O.S. through his half-brother Charles Bosanquet who had been a secretary of the Council from 1870 to 1875, and his Balliol friend, Charles Loch. He served as a member of the Society's district and administrative committees and presented lectures which were published in the Charity Organisation Review.

Although Bosanquet's interests were primarily philosophical, he published a number of works which were referred to by social workers. They included: Aspects of the Social Problem (1895), and The Social Criterion: or, How to Judge of Proposed Social Reforms. (1901).

Source: Dictionary of National Biography 1922-1930, s.v. "Bosanquet, Bernard," by A. D. Lindsay.

HELEN BOSANQUET--(1860-1925)

Social worker--Daughter of Rev. John Dendy, a Unitarian minister from Manchester, Helen Bosanquet was educated at Newnham College, Cambridge, where she achieved First Class Honours in the Moral Sciences Tripos. In 1895, she married Bernard Bosanquet and joined him in working with the Charity Organisation Society, where she served as district Secretary until 1897 when the Bosanquets left London to live at Caterham. She did not terminate her relationship with the C.O.S., but expanded her participation in the field of social work, becoming a University Extension lecturer and in 1905, a member of the Royal Commission to study the Poor Law.

She was a prolific writer in the field of social work; her works included: Rich and Poor (1896), The Standard of Life and Other Studies (1898), The Strength of the People: A Study in Social Economics (1902), and Social Work in London 1869 to 1912: A History of the Charity Organisation Society (1914).

Source: Who Was Who, 1916-1928, s.v. "Bosanquet, Helen."

OCTAVIA HILL--(1838-1912)

Philanthropist and housing reformer--Grandaughter of
Dr. Thomas Southwood Smith, a well-known authority on fever
epidemics and sanitation, Miss Hill became familiar with the
problems of the poor at an early age. She began work with
the Ladies Guild, a cooperative association organized by
the Christian Socialists in 1852, and was soon put in charge
of a branch which taught ragged school children how to make
toys. Her early contacts with Frederick Denison Maurice
and John Ruskin encouraged her to continue in her work with
the poor.

In 1856, she was made secretary to the women's classes
at the Working Men's College, and a few years later, she and
her sister began their own school for the poor. At this
point her general interest in the poor became more specific,
and she focused on the problems of housing. In 1864, with
funds procured from Mr. Ruskin, she purchased the first ten-
ement building which she and her followers renovated and
managed. By establishing her scheme on sound business prin-
ciples as well as concern for the poor, she managed to in-
crease the number of tenements under supervision.

Miss Hill's expanding program as well as her dimin-
ishing health made the delegation of duties her only alterna-
tive. Working on the assumption that success depended on
skill, however, she made an effort to train her volunteers.
This effort was later expanded on by the Charity Organisa-

tion Society and the university settlements, and eventually developed into formal programs for social work education.

Miss Hill's works included: <u>Our Common Land and Other Short Essays</u> (1877), <u>Homes of the London Poor</u> (1883), and <u>The Charity Organisation Society</u> (1889).

Source: <u>Dictionary of National Biography--Twentieth Century 1912-1921</u>, s.v. "Hill, Octavia."

SIR CHARLES STEWART LOCH--(1849-1923)

Social worker--Plagued by periods of ill health while
a student at Balliol College, Loch gave up his original
interest in the Indian civil service, and turned to a ca-
reer of social service in England. He became a clerk at
the Royal College of Surgeons in 1873 and joined the
Islington branch of the Charity Organisation Society. In
1875, he was appointed to the C.O.S. Council. Although
small when Loch first joined it, the C.O.S. grew under the
guidance of his enthusiastic but careful administration;
his efficiency complemented and influenced the C.O.S.'s at-
tempts to bring some order to the chaotic field of public
and private charity. This efficiency was balanced by Loch's
insistence that all requests for aid be investigated by a
corps of volunteers recruited largely from the upperclasses.

Loch was interested in the government's response to
the problems of the poor and was an active member of a num-
ber of royal commissions, including those which investigated
the aged poor (1893-1895), the feeble-minded (1904-1908) and
the poor laws (1906-1909); he was largely responsible for the
Majority Report issued by the Royal Commission to study the
Poor Law. Although Loch recognized the need for government
investigation of the problems of the poor, he opposed gov-
ernment intervention; he criticized the social legislation
of the Liberal government of 1906 to 1914 as freeing the in-
dividual from responsibility which was inherently his.

Loch's many works included: <u>How to Help Cases of Distress</u> (1883), <u>Charity Organisation</u> (1892) and <u>Methods of Social Advance</u> (1904).

Source: <u>Dictionary of National Biography 1922-1930</u>, s.v.
      "Loch, Sir Charles Stewart," by R. B. Mowat.

EDWARD JOHNS URWICK--(1867-1945)

Political economist and social work educator--Educated
at Oxford where he received a First Class in Literature,
Urwick became involved in the field of social work through
his participation in the efforts of Toynbee Hall--he served
as Sub-Warden between 1899 and 1902. In 1903 he was ap-
pointed director of the School of Sociology, later to be-
come a department of the London School of Economics. He
remained a Professor of Social Science and Administration
at LSE until 1924. Urwick's belief that to be effective,
social work education had to combine the theoretical and
the practical, was demonstrated by his willingness to assume
the directorship of the School of Sociology, as well as his
writings, which included a number of passages on social work
education.

Urwick authored a number of books including: Luxury
and Waste of Life (1908), A Philosophy of Social Progress
(1912) and The Social Good (1927).

Source: Who Was Who, 1941-1950, s.v. "Urwick, Edward Johns."

BEATRICE POTTER WEBB--(1858-1943)

Fabian Socialist--Born into an upperclass Gloucester family, Beatrice Webb was educated by governesses; she supplemented this education through extensive travel and reading. Influenced by her close relationship with Herbert Spencer, she began working with the poor, first through rent-collecting and later in connection with Charles Booth's social survey (Booth was married to Beatrice's cousin.) She became interested in the cooperative movement, publishing The Co-operative Movement in Great Britain in 1891. She also began reading the Fabian Essays and developed a great admiration for Sidney Webb; in 1891 they were married. From that point on, Sidney and Beatrice Webb's work became a joint endeavor. Their work in the Fabian Society and almost endless list of publications pointed to the fact that this endeavor was to be life-long.

Perhaps Beatrice Webb's most-remembered achievement was the Minority Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Law, an effort for which she was largely responsible, and whose end she would witness before her death. Included among her many works were My Apprenticeship (1926) and Our Partnership (1948).

Source: Dictionary of National Biography 1941-1950, s.v. "Webb, (Martha) Beatrice," by Mary Agnes Hamilton.

SIDNEY JAMES WEBB--(1859-1947)

Fabian Socialist, social reformer and social historian--Born into a lower-middleclass London family, Sidney Webb was educated at the Birkbeck Institute and the City of London College. In 1878 he entered the Civil Service, and advanced rapidly; in 1886 he obtained his LL.B. from London University. In 1885, under the influence of George Bernard Shaw, Webb joined the Fabian Society; his efforts in organization as well as propaganda work were unequaled. He was to become Fabian socialism's chief proponent and historian.

Although one of Webb's earliest interests was in the history and operation of the trade unions, he spent a great deal of time in the study of educational issues. At the elementary level he worked for educational reform; at the university level, he was instrumental in the establishment of the London School of Economics and Political Science, where he served as honorary professor of public administration from 1912 to 1927.

Included among Webb's best-known works are The History of Trade Unionism (1894), Industrial Democracy (1897), English Poor Law Policy (1910) and Methods of Social Study (1932).

Source: Dictionary of National Biography 1941-1950, s.v.
    "Webb, Sidney James, Baron Passfield," by Mary Agnes
    Hamilton.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Rosemarie Bridget Bogal
has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Rosemary V. Donatelli, Director
Associate Professor, Educational Foundations,
Loyola

Dr. Gerald L. Gutek
Professor, Educational Foundations
Loyola

Dr. Steven I. Miller
Associate Professor, Educational Foundations
Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the
dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies
the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated
and that the dissertation is now given final approval by
the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial ful-
fillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy.

May 5, 1977
Date

Director's Signature