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The major objective of this thesis is to throw new light on the problem of "how" and "why" the function of the State within society changed dramatically during the first few years of the twentieth century. By concentrating on the Liberal Government's measures of 1906 to 1907 to improve the health of working-class children this thesis hopes to show that the rôle of men and their beliefs played a far more important part in the development of the "British Welfare State" than has hitherto been credited. By illustrating how the social, political, and economic conditions of the period 1870 to 1900 affected the consciousness of individuals and groups, it attempts to explain why there was a delay between the time when the extent of poverty became intolerable and the time when measures were enacted to relieve the problem.

Three major themes intertwine throughout this thesis. These are: the cause of government growth; the changing status of working-class children; and measures to improve the health of the nation. Chapter One discusses the social, physical, and psychological factors which affected the health of children before 1880, and illustrates the high esteem in which working-class parents held their children. Chapter Two shows how middle class Britain attempted to deal with the problem of child health in the period before the end of the nineteenth century.

Chapter Three attempts to explain "how" and "why" the physical condition of the British working class became a question of major political significance for the first time. Specifically it describes the nineteenth century origins of the "National Efficiency" movement, the
part played by the movement in concentrating public attention on the physical condition of the working class, and discusses the blue-print for social action formulated by the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration.

The last chapter describes how the Liberal Government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman began the enactment of this social blue-print. Their first step was an Act which allowed local education authorities to feed needy school children free of charge. This was soon followed by another Act which allowed local education authorities to require the medical examination of all children attending public elementary schools. Together these Acts began a process of long-term social planning in Britain.
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INTRODUCTION

Since the end of the Second World War major changes have taken place in the way history has been studied and written. Social history, once described as "history with the politics left out" has become dominant in the discipline. By comparison, older and better established approaches have been subordinated in the search for a broad and exciting new design—the history of society. These dramatic changes in the discipline are themselves reflections of a vast social revolution which has swept through the industrialized world over the last hundred and fifty years. In Britain this revolution has been responsible for broad changes in social standards and social conditions. These in turn have initiated reforms of the law. Though these legislative changes have been of considerable interest to historians for many years, much confusion remains about their nature and direction.

This confusion stems from two sources. First, the actual words used to describe the social transformation have tended to block the way to a satisfactory explanation. Terms like "laissez-faire," "collectivism," "state intervention," and particularly, the "welfare state," have become embroiled in contemporary political controversy. As a result, many have become "politically loaded" and have acquired inclusive as well as exclusive meanings.

The second and more important source of confusion is to be discovered in the methods selected to analyse nineteenth century government growth and the emergence of the modern conception of the British State. Though it is now widely accepted that there is much more to the process
of social policy formation and legislative action, and hence government growth, than the direct and inverse relationship seen by A. V. Dicey \(^5\) between law and public opinion, attempts so far to explain "how" and "why" the function of the State within British society has changed over the last hundred and fifty years have tended to concentrate more upon finite political events--the Acts of Parliament which embodied social reform--than the actual agents of social change. \(^6\) Where there have been attempts to deal extensively with causal factors, little attention has been given to weighting the factors involved in order of their importance. \(^7\) In addition, these efforts have devoted more time to such "concrete" changes as the physical conditions of life than to the impact of these changes on the Victorian or Edwardian consciousness. \(^8\) In fact, with the exception of a few general articles historians have largely ignored the impact of changing social standards on social policy formation and legislative action. \(^9\) This appears to be a particularly serious error from two points of view. Calvin Woodward has pointed out that a strong case can be made for social standards being ultimately responsible for deciding whether or not, and if so when, a particular group or individual will find a specific form of behaviour or condition "intolerable," as well as their determining the context in which social problems are cast, the types of solutions sought, and the forms of activities that particular individuals will demand of their national institutions. \(^10\) John H. Goldthorpe has claimed that an "action frame of reference"--analysis in terms of the changing social standards of particular groups of individuals--can be particularly valuable in cases where time-lags exist
between the identification of an acute social problem and the provision of effective counter-measures. As a result, it appears that existing methods of analysis have not only misrepresented and subordinated the place of men and their beliefs in historical analysis to a secondary level, but have been responsible for oversimplifying many of the social, legislative, and administrative changes which occurred during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. This oversimplification has lent a false connotation of "inevitability" to the process of social change. In addition, it has led to the assumption that social legislation occurred according to some sort of natural rhythm or as the result of accidents of history, and consequently, that there were no time-lags or discontinuities in the historical process between the moment when a certain social phenomenon was identified as being "intolerable" and the time when the British Government acted to improve the situation. In consequence, existing methods of analysing social change have implicitly ruled out the possibility of any long-term notion of social planning on the part of late-Victorian politicians and administrators.

This thesis is concerned with the changing function of the British State during the first decade of the twentieth century and is based on the assumption that recent analyses of nineteenth-century government growth and the "origins of the British Welfare State" represent oversimplifications on at least four grounds. First, they have not satisfactorily explained why certain social problems became "intolerable" when they did. Second, they have glossed over why the British Government acted when it did. Third, they have not taken into full consideration the
time-lags and the discontinuities in the historical process. Fourth, they have tended to overlook the possibility of any notion of long-term social planning.

Objectives

Besides attempting to illustrate how an examination of the changing social standards of particular groups or individuals in society can provide the historian with valuable insights for understanding social policy formation, legislative action, and government growth, this thesis has two more specific goals. The first is fairly straightforward. By trying to explain exactly "how" and "why" the British Parliament came to pass legislation in 1906 to 1907 which allowed local authorities to feed and medically inspect public elementary school children, this thesis is intended as a specific study of social policy formation, legislative action, and government growth. The second goal is more complex. The passage of the Elementary Education Acts is a major concern. Likewise, the emergence of health consciousness during the late nineteenth century, the health of children generally, and the changing status of working-class children specifically, are all important underlying themes. As a result, it might be expected that this thesis hoped to provide contributions to the histories of British education, medicine and childhood. This, however, was not the primary intention. Rather the studies of child health, nineteenth-century health consciousness and the passage of the Education Acts have been used to show how the status of children changed. It is a primary facet of this thesis that this change reflected a more profound change of status—that not of the working-class child
but rather that of the future working man. As a result, this thesis is intended to represent a contribution to the history of the working class.

Background

British children of all socio-economic groups now enjoy a position of particularly high status. At the political level the State recognizes that the nation's children represent one of the country's most vital assets. In legal terms children now possess definite, inalienable rights: to food, clothing, and shelter; and to medical care and education according to their needs and abilities. Besides legal yardsticks, a whole range of cultural rules now restricts the exploitation of children. Cruelty to children, and the sexual abuse of children by adults, have become serious taboos. At the same time, it is now accepted by all the political parties that it is the function of government to ensure that children obtain these rights and protections.

The State's recognition of its responsibility to provide the nation's children with certain protections and social services has only come about during the last hundred and fifty years. For most of the nineteenth century the majority of British children were left poorly clothed, undernourished, and dirty and smelly. Some children were fortunate enough to receive a smattering of education. Few obtained medical care. Many saw long hours of arduous labour for little reward. Poverty for most children was endemic and unavoidable. Harsh treatment was handed down to young offenders by the courts. Some children were brutally beaten by employers, overseers of child labour, and parents alike. Family life, even when both parents were alive, often turned into a
struggle for existence. Death and disease were indeed frequent visitors. It was not unlikely for a child to lose one and sometimes both parents before maturity. The death of a brother or a sister or two, as well as many childhood friends, was only to be expected. Homes, often back-to-back and with few windows, were crowded together, row after row, behind the more respectable looking main streets of towns and cities. As a result, living conditions were often cramped, squalid and unsanitary. All these, coupled with the intimacy of the family's communal sleeping quarters, placed children in numerous moral and physical dangers. Nevertheless, slowly, piece by piece, each of the barriers to a healthy, moral and happy childhood were removed. Between the 1830's and the 1870's legislators concentrated mainly on the conditions of juvenile labour and the child's moral character. Acts were passed which restricted the number of hours a child might work. Women, girls, and young children were forbidden to enter several forms of employment. During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, education, the prevention of cruelty, and the establishment of special provisions for physically handicapped and mentally retarded children attracted political attention. In the first decade of the twentieth century legislation specially aimed at the improvement of the health standards and life chances of the young was passed. Since that time legislation geared to benefit children has been mainly concerned with the improvement or enlargement of existing laws.

Legislation specifically introducing social welfare schemes for children not only play an important rôle in the emergence of the British Welfare State but reflect a change in status of children. Changes in the
status of children, particularly those from a working-class background, can provide valuable insights into the cause and extent of social change over the last hundred and fifty years.

Unfortunately the changing status of specific groups in society has seldom been used by historians as a tool for historical analysis. Recent popular histories of the "welfare state," such as Maurice Bruce's *The Coming of the Welfare State*, have implied that the change in function of the British State over the last hundred and fifty years has come about as the result of a sort of evolutionary process. That is to say, the shift from a State which saw the minimum of State interference in the economy and social life of the British people to one which saw the need for State intervention in many fields of life, was brought about by an unrelenting demand for social justice as the result of a "typically English" response to the problems and conditions of British society.¹²

The evolutionary theme is even present in recent contributions to the history of British education and childhood.¹³ A recent article by Nigel Middleton entitled, "The Education Act of 1870 as the Start of the Modern Concept of the Child," despite the fact that it uses the conception of changing status, albeit confusingly, is perhaps typical. Though he admits the 1870 Act neither made education free nor compulsory, Middleton suggests that its "most far-reaching effect was to give the child a special status and set in train a chain of measures which revolutionized his position in society."¹⁴ Such statements need particularly close perusal. Not only may Middleton be guilty of placing his cart before his horse, but, as Frank Musgrove has shown,¹⁵ the implications
of measures providing services and protections for children are far from clear-cut. While on the one hand provisions and protections may indicate a rising concern for children, they also illustrate a process at work in society in which specific groups are separated and classified. Nevertheless, it is Middleton's claim that the 1870 Education Act opened a beneficial version of Pandora's box which "incontrovertibly" set in motion so many social improvements "that it is difficult to list them in an organized fashion," which is particularly worrisome. Even if one overlooks for a moment the fact that Middleton fails to explain exactly "how" the 1870 Act caused this multitude of social improvements, one is still left with a number of assumptions which are not necessarily supported by the facts. Taken to the ultimate logical conclusion the opening of Middleton's beneficial Pandorian box allows no qualitative difference between the legislation of the late nineteenth century and that of the first decade of the twentieth century. In addition, it suggests that late-Victorian and Edwardian politicians and administrators had no long-term conception of social planning, to say nothing of the fact that it completely glosses over the time-lag of more than twenty years between the time when education became compulsory and when the British Government intervened to improve the health and welfare of elementary school children.

Some profound economic, social, and political changes lay behind the Education Act of 1870. Just as the 1870 Act needs to be explained in these terms so too do the measures which were passed to ensure the health of children. This thesis hopes to show by examining the changing status
of British working-class children between the middle of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth how earlier interpretations of the development of child health and welfare legislation have been misleading. As a result, this study is more concerned with a new synthesis of existing evidence than with primary research. Specifically, it sets out to illustrate that there was a fundamental, qualitative difference between measures to improve the health of school children of 1906 and 1907 and those of the previous century. As a result, it argues that the School Meals Act and the provision of free medical inspection for elementary school children derived primarily, not from humanitarian desires to improve the health and welfare of children, but from the fear that the British race was deteriorating. This fear, it will be shown, penetrated the very core of all that was sacred to the British. People from many walks of life, with a variety of interests and ideas, all believed that unless something were done, Britain would not be able to maintain its position as the world's greatest military, industrial, commercial, and colonial power. This "national emergency" allowed a strange assortment of people to join together momentarily and demand action of an unprecedented kind. This convergence of what had sometimes been divergent social forces not only lasted long enough for action to be instigated, but for British politicians and civil servants to develop a clear understanding of the need for long-term social planning. As a result, while this also had the effect of raising the status of the working class, it was not the British working man, but rather the British working man's sons and daughters—the children of the nation—who were first to receive attention as the result of this new social farsightedness.
FOOTNOTES

1 G. M. Trevelyan's remark is cited by E. J. Hobsbawm, "From Social History to the History of Society," Daedalus, 100 (Winter 1971), 21.

2 See ibid., pp. 20-45.

3 There is now general agreement on this point. J. B. Brebner, "Laissez-faire and State Intervention in Nineteenth-Century Britain," Journal of Economic History, 8 (Supplement, 1948), 59-73, drew attention to it by giving the same sort of treatment to A. V. Dicey's notion of government growth as Marx had given to Hegel. In this way he showed that Jeremy Bentham, the "arch-supporter of laissez-faire," also favoured "collectivist" methods.

4 For example, take the terms "laissez-faire" and "welfare state": the former has been used to imply a general philosophy in which the state interferes as little as possible with the day-to-day life of the individual. It has also implied a specific, non-interventionist economic policy of the British Government; the latter is even more ambiguous. In 1948 it was a popular pseudonym for the political, social, and economic policies of the British Labour Government. Most people believed "it" was fully operational, but few knew what the "it" was. Cf. Asa Briggs, "The Welfare State in Historical Perspective," European Journal of Sociology, 2 (1961), 221. In addition, it has been used by analysts of comparative international development as if it had universal implications. It now appears that the term "welfare state" carries specific ideological, political, legal, sociological, and economic nuances. Cf. Arthur Marwick, The Nature of History (New York, 1970), pp. 219-20, and T. H. Marshall, Class, Citizenship and Social Development (New York, 1964), chapter 14.


6 This trend is still found in both general and specific studies. The most recent general history of the welfare state follows this approach. See Derek Fraser, The Emergence of the Welfare State (London, 1973). The most recent contribution to the history of childhood, though promising a "sociological" approach follows it. See Ivy Pinchbeck and Margaret Hewitt, Children in English Society (London, 1973), I and II.

7 General surveys of the history of the welfare state, such as David Roberts's The Victorian Origins of the Welfare State (New Haven, 1960), or Maurice Bruce's, The Coming of the Welfare State (London, 1972), provide a wonderful "shopping list" of factors responsible for social reform, and have failed to place the factors involved in any form of order.

8 Oliver MacDonagh has suggested, "The Nineteenth-century
Revolution in Government: A Reappraisal," Historical Journal, I (1958), 52-67, that a particular "concatenation of circumstances" was responsible for government growth. It is interesting to note that he makes no specific mention of changes in social attitudes or standards in his "model." This discrepancy was duly noted by Jennifer Hart, "Nineteenth-century Social Reform: A Tory Interpretation of History," Past and Present, 31 (July 1965), 39-61. She has shown that the starting point of MacDonagh's "model" contained a tautology, namely "intolerability" while purporting to explain "why" something happened, in fact, explained nothing. She believed that the term was too elastic because she saw no agreement on either the criteria for qualifying an issue as being "intolerable" or on the facts of a social issue.


10 See Woodward, pp. 286-328.

11 See Goldthorpe, pp. 41-56.

12 See Bruce, p. 7.

13 For example, see Pinchbeck and Hewitt.


16 See Middleton, p. 173.
CHAPTER I

CHILD LIFE AMONGST THE MID-VICTORIAN WORKING CLASS:
A DISCUSSION OF THE SOCIAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL, ECONOMIC
AND PHYSICAL FACTORS AFFECTING
THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN

Despite such recent contributions to the history of childhood as Ivy Pinchbeck and Margaret Hewitt's Children in English Society: From the Eighteenth Century to the Children Act of 1948, surprisingly little is really known about what it was like to be a juvenile member of the mid-Victorian working-class community. Hitherto, British historians, in spite of promises of a "sociological approach,"¹ have seldom gone beyond an explanation of how Acts of Parliament which affected the health and welfare of children originated. It is perhaps an obvious, but, nevertheless, much overlooked fact, that all the laws directed specifically for the benefit of children prior to the advent of the twentieth century were prepared, passed and executed, without exception, by members of the upper classes, and that these laws, for the most part, affected only the lives of the offspring of the working class. As a result, this concentration on political events rather than on the things which affected the average child on a day-to-day basis, had been responsible not only for limiting the discussion of Victorian childhood to the perspective of those who played a part in framing the Acts, but also for introducing a certain amount of class bias to the analysis when generalizations about the nature of Victorian childhood have been made. It is, therefore, not surprising
to find the following assumptions, be they implicit or not, in current usage: (i) working-class parents tended to treat their children cruelly and cared little for their offspring's future; (ii) that the humanitarian instincts of the ruling classes were primarily responsible for the child health and welfare legislation of the first decade of the twentieth century; and (iii) that the notion of childhood as a specific period in an individual's life became accepted by all groups in society about the same time.

This chapter is concerned with those social, psychological, economic and physical factors which were responsible for seriously undermining the health of working-class children during the mid-Victorian period. The concentration on the conditions of child labour and the working-class family environment attempts to correct a number of misapprehensions about the nature of changes in the conditions of working-class child life. By providing evidence which shows that the mid-Victorian working class held their children in high esteem, and that this esteem did not decline as child labour became more and more restricted, this chapter hopes to provide a more accurate image of the relationship between the working-class parent and his child. By suggesting that the ruling classes did not see any urgent need, beyond the obligations of their religious beliefs, to be concerned about the well-being of working-class children as a distinct and special group in society until the late 1860's, and by arguing that the Education Act of 1870 represented something more profound than merely the opening of a beneficial version of Pandora's box, this chapter serves to set the scene for a later discussion of the development of child health and welfare services in which the primary
driving force is seen not in terms of humanitarian instincts but in the need to supply a future generation of physically and mentally capable workers and soldiers.

I

The well-being of the mid-Victorian working-class child depended on the prosperity of the family unit. At the same time, the prosperity of the family was critically affected by the number of children that survived the first year of life. Though there were no detailed surveys of working-class poverty conducted before Charles Booth's study of London in the late-1880's and 1890's, recent family reconstruction studies of Lancashire towns have shown that as many working-class families suffered from poverty during the mid-nineteenth century as did in the closing years. In addition, these studies have shown that there was a definite cyclical pattern to family poverty. Michael Anderson has shown by examining food prices, rents, total family incomes, family size, and the ages of children in the life-cycles of married couples that by far the most important influence on family prosperity was not individual wages, food prices, or rents, but the number of dependent children a family had. He has concluded that as soon as a working-class family had five dependent children it suffered severe distress, and that while wage increases and falls in food prices or rents brought some relief, the problem was not alleviated until at least one of the children was able to contribute to the family income. Since most mid-Victorian working-class families had at least six children it may be concluded that before birth-rates began to fall, nearly all working-class children were poverty-stricken at one
time or another. This conclusion is substantiated by J. D. Foster's study of Oldham. He asserts that no more than 15 per cent of working-class families completely escaped a period of poverty.\(^5\)

These periods of family poverty had catastrophic consequences for Britain's next generation of agricultural and industrial workers. Though many agricultural workers had small plots of land and were able to grow some of their own food, and were not forced to live in such squalor as their urban counterparts, serious obstacles to a healthy existence remained for those who lived in rural districts. In the countryside it was rare to find cottages with more than two bedrooms, and most had only one.\(^6\) This fact alone would not have been too serious, but it was compounded by agricultural workers being amongst the last to limit the size of their families,\(^7\) and pressure in some areas, to constrain the building of new cottages. As a result, overcrowding, a major influence on the spread of disease, represented a considerable problem. A mid-century government report noted a case at Stourpaine in Dorset where a family of eleven slept in one room. This room was ten feet square, seven feet high at the centre, and had only one fifteen inch square window. According to the Commissioner who made the report, such conditions were common amongst families of this station.\(^8\)

In the industrial centres population pressure, created by normal population growth\(^9\) and compounded by migration,\(^10\) put a considerable stress on the social system. Towns expanded faster than satisfactory housing could be built. Existing sewage and drainage systems failed to cope with the greater volume of waste products now demanded of them. In
Lancashire, which was one of the most urbanized counties in Britain, the problem created by population pressure became acute. Michael Anderson has shown that another world existed behind the respectable main streets:

There were long rows of blackened two-story terraced cottages, some built back-to-back. There were also narrow twisting lanes and enclosed courts of a dozen or fewer houses. Overshadowing all were the factory chimneys. Here and there were shops and chapels and public houses. In some areas the houses had been built so rapidly that the roads were left unpaved, unsewered and unguttered, along which vehicles passed with difficulty. Some of the houses were so badly built that they were in need of repair almost immediately. In some towns much of the population lived in dark, damp cellars.

In Liverpool some 30,000 people, many of them children, lived in such cellars. In Manchester a further 18,000 suffered an equally squalid fate. A mid-century government report on town life described a visit to a sick woman and her infant who lived in one of these dreadful places:

There was no light, no ventilation in it, and the air was dreadful. I had to walk on bricks across the floor to reach the bedside, as the floor itself was flooded with stagnant water.

According to the sick woman's visitor there was nothing extraordinary about the situation. In towns where migration of the young and newly marrieds placed a special pressure on housing, the consequences of overcrowding were even more serious. In Preston 9 percent of houses contained more than one family. Most of the secondary families lived either in one room or one of the cellars described above. Thirty per cent of houses had more than seven occupants, and 56 per cent had more than five. The mean for the whole city was 6.1. This pressure made the sharing of beds a necessary requirement of urban living for some people. A
mid-century government report on living conditions in large urban centres showed that in one instance there were 1,500 cases in which three persons slept in one bed; 738 with four persons in one bed; 281 with five; ninety-four with six; two with eight; and thirty-one with no bed at all. The intimacy of these sleeping arrangements in which the sexes were not always segregated, led both to incest and to promiscuity.

Though the working class, and especially the immigrant Irish element, have been blamed for the conditions in which observers found their homes, this criticism may not be justified. While it is undoubtedly true that some of the worst urban areas were occupied by neophyte urban dwellers from Ireland, at no time between 1841 and 1907 did the Irish-born population of England and Wales exceed 3 per cent of the total population. More significantly, it appears from the recent studies of Lancashire towns, and one must remember that Lancashire was the natural county of entry for the Irish, that the majority of working-class homes were kept as clean and as neat as was possible within the size of the family budget. This good housekeeping, it must be pointed out, was carried out despite a lack of running water, few inside toilets, no outlets to the main sewage system, and the inhibiting influence of the Window Tax.

The lack of facilities that the average working-class home had must have influenced the health of children. The Window Tax, by causing the owners and managers of existing buildings to close up every window which was not absolutely necessary, and by inhibiting the design of new homes, must have affected the eyesight of several generations of children.
The fact that many cities like Manchester officially discouraged water-closets because of the strain they might put on municipal drainage and sewage systems, caused the extensive use of communal privies. In the City of Westminster, it was reported that there was on average one privy to every three families. However, there were some eighty-two examples where at least twenty families used the same facility. There is little doubt that the use of such, the common practice of keeping animals in or near the home, and the extensive use of the horse as a method of urban transport, provided ideal breeding grounds for *Musca Domestica*, the common housefly. This insect must have represented a major factor in the spread of food-injected diseases among Victorians. The fact that most homes did not have running water, and that for part of the period under study, there was a tax on soap, made personal hygiene difficult. The cost of washing materials led to some bizarre substitutions. One technique prevalent amongst the poorer families of northern England was the use of urine as a substitute for washing soda in the removal of grease. Personal hygiene was also impeded by the number of changes of clothing an individual had. Drawings and photographs of working-class children indicate they had few, and that what they had was ill-fitting and much patched. Though the early results of the medical inspections of school children do prove that children were as unwashed as they appeared, and that many had not had their clothes off for several months on end, these reports in themselves do not prove that the majority of working-class children were neglected by their parents. If anything, the fact that their clothes were much patched proves the contrary.
this failure to wash jeopardized the health of many children. Climbing-boys, for example, who seem to have been particularly prone to scrotal cancer, were reported by one Royal Commission to have washed as infrequently as once in six months.26

Another factor which had a direct bearing on the physical condition and stature of children, as well as their ability to fend off disease, was diet.27 As has already been indicated, a large section of the lower orders, in both the town and the country, was unable to purchase an adequate supply of food for the whole family. This made it necessary for some members of the family to receive special treatment. Recent evidence28 for the period after 1860 has come to light which clearly shows that female members of the family often sacrificed their own health by giving part of their share of the family's food to the male breadwinners and the young children. Though there is also evidence to show that the very young were given special rations by their mothers, one can be sure that a multitude of Britain's working-class children suffered protein and vitamin deficiencies during the most important growing periods of their life.29 The most obvious support for this contention is the prevalence of rickets in the major urban centres. Sir Jack Drummond has shown that the affliction became known as the "English disease," and that it reached severe proportions during the most rapid period of industrialization.30 By 1870 it was reported that as many as one-third of all poor children in London and Manchester showed the characteristic signs.31

Besides an inability to purchase sufficient food to sustain the whole family, other factors impeded the achievement of an adequate
standard of family nutrition, even among the more well-to-do members of the working class. Because of the cost of fuel, cooking on a regular basis was an expensive business. This coupled with the fact that many urban homes were not equipped with cooking grates, ovens, and other utensils, had the effect of limiting the ways in which food could be prepared and made it impossible for many households to take full advantage of the food that was bought. The problem of how to obtain a diet, sufficient in both quantity and quality, was further compounded by a general lack of knowledge of what constituted a balanced diet and an inadequate understanding of many of the principles of domestic economy.

All these, plus the lack of time available to working women for cooking, led to the purchase of more expensive and less nutritious food than was necessary.

The trend towards female factory employment during the nineteenth century had immediate and disastrous affects on the health of the young. Because it was a common practice for mothers to return to work as soon as possible after giving birth, breast feeding fell into disfavour. This led to a reliance on substitute milk. Not until late in the nineteenth century were attempts made to ensure that cow's milk was both unadulterated and uninfected. John Burnett has shown that prior to this time not only was milk often diluted, sometimes by as much as 50 per cent, but that highly impure water was added. As a result, many of Britain's infants were not only deprived of the best nutrition available to them and natural defences against disease, but were actually poisoned or infected at the same time. Another dangerous practice adopted by
working mothers was that of administering drugs to children in order to keep them quiet. Mixtures, such as Atkinson's Royal Infant's Preservative, Godfrey's Cordial, and Mrs. Wilkinson's Soothing Syrup contained such narcotics as laudanum, morphia, and opium. The sale of such concoctions in factory districts was enormous. It was estimated that some 12,000 doses of Godfrey's Cordial were administered weekly in Coventry in 1862. In other towns, of which Nottingham is a good example, weekly doses were proportionally even higher. Even towards the end of the nineteenth century chemists were still selling opiates by the gallon. The results of the use of "quietness" according to Alexander Somers, a lecturer in one of the largest provincial hospitals, were that:

Thousands of children so treated by those hired to care for them in the absence of their mothers lost flesh, colour and appetite, their skin was sallow and wrinkled, their features pinched and shrivelled, and they gradually pined away and died; others perished from the diseases of the brain; and some, after a larger dose than usual, fell into a profound sleep from which they never awoke.

Alcohol consumption had both a direct and an indirect affect on the nutrition and health of children. In the first instance the consumption of alcohol by parents reduced the amount of money that could be spent on food for children. In the second place, the drinking of alcohol by children themselves appears to have been a relatively popular practice. There was no law prohibiting the sale of alcohol to children until the late 1880's, and drunkenness among children was widespread.

As a result of overcrowded and unsanitary conditions, and inadequate diets, death and disease were familiar callers at working-class homes. Life chances in the industrial centres were much lower than in
the smaller provincial towns or in the countryside. In Preston, where the death-rate was thought to be the highest in the kingdom, only 44 per cent of the people were still alive on their twenty-sixth birthday. This compared with a national life expectancy for those born about 1840 of forty-two. For the child to lose a brother or a sister or two before he reached maturity was therefore only to be expected. In the Staffordshire potteries and the Lancashire manufacturing districts, mortality amongst the young was particularly high. In one local study 47 per cent of children died before their fifth birthday. Because of these high rates of child mortality one might expect a certain degree of parental indifference to have emerged. However, this does not appear to have been the case. There is much evidence to prove that parents grieved as heavily over the loss of each child as there is evidence to the contrary. Of one thing there is no doubt. The death of each child caused a considerable short-term burden to the family exchequer. Even the cost of child funerals about mid-century ran as high as one pound to thirty shillings. Admittedly there were organizations which helped offset the cost of these emergencies. For instance, many families made use of burial clubs. Nevertheless, over the long-term it is probably accurate to suggest that the aid given by one poor family to another in times of crisis was much more important.

In spite of the inaccuracies and the inconsistencies of nineteenth century mortality and disease incidence statistics, there is no difficulty in discerning the most pressing health problems facing working-class families. By far the most important dangers to good health were
the infectious diseases. Between 1848 and 1872 some 7,517 per million
males and 7,232 per million females died annually from such infections. This meant that out of every thousand male and female deaths 338 and 321 died respectively from one or other of the infectious diseases.

The most important of the infectious diseases was respiratory tuberculosis. It killed more of both sexes than any other disease by a considerable margin. More than twice as many females died of phthisis as they did from the next most important cause of death, the throat dis-tempers. These were followed by typhus and typhoid, other tubercular infections, whooping cough, measles, smallpox, cholera, and the lesser killers, influenza, dysentery, and syphilis.

As might be expected, infectious diseases were responsible for a particularly heavy death toll amongst children and teenagers. Death-rates for children between one and five years of age were stationary until 1870. Prior to that time scarlet fever was the most devastating disease. Also important were tubercular infections, and, of course, the childhood diseases whooping cough and measles. Boys and girls aged between five and fourteen were more likely to die of an infectious disease than anything else. Scarlet fever, as with younger children, was the principle killer. However, for this age-group it eliminated twice as many individuals as did the second most deadly disease group (typhus and typhoid). Respiratory tuberculosis, as well as other tubercular infections, smallpox and cholera, also killed many. With teenagers and young adults (15-24 years of age) deaths from phthisis were considerable. Before 1870 the disease killed two men in five and almost
five women in ten. The only other important cause of death for this age group was typhus and typhoid. 53

The appalling risks to working-class health that nineteenth century mortality statistics reflect were little offset by the services provided by the medical profession. Large sections of the lower orders never saw a doctor from the time they were born until the time they died. Most were delivered into this world with only the aid of an untrained midwife. 54 Most departed with only family friends or close relatives to comfort them. 55 Only the more well-to-do members of the working class, and then nearly always only the male breadwinners, 56 could obtain the services of a doctor on a regular basis. Higher paid workers sometimes put money aside for health services. 57 However, according to T. Ferguson these people were the exception rather than the rule:

Only a small minority of people made any kind of provident arrangement to ensure the availability of medical care should they fall ill. Some were members of Medical Clubs, contributing a few coppers a week in return for which a doctor undertook to look after them when they were ill, some were members of Friendly Societies or Trade Unions that provided benefit; but these were in the main the thriftier elements in the population and for most working people illness was a catastrophe too terrible to contemplate. 58

For the remainder who were not members of clubs, societies or unions, few alternatives were available. Almost to the end of the nineteenth century the services provided by the Poor Law authorities were extremely limited. For the most part, treatment was restricted to those who were chronically infirmed and residents of the work house. This meant that few children saw the Poor Law Medical Officer, that adults only saw the doctor when their disease was well advanced, and that midwifery cases came under the
parish doctor only when the local authorities approved. For those who did manage to see the Poor Law doctor, the treatment he could provide, even by mid-nineteenth century standards was limited. Not until 1864 were the Guardians allowed to dispense expensive medicines like quinine and cod-liver oil. The final authority for the provision of such "medical extras" as high protein foods rested firmly with the Boards of Guardians not the medical practitioner. Unfortunately the Boards tended to deny such forms of treatment on the grounds of cost, even though their medical staff warned them that such strengthening diets might have considerable beneficial effects on the recovery-rate of patients. Treatment under the Poor Law authorities was also hampered by the conditions of employment of doctors themselves. There is no doubt that most parish doctors were extremely badly paid. According to Dr. J. A. Owles, the superintendent of the Liverpool Medical Mission, parish doctors struggled to build private practices because of their inadequate salaries, and few had any inclination to do more than was absolutely necessary. The outpatient departments of the voluntary hospitals provided an alternative where institutional treatment was not required. There, despite the fact that charges were not usually made, the would-be patient was often asked for a "subscriber's letter." Such letters were much abused and often hard to come by. Another alternative was the medical mission. Such institutions sought to help two groups of people--those who were not seriously ill and the very poor. They were particularly successful at helping children. By comparison to the Poor Law Boards, the medical missions stressed both home nursing and medical extras. In this way the
mission doctors saw to it that their patients received the treatment they needed. Beef, milk, tea, and other foods for the stomach, coal for the fire, and blankets for the bed, were all supplied. At the same time the needs of the whole family were taken into consideration. In addition, the presence of the doctor or the mission nurse in the home helped spread the gospel of hygiene and knowledge of domestic economy. Unfortunately, these medical missions were only to be found in the larger towns. This left the rural sick entirely at the mercy of the Poor Law medical services. Even where there was a mission it was impossible for it to deal extensively with the sick poor.

The worst misfortune that could overtake a working-class child was the death of one or both of his parents. In the major urban areas where death-rates for all age-groups were highest, it is probable that up to one-third of all children lost one parent before they were fifteen, and of these perhaps a quarter lost two. The effects of such misfortune on a child's welfare was potentially catastrophic. Families who lost the main breadwinner experienced poverty more on a permanent than a cyclical basis. Only when older children obtained well-paying jobs did the family's conditions substantially improve. As a result, premature death of a father made it necessary for those children who were fortunate enough to be obtaining an education to leave school at the earliest possible opportunity. Though the death of the mother was financially less disastrous to the family, it often endangered the child's mental and physical health. It is probable that without the mother's additional income many families were forced to move to less satisfactory accommodation.
Where there were no older female children the lost domestic expertise must have had a considerable effect on the standard of the family's diet. Nevertheless, such misfortunes were often compensated for by the kindness of neighbours and relatives. Fortunately, it appears that such people came to a family's aid when a major breadwinner was sick or had recently died. A letter revealing the extent of such neighbourliness in Birmingham about mid-century stated:

Day by day, yes and month by month, have I known the younger children of a sick and dying parent fed at different neighbours' tables, and fed willingly, as members of the family.  

As a result of close ties of kinship and strong bonds of neighbourliness, many children who lost their parents at an early age, were saved from the workhouse. Instead many found themselves living with their cousins or neighbours. For the most part, it appears that only those families who had moved away from their close relatives to seek their fortunes elsewhere and had not yet become fully fledged members of the community, were forced to enter the workhouse or to live as best they could.  

II

During the nineteenth century the population of Britain increased dramatically. In successive decades from 1851 to 1881 the population of England and Wales grew by 12.3 per cent, 13.0 per cent, and 14.25 per cent to a total of 8,047,000. This growth of population changed the age structure of society. Contemporaries like Charles Booth thought the resulting increase in the ratio of children to adults nothing less than
remarkable. The percentage of those under fifteen years of age rose from 35.4 per cent of the total population in 1851 (6,353,800) to 36.5 per cent in 1881 (9,468,200). A significant, but nevertheless, relatively small number of those under fifteen worked regularly. In 1851 some 9.0 per cent, or 579,000 boys and girls, were gainfully employed. At that time more than 200,000 were employed by textile, dyeing or dressmaking firms; some 119,000 were employed to help on farms; more than 70,000 were gainfully employed as domestic servants; approximately 50,000 worked on ships or in the docks about the country; in excess of 30,000 children worked in mines; and a further 20,000 were employed in the metal trades. Opportunities for girls existed mainly in only three of the major forms of employment open to juveniles. More than 85 per cent of those in domestic service, approximately 55 per cent of those in textiles, dyeing or dressmaking, and 11 per cent of those employed on farms, were girls. It should be noted, however, that of all the children under fifteen only 6.3 per cent, or 41,900, were under ten years of age.

Between 1851 and 1881 employment opportunities for those under fifteen, and particularly those under ten years of age, declined. In England and Wales during the period 1861 to 1871, most industries began to provide fewer jobs for those under fifteen. In Scotland this decrease in job opportunities occurred a decade later. All over Britain a decrease in the employment of children under ten years of age occurred earlier. Considerable reductions first took place between 1851 and 1861. In the following decade the decline in the number of jobs was more marked. By the 1871 Census almost half as many children under ten years of age
were working as there had been twenty years before.

Despite the fact that child labour was decreasing, and never more than one child in ten was a regular member of the labour force after mid-century, the effect of working conditions on children is still worth considering. There is little doubt that the working conditions of the half million that were employed every year, were often harsh. Even before the child started work there was sometimes a long walk to be made before reaching the place of employment. Though the town child often had to walk several miles each day it seems likely that those who worked in agriculture travelled greater distances. The 1867 Report on the Conditions of Women and Children in Agriculture gives evidence to this effect. A Mrs. Adams of Denton, Huntingdonshire, reported to the commissioners:

In June 1862 my daughters Harriet and Sarah, aged respectively eleven and thirteen years, were engaged to work on Mr. Warman's land at Stilton. When they got there, he took them to near Peterborough; there they worked for six weeks, going and returning each day. The distance each way is eight miles, so they had to walk sixteen miles each day on all the six working days of the week, besides working in the field from 8 to 5, or 5:30, in the afternoon. They used to start from home at five in the morning, and seldom got back before nine. They had to find all their own meals, as well as their own tools. They were good for nothing at the end of six weeks. The ganger persuaded me to send my little girl Susan, who was then six years of age. She walked all the way (eight miles) to Peterborough, and worked from 8 to 5:30, and received fourpence. She was that tired that her sisters had to carry her the best part of the way home—eight miles, and she was ill from it for three weeks, and never went again.71

Despite these severe conditions, those that worked in the open air were often much better off than those who were employed underground or inside. In factories unguarded machines often mangled and sometimes killed children who got in the way of the moving parts. As well, a lack of ventilation
ventilation and high humidity encouraged the spread of infections. In the mines where dangerous conditions were always present and work was particularly arduous, dampness and sunlight deprivation reaped their toll on the physique and constitutions of the young. It is also likely that mining had damaging psychological consequences for the young employee. There is evidence to show that many young children were left all alone for hours on end to do their jobs in complete darkness. Throughout the spectrum of nineteenth century industry long hours of labour with few or no breaks for rest or food were the accepted norm. This was in line with contemporary economic thought, as some leading economists believed that it was only in the last hour of work that profits were made. Despite the fact that members of the medical profession suggested greater output could be obtained if there were more rest breaks, long hours of labour with the minimum of rest periods continued nearly everywhere.

Apart from walking long distances to their place of employment and then having to work long hours in unsanitary conditions, often on an inadequate diet, children were subjected to direct forms of cruelty by their employers. In many instances these cruelties helped undermine the young employee's health. In the case of boy chimney sweeps, and there were as many as 2,000 of them between five and ten years of age in 1864, a common practice was to harden their limbs in brine. Digby Seymour reported to the House of Commons of 30 April 1864, that:

In many cases the flesh did not harden for years. By that fearful training their bodies were deformed and their backs often covered all over with sores. The "sooty cancer" also prevailed amongst these
children, who had to sleep nine and twelve in a bed in the most foetid atmosphere . . . There was a regular system established in this country for the hire and sale of children for the purpose of carrying on that illegal and cruel occupation . . .

Even as late as March 1875, the *Times* reported the death of a boy named Brewster at the Fullorn Lunatic Asylum and expressed its concern that this cruel form of employment might be increasing. In mines there is much evidence to show that the butties and the corporals beat and kicked the young workers under their command. Sadly it was often the weakest children who received the most severe beatings.

Besides wage-labour there were other avenues open to working-class children. For the family that became destitute, the Poor Law, with all its undesirable social stigmas, was always available. Following the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 Boards of Guardians were given the responsibility for differentiating between those who were unable to support themselves because of physical incapacity and those that merely did not have sufficient funds to support themselves on a regular basis. The law with regard to the physically incapable was relatively benevolent. It allowed the authorities to provide outdoor relief. By contrast the law was particularly harsh to the families of the able-bodied poor. For them the only alternative was the workhouse. On appearing at the workhouse gates families were immediately split up—husbands from wives: parents from children. The diet inside was plain, monotonous and inadequate. Normally it consisted of nothing more than broth or gruel and dried bread or potatoes. Occasionally, small amounts of bread and cheese were made available. Apart from an inadequate diet which made children
less able to fend off infectious diseases, conditions inside the red-brickled "bastilles," as the workhouses were known, were unlikely to enhance child health. Reports available reveal that some of them were ideal places for spreading disease. In addition, there were many instances of blatant cruelty. Boys and girls were frequently flogged. There was even a case reported of a two-and-a-half year old child being forced to eat his own excrement for dirtying himself.

For those who neither found employment nor received financial aid from the Poor Law Authorities or private charities, illicit occupations still remained as an alternative. As late as 1876 Dr. Barnardo estimated that in London alone there were at least 30,000 neglected children under sixteen sleeping out. There seems little doubt that many of these survived through criminal means. This was despite the fact that nineteenth-century justice inflicted heavy penalties on juvenile criminals. Even so, many children found that a criminal way of life had advantages. Mary Carpenter, a person much interested in lower-class juvenile crime and prison reform, reported:

Their present mode of life is so lucrative and so pleasant, that they will not exchange it for another apparently presenting far greater advantage. Their filth and rags are no annoyance to them, for they are the implements of their trade; the cold and the hunger which they continually endure are most amply compensated by an occasional luxurious meal. The close and noisome dens in which they are stowed at night present nothing revolting to their feelings, and they prefer them to a clean abode where they must resign their occupation and some portion of their liberty.

J. J. Tobias, a historian specifically interested in nineteenth century crime, has concluded that while these children may often have been cold,
wet, uncared for, or unloved, they enjoyed a more varied and adventurous life than their honest contemporaries. In addition, Tobias has suggested that their conditions of "work" were often compensated for by times of plenty in which they could eat and drink to their heart's content amongst pleasant company. 84

There is little doubt that boys and girls of the criminal classes were promiscuous from a relatively early age. Reports are available which clearly show that girls of no more than fourteen years of age could not remember their first intercourse. In addition, it is known that some young criminals spent their ill-gotten gains on prostitution. As a result, it is not surprising that venereal diseases were contracted by twelve-year olds, that some brothels specifically catered to children, and that some young criminals actually lived with prostitutes. 85 However, it seems unlikely that most child prostitutes lived in brothels. What seems probable is that the majority lived with their parents some distance away from the area they "worked" and were forced to bring home most of the illegal earnings. 86 This state of affairs would explain why child brothels were never a major target for investigation. Kellow Chesney has suggested:

More than any other class of prostitutes, they seem to have been the product of the rookeries, conditioned to depravity before they ever took to hawking themselves on the streets. In fact the degradations, and above all the overcrowding, of the worst slums led to an indiscriminate sexuality that defies comment. One may read of a man convicted of outraging a small child begotten by himself on his own daughter. Born in such an environment, brought up to fight for existence by every means at hand, habituated to pain and brutality, it is no wonder if some of those children were ready to exploit their one readily cashable asset. 87
Unlike other forms of child employment which decreased as social conditions improved, child prostitution increased as the nineteenth century drew to a close.88

The overall decline in child labour had both positive and negative affects on the well-being of British working-class children. In families where the total family income was close to the poverty line the withdrawal of child labour probably had a detrimental effect on the family's diet and on other essentials like heating and perhaps housing. However, because many children no longer had to face the daily dangers to life and limb and suffer the unhealthy conditions, cruelties and physical stress in factories and mines, it is highly likely that many more children had the opportunity to develop better physiques and constitutions than would otherwise have been possible.

III

During the nineteenth century legislation affected the social and economic status of children in at least four different ways. Changes in the way the State might punish its young offenders had the effect of raising the age of that group of individuals which had less-than-adult status. By the early part of the nineteenth century English Common Law had provided two social groups with a special immunity against punishment. Infants under seven years of age were considered as being incapable of felonious intent. For children between seven and fourteen years of age there was a presumption against felonious intent. However, a Victorian legal authority, W. Clarke Hall, has shown that evidence "tending to show
deliberation was sufficient to prove such intent." As a result, the severest of penalties were suffered by children of seven or more years. However, starting with the Youthful Offenders Act of 1854, which represented according to Mathew Davenport Hill, the Recorder of Birmingham, the Magna Carta for juvenile delinquents, a series of Acts, by establishing special forms of treatment for juveniles, separated the young offender from the mature criminal.

Though employers had long since recognized the difference between adult workers and the younger members of the working classes by the amount of money they were prepared to put into their wage packets, a series of Acts of Parliament, inspired more by a concern for the morals of children than for their health or physical condition, further defined the younger worker's less-than-adult status. By 1870 legislation had been passed which affected most of the major forms of juvenile employment with the exception of domestic service. Factories were not permitted to employ anyone under eight years of age and those under thirteen were restricted to a set number of hours. Women and young children had been completely banned from working underground in mines, while boys between twelve and sixteen years of age were restricted in the number of hours they might work per day and per week. No agricultural gangs were allowed to employ any child under eight years of age and the distances that youngsters might walk per day were restricted. In addition, some particularly nasty and dangerous forms of employment, such as chimney-sweeping, were placed off-limits to juveniles as old as fifteen.
The Education Acts of the 1870s and 1880 which were passed largely to "compel our future masters to learn their letters" and to provide a supply of workers with the necessary skills for the new forms of industry, further helped to define this less-than-adult status. The 1876 Act, by making it no longer possible for farmers to employ children under ten years of age, dealt a death blow to the agricultural gang system and largely put an end to the worst excesses of juvenile agricultural labour. The 1880 Act, by making education compulsory for all children between the ages of five and ten years of age, and by making it necessary for any child between ten and thirteen years of age to possess a leaving certificate before he or she could start work, completed the picture.

Changes in the laws affecting the relationship between the parent and the child, by limiting the powers of the parents and delineating specific duties towards their offspring, began to provide children with an independent status. In this regard the Acts preventing cruelty to children and those stipulating powers of adoption and custody were of particular importance. The prevention of Cruelty to Children Act of 1889 was rightly referred to in the Houses of Parliament as the Children's Charter. Not only was it a particularly effective measure for dealing with parents who willfully mistreated, neglected or abandoned their children, but it also prompted the idea of specific civil rights for children beyond those of freedom from physical cruelty and neglect.

IV

Certain conclusions may be drawn from the preceding discussion.
of the social and economic conditions experienced by working-class children and the legislative changes which had a bearing on their childhood. Prior to 1870 a good deal of concern had manifested itself about the moral welfare of children and the more blatant forms of physical cruelty inflicted upon them. This does not imply, however, that nobody cared about the general health and social conditions of children. It is a well-established fact that the middle and upper classes held their offspring in high esteem. They were quite prepared to spend considerable sums on their children's behalf. The middle class, for example, made considerable sacrifices by spending large sums on education. At the other end of the social scale the working class also made sacrifices for their children. Neighbours and relatives fed, clothed, and sheltered needy children. Working mothers often went without food so that their children would not go hungry. There is, in fact, little evidence to suggest that it was any more than a small group of working-class parents who unduly chastized or persecuted their children. There is also little evidence which contradicts the view that only a small group amongst the upper and middle classes concerned themselves, to any large extent, about the social and physical conditions of working-class children. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that from about the third quarter of the nineteenth century onwards a profound shift in the status of working-class children occurred.

The nature of this new status for working-class children was complex and at times paradoxical. Prior to the 1870s, the Factory Acts and the new laws relating to the punishment of juvenile criminals tended to
isolate working-class children and place them in a less-than-adult world. From at least the middle of the nineteenth century the economic value of working-class children to society as workers, declined seriously. Fewer and fewer of them were needed to man the major commercial and industrial enterprises of Britain. Only in the service industries was there any continued demand. In a strictly Marxist sense, the children of the working class were ceasing to be members of the proletariat. However, at the same time, the very scientific and technological advances which had caused a decrease in the number of child workers required, also demanded that a new type of adult worker be produced. This new adult worker had to be able to read instructions, evaluate costs, measure weights, and to calculate angles. It was in response to this demand, and in conjunction with the perceived need of the upper classes to educate the newly enfranchised members of the working class in the established ways of liberal democracy that the Education Act of 1870 was passed. While the value of working-class children had fallen to practically nothing in current market terms, their value as future citizens and mature workers had become considerable. This shift in attitude towards the working-class child, and the provision of a special status which accompanied it, tend to explain the development by the State, of protective measures to ensure the health and welfare of children which followed the Education Act of 1870. It should be noted that some of these measures were specifically geared to make the child independent of his parents. In fact, certain rights of working-class parents were sacrificed in order to ensure a full complement of workers for Britain's
future. As a result, the suggestion that the Education Act was the starting point of the modern concept of the child and was the benevolent opening of Pandora's box, is misleading. While the Education Act of 1870 was a reflection of the new special status of working-class children, it more closely represented the starting point of the modern concept of the new British worker. The Education Act was not the opener of Pandora's box, but merely one of the prizes found within.
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CHAPTER II

CHAPTER II

CHANGES IN HEALTH CONSCIOUSNESS IN LATE-VICTORIAN BRITAIN:
AN ASSESSMENT OF THE ROLE OF "EXPERTS" IN
IMPROVING THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN

It is quite wrong to assume that the Elementary Education Acts of the 1870's and 1880's were ultimately responsible for initiating a series of special services to improve the health and welfare of children. Not only can it be argued that some of the measures selected actually had earlier origins than the Education Act of 1870, but it can be shown that some of the ensuing legislation had little or nothing to do with children being at school. To evaluate correctly how and why child health services developed, and, more important, why they emerged when they did, consideration must be given to such factors as: the extent of medical knowledge (particularly with reference to nutrition, school hygiene, and child psychology); the influence of religious beliefs and the moral code implicit in the Poor Law; the availability of funds and the degree of authority exerted by central government over local authorities; and the impact of changing attitudes towards the inviolability of the home, self-help, and the relationship between parents and children; as well as the influence of socialism and the impact of bodies representing working-class interests on the political process.

This chapter looks at the period of forty years from 1860 to 1900 and attempts to show how the special services to enhance the health and welfare of children were institutionalized by law and voluntary
programmes. Prior to elementary education being made compulsory in 1880 the institutionalization of child health had depended more on the work of doctors and a few individuals with a specific interest in the problem than on party politics. From the early 1880's this state of affairs changed dramatically. Two factors lay behind this change. First, largely as the result of the actions of London's casual poor, middle-class fears of violence were intensified. These fears, in conjunction with the formation of the Independent Labour Party and other socialist groups, ensured that the demands of the British working man would not only be brought to the attention of the upper classes but would receive a favourable hearing. The other factor was A. J. Mundella's revision of the Education Code of 1882. As a result, this chapter has been broken down into two distinct parts, one describing the events occurring before 1880, the other describing the activities of the period 1880 to 1900.

I

Punishments of juvenile offenders were steadily softened from quite early in the nineteenth century; the conditions of child employment were improved from almost the same time; but state intervention to prevent child abuse came much later. To all intents and purposes the Englishman's home, whether it was the stately home of one of Britain's large landowners or the squalid hovel of an unemployed, drunken farm labourer, was his castle. There his powers over his wife were great, and those over his children greater. Prior to 1870 there were only two provisions under which the Crown could intervene on behalf of children.
The first concerned children who became wards of a court. Here the law often intervened between the parent and the child to protect the property rights of the child. The second arose where a child's death was found to be due to a failure to provide medical attention or sufficient food. The parents could be found guilty of manslaughter. But it proved much harder to enforce.

In fact, it was only through action to prevent child neglect by third parties that the authorities were alerted to the problem of the infant death-rate and child abuse generally. In the first instance the spur to this quickening of social consciousness came from the dissemination of convincing information about baby-farming. Prior to the notorious Waters and Ellis trial of 1870 the medical profession had begun a campaign to control this practice. At the instigation of its honorary secretary, Dr. J. D. Curgenven, the Harveian Society had appointed a committee of investigation. This committee was responsible for placing a series of recommendations before the Home Secretary in January of 1867. Unfortunately, the Government declined to take any action at this time. Undaunted by this initial setback the medical profession continued to apply pressure. Dr. Curgenven himself read papers before the influential annual conferences of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science in both 1867 and 1869. In both instances resolutions were passed to end the evils of baby-farming. In 1868, Dr. Ernest Hart, the editor of the British Medical Journal published a series of articles on the subject. These were responsible for prompting the "children's champion," Lord Shaftesbury, to bring the matter up in the House of Lords.
Encouraged by the support not only of his own society and the NAPSS but also of the British Medical Journal and Lord Shaftesbury, Dr. Curgenven set about establishing a society to pressure the Government into legislative action. This as it turned out was formed even before the Waters and Ellis trial was completed and was responsible for the appointment of a Select Committee on the Protection of Infant Life and the eventual introduction of the Infant Life Protection Bill by the Salford Member of Parliament, W. T. Charley, in February of 1871. Though the Act contained no overly stringent regulations, and advertisements for "adoption" continued to appear, this represented an important precedent for child rights and an important step in the protection of the health of very young children.

Despite the claims by Lord Shaftesbury that parental cruelties were "enormous" and "indeputable," and statements by Dr. Barnardo that there were more than 30,000 homeless and destitute children in London, no direct restrictions on parental rights were made for more than ten years. Shaftesbury's own beliefs concerning the inviolability of individual authority in domestic matters is illustrative of the sense of helplessness that many of those who wished to outlaw all forms of child abuse must have felt. While he was well aware that public attitudes could normally be changed by private groups revealing detailed information of terrible conditions, he continued to believe that parental cruelty was of "so private, internal and domestic a character as to be beyond the reach of legislation" and that such a topic would not be entertained by either House.
As with the case of the physically abused child, interest in physically and mentally defective children preceded the Elementary Education Act of 1870. However, in this instance the interest was of longer standing. It was not in conflict with parental rights; nor was concern for the physically or mentally incapable in conflict with the moral code embodied in the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834.

Though a special school for the deaf had been opened by Thomas Braidwood in Edinburgh as early as the 1760's, it was blindness which first captured the public imagination and was able to tap the coffers of the philanthropically-minded. At first, people assumed that the blind were incapable of fending for themselves and, consequently, were doomed to be dependent on the sighted. In fact, very few options were thought to be open to the blind. Either they had to be supported by relatives, friends, or a pension from some benevolent society, or they had to rely on begging. It was because begging was considered socially unacceptable that the impoverished blind received tacit recognition of the helplessness of their state and were not subjected to the ordinary means test or the rigours of out-relief normally ascribed to the able-bodied poor under the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act.

Between 1850 and 1875 this attitude towards the blind began to change. Behind this shift in social consciousness lay the work of people like Elizabeth Gilbert. Blind since a severe attack of scarlet fever at the age of three, Elizabeth Gilbert was responsible for persuading many of those in authority to believe that blind people were not necessarily social parasites. Public recognition of this fact came with the passing
of the Education and Maintenance of Pauper Children in Certain Schools and Institutions Act of 1862. This Act empowered Boards of Guardians to maintain, clothe, and educate the blind children of pauper parents in special schools providing that the cost involved did not exceed the amount required to keep them in the workhouse. In only a few years the application of the self-help principle to the blind was complete. By 1886 the Home Teaching Society was able to state in its annual report:

There are many disadvantages attendant on the giving of pensions to the young and able-bodied blind. Often a small dole or pension entirely destroys the efforts which the blind might otherwise be induced to make towards self-help.

Unfortunately, the deaf were unable to evoke the same level of public sympathy as the blind. The cause of this failure lay in the nature of the defect itself. Though an individual might look normal in every respect, his failure to hear what was said led initially to an inability to communicate. It was for this reason that in the early years of the nineteenth century the deaf were dispatched along with the idiots and imbeciles to the lunatic asylums. Nevertheless, several special schools for the deaf were established before 1870 through voluntary contributions, and Boards of Guardians, through the 1862 Pauper Children Act, were given the authority to send deaf children to them subject to the same cost restrictions that were imposed on blind children.

By comparison with either the blind or the deaf, children who suffered from either mental or other physical defects attracted much less attention in the period before 1870. In the case of those who were physically defective this is particularly surprising. Not only did the
early employment commissions and popular novelists like Charles Dickens draw attention to those who had suffered industrial injuries or were born with a debility, but we now know that rickets was particularly common among the child populations of the major urban centres. Nevertheless, at no time during the nineteenth century did the child who through accident, inheritance, or malnutrition became physically incapable of leading a normal life, become the central figure of a government report. Nor was it until the last decade of the nineteenth century that he became a major topic of concern among the philanthropically-minded. It seems reasonable to conclude that the reason little attention was paid to such children was the total lack of medical expertise concerning orthopaedic treatment.

Those with mental defects were only slightly luckier. Though it was possible to collect out-relief for the mentally defective child who lived at home, most—whether they were merely feeble-minded or epileptic—went with the idiot and the imbecile to the lunatic asylum. Unfortunately, despite the fact that one report to the 1860 Select Committee on the Care and Treatment of Lunatics mentioned the existence of "a department of psychological medicine" at one such institution, and it was generally acknowledged that there existed both a strong urge to cure the insane as well as a belief that early treatment could produce radically beneficial results, places housing the mentally defective were seldom more than merely custodial centres. An opportunity to change this situation had come with the passing of the 1862 Act which had allowed Boards of Guardians to maintain feeble-minded, but not "imbecile"
or "idiot" children, at special schools. However, because the Education and Maintenance of Pauper Children Act was only permissive, and the number of special schools small, its effect was very limited.  

In the years which followed the Elementary Education Act of 1870 interest in physically and mentally defective children became more urgent and comprehensive. In 1874 two important steps were taken. One was the decision of the London School Board to establish special classes for the blind and the deaf children of the metropolis. The other was the formation by the Charity Organization Society of London, a philanthropic body recently formed to make the distribution of charity more efficient and to prevent begging, of a special select committee on the training of the blind. This was made up of representatives from most of the major London societies interested in the welfare of the blind, and included such notables as the Duke of Westminster, Lord Shaftesbury, and Lord Lichfield.

The causes of these two events are perhaps more diverse than one might expect. Obviously the mere fact that the Education Act of 1870 made School Boards responsible for seeing that all children would receive an education was of tremendous importance. Nevertheless, two other factors also played an important part. The first was the publication by Colonel Mansfield Turner and William Harris of a Guide to Institutions and Charities of the Blind (1871). The second was the belief that Britain was slipping behind the Continent in its care of the Blind.  

The COS committee was responsible for making the first assessment of the extent of blindness in the United Kingdom. Some 30,000 people were thought to be blind, and of these only one-third were considered to
be capable of working. In London alone some 2,890 people were found to be blind. Of these one in twelve was born blind; 493 were in Poor Law institutions; between eight and nine hundred were capable of work; and some 300 were children. When published the Committee's report, The Training of the Blind, recommended that blind children should be educated from age five and that more teachers be trained.

About the same time the COS created a special committee to investigate the education and care of idiots, imbeciles, and harmless lunatics. Like the Committee on the Training of the Blind it was busy and thorough and included a number of influential people amongst its membership such as Sir Charles Trevelyan, the Earl of Devon, Lord Lichfield, Sir J. P. Kay-Shuttleworth, U. J. Kay-Shuttleworth, Lieutenant-General Cavenagh, and several prominent doctors. Before it reported in 1877, it had visited four institutions; held thirteen meetings, and heard evidence from the United States of America, the colonies, and several European countries. One of its main findings was that the harmless could be trained by proper methods and should, therefore, be placed in special institutions. It was even the belief of the COS that the size of the total problem was too big for private philanthropy, and that state support should be obtained to aid local voluntary institutions. These and other recommendations were taken to the Local Government Board on 16 May 1877 by a large deputation which included Lord Shaftesbury. The endeavour was particularly successful. A clause which drew the distinction between harmless lunatics and others, and empowered local authorities to establish schools was inserted in the County Government Bill. Unfortunately,
the clause was later withdrawn with the Bill.\textsuperscript{15}

The spread of organizations specifically geared to provide meals for needy children was directly tied to the extent of medical knowledge concerning the relationship between diet and disease in the period before 1880. In the first instance new medical knowledge came from France. As early as 1848, the French Government had appointed a commission to enquire into scrofula, rickets, impoverishment of the blood (angina couenneuse), and other diseases afflicting children. The conclusion reached by the Commission was that these diseases were caused by a lack of animal food in the diet, and that they might be checked if poor children were given a meal of fresh meat at least once a month. Though political events prevented any immediate response in metropolitan France, Victor Hugo was able to initiate a programme on the island of Guernsey in 1862. There he fed forty of the most necessitous children—twenty every two weeks—with fresh meat and a glass of wine. On 16 January 1864, \textit{Punch} published an article about Hugo's scheme. It revealed not only that many sick children had been cured, but also that the physical constitution of nearly all the children had improved. Besides pointing out Victor Hugo's belief that it was the Christian duty of the rich to look after the poor, \textit{Punch} argued that it also made good economic sense to provide needy children with good food:

\begin{quote}
The stronger the child is, the greater is the chance that he will grow up a strong man: and the stronger the man is the more work he can do, and the less chance will there be of his coming on the parish. So putting charity aside, it would be wise economy to give the children of the poor people now and then a meal of meat, and strengthen thus their sinews and constitutions.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}
In addition, *Punch* suggested that while it might not be possible for people to follow Victor Hugo's example to the letter, it was entirely feasible for the richer members of the community to club together and hire a dining-hall. Within a month of the publication of this article the Destitute Children's Dinner Association had been formed.

Besides the obvious influence of Victor Hugo's scheme it seems likely that the formation of the Destitute Children's Dinner Association owed something to the work of Dr. Edward Smith. As early as 1862, he had been asked to report to the Privy Council on the nourishment of distressed cotton operatives. His report related to the unemployed factory population of Ashton-Under-Lyne, Blackburn, Manchester, Preston, Stockport, and Wigan, and was the first extensive attempt to relate good nutrition with the cost of food per head per week. It clearly outlined the reasons for defective cookery, identified the lack of animal food in the diet, and suggested suitable diets. In addition, it stressed the importance of highly nitrogenized food for the young and pinpointed milk as the most perfect food both in nutritional and cost terms. It seems indisputable that Dr. Smith's report, when published in 1863, must have brought the problem of child nutrition in depressed areas to the attention of many important people of charitable minds in Government, the medical profession, and elsewhere.

In the period which followed the formation of the Destitute Children's Dinner Association many similar organizations were formed. While there may be some doubt regarding the influence of Dr. Smith's work on the formation of the first organization for feeding school children,
there is little doubt that his later work, by raising the health consciousness of people generally towards the need for good diets, helped the extension of charitable concerns for feeding needy children. In 1864 he both published *Practical Dietary for Families, Schools and the Labouring Classes,* and carried out an examination of the diets of agricultural labourers, kid-glovers, needlewomen, silk weavers, shoemakers, stocking glove weavers, and throwsters. Published as the "Report to the Privy Council on the Food of the Poorer Labouring Classes in England," this examination represented the first attempt in any country to ascertain the national dietary. Some two years later Dr. Smith conducted a special study of the dietaries of workhouse inmates. His report contained the following severe warning about the consequences of letting working-class children go underfed:

It is a matter of both public policy and of local advantage, that children should be so fed that whilst they shall not acquire tastes which can not be satisfied in after life, they should grow up strong and healthy and be able to serve their employers and gain a living. If they should be of feeble health and imperfectly developed, they may procreate children of inferior health, and both they and theirs are likely to come to the workhouse to be maintained at the public expense. Moreover, so far as quality of mind (as indicated by intelligence and enterprise) is associated with defective bodily power (and this in the poor is far more general than has been recognized) they will also continue to occupy an inferior position even amongst their fellows, be inferior workmen and citizens; and be less influenced by the educational efforts which the state and private organizations are so widely making.

The influence of this report was not missed by the authorities. Dr. Smith was asked to make further suggestions detailing how workhouse diets could be improved. These appeared in the 20th Annual Report of the Poor Law Board and specifically emphasized the point that an abundant supply
of food was essential to the young's growth, health, and strength, and laid down several principles for feeding children of different ages.\textsuperscript{22}

Between October 1869 and April 1870, several months before the Education Act was passed,\textsuperscript{23} fifty-eight dining-rooms were opened in the metropolitan area.\textsuperscript{24} M. E. Buckley, an early historian of the school meals' movement, has suggested that from the first, the motive, though largely sentimental, was supported by educational considerations.\textsuperscript{25} This argument is substantiated by a report in the \textit{Times} of 5 December 1867, concerning statements made by the fund raising committee of the Destitute Children's Dinner Association:

Their almost constant destitution of food is not only laying the foundation of permanent disease in their debilitated constitutions, but reduced them to so low a state that they have not vigour of body or energy of mind sufficient to derive any profit from the exertions of their teachers.\textsuperscript{26}

Nevertheless, the claim made by Dr. Smith in his book, \textit{Foods}, published in 1873, the year before his death, that the concentration of the public's attention on foods and dietaries had been caused by a considerable increase in commercial intercourse with distant countries, a marked improvement in the purchasing power of the masses, and a rapid increase in wealth generally,\textsuperscript{27} cannot be taken lightly.

It is difficult to generalize about the effectiveness of these early schemes for feeding hungry children. On the one hand, little is known about how many children were being fed on a regular basis. On the other, there is insufficient data available to assess the quality of the food prepared. In spite of these drawbacks some qualifications may be
made about specific schemes. Perhaps the most successful was one established at Rousdon in Devon. There, prior to 1876, children had to walk long distances to and from school on "wretched morsals" of food. However, in that year Sir Henry Peek provided one good meal every weekday at the cost of one penny per day. According to an inspector the results were very successful:

What strikes one at once on coming into the school is the healthy vigorous look of the children, and that their vigour is not merely bodily, but comes out in the course of examination. There is a marked contrast between their appearance and their work on the day of inspection, and those of the children in many of the neighbouring schools. The mid-day meal is good and without stint. It acts as an attraction, and induces regularity of attendance... Before the school was started the education of children in the neighbourhood was as low as any part of the district.28

However, it appears from other evidence that in most instances children were provided with meals much less frequently29 and seldom at all during the summer months. In a letter to the Times John Palmer, the secretary of the Clare Market Ragged Schools, reported that he knew of only one case where dinner was provided as often as three times a week.30 Nevertheless, it also appears from the records of the Destitute Children's Dinner Association31 and the Ragged Schools Union32 that one good meal33 a week was not only sufficient to improve the physical condition of the children concerned, but also to allow better school work to be produced.

While the effectiveness of these schemes may be in some doubt their purpose was not. They did not set out, as the Charity Organization Society made clear, to relieve indiscriminately the multitude of poor children to be found in the lowest parts of the metropolis. Instead,
the object was to encourage those who attended ragged and other schools
to take full advantage of the moral and religious training that was made
available. In fact, special care was taken to avoid any charge of pauper­
izing the parents. It was for this reason that the Destitute Children's
Dinner Association and other feeding organizations required payment for
the food provided. Normally the levy was a penny, a sum far short of the
actual cost. Nevertheless, even this small amount was beyond the means
of many children.

In the period before 1880 policies governing the institutionaliza­
tion of child health clearly followed the philosophy dictated by the
Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834. Those who were considered to be physi­
cally incapable were recognized by the State as requiring special ser­
vices and in need of relief. Those who were able-bodied, even though
they were only children, and it was no fault of theirs that they were
hungry and undernourished, were left to the hands of charity.

II

During the early 1880's a bitter controversy over "mental over­
pressure" in schools developed. This had the effect of intertwining the
philosophies and actions of all those interested in either the school
hygiene movement, or hungry or defective children, and was responsible
for initiating the first medical inspections of elementary school chil­
dren. For this reason it seems most appropriate to describe the efforts
to improve the health and welfare of children during this period in
terms of two specific categories: one concerning the actions to improve
the health and welfare of the school child, the other those attempting
to improve the conditions of the child before he was old enough to go to
school or while he was in the home.

In the 1860's the medical profession's interest in education had
been limited to methods of containing the spread of infectious diseases
in schools. In the following decade this interest was enlarged to in­
clude the relationship between the physical condition of the school child
and his ability. Though several important papers concerning this rela­
tionship were published in the leading medical journals by such people
as Dr. Robert Farquharson and Dr. Francis Warner, there was no indication
that any vigorous controversy was imminent.

In April of 1880 an event occurred which changed all this. As
with the case of the development of feeding organizations it was news
from abroad which actually set things in motion. In this instance it
was the decision of the London Times to reprint part of a paper entitled,
"Habitual Headache and Brain exhaustion," which had been read by a cer­
tain Dr. Treichler to the Neurology and Psychiatry section of the German
Association of Natural Historians and Physicians in the previous year.
One may well ask why a paper read before a German society should have
attracted so much attention in Britain when similar papers published at
home by British doctors had not. The answer is fairly simple. In the
aftermath of the Franco-Prussian war things German tended to be much
admired in Britain. This was particularly true of the Prussian school
system. In addition, it was in Germany that much of the valuable work
in the field of child psychology was being carried out. Thus, when it
was said that German school children suffered from gross over-pressure, people in Britain listened attentively. The response to the Times' article was considerable. Letters by Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, Dr. Sophia Jex Blake, Dr. Robert Farquharson, and J. S. Laurie were published by the Times and raised all the important issues that were later to form the nub of the over-pressure controversy: How extensive was it? Could it be eradicated? Did it show a bias towards a particular sex or class? How important was malnutrition as a contributory factor?  

Between 1880 and 1884 several important events occurred within the medical profession which though not directly related to the problem of over-pressure, made the question of child health appear more important. Among these were Dr. Priestly Smith's investigation of some 2,000 Birmingham school children and Training College students, and the publication of the first British text-book on school hygiene by Dr. Clement Dukes, the physician to Rugby School. Another landmark came in 1883 when the Anthropometric Committee of the British Association for the Advancement of Science presented its final report. This clearly drew attention to the disparity between the physical dimensions of one class of British children and another:

The most obvious facts which the figures disclose are the check which growth receives as we descend lower and lower in the social scale, and that a difference of five inches exists between the average stature of the best and the worst nurtured classes of children of corresponding ages, and of 3½ inches in adults.

At the same time concern about mental over-pressure by elementary teachers and members of government departments increased. In 1882 A. J.
Mundella instigated a revision of the Education Code. When completed the New Code stipulated that grants should be calculated on the basis of the number of passes obtained as a percentage of the number of children presented for examination. This had the effect of reversing the attitude of elementary school teachers. Hitherto it had been in their interest to put up as many children as possible for examination. Now the opposite became true. As a result, the National Union of Elementary Teachers came out strongly against Mundella's New Code and over-pressure. A resolution passed by the executive under pressure from the rank and file stated:

The excessive requirements of the Code, some of the present conditions of examination, and the great irregularity of attendance at school, are causes which lead to great pressure upon the children in elementary schools, and place especially heavy burdens upon the weak and dull children.43

In 1883 the question of over-pressure, or "over-education" as it was more often called at the time, became a matter of Parliamentary debate. On 16 July Lord Stanley of Alderley asked whether the Government intended to approve compulsory homework in elementary schools at a time when the press was alleging over-pressure and when returns were showing substantial increases of insanity, in view of the fact that two doctors, formerly attached to the West Riding Lunatic Asylum, had suggested that educational strain was a cause of illness.44 It was this question which made the matter into a controversy of some import. The Government, and Mundella especially, had invested much time and effort in the New Code and were not about to see what they believed to be a more efficient system of education made redundant by a conspiracy of lazy teachers and
greedy voluntary school managers. As a result, Mundella in replying to criticism in the Commons argued that malnutrition, not the Education Code, was the cause of strain. In this position Mundella had the full support of his department. According to Gillian Sutherland, Her Majesty's Inspectors rebutted charges of over-pressure by defending the New Code and "payments by results" in their reports, at public meetings, and in letters to the Times. They persistently argued that malnutrition was a far more serious cause of sickness and strain than over-pressure. It was for this reason that they gave ardent support to the Penny Dinner movement, and perhaps why Mundella came to sponsor a pamphlet on the subject. Likewise, Lyon Playfair, the Liberal health authority, also came to defend the Code by pointing out that child mortality had been falling since 1870 and that there was no evidence to show that deaths from brain diseases were increasing. Samuel Smith went further. He suggested that if Parliament went so far as to compel children to attend school they should provide them, if need be, with sufficient food to cope with the pressure. In addition, he argued that there should be medical inspection of schools, and that grants should be based partly on the physical health of the children concerned. In August the Lancet began a series of articles and stated quite categorically in support of Mundella: "the educational system is not overworking children but demonstrating that they are underfed."

Neither these nor other defences were able to resist the attack on over-pressure and the Code either in or outside the Houses of Parliament. In Parliament Stanley Leighton in the Commons, and Lord Stanley
in the Lords, maintained a fairly constant attack. Outside, Thomas Heller, the Secretary of the NUET, took advantage of an opportunity to address a combined session of the Health and Education Sections of the NAPSS at Huddersfield in October on the dangers of over-pressure. In February of the following year the former director of the West Riding Lunatic Asylum, Dr. James Crichton-Browne, who was also the founder of Brain and was now one of the Lord Chancellor's Visitors in Lunacy, wrote a strong letter to the Bradford Observer on the dangers of over-pressure from payments by results. This was sufficient to force Mundella to request Dr. Crichton-Browne to visit some London schools and make a report. The report represented a severe indictment of the educational system and re-echoed the warnings given by Charles Dickens in his novel, Dealings with the Firm of Dombey and Son: Wholesale, Retail and for Exportation in 1848. When the report was eventually published on 1 May 1884 it was accompanied by a memorandum written by a close adviser of Mundella, J. G. Fitch. Whereas the work of Dr. Crichton-Browne contained the latest in medical opinion, that of Her Majesty's Inspector was based only on cold hard fact. As a result, Fitch was able to discredit much of Dr. Crichton-Browne's report on the basis that it failed to use a scientific method of analysis.

Thus, by 1884 the controversy over mental over-pressure had reached a stand-off. Because little in the way of new convincing evidence had been produced by either the medical or teaching professions since 1880, the case that mental over-pressure was severe enough to cause death remained unproven. However, because the issue of child health had
been brought so forcefully to the public's attention by the debate, the Government and the inspectorate, in order to support the New Code, had been forced to concede that serious dangers to the health of children existed. While Fitch might attempt to rebut Dr. Crichton-Browne's suggestion that free milk and meals as well as regular and detailed medical inspections should be given to elementary school children, with such words as:

... a school is established for the purpose of instruction and not for the purpose of dispensing new milk ... I trust that the statesmen and the philanthropists who are now considering the difficult and anxious question will think twice before complicating the problem of national education by mixing it up with the administration of food and medicine to the children of the poor.\textsuperscript{57}

the consensus of informed opinion was fast moving to the position that to compel a hungry child to attend school was not only to place his health in severe jeopardy, and, consequently, that something urgent needed to be done about the case of necessitous children, but also to waste money needlessly on expensive education.\textsuperscript{58}

In fact, no sooner had the over-pressure debate died down than a new controversy over the merits of penny dinners began. On the one side were those like Mundella who believed that providing meals only for those who could afford to pay was not enough, as well as those who considered that free meals could be justified on the basis that parents made a financial sacrifice in sending their children to school. On the other were those like the members of the COS who believed that the only means of avoiding pauperization of the parents was by insisting on a charge being levied. Despite these differences the debate was sufficient to cause a
considerable increase in the number of voluntary feeding organizations during the year 1884. On 13 December the School Board Chronicle could report Mundella as stating that since his mention of the Rousdon experiment in the House, school meals had been provided in rural districts at an unprecedented rate. In London the Council for Promoting Self-supporting Penny Dinners had been established. In only a matter of some five months the number of penny-dinner centres jumped from two to fifteen.

The provision of free school meals found early supporters both among private philanthropists who believed that suffering had to be relieved regardless of the moral consequences to the destitute, and among socialists and members of the labour movement. The Referee Fund which owed its beginnings to Mrs. Burgwin, the headteacher of the Orange Street School, Southwark, and its development to Mr. G. R. Sims, the author of How the Poor Live, and Arnold White, who made appeals through the columns of the Referee, had always given free meals to those in need. Likewise, the Board School Children's Free Dinner Fund which also began before the penny dinner movement, had adopted a policy of only feeding the children of those parents who were either ill, out of work, or otherwise unable to provide the necessary penny or half-penny required elsewhere. Advocates of free school meals among socialists and members of the labour movement emerged only a little later. As early as January of 1882 socialists at a series of public discussions on "Practical Remedies for Pressing Needs" suggested free feeding. However, it should be noted that in this and other instances socialists and members of the labour
movement always insisted on the feeding of all children who were forced to attend elementary schools. The feeding of school children developed as part of their overall platform of "free maintenance" of school children. The first political party to adopt free school meals as part of its official programme was the Social Democratic Federation under the leadership of H. M. Hyndman. It had canvassed right from its inception on the basis of "free compulsory education for all classes, together with the provision of at least one wholesome meal a day in each school."  

The growth of voluntary feeding organizations which developed as a result of all these pressures led to a serious overlapping of programmes and much wasting of effort in London. In 1887 Sir Henry Peek attempted to rectify this situation in London by doing for school feeding what the COS had done for charity. Unfortunately, his attempt was not as successful. However, in 1888 two SDF candidates up for election to the London School Board, Annie Bessant and Stewart Headlam, made school meals the main point of their election addresses. In the following year, partly as the result of Annie Bessant's exposure of the utter absurdity of trying to educate half-starved school children, the London School Board set up a committee of enquiry. This established that food was being supplied very unsatisfactorily. Not only were some areas being over-supplied while others were left without any supplies at all, but in most districts most of the children could not be fed frequently enough and were not fed at all during the summer months. The Committee was able to obtain some indication of the size of the problem at hand. It was believed that approximately 12.8 per cent (43,888) of the children
attending schools runs by the Board were permanently in need of food, and that less than half of these (24,739) were actually being looked after. In addition, it found out that a penny was a prohibitive sum for a considerable number of very poor children. As a result, the committee recommended that "cheap or free meals should be provided for poor children in the public elementary schools of London on such a scale that no child really underfed should be without one meal a day." At a meeting held on 2 November 1889, at the London School Board Sir William Hart Dyke put forward the proposal, which was duly seconded by Mundella, to establish a central organization for ensuring "a more economical and more efficient system of making provisions." This came into being as the non-party, London School Dinner Association. However, it should be pointed out that two of the more important voluntary societies providing meals declined to join the new Association. One was the Destitute Children's Dinner Association; the other was the Board School's Dinner Fund. The first chose to remain outside the Association because one of its rules stipulated that a certain amount of animal food had to be included in the meals provided. The second refused to join because it did not believe that payment should be required in all cases.

At the time of the formation of the London School Dinner Association self-supporting meals were the rule rather than the exception. By about 1895 the converse was true. Then only approximately 10 per cent of the meals provided were actually paid for by London's needy children. Several factors played a part in bringing about this change. First, it seems highly likely that the number of children without the necessary
penny actually increased. Not only were there substantial increases in London's population, but the 1880's represented a period of unusual distress for London's unskilled labour. It also appears that the fear of working-class violence, engendered in the middle class by London's casually employed during the middle and late 1880's, had the effect of making the more well-to-do more willing to provide money for feeding organizations. Meanwhile those in charge of feeding organizations were more prepared to turn a blind eye to the child who did not have his penny or his half-penny, at a time when the influence of the moral code implicit in the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act was declining, and when Charles Booth was proving that poverty had little to do with moral character and more to do with the amount of employment available in a district and the size of the wage packets provided.

By 1895 another change in the pattern of school meal distribution was visible. As indicated earlier in this chapter the earliest feeding organizations paid careful attention to the quality and quantity of the meals provided. By 1895 the tendency to provide a good helping of meat with every meal had declined considerably. According to M. E. Buckley, the chief reason for this was that the need to attract children now that meals were free was no longer as great as when payment had been required. In London another reason was that the National Food Supply Association, the organization which did most of the catering, did much to promote vegetarian interests in the form of vegetable soup. According to the evidence given by C. H. Heller to the Special Committee on underfed Children in 1895, the provision of this soup had undesirable effects.
"The soup ... varies so little from day to day that it is natural for the children to grow tired of it." 72

In 1898 the London School Board made a third attempt to deal with the problem of feeding hungry children. The evidence given to the General Purposes Committee clearly shows that as far as school feeding in London went the same complaints about the lack of adequate and detailed plans were still warranted. Nevertheless, it is also quite clear from the report that a profound shift in opinion had taken place among those who were responsible for the administration of school meals. This was true even among those who were "keenly anxious to prevent the undermining of prudence or self-help by ill-advised or unregulated generosity." 73 Not only was it now freely admitted that the community's first duty was towards the child and that the feeding of needy school children represented an essential service—people now even went so far as to recommend that it should be extended to cover the summer months and should form part of the overall work of the Centres for Physically and Mentally Defective Children 74—but also that this service should be provided even if it had a subversive effect on the moral character of the parent. In any event, the committee now believed that they were on solid ground on this point for they had found no evidence to show that feeding diminished any sense of parental responsibility, and, consequently, believed that parents who could feed their children, but failed to do so, should simply be summoned for cruelty. 75 More significantly, it was now also seen that while underfeeding would cease with the general moral and material improvement of the community, the prevention of underfeeding, with its
consequent problems of under-education and increasing malnutrition, could provide a potent force in hastening the process of that improvement. It has already been shown that such MP's as Samuel Smith of Liverpool had advocated the medical inspection of schools as early as July of 1884 and had suggested that grants should be tied to the physical condition of students. In August 1888 Dr. Francis Warner read a paper to the Psychology Section at the annual conference of the British Medical Association under the title, "A Method of Examining Children in Schools as to Their Development and Brain Condition." Reaction to this paper was sufficient for the BMA to sponsor a committee to investigate the development and brain function of elementary school children. In 1889 a report covering fourteen schools and some 5,444 children was published. This was by far the smallest of three investigations. The results of the report were such as to cause the BMA to urge the Government to appoint a committee of enquiry. Though this effort proved to be unsuccessful, considerable public interest in the medical inspection of school children was generated and a joint committee of the COS and the BMA was established in 1890. This resulted in the investigation by Dr. Warner of some 50,027 children in a further 106 schools. In 1892 a committee was appointed through the British Association for the Advancement of Science to undertake a similar investigation. As a result, Dr. Warner, in conjunction with Dr. Shuttleworth and Dr. Fletcher Beach, examined a further 50,000 children during the years 1892 to 1896. Together the results of these investigations were published as the "Report on the Scientific Study of the Mental and Physical Conditions of Childhood,
Arouse general interest in the whole subject of educational hygiene. The need for the scientific classification of school children according to their mental and physical capacities was evident and, as a result, mental deficiency was officially recognized in 1889, by the Royal Commission on the Blind, Dumb and Feeble-minded. Dr. Warner also drew public attention to the many conditions adversely affecting the health of the school child. In fact, he laid the foundation of the science of child study and stimulated the interest of medical men in the larger field of school hygiene.77

At this time there was no specific statutory provision for appointing medical inspectors of schools at the local level. In fact, although there was considerable enthusiasm amongst individual researchers and doctors generally, there was very little in the way of official support for medical inspection. However, some of the more progressive school boards examined the Elementary Education Act of 1870 and appointed special medical advisers as "necessary officers" under the general powers of section 35. In 1889 the London School Board had been first to break new ground with the decision to appoint a full-time medical officer and a junior clerk to do the clerical work. When, in the following year, Dr. W. R. Smith was appointed at a salary of £400 per annum his duties were limited to reporting on candidates for permanent office, and to advise on the light, sanitation, space, and ventilation of school buildings, and specifically did not include the medical inspection of school children.

The expansion of health services and medical staffs in London and elsewhere was directly related to the work of political factions,
investigatory committees and philanthropic organizations, as well as
news from abroad and legislation itself. In 1883 a Royal Commission on
the Blind and Deaf and Dumb had been set up. When its report was made
available in 1889 it made mention of the fact that far too much of the
education of blind children had been left to charity. Consequently, it
included the recommendation that blind children between the ages of
five and sixteen, and deaf children between the ages of seven and six­
ten years of age, should be compulsorily educated. As well, it
brought into focus the distinction between the feeble-minded child and
the imbecile. Consequently, it recommended that mentally defective
children should be separated from normal children and given special
education. In 1890 the London School Board received a copy of a re­
port on the Elberfeld school system in Germany. This showed that
special day school treatment could make effective wage-earners out of
87 per cent of the children admitted. As a result, the Board decided to
establish special day centres modelled on the German example. Here,
as later in Bolton, Reading, Salford and other towns, socialists and
other working-class groups were in the forefront of the movement seeking
special provisions for the physically and mentally handicapped. In
1893 the Elementary Education (Blind and Deaf) Act was passed by Parlia­
ment. This laid down two connected principles. On the one hand, author­i­
ities were forced to provide educational establishments for blind and
deaf children. On the other, parents became obliged to send blind or
deaf children between the ages recommended by the Royal Commission to
such schools and to contribute towards such education. This Act not
only led to a definite extension of school board health services and the enlargements of medical staffs, both in London and elsewhere, but also to the recognition of the fact that the problem of mentally defective and epileptic children "was of considerably greater complexity than that of the blind and the deaf child, if not in the methods of instruction and the actual organization of schools, at least in the broader medical and social issues involved."  

In 1898 the London School Board had obtained the half-time services of two doctors. One of these was a woman who was given the job of examining female candidates for permanent employment. Over the next four years the medical department was reorganized to include four clerical assistants and a new medical officer was appointed. Nevertheless, the main function of the medical staff still appears to have been the medical examination of prospective employees, the control of outbreaks of infectious diseases in schools, and the medical inspection of defective children. By 1902 Bradford, Birmingham, Hull and London all had medical officers attached to their school boards; Leeds and Sheffield had provided public medical supervision for physically and mentally defective children, and an association of Medical Officers of Health had been formed in London.  

What went on in Bradford is worth relating in some detail because it broke new ground. Bradford, it must be remembered, was not only the place of publication of Dr. Crichton-Browne's letter but also the home of the Independent Labour Party. As a result, interest in medical problems relating to education was high and socialist influence
strong. In 1892, some two years before an ILP candidate would be elected by the East Ward to the School Board, Dr. James Kerr was appointed as Medical Officer. Dr. Kerr's position, unlike the one in London, included a special responsibility for the general health of school children. In 1894 Margaret McMillan, an intellectual and an ardent socialist was elected by a small majority to the School Board, one of the few posts open to women. From her first attendance she campaigned for cleaner children and the provision of school baths. Albert Mansbridge, her biographer, has claimed that the experience of seeing so many dirty children during her campaign for school baths led Miss McMillan directly to the notion of medical inspection. When an opportunity arose for such examinations at the Usher Street School in 1899, she watched every minute of Dr. Kerr's examination of 285 girls, and gave advice on deafness, her own childhood affliction, where it was appropriate. In addition, Margaret McMillan was a great advocate of publicly supported school meals. In this she co-operated, in the early years, with Robert Blatchford in the work of the Cinderella Club in Bradford and elsewhere in the North of England. According to Brian Simon, Margaret McMillan's struggle for improvements in working-class child life took on an "epic quality and became the model of what an isolated socialist on a school board could achieve."

It has already been shown that the COS had a long interest both in physically, as well as, mentally defective children, and that the Society had joined with the BMA to make medical examinations of children in 1890. In the same year the Council of the COS appointed a special
committee to report on the public and charitable provision for feebleminded, epileptic and deformed and crippled persons. In 1892, the same year that the first of the London School Board's special centres was opened, the COS sent a deputation to the Local Government Board. Though this deputation had little immediate effect, the COS's proposals led to the formation of the National Association for the Care of the Feebleminded in 1895. It was through the pressure of this organization that the Government was forced to set up in 1896 a committee to inquire into the education of the feeble-minded. It was a result of the production of this committee's report in 1898 that the Elementary Education (Defective and Epileptic Children) Act was passed in 1899. This was a permissive Act and merely allowed school boards to establish special schools for mentally and physically defective as well as epileptic children between the ages of seven and sixteen years of age. It did, however, allow all school boards to ascertain, through the services of a doctor, which children in the neighbourhood were unable to take advantage of the normal educational facilities.

Efforts to improve the lot of the child at home can be divided into two distinct groups, those covering children of any age and those which concerned only the child too young to go to school. The first may be said to have started in the early 1880's; the second began much later towards the end of the century.

In the early 1880's important steps were made towards the outlawing of child abuse in the home. The first was the result of a visit to the United States of America by a certain Liverpool banker named Thomas
Agnew. Following a chance visit to the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children in 1881 he made himself aware of the successful pioneer work against child cruelty carried out in several other American cities. On his return to England a rather bizarre opportunity presented itself for him to further the cause of child rights. With the help of Samuel Smith, his local MP, he extended an appeal to provide a Dog's Home to include a Home for Children. This led to the founding of the Liverpool Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children in 1883. Before the end of the decade at least thirty-three other towns had formed similar societies, and many of these had joined forces with the London Society to establish the National Association for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. Within only a few months of the founding of this Society in May of 1889 a Bill, often referred to as the "Children's Charter," was enacted. The swift passage of this highly contentious Bill was due entirely to the careful preparatory work of the Society. In its final form the Act made it a misdemeanour to cause a child (a boy under fourteen or a girl under sixteen) to be: "ill-treated, neglected, abandoned, or exposed in a manner likely to cause such a child unnecessary suffering, or injury to its health." In this way A. J. Mundella, the Bill's sponsor, saw to it that children were given the same protections as animals had been given under the Cruelty to Animals Act and the Contagious Diseases Act for Domestic Animals.

While the national conscience took some time to educate and the words, "I dismiss the case, the woman did not know the law," were often repeated in the courts, the law was brought to bear. In the five year
period between the passing of the amendment to increase both the penalties and the age limits, more than 47,000 complaints were investigated by the NSPCC, some 5,702 persons were prosecuted, and about 94 per cent of these were convicted. In addition, once the barrier of parental rights had been broken, other important pieces of legislation could be passed. The first of these was the Poor Law Adoption Act of 1889. This removed the rights of parents proven to be irresponsible, and allowed the courts to appoint overseers to ensure the welfare of the children of such parents. The second important piece of legislation was the Custody of Children Act of 1891, often called the "Barnardo Act." This prevented parents who had earlier abandoned or neglected their children from reclaiming them once they had reached working age.

During the early years of the NSPCC some quarters of the population believed that it was only working-class parents who were cruel to their children. Indeed letters to the Times went so far as to suggest that the NSPCC was becoming a terror to the poor. Neither of these propositions can be supported by the facts. As the first Honorary Secretary of the Society, the Reverend Benjamin Waugh, was to remark, the NSPCC had "a single eye to putting down the cruel treatment of children, which (can) be turned aside by neither the poverty nor the wealth of their wrong-doers." The biographers of the NSPCC, Anne Allen and Arther Morton, have shown that the case-work of the Society clearly substantiated the Secretary's claim. In fact, they state categorically: "This is utterly untrue; the cases are very uniformly distributed amongst the population."
Interest in infant welfare, and, consequently, in infant mortality, also developed with the decline in the birth-rate. By the 1880's several demographic trends had become clearly discernible. First, the birth-rate in England and Wales had begun a definite decline. This was specifically true for communities living in major urban centres. Second, death-rates from the most deadly infectious diseases had fallen dramatically. This was particularly true for the younger age-groups. Third, there was no sign anywhere that the benefits of the victories over sickness and disease were being passed on to infants. This fact, in conjunction with the fall in the birth-rate, was sufficient to alarm many doctors. However, when it was also noted that the birth-rate in the colonies had fallen even more rapidly than in Great Britain, and when the growths in population of Britain's major industrial rivals were taken into consideration, the problem of infant mortality took on a greater political significance.

It was well-known that a major cause of infant mortality was epidemic diarrhoea. Between 1880 and 1890 no less than three important papers were presented on the subject. In 1880, Dr. Longstaff spoke to the Society of Medical Officers of Health. In 1887, Dr. Ballard provided a special supplement to the Medical Officer's Report to the Local Government Board, and, in November of 1889, Dr. Newsholme discussed the subject in his Presidential Address to the Society of Medical Officers of Health. According to Dr. G. F. McCleary, one of the infant welfare movement's pioneers, "Dr. Newsholme's address attracted attention and did much to stimulate preventative action. It was one of the influences
that contributed effectively to the rise of the infant welfare movement." Indeed, Dr. Newsholme's address made a number of important recommendations and observations. He thought that the cause of epidemic diarrhoea was to be found in unclean soil and that it infected the air and was readily digested with food, especially milk. In order to eliminate the disease he suggested: methods of improved scavaging; better paved alleys and yards; the replacement of all privies with water carriage systems, and, very significantly, the municipal supply of sterilized milk. As a result of these three investigations the problem of infant mortality was seen as one which primarily concerned hand-fed babies, and, more importantly, one of teaching mothers how to rear their children.

As with other aspects of the movement to improve child health, it was the example of how things were done abroad that was the cause of progress towards a solution in Britain. According to Dr. Drew Harris, it was an article published in the Journal of State Medicine in December of 1898, describing Dr. Dufour's Goutte de Lait at Fécamp in France which led him to establish Britain's first milk depôt at St. Helens, Lancashire. In 1900, one year after the founding, Dr. Harris described the effect the depôt had had to the annual conference of the BMA. Within only a few years Liverpool, Ashton-under-Lyne, Dukinfield, Battersea, Leith, Bradford, Burnley, Glasgow, Dundee, Leicester, Lambeth, and Woolwich had followed St. Helens' example.

III

These were the methods adopted to improve the health and welfare
of British children during the second half of the nineteenth century. By 1900 Parliament had intervened only to secure the health and welfare of defective children and to protect children against cruelty, neglect and sexual abuse. Neither the legislation outlawing cruelty nor that providing services for defective children contravened the moral philosophy of the 1834 Poor Law. Though it was becoming more and more obvious that voluntary programmes were quite incapable of coping with the problem of widespread malnutrition among working-class children, the provision of meals remained within the domain of private charity. Likewise, while extensive medical examinations of children had revealed the high proportion of working-class children who were in need of medical attention, the medical inspection of school children continued to be carried out only at private schools and at a few state-funded elementary schools run by progressive local authorities. Any treatment given to working-class children was restricted to minor ailments which could be dealt with by a nurse, and was severely limited by the fact that only a few school boards had employed a school nurse by 1900.

Such an understanding of events suggests that the following questions need answering: (i) does the failure of the British Government to become involved in the provision of meals when it was known that voluntary organizations could not cope with the problem of working-class malnutrition deny the possibility of the moral code implicit in the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act being broken before 1900? (ii) If it does not, how can the delay of nearly twenty years between the time when working-class child health standards were found to be intolerable and the time
when government intervened to do something about the problem be ex-
plained? (iii) What justification is there for seeing the Acts which set
out to secure the health, welfare and education of defective children,
or the Act which attempted to prevent cruelty to children, as being the
starting point of the child health service? and (iv) Does the fact that
there were no Acts which specifically set out to improve the health and
welfare of working-class children before 1900 deny the possibility of
there having been a significant change in the status of working-class
children before that time?

Such questions cannot be answered realistically without examin-
ing them within the context of the changing social circumstances of the
1880's and 1890's. It is important to remember that working-class
children were not at any time during the last twenty years of the nine-
teenth century the major social concern of the British middle class.
The group which most worried and frightened the more well-to-do was
London's 'residuum'--the casual poor. Consequently, increases in the
number of feeding organizations and in the amounts of money spent on
feeding needy children more closely represent an attempt to appease the
casual poor than symbolize a rise in status of working-class children.
Likewise, the increasing practice of providing meals free of charge in-
stead of requiring recipients to cover part of the cost should not be
seen in itself as proof of a breakdown in Poor Law philosophy. Rather
the change in practice should be recognized as reflecting the middle
class's broader realization that chronic poverty, not pauperism, was the
major social problem facing the age, and that private subscription and
compulsory payment were incompatible with its solution.

Chinks in Poor Law philosophy began to appear in the 1880's. In 1885 the Medical Relief (Disqualification Removal) Act was passed. This made it no longer necessary for a person obtaining medical treatment through Poor Law authorities to be disenfranchised. In the following year Joseph Chamberlain issued a Local Government Board Circular which permitted authorities to establish local works programmes that would relieve unemployment. With the exception of the renewal of this Circular in 1891, 1892, 1893, and 1895 there was no further specific government action to relieve the casual poor until the Conservative Government passed the Unemployed Workman Act in 1905. This delay reflected a general lull in the public's concern for the very poor. Gareth Stedman Jones in his very perceptive study of the period, Outcast London: A Study of the Relationship between Classes in Victorian Society, has suggested that at least five factors were responsible for defusing the social crisis which the Trafalgar Square riot of 1886 epitomized. The most immediately effective was the London dock strike of 1889. The sight of an orderly procession of dockers marching through the City of London produced a deep sigh of relief. Instead of being a threat to social peace, the unionization of the unskilled became a symbol of self-help and moral improvement. Though the findings of Booth's pilot surveys were not initially well received, their publication in book form shortly after the dock strike married nicely with the change in middle-class attitudes. Together with the visible proof that the unskilled now meant no harm to person or property, Booth's analysis turned the casual
poor from a political threat into a social problem. 107

From the late 1880's there was a general improvement in the conditions of trade. Declines in traditional industries began to be offset by the expansion of newer ones. 108 The very high rate of unemployment which had been reached and maintained during the mid-1880's began to fall. 109 With the exception of the years 1890, 1891, 1896, and 1897 the steady advance in real wages which began again in the mid-1880's, continued. 110 All these factors, by reducing the amount of distress naturally, tended to offset the need for government intervention.

Two other factors helped defuse the social crisis. As certain industries declined within the central cores of cities newer ones sprang up or were relocated in the suburbs. This, coupled with the development of cheap train transportation, reduced the pressure on housing in the cities and made it possible for many members of the working class to live outside the central cores. Together these developments reduced the fear widely held by the middle class that the respectable working class would be infected by the degenerate elements in society. 111

In a number of ways the Education Acts which provided the legal basis for establishing special services for defective children represented the starting point of the State's involvement in child health. Not only were these Acts partly responsible for the growth of medical appointments to school boards, but the continuous contact of doctors with school boards, required by the need to classify the extent of physical defects and to draw the line between the imbecile and the feebleminded child, must have alerted school board members to a whole range of
child health problems to which they would otherwise have remained unaware, and must have developed an expertise among the lay administrators. Perhaps more important, the medical examinations of large numbers of children that preceded the Acts, and which were carried out partly to demonstrate the need for such measures, played an important rôle in raising the consciousness of the British middle class to the problem of child health. However, the fact that articles written by such eminent British physicians as Francis Warner did not attract much attention outside a small group within the medical profession before the 1880's illustrates that the reason the "mental over-pressure in schools" controversy did not reach its peak until 1884 had more to do with a greater awareness of social conditions and a broader understanding of the causes of poverty in the 1880's, than to a lack of knowledge of child psychology in the 1870's. Likewise, the fact that the "mental over-pressure" controversy was able to induce such busy campaigners of improved housing, stronger imperial policies, and state-aided immigration, as G. R. Sims, Arnold White, and Lord Brabazon, to become active supporters of school meals, suggests that the wish to avoid "over-pressure" stemmed more from a desire to ameliorate the casual poor and to defuse the social crisis of the 1880's than from greater medical knowledge of, for example, the effects of malnutrition on growth and development.

By comparison, the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act cannot be considered as a starting point of a state-run child health service. No governmental bureaucracy was formed to prevent the health of children being impaired by cruelty, neglect or sexual abuse; nor was any expertise
developed to help create a medical service for children. Nevertheless, the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act was important in the development of programmes to improve the health of children. Not only did it concentrate attention on the plight of children, but it established an important legal precedent. Following its passage children were considered to have definite rights. Under certain circumstances these rights could pre-empt those of parents. However, the ease with which the Bill was passed through Parliament in 1889, and the consequent acquisition of rights by children, are not indicative of children having obtained a new or special status in the community. Rather they more closely reflected the rising concern over Britain's future place in the world and a change in priorities—namely that the degeneration of the race and national efficiency were more important questions than the demoralization of the present adult population. The Boer war was to be responsible for making the change in priorities among the middle class more explicit, and for raising the level of concern over Britain's place in the world to such an extent that the demand for efficiency became a matter of the utmost national urgency. It was as a result of this new sense of urgency that the quest for national efficiency was seen to imply both the need for a ready supply of physically fit men to protect the Empire against attack and a continuous stream of physically efficient men to keep the wheels of industry turning. To ensure such a supply, it became obvious that some great long-term plan of social action was necessary. This would not only have to prevent any degeneration of the British race, but would have to ensure that the constitutions of those at the
bottom of the social pyramid were improved. To bring this about it was only logical that the health and physical development of working-class children would be called upon to play a major part in the new blueprint.
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CHAPTER III

THE NATIONAL EFFICIENCY MOVEMENT AND THE QUESTION OF PHYSICAL DETERIORATION: BASIC INGREDIENTS IN THE FORMATION OF A NATIONAL BLUE-PRINT FOR SOCIAL ACTION

In the period between the end of the Crimean war and the close of the nineteenth century, Britain's military underwent no serious test. Despite the fact that British military strategists had not failed to notice that the Franco-Prussian war had given a new significance to standing armies, those charged with the responsibility of maintaining the British armed forces continued to think more in terms of how the Royal Navy would guard the sea lanes to the Empire than about the physical and mental capabilities of the average British private soldier. A small guerilla war, waged several thousand miles away in Southern Africa by a relatively small number of Boer settlers was responsible for dramatically changing the perspective of the Whitehall planners, and for concentrating the attention of the British upper classes on the social conditions endured by their less privileged countrymen.

This change did not come about with the outbreak of hostilities with the Boers in October of 1899. Rather the early months of the war saw the British consumed by a jingoistic fervour and indignant at the effrontery of an enemy who chose to fight in his ordinary working clothes. Public opinion during this period was ill-informed, superficial in its judgement, hasty in the celebration of victories, and easily overcome by defeats: support for the war depended more on self-righteousness and
pride than on issues and principles.\textsuperscript{1} There was the odd warning by alarmists like Arnold White\textsuperscript{2} about the terrible physical standards of those members of the working class who volunteered for the army, but these were largely ignored. Few bothered to concern themselves about British military capabilities, or worried themselves about the British political system's ability to generate strong leadership and maintain Britain's economic strength and imperial dominance.

Britain's day of reckoning came during the early days of December, 1899. In one week--called colloquially "Black Week"--the British troops in Southern Africa suffered three serious reverses. The first occurred at Stormberg, northern Cape Colony on 10 December. There a brigade of British troops under the leadership of General Gatacre lost 719 men and two guns. On the following day Lord Methuen with a large division was soundly beaten and lost 950 men at Magersfontein on route to relieve Kimberley. Four days later the commanding general of the British army, General Sir Redvers Buller, was completely outclassed by the skill of Louis Botha at Colenso, Natal, and lost some 1,100 men and ten guns out of six artillery batteries, four infantry brigades and one mounted brigade.\textsuperscript{3} These defeats were considered of sufficient importance for the Government in Westminster to replace Buller with Lord Roberts, and to send out heavy reinforcements.

The reaction of an incredulous public to these reverses was immediate, dramatic, and at times almost hysterical. Karl Pearson believed that they depressed the nation's spirits to the lowest level in living memory.\textsuperscript{4} L. S. Amery considered that the reverses were responsible
both for changing "the complacent arrogance and contempt for other nations" held by many in Britain as the result of long years of peace and prosperity to a truer consciousness of Britain's strengths and defects.\(^5\) One of the first to express this new consciousness publicly was John Knowles, the editor of Nineteenth Century. Starting with the July issue of 1900 he used the pages of his influential periodical under the emphatic headline, "The Lessons of the War," to urge the formation of a vigilence committee.\(^6\) This committee was given the title of the Administrative Reform Association,\(^7\) and was charged with the responsibility for seeing that the country was governed according to "ordinary business principles and methods."\(^8\)

Though there was, therefore, some substance to the claim made by G. B. Shaw in an election manifesto that the war had been responsible for turning "fierce searchlights on official, administrative and military perfunctoriness,"\(^9\) the general election, when it came in October of 1900, was resolved entirely over the issue of the war and whether or not it should be continued.\(^10\)

In many ways the "Khaki Election," as the general election of early October 1900 has become known, obscured the popular will. Following the relief of Mafeking on 17 May 1900 the British army won a series of victories which culminated in the capture of Johannesburg and the Transvaal capital, Pretoria. By October Lord Roberts had proclaimed the annexation of the Boer republics, and, despite the change to guerilla tactics, had claimed that the war was won.\(^11\) It should be remembered that in the period between the last election and October 1900 the
Conservative and Unionist majority in the House of Commons had been cut from 152 to 128 seats. It was precisely with this in mind that the Government, and particularly Joseph Chamberlain, decided to dissolve Parliament and to capitalize on the recent military successes. The result was a tremendous victory for the incumbent government and imperialism. Some 402 Conservatives and Unionists were elected and opposed only by some 268 Labour, Liberal and Irish Nationalist MP's. What C. F. G. Masterman called a "gargantuan banquet of social reform, housing, temperance and education," on the part of the Liberals, was turned down flat by the electorate.

In the period which followed the general election the patriotic fervour which had played an important rôle in British political life over the last twelve months cooled. This cooling provided an opportunity for national self-inspection. The astonishment that many Englishmen had felt while on holiday on the Continent during the summer of 1900 at the unpopularity of Britain now turned to an acute feeling of international isolation. Moreover, the possibility first expressed by that organ of orthodox liberalism, the Economist, as early as 1851, of Britain being overhauled by the rapidly expanding economies of the United States and Germany now showed definite signs of coming true. At the same time the growing rumours that the British race was deteriorating began to hold more credence. This new awareness of Britain's position was responsible for bringing together many different types—businessmen, eugenicists, Fabians, industrialists, financiers, idealists, imperialists, militarists, philanthropists, scientists, socialists, social reformers, trades-unionists,
men of both old-line political parties and common working men—into a national movement for efficiency. 16

The wide appeal of the National Efficiency movement meant that it necessarily included several opposing political philosophies and represented a wide range of vested interests. Nevertheless, a common bond of sufficient strength was found to keep it functioning as a cohesive whole. This common bond concerned the physical and mental strength of the nation. Through it the needs of the least well-to-do became inextricably joined to imperial interests, and social reform gained sufficient respectability to become a matter of major political importance. Not only did this concern for social reform create a new sense of community and a new patriotism, but it also allowed a new moral code to be established and a blue-print for social action to be formed.

It is impossible here to describe in detail the origins and nineteenth-century background of the National Efficiency campaign. Nevertheless, G. R. Searle's recent study, The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought, 1899-1914, has shown by its lack of attention to the problem that the campaign cannot be put into proper perspective without a more profound analysis of the movement's ideological roots. 17 To understand how the National Efficiency movement could function with so many vested interests to be appeased, it is necessary to see the campaign for National Efficiency both in relation to the major social forces affecting Victorian life and
as the natural culmination of the nineteenth-century reaction to what Cobbett called the "System." Only in this way can the seemingly contradictory causes of the social legislation of the first decade of the twentieth century—the products of the National Efficiency campaign—be reconciled.

At the beginning of Victoria's reign two theoretically hostile forces—Utilitarianism and Evangelicism—were joined to create and rationalize middle-class modes of thought and conduct; a union which the famous French historian, Elie Halévy, thought contained the "fundamental paradox" of Victorian society. On the one side lay the social and political thought of Jeremy Bentham and such Philosophic Radicals as James Mill, and the economic thought of John Bright, Richard Cobden and the rest of the Manchester School. Such thought was cold, analytical, vigorously skeptical, sometimes anti-religious, and not without its own antagonisms. It held that man was naturally good, pleasure seeking, and had an optimistic future providing he relied on reason rather than faith and obeyed the laws laid down by the classical economists. On the other side were the quasi-fundamentalist beliefs of a broad group of protestants. Burdened by a profound sense of man's sinfulness, the Evangelicals believed that salvation could only be obtained through good earthly actions. For this reason they were more concerned with how a man lived than with how he worshipped. In all things the Bible was the Evangelicals' supreme and literal guide to conduct.

Opposition to the atomistic and mechanistic thinking of what may be termed the Benthamite-Evangelical orthodoxy came from many quarters.
During the mid-Victorian period Utilitarianism was softened by the introduction of humanistic values drawn from Wordsworth and Coleridge into Bentham's felicific calculus. In *Utilitarianism* John Stuart Mill suggested that some pleasures were more important than others and that the development of the human character was also worthy of consideration.

About the same time the *laissez-faire* economic theory of the Manchester School received its first serious questioning. Even Utilitarians were forced to admit that subsistence and employment had increased faster than population since Malthus' prophesy of catastrophe. This led John Stuart Mill to assert that the distribution of wealth was not dependent on natural laws but on the laws and customs of society as determined by the opinions and feelings of the ruling class. During the period of the so-called "Great Depression" social inquiries by statistical societies, the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science and the Liberal-turned-Tory, Charles Booth, clearly denied Adam Smith's premise that were individuals to be left alone to pursue their own self-interest they would be led by an "Invisible Hand" to benefit society at large. Indeed, Booth's giant survey of London, begun in the late 1880's, proved once and for all the existence of a large mass of working people who had not benefitted from Britain's increased prosperity.

From about mid-century two forces began to affect the Evangelical temper of the age. One of these was evolutionary theory. Influenced by Malthus' *Essay on Population*, Charles Darwin came to the conclusion that a process of "natural selection" operated in the struggle for existence and led to the formation of a more favourable species. Published
eventually as *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* in 1859.\(^{26}\)

Darwin's theory contained no hint of a benevolent force, superior intelligence, or divine justice or purpose. Though Darwin did not immediately apply his theory to the human species, his audience did. In this way his work not only fostered materialism but became a challenge to the moral assumptions of the period and a direct threat both to the historicity of the *Bible* and the basic principles of Christian faith.\(^{27}\) In short, if there was no perfectly created being, there was no Fall of Man and no Redemption. And if there was no original sin, there was no need for God to sacrifice his only son for man's salvation.

Between 1860 and the end of the century evolutionary theory was applied increasingly to the evolution of society and to political and economic thought.\(^{28}\) Before 1880 the casual poor, or the 'residuum' as they were called at the time, were thought to exist only in isolated pockets in the big cities. Because they were not considered as posing a major threat to social harmony they seldom attracted the attention of social investigators. What was more, the upper orders believed that any problem they did pose could be solved by philanthropic action. In the early 1880's a drastic change in social thought took place. The theory of demoralization,\(^{29}\) the principle which governed the treatment of the poor, was replaced by the theory of urban degeneration.\(^{30}\) At the root of this major re-orientation of social thought was the fear that the honest working man might be reduced to the level of the lowest common denominator.
In 1883 G. R. Sims published a series of articles for the *Daily News* under the title "How the Poor Live." These were followed in October by an anonymous pamphlet, *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London: An Enquiry into the Condition of the Abject Poor*. Both revealed, as the Royal Commission they were responsible for establishing was to confirm, that a serious housing shortage existed in London, and that the casual poor, far from being a small percentage, in fact, constituted a substantial proportion of the working class. Together with the formation of such socialist groups as the Social Democratic Federation and the deepening economic depression, the concern these publications generated was responsible for the widespread fear that the honest working man would be infected by the 'residuum,' and for causing a wave of panic to spread through the upper echelons of society.

Two other questions made the housing crisis a matter of the utmost urgency. One concerned the consequences of the agricultural depression. If the theory of urban degeneration was correct did the continued influx of agricultural workers to the cities mean that the race would inevitably deteriorate? The other concerned the impact of humanitarian legislation and advances in medicine and sanitation. If these prevented the process of natural selection did they not compound the problem by allowing many of the unfit to survive and multiply?

Such questions were particularly worrisome for those who took a special interest in the future of the British Empire. Such men as Lord Brabazon, Samuel Smith, and Arnold White were very concerned about the problems of the 'residuum' and urban degeneration. They considered
that London's distress was an imperial problem, and believed that the solution to it demanded exceptional imperial measures. This line of argument led "social imperialists" to adopt an opposing point of view on such issues as free meals for school children to such philanthropic agencies as the COS which adhered rigidly to the moral code implicit in the Poor Law. Lord Brabazon, for example, regarded free dinners for needy children as an urgent necessity if further physical deterioration was to be averted among the working-class population. Another scheme which attracted much attention among social imperialists was state-aided colonization. An initial proposal put forward by Lord Brabazon evoked much criticism. J. H. Tuke believed that Brabazon's plan to settle the casual poor in the colonies would not be well received by the colonial authorities because he thought town-born labourers did not make good farmers. To meet this objection Samuel Smith proposed that destitute children should be offered state assistance to immigrate to one of the colonies on condition that they first followed a course of technical education.

The suggestions made by the social imperialists in the 1880's were, as one of their number admitted, like voices crying in the wilderness. The type of evolutionary argument that was listened to was more like that of the inveterate Liberal and individualist, Herbert Spencer. Writing in the *Contemporary Review* shortly after the publication of *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London* Spencer attempted to discourage government action to improve social conditions. He suggested that such intervention would totally prevent the beneficial workings of
the "survival of the fittest"\textsuperscript{42} which he believed was the sole guarantee of progress.\textsuperscript{43}

By the 1890's, thanks to the Third Reform Act, there existed a very substantial section of the voting population who looked not to private charity to solve the problem of unemployment and poverty, but to the State. Consequently, Spencerian type arguments declined in favour. Nevertheless, there were those who continued to see a need to establish a unified theory of social evolution which would fully explain class differences without repudiating social-Darwinism. Such a man was Benjamin Kidd, a civil servant of Liberal leanings. He considered that the Marxists were the only group to have explained class antagonisms satisfactorily, and that their theory was as anti-social as that of Spencerian individualism. Kidd, like Carlyle, Dickens, Kingsley, and Ruskin before him,\textsuperscript{44} held that Britain's first duty was towards the welfare of its own citizens, and that improvements in social conditions should come, if necessary, at the expense of "inferior" races and nations. Such thinking led many Liberals and a good many Tories to the conclusion that the real struggle for existence was not between the various elements of British society but between the various nations and races of the world.\textsuperscript{45} Kidd had no doubts that in such a struggle the Anglo-Saxon and Teuton races would do well. They had, he believed, higher "social efficiency," the quality\textsuperscript{46} which led nations to greatness.

Shortly after the publication of Kidd's \textit{Social Evolution} Karl Pearson, a 'socialist' who adhered to Marxian economics but denied the idea of class struggle and the rôle of revolution in history,\textsuperscript{47} wrote an
article 48 for Fortnightly Review which severely criticized Kidd and Spencer for suggesting that socialism was in opposition to natural selection. Pearson considered that it was totally wrong to believe that socialism limited the economic competition between the individual members of society and thus prevented progress. To the contrary, he maintained that there was no special power in socialism which either prevented "physical selection"—the struggle of society against its physical environment, disease, climate, physical wear and tear, etc.—or which stopped the struggle between the superior and the inferior races. For Pearson three factors affected natural selection—intra-group struggle, physical selection and extra-group struggle; and only the first could be affected by socialism. What worried Pearson was the possibility of a war with a major European power or a world grain shortage. Either, he believed, would destroy the British social system. "We should be crushed in the extra-group struggle," he argued:

> Because we have given too much play to intra-group competition, because we have proceeded on the assumption that it is better to have a few prize cattle among innumerable lean kine than a decently-bred and properly-fed herd with no expectations at Smithfield.49

It was this kind of 'national socialism' which attracted many socialists, particularly such Fabians as Sidney Webb, to the idea of social imperialism, and led Pearson to suggest that "no thoughtful socialist . . . would object to cultivate Uganda at the expense of its present occupiers if Lancashire were starving."50

At the same time as Darwin was first expounding his theory of natural selection certain liberal churchmen—or Broad Churchmen as they
were known at the time—were in the process of preparing an attack on the theological rigidity of the Church of England. Though never more than a small group of individuals with certain ideas in common these Broad Churchmen were to effect a powerful influence over the Evangelical temper of the mid-Victorian period and the political and social thought of the remaining forty years of the nineteenth century. The Broad Church movement owed much of its inspiration to Coleridge and to German thought. Broad Churchmen believed that the Bible should be subjected to the same vigorous historical and scientific examination that all serious works of scholarship received, and considered that certain sections of the Scriptures were unsuitable as moral guides. Benjamin Jowett, the leader of the second generation of Broad Churchmen, argued in his contribution to Essays and Reviews (1860), the group's most influential and representative work, that Christianity had to adapt itself to the best knowledge available. Thus, for some Christians faith became a matter of spiritual rather than literal truth, and the conflict between science and religion partly settled before it had really had time to develop.

Broad Churchmen considered it a duty of the Church to ameliorate the social dislocation created by industrialization. For this reason they favoured a National Church which could absorb the shock of popular democracy by reconciling class differences and by preparing the working class for a greater participation in the life of the nation. Broad Churchmen hoped that such a Church would overcome the anti-social aspects of Benthamism and laissez-faire economics, but would preserve the high culture of the traditional ruling class.
An important off-shoot of the Broad Church movement and the idea of the National Church was the 'idealization' of the State. In the "great literary monument of this disposition"—Culture and Anarchy: An Essay in Political and Social Criticism (1869)—Matthew Arnold pointed out that the notion so familiar to antiquity and to contemporaries in Europe of the State as a body able to order the lives of individuals in the general interest, was virtually unknown in Britain. The failure to see the State in this light, he suggested, had resulted in the worship of freedom for its own sake, and therefore in anarchy. This antipathy towards authority, Arnold argued elsewhere, was linked logically with the British distrust of science and science training.

The years of the "Great Depression" which followed shortly after the close of the Franco-Prussian war represented a period of anxiety and great philosophical change for the British middle class. Three major social forces were to affect their thought and action. One was the development of the British Idealist School of philosophy. Another was the advance in science and technology and the economic change which accompanied it. The third was imperialism. Each had the effect of turning British eyes on Germany.

Following the Second Reform Act many members of the middle class feared that the enfranchisement of the working class would lead to a harsh popular despotism antipathetical to individual industry and achievement. For many the fear of full-scale revolution was never too far out of mind. Two questions particularly perplexed the Liberal intelligentsia who believed that their Party stood for administrative reform
and efficient government. What, they asked, was the point of reforming institutions if declining social discipline made it impossible for them to function effectively? And what was to become of the country if interests abroad were to be sacrificed to a purely insular view of politics?

To 'old Liberals' such as A. V. Dicey, W. E. H. Lecky, H. S. Maine, and J. F. Stephen who were steadily moving to the right, the answer to anarchic individualism was to be found in more forceful and autocratic methods of government. To other intellectual Liberals like Matthew Arnold the answer lay in the State's involvement in education. At Oxford the Broad Church leader, Benjamin Jowett, had both a practical and a philosophical solution to the problem.

As Master of Balliol Jowett set out to make the college a "nursery for statesmen." As a Greek scholar he made a considerable contribution towards the revival of Greek thought. This revival had the effect of turning attention away from hedonism and utilitarianism towards an ethic of self-perfection based on a theory of human nature within a metaphysical framework. As one of the few dons able to read German Jowett also stimulated the study of German idealism at Oxford.

It was under this administration that T. H. Green, a former student of Jowett's, became the Whyte Professor of Moral Philosophy. Green converted what had often been in Germany a justification for conservative policies to a practical programme attractive to the left wing of the Liberal Party. Green became convinced that only German thinkers had realized that the primary task of modern philosophy was to find "formulae adequate to the action of reason as exhibited in nature and human society,
in art and religion," but was led to the conclusion that the political application of German Idealism was irrelevant to British institutions. Nevertheless, he considered that it was still possible to construct a philosophy of life consistent with his theological beliefs. Green found the solution in a new concept of citizenship. Through it the British Idealist School built a bridge which linked religion and political action. By adding a political dimension to Victorian theology the eyes of those with troubled consciences were turned away from a vision of salvation in the next world to the reality of social problems in this. By providing a religious motivation for the formation of social policies the educated middle class were inspired to go beyond considering that something should be done to doing something about the less fortunate. Green's conception of citizenship was based on the notion that there was a good common to both individuals and to society as a whole. Because he considered that "every injury to the health of an individual" was a "public injury" he believed that it was necessary for society to take men as they found them. If they found them stumbling over such obstacles as drink, ignorance or poverty it was the State's duty to intervene and remove the obstacles preventing a moral life. In the same way "any kind of property which (realized) the will of one man at the expense of stopping the realization of the many" was to be condemned. The advocacy of positive freedoms was in complete contrast to the harsh moral code implicit in the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 and the non-interventionist spirit of the prevailing politico-economic system. Instead it implied that the material reality was not the only reality, that
individual freedoms were not necessarily anti-thetical to the growing authority of the State, and that certain actions were necessary for some individuals to be free to live moral lives.\textsuperscript{72}

Besides Jowett and Green, F. H. Bradley, D. G. Ritchie, Bernard Bosanquet, Edward Caird, William Wallace and others played an important part in challenging existing attitudes towards the less fortunate. Fundamentally individualists at heart\textsuperscript{73} they rejected Gladstonian Liberalism, avoided Marxism, and developed a new democratic Liberalism with State action as an integral part. Together they inspired either directly or indirectly a whole generation of young middle-class people to do something personally about existing social conditions.\textsuperscript{74} S. G. Checkland has argued that because the Idealists "altered thinking about society at its social roots" their influence was greater than the earlier head-on attacks of Carlyle and Ruskin on the older economic philosophies.\textsuperscript{75}

In their ardour for Germany and its scientific method Broad Churchmen and Idealists were not alone. In 1903 Sir Norman Lockyer, the editor of the respected scientific periodical, \textit{Nature} suggested to the British Association for the Advancement of Science that British universities should become "as much the insurers of future progress as battleships are the insurers of the present power of states."\textsuperscript{76} In saying this Lockyer was merely reiterating an opinion which had been held by many members of the British scientific community for more than thirty years. In 1867 Dr. Lyon Playfair, the Professor of Chemistry at Edinburgh University and a man of considerable scientific eminence,\textsuperscript{77} had written a letter to Lord Taunton, the chairman of the Royal Commission inquiring
into the state of secondary education. Referring to conversations he had had with other Jurors at the recent Paris Exhibition, Playfair stated:

I am sorry to say that, with very few exceptions, a singular accordance of opinion prevailed that our country has shown little inventiveness and made little progress in the peaceful arts of industry since 1862 . . . So far as I could gather them by conversation, the one cause upon which there was most unanimity of conviction is that France, Prussia, Austria, Belgium, and Switzerland possess good systems of industrial education for the masters and managers of factories and workshops, and that England possesses none.78

Many British economists, inventors and manufacturers also showed their admiration for Germany's industrial use of science and technology, and noted with a certain degree of bitterness that the German economy had expanded rapidly behind high tariff walls. Immediately after the French defeat in the Franco-Prussian war W. C. Aitken, the Senior Vice-President of the Birmingham and Midland Institute, told his institute that the German victory came as the result of science training:

From masses of steel produced by the metalurgical knowledge of Krupp of Essen--converted into ordnance by the industrially-educated engineers and workmen--served on the battlefield by artillerists trained to a perfect knowledge of the laws which guided projectiles in their course.79

In 1886 the Final Report of the Royal Commission on the Depression of Industry and Trade brought attention to the increasing severity of German competition in home and export markets.80 From about this time the British press was full of gloomy tales of lost export markets and poor British performance abroad.81 The general bitterness created by Germany's success was made apparent by the popularity of E. E. Williams' Made in
Germany. Published in 1896 at the end of the "Great Depression," it not only encapsulated the essence of British feelings at the time, but became the symbol of Britain's predicament. All too often British industries were presented as being technologically obsolete and their business practices old-fashioned in contrast to German manufacturers who spent considerable sums on industrial research and incorporated the latest innovations in production and marketing. Sir Joseph Swan, for example, the inventor-manufacturer and fellow of the Royal Society who played an important rôle in the foundation of the electric lamp industry, stated when recording his impressions of the Paris Exhibition of 1900 that:

"Besides Krupps, England presents a sorry spectacle. Here and there you see something English; but one is struck by the fewness of the English exhibits and the general want of "go" they indicate. If the light exists with us, it is hidden somewhere."  

Thus by the 1880's the British middle class had been converted from a group that was largely prepared to let nature take its course, to one which actively sought both a more efficient and scientific approach to business and government, and the improvement of social conditions among the less fortunate. As yet, however, the middle class, with a few notable exceptions had not realized that their two objectives were mutually dependent.

The more competitive economic climate which developed over the last three decades of the nineteenth century, made conditions much tougher for British interests abroad. Unfortunately, neither of the two established British intellectual traditions--the Benthamite and the Coleridgian--provided any direction by which Britain could fulfill her
rôle as a Great Power in a world in which 'ideological' presuppositions had ceased to be relevant. The thought of the Cambridge historian, John R. Seeley, in whom the Broad Churchman, the idealist, and the imperialist were one, is therefore of particular importance because it not only offered a choice of action but began to show how an efficient State was dependent on the social and physical conditions of the working class. R. T. Shannon has suggested in his brilliant essay on Seeley that:

His contributions on the Broad Church in relation to the national idea are not in themselves indispensable; his contribution of a philosophy of imperialism was not in itself unique. His unique and indispensable rôle was to link the two through the process of historical moralization: to make the idealized State also the power State. To the "old Liberal" reaction against "Mill-Gladstonism" associated particularly with Fitzjames Stephen, Maine, Dicey and Lecky, Seeley ... added the missing link.

Seeley demonstrated in *Life and Times of Stein, or Germany and Prussia in the Napoleonic Age* (1878) that the Prussian State's willingness to offer moral leadership and to implement cultural, economic and social reforms following its defeat by Napoleonic France was responsible for Germany becoming a Great Power. In his most influential work, *The Expansion of England* (1883) Seeley argued that the future Great Powers—Russia and the United States—were easily discernible because they consisted of large continuous tracts of land. He maintained that the British public had a choice—either to build a new Stein and a large sea-based empire, or to watch as their country was reduced to the level of a second-rate European Power. For Seeley, the Broad Churchman, there was but one response. The British had a moral duty to maintain the country's status as a World Power. His answer as a historian was to
replace the traditional 'Whig' interpretation of British history—one in which the growth of constitutional liberties was paramount—with a new theme, the growth of Britain as a World Power.\textsuperscript{90} His solution as an imperialist was the formation of an imperial federation in which the Anglo-Saxon colonies would have equal partnership and guarantee the population, the territory, and the economic resources\textsuperscript{91}—"a world-Venice, with the sea for streets, Greater Britain."\textsuperscript{92}

\section*{II}

The real starting point of the National Efficiency movement came only a few weeks after the disastrous Liberal defeat at the polls in the "Khaki Election." On 16 November 1900, the Liberal ex-Prime Minister, Lord Rosebery, took the opportunity of his rectoral address to the University of Glasgow to ask the nation to indulge in self-examination. According to the London Times, he feared that the Empire would be lost through complacency if periodical national stock-taking was not pursued. Only a virile imperial race, he argued, strong both in mind and body, could survive and maintain the largest imperial domain in the history of the world. As a result, he requested the nation to ask itself if it was fit for such a prodigious inheritance. In this regard he had three specific areas in mind for closer scrutiny. First, the universities needed to ensure that their programmes were providing the qualified people required to administer an empire on business lines. Second, government should examine how urban life could be improved as the existing slums and rookeries of the big cities were no place to rear the
able-bodied rank-and-file necessary to keep the wheels of empire turning. Third, the business world would be advised to follow the example of Germany's thoroughness and scientific method if it wished to avoid being left behind. Lord Rosebery's speech therefore recognized the need for an all-encompassing programme which would modernize institutions, bring education in line with the needs of the twentieth century, improve the health of the nation and the conditions of the cities, and have businesses run more scientifically.

Lord Rosebery's speech led both to an attempt to form a new political party of national efficiency under his leadership, and to a close examination by the British people of their economic, political and social system. The formation of a party of national efficiency failed because Lord Rosebery proved to be a reluctant leader, and because a change occurred in the standings of the established political parties. The British people's examination of their economic, political and social system, on the other hand, had long-term repercussions, and led eventually to the formation of a national blue-print for social action.

To understand why Lord Rosebery's speech was initially so influential, and yet why this attempt to form a party of national efficiency eventually failed, it is necessary to consider the state of party politics at the time. By the close of 1900 there were already marked signs that the Conservative and Unionist Government was losing the public's confidence. Even before the country went to the polls in October, twenty-four constituencies had rejected Conservative or Unionist candidates at bi-elections. Though the "Khaki Election" provided the Government with a
majority of 134 seats, a considerable margin for an incumbent, an exami-
nation of the election results shows that approximately 47 per cent of 
the electorate voted against the Government and, presumably, against 
the war. In the months which followed the general election enthusiasm 
for government policies continued to decline. Even long-term supporters 
of Lord Salisbury began to doubt the aging Prime Minister's leadership.

By comparison the Liberal Party was seen to be in complete disarray. 
The war had divided the Party into three camps. At one end of the 
Party's political spectrum were the Liberal Imperialists, of 'Limps' as 
such men as H. H. Asquith, Sir Henry Fowler, R. B. Haldane, and Sir 
Edward Grey were called colloquially. In the middle was a group of men 
who reluctantly supported the war. At the other extreme were the 'pro-
Boers' who adhered to Gladstone's 'Little England' conception of empire. 
This group was small in number but included such influential men as 
John Burns, Herbert Gladstone, Henry Labouchère, Lord Morley, and the 
young Welsh leader, David Lloyd George. Initially Sir Henry Campbell-
Bannerman, the Party's leader since Gladstone's death in 1898, had tried 
to retain some semblance of party unity and order by steering a middle 
course between the two extremes. However, startling news concerning 
the treatment and conditions experienced by Boer women and children in 
concentration camps brought to light by Emily Hobhouse, led Campbell-
Bannerman to denounce the war publicly. This shift in position brought 
into the open a fear that the Liberal Party might split irrevocably which 
many had held privately for as long as a year.

This situation created a kind of political power vacuum. The
neophyte Labour Representation Committee whose formation had even been lost among the news of the relief of Ladysmith and the capture of the Boer general, Cronje, was neither strong enough nor sufficiently organized to bridge the gap that the division among the Liberals and the lack of confidence in the Conservatives and Unionists had created. Under such circumstances Lord Rosebery, as an ex-Prime Minister, would automatically have commanded a certain amount of respect and held the public ear. However, it was precisely because he had managed to stay out of the Liberal Party internal squabbles, and above the criticism of government that he proved so successful at cutting across party lines and class interests, and drawing such a wide measure of support to his policy of business principles and efficiency in government.

Support for Rosebery's policy came from many quarter. At one end of the political spectrum were managers of Conservative newspapers like Moberly Bell of the London Times. In the middle were the Liberal Imperialists, men such as Asquith, Haldane and Grey, for whom Rosebery had a natural affinity. At the other end were members of the Fabian Society such as G. B. Shaw and the Webbs. The help which Moberly Bell and other Conservative newspapermen gave was obviously of key importance in getting Rosebery's views into the public eye. Likewise, the efforts made by such men as Richard Haldane in building up an organization were crucial. However, the work produced by Sidney Webb deserves to be covered in some depth because it proved invaluable in a philosophic sense.

During the summer of 1901, at a time when the Liberal Imperialists
believed they were fighting for their political lives, R. B. Haldane and G. B. Shaw successfully encouraged the Webbs to join the Rosebery camp. This led Sidney Webb to write his famous attack on Gladstonian Liberalism, "Lord Rosebery's Escape from Houndsditch," for Nineteenth Century. This article was extremely influential for a number of reasons. Because Webb himself, with all his various contacts, was the author, National Efficiency soon began to appeal to a much broader cross-section of society than Lord Rosebery could muster. At a time when the Labour Representation Committee was requesting Trade Union support for the idea of independent Labour candidates, Webb was calling for a revitalized opposition—one which could capture again the position as the political organ of the progressive instinct. They had lost it, he said, because England had become a "new people" in the last twenty or thirty years. Men's minds, he claimed, had gone through as distinct a change as in Elizabethan days:

We have become aware, almost in a flash, that we are members of a community . . . The Labourer in the slum tenement, competing for employment at the factory gate, has become conscious that his comfort and his progress depend, not wholly or mainly on himself, or on any other individual, but on the proper organization of his Trade Union and the activity of the factory inspector. The shopkeeper or the manufacturer sees his prosperity wax or wane, his own industry and sagacity remaining the same, according to the government of the city, the efficiency with which the nation is organized, and the influence which his Empire is able to exercise in the councils, and consequently in the commerce, of the world. Webb, in fact, felt that the rising generation of voters was deadly tired of the old Gladstonian Liberalism which still thought in individuals; believed in freedom of contract, supply and demand, and voluntarism in
philanthropy and religion, and was consequently axiomatically hostile to
the State and unsympathetic to the deliberate organization of Empire.

What men felt and wanted corrected, he thought, was their sense of shame:

What is in their minds is a burning feeling of shame at the failure
of England—shame for the lack of capacity of its governors, shame
for the inability of Parliament to get through even its routine busi-
ness, shame for the absence of grip and resourcefulness of our states-
men, shame for the pompous inefficiency of every branch of our public
administration, shame for the slackness of our merchants and traders
that transfer our commercial supremacy to the United States, shame
for the supineness which looks on unmoved at the continued degreda-
tion of our race by drunkenness and gambling, slum life, and all the
horrors of the sweated trades, as rampant to-day in all our centres
of population as they were when officially revealed fifteen years
ago. This sense of shame has yet to be transmitted into political
action.

Webb's article was also important because it incorporated T. H. Green's
notions of freedom. Webb held that the ordinary elector was no longer
interested in nineteenth-century concepts, but instead desired corporate
freedom:

Freedom for his Trade Union to Bargain Collectively, freedom for his
cooperative society to buy and sell and manufacture, freedom for his
municipality to supply all the common needs of the town, freedom,
above all, from the narrow insularity which keeps his nation backing,
"on principle" out of its proper place in the comity of the world.
In short, the opening of the twentieth century finds us all, to the
dismay of the old-fashioned individualist, "thinking in communities."

In one sense Webb's writing was crucial to the development of
National Efficiency as a political platform. The incorporation of the
"national minimum," which according to Bentley Gilbert, was Sidney Webb's
most important contribution to social thought, made National Efficiency
generally acceptable. Webb saw in the "national minimum" a vehicle which
political leaders could use to attract the mass of unpolitical citizens. By utilizing it, the open sore, represented by the eight million people who Sir Robert Griffen had pointed out were living on a total family income of twenty shillings or less per week, could be healed, and the first step towards National Efficiency established. According to Sidney Webb the "national minimum" was required not simply for the comfort of the British workers, but to ensure the success of British industry in world markets. At one point Webb stated, "when a man is ill, the only profitable thing for the community is to cure him as thoroughly as possible with the least possible delay." The method he suggested for enacting this principle went further than the provision of an all-encompassing Factory Act which dictate minimum levels and standards of education, leisure and wages for all workers. Instead he advocated minimum levels for the social environment as well. Can we any longer afford, he asked, "as a mere matter of business" to have the 'submerged fifth' "housed, washed and watered worse than our horses?"

The implications of the "national minimum" for the Poor Law authorities were considerable. While the Government had legislation at hand for enforcing minimum sanitary and public health standards in most urban areas, the Local Government Board had largely failed to enforce these regulations or to introduce new improvements. As every Medical Officer of Health knew, proper enforcement could reduce the death-rate by as much as five per thousand and thus save the country several millions of pounds. For this reason Webb believed that the enforcement of the "national minimum" would necessitate a new point of view being
adopted at the Local Government Board and great extension being made to municipal activities in both the country and the town. Specifically he believed:

The policy of National Efficiency, applied to the Poor Law, would replace the present critical and repressive attitude of the Local Government Board by a positive programme of Poor Law Reform. What an energetic President would take in hand would be, not only the vigorous discouragement of outdoor relief to the able-bodied (women no less than men), but an equally vigorous insistence on the humane treatment of the aged, the most scientific provision for the sick and above all, the best rearing of the "children of the State."  

While Webb's article was not only important for making National Efficiency a viable political platform with widespread appeal, it also showed the wide range of programmes with which society would have to deal in the twentieth century. The replacement of the present "romantic and incapable soldiering" with a system of "scientific fighting" was recommended: so too were reforms of the Houses of Parliament and local taxation. In addition, a new "energetic rehandling of the Budget" and changes in education were required. With regard to secondary education Webb thought that the Government's failure to enact its proposals was a public disgrace. What was needed, he believed, was "a large-hearted plan" that would put Britain's educational facilities and services on a par with her international rivals. Only this would fire the imagination and patriotism of the man in the street.  

It was about the time of the publication of Webb's article that interest in the question of national physical deterioration really began to develop. The first stirrings came with the publication of two books: Arnold White's *Efficiency and Empire*, and Seebohm Rowntree's *Poverty: A*
Study of Town Life. In the former White specifically pointed to two important sources to substantiate his claim that the physical condition of the average British working man was far from satisfactory. He noted that of 11,000 men who had offered themselves for war service at the Manchester recruiting centre between October of 1899 and July of 1900 as many as 8,000 were found completely unfit to carry a rifle or to stand up to the rigours of military discipline; and that of the remaining 3,000 only 1,200 were considered to have attained the moderate standard of muscle power and chest measurement required by the military. Consequently, he concluded, "two out of every three men willing to bear arms in the Manchester district are virtually invalids," and reminded his readers that "there is no reason to think that the Lancashire towns are peopled by a stock inferior in stamina to that of the other large towns in the United Kingdom." In addition, he noted that many London contractors imported labour from the countryside because the town dwellers did not have sufficient strength. Rowntree added further evidence to White's argument. He noted that of the 3,600 volunteers examined at the Leeds, Sheffield and York depots between 1897 and 1900 26.5 per cent were rejected as totally unfit for service while a further 29 per cent were provisionally accepted as 'specials.' From these figures he concluded that if the physical condition of the working man in the rest of the country was no better at least 50 per cent would be considered as being incapable of military duty, and went on to note:

Even if we set aside considerations of physical and mental suffering, and regard the question only in its strictly economic and national aspects, there can be no doubt that the facts set forth in this chapter indicate a condition of things the serious import of which can hardly be over-estimated.
Though widely read, these books created no immediate major outcries. Nevertheless, W. T. Steed, the pacifist editor of Review of Reviews, considered Rowntree's observation that "the labouring class receive upon average about 25 per cent less food than has been proven by scientific experts to be necessary for the maintenance of physical efficiency" was very important in view of the economic challenge facing the country.

By comparison, an article, now known to have been written by Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice, but published under the pseudonym 'Miles' in the January issue of the influential periodical, Contemporary Review, created a considerable stir. The author pointed out that the proposed Militia Ballot would not be necessary if all those applying for military service were physically fit. In addition, he claimed the proportion of only two out of every five men being fit to bear arms represented a national danger. He cited three major reasons for this disgraceful state of affairs. First, he drew the relationship between good health, good digestion, and good teeth.

That the teeth of men who are of age to enter the army are in our generation so defective as to constitute one of the most serious causes contributing to the want of protection between those willing to enlist and those who ever become effective soldiers is therefore attributed, at all events primarily, to the fact that they did not receive proper nutrition during the period of childhood.

Second, he established flat feet as a significant factor. Last, and most important of all, he claimed that "the immense proportion of the stunted, anaemic specimens of humanity" was caused by the fact that they were themselves the children of children.

A second article by Maurice appeared exactly a year later. A
contemporary, J. M. Mackintosh, reported that a "vague growing uneasiness about the physical condition of our recruits was crystalized" by this second article which was the "immediate cause of the appointment of the important and effective Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration" which soon followed. 

Maurice himself indicated that "National Health: A Soldier's Study" was the result of considerable public interest. It explicitly demanded the larger national research that Charles Booth had requested, and called upon the medical profession to lead the way.

By 1903 concern over the physical state of the British working class had almost reached its zenith. In May of that year George Shee wrote an article on the subject of the "Deterioration in the National Physique" for Nineteenth Century and After which favoured compulsory military service. He pointed to the fact that the number of recruits under the standard height of five feet six inches had increased between 1845 and 1900. In 1845 only 105 men per thousand were under the standard height: by 1887 528 per thousand were. By 1900 this figure had risen to 565. In addition, he showed how the Government had been forced to lower its height standards progressively from five feet five inches in 1872 to five feet in 1900. At the same time he noted that continental armies had improved since the adoption of compulsory military service, and backed this statement up with the declaration of Lieutenant-Colonel C. M. Douglas that "as the result of three months training, the recruit gains in weight and height, girth of chest and limbs."

Of course there were many other aspects to the National Efficiency campaign than simply the ones mentioned above. In the month-and-a-half
which followed Lord Rosebery's initial speech the London Times alone pub-
lished at least nine major articles on inefficiency in British industry. The periodical press, and especially the National Review, soon became inundated with articles dealing with one or another of the main themes of the National Efficiency campaign. Books were published which examined the ability of the British school system to fulfill public needs. Government documents included severe criticism of Britain's industrial leadership. Writers such as Ramsden Balmforth, Robert Blatchford, Karl Pearson, G. B. Shaw, Sidney Webb, Arnold White, and later H. G. Wells, continued to illustrate the influence of Charles Darwin and the eugenics movement on the National Efficiency campaign. Sports and Physical exercise were promoted by groups interested in increasing physical efficiency. Other factions, more concerned with the development of better working habits, sponsored such organizations as the Boy Scouts and the Boys' Brigade which fostered discipline, self-confidence and temperance. Even the royal family got into the act. The Prince of Wales in language couched in similar fashion to the Duke of Edinburgh's more recent 'fingers out' speech, told the nation to 'wake up!' Clubs were started which provided intellectuals and politicians with an opportunity to discuss the various themes of the National Efficiency campaign. The most important of these was the Co-Efficients. Started by the Webbs in November of 1902, it brought together most of the more prominent names in the National Efficiency campaign. At first twelve men each with specific portfolios, were present: Leo S. Amery (the army), Carlyon Bellair (the navy), Sir Clinton Dawkins (banking),

Lord Rosebery who did not like the Webbs, never attended, but did attach his name and influence to just about every project for higher education formulated in the early years of the century, and continued to make speeches reiterating his demand for a bold policy of administrative, educational and social efficiency. And last and by no means least, the months which followed Lord Rosebery's Glasgow speech were those which saw Kipling's verse at its most influential. In January of 1902 the Times printed "The Islanders"—Kipling's savage attack on the decadence of the British nation. Later his poem, "The Lesson, 1899-1902," captured the public's desire to repair British deficiencies.

With the coming of the end of the war in southern Africa and the reintroduction of a revitalized Liberal Party, as the result of the Education Bill, to the House of Commons, the need and opportunity for a party of National Efficiency under Lord Rosebery faded away. Nevertheless, the elements of the National Efficiency campaign remained on the forefront of the political stage. If anything they actually increased in importance.
Late in 1902, following the alarm sounded by Lord Selborne, the First Lord of the Admiralty, in a cabinet memorandum about the composition and design of the German fleet, new concerns about the intentions of Germany were generated. These developed into a case of Germanophobia. By April of 1903 the Foreign Office felt obliged to drop their plan to co-operate with the Germans on the Baghdad railway project. G. R. Searle has suggested that a 'cold war' atmosphere developed between Britain and Germany, and that this prevented any return in Britain of complacency and over self-assurance, and "emphasized the pressing importance of carrying through reforms that would strengthen the 'scientific' basis of British society and administration and increase the Empire's readiness for war." 

In fact, over the next few years interest in the way Germans did things attracted a tremendous amount of attention. One of the largest studies was produced by Arthur Shadwell. His two volume work compared the industrial efficiency of Germany with that of the United States and Britain. However, it was the belief that German living conditions were better and produced more physically and mentally capable individuals to man the guns and wheels of industry which really appeared to hit home. T. C. Horsfall noted in *The Example of Germany: The Improvement of Dwellings and Surroundings of the People* that the streets of Germany were more or less free from sickly-looking, ill-developed and undersized individuals that were so common in the great towns and cities of Britain.

The cause of this better physical condition was largely put down to two specific practices incorporated in the German system. The first
of these was the Bismarckian system of social insurance: the other concerned the German Army system. Sir John Gorst, a politician who was later to play a crucial role in the development of legislation to improve the health of children, studied the German social insurance programme in detail, and concluded that both the central and local governments of Germany were much more efficient in promoting the welfare of the people than those in Britain. 143

It has already been argued that certain factions in the National Efficiency movement attempted to sponsor institutions which fostered discipline, sobriety and vigour rather than directly to encourage the welfare of the people. It was from the study of institutions which would train people to be more disciplined, and hence make them more efficient, that a greater understanding of the importance of the physical conditions of the people was reached. With the coming of the increased fear of Germany's military and economic potential the German Army, naturally enough, came under the closest scrutiny. Articles such as J. L. Bashford's "The German Army System and How it Works" appeared from time to time in the periodical press and concluded that the army was an invaluable asset in improving the industrial efficiency of the labour force because of the habits of neatness, order and discipline that it inculcated. 144 However, it was the connection drawn by such men as Sir Henry Birchenough between the need for discipline and the need for physical fitness which once again drew attention back to the physical condition of those entering the British Army. In his article, "Compulsory Education and Compulsory Military Training," he not only argued that the
army as the nation's chief school of physical fitness and moral discipline represented the foundation stone of National Efficiency, but also that universal military training, even if Britain's military requirements were not as pressing as they were, should be advocated.145

The matter of whether the British race was physically deteriorating was first brought into debate in Parliament as early as March of 1902. In that month two events occurred which were to prove important in the development of better health standards. The first was a debate concerning the standards of men applying to join the army. On 7 March Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham) drew the House' attention to the deplorable standard of recruits:

We had reduced every kind of measurement, the age, and the weight, and now we are going to take men with false teeth, and even with glass eyes—or eye glasses—he did not know which.146

On the same day the Irish Nationalist MP, John Dillon (Mayo East), claiming to have been a student of recruiting returns for some years offered the opinion that "the physique of the British nation was rapidly deteriorating." He complained that the recruiting returns were incomplete. They ought, he reminded the House, "to be important documents bearing upon the physique of the population." As the returns showed that 640 out of every thousand men came from agricultural backgrounds, he claimed "the Government were talking about keeping up a great army, and all the time they were looking on while the sources from which these recruits alone could be drawn were being destroyed." He asked rhetorically: "judging from the condition of some of the recruits who had been accepted,
what in the name of God must have been the conditions of those who were
rejected?"  

In the same month as the first debates in Parliament the Royal
Commission on Physical Training (Scotland) was set up. It was specifi-
cally requested to estimate how extensive physical training programmes
were in Scottish schools, and how such programmes might be made to con-
tribute towards the strength of the nation. When the Commission re-
ported in 1903 it made a number of very interesting observations and
recommendations. Witness after witness noted the need for better
feeding. Several provided warnings of the possible dangers that
underfeeding could have on school children. One witness stated that if
the authorities were going to develop the physical training of children
they would have to be on their guard against overworking them, and
noted that even light exercise could do positive injury to children who
were underfed. Dr. Clement Dukes warned:

Children can exist, when doing no mental or physical work, on a bare
subsistence diet, but . . . a bare subsistence diet becomes a star-
vation diet when mental or bodily work is added.

However, on the question of whether society was justified in improving
the physical condition of a large number of future citizens at a cost of
removing parental responsibility, the Commissioners could make no
decision.

Besides specific references to physical exercises the Commissioners
suggested that school children be medically inspected and systematic
records kept of all physical and health statistics. To do this they recom-
mended the addition of a small number of medical and sanitary experts to
the inspecting staff. In addition, they advocated co-operation with voluntary agencies to overcome the problem of underfeeding. Where this proved inadequate the Commissioners believed that powers should be given for local authorities to provide a meal and to take steps to recover the cost from the parents.\textsuperscript{152} Unfortunately, the Commission's Report failed to attract much attention in the nation's capital and its recommendations to gain any immediate supporters.

The same was not true of a memorandum prepared in April by Sir William Taylor, the Director-General of the Army Medical Department, which was sent to the Secretary of State for War and published later as a Parliamentary Paper.\textsuperscript{153} According to the \textit{Lancet}, the debate over physical deterioration became acute from this point onward. The press was swamped by affirmations and "silly and impractical suggestions."\textsuperscript{154} On 6 July 1903 members in the House of Lords called for a full-scale inquiry. The Earl of Meath, a man with diplomatic experience in Berlin and consequently well versed in German social welfare schemes and the causes of German industrial successes, summarized the debate to date. He reminded their Lordships that the Royal Commission on Physical Training (Scotland) 1903 had stated:

\begin{quote}
There exists in Scotland an undeniable degeneration of individuals of the classes where food and environment are defective, which call for the attention and amelioration in obvious ways . . . .\textsuperscript{155}
\end{quote}

His evidence from the Royal Commission on Secondary Education showed that the more intelligent classes and the more favoured classes were taller and heavier than the less intelligent and the less favoured. Consequently
he remarked, "without proper feeding we can not have a sturdy nation. It must be seen that pure fresh milk be brought within the reach of the poor both in town and country . . ." He praised the Battersea Borough Council for setting up a milk depot but pointed out that Berlin had had a perambulating milk-and-cream-cart service since 1870, and that their carts were all locked to prevent infection. He cut fresh ground by noting that the recruiting returns for the Royal Navy and the Royal Marines were no better than those for the British Army. Once again he compared the situation with that in Germany. There, he stated, 80 per cent of those presenting themselves for military service were found to be physically fit. All these indications led him to the conclusion that a Royal Commission or Committee of Inquiry was needed.  

In response to the Earl of Meath's demand which was supported by the Bishop of Ripon, the Lord President of the Council, the Duke of Devonshire, promised to place the Taylor minute on the table and to consult with the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons. It appears from the Minutes of Evidence of the Inter-departmental Committee Report on Physical Deterioration that he had already contacted the College of Physicians as early as 11 June 1903. On 25 July, only two days before the formal reply of the College of Physicians, the British Medical Journal appears to have become convinced that race deterioration was a possibility and that the situation warranted a full-scale investigation. 

Nearly a month after the reply of the Royal College of Surgeons the Privy Council announced the formation of an Inter-departmental Committee, not the Royal Commission that many had expected and which the
Duke of Devonshire had given the House the impression would be forthcoming.\textsuperscript{160} When one remembers that the Royal Commission of Physical Training (Scotland) had already reported on 31 March 1902, and had received scant attention,\textsuperscript{161} the selection of this lower ranked committee is particularly interesting. In fact, recent students of the 'Origins of the Welfare State,' such as Bentley Gilbert, have suggested that the lack of attention given to the Scottish Royal Commission and the delay in naming a committee of investigation clearly exemplify the extreme reluctance with which the Unionist administration approached matters of social reform.\textsuperscript{162}

Pressures from various quarters forced the Government to enlarge the scope of the inquiry and allowed the committee of seven civil servants to place before Parliament and the public a document similar in approach to a Royal Commission.\textsuperscript{163} After twenty-eight days of evidence from sixty-eight witnesses the \textit{Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration} was published.\textsuperscript{164} The Report indicated that there was no proof of general inheritable degeneracy among the British working classes, but at the same time it gave tacit approval to the assumption that there was physical deterioration among the group from which the recruits for the military came.\textsuperscript{165}

Among the causes of degeneration indicated by the Report urbanization, with its associated problems of overcrowding, pollution, and alcoholism, was thought to be the most important. The Report indicated that town planning was superior in Germany;\textsuperscript{166} sunlight deprivation as the result of pollution caused anaemic conditions;\textsuperscript{167} and that
back-to-back houses and common lodging houses were still in extensive use. 168 With regard to drunkenness the Committee concluded that it was the "most potent" and "deadly agent" of physical deterioration next to urbanization. Moreover, the Committee believed that because the only relief for many people from the psychological ill-effects of bad housing, poor nutrition, depressed and polluted surrounding, and long hours of labour in over-heated and badly ventilated rooms, was the "excitement of town life," no demonstration of the connection between alcoholism and such factors was necessary. 169

The question of working-class diets played an important part in the proceedings. With the exception of one man, 170 the Committee and all those who gave evidence agreed that the effects of improper or insufficient food in determining physique were prominent causes of degeneration. 171 They believed that the average man daily fell short of the necessary 3,500 units of energy and the 125 grammes of 'proteid' needed to maintain physical efficiency. 172 They concluded that the purchase of alcoholic stimulants, the cost and availability of food, bad teeth, betting, food adulteration, and the lack of suitable cooking facilities prevalent in overcrowded living quarters were causes of poor nutrition. 173

What happened to the new-born and the children of Britain was the question which most worried the Inter-departmental Committee. Evidence clearly indicated that infant mortality had not decreased over the previous twenty-five years and that illegitimate children had enormously greater mortality-rates. Moreover, at least half of the deaths in the first year of life occurred in the first three months. 174
Responsibility for these alarming statistics was primarily attributed to the reduction of breast-feeding among working-class women. The main reason for this change of habit was thought to be the return to work of the mother as soon as possible after giving birth. This premature resumption of employment, the Committee believed, could be explained by the death of the husband, his lack of work or insufficiency of income, desertion by the child's father, the mother's fear of losing her job, or simply the preference of many women for factory work rather than domestic service. The reduction in breast-feeding meant that large sections of the working classes had to rely on cow's milk, although evidence showed that it was nearly impossible to obtain uninfected milk. Parental ignorance and child neglect also came under attack by the Committee. The discovery that deaths from overlaying occurred mainly on Friday and Saturday nights had obvious implications. A failure to guard children against fires, a lack of ventilation and poor sleeping conditions were other causes of concern. Even artificial nipples were censured by the Committee:

One of the most noxious practices described is the habit of giving india-rubber nipples to suck . . . (This has) the effect of causing contraction of the roof of the mouth and air passages at the back of the nose, which is prejudicial to proper breathing and also instrumental in introducing foul germs into the system by virtue of the dirt accumulated.

Though the Committee were greatly alarmed by the dangers to which working-class infants were exposed, they saw cause for even greater concern in the evidence provided by the medical profession about the diet of the working-class child. Dr. Eicholz concluded that as many as
121,000, or 16 per cent of the children in London elementary schools were underfed. In Manchester not less than 15 per cent were thought to be undernourished. In Leeds Dr. Hall estimated that as many as 50 per cent of the children in a poor school suffered from rickets, and that not too far away in a more well-to-do school the figure was only about 8 per cent. Dr. Robert Hutchison, a physician at the London Hospital and perhaps Britain's leading authority on nutrition, suggested that insufficient food during the critical period of growth in the school years could lead to children being permanently stunted. Dr. Collis of the London School Board was even more emphatic. He estimated that as much as nine-tenths of all child sickness derived from malnutrition.

The Inter-departmental Committee Report on Physical Deterioration was without doubt the most far-ranging social document produced by the British Government to date. All together the Committee placed before the Government and the public some fifty-three specific proposals for improving the social conditions of Britain. An analysis of the reforms recommended shows that there were a number of areas in which the Committee wished further information. To this end they suggested the setting up of a permanent anthropometric survey, a register of sickness through the Poor Law Medical Officers' Returns, a strictly scientific enquiry into the physiological cause and effects of over-fatigue, as recommended by the Brussels Congress, a more detailed analysis of infant mortality, still-births and causes of death statistics, an investigation of the effects of sterilization (e.g., milk), a Commission of Inquiry into the prevalence and effects of syphilis, an investigation into the
extent and nature of the increase in Lunacy in Ireland, and inquiries into vagrancy and defective children. The Committee pointed out several areas which they believed should be covered by fresh legislation. These included the provision of open spaces, cooking grates, school meals, medical inspections for children and special magistrates for juvenile cases, and regulations controlling juvenile smoking, alcohol consumption, milk retailing, food adulteration, female employment, and building. In addition, the compulsory notification of syphilis was recommended.¹⁸⁵

The Report is important not only because it attempted to establish a new blue-print for social action, but also because it contained severe, though often veiled, criticism of the philosophy and method of operation of the Local Government Board. At one point in the text there appears the comment:

It appears to the Committee that in regard to food, as in other matters, there is something wanting to the ideal of the Local Government Board as a department of health, and that it is desirable that this aspect of the Board's administrative functions should receive greater attention.¹⁸⁶

In order to rectify this position the Committee suggested the creation of an advisory council on the lines of Le Comité Consulatif d'hygiène publique France which would represent all the Departments of State concerned with matters relating to public health. This, the Committee stated:

Would be calculated to supply the knowledge and stimulus which are necessary in order to give the Public Health side of the Board's administration a prominence which the multiplicity of the other functions may have tended to obscure, and to attract to its work that measure of public interest which has perhaps been lacking hitherto.¹⁸⁷
Implicit in the recommendations of the Committee were moves towards the centralization of power over health matters. For example, the Committee was in favour of having full-time Medical Officers of Health employed in urban areas over a certain size who could not be dismissed (except in cases of misconduct) without the approval of the Local Government Board. Proposal Number 10 indicated the desire for strengthening the chain of command so that County Councils, through an appointed Medical Officer of Health, could be empowered, after reference to the Local Government Board, to act in matters of local administration (except municipal boroughs) concerning Housing and Public Health Acts where necessary. The intention of the Committee as to where the power should lie was made explicit by recommendation Number 11:

The Local Sanitary Authority should be required to furnish the Local Government Board, through the County authority, reports according to certain requirements, which show accurately what was being done, or left undone, in matters of sanitation and administration generally, and would thus form a basis of comparison between different districts. Armed with this information it should be the duty of the Central Authority to watch closely local administration, and to endeavour constantly to level up backward districts to the standard attained in the best administered areas.

The conclusions of the Report also included proposals for state intervention in addition to the provisions for school children. For example, proposal Number 5 stated:

It may be necessary, in order to complete the work of clearing crowded slums, for the State acting in conjunction with the Local Authority, to take charge of the lives of those who, from whatever cause, are incapable of independent existence up to the standard of decency which it imposes. In the last resort, this might take the form of labour colonies on the lines of the Salvation Army-colony at Hadleigh, with powers, however of compulsory detention.
The children of persons so treated might be lodged temporarily in public nurseries or boarded out...  

The Committee concluded that the removal of all the evils noted could not take place without what they called "some great scheme of social education."

The Committee believed that such a scheme should develop new methods to inform the public about the latest techniques of home management and child rearing. They proposed that girls should receive instruction at school in the proper selection and preparation of food, and that school children generally should be trained in the laws of health and specifically the care of teeth. A number of schemes which would provide women with the latest information on family hygiene, infant feeding and home management were considered. The Committee suggested that mothers' meetings and lectures were ideal places for disseminating knowledge on food selection and preparation, and especially infant feeding and management. They also advocated the formation of health societies on the lines of those already established at Manchester and Salford for the whole country. In addition, the Committee intended that midwives should play an important rôle in educating expectant mothers now that the State could be sure standards of professional proficiency had been established.

Among the final words of this, the most far-sighted report on public health and best blue-print for social action to date, was a clear warning of how all would be of no avail unless another overriding change took place. The seven committee members, backed up by the evidence of some of the most influential social reformers, the leaders of the medical
profession, and a whole bevy of assorted civil servants and well-meaning individuals, maintained:

In the carrying out of their recommendations for the rectification of acknowledged evils, the Committee do not rely upon any large measure of legislative assistance; the law may with advantage be altered and elaborated in certain respects, but the pathway to improvement lies in another direction. Complacent optimism and administrative indifference must be attacked and overcome, and a large-hearted sentiment of public interest take over the place of timorous counsels and sectional prejudice.

Social change was now not only demanded but was there for the asking providing the Committee's last recommendation could be made effective. At the root of the problem lay bad health, inadequate health administration, poor nutrition, and insufficient training in the laws of health. The full circle of poverty showing the relationship between all its causes and effects was now revealed for all who cared to see. The work of Booth and Rowntree had shown that low and irregular wages, and total unemployment led directly to an insufficient diet and bad and overcrowded living conditions. These manifestations of poverty, the Report proved conclusively, caused bad health. Sickness, disease, high infant mortality, premature death of breadwinners, and at best, physical inefficiency, in turn, led to poverty. The picture was now broad enough so that the rôle of alcoholism, betting, crime, food adulteration, industrial pollution and vagrancy could be seen in their true light. To break this vicious circle legislation of wide compass, public education in the laws of health and household management, higher and more regular wages, and above all, the introduction of full social protection for children were needed.
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CHAPTER IV

THE ENACTMENT OF A SOCIAL BLUE-PRINT: THE MEDICAL INSPECTION AND FEEDING OF SCHOOL CHILDREN
--INITIAL STEPS IN LONG-TERM SOCIAL PLANNING

Between the publication of the Inter-departmental Committee Report on Physical Deterioration and the introduction of free medical inspection for elementary school children in 1907 the British social system became a topic of major debate among the very highest levels of political life. Such debate was not without effect. During the first twelve months of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's Liberal Government legal precedents were established which opened the way for the 'Welfare State.' Through the introduction of health and welfare programmes for elementary school children in 1906 and 1907 the State acknowledged its duties towards the protection of its citizens.

Looking back at the social reforms of these early years it is easy to suggest that legislation was not only sporadic and followed no logical progression, but was inadequate to meet the full needs of society. Criticism of this type fails to understand the nuances and subtleties of Edwardian politics. Moreover, it belittles the great steps that were taken. Severe problems faced those who wished to introduce social reforms. On one side the leaders of both old-line political parties were reluctant because of financial considerations to allow Parliament to indulge in the discussion of such 'luxuries.' On the other side the advocates of social reform, besides facing Cabinet reluctance, and, if in
opposition, often a lack of enthusiasm among their own leadership, found themselves in a quandary. The London and York surveys which had helped to isolate the conditions and causes of poverty had also opened the door to a multitude of questions concerning the conditions of labour. Likewise, the Royal Commission of Physical Training (Scotland) of 1903 and the Inter-departmental Committee Report on Physical Deterioration of 1904 had raised numerous questions concerning the standards of health and the quality of the diet of all age-groups among the population. As a result, the major problem facing social reformers was not how to overcome the indifference and reluctance of the nation's leadership, but the selection of a measure which would establish a precedent for others. It is with these difficulties and subtleties in mind that any debate on the breakdown of the Poor Laws should be discussed.  

I

The first Unionist Government of the twentieth century, though responsible for initiating numerous committees of investigation, largely avoided acts of social reform. Nevertheless, it was a member of the Unionist Party, Sir John Eldon Gorst, who not only adopted the issue of child health and welfare and made it a major concern among social reformers, but who played an important rôle in the preparation of legislation to improve the health of school children. Despite being in his late sixties Gorst was probably in tune more with members of the young Idealist school of politicians and civil servants who had 'come down' from Oxford over the last thirty years of the nineteenth century than
with members of his own Party. Gorst's thinking on social reform had been greatly influenced by members of the Disraeli Government of 1874 to 1875. As a result he retained a large measure of respect for the lower orders. It was, in fact, his continued appreciation of the very real hazards that the more humble orders faced which alienated Gorst from members of his own Party. Bentley Gilbert has maintained:

His cynicism about the goodness of men in general and politics in particular, his small regard for such Tory ikons as the land and the Church, his lack of enthusiasm for the Boer war when it began, and most important, his continued advocacy of social reform—all these served to isolate Gorst from his Party.³

Gorst's many speeches and articles⁴ in the important periodicals of the period illustrate that he was very well-informed of the latest in social thinking. It seems likely that the source of much of his information must have been Toynbee Hall. Gorst made many visits to this "research laboratory for social reformers."⁵ There he must have had numerous conversations with his friend, Reverend Samuel Barnett, and many young Oxford graduates⁶ who could have provided him with an accurate picture of working-class conditions.

Gorst's involvement in education began in 1895 when he was appointed Vice-President to the Privy Council. He was, therefore, at a senior level when the first steps⁷ were being taken towards an official acknowledgement of the State having a specific duty to safeguard the health and welfare of children.⁸ Gorst felt obliged to resign over the 1902 Education Act. His later attacks on the Unionist Government over their failure to do anything about child health led the future Liberal
Prime Minister, David Lloyd George, to remark in the House of Commons that "educationally they owed a great deal to the fact that the right honourable Gentleman was unmuzzled." It was as a backbencher that Gorst first noted the important point that attempting to teach children who were too physically unfit to benefit from educational instruction was the "height of absurdity." Later in 1903 Gorst decided to leave the Conservative Party over tariffs. He realized that while tariff reformers had given their approval to social measures which would both improve the condition of the people and enhance the national physique, they had acted as a force against legislation because they demanded that reforms should only be financed out of revenue collected through a general tariff. As a result, he felt obliged to attack those who supported tariffs. In an article, mainly for a North American audience Gorst explained how tariffs, through their consequent effects on wages and prices, could have a detrimental effect on the lives of children. Specifically, he argued that a policy designed to retaliate against German tariffs would be disastrous. Relying heavily on the work of Booth and Rowntree as well as information gleaned from the Royal Commission on Physical Training (Scotland) and the debates concerning the standard of recruits for the British army, Gorst wrote:

To estimate the possibility of persuading the electors to adopt a scheme which involves a tax on food, the true economic condition of the people of the United Kingdom must be taken into consideration. The mass are workers whose life is a continuous struggle to obtain for themselves and their families food, clothing and shelter. There is a certain sum of money which will purchase enough of these to secure moderate comfort. This is called "the living wage." It varies in different parts of the country, owing chiefly to variations
in prices, not of food or clothing, but of shelter. What proportion of the people fail to obtain this living wage cannot be certainly and accurately determined by any statistics in existence. The best conjecture seems to be that it cannot be less than thirty per cent. These people are half-starving themselves, and are bringing up half-starving families of children. The condition of disease, debility and defective sight and hearing, in the public elementary schools in poorer districts, is appalling. The research of a recent Royal Commission has disclosed that of the children in public elementary schools in Edinburgh, seventy per cent are suffering from disease of some kind, more than half from defective vision, nearly half from defective hearing, and thirty per cent from starvation. The physical deterioration of recruits who offer themselves for the army is a subject of increasing concern. There are grounds for at least suspecting a growing degeneracy of the population of the United Kingdom particularly in the great towns.11

As a result, he concluded that an increase in food prices brought about by the introduction of tariffs would raise the scale of the "minimum wage" everywhere. This would mean not only that those families on or below the poverty line would suffer even greater hardships and deprivations, but also that some of those previously above the line who had only known the real miseries of poverty at times of crisis would now experience them on a continuous basis. It was his belief that "the actual experience of such a catastrophe would create a revulsion so violent as to threaten the stability of society."12

Concern for the health and welfare of children preceded the publication of the Inter-departmental Committee Report on Physical Deterioration. On 20 April 1904, Gorst embarrassed the Government by seconding a motion by Claude Hay for feeding compulsorily educated children.13 Immediately after the publication of the Report, and as soon as the subject could feasibly be broached in Parliament, Gorst was on his feet again recommending that local authorities be given the power to feed.14 Such
attacks drew many supporters, especially from the Labour benches. Will Crooks, another man equally dissatisfied with the Government's lack of action, pointed out sarcastically:

Dealing with the question of underfed children attending schools the honourable Member urged that something should be done in this matter at once, and that it should not be put off to next year. The question has been discussed for years, and it would be postponed again and passed on to the honourable Gentleman's successor if the policy which had been pursued in the past were continued.  

Nevertheless, the matter was put off until the following year. When the King's speech came to be read, no mention was made of any intention to feed needy school children. What was more, the Unionist Government appeared to have no plans for any legislation stemming from the Report. In fact, it is known that Gorst's successor at the Board of Education, William Anson, a man who was also in favour of reform, had been told by A. J. Balfour, as early as May of 1904, that he could be "as sympathetic as he liked but there would be no increase in the rates."  

A clearer indication of the Government's desire to do nothing may be gleaned from Cabinet Minutes. On 10 February 1905, only a few days before Parliament was due to open, the President of the Board of Education, the Marquis of Londonderry, suggested to the Cabinet that the Government should do nothing about the Physical Deterioration Report. The method of obstruction he suggested was the old device of setting up a second committee to investigate the findings of the first. This he believed, would be sufficient to avoid any nasty questions over the king's speech by giving the appearance that something was being done. In this way any action could be postponed until new findings were available,
and providing the new committee approached the subject with preconceived conclusions, as he recommended they should, the whole matter might be dropped.¹⁷

The Government followed Londonderry's advice. In March of 1905 the Inter-departmental Committee on the Medical Inspection and Feeding of Children Attending Public Elementary Schools was established. The terms of reference were such that, to all intents and purposes, the Committee was confined to noting results. Despite these limitations, the Report when published in November of the same year, revealed some important facts. With regard to medical inspection the Committee concluded that the "results [left] something to be desired, and that there [was] much room for improvement."¹⁸ Where medical problems or defects were identified the Committee found that, with the exception of minor ailments such as small sores which could be dealt with by nurses, no treatment was provided for fear of reducing the parents to poverty. In addition, it was found that medical investigations were conducted in only a few areas. Small towns and rural areas appeared to be particularly badly off in this regard.¹⁹ As far as school feeding went, the Committee was not asked to establish the number of children in need or whether existing voluntary agencies could deal with the task: neither was it asked to evaluate whether the cost of feeding should be born out of public funds. For this reason, Sir John Gorst and Dr. T. J. MacNamara declined the Committee's invitation to give evidence on grounds that no useful purpose could be served.²⁰ Nevertheless, in spite of the absence of two of the more important proponents of measures to improve child health and welfare,
and the fact that the Committee noted that there was a substantial number of voluntary school feeding organizations in operation—some 350 in total of which more than 150 were in London—the Report was able to convey the impression that the whole voluntary system of providing meals for school children needed serious reorganizing. 21

To a certain extent, the responsibility for the Unionist Government's failure to do anything about the pressing problems pointed out by the various Inter-departmental Committee Reports lay with the Local Government Board and the Treasury. The former, until at least 1910, represented a very conservative institution drenched in the principles of the 'workhouse test' and 'less eligibility.' Roy Macleod who has examined the workings of the Local Government Board in some detail during this period has remarked:

Although the LGB had been among the first departments to scrutinise its administrative practices, the department lacked the fresh enthusiasm which Robert Morant brought to its sister-board of Education. Instead two ageing and conservative vestiges of the "old School," Samuel Provis and Alfred Adrian, Permanent Secretary and Legal Adviser, respectively, remained in power as the LGB moved into the twentieth century. The animus of reform did not significantly pervade the department until both men retired in 1910. In the first decade of the century, the Board was thus prey to those who saw it as the representative of all who opposed reform in the central machinery of government.

The new century had scarcely begun when, during the sittings of the Committee of Supply, the Board was attacked for its dilatory response to growing demands for better housing, a revised poor law and improved national health. Sir Walter Foster, Parliamentary Secretary, took care to place the major blame for these delays at the door of the Treasury. 22

If the Government thought it could get off the hook by ignoring the issues, by blaming the Treasury, or, at worst, by using delaying
tactics, it was mistaken. On 20 January 1905 the National Labour Confer-
ence on the State Maintenance of Children met at the Guildhall and
declared unanimously in favour of State maintenance "as a necessary
corollary of Universal Compulsory Education, and as a means of partially
arresting the physical deterioration of the industrial population of this
country, which is now generally recognized as a grave national danger,"
and called upon the Government to introduce legislation which would
permit local authorities to provide school children with meals out of
the national exchequer. The Government also faced a rising clamour
from teachers. The National Union of Teachers came out strongly in
favour of legislation at their 1905 annual conference in Llandudno.
Likewise, a conference of School Attendance Officers' Association passed
a similar resolution.

Agitation of this sort found many supporters in Parliament. On
14 February 1905 Sir John Gorst brought the matter up again. On the
23rd he promised the Government no respite until it did something, and
maintained:

He would bring it upon the Irish Estimates, the Scottish Estimates,
and the English Estimates, and he would entreat the Government for
the sake of the nation and the Empire . . . not to neglect the recom-
mendations of the Committee.

Within a month two Bills had been placed before the House for first read-
ing by Claude Hay and Arthur Henderson.

A visit in April by an impressive and influential quartet--Gorst,
Dr. Robert Hutchison, a leading dietician, Dr. T. J. MacNamara, and the
Countess of Warwick--to the now infamous Johanne Street School was
sufficient to cause both immediate local action and a debate in the House of Commons. An examination of twenty boys by Dr. Hutchison revealed malnutrition to be so acute that effective school work was quite impossible. Pressure by the quartet on the local body responsible for the administration of the Poor Laws made the Lambeth Board of Guardians provide out-door relief for all necessitous school children in their area.

On 18 April 1905 J. B. Slack, the MP for St. Albans, proposed a motion for school feeding. This resolution marked an important stage in the movement for child health. Besides obtaining support from all sides of the House the discussion allowed the Labour MP, Keir Hardie, to get to the heart of the problem and to note a new feature. He said:

It was no longer said that this matter should be left to private charity. The dispute at the present moment between those who supported and those who opposed the motion was as to whether the money necessary was to come from the education fund or the poor fund. This was a very important point gained. He understood the contention of the Honourable Baronet [Sir George Bartley] who moved the Amendment was that parents whose children had to be provided for were in a condition of poverty because of their own intemperate habits. He desired most emphatically to protest against that assumption. The investigations made by Mr. Booth in London, and Mr. Rowntree at York proved conclusively that one-third of the population were in poverty not because they were intemperate or because they indulged in betting, but because the wages they received were not sufficient to provide them with the requirements of comfort and decency. Were people in that condition to be punished twice, first for denying them a living wage in exchange for labour, and next pauperizing them?

He concluded his very astute speech by indicating a number of options open to the House preferable to the pauperization of parents. More significantly he pointed to paragraph number 426 of the Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration. The Board of Education
and the Local Government Board, he said, "should be more helpful pending legislation." If they took this to heart something could be done providing the debate engendered the "large-hearted sentiment" for which the Report called. To all this William Anson could only promise that the Local Government Board would be issuing an order to all Boards of Guardians throughout the country by which school children might be fed.  

When the Relief (School Children) Order was finally issued on 26 April 1906, its scope was extremely limited. Only children living with their fathers in a permanent state of impoverishment, or where their parents were able to pay for meals but failed to do so, were eligible. According to C. A. Elliot, the Chairman of the Committee on Underfed Children established by the London County Council, the exclusion of all orphans and children of widows reduced the number of underfed children who were eligible by more than half. Further, he believed that the restriction to children in a permanent state of impoverishment ruled out more than half the remainder. Nevertheless, the Order did allow the child of parents who failed to pay to be fed for a period of one month, and for the Poor Law authorities to prosecute such parents for cruelty or vagrancy. Despite the Order's limitations it is of particular significance for two reasons. First, though the Order left the working man and his family firmly under the Poor Law, its importance, as in the case of the Chamberlain Circular, lies in the fact that it represented a definite indication of the direction in which things were moving. Second, reaction to the Order was such as to make it a dead letter. Within a very short time school authorities were up in arms over the
harsh methods of the so-called 'Guardians of the Poor' had come to believe that they served no useful purpose for education. Parents became even more heated in their objection to the methods used and reacted by refusing to allow their children to accept meals. Moreover, the Order had the effect of cutting back the flow of voluntary subscriptions. As the Order applied only to the absolutely destitute, this meant that many children who were not technically destitute but who had been helped before because they went to school hungry, were not permitted to be fed. In this way the notion that the only way to administer effectively the provision of school meals was to put them under the direction of education authorities was confirmed. This had the effect of ensuring that no new Act of Parliament providing either for the feeding or medical inspection of school children would be entrusted to the Local Government Board. 39

When the electorate decided that they had had enough of Unionist government in December of 1905, those who favoured the adoption of measures to secure the health and welfare of children had no real reason for believing that the new Liberal administration under Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman would look any more favourably towards their plans than A. J. Balfour's Cabinet had done. As has already been mentioned, the Liberal leaders had been absent when the previous Government had been defeated in a non-party vote. In addition, the Liberal election manifestos has contained no mention of plans for either the medical inspection or feeding of public elementary school children. Thus when William Wilson, the newly elected Labour MP for Lancaster, won the draw for private member's Bills, luck took a slight hand in keeping the spotlight of public
attention on the issues and in maintaining pressure on Britain's leadership. 40

Robert Morant, the senior civil servant at the Board of Education was forewarned of Wilson's intentions. He went uninvited to a meeting of the Independent Labour Party at Clifford's Inn where the physical welfare of children was under discussion, and assured those present of his agreement with their aims. 41 How he came to be there is uncertain. On the evidence of his Educational Code of 1902 and a letter he later wrote to Margaret McMillan he had long thought that the physical condition of scholars was of more importance than the subjects taught. 42 What seems likely is that the Webbs, knowing of Morant's beliefs, advised him of the forthcoming meeting. In any event Morant advised his opposite number at the Local Government Board that a proposal was imminent and suggested that they should organize talks between their two departments. 43

The Bill eventually put before Parliament gave the responsibility for school feeding to local authorities. Opening the second reading of the Bill, Wilson stated that there were many families existing on less than 18 shillings a week, a sum clearly insufficient to feed a growing family. Returning to the well-used efficiency arguments he asked the House to look at the Bill strictly on business grounds, and argued that the money spent on school meals would be well invested "because not only would the children be better equipped for fighting the battle of life, but it would be found . . . that the expenditure on prisons, workhouses, and asylums was considerably reduced." 44 During the debate which followed the President of the Board of Education made an important acknowledgement.
Besides concurring that the French experience indicated that educational authorities were the appropriate branch of government to administer school meals, he stated that "if the child could not be taught before it was fed, then fed it had to be." In spite of this admission Birrell attempted to send the Bill to a Select Committee. Many MP's having been fooled by this tactic once too often saw this move as yet another delaying device and would have nothing to do with it. To reduce the disquiet John Burns, the President of the Local Government Board, agreed to adopt the Bill and to devote Government time to it as soon as the Select Committee's report was received. In this way, and not because of any legal or moral obligation, the Liberal Cabinet, though with obvious initial reluctance, came to support this measure of social reform and eventually to introduce the most remarkable and controversial invasion of the Poor Law yet seen. The exact nature of the new attitude that this invasion represented was made clear in a speech to the House of Lords by Lord Grimthorpe. He remarked:

The children are the paramount consideration . . . In a great many cases the parents are already demoralized owing to themselves having been insufficiently nourished in their youth. Because they suffer from these conditions there is no reason why we should inflict similar conditions on the children . . . Experience in these matters shows us that the sense of parental responsibility will be increased rather than decreased. When the parent sees that his child is regarded by the nation as a valuable national asset he himself will think more of the child.

When the Bill was finally enacted on 21 December 1906, it was not as extensive as originally proposed. Ironically the Lords had excluded, at the Bill's penultimate stage, the very children who had been the
earliest subject of investigation from the benefits of the Act. This symptom of revolt by the Lords maintained the high level of public interest that the Bill had held right to the last. It caused the Liberal Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, to tell the House, in his only intervention in defence of school meals, that while the Lords' Amendment would have to be accepted their objections were all "moonshine." Specifically he stated that the removal of Scotland from the Bill represented "the strongest case of inversion of authority on these Constitutional matters, that they had ever seen. Stronger than the Education Bill, stronger than the Plural Voting Bill, was this little thing." Despite the Act's limitations there is no doubt it represented a major yard-stick of social progress. The seed sown so long ago by Victor Hugo and the Destitute Children' Dinner association had at last come to national fruition. The controversy concerning 'over-pressure in elementary schools had allowed the matter to germinate, and the National Efficiency movement and the crisis created by the Boer war had proved that compulsory education without feeding was harmful to health. The law in its final form was permissive, merely providing local education authorities with the power to provide public elementary school children with meals. No authority was compelled to feed needy children. Authorities were permitted three alternatives for funding such programmes. They could either solicit monies from voluntary organizations or ask their students to pay for the food they received, or, in the last resort, they could provide the meals out of public funds on condition that the charge on the rates did not exceed more than one halfpenny in the pound.
In effect, this last alternative demonstrated that the State had at last fully recognized that it had a duty to protect the health and welfare of its children. Something of a social revolution had, in fact, occurred. The child of the working man had become a vital national resource. A legal precedent had been established by which a particular group within the community might obtain social welfare without having to suffer the rigours of the Poor Law. In philosophic terms the Act established a principle for further social reforms. But most important of all, it helped remove the threat of disenfranchisement, the fear of pauperization, and the belief that those then at the bottom of the social pyramid were second-class citizens.

II

While the fight against the Education (Provision of Meals) Act of 1906 was mainly in terms of the principle involved, opposition to the provision of medical inspection of children attending public elementary schools was mainly over details. For this reason, the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act of 1907 which incorporated medical inspection for elementary school children, never sparked the same public commotion that the School Meals Act had created.

Reference has already been made in an earlier chapter to the first medical inspections of school children in Bradford by Dr. James Kerr, and to the terrible state of health and hygiene that these inspections revealed. Likewise, mention has already been made of the adoption of both school feeding and the medical inspection of school children as
part of the programme of State maintenance advocated by socialist groups during the latter part of the nineteenth century. In the period before the National Efficiency campaign moved into top gear few new voices were heard asking for the medical inspection of school children. From the time when national physical deterioration became a matter of grave consideration, however, the subject of medical inspection emerged as a topic of considerable importance and much debate. This concern took two forms. On the one hand there were those who wanted to make sure, by establishing an anthropometric survey, that the British race was not physically deteriorating before their eyes. On the other were those who saw the terrible conditions of working-class child life on a regular basis and wanted a system of medical inspections set up so that something could be done to reduce the amount of disease and sickness.

One of the first to propose school medical inspection on behalf of the former group was that ardent imperialist and close friend of Chamberlain, Milner and Rhodes, Sir Edward Grey. In November of 1901 he wrote a letter to the London Times in connection with their "Crisis in British Industry" series of articles. He believed that the real crisis lay not with the nature of British industry itself but in the condition of the average British worker. Specifically he was worried that it might not be possible for the third generation of slum-born, polluted-city dwellers to bear the heavy burden of empire. He argued that the success of Britain's livestock farmers in nearly doubling the size of British breeds of cattle and sheep over a fifty-year period by recording their weights and by paying careful attention to the needs of
the animals in their charge, offered a perfect example for the rearing
of children in Britain. He suggested an annual stock-taking in which
every school child be weighed and measured as an essential preliminary
to the adoption of measures to secure the national physique. According
to the Presidential Address of Sir James Crichton-Browne to the Medical
Section of the International Congress for the Welfare and Protection of
Children on 15 July 1902, the favourable reception given to this proposal
marked a great and beneficial change in the British attitude towards
child study.

Official recognition and endorsement for the idea of medical
inspection for school children also came from both the medical profession
and from teachers. On 14 November 1903, some five days before Dr. Arthur
Newsholme's article, "The Organization of the Medical Inspection of
Schools," was published in the British Medical Journal, the British
Medical Association came out in favour of medical inspection. A little
more than a year later a meeting of the Society of Medical Officers of
Health urged that medical inspection should be conducted by general
practitioners, not special whole-time doctors or Medical Officers of
Health. The British Medical Journal was quick to notice the importance
of this. Within a few days the Journal had begun a campaign to draw the
distinction between the two ways of dealing with the medical inspection
of school children. On 14 January 1905, a leading article pointed out
that the periodical medical inspection that Sir Lauder Brunton had talked
of when he had introduced the subject to the meeting of Medical Officers
of Health, would fail to pick out the feeble-minded, the short-sighted
and the underfed child before preventable damage was done. On the other hand, it argued, the general practitioner, because he knew both the area and the local people, and because he could visit the local schools on a regular basis, would be able to supervise the health of the children involved, and cases of infectious diseases, underfeeding and overpressure would be spotted quickly. The Journal continued to keep this point of view before its readers over the next few months. In February of 1906, the Journal, in another leading article, took its proposal a stage further. Because only two of the fifty-eight county councils had approved an organized scheme of medical inspections (less than seventeen had actually discussed the matter), and as it believed the forthcoming report of the Royal Commissioners on the care and control of the feeble-minded was bound to reiterate the recommendation of the Committee on Physical Deterioration for medical inspection of school children, the Journal suggested a four-point plan for medical inspection: (i) that there should be a medical department at the Board of Education; (ii) that there should be a medical officer for schools for each local education authority; (iii) that the salaries of MOH's should appear in the Education Account; and (iv) each authority should submit a report to the Medical Department of the Board of Education.

In August of 1904, the editor of the Schoolmaster (an organ of the National Union of Teachers) Dr. T. J. MacNamara, a man with some thirty years experience in elementary education as both a teacher and a member of the London School Board, wrote an article for Nineteenth Century and After entitled, "The Physical Condition of Working-class
Children," which strongly favoured the introduction of medical inspection. MacNamara's argument is interesting because it shows how opposite sides of the political spectrum could come together to preserve the health of children. Besides insisting that it was both essential to the prosperity of the nation and a duty, not just of the benevolently inclined, but of the community as a whole to see that every child had food to eat, warm clothing to put on, and a comfortable house to live in, MacNamara also considered that the medical inspection of school children was a communal obligation. All this, he argued, might sound like "rank socialism" but, in fact, it was nothing more than "first-class imperialism." To prove his point he asked only that people should read the last article in a recently published report of the Board of Education which showed just how far people in Brussels considered their obligation to their children to run.

Semi-official groups also endorsed the idea of the medical inspection of school children. One such group called the National League for Physical Education and Improvement included a number of Medical Officers of Health and such influential people as the Bishops of Ripon and Southwark, Bramwell Booth, R. B. Haldane, Lord Alverstone, and the man who had started off the whole debate on physical deterioration, Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice. In February of 1906 this group sent a delegation to the Board of Education to see if they could use their influence privately to have the medical inspection of school children included in the Education Bill that they knew was being prepared at the time.

Besides arguments based on British business efficiency,
imperialism, physical deterioration and strictly medical reasons, demo­
graphic considerations also influenced those who advocated the medical
inspection of school children. As long ago as 1883 J. R. Seeley had
argued in *Expansion of England* that the same technological advances
which had once made larger political units possible would also be the
undoing of such units were the states in question not to expand their
scale of operation.\(^6\) It was perhaps with this comment in mind that
Joseph Chamberlain put forward the hypothesis, in a speech at the Guild­
hall in January of 1904, that in military or economic rivalries, victory
would go to the one with the big battalions.\(^6\) It was not without good
reason, therefore, that the growing disparity between the population of
Germany and that of Britain began to cause alarm.\(^6\)

The medical profession became particularly alarmed at the declin­
ing birthrate and the appallingly high infant mortality-rate. In June
of 1905 Dr. Sampson Moore, the Medical Officer of Health for Hudders­
field, published a very detailed report on infant mortality. It went
through four editions in a very short time. Dr. G. F. McLeary, a lead­
ing authority on the early infant welfare movement, believed that "it
[w]as doubtful whether any other report by a medical officer of health
[had] had such a popular reception."\(^6\) This success was quickly followed
by the publication of Dr. George Newman's influential book, *Infant
Mortality* (1906). Also in 1905 the first infant welfare congress was
held on the Continent. Though the British Government did not send
official representatives, local authorities such as Huddersfield, Batter­
sea and Glasgow did.\(^6\) In June of the following year a national
conference on infant mortality was held in London. Shortly afterwards
Dr. George Newman, who was soon to join Robert Morant at the Board of
Education as the Chief Medical Officer, noted that Britain was "burning
the candle at both ends." He pointed out that in 1905 alone some 120,000
infants under one year of age had died and that this was very grave in
view of the marked decline in the birth rate. "It is idle to wonder at
physical deterioration," he continued:

If the majority of the nation's infants have before they grow up to
pass under such unfavourable influences as are able to kill 150 in
every thousand. A high infant mortality must therefore be taken, as
Sir John Simon said, to denote a prevalence of those causes and con­
ditions which, in the long run, being about a degeneration of the
race.  

As a result, he argued that the first remedy needed was regular medical
inspection, and advocated that each child should be examined at least
three times during its school life, while those needing treatment should
be examined more often.  

On 26 May 1905 a sub-committee of the Fabian Society was set up
to consider the very problem of birth-rate and infant mortality sta­
tistics. This committee provided an informal interim statement to The Times on the 11th and 18th of October, 1906. The most alarming fact
revealed by the report was the confirmation of an earlier statement by
the eugenicist, Karl Pearson, that the poorest 25 per cent of the British
population were producing about 50 per cent of the next generation.
This, according to Sidney Webb, the author of the report, could only
lead to national deterioration. Webb's solution, as had been Pearson's,
was the 'endowment of motherhood.' He stated confidently:
Once the production of healthy, moral and intelligent citizens is revered as a social service and made the subject of deliberate praise and encouragement on the part of the Government, it will, we may be sure, attract the best and most patriotic citizens.69

The first indication that the question of medical inspection of school children was to be raised in Parliament came as early as 2 April 1906. On that day the Labour MP, Will Thorne, introduced a Bill which would not only have provided secular education and a free meal to every child attending State-supported schools, but would also have made it necessary for every local education authority to appoint a medical officer to carry out the medical inspection of students. In both the case of meals and of medical inspections the costs were to be met by the Imperial Exchequer. 70 Because the Bill was brought forward by a private member and time was limited, medical inspection never reached the order paper on this occasion.

The demand for the medical inspection of school children began in earnest in Parliament with the Education Bill of 1906. On 9 April, the newly-elected Liberal MP, C. F. G. Masterman, came out against the Government, in his maiden speech to the House, because he believed that the Bill did not go far enough. Particularly he pointed to the question of medical inspection which he noted had been started by a few local authorities in a rather random and spasmodic manner. He believed there were many MP's who would like to see such practices carried out systematically at the national charge. 71 In between readings the matter was taken up by the Labour MP for Merthyr Tydvil. He specifically asked the President of the Board of Education whether he contemplated the
creation of a special medical staff to supervise the efforts of the local educational authorities in attending to the health and physical condition of the children in their charge.  

On 14 July the Liberal MP for Berwickshire, H. J. Tennant, himself a Scot, proposed an Amendment to the Education Bill for England and Wales. This would specifically have made it a duty of every local authority to attend to the health and physical condition of children in their charge. In support of his claim that arguments for medical inspection were "overwhelming," he cited statements from the Inter-departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration, the Royal Commission on Physical Training (Scotland) and the recent study concerning the physical condition of children in Dundee undertaken by the Dundee Social Union, as well as bringing the House's attention to the compulsory programme for medical inspection in Germany, Switzerland, and the United States of America. "Education in this country," he said, "was compulsory and universal, and therefore the conditions upon which education depended ought to be compulsory." There then followed a lengthy debate in which a considerable amount of support was advocated and little objection to the measure heard. C. F. G. Masterman registered his opinion that no satisfactory settlement could be reached until there was medical inspection of schools. Sir Gilbert Parker reminded the House that the request for the measure had come from both sides of the House and argued that if a plebescite were to be held tomorrow a great majority would be found to support it. In addition, he believed that inspection would have as great an effect on the lives and health of slum children as had compulsory
T. J. McNamara pointed out that Brussels, a city one-tenth the size of London, had eight times as large a medical staff as had Britain's capital. He was of the view that the problem before the House was much more pressing than anything the Board of Education had worried about in the last three years. On one thing many MP's of all parties agreed: a system of medical inspection would be worth all the rest of the Bill put together.

It was as the result of a question by W. C. Bridgeman, the MP for Oswestry, that matters turned to the important question of treatment. In addition to reminding the Committee that there was also the matter of pre-schoolers to be considered, he asked for clarification on whether the Amendment meant to include the cost of treatment. It was perhaps for this reason that Augustine Birrell asked for the acceptance of an Amendment which would clearly put the onus of responsibility with the local authorities not the central government. The advocacy of this Amendment by the President of the Board of Education led Dr. T. J. McNamara to ask Birrell whether he meant inspection on a compulsory basis. In response Birrell stated that it was not in his mind that there should be treatment. MacNamara replied that he had not asked about treatment but about inspection. To this Birrell argued that inspection on a continuous basis implied treatment. Seen in that light C. F. G. Masterman believed that Birrell's Amendment did not represent the desires of the committee and that inspection would be quite useless unless it was carried out on a continuous basis. All this discussion, though proving the profound interest in the medical inspection of school attendance.
children, was to be of no avail as Birrell's Amendment was to die with
the Bill in December of 1906.

Early in the new year two other Bills were presented to Parliament
which incorporated the medical inspection of school children. The first
of these was also a private member's Bill. On 15 February Walter Rea,
the Liberal MP for Scarborough introduced a Bill to be known as the Edu-
cation (Vacation Schools and Medical Inspection) Act. This Bill took
verbatim the two operative clauses from the 1906 Education Bill. The
one dealing with medical inspection stated that it was:

The duty [of every local authority] to provide for the medical inspec-
tion of children before or at the time of their admission to public
elementary school, and on such other occasions as the Board of Educa-
tion direct, and the power to make such arrangements as may be sancti-
ﬁed by the Board of Education for attending to the health and
physical condition of the children educated in public elementary
schools.84

The second Bill, to be known as the Education (Administrative Provisions)
Act, was introduced on behalf of the Government by the newly appointed
President of the Board of Education, Reginald McKenna, and was supported
by Augustine Birrell and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of
Education, Thomas Lough. It included among a number of provisions the
same two measures, in exactly the same wording, as were present in Rea's
original proposal.85

On 1 March Rea introduced his Bill for second reading. He made
it perfectly clear that the two operative clauses had come directly from
the derelict Education Bill. Specifically he noted that both of the
clauses, and particularly the one dealing with medical inspection which
he considered to be the more important one of the two, had already been accepted by the leader of the Opposition, by Sir William Anson, and by Dr. T. J. MacNamara, as well as both sides of the House generally. At that time Thomas Lough, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education said that there were perfectly good reasons why the Government should give the Bill its "benevolent support": not only were the two clauses taken from a Government measure, but both had been regarded as being 'non-contentious' in both the Lords and the Commons. In addition, he stated that he saw no reason why the Bill should be rejected just because the Government was introducing an Education Bill.

Three months later there was still no sign of the Government's Bill. When Rea's Bill came up for consideration on 14 June after being amended by a Standing Committee, it came as no surprise to anyone when Colonel Lockwood expressed the opinion that the measure ought to be adopted by the Government. Furthermore, he told the House that he had recently had the opportunity of introducing an influential deputation to the President of the Board of Education and that they had strongly emphasized the need for the supervision of child health. It was also at this point that W. W. Ashley asked for the insertion of a clause which would allow local authorities to recover the cost of "attending to the health and physical condition of children." It is clear from Lough's reply not only that members of the Government were well aware that treatment would be involved, but also that such treatment was necessary. In the division that was forced those in favour of recovering the costs from parents were overwhelmed by a considerable margin (229 to 39). At least four members of the Cabinet were present and helped defeat the motion.
Despite its successful passage through the House, the Bill never came up for a third reading, nor was formally adopted by the Government. Instead, the Government preferred to proceed with the second reading of its own Bill. On 31 July McKenna introduced what he called a "non-contentious" Bill. Far from allowing medical inspection to be hidden in a mass of other provisions, the President of the Board of Education drew specific attention to Clause 10 and stressed that it dealt with the subject of medical inspection in exactly the same form as the one which had been introduced by Rea and had already been approved by the House. Nevertheless, on 12 August, after the Bill had returned from the Standing Committee, the Opposition introduced the principle, as they had done when the Education Bill of 1906 and Rea's Bill had been discussed, of charging parents who could afford to pay for treatment. As on the previous occasions such a proposition was quashed in division.

At the second reading of the Bill in the Lords no attempt was made to enshroud the medical inspection clause in a cloud of other issues. To the contrary, the Earl of Crewe who introduced the Bill on behalf of the Government, drew specific attention to the fact that McKenna had been unable to accept the proposal that parents who could afford to pay for treatment should be made to do so on similar lines to the Provision of Meals Act. Specifically he argued that in a number of instances the failure to attend to child health problems was due more to ignorance than to neglect and that if parents were to be charged for visits of doctors and nurses to their homes as the result of school medical inspections, the result would be that parents would refuse to allow
such people into their homes. He also pointed out that the cost of medical inspection was to be met by an increased grant to local authorities in the next Estimates.\(^\text{97}\)

It would, therefore, appear that the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act which was finally enacted on 28 August 1907, came about in a very frank and candid manner. There can be no doubt that all involved knew that medical inspection meant treatment. That the Act came about without the public clamour\(^\text{98}\) that accompanied the School Meals Act owed more to the fact that the medical inspection of school children had become a non-contentious issue long before the Liberal Government attempted to deal with it, than to the political antics of Robert Morant.\(^\text{99}\) In turn, the reason it was no longer contentious owed much to the establishment of the principle that the health and welfare of children was to be considered as being of more importance than the demoralization of the parents which the School Meals Act had embodied. Even among those who were sincerely concerned about how the costs of this new service were to be met there is evidence to suggest that the majority considered the ability of the local authority to pay for the measure a more important motive for asking the parents to meet the costs of out-of-school treatment than the demoralizing effect of free treatment on the parents. Therefore, while it is impossible to assess fully the involvement of Robert Morant in the development of measures to enhance the health and welfare of children before 1908 on the basis of existing evidence,\(^\text{100}\) it would appear that if there was any "administrative-political trick" on the part of the Board's Permanent Secretary, it was in reality
nothing more than a mild deception. What seems more likely is that what Morant held back from McKenna was not that inspection would lead to treatment—McKenna knew that—but rather his estimate of the magnitude of disease and deformity amongst the child population. As a result, McKenna was neither able to estimate realistically the cost of rectifying the situation nor to foresee the demand for a large medical department that would necessarily arise. In this way the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act of 1907 inaugurated quietly a medical service based on personal health care, not public health. Equally important, the Act, by setting up regular medical examinations for children, opened the way for the practice of preventative medicine. In so doing the Act found great favour with the bulk of the medical profession and social reformers like Margaret McMillan.

Whatever the case, in the years that followed Morant's hypothesis was proven correct. Medical inspection of school children and Reports by the Commissioners on the Poor Law showed that vast sections of the working class were plagued by sickness as they grew up. To rectify this situation the Board of Education expanded its Medical Department, made more funds available, sent out numerous Circulars on how to improve child health, helped found school clinics and did a host of other things including attempting to co-ordinate the work of school medical officers with that of public health officials. Revelations concerning the appalling standards of recruits for the British Army during the First World War pushed affairs a stage further. In 1918 an Education Act was passed which made it the duty of local education authorities to provide treatment
for dental and visual defects, enlarged tonsils and adenoids, minor ailments generally and ringworm. In the following year a further Education Act made treatment compulsory. In many ways the Act was redundant. By that time nine out of ten local education authorities had begun to exercise their powers and had been responsible for establishing some seven hundred school clinics. In a number of instances these school clinics were combined with maternity and child welfare centres saving space and the duplication of treatment equipment. In addition, many education authorities had made special arrangements with local hospitals. The stage was set for the establishment of a full Ministry of Health with Sir Robert Morant as its first Permanent Secretary.
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The Charity Organization Society was partly responsible for this clamour. For an example of their protests see Sir Arthur Clay, "The Feeding of School Children," in J. St. Loe Strachey, ed., The Manufacture of Paupers: A Protest and a Policy (London, 1907). Articles in this series appeared in the Spectator between May and July of 1906. At that time Strachey was its editor. Clay was an important figure with the COS.

Gilbert, The Evolution of National Insurance in Great Britain, pp. 117-18, has attributed the Bill's quiet passage to an "administrative-political trick" on the part of Robert Morant. The prime consideration on which Gilbert's contention is built appears to be the recollection of
Sir Lawrence Brock as expressed to Violet Markham over a decade after the fact. According to Brock, Morant knew: "but did not tell his Minister, that medical inspection would reveal such a mass of disease that no Government subsequently would be able to resist the demand of the Local Education Authorities to provide treatment. Morant told me himself that he foresaw what would happen and meant it to happen because without the horrifying results of inspection there was no chance for a Bill authorizing treatment" (see Violet Markham, Friendship's Harvest [London, 1956], pp. 200-201). To go along with Gilbert's interpretation one must not only assume, as Gilbert does, that Birrell's replacement at the Board of Education, Reginald McKenna, was an "unimaginative minister, who knew nothing of education, whose talent, whose interest, and whose best work would be entirely in the area of finance, and who had no understanding of the implications of school medical inspection" (see Gilbert, The Evolution of National Insurance in Great Britain, p. 128); but also that neither members of the Government nor the House had any idea where medical inspection would necessarily lead them.

100 Allen's biography of Morant is quite inadequate for any realistic assessment of Morant's rôle in the development of school health programmes. Beyond Brock's statement Violet Markham is not very helpful. Though Gilbert has apparently examined the Board of Education Papers at length, his study does not portray Morant's rôle in any depth.

CONCLUSION

The period of the Boer war was a watershed in more ways than one. Not only did it see the end of the longest reign in modern times and the arrival of a new century, but it represented the culmination of the nineteenth-century reaction against Benthamism, Evangelicism and Laissez-faire economics. Social legislation thereafter was to be governed not by any Christian duty or theory of demoralization but by the principle of the needs of the State.

To suggest that socialists or groups representing working-class interests were ultimately responsible for the enactment of legislation to ensure the health and welfare of working-class children is to continue the myth that such social legislation merely evolved. Such a suggestion fails to take into consideration the time-lag between the point when the condition of working-class children was identified by the middle class and by Parliament as being intolerable, and the time when the Liberal administration of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman did something about the problem.

The "Condition of England" question waxed and waned during the nineteenth century along with the political fortunes of the Whig and Tory Parties and the economic success of the nation. In the 1880's the question took on larger dimensions than ever before. Readers of the periodical press of the 1880's and the 1900's cannot help but notice the similarity that exists between the articles that appeared in both periods in the selection of subject matter, the approach used, and the objective intended. Child health was as much a topic of concern for middle-class
late-Victorians as it was for middle-class Edwardians. For both groups the physical condition of the working classes was an overriding concern. Yet major government action to ameliorate the working class and their children only began in the first decade of the twentieth century. Such a delay can only be explained by one or more of the following: (i) though the middle class were concerned about the condition of the working class they had no will to do anything about it; (ii) concern generated during the 1880's was only of a local nature and was therefore insufficient to bring about national legislation; (iii) during the 1880's the moral code implicit in the Poor Law was still strong enough to prevent any social action which was philosophically contradictory to it; and (iv) the 1890's were responsible for defusing the issues which created the social crisis of the 1880's.

Beatrice Webb's diary, the success of the Lord Mayor's appeal, and the flood of graduates participating in the university settlement movement all suggest that the late-Victorian middle class were not lacking in either the desire or the will to do something personally to improve the condition of the working class. Though Gareth Stedman Jones' work suggests that the problem of the casual poor and London were synonymous, this was not the case. An examination of the press immediately after the Trafalgar Square riot of 1886 shows that the casual poor were a pressing problem for a number of provincial cities. Nevertheless, while groups of casual poor may have been of concern to particular middle-class urban communities, the casual poor as an entity in itself was seldom seen as a national problem. The passage of the Medical
Relief (Disqualification Removal) Act in 1885 and Chamberlain's Local Government Board Circular of 1886 both clearly indicate that politicians were quite prepared to overrule Poor Law principles when they thought the situation warranted it.

It has been argued in this thesis that the 1890's were a period in which the major elements responsible for creating the social crisis of the 1880's were defused. Nevertheless, the fact that economic conditions changed for the better, and thus tended to defuse the crisis, does not explain the success of the National Efficiency movement after 1900. This success appears to have depended on a new crisis. At the bottom of this crisis were the British military failures in southern Africa in 1899. These were responsible for jolting the British public out of their complacency and for turning attention inward on to the social conditions of the British working class.

This moment of self-analysis came at a very propitious time for the advocates of social reform. Economic competition between Britain and her European rivals for markets on the Continent and further afield had become intense. Trade figures showed rapid advances for the United States of America and several European countries, particularly Germany. With the population gap between Germany and Britain now showing signs of widening rapidly in Germany's favour, many in Britain now began to fear that her industrial capacity might be caught up if not positively overhauled. Prior to the redresses suffered at the hands of the Boers few in Britain, despite the well-publicized lessons of the Franco-Prussian war, had worried about Britain's ability to fight a European land war.
The stark realization brought home to the British by the Boer war that her volunteer army was no bigger than that of a minor power, and that the physical strength of her reserves and reinforcements left much to be desired, was responsible for changing all this. Suddenly, it appeared, the British found themselves alone and vulnerable. All this occurred at a point in time when traditional political parties were either out of favour with the electorate or lacking widespread popular support. The Unionist leadership had lost the people's confidence: the Liberal Party was in complete disarray, and the Labour Party was as yet hardly born. This set of circumstances allowed what might otherwise have been a brief and muffled outburst on the part of Lord Rosebery at a distant Scottish university to echo like a cannon going off in the nation's capital. In this way a wide variety of people, of differing political philosophies and diverse vested interests, found themselves bound together by a common fate, their illusions and self-confidence shattered. Compelled to overcome their differences, they joined forces in defence of the nation and her empire.

The common bond and sense of urgency that this mood engendered found outward expression in the movement for National Efficiency. The campaign which stemmed from this movement challenged the remaining elements of Gladstonian Liberalism and ensured that thereafter business principles and scientific reasoning would play a critical role in the administration of Britain. In no area were these two new guiding forces more strongly felt than over the question of whether the British race was physically deteriorating. Britain, it was now claimed, could no
longer afford to water its horses better than it looked after its labour force.

The School Meals Act of 1906 and the Administrative Provisions Act of 1907 were but two of several legislative measures adopted to secure a more physically efficient labour force. In terms of Government growth the two Acts had different impacts. At the local level the School Meals Act allowed authorities to provide meals as and when they desired. In consequence the number of local authorities setting up a special bureaucracy to deal with this provision was very limited in the immediate years following the Bill's enactment. At the central level hardly any effect was felt. By contrast the impact of the Administrative Provisions Act was both immediate and considerable. The Board of Education found it necessary to appoint a special medical department under the leadership of Dr. George Newman to advise and assist local authorities and to ensure that the Act was carried out. At the local level each school board was forced to employ a medical staff to carry out the requirements of the Act. In this way there came into existence Britain's first national, unified health service independent of the restrictions of the Poor Law. When the time came to set up a Ministry of Health after the First World War it was only natural that the experience gained by Morant and Newman in setting up a medical department at the Board of Education should be called upon again.

By concentrating on the preparation of legislation which allowed needy children to be fed free of charge at the State's expense and to make it compulsory for all local education authorities to inspect
medically all elementary school children in their charge, this thesis has illustrated four important points. First, the belief that Britain might be losing her imperial, industrial, and military supremacy was a very real fear for a large section of British society. This fear was of sufficient magnitude to overcome well-established modes of thought and well-tried social yardsticks like the moral code implicit in the Poor Law. Second, the discussions in both Houses of Parliament of the Provision of meals and medical inspections for school children clearly reflected that social standards of large sections of the upper and middle classes had gone through rapid changes since the closing years of the nineteenth century. There was no longer any question of whether the State should intervene. Now the only question facing MP's was which Department of State should be asked to cover the cost. Third, the nature of the Acts themselves, providing one accepts the argument set out in this thesis that they were primarily pragmatic responses to events and intended as methods of improving Britain's industrial and military efficiency, clearly substantiates the claim that the National Efficiency movement was responsible for inaugurating an element of long-term planning into the process of social policy formation. Fourth, there seems little doubt that the two Acts reflected a rise in status of working-class children. In fact, such a rise in status appears more obvious when the full implications of the 1902 Midwives Act and the "Children's Charter" of 1908 are also taken into consideration. Nevertheless, such a point of view may be misleading because it does not go far enough. If, as has been argued, the real instruments of causation
were not compassionate or humanitarian instincts but rather the
National Efficiency movement and the fear that the physical condition of
the British race was deteriorating, it seems fair to conclude that the
Education (School Meals) Act of 1906 and the Education (Administrative
Provisions) Act of 1907, besides being pragmatic responses to urgent
needs and representing examples of long-term social planning, also
heralded a clear legislative warning that the status of the working
class had risen to new heights on the social scale.
FOOTNOTES

1 Beatrice Webb writes on the "consciousness of sin" being the starting point of progress: see My Apprenticeship (London, 1971), pp. 191-92. She states: "The origin of this ferment is to be discovered in a new consciousness of sin among men of intellect and men of property; a consciousness at first philanthropic and practical--Oastler, Shaftesbury, and Chadwick; then literary and artistic--Dickens, Carlyle, Ruskin and William Morris; and finally, analytic, historical and explanatory--in his latter days John Stuart Mill; Karl Marx and his English interpreters; Alfred Russell Wallace and Henry George; Arnold Toynbee and the Fabians. I might perhaps add a theological category--Charles Kingsley, F. D. Maurice, General Booth and Cardinal Manning. 'The sense of sin has been the starting-point of progress' was, during these years, the oft-repeated saying of Samuel Barnett, rector of St. Jude's Whitechapel, and founder of Toynbee Hall."


3 See, for example, The Saturday Review of 20 February 1886. It stated: "The London riots threatened continuance for days. Leicester has been for the past week in a modified state of siege--a severe punishment even for the most radical town in England . . . There have been riots in Great Yarmouth. The bank clerks at Birmingham have worked like modern copies of the ancient Israelites, with the revolver in one hand and the gold-shovel in the other. Collections of really or nominally unemployed men have informed the Mayor of Sheffield significantly that they 'don't want to follow' the example of London and Leicester. 'The Riots' has become a standard heading of the newspapers, like 'Police Report' or 'The Market.' Nothing of the kind, nothing even distantly approaching it, has been known in England for more than a generation . . . ."

4 The exceptions to the rule, as the thesis has indicated, were such social imperialists as Arnold White.

5 This fact had been pointed out as early as 1887: see Dilke's estimate, for example, in his book, The Present Position of European Politics (1887), p. 306. He stated that Britain: "could place in the field in Europe a force about equal to that of Servia." Cited by G. R. Searle, The Quest for National Efficiency, A Study in British Politics and Political Thought, 1899-1914 (Oxford, 1971), p. 6.
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